

Hypermodern Cinematic Audiovisuality

A Classification of Associative Frameworks

By

Jarmo Valkola

Hypermodern Cinematic Audiovisuality: A Classification of Associative Frameworks

By Jarmo Valkola

This book first published 2025

Ethics International Press Ltd, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2025 by Jarmo Valkola

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Print Book ISBN: 978-1-83711-262-3

eBook ISBN: 978-1-83711-263-0

This book is dedicated to my family.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Theoretical Forms, Perspectives and Parameters of Cinematic Representation	1
Part One: The Constitutive Contingency of Hypermodern Vision	1
Part Two: Audiovisual <i>tableaux vivant</i> in a Hypermodern Context of Appearances.....	53
Chapter 2: Audiovisual Structuring: Spatial, Temporal and Representative Forms and Mindsets	117
Chapter 3: The Specified Cases of Hypermodern Affectional Parameters	226
Part One: Metaphorical Qualities of Audiovisuality	226
Part Two: Hypermodern Occurred Cadences	251
Part Three: The Hypermodern Rhetoric of Time and Space	306
Chapter 4: Hypermodern Frame of Orchestrated Reflexivity	385
Chapter 5: Conclusive Criteria of Hypermodern Sophistication..	443
Epilogue	463
Bibliography	466

Chapter One

Theoretical Forms, Perspectives and Parameters of Cinematic Representation

Part One: The Constitutive Contingency of Hypermodern Vision

The hypermodern sense of audiovisuality relates to the proliferation of new media technologies in the hypermodern century of our times, in ordering ideas and orchestrating a plurality of media devices, particularly for educational admirable purposes. We are dealing with the emergence of a parlayed sensibility towards hypermodern intentions in the sectors of cinema, media, and arts. Offering the concept of media literacy, we can come near the educational challenges that are brought within. We are calling for a new, patterned focus of our intentions in the middle of a wide variety of choices and new calculated devices that are for once brought in to augment our capability to control the rise of new media. Among these discourses and efforts that paved the way for illustration and control our historical and cultural visions in the poignancy of our hypermodern times, we can open, historicise, and expand our views and horizons towards the necessary proliferation of a hypermodern sentience of audiovisuality in the middle of all these interactive technological, ecological, and cultural alterations that we are currently facing.

As Gilles Lipovetsky has verified, my setting is broad, and extensive, covering and ranging from psychology, cognitive and phenomenological studies to neuroscience, as well as to art, film, media, and cultural studies, never forgetting the historical and cultural background within these visionary statements. I am searching for a wide

variety of approaches in this field and would not be satisfied with the creation of a single interdisciplinary map for these affiliations and associations. I will examine textual, intertextual, and audiovisual modes of representation, enrafting the audiovisuality of cinematic images and sounds through a discursive network that responded and shaped the emergency and cultural and historical appropriation of cinema. Besides that, I try to find alternative modulations and challenges to recapitulate and develop my aims and strategies and pursue for a directive of hypermodern insinuations and momentums of evolving and wanton amalgamations of conjectural, hypothetical frames, materials of reference, perceptive illustrations of them, and deliberative cogitation concerning the hypermodern assessment of metaphoric and figurative assertions of film, art and media. This advent enters through the involvement of several operating doctrinal pillars including allegedly metaphysical, literal, and textual traces and trajectories of hypermodern innuendos, providing a needed and helpful background and an assortment for an engaged reciprocal exchange of philosophical intentions and epistemological and efforts to increase aims and our sense of audiovisual possibilities, the further developed barrage of combinations of images and sounds in the midst of the all-important evolvments and negotiations between these transdisciplinary aspirations.

Throughout his ideas and foreboding, Gilles Lipovetsky has parlayed and widened our trend of knowledge with hypermodern interlinks to our time and there is a constant interplay between different levels of representation, as he is bringing in new methods to describe new cinematic and mediatic experiences under the rubric of hypermodern, and intentionally also deployed and developed the forms of media missive. Our existence is contingent and inhabited by these 'touches', and our eyes and ears are bombarded by this new and variegated form of audiovisuality. The whole urban environment is replete with audiovisual displays of décor and layout. In theory, it is possible to

interpret and read all these technologically advanced and other ways produced data, at the same time when art and design has led to different notions, concrete observations, and research activities on this agenda. The reproductive noosphere of hypermodern contingency consists of different viewpoints such as science, technology, and cultural conflation. The web of knowledge around these intentions is as broad and compendious as the culture of life and, at the same time, pertinent to various more substantial activities. Hypermodern perspectives constitute and comprise a problematic, reiterative field for academic and intellectual forward-thinking. There is no single definition of hypermodern, and its several standpoints may have semantic and other overlaps.

The family tree of hypermodern signification consists of various advances constituting a diverse set of voices and discursive network of associations. The orchestration of these polarizing vortex esquires a specified handling of space/time components in the audiovisual field of cinema, releasing the potentiality of film's contingent capacity to bring and bridge together the different manifestations of temporality. Time can appear as a form of the realm of contingency in these hypermodern intentions of perspectives. Hypermodern times can achieve its modern and further designated forms, causing incarnations that are connected to various durations inside the temporal complicity of appearances, sometimes even repudiating and creating varied semantics of argumentation around them.

At the same time, contingency appears as a 'pure record of time' (Ross), since cinema has this strange capacity to embody the contingent, and to capture the moment of time in all its rational and other purposes. But, during these moments, we can move outside of it, into a kind of pre-orchestrated transition of connotation, full of particularity of phenomenological underlining of perception. These phenomenological touches create our apprehension of time's different layers of

continuity and discontinuity. In this sense, the created hypermodern contingency may lay out a fitting epigraph of how cinema can have its architectural orchestration, shifting from its historical, ecological, and probing cultural forms, embedded in both the editing and montage processual ties of film, as well as its architecturally orchestrated forms of appearance and persistence when the flow of perception continues and gains various modes of exposure. This means that the audiovisual cinematic terrain is contributed and built inside of the phenomenology of spatial and temporal continuity of conditional solutions that link up hypermodern audiovisual media from the beginning of the 21st century to other contemporary discursive forms and constellations.

Subsequently, the philanthropical contributions and postulations addressed here are philosophical, theoretical, psychological and sociological as ramifications including contemporary challenges of audiovisual relations associated with cinematic language and aesthetics. These are implied and historically and culturally distinctive impulses and inclinations, including and itemising their hypermodern components. The created entity embodies case studies, or study groupings and their windows, connoting to a group of cineastes who have significantly advanced and contributed to the development of hypermodern cinema.

The verisimilitude and preciseness of the cineaste's message is augmented at certain levels, but the manufactured entity is also related to a few other occasions with a contribution to the effectiveness of the filmic *modus operandi*. Nevertheless, cinematic architecture and fabrication of a certain substantial topography and an environmental atmosphere and context into the narrative is intended to acquire extra layers of meaningful alliances in the overall coexistence of experience and collective sense of these hypermodern activities. Transitions in social, ecological, and economic life have indelibly shaped the cinema of the 20th century, and this sort of transition has predominantly

continued in the 21st century, during our hypermodern days. In one way or another, hypermodern films resound and measure these transformations and refashions of contingency, contributing convincingly to the development of providing images, sounds, sensations, and appearances that convey the poignancy of these cultural and historical procedures to the current audiences. In exploring the historically and culturally specific currency and resonance of the mediatic discourse, and audiovisual culture around it at the same time as the circulation of matters within audiovisual media has happened, the subsequent exploration will consequently combine literature and audiovisual analysis within an avowed view on the cultural significance of media and the science.¹

Audiovisual alteration and intonation within the framing of these challenges through hypermodern perspectives of depiction of cinematically enhanced audiovisual structures highlights the ways how the following chapters close-examine a vast set of historical and cultural fantasies and realities. The malleable and formative inspection of hypermodern cinema should involve an insight and core discernment of how the parts contribute to the whole and what makes the hypermodern film stand on its own terms in the current context. These precipitate forms of hypermodern film can only be determined by historical labor and speculative analysis across various media shaping surroundings. Our compact and hermetic dissection deals in depth with formal and stylistic issues, delineated to cultural, epistemological, and manifested aesthetic concerns to examine and illustrate the practices that have shaped the evolution of hypermodern cinema in the realm of existential choices and other concerned frames of reference.

By centering on hypermodern visions and their modulations, the singular films analysed here are central sources of our general and diverse argumentation, thereby giving room for detailed reasoning

and logic of vindication that happens in the shade of modern cinematic comprehension of our time. Despite still and instead of simply imprimatur the cinematic theories and conceptions intrinsic in filmic and literary texts of our time, we will engage phenomenological, cognitive, and partly semiotic and historicist diagnosis of these entities and discursive realms. It unfolds in the form of explicit, ritual precision to tackle underlined representations of *Hypermodern Cinematic Audiovisuality* with historically and culturally orchestrated resonance of audiovisual culture. The analysis amalgamates literal and audiovisual inspection and perusal that cuts across the whole mediatic centrum of appearances, interpolating cinema's representational practices together with a larger conceptualization and poignancy of historical and cultural discourses and features of technological media as cinema. The wholeness is built around core premises and, in certain cases, also ethical predicates and conundrums that highlight the constitute and contingent dwelling on nature of cinematic representation as a form of art with discursive and pre-discursive assigned features and modes of representation embedded in a certain institutional substance. This all encourages researchers to search for the widest orbit of intuitions and parameters for the constitutive contingency of hypermodern films and their obvious contribution to the development of cinema. In a more intricate manner, a single film can exist as an alleged set of interpolating figures and tropes that appear and function as succinct, resilient, and interrelated attributes to come up with a larger framed universe of conscious and partly unconscious or invisible phenomena that initially invokes and channels the presumable conditions of expression and representation.

In the Hypermodern Discursive Realm

In a resemblant manner and within these constraints, the discursive and probing examination of textual, intertextual, and audiovisual modes of representation is embedding the alleged cinematic audio-

visuality to a hypermodern discursive network that responds to and is also shaped by the emergence of further historical visioning and cultural appropriation of filmic design and customary invention. As these incarnations corroborate, rather than striving to emulate and render an absolute clarity of it, our aim is to rely on rhetorical guidance and advice to develop research entities and individual substances, especially pitch contours around the hypermodern ideas on audiovisual relations and their historically orchestrated echoes, including the relations between images and sounds, and their further audiovisual and synergic interactions. Especially with soundscapes, and their somatic and other influences, this placatory approach includes the early experimental, polarised analysis attitudes of researchers like Béla Balazs and Jean Epstein with sound modifications of the nervous system, and later ones such as Michel Chion and other prominent (John Belton, Rick Altman, Claudia Gorbman, Lawrence Kramer, Nicholas Cook, Elizabeth Weis etc.) developers of sound and sight and their interactive relations. As this discourse demonstrates, the hypermodern angle of audio-visuality relies significantly, however, on the integral relationship in depth between theory and practice of epitomised emanation, and the exigence to expand our distilled cognizance of aesthetics, history, and the constitutive role of technology. In hypermodern edict this means an all-present will to emphasise the idea of intangible and concrete cognizance later to be incorporated and embodied in the zeitgeist of virtual and other new strands of cinema. Hypermodern, nowadays ever-present mode poses questions about the general function of significant forms of filmic knowledge and its applications, and its reliance on scientific methods and supplements of actual narratives. The fabric and constitutional web of knowledge has its expanded array of amendments, revisions, and modifications in the digital era, concerning distinctly the stance of truthfulness and candidness. It is the first interdisciplinary study on hypermodern audiovisuality in cinema with a focus on findings cognitive studies, philosophy, psychology, phenomenology, commu-

nications, and art, film, and media studies. In addition to hypermodern affectations, we can speak about the organic role of audiovisuality and its intrinsic coincidences to humane, anthropomorphic progress. Through this logic, we can distinguish audiovisuality and scan and map it from the position of rhetorical and aesthetic impressiveness and through its consequential historic substance.

In a large-scale picture with a wide-ranging emphasis, hypermodern forms and onsets can appear and possibly become futuristic descriptors and explainers for a substantial span of efforts to make formerly discrete media apparatuses both more ubiquitously and fluidly integrated in our world of contingency and indexicality. The capacity to embody and study these realms, especially in times of digital technologies, underlines the importance of new innovations, the forms of unexpected accomplishment of cinematic solutions, in order to produce and highlight the historiographical forms and our awareness of them. The tangible embodiment and territory of these anamorphic figurations simultaneously points out the intangible interpretation of singular and other vital aspects and fabrics of aesthetic and audiovisual potentials. These are beneficial expedients and applicable observations unifying the interpretative activity of hypermodern perception to the actual mobilization of hypermodern examination that compresses the immediate and affectionate features of cinema to the confluence and overall modality of our times. Following Gilles Lipovetsky's spiritually embedded mentoring and funneling, these are maneuvers and gesticulations of development, transaction, and fluctuation, signaling aspirations and impulses for further preferences and priorities, including a new sensibility in the middle of the multiplicity and variability of emerging media forms. Lipovetsky's ideas link audiovisual media from the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries to current discursive constellations, creating an interdiscursive web of film and media theory with scientific elements in it and combining the scope of cultural history with formally attested

interpretation and analysis, emphasising hypermodern noosphere of features, audiovisual and intertextual modes of representation, embedding the audiovisual media into a discursive genesis of ideas and concepts of hypermodern intuition.

By this way, the close reading of these effects and visions is made possible, with intermedial crossings happening in between. Lipovetsky's hypermodern ubiquitous intuitions happen as figurative comparisons and shift to assertive declarations and camouflaged indications creating and relying on impugning a purely scientific consideration around it, orchestrating a more detailed deconstruction of the phenomenon in conceptual terms, and an extensive account on hypermodern visioning, which is closely tied to the intensity of scientific discourses from which they lean on. At these moments, the actual history of schemes is connected to our interpretation of it, to the spatial and temporal outlines of it, conceived and procreated as spirals and augmented metaphors of our existence. The implication of cultivation is developed through these premises and occasionally reformed through historical polyphony and piquancy of ideas.

As these perceptions imply, another unexpected variation of matters is bracketed with the studies and actual readings of later, partly hypermodern figurations that countered this charge, and the capacity of earlier aggregations. By contrast to direct representations of hypermodern parameters, these aspirations were more focused on poetic, allegedly metaphysical reveries and other implications of realism to provoke and control the equivalent limitations of filmic representations. Looking back, one of the inescapable merits of modern cinematic theorisation has been the insight that rhetorical figures and narrative forms are constitutive of both conjectural and utilitarian onsets to their essence as cinematic forms of figurative and verifiable dimensions. Philosophical undercurrents have also been part of this angle, and here the philosophical, cognitive, mental and phenome-

nological mapping of potential strategies are categorized, accounted, and advocated vigorously. Without their presence it would be simply impossible to illustrate and analyse the reflection and pre-discursive arsenal and metaphorical motif of hypermodern presence. With this elementary outline in mind, we set out to explore the reciprocal exchange of discursive particles and hybrid realms of audiovisual combinations among and within hypermodern meditations. Such an advance marks an appeal that reconstructs and ascertains the intertwining of relationships that are crucial and consist of hypermodern negotiations of representation. An artful way of representing these phenomena becomes ostensibly interwoven as an essential part of this discursive onset.²

Moreover, each of these discursive spheres and commencements do abide submerged in a certain institutional or otherwise directed purpose or contexture. While acknowledging these and further challenges of this endeavour, we are consigned to cognitive and phenomenological provinces of the research, and these adjudicated and proclaimed purposes go beyond the trivial uses of hypothetical and meticulous purposes. Hypermodern hypothetical perspective will lay out possibilities for sufficient scientific conditions that arrange the outline of narrative and rhetorical figuration of the contingent knowledge, and during this formation, certain accumulation of recursive sounds and images taken together may be read as a form of vision that allows us to consider the ramifications of hypermodern spectre, and interpretation of the demonstrative mastery and full command of hypermodern representation.

The early 21st century debate around these matters will assist us to concentrate on discursive factors and figures that show us the necessary links between these different elementary realms. A close reading of matters in question helps us to avoid the forthcoming scientific and other traps and alterations that comment on this transfer, but our

hypermodern transformation waits around these corners as well as the critical re-evaluation and disciplinary equivalence of hypermodern appropriation of affinities and discrepancies inside historical and cultural exchanges. One of the main provocative acumens of this investigation is to reinforce and augment the dialogical intertwining of audiovisual performances to master and clarify their chains of function through terminological and theoretical forms concerning the specified iconography of hypermodern existence. This theoretical postulation is a thoroughly hypermodern construction in representing these entities. The cinematic discourse around the audio-visual language of poetic license and other installments reminds us of other dimensions to emphasise and perform other spectrums of attention. Hypermodern modality offers a widening predicament to work out our existential forms and proliferations in the age of histrionic peroration and cultural environments of critical and philosophical comprehension and insight. Hypermodern filmic discourse can be supplied with required expositions and resolved based on our planned magnitudes. In an identical sense, hypermodern cinematic examples manage to lay out a phenomenological framework for our wider intuitions of mental orientation. The research around audiovisual items of display are somehow delineated by the assimilation that audiovisuality is not geared around simplified duplicates of our existence, but more likely to express up to date visions and possibly panoramic prospects to be appraised as formats of our cognitive portrayal, an account of personal mindscape and a further comprehension of substantial, eminent apprehensions.

In the overall scheme of things, the perspective, procedure, and submission of the subsequent study on *Hypermodern Cinematic Audiovisuality* is proposed by this literary text, which is profoundly multifaceted and respectively interdisciplinary in all its different ambiances, absorbed and engrossed with the functions, justifications and epistemological consequences of hypermodern stance in its concep-

tual, hypothetical, postulated, and academically speculative schemes, classified frameworks, and visions. Yet beyond this, and in examining the historically especial resonance and role of hypermodern audiovisuality as it emerges in the beginning of 21st century and is circulated within media and audiovisual culture, our visionary contains and strings literary and audiovisual interpretation and analysis in terms that are highlighted during these hypermodern times. It features an indication of a mere possibility, especially on the level of moving across film and media studies, cultural history, literary indexing, and implications and visions to scientific theory of cognitive and phenomenological mindsets.

The intellectual level of descriptive methodology is evident when *Hypermodern Cinematic Audiovisuality* explores, investigates, and evaluates the different categorical epitomes that frame and embody those disciplines which are made of images and sounds of audiovisual creations. The onset is substantial, extensive and far-reaching in the French philosopher Gilles Lipovetsky's accurate and spiritual funneling of apprehension of the hypermodern constellation, its scope and extent from philosophical intentionality and objectivity to personally inclined and retrospectively assigned accents of consciousness with alleged phenomenological sensitivity and cognitive sentience reaching towards neuroscientific allegedly physiological and psychological consequences and conclusions, including also artistic, mediatic, and culturally predisposed pile of preferences.

Another associated point responds to the inquiry of the phenomenological nature of our mental factory of capacities, especially how the invoked audiovisuality is a codified scenario amidst all the discrepancies that we are facing with the treatment of audiovisual association and orchestrated phenomena of these metaphorical observations. Incidentally, a sole cinematic fabric can become an alleged site of designed architectonics, procreated of devised short-term audiovisuality in the

middle of a scenery, composed of activities and details of tangible presence and phenomenal sketches of suppressed stratagems. Mostly, we can acknowledge the flow of audiovisuality as perceptive and continuous dynamics of motion that form a puissant part of our access to the distilled surface and overall style and interactive alignment of perceptual qualities offered and interpolated by the film.

To a certain extent, this kind of anamorphic figuration of the sphere of scholarly entwined literary text values the qualities of form and content, offering a response to the idea that the created and emphasized audiovisuality appears to be a distinctively prominent mode, attribution, and characteristic of our contemporary existence. It seems to engage and preoccupy most intrinsic sections of our being, extending our senses and transforming them towards new perspectives, viewpoints, and frames of reference as maintained by audiovisual cooperation.

Therefore, our hypermodern consolidated attitude and demeanour concentrates on a few elementary features inside the cinematic realm. The first of them is allegedly related to the flexibility and conductivity of filmic audiovisuality, especially paramount in focusing on the foremost and predominantly presented enactments of preliminary prospects of sound design and its acousmatic dimensions. These illuminations are there to conform, adjust, and illuminate extra pitch contours through the artistic machination of vibrated cadences and durational glow of light and shade orchestrations. These all are worked for other cinematic implementations in order to strain the possessive figurations of our elemental missive.

Aside from cinematic discourse and profilmic attempts to frame the unfolding of an event, our goal emphasizes and accentuates the accomplishment of phenomenological components of sensory and affectionate qualities of cinematic images and sounds, and their immediate addressing and interpolating of the human mind. Furthermore, the cognitive, phenomenological, and mental operations that

go with or attend as associates in these cases of filmic comprehension. We can ask what pivotal and necessary questions does the cinema's standpoint offer for our research objectives and how can we apprehend and situate them? Our visionary outlook should be explored through a theoretical inspection of authentic prospects since it forms a zealous practice in this respect. Yet another intention is engaged with the implied conjectural and philosophical mode of memory in cinema, meaning the evocative quality and evasive endowment of images and sounds that add to the historical and cultural contingency and significance of cinema as spatial and temporal medium.

Diametrically noted, the fragments of images and sounds are realised and unrealised, modeled, and composed of spaces that occur in the midpoints of this voyage, a world of transformations and thoughts full of certified intensity in the middle of these processions. In general terms, the style of representation controls and induces the semantics of audiovisuality and is determined by the material through which documentary experimentation works. It means that filmic, poignant affections are an integral part of the ability to register. Develop, and predicate the intermediate and associative characteristics of cinema. Generally underlined, the conceptual existence of film refers to the intention in which the filmmaker's selective choices in using images and their aural affiliations enhance and foreground aspirations of control and aesthetics as key sources of filmic expression.³ The intensity of scientific prospects emerging from the side and interlinkage of study design and theoretical criteria of hypermodern scholarly speculation is something worthwhile pondering, appearing in these links, pointing to the overall critical discourse around these inclinations. There lies the aspects of observation and circulation towards case histories embodied in these situations, thereby appropriating and transforming studies of these issues, and constituting more theoretical approaches that are seemingly introducing new versions in addition to older ones. These theoretical attempts may need seemingly empir-

ical confirmation before they can be applied. The case history of these figurations proves that the means of adopting purely methodical approaches of study design is an exchange of regarded and emerged narrative patterns that follow certain expected lines and dimensions of influences acknowledged in this concern of affiliations.

In our hypermodern situation, the alleged contingency of sights and sounds, offered for our assimilation, and the fabricated audiovisuality appearing as a sophisticated presence of intervention, allegedly as a phenomenological license that expands its passing moments in order to preserve sounds and images, increasing their impact and presence through interventions of documented cultural history. Our subjectivity can be raised as a composite of this cultural memory, as we are tracing our geophysical presence. This all represents a complicated existential effect, a perceptual voyage that deals with memory issues, architectural and other constituent roles of imagining and embodying the referential side of memory, that, more or less, shifts and transforms our contingent presence of experiences. There is a characteristic change of the forms of this manufacturing, and these can also be intimate and tender experiences, extending their signs over larger forms of interpretation. The social landscape of affairs can change into an intimate vision of features, underlining hypermodern, significant personal perspectives with diverse and embodied visions. Equally explained are the immanent relations of sights and sounds when they are intertwined through a poignant meditation of transfigured manners and their way to be reflexive for memory issues. Our 'theatre of memory' consists of general and intimate visions that work as constitutive contingencies through our psychic architecture of mapped memories. Of course, cinematography represents and modifies these mind-level faculties into an existence of a composite. After that, they are indexical signs intensified through cinematic touch. The hypermodern significance lies in these moments.

On a more erudite level, the specific radius and scale of reproduced, multiple and intermittent images and sounds in contemporary audiovisual culture means that the concepts and beliefs of authenticity, originality, and space gain unaccustomed, alleged intricacies and consistent connotations to complicate and itemise the picture. The art of the past has been transformed into this new 'image and sound world'. Even more articulately, the context of the rhythms and intonations of images and sounds is wide and open to new forms of comprehension and interpretation. Nowadays image-reflections and sonic vibrations are more prone to circulation, exchanged conditions and remaking, regarding production and exhibition of images and sounds, and an audience projection of them. These are the main features of contemporary media and audiovisual cultivation, and its emanating influence. In today's world, the protracted proliferation of audiovisuality, the connections between sounds and pictorial formations, cannot cohere into one single picture for the contemplation of academics. In this sense and in addition, audiovisual culture is correlated to the information and visual and aural overload of everyday life.

Abbreviations inside Hypothetical and Pragmatic Visioning

Before addressing the difficult point of view of how to comprehend and build a constitutive view on hypermodern audiovisuality and its shared synergy of technological evolution, media and surrounding cultural discourse, it is evidential to express, presume, and outline the ramifications of intermedial intersections and literary discourses around our central themes of address. The contingency of nonetheless mutually constitutive interrelation that links hypermodern emergence and cultural, ecological, and historical appropriation of these matters, happens around 2000. At that time, the staging of hypermodern was not limited to the venues of film and media. Parallelly, this study will interconnect cultural history with formal film evaluation in exploring the hypermodern reciprocity between cinema and media.

As this referential point to exact documentation of matters refers and indicates, Gilles Lipovetsky's constitutive appropriation of scientific explorations are concomitant credentials of this investigation. In an identical form, the constitutive role of Lipovetsky was already recognized in my previous study *Hypermodern Documentary Discourse in Cinema* (2022), and the appropriation of his findings and perspectives is an essential part of this one as well.⁴ The manifested interiority of scientific visions ostensibly introduces the surreptitious acquisition of hypermodern iconography in this *mise-en-scène*. Nowadays, hypermodern media are perceived as clandestinely manipulating and influencing their audiences. The rhetoricity of cinematic components is part of hypermodern essentialism and their figurative, conditional meanings in order to represent the images and sounds of cinema in full order. This all coincides with the cinematic interrelations that go beyond the usual practice of these particles. They are essentially interlocking tropes of this phenomena, offering similitudes and functions, which are closely tied to represent the current hypermodern style of emphasizing the influential conditions of representation.

There is a fundamental role for the audience as well, and it is enhanced by and large by a reliance on impressive cinematography. These are all fundamental features embedded in various discursive and partly pragmatic ethos of boundaries among hypermodern cultural realms and resonances that are surprisingly permeable, and increasingly reliant on their most dependable defensive techniques, rendered in apparently valid conceptual language of jurisprudence, limited in the terminological correspondence over narrative strategies and patterns that were developed earlier in film history, but may not totally reflect an actual convergence. This forms a particular code of conduct for later experimentations concerning the analytic appropriation of more detailed views on hypermodern specifications.⁵ Or rather, these retrospectively consigned and linked attributes were unfolded and defined, appearing as distinct phases that could be distinguished from each

other by scientific characteristics functioning especially on the levels of our contemporary, contingent existence.

Furthermore, it procreated a new sensitivity towards hypermodern features in film, describing them as constitutive and essential ones concerning our current times. As this reference to precise documentation indicates, the audiovisual narrative appropriates a vast collection of theoretical details and controversy about audiovisuality in general, and hypermodern audiovisuality in the context of these matters.⁶ Whatever its aspirations, Lipovetsky's scientific alchemy and its reputation legitimized hypermodern as a subject of serious and far-reaching speculative ambitions, evolved from his book *Les Temps Hypermodernes* (2004), forming an equivalent dynamic link of theory around the subject. As told, Lipovetsky still succinctly asserted and induced the concept of hypermodern in the early years of the 21st century, to note contemporary life with his manifestation. He documented diligently the current human evolution with one word, which came to signify the challenges for our time. The lasting merit of Lipovetsky's documentation lies in his consistent description of the word. For him, hypermodern is something that neatly captures the portents of time and phylogeny and does it with avowed strife and understanding. Lipovetsky's assimilated supervision of these matters has been more than imperative to this development. In this sense, his developmental attitude has been shaping the nature of hypermodern content and its variations, as well as acquiring and eking out larger visibility and significance for the matter in connection with other meaningful movements in film history. Paying attention to this debate about hypermodern manifestation of the accurate affinities between hypermodern theory and Lipovetsky's invocation of these matters allows us to find the core of associations related to the development of audiovisual media and the rhetoricity of its nature. The intermedial nature of this pragmatics is embedded in constitutive and contingent residue of symptoms.⁷ Following this, hypermodern cinema in conceptual terms,

contains a rather recent phenomenon, which has links to other even bigger cultural and social changes that have happened during the last thirty years. Its intercultural nexus reflects the ways hypermodern filmic existence is verified in association with other tangible changes and new upcoming in the overall table of cinematic metamorphosis.

Lipovetsky's insightful manner of treating these ubiquitous characteristics, ideals, and omnipotent visions seem especially suitable for his visionary look over the hypermodern essentialities in our time and in the significance gained around these issues, which in his hands are crossing over the institutional and other realms, considering the examination of our current film and cultural production. The critical validity of hypermodern production in the milieu of our filmic cultivation with its changing vantage points of technological and aesthetic values will certainly create tensions around these subjects. In the middle of these challenges and charges we need to concern our successive objectives towards the symptoms of the profoundly encoded patterns in the flow of history to supply a reverberation of hypermodern figuration as it has been understood and circulated among scientific and other notions within our audiovisual culture and resonance of cultural history. In order to meet these upcoming summonses, we need to ascend further speculation and discussion over these matters and remediate the place of hypermodern accentuation designed to follow the possible impressions.

In the buildup of this research on questions around the concept of hypermodern, I firmly and conscientiously advocate and promote a comprehensive and detailed account, expressively aligned with theoretical, discernible reflections, as well as literary, scholarly ambitious invocation and narrative, audiovisually centered analysis of the perceived entities. They are underlined, accentuating a particularly intricate mode of understanding in order to sincerely advocate, analyse and further envelop the dialogic interaction between the

constituents of theory and practice and their proposed outcomes. Instead of merely describing, relating, or straightforwardly establishing the conceptions and conjectural indicators of cinematic discourse, this expedition on hypermodern audiovisuality engages in a circular alteration and metamorphosis of distinctive compass points and allocative visions containing phenomenological and cognitive ingredients of this attempt to come to terms with these ideals. Correspondingly, it is not only a question of hypermodern images and sounds and their aftermath, but also perspectives around the importance of, for instance, silence and how it reverberates with a certain palpable intensity throughout the narrative. As one of the most important and complex measures of this examination is the aim to envisage and picture these moments and, in a number of respects, this is prehistoric scheme, accordant with these and other symptoms will pitch in to differentiate diligently what hypermodern cinematic audiovisuality actually intends to convey. In order to comprehend the most accomplished features of this phenomenon, we will also ameliorate placing these ideas both culturally and historically with regard to other structurally similar marvels of media history and with a distinctive consolidation on media educational summons. It features both conjectural and pragmatic demands, covering a specific curiosity towards a cognitive mapping of intercontinental chains of various impacts and vibrations in of narrative and audiovisual *modus operandi* that is being metamorphosed in time. This fashion of traditions is modifying our mediatic communication continuously, constituting worldwide affectations especially in the form of an enlarged distribution and alleged transmission of audiovisual figurations. By any metric of means, this development can be described from multilateral media educative environments suggesting up to date acumen related to our philosophical interrogation. Against this background, our media didactive perception would fit the bill to elucidate these angles and establish further evaluation of these hallmarks. It is not a straightforward or definitive portrayal of these problematics, but

principally an intricate and dialogical converse to uncover essentially historic, artistic, and other rates of measure. Our supreme aim is to distinguish more accurately these modern and hypermodern forms of tactics that have emerged in the beginning of the twenty first century, the recent modes and styles of reasoning that have been molded and shaped from inventive classifications inside the whole media ancestry. This inspection is beneficial through its cited association to educative contests of media which have unfolded around hypotheses of manifested veracity of sounds and images during a period of digital media wherein authenticity gains novel objectives.

We can also confess that the possibilities and defined promises of the study of audiovisuality should be involved with the research of form and content on all levels, notifying the production of audiovisual contingency with these kinds of methods and conundrums. It must also engage a convoluted form of clandestine agency that arises from bodies of knowledge. At the macro level of mutable appearances, it should be acknowledged to relate to the study of form and variances of the content for the telos and assessment of comparative and historical dissection. Attention to form and content and the relative autonomy and, in some cases, parlayed neutrality of form forces our minds away from any single interpretative and transcriptional framework. It also encourages researchers to look for the widest possible ambit of divergent explanations for the incrementally contingent subsistence of films and their predominant endowment to the substantiated evolution of cinema.

As this all indicates, our assumptions can be apprehended, but one of the main proposals of hypermodern cinema is to highlight the implicated insinuations, and sustainable projections of contemporary and verified existence, the sights, sounds of audiovisual tensions and occurrences which emerge as audiovisual orchestrations. In connection therewith, hypermodern cinema is situated within modern and

postmodern influences and beyond them into the wave of intercultural communication efforts and affectations in order to establish and further formulate a conscious, theoretical and conceptual framework of schemes behind the constitutively arranged modes of hypermodern representation. The cultural realm around hypermodern impacts entails poignant effects and descriptions that are perceived from our vantage point as potentially transparent invocations of epitomised figurations and narratively embodied formations that are believable and reasonable outcomes for further scrutiny. The symbiotic exchange between these conceptions and visions of consistent notions that elude monocausal definitions, since they are parts of the rhetoricity of hypermodern elemental relevance that inclines with an emergent mode of invocation which becomes evident in its recent turns of historical procedures. There is an ostensibly illuminated stance that renders a purely conceptual representation of these precision-targeted phenomena visible and unites these definitudes formally believable and grounded. It explains why we can think that whenever we are dealing with outlooks towards the social, historical time, the visionary allegations can be serious, critical, and persuasive by nature, but they are also functions, procedures and modes of the phenomena they describe. It is believable that even already during the shooting of the material, each set of options needs to be concurred at a phenomenal rate, and examined cinematically as the created audiovisual entity agitates and blends the provided contingency and poignancy of historical evolution and ardently augmented visions of it. These are matters of specification and succinct forms of experience that may suggest narrative challenges to identify and label the study of these issues. They are to be conceived so that the expected audiovisual projection endows its redemptive considerations and growing assurance through its contingent procedures. There lies the manifested apparition and reciprocal exchange between hypermodern insinuation and its affectations. These are seminal ideas behind our perceptive approach in grounding them to the core contention

of hypothetical and analytical reflections and intellectually appraised connotations around audiovisual media in the age of the 21st century.

Hypermodern Insinuation of Constellations

There is a probable precarity towards what kind of artefacts belong to the category of cinema. This must deal with the objectives of filmmaking, and the contours of inner qualifications or relevant trademarks of an especial artefact. This has also something to do with the spectatorial ability to estimate a given work, and how it can be valued. By analysing representations of hypermodern filmmaking, scientific and literal perspectives from the 21st century on, we are investigating an interesting set of histrionic and cultural chimera with shifting realities of our times. Nowadays, hypermodern media are reflected as surreptitiously having capacities to transformative influence and manipulate their audiences. Our sense of history's unfolded confidentiality may have weakened, but, at the same time, the rise of globalization creates another set of fears associated with the opaque nature of these phenomena. At the turn of the 21st century, and during the last decades, there have been various ways to categorise and define hypermodernism, but still, and at least partly, we are missing the final words concerning this subject. We might seemingly think that there are many definitions around the context of hypermodern: for example, following Carl L. Plantinga the intention of a non-fiction film or documentary lies in the strong attitude of a documentary filmmaker towards the subject at hand and what is presented about it (Plantinga 1997: 25).

The infusion of filmmaker's own personal voice is crucial, as well as the presence of her/his body, and her/his gaze bound to the visionary outlook created by the camera. As stated by Stella Bruzzi, a documentary deals with the dialectical understanding of the real world (Bruzzi 2000: 9). A documentary interprets the issues it tries to cover and separate, and the very fact that documentary filmmakers have

always employed defined structuring devices in their work has meant that they have inevitably become involved in different kinds of acts of interpretation, however much they may sometimes wish to deny it. These transcriptive strategies are of assertive interest here. Documentaries try to solve the conundrums of distinctive intertextuality they depict which means that the organisation of the documentary presentation goes often in such a way that a problem is first identified, and its ramifications worked through, and a number of eyewitnesses and onlookers have been called into account before a solution is finally offered. This narrative structure might have various 'common-sensical' attractions, and one can easily see how the constant application of such an organising principle will frame the issue under discussion in a particularly attributed way. Audiences may, for instance, become favorably predisposed to accept the solution being offered in the documentary's concluding section and not accept possible alternatives. They may also get used to the value set which suggests that where a problem is identified a solution will also be forthcoming (Nichols 1991: 18-19).

In the 1980s the epistemological foundations of documentary realism and the epitomes of objective observation were called into question. So, the boundaries of the genre were extended and blurred, as the intense exploration of subjective characteristics became more and more imperative (See, for instance, Helke 2006: 207). One way to deal with documentaries lies in the terms of the phenomenon. We can think of documentaries as a genre, which has some general and assigned accents. Different textual and audiovisual codes, conventions, and norms are present in a way that is different from other genres. Every film has its own inner edifices and conditions, which are original, but these might also have prevailing characteristics with other structures concerning filmic facets. The more one looks closely at the edifice and concreteness of documentaries, the more one gets over-ridden by the focal point of view, how documentary filmmakers gain

explicit narrative devices through which the unity of their stream of stories will be reinforced. This correlates to the considerable tension of dramatic impact and touch of a single documentary with an interesting storyline. Paul Rotha once said that the essence of documentary lies in the dramatization of real material (Rosenthal 1988: 21). Watching creative simulations based on real happenings is one of the crucial features of modern culture (Williams 1976: 59).

Our experimentation here is not just about the encounter between other disciplines and cinema, but the rendezvous between other disciplines and film and media studies. Pointedly, we are arranging a short-term dialogism between scientific methods and exploratory modes common to film and media studies and, on a broader level, a defined rendezvous with the collective history of art and science, and in this meeting the protocols, ideas, and traditions of edification and aesthetics assume a significant importance. It forms a corresponding and tangible dealing between various navigations. We can think of methodical conceptualization of investigation and narrative patterns in obedience with case histories offering calibration and elucidation of an intensive and broad dispute over these matters. As a related spectrum of association, we can think further and ask: What does the result of such an assignment look like? What can we benefit from such an encounter? Or, to make it even more pronounced, what are the real expectations and alleged outcomes of this kind of interdisciplinary research? Probably the best incentive we can anticipate is the organic vigour for the intention to bestow us with some aspiring questions of the sort that may not always be quite easy to discover, and instead of confirming questions we might also look for methods that may seem like a foreign inundation at first glance. To codify all this to questions (and the space of possible answers) we need to know the discipline well enough to gradually concede patterns that are prevalent to our point of view. Interdisciplinary probing brings forth distinctive challenges when connecting different scientific fields and associational

frameworks of research and creating situations that need new kinds of reflection.

Gilles Lipovetsky's conception of classical modernity comes close to this exactly when we assimilate that audiovisual kinships are conceived of as the product of filmmaking practices and cultivated aesthetics, developed through socio- and psychophysiological intricacies and recapitulated contingencies of classical modelling. These inspective sights are parts of the intertextuality of audiovisual, sometimes metaphoric and articulate dialogue between sounds and images, creating a needed reflection and repercussion of the framed attraction of hyperreal (Baudrillard) characteristics and paradigms. The unification of audiovisual perceptions affects temporal and spatial qualifications which assume expanded accretions of further significance. Our comprehension of audiovisuality and its embodied infiltrations can be emphasized by exceeding an affectionate regime of simulation into its content. A hypermodern film can appropriate cadencies illuminated in its audiovisual rhythmic, in order to procreate a formality or courtesy of temporal aspects of narration, subordinated to its spatial distractions. Regularly, these cadences can be elaborated inside and between the unfolding scenes, sometimes featuring mosaic presence of intermixing narrative elements and furnishing a polyphonic montage construction of audiovisual signatures, layers of hypermodern *mélange* that expresses the enunciation of explicit commentary. These are audiovisual components, which can have a special and varying degree of intimacy and simplicity of appearance and persistence. They are dependent, provisional and singular visions of a particular film narrative that impart and confirm the explicit nature of audiovisual relations. From the existential point of view, it is interesting to notice that the timeline of duration and interactive, evasive quality of hypermodern prescription may be an upshot of substantially assessed tensions inside the audiovisually sophisticated visions.