‘Hey, I Escaped the Ropes of Time Once More’: Three Readings of Jonas Mekas’s Reminiscences of a Journey to Lithuania Based on its Temporal Aspects

As we shall see, the summary narrative of the diary films is the attempt to regain Lithuania, a mission that has several components whose isomorphism and fungibility supply the massive energy of Mekas’s myth. The myth has a psychoanalytic component – the recovery of the mother; a social component – the recovery of the organic village community; an environmental component – the recovery of the rural scene; and a philosophico-aesthetic component – the recovery of a cultural practice appropriate to these.

David E. James

Jonas Mekas’s diary film Reminiscences of a Journey to Lithuania (1972) has been chosen for this analysis mainly for two reasons:
1) it is the first of Mekas’s diary films that contains extensive footage filmed in Lithuania;
2) the film’s temporal aspects, to the best of my knowledge, have never previously been the privileged object of an academic analysis.

In this paper I will try to unfold three readings of Mekas’s film by focusing on the various forms of temporality intrinsic to it. The first reading is in a sense semiotic; it is specifically concerned with the oppositions found in the film’s verbal layer, namely the voice-over commentary spoken by Mekas throughout the film. This reading is also the most restricted of the three, precisely because it does not account for the remaining elements of the work. The second reading is psychoanalytic. It is essentially an application of a theory developed by Jeffrey Prager in which he attempts to describe the relationship between psychological trauma, an individual’s perception of time, and what Prager calls ‘the repressive community’. This reading provides the viewer with one possibility of connecting the narrator’s experiences prior to, during and after the Second World War – without turning to Mekas’s biography but judging from what is stated in the film – to the temporal structure of the film, as well as the audience’s role in the film’s making.

The third and final reading is chronotopic. This reading, based on the method proposed by Mikhail Bakhtin, regards the temporal aspects of the film jointly with the spatial aspects, and allows for a conceptualisation of the dominant worldviews expressed in Reminiscences.
Due to spatial limitations, I will not go into details about the methodological decisions or further implications of my analysis. I must also apologize that I will not provide a broad introduction to the film and will only briefly outline what is important about Reminiscences for the purposes of this analysis.

The length of the film is 88 minutes. It is divided into three parts. The first part lasts for roughly twelve minutes and shows footage from Mekas’s first years in the USA. The second part lasts for almost an hour and depicts the titular journey – Mekas’s return to his homeland, a small village on the north of Lithuania, Semeniškiai, after twenty-five years of exile, accompanied by his brother, Adolfas Mekas, and Adolfas’s wife, Pola Chapelle. This part is the only one which has its individual title: “100 Glimpses of Lithuania, August 1971”. The final part lasts for sixteen minutes and comprises two smaller episodes. The first is the footage of Jonas and Adolfas visiting Elmshorn, Germany, the site of the labor camp in which the two brothers were detained in 1944. The second episode shows Jonas visiting Vienna with fellow New York-based artists: Peter Kubelka, Hermann Nitsch, Annette Michelson, and Ken Jacobs. Thus, the film begins just outside New York and finishes in Vienna.

The feel and mood of Reminiscences is very intimate and melancholic with a tinge of brightness. The raw individuality of the handheld camera is enveloped by a rationalistic structure, which nevertheless retains subjectivity. The color palette of Reminiscences has a subtle blue tint, which adds to the melancholy, although there is also a black-and-white portion in the first part of the film. In addition, the soundtrack, apart from Mekas’s voice-over commentary, includes pieces of piano and Lithuanian folk music, both in minor key and of unacknowledged authorship, as well as bits of sound recorded on location in Lithuania. Perhaps most importantly, there is a strong contrast between Mekas’s experiences, captured in his monologues, and the blooming rural scene bathed in sunlight. It can be said that these formal qualities complement the film’s central theme of the impossibility of return home.

The First Reading

Let us begin by assembling the phrases spoken by Mekas in the film that directly relate to time or duration. Here are some of the most significant ones, presented in chronological order:

1) “That early fall in 1957 or ’58, one Sunday morning we went into the Catskills, into the woods”;
2) “It was good to walk like that and not to think, not to think anything about the last ten years, […] the years of war, of hunger, of Brooklyn”;
3) “…that early fall day for the first time I did not feel alone in America”;
4) “There was a moment when I forgot my home. This was the beginning of my new home. ‘Hey, I escaped the ropes of time once more!’ I said”;
5) “Yes, we are, we still are displaced persons even, even today”;
6) “The minute we left, we started going home, and we are still going home. I am still on my journey home”;
7) “Have you ever stood in Times square and suddenly felt very close to you and very strong the smell of a fresh bark of a birch tree?”;
8) “…and there was Mamma, and she was waiting, she was waiting for 25 years”;
9) “…and there was our uncle, who told us to go West: ‘Go, children, West, and see the world!’ And so we went. And we are still going”;
10) “…and as we were approaching […] the places we knew so well, suddenly in
front of us we saw a forest; I did not recognize the places. There were no trees when we left;  

11) “Our mother is telling about the terrible postwar years and how the police was waiting for a year for me to come home. [...] Every night the police was waiting behind the house in the bushes.”

In the sentences 1), 3) and 11) we find seasons of the year and parts of the day mentioned: “early fall”, “one Sunday morning”, “every night”. The three examples can be divided so that the first two mentions are put into an opposition with the third one. The first two mentions refer to a single event, a walk in the Catskill Mountains, during which, as we know from the context, the sensations of “forgetting home” and “beginning of a new home” occur to the subject. These sensations have a euphoric connotation, that is, are invested with positive value. The third mention, on the other hand, refers to a negative experience, extended in time by means of the iterative quantificator “every.”

We may already sketch a provisional scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular event</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>iterative event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>euphoric</td>
<td></td>
<td>dysphoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the sentences 2), 4), 6), 8) and 11) we find units of the so-called clock time: “ten years”, “moment”, “minute”, “25 years”, “years”, “a year”. These can easily be divided into two groups based on their length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>moment, minute</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>a year, years, ten years, 25 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brief</td>
<td></td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can tell straight away that the opposition between singularity and iterativeness is maintained here. However, the phoric aspects need to be analyzed in more detail.

The left half of the division corresponds to two critical events: the minute of “leaving home and starting going home” and the moment of “forgetting home and beginning of a new home”, which is a further verbalization of the same Catskills walk experience. In both cases there is a double relation with the spatial denomination “home” established: it is simultaneously disjunctural (marking a disruption of the subject’s connection to “home”) and conjunctural (marking a setup of the subject’s connection to “home”).

Secondly, since both of these events are punctual – that is, are said to have occurred at precise points in time – they can be described in terms of inchoativity (the tendency towards initiation) and terminativity (the tendency towards conclusion). Again, both cases show duality in this respect: they are simultaneously inchoative (“beginning of a new home”, “starting going home”) and terminative (“forgetting”, “leaving”).

Despite these similarities, the two events seem to differ in their phoric aspects: the sensations of “forgetting home and beginning of a new home” have a euphoric connotation, whereas the sensations of “leaving home and starting going home” have a dysphoric connotation. This introduces a certain ambiguity on the left side of the given opposition.

We have located on the right side of the division four units denoting periods of time that appear huge in comparison with the brief periods on the left. All of these units (“ten years”, “25 years”, etc.) denote duration and while they do have a starting and an end point (otherwise, they would not be possible to measure), in themselves they are not events but states, or non-events, if you will.

For instance, the mention of “ten years” is followed in Mekas’s commentary by the syntactic objects “of war, of hunger, of Brooklyn”, but these objects are not realized as events. Instead, they appear as inconclusi-
ve and are neither inchoative, nor terminative. Similarly, when “25 years” is used to temporalize the process described as “Mamma’s waiting”, we can see that it is neither an event, nor a line of events, but a state. The same applies to the police ambush which we have previously associated with the iteration of events.

In addition, all of the temporal units in question have a common dysphoric connotation. Furthermore, the non-events to which they refer (“waiting”, “war”, “hunger”, “Brooklyn”) all maintain a disjunctive relation with “home”.

The sentences 5), 6) and 9) contain the lexeme “still”, which a) implies a continuous process, b) implies the existence of a point of its completion, and c) establishes a tensive relation between the process and its completion. Since the trajectory of moving in these examples points towards opposite directions (“West” and “home”), we can suppose that the subject is located on the central point of the imaginary plane connecting the two end points, and this conforms to the narrator’s statement of him and the other DPs “being displaced persons even today”. Thus, the completion of the durative process seems distant and possibly unreachable. Moreover, by means of the repetition of the lexeme “home”, the sentence 6) overrides the sentence 4), positing “home” as a destination that has never been reached yet. The dysphoric state consumes the euphoric event.

Moreover, it is clear from the situational context of the sentences that the two end points do not correspond to any of the spatial denominations present in the film:

“home” ≠ “Lithuania”, “Semeniškiai”, “Biržai”

All of this suffices to say that the sentences with the lexeme “still” fit perfectly into the right side of our opposition.

The sentences 7) and 10) include the lexeme “suddenly” which, on the contrary, implies a singular and punctual event. In one case it has a euphoric aspect and, in its accompanying of the scent of the fresh birch tree bark, establishes a conjunction with “home”. In the other a dysphoric aspect manifests itself and a disjunction with “home” is established via the unexpected change in the otherwise familiar landscape of Semeniškiai. Here we come across the duality factor once again: a set of punctual events appears phorically and junctionally ambivalent. These examples, then, retain the features characteristic to the left side of the opposition.

We may represent the outcome of our analysis at this point as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>punctual events</th>
<th>states, non-events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ambiphoric, ambijunctional</td>
<td>dysphoric, disjunctonal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What can a viewer devise from this analysis? Firstly, that there are at least two different types of time present in the film’s voice-over commentary. One of them is of a punctual kind and the other is of a durative kind. The latter is associated with emotional and temporal continuity, while the former is associated with emotional and temporal disruption. Punctual time is entwined with both euphoric and dysphoric experiences, while durative time only with dysphoric ones. In the first type of time the subject may find either a conjunction or a disjunction with “home”, but in the other he only finds disjunction. Hence, we may justly assume that durative time is what the narrator has called “the ropes of time” and punctual time is what allows him to “escape” them.

Secondly, we may speculatively propose that this temporal structure parallels the overall experience provided by the film, although, of course, a separate study would be required to firmly prove such a hypothesis. Nevertheless, one can see that the opposition we have just proposed is dominated by
negative aspects. Such an asymmetry correlates with the entirety of the narration and its melancholic mood. It is as if the analysis that has just been undertaken anticipates the twofold emotional effect produced by Reminiscences, whereby brightness and joy occur only briefly and are very fragile in light of the dragging states of emotional and psychological discomfort. It is these brief moments that need to be noticed and cherished.

The Second Reading

Contrary to the dominant psychoanalytic tradition, Jeffrey Prager defines “psychological trauma” not as an event in the past but a condition of the present. According to Prager, the main symptom or consequence of a psychological trauma has to do with an individual’s perception of time: substituted for a “normal” time perception is the state of “timelessness”: “The present is distorted to incorporate the memory of an un-metabolized, or unprocessed, past; a then folds in upon the now largely without awareness or distinction.”3 Time is now perceived as “frozen and unyielding, even as threatening the attachment of the person, or the collectivity, to a defining sense-of-oneself”, as “the fear of [trauma’s] present-day return […] shapes the person’s relationship to the future”4.

Apart from this influence on temporality, trauma’s manifestations are always social, since it “indicts in memory the victim’s intimate community – principally mother, father or other caregivers – who, at the time of such overwhelming experience, is felt to have failed to protect the victim”5. Furthermore, in trauma, harm and disillusionment are inextricably conjoined. For instance, trauma “shatters a fantasy of omnipotence: the destruction of the victim’s sense that because of the perfection of the world, all is possible and anything can be achieved”6, however irrational this initial feeling may be. Trauma, then, has a social and a temporal aspect.

In the case of Reminiscences the event that defines the traumatic condition is the narrator’s exile from his homeland in July 1944 together with his brother Adolfas. The temporal aspect of the condition manifests in the way the seemingly unrelated present-day activities regularly yet almost imperceptibly evoke emotional and often painful fragments of the past. This certainly applies to editing: Mekas often cuts temporally distant shots together or subverts the chronological order of a sequence, like in the case of jumping between fall and winter footage in the first part of the film.

The present and the past are interwoven to such an extent that curious contradictions occur when the narrator attempts to express his thoughts verbally. For example, in the Catskills episode the narrator speaks of the joy of having his mind free from the troubled war and postwar memories, and says: “I was wondering myself that I could walk like this [and not] think about the years of war, of hunger, of Brooklyn.” The narrator is talking of not thinking about the traumatic events, but such a phrasing suggests precisely the opposite: it posits the thought about the traumatic events (even if in the form of its own negation) as being part of the memory of the Catskills walk, which was previously stated to be free of it. The past interferes with the present; one is constantly mistaken for the other.

The social aspect of the traumatic condition is embodied in the complicated relationship between the two brothers and the family members that had remained in Lithuania. By no means do I consider these family members the perpetrators of the narrator’s traumatic experiences, rather I believe that it is their absence, the fact of physical distance and the inability of sharing the traumatic experience with them, that fuels the narrator’s
suffering. Moreover, because of their exile, the narrator and his brother have in the meantime been excluded from the no less definitive experiences shared by the family members in Lithuania. Suffering is felt by both parties, and in their own way, and therefore the will to overcome the ensuing existential lacuna between them becomes all the more challenging. Note how in the film the united family members talk very little about their respective experiences. Attention is directed elsewhere, although this theme never leaves the frame completely.

What means can help to overcome such a condition? Prager states that closure becomes possible if a community of listeners, capable of understanding the condition and its origins, is formed: “Only when the conviction develops that significant others ‘know the trouble I’ve seen’ […] does it become possible to appropriate past experiences on behalf of the future.”7 The participation of the “significant others” allows for a conquering of both the temporal and the social ruptures: “Present-day members of a community-in-formation collude, on behalf of a common future, to move beyond memory and to enable, once more, an illusionary world of possibility for everyone. When it occurs […] individuals are able once again, each in their own way, to engage the world freely and on their own behalf.”8

Inversely, when such a “redressive community” is absent, according to Prager, the “victim” begins to shout (compare the narrator’s confession from early on in the film about his first memories from New York: “I wanted to shout, to shout that there was a war, ‘cause I walked the city and I thought that nobody knew that there was a war, nobody knew that there are homes in the world where people cannot sleep, where the doors are being kicked in at night”, etc.).

In the case of Reminiscences there are two groups of “significant others”, the narrator's family and the viewers of the film. What unites them is the will to hear and understand the narrator's trouble. By joining his family members in Lithuania and then by presenty addressing the viewers of Reminiscences, the narrator is creating his redressive community. In other words, it is the homeward journey, the act of narration and the presence of the audience that constitute the possibility of closure.

In the third part of the film, as the narrator leaves Lithuania, he loses his homeland for the second time. This is, of course, a symbolic and much less intensive repetition of the 1944 and postwar events, but it is important that the narrator is now surrounded by friends who all share the experience of living in a foreign culture. In fact, the narrator sees his companions as people who are able to feel at home and take root in an alien environment, and this attitude serves as a model for him.

Vienna and its surroundings, the company’s destination, are explored by the narrator as a place where the past is preserved without interrupting the city’s present. A big part of the film’s third part is thus devoted to the company’s visit to the medieval monastery of Kremsmünster and to an abandoned countryside mansion purchased by Hermann Nitsch for his theatre (both scenes edited to religious choral music). These and other sites appearing on screen, as well as those simply mentioned in voice-over, illuminate the narrator’s own ambitions of maintaining a culturally and temporally manifold identity. At one point he says: “I begin to believe again in the indestructibility of the human spirit, in certain qualities, in certain standards that have been established by men through many thousands of years and that will be here when we are gone.” A few moments later, as we observe the view from the Kremsmünster tower, the voice-over concludes: “It was very, very peaceful. Our hearts and our minds elated.”
Yet, interestingly, the possibility of a cultural cohabitation is put to question in the final scene of the film: Hermann Nitsch’s favorite fruit market, one of Vienna’s oldest, is set on fire. The narrator comments bitterly: “They want a modern market now.” In a wider context, this may seem as a denial of redress, but, in fact, Prager theorizes the threat of failure as part of the closure process: “Paradoxically, redress is achievable only when the shadow of absolute failure constitutes real possibility, when the potential for an even more permanent alienation between members is not foreclosed.” If we are to believe Prager, the market fire scene is actually crucial for the psychoanalytic reading of the film: it provides the final element needed for the trauma’s closure.

Family reunion, narration and audience constitute the core, but without the threat of failure closure would be impossible. This is why it is important that the viewer sees the final scene as a purposive part of the whole project of redress. The film is, then, a construct which serves as a guide to a safe and trustworthy relationship with one’s social environment and one’s perception of the future in the case of psychological trauma.

The Third Reading

In 2006, a chronotopic analysis of Mekas’s film *Lost, Lost, Lost* (1976) by Efrén Cuevas was published. Cuevas identified two dominant chronotopes in the film’s spatio-temporal system: the idyllic chronotope and the chronotope of the road. These same chronotopes, albeit in a different way, dominate in *Reminiscences of a Journey to Lithuania*. The names of these two types, as well as the term *chronotope* itself, are borrowed from Mikhail Bakhtin’s 1937 essay “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel”. Bakhtin writes: “We will give the name chronotope (literally, ‘time space’) to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature.”

It is important to note that Bakhtin’s definition is ontologically limited to spatio-temporal relationships produced by language. Unfortunately, I am not in a position to argue that Bakhtin’s method is perfectly applicable to an audiovisual discourse, so for now I will simply go with Cuevas’s statement: “Transposing Bakhtin’s approach from novel to film seems natural, given the spatial and temporal materiality of the film medium. […] This is especially evident when working with diary films, since the filmmaker is working necessarily with images placed in temporal frames to disclose his worldview.”

According to Bakhtin, the idyllic chronotope is distinguishable by “an organic fastening-down, a grafting of life and its events to a place, to a familiar territory with all its nooks and crannies, its familiar mountains, valleys, fields, rivers and forests, and one’s own home. […] This little spatial world is limited and sufficient unto itself, not linked in any intrinsic way with other places, with the rest of the world.” In addition, the unity of place “fuses the cradle and the grave (the same little corner, the same earth), and brings together […] the life of the various generations who had also lived in that same place, under the same conditions, and who had seen the same things.” Also characteristic of the idyllic chronotope are cyclical time and the cult of food and drink.

Cuevas points out the importance of nature in *Lost, Lost, Lost*, where it functions as a metonymy of the idyllic chronotope. She argues that New York’s parks, gardens and other green spaces, or natural objects such as flowers, embody idyllic harmony for Mekas because they retain features of the countryside in an otherwise urban environment. Furthermore, Mekas comes close to realizing
cyclical time through his everyday filming practice. Concentration on nature and the mundane is thus understood as Mekas’s ways of seeking elements of the idyll associated with his life in Lithuania before departure.

The space of “100 Glimpses of Lithuania, August 1971”, on the other hand, is not just partially idyllic but idyllic par excellence. The narrator visits his familial home where agricultural labor is still central to the community and is still governed by the phenomena of nature. In addition, the space is inhabited by objects possessing memories of the past, such as the scythes and ploughs, which Jonas and his brothers used in the fields as children. Also, the cult of food and drink, although present in Mekas’s New York-based films (one remembers the footage of George Maciunas’s dumpling parties or the many occasions of wine-drinking), is especially significant in Reminiscences: indeed, we see different generations gather at one table and hear the narrator proclaim: “Oh, cool water of Semeniškiai! No wine ever tasted better anywhere.” Central to this space is the figure of the mother (“Mamma”): through her the community and the different generations are connected, and the way she takes up everyday tasks (for example, cooking in the open air, just like someone a hundred years ago would) is suggestive of an inner stability in light of sociopolitical change.

On a closer look, though, it becomes apparent that the film presents a variation on the theme of the idyll’s destruction, also outlined by Bakhtin. He defines it as the narrative of “the idyllic world rapidly approaching its end” due to its submission to “the forces that are destroying it – that is, the new capitalist world”\(^5\). From the time of the narrator’s childhood, the space of Semeniškiai has been deformed on various levels: as a consequence of the Soviet occupation, a dozen of neighbouring villages have been reorganised into a collective farm and the labor has been mechanized, completely changing the sociocultural landscape of the area. Moreover, Mekas’s own use of camera and microphone is alien to the organic local culture. These changes are not so much “capitalist” as they are industrial and economically-conditioned. But perhaps most important is the absence of the father (who died in 1951) because it disrupts the temporal unity, the natural change of generations, and marks the final disillusionment in the idyll’s continuity, the irretrievability of the sense of omnipotence linked with childhood years.

Therefore, one can read the way Mekas films his family and the surviving artifacts from his early years as an effort to reconcile to the idyll’s loss. The same can be said of certain elements of the spatio-temporal relations in the first and third parts of Reminiscences: their micro-narratives can be interpreted as attempts at reconciliation by means of discovering individual idyllic elements in the green areas of New York, the cultural heritage of Vienna or the cinema’s ability to manipulate time and space.

The chronotope of the road is defined by Bakhtin as follows: “On the road (‘the high road’), the spatial and temporal paths of the most varied people – representatives of all social classes, estates, religions, nationalities, ages – intersect at one spatial and temporal point.”\(^6\) In other words, it is a chronotope of encounter and, as such, it takes on an important role in Lost, Lost, Lost, “helping Mekas merge with his new country and share its goals”\(^7\) as social distances collapse during his regular walks around the city. In Reminiscences, even though the concept of the road underlies the titular journey, this chronotope practically does not appear in its pure form. The film depicts major stops rather than the travelling process.

Moreover, the few manifestations of travel that do occur in Reminiscences are in fact extensions of the idyllic chronotope. Firstly,
this is because the road reveals temporal discontinuity of the familiar territory and may participate in the idyll’s destruction. Such is the case of the narrator’s remark about not recognizing a forest when approaching Semeniškiai.

Secondly, the figure of the road reappears at another crucial moment, when a new song “about somebody who is far away” (“Pilkė keleliai dulka”) is sung to Jonas. In the song, time and space are fused into one entity. The state of displacement and longing is located in the present (“Oh, how much I have missed you, mother!”) and put in contrast to the figures of nature (a group of rustling green birches, blooming Guelder Roses). Nature embodies harmony and continuity that are missing from the human realm, yet the very fact of embodiment is enough to grant the hope of achieving them once again in the future: “Soon the long road will bring me home.”

The road, while being a metaphor for the existential distance between the present state of suffering and the sought sense of omnipotence, is nevertheless invested with a power to reintroduce the subject to the idyllic worldview. Stated differently, the idyll is supported by the road in this instance. Transposing this fantasy to his own situation, Mekas accompanies the song with shots of his mother walking down the country road. In essence, the said song invokes a narrative that constitutes the core of the entire project of Reminiscences, namely, that of the subject’s return home. Consequently, the way in which the viewer interprets this little episode is going to direct their interpretation of the whole film.

Conclusion

The three readings outlined in this article are not meant to be understood as an exhaustive body of theory on Mekas’s brilliant film. None of them is supposed to be superior in relation to the others. They simply delineate partial and infinitely subjective possibilities of apprehending the film. Moreover, depending on one’s point of view, each reading can be viewed as self-sufficient or as merely opening up a wider discussion. One is welcome to combine them with one another or with interpretations and methods of analysis not mentioned here altogether. Some elements of one reading will necessarily correlate with elements of the other (perhaps even rule each other out), and it was my intention to touch upon the same ideas from different perspectives without referring to what is said at another point in the article.

I wished to demonstrate that temporality acquires huge significance in Mekas’s film and that it can take on many guises. A relatively broad understanding of the film can be developed from analyzing a little portion of the narrator’s text in which time or duration is mentioned. A psychoanalytic perspective is able to produce a fruitful reading of the film’s temporal aspects and offer a particularly active role for the audience by making use of the revisionist concept of psychological trauma. Finally, the semantic whole of the film’s dominant spatial and temporal aspects can be articulated with the aid of a chronotopic analysis.

For me, the beauty of these readings is that they bring to light different bits and pieces of the analyzed film. At the same time, none of them can account for absolutely all of it. But who would want that? It is always a good sign if, after a part of it has been explained, a work of art retains its power to delight.
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