WE WILL NOT RECOVER FROM SCEPTICISM UNLESS WE AIM TO THE EXISTENTIAL: EMOTIONAL ENGAGEMENT AND POPULAR MUSIC IN *THE LEFTOVERS*[*]

Enric Burgos (University of Valencia and Jaume I University)

INTRODUCTION

The Leftovers (HBO, 2014-2017) presents us with the various human reactions to the "sudden departure" of 2% of the world population. Some refuse to accept what happened and face its consequences, a few try desperately to find an explanation for the event, others prefer turning the page anyway and some others just make everyone remember the day everything changed. Almost all of them, however, are at odds with the situation and show their problems in order to live with uncertainty.

The series' storyline offers itself to be read alongside Stanley Cavell's approaches to scepticism. It is not in vain that the characters of the show are involved in the difficult task of acknowledging the truth scepticism can teach us, namely, that our relationship with the world, with the other minds and with ourselves is not to be understood in epistemological terms but in existential ones. In parallel, *The Leftovers* places its audience in a similar position. If we want to enter into therapeutic dialogue with the series we have to abandon our obsession with certainty and continue watching (and living) in the presence of doubt.

Within the dual possibility of recovering from scepticism via the *pathos* that *The Leftovers* presents to both its characters and its viewers, the series' soundtrack plays a fundamental role. Three reasons impel us to focus our study on the music of the show and, more specifically, on popular songs which have been included: first, the overwhelming presence of pop songs throughout the show's three seasons; secondly, the will to give the aural the place it deserves in the analysis of the audio-visual and to value its contribution to philosophical reflection; and thirdly, the special link the series establishes with pop culture through these tunes.

Therefore, our writing aims at two main goals: making explicit those which we consider the main links that can be found between *The Leftovers* and Cavell's point of view on scepticism and moving image and, primarily, explaining different ways in which the inclusion of pop songs in the TV series supports (and contributes to) that reading in Cavellian fashion. In doing so, we will analyse a series of passages that are particularly relevant for our purposes,

paying special attention to those in which pop songs best show their expressive potential in relation to the images they go with.

The structure of our essay will be as follows: first, we will offer a general overview of Cavell's considerations on scepticism, including some remarks on the ontology of the moving image and the two movie genres the philosopher focused his *readings* on. Then, we will proceed with the analysis of the selected scenes, which will be carried out in three separate sections. The first one will deal with the question of self-knowledge by following the evolution of the main character and focusing mostly on Season Two. The second section will draw attention to the relationship between Nora (Carrie Coon) and Kevin (Justin Theroux) with a special emphasis on Season Three. We will evaluate their obstacles towards acknowledgement, their separation and final reunion. In third place, we will examine the peculiar bond the show establishes with its audience. Finally, we will summarize the main contributions of our article in the conclusions.

CAVELL'S APPROACHES TO SCEPTICISM

According to Stanley Cavell, modern scepticism constitutes a new version of the constant human desire to deny its humanity. Notwithstanding, there is a substantial difference between modern and earlier scepticism: "The issue posed is no longer, or not alone, as with earlier skepticism, how to conduct oneself best in an uncertain world; the issue suggested is how to live at all in a groundless world. Our skepticism is a function of our now illimitable desire."[1] After God's death and the advent of the so-called new science, the *ethos* characterizing the old approaches to scepticism is substituted by a theoretic perspective. Thus, the modern desire to obtain an objective proof of existence aside from our experience sets out the Cartesian obsession with the requirement of certainty that traditional philosophy will take on. Moreover, this same desire is found in the pointless attempt to refute scepticism that ends up succumbing to it. Yet for Cavell scepticism is not only a philosophical problem but also a problem related to the way we experience our human condition in our day-to-day lives[2] and a problem casting reflections on our culture's diverse manifestations.

As claimed by the author, the sceptical scenario shows three interrelated faces: scepticism about the external world,[3] about the other minds[4] and about the self. With regard to scepticism about the external world, Cavell maintains that "the presentness achieved by certainty of the senses cannot compensate for the presentness which had been elaborated through our old absorption in the world"[5] and that "we try to get the world to provide answers in a way which is independent of our responsibility for *claiming* something to be so."[6] In Heideggerian fashion, Cavell offers a diagnosis of the modern condition that helps us appreciate our disconnection with the world: "Our condition has become one in which our natural mode of perception is to view, feeling unseen. We do not so much look at the world as look *out at* it, from behind the

self."[7] Conceiving the world as an object and excluding the subject from the knowledge of its ordinary reality lead to a gap between the individual and the world that cannot be bridged rationally. Moreover, the subject who views himself outside the world as a whole evades his responsibility of acting on the world and avoids the commitment to his finiteness, escaping from his human condition.

Considering the problem of the other minds, we find a similar epistemological difficulty. The individual's intention to obtain a knowledge of the others which is similar to the one he has of his own states results in the disconnection from them. In such a situation, "we convert the other into a character and make the world a stage for him."[8] This avoidance of the other (and the avoidance of revealing oneself to the others) goes hand in hand with the side of scepticism that affects the self: "the surmise that I have not acknowledged about others, hence about myself, the thing there is to acknowledge, that each of us is human, is not, first of all, the recognition of a universal human condition, but first of all a surmise about myself."[9] The individual's conscience remains in its insularity, in that isolation that subjectivity provides and that leaves the human creature closed in its privacy, unknown and unacknowledged.

Scepticism therefore means denying our ordinary forms of life,[10] a state of complete unfamiliarity with the world,[11] an installation in the false ordinary's damaged relationships which drowns out the human voice both in academic philosophy and in our everyday life. This is why Cavell proposes the return to the authentic ordinary as the way to recover from the life we have inherited under the conditions of scepticism and regain human confidence in autonomous existence in community. Nevertheless, this way back home is only possible if we accept the truth scepticism can teach us, i. e., that our connection to the world, the others and ourselves is not a function of knowledge.[12] Indeed, the ordinary can be embraced through experiential and existential approach and not through epistemological effort or intellectual means. We can consider then the *two faces of scepticism*: on the one hand, it implies a *threat* but, at the same time, it serves an *impulse* to restore the ordinary connections that let us recover from scepticism itself.

This recovery entails an acceptance of the world and its uncertainties, a will to introduce ourselves in the mystery of the world's existence,[13] as the world is not to be known but lived. In parallel, we can mend the gap between ourselves if we let the *pathos* guide us. In other words, it is not enough to know the others and their circumstances; we must do or reveal something in the face of that knowledge, we must respond (with responsibility) to our fellow human beings. Or, as Cavell would say: "The world is to be *accepted*; as the presentness of other minds is not to be known, but acknowledged." [14] My acknowledgement of the others (as well as the acknowledgement I get from them) is intimately related to the achievement of selfhood: "Without following our own thinking, we cannot know the minds of others. And without following the thinking of others, we cannot know our own minds, cannot have conviction in our

thoughts, cannot claim them as our own." [15] Not coincidentally, Cavell's perfectionist considerations suggest that self-knowledge can be understood as that kind of acknowledgement of myself I can reach by taking myself as other, by being able to cope with the uncanniness of a self-distanced perspective which can guide me to learn something new about myself—which can drive me from the *mourning* of the dead self to the *morning* of the new one.[16] But, despite these chances of recuperation, it is worth noting that in the opinion of Cavell scepticism cannot be erased once for all and we are called to continuously accept the presence of doubt.[17] Consequently, our recoveries from scepticism are never an ultimate overcoming of it and we are destined to *cyclic* renewals that allow us to live with scepticism without living in it.

Cavell's diverse approaches to moving image are closely related to his views on scepticism and moral perfectionism. What is more, we can hardly dissociate his philosophical investigation from his study on the moving image and readings of films, as both interests often interweave in his writings. In the light of considering this fact as well as the use of some Cavellian notions we will make later, we find it convenient to add some brief reflections about the link between the ontology of the moving image and scepticism as well as some remarks on what the author names *comedies of remarriage* and *melodramas of the unknown woman*.

According to Cavell, photography and cinema are able to preserve the world's presentness without representing it by virtue of their automatism. So, photography and cinema seem to satisfy the "wish for the power to reach this world,"[18] the "wish for the world re-created in its own image."[19] However, this does not solve the problem of reality at all but brings it to some ultimate head "since the connection is established by putting us the condition of 'viewing unseen', which establishes the connection only at the price of establishing our absolute distance and isolation. And this is exactly the price of skepticism."[20] To rephrase it, film leaves us, as viewers, in the same position as the subject of the sceptical scenario who looks out at the world from behind the self. This is what makes Cavell maintain: "Film is a moving image of skepticism: not only is there a reasonable possibility, it is a fact that here our normal senses are satisfied of reality while reality does not exist—even alarmingly, because it does not exist, because viewing it is all it takes."[21]

Hence, film holds the world at a distance from the viewer and continually questions its reality, but can we speak about television in similar terms? And, moreover, is it legitimate to follow Cavell's studies on film in reading television series? The philosopher's exploration of the differences between film and television seem to deny that possibility. While the author calls the material basis of movies "a succession of automatic world projections" which is connected to the *viewing* mode of perception, he characterizes the material basis of television as "a current of simultaneous event reception" and links it to the *monitoring* mode of perception.[22] Our attempt to read *The Leftovers* in the light of Cavell's approaches to films becomes complicated if we consider that, for him, the serial procedure is undialectical[23] and the format appears to be

crucial: "My claim about the aesthetic medium of television can now be put this way: its successful formats are to be understood as revelations (acknowledgements) of the conditions of monitoring, and by means of a serial-episode procedure of composition, which is to say, by means of an aesthetic procedure in which the basis of a medium is acknowledged primarily by the format rather than primarily by its instantiations."[24]

Throughout "The Fact of Television" Cavell presents arguments like these in order to support the assertion made in the first paragraphs of the article: "Certainly I have been among those who have felt that television cannot have come of age, that the medium must have more in it than that has so far been shown."[25] Now, forty years after the writing's publication, we are moved to think that the medium has come of age, that certain television series stand for the emergence of something new as television and that they can be treated as unitary works of art, comparable in their form and function to films or novels.[26] As Martin Shuster says: "[R]oughly with *Twin Peaks*, film and television become intertwined historically and aesthetically in ways that suggest a novel medium, a medium that combines elements—automatisms—of each (…) Noting the connections between these media is the best way to set up an elaboration of the genre of 'new television'."[27] Those are the main reasons why the author takes the challenge of reading some television shows (which are representative of the mode of "new television"[28]) through Cavell's point of view on films. We will follow Shuster's example and keep our goal of dealing with *The Leftovers* in Cavellian fashion by referring occasionally to some ontological questions the show raises and mainly, by establishing connections between the television series and Cavell's remarriage films and melodramas of the unknown woman.[29]

Considering firstly remarriage comedies, the most salient characteristic of this genre of movies (and what drives its plots) is the couple's reunion after being separated.[30] According to Michael Fischer,[31] we can identify the five main plot elements that are shared by the films constituting the genre: 1) the dispute between man and woman, 2) the present threat of divorce/separation (the sceptical disconnection that menaces the couple), 3) man and woman's individual metamorphosis (their respective self-knowledge achievements), 4) the conversation that leads to mutual acknowledgement (which happens away from the city and far from interferences[32]) and 5) the restoration of the relationship under a new perspective (and in a non-ultimate way[33]).

Melodramas of the unknown woman also explore the question of what it is to constitute a marriage, but this second genre manifests the dark side of remarriage comedies.[34] In fact, the defining features of remarriage films are negated systematically by these melodramas.[35] The main negation in melodramas affects marriage itself, as it is not re-conceived and provisionally affirmed but transcended.[36] The couple in melodramas cannot solve their differences in the way the protagonists of the comedies do. Their past "is frozen, mysterious, with topics forbidden and isolating"[37] and their present is not much different. Their verbal interchanges are not real

conversations (those conversations that lead to conversion) since they, in denying one another, do not speak the same language.[38] The man is unable to face transformation—to get into the dynamics of mutual education marriage can imply—and the woman realises that her claim for acknowledgement cannot be satisfied by the man.[39] As a result, the woman takes her private torments as the means of providing humanity with a further perspective of herself.[40] She acknowledges her isolation and unknownness and she traces her new identity on her own, she metamorphoses outside marriage.

But the recovery from scepticism that Cavell finds in these both genres is not restricted to their protagonists' journey in the film. Following the main characters throughout the path that takes them from sceptical disconnection to recovery, the viewer is offered the chance to get out from his isolation and inhabit the world in a different way. Of course, this does not just happen after watching a remarriage comedy or a melodrama of unknownness, but every time a film (or, why not, a TV series) encourages us to be enriched by the personal experience of watching and *reading* it. Each film presents its particular way to move us and stimulates us to discover it without neither forgetting the film itself nor our own and inalienable experience of it.[41] In other words, film and viewer engage in a therapeutic conversation where the film plays the role of a friend or mentor that impels the viewer to find for himself his own route to self-knowledge and self-realization.

KEVIN'S HALFWAY TO SELF-KNOWLEDGE

Since the pilot episode (S1E1) Kevin Garvey is presented as a lost person with difficulties in emotionally handling his life and the post-October 14 world. The Guilty Remnant (GR) challenges him as a police chief who has to ensure the order of his community in the face of the chaos that the sect intends to spread. But the GR soon stands as a symbol of everything Kevin is going through, and not just professionally. His fight against the GR becomes more and more personal until it gets materialised in the figure of Patti Levin (Ann Dowd), who embodies Kevin's darkest part he will have to deal with. This becomes more apparent when, after kidnapping Patti in his confused state of sleepwalking (S1E8), Kevin admits something is wrong inside him and the confrontation with himself is unleashed.

After burying Patti, Kevin begins hallucinating conversations with her (S1E10). Patti's ghost becomes a kind of "other self" Kevin will have to get along with. These conversations are strongly characterized by uncanniness. It is not just because of the unearthly apparitions of a dead person, but also due to the above-mentioned uncanniness involved in the act of facing the self as other and by reason of the disturbing revelations Patti makes to Kevin. That is the case of the two scenes in which Patti discloses Kevin's attempt to kill himself and tries to make him reflect on the way it contradicts his so-called love for his family (S2E4). Both scenes include

fragments of Rick Astley's "Never Gonna Give You Up" that are sung a cappella by Patti: "I just wanna tell you how I'm feeling / Gotta make you understand / Never gonna give you up / Never gonna let you down / Never gonna run around and desert you." Apart from affixing another disconcerting element to the scenes, the song highlights Kevin's impossibility to simply get rid of Patti. He will have to face himself as ineluctably split or doubled and to accept his way to self-knowledge's endless condition, that is, his perpetual quest of the (Emersonian) *unattained* but *attainable* self.[42] While in these scenes the sense of menace to Kevin's present self prevails, he will end up appreciating the loving chance (just as loving as the song's lyrics) the challenge of self-transformation (of death and resurrection) implies.

Two episodes earlier (S2E2), the song "Where Is My Mind?" had already linked Kevin's uneasiness and frustration to the inner struggle he settles through his confrontation with Patti's ghost. The dreamlike and surreal atmosphere in which we are immersed by the verse (and by the question the song title formulates and the chorus repeats) brings us closer to Kevin's insane confusion and loss of control. As The Pixies song is playing an extraordinary montage sequence shows the main character contemplating the devastated Mapleton, his vain attempts to repair the washing machine, flashes of Patti's last hours and burial and Kevin's purchase of the shovel he unearths Patti's body with. The intense bridge that links the chorus with the verse (the moment of greatest instrumental chaos and noisiness in the song) underscores Kevin's driving: he sees a police car entering the road which he overtakes to recklessly run the risk of being accused of carrying a corpse.

The next episode (S2E3) will recur to the same melody—this time in an instrumental version—to go beyond the specific case of Kevin and extend its scope to the respective struggles faced by other characters in the series. A new montage sequence built around Maxence Cyrin's piano performance of "Where Is My Mind?" shows Laurie (Amy Brennman) writing her book on the GR and her (along with Tommy's) efforts to reintegrate former cult members. The slow tempo of the song (*andante*), the use of *rubato*, the *dolce* character and the rich timbre of the piano exploit the expressive potential of the original composition and offers us a different face of the musical theme. The two performances (The Pixies/Cyrin) respectively illustrate the *threat* of scepticism and the *impulse* it involves if we acknowledge its truth. The lyrical variations Cyrin includes in the verse's chord progression provide the climax of this kind and sweet version. Not by chance, this fragment is made to coincide with ex-GR Susan's emotional reunion with her son and husband.

Both versions of the music theme will be concatenated in perfect continuity in a couple of later scenes (S2E7). While Cyrin's cover sets the conversation between Kevin and Laurie about Tommy (Chris Zylka) in Jarden, the original song by The Pixies goes along again with Kevin driving in a hurry and looking for John (Kevin Carroll), who will in turn take his fingerprints and end up incriminating Kevin in the disappearance of Evie (Jasmin Savoy Brown). The

juxtaposition of the two performances dwells on the *two faces of scepticism*, this time by illustrating Kevin's contradictory urges: on the one hand, his desire to assume his responsibilities as a family man—*his search for home*—which can be connected with the *impulse* to recovery that scepticism implies if we acknowledge the truth it teaches us. On the other, Kevin's drive to flee and his self-destructive tendency—*his running away from home*—that relates to the despair in which scepticism throws us if we just take it as a *threat*. In any case, both divergent needs are entirely human since "it is natural to the human to wish to escape the human."[43] Similarly, we could add that the search for home and the running away from it are equally a part of our human condition. After all, "[w]e are (…) in relation to the ordinary both at home and not home; it is uncanny."[44] As we are about to see, Kevin's two propensities will be soon more explicit with his comings and goings to purgatory.

Kevin's first journey to the afterlife hotel (S2E8) culminates in his murder of the little girl Patti. As David Burton (Bill Camp) tells Kevin on the bridge, he will not be the same after killing her. From that point onwards, the main character will not face himself through Patti's ghost in the world of the living but through his trips to the afterlife hotel, where he will go on interacting with Patti as his other self—though Kevin will also have to deal with different versions of himself in the realm of the undead. That purgatory is a place for Kevin to hideaway and avoid his responsibilities but, at the same time, a place where he is able to find himself and experience the need to resuscitate and come back to life renewed, transformed (to put it in another way, *his need to return home*). This is the wish he expresses during his second stay at the mysterious hotel (S2E10). After being shot by John, Kevin visits the realm of the undead again, where Burton encourages him to sing at the karaoke to fulfil his will of going back. Dressed as Garvey, the Police Chief of Mapleton—and not as the international assassin Harvey, like last time—the main character accepts the illogical (stupid, nonsensical, even humiliating) challenge of singing to come back to his family. It is an emotional and existential urge that makes him act, that makes him sing and stay alive. This action frees him from the burden of doubt and gets him closer to the world he is interacting with, no matter how fake it can be. As long as he is (inter)acting, that world is, at least to a certain extent, real for him. And this perspective which acknowledges that our existence, our thoughts and actions are embedded in a shared world is precisely the one that allows us to stop conceiving scepticism as a mainly epistemological problem.[45]

Simon & Garfunkel's "Homeward Bound" starts to play. After the first chorus, the close-ups of an uncomfortable and nervous Kevin are mixed with flashes from previous episodes that match perfectly with the lyrics of the song. The words "Every day's an endless stream / Of cigarettes and magazines" are sung by Kevin while editing juxtaposes a shot of the main character secretly smoking and an image of the volume of *National Geographic* Kevin Garvey, Sr. (Scott Glenn) gave to his son. When Kevin pronounces "I'll play the game and pretend" a

shot of the party in honour of Kevin Garvey, Sr. (S1E9) reminds us of a family that no longer exists together with deteriorated relationships and pretence that Kevin must abandon to move forward. Holding back his tears and sniffling, Kevin faces the last chorus of the song: "...I need someone to comfort me. / Homeward bound / I wish I was / Homeward bound / Home, where my thought's escapin' / Home, where my music's playin' / Home, where my love lies waitin' / Silently for me". As soon as he finishes singing this last line, a brief close up of a smiling Nora with wet eyes fills the screen.

Kevin wakes up and goes to Erika's nursery. When John arrives, he cannot believe Kevin is not dead. While cleaning Kevin's wound, John confesses in tears: "I don't know what's happening". The first quiet notes of Cyrin's version of "Where Is My Mind?" start sounding and the main character replies: "Me neither." John's nervous crying contrasts with Kevin's quietness and the louder piano riff of the song provides the emotional approach to the overwhelming moment. While the chorus is playing, John and Kevin are on their way back home. The tune concludes when John opens his home's main door, remarking the aforementioned dual use of the song to underline despair and to illustrate moments in which the way out to that despair is glimpsed.

In the beginning of the series, Kevin tried to be the incarnation of law and order (as police chief, as father of a family), he wanted to stay away from his father's insanity and could not accept his own mental problems. After confronting himself through Patti's ghost and his two visits to purgatory, the protagonist is on his way to face his situation in other terms. The last two commented scenes accentuate Kevin's ongoing self-renewal. First, he has been able to break his logical barriers and take the ridiculous challenge of singing at the karaoke (to keep on living, because he *deserves* to do so). Then, he has shown no stress at all when admitting he does not *know* what is happening before John. Kevin is not so much repressing his darkest part but trying to come to terms with his "other self" and he seems to be unblocking his *pathos* and taking responsibility for his claims. To put it another way, the main character is starting to walk the perfectionist path which entails "an expression of disgust and disdain for the present state of things so complete as to require not merely reform, but a call for transformation of things, and before all a transformation of the self."[46]

The recurrent appearance of "Where Is My Mind?" throughout the second season can also be associated with the *cyclic condition of scepticism* we suggested above, that is, with the periodical efforts of recovery we are destined to make since it is not possible to overcome scepticism once for all. Those circles drawn by "Where Is My Mind?" are similar to the ones traced by the theme "Departure" and its variations, which not only accompany the scenes where the big trauma of October 14 is recalled and many others where we witness the little deaths of scepticism but also those moments that aim to the hope of recovery. The rhyme between the piano version of "Where Is My Mind?" and "Departure" is highlighted when the latter is used to

close the circle of season two with Kevin's arrival to his place. Max Richter's theme is heard when Kevin raises his eyes to realise his "big family" is in the house. Just one panning shot shows Jill, Laurie, Matt and a recovered Mary, Tommy and Lily and finally Nora, who walks towards him and says: "You're home." A reverse shot depicts Kevin's reaction, a mixture of laughing and crying that portrays the same ambivalence we have noticed in both songs.

Both Season One and Two end up with Kevin coming back home after disorder and confusion—i. e., the riot against the GR resulting in the cult-like organization's houses having been set on fire (S1E10) and the GR's infiltration in Miracle (Jarden) with subsequent chaos and destruction by the outsiders (S2E10). The two season finales offer us big reasons to include *The Leftovers* in the genre that Shuster terms "new television." According to the author, the thematic mode of these series "exhibit a contemporary world as entirely emptied of normative authority" in which "the institution of the family consistently appears exempt from (…) such a portrayal."[47] In fact, "family (but not thereby a traditional one) is presented and explored as a symbolic site for worldly renewal and possibility"[48], as "an *alternative* to or a replacement for 'society at large'"[49]. *The Leftovers*' alignment with this thematic mode allows us to establish a first general link between the show and Cavell's remarriage comedies with the help of Shuster's argumentation[50]: both share the aim of commenting upon the social bond and presenting a "further instance of experimentation in consent and reciprocity,"[51] both remark that "community remains possible even when the authority of society is denied us."[52] In this sense, we could understand *The Leftovers* as moved by the same wish that Cavell appreciates in films: "[Movies] unappeasable appetite for stories of love is for stories in which love, to be found, must find its own community, apart from, but with luck still within, society at large; an enclave within it; stories in which society as a whole, and its laws can no longer provide or deny love."[53]

LOVE IN THE TIME OF DEPARTURE: NORA AND KEVIN'S JOURNEY FROM AVOIDANCE TO ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The way to self-knowledge is not one to be made on one's own[54] and so, Kevin looks for support in several characters through his pursuit for transformation. Among them, Nora occupies a special place. They first meet as outsiders at the Christmas Ball (S1E4) and encounter each other by chance at the courthouse, where both are filing for divorce (S1E6). After a real first date which is interrupted by the GR (S1E7), Kevin invites Nora for dinner with Jill (Margaret Qualley) and Aimee (Emily Meade) (S1E8). But Kevin's troubled mind does not leave much space for devoted love and Nora does not seem to be in a better position. Her obsession to know the truth about the departure and discover what happened to her children—and the painful impossibility of mourning for them, as they are not dead but gone—leads her to

the decision of leaving Mapleton and writing a farewell letter to Kevin (S1E10). After finding Lily at the porch, she stays and her feelings expressed in the letter remain unknown to Kevin.

They blindly forge ahead with the recently-adopted Lily and Jill, trying to begin a new life in Jarden (S2E1). But this attempt of a fresh start is not accompanied by the determination of being honest to each other, of relying on (and being reliable to) the other. And when Kevin opens himself to Nora by confessing his hallucinations (S2E7), she leaves with Mary and Lily (S2E8). It seems that it is mainly the chaos caused by the GR in Jarden—in a similar way to what happened in Mapleton at the end of Season One—that sees them meet again at home (S2E10).

Things look better for them at the beginning of Season Three. Kevin appears to be a cornerstone of his family and community again. He is the police chief in Jarden and Nora has returned to work as a Department of the Sudden Departure agent. However, Kevin is still on his uneasy way to find himself—this time trying to handle with the messianic attributes that Matt (Christopher Eccleston), John and Tommy project on him—and Nora has not got over her unrest and dissatisfaction, even less after Lily's comeback with her biological mother. As in Season One and Two, Kevin and Nora go on behaving like the couples in the melodramas of unknownness. They still have not realised that "[i]t is (…) the logic of human intimacy (…) that to exchange understanding with another is to share pain with that other, and that to take pleasure from another is to extend that pleasure."[55] The scene in which Nora discovers Kevin's awkward asphyxiating rituals (S3E2) is especially eloquent of the couple's unchanged mistrust. It is not just that Kevin needs to do so and keep it in secret; there is also Nora's tattoo and its heart-breaking backstory—which she does not share with him—as well as Kevin's (naïve, or even clumsy) proposal of having a child and Nora's (funny, or even insulting) reaction. And above all, there is their reciprocal pretending of happiness, their avoidance and their insistence on being unknown to the other.

All of this triggers in Melbourne (S3E4) where Kevin travels to with Nora, without really knowing about her intentions in relation to the machine that supposedly reunites the remnants with those departed. Nora seems to overcome her rational boundaries, not for the sake of the relationship but for her individual aspiration of finding her children with the help of that mysterious device. In the same fashion, Kevin is absorbed by his personal disorder, which now includes hallucinatory visions of Evie. A-ha's song "Take On Me" and its variations underscore those non-shared particular purposes of both Nora and Kevin and connect them to their break-up. The first time we hear the song is in Nora's arrival at the abandoned warehouse where she meets the physicists that work on the radioactive machine project. As she climbs the stairs, one of the physicists is playing the initial keyboard riff of the song on a grand piano. Some minutes later, the non-diegetic Genghis Barbie's French horns cover of the hit sounds as the images show the respective private concerns of Nora and Kevin. Again, the riff from the opening

accompanies Nora, this time while she gets into the box that imitates the real transporting device. The editing juxtaposes the closing of the box's lid with Kevin's opening of the library doors on his search for Evie at the precise moment the song's verse starts. Similarly, the beginning of the chorus is marked with a new shot—a rotary zenithal one that emphasizes Kevin's disorientation.

Working as a sort of catalysis,[56] both versions of "Take On Me" anticipate the couple's fighting that will end up in Kevin's leaving and the couple's separation. The dispute in the hotel room raises Kevin's fear to tell Nora about his latest visions and clearly sets out that Nora is still stuck in her family's departure and expected some reaction from Kevin when Lily was taken away from them. Yet, first and foremost, the scene makes it self-evident there is no proper communication between them. In other words, there is not—and there has not been—any place for that kind of real *con-versation* which leads to *con-version*. As we said before when referring to the couples in the melodramas of unknownness, they are far from reaching the mutual education that the protagonists of the remarriage comedies achieved.

On stepping through the hotel's door, Kevin finds his father, who convinces him to get in Grace's truck. We can hear the introductory drum loop of the original song by A-ha. Inside the vehicle, Kevin looks skyward through a window full of rain drops. Once more, the beginning of the keyboard riff coincides with a shot of Nora, sat in the room's bed. She is smoking, the fire-fighting devices are pouring water all over the room and the lights go out. While the smoke drives us to the GR's hopelessness, the water—often associated in *The Leftovers* with death and resurrection—and the cheerful tune makes us wonder: Will it ultimately be the end of the relationship?

The years go by and the older Kevin and Nora re-meet in a rural Australian town (S3E8). Kevin invites Nora to go to a local dance with him. Confused and angry because he seems unable to remember anything of their common past apart from the time they met at the Christmas Ball, Nora rejects the invitation at first but finally turns up at the dance, which in fact is a wedding celebration. While she looks for Kevin in the crowd, Robin Trower's sunny "I'm Out to Get You" is being played: "I'm out to get you / Create a disturbance in your mind / I've been sent to select you / From another place in time / It's gonna be something new / And you better not hesitate / For the first time in your life / You can celebrate". By the time they make eye-contact, the song's chorus lets us hear: "Close your eyes / count to ten / Make a wish and we'll be there / Turn around, and maybe then / Your whole life can start again". Though the optimistic words of the song, Kevin's persistence in negating the past blocks Nora's receptiveness. This is especially obvious towards the end of the scene. Nora and Kevin dance to Otis Redding's "I've Got Dreams to Remember" in tears. Beyond the fact the song talks about separation and longing for reunion, it delivers us back to the previous time in the series when it was heard: the couple's dinner with Jill and Aimee, namely, Kevin's first attempt to form a

family with Nora and one of the memories he now pretends to erase along with the rest of the experiences they went through together. As Nora cannot stand Kevin's lies, she decides to go away.

Next day, Kevin comes back to Nora's place and reveals the truth: he could not believe she was dead and, as Kevin says, "I had to do something about it," so he has been searching for her all these years. That is to say, he had to *act* according to what he believed and what he felt towards her, he had to *respond* consequently. Kevin's visceral sincerity is welcomed by Nora this time. She tells him she was transported where all the departed live and found her family: "They were all smiling. They were... happy. And I understood that, here, in this place, they were the lucky ones. In a world full of orphans, they still had each other." Unlike Nora and Kevin and almost everyone in the world where the departed were a minor part of the population, they had moved on by leaning on each other, by triggering the *pathos* that allows living in the face of scepticism. Nora felt she did not belong there, so she came back. When Nora finishes her story, she states she did think about Kevin and want to be with him, but she adds: "And I knew that if I told you what happened… that you would never believe me." And Kevin responds: "I believe you." At that moment, the theme "Departure" fades in slowly, this time showing its brightest side, the one that serves acknowledgement and reconciliation. Kevin no longer allows the past determine the meaning of what is happening at the moment[57]: "Why wouldn't I believe you? You're here." They hold each other's hand, crying and smiling at the same time and Nora replies: "I'm here."

Nora and Kevin spent many years together, but they never got to *speak the same language*,[58] they were not able to let themselves matter to each other.[59] They refused to know and to be known, they avoided acknowledgement; they were an expression of scepticism.[60] Now things have changed, they both have come to terms with themselves and they are ready to accept human relatedness and repetition,[61] prepared to live the "further instance of experimentation in consent and reciprocity"[62] that reunion after separation offers. At last, they are able to keep that crucial conversation which involves *empathic projection*[63] and leads to the overcoming of the gap between themselves. We could say, this conversation allows them to leave aside the unknownness that marked their past and to embrace a new perspective, such as happens to the couples in the remarriage comedies: "The conversation of what I call remarriage is (…) of a sort that leads to acknowledgement; to the reconciliation of a genuine forgiveness; a reconciliation so profound as to require the metamorphosis of death and revival, the achievement of a new perspective on existence; a perspective that presents itself as a place, one removed from the city of confusion and divorce."[64] It is never too late, and they both can finally abandon *mourning* and dive together into the light of a new *morning*.

THE CHALLENGE TO THE VIEWER

The present section will try to explore the kind of experience *The Leftovers* provides its spectator. Although we have so far offered some hints of this—our previous readings imply a personal reaction to (and interpretation of) certain aspects of the TV series—we will now further explore the sort of relationship *The Leftovers* attempts to keep with its audience. As before, the role of popular music in the show and the Cavellian insights about film and scepticism will guide our examination.

In a broad sense, it can be said *The Leftovers* entails a challenge to the audience. Its narrative is far from the conventional causal-chain we find in the hegemonic audio-visual order. Unmarked leaps in time, hallucinatory episodes, dreams and other difficult-to-locate passages are mixed together while the information supplied to the viewer remains deliberately incomplete. All of this results in an epistemologically confusing experience which is, at the same time, an intriguing and emotionally engaging one. This is just one way of expressing the shocking dynamics of estrangement/closeness that, as we will see, the series establishes with its audience at several levels and by different means. We will understand these dynamics as an expression of (or better said, as an extension of) the sceptical scenario moving image displays to its audience. Certainly, every "succession of automatic world projections" presents us with a mysterious combination of real and fantastic elements and throws us to the enigmatic specificity of cinematic experience, one that we do not know how to place ontologically.[65] But some audio-visual works (as *The Leftovers*) specially foster our doubts between taking the projection on the screen as an image of the world or as something real and invite us to regard our day-to-day world in order to give sense to the world on the screen. In that regard, we will take these dynamics of estrangement/closeness as a way of emphasizing the dialectics of scepticism the moving image reproduces, as a way of highlighting the necessary intervention of the viewer to put together the bits of the world *The Leftovers* gives him[66]—to shape the world he is viewing on the screen.

The bond the viewer builds with the main character can offer an example of what we have just maintained. Identifying with Kevin is not an easy movement. Obviously, he is not the hero we can effortlessly attach to: his mental problems and troubled temper, his strange behaviour and our partial lack of knowledge about him drive us to a peculiar bond with Kevin. Let us return to one of the songs we have already discussed in order to depict how it sheds light on this curious link. As said above, the first time we hear The Pixies' "Where Is My Mind?" in the aforementioned montage sequence (S2E2) we associate the cryptic and lysergic words of the verse and the plainer meaning of the question repeated in the chorus to Kevin's confusion. But, at the same time, the lyrics can also be referring to our own feelings as viewers before the passage since we are as disoriented as Kevin. Like in many other cases in the show, not-

knowing is what connects us with him, that is, we identify with Kevin in perplexity. Moreover, if we consider what we previously stated—namely, that the recurrence of the tune in its different versions makes this uncertainty extensive to several characters and situations—we can also contemplate perplexity as a main factor in the audience's engagement with the story itself.

Before skipping to the next song, we would like to add some remarks on the same excerpt. The way "Where Is My Mind?" is displayed in the sequence reinforces the audience's disconcert with a trick that is recurrent throughout the series. The first shots make us think of the music as non-diegetic (or extra-diegetic), but shortly after, a tight shot of Kevin's earphones suggests an internal auricularisation[67] sustained until the action moves to the motorway. Once there, Kevin is driving his car with no earphones, so we can be pushed to think of the non-diegetic option again. When the police officer asks Kevin to turn off the vehicle, he switches off the car's ignition and the song immediately stops, aiming to a diegetic use of the music. The fact that the tune abruptly ends just before the chord progression returns to its tonic entails an additional a sense of lack of closure, instability and discomfort to the viewer.

At first sight, and in an attempt to follow a Cavellian point of view, we could think of diegetic music as an aural part of the world presented by *The Leftovers* that fosters our engagement with that world, while non-diegetic music is something external added to that world which highlights our distance from it (and our questioning of it). Although this could be a reasonable reading, we think it loses the specificity and potential of the show's recurrent trick. After all, a great part of the audio-visual products combine diegetic and non-diegetic music (and they do not achieve the above explained effect at all). Shuster provides us with another argument that can weaken our intuition: imagining something visually denotes the sort of "vision" involved in being in a *world*, and thereby can make plausible the presence of non-diegetic music since it would be implicated with the phenomenological notion of a mood [*Befindlichkeit*].[68] So to speak, non-diegetic music would not be so "external" to the world presented and that would complicate the initial interpretation. In our view, the key of the trick *The Leftovers* displays lies in underlining ambiguity by making obvious what normally goes unnoticed, by making evident manipulation through the conflict between diegetic and non-diegetic music. That is the way this trick emphasizes the fact that moving images present us with projections which screen the world for us but, at the same time, screen us from the world they hold.[69]

Going back to the spectator's intricate identification with Kevin we can go a bit further by re-reading the choice of Astley's "Never Gonna Give You Up". When dealing with the evolution of the main character we underlined his exposition to the uncanny. We can now point to uncanniness as a shared feeling between Kevin and us that fosters identification (at least) in these two scenes. Sung by Patti in both dramatic contexts, the romantic anthem from the eighties gets transformed into a threat for the police chief and for us who feel a disturbing

unheimlich sensation as a result of such an unexpected and anempathetic[70] juxtaposition. The experience gets even more disconcerting if, by means of intertextual connections[71] which take us to the Rickrolling phenomenon,[72] we attach an extra layer of weird humour to the scenes.

Let us now leave aside the question of identification to focus on the notions of "anempathetic music" and "intertextual connections" evaluating how they drive the audience to conflict. Revisiting the use of A-ha's "Take On Me" in the break-up scene will serve our purpose. The cheery tune generates an anempathetic effect when contrasted with the sadness of what we are watching. On the one hand, this shock leads the audience to an intensification on their emotion.[73] On the other, it seems to offer the viewer the possibility of keeping a distance from what the images are telling him. In this sense, and as we suggested before, the joyful song could encourage us to hope for a better end for the couple. But image and sound are indissolubly united by a synchresis that is far from any logic[74] and the viewer is abandoned to the tense dynamics of closeness/estrangement the scene displays. Furthermore, intertextual links can deepen this ambivalence: while the happy tune may open the doors of hope, the viewer's evocation of the highly popular video clip for the song can make him infer the impossibility for Nora and Kevin to inhabit the same world as it happens (in a more literal way) to the couple in the music video.

Nonetheless, one of the best examples of *The Leftovers*' intertextual games which connect the audience with their popular culture is provided by the recurrent inclusion of references to the sitcom *Perfect Strangers* (ABC, 1986-1993). These allusions work as a running gag in Season One and Two, in which we are told, respectively, that the four principal cast members of the show disappeared on October 14 and that Mark Linn-Baker did not actually depart but was hiding in Mexico. In Season Three, the references move beyond anecdotal and their tone changes radically when Linn-Baker (as himself) informs Nora about the transporting machine (S3E2), which prepares the ground for a plot-turning point. As we notice from its outset, this episode is full of nods to *Perfect Strangers*: while its title "Don't Be Ridiculous" recalls Balki's catchphrase, the opening credits introduce the sitcom's theme song "Nothing's Gonna Stop Me Now". Let us show how both nods will soon become decidedly significant in relation to Nora.

After talking to Baker in St Louis, Nora dismisses the machine as pseudoscience at first. But before returning to Jarden, she drives to Kentucky where Lily and her mother live. Nora finds Lily in a park and gets out of the car to give back to the little girl the toy shovel that a child has just grabbed from her. Then Lily asks Nora: "Who are you?". Nora's smile vanishes at that moment and an ethereal and mysterious synthesizer pad fades in. After a short chat with Lily's mother, Nora gets into her car and leaves. We can see her deeply impacted and weeping, but the only thing we hear is a soft piano that joins the synthesizer pad to freely perform the melody of "Nothing's Gonna Stop Me Now". Max Richter's instrumental version does its best to turn shiny happiness into melancholy, but, above all, pushes us to make guesses about Nora

which contradict her initial refusal of the radioactive device. By virtue of links related to our knowledge of *Perfect Strangers*—that is, by the connection we establish between the cover and Linn-Baker's proposal—we are driven to consider that, after her last emotional shock, Nora feels the machine is not so *ridiculous* thus she is starting to consider it as an option for her. After all, *it's her life and her dream and nothing's gonna stop her now*.

Just like the sitcom's theme song, some more tunes are heard in the opening credits of Season Three. Functioning as paratexts,[75] they normally set the tone and/or provide valuable information which is intimately addressed to the viewer. Sometimes, the song in the opening credits concurs with what we are about to see, as it happens when "This Love Is Over", by Ray LaMontagne & the Pariah Dogs, precedes Kevin and Nora's breakup (S3E4). Some others contribute to the friction in which *The Leftovers* often plunges its spectator. That is the case of Richard Cheese's "Personal Jesus" (S3E3). Although its lyrics could make us believe in the messianic condition Kevin's friends attribute to him, Richard Cheese's lounge version—with its faster tempo and light hearted mood—takes us down to earth and even ridicules that supernatural interpretation. In other instances—as it paradigmatically occurs with the use of "Let the Mistery Be"—the song seems to give a sort of advice that could be followed by the characters but mostly, by the audience. In fact, Iris DeMent's song appears in all the opening credits of Season Two and, not by chance, in the ones of the series finale (S3E8). At the end of this last episode, the audience is impelled to risk their final judgement. Sharing with Kevin the spectator condition while listening to Nora's story, we have to respond not only before it but also before the series as a whole. And of course, there is the option for us to leave aside the epistemological gaps, to dismiss the doubts and uncertainties and affirm, with Kevin, that we do believe (or want to believe).

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout, we have dedicated our essay to upholding the pertinence of *The Leftovers'* reading in Cavellian fashion and analysing popular music's use in the TV series in order to highlight its contribution to that reading. We have confirmed *The Leftovers* goes far beyond the traditional "underscore" soundtrack with its music dismissing a secondary role to achieve leadership and great effect. Pop songs in the show underpin the narrative and expressive potential of the inherent mixture the audio-visual involves by means of their significant lyrics and the evocative power of the instrumental, which reaches the emotions words can hardly get to; on account of the strong connection we feel with the original catchy songs and with their "adapted to the mood" versions; through their concordance with what we are watching or their conflict with it; and with the help of the multiple and suggestive intertextual connections that re-link us to popular culture.

In the first section of our analysis we have remarked how the use of popular music helps to sharply draw crucial aspects that are related to the task of self-knowledge and self-transformation such as the fact of taking oneself as other, the conception of scepticism both as a threat and as an impulse to recovery and the cyclic condition of the sceptical menace. When dealing with avoidance and acknowledgement through the examination of Nora and Kevin's relationship we have been able to appreciate to what extent a song and its variations pave the way to associate their attitude of remaining unknown to the other with their separation. Furthermore, we have pointed to the way the music outlines the couple's longing for re-establishing (and renewing) the relationship in the series finale. The last section has been devoted to showing that the possibilities of recovery *The Leftovers* offers to its spectator transcend the mere passive tracking of the main characters' path. In that sense, we have provided some examples of the tense estrangement/closeness dynamics the series displays to its audience and connected them with moving image's questioning of its reality. Firstly, we have commented on the music's emphasis on the role that uncanniness and perplexity play in our identification with Kevin. Then, we have referred to the intertwining of diegetic and non-diegetic music as a way of underlining that moving image screens a world for us but also screens us from that world. Afterwards, we have presented the use of anempathetic music as a means to reinforce conflict in the viewer. Finally we have seen how the intertextual games suggested by some pop songs strengthen the ambiguity of the series and its continuous appeal to the spectator.

As a matter of fact, the inconsistency *The Leftovers* exudes and its null aspirations of univocity or certainty impel the viewer to a hermeneutic exercise that cannot be exclusively reduced to logical operations. Therefore, the show not only strives to present the spectator with a sceptical scenario and to confront him with reflective conscience, but also offers him the possibility of finding a participatory and affective way to escape the dead end. Ultimately, it is our acceptance of *pathos* that can heal the conflict in which we have been plunged by the show, that can make us reach an existential learning from the conversation we have kept with the series, that enables *The Leftovers* to convince us of the possibility for a real change in human existence's conditions.[76]

[*] The author would like to thank the editor Susana Viegas and the anonymous reviewers for their advice and efforts in enriching this article. The text is equally indebted to José Pavía and Adrian Hart's linguistic corrections.

[1] Stanley Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3.

[2] Cf. Stanley Cavell, *The Claim of Reason. Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 468.

[3] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 129-243.

[4] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 329-496.

[5] Stanley Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), 323.

[6] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 216 (emphasis in original).

[7] Stanley Cavell, *The World Viewed. Reflections on the Ontology of Film. Enlarged Edition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), 102 (emphasis in original).

[8] Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?*, 333.

[9] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 438.

[10] Stanley Cavell, *Contesting Tears. The Hollywood Melodrama of the Unknown Woman* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 89.

[11] Cf. Stanley Cavell, *In Quest of the Ordinary. Lines of Skepticism and Romanticism* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 165.

[12] Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?*, 324.

[13] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 241.

[14] Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?*, 324 (emphasis in original).

[15] William Rothman and Marian Keane, *Reading Cavell's The World Viewed. A Philosophical Perspective on Film* (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 2000), 23.

[16] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 212.

[17] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 431.

[18] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 21.

[19] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 39.

[20] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 195.

[21] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 188-189.

[22] Stanley Cavell, "The Fact of Television," in *Cavell on Film*, ed. William Rothman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 72.

[23] Cavell, "The Fact of Television," 80.

[24] Cavell, "The Fact of Television," 72.

[25] Cavell, "The Fact of Television," 61.

[26] Martin Shuster, *New Television. The Aesthetics and Politics of a Genre* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), 2.

[27] Shuster, *New Television*, 46.

[28] Shuster, *New Television*, 3.

[29] It is obvious that *The Leftovers* is neither a remarriage comedy nor a melodrama of the unknown woman, but some aspects of these genres will be useful for our reading of Nora and Kevin's relationship.

[30] Stanley Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 1-2.

[31] Michael Fischer, *Stanley Cavell and Literary Skepticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 88.

[32] Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 19, 172.

[33] Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 126-127; Cavell, *In Quest of the Ordinary*, 178.

[34] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 136.

[35] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 115.

[36] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 6.

[37] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 6.

[38] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 99.

[39] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 6.

[40] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 159.

[41] Cf. Stanley Cavell, "The Thought of Movies," in *Cavell on Film*, ed. William Rothman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 93.

[42] Stanley Cavell, *Conditions Handsome and Undhandsome: The Constitution of Emersonian Perfectionism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 12.

[43] Cavell, *In Quest of the Ordinary*, 59.

[44] Richard Eldridge, "Between Acknowledgement and Avoidance," in *Stanley Cavell*, ed. Richard Eldridge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 5.

[45] Cf. Philipp Schmerheim, "Skepticism films: Knowing and doubting the world in contemporary cinema" (PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2013), 256.

[46] Cavell, *Conditions Handsome and Undhandsome*, 46.

[47] Shuster, *New Television*, 6.

[48] Shuster, *New Television*, 6.

[49] Shuster, *New Television*, 163 (emphasis in original).

[50] Shuster, *New Television*, 161.

[51] Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 182.
[52] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 214.
[53] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 214.
[54] Vid. Stanley Cavell, "The Good of Film," in *Cavell on Film*, ed. William Rothman (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 336.
[55] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 221.
[56] Roland Barthes, "L'effet du réel," *Communications* 11 (1968): 95-101.
[57] Cavell, *Must We Mean What We Say?*, 322.
[58] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 99.
[59] Cavell, *Contesting Tears*, 181.
[60] Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge*, 143.
[61] Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 241.
[62] Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 182.
[63] Cavell, *The Claim of Reason*, 423.
[64] Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 19.
[65] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 16-17.
[66] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 156.
[67] André Gaudreault and François Jost, *El relato cinematográfico*, trans. Núria Pujol (Barcelona: Paidós, 1995), 146.
[68] Shuster, *New Television*, 209-210, note 24.
[69] Cavell, *The World Viewed*, 24.
[70] Michel Chion, *La audiovisión. Introducción a un análisis conjunto de la imagen y el sonido*, trans. Antonio López Ruiz (Barcelona: Paidós, 1993), 19.
[71] Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestos: La literatura en segundo grado*, trans. Celia Fernández Prieto (Madrid: Taurus, 1989), 10.
[72] Rickrolling is a practical joke and a meme involving the unexpected appearance of the music video for "Never Gonna Give You Up".
[73] Chion, *La audiovisión*, 19.
[74] Chion, *La audiovisión*, 65.
[75] Genette, *Palimpsestos*, 13.
[76] Cavell, "The Good of Film," 343.