

Notes Toward a Cinema of Anagnorisis

The Limited Series: The House on the Waste Ground

A house is always born before its foundations. It begins at the moment when the imagination establishes an order: here rather than there; inside rather than outside; one line permits movement, another brings it to a halt. Long before stone and concrete, architecture already determines what may be seen from a given position and what will disappear when the observer's position changes. Cinema does much the same. It places the spectator in a particular position and conceals the fact that this placement is already an interpretation. A frame is not simply an image of the world. It is a boundary drawn around the act of seeing.

It is therefore fitting that the central figure of "The House on the Waste Ground" should be an architect. His profession has trained Alejandro to translate uncertainty into parameters. A woman called Marta arrives and commissions a building of exactly 222 square metres: four wings facing the four cardinal directions, on the site of a former landfill. The fee is implausibly generous. The terms are precise and radically incomplete. Everything has been specified except the building's purpose. Alejandro accepts the commission because his practice is close to collapse and he needs to preserve his work, his employees and the image he still has of himself. Marta brings not temptation, but the possibility of continuing a life that has already begun to disintegrate. Death rarely announces itself as death. It enters life disguised as necessity.

From this moment, the film constructs around Alejandro a structure whose plan he cannot read. A woman in a wide-brimmed hat moves through Mexico City. After a while, a private detective appears. Strange, extravagant murders occur at the periphery of the narrative. An adolescent girl speaks of a dead father who continues to send her gifts. Eagles, weapons, rituals, constellations, neuropsychology and fragments of Mesoamerican cosmology form an expanding system of correspondences. The enigmatic house seems destined to become the key to everything: a cosmogram, a temple, a tomb, a map of consciousness or a machine of passage into the afterlife. Yet the building touches each of these interpretations and withdraws. Its meaning remains unresolved because the man designing it does not yet know where he himself is.

Yet almost simultaneously, another film begins alongside Alejandro's story. It follows Natalia – a dancer moving within mechanical exoskeletal wings – and the constellation of figures, investigations, cults and ritual signs that surrounds her. Her father is associated with neuropsychology, while her mother, a former biathlete, trains marksmen in Canada. For much of the limited series, the two plot lines exist as autonomous narratives, as though they belonged to different genres and even to different films. They move beside one another, occasionally reflecting each other, but reveal no evident causal connection. The spectator is compelled to ask where and how these trajectories will meet: whether one story is the dream of the other, its symbolic reflection, or a fragment of a larger construction that has not yet become visible.

Dreamlike cinema usually alters the world. Space expands, time repeats itself, identities dissolve. Here the transformation is quieter. Mexico City remains material and indifferent. Offices open, telephones ring, cars cross streets; people work, betray, train, travel and die. The strangeness does not arise because reality has abandoned its laws. It arises because Alejandro continues to live by those laws after his own relation to them has already changed. Yet sometimes the world is innocent. It has not necessarily deceived Alejandro. It has continued to present facts, causal traces and visible surfaces. It is not the world that has shifted, but the

observer's position. Alejandro believes that he stands before events still in progress. He assumes that the truth lies ahead and that every disturbance announces something approaching. But the decisive event is not approaching. It has already happened.

A conventional detective story creates ignorance by concealing evidence: a witness lies, a door remains locked, a document disappears. "The House on the Waste Ground" proceeds differently. Its facts are not so much hidden as incorrectly located. We see what has happened while continuing to believe that we are seeing what is happening. The evidence is present, but placed within a perspective that makes recognition impossible. In a conventional mystery, the world contains a secret. Here the spectator's relation to the world is the secret. This is why architecture is not a decorative metaphor. Architecture is the art in which location becomes destiny. Alejandro considers himself the architect because he lays out the lines, but gradually it becomes clear that he has himself been placed inside another person's plan. The forces surrounding his life have already reduced him to a function: a husband to be removed; a financial vulnerability to be exploited; a target to be located; a body to be disposed of. The murder is geometrical in the most ordinary sense. One person desires a particular result. Another is paid to produce it. Distance is calculated. A moment is selected. The act is completed.

Beneath the film's metaphysical ornament lies a crime that would occupy only a few minutes in a more conventional narrative. Carlos Espinoza, the lover of Alejandro's wife, commissions his murder. The killer performs the task, then returns to Canada, where he continues his shooting practice under the supervision of Natalia's mother. The two stories, having long existed as two nearly independent films, are joined not by cosmic symmetry but by the logistics of a completed commission. Philosophical distance collapses into the ordinary movement of a man who has left after a murder. This almost offensive literalness does not cancel the film's mythological dimensions; it changes their ethical weight. Natalia's parallel narrative proves not to be an abstract symbolic commentary upon Alejandro's fate, but a space already entered by the consequences of his murder. The narrative does not complicate the crime. It complicates the experience of the man against whom the crime was committed.

Thus a particular form of anagnorisis emerges. In its classical sense, anagnorisis is a passage from ignorance to knowledge: an identity, kinship, crime or the true meaning of an action is revealed, and everything that preceded it is reorganised. But "The House on the Waste Ground" does not simply reserve a single fact for a final revelation. It distributes that fact throughout the narrative, withholding not information but the position from which it can be understood. Final recognition becomes not the acquisition of new knowledge, but the collapse of the perspective that made what had already been seen mean something else. We thought Alejandro was moving towards an event. We discover that all along we have been living in the interval between an event and its recognition.

This would be enough to constitute an elaborate cinematic mechanism. One might admire the inversion of noir, the distribution of evidence, the convergence of two narratives and the transformation of architecture into a model of perception. But formal precision does not yet explain why the final revelation hurts. A spectator may discover that a protagonist has been dead all along, dreaming, or existing only in another person's imagination, and experience the revelation as an elegant correction. The mechanism snaps shut, the details fall into place, and the work is rewarded for having deceived us fairly. "The House on the Waste Ground" does not snap shut. The knowledge it delivers leaves loss in its wake.

Why?

Because the delay protects neither the mystery nor the possibility of another outcome: the murder has taken place, the killer has left, the body awaits discovery. No action within the apparent present can restore the future taken from Alejandro. The delay protects intimacy. At first Alejandro is available to us as a type: the compromised architect, the anxious employer, the betrayed husband, the noir protagonist accepting an offer he should refuse. But the duration of Alejandro's screen presence changes the spectator without announcing that a change is taking place. We remain beside him while he attends to matters that final knowledge will render futile. He tries to preserve his practice, responds to the commission with suspicion and hope, makes promises on credit from a future that no longer exists, and says goodbye to Rafa without knowing that the words have already become final. He continues to care for the world beyond the point at which care can still reach its object.

There is nothing heroic in these actions. Alejandro is allowed irritation, fear, vanity and error. Compassion would be too cheap if it depended upon moral perfection. The film takes a greater risk: it permits a man to remain particular and imperfect for long enough that his flaws cease to count against the gravity of his loss. Alejandro has been deprived not only of life, but of the possibility of completing his small obligations. Concern becomes familiarity. Familiarity becomes closeness. Closeness may become love. And once love has entered, knowledge can no longer remain neutral.

This is the anagnorisis concealed within the first anagnorisis. The first recognition is factual: Alejandro is dead; the crime preceded the narrative present; the private detective is implicated in the murder; visible life has become the perceptual afterimage of its own cessation. The second recognition is moral: while attempting to understand Alejandro's condition, we have watched him cease to be the bearer of a mystery and become a man whom final knowledge can no longer take away from us. Had we known of his death from the beginning, every gesture would have become a symptom, every conversation a clue, Marta an obvious guide, and the house a funerary sign. Knowledge would have clarified the film while diminishing the man. We would have seen a dead man moving. By withholding final knowledge, the film allows us first to see a man.

This is why the comparison with Hamlet becomes necessary. Not because Alejandro resembles the Prince of Denmark, nor because the film reproduces a revenge plot. Their kinship lies in the tragic use of delay. It is often said that Hamlet delays revenge. But if the play merely postponed the killing of Claudius, all its interruptions would be technical obstacles between the Ghost's command and its execution. In fact, the play postpones the human meaning of revenge. During the delay, the command passes through love, friendship, theatre, familial memory, power and the destruction of other lives. Revenge remains conceptually simple – the murderer must be killed – but its moral substance grows more complex with every scene. By the time vengeance becomes possible, it can no longer restore the order whose violation demanded it.

Great tragedies rarely postpone the event. They postpone the meaning of the event. Hamlet postpones vengeance. "The House on the Waste Ground" postpones final knowledge. Had Hamlet killed Claudius at once, the act might have satisfied the logic of the Ghost, but Hamlet would not have come into being. Had the film announced at the outset that Alejandro was dead, the revelation might have satisfied the logic of the mystery, but this tragedy would not have come into being. Revenge requires time to acquire the weight of all that it cannot repair. Knowledge requires time to acquire the weight of the man it cannot restore. Yet there is also a difference between the two delays. Hamlet's delay expands the catastrophe: new lives are drawn into it, and guilt and destruction accumulate. In "The House on the Waste Ground", the crime is already complete. The delay operates primarily within perception, and its

consequences fall upon the spectator. We are given time not to prevent Alejandro's death, but to become capable of grieving it.

It is here that the film's metaphysics submits to ethics. Santa Muerte, altered states of consciousness, ritual, cosmology and the migration of signs between Mexico City and Canada might have transformed Alejandro into an example of a universal truth about mortality. Instead, every larger question gradually returns us to one man: an anxious architect trying to preserve his work, answering his friends, accepting a commission because he sees no dignified alternative, moving through a city that has already continued without him. At the centre of the labyrinth lies not a metaphysical proposition. There lies a murdered man.

The form of the limited series intensifies this ethical design. Collective cinema-going historically gathers spectators for a single, uninterrupted event. A streaming series returns to the individual spectator across several evenings. Between episodes, the plot temporarily ceases, but the relation to the protagonist continues. Alejandro remains in the spectator's memory not only as a problem awaiting a solution, but as an unfinished presence. Serial duration gives us time not so much to solve him as to draw near to him. The intimate screen therefore does not diminish the work's cinematic scale. It makes possible the particular form of closeness upon which the final recognition depends.

The film's dreamlike form must also be understood differently. Its meaning lies neither in ambiguity for its own sake nor in a refusal of explanation. The dream performs an ethical delay. It does not conceal the murder for the sake of suspense. It prevents final explanation from colonising every image too soon. While the spectator constructs theories, compares signs and searches for causal connections, the film performs another task: it creates attachment. What appeared to be narrative postponement was emotional preparation. What appeared to be metaphysical opacity was protecting a human face from premature explanation. By the time the body becomes evidence, the evidence can no longer exhaust the man. By the time the crime is solved, the solution can no longer satisfy us. The film has not saved Alejandro from death. It has saved his death from becoming the only truth about him. The dream ends. The facts remain. The nonexistent house hovers over the waste ground, its four wings facing a world that continued without its architect. Marta has known everything from the beginning, and the world has remained innocent.

The spectator finally understands what happened to Alejandro, but by then Alejandro has ceased to be merely the bearer of the mystery. Across several episodes, attachment, compassion and perhaps love have arisen. The bitter truth arrives, but it is no longer first – and therefore no longer paramount. Final knowledge should never arrive before love.

Lucien Orsini

(translated from the Italian)

2026

