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**Reflection: Week 5**

It takes two crates to create a world, and an isolated crate is an asset. While I’m aware the prompt likely presented that question as rhetorical, I believe that the answer holds merit due to the relational elements required to make up a game world. Replace that crate with some ground tiles, and it’d be difficult to argue that it isn’t a miniature world placed into the computer. While it’s tempting to think of them as entirely separate and distinct, the control a developer has over their game assets makes every aspect of their properties subject to change. I demonstrated this with the tree object in the fourth scene of the assignment. There, I simply adjusted the size and shape of its hitbox to make it act like ground for the Godobot. While the usage of tiles is more efficient (as seen with the crates falling on the bricks within the same scene), a developer can technically utilize both tools to achieve the same result. There is nothing special about the raw picture file containing the tree nor the crates. Rather, their importance lies in how they can be utilized in conjunction with the mechanisms provided by Godot to create the illusion of a tree in a game world, convincing or otherwise.

Turning back to *Unpacking*, I want to call attention to the pig stuffed animal. A player sees a larger version of it on-screen at the start of the game, and it will reappear many times afterwards. In terms of components, the pig is a collection of pixels of different colors that are coded to be dragged around and placed onto different areas of the screen. The functionality isn’t different from many of the other items that the player must unpack, yet the reoccurring nature of the object not only provides a sense of humanity to the game’s unseen protagonist, but also acts a prototype for how the rest of the objects in the game world work.

**Reading Notes:**

* Prop-Oriented Make Believe – A game cooked up so we can see the nature of the prop.
  + Regarding *Unpacking*: I reflexively called the unseen protagonist a nerd upon seeing the D20 sprite.
* Paper airplanes inform the user about the function of the prop itself.
* “[Content Oriented] cases make-believe looks forward to the content of the make-believe.” A tad circular, but it’s about the fiction generated by the prop.
* The act of make-believe-based recognition is automatic. “The subject matter of the (potential) make-believe is merely useful [to understand the prop itself(?)]”
* Active participation required.
  + Or not?
  + Okay, there’s always a minimum bar.
* Okay, so it seems like explanations prevent the game from occurring. But providing explanations yourself is participation.
  + This makes more sense the more I think about the role those fictional objects play in *Unpacking*.
* Page 8 does kinda confuse me. Something about “women” designs.
* “Time is money” is honestly a good example of a metaphor in action. ***Metaphor suggests the mind to a game of make-believe.***
  + “General Motor’s health (non-literal) is improving” is one example.
  + Of course, metaphors are often not reversable “Life is hell” vs “Hell is life.”
* Okay, so there’s a decent amount of meandering on the aspects of metaphor. At least there’s distinction in the sentences.
  + Active participation is more important in music(?)
* (Pg. 17) “What metaphors do, in many cases, is to activate relevant dispositions or abilities, rather than to make us aware of the principles of generation.”
* **(Pg. 20) “Metaphors thus make such things as sunlight and the sea into something like representational works of art.”**