While I was fixing the scenes for the Godot, I struggled a little bit more than I have on other assignments for this class. I missed both lectures this week (sorry, Navy interview and graduate lab tour just so happened to get scheduled during your class) and as I such I had to do a lot more leg work here to make everything work. Without the foundations of collision boxes I found myself doing a little more trial and error with the fundamentals of the scene instead of spending that time getting “fancy”. I say this, because as I was fixing everything I found myself completely disregarding the sprites and nodes as props. While I was fixing everything, the visuals and sprites simply became operations that were or were not working. This intrigued me to think about before writing this, because I had such a different experience with unpacking. While fixing my scenes and looking at the code and making hitboxes, everything was operations and what data type was creating an error or what mathematical reason did my sprite have for getting stuck inside the floor.

When I was playing unpacking, I was really doing the same thing as I was with the Godot sprite (This sounds Bogostian almost and I hate it). I was moving these objects around to have them be and do what I wanted them to, but this time I was emotional about the diploma going under the bed. I was sad when the MC moved out of college and into a new apartment. I was happy to see the nursery room in the final stage. The props in unpacking allowed me to envision that make-believe moment of there being literal meaning behind the props/pixels I was playing with that the readings were about, and I think that is why I enjoyed the game like I did. That make-believe moment where the props were making me imagine a story and being more than what it is on the screen is why the game was so compelling.

I will say, I don’t know if I can get behind Walton’s prop-oriented world view for every day life. I disagree that statements like “a rising melody” have to be called that because we then imagine a rising sound and that explains the figurative speech/term. I feel like I have always been one to just consider the context of how a phrase is used and my experiences over if a statement makes sense. Considering a rising melody, I would disagree that it is necessary or even beneficial to make-believe what the statement means to understand its meaning or give it meaning, because of interpretation. Is the melody’s pitch rising? Is it rising in terms of moving your fingers around a fretboard or instrument? If I can’t be sure what is being imagined without clear context, can I really say that make-believing that moment for the prop that is that phrase is critical?