

EDITORIAL

Welcome to the inaugural issue of *Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image*, an international journal devoted to the philosophical inquiry into cinema.

Since its beginnings, cinema has been the subject of philosophical investigation on the both sides of the Atlantic. Early in the twentieth century, Henri Bergson (1907) and Hugo Munsterberg (1916) offered, arguably, the first deep philosophical reflections on the recently born art. From the outset, their inquiries reflected different philosophical engagements and traditions. Bergson's ideas were highly influential in continental Europe and inspired a significant amount of artistic production that persisted, at least until the beginning of the Second World War. Munsterberg's pioneering study was almost forgotten, until the revived interest from cognitive film theorists in the nineties. During the twentieth century, in continental Europe, cinema inspired deep philosophical investigations about its nature, functioning, and reception — integrating, for the most part, the influences of Gilles Deleuze, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Theodor Adorno, Walter Benjamin, amongst others. Within analytical philosophical traditions, with the exception of Stanley Cavell's work since the seventies, the philosophical issues related to cinema found little expression until the last two decades when a change occurred. This change spearheaded innovative research and from it emerged new issues and questions, establishing a body of literature from philosophers like Noël Carroll, George M. Wilson, Gregory Currie, Paisley Livingston, that has underpinned subsequent investigations and debates in this scholarly field.

Additionally, throughout the often overlooked history of film theory, filmmakers and film-theorists such as Sergei Eisenstein, Jean Epstein, Rudolf Arnheim, Dziga Vertov, André Bazin, and Siegfried Kracauer, had continuously and consistently considered the medium and the many philosophical issues regarding the cinematic image in particular and prolific ways. *Cinema* will reflect its editors' belief that it is

time to revive all these traditions, bringing together the views of film theorists with the more recent philosophical contributions in the area.

On the other hand, particularly since the digital shift, the uses and definitions of “cinema” have become permeable. We are not going, however, to tackle the thorny issue of definitions here: the question “what is cinema?” or “what is the philosophy of cinema?” will be left to our contributors in this and future issues. Nevertheless, unquestionably, today, cinema means not just *film*, but other forms of the *moving image*. Traditional filmmakers are increasingly using digital and animation techniques and the usual understanding of cinema as film is being challenged with the digital shift. The same is true of television. Furthermore, ever since the 1960s, artists have increasingly incorporated video into installations in exhibitions and, more recently, new creative outputs include the use of new media. The shift, therefore, from film theory and the philosophy of film into studies of the moving image and its related philosophy, is not only a theoretical option, but it corresponds to, and reflects an actual change, one which extends across contemporary visual culture as a whole. We believe that, in its myriad forms and applications across a wide range of creative practices, the moving image will continue to be, perhaps more than ever, a subject of philosophical and theoretical inquiry.

The purpose of *Cinema* is consistent with this view: its aim is to provide a platform where cinema, taken in its broadest sense, as *image in motion* and *image that moves*, can be a topic of serious scholarly work. While continuing to support the established philosophy of film and film theory, the journal also aims at challenging the conventional divisions between film and other forms of moving image culture. In its urge to remain faithful to the long history of theoretical and philosophical research on cinema, from both sides of the Atlantic, the journal will not be confined to a single method or approach. The editors are aware of the division that still prevails between the analytic and the continental philosophical approaches to

cinema and we acknowledge that some recent developments in these fields show that this gap can be overcome.¹ Accordingly, one of our main editorial objectives is to encourage collaboration and exchange between disciplines (film studies and philosophy), methods (analytic and continental), and approaches (Marxist, phenomenological, psychoanalytic, cognitivist, and others), providing a platform for a dialogue while offering new opportunities for emergent and established scholars in these areas. To guarantee this, the Editorial Advisory Board gathers prominent scholars from a wide range of traditions and institutions who share with the editors the conviction that there is a need for an international journal with the remit of fostering this kind of fruitful dialogue.

In our inaugural issue we are delighted to feature articles by some of the most respected scholars working in a number of key areas in the intersection between philosophy and the moving image. We anticipate that their contributions will convey the diverse and comprehensive scope of the journal. The first article by D. N. Rodowick, "A Care for the Claims of Theory," revisits Christian Metz's work and sees "Cinéma: langue ou langage?" as a seminal essay in which Metz attempts to construct a discursive position for himself and for the academic study of film. Rodowick considers that the French theoretician copes with how semiology, still under Saussure's shadow, always faltered in a confrontation with the image. He further discusses how Metz aims to be conceptually precise, methodologically systematic, and suggests a new idea of film theory that emerges out of phenomenology, filmology, structuralism, classical film aesthetics, and cinephilism. Metz's *careful attitude* and *intensive search* anticipate later developments in the field of film theory. As Rodowick ultimately argues, one can hear echoes of his standpoint in Noël Carroll's prospects for theory, twenty-four years later. (It is an excerpt from

An Elegy for Theory, forthcoming from Harvard University Press in 2011, that we are honored to pre-publish.)

Thomas E. Wartenberg's "Carroll on the Moving Image," considers the definition of the *moving image* that Noël Carroll has put forward and concludes that Carroll has not completely avoided the essentialism of classical film theory. Wartenberg argues for a rethinking of the project of film theory in a manner that is more deeply anti-essentialist, which entails accepting that any concept of the moving image is *historically contingent*.

Raymond Bellour's article, "Deleuze: The Thinking of the Brain," investigates Gilles Deleuze's views on the cinema-body-mind concept, which address the relationship between the brain and thought, neurons and the mind, which is, undoubtedly, one of the most up-to-date topics in Deleuze's philosophy of cinema. Bellour demonstrates that Deleuze brings together philosophy, cinema and the neurosciences not to create a *science of films*, but instead, to think of them philosophically. The article directly confronts what the author considers to be the "dogmatic application of knowledge of the cognitive sciences" by most cognitive theoreticians of the cinema. Drawing also on Daniel Stern's concept of *vitality affects*, Bellour argues that affects "associated with the force, intensity, quality, form or rhythm of an experience," are irreducible to scientific regularities and that "all science of art therefore lives in the tension between real science and the impossible science of the single being."

Interested in a totally different line of thought, Patricia MacCormack's essay, "Mucous, Monsters and Angels: Irigaray and Zulawski's *Possession*" further investigates the relation between cinema, body, and mind, relating it instead to psychoanalytic theories concerning gender views of the role of women in cinema studies. Based on an analysis of Andrej Zulawski's *Possession* (1981) and the work of Luce Irigaray, MacCormack discusses how female desire both is and can create *mucosal monsters*, and how these relate to the idea of the image (or the screen) as a

new plane of *spectatorial pleasure*. MacComack further discusses how, in this plane, the viewer is no longer distinguished from the image, and he/she can experience “the image without sight and the self without subject.”

Finally, Murray Smith draws our attention to epistemological issues and considers the so-called *l'affaire Sokal*, which is directly related to the divide between continental and analytical philosophical traditions. Smith opts for the kind of “ethical searching” that Rodowick describes in the opening article and diagnoses what he believes to be the still prevalent prejudice “against analytic philosophy within film and related fields of study, along with a concomitant commitment to continental philosophy,” that often mistakes the analytic tradition as a “narrow, monolithic approach” to film. Murray makes a case for arguing that the analytic tradition is itself pluralistic, advocating for what he calls a *robust pluralism*, which, epistemologically, endorses a *relative plausibility* view. This view, while accepting the contingency of all claims, “does not abandon assessing the likelihood of particular truth claims being true.”

Susana Duarte Nascimento and Maria Irene Aparício inaugurate our interviews section with an interview to Georges Didi-Huberman. In this interview Didi-Hubermann talks about his latest book *Remontages du temps subi. L'œil de l'histoire 2*, recently published by Les Éditions de Minuit and discusses on the theme of his current work: the role of images, in particular cinematographic images, in the legibility of History.

The Conference Reports section is launched by William Brown's “Cognitive Deleuze” and mirrors the aim of the journal not to be confined to a discipline or a method. Brown describes two very different conferences, the SCSMI Conference at Roanoke and the Deleuze Studies Conference in Amsterdam, calling attention to the productive critical exchange that may be established between them. We strongly endorse this approach, not only to keep dialogue alive, but also to guarantee the presence of a critical and philosophical effort in every section of the journal.

We hope you enjoy this first issue of the journal and welcome your comments [cjpmi@fcsb.unl.pt]. For the following issues, authors are warmly invited to make submissions to the journal. Articles will be selected for their ability to critically and innovatively engage with philosophical inquiries into the moving image.

We want to express our gratitude to all who have worked to make *Cinema* become a reality. We are grateful to the members of our Editorial Advisory Board for their willingness to accept our invitation and for their collaboration in this project and, particularly, in this first issue. Our thanks are extended to our section editors, Susana Nascimento Duarte, Maria Irene Aparício, and Joana Pimenta, who are an essential part of the editorial team. We are also most indebted to the Philosophy of Language Institute at the New University of Lisbon for all its help and support that have made it possible for us to believe that this project will have a long and fruitful future. It is with this confidence that we are watchfully waiting to observe the aftereffects of this release, mirroring the eye in the image on the website header, taken from Manoel de Oliveira's *Past and Present (O Passado e o Presente, 1972)* — not quite able to anticipate what is to come, but eager to see it.

THE EDITORS

Patrícia Silveirinha Castello Branco

Sérgio Dias Branco

Susana Viegas

1. See, e.g., Paisley Livingston and Carl Plantinga, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy and Film* (London: Routledge, 2008) that includes entries on authors like Rudolph Arnheim, Benjamin, David Bordwell, Christian Metz, and Jean Mitry, and on approaches such as cognitive theory, phenomenology, and psychoanalysis.