

# Contents

<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
Introduction <i>Havi Carel and Greg Tuck</i>	1
<b>Part I Deep Focus – Approaches to Film-Philosophy</b>	
1 On the Possibility of Cinematic Philosophy <i>Thomas E. Wartenberg</i>	9
2 Re-enfranchising Film: Towards a Romantic Film-Philosophy <i>Robert Sinnerbrink</i>	25
3 Notes on Stanley Cavell and Philosophical Film Criticism <i>Andrew Klevan</i>	48
4 Broken Glass by the Road: Adorno and a Cinema of Negativity <i>Hamish Ford</i>	65
5 Film Can't Philosophise (and Neither Can Philosophy): Introduction to a Non-Philosophy of Cinema <i>John Mullarkey</i>	86
<b>Part II Wide Angles – The Boundaries of Film-Philosophy</b>	
6 The Loom of Fate: Graphic Origins and Digital Ontology in <i>Wanted</i> <i>Stephen Mulhall</i>	103
7 Film, Literature and Non-Cognitive Affect <i>Amy Coplan and Derek Matravers</i>	117
8 Theory as Style: Adapting <i>Crash</i> via Baudrillard and Cronenberg <i>Catherine Constable</i>	135
9 The Ghost is the Machine: Media-Philosophy and Materialism <i>Karin Littau</i>	154

10	Art, Cinema, Sex, Ontology: Maurice Merleau-Ponty and the In-visible of Cinema <i>Greg Tuck</i>	171
<b>Part III Directors Cut – Readings in Film-Philosophy</b>		
11	Fleshing Out the Image: Phenomenology, Pedagogy, and Derek Jarman's <i>Blue</i> <i>Vivian Sobchack</i>	191
12	Serious Men: The Films of the Coen Brothers as Ethics <i>Julian Baggini</i>	207
13	A Bleak Burlesque: Michael Haneke's <i>Funny Games</i> as a Study in Violence <i>Andrew McGettigan</i>	223
14	In the Grip of Grief: Epistemic Impotence and the Materiality of Mourning in Shinya Tsukamoto's <i>Vital Havi Carel</i>	240
	<i>Index</i>	256

# Introduction

*Havi Carel and Greg Tuck*

Film studies scholars have always drawn on philosophical ideas. Philosophers, and in particular those working on aesthetics and philosophy of art, have been interested in cinema for as long as it has existed. However, the last few years has seen the emergence of extraordinary interest in the conjunction of film and philosophy. This is not to say that it is a well-defined field of enquiry or one that has broad agreement amongst its practitioners on what exactly it is and what it should be doing. Is it a name for a type of philosophical sub-discipline, the identification of an object of philosophical enquiry, or illustration? Is it a reorientation or a methodological approach to the study of film, a new way of doing 'film studies'? Is it really, in even the most porous and provisional sense of the term, a 'discipline'? And is it the same sort of practice regardless of which side of the conjunction one originates from? In addition, both film studies and philosophy are themselves heterogeneous practices, divided between radically different conceptions of what 'counts' as legitimate modes of study. Thus the conjunction becomes even harder to define. So why bother with it? What is to be gained from asking the question 'what is film-philosophy'?

Disciplinary boundaries are both productive and limiting, a necessary guard against simplification and generality, as well as self-serving barricades that protect the status quo. Hence studies that attempt interdisciplinarity have their own special rewards and dangers. At their best they can introduce concepts and modes of analysis from one discipline and apply them to another, refreshing seemingly tired or well-worn ideas. At their worst they can seem ill-considered impositions which overlook well-established and subtly structured modes of thought, producing inappropriate applications and unproductive unions.

When considering film and philosophy, the philosopher's first question is: 'are such mass cultural products philosophically productive?'

## 2 Introduction

And if so, what is it about *films* rather than other aspects of culture (gardening, football, soap operas) that makes it a worthy site of attention? The film studies scholar may ask, given that as a discipline film studies has been influenced by a broad range of humanities and social sciences disciplines, what is to be gained by limiting its theoretical resources to a single area, namely philosophy?

While there are studies that describe themselves, perfectly legitimately, as exercises in the philosophy of film, in these cases film is clearly positioned as the junior partner. Film here is the object of study and as such is reduced to a thing placed under a pre-existing and fully-developed philosophical gaze, rather than seen as a more troubling site of thought and experience in its own right, one which has equal potential to expose the problems and limitations of a given philosophical method. Similarly, while offering more equality between the terms, the conjunction 'film and philosophy' still suggests a pre-existing demarcation between the fields. In some cases the discipline of film studies seems to be ignored or sidelined. As a consequence, film tends to be reduced to a single 'object' (the individual film), shorn of its wider historical and cultural articulation and its reliance on the complex institution we call 'cinema'. Under such circumstances, the film risks being reduced further to a set of notions or concerns that could have been identified from the script, rather than issues that arise from an engagement with the visual, aural and kinetic experience of moving images.

The uptake of philosophical ideas within film studies has itself not been without problems. Sometimes the adoption of certain philosophical positions can look rather piecemeal and contingent. Consequently, philosophical differences tend to get magnified and the so-called divide between analytic and continental traditions, which is increasingly traversed, or even seen as irrelevant in much contemporary philosophy, remains championed by many in film studies.

Yet beyond this particular binary of a successful or failed assimilation there is another possibility for such conjunctions: a revitalising hybridity that aims at a more truly synthesising outcome. Here the conjunction is less a boundary, traversed from one side to the other more or less successfully, but a moment of expansion in which a field of thought becomes mapped and nourished by both traditions. The boundary is not so much crossed, as expanded, broadened so as to become a terrain of its own. To keep open the possibility of mutual transformation while offering a coherent yet non-excluding notion of what this new terrain may yield, we describe this domain as film-philosophy.

As will become apparent, even this more open and provisional description of the conjunction does not preclude disagreement among our

contributors, who engage in a variety of differing film-philosophical endeavours. But this lack of agreement is what, in part, contributes to the area's richness, as we hope readers of this volume will agree. At the same time, the collection has not been set up as an adversarial relation between these different approaches. While critiques are both mounted and defended against a range of philosophical positions, what unites these contributions is a desire to map out a practice, a variety of ways of doing film-philosophy that is mutually informative to both philosophy and film studies. Hence readers will discover how cognitivist film theorists appeal to philosophy of mind and perception and even to neuroscience to analyse the experience of film viewing, alongside a range of more traditional aesthetic or phenomenological descriptions of the film experience. Some chapters demonstrate a direct engagement with a named philosopher such as Cavell, Adorno or Merleau-Ponty while others develop a more synthesised approach in which themes and questions, rather than method, dominate. Our aim is to open up, rather than close down, debate and to allow readers to make their own judgements on which of these approaches seem the most suitable for their purposes.

While some contributors remain cautious, others are more optimistic about the future of film-philosophy. Nonetheless, they are all prepared to consider not only what philosophy can bring to our understanding of film, but also what film can bring to our understanding of philosophy. How can an understanding of film as an individual text, aesthetic tradition, and social and historical practice help us to broaden our understanding of philosophical activity as going beyond the written and spoken word? Does this practice transform our views of what philosophy is? What does a more philosophical consideration of the medium-specificity of motion pictures (if indeed such a hybrid art form can be said to have one) add to our understanding of film? These are some of the issues that are discussed in this book. The collection is presented in three parts. Part I offers general overviews and speculation about what the conjunction can achieve. Part II discusses the boundaries of film-philosophy and its relation to other media. Part III delivers more particular readings of individual films or filmmakers.

## **Part I Deep Focus: Approaches to Film-Philosophy**

The collection opens with Thomas E. Wartenberg's careful consideration of what film can achieve philosophically. He outlines what he calls the moderate pro-cinematic philosophy position, which defends the view that film can creatively be used to illustrate philosophical ideas, but it

#### 4 Introduction

can also be used for more than this. Specifically, film can be used as a thought experiment, or in the case of avant-garde cinema to perform its own aesthetic experiments. Next, Robert Sinnerbrink develops what he refers to as a romantic film-philosophy, one which claims film as its own mode of philosophical presentation. In much the same way that poetry's capacity to deploy language in its own provocative and evocative ways challenges the primacy of prose, the multi-sensuous experience of cinema opens up profound new ways of thinking that philosophy can learn from. Andrew Klevan's sustained engagement with Stanley Cavell's reading of Wittgenstein produces a generous and affirmative understanding of the collective pleasures of cinema. Klevan outlines the rewards of careful spectatorship, revealing a medium capable of discovering, investigating and returning to the profound significance of what might at first appear inconsequential and ordinary moments.

In direct contrast to this sense of appreciation, Hamish Ford engages with the thought of Theodor Adorno to produce a far more austere reading of the failure of art in general and cinema in particular to transcend its material conditions of existence. However, in the bleak social analysis offered by some of the most challenging examples of European Art cinema, Ford maps a confrontation with negativity that is not entirely without hope. In the final chapter of this part John Mullarkey engages with the thought of François Laruelle to radically question not only film's capacity to philosophise, but philosophy's ability to escape from its own modes of idealism and representational thought that predetermine its analysis. Film's failure to capture what we call reality is illustrative of a wider philosophical failure; one which cannot be overcome but is lived with through a more pluralist approach to what is philosophically or artistically productive.

### **Part II Wide Angles: The Boundaries of Film-Philosophy**

The second part of the collection addresses the issue of medium-specificity and materiality of cinema in order to investigate its similarity to and difference from other art forms. It begins with Stephen Mulhall's chapter on *Wanted* (Timur Bekmambetov, US/Germany, 2008) a film that reflects many of the issues raised by contemporary cinema based as it is on a graphic novel and heavily reliant on digital technology and special effects. Mulhall's close reading not only raises profound questions as to the status of cinematic ontology in the digital age but also opens up wider philosophical considerations regarding the definition of the real itself. The next chapter presents a debate between Amy Coplan

and Derek Matravers on the immediacy of cinema and its capacity to produce affect and how this affect relates to emotional response. While both are sympathetic to much contemporary cognitive film theory, Coplan wonders to what extent film produces a more immediate, non-cognitive affect, a question which itself raises important issues regarding the limits of the cognitive. Matravers responds by questioning whether such affects are unique to cinema or are equally, or even better produced, through our engagement with literature.

Catherine Constable continues this consideration of cinema's relation to writing by widening it to include philosophy itself as a written practice. More specifically she compares David Cronenberg's cinematic treatment of J. G. Ballard's novel *Crash* with Jean Baudrillard's philosophical one, in order to examine to what extent style, both in written and cinematic form, is a mode of philosophy. Karin Littau considers the materiality of the printed word in relation to the cinematic image to remind us of the vital role media history has to play in our conceptualising of film-philosophy. In the final chapter Greg Tuck continues to consider both the aesthetic and historic boundaries of film through an examination of Early Cinema's relation to painting.

### Part III Directors Cut: Readings in Film-Philosophy

While our final section continues to raise a range of issues about film-philosophy, what marks it out is a deep engagement with the intentions and techniques of a particular filmmaker. We begin with Vivian Sobchack's reading of Derek Jarman's *Blue* (UK, 1993). Despite the supposed simplicity of the image, Sobchack reveals the perceptive density and performativity contained in the experience offered by this film. By holding back on the urge to interpret and judge, instead attending to what we actually perceive, she uses the film to present a sophisticated phenomenological pedagogy in which the primacy of embodiment to the cinematic experience challenges its reduction to a cognitively informing domain.

Her chapter is followed by Julian Baggini's analysis of the moral universe opened up by the films of the Coen brothers. In films such as *No Country for Old Men* (US, 2007) and *Burn After Reading* (US, 2008), Baggini identifies a recognisable human world that develops a philosophically vital analysis regarding the ethical as more effective when concerned with keeping our baser instincts in check than in offering models of moral perfection. While excited by the possibility of film's contribution to such debates, Baggini is also keen to outline what he feels are its limits.

6 *Introduction*

The moral and ethical theme is continued by Andrew McGettigan's analysis of Michael Haneke's two versions of *Funny Games* (Austria, 1997 & US, 2007). Here it is not just the thematic but formal presentation of moral behaviour that comes under examination, not least in the question to what extent Haneke manages to represent our capacity for violence in ways that truly open new ways of thinking about it. For McGettigan the problem of avoiding cliché or worse, succumbing to the irrational pleasures of violent imagery, is overcome by Haneke's counter-aesthetic that encourages reflection rather than identification.

In the final chapter Havi Carel discusses Shinya Tsukamoto's *Vital* (Japan, 2004) as an example of how film can materialise complex emotional experiences such as grief and mourning. Carel demonstrates that the existential issues raised by the narrative, not least what it is that gives life and animation to the human body, are echoed and in part answered by the form of the film and by Tsukamoto's aesthetic choices.

While clearly offering a broad range of opinions and approaches to film-philosophy, what all of these contributions share is a profound belief in the value of the conjunction for both disciplines. In a world more and more dominated by mediating technologies of the audio-visual, it is almost a duty of philosophy to engage with cinema. Film studies has much to offer philosophy in this respect, reminding it to examine the wider significance of the cinematic experience and not to succumb to the temptations of 'script' philosophy or limiting its engagements to films it can more easily identify as 'art' and therefore subsume under existing aesthetic models. It is what films *do* that is different from existing art that requires most attention. Film studies, too, is enriched by the conjunction, not least by being made aware of its own philosophical underpinnings and the need to both broaden and strengthen them. The practice of film-philosophy is not limited to debates in aesthetics and philosophy of art, but also reinvigorates contemporary debates in epistemology, metaphysics, politics and ethics, as this collection demonstrates. It can serve to push philosophy to confront its residual iconoclasm that makes some of its practitioners fearful of images and the imaginary as well as demand a more rigorous approach to the uptake of the philosophical canon by film studies. Together they demonstrate that however uncanny the view of Plato's cave as a metaphor for cinema seems, it is clear that the movies offer far more than illusion.

## Index

- Adorno, Theodor, 2, 3, 44, 65–85, 97, 99, 236
- Akerman, Chantal, 73  
*The Meetings of Anna/Les Rendez-Vous d'Anna*, 74
- Alfredson, Tomas, 237n.8  
*Låt den rätte komma in/Let the Right One in*, 237n.8
- Alien films, *The*, 13, 14, 18, 26, 32, 44n.11, 122–3, 123
- Allen, Woody, 19  
*Crimes and Misdemeanors*, 19
- Almódovar, Pedro, 38, 254n.3  
*Todo Sobre Mi Madre*, 38–9, 254n.3
- Anderson, Paul Thomas, 122  
*Punch Drunk Love*, 122
- Antonioni, Michelangelo, 29, 71–6, 83n.9  
*L'Avventura*, 29  
*L'Eclisse*, 71–6, 82  
*La Notte*, 83n.9
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, 159, 160, 161
- Aristotle, 158, 162, 215, 235, 236n.2
- Austen, Jane, 126, 129–30
- Bachelard, Gaston, 198, 204
- Baggini, Julian, 5, 32
- Ballard, J.G., 5, 135–53
- Barthes, Roland, 191, 199, 203, 226–7, 230, 232, 235
- Baudrillard, Jean, 5, 135–53
- Beckett, Samuel, 33, 44, 229  
*Film*, 33, 44
- Bekmambetov, Timur, 4, 103  
*Wanted*, 4, 103–16
- Benjamin, Walter, 52–3, 63n.10, 82, 166–7, 228, 231, 235
- Bergman, Ingmar, 29, 68, 72, 80, 81, 83n.6  
*Hour of the Wolf/Vargtimmen*, 83n.6  
*Persona*, 68–9, 71–5, 77, 80, 82, 83n.6, n.13
- Smiles of a Summer Night/Sommarnattens Leende*, 29
- Bergson, Henri, 29, 90, 93, 94, 96, 160
- Bersani, Leo & Dutoit, Ulysse, 38–41, 44n.1, 45n.12
- Bertolucci, Bernardo, 10  
*Conformist (I & II), The, /Il Conformista*, 10
- Bordwell, David, 30, 42, 94, 117
- Bradley, F.H., 92
- Bradshaw, Peter, 226
- Capra, Frank, 51–2, 55  
*It Happened One Night*, 51, 55  
*Mr. Deeds Goes to Town*, 49
- Carel, Havi, 6, 45n.14
- Carroll, Noël, 30, 31, 42, 117, 120–121, 202
- Cavell, Stanley, 2, 3, 13, 23n.3, 29–31, 39, 41, 43, 44n.1, 48–64, 67, 87, 88, 95, 99n.5, 247
- Chalmers, David, 23n.8
- Cinematic Philosophy Thesis, *The*, 9–23
- Clover, Carol, 229–30, 234
- Coen Brothers, *The*, 5, 207–22  
*A Serious Man*, 219–20  
*Barton Fink*, 211–16, 217  
*Big Lebowski, The*, 211, 215, 217  
*Burn after Reading*, 5, 218–19, 221  
*Fargo*, 216–17, 218  
*Intolerable Cruelty*, 213  
*Ladykillers, The*, 213  
*Man Who Wasn't There, The*, 217  
*No Country for Old Men*, 5, 217–18, 219
- Columbus, Christopher, 228  
*Home Alone*, 228
- Conan Doyle, Arthur, 58–60
- Coole, Diana, 67, 73, 83n.5
- Craven, Wesley, 123  
*Scream*, 123
- Critchley, Simon, 26, 44n.7

- Cronenberg, David, 135–52  
*Crash*, 135–52
- Curtis, Richard, 88  
*Love Actually*, 88
- Danto, Arthur, 25, 33, 34–5
- Debray, Régis, 155, 156, 160
- Demme, Jonathan  
*Silence of the Lambs*, 123
- Descartes, René, 19, 20–21, 32, 210
- Deleuze, Gilles, 23n.2, 28, 29–31, 44n.1,  
 78, 83n.12, 86–8, 89, 94, 98, 240
- Dick, Philip, K. 140–1, 142
- Donner, Richard, 237n.7  
*Superman: The Movie*, 237n.7
- Duras, Marguerite, 29  
*Hiroshima Mon Amour*, 29
- Edison, Thomas Alva, 159–61, 166
- Eldridge, Richard, 10, 17, 20
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 29, 57, 58
- Fassbinder, Rainer Werner, 68, 74  
*In a Year with 13 Moons/In einem  
 Jahr mit 13 Monden*, 68, 71, 72,  
 74, 82
- Ford, Hamish, 3–4, 82n.1, 83n.11,  
 225, 232
- Frampton, Daniel, 9, 26, 44n.1, 87–8,  
 209
- Frankfurt School, The, 65, 67, 82  
 (see also Adorno)
- Freud, Sigmund, 53–5, 58, 59, 144
- Ginzburg, Carlo, 59–60, 62n.7
- Glendinning, Simon, 56–8
- Godard, Jean-Luc, 27–8, 38–40, 41,  
 44, 45n.13, 68, 71–2, 74, 78–82,  
 83n.12, 86  
*Le Mépris*, 38–40, 44n.2, 45n.13  
*Two or Three Things I Know About  
 Her/2 ou 3 choses que je sais d'elle*,  
 71–7, 78–82  
*Vivre sa Vie*, 27–8, 41
- Goldman, William, 90, 99n.2
- Gondry, Michel, 17  
*Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind*,  
 17–18
- Gunning, Tom, 117
- Habermas, Jürgen, 67
- Hamer, Robert, 228  
*Kind Hearts and Coronets*, 228
- Haneke, Michael, 5–6, 43, 68, 71,  
 86–7, 89, 223–39  
*Caché/Hidden*, 68, 72, 78, 81–2,  
 86–7, 89  
*Code Unknown/Code Inconnu*, 86–7  
*Fragments einer Chronologie  
 des Zufalls/71 Fragments of  
 a Chronology of Chance*, 71,  
 236n.236  
*Funny Games/Ölümcül oyunlar*, 5–6,  
 223–39  
*Seventh Continent, The/Der Siebente  
 Kontinent*, 71, 74, 75–7, 81
- Haptic, 240, 242–3, 247–8, 250–4
- Heidegger, Martin, 38–39, 44n.11,  
 44–45n.12, 48, 91–92, 120, 164,  
 168n.7
- Hegel, 67, 82–3n.4, 97, 99n.7
- Hitchcock, Alfred, 29, 228  
*Rear Window*, 228
- Ihde, Don, 194–5, 199, 200–1 203–4
- Intentional Stance, The, 207–9
- Jarman, Derek, 5, 191–206  
*Blue*, 5, 191–206
- Kant, Immanuel, 14–15, 61, 164,  
 224
- Kaprow, Allan, 93
- Keathley, Christian, 52–55
- Kittler, Friedrich, A., 155–66,  
 167–8n.4, 168n.6
- Knight, Deborah, 19–20
- Kompridis, Nikolas, 29, 36–7
- Kracauer, Sigfried, 30, 82n.1, 83n.3,  
 165, 224
- Kubrick, Stanley, 229  
*A Clockwork Orange*, 229
- Lamorisso, Albert, 234  
*Crinc Blanc*, 234
- Laruelle, François, 4, 89–90, 91, 93,  
 97, 99n.1
- Lee, Ang, 127  
*Sense and Sensibility*, 127–32

- Levinas, Emmanuel, 57, 86–7, 89, 215
- Linklater, Richard, 10  
*Waking Life*, 10
- Livingston, Paisley, 12–13, 23n.2, 44n.6, 72
- Lumières, 162, 179  
*Arrivée d'un train en gare à La Ciotat*, 179
- Lynch, David, 33, 45n.13  
*Mulholland Drive*, 45n.13
- Lyotard, Jean-François, 83n.8, 86
- Mackendrick, Alexander, 228  
*The Ladykillers*, 228
- Malick, Terrence, 33, 38, 43, 44–5n.12  
*The Thin Red Line*, 38–39, 44–5n.12
- McGettigan, Andrew, 5–6, 94–8, 99n.7, 254n.2
- McLuhan, Marshall, 157, 163, 164
- McNaughton, John, 228  
*Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer*, 228
- Mai, Joseph, 96–7
- Makavejev, Dušan, 74  
*Sweet Movie*, 74
- Marx, Karl, 67
- Marxism, 28, 30, 35, 82n.1, 83n.7
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 2, 5, 171–87, 191, 192, 193, 199, 243, 244, 253
- Minnelli, Vincente, 60  
*Band Wagon, The*, 60–1
- Mulhall, Stephen, 4, 13, 14, 17, 18, 26, 44n.1, n.11, 207, 209, 211, 220
- Münsterberg, Hugo, 30  
*Photoplay, The*, 30
- Narboni, Jean, 69
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 18, 29, 67, 154–5, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167n.1
- Non-Philosophy, 31, 86–99
- Nussbaum, Martha, 118
- Oldman, Gary, 227–8  
*Nil by Mouth*, 227–8
- Ophuls, Max, 49
- Letter From an Unknown Woman/ Brief einer Unbekannten*, 49
- Paradigm Shift (Thomas Kuhn), 158–60
- Parain, Brice, 27–8, 44n.2
- Parker, Alan, 122  
*Angel Heart*, 122
- Pascal's wager, 230, 236n.5
- Pasolini, Pier Paolo, 225  
*Salò o le 120 giornate di Sodoma*, 225
- Phenomenology, 2, 5, 33, 38, 120, 126, 155, 171–87, 191–206, 225, 240–55
- Plato, 16, 18, 19, 20, 31, 32, 34, 49, 156, 162–4, 208  
The Allegory of the Cave, 6, 10, 20, 34–5, 49
- Poe, Edgar Allan, 58
- Ponech, Trevor, 21
- Powell, Michael, 229  
*Peeping Tom*, 229
- Prinz, Jesse, 118–19
- Rancière, Jacques, 31–2
- Rapper, Irving, 50–1  
*Now, Voyager*, 50–2, 56
- Reiner, Carl, 14  
*All of Me*, 14
- Renoir, Jean, 49  
*Rules of the Game/La Règle du jeu*, 49
- Resnais, Alain, 29, 40, 71, 88  
*Hiroshima Mon Amour*, 29  
*L'Année dernière à Marienbad/Last Year at Marienbad*, 71, 74, 88
- Richardson, Tony, 226  
*Tom Jones*, 226
- Robinson, Jenefer, 118–19
- Rodowick, D.N., 30
- Romanticism, 29, 36–44, 49, 79, 131
- Romantic Film-Philosophy, 3, 26, 29, 25–45
- Rushton, Richard, 95–6
- Russell, Bertrand, 160–1
- Russell, Bruce, 15, 23n.7
- Schlegel, Friedrich, 25
- Scott, Ridley, 18, 32, 44, 122, 125  
*Blade Runner*, 125, 126

- Shakespeare, William, 154–5
- Sherlock Holmes, 58–9
- Shaviro, Steven, 23n.5
- de Sica, Vittorio, 88  
*Ladri di Biciclette*, 88
- Silverman, Kaja, 44–5n.12
- Simmel, Georg, 165
- Sinclair, Iain, 136–7, 146–7
- Sinnerbrink, Robert, 3, 93–5, 97–8, 254
- Smith, George Albert, 171–3, 178–82,  
 186–7, 187, n.1  
*The Kiss in the Tunnel*, 171–3,  
 178–82, 187, n.1
- Smith, Murray, 9, 12, 13–14, 19–20,  
 31, 32, 42, 120, 122
- Sobchack, Vivien, 5, 139–40, 142,  
 143, 145, 185–6
- Solomon, Robert, 10, 118
- Spielberg, S., 123–15  
*Jaws*, 123–5  
*Jurassic Park*, 123  
*War of the Worlds*, 123
- Tarrantino, Quentin, 237n.9  
*Reservoir Dogs*, 237n.9
- Tarkovsky, Andrei, 234  
*Solaris*, 234
- Three Musketeers, The, 27
- Tuck, Greg, 23n.10, 62–3n.9,  
 82–82n.4, 99n.4, 240, 248
- Tsukamoto, Shinya, 6, 240–55  
*A Snake of June/Rokugatsu no hebi*,  
 243–4, 248  
*Tetsuo*, 243  
*Vital*, 6, 240–55
- Vidor, King, 95  
*Stella Dallas*, 49, 95–6
- Wachowski, Andrew & Larry, 12, 32  
*Matrix* films, The, 12, 18–19, 23n.8,  
 32, 33
- Walton, K, 128, 130
- Warhol, Andy, 21  
*Empire*, 21
- Warner, Marina, 156–63, 167n.4
- Wartenberg, Thomas, 3, 25, 31, 32,  
 44n.3
- Wheatley, Catherine, 223–4, 227
- Williams, John, 123, 124
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 3, 29, 48–59,  
 87, 88, 93, 208, 220–1
- Wood, Sam, 52  
*A Night at the Opera*, 52
- Žižek, Slavoj, 86, 89, 94, 227