

**Cinephilia and Fandom:  
Two Fascinating Fascinations**

Matthew John Goodsell

A thesis submitted by Matthew John Goodsell  
in fulfilment of the requirements of the  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
for the degree of Master of Arts (By Research)

Department of Interdisciplinary Studies of the  
Manchester Metropolitan University

March 2014

## Abstract

This thesis concerns the synthesis of two discourses which, at first glance, might seem quite disparate. On one hand is cinephilia, currently emerging as a type of self-reflexive love of film. Writers like Christian Keathley have begun, in the last decade or so, to outline an attitude to and discourse about film which is both adoring and analytical. In my first chapter, I look at the origins of cinephilia: we see how it emerged in France in the middle of the last century, notably on the pages of *Cahiers du Cinéma*, as a style of writing about film which was both highly enthusiastic and intellectually engaged. We look at how it functioned and what made it different from what had been before. I go on to outline Willeman's idea of the cinephiliac moment, where a writer seems to fixate upon a certain passage of filmic text. How this discourse functioned and continues to function today is then examined at some length.

The second chapter of this thesis concerns fandom, fan studies, and the recent rise of fan activity as an area of academic interest. Scholars such as Henry Jenkins have started to look at what could be called a community: a group of people who often meet only online, but who share a deep love of certain filmic texts. They exhibit that love in a variety of ways: they use texts as the basis for their own artistic output. There is thus a kind of creative love, where texts are played with, in a way entered into. It will be shown how fandom is more of a physical kind of adoration, where fans seem to seek to enact their love, articulating it through creation rather than analysis.

Yet the two discourses have some things in common. In the third chapter of this thesis, the relationship between the two will begin to be examined. As a way to start to look at this relationship, I look at my own love for certain filmic texts, most prominently *Star Trek First Contact* (Frakes 1996), in order to see whether it is best categorised as fandom, cinephilia, or a mixture of both. By looking at such reactions, both my own and those of others, one gets a sense that neither literature completely describes how certain people are currently reacting to certain texts. I show how such reactions go beyond words yet still demand to be articulated. They are often highly emotional; in my case my reasons behind fixating upon a certain piece of filmic text is deeply personal, rooted in my experiences as a disabled man. Thus, if the cinephiliac

discourse seeks to explain why we love film, fandom answers by tactilely enacting that love.

We will see how a hybrid discourse is emerging, then, and in the fourth chapter of this thesis, this hybrid will be expounded in greater detail. The relationship between fandom and cinephilia is not a straightforward one: on one level they are utterly different discourses; yet, on another, they seem to overlap and merge at certain points. Until now, scholarship behind both discourses has been utterly separate. Yet the prospect that the adoring, self-reflecting cinephile and the engaged, creative fan might be articulating similar things in different ways surely offers up exciting new areas of research.

## **Introduction**

A love of film may be articulated in many ways, ranging from discussing film with ones friends to writing at length about film. This thesis will focus on two types of fascination with film: cinephilia, being a type of expressive, self-reflexive love, articulated through a type of discourse that is both adoring and analytical; and fandom, a type of communal love that can be seen through the artistic and critical responses of fans. It will attempt to locate points where they might intersect. New kinds of discourse are emerging that neither cinephilia nor fandom can fully describe, yet seem to exhibit elements of both. Writers such as Christian Keathley (2006) and Murray Pomerance (2008) have begun to articulate a type of cinephilia that goes beyond analysis and discourse; Henry Jenkins (2006) and Matt Hills (2002) have begun to examine the rise of the fan, and have written on the subject from an academic, sociological perspective. Yet the two types of cine-love have yet to be fully squared. In analysing the relationship between fandom and cinephilia, we find points where the two merge and overlap, yet neither literature fully accounts for this phenomenon. It will be demonstrated that types of commitment now exist that exhibit elements of fandom and cinephilia, yet are possessed of something more: a need to physically enter into film, and make real and extend what is being watched. In this way, this thesis picks up where Keathley and Pomerance leave off: they both, in part, articulate ways in which the love of film might go beyond language and theory into something more physical; Keathley has noted how cinephilia sometimes manifests itself bodily – that is to say, cinephiles have, in their writing, almost claimed to feel what they are watching on screen. This thesis demonstrates that one of the solutions to the need to express the inexpressible, the cinephiles' desire to articulate ways in which film might actually be 'felt', may lie in fandom or fan-like activity.

This thesis thus examines the relationship between two types of filmic love. At first glance, the two appear irreconcilable, each having its own origins and practices. Yet through a close examination of those practices, it will be shown that this apparent dichotomy can be traversed. Rather than using one overarching methodology, by looking at how both fans and cinephiles have responded to film, examining what they create, it will be shown that aspects of one can be seen in the other. While writers like Laura Mulvey are referenced, it is not our aim to overtly root the discussion in any

pre-established model of attraction, as such models deal with the psychoanalytic foundations of scopophilia rather than the discourses of filmic love. In this way, this thesis concerns the reception of films rather than their interpretation; at the same time, it will be necessary to show how certain films and pieces of film have been interpreted – reacted to – in order to analyse fan and cinephile activity. Although this thesis can be broadly termed post-structuralist and phenomenological given its emphasis on the first-person experience of film, it was necessary to avoid one strict academic approach, although intellectual rigour was maintained as far as possible.

In the first chapter of this thesis, then, cinephilia will be examined alone. We will first define more precisely what cinephilia is, and when it might have arisen, before going on to present an overview of the way in which contemporary writers are exploring the phenomenon. The ‘Oxford English Dictionary’ locates the first published use of the term as 1<sup>st</sup> January 1963. In its simplest terms, it is a fascination with and attraction to film; yet under these terms, anyone who watches and likes films could be said to be a cinephile. Cinephilia seems to refer to something more than the ‘every day’ interest with film. Films pervade our culture – they seem to be everywhere, from television to advertising to, most recently, the Internet. A willingness to go to watch films, either in the cinema or at home, seems to be equally common. However the distinction between the casual film-goer and the cinephile is that whereas the former goes to ‘the movies’ to satisfy a need for escapism and adventure, the cinephile, as Paula Amad notes, is an obsessive. She notes that cinephilia is a “certain kind of intense loving relationship with the cinema”, also writing of “the desire for the cinema.” (Amad 2005, 56) Hence this love can also manifest itself as an intense criticism as well as a form of connoisseurship, as it often did on the pages of *Cahiers Du Cinéma*.

Perhaps above all, then, cinephilia is an “intense loving” for film. The cinephile is a collector with a passion for rare or old films; cinephiles are connoisseurs, both loving and critical of film. To a certain extent, it is a rather romanticised view, highly enthusiastic almost to the point of absurdity. Yet the cinephiles’ love can also manifest itself as an intense criticism. Cinephilia, then, is a questioning love: rather than being a general, unthinking love of all film, it is a love of what film can be. We will show how this kind of reflexive adoration led, in the nineteen fifties and sixties, to the foundation of a sort of discourse – a way of writing about film that, unlike what went

before, was unafraid to show its love. Arising out of a rejection of the ‘cinéma du papa’, as the ‘young Turk’ writers of *Cahiers du Cinéma* rather derogatively branded films belonging to the so-called ‘tradition of quality’, and the staid, unenthusiastic writing on film that had preceded it, we will see that a group of writers in France began to establish a new literature on film, one composed of energetic, adoring articles. The ‘cinéma du papa’, they felt, had tethered French films largely to big-budget literary adaptations, and writing about films to an attitude of refinement and seriousness. The writers of *Cahiers* were eager to reinsert the unfettered enthusiasm that had brought them into the cinema in the first place back into writing about film, and to engage both intellectually and enthusiastically with mainstream Hollywood film previously scorned by the French film press. It is this unashamed adoration that is, arguably, one of the defining features of cinephilia.

At the same time, however, cinephilia is also a questioning love: rather than being a general, unthinking love of all film, it is a love of film’s potential. Cinephiles reflect on film, and also on their love of film. One aspect of cinephilia is self-reflection and a fascination with cinephilia itself. It is a fascination both with film and what it is that makes films captivate us so intensely. Keathley notes how journals such as *Positif*, a French film magazine founded in 1952 by Bernard Chardère, and often said to act as a counterpoint to *Cahiers du Cinema*, treated film in terms of its component parts, parts that were open to analysis and scrutiny. That is to say, every element of a film was seen to be there for a political, sociological or philosophical reason. In cinephilia, on the other hand, we find the concept of excess: film was something more than the sum of its parts; it was engaging and exciting, and this needed to be expressed for its own sake (Keathley 2006, 84). Part of this expression was the need to write not only about film, but to document and justify one’s love of film as well. Thus in the first chapter of this thesis we will seek to further refine our understanding of what cinephilia is, locating it in the space between the need to love and the need to reflect.

The second chapter of this thesis will focus on fandom. It is necessary to examine how fans operate in order to see what fandom is, and what similarities it may have to cinephilia. Fan, from the Latin, *fanaticus*, meaning one who is devoted to the temple, within contemporary society is taken to mean a person with a strong liking for something, usually in the realms of the media or sport. From here it follows, that one

could be a fan of anything: indeed, objects of fandom can range between anything from film stars to types of clothing; it is not uncommon, for instance, to hear someone speak of being a fan of a certain type of breakfast cereal. It is therefore necessary to restrict our definition of the term fan, as Jenkins and Hills do, to the media fan. Other types of fan presumably display different types of behaviours, but it is fans of films that interest us.

For Henry Jenkins and Matt Hills, fandom exists at the interpersonal level rather than that of individuals. That is to say that, although fans are individuals and often produce output on their own, they also exist in relation to other fans. It will be shown how fans group together to establish communities, of sorts; they utilise a form of ‘collective intelligence’, where groups of fans come together – often online – to share knowledge and enthusiasm.

We will see how this shared adoration compels fans to generate art inspired by the object of their love. Through this, they enter into the fictional worlds created by what they see on screen by elaborating upon it. To use Jenkins’ word, they become “textual poachers” (Jenkins 1992), encroaching onto the property of others and using it for their own means. It will be shown how, although fans do not directly reflect on their love, as cinephiles do, they often show signs of a knowing irony in their work, as if they know that what they are doing is fetishistic.

Through this irony, an interesting comparison may be drawn between fandom and cinephilia. In Chapter Three, we begin to examine the relationship between the two phenomena. While Chapter Four will examine the relationship between the two discourses from a more-or-less objective viewpoint, this chapter will begin that work by dealing with my own reaction to specific texts in order to examine whether such reactions qualify as fandom, cinephilia, or a hybrid of the two. Thus this chapter is largely based around my own fascination with Star Trek, and more specifically the eighth *Star Trek* film, *First Contact* (Frakes, 1996). We will see how writers such as Jason Sperb have written about such films as cinephiles – Sperb indeed draws upon Keathley’s ideas directly – yet also display traces of fandom in their work. Furthermore, we will see how, online, on websites like YouTube, some fans are beginning to create material that fixates upon certain moments in film. This seems to

be especially the case with *First Contact*: online, there are many instances of fans choosing the scene I too see as one of my ‘cinephiliac moments’ to form the basis of their artistic expression. Whether these fixations constitute cinephiliac or fannish activity is a matter of some debate, but the prospect that they might contain elements of both, even alluding to something of a hybrid, offers up fascinating new areas of research. Hence, *Star Trek: First Contact* offers us a good medium through which to examine the relationship between cinephilia and fandom. Therefore, in this chapter I attempt to examine my own, rather personal reasons for obsessing over a moment in film, drawing links between my life, the anger Captain Picard displays in the scene, and Melville's *Moby-Dick*, which Picard references. I see, or think I see, glimpses of my own anger in Picard's face. It is clear that I have reacted to this passage of film on some deeply personal level; here one can glimpse my own love of film, be it fannish or cinephiliac, and the reasons behind it. I therefore look at this scene in some detail, drawing out its references, examining its iconography, searching for the reasons behind my obsession, and in doing so articulate a kind of love for film which spans fandom and cinephilia.

It follows, then, that in Chapter Four the principles laid out in Chapter Three be examined in greater theoretical detail in order to see whether they hold water. In this chapter, this examination will be carried further by citing instances where the cinephiliac discourse displays aspects of fandom, and where fans display aspects of cinephilia. We will also locate instances whereby fans show signs of fetishising a single moment in film, in order to examine whether fandom has an equivalent of a ‘cinephiliac moment’. Such moments can vary in length and content, ranging from the briefest pieces of filmic text, to lines of dialogue to entire scenes. Given that so much cinephiliac writing concerns the isolation of key moments in film for special praise, a large proportion of this thesis is devoted to examining whether fans do indeed fetishise contingent, excessive or personal moments in film in order that a comparison might be drawn between the two types of love. This is, of course, not a straightforward task; fans do not, unlike cinephiles, articulate their actions. Yet we will see how they often select words or phrases from films to play with, and that this ‘textual play’ can range from remixing lines of dialogue, as in the case of the various instances where fans have remixed lines from Arnold Swarzenegger films (Miscellaneous [online]), to recreating entire scenes from films. It is therefore left to

us to discern their intentions and fascinations through the art they create. This leaves us to conduct a sort of divination, where the traces of one phenomenon are sought for in the subtext of the other.

Throughout the history of writing about film, both cinephiles and theoreticians have sought to define the viewer's relationship with the screen. For example, they ask whether the screen is more akin to a window or a door. Like the window, the screen is a framed portal through which one can observe the world; and, like the window, the viewer has little actual control of what he observes. Yet, as Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener (2010) point out, like the door viewers have always felt the urge to step through, to enter into film. However, for writers like Elsaesser and Hagener, this takes the form of a written exploration, outlining, for example, how film explores the blurring of fiction and reality. He points out how early film in particular played with such ideas, also citing for example how Fritz Laing played with concepts like mirrors in films such as *M* (Elsaesser and Hagener 2010, 85). While in cinephilia such ideas are usually explored in prose, Fans, on the other hand, take this notion further by acting upon filmic texts themselves, taking them as the basis for their own art. In a sense, we will see that fans have found that way to enter film that cinephiles have long attempted to elucidate. To frame it another way, both cinephilia and fandom exhibit the same combination of intellectual engagement and unabashed love, but whereas one articulates this love through words, writing and direct analysis, the other enacts and performs it. They are different responses to the same compulsion.

This thesis will therefore attempt to locate the meeting point between two types of love: one is reflexive, the other active. Above all, in stark contrast to Deleuzian models of viewing, as outlined by Rushton (2009), both posit active, engaged spectators. Cinephilia attempts to account for its love, fandom seems content just to put it on display. Cinephilia is not fandom, and fandom is not cinephilia; yet the two seem, at certain levels, to converge, forming new ways to look at film and its love. As we will see, cinephilia is not only an enthusiastic style of writing about film, but by extension a perpetual rephrasing of the question “why do you love film?” to which there can be no real answer. Yet by enacting that love, fandom answers by simply articulating that love in a different way, and it is there that the two discourses merge.

## Chapter 1: Definitions of Cinephilia

The term cinephilia has a variety of meanings, depending on context: cinephilia can be defined as the love of film and the cinema, yet it is also coming to mean, in academic circles especially, a type of self-reflexive discourse concerning film – a discourse that is unafraid to directly articulate its love. Here, of course, the word discourse is used in the general sense, broadly meaning an interexchange of ideas. In this opening chapter, therefore, we will attempt to define cinephilia. It is necessary to negotiate the gap between how the term is commonly used and defined – the love of cinema and film – and how the term has come to be used to refer to a specific intellectual discourse about film, one which is primarily historical yet has a contemporary manifestation. These two meanings are both utterly separate yet also interwoven, as both have as their basis a love of film.

For some people, the love of film can be said to carry with it an urge to detail and document that love in the form of a discourse, as it did first, Keathley argues in Chapter Four of *Cinephilia and History*, with the writers of *Cahiers du Cinéma*.

Jean-Luc Godard was the critic perhaps most inclined to the practice of merely describing – but with great verve and excitement – a film’s privileged moments...These scenes were recounted simply because they are particularly striking, and thus memorable, in their conception and execution – at least for Godard. While simple pleasure alone may seem fair justification, one rarely finds such gratuitous recounting of scenes in contemporary film criticism. (Keathley 2006, 83)

It was this enthusiasm to demonstrate one’s passion for film as well as to open it up to analysis which the writers of *Cahiers* pioneered, and it is precisely this combination which Keathley defines as cinephilia. Cinephilia can be said to be a twofold love concerning not only with a fascination for film, but also a fascination with that love itself: cinephiles seem, to a certain extent, fascinated by their own fascination. Of course, there had been writing about film before cinephilia, but the cinephiliac discourse, as we will see shortly, was and is one that was unafraid to show its adoration along with its interest. This is what made it distinct: the cinephiliac discourse not only concerns the evaluation of film, but exhibits a type of loving engagement with film. Cinephiles seem to need film, even structuring their lives

around them; cinephilia is thus also a type of culture based around writing, watching and thinking about film, as well as about the very love of film itself.

Let us look at how this culture first manifested itself. Cinephilia is the point where filmic pleasure and analysis meet. Keathley points out that many of the film reviews to be found in *Cahiers du Cinéma* were short, to the point and unapologetically adoring. Such articles were not so much reviews in the conventional sense, but ‘responses’ to films, yet within them Keathley unpacks many intellectual and philosophical notions, particularly notions concerning auteurism. According to Keathley, the films that the writers of *Cahiers* were often the most enthusiastic about were those that showed something of the director’s personality. The films these writers were most keen on weren’t necessarily a director’s best films, as judged against certain criteria, but texts that revealed something of their personalities, of their intentions or of their worldview. Because these writers also privileged certain fleeting moments in film to write so passionately about, Keathley also uses such reviews as evidence for the idea of the ‘Cinephiliac Moment’. (Keathley 2006, 83) Thus their absolute enthusiasm for film had a form of intellectual or philosophical basis: their reviews were uniquely enthusiastic, but theirs was not a blind, unthinking enthusiasm – it was motivated by intellectual principles and by a belief that film was a unique, revelatory art form.

Much of the writing deemed to be cinephiliac concerns the fetishisation of small fleeting moments ignored by other viewers, notions of the accidental or peripheral details within film. In their reviews, the writers of *Cahiers* were especially expressive about small details that they noticed. That is to say, the early cinephiles valued peripheral details within film: details that could be said to show something of a reality beneath or behind the fiction of the film; almost something that made the film more ‘real’, or exposed something of the director’s personality. Other viewers may have thought these moments unnoteworthy, but the early cinephiles, in examining the way in which such scenes could be seen to illustrate quite complex artistic and indeed political mechanisms, used them as part of the basis for their argument that there was more to film than mere entertainment. Perhaps above all, however, they were also expressions of the type of absolute love which makes the cinephiliac discourse distinct.

[T]he spark that prompted the *Cahiers* critics desire to write did not stop at description. Rather, as Willeman argues, in their descriptions was an attempt “to find formulations to convey something about the intensity of the spark.”: ultimately, this intensity was “translated and, to some extent, rationalised, secondarised, in the writing, into a *politique*.” The *politique*, too, worked on privileged moments and previously unacknowledged details, but here the focus was on those details that were signifiers of a director’s consistent style, theme, and worldview. (Keathley 2006, 65)

It could be said that it is this spark which makes the cinephiliac discourse unique. The writers of *Cahiers* wanted to let their readers know what it was about film which made them want to write about it. Yet they went further, trying to rationalise their love into some kind of codified system of writing about and analysing film. Perhaps one of the initial, overarching questions cinephiles ask, as did the proponents of the New Wave and the writers of *Cahiers du Cinéma*, is *what is it about film itself that fascinates us?* (Harris 2003, 3) In trying to convey something of the intensity of that spark, they needed to define what it was they loved about film, in turn needing to rationalise that love by demonstrating films to be the expressions of individual artists. In asking such questions, one implicitly assumes that film is a valid field of study, rather than a mere form of entertainment. Yet in order to justify film and the love of film, one has to take a step further and enquire too into the ways in which that love manifests itself. Part of the analysis the concept of cinephilia opens film up to concerns questions about the ‘dissection’ of film; cinephilia seeks to investigate which part of film fascinates us, trying to locate precisely the aspects of its construction which cause us to fixate for so long on the screen. Rather than seeing film as simply a distraction, a form of entertainment and not as an art, cinephilia was the first discourse to intellectually inquire into the workings of film and yet retain something of the unabashed love which attracted one to film in the first place. In doing so it resituates film: to the cinephile, film is neither pure entertainment nor escapism; nor is it something one should attempt to deal with at a critical distance. To the writers of *Cahiers*, film was something to be loved, but this love needed to be reflected upon and written about. Their love therefore endowed their writing with a type of fascination in film which had not been given voice before. Yet in turn this fascination itself was a source of fascination. If film is a legitimate art form, and if it could be loved, then that love needed in turn to be documented.

Cinephiles do this in several ways. For example, this type of loving fascination for film may sometimes be seen in the way in which cinephiles often attempt to rank film. By asserting that certain films are better than other films, they demonstrate a love for film which is regulated by certain criteria. That is to say, in the way in which cinephiles frequently seek to place individual films in hierarchies, they demonstrate an interest in film which is both loving and discerning. The cinephiliac discourse can thus be said to have something of a historical outlook. De Valck et al describe it as “an act of memory. Many of the reflections on cinephilia as a critical concept emphasise its interpenetration with the past.” (De Valck 2005, 14) Cinephiles seem keen to place a film within the context of the history of film. Thus the desire to watch, analyse and articulate a love of films seems to be twinned with the desire to understand the history of films. Rather than concern themselves with supplementary materials, however, cinephiles seem mainly to use film itself to trace its own history. In the cinephile, there seems to be a constant fascination with the films of the past. Jean-Luc Godard and the film-makers of the French New Wave, for example, seem to be obsessed with the American film-makers of the twenties through to the fifties. Within cinephilia we also find the urge to classify film; there is a need, for the cinephile, to put film in some sort of codified and structured order. Thus, Amad writes of “the cinephile’s approach to sorting through the vast amount of films on offer [that] is defined by his penchant for the “abstracted and transcendent reduction[ism]” of the collector, the classifier.” (Amad 2005, 65) There is always a fascination with what went before and how it relates to the present in terms of both film and cinephilia itself; that is to say, for the cinephile, it is not enough to express a love of film, nor is it enough to be interested in the history of film: to be a cinephile is also to take an interest in the history of the love of film. In this sense, cinephilia is both a subject of historical study and something current at the same time.

In March 1995, Antoine de Baecque and Thierry Fremaux organised a conference: “The invention of a culture: the history of cinephilia” at the Lumiere institute in Lyon, featuring an impressive roster of international critics and scholars...Rather than echoing American critics and simply bemoaning the demise of cinephilia, de Baecque and Fremaux proposed to treat cinephilia as an historical object of study – to engage in a measured consideration of exactly what practices and circumstances defined cinephilia, what forces brought it into being, and what effect it had on film culture and culture in general. If cinephilia gave birth to the first histories of cinema, they argue, then it falls to us in the post cinephiliac era to look back and chart the

history of cinephilia itself, to construct, in their words, a “history of the history of cinema.” (Keathley 2006, 3)

Cinephilia, then, is an active love, and one that is partly directed back in upon itself: cinephiles, in part, also seem fascinated with the very fact that they are fascinated. The quote above demonstrates the cinephile’s desire to critically engage not only with film but the love of film itself, and the history of that love. Thus cinephilia is not just an attempt to sanctify film, but also to sanctify and legitimise our love for it. It is as if their very fascination grows to a point where the cinephile become interested with the fact of being fascinated. On the other hand, in the above extract there is a sense that what de Baecque and Fremaux were exhibiting was not cinephilia *per se* but a post-cinephiliac mutation of it. For the cinephile today, then, it is not enough to be fascinated with film, nor is it sufficient to be fascinated with the history of film: the cinephile is also fascinated by how others have been fascinated. Yet what Keathley means by “us in the post cinephiliac era” (Keathley 2006, 3) is open to debate, as it would imply that cinephilia is not something current, but a phenomenon of the past. The cinephiliac discourse today seems to extend the love of film to encompass these secondary yet concomitant fascinations. At its core, this fascination with the love of film still holds an obsession with the very thing which brought us to that fascination: film. If this is not the case, then cinephilia is a thing of the past, and cinephilia has evolved into a post-cinephiliac fascination with cinephilia as it once was, and cinephilia is no more. It would no longer be the love of film but a curiosity about how film was once loved. Yet we know the love of film, and the urge to express that love still exists through writers like Keathley, for they would not write if they did not care deeply for their core subject. Cinephilia is therefore the simultaneous love of two distinct things: film and the love of film. Hence to restrict the definition of cinephilia as merely the love of film, however intense, may be to deal with only half the issue. Along with its self-reflexive aspect, cinephilia can be examined in terms of its other component activities. Thus there is now a rhizomic quality to cinephilia: cinephiles “treat cinephilia as an historical object of study” (Keathley 2006, 3), so their love of film grows to encompass other interests. In order to demonstrate that film is something more than entertainment, the cinephile has to account for his own passion for film, in part by documenting the history of the love of film. In this way, the love of film seems to spark several interlinked fascinations. Not only is it the love of film, and a keenness to express that love, but it also takes itself to be its own subject of

study. Part of the question the concept of cinephilia asks is *why are cinephiles fascinated by film*.

Indeed, Jean-Luc Godard plays with this very idea in *Le Mépris* (Godard, 1963), in the opening scene showing Bridget Bardot's body. By having Camille ask Paul which part of her body he likes, Godard seems to ask what it is about film we love, seemingly asking whether we just like looking at bodies, and if so, which parts of the body are we most attracted to.

[T]he waters above the heavens, enemy of the Odysseus with whom Paul parallels himself. For Paul (Michel Piccoli), his wife (Brigitte Bardot) is as inscrutable as the statues of the gods in the putative Fritz Lang film. But that inscrutability is less indicative of divinity than of her objectification: the naked backside she displays at the film's beginning anticipates the pornography of the Roman art coffee table book she and Paul both flick through. (Coates 1998, 38)

Godard thus explores the fetish in a rather cinephile-like way, taking it apart to reveal the underlying voyeurism and 'pornography'. By drawing our attention to Paul's voyeurism in such a methodical way, he forces us, in this scene, to reflect on the fact that we, the viewers, are being manipulated and titillated. This scene also functions as a rather sarcastic dig at the studio executives who insisted that the director include a shot of Bardot in the nude, thereby also saying something about the commercialisation of film. The scene therefore demonstrates one aspect of cinephilia in that it seeks to lay bare what motives and meanings lie behind film, as well as the motives behind our desire to watch film, something that Godard and his fellow writers also sought to achieve through their articles.

We can thus begin to see that as soon as one starts to examine the notion of cinephilia, one encounters problems and contradictions. While at face value cinephilia can be said to be the love of film, in trying to more fully define what cinephilia is we see that the notion is far more nuanced. Thus another layer of debate is added when we take into account that the act of going to the cinema is usually accompanied by a peripheral experience. Watching films and going to the cinema is a social as well as intellectual activity; it is physical as well as scopic. Any definition of cinephilia must reflect not only the type of concomitant fascinations we have outlined above and will return to shortly, but also the social and physical aspects of watching films. Part of the

cinema's attraction, is the physical act of going, buying tickets and perhaps confectionery, and sitting in a darkened room. As Keathley and Godard both demonstrated in very different ways, examining the love of film is itself part of that love. Hence, the very activity of going to the cinema and its associated activities can be areas suitable for examination, from the fetishistic aspects of sitting in a darkened room to the fact that cinemas, in a way, legitimise the eating of popcorn. Historically, seeing a movie was often a special event to be cherished and fetishised – before the rise of home video, films were special and thus they had a quality of intimacy. Part of the thrill of going to the cinema was, and still is, the feeling of being absorbed into the cinema and taken elsewhere. As Walter Benjamin wrote: “‘getting closer to things’ in both special and human terms is every bit as passionate a concern of today’s masses as their tendency to surmount the uniqueness of each circumstance by seeing it in reproduction.” (Benjamin 1936, 3) Benjamin’s contention here is that, part of the attraction of going to the cinema is the cinematic apparatus itself, for it alone has the ability to encompass all of one’s vision and thus transport the viewer somewhere else physically. There was, between film and viewer, an aura, “the unique apparition of a distance, however near it may be”. (Benjamin 1936, 3) That is to say, viewing a film in the film-theatre allows the viewer a unique experience: the viewer is, at the same time, both close to and far from the screen; the viewer is both intimately involved with yet utterly separate from the action of the screen, just as, in the dark of the cinema, in a sense one is alone even if they are surrounded by fellow audience members. Such ideas are amplified by Laura Mulvey’s ideas about scopophilic distantiation and narcissistic identification: the darkened room helps us identify with what we see, and we love it because we love ourselves. As Anneke Smelik explains,

In her ground-breaking article 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema' (1975/1989), Laura Mulvey uses psychoanalysis to understand the fascination of Hollywood cinema. This fascination can be explained through the notion of scopophilia, the desire to see, which is a fundamental drive, according to Freud. Sexual in origin, like all drives, *der Schautrieb* is what keeps the spectator glued to the silver screen. Classical cinema, adds Mulvey, stimulates the desire to look by integrating structures of voyeurism and narcissism into the story and the image. Voyeuristic visual pleasure is produced by looking at another (character, figure, situation) as our object, whereas narcissistic visual pleasure can be derived from self-identification with the (figure in the) image. (Smelik 1998, 353)

Thus cinema has the ability to transport a viewer: they become witnesses to events they would not otherwise be privy to. At the same time, they are distanced from the action: like the flâneur, they observe events rather than taking part in them. Thus, not only does cinema reproduce the world for us to see – an aspect which particularly fascinated early cinema-goers – but it affords us the unique ability to observe without being observed ourselves. The viewer is, at one at the same time, both distanced from and part of events; what is happening on the screen is both intimate and abstracted.

In terms of attempting to forge a definition of cinephilia, however, this could be said to raises question about other ways of viewing film, such as on television: it is debatable whether watching a film on television qualifies as indulging in cinephilia, for writers like Barthes and Bazin also obsessed over and wrote about the very cinematic apparatus, including auditorium-specific concepts like the 'aura' of the darkened room. One might ask too whether there is the same 'apparition of a distance' at home that there is in the cinema, or the same sort of narcissistic self-identification? Indeed, the rise of home video can be seen as the demise of this manifestation of cinephilia, but it also may be said to be inaugurating a new type of viewing which emphasises the experience of the viewer over the structure of the film, one which might no longer be termed cinephilia as, say, Keathley uses the term, yet still has elements of the cinephiliac discourse. As Casetti argues,

Cinema today is expanding its borders, but also risks losing its identity. When we see a film – or something similar to a film – on YouTube or on a mobile phone, are we still in the terrain of cinema, or have we moved elsewhere? We may answer this question only if we define what a filmic experience is. (Casetti 2009, 57)

Given that cinephiles often seem to focus on the specific attributes of watching a film in a darkened auditorium rather than, say, on the television, this would seem raise questions about how one would separate, in academic terms, watching a film in a cinema rather than at home. One might ask whether a viewer be said to experience the same thing. Such questions arise in much cinephiliac writing. The discourse of cinephilia also seeks to describe the role the act of cinema-going plays in the self-reflexive love of film. Bazin argues that the act of going to the cinema carries with it certain, perhaps fetishistic qualities that one cannot achieve at home. Cinephilia, then, is not simply about watching film, but about watching it in certain specific places.

Thus part of the concept of cinephilia is our dual love of film and the cinema. In order to account for cinephilia, one must ask, as the proponents of the New Wave and the writers of *Cahiers du Cinema* did, what is it about film itself which fascinates us, and why we are so attracted to sitting motionless in a darkened room staring at a screen for so long. (Harris 2003, 3) Again, from this point of view, it can be said that cinephilia is not just the love of film but a fascination with that love, and the conditions that give rise to it. (See Chapter Three).

We can see, then, that cinephilia is not merely a love of spectacle or a love of watching, but a curiosity about cinema and its workings, and about what attracts us to it. It would seem to accept cinema as a spectacle – that is, an art form of novelty - but goes a step further to enquire into its structures and codes. In a way it is a kind of deconstructive love in that it seeks to break down the very thing that it admires (again, the example from Godard illustrates this well: when one starts to analyse and articulate why one loves something, that love is made conscious and thus takes on a new dimension or quality that it did not seem to have before). Perhaps due to its rhizomic quality – the way in which cinephilia looks in upon itself - cinephilia, as noted above, can be said to be a type of discourse both expressive of and fascinated by the love of film.

In order to better understand cinephilia and the tension between the urge to love and the urge to frame that love in some form of intellectual structure, it is necessary to locate the point at which it arose. It could be said that cinephilia began in France in the early fifties, arising from the combination of the publication of François Truffaut's '*A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema*' (Truffaut 1954a), together with the writings of Andre Bazin, in particular the two volumes of his '*What is Cinema?*' (Bazin 1967). As we saw in the above extract from Keathley, this period saw the beginnings of a new type of critical engagement with film, one that valued it as artwork deserving of intellectual rigour. With it, we see for example the rise of auteurism, as with the need to value films brought with them the need to respect them as the work of a single director. As we have already glimpsed, part of the reason why they prized individual details or contingent moments within film was that the *Cahiers*' writers used them as evidence for the argument they could see something of a director's personality within film. This notion, Keathley argues, had its basis in

painting, where authorship could be discerned in the details that the painter created quickly. That is to say, details which the painter sketched repeatedly and quickly, often without thinking, such as ears or noses, were similar in every picture a painter made. They could therefore be used as a sign of authorship.

In fact, however, one can draw a clear comparison between cinephilia and the art critical discourse of connoisseurship, which, as S.J. Freedberg has defined it, is "the use of expert knowledge of a field (in this case, the history of art) to identify objects in it, determine their quality, and assess their character." Taking as an example Bernard Berenson, one of the most famous of all connoisseurs, the similarity between connoisseurship and cinephilia becomes clearer. Working in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Berenson began his career as an art authenticator, trained in the method of Giovanni Morelli. Focusing almost exclusively on internal evidence, Morelli had argued that, in assigning authorship to a painting, one must look past the obvious characteristics of a style or school and focus instead on marginal elements such as fingernails and earlobes, for these are details that the painter composes rapidly, without conscious intent, and it is thus here that his personality shows through most clearly. It was only through careful analysis and comparison by this method, Morelli argued, that authorship could be established with a high degree of certainty. (Keathley 2006, 15)

Similarly, if films by a given director could be shown to contain moments or details which bore similarities to his or her other pieces, then the case could be made that film was the artistic expression of an individual. Cinephiles view film as a body of artistic work to be both appraised and catalogued, and the generation of auteur theory enabled them to approach film in a manner more akin to literature – that is as a corpus of texts with some structure to it, rather than as a haphazard array of entertainments. Most basically, if film was seen as the product of a committee or group intent only upon distracting people in order to take their money, it belonged to the ranks of other puerile entertainments. If, on the other hand, film could be seen to be the expression of a single person, it could more easily be ranked alongside the other ‘high arts’, such as literature or painting; film could be said to say something both about the world in general and the personal vision of individual who created the text. Thus, according to Keathley, these details are the basis of Paul Willeman’s ‘cinephiliac moments’. Although auteur theory had its roots in debates over who a film can be said to ‘belong to’, it also can be said to have gone some way to sanctifying film as an art form. Just as authorship of a painting could be discerned in the details, the critics of *Cahiers* held that the personality of a director was evident in peripheral details in the filmic shot, or

at least small ‘moments’ not intended to catch the viewer’s attention. (Keathley 2006, 85)

Hence it could be argued that auteurism is a good signifier for cinephilia, as the debates surrounding auteurism are an example of the degree to which the cinephiles engaged with film. It was this rigorous debate, combined with an intense passion, which made the cinephiliac discourse unique. Writing in *Film Comment*, Andrew Dudley notes that:

Bazin certainly helped jumpstart auteurism, and his reputation rode a long way on the directors he championed. In the seventies Truffaut saw to it that writings on Chaplin, Welles and Renoir came out in separate volumes, all with English translations, not to mention *The Cinema of Cruelty*, which has pieces on Buñuel, Dryer, and Hitchcock, among others, are anthologised. Yet Bazin was himself hardly an auteurist. Two of his most revealing essays are his iconic “How Can You Be A Hitchcockio-Hawksian?” and his level-headed rebuke of the *Politique des Auteurs*. Bazin wasn’t out to douse the wildfire enthusiasm of the younger critics; he understood how crucial is the energy that cinephilia gives to one’s eyes and language.” (Dudley 2008, 39)

The way in which Dudley describes how Bazin was able to advocate as well as rebuke auteurism shows how the writers of *Cahiers* saw every facet of film as open to debate: they entered into arguments with enthusiasm, writing not only from one stance but several. Perhaps spurred on by their passion for film, this new kind of critical engagement with film also led these early cinephiles to advocate a new kind of cinema, and to break away from what had been before. It was Truffaut, however, rather than Bazin, who set forth in his polemic an abandonment of French cinema up until that point. In his 1954 essay, ‘A Certain Tendency in French Cinema’, Truffaut branded the French ‘quality cinema’ as ‘cinema du papa’, and sought to make a new type of cinema in France; until then, French cinema had largely been a matter of literary adaptations. As Keathley points out: “Frustrated by the current French cinema's preoccupation with adapting major literary works in a dull, lifeless way, these young critics – Jean-Luc Godard and Francois Truffaut among them – turned their sights to American films, which they believed displayed the directness, unpretentiousness, action, and modern attitude that their own national cinema lacked.” (Keathley 2006, 14) The writing that concerned that type of cinema, Truffaut describes as ‘academic’ – that is, devoid of passion. His writing would be endowed with a certain sense of love for film, especially popular American films which, before

then, had been a target of derision in French film writing. For him and the other writers of that era – the so-called ‘Young Turks’ – French cinema up until that point was a literary cinema, chiefly concerned with adapting literature for the screen. If a film is adapted from a novel, of course, it cannot truly be considered the work of an auteur, as the original author of the book or play from which the film or play was adapted would have had a large part to play in the text’s creation.

That is not to say that the writers of *Cahiers* held that a literary adaptation could not be seen to be the work of an auteur – after all, a large part of Hitchcock’s work was itself taken from literature – but that the texts they prized the most were those they saw as uniquely cinematic.

Truffaut’s polemic was not an empty one, of course; it was also a polemic for a different French cinema. He considered the dominance of the Tradition of Quality and of ‘psychological realism’ (which he opposed to the pre-war ‘poetic realism’) responsible for public incomprehension of ‘such new works as *Le Carrosse D’Or*, *Casque D’Or*, not to mention *Les Dames du Bois de Boulogne* and *Orphee*.’ The names Truffaut cites in arguing for a French cinema of *auteurs* are Renoir, Bresson, Cocteau, [...] Such film-makers, Truffaut argued, have a ‘world view at least as valuable as that of Aurenche and Bost’, would be incapable of conceiving characters as abject as Aurenche’s and Bost’s, and, curious coincidence... they are *auteurs* who often write their own dialogue and some of them themselves create the stories they direct’ (Hillier 1985, 22)

Thus Truffaut argued for a new type of cinema and a new attitude to film which would celebrate films as the singular vision of a director, or *auteur*. In the above quote, one can almost detect a hint of sarcasm in the way in which Truffaut rejects the idea that film can be the product of many people. He, like the other cinephiles, favoured directors with a discernible worldview that could be seen in their work. In the opening of an article entitled ‘The Rogues are Weary’, which appeared in *Cahiers du Cinema*, Truffaut writes:

Every one of Jacques Becker’s films is a Jacques Becker film. This is only a small point, but an important one. There is, in fact, little to tell us the recent *Therese Raquin* was not made by Feyder, *Les Orgueilleux* by Pagliero, *Les Armants de Brasmort* by Yves Allégeret and *Mam’zelle Nitouche* by Duvivier. Yet we could not conceive of *Edouard et Caroline*, *Casque D’Or* or *Grisbi* being signed by Autant-Lars, Gremillon or Delannoy. (Truffaut 1954b, 28)

In arguing that films bear the imprint of the directors who made them, and further in arguing that some films can be said to bear such an imprint, Truffaut is, in a way, making a case for films status as an art. He is arguing that such imprints reveal a level of artistry, just as the details of a painting can be used to reveal the painter. To Truffaut, only certain directors can make certain films, and therefore their films must be reflected upon, evaluated and indeed cherished upon the same intellectual level as any other piece of art. Truffaut points out that only Becker could make a Becker film; that is, they bear the marks of his authorship, marks which only Becker could endow into a film. The *Politique d'Auteur* valued films that bore the marks of directorship the most. These were the films the writers of *Cahiers du Cinéma* celebrated the most, and were the most vocal and joyous about, as it was these films which, to them, most clearly demonstrated film's unique revelatory power. Thus, what we can glimpse in the above quotations is the emergence of a specific kind of reflexive discourse about film: cinephilia does not denote, as one might take it at first glance, a general love for the cinema, but a specific kind of adoration, both fetishising and questioning; it is utterly enthusiastic, yet this enthusiasm is filtered through certain values and ideals about film. In the above quotes we can observe the beginnings of a very specific kind of discourse. Film had been written about before, both popularly and academically, but there does not appear to have been this combination of problematization and fetishisation in that writing. Cinephilia seems to seek to be both intellectual and populist; it seems to want to root film in a wider academic discourse, making links between it and other art forms, especially literature, yet it attacks what had been before as being too dry and academic, and seeks to exhibit an affection for film rather than trying to deal with it at a critical distance. The writers of *Cahiers* did not see what they were doing as academic but populist, and yet they allude to and ground film in a discourse very much like an academic one. Bazin, for example, speaks of the 'psychology' of film; Truffaut draws parallels between film and literature, as well as writing on the impact of technologies such as Cinemascope, for example in his 1954 essay 'En Avoir Plein La Vue'. Thus such writing oscillates between fascination, sheer enthusiasm and intellectual enquiry, as well as between the urge to link film with the other arts while conveying its unique expressivity. Within the writing of those first cinephiles we find a tension between populism and elitism, intellectual exploration and pure unabashed love that is at the core of cinephilia. It is this passion for film, rather than the fact that it could be said to be as intellectual as anything that had been

before, that made the cinephiliac discourse different. In other words, although this new kind of writing about film clearly engaged with its subject intellectually, it was its inherent enthusiasm which made it unique.

This mixture of enthusiasm and engagement becomes clear when one starts to examine their writing. It seems to combine curiosity, love, and a curiosity about that love. Take, for example, this passage from 'The Rogues are Weary', in which Truffaut writes:

This search for an ever more exact tone is particularly marked in the dialogue. In *Casque D'Or* Raymond (Bussieres) comes into Manda's (Reggiani) carpentry workshop and says 'Alors, boulot, menuise?' ('Work, scrape, eh?') Not only could a scriptwriter never have written this line, but it is also the kind of line which only improvised on the set. None the less, this 'boulot, menuise' still has an intelligence (in the sense of complicity between friends) which confounds me every time I see it. (Truffaut 1954b, 29)

As with the one before it, this extract shows a number of things that are pertinent to this discussion. Firstly and most obviously, Truffaut seems to be questioning the extent to which the director is indeed in control. Certain details, he apparently suggests, must be added after the script has been written and during rehearsals, or even during filming. He is thus using this piece of film to engage with and explore auteur theory: he raises questions about whether these details are the work of the director or the actors themselves. He focuses in on small details in film and rhetorically asks where and how they were created. Secondly, Truffaut is displaying and admitting to a kind of love for film that goes beyond analysis; in *Cahiers du Cinema*, for the first time, perhaps, writers displayed their affection for film openly, as if finally 'coming out' about something illicit or secret. The way in which he admits to being 'confounded' seems to have an air of joy to it. Thirdly, the way in which Truffaut admits to being 'confounded' by the line of dialogue every time he hears it is also highly reminiscent of Willeman's concept of the 'cinephiliac moment': he seems fixated by this line, just as Keathley suggests we are fixated by moments in film, and likewise would seem to suggest that he believes this line exceeds the filmic text and becomes something personal to him. That is to say, it seems to resonate with him personally, affecting him on an individual, emotional level; triggering in him memories, feelings or thoughts which other viewers might not have. To be

confounded by something suggests, to a certain extent, that one cannot account for it and yet is highly curious about it.

Within such writing we can see, then, a set of contradictions: the need for intellectual rigour, but also for a new kind of enthusiasm and engagement for film, in stark contrast with what had been before. In this new kind of cinephiliac writing, we see a love or adoration of the cinema, but also the will to dissect that love in order to discover what lies beneath; the urge to be proletarian and popularise, even though their very writings in a way betray their status as middle-class intellectuals. In this writing, there also seems to be a will to explain, comprehend and even pass on an enthusiasm for film to others. The same or similar contradictions can be seen in cinephilia today, for in self-confessed cinephiliac writing, such as that by Keathley, the love of film seems to go hand in hand with the urge to document and account for that love. In both the articles of *Cahiers* and later cinephiliac writing (that is, writing that is both about cinephilia and itself displays cinephilia at the same time) we see the same kind of urges and motivations. Ultimately, these can be said to be the expression of the love of film, for in cinephilia love and the expression of it go hand in hand. Cinephilia is a type of love that brings with it an urgency to display and explain itself. The way in which Truffaut used the word 'confounded' betrays a certain wistfulness at his inability to explain why he focussed upon that specific line of dialogue, and therefore an eagerness to do so.

Even within the language cinephiles use, then, we see a sort of tension between the desire to explain and the desire to express love. Thus, cinephilia goes far beyond a casual love of film into something more engaged. Cinephilia, by taking the very love of film into its own field of study, problematizes and therefore legitimises that love. By admitting to the fact that one loves film, rather than trying to hide that love like some leftover remnant of childhood, both film and the love of film can be studied as one field. The concept of cinephilia therefore reclassifies film and its love, repositioning it intellectually, opening it up as an area of critical study. It validates film as an art form and also the love of film as an object of study in its own right. As Keathley notes above, cinephilia is not just concerned with the love of film, or the classification of it, but it is also an attempt to define the nature and history of that love. It is not only a fascination with film itself, but also a fascination with that

fascination. It can be said to be a set of simultaneous, interwoven fascinations concerning both film and the love of film simultaneously. Just as Godard attempts to deconstruct our love of film within the text of *Le Mépris*, Keathley deconstructs our attraction to film through his writing. By dealing with it through its component parts, cinephiles seek to pin down what it is about film that brings about such an intense fascination. Whereas Godard was doing this fairly wryly and cynically by drawing our attention to the baseness of pure voyeurism, cinephile writers such as Keathley and Pomerance do this by writing about and considering cinephilia's component aspects. At the same time, both maintain a love for film and both display an eagerness to explore that love, albeit in different ways.

In cinephilia, then, questions of how one loves film and why one loves film merge, for in trying to convey something about the manner in which one loves film ('how') one must also automatically explain what motivates that love ('why'). Keathley has argued that another aspect of cinephilia can be said to be the love of spectacle, pointing out that films were originally fairground attractions (Keathley 2006, 65). That is to say, part of the reason for going to watch films is to experience something novel, new and exciting. Throughout its history the love of the spectacle has driven people to the cinema. With early cinema, it was the novelty of seeing images which move, fragments of captured reality; today, in mainstream film, it is a fascination with stunts, special effects and so on. Keathley argues that at least part of cinema's attraction in its infancy was a fascination with the novel, spectacular or unusual.

With this concept, Gunning challenged not only the belief that early cinema was merely a "primitive" version of narrative cinema but also the long-standing opposition of documentary/Lumiere and fiction/Melies modes. In fact, he argued, the films of both those pioneers can be united in "a conception of cinema that sees cinema less as a way of telling stories than as a way of presenting a series of views to an audience, fascinating because of their illusory power", regardless of whether that illusion is realistic, as with Lumiere, or magical, as with Melies. Furthermore, it alerts us to the fact that "attractions" may include not only moments of performed spectacle (a dance or a chase) but also captured reality: the wind in the trees. (Keathley 2006, 106)

Early cinema-goers, then, were not only attracted by film's capacity to tell stories, but also by its ability to 'capture reality'. This aspect of the cinema also intrigued writers like Bazin and Barthes just as it did the first viewers crowding into tents in fairs in

order that they might see themselves on the screen. Keathley argues that, in the ‘transitional’ cinema era, an interest in the spectacular or novel was subordinated to plot and dialogue. Before then, what he terms ‘protocinephilia’ (Keathley 2006, 112) was largely a fascination with novelty, especially the novelty of seeing reality represented on screen. However, as we will soon see, much of the writing on cinephilia concerns notions of the contingent, which holds within it overtones of the new and unexpected. The notion that we are fascinated by the new or spectacular, the unexpected or original, seems to be central to cinephilia, as it has been from cinephilia’s earliest manifestations. In part it is the attraction to the new and novel, the uniquely cinematic or revelatory, which fascinates cinephiles; it was the unexpected that brought about some of the most enthusiastic reactions in the early cinephiles, and tracing the history of how this fascination has been put on display is the concern of much contemporary writing on cinephilia. Such writers fixate on moments within film, describing them, basing arguments about directors upon them; yet they also attempt to explain why they are fixated, again illustrating the multi-dimensional aspect of cinephilia. It is a discourse which takes itself as its own subject.

On the one hand, then, cinephilia can be said to be born of an attraction to the new and novel within film. On the other, however, it can equally be said to be a discourse or discussion about what attracts one to film. If cinephiles are attracted to the new, novel or contingent within film, they simultaneously seek to explain or describe how and why they are attracted. To be a cinephile is to perpetually explore why one is attracted to film. To seek to describe the attraction of film is also to, implicitly or explicitly, justify it. Therefore, in order to convey to their readers what lay behind their love of film, what motivated them to write so enthusiastically, the writers of *Cahiers* examined ways in which film itself could be a means of social or political expression. This included discussing the very *mise-en-scène* as nobody had before: close ups, for example, were described as fascist whereas wide angle shots were said to be more democratic as they gave the viewer the chance to choose what to look at. Indeed, it could be argued that almost everything to do with the cinema of the New Wave was politically inspired: its very *raison d’être* was political, intertwined with a rejection of the ‘cinema du papa’ or ‘quality cinema’ that had been before, as well as a justification of film and its love. To the *Cahiers*’ writers, a break from the old way of thinking and writing about film had to be made, and cinema had to be shown to be

relevant, political and edgy. To justify their love of film, and to position it firmly as an important contemporary art form, the earliest cinephiles felt the need to reposition film, demonstrating how the very way in which it showed things could be explored for its hidden meanings. Their writing was exploratory and analytical, and the cinema they would later produce would be one that broke the rules of the cinema before it, directly drawing attention to and confronting what had been before. Thus we see, in the films that some of the *Cahiers* group would go on to make, actors turning to the camera and addressing the audience directly. In *À Bout De Souffle* (Godard, 1960), for instance, Michel at one point turns to the camera and tells us all that we can go fuck ourselves (some translations say 'get stuffed') if we do not like the scenery. Throughout that entire sequence, moreover, the character constantly addresses the camera, singing and rhyming; such a thing would never be done in the 'quality cinema', and very rarely in Hollywood cinema. It would appear that Godard is trying to distance himself from the 'quality cinema' aesthetic in order to draw attention to both it and his new style. Just as with his writing, he draws attention to and thus politicises the very stylistics of film in order to legitimise film's claim to art.

What is termed here as the politicisation of film could also be construed as its subjection to a form of exploration on an artistic level, an attitude to film arguably best exemplified by Raymond Durnat (1976) or David Bordwell (1985). This is an interest in the very language or structure of film, in the same way that a bibliophile can be interested in the very words of a poem. Although they may approach their subject in different ways, Durnat and Bordwell write about the very camera movements, shots and camera angles that make up a film, or even a single shot. In this manner, they chronicle the 'poetics' of film in an attempt to decode it and hence uncover further meaning. They, rather like the writers of *Cahiers*, delve into the very textuality of film, treating individual film and passages of film as areas of exploration and interpretation. As Bordwell puts it, they seek to insert film into the domain of poetics:

Aristotle's fragmentary lecture notes, the *Poetics*, addressed what we nowadays recognize as drama and literature. Since his day we have had Stravinsky's *Poetics of Music*, Todorov's *Poetics of Prose*, a study of the poetics of architecture, and of course the Russian Formalists' *Poetics of the Cinema*. Such extensions of the concept are plausible, since it need not be restricted to any particular medium. "Poetics" derives from the Greek word

*poiesis*, or *active making*. The poetics of any medium studies the finished work as the result of a process of construction--a process which includes a craft component (e.g., rules of thumb), the more general principles according to which the work is composed, and its functions, effects, and uses. Any inquiry into the fundamental principles by which a work in any representational medium is constructed can fall within the domain of poetics.(Bordwell, 1989, 370-371)

It would appear that, to such writers, the artistry of a film lies within its basic components, and hence their cinephilia expresses itself in an attempt to chronicle and categorise such components, to catalogue the 'poetics of cinema'. In the above quote we can see how, from the way in which Bordwell makes links between film analysis and the approaches other writers and thinkers have taken to other arts, cinephilia not only manifests itself as a love of film, but a curiosity about it and how it operates on an artistic level. He demonstrates how film can be seen to operate on an intellectual, artistic level. Again, it could be argued that we see the roots of this type of cinephilia in the pages of *Cahiers*: those writers too were interested in every facet of film, from the shot onwards. To justify their love of film, cinephile writers attempt to reveal its links to other art-forms and other philosophies; at the same time they also attempt to show how film reveals something of reality. The discourse of cinephilia, in opening film up to intellectual enquiry, reveals the ways in which film is constructed, but in doing so also reveals what film says about the world around us.

For example, elsewhere Bordwell, in a passage about the use of space, shows in detail how the camera, while claiming to show us some semblance of reality, actually shows us a highly orchestrated fiction:

Even if we put aside the contradictions in the notion of an “ideally placed possible spectator,” we must recognise that analogies to phenomenal perception tend to “naturalise” the operations of style. Camera and microphone become anthropomorphic, stationed like a person before a real phenomenon...Yet staging an event to be filmed is no less part of fictional moviemaking than camera placement or editing. The imaginary witness account forgets that in cinema, fictional narrative begins not with the framing of a pre-existent action but with the construction of that action to start with. (Bordwell, 1986, 11)

For Bordwell, then, everything within a film is a construction and therefore open to scrutiny. He enters into discussions over the precise status of the viewer – that is, whether the viewer is a hypothetical ideally placed spectator, or one whose

perspective is being manipulated by the director. Above all, for writers like Bordwell, film is a created item about which everything must be explored. Likewise, for the writers of *Cahiers* and the cinephile writers who followed them, every part of the micro elements of film form is open to debate. They recognised in their writing that everything on film was a construction, valuing it as the artistic expression of a single auteur, but one that could be shown to say something about reality. However, it could be argued that, because it lacks the spark of enthusiasm so important to cinephilia, such analysis stops short of it; it is the combination of enthusiasm and curiosity that makes the discourse distinct. This synthesis created a plethora of questions and paradoxes to be explored, arguably the central two of which – auteurism and arguments over peripheral details – we have already touched upon.

We have seen, in France in the early fifties, there arose a way of thinking and writing about film that concerned itself with both the establishment of auteurist principles, valuing film as the expression of a single director, and the expression of the writer's love for film, and details within film. We have seen that this was part of an attempt to both reclassify film taking its status from that of mere entertainment to that of a supreme contemporary art form, and that this was twinned with the desire to express and justify a love of film.

However, it could be said that to try to engage with and intellectualise the object of one's love means one's relationship towards it alters. The moment one finds a way to account for the peripheral, intriguing details within film that catch the eye, the details which are such a recurrent in so much cinephiliac writing, our attitude towards them must change. In attempting to account for the very thing which brought us to the cinema in the first place, which, as we have seen, is a necessary step in rationalising and legitimising our love for film, we start to examine very inarticulatable passion which compelled one to go into the cinema to begin with, changing it into something else, something more problematic yet no less profound.

In other words, the concept of cinephilia being born, at least in part, of a fascination with such peripheral details and a love for something quintessentially cinematic, yet which one cannot quite articulate, is problematic. Such details are used to demonstrate authorship; thus, the writers of *Cahiers* contended, they revealed something of the

author's unconscious personality. Yet it can also be said that these details reveal just as much about those writers who fixate upon them. Within contemporary writing on film, we find the concept of 'interpretive communities' (Fish, 1980) being mooted more and more. This theory problematizes the locus of meaning in a text – it questions the place where meaning is generated. It posits that meaning in a text is culturally constructed: a reader or viewer approaches a text from within the context of his or her own culture. This, like reception theory, draws the locus of meaning away from the author or director of a text – meaning is no longer his or hers to endow; it now lies with the viewer to take what he will from any given text. This is useful to us in a number of ways: firstly, one might suggest that both our original cinephiles – the writers of *Cahiers* and creators of the New Wave – and those who we can roughly define as fans constitute just such an interpretive community. They both are a group of people with their own way of interpreting texts. In other words, what the writers of *Cahiers du Cinema* wrote about the films they were so fascinated by and the way in which they conveyed their enthusiasm can be used to examine an attitude to film which had not been seen before: an attitude we can call cinephilia. Secondly, we can see that this model of interpretation is at odds with auteurism as questions arise over whether meaning in a film lies with the director or viewer.

However, this also gives rise to problems when we factor in models of cinephilia which deal with the peripheral details so valued by cinephiles. That is to say, if we take an auteurist stance, where the meaning of a film is endowed by the director, the prospect of the contingent seems to be ruled out, as everything in a film was put there by the director. This must lead us to reception theory, where the intention of the director is not relevant, or to postmodern notions concerning 'The Death Of The Author' which say that the meaning of a text is constructed by the reader or viewer, and therefore meaning stands outside of directorial intent. This means that the cinephiliac moment is something personal to the viewer: it is where his personal unconscious (Freud) or real (Lacan) breaks through into the symbolic. If we follow that through, though, it would seem to imply that the unconscious or repressed becomes conscious. Freud, of course, always famously maintained that the unconscious or repressed must remain so unless it is exposed through analysis, dreams, slips of the tongue or, perhaps, jokes. In opening film up to such a high degree of scrutiny, it may be that cinephile writers reveal just as much about

themselves as they do about the films they write about: by fixating on and writing about moments in film which intrigue them, they reveal something about their own unconscious. Such writing thus functions as a type of therapy.

If this is so, however, then auteurism itself seems pointless except as a means of cataloguing films, as textual pleasures and analysis lie only at the viewer's end – what the director did or did not intend is irrelevant. The question therefore arises, what is being repressed, and by whom? To a certain extent, cinephiliac writing and the study of cinephilia have become, in the so-called post-cinephiliac era, a discourse dealing precisely with such questions, thereby asking too what the love of film says about those who love it. It may be that the viewer acts as a kind of hidden therapist for the director, taking pleasure in trying to uncover his politics, worldview, or his repressed emotions. Yet if this is so, why is it that we viewers experience cinephiliac moments as if it is not our 'unconsciousness' being uncovered?

Therefore, intertwined with debates over where authorship and meaning lie, we can see that far more profound debates are taking place. On the one hand, if it is the unconscious of the director being uncovered, cinephilia is a question, in a way, of taking pleasure from acting as the director's analyst, analysing his worldview. On the other hand, cinephiliac moments are said to be moments where the viewer takes pleasure from the small somewhat contingent details in the text, irrespective of what the director intended or not.

If the latter point is the case, moreover, once again we see a paradox: how can one be both auteurist and believe that some elements of a film are outside of directorial intent; indeed, how can one claim to be an auteurist and make authorial intent irrelevant, almost at the same time? Often, cinephiles use such details as the starting point for cinephiliac anecdotes, triggering chains of associations which usually end a great distance from the filmic moment where they began (Keathley 2006, 153). But if the former is the case, and cinephiliac moments are a matter of our own unconsciousness being exposed, then, just as Roland Barthes could not, in the end, show us the picture of his mother, we cannot reveal what inspired our love for film. Barthes explains "I cannot reproduce the Winter Gardens Photograph. It exists only for me. For you, it would be nothing but an ordinary picture, one of the thousand

manifestations of the ‘ordinary’.” (Barthes 2000, 73) Just as the photograph Barthes speaks of revealed something deeply personal to him but which would be of little consequence to any other viewer, so much so that he deemed it pointless to show us, it could be that we can never quite explain what inspires our own cinephiliac moments. The writers of *Cahiers du Cinema* prized the moments in film which, to them, showed something of the directors intent or personality as we have seen, yet the way in which such writers pick out, discuss and fetishise such moments could be seen to show as much about the writers as the directors. As a way to resolve this contradiction, Barthes suggested that the text is a social construct whose meaning is ‘shared’ by both producer and consumer.

In trying to define cinephilia, then, it is necessary to explore both the phenomenon itself and the way in which others have manifested and explored it. This would be further complicated when debates over academic rigour are factored in: the cinephile seems to want to be close to and distanced from his subject at the same time. After all, the discourse of cinephilia began, in part, as a means of evaluating film, showing it to be a multifaceted art-form worthy of respect and admiration, and at the same time an eagerness to exhibit a love of film while legitimising that love. Yet, as we have seen, one cannot write objectively about a love which one possesses: the cinephile attempts to reflect on his own love for which he needs to be distanced from it, yet remain close enough to still love the thing that brought him to the subject in the first place. This recalls Laura Mulvey’s (1973) contention that narcissistic identification makes us ‘close’ to the screen and scopophilic objectification distances us from it. In a blog entry dated March 23, 2007, Jason Sperb articulates this dichotomy, by proposing a distinction between academic and cinephile in his blog. He writes:

What is a model for writing about cinephilia in academia? Then again—I am reluctant to frame it in those terms. There is still too much critical distance; I would prefer to think of it as how one writes as a cinephile, as an academic. But there is still the question of a model. How does a scholar write as a cinephile? (Sperb [Online])

Sperb maintains that because of the critical distance needed for academic writing, questions should be raised over whether an academic can be a cinephile at the same time. Academic cinephilia – the type of cinephilia taken up from the writers of *Cahiers du Cinema* and their contemporaries - seems to want to exist both outside and

within cinephilia simultaneously, attempting to both articulate a love of film and catalogue the forces behind it at the same time.

It's easy for most cinephiles. They can just write. But how can a scholar (they of the "critical distance" persuasion) also write as a cinephile? It is not enough to write about cinephilia, as almost all "cinephiliac thinkers" (Willemen) do, to think of it as this mysterious terrain, within which one asserts themselves ethnographically, and then retreats with thoughts, observations and eventually theories . . . *upon reflection*. This is cinephilia "scholarship." Conversely, it is too easy to simply write as a cinephile—to write without the self-reflexivity required for cinephilia to regenerate and proliferate as something beyond the cinephile. (Sperb [Online])

Thus Sperb suggests that there are two intertwined elements to cinephilia, both of which are vital for it: cinephiles must both show a love for and engagement with film, and to see cinephilia itself as 'mysterious terrain' to be reflected upon with some sort of critical distance. Although Sperb might not see himself as a cinephile but as a scholar, he is nevertheless articulating the same inquisitive love of film found in cinephiliac writing: as a cinephile and scholar of cinephilia, he positions himself both distant from and close to the text. Thus the cinephile must also exist both inside and outside cinephilia: he must both love film and yet maintain a critical distance from it; he must be conscious of his love, yet also be conscious of that love's very unconsciousness; he must try to describe what he himself knows to be indescribable. To some degree, cinephilia recognises its own rhizomic contradictions; a dialectic therefore exists where cinephiles are both lovers and scholars of film, loving film, engaging with it intellectually. They are aware of the gap between the two, and in turn also take that gap as a focus of their enquiry, thus negating it. A respondent to Sperb's blog entry, HarryTurtle, denies that this gap is necessarily problematic, stating that the distinction Sperb sets up is a false one:

[A] scholar can very well be infected by the virus of cinephilia, but still channel the emotional bias to keep that proverbial critical distance. The spirit of the written article is a personal decision to accomplish the expected result. I'm sure any scholar could write endlessly about their taste and favourite films with pure emotion, but is it really desirable when you could relativize and even contradict your own impulses with some insights? (HarryTurtle, in Sperb [Online])

Within cinephilia, then, there is a problem of trying to maintain a critical distance while still trying to be involved in and part of a film. There is a need to remain

distanced from film in order to catalogue and describe it objectively, yet this would entail actively suppressing the core aspect of pure fascination and joy which brought one to film in the first place. In a way, problematizing cinephilia, politicising it and opening it up as an area of debate place created these problems. In starting to write about film, in problematizing and politicising it, writers are forced to ask questions of film and their love for it to which there can be no answer without stripping it of the very spark of cinephiliac fascination which intrigued us in the first place. Films trigger, according to writers like Keathley, fixations on peripheral or otherwise ignored details within film, fixations and fascinations that cannot quite be articulated. Such details, it is speculated, trigger something unconscious within the viewer – something one cannot quite articulate but is nevertheless compelled to. This is not to imply that they are brought into consciousness, but it could be that we are unconsciously reminded of the repressed memory, which would lead to a fixation on a moment in a film. The viewer would never consciously know what caused this fascination. Cinephilia is an attempt to define and describe what it is about film we love so much, causing it to oscillate between articulating that love and documenting the issues surrounding that love. As stated above, it can never quite achieve its stated goal of articulating the love of film without either destroying it by locating the repressed thing which inspired the love, or documenting film's structures objectively, which by definition would be devoid of the kernel of love so vital to true cinephilia. Yet, as with the writers of *Cahiers du Cinema* especially, cinephilia is also an attempt to negotiate the boundaries between the urge to express one's love and one's intrigue: cinephiliac writers are both involved and distant, existing both inside and outside of the fetish; taken in by the spectacle, yet fascinated about why that is so.

## Chapter 2: Fans and Fandom

Fan Studies is a growing field of research: increasing numbers of academics, particularly those such as Hills and Jenkins who are from a Media Studies background, are starting to look into its complexities, and increasing numbers of mainstream journals, such as *The Journal of Fandom Studies*<sup>1</sup>, are being published. The field is shedding light on a very specific, rather complex type of fascination. Here, of course, one must state that this definition refers to the media fan rather than, say, the sports fan or music fan, although there may well be common features between the three. As stated in the introduction, the word fan stems from the Latin, *fanaticus*, meaning, literally, “of the temple”<sup>2</sup>, that is, a temple devotee or a particularly religious person. We derive the English word fanatic from the same origin, but there is an obvious problem with this definition: fans are not necessarily fanatics. While some have very strong bonds with the object of their obsession – whatever that may be – to brand them fanatics, or to suggest that their obsession is in a way religious, is to overstate the situation.

It would be necessary, then, to find a definition of what fandom is before we proceed any further. A precise definition would seem to be elusive, however, despite the field of fan studies having become quite central to cultural and media studies, (Jenkins 2006, 6).

To date, defining ‘fandom’ has been no easy task, despite (or perhaps because of) the ‘everydayness’ of the term. Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998) place the fan, the ‘cultist’ and the ‘enthusiast’ along a spectrum of identities and experiences, distinguishing between them by linking increased specialisation of interest, social organisation of interest and material productivity to the move from ‘fan’ to ‘cultist’ to ‘enthusiast’. (Hills 2002, ix)

For Abercrombie and Longhurst, then, the term fan refers to one of a range of identities concerning interest in a specific area. Whether one is a fan, cultist or enthusiast depends on how one’s love manifests itself. The term fan, then, would seem to refer to a specific type of hypersensitive viewer, at one and the same time devoted to and highly critical of a specific media text; one who displays that devotion creatively by producing art based on their object of interest. It is this specific attitude towards a text – one which is both loving and critical – which makes drawing

comparisons between fandom, or at least certain manifestations of it, and cinephilia so appealing and timely.

However, fandom has several features that are specific to it that must first be examined before any such comparison is made. Fandom also refers to a type of community: Jenkins suggests, in *Textual Poachers* (1992), that fans (or fen, the term used to refer to a group of fans<sup>3</sup>) group together to form social networks, of sorts, either online or offline. These are groups of like-minded people who share an interest in a particular text or set of texts. However, this adds another dimension to fan studies: it is not just the examination of the activity of the individual, but how fans interact with each other. Thus within fan studies we find the idea, proposed by Jenkins, of collective intelligence, in the way that fans group together in order to share knowledge.

On the Internet, Pierre Levy argues, people harness their individual expertise toward shared goals and objectives: “No one knows everything, everyone knows something, all knowledge resides in humanity.” Collective intelligence refers to this ability of virtual communities to leverage the combined expertise of their members. What we cannot know or do on our own, we may now be able to do collectively. And this organization of audiences into what Levy calls knowledge communities allows them to exert a greater aggregate power in their negotiations with media producers. The emergent knowledge culture will never fully escape the influence of commodity culture, any more than commodity culture can totally function outside the constraints of the nation-state. (Jenkins 2006, 26-7)

Fans, then, operate as ‘knowledge communities’, working together to examine and explore texts; expressing their fascination as part of a community of other fans. Such communities should not be confused with Fish's ‘interpretive communities’: here, the word refers to an active grouping of people brought together through a common interest, rather than a community of people with a shared set of cultural assumptions. Fans are active in their pursuits, displaying their engagement with a text in many ways. They tend to operate on the text; that is, they draw things from it and use it in unforeseen ways. For example, perhaps most commonly they write fan fiction, where they take published stories – writing, film, or in any media – and flesh out certain details. Commonly, they take peripheral characters and compose stories placing them in new situations, thereby performing a type of analysis by artistic experimentation. This could be seen as a kind of exploration of the text, but, according to Jenkins, there

are also elements of play involved. At its simplest, this might be seen as an extension of the type of 'what if' questions many viewers ask of texts, save that these fans take that question a step further and actively explore texts. Even when we put aside the legal issues surrounding such writing – there certainly have been issues raised surrounding its legality under copyright law – such writing is problematic inasmuch as it questions traditional models of authorship. Fans take a text and make it their own. They may, for example, make characters act in ways in which the author of the original work did not intend, or take the plot in a completely different direction. This calls into question the idea of the text being the creation and property of one person: once it is placed in the public domain, it seems, to the fan the text is fair game for anyone to use to their own purposes. This gave rise to Jenkins branding such writers as 'Textual Poachers', for they encroach on the property of others, using it to their own ends (Jenkins 1992, 17-19).

Rather than being a matter of unrestrained textual play, this kind of fan creation is governed by an ad-hoc set of rules which fans agree on. They follow a kind of logic which prevents writers from going too far: for example, writers of fan fiction cannot – or rarely – kill major characters. In other words, fans view the original texts as uncontradictable and semi-sacred: they can write about anything, as long as it does not contradict 'canon'. For an example of a fan-generated list of rules see 'Fluterbev' (online). Thus they have a kind of paradoxical auteurism which trespasses into the grounds of the original producer of the text, yet holds it in high reverence. Indeed, it would seem that one of the contradictions at the heart of fandom is that fans love their text, yet seem, in a way, sufficiently dissatisfied to work on it themselves. Fan fiction writing is thus partly a question of filling in the gaps: writers of 'fanfic' tend to write about and elaborate on the things the original author left unsaid. Thus it is an art of the margins, set in marginal places and concerning itself with marginal characters.

According to Professor Henry Jenkins (Director, Comparative Media Studies Program, M.I.T.), fan fiction is "born out of a mixture of fascination and frustration", as the original material captures the imagination but fails to satisfy. Writers placing "marginalized peoples" at the centre of their stories, "play out a drama about acceptance, tolerance, even an embrace of their difference." (Papamichael [Online])<sup>4</sup>

Paradoxically, then, fans are both satisfied and not satisfied with the text. They restrain themselves from contradicting the original text, showing that they adhere to some form of reverence to the author, yet use that text to suit their own ends. Their relationship with the text is not as straightforward as one might think, then, as fans have the potential to be critical of the text as well as loving it. Further, it may be that their love can be said to extend beyond the text, in some senses: through fan fiction, they fill in the gaps of the narrative, extending it, elaborating on it, and so on. Fans use texts as springboards for their own creative process, seeing a text not in terms of the author's vision or message, but as an array of fictional concepts to expand upon and explore through their own creations. In what might be considered an example of fan self-reflection, Remi notes

The phenomenon of derivative stories is not something unique to the Harry Potter books. This is exactly what great stories always have done and always will do: they tend to multiply, while usually still preserving their original identity. They stimulate, incite and spur their readers to delve into the vast wealth of their details and to explore their abundance of narrative cores and seeds, by letting them grow into stories of their own. By experimenting and playing with them. The stories born out of these creative games even may serve as a commentary on Rowling's original texts which makes us rethink various meanings and aspects of her work. (Remi [Online])

In some cases, fans seem to want to exist within the fiction of the text. They often talk about fictional universe, which they seek to inhabit or 'play in'. It is almost as if they do not treat the text as a narrative fiction, but a porthole to another world, to be explored. While some may see this as juvenile, it would suggest that the fans' conception of what the text constitutes is very different to the classical, or at least 'usual', construction, where style and narrative are balanced, and form the artistic expression of an author. Rather, it seems that the fans' conception of fiction goes beyond the text; they treat the text as a starting point, using it to trigger ideas to use in their own creation and in doing so comment on the original text. While their idea of what is 'canon' is sacrosanct, as noted above, for them the text extends beyond itself into a fictional universe in which to play. Whereas some may view the text as a finished product that is bounded within itself, to the fan, the text is a starting point. For the fan, the text is not just the sum of its sign systems, or just a story, but an area to play in and explore. They seem to bring into question precisely what a text is. That is not to say that they do not respect the integrity of a text or the authority of its author, but that they express this respect in their own ways.

As we will see later, this is not too distinct from the activity of the cinephile, who also views the text as more than the sum of its parts, but whereas cinephilia sees film as having unsaid elements that can then be analysed to reveal the unconscious, to the fan, the unsaid elements of the text are spaces for play and exploration. In other words, both cinephilia and fandom have shared conceptions that what is onscreen does not constitute the limits of the area of exploration, yet both explore this area in different ways. Whether or not it is correct to equate these two conceptions of textual lack is debatable, but fandom seems to have it as one of its cornerstones. Fans focus on the marginalia of an art work, and then operate on it. The way they do this varies enormously, but it may be suggested that this attention to detail and thirst for knowledge on the subject they possess help make the generation of the fictional universe more complete. The greater the level of detail, the more realistic the fictional world feels, and the more one can allow yourself be drawn into it.

Fans seem to crave this ability to immerse their selves within a text. There is a sense that they want this world to feel whole and complete, despite knowing that it is a fiction. This is why they expand on it through ‘fanfic’; it is also why many pride themselves on a near-encyclopaedic knowledge of their chosen area. Yet some seem to want to delve further into their chosen world, to physically enact it. Some dress up as their favourite character or group of characters. For instance, in the case of *Star Trek*, many fans famously dress up as Klingons. Indeed, they go as far as learning the Klingon language, a tongue with no use other than as to increase the sense of realism; others buy props and costumes, including expensive prosthetics and weapons. In the case of the *Lord of the Rings* by JRR Tolkien, as indeed its film adaptation, (Jackson, 2001-2004), the number of Sindarin (Elvish) speakers is growing (Parkinson [online]) and replica swords are still on the market.(Anonymous, no date [online]) One may also buy Bat’leths<sup>5</sup>, and some fans have learned how to use them as part of a display. (Anonymous, 2002 [online]) Such things have no use other than as ornaments, and indeed would be potentially lethal if used for the purpose for which they were designed.

Fans enter into a text in a variety of ways, one of which is physically mimicking it. It may be worth noting that film itself documents this phenomenon: in Godard’s *Pierrot*

*le Fou* (Godard, 1965), the main character is seen emulating gangster films in front of a mirror. This phenomenon would seem to also occur in ‘real life’: a classic example may be to order a martini ‘shaken, not stirred’, an obvious reference to the Bond films. Thus they open up new ways to physically participate in the text.

These instances may interest us inasmuch as they are articulations of a type of fandom. They seem to suggest that, for the fan, merely talking about film is not sufficient – one seeks to emulate the film, mimic it, live it, to be in it. Thus they open up new ways to physically participate in the text and to extend the boundaries of the text. It would seem to be the articulation of a type of love of film which goes beyond verbal language into mimesis. The manner in which fans sometimes mimic films is of interest in that it formulates a relationship between text and viewer that goes beyond the desire to talk, into the desire to exist within. Fans can be said to disregard or blur the boundaries between fiction and reality, consciously entering into the fictional structures of the text, treating them as if they were real.

Such play can be seen as a desire to ‘flesh out’ film – to transform it from the symbolic into the real. In the desire to ‘live’ film lies the desire to somehow make the film real, to believe that a (fiction) film is more than a series of images. In a way this recalls Jenkins’ simile of fans being textual poachers, trespassing onto ground that is not theirs, physically entering into the text. Again, with fans, there seems sometimes the need to believe that there is a coherent world outside the shot. It is as if they bypass what we know to be true – that film is a manufactured fiction – and chose to believe in the reality of what they are presented while at the same time remaining conscious of the fact that it is not. This aspect of fandom could be said to also apply to western culture more generally: for instance, people sometimes speak of their lives in filmic terms, describing certain pieces of music as ‘soundtracks to their life’ and so on.

As a result of the fan’s belief that film is more than it is, they, like children acting out films or extensions to films in the playground, often mimic what they have seen on film. It is debatable whether this is conscious or unconscious – it may be either. Either way, it is clear that fans believe that the text is a space that can be entered into. Moreover, it can conceivably take many forms, and extend from dressing like a film

star to consuming the type of food we have seen our film idols eat, to talking like them. To draw a simile, something similar happens in relation to writing: after one has read a fair quantity of a particular author, one often finds oneself writing like them.

There are conceivably many reasons why one might do this. There are, no doubt, some elements of performance involved. As noted above, to re-perform certain elements of a film triggers the memory of that film in those around you. Thus, to fans, film becomes a common reference point – a cultural signifier needed to articulate certain ideas, especially bonds of friendship. What these ideas may be probably depends on the film: again, in ordering a vodka martini, one may be trying to endow oneself with certain notions of suave sophistication. From this we can perhaps glimpse how prevalent and central film is in certain areas of contemporary culture, and how film has become a common codex for fans – a system of narratives that they can all reference. In fan culture, it is rather as if film has replaced religion in supplying us with a social order, a framework through which we can make meaning of the world. Indeed, Jenkins notes how fans sometimes use things like *Star Trek* for moral guidance. Yet this poses questions concerning how what is essentially a two-dimensional representation of the world can structure a three dimensional universe.

Fans seem to like to share their fascination. They engage in fan activities together; the conventions where they do so could be seen as social events. This both re-enforces the degree one can enter into the fictional universe, and helps perpetuate it. One need remember here, however, that such things as merchandise are sold in order to make a profit, so the companies behind franchises like *Star Trek* have a vested interest in generating enthusiasm. They want people to go to conventions, to become consumers. On the other hand, in a sense, by entering into the textual world, either physically through mimickery or artistically by creating fan fiction, fans endow their selves with something more than they usually have. Fans use their shared interest as a psychological support system, using shared referenced points as a basis for interpersonal relationships and as a way to express things they may ordinarily feel unable to. When dressing up as a Klingon, for example, one may take on the persona of a brave warrior, ready to do battle with a Bat'leth, even if in the mundane world one may be a meek and mild pacifist. This type of textual play supplies fans with an

outlet for feelings, emotions and desires which they may not ordinarily have access to, allowing them a forum in which to express them. (Hills 2002, 60)

Thus, the interest of the fan could be said to be perpetuated largely by the communal element of fandom. 'Fanfic' is written for an audience, of course, which is likely to be composed of fellow fans. These readers then can give feedback to the writer/creator, should they so wish. This applies especially when the work is published on the internet. In this way, a sense of community can be fostered. Not only do fans get ideas from the original source material, but they feed off each other's work, exchanging ideas and perspectives. Thus, the exploration of a text is a communal activity; fans demonstrate their interest mostly in relation to other fans.

The reasons behind this could be said to be social: as Jenkins and others have noted, however, for some time fans have, by and large, been seen as outcasts. The stereotypical view of the fan is perhaps the geek, an antisocial misfit – usually male – who stays in his room and indulges in fannish activity. According to Jenkins, the communal aspect of fandom developed to counter this, eventually forming what could be seen as a subculture. (Wheaton [online]) In a way, fandom and this cultural and communal aspect cannot be separated, inasmuch as fans need other fans in order to exhibit their fandom. If nobody else was interested, fan-art would be pointless. Therefore fandom can only be dealt with in terms of its communal and artistic output, which is why writers like Jenkins use a sociological framework to deal with fandom. Fandom can be defined as a nexus of artistic contributions, each with a piece of mainstream media as its starting point, but each appropriated by an individual. In a way, fandom is a (post-modern) artistic movement, a form of subculture, and an individual's pastime. All three together form a kind of love for a particular facet of contemporary western culture. Fans get a sense of belonging and community from it; they use it to facilitate artistic output; and they derive, according to Jenkins, a form of moral code from it. In short, fandom is both a form of community, expression and fascination.

There are many facets to fan output, each related in varying degrees to satisfying one or all of these three forms. Writing fan fiction, for example, satisfies not only the need to express oneself, but also the need to belong. Fans seem to enjoy getting feedback,

just as mainstream authors may like reading reviews of their books in the press. However, fan writers write specifically for their fellow fans in many cases, so the writing and reading of fan fiction helps develop communities, and also friendships. Indeed, the developing of friendships through common interests is something quite inherent to the draw of fandom. In a blog entry entitled "Fandom's About Not Being Alone Anymore", Will Wheaton quotes the following Firefox news story:

Fandom's about not being alone anymore. Maybe you started as a fan-inna-box, two hundred miles from the nearest con and farther still to the nearest fan, but you came here to find friends, and to share your squee, and to create things together, and to say, "I was here, and I loved this thing, and these are the people who will remember me." Maybe they'll remember you for that fanfic where you had all the characters doing a kickline, and maybe they'll remember that filk you did to "The Wreck of the Edmund Fitzgerald," and maybe they'll recall with a smile the weird in-depth meta you did on the time-travel episode, and maybe they'll remember the vid you did of the dancing penguins, but mostly, the good friends will remember the other things you did and talked about, your pets and your family and that trip you dreamed of and that crazy prank you pulled on your boss and that time you dyed your hair blue. Even if you never met in the real world, the way the mundanes would say you define a friend, they'll remember. (Wheaton [Online])

Thus it is through these interests and common enthusiasms that friendships are developed. The social aspect so obvious in the above quote is integral to fandom. Yet also evident in this quote is another aspect of fandom we have yet to cover: the author uses many technical, unusual terms, slang, and quite an odd sentence structure. This is a form of language that, while still being English, seems foreign to someone unaccustomed to it. Along with their own culture, it seems fans have developed an online dialect: they use words like 'mundanes' (presumably for non-initiates), 'meta' and 'squee'<sup>6</sup>. This language, one could argue, acts to consolidate fandom and fan culture; it acts as a badge to show that they are somehow removed from the mainstream, as well as operating to exclude those who do not understand it. In a way, this is a sign that fans have embraced the position of social outcasts, but they paradoxically do so as a group. Fan culture is still ostracised – or, rather, is perceived to still be ostracised – by the mainstream; fans have negated this by embracing the position of other as well as developing a sense of belonging. They belong by developing and fostering the sense that they don't belong.

This is why, as Jenkins suggested, fan culture appeals to those already on the edges of society. Through writing fan fiction or creating other art, they can participate in a culture where previously they may have been denied the opportunity to do so. They can feel they belong through shared interests and knowledge-sets, for fans and fan culture prizes knowledge that may elsewhere be useless. Through shared dialects, interests, and sets of knowledge, new cultures are forming, which pay no heed to the usual obstacles to social interaction. Moreover, this feeds back in to fandom: the fascination of the fan gave rise to fan culture, yet, in turn, fan culture perpetuates and reinforces that fascination. Again: one cannot separate the aspect of fandom which is love from its other, social aspects, especially if we are going to treat the idea of fandom in the same fashion as writers like Jenkins have. Through this sense of community, through the shared stylised language, fans seem to be becoming increasingly advanced in their communications and the way they interact. Their fanfic is often complex and growing in its complexity, as often is the feedback offered by other members of the fan community. This affects the relationship between fan and source material, and in turn has an effect upon fan writing and source material.

Fans also differ from other types of viewers in their actual relationship to the text, by which I mean the manner in which they view a text. Normally, a viewer sits quietly, looking at the screen, virtually motionless. There is a certain type of etiquette and decorum involved, which some suggest we have been conditioned into. Fans, on the other hand, actively involve themselves in the text: it could be said that, for them, Brecht's fourth wall (Brecht, 1961) does not and has never existed. They disregard it, and in a way enter into the action of the text, involving themselves in what is happening on the screen. Fans sometimes talk during screenings, not only to those around them, but also directly to characters within the film. Rather like the audience in a pantomime, they have been known to shout at the screen, warning characters about things they do not know, or – perhaps most commonly – completing their lines.

Hills suggests that this activity is, again, communal, and helps to strengthen bonds of friendship between fans. For example, in his chapter on 'Watching *Star Wars* Together', (Hills 2002, 29) Matt Hills describes a type of gathering, where a group of fans invite him to watch *Star Wars* (Lucas, 1977) with them. This is a type of party where the fans seem to relish not only the viewing of the text but what each viewer

can add to the text. They do things like complete lines as they are said on screen, repeat them for comic effect, or add information for the benefit of their fellow viewers (“this is where” or “this is why” etc). Hills goes on to suggest that this type of behaviour is concerned with exhibitionism: fans like to show their fellow fans how well they know a text. Indeed, Hills points out that there is an element of competition involved: fans compete to be the first to shout a line out, score points by offering information, or assert their mastery by offering the wittiest comment.

Such behaviour can tell us many things about the fan. Firstly, they seem to pride themselves on how well they know a text: from the way in which fans complete the lines of the characters, for example, it is clear that they watch films repeatedly, although whether they just watch the object of their fandom many times, or enjoy repeated viewings of any film they watch, cannot accurately be said. Secondly, it implies an attitude to the text that is paradoxical inasmuch as it respects it and seeks to deride it at the same time. On the one hand, fans value a text well enough to want to learn its lines, marginalia and almost everything about it. On the other, fans use this knowledge subversively. They talk through screenings, often making fun of it, bending it for their own purposes. This is an obvious contradiction. They appear to value the text, and occupy the position of its dissenters. For example, there are many parodies, of varying quality, of things like *Star Wars* (Lucas, 1977) or *Lord of the Rings* (Jackson, 2001-2003): If one types the words ‘*Star Wars* parody’ into YouTube, 20,300 results are found, compared with 4180 for *Lord of The Rings*. Yet one can persuasively argue that in order to make such a parody, it is necessary to know – and therefore in a way value – the source material. Indeed it is clear that Brandon Hardesty, who re-enacts scenes from films and uploads them to the Internet (see Chapter 3: ‘Fandom, Cinephilia and the Final Frontier’) must have watched the original scenes he recreates tens if not hundreds of times. (ArtieTSMITW [online]) There is a certain love evident in his work, even if he acts mockingly.

In some respects, then, one could argue that fandom is self-knowing. That is to say, fans seem to realise the nature of their activities, knowing they are entering into a piece of commercially-produced fiction designed on one level to make money, yet proceed anyway. They treat their subjects paradoxically, both loving them and viewing them as, and revealing, their component elements at the same time. By

playing with the texts, they enter into a fetish, yet show knowledge of how that fetish works through their ability to play with the source. We can therefore see a duality in fandom: fans – or at least, some of the fan community – seem to know that they are fetishising a text and are able to perform a form of analysis on the text. By fetishising, we mean they turn a text into and treat it as something more than its intended purpose, endowing it with various extra properties than others might see a text as having; for fans, a text is always something more than a piece of narrative fiction. In a way, moreover, through their mocking of the text, through the way they learn and play with lines, through the way they recreate and parody scenes, it is evident that fans exist both inside and outside of the fetish. However, that is not to say that they are aware of what they are doing in those terms: they analyse the object of love, but do not analyse the nature of that love. Fandom seems to lack the rhizomic aspect of cinephilia which leads it to examine its own nature. Therefore it is left to writers speaking, in a way, from outside of the fan community to document the working of fandom.

Because these two facets remain separate in fandom, in turn this gives rise to Hills' 2002 notions of 'fan-scholars' and 'scholar-fans'. According to Hills, the activities of fans and scholars seem to overlap in certain areas. He suggests that fan scholarship is increasing, as is scholarship on fandom. From here, Hills suggests two distinct terms: 'fan-scholars' and 'scholar-fans'. In *Fan Cultures* (2002), Hills defines a 'fan-scholar' as a fan who uses academic theories and methodologies in relation to his or her fan activity. The fan presumably borrows from the academic sphere in order to lend credibility to their work. Hills argues that academics and 'scholar-fans' may see this as a threat to their academic authority, and thus presumably dismiss 'fan-scholars' as something akin to the amateur.

'Scholar-fans', in contrast, are academics who also profess to being fans. Both Matt Hills and Henry Jenkins claim to be scholar-fans. Both writers use their experience in cultural studies to inform their participation in fan activity. However, their work, as noted above, seems to be largely concerned with documenting the activities of fandom with a view to describing what it means to be a fan from a sociological perspective, rather than trying to analyse themselves, their own activity and their own fascination. This gives rise to the assertion that fandom is dealt with from the outside looking in, which in turn brings about a kind of conflict of interest, as Burr explains:

Hills (2002) argues that cultural theorists have been unable or unwilling to transcend a dichotomy which places academic discourse and identities in the realm of the rational / passionless and fan discourse and identities in the realm of the immersed / open (the opposite term in each case depending on the side of the dichotomy to which the writer is attaching positive value). He argues that attempts at 'hybridization' (notably from Doty, 1993 and Burr, 1998) fail in various ways and points to the tension and conflict implicit in the relationship between academic and fan identities, and the defensiveness and anxiety associated with trying to have a foot in both camps. The scholar-fan and fan-scholar thus become liminal and transgressive identities. (Burr 2005, 375)

There are therefore problems in trying to both divide and reconcile the idea of fandom and scholarship. To writers like Burr, the fan-scholar and scholar-fan remain two distinct identities, so fans cannot be said to reflect on their own activities in the way that cinephiles do. It appears to be a question of whether one can document fandom from the outside without classifying oneself as a fan. If not, the question arises over whether a writer may be too involved, emotionally, with his subject. Yet if fandom was observed from the outside, some would argue that the passion inherent in fandom would be lost, and such studies would therefore miss the point. Writers like Hills and Jenkins seem to be trapped in this dichotomy: they seem to be both inside and outside fandom. They cannot truly be said to be fans because what they produce cannot be described as fan-art, but scholarship coming from outside of fandom.

Fans themselves do not usually document their own love, but simply exhibit it. At the same time, they seem to be conscious of their fetishisation, as we can observe by the irony in what they produce. At one and the same time, they are distanced intellectually from their subject and are close to it, in almost exactly the same way that the 'scholar-fan' and 'fan-scholar' is distanced from, yet close to, their subject. In both cases, we can see the same or at least very similar speaking-position paradoxes. This raises the question of where fans and scholars can respectively be said to 'speak from'. This question has a major bearing on the question over whether fandom is autoreflexive. That is to say, does it reflect upon itself, or is it reflected upon from somewhere else? We have shown that it knows itself, but we have yet to resolve the question of whether this the same as reflecting upon its own nature, or whether is it correct to equate the ironic distancing some fans show in their fan art to what can be termed 'the innate autoreflexivity of cinephilia'. There seems to be a blurring between the fan, the

scholar-fan and the fan scholar, but because they remain separate figures, it is hard to say whether fandom has the capacity to look in upon itself, as cinephilia seems to do. While, on the face of it, the two appear wholly different, fans show knowledge of what they are doing through the way they position themselves in relation to the text. One could argue that this positioning shows a degree of self-knowledge, and their output is therefore self-reflexive. In the next chapter, we will attempt to define this relationship more clearly.

### Chapter 3 – Fandom, Cinephilia and the Final Frontier

In chapters One and Two, we have outlined two seemingly rather different discourses. At first sight fandom and cinephilia seem worlds apart, but, using a specific example, it can be seen that hybrid discourses are emerging online which neither literature quite accounts for. Before we attempt to investigate the precise parameters of the relationship between fandom and cinephilia, it may help to outline one possible response to a film, in a general sense, examining how it manifests itself in order to see whether it fits into one category or the other. This way, we can get a sense of the fluidity of filmic love, observing that neither discourse fully accounts for the reactions to film which are now emerging.

As we will see, any discussion of the adoration associated with the *Star Trek* franchise is prone to be caught up in questions of the difference between cinephilia and fandom. It is a highly popular series of television programmes and films – the latter of which we will be concentrating on here – and I must, from the offset, confess a particular liking for it. There is, of course, a vast difference between the two positions: fandom is characterised by a type of playful adoration, whereas the cinephile's approach to his subject matter is more prone to questioning and – often academic – inquisition. Yet there has been academic inquisition associated with *Star Trek*, from oddly divergent quarters; it could be argued that this inquisition, which extends beyond the realm of fandom, constitutes the cinephilia associated with *Star Trek*. Either way, both stem from 'an intense liking' for film. Thus I would argue that the two are not mutually exclusive; while they remain distinct discourses, as we have seen there are points at which the two blur to form a third, hybrid discourse. In the case of *Star Trek*, we can certainly see the opening up of 'Collaborative Remix Zones' Hudson and Zimmerman allude to, as well as the Textual Poaching Jenkins describes, yet *Star Trek* is also, we will see, a focus for cinephilia or cinephilia-like activity.

Moreover, it has been argued that film production methods went through a paradigmatic shift after George Lucas' *Star Wars* (1977). This, in turn, can be said to have brought about a cinephilia of the digital age, an age of computer graphics, and of the awe inspired by, say, watching star ships collide (Sperb 2007, 49). It is this variety

of cinephilia which interests us, as it has aspects of fandom. In his appraisal of his experience associated with *Star Trek: Nemesis* (Baird, 2002), Jason Sperb wrote:

The dynamic incision of pleasure, its disruptions and its openings, is a central though seldom foregrounded issue within the immense body of critical film studies. And the lingering visibility of pleasure's discursive scar, cinephilia, has not been masked with the emergence of digital visual effects, but rather has become intensified, throbbing, in tandem with the rising awareness of its mutating and liberatory possibilities. Thus, I have a sense that something, in a wave of digital cinephobia, has been missed thus far--a gap in thinking about the unthought, and about cinephilia in the contemporary historical period. (Sperb, 2007, 49)

Sperb argues that the same kind of obsessive love, the same kind of abstract emotional tug that Bazin outlined – ‘pleasure's discursive scar’ - can still be found in the modern digital era. To him, cinephilia has not been discarded but intensified by the emergence of digital effects, although this has not been picked up upon by other writers due to their ‘digital cinephobia’. He holds that, while many writers are yet to embrace new technologies, cinephiliac joy can still be found in the digital era. He references Keathley, arguing that cinephiliac moments can still be reached in the science fiction film.

Halfway through the film, the Starship Enterprise collides head-on with the Reman battleship, the Scimitar, in a striking sequence featuring effective model work, sensual digital imagery, and hauntingly sparse sounds. Score drops off the soundtrack, leaving only the boom of the collision, followed by the awkward silence of space. When I tried to explain the impact this moment had on me, however, I could only say, "I just really liked the scene where the ships collided. It felt real." (Sperb 2007, 50)

Sperb argues that this, for him, was a cinephiliac moment, inasmuch as it was a moment of complete, inexplicable adoration, just as Keathley defines them. Thus, irrespective of this moment's place within the *Star Trek* franchise, Sperb shows that the cinephile's obsession with fleeting moments in film can occur within a special-effects driven blockbuster. It is clear, to my mind at least, that Sperb is not a ‘Trekkie’ – that is to say he is not a traditional *Star Trek* fan. He defines himself and his friend as ‘aspiring academics’; the fact that he is drawn to write about his experience of this film leads one to infer that he is a cinephile as one of the hallmarks of cinephilia, of any stripe, is the compulsion to articulate the experience of watching a film. He writes that, “My inability to provide an objective or logical reason for this love is a hallmark

of the cinephiliac moment. As Christian Keathley explains, "Because cinephiliac moments are themselves intensely subjective, bound up perhaps with personal value of some unrecoverable meaning, writing about such moments will often mobilize personal information" (Keathley 2006, 145). Thus, somehow, *Nemesis* awoke the cinephiliac within me." (Sperb 2007, 50) His article allows us something akin to the perspective of the outsider looking in: clear of the pseudo-emotional baggage of fandom, but still maintaining a respect for the franchise. Thus in a way Sperb could be said to straddle both discourses. As such, Sperb rejects claims that cinephilia has ended.

If cinephilia has waned for spectators of Sontag's generation, it might be because they hold on so tightly to a historically specific mode of cinephilia (described above) that newer, "young" generations seem unable to grasp (unable to reproduce or proliferate); particularly since exhibition and distribution practices have changed so radically in the past three decades. Paradoxically, cinephilia must embrace the unrepeatable in order to be repeatable--that is, free the fragments of the cinephiliac moment from their social and historical origins. [Sontag continues] "if cinema can be resurrected, it will only be through the birth of a new kind of cine-love" (122). (Sperb 2007, 57)

Sperb seems to suggest that this 'new type of cine-love' is the adoration of the big screen CGI extravaganza that has arisen in the wake of the 1977 Lucasian paradigm shift. However, he and other writers who have chosen to address *Star Trek* in a cinephiliac fashion – to whom I will turn shortly – all locate their discourses in relation to more classical thinkers like Bazin and Lacan. It is as if in order to legitimise their own work they need to root them in previous discourses. Even though Sperb claims his love for this moment in *Star Trek: Nemesis* is irrational and inarticulate, he goes on to attempt to correct that by modelling his experience on the theories of Bazin. Typically for a cinephile he grounds his experience in a theoretical base while still maintaining he can never fully account for his love. This, as argued above, is one of the hallmarks of modern cinephilia (and, by extension, the study of cinephilia) – the overriding compulsion to attempt to explain the inexplicable. The cinephile knows that he can never explain his love, yet is somehow compelled to do so. Sperb writes:

I write here about *Nemesis* precisely because it instils in me that which I cannot quite grasp, but which also causes me to believe that we can make an

intelligible argument about something--namely, the virtual pleasures of effects such as CGI. (Sperb 2007, 54)

This writer would seem to maintain, then, that even in the modern era of film-making, that inarticulable 'pricking' that both Barthes and Keathley outline, is achievable. Sperb admits that he cannot quite define what he finds so intriguing or enjoyable about the computer-generated fragments, but still seems compelled to do so. Unlike writers before him, however, the details in the image he fixates upon are not those the camera captures by accident, but ones deliberately created on computers. We can therefore see a shift in the focus of cinephilia to engage with new technologies, or, rather, the merging of cinephilia with aspects of fandom to form a third discourse.

However, one could argue that with its focus on the special effects spectacle, films such as *Star Trek: Nemesis* are designed precisely to motivate such a reaction. That is to say, sequences such as the one cited by Sperb are intended to be memorable, to make the audience gasp in unison. To this end, as Sperb outlines, the technicians responsible for computer effects went to great lengths to add as much peripheral detail as possible. This is obviously a reflection of the cinephile's obsession with the marginal detail, and the fragmentary or peripheral moments within film. Sperb details how the debris of the Starship collision catches his eye to the point that he fixates on it. He notes that, "In the course of making a film, technicians will spend months on a single sequence, or even a single shot, with the anticipation that it is the fragments (embedded within the more celebrated spectacle of the overall effects images) that will cement the film's attraction." (Sperb 2007, 52) Thus such fragments are fetishised; the viewer fixates, as he is intended to, on such details, even if he is not conscious of doing so. This gives such films the effect of realism, even if they are so manifestly fiction. He adds:

Moreover, it is often the affective jolt of fragments (debris, rubble, scraps, particles), more so than the intended central object of the image (spaceships, say), that adds to the sense of realism in these shots, giving them a de-familiarizing effect--just when one might be inclined to say that "of course, the shot is fake," a fragment, or two, or a hundred, scatter across the screen, which then disrupts that conscious assumption. (Sperb 2007, 52)

Hence what is so obviously fake (humanity has not yet built sovereign-class starships) is awarded the appearance of reality, allowing Sperb to fixate upon it. Indeed, this

might be said of film as a whole: after all, its very grammar requires the viewer to suspend disbelief. As Bazin notes in *What is Cinema?*, shot/reverse shot, so beloved of Hollywood directors, is a fiction.

If the film is to fulfil itself aesthetically we need to believe in the reality of what is happening while knowing it to be tricked. Obviously the spectator does not have to know that there were three or even four horses or that someone had to pull on a cotton thread to get the horse to turn its head at the right moment. All that matters is that the spectator can say at one and the same time that the basic material of the film is authentic while the film is also truly cinema. So the screen reflects the ebb and flow of our imagination which feeds on a reality for which it plans to substitute. That is to say, the tale is born of an experience that the imagination transcends. (Bazin 1967, 48)

Therefore for Bazin, Keathley and Sperb, the very act of film viewing is founded on the need for the viewer to ignore the fact that what he is viewing is a trick; all three maintain, too, that this effect is eased by the inclusion of peripheral details. We know that, when we watch two people holding a conversation in which the director employs shot/reverse shot, each person's utterances are filmed separately, but we choose to disbelieve this fact and allow ourselves to be swept away in the fiction: the viewers' imagination must transcend the experience; the fiction must take on a reality, enabling the viewer to almost enter into it. The more detail that is included in the shot, the easier the viewer finds it to do so as the more it pertains to reality. Similarly, when we watch starships collide, the more peripheral detail is included, the more it "feeds on reality" and the more likely we are to accept and – perhaps – fetishise the sequence.

However, perhaps it would be accurate to state that we are more likely to believe or fetishise a shot – as opposed to disregarding it – if it fits our ideas and preconceived ideas concerning reality. After all, nobody has seen two starships collide. The more an image pertains to a preconceived notion of reality, the more likely it is to be fetishised. Barthes stresses that punctum operates on a personal level, leading one to assume that every viewer's notion of what is true or real is different. It may be because we all have similar notions about the structure of looking – there must be an object and a viewer – that we accept shot/reverse shot as a depiction of reality, even though it is fiction. Hence Sperb fetishises this sequence in *Star Trek: Nemesis* because it fits his personal notion of reality. Indeed, this is a film which has a starship with an American-sounding name – The *Enterprise* – opposed by a ship with an

Islamic-sounding name: The *Scimitar*. Thus, through this choice of names, the sequences may have resonated with an American public at the time very fearful of Islam. Thus one could speculate that Sperb is attracted to this scene because the real, or his notion thereof, happens to burst forth from an otherwise ‘lacklustre’ film: it reinforces a pre-existing, comforting opposition – western ‘democracy’ versus Islam.

However, this contrasts strongly with the reasons why Bazin and the writers of *Cahiers Du Cinema* highlighted moments in film for special attention. As Keathley notes, within such moments they sought to detect the mark of the director. They scanned the screen, looking for his or her artistry. Thus, unlike Sperb, their fixation on the fragmentary was motivated by something more than pure joy. As we saw in Chapter One, there was a firm rationale behind these moments which was expressed with unabashed enthusiasm; what Sperb writes about seems to lack that rationale. He seems uninterested, for example, in the intent or personality of the director. It seems that what matters for writers like Sperb, in the era of digital cinephilia, is the extent to which a moment seems ‘real’: moments which strike one personally, or moments which pull one into a film. If this is true then it would imply that cinephilia in its modern incarnation has a basis in notions of ‘the real’; that is to say, viewers are drawn towards images that ‘fit’ or reinforce their own reality. This type of filmic love should be seen as distinct from the original discourse of cinephilia, as it has taken on aspects of fandom and lost aspects central to the writing of the original cinephiles.

In order to deal with how this third discourse has manifested itself in relation to *Star Trek*, then, one must address why something so manifestly unreal (more so than any other type of film) is so popular. It could be argued that, although it is so obviously fiction, things like *Star Trek* appeal to one’s notion of reality on other levels. Many have pointed out its allegorical nature. Others have argued that it offers viewers a vision of the future that is comforting to many: it would seem to prophecise a future in which man has united as one. This is part of *Star Trek*’s attraction from a fannish perspective; one of the reasons why fans want to ‘play’ in a text is because it presents one with a utopian vision of the future. Of course, others have argued that this would be a dystopia in reality – it could be argued that the idea of a ‘United Earth’ is a fascist idea, and that *Star Trek*’s vision of the future in fact has Earth controlled by a military dictatorship or, perhaps, a US hegemony, a planet remade in America's image. That

aside, the question remains: how do the *Star Trek* films present us with visions of ‘the real’ which many find so attractive? Why is Spock so fascinated by the collision of the Scimitar and the Enterprise; and why has a scene from the eighth *Star Trek* film, *Star Trek: First Contact* (Frakes, 1996) fascinated me for over ten years?

The scene in question opens with Picard sitting at the table in the meeting room of the Enterprise. He appears to be mending a weapon, which, again, strikes one as uncharacteristic of him and leads one to infer his more aggressive mood. This shot lasts around half a second. The director, Jonathan Frakes, then chooses to cut to the door. Lily, the film's ingénue, enters through it and instantly delivers the line “You son of a bitch!” Swearing is very rare in *Star Trek*; the only other time it was used was a comedic “Oh shit,” from Data in *Star Trek: Generations* (Carson, 1994). We therefore infer that this is unlike any other moment in *Star Trek*. Lily has a strong southern-American accent, which contrasts with (or perhaps acts as counterpoint to) Picard’s English accent<sup>7</sup>. This difference with accent and diction is instantly noticeable when Picard replies with “This really isn’t the time.” Hence the question of power and who is in control arises from the offset. The Captain tries to maintain his power; indeed, at this point, he still acts like he is in control. He is still clinging to the dominant order in which black is subordinate to white, woman is subordinate to man, and the young are subordinate to the old. But, as the ingénue, Lily fails to respect this order, and holds her ground.

We then see a headshot of her forcefully explaining her views: “Okay, I don’t know jack about the twenty-fourth century, but everyone out there [on the bridge] knows that staying here and fighting the Borg is suicide; they’re just afraid to come in here and say it.” Again the contrast in diction is clear. Lily uses slang, whereas Picard’s lines are well enunciated. By arguing with the Captain, she is repeatedly disregarding the normal order – the ‘chain of command’ to which Picard clings. Thus we already see a set of binary oppositions being set up. Predictably, then, Picard enunciates: “The crew is accustomed to following my orders.” It is noteworthy that Picard does not look up, nor has he throughout this entire exchange. His attitude shows that he believes the symbolic order cannot be broken, and therefore he does not need to acknowledge Lily. His concept of ‘I’, imbued in him from the Mirror Stage and intertwined with concepts of power (maleness, age, rank, etc.) is so strong that he

does not (or does not want to) acknowledge it being broken down. Thus, Lily's reply, "They're probably accustomed to your orders making sense," is a further incision into that order, inasmuch as she questions both his authority and his ability to "make sense" – that is, to render himself coherently in the symbolic. In a way, therefore, Lily is questioning Picard's position in the symbolic/social order and his entire being. Given that Picard is ordinarily so 'by the book' and straight-laced, these would be powerful challenges indeed. Moreover, this power-struggle, this gradual breaking down of the chain of command, is, one might argue, fascinating to watch.

Thus far, however, in contrast to the dialogue, the camera has abided with Lily. She, standing, appears big, while Picard, sitting at the desk, appears small. In terms of *mise-en-scène* and *mise-en-shot*, then, the balance of power is ambiguous. Only through the dialogue is it challenged. In other terms, while the dialogue suggests Picard is in command, the camera suggests Lily is. This juxtaposition helps to build up the tension of the scene.

However, this balance changes with the next shot. We cut to Picard, sitting at his desk, in medium close-up. He finally looks up, acknowledging Lily fully for the first time, and with force says, "None of them understand the Borg as I do. [Pause, then quietly, as if to himself] No-one does. No-one can." Hence we see his first outburst of anger in this scene, perhaps suggesting that, as Lily grinds down the symbolic, the 'real' of Picard's emotion breaks down. The audience start to perceive real venom in Patrick Stewart's voice, as if his anger is no longer entirely fictional.

With this comes a change in the dynamic of the scene. Lily's next line is questioning: "And what is that supposed to mean?" We cut back to Picard, who looks up with scorn, throws a rag vigorously onto the table (I notice small details, like the sound this makes). Continuing to repair his weapon, Picard tells Lily of his 'assimilation' by the Borg. How he has "A somewhat unique perspective on the Borg," and how he knows how to fight them. He concludes his monologue with a condescending dismissal designed to re-establish the 'proper' power-structure, as Picard sees it: "Now if you'll excuse me, my dear, I have work to do."

Yet Lily still refuses to yield to the dominant order, and continues to chip away at it. She holds her ground, responding with the, in a way, equally condescending: “I am such an idiot. It is all so simple. The Borg hurt you, and now you’re gonna hurt them back.” During this utterance, she steps closer to Picard, so that they are on the same level. She is self-assured, and has a type of swagger: to her, Picard’s order does not exist; she is outside of it. Once again, however, Picard attempts to maintain his dominance: “In my century we don’t succumb to revenge. We have a more evolved sensibility.” This is a blatantly condescending attempt to re-assert his authority: he is more ‘evolved’. Lily responds instantly and vigorously by resorting to a swearword: “Bullshit!” This is a clear demonstration that she is still the ingénue, for the crew of the Enterprise would never swear at their Captain. As such she has no respect for the Captain’s authoritarian power structure he clings so, especially if doing so will doom them. She continues, stepping closer: “I saw the look on your face when you shot those Borg on the holodeck. You were almost enjoying it.” In a last effort to maintain the social order and thus the illusion that he is, in fact, somehow still superior, he rises, and half whispers, “How dare you.” It is clear that his composure is ebbing away.

Lily replies, “Oh come on, Jean-Luc! You’re not the first person to get a thrill from murdering someone. I see it all the time.”

This impertinence, as the Captain might see it, has, at last, broken down the power structure completely. It is as if the insinuation that Picard got a thrill from murder, making him a barbarian and therefore no longer a master of the symbolic was enough to make it so. The Captain loses his composure, and, as mentioned above, ceases to be a parody of a cool, reserved Naval Captain and becomes more human. He has now given up his pretence of a social hierarchy, advances on her, and barks, “Get out!”

Lily sticks to her guns. After all, any notion of power structures didn’t matter to her in the first place; why should she obey his orders or respect his space. It is clear, now, in terms of vocabulary, intonation, and camera angles, that the two dramatis personae are on an equal footing. Both appear to be very angry, and their anger is striking. Rarely have I seen raw emotion such as this on the screen. In a way, it seems real.

Lily responds with an angry, accusatory question: “Or what? You’ll kill me, like you killed Ensign Lynch?” She seems to have a mixture of fear and rage. Once again, the tone seems to change. This time, Picard tries to regain control by justifying his actions: “There was no way to save him.” Of course, this power struggle is played out largely through intonation of voice as much as it is through camera work. Thus Picard’s intonation is reconciliatory – he tries to regain control by calming the situation down, and vice versa. It would seem he is under the illusion that he is still in command in the room. Yet Lily maintains the tension through her anger: “You didn’t even try. Where was your evolved sensibility then?” She is now mocking the Captain; the hierarchy is shown to be an illusion. If anything, ‘power’ resides with her. Yet with one last attempt to keep up the pretence of superiority, Picard replies with a somewhat paternal, yet still rather bitter: “I don’t have time for this,” and he starts mending his weapon again

Once again, Lily sticks to her guns, still mocking Picard. “I’m sorry. I didn’t mean to interrupt your little quest. Captain Ahab has to go hunt his whale.” This is delivered in a rich American accent that, for me at least, sticks on the ears. Although there are many such moments in this scene, the way in which Picard raises his head from his gun catches my eye. There is silence; the scene has been barren of music. He mutters an almost inaudible, “What?” as if stunned. There is still condescension in this word, yet there is more: a type of wounding. Lily, it seems, fails to realise this, however, and continues mockingly: “You do have books in the twenty-fourth century?” “This is not about revenge” Picard replies. We know that Picard is a bookish man, so the dramatic irony is that Lily has stumbled upon a nerve. The dialogue now gets quicker as tension mounts. “This is not about revenge,” Picard says. He is still trying to maintain authority and the belief that he is acting out of the best interests of his crew. Lily simply calls him a “Liar” desperate to break down exactly that which Picard is trying to defend. Picard replies, more frantically, “This is about saving the future of humanity!” Rather than something as vainglorious as revenge, Picard would rather fool himself that he was acting out of altruism. He seems to want to be something more than a man, even though Lily needs to remind him that he can only be just that, with all man’s flaws. Indeed, elsewhere in the film, the line is delivered: “Don’t try to be a great man. Just be a man, and let history make its own judgements.” Altruism would justify his need to cling to power; vengeance would not.

Lily still maintains the pressure: “Jean-Luc blow up the damn ship!” she cries, desperate now to make the Captain follow the best course of action. Although she does not respect his authority, she knows that he still carries authority over the ship. Hence, ironically, despite all her transgressions, she knows she must defer to him. However, Picard now rages at this last ‘command’, crying “No! Noooooo!” between the first and second ‘no’, there is a shot of Lily looking wide eyed, aghast. She, like the audience, has never seen Picard this angry before. His rage is clear. After the second ‘No’ he picks up his weapon and smashes a nearby display cabinet. This action, this rage, seems real to me. It reminded me of a time when I too felt white-hot anger and frustration. Thus, as Bazin describes, I related to it personally. There was a time when I too felt as Picard seems to feel; a night when I too smashed my room. There is a loud crash as the glass breaks; we see it shatter and fall. We see the model star ships wobble and fall. We cut to a shot of Picard, looking at what he just did, and then turn back to Lily, who, as we see using a two-shot, looks on in alarm. She is quiet.

Non-diegetic music returns from its absence throughout the scene, and, as he approaches Lily, Picard recites the following:

They invade our space, and we fall back. They assimilate entire worlds, and we fall back. Not again. The line must be drawn **here!** This far, no farther! And I **will make them pay** for what they have done! (*Star Trek: First Contact* [Frakes 1996])

I find myself fetishising this line in particular. It is delivered with great emotion. Picard puts stress on certain words – those I’ve labelled in bold – so that he seems to spit them, as one may imagine Ahab spitting his words at Starbuck. Indeed, in quite a neat parallel, just as Ahab was still part whale due to his whale-bone leg, earlier in this film it was made clear that Picard is still part Borg inasmuch as he could still ‘hear’ their collective voice. Thus there is real power behind these words: for a moment the captain of the Enterprise becomes the master of the Pequod, and in a sense pilot of my wheelchair too. Even though Patrick Stewart is a trained Shakespearean actor, well-schooled in emoting, something in these lines feels real, just as the collision between the spacecraft felt real to Spurb. To me, they feel more than part of a discourse; more than entertainment. It is as if, in this display of absolute hatred, I can read my own

hatred. Therefore not only does the intensity of the emotion hold me transfixed, but Picard seems to channel my own emotion, too. Moreover, I find myself focussing on individual sentences, words, and even syllables in this monologue. I am transfixed by the rage in Picard's face when he says, "And I will make them pay..." emphasising the words 'I' and 'pay' so much that, to these points, Picard's eyes seem to glow with rage.

The most reasonable explanation for my fetishisation of this line in particular is that I relate it directly to my own life. As I mentioned, there have been times when I too have felt the anger which appears so vividly on Picard's face. Frankly it reminds me of how I felt after hearing of the death of my friends, Andrew Fox or Richard Simpson. I found myself wanting to emote as Picard emotes; I want to spit my lines. I believe I feel the same degree of anger shown on Picard's face. In a strange way, then, these words touch me personally. If one accepts Sperb's contention that cinephiliac moments can be found in modern CGI sequences such as his crash, then I would add my own contention that one can similarly fetishise lines of dialogue. I 'feel' these lines; there was a time, not long ago, when I wanted to recite them myself. We can therefore see that I relate to this sequence of the film personally. As Lacan describes in his Mirror Stage, we, in a way, see ourselves reflected in the symbolic; thus I saw myself – my own rage – reflected in Picard's face (Lacan, 1977). That image meant I recalled that rage, and oddly perhaps, allowed Picard to release it for me. On the other hand, this line is one of the climactic points of the sequence – the tension of the struggle for dominance over the conversation has finally come to a head, and Picard has finally lost control. Yet there is something more; something which pricks me as an individual.

This line, however, seems to stump Lily, and again she is quiet. She seems shocked, horrified, by Picard's rage. The camera shows her looking scared, bringing to mind the words of Melville: "'God keep me! - keep us all!' murmured Starbuck, lowly." (Melville 1851, 179) Indeed, Lily's seems, in this scene, to be a decidedly Starbuckian role. She crosses to the smashed display cabinet, looking at Picard in horror as he walks towards the window. We hear faint violins and an echo of the film's main musical theme. Lily picks up one of the golden models: "You broke your little ships," she says, quietly. It is as if she has given up. Picard turns to her, and then turns back to

the window. In one last show of both contempt and defiance, Lily starts to leave, saying in her southern accent: “See ya around, Ahab.”

What follows is an excerpt which I must have watched several hundred times. I seem obsessed by it. It starts with a shot of Lily by the display case, but we instantly cut to a medium close-up of Picard, silently looking out into space. He then recites a quote from ‘Moby Dick.’

*And he piled upon the whale's white hump the sum [here we cut from Picard to Lily, looking on in wide-eyed surprise] of all the rage and hate felt by his whole race. [Here we cut back to the Captain, looking out into space] If his chest had been a cannon, he would have shot his heart upon it. (Star Trek: First Contact [Frakes 1996])*

We cut back to Lily. Like her, I feel surprise at what just happened. There is a great gentility to the way in which Picard recites these lines, which contrasts keenly to the rage and hate of what went before. Picard has obviously realised something about himself, and has done so in a manner so quintessential of his character. We know he has always been a bookish character – ironically, Lily just happened upon the very thing that forced Picard to see the folly of what he was doing. This is why, in contrast to Wall Hinds, whose criticisms of this scene will be outlined shortly, I believe that this scene is entirely in keeping with Picard’s character. It is as if, by reciting the quote from ‘Moby-Dick’, Picard shows he has realised – or perhaps admitted to himself – that Lily’s allusion was accurate. In a way, this is how he returns to his ‘normal’ self. This is how the usual structures are restored.

Henceforth. of course, Picard’s mood changes. The scene ends with Lily admitting that she never read the book, to which Picard explains, “Ahab spent years hunting the whale that crippled him. In the end, it destroyed him, and his ship.” The last line of the scene is Lily’s, “I guess he just didn’t know when to quit.” At which Picard puts his weapon down among the broken models, and leaves the room.

There are, of course, many factors which one must examine in order to explain my love for this particular moment in film. More than those sequences examined in my other chapters, possessed of something that I have not found in any other film, this moment in particular fascinates me. I freely admit to being obsessed with it. Ever

since I first went to see this film in the cinema with my parents, this scene in particular – let’s call it, for the sake of brevity, ‘the Ahab scene’ – has held a kind of fascination for me. For a long time, before I could access it easily on the internet or DVD, I longed to see this scene, and found great joy whenever I did. Indeed, this ‘rarity’ may have helped to further entrench my love for this moment, just as the true cinephile takes joy in hunting down and viewing films that are rare. Similarly, Sperb writes:

Even though *Nemesis* is a movie I hadn't thought of in years, it has provoked within me the present project--studying this material and recording this moment, even though I can barely understand what it was that I experienced. (Sperb 2007, 54)

Thus I wished to constantly return to that moment and, with the advent of YouTube, return to it again and again. It was as if the rarity of it had encouraged me to view it even more, to desire it more. My online diary for the day that I found it records:

I was hanging around the pc rooms with Steve this morning, surfing randomly. We were on you tube, and look what I found. this clip - the first contact scene where Picard quotes Moby Dick - I regard as one of the finest sequences in all of cinema. It’s finely written and masterfully acted. I love it, I can’t really explain why though. (Goodsell [Online])

Perhaps it is worth noting, too, that this was the first clip I looked for upon discovering YouTube. The fact that, as a person with Cerebral Palsy, I cannot physically handle things like DVDs meant that, before my friend showed me YouTube, I had no way of accessing this piece of film. It would have meant asking someone to set up the film for me, which I felt awkward doing too many times. Once I could access it easily, however, I watched it many times, and became even more fascinated by it to an even greater extent, partly because it was once so inaccessible. Yet the fact that it was once rare, and suddenly was not, does not answer the question of why I like this moment in particular. Indeed, it seems that I am not alone in my liking for this clip: for instance, there have been one or two attempts, posted on YouTube, to recreate the scene, which I will examine shortly. In a discussion of the use of Melville in *Star Trek* as a whole, Elizabeth Jane Wall Hinds writes in *The Wrath of Ahab; or, Herman Melville Meets Gene Roddenberry*:

After fourteen years of slumbering in the deep, *Moby-Dick* surfaced again in the 1996 *Star Trek: First Contact*, the first *Star Trek* film to feature the *Next Generation* cast exclusively. Even the 1986 *ST IV: The Voyage Home*-an adventure-quest comedy about whales-had avoided the essentially tragic *Moby-Dick* as subtext. *First Contact*, however, has the Enterprise crew take on the Borg, a cybernetic race that “assimilates” all species in its path and a long-time nemesis from the *Next Generation* series. Nameless-the Borg have a collective identity, greeting others with, “We are the Borg”-and all but faceless behind their cybernetic implants, the Borg stack up as fair candidates for the inscrutable Moby- Dick’s role. And having once captured and assimilated Captain Jean-Luc Picard, the Borg have earned Picard’s enmity, serving up a reasonable background to a Kirk-vs.-Khan-style battle to the death. [...] *So* obvious is it even to Lili, a character from twenty-first-century Earth, that Picard seeks revenge against the Borg for his own torture, she calls him “Captain Ahab.” At the end of a tense argument, Lili offering the rather Starbuck-like rationale that all the humans remaining will live if they only abandon ship, Picard succumbs to reason, citing Ahab’s vengeful words: “If my heart were a cannon I’d burst it upon him.” But with irony, for Picard hears in these words the death wish Ahab ignores. (Wall Hinds, 45)

Full of mistakes though it may be (the writer misquotes the captain, and this was the second film of *The Next Generation* crew, rather than the first), and although she finds the scene ‘misplaced’, the fact remains that Wall Hinds displays a high level of interest in this scene. Critical though she may be, and although she may have mentioned it for the sake of academic thoroughness, it is obvious that something in this scene caught her eye. She points out, “Yet Picard is not Kirk, as *The Next Generation* is not classic *Trek*, and the result in *First Contact* is a peculiarly misplaced motive in this scene. Uncharacteristically macho, Picard’s outburst of vengeance rings somewhat hollow for a character whose customary procedure is patient diplomacy.” (Wall Hinds 1997, 46) Yet it is precisely this deviation from character, this rare outburst of pure emotion that attracts me to this scene; that which Wall Hinds finds misplaced I find striking. I find myself fascinated by the rage on Picard’s face, how he spits his words, and how taken aback Lily seems. It is indeed out of character, but for me and other viewers, that adds, rather than detracts, from the scene. This is the dark side of Jean-Luc Picard, and it fascinates me to see it. At the same time, I would argue that he remained in-character too; my knowledge of the *Star Trek* programmes – and any thorough discussion of the *Star Trek* films will eventually have to touch on them – informs me that Picard is quiet, bookish, and is almost a stereotype of an eighteenth-century naval captain. Thus, in the moment where he shows real emotion, he breaks

away from that stereotype to become more human; in my eyes, he becomes more real, reminding me of times when I felt similarly angry.

It is likely that this is one of the factors which motivates me to watch this scene repeatedly. I often just watch this scene, rather than the whole film. As with Keathley's 'wind in the trees', and Sperb's 'fragments', I find my attention is drawn towards the details of the scene, such as lines of dialogue, or gestures. I find myself memorising the whole scene, and playing it back in my internal monologue. Indeed, the scene seems to hold great resonance with me in relation to my personal life; I too sometimes feel like Picard, wanting to right the wrongs of the past, but knowing that, ultimately one must let go before you destroy yourself. Thus this scene appeals to my 'personal reality'. Again, in contrast to the *Cahiers*' writers, my interest and joy is not motivated by politics or artistry; I do not seek clues to the director's personality within the scene. I like it because it speaks to me personally. I see, or think I see, in Picard's eyes a degree of anger and frustration I too once felt upon hearing of the death of my school friends Andrew Fox and Richard Simpson. By the same token, the way in which Picard realises at the end of the scene that to fight the Borg is folly also reminds me that railing against disability – the very thing which took my friends from me – is folly. After all, Ahab's quest was motivated by the fact he was made disabled by the white whale; and the equipment I use to communicate and move around are reminiscent of Borg implants, which in turn evoke Ahab's whale-bone leg. Thus this piece of film resonates with me personally.

Above I have described my absorption into the text; I could not help being dragged into the text, detailing every nuance. Looking over it, it does not constitute the analysis of cinephilia or fandom, but is, in fact, an example of what I have above called the synthesis of the two discourses.

Yet this would fail to explain why this scene appeals to others, save to say that we all have our personal grievances and vendettas; we all have times when we can be compared to the Captain of the Pequod. In doing so, however, one can only go so far: this scene seems to have been 'picked out' by many people. Although one should of course be cautious when using such material in an academic paper, online, people have left comments such as:

Personally I think his beef is not so much with the BORG as much as it is with LOCUTUS?

The depth is incredible, Man VS Self VS Machine (BUTSEKZPIRATE [Online])

This scene almost ruins Star Trek for me, because it's just THAT GOOD. Seeing conflict between the crew, and letting Patrick Stewart really go for it. An incredible scene. (Quitchoy [Online])

TNG: Best Star Trek

This Scene: Best in all of ST Movies (breaker909 [Online])

Widely respected reviewer, Tim Lynch – who, incidentally, is alluded to in this very scene in Lilly's reference to Picard killing of 'Ensign Lynch' – writes of it:

Every single moment in that scene was not only watchable, but compelling: from Picard's outburst where he breaks his "little ships", to the varied references to *Moby Dick*, to Picard's final realization that he may be sacrificing everything he has for a moment of pain, there really wasn't anything about that scene I'd change. (Lynch [Online])

It would thus appear that the praise for this scene is widespread, but the way in which it alone has been picked out by reviewer after reviewer leads one to believe that there is something unique to it that makes it stand out, not just to me but to others. Therefore to pick apart my cinephiliac lust for this scene I must deal with two things: the question of why it appeals to me and why it might appeal to others. Admittedly, these may overlap, but I suspect there will be differences too: not everyone will have had the experiences I have, so other viewers will have different motives for reacting to this scene as they do. If, as Reception Theory suggests, meaning now resides with the viewer, when we look at how this scene is fetishised, standing almost totally alone in *Star Trek* folk-memory, then the question is surely posed: what does it mean? If it has a personal resonance for me, then surely it has personal resonance for others but for different reasons. I would personally suggest that there is something within the very *mise-en-scène*, it is very aesthetic, which makes it stand out. I find myself looking at every camera movement, every intonation of dialogue from syllable to syllable, every rise and fall of the non-diegetic music. These things have obsessed me, as they apparently have others. The question is, why? What makes this scene so powerful? What, for me and for others, could it mean? It is clear that this is a moment of cinephiliac joy, not because it sheds light on the director's artistry, but because it

intrigues me in other ways. Inasmuch as I enquire and ask questions about this scene, I act as a cinephile; in that I have almost memorised this scene line for line, I act as a fan. The two overlap in the pure joy I get from watching this clip, which is why I would suggest my reaction to it constitutes a part of the third, hybrid discourse.

In this chapter, I have attempted to explore the factors which inspire my fascination for this scene. Yet, in doing so, in attempting to uncover the motivations for my cinephilia, I have, in a sense, acted as a cinephile, since part of cinephilia is to reflect on and question one's own fascination. Given that one facet of cinephilia is the urge to try to explain one's love, one cannot write a thesis on cinephilia without attempting to explain why one loves the films that one loves. No true cinephile can extract themselves from a discourse on cinephilia, so any question of objectivity is irrelevant. In trying to define cinephilia, we cannot help but participate within it; when we demonstrate our love for film, we are partly helping to define cinephilia. As much as we try to document what is going on on-screen, we can never fully articulate our love; yet at the same time, something within that love urges us to do so. As we cannot explain why we love something, we can only demonstrate our love as best we can. It is this urge to demonstrate love which has always been one of cinephilia's defining features, but in the modern era this desire seems to have become more active and physical. Hence cinephilia borrows the physical aspect of fandom, and, with their shared desire to enter into a text, they unite to become a new, separate discourse. While the scene from *Star Trek: First Contact* has, as we have seen, motivated others into producing 'fan art', I feel myself responding in a very personal way. Each viewer, as an individual, will respond to a film differently; both fandom and cinephilia set up areas where viewers can demonstrate that response to others. Hence the range of possible interpretations (Keathley 2006) remains open rather than being closed down. The coming together of fandom and cinephilia opens up a space, often online, where filmic material can be reinterpreted, analysed and played with in new ways.

Perhaps one of the most interesting responses to this scene appears on YouTube. A YouTube user, Brandon Hardesty, chose to create a solo rendition of this scene and post it on the internet as part of a series of "reconstructions". (ArtieTSMITW 2006 [online]) These are word-for-word recitations of this user's favourite scene, thereby supplying us with an example of a fan who picks out cinephiliac moments, as

Keathley describes, but then goes on to play with the text, as Jenkins suggests fans do. Further, we can also perceive the positive spectatorial proactiveness Casetti writes of: Hardesty can be said to have physically entered the realm of the text like the flaneur entering the arcade in order to sample it, experience it, to act it out. It would seem that this scene has motivated him physically rather than, as in the case of the cinephiles, cerebrally. He has also turned his home from a private to a public space: just as Rushton writes of viewers being absorbed by film, this fan has entered into the text not only to see but to be seen. In a way, he is attempting to make the public space of the film into his own private one, yet also to reopen it up to the public by posting it onto the internet.

Thus we can see how, at one and the same time, cinephilia can be shown to have aspects of fandom and fandom aspects of cinephilia. What Hardesty has done, intentionally or not, is to merge two forms of filmic love; his work can be used as an example of the coming together of many discourses. In a way, this is a point where cinephilia merge to form a discourse that is both more private and personal, yet more public and communal. It has become more physical. I feel what Picard feels in this scene, and indeed I can see something similar in Hardesty. As a disabled man, I sometimes feel I have been through experiences few others have. His Borg ship becomes the rather claustrophobic walls of a special school; the sense of loneliness and isolation inherent in the line, “None of them understand the Borg as I do. No-one does. No-one can,” reverberates powerfully. Few people have experienced losing so many school friends; thus the anger and isolation I see in Picard’s eyes becomes, in a way, mine. Watching someone else act this out, with the same emotion, makes my experience more communal. Whether I read this scene as a fan or as a cinephile is unclear: I use words and actions to explain my interest, as the writers of *Cahiers* did, but that interest is not motivated by any of the reasons outlined in Chapter One. I do not look for signs of the director’s artistry; I do not compare this scene to others of its kind. On the other hand, I have not produced any artistic reaction to this scene, as a fan perhaps would. Yet this scene intrigues me; I cannot quite explain why or how, but like both fans and cinephiles, I see something in this scene that compels me. Something within it touches my own sense of reality; it touches me on a personal level, and I seek to enter into it, or watch someone else do so. Thus, for me and for

others, this scene can be used as an example of the coming together of fandom and cinephilia, and the emergence of a third hybrid discourse with elements of both.

## Chapter 4 – The Relationship Between Fandom And Cinephilia

In the previous chapter, I outline my own engagement with the *Star Trek* films, suggesting how this might be shown to have both elements of cinephilia and fandom, yet also touch me on a more personal, emotional level. Through this I aim to now deepen our understanding of both, and the points at which they meet. Based on the problems reconciling the two discourses outlined in Chapter Three, we can now see that a greater analysis is in order.

There seems to have been a recent surge in interest in modes of viewing that are similar to, yet separate from, cinephilia. Scholarly publications, such as *Screen*, are increasingly engaging with fandom, or at least fan-like activity. This creates the dynamic where, on the one hand, cinephilia can be said to be expanding, yet at one and the same time, fandom becomes cinephiliac inasmuch as it starts to create a discourse. Francesco Casetti articulates the merging of two types of viewing: on the one hand, there is what we call cinephilia, and he calls the ‘filmic experience’, which he defines as “arguably both that moment when images (and sounds) on a screen arrogantly engage our senses and also that moment when they trigger a comprehension that concerns, reflexively, what we are viewing and the very fact of viewing it.” (Casetti 2009, 56). That is, the moment when the viewer becomes aware of film as a multi-faceted text which is open to analysis, or the point at which he or she begins to reflect on their own activity. However, Casetti goes on to explain how this is related to or has become relocated into a kind of expressivity:

Lastly, filmic experience becomes increasingly private: something to be had inside ‘reserved’ spaces (such as the home) or in isolation (and this even though the barriers around us have become glass walls). In short, filmic experience becomes more and more personalized. In turn, it also becomes increasingly active. The spectator has ceased simply to consume a show and begins to intervene in the act of consumption: she/he is asked not only to see, but also to do. That is why this type of experience may be characterized as a *performance*. (Casetti 2009, 63)

While Casetti does not refer to fandom by name, it is obvious that he is discussing the type of culture I have been trying to account for: fans often watch films in their homes, often alone on their computers; and Jenkins too speaks of fans ‘performing’. The way in which he writes of ‘glass walls’, for example, recalls not just the growth

of surveillance culture, but also the way in which fan reactions to films are, in turn, observed by others. In other words, he is describing a mode of viewing film which is both self-reflexive (a facet of cinephilia) and performative (a facet of fandom). In his 'filmic experience', the viewer is actively involved in the text. However, Casetti focuses more on things like DVD menus and how this more democratised form of viewing differs from the traditional cinematic experience, but he does not quite make the next step. He writes that:

It is clear that through new *windows*, subjects often 'invent' ways of building their 'own' experience. This invention can be seen as a negative act (when they give up the linear viewing of a film and simply linger on privileged clips), and as a positive spectatorial proactiveness (when they use home theatre systems to reintroduce a certain sacredness to the act of viewing). Such creativity is, however, ambiguous. It is often simply an execution of pre-established rules (DVDs allow – and actually anticipate – viewing 'in pieces'). (Casetti 2009, 64)

Casetti does not make the association between this type of viewing pieces of film and cinephiliac moments explicitly, but the way in which new technologies allow for the viewing of film in chunks almost begs for the comparison to be made. He alludes to Bazinian and Barthesian concepts like the aura, suggesting how theatrical viewing is replicated at home by turning lights off, but he does not make specific connections. Yet it could be argued that a reader who is familiar with both writing about cinephilia and writing about fandom might perceive aspects of both in what Casetti writes, although it might be a step too far to declare he is overtly discussing either. What he sees as 'negative act', the way in which some viewers chose to 'linger' on 'privileged clips' could indeed be seen as the picking out of cinephiliac moments. Thus, from the example of Casetti, we can see how writing on film has or is seeking to move away from theory into a more celebratory and active mode, where the experience of viewing can be seen to go beyond words yet is still written about. Just as Pomerance writes of film experience having gone beyond narrative and theory – beyond analytical articulation into something more descriptive, personal and preverbal (Pomerance 2008, 3) – the writing of Casetti both describes and is an example of a mode of viewing which has both aspects of fandom and cinephilia. In short, it is a synthesis of the two discourses.

However, this new discourse could be said to contradict one of the basic facets of cinephilia, as well as itself, in that it seeks to move away from older ways of writing and thinking about film in terms of analysis in favour of a form of celebration, even though it continues to use analytical tropes to frame debates. For example, cinephiles seem to have accepted Freud's insistence that the unconscious cannot be accounted for consciously, yet still attempt to account for it as well as that very unaccountability. As noted in Chapter One, cinephiles are forever circling around the reasons why film fascinates us, yet can never quite articulate it. They seek to extend filmic discourse beyond theory, even though their writing is itself theoretical inasmuch as it seeks to root film firmly in a wider artistic context. In a way, cinephiliac writing accepts the fact that filmic love is unaccountable, but nevertheless tries to account for it using the tropes of what went before; in this new hybrid discourse, this contradiction seems even more profound in that it seeks to document that which it itself suggests is beyond narrative and theory. As with cinephilia, it displays its love openly, tries then to account for that love, but then goes a step further enquiring into its own structures.

Perhaps we can shed more light on this problem by recalling that the main difference between film theory and the discourse of cinephilia is that, while film theory maintains an air of objectivity, cinephilia accepts the act of viewing is subjective. In writing on the impact of Deleuze, Rushton writes; "Rather than spectators passively deprived of their bodies and held in thrall to an ideological apparatus, Deleuze's writings gave rise to the possibility of spectators who engaged their bodies and senses in ways that made *Screen Theory* seem incorrigibly short-sighted." (Rushton 2009, 45). Cinephilia thus posits viewers as active beings: while one may sit still and silent in the dark of the cinema, viewers are nevertheless active beings, whispering, thinking, eating, and, after the film, debating and performing. As a result, screen/film theory has therefore had to extend its scope to engage with new ways of thinking about film; cinephilia is the result of this extension, and writers like Casetti could be said to be taking it a step further by engaging with even newer ways of viewing. At the same time, such writers have not abandoned the analytical tropes or theories which their forebears created, but expanded them or adapted them to fit new ways of thinking. For example, Casetti discusses new viewing platforms, such as home video, YouTube, and mobile phones, in terms of Walter Benjamin's work on the flâneur:

The theatre is not a retreat, like the home, nor is it an open world, like the metropolis. It instead forms something of a middle ground, where citizens converge and share the same emotional experiences. Looked at in this way, it provides a peculiar form of habitat: here one can be a mobile individual, a *flâneur*, and at the same time find a place of belonging. It is therefore a physical place, a little like the arcades or malls of the nineteenth century. And it is also a place permeated with a set of shared symbols which function, in a Heideggerian way, as language does for a community. (Casetti 2009, 58)

Here, Casetti argues that cinema-going is a communal experience: this recalls Jenkins' notion that fandom exists on a communal level, using 'shared symbols' to form a sort of subculture. Yet Casetti frames the viewer in a way which also recalls much writing on cinephilia and more classic types of film viewing too. In doing so, he is making a direct comparison between the two types of viewing. He goes on to describe how old ways of seeing the film-goer have changed to incorporate new modes of viewing and new relationships with film:

On the one hand, there is the need for *expressivity*: the identity of social subjects hinges increasingly upon the way they can put this into play. [...] On the other hand, there is a need for *relationality*: social subjects are less and less part of pre-established social networks, and so they must build their own. [...] The urge to face these two needs (for expressivity and for relationality), as well as the competition with other media, pushed cinema towards an exploration of new possibilities. If cinema relocates itself, it does so in response to this situation. (Casetti 2009, 60)

Paradoxically, then, film viewing is becoming more private and yet more communal. Casetti believes that, in order for film to keep its centrality in culture, new forms of viewing must emerge where the viewer is not passive but active. Traditionally, the cinema was a social venue where people went to meet friends, in a way expressing one's social needs and desires. At the same time, at the cinema, one sits silently in the dark; in a way, like the *flâneur* in the alienating maelstrom, one is completely alone. Cinephilia has moved itself into the home, which is a more private space, and yet has in some respects become more public inasmuch as film viewing and discussion has become more communal, online. New technologies allow for new forms of feedback, debate and engagement. This allows for a more active type of viewing, where viewers can enter *bodily* into the action of the film, yet, as Casetti and others note, still retains facets of the cinema: for example they turn off the lights and increase the volume to help recreate the feel of the darkened auditorium. The desire to express oneself socially by going to the cinema has now, at least in part, become a new type of

expressivity through the act of creation. It could be that the combination of the desire to actually enter into or participate physically in a text enables a greater level of absorption.

In his article ‘Deleuzian Spectatorship’ Richard Rushton writes of the difference between absorption and immersion: “The mode of absorption is one in which the spectator *goes into* the film – that is, is absorbed in or by the film – whereas in the mode of immersion the film *comes out* to the spectator so as to surround and envelop her/him... each offers a significantly different mode of engagement.” (Rushton 2009, 50) This dynamic offers us a way of squaring film theory with new types of viewing. Fans can be said to allow themselves to be absorbed into a filmic text, physically entering into it, just as cinephiles can be said to do.

For example, at one point in his book *Courbet's Realism*, Fried discusses the extraordinary canvas *The Wheat-Sifters* [...] He convincingly argues that the figures in the painting are in some sense surrogates for those viewing the painting, but also that the two sifters who are engaged in the activity of sifting are not there merely to *represent* those people and those actions. In other words, they are not merely there to be looked at. Rather, Fried claims that the type of engagement a viewer has with this painting and with these figures is ‘no longer one of beholding but a mode of identification in which vision as such is all but elided’. [...] To put it bluntly, one of the possibilities which absorption holds forth is *the possibility of being another being*. (Rushton 2009, 50)

This contrasts strongly with the principal of immersion, which “offers only the option of remaining firmly within the bounds of one's own selfhood” (Rushton 2009, 51). That is to say, to be immersed into a text, one might be entertained by it and engaged in the plot; but to find oneself absorbed into a text is to go a step further and to seek to somehow participate in it actively, no longer being confined to one's sense of self but actually becoming another person. Both fans and cinephiles take this extra step, albeit in differing ways, whereas other, more casual, viewers do not. Rushton rehearses the debates on how one can be seen to bodily enter into a text, giving oneself over to it. Just as Fried argues that the figures in the painting act as surrogates to the viewer, it could be said that both fans in particular superimpose themselves into the fictional world of the film. However, rather than seeing themselves embodied within a character in the film or figures within the painting, fans achieve this superimposition actively. Fans enter into the fictive space by making ‘fan art’. Inspired by what they

see, in many respects fans become other beings; the difference is, rather than perceiving themselves as pre-created characters within the text, fans create their own surrogates through which they explore the fiction. In a way, then, 'fan art' can be seen to articulate the way that they have been absorbed by the film. This strongly recalls Jenkins' simile of 'poaching' that has connotations of trespassing or entering into other spaces, inasmuch as fans can be said to create their own means of absorption and therefore can be said to be absorbed intentionally. In the case of Brandon Hardesty, for example, he overtly becomes both Captain Picard and the actor playing him, Patrick Stewart. Similarly, cinephiles can be said to be absorbed by their active engagement with a text, achieved through their writing. In both cases, we can see a willingness to reposition oneself as a viewer, not as passive or solitary but as active and as part of a community.

Thus we can see that as a result of its engagement with other forms of viewing, cinephilia, as discourse, has been forced to open itself up; writers have therefore started to discuss new ways of thinking about film as a way to escape the fact that their love can never be truly accounted for. This has entailed engaging with new types of viewing, and the emergence of a new hybrid discourse. As we have seen, cinephilia is self-reflexive, and writers have begun to look into new ways of expressing a love of film which incorporates both this self-reflexivity and a willingness to demonstrate the love of film more physically. New forms of media have, as Casetti touched upon above, also meant a branching out of cinephilia itself.

Despite obsessions with singularity, originality and rarity within cinephilia, TMCs [transnational media corporations] extend and expand these desires to encounter the sacred object of 35 mm celluloid master prints by digitizing images, reproducing them for DVD, video on demand (VOD) and countless other formats and uses. This 'repurposing and multiplatforming' of 'cinema', to adopt the language of TMCs, actually denotes a *multiplication* of the past and the cinephiles' archive, a move from one pristine cinematic artefact as an essential, unified, unassailable urtext to many different iterations, versions, explanations, juxtapositions, forms and presentations. (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 136)

It could be argued that what Hudson and Zimmerman call 'transnational media corporations' facilitate not only cinephiliac activities, with its intense fascination with film history, but also specifically 'fannish' activities. The technologies they have created enable viewers to make texts their own. As Jenkins and Hills describe, fans

take pre-made texts and re-edit them to suit their own purposes, the irony being that this is facilitated by the advent of transnational corporations presumably intent on making as much profit as possible from such activity. Nevertheless, again, we can see then that links are being made between cinephilia and fandom, from within cinephiliac discourses. Interestingly, Hudson and Zimmermann go on to write “Cinephilia in an era of DVDs is associated with ownership in the home space, rather than with spectatorship in the theatrical space.” (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 136) They seem to be arguing that this type of creation is a form of cinephilia, implying that they believe there to be no difference, or that one has morphed into the other. This vision of cinephilia has strong echoes of fan-like activity with its liking for film-related trivia, but now include concepts which

...transform Laura Mulvey's ‘visual pleasure’ and models of desire into models of exchange. Other [writers] have expanded cinema beyond film history and theory, arguing that the practices of interactive and Paracinephilia media fandom – often rejecting the official aesthetics of the cultural elite – are structurally indistinguishable from the practices of academics and professional film critics. These theorizations of cinephilia articulate a psychoanalytic model of an eternal quest for what has been lost and can never again be found. This insatiable, fetishistic desire for an unassailable object is now rerouted by TMCs, which purport to offer each generation of cinephiles new and enhanced access to lost ‘masterpieces’ and ‘contemporary classics’ in remastered DVD transfers, special boxed editions, and extra features. (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 136)

In a way, then, the ‘eternal quest’ of cinephilia has reached its goal in fandom. Cinematic love is expanding into new models and forms; it is no longer, it seems, the preserve of ‘academics and professional film critics’, but is increasingly finding voice in fan output. It is a desire to own and cherish film by collecting boxed sets and memorabilia, and also an urge to go further and have mastery of – to enter into – film. Even though Hudson and Zimmermann place transnational media corporations as having positioned themselves as gatekeepers with a vested interest in the capitalistic fetishisation of such memorabilia, it might also be said that the urge to own film, to possess it as a connoisseur might a rare wine or book, is a cinephiliac one. The unassailable object, it can be argued, is both a love of film and a drive to articulate a love that, once articulated, destroys itself; it can alternatively be said to be the cinephiliac moment: the moment of pure filmic joy. In either case, new technologies have enabled that joy to be both captured and articulated. Machines like the DVD player allow moments in film to be re-lived again and again; such technologies

change some of the dynamics of cinephilia drastically, but can also be said to facilitate fannish activities too. Hudson and Zimmermann, moreover, go on to state how “Pleasures once confined to cinemas migrate to television and computer screens, [...] Within transnational capitalism and Web 2.0, cinephilia shapeshifts into mediaphilia – an excessive love of audiovisual images mediated by analogue and digital video technologies.” (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 138). It is this very 'technophilia' which Casetti credits too for the repositioning of what he calls the 'Filmic Experience'. Thus, in the literature, we can see how writers have increasingly embraced new ways of viewing, and new attitudes to film. Moreover, Hudson and Zimmermann write

Moving away from passive spectatorship and insider knowledge of DVD extra features, cinephilia can mobilize active interactions where process overshadows product. The materiality of the cinematic is no longer sacralized, it is now endlessly reworked. (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 137)

This 'endless reworking' Hudson and Zimmermann refer to is of great importance for us, as it is very much reminiscent of the reworking of existing films by fans. Although they don't explicitly refer to fan activity as outlined by Jenkins or Hills, the 'active interactions' they refer to could easily be extended to the domain of fandom. Thus, writers are attempting to see where fandom and cinephilia might meet up. They are increasingly bringing film theory to bear on new fan output, yet also seem to be accepting – at least in some quarters – that cinephilia itself is also changing to incorporate elements of fandom. Cinephilia has moved away from the semi-sacred domain of the cinema and into the home: the large screens of the auditorium have given way to the much smaller screens of the television or the computer. While some viewers may still enjoy going to cinemas or even replicating the cinema at home, increasingly diverse ways of filmic consumption are emerging, in turn leading to new ways of responding to film. Hudson and Zimmermann thus write of 'collaborative remix zones' – fora, usually online, where fans share what they create:

Collaborative remix zones move away from immobilized and apolitical fetishistic image worship into the construction of collaborative communities where new knowledges and new connections can be actualized within a radical historiographic practice. Collaborative remix zones propose a radical rethinking of cinephilia infused with political urgency as the industry of cinema converts fully into an intellectual property industry. We therefore propose the following shifts in cinephilia: from a fixation on the past, including the past as it is reactivated through memory, to a recognition of the present moment; [...] from a logic of individual, private and unconscious

desire to a logic of collaborative, shared and politicized exchange; and from the production of national imaginaries to the activation of repressed and suppressed discourses and practices that foreground transpolitical connections and vectors of movement. (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 143)

According to Hudson and Zimmermann, then, cinephilia is changing as technologies change, and as it does so it acquires aspects of fandom, particularly its communal, collaborative and creative dimensions. The spectator has been repositioned. Although Hudson and Zimmermann's words may go slightly too far, it is nevertheless true that cinephilia can be constituted as 'fetishistic image worship', a worship which they state as being replaced by the urge to create, share and participate in, rather than just watch. It is also true, as we have seen, that cinephilia is shifting to incorporate new ways of viewing, new attitudes to film, and indeed new ways of entering into the filmic text. Their call for cinephilia to change from "a fetishistic relationship with a lost object (what has been created) to an engaged relationship with process (what can be created)" (Hudson and Zimmermann 2009, 143) is particularly interesting, as it reflects how cinephilia has exchanged its desire for sublime, revered images to a desire to create, play or participate. It is as if, through self-reflection, cinephiles have realised the impossibility of their own task, but have resolved this by starting to openly and unashamedly demonstrate their love, as fans do.

Dialogue with the film and its author, in search of a meaning; dialogue with the other spectators, in search of a community: what comes to light is a situation in which the spectator loses her/his privileges and her/his exclusiveness as observer; she/he has to face – and to expose her/himself to – the world and the others. The effect is a profound restructuring of spectatorial subjectivity (no more 'mastery', but remaining 'open' to things). But the effect is also an increasing role for film's prelocutionary effects, that is, its ability to do and make others do. (Casetti 2009, 60)

This "restructuring of spectatorial subjectivity" results in a repositioning of the viewer, in a way. No longer do we allow the text to come out to us, but, as we have seen, we muscle our way into a text, inserting ourselves into it, either discursively in the case of the cinephile or creatively in the case of the fan. In both senses we act in relation to others, speaking for others to hear, therefore retaining the social aspect of the love of film. Cinephiles enter into a dialogue with the director in search of meaning, fans create for fellow fans; both are forms of the same creative, reflexive, shared love of film. Both cinephile and fan discourses reflect these same essential

desires, so, in a way, the two are merging both at the level of their activity and at the level of their discourse.

Nevertheless, one important, central question remains: do fans fetishise or at least focus their attention upon the small, peripheral details within film – the contingent or liminal? This has been a central theme of cinephilia since its infancy: it still seems to play a major role in cinephiliac writing. Indeed it seems to be a central point of the work of Keathley, upon which this thesis largely draws. It could be argued that, in order to define the relationship between fandom and cinephilia more precisely, we must examine the extent to which fans fixate upon small, peripheral moments or details within film. Moreover, if a third, hybrid discourse is indeed emerging, then the degree to which the contingent can be shown to be fixated upon fannishly must be examined, or, to put it another way, a good way to examine the relationship between the two discourses may be to look at the way in which fans and cinephiles might respond to the same pieces of film.

However, to answer these questions, a way of establishing whether fans fetishise the liminal must be found; or, more precisely, whether they notice and reflect on small, liminal details in film. As noted in the previous section, fans do not document or reflect upon their activity in the same autoreflexive, exploratory prose that we can observe in cinephilia, so we either have to rely on academics such as Jenkins to document it for us, or try to decode fan production ourselves, looking for evidence that a fan has fixated on a moment. Yet even here, it would be very difficult to tell what this fixation was born of. Hence fandom is articulated from the outside rather than the inside. Also problematic is the fact that much fan material is published online, where short clips of film are often favoured. This distorts the situation somewhat, as it is hard to say whether the brevity of some fan-made film is a sign of a preference for such fleeting moments or just a symptom of technical limitations.

A solution would be to try to decode my own fascinations. I define myself as a fan, yet I also feel I have cinephile-like tendencies; as a writer who focuses on the subject, I also have a good understanding of what defines both, as a result of my writing this very thesis. For me to use my own fascination with moments in certain films in order to examine whether they are born of fandom or cinephilia would be to deliberately

create a hybrid in myself: a fan who reflects in prose. On the other hand, given that I am trying to locate and define my own love using self-reflexive prose, this might simply mean I am being a cinephile. I know enough about film to revere it as an art, make comparisons between films, and so on; yet I seem to also have an extremely fan-like enthusiasm for certain films, or certain moments in films. Thus, with a view to greater understanding the relationship between fandom and cinephilia, I will look at my favourite moments from several films in order to try to find where my fascination with them comes from. While such an approach is not without its problems philosophically, the fact that I can be defined as both a cinephile and a fan may help us to locate the point at which the two converge.

Of course, impetus was taken from Keathley's notion of the cinephiliac moment, and I only had this idea after reading his work. Thus whether his book made me decide to consciously adore certain moments in films, or whether I had unconsciously fetishised them beforehand, and Keathley's book gave a voice to this fascination, it is impossible to say. However, I distinctly recall liking these moments, as well as others, before I read anything on cinephilia, which leads me to presume that it was the fan in me which made me fixate on these moments.

I, personally, locate one or more such moments in *Jurassic Park* (Spielberg, 1993). I find great 'magic' in the way in which the protagonists first sight the dinosaurs. Obviously, the audience is supposed to feel exhilarated at this moment; the magic of the cinema has seemingly resurrected ancient sauropods. From the way the director uses shot/reverse shot to display both the dinosaurs and the characters, the viewer is prompted to feel amazed – this much is, to a certain extent, obvious. Yet, there is more to this sequence. I am filled with wonder and enthusiasm at this shot – feelings that exceed the cinema. The shot seems to remind me – and here you will have to forgive the cliché – of the wonders of nature, of the marvels of science. Despite its status as fiction, this shot seems to speak to me about both human potential and, rather paradoxically, their insignificance. Such shots allow one to fantasise about and reflect on the human condition: we have mastery over nature, so much so that we can perform feats like resurrecting the dinosaurs, yet, both to the brachiosaurs they/we behold and in terms of evolutionary time; the protagonists and the audience are

insignificant. Thus, in a way, this shot stands to affirm the human condition and remind us of its irrelevance.

My attitude to this section of film can be seen as both cinephiliac and fan-like. I enthuse about it – it triggers thoughts and memories that go beyond a film, making me eager to find out more. Often, films can inspire fans to go on to other, semi-related activities: one often hears stories of how fans have chosen such things as clothes, cars or even their profession on the basis of their favourite film.

My favourite Bond film is *Goldfinger*. I own a DB9 Aston Martin and the only reason why I have it is because of James Bond. (Spielberg, quoted in Bouzereau 2006, 111)

Thus, in both fandom and cinephilia, film is often the starting point at which an interest is triggered or unlocked; films awaken in the viewer interests which may not have been intended by the film. It was probably not the intention of the makers of *Goldfinger* to advertise or boost sales of Aston Martins, for example, yet details within film can be the basis for interests or desires which the director probably did not intend to trigger. Similarly, the ending of *Jurassic Park* also fascinates me. As the protagonists are flown away from the collapsing theme park, they notice a flock of birds flying alongside their helicopter. According to modern palaeontology, modern birds evolved from dinosaurs, and no doubt Spielberg was alluding to this fact, yet from the way in which the theme music plays, alongside the use of wide angle oceanic shots, this moment again reminds me of human potential and insignificance. Not only does it instil me with a love of film, but also a love of science. It is as if this shot makes me want to know more. One is struck by the beauty of the bird, but also to its resemblance to the dinosaur. It should be noted that, on a very superficial level, I have always harboured a love of science – I have romantic notions about its potential, and find a certain beauty in it. Thus, this moment has a personal resonance that probably goes beyond the director's intent. Not only does my joy stem from the beauty of the shot, but also from its metonymic value – what it reminds me of: the sprawling narrative of the evolution of life on this planet. Perhaps it is also relevant that, ever since watching that shot, every time I see a bird I inadvertently hear the main theme to *Jurassic Park*, such can be the grasp of love for a film.

On the other hand, it could be argued that I am not a cinephile, but a fan of *Jurassic Park*. I find it inspiring me, in the way fans can be said to be inspired to write ‘fanfic’, for example. This is different from, yet related in some ways to, the non-fiction prose of cinephilia. One wonders what would happen if such things actually came to pass. This, it can be argued, is a classical element of fandom. Not only do I fetishise this moment, but it inspires me. A fan would use this moment to trigger something creative.

As to whether this ‘superficial love’ – that is to say casual interest – of science gave rise to my love of such films, or whether such films inspired my rather romantic keenness for the scientific endeavour is a matter of some debate. It is certain, personally speaking, that the films I watch increase my interest in the subject matter they concern. This is, of course, a facet of fandom – one wants to emulate what one sees on screen. In a way, my love for this moment can be seen as ‘fannish’, but the moment I reflect on my love, I become a cinephile.

This could be further illustrated when we look at my next favourite moment. It occurs in the Bond film *The Spy Who Loved Me* (Gilbert, 1977), at the end of the pre-title sequence. Bond (Roger Moore) being pursued by enemies on skis, runs over the edge of a precipice, seemingly to his death. Then, at the last moment, his Union Flag parachute opens, and the title music begins. Of course, this moment is again intended to exhilarate; it is manifestly designed to be suspenseful in order to draw the audience into the film. Yet there is something within this sequence that sticks in my mind more than most such sequences – that somehow makes it punctic, for me at least.

It seems to me that this sequence captures the very essence of the James Bond persona. His obvious character flaws aside, he appears to be the very epitome of male bravado: daring, brave, attractive to women and so forth, thus the male spectator puts himself in his position, or rather is intended to do so by the various cultural constructs that make up what it means to be male in our society. This moment is especially applicable to this, for Bond once again proves himself to be immortal. It is relevant that he is saved at the last moment by the opening of his parachute, emblazoned with the Union Flag: he clutches victory from the jaws of defeat, life from the jaws of death.

Also relevant is the fact that, as the title sequence begins, two female hands appear to seemingly catch the parachute: Bond, rather than being saved by the foresight of his country, is saved by a woman. This appears to play out the male fantasy of being held by a woman, as we were once held by our mothers, and in so doing possess our mothers, as Freud described. Thus we can perhaps see in this sequence victory over the real of death, and also mastery over woman. Both are male fantasies the Bond films return to constantly. After all, we commonly refer to both ships and countries as female. This is perhaps why, as a male, I find this sequence so appealing. It should also be noted, for the sake of fairness, that I am also fond of Carly Simon's theme 'Nobody Does it Better'. Nevertheless, this sequence holds particular appeal to me, although whether it is a 'cinephiliac moment' in the Keathlian sense would be a matter for some debate, as it constitutes a deliberate manipulation of structures to stimulate male desire. That is to say, it is not personal to me but is intended to appeal to all men. As James Chapman points out in his discussion of *License To Thrill*,

In the view of film critic and Bond fan Giles Whittell, the Bond films have thrived for so long 'as realisations of wild adolescent fantasies about sex, gadgetry, invincibility and what it means to be British'. According to this line of argument, the Bond films work in much the same way as the original Ian Fleming books, creating a fantasy world of beautiful women, easy sex, and consumer affluence, and, moreover, one in which the decline of British power never took place. (Chapman in Linder 2003, 113-114)

That is to say, they are designed to sate widespread adolescent male fantasies concerning "sex, gadgetry [and] invincibility". On the other hand, if we again place Keathley aside for the moment, this sequence does heighten my personal sense of cinephilia: I love this sequence, I find it exciting and stimulating for reasons which apply to me alone, and therefore because of it I want to return to it repeatedly. It shows me someone performing incredible physical feats which I, as someone with a disability, could never do. Not only that, due, perhaps, to its reinforcement of notions of male order and fantasies of immortality, it makes me want to see more films that fulfil the same desires.

It is clear that my response to this sequence can easily be termed 'fannish'. But the moment in which I take the time to consider what captivates me about this moment, to document its structures, and to reflect consciously on my love, it can be said to

become cinephiliac. In a way, by writing such an analysis, I am reading against the director, trying to make out what he perhaps shows us without necessarily meaning to. I am also trying to decode what these sequences mean to me, and why. This is strongly reminiscent of the early cinephiliac writing of the *Cahiers* group, who read into texts things that were not at first apparent. Like the cinephile, I place this sequence in relation to structures that are external to the film. I read into the film what the director did not necessarily intend to place there. On the other hand, I do not do this in order to try to discern anything about the personality of the director or his motives: I like this moment, as with the ones before it, because of the effect they have on me, not because of any intellectual or political motives.

Yet I have also responded to this sequence in a ‘fannish’ way. I first realised I liked this section of film after it was acted out by comedian Steve Coogan in the situation comedy, *I'm Alan Partridge* (episode *Never Say Alan Again*). Something in the way Coogan acted made me want to follow up his reference, and subsequently fall in love with or fetishise the sequence myself. It could be argued that this is precisely how a fan might react to such a stimulus: according to Jenkins, part of fan activity is seeking out referenced material. Part of the textual play Jenkins describes is to use one text to spring to and connect with another, then another, then another. So in this sense, my fascination with this sequence is not cinephilia at all but fandom inasmuch as it was primarily a ‘fannish’ urge which brought me to this sequence in the first place. It was only after I was brought to this sequence that I read into it using a discourse that might be termed cinephilia. In other words, my conscious reflection redefined fandom as cinephilia. This example also shows how fandom – or at least a fan-like activity – can give rise to an experience like a cinephiliac moment, but it is only when it is termed as such, abstracted and reflected upon that it becomes something other than fandom. From this we can get an idea of how strong and complicated the interrelationship between cinephilia and fandom may be: one seems to feed into another, and back again. Hence, from this perspective, splitting the two is difficult. In a way, we can now see that the only real difference is that one is conscious, the other is not, or, put another way, one is motivated by a will to examine film for signs of a director’s intent, the other by the pure joy of watching almost totally unconcerned with directorial motives. Fandom, or my fandom, lacks the political aspects of cinephilia.

This, however, raises questions over whether such moments appeal universally. It may be possible to document the structures of what is happening on screen in order to gain a clearer account of its construction, but this will not explain why this sequence does not appeal to every heterosexual male. As we have seen, this sequence reaffirms the heterosexual male fantasy; Bond, as a figure, can be said to be symptomatic of a type of nostalgia, for a time when Britain was a significant world power (hence the flag). Yet this does not explain why I, personally, am taken by it while other men are not. While I can only speculate upon this, it may be connected with falling: as a disabled man, I have fallen many times – often I hurt myself. To fall, but to be saved from falling, would be a fantasy which would appeal to me, and only to me. Therefore I can be said to *experience* this film unlike any other; I am absorbed by it, entering into it personally. Bond, in a way, is everything I am not: suave, sophisticated and dextrous, so to see his world and to be enticed into it is a very alluring prospect indeed. He has the ability to control himself and his surroundings in a way I will never be able to; the relief the viewer feels when Bond's parachute opens is one I will never feel. In this way, this sequence has a physical dimension that strikes me personally. While I am aware that this sequence is a construction designed to perpetuate a British myth, its personal aspect cannot have been constructed as it applies only to me. Thus it can almost be said to be 'accidental', even if this is not quite in Barthes' sense.

We can also see how cinephilia and fandom may be merging in other quarters. Pomerance, for example, seems to approach films from the perspective of their creation. That is to say, he documents the step-by-step process certain films went through, often in extreme detail. While he shows, without doubt, both a love and a fascination with film, his writing has traits of both cinephilia and fandom. Pomerance undertakes a form of close textual analysis: for example, in chapter three of *The Horse who Drank the Sky*, he obsessively chronicles the pains to which Hitchcock went in order to procure the famous Mount Rushmore scene in *North by Northwest* (Hitchcock, 1959). The way in which Pomerance details the politics involved in achieving this shot, as well as the length to which he describes them, recall something of the 'fan-obsessive's' desire for every possible detail about a film, as well as the cinephile's fascination with the creative process.

As the slides were to be projected in the MGM studio at Culver City, behind action to be filmed along with fake rocks and angled pieces of sculpture, it was necessary that they should be adequately bright, and for this purpose the artists made use of a technique that had been devised in the 1930s by Farciot Edouart working at Paramount, namely, to make multiple copies of each slide and project them on top of one another as a way of increasing the saturation and brightness of the background image. (Pomerance 2008, 69)

Hence, on this level, there can be no distinct boundary between the two types of obsession: in cinephilia we can glimpse a fan-like obsession with peripheral and background details, and in fandom we can see an obsession with the contingent, albeit one never directly or explicitly articulated. For example, like the fan, Pomerance concerns himself with the details of production – who did what – but there is also a fascination with the history of cinema, which Keathley describes as very much a trait of cinephilia. On the other hand, an interest in the methods by which a film is produced can also be said to be a cinephiliac trait. Sperb illustrates how he researches his own cinephiliac moment, found in *Star Trek: Nemesis* (Baird 2002):

As detailed in Cinefex, the collision itself was first done with 1/45-scale models (Norton, 107), that were then in post-production "lined up and blended with the full CG versions of both ships" (108). As I learned later, the fragments themselves were both model shards and reconstituted computer-generated particles. According to associate visual effects supervisor Kelly Port, "it was really tricky because there was just so much minute debris," and the designers merged the debris from the original model crash with "additional CG debris" to the point that they were all indistinguishable (109). And, by looking at the production of that shot, one begins to sense the larger, though perhaps unheralded, significance of cinephiliac fragments to visual effects films. (Sperb 2007, 52)

Both Jenkins and Hills also note how fans often collect peripheral material, such as books that detail the process by which a film is made. Often, these books are created for the non-specialist fan; thus we can see how both fans and cinephiles can have similar interests in that they both try to peek behind the stage curtain. However, the fact that Sperb is referring specifically to a cinephiliac moment – one which he recognises as such – is relevant here. He seems to be more or less only interested in the production details of this particular moment; he seems less interested in the other parts of the film. As we will see in the next chapter, while it can be shown that fans do isolate and focus on specific moments in film, the concept of the cinephiliac moment betrays Sperb as more of a cinephile and less of a fan. He locates this moment within

a much larger narrative – that of film-making and film history – and sets about reflecting and expounding upon it. Pomerance does something similar inasmuch as he shows how techniques used in his own cinephiliac moments can be traced within the history of film-making.

However, while scholarly writing may have embraced fan-like activity, and while, as Jenkins demonstrates, fans can be scholarly, there is a space remaining in between. As touched upon in Chapter One, a third kind of discourse is emerging and must emerge. On the internet, writers such as Jason Sperb have begun to articulate a kind of viewing which seems to prioritise both the person and the experience. While what we can now call ‘traditional cinephilia’ took as its task the hunt for the love of film from the screen down, and fans seem content merely to express their love, this new type of cinephilia prioritises the personal. It asks how does this film affect me rather than how is this film designed to effect. Yet what fandom seems to lack is the willingness to engage both with film and with itself that is found in cinephilia. For example, in some of their work we can see a fascination with novelty or stunts akin to that Keathley asserts is found in ‘transitional cinephilia’, yet it lacks the ability to explain, in its own terms, why that is so. What fans produce demonstrates a love of film, but does not go beyond this demonstration. Part of the cinephile’s fascination is a fascination with cinephilia itself, an aspect that, because it has no concomitant discourse, fandom lacks. Conversely, what cinephilia lacks is an ability to demonstrate its love absolutely: it is forever trying to explain why we love film, and articulating why film intrigues us, but it can never quite achieve its goal. By displaying that adoration, yet without articulating anything around it, fandom seems to be able to do what cinephilia cannot.

What is emerging, then, is a new type of filmic love that has elements of both cinephilia and fandom, but which seems to be a hybrid of the two. Like cinephilia, it is scholarly, engaging with the text, probing it, placing it within a wider context. Yet like fandom, it has elements of dialogue and community. In Chapter One, for instance, we saw how Sperb engaged discursively with the question of critical distance; his ideas were then countered by someone writing under the name HarryTurtle. This type of writing, then, is starting to resemble more of a dialogue than a discourse. As cinephiliac writing moves onto the internet, it assimilates other modes of engagement. At the same time, as Rushton points out, cinephilia is engaging with such ideas as

absorption: going almost bodily into a film, just as Jenkins describes fans doing. Casetti, too, writes of how new dialogues are being opened up, both between the viewer and author, and viewer and other viewer. This, he states, has a profound effect inasmuch as it restructures the relationship between viewer and text. It has become more subjective, more personal, which allows for the count and counter-point dialogues that have emerged online. It would seem that, here, everyone has the ability and right to contribute to the conversation, which, in turn, renders the question of film viewing a personal one. We are absorbed as individuals. This is mirrored by the way in which, as Hudson and Zimmerman point out, cinephilia has embraced new forms of viewing, such as YouTube. In front of a computer (or hand-held device such as a smart-phone), sometimes wearing headphones, the viewer is often alone, and is therefore likely to interpret a film in a way specific to his solitary experience. Thus at one and the same time, this new type of cinephilia is both communal, inasmuch as what it produces is released to a vast audience, and highly personal. In being opened up to more people by new technologies, in a way cinephilia has become more democratised and therefore more personal. Thus, it has shifted from the general to the specific. When interacting with the internet, each user can be an individual. At the same time, this could also be said to echo the experience of going into the cinema auditorium: as Bazin described, there we sit in the dark, essentially alone while being surrounded by people. Thus in the cinema and in front of the computer one can almost perceive the same strange dualities. The difference is, at home, the fan is physically alone and can only be seen as part of a community online.

## Conclusion

This thesis set out to explore two very different types of film-viewing; two attitudes to the cinema that, at first glance, appear to have nothing in common save that they are forms of love for film. For example, one could raise questions over why it is only certain films that fans seem attracted to. One might ask why it is that fans only seem, by and large, to respond to mainstream, franchise films. Fan parodies of films such as *Bicycle Thieves*, *La Dolce Vita*, *Wings of Desire*, and so on seem rare, if they exist at all. There seems to be a predilection towards the contemporary and, to some extent, American in fan culture, in contrast to cinephilia's historical bent. One explanation for this is that, in order to retain its coherence as a community, fandom uses reference points which must constantly be updated. That is to say, fans seem to need to keep themselves relevant by producing fan art in response to recently released films. It is a culture of the moment, and to some extent fan artists are judged on their ability to stay current, competing, in a way, to be the first to respond to the most recent films. Cinephilia lacks this aspect: cinephiles seem free to comment on films irrespective of when they were created. Cinephilia is more focused upon exploration and enquiry, and so does not have the competitive aspect of fandom.

Yet, as has been shown, while they should still be considered separate discourses, fandom and cinephilia share common traits beyond the obvious. More precisely there seems to be a common ground between the two; a point where they merge to form what I have termed a third, hybrid. Casetti notes that "It is clear that cinema, in widening its definition, risks losing its specificity. At the same time as it relocates, its identity is subject to question" (Casetti 65). In broadening the definition of film, in multiplying the ways it can be consumed, we lose the innately cinematic aspect which so inspired the writers of *Cahiers*. While Casetti speculates about the demise of what he terms 'the filmic experience', and what we call cinephilia, it is clear that filmic love is repositioning itself. Casetti poses the question: "[W]hy... should we even seek to preserve film experience? Should it not be consigned to the attic, so to speak, or to a museum?" He answers:

There is perhaps one thing that is still guaranteed in the permanence of the cinematographic within a vast mediascape: this is an aesthetic dimension, in the proper sense of the term, that can pit itself against an otherwise generalized

and growing anaesthesia. Filmic experience, in fact, still presents itself as a moment which 'enlivens' our senses and nourishes sensibility. This is true, above all, of the cinematographic in its performative variant. (Casetti 2009, 65)

The metaphor of anaesthesia is, perhaps, an apt one, for it connotes the feeling of nothing towards film. For Casetti, then, filmic experience, the moment when film pricks us on a deep, emotional or personal level, is still very much alive, but now has a performative, active aspect. This might be seeking to recreate the cinematic 'aura' at home by dimming the lights and increasing the volume, or it might go further into creativity, but either way it reveals the same deep desire for film. Both fans and cinephiles seek to revere the filmic text, act upon it and enter into it. This is where the two discourses meet: both cinephiles and fans *feel* something; both act upon and engage with this feeling. Through cinephiliac reflection, and through what Jenkins calls 'textual poaching', they both open up this aesthetic dimension, combatting this anaesthesia. For both, film becomes, in a way, something tangible, permanent, and above all felt, rather than some fleeting distraction. Both discourses go beyond Deluzian models of film viewing, where the viewer is passive, and also threatens them. Perhaps, as Mary Ann Doane speculated in her reading of Krauss's notion of medium specificity, "A medium is a medium by virtue of both its positive qualities (visibility, colour, texture of paint, for instance) and its limitations, gaps, incompletions (the flatness of the canvas, the finite enclosure insured by the frame)" (Doane 2007). For Doane, the close link between sign and referent in film gives it an urgency like no other art form, an urgency which compels cinephiles to explore and inquire, and fans to create; that "which 'enlivens' our senses and nourishes [our] sensibility." (Casetti 2009, 65). Both fandom and cinephilia share this urgency or proactiveness, although only cinephilia has the capacity to reflect upon that fact. Both discourses seek to transgress the material limitations of film.

This thesis shows how cinephilia's proactiveness has led to it attempting to account for new forms of film viewing which are, by definition, unaccountable. A cinephile is a film viewer who reflects on his own activity, trying to account for his own love, unafraid to put it on display while remaining aware of and interested in that very love. Fans, like cinephiles, put their love of film on display and often seem aware of that love, but do not enquire into its nature, instead manifesting it as a performance. While

cinophilia remains a distinct discourse, at the same time, cinophilia is embracing more and more fan-like activity, due, in a way, to the realisation that it can never fully account for itself, as well as to its adaptation to new technologies. It therefore attempts to account for new more physical forms of viewing within its own scholarly terms, thus evolving into something new. The work of Francesco Casetti is perhaps a prime example.

This sort of discourse differs from those of Jenkins and Hills because it approaches the subject from an artistic rather than anthropological basis. While it is true that both writers claim to be fans, and so cannot be said to write 'from the outside', they do not focus on their own activity. They document the activity of fans academically, but this writing is not 'fannish'. Therefore it lacks the cinephiliac aspect of being both within and outside itself. Fandom does not have the self-reflexive, rhizomic aspect of cinophilia: part of cinophilia is an interest with itself. Because it has no concomitant discourse, fandom does not ask questions about itself. In Chapter One, we saw that writing as a cinephile entailed asking questions about the love of film itself, manifesting itself, for example, in debates over the attraction of early cinema Keathley discusses. Fandom has no capacity to look inwards upon itself, and thus fandom is a sociological phenomenon whereas cinophilia is a philosophical discourse. The discourse in which the two come together, however, seems to retain that rhizomic aspect of autoreflexive cinophilia, yet takes up the active, participatory, playful aspect of fandom.

We opened, in the first chapter, with an exploration of the term cinophilia as it might be used in everyday conversation. We use the word frequently to denote a love for film and nothing more: if a friend frequently goes to the cinema or is constantly talking about film, we call him a cinephile. This is sometimes a term of derision. Yet it was quickly found that this 'basic cinophilia', as we termed it, could not account for the term as it was used in academia. Here, the term is used to denote something much more precise: a type of highly sensitive viewing or looking, as well as a longing, a fetishisation, a critical re-positioning of oneself vis-à-vis film that was not pure love and yet still was. It was also an attempt to account for this love, while maintaining, at the same time and as a result of that attempt, that it was impossible to do so. In this sense, cinophilia is a discourse both self-perpetuating and impossible.

Alongside this we set out fandom with its art and community. Most dismiss fans as 'geeks', hardly worthy of study. Yet Jenkins and Hills have shed light on a fascinating subculture, which produces its own art and even has its own language. What brings fans together is a shared interest, and it is this interest which binds this community together. It, too, is a form of viewing that is something other than normal. Fans have a relationship with their chosen text that is something other than 'commonplace' or 'casual'. Like cinephiles, fans reread texts, often seeing things others miss. Yet the manner in which fans show this love is very different from cinephilia: fans are productive, they show love by expanding on the original so that, in many ways, they subvert it and use it for their own ends. Nevertheless, this subversion betrays, in the fan, a deep fascination with the original text. It was argued that, through what they produce, the same fascinations we see in cinephilia could be observed in fandom.

There are, of course, problems with this assumption. Any work of art is open to interpretation and this applies no less to art produced by fans. Thus it was necessary to try to second guess fans; to try to read into their work what they may have meant, in order to establish any common ground with cinephilia. Nevertheless, this thesis must be read in the context of that interpretation – we can never be sure of a fan's thoughts.

However, the way in which cinephiliac writing seems to be embracing new ways of viewing and showing adoration, as was shown in Chapter Four, may indicate a repositioning of cinephilia. Whereas its task was once general, it may be becoming more specific and personal. It seems, in a way, to have relocated itself. It seems to have resolved that the only way one can describe the love of film is to describe how we love it – how it makes us feel. This give rise to a need for expressivity and proactiveness. On the other hand, this could be said to have been the essence of cinephilia from its conception, only that it has now found new means of expression – it has become more physical, performative. On the internet, cinephilia no longer needs to justify itself, which frees it up to pure expression. Thus the cinephiliac discourse is becoming much more subjective; as Pomerance describes, film experience has moved beyond narrative and theory into something more discursive, expressive and, as Keathley demonstrates, anecdotal. At the same time, as cinephilia embraces new technologies as well as, perhaps, the communal aspects of fandom, the discourse

becomes much more like a dialogue. While there is still an awareness that film seeks to emotionally manipulate the viewer to some degree, through the way in which fans play with texts, we can perceive a certain self-consciousness in fandom which cinephilia also possesses. Hence, both seek to reposition the viewer as both active and unique; both seem to be types of highly involved types of engagement, and the way in which they are increasingly swapping attributes implies the generation of a third, hybrid discourse.

While it would not be correct to state that every viewpoint on film is equally valid, as both fandom and cinephilia place a value on sourced research, there is a sense that what now counts in both discourses is personal experience. As we saw in Chapter Three, the only way I could account for my love of the scene from *Star Trek* was to place it in the context of my personal life. I attempted to seek out what it is about *Star Trek* that fascinated me. I found that I could not come to any firm conclusions, but my relationship with a certain scene within *Star Trek: First Contact* was based on things deep within me: the anger and hatred I read on Picard's face brought back memories of school and anger that I felt at the death of my friends. This is surely the kind of raw emotion film is capable of inspiring which is at the core of both cinephilia and fandom.

There seems, therefore, to be a new kind of discourse emerging – one with elements of both fandom and cinephilia, and one which shares the love of film they both possess. If one can, perhaps, never fully articulate and reflect upon one's love, all that is left is to put it on display. One must enter into a text and express one's adoration without using words. At the same time, there will still be the urge, for some, to account for and reflect upon that activity, so cinephilia will always remain distinct from fandom. Cinephilia is a unique, self-reflexive discourse which enquires into almost every facet of film yet is unafraid to show its love; fandom is a type of communal passion for film which prizes creativity. The two, however, seem to be borrowing elements from each other, and a new hybrid discourse, one positing active, creative and questioning spectators, can be said to appear where the two meet.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Printed References: Books, Periodicals and Articles

Amad, Paula. 'Objects Became Witnesses: Eve Francis and the Emergence of French Cinephilia and Film Criticism.' *Frameworks*, 46.1 (2005) 56-73.

Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida*. London: Vintage Classics. 2000.

Bazin, André. *What is Cinema? Volume 1 and 2*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, & London: University of California Press. 1967.

Brecht, Bertolt & Anderson, Edith. *Theatre for Learning*. 1961.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. New York: Fontana Collins. 1936.

Bordwell, David. *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1985.

Bordwell, David. *Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1989.

Bouzereau, Laurent. *The Art of Bond; From Storyboard to Screen: the Creative Process Behind the James Bond Phenomenon*. London, Basingstoke & Oxford: Boxtree. 2006.

Burr, Vivien. 'Scholar/'Shippers and Spikeaholics: Academic and Fan Identities at the Slayage Conference on Buffy the Vampire Slayer.' *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8.3 (2005) 375-383.

Casetti, Francesco. 'Filmic Experience.' *Screen*, 50.1 (2009) 56-66.

Coates, Paul. 'Le Mépris: Women, Statues, Gods.' *Film Criticism*, 22.3 (1998).

De Valck, Marijke. & Hagener, Malte. *Cinephilia: Movies, Love and Memory (Film Culture in Transition)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 2005.

Doane, Mary Ann. 'Indexicality: Trace and Sign: Introduction'. *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 18,1 (2007): 1-6.

Dudley, Andrew. 'The Godfather; Critic and 'Cahiers du Cinema' Founder Andre Bazin, Still With us After Fifty Years.' *Film Comment*, 44.6 (2008) 38-40&42.

Durgnat, Raymond. *Durgnat on Film*. London: Faber and Faber Limited. 1976.

Elsaesser, Thomas and Hagener, Malte. *Film Theory: An Introduction Through the Senses*. New York, USA: Routledge. 2010.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in this Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press. 1980.

Harris, Oliver. 'Film Noir Fascination: Outside History, but Historically So.' *Cinema Journal*, 43.1 (2003) 3-24.

Hillier, Jim. *Cahiers du Cinema volume 1: The 1950s; Neo-Realism, Hollywood, New Wave*. London, Melbourne, & Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1985.

Hills, Matt. *Fan Cultures*. London, USA, & Canada: Routledge. 2002.

Hudson, Dale and Zimmermann, Patricia R. 'Cinephilia, Technophilia and Collaborative Remix Zones.' *Screen*, 50.1 (2009) 135-146.

Jenkins, Henry. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*. New York & London: Routledge. 1992.

Jenkins, Henry. *Fans, Bloggers, and Gamers: Exploring Participatory Culture*. New York & London: New York University Press. 2006.

Keathley, Christian. *Cinephilia and History, or the Wind in the Trees*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. 2006.

Kim, J.-H. 'The Post-medium Condition and the Explosion of Cinema.' *Screen*, 50.1 (2009) 114-123.

Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: a selection*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge Classics. 1977.

Linder, Christoph (Editor). *The James Bond Phenomenon A Critical Reader*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press. 2011.

Melville, Hermann. *Moby-dick, or, The Whale*. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1851.

Mulvey, Laura. 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema.' *Screen*, 16.3: (1973) 6–18.

Pomerance, Murray. *The Horse Who Drank the Sky; Film Experience Beyond Narrative and Theory*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, & London: Rutgers University Press. 2008.

Rushton, Richard. 'Deleuzian Spectatorship.' *Screen*, 50.1, (2009) 45-53.

Smelik, Anneke, M. *And the Mirror Cracked: Feminist Cinema and Film Theory*. St. Martin's Press, New York. 1998.

Sperb Jason. 'Sensing an Intellectual Nemesis.' *Film Criticism*, 32.1 (2007).

Truffaut, François. 'A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema.' *Cahiers du Cinema* (1954).

Truffaut, François. 'The Rogues are Weary.' *Cahiers du Cinema*, 34 (1954).

Wall Hinds, Elizabeth Jane. 'The Wrath of Ahab; or, Herman Melville Meets Gene Roddenberry.' *Journal of American and Comparative Cultures*, 20.1 (1997) 43-46.

### **Online**

Anonymous (no date) 'Lord of the Rings Swords.'

([http://www.tolkientown.com/ttc/Lord-of-the-Rings-Swords/cPath/119\\_120.html](http://www.tolkientown.com/ttc/Lord-of-the-Rings-Swords/cPath/119_120.html))

(Last accessed 5 June 2009)

Anonymous (2002) 'Vulcan Undiplomatic Corp.'

(<http://www.rapplean.net/batleth/team.html>) (Last accessed 5 June 2009)

ArtieTSMITW (no date) 'Brandon Hardesty's Youtube Channel.'

(<http://www.youtube.com/user/artietsmitw?blend=1&ob=4>) (Last accessed 1 July

2013)

ArtieTSMITW (19 March 2006). 'Reenactment #5: Star Trek: First Contact.'

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=639wmgLAnKY&feature=fvw>) (Last accessed 5

June 2009)

breaker909, comment on 'Reenactment 5, Star Trek First Contact'

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=639wmgLAnKY>) (Last accessed 1 July 2013)

Butsekpzpirate, comment on 'Reenactment 5, Star Trek First Contact'

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=639wmgLAnKY>) (Last accessed 1 July 2013)

Cornellia Remi (1 July 2005). 'The Art of Unfinishing: HP Fanfiction and the Power of Storytelling' (<http://www.hp-lexicon.org/essays/essay-storytelling.html>) (Last accessed 3 April 2012)

Papamichael, Christine. 'Harry Potter and the Curse of Disability'

([http://www.bbc.co.uk/ouch/features/harry\\_potter\\_and\\_the\\_curse\\_of\\_disability.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/ouch/features/harry_potter_and_the_curse_of_disability.shtml))

(Last accessed 15 June 2013)

Flutterbev. 'Meta: The Rules of Fandom (Part 1)'

(<http://flutterbev.livejournal.com/618190.html>) (Last accessed 15 June 2013)

Goodsell, Matthew. 'Woohoo, found THE clip'

([http://www.matthewgoodsell.co.uk/entry.php?entry\\_id=557](http://www.matthewgoodsell.co.uk/entry.php?entry_id=557)) (Last accessed 30 June 2013)

Lynch, comment on 'Reenactment 5, Star Trek First Contact'

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=639wmgLAnKY>) (Last accessed 1 July 2013)

Miscellaneous. 'Who's your daddy and what does he do?'

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LTvUFTMgBpc>) (Last accessed 9 July 2013)

Parkinson, Justin (4 March 2004) 'Do you speak Elf?'

(<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/3532003.stm>) (Last accessed 5 June 2009)

Quitchy, comment on 'Reenactment 5, Star Trek First Contact'

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=639wmgLAnKY>) (Last accessed 1 July 2013)

Remi, Cornelia. The Art of Unfinishing: HP Fanfiction and the Power of Storytelling

(<http://www.hp-lexicon.org/essays/essay-storytelling.html>) (Last accessed 9 July 2013)

Sperb, Jason. 'How does a scholar write as a cinephile' (<http://dr-mabuses-kaleidoscope.blogspot.co.uk/2007/03/scholars-cannot-write-as-cinephiles-but.html>)

(Last accessed 5 June 2009)

Wheaton, Will. 'Fandom's about not being alone anymore'

(<http://wilwheaton.typepad.com/wwdnbackup/2008/12/fandoms-about-n.html>) (Last accessed 15 June 2013)

## **Films**

*À Bout De Souffle* Directed by Jean-Luc Godard Les Films Impéria 1960 DVD

*Jurassic Park* Directed by Steven Spielberg Universal Pictures 1993 DVD

*Le Mépris (Contempt)* Directed by Jean-Luc Godard Compagnia Cinematografica  
Champion\_1963\_DVD

*Lord of the Rings the Fellowship of the Rings* Directed by Peter Jackson New Line  
Cinema 2001 DVD

*Pierrot le Fou* Directed by Jean-Luc Godard Compagnia Cinematografica Champion  
1965 DVD

*North by Northwest* Directed by Alfred Hitchcock\_Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM)  
DVD 1959 DVD

*Spy Who Loved Me, The* Directed by Lewis Gilbert Danjaq 1977 DVD

*Star Trek: First Contact* Directed by\_Jonathan Frakes\_Paramount Pictures 1996 DVD

*Star Trek: Generations* Directed by David Carson Paramount Pictures 1994 DVD

*Star Trek: Nemesis* Directed by Stuart Baird Paramount Pictures 2002 DVD

*Star Wars Episode IV: A New Hope* Directed by George Lucas Lucasfilm 1977 DVD

## **Television Programmes**

*“Never Say Alan Again.” I’m Alan Partridge.* (1997-2002) Directed by Armando  
Iannucci TalkBack Productions, Episode aired 12 February 2002 DVD

## Footnotes

---

<sup>1</sup>ISSN: 20466692

<sup>2</sup>“fan2 abbr. of FANATIC. An early isolated use (phan, fann) is recorded from late XVII; the present use dates from late XIX and is orig. U.S.” T. F. Hoad (1993) ‘The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology.’

<sup>3</sup>“Noun fen pl. (singular: fan)

A plural form of fan used by enthusiasts of science fiction, fantasy, and anime, partly from whimsy and partly to distinguish themselves from fans of sport, etc.” Anonymous. (No date) ‘Cinephilia.’ (<http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/cinephilia>)

<sup>4</sup>My use of Papamichael here, as opposed to quoting Jenkins directly, is a deliberate one, as her short article is about fans writing characters with disabilities into the Harry Potter texts.

<sup>5</sup>“The bat'leth, or "sword of honour", is a traditional Klingon blade weapon. Resembling a crescent-shaped, two-ended scimitar, the bat'leth is wielded using three handholds along the outside edge of the blade. It is widely considered the most popular weapon among Klingon warriors.” Anonymous. (No date) ‘Bat’leth’ ([http://memory-alpha.org/en/wiki/Bat’leth](http://memory-alpha.org/en/wiki/Bat'leth))

<sup>6</sup>The term Squee can be used to illustrate this point well: “Squee - A noise primarily made by an over-excited fangirl, however it has spread rapidly and is now widely spread among the web community. Omg!! New Harry Potter book out!! Omg Squee squee! Omg!!!” Anonymous. (No date) ‘Squee.’ (<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=squee>)

<sup>7</sup>Patrick Stewart, of course, was originally a Shakespearian actor with the RSC.