

this way that we enter the field of “Cinephilosophy” and we meet Stanley Cavell, who had a broader and fundamental role in regaining the transcendentalist heritage, and who largely (although not exclusively) based his interpretation of films on transcendentalist philosophy.

Stanley Cavell (especially for his well-known book about the “comedy of remarriage,” *Pursuits of Happiness*, 1981) and poetics (for its traditional attention to the issue of genre) also meet each other in what Cerisuelo defines as the “seconde comédie américaine,” which has Preston Sturges as its leading figure and which particularly interests the author due to its “post-classical” features.

As a matter of fact, Stanley Cavell can be regarded as the true core of the book – the center (the two sections “La philosophie et le cinématographe” and “Stanley Cavell, un philosophe au cinéma”) of the central part (“Cinephilosophie”). It is in this part that we clearly understand that the relationships between cinema and philosophy do not consist of a process by which cinema would illustrate or provide examples of philosophical concepts – this is actually the worst way to conceive these relationships.

In opposition to this perspective, Cerisuelo’s proposal is in tune with Francesco Casetti’s idea (*The Eye of the Century*, 2008) of considering cinema as a form of thought and a place where philosophical investigation can be developed;

and indeed, it is not by chance that both Cerisuelo and Casetti refer to Gilles Deleuze (to whom Cerisuelo devotes the section “Deleuze et la comédie: petite forme et grande santé”) and, of course, Stanley Cavell.

Cavell’s “philosophical criticism” remains the focus of Cerisuelo’s research, perhaps one of the best examples of “cinephilosophy” and, I would add, a “forerunner” of the “expanded poetics.” As Cerisuelo writes (pp. 196-197), “plutôt que de considérer la philosophie comme une activité qui consisterait dans la ‘création’ de concepts et dont le cinéma montrerait en quelque façon le théâtre des opérations, Cavell semble procéder à rebours en préférant un geste plus rigoureux qui aboutit à un gain en terme de liberté. Assez proche en cela de la critique, Cavell organise une interprétation centrifuge qui part du film, toujours minutieusement résumé, et propose une ‘lecture,’ certes autonome du film en question mais rejoignant inévitablement des questions qui le dépassent et aussi [...] que le cinéma contribue à régler (ultime tour d’écrou wittgensteinien).”

In this perspective both cinema and poetics, besides being (although on different levels) “arts of relations,” are definitely aimed at becoming (p. 197) “un laboratoire inappréciable pour l’étude de notre relation au monde.”

[Valentina Re,
Università Ca’ Foscari, Venezia]

Gertrud Koch, Volker Pantenburg,
Simon Rothöhler (eds.),
Screen Dynamics.
Mapping the Borders of Cinema,
Österreichisches Filmmuseum/Synema
Publikationen, Vienna 2012, pp. 184

in previous years with the arrival of the digital age. The launch of the iPad marks a decisive step in the delocalisation of audio visual contents and the relocation of the viewing experiences, especially in terms of cinema.

Screen Dynamics collects together essays from a conference called “Cinema without Walls,” held towards the beginning of 2010. It is a valuable document on the way film and media studies approach the issue of cinema’s

future and the forms that it assumes in the digital environment. The text includes a plurality of perspectives that, on the one hand, demonstrate the vivacity of the debate (and therefore also the urgency of finding a solution to the issue of cinema and the digitalisation process) and, on the other, they provide a chance for a meta-disciplinary reflection on the reorganisation process of film studies.

The text provides an important opportunity to reorganise and revive the debate. Reading the essays collected in *Screen Dynamics*, we can identify three aspects that outline a new possible architecture of film and media studies.

The first aspect deals directly with the research policies. In particular the essays by Gertrud Koch and Vinzenz Hediger examine a change in film studies and a progressive shifting of the reflection on cinema from 'what it is' (revealed as aporetic well before the start of the digitalisation process) to 'where it is' – and, according to Koch, also 'when' and 'how' cinema is. Especially the issue of place and space becomes crucial: film studies are called upon to account for the plurality of cinema locations (intended as places where cinema is experienced, as well as places of production – the impulse originating in postcolonial studies), but also, and more radically, to account for the configuration that the cinema experience space assumes and of the network of relations that come into being between film, spectator, platform and the social and cultural environment. In this sense the reformulation of the question at the heart of film studies assumes a strategic importance: it imparts an inductive progression to the reflection, breaking the impasse of the speculative and ontological approaches, and encourages an understanding (and therefore appreciation) of the multiple situations and contexts that cinema is relocating in and reinventing itself, demonstrating the persistent (social, cultural and aesthetic) prominence of the cinematic experience.

The second aspect that emerges from *Screen Dynamics* is the naturalization of the change. The digital age has not distorted cinema's identity; rather it has rendered the plurality (or better still the mobility) of its forms patent and irrefutable. The experimentation and contamination with art (Volker Pantenburg), the phenomena of metalepsis (Thomas Morsh) and the interaction (Victor Burgin), are all aspects that could already be found in cinema; they have merely been intensified in the digital environment. Expanded cinema represents a stage of cinema's evolutionary process and the changing forms that it presents itself in are the epiphenomenon of the mobile nature of the medium. Similarly to theories on spectatorship – Patenburg recalls – the comparison with the empirics and the acknowledgement of the complexity and variability of historical data allow us to grasp, in the exuberance of cinema's current forms, the full expression of its nature and, I would add, proof of its versatility and capacity to communicate with the present.

A final aspect emerges from the essays collected in *Screen Dynamics*, which we can sum up as cinema's resilience, in other words its capacity to maintain its distinctive traits. The theme of resilience emerges in different contexts in relation to different aspects. Tom Gunning, for example, examines the issue of cinema's indexicality (with its speculative criticality), highlighting the capacity of digital technologies of strengthening the 'impression of reality', confirming a 'classic' aspect of the medium. Or, in terms of the way cinema is viewed, the phenomena of new cinephiles, however renewed and often different from the past, reveal continuity between a contemporary cinematic experience and its previous forms (Jonathan Rosenbaum). Or Miriam Hansen's proposal of leaving the task of rethinking cinema to the new generations and avoiding the pessimistic visions of the effects of digitalisation, implies

the idea of a persistence of the cinematic experience as something that lies deep in the culture and collective memory (not least, as Raymond Bellour's essay reveals, as nostalgia), which is merely waiting to be acknowledged.

The essays collected in *Screen dynamics*, for their diversity in approach and perspective, share the conviction that cinema is anything but dead, but rather livelier than ever.

Film studies are perhaps in not such a healthy state, often stuck on rear guard positions and with a categorial and speculative apparatus that finds it difficult to account for any changes. *Screen dynamics* seems to me like an excellent survival manual: may those who read it, apply it.

[Mariagrazia Fanchi,
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milano]