

Gilles Deleuze

Seminar on Cinema: The Movement-Image

Lecture 16, 27 April 1982

Transcribed by Catherine Chrétien-Maffre; Revised by Emmanuel Péhau (Part 1, 52:39; part 2, missing); additional revisions to the transcription and time stamp, Charles J. Stivale

Translation: Graeme Thomson & Silvia Maglioni

Part 1

... I have better news regarding the health of François Châtelet¹, they've now been able to unplug him a little from his machine, from his respiratory machine, so the situation has slightly improved...

So we continue with our aim of finishing, of finishing up with the action-image. And then, you remember, you'll certainly remember the point we had got to. We have our two forms of action-image: one which corresponded to the formula S-A-S': situation-action-modified situation – modified or else restored or worsened, and so on. To summarize it again, it is a movement from situation to duel. I won't explain these terms anymore, since we've already dwelt on them for a long time. The other form of action-image is of the type A-S-A': action-situation-action. This time, we move from the index to the situation. This second form of the action-image implies that all that we know about the situation will derive from what is suggested by the action. So, that corresponds well to the formula A-S-A or A-S-A'.

And I was saying, well, regarding the first type, let's call it the large form, or we could call it spiral – I've tried to explain why it would be a spiral – or else we could call it ethical. Here I just want to clarify this point: why "ethical"? I said it last time. Because, taking the word "ethos" in its etymological sense, the ethos is both the stay or the place of stay and the "way of being", the behavior, the habitus. So the formula S-A-S is indeed a formula that we can call "ethics" in the double sense of "ethos": a situation in which one stays, and the habitus-action. But I want to insist on this point. If I use the word "ethics" here, it's because I must really have need of such a word, even though another term might seem more convenient. This other term that seems more convenient and that is often used in relation to cinema is "epic", and for example, we are often told that the Western has evolved from being epic to tragic, to romantic. Okay. So if I prefer a word other than "epic", it's perhaps because, for reasons we have not yet seen, "epic" does not constitute a sufficient or satisfactory concept for our purposes.

So I would say for the moment that the formula S-A-S designates the large form of the action-image, or the spiral form or the ethical form, and we have in fact seen that this form would culminate finally in what we could call the American ethos, that of the classic American film. I can therefore say that the A-S-A' formula is the small form and that it is elliptical, and here I want to remind you of the two meanings of the word ellipse²: geometric figure with two centers – so it is clearly distinguished or clearly opposed to the spiral of the large form – a geometric figure with two centers, but also a rhetorical figure which indicates something missing... a gap in the narrative. And you see why there's a gap in the narrative: the two centers in my formula are A, A'. For A-S-A' the two centers are A and A' and the

objective gap – so here I already have an elliptical form in the geometrical sense, but it's also an elliptical form in the rhetorical sense, this time through reference to the S between the two As, since, by its very nature, the situation can be unveiled only insofar as the action is... insofar as the action discloses it... [*Interruption of the recording*] [6:05]

... elliptical, what will this be? We need a concept. And immediately I say to myself: it is not by chance that, in terms of the genre distinctions I made when I spoke about the historical film – very rapidly – the great historical epic would indeed be the spiral form or the large form. But what the Germans call "the costume film" – the costume film à la Lubitsch, in his so-called historical films³ – the costume film, that would be the small form, which is of the A-S-A' type. And I had tried to make... The film... for example, the crime film, that's the S-A-S form. But the detective film would necessarily be the A-S-A' form. Why? Because, in the detective film, by definition, we go from the index to the situation, and all that we know about the situation is what we are given to know by the index or indices.

Well, but I had the impression that in my distribution of genres, the small form always refers to something that, from the point of view of a general theory of genres, could be called comedy, and by comedy I don't necessarily mean to say "comic", although the question immediately arises for us: isn't comedy fundamentally the small form A-S-A', particularly in its most radical cinematographic guise, that is to say, the burlesque? We will have to ask ourselves this quite rapidly, because today, we have to go fast... Maybe, maybe...

But I would say that we need a concept that goes beyond comedy, to indicate a type of comedy that can be dramatic, in costume, historical. That's why, if we want to look for a concept – even if I'm not too fond of it and would have preferred a better word – we'll use the notion of the "comedic"⁴. And we'll say that the small form – not to confuse it with the comic, which is only one case of the comedic – we'll say that the small form, A-S-A, is elliptical in the double sense of the ellipse/ellipsis. It is comedic. But that doesn't help us much. And yet the task we have now is... This is just terminology. Well, I like terminology, but... but it's a matter of giving a concrete character to the difference between these two forms of the action-image, large form and small form, as we have just named them using several terms.

Now, to try to make this clear, we are in the same situation. I say to myself: how can we try to make it clear? Well, the more we forget from time to time what we are talking about, the better. The light, by definition the light we can shed on a subject will always come from elsewhere. Even if sometimes we don't realise it... it always comes from somewhere else. So I say to myself: let's try and look for it. What orders of information would permit us to advance in a comparative analysis of the two forms? You see, so far, I've... What I did on all the previous occasions was to make an analysis of the large form, and then last time I began an analysis of the small form. But what I need to do today is really to carry out a kind of comparative analysis of the two forms so as to bring out their differences at a deeper level than that of simple terminology.

And I say to myself: well, I would like to use three kinds of givens, and in philosophy, I believe that as in science, there are things that have been done in this regard. And when something has been done well, we should use it. So, I would like to analyze three kinds of givens – we can forget about cinema for the moment – an epistemological given, an aesthetic given, and a mathematical given. So allow yourself to be guided, as though with full confidence, I mean, don't even ask yourself how this applies, and then maybe it will

immediately become apparent how it applies to our research on the different forms of action-image there are in cinema.

So, my first type of research would be epistemological. And here I'm referring to an essay by Georges Canguilhem⁵, in a collection of essays entitled *Knowledge of Life*⁶, and the article in question deals with the notion of 'milieu', which if you remember is a notion that for our part we had already encountered at the level of the action-image. Now, Canguilhem makes a historical analysis of the concept of milieu in the sciences, and what he tells us is roughly this: 'milieu' has had two meanings, two apparently quite different meanings. And the question is: can we pass from one to the other?

First meaning of the word 'milieu', when the word first appears, when the word appears in a usage that will later become very familiar – in fact it happens quite late. When we talk about a milieu or the milieu, with whom does this make its appearance? It appears with the Encyclopedists. The *Encyclopédie*⁷ of the 18th century, devoted an article to 'milieu' emphasizing how it was a new notion for the time. And it is a notion of pure mechanics. And it derives from whom? – even though the person in question did not himself use the word 'milieu' – it derives... and those who introduced the word 'milieu' in this first sense would claim it came directly from him – it derives from Newton.

And what does it signify? It signifies what Newton was to call a fluid, a fluid. But what is a fluid for Newton? It is the vehicle of *an action at a distance*. It is the vehicle of an action at a distance. For example, the attraction between two bodies – you recognize one of Newton's famous ideas – the attraction between two bodies. Well, here the milieu is the intermediary. You see why it is called milieu: because it is in the middle (*au milieu*). It is the intermediary between two bodies, between two centers. And it is the path taken by the action of one body on the other or of the interaction of the two bodies. Where there is no action at a distance, there is no milieu. So is it so surprising that we have to wait until the 18th century and Newton? No, it is not surprising, we understand exactly why the notion, or the beginning of a notion, of milieu is formed then.

Take Descartes: if you consider Cartesianism, the only action is that of contact. In a physics where action is contact, there is no place for the concept of the milieu. The concept of milieu emerges from the moment when two bodies exert upon each other an action at a distance, in such a way that the milieu will designate the vehicle of this action at a distance. For example, the ether. This will be a fluid, a fluid in which the two bodies are immersed and without which they could not exert an action at a distance upon each other. Understand, what I am saying here... will help us a great deal. Here I have no need to distort the text to be able to say that we are already fully within an elliptical form. The milieu is precisely the line that unites the two centers. And it is in this sense that the whole of the 18th century will employ the word 'milieu'.

What's more, action of contact, through what from a mechanical point of view will be a very important revolution, the action of contact, you understand, will be grasped as a particular case of action at a distance. Indeed, two bodies in contact will be considered as two bodies between which there is an infinitely small distance. That is to say, the action of contact will itself be... once Newton posits the theory of actions at a distance, the action of contact will be treated as a particular case of action at a distance. In what form? In the form of a differential or differential rapport, the differential rapport of the two bodies in contact. In other words,

between two bodies in contact, there is a distance, therefore there is a milieu, but one that consists in an infinitely small distance. Okay.

At the end of the 18th century, a very new concept appears. The first person to propose it is the biologist, or rather the naturalist, Jean-Baptiste Lamarck⁸. He refers to it in the following way, as 'ambient circumstances' or 'influential circumstances'. And this time, the notion designates, this notion will very quickly be given the name – specifically by Auguste Comte⁹, in the nineteenth century – it will be called 'milieu'. And here, it is no longer... it is no longer a mechanical notion – it's very important to trace the history of a notion from this point of view – it is no longer in any way a mechanical notion, it has become a bio-anthropological notion, namely, the entirety of the ambient circumstances exerted on a living being considered as a center.

You see, it is no longer the milieu that is in the middle – in a sense, the word has lost its *raison d'être* – it is no longer the milieu that is in the middle. On the contrary, *it is the living being that is in a milieu*. The milieu now refers to the set of ambient circumstances that are exerted on a living being. This is completely different from the Newtonian sense which was: "vehicle of action at a distance between two bodies". Here it is an image. On the one hand, it is an image... in the simplest sense it is a spherical image: the entirety of the ambient circumstances, given that the milieu exerts its action on the living being – and Auguste Comte in his course on positive philosophy will develop this whole conception, which at the time was extremely new, of the relations of the living being to its milieu. But it is equally true that the living being reacts to the milieu, that is to say that we are fully... this sphere, meaning the sphere of the milieu, if you take into account the centripetal movement – action on the living being at the center – and the centrifugal movement – reaction of the living being upon the milieu – which multiplies with man, since man, as he receives the influence of the milieu, constructs an artificial milieu... what we have here is precisely the emergence of the S-A-S' form. Do you follow me?

And yet I would say that the first form is in fact an absolutely spiral form. There is a spiral of the milieu, insofar as it acts on the living being at the same time as the living being reacts upon it. I would thus say that the milieu in the anthropo-biological or rather bio-anthropological sense delineates exactly what we called the large form of the action-image, whereas the mechanical milieu in the Newtonian sense, which is by nature elliptical, borrowing the shape of an ellipse, which is equally valid for distant bodies and bodies in contact – and I insist on this because I will need it later – well, it is the A-S-A' form, where this time A and A' designate the two distant bodies, and S, the milieu, the vehicle of the action of one body upon the other. Is that clear? Do you follow me? So, I would say let's put that aside for the moment as a first component for our analysis.

Second component, which at first sight has nothing to do with this. And indeed, we have to keep – above all, we mustn't mix them up – but I will say, second component, this one completely different, an aesthetic component this time. And after all, after all, those who have read a bit of Eisenstein will know how he loved making comparisons between cinema and Chinese painting. He devotes some very interesting pages to this. Why did he like it so much? Because Chinese painting took the form of a 'scroll', and in the unrolling of this scroll, he saw a prefiguration of the unrolling of cinema, a kind of pre-cinematographic unrolling¹⁰. But, for my part, it is from a completely different point of view that I want to make this connection with Chinese painting. Because... in this respect, many specialists in Chinese painting have written some very fine things – and here I borrow some pages from Maldiney¹¹.

And Maldiney invokes a treatise on painting from the sixth century, by Sie Ho. I don't know how to pronounce it... S-I-E, and then H-O.

And this treatise, which will become a classic, this treatise on Chinese painting in the 6th century, proposes two principles, two principles of painting. And the first is: the painter must reflect, must express *the breath of life*. And what is the breath of life? The breath of life is what unites all things. It is what the Greeks would call universal sympathy. It is what unites all things from within. It is breath. It is a kind of universal respiration, with systole and diastole, with contraction and expansion, which embraces all things and expands all things, and in which all things bask. And it is in this element of the breath of life, of the great systole-diastole respiration, that all things and all beings appear. The breath of life is like the background from which all things arise as they manifest themselves, as they appear. And if the painter does not know how to convey something of the breath of life in his painting, he won't be a good painter. Okay.

But the second principle is, I would say, a kind of space of propagation. It is a space that is diffused through things and beings. I would also say that all things and beings are part of this breath of life. They are in the middle of this breath of life. I don't need to add any more other than to say that this is the form, this is the large form. It is the large form of S-A-S: the contracting of breath – all living beings contracted – the expanding of breath. Things have to breathe, in a cosmic breathing. Wonderful. But it's not enough.

And the second principle of the treatise on painting is: the painter must not only collect and express the breath of life in its spiral movement, but he must also seek out the skeleton. He must seek out the skeleton, and what would the skeleton be in this case? It is the articulation. It is the – or rather a – *line of the universe*, a fiber of the universe, a fiber of the universe that connects two separate beings or several separate beings. A fish and the water's edge, or a stone. Between a fish and a stone in the water's depths passes a line of the universe. If you don't have the skeleton, if you don't know how to draw the lines of the universe, the fibers of the universe, you don't know how to paint. What does this mean? The right line. The right line that connects or that will – connect is already too much, the idea of connecting belongs perhaps to the breath of life, but let's use the word provisionally – the line that goes from the fish to the stone. The pike, for example, in order to attack conceals itself among the reeds, there is a pike-reed line of the universe. Find the right line, remembering that the right line is not a straight line. And yet it is the purest line. The straight line is not the pure line, it is an abstract line. The line of the universe is never straight, but it is always pure. So, this time, the skeleton is not at all a skeleton. It is no less alive than the breath of life. It is the line of the universe that unites separate beings.

So that what issues from this point of view, from the point of view of the skeleton, from the point of view of this second principle of painting is no longer the coming together of everything in a Whole. So, what is it? It is almost the opposite. It is the separation of all into events – each of which is autonomous and decisive. The line of the universe is what goes from one autonomous and decisive event to another autonomous and decisive event. And painting must trace the lines of the universe, that is, it must go from autonomous decisive event to another autonomous decisive event. Seize the fish as an autonomous decisive event, the stone in the depths of the water as an autonomous decisive event, the reeds along the riverbank as an autonomous decisive event, and draw the line of universe.

And as I said earlier, in the breath of life that brings all things together as one, in this breath, of life what is going on? It is the mode in which things appear. But when the Chinese painter draws the lines of the universe and no longer the great breath of life, what counts – and this is in no way a contradiction since the two principles are linked – what counts is not so much the mode of appearance of things but something equally important, or no less important, but which can only result from the second point of view, namely: *the mode of their disappearance*. And things appear only in their disappearing, exactly the way a hill becomes visible only when evening falls, or when it is covered by mist, or in the way the pike reveals itself only in hiding among the reeds to which it communicates no more than a kind of tremor, an agitation of the reeds that is nothing other than the line of universe uniting the reeds with the pike and the pike with the reeds. *It is therefore in their disappearance that things will show themselves*, according to this second point of view. It is no longer a space of propagation, like that of the breath of life, or the space of respiration. It is a vector-space. The skeleton is the vector. It is the line of the universe.

So there you have it. I don't even have to comment to say that I can call S-A-S, the large form, the first principle of the breath of life, of respiration, of cosmic respiration, while I would call A-S-A', the small form, the search for the skeleton or the line of the universe. And what do A and A' designate this time? They designate things or beings conceived as events, each of which is autonomous and decisive. A and A': each is an autonomous and decisive event. S is only significant in relation to them and manifests itself only in relation to them, since the line of the universe is always relative to certain beings or events. It is the line that goes from one to the other, the purest line that goes from one to the other, such that the hand must be able to draw it without trembling, even if at some point it must be pierced. It will be a perfectly elliptical shape, in the sense of both ellipse and ellipsis... Yes? So this works very well. I mean, it's our second component.

Third component: we find this in mathematics. What I am going to say here does not presuppose any specific mathematical knowledge, which in any case I do not have. Those of you who are interested – since it is very interesting – can consult one of the few rare great books on the philosophy of mathematics published in France, namely Albert Lautman's *Essay on the Notions of Structure and Existence in Mathematics*¹² which was originally published by Hermann but which has been reprinted by 10/18 Editions... Is there one 'n' or two 'ns'? One 'n', I think. Albert Lautman: L-A-U-T-M-A-N, yes, I think so. And there is a chapter in this book which I think is quite wonderful, called "The Local and the Global", which shows that in all the different phases of modern mathematics, we have two approaches that are sometimes opposed and sometimes combined – there is no absolute opposition – sometimes they are opposed, sometimes they are combined – a local approach and a global approach. And this is the case, for example, for the theory of analytic functions, but it's also true for many aspects of geometry and of geometric space. And these two approaches – local and global – dominate, and this is not only true for modern mathematics, though it's a very important aspect of modern mathematical methods, but I'm sure it wouldn't be difficult to find an equivalent in ancient mathematics... Okay.

So, what are these two approaches? Well, in the global – and here I'll keep to some notions which are not at all mathematical, which is why I refer you to Lautman's text, for those of you who are interested – well, the global method consists, if you will, in characterizing a function for the whole of a domain. A function would be characterized for the whole of a domain. What does this mean? It means that the global method seeks above all to define a totality, a totality independent of the elements that compose it. What it's really tackling is a

structure of the set. And how does it do this, particularly at the level of an analytic function that involves singularities, that involves singular points? Well, it's a method that will be able to assign a place and a function to any given element. Good. But under what conditions? Even before knowing the nature of these elements, according to the structure of the set we will be able to assign them a univocal place and function – and I insist on this idea of the univocal – that we will be able to assign a univocal place and function to elements whose nature is as yet unknown. So that the function will be, as we said, appropriate to the whole domain.

Contrariwise, how does the so-called local method proceed? The local method no longer deals with the structure of the set – which it cannot provide – but with an element of mathematical reality, an element of the set, even if it is infinitesimal. Here we again encounter the notion of the infinitesimal which I will need in a moment, so I insist... The local concerns the most infinitesimal element of mathematical reality, and moves step by step. It moves step by step until it reaches another element. You will say to me, this is not difficult: it is like saying that the local method moves from part to part, while the global method moves from the set to a given part. Well, no, that's clearly not the way it is. I insist on this: *there is no less totality in the local than in the global*; it is simply that the totality is not conceived in the same way. I mean, we move step by step from the infinitesimal element in order to reach another element. Good.

But between the two elements, there will be a system of relations that is literally polyvocal and polyvalent. And it is this system of polyvalent, polyvocal relations between two elements that will allow us to determine the corresponding totality. And how do we do this? Well, there is no need to go into mathematical detail here. For example, a function will be defined in the neighborhood of a point. A function will be defined in the neighborhood of a point. You take this point as the center of a circle, and inside this circle, you take a new point corresponding to the function – it has to be inside, otherwise the local method won't work – and this point you take inside the circle, which is a circle of convergence, you take a point inside the circle, which you treat in turn as the center of a new circle. You therefore obtain sequences of convergent series, which amounts to saying what? That you have made a succession of local operations, and you have constructed your space in the course of this succession of local operations, step by step.

And this polyvocal relation between two elements occurs every time. You see how these elements are now defined: they are each defined as the center of a circle, but with the second element being taken within the first circle, so you actually expand and extend your space step by step. This will typically be an amorphous space, a space of connection, a space of connection though not at all a space devoid of totality. The totality will be given through the system of relations between elements. Here we have a completely different conception of totality. And as you take your circles and, on each occasion, a point inside the previous circle which will become the center of a new circle, you in fact squash your circles so you end up with a properly elliptical shape.

This method, in particular the step-by-step construction of space, is a method made famous by a great mathematician called Riemann¹³, and a Riemannian space, in this sense, presents itself precisely as a space of connection, that is to say, a space of juxtaposition of amorphous parts, each of which – and I have no need to force the issue to be able to say each – each of which is treated as an autonomous decisive event. I would say that the global method in mathematics is the S-A-S, and the local method is the A-S-A. Okay.¹⁴

So now, I can finally reassemble everything – it doesn't matter whether it be a question of aesthetics, mathematics and so on, since we're no longer dealing with these – and we can now fully return to cinema, that is to say, it's really a question of the two forms, meaning the two forms of the action-image. Whether this action consists in constructing a mathematical space, making a painting – a Chinese painting – or in making a movie is of no importance to us. We hang on to our two forms. Because these examples have at least served me in justifying these different terms – spiral, elliptical – and it seems to me they give us a more concrete idea of the confrontation between the two types of action-image.

With all kinds of presentiments – now I want to move on quickly, very quickly... It's... It's quite simple, extremely simple I would say, from the point of view of... well, let's imagine some kind of practical exercise through film commentaries, eh? Okay. I can say the first case would be those directors authors who liked to go from one form to the other, as if it was a rhythm for them: a large-form film followed by a small-form film. There are many great directors for whom we couldn't even say they had a preference. Whose work consisted in alternating between large and small-form films. And you see, incidentally, that what I call small-form can easily include wide-screen pictures. It's obvious. Okay.

In principle, it is cheaper than the large form, as I have said many times, but it can be just as expensive. If you like... okay. I would say regarding these directors... I can think of two cases: Hawks, he likes doing this, it's almost as if it's a form of repose for him... He makes a large-form film, then follows it with a small-form film. Well, to take two neighboring points of Hawks' work, you have *Scarface* which is a typical large-form film of the S-A-S type, as well as a milieu film in the sense of it being a crime film. Whereas the *The Big Sleep*¹⁵ would be a classic small-form film, with ellipses, with ellipses playing an important role. It's an exemplary film from the point of view of ellipses.

Lang will be even more interesting in his alternations. When I... when I was trying to introduce the notion of large form, I took an example that had already been considered by Noël Burch, that of *M*¹⁶. And I tried to show how it was a typical large-form film of the S-A-S type, with the situation, the parallel montage, or the alternating montage of actions, the tightening around a double pincer movement that will define M's duel with the police and his duel with the beggars, and then the S' which poses the question: is the situation modified after M's arrest? Or is it not modified? In what sense is it S'? In what sense is it not an S'? etc. So this was typically a large-form film.

But when you think of an extraordinary film like... what is it again? It's at the same time formally speaking... You see how that sometimes directors invent scenarios simply to... no not simply, but where the formal problems are nonetheless fundamental. There is one film – I'll mention it very quickly, for those who remember it – *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt*,¹⁷ which is like a brilliantly executed distillation, a kind of insanely brilliant exercise in the small form of A-S-A'. And indeed, what does it concern? For those who remember, it's about someone who fabricates false clues – it goes all the way from these clues... and you'll see how this is a really classic A-S-A' form – someone with a very complicated mind fabricates false clues by which he will be accused of a crime. Ostensibly, he does this to question miscarriages of justice. Do you follow me? But, in reality, he is the real criminal, and his whole fabrication of false clues is in order to hide the real clues he has left. You have exactly the structure: A, false clues; S, situation, meaning what the clues suggest about the situation; and A', the real clues that will be discovered and that will reveal a new situation. The

structure of *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt* is a kind of masterpiece in this respect, it really is the finest example of the small elliptical form.

Second type of practical exercise: are there any directors who have a vocation, a predominant vocation, directors who are only comfortable working with the large form or directors who are only comfortable working with the small form, given that, as always, the small form is no less great than the large one? Here I would propose two ‘couples’ and then leave you to discover them for yourselves. A Soviet couple and a Japanese couple.

The Japanese couple obviously is Kurosawa-Mizoguchi. It seems obvious to me that – but I’m not going to elaborate on this, because we have too much to do – that Kurosawa’s space is a space of breath, it’s a space of respiration. And Kurosawa’s cinema is fundamentally large-form, even in his detective films. He made a great detective film, whose title I can’t quite recall at the moment, the guide, the very beautiful film about the guide... I don’t remember... Anyway.¹⁸ But anyway, it’s the large form, it’s... It is the breath of life, the great respiration. And we can even say there is a kind of Kurosawa signature, a calligraphic signature that draws, precisely, the equivalent of a Chinese spiral, sorry, I mean of a Japanese spiral. This is the movement that you always find in Kurosawa, which is that something descends from top to bottom, there’s a line from left to right. Something goes from left to right and something comes back from right to left again, so that it’s like a character who organizes what is precisely a global space. It’s very odd, this descent of things, it begins with...

[*Tape ends. Recording and transcript of Part 2 are missing from both Paris 8 and Web Deleuze.*]¹⁹

¹ François Chatelet (1925 – 1985) was a historian of philosophy and a scholar of political philosophy. Along with Deleuze and Michel Foucault he co-founded the department of philosophy at Vincennes and was also one of the co-founders of the College Internationale de Philosophie. His most well-known works include the eight-volume *Histoire de la philosophie* (1971-73) and the posthumously published *Une histoire de la raison* (1992).

² We have already seen in the previous lesson how the French word *ellipse* is translated in English by two terms, “ellipse” in the sense of a geometric figure and “ellipsis” in the rhetorical sense of a narrative gap.

³ The early films Lubitsch made in his German expressionist period include a number of costume dramas the most well-known of which are *Madame Du Barry* (1919), *Anna Boleyn* (1920) and *Sumurun* (1920). Regarding Lubitsch’s rapport with the costume film see *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, p. 163.

⁴ See Deleuze’s use of this concept at the beginning of chapter 10 of *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, p. 160.

⁵ Georges Canguilhem (1906-1995) was a French philosopher and physician who specialized in epistemology and the philosophy of science (in particular, biology). A key figure in post-war French philosophy he was a mentor to many of the figures of the French intellectual left who emerged in the 1960s including Althusser, Foucault, Derrida and Lacan.

⁶ *Knowledge of Life* is Canguilhem’s most well-known work. The book is divided into three parts, the first of which considers the specificity of animal biology as a science, while the second deals with the theory of cells. The third meanwhile explores the historical and conceptual significance of vitalism – a concept developed by Henri Bergson which Canguilhem had initially rejected but which he returned to in later years – and the possibility of conceiving organisms not in mechanical and technical terms, but rather on the basis of an organism’s relation to its own milieu, its ability to survive in this milieu, and its status as something greater than “the sum of its parts.” See Georges Canguilhem, *Knowledge of Life*, (Paola Marrati and Todd Meyers eds.) Trans. Stefanos Geroulanos and Daniela Ginsburg, New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.

⁷ *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers* (Encyclopedia, or a Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts) better known simply as *Encyclopédie*, was a general encyclopedia published in France between 1751 and 1772, with later supplements, revised editions, and translations. Compiled by a large number of many writers, known as the *Encyclopédistes*, it was edited by Denis Diderot and, until 1759, co-edited by Jean le Rond d’Alembert.

⁸ Jean-Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, chevalier de Lamarck (1744 – 1829), known simply as Lamarck, was a French naturalist. A soldier, biologist, and academic, he was an early proponent of the idea that biological evolution occurred and proceeded in accordance with natural laws.

⁹ Isidore Marie Auguste François Xavier Comte (1798 - 1857) was a French philosopher and writer who first formulated the doctrine of positivism. Often considered the first philosopher of science in the modern sense of the term, Comte's ideas were also fundamental to the development of sociology.

¹⁰ “One of the most ancient forms of visual depiction of landscape is the Chinese picture scroll – an endless ribbon (almost a film reel) of the panorama of landscape unwinding horizontally.” See Sergei Eisenstein, *Non-Indifferent Nature* Trans. Herbert Eagle, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 1987, pp. 229-230.

¹¹ Henri Maldiney (1912 - 2013) was a French philosopher. A leading proponent of phenomenology in France his interests included the expressive and creative aspects of mental illness and theories and practices of art.

¹² Albert Lautman (1908-1944) was a French philosopher of mathematics and resistance fighter during World War II. His *Essay on the Notions of Structure and Existence in Mathematics* which Deleuze refers to here was most recently published in English in the collection *Mathematics, Ideas and the Physical Real*, Trans. Simon B. Duffy, London; New York: Continuum Press, 2011.

¹³ Georg Friedrich Bernhard Riemann (1826 -1866) was a German mathematician whose primary interests were in analysis, number theory, and differential geometry. In the field of real analysis, he is mostly known for the first rigorous formulation of the integral, the Riemann integral, and his work on Fourier series. His contributions to complex analysis include most notably the introduction of Riemann surfaces, which broke new ground in a natural, geometric treatment of complex analysis.

¹⁴ On these types of spaces, see *The Movement-Image*, pp. 207-208.

¹⁵ *The Big Sleep* (1946) is a film by Howard Hawks based on the novel by Raymond Chandler and starring Humphrey Bogart, Lauren Bacall, John Ridgley, Martha Vickers and Dorothy Malone. The story concerns private detective Philip Marlowe who is summoned by a wealthy former General to resolve the debts one of his wayward daughters owes to a bookseller, but who soon finds himself embroiled in a labyrinthine mystery of murders and disappearances. The film is generally regarded as one of the great film noirs.

¹⁶ Deleuze quotes Burch's text on Lang, “Cinema, théorie, lecture”, in *The Movement-Image*, p.152.

¹⁷ *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt* (1956) is a film noir by Fritz Lang starring Dana Andrews and Joan Fontaine. The story concerns a writer who agrees to have himself framed for a murder he didn't commit to demonstrate the fallibility of the justice system. When a showgirl is found strangled, the writer plants a series of false clues that will lead to his arrest and conviction. But truth turns out to be stranger than fiction.

¹⁸ *Dersu Uzala* is a 1975 Soviet-Japanese film directed by Akira Kurosawa. Concerning the life of a native trapper in the wilderness of the Russian far-east, a man completely at one with his environment but whose form of life will inevitably be erased by the advance of civilization, it tells the story of the profound friendship that develops between the trapper and a Russian explorer whose life he saves.

¹⁹ Although this segment of the lecture cannot be found, Deleuze refers to it in the first part of session 11 of Cinema 2 (February 22, 1983). Regarding Kurosawa's approach to the large form and the comparison Deleuze makes between his cinema and that of Mizoguchi representing the small-form, see *The Movement-Image*, pp. 188-92 and then pp. 192-196.