

Oxford Bibliographies

Your Best Research Starts Here



Christian Metz

Matthew Flisfeder

LAST MODIFIED: 28 MARCH 2018

DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199791286-0286

Introduction

Christian Metz was a French film theorist, writing mainly in the 1960s and the 1970s. Metz is most well-known for his application of structuralist and semiotic methods to the analysis of film language and film form, as well as for his concept of the “imaginary signifier,” which applied Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic concepts to the analysis of film spectatorship. Metz’s writing on semiotics helped to popularize this method in film studies, alongside his peers in other humanities disciplines, such as Roland Barthes. His writing has been influential in both European and North American contexts, with much of his work translated into English and reprinted in four books: *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema* (1974), *Language and Cinema* (1974), *The Imaginary Signifier* (1982), and *Impersonal Enunciation, or the Place of Film* (2016). Metz’s work has appeared in numerous anthologies dedicated to film studies and film theory, and he is often associated with influencing English film theories that appeared in the British journal *Screen*, sometimes referred to as “Screen Theory.” For his writing on the concept of the “imaginary signifier,” he has sometimes been classified as an “apparatus theorist,” alongside other influential French film scholars, such as Jean-Louis Baudry. The entries will be of interest to scholars seeking deeper understandings of the role that Metz played in developing semiotic methods in the film analysis, and its relationship to psychoanalytic interpretations of cinematic spectatorship. This article includes articles authored by Metz, but also pieces that critically review Metz’s work and its impact on film studies and film theory. The sections are ordered to provide a guideline for moving from Metz’s work on structuralism and semiotics, to show his progression in venturing toward psychoanalytic approaches—a logical move considering the influence of Jacques Lacan, who used structuralist methods and semiotics to reinterpret Freud. It is here that we can also see Metz’s influence in bringing, not only structuralist methods, but Lacanian psychoanalytic concepts as well, into the field of film theory, especially at the moment when film studies programs began to be formalized in North American and European universities. The author would like to thank Rebecca Schur and Taylor Fenn for their time and assistance in preparing this article.

Overviews

Readers and scholars unfamiliar with Metz would do well to begin with general overviews of his works. Buckland 2017 provides a brief overview of Metz, his use of linguistic, structuralist, and psychoanalytic concepts, and some of the concepts that Metz himself coined. Deane 2016 highlights Metz’s contribution to film theory and attends to some of the contradictions in Metz’s use of structural linguistics for film analysis. Rodowick 2014 includes an extensive look at Metz’s influence on film theory and his pioneering role in using structuralist methods. The edited collection Tröhler and Kirsten 2018 examines Metz’s ongoing relevance and influence on film studies and his development of phenomenological structuralism. The eulogy Altman, et al. 1993, written shortly after Metz’s death, gives a clear indication of the impact he and his work have had on contemporary film and media theory. The entry on Metz in Lechte 1994 provides a more detailed description of the Metz canon, including descriptions of concepts for which he is most well-known, including his analysis of the “grande syntagmatique” and the “imaginary signifier.” Although Metz’s impact was advanced first in the French context in the 1960s, later English translations

of his work began to gain traction in the early 1970s. Tomaselli 1995, also in the wake of Metz's death, recounts the impact that Metz's work has had in the Anglo-Saxon context of film studies, and describes how his conceptual approach will endure beyond film theory.

Altman, Rick, Dudley Andrew, and Lauren Rabinovitz. "In memoriam [Christian Metz]." *Iris: Revue de Theorie de l'Image et du Son* 16 (1993): 2.

This article is a brief eulogy of Christian Metz. The authors speak to how Metz shaped cinema studies at large and touched each of them personally. There is a note directing readers to more content on Metz: an essay by Roger Odin in this volume of *Iris* (no. 16), and the entirety of *Iris* no. 10.

Buckland, Warren. "A Furious Exactitude: An Overview of Christian Metz's Film Theory." In *Conversations with Christian Metz: Selected Interviews on Film Theory (1970–1991)*. Edited by Warren Buckland and Daniel Fairfax, 13–32. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017.

In this introductory chapter, Warren Buckland offers a brief overview of Metz as both a writer and a researcher, discussing some of the key concepts that influenced his work, including linguistics, semiology, and psychoanalysis, as well as some of the concepts that Metz himself generated, such as the "imaginary signifier."

Deane, Cormac. "Translator's Introduction." In *Impersonal Enunciation, or The Place of Film*. Translated by Cormac Deane. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

In the translator's introduction to Metz's *Impersonal Enunciation*, Deane highlights Metz's contributions to film theory, and discusses how this book differs from Metz's previous work. Specifically, Deane discusses how Metz's later insights arose from the contradictory position that the semiology of language failed to formulate a film semiology, while also showing that such a project still works.

Lechte, John. "Christian Metz." In *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers: From Structuralism to Post-modernity*. By John Lechte, 89–94. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

This chapter in John Lechte's book is an encyclopedic entry briefing the major works of Christian Metz. The chapter includes a short biographical introduction and is organized into sections on Metz's ideas like "langue" and "langage," the impression of reality, enunciation, "la grande syntagmatique," the imaginary signifier, and film as dream.

Rodowick, D. N. *Elegy for Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Rodowick's book looks at the place of cinema studies in 21st-century humanities, and examines the meaning of theory for the arts. The book includes a lengthy discussion of Metz, his influence on studies of film language and semiotics, and his pioneering role in using structuralist methodologies.

Tomaselli, Keyan G. "The Impact of Christian Metz in Anglo-Saxon Cinema Studies: A Personal View." *S – European Journal for Semiotic Studies* 7.1–2 (1995): 259–273.

This paper is a literature review of responses to Metz's English translated work since 1974, bookended by reflections on how Metz has influenced Keyan Tomaselli personally. Tomaselli narrates a contentious debate around the place of film semiology in

Anglo-Saxon cinema studies, but concludes that Metz's legacy endures in the philosophical credibility and in the rigor that his work conferred on the field.

Tröhler, Margrit, and Guido Kirsten, eds. *Christian Metz and the Codes of Cinema*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018.

This book brings together a collection of contributors who present close analyses of Metz's writings and their theoretical positions. The chapters included reflect on Metz's ongoing influence in film studies, his creation of numerous categories and concepts that are still used for film analysis, and his development of phenomenological structuralism.

Key Texts

Metz's key texts and articles have been translated into English and have been collected in four books. *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema* (Metz 1974a) and *Language and Cinema* (Metz 1974b) both include texts related to Metz's formal and structural approach to film criticism. The former deals more with specifically semiotic approaches to film criticism and ways to read cinema through semiotic and phenomenological approaches, whereas the latter takes up the question of film codes. *The Imaginary Signifier* (Metz 1982) is a compendium of Metz's influential work using Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic concepts and theories for interpreting aspects of spectatorship. In his recently translated book, *Impersonal Enunciation, or the Place of Film* (Metz 2016), Metz combines his semiotic and psychoanalytic approaches to develop a more detailed understanding of how films "communicate."

Metz, Christian. *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. Translated by Michael Taylor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974a.

This book collects English translations of some of Metz's most influential texts on the phenomenology and semiotics of cinema.

Metz, Christian. *Language and Cinema*. Translated by Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton, 1974b.

This text is a translation of Metz's PhD thesis written over a ten-year period. It is a systematic attempt to define film semiotics in terms of a combination of specific and nonspecific codes to define filmic textuality and filmic writing.

Metz, Christian. *The Imaginary Signifier: Psychoanalysis and the Cinema*. Translated by Celia Britton, Annwyl Williams, Ben Brewster, and Alfred Guzzetti. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

This book collects English translations of Metz's writings on psychoanalysis and the cinema. Metz's concept of the "imaginary signifier" is contained in the first part of the book, and relates to his theory of film spectatorship. Later parts of the book show how psychoanalysis can be used to interpret the content of films.

Metz, Christian. *Impersonal Enunciation, or The Place of Film*. Translated by Cormac Deane. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

This book develops a linguistic discussion of film texts, one that disputes Francesco Casetti's use of pronouns, to discuss the way film address spectators. Metz defines enunciation as impersonal, reducing it to reflexive moments in film.

Structuralism

Structuralism was an influential school of thought in French theory in the 1950s and 60s. It drew primarily on the structural linguistics of Ferdinand de Saussure, and the Structural Anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss. The basic premise of structuralism is that both language and culture can be studied as structures with consistent and transferable elements. Metz 1976 shows how Metz's work fits this model of structuralism and discusses how he applied its methods to his analyses of film language. Metz 1985 explains further how he sees in film formal elements that are not unlike those of spoken language, such as contradiction between the spoken utterance and the position of the speaker. Within the context of a structuralist analysis, Metz 1974 also aims to distinguish between structures of larger messages and structures specific to an individual filmic text, to show the way that codes are produced to assert meaningfulness in cinema. For his writing on the structure of films, Metz has been compared to other theorists applying linguistic models to cultural analysis. Stam 1986, for instance, compares his work to that of Mikhail Bakhtin. Stam 2000 also highlights Metz's influence in structuralist models of film analysis; and whereas Alemany-Galway 2002 acknowledges Metz's relationship to structuralism, the author references his influence on postmodern film theory because of the role that Lacanian psychoanalysis played in Metz's later writing, which she regards as closer to poststructuralist (see Psychoanalysis and the Imaginary Signifier).

Alemany-Galway, Mary. "Metz: Structuralist Film Theory in the Light of Poststructuralism." In *A Postmodern Cinema: The Voice of the Other in Canadian Film*. By Mary Alemany-Galway, 61–80. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2002.

Mary Alemany-Galway reads Metz as a quintessential structuralist film theorist in order to set up her own postmodern film theory. Alemany-Galway identifies elements of Metz's work that form a structuralist framework, and parses the tension between this theoretical foundation and Metz's use of Lacan, whom Alemany-Galway reads as poststructuralist.

Metz, Christian. "'Structure of the Message' or Structure of the Text?" In *Language and Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 87–91. Translated by Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

The purpose of this article is to explain the difference between what is meant by the structure of the message and the structure of the text. Metz explains that because a message is a singular system, it actually does not have a structure, but instead is just a fragment of the code that makes up the structure of a larger text. Films are given as an example of a text due to the fact that they contain several codes and many messages.

Metz, Christian. "On the Notion of Cinematographic Language." In *Movies and Methods*, Vol. 1. Edited by Bill Nichols, 582–589. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

In this paper, Christian Metz raises the question of if film is a language in itself. He reasons that film lacks a *langue*, which is the code that allows for the generation of messages. Metz then goes on to search for features of a film language that go beyond just the image and concludes that although a cinematographic language is not yet understood, the idea of it is less vague than before.

Metz, Christian. "Instant Self-Contradiction." In *On Signs*. Edited by Marshall Blonsky, 259–266. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Metz describes an "instant self-contradiction" as the circumstances of an utterance that instantly invalidates the assertion of the utterance. Metz goes through a number of examples of this form of contradiction and discusses its importance within

humor. He also expresses the role that contradiction plays within Freudian metapsychology.

Stam, Robert. "Film and Language: From Metz to Bakhtin." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 19.1 (1986): 109–130.

Robert Stam situates Metz's semiotic work historically within the gaining influence of linguistic structuralism at the time. Stam points out some contradictions in Metz's analysis of syntagmatic elements, but argues for a Bakhtinian "translinguistics" rereading of Metz in order to recover aspects of cine-linguistic analysis that provide a framework for political analyses of the ideological function of film as discourse.

Stam, Robert. *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

This introductory reader to film theory by Robert Stam covers an array of theoretical, historical, and geographical movements in film theory. Metz is referenced throughout in connection and contrast with other theorists. Sustained attention is given to Metz's work on "film language" and cinematic code in the section on structuralism.

Semiotics

Semiotics is a method of linguistic analysis devised by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. It is, as Saussure described it, a science of signs, with each element of a language (from a word to a sentence, and even an entire text) constituting a sign and/or a system of signs that go together to create meaningful utterances. More generally, semiotics is a theory of meaning based on internal values (differential relations between codes, rather than the relation between a sign and reality). These differential relations include syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations. Semiology is also premised on the identification and classification of minimal units within a semiotic system, such as morphemes, phonemes, and distinctive features organized into binary oppositions. These concepts form the basis of Metz's film semiotics. Andrew 1976 and Harman 1977 show that, while connected to structuralist thought, it was his use of semiotics for film analysis and criticism that has remained tied to Metz's legacy in French film theory. While acknowledging Metz's influence on French film scholarship, pushing it in the direction of semiotic analysis, Andrew 1977 claims that it is a productive direction that still needs to be read alongside other methods, such as dialectical analysis. Works such as Baseheart 1980 also credit Metz for expanding the semiotic language of film analysis to include interpretations of the connotative aspects of meaning construction, but also understand this in light of his movement toward psychoanalytic approaches (see *Psychoanalysis and the Imaginary Signifier*). Others, like Shryock 1973, however, point to Metz's attention to denotative elements of film language, finding matters of connotation to be absent. It is therefore worth considering Metz's approach in its larger totality, as Heath 1973a, Heath 1973b, and Tudor 1981 do in trying to develop a systematic account of Metz's grander semiotic framework. Guzzetti 1979 similarly builds a systematic account of Metz's conceptual semiotic framework, but shows that contradictions exist in his framework that are worth parsing out. Penley 1975, in a review of Metz's *Film Language* (Metz 1974a, cited under Key Texts), addresses the relationship between Metz's film semiotics and radical critiques of ideology.

Andrew, Dudley. "Christian Metz and the Semiology of the Cinema." In *The Major Film Theories: An Introduction*. By Dudley Andrew, 212–241. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

This chapter situates the impact of Christian Metz's semiological approach to cinema studies within the broader movement of contemporary French film theory. Dudley Andrew relates the scope and progression of Metz's individual project to Metz's hope for the discipline at large to become more scientific and specific in its analysis of film.

Andrew, Dudley. "Film Analysis or Film Therapy: To Step Beyond Semiotics." *Quarterly Review of Film Studies* 2.1 (1977): 33–41.

Dudley Andrew discusses how film studies may productively build off of semiotic contributions. Andrew likens Christian Metz's (over)emphasis on the deconstruction of latent codes in film to a psychoanalyst's treatment of a patient, and recommends future film analysis practice dispossession, antithetical reading, and dialectical synthesis to better capture "the great film" as a whole.

Baseheart, Mary Christopher. "Christian Metz's Theory of Connotation." *Film Criticism* 4.2 (1980): 21–37.

Mary Christopher Baseheart translates and exposit sections of Christian Metz's *Essays Vol. 1, Language and Cinema* (Metz 1974a, cited under Key Texts) and *Essays Vol. 2* that reference connotation. Baseheart hypothesizes that Metz's progression of ideas demonstrates that connotation becomes an obstacle for Metz's theory of symbolic codification, which Baseheart links to Metz's shift toward psychoanalytic codification.

Guzzetti, Alfred. "Christian Metz and the Semiology of the Cinema." In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. 2d ed. Edited by Gerald Mast and Marshall Cohen, 184–203. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Alfred Guzzetti parses Christian Metz's use of semiotic terms in an attempt to clarify some ambiguities and apparent contradictions. Guzzetti offers an alternative interpretation of a syntagm based on the sportscasting genre to demonstrate some limitations in Metz's strict adherence to narrative film. Ultimately, Guzzetti critiques Metz for attempting to theorize film language in abstraction from cultural norms.

Harman, Gilbert. "Semiotics and the Cinema: Metz and Wollen." *Quarterly Review of Film Studies* 2.1 (1977): 15–24.

Gilbert Harman examines the logical underpinnings of theorizing a semiotics of the cinema. Harman summarizes the theoretical frameworks put forward by Christian Metz and Peter Wollen. Harman argues that Metz and Wollen both base their theories on a fallacious equivocation of the term "code," and expresses doubt that semiotics is a fruitful way to analyze film.

Heath, Stephen. "Metz's Semiology: A Short Glossary." *Screen* 14.1–2 (1973a): 214–226.

Stephen Heath defines Christian Metz's key terms for the reader uninitiated in film semiology. Heath includes the following definitions in his glossary: cinema, cinematic, cinematic codes, cinematic sub-codes, cinematic language, code, codes of expression/codes of content, film, filmic, filmic writing, form/matter (or purport)/substance, semiology of film, specificity, system/code, text/message, and textual system (singular system).

Heath, Stephen. "The Work of Christian Metz." *Screen* 14.3 (1973b): 5–28.

Stephen Heath outlines seven major issues engaged by Christian Metz's semiological framework. Heath reflects on the integral role of narrative to Metz's work and its emphasis on the specificity of cinematic language. Heath calls for more attention to Metz's concept of filmic writing as an alternative to some of the problems of cinematic language.

Penley, Constance. "Film Language by Christian Metz: Semiology's Radical Possibilities." *Jump Cut* 5 (1975): 18–19.

In this review of Metz's *Film Language*, Penley discusses the possibilities of using film semiotics for radical critiques of ideology.

Shryock, Doug. "Connotation and Denotation in the Semiology of the Cinema." In *Semiotics and the Cinema: Selected Essays and Discussion Transcriptions from the 1972 Oberlin Film Study Conference*. Vol. 2. Comp. by Christian Koch and John Powers, 252–256. Oberlin, OH: Oberlin College, 1973.

Doug Shryock narrows the applicable scope of Christian Metz's framework within a semiological analysis of cinema. Shryock clarifies that Metz's filmic analysis is focused on denotative structures, and proposes the application of other sources that discuss connotative structures in conjunction with Metz to form a complete semiological analysis.

Tudor, Andrew. "Modern Film Theory: Metz' Semiotics." *The Australian Journal of Screen Theory* 8 (1981): 49–67.

Andrew Tudor traces the development of Christian Metz's ideas throughout his corpus. Tudor relates this evolution to larger trends in film theory over the same time period, namely a move away from aesthetics toward models of film, and calls for more pluralistic inquiry into the workings of film.

The "Grande Syntagmatique"

Metz's concept of the "grande syntagmatique" is one of his chief contributions to the semiotic analysis of cinema. Metz identified a paradigmatic code consisting of eight sequence types that signify in relation to each other. These eight types are different ways of reconstructing filmed events where each syntagmatic type gets its meaning paradigmatically in relation to the other seven types. Syntagm, as opposed to paradigm, refers to the syntactical structure of an utterance. Metz 1966 and Metz 1967 use the semiotic category of the syntagm to show its role in understanding the diegetic construction of film form, as well as the role of editing in creating a film syntax. One example of where the syntagmatic, according to Metz 1972, plays an important role in film form is in looking at practices of filmic "punctuation," such as the fade-out. Buckland 1995 contrasts Metz's syntagmatic approach to film syntax with Noam Chomsky's universal grammar to show how film semiotics differs from a broader psychological conception of phenomenal reality. Bateman 2007 shows how the syntagmatic in Metz's approach can be extended to include paradigmatic analyses to show how meaning is formed in cinematic expression.

Bateman, John A. "Towards a 'grande paradygmatische' of Film: Christian Metz Reloaded." *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* 167.1–4 (2007): 13–64.

John Bateman reviews Christian Metz's "grande syntagmatique" and scholarly contributions that have extended either a syntagmatic or paradigmatic understanding of it. Bateman reformulates Metz's "grande syntagmatique" through Halliday's systemic-functional model of linguistics to create a paradigmatic organization with syntagmatic elements, or a "grande paradygmatische."

Buckland, Warren. "Michel Colin and the Psychological Reality of Film Semiology." *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* 107.1–2 (1995): 51–79.

Warren Buckland employs Michel Colin's rereading of Christian Metz's "grande syntagmatique" to investigate whether cine-semiology describes a spectator's mental processes with as much scientific accuracy as Chomskyan grammar describes those of a speaker. Buckland concludes that according to the terms of transformational generative grammar, film semiotics does not correlate to a psychological reality.

Metz, Christian. "La grande syntagmatique du film narrative." *Communications* 8 (1966): 120–124.

This article excerpts part of a conference presentation given by Metz, where he outlines a syntagmatic structure for the narrative film that includes six syntagmatic, or constituent elements of a film. Metz discusses how this kind of syntagmatic analysis relates to two other areas of cinema studies: diegetic understandings of film and extradiegetic factors like film editing.

Metz, Christian. "Une probleme de semiologie du cinema (=la syntagmatique)." *Image et Son: La Revue du Cinema* 201 (1967): 68–79.

Christian Metz introduces syntagmatic analysis in the context of cinema, and defines some of its associated semiotic and linguistic terms. Metz builds on his earlier work in "La grande syntagmatique du film narrative" (Metz 1966) by again categorizing eight kinds of autonomous syntagms, or sequences in the context of film, with some adjustments to his previous taxonomy.

Metz, Christian. "Ponctuations et demarcations dans le film de diegese." *Cahiers du Cinema* 234–235 (1972): 63–78.

Christian Metz theorizes the concept of cinematographic punctuation, arguing that it is more complex than identifying elements in cinema that supposedly correspond to elements of written punctuation. Incorporating syntagmatic analysis, Metz discusses the use of ideographic signs (i.e., the fade-out of a shot) to establish symbolic demarcations in narrative film.

Metz on Semiotics

The development of the semiotic method for film analysis is one of Metz's chief contributions to the practice of film scholarship and theory. As scholars have noted (see Semiotics), Metz's model and framework developed over the body of his work. In the earlier parts of his career, Metz 1964 sought to bring recognition to semiotics as a valid form of filmic analysis. Semiotics, for Metz 1970, was useful for showing how previous theories of the image, seeing it merely as an analogical signifier, missed out on other factors of meaning construction. In Metz 1974a, he sets himself the task of defending the semiotic approach in contrast to other previous and competing approaches to the study of film form. Doing so, much of his writing on semiotics tries to parse out central semiotic analytical categories. Metz 1966 examines the difference between "langage" (or "parole") and "langue." Metz 1968 explores the relationship between signifier and signified as elements for dealing with film form and content. Metz 1974b looks at the distinction between denotation and connotation. Metz 1969 is about codes, and Metz 1967 addresses words and numerals as semiotic units. In trying to advocate for the semiotic approach, though, Metz 1974c showed awareness of its complexities, which he still tried to contend with in his earlier writings.

Metz, Christian, et al. "Bibliographie critique des textes fondamentaux de linguistique et de semiologie." *Communications* 4 (1964): 136–144.

In this coauthored article, Christian Metz and colleagues present an annotated bibliography of fifty-eight texts fundamental to a basic understanding of the concepts, methods, and problems related to semiotic analysis, and recommend seven journals for further reading. The list draws upon literature from linguistics where there is overlap with semiotics.

Metz, Christian. "Les semiotiques ou semies: A propos de travaux de Louis Hjelmslev et d'Andre Martinet." *Communications* 7 (1966): 146–157.

Christian Metz contrasts two understandings of the terms “langage,” the human ability to communicate, and “langue,” particular systems of communication, in the work of linguists Andre Martinet and Louis Hjelmslev. In so doing, Metz contextualizes why linguistics did not develop into a sub-discipline of semiotics and provides his own definitions of these terms in regards to cinema.

Metz, Christian. “Remarque sur le mot et sur le chiffre: A propos de conceptions semiologiques de Luis J. Prieto.” *La Linguistique: Revue de la Societe Internationale de la Linguistique Fonctionelle* 2 (1967): 41–56.

Christian Metz expands on the problem of the “word” and the “numeral” as semiotic units presented in the work of Luis J. Prieto. Metz hypothesizes the presence of an underlying semiotic layer, “le palier hyposemique,” within some codes to better understand these semiotic problems.

Metz, Christian. “Propositions methodologiques pour l’analyse du film.” *Social Science Information/Informations sur les Sciences Sociales* 7.4 (1968): 107–119.

To begin the article, Christian Metz posits that the commonly made juxtaposition of form and content in film analysis is an implied contrast of the signifier and the signified. Metz elucidates four assumptions that make this distinction between form and content invalid, defines the terms signifier and signified, and presents a more rigorous methodology for film analysis.

Metz, Christian. “Specificite des codes et specificite des langages.” *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* 1.4 (1969): 370–396.

Christian Metz analyzes Emilio Garroni’s theory of codes and langages, which loosely translates to modes of communication or arts. Metz critiques Garroni for marking a concrete distinction between heterogeneous codes that differentiate a langage from homogeneous codes found across languages. Metz argues that one should compare several languages from the point of view of one code and vice versa to understand the complex relational specificities of each.

Metz, Christian. “Au-dela de l’analogie, l’image.” *Communications* 15 (1970): 1–10.

Christian Metz aims to theorize beyond the commonly accepted view of the image as an analogical signifier. Metz provides nine points to dispute that an image signifier more directly translates its signified than other media in order to strengthen his argument that a field of semiotic analysis is required to fully understand the image, its code, and its message.

Metz, Christian. “The Cinema: Language or Language System.” In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 31–91. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974a.

This chapter is a translation of Metz’s essay, “Le cinema: langue ou langage?,” published in *Communications* in 1964. Here, Metz discusses the various approaches to cinema that have been used by other theorists. He then highlights the importance of building on those approaches in order to create a semiotic theory of cinema, on which he elaborates throughout the next chapters of *Film Language*.

Metz, Christian. “Problems of Denotation in the Fiction Film.” In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 108–198. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974b.

This chapter is a translation of Metz's article "Problèmes de dénotation dans le film de fiction: Contribution à une sémiologie du cinéma," published in 1966. In this article, Metz addresses the idea of denotation within film and attempts to develop a semiotics of the narrative film. He discusses the motivation of the denotative and connotative aspects in film and speaks to the relationship between the two.

Metz, Christian. "Some Points in the Semiotics of the Cinema." In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 92–107. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974c.

This chapter is a translation of Metz's article "Quelques points de sémiologie du cinéma," published in 1966. In "Some Points in the Semiotics of the Cinema," Christian Metz explains the complexities that go along with taking a semiotic approach to film. Despite the number of difficulties mentioned in the article, Metz maintains the importance of refining this study of linguistics and semiotics in order to gain a further understanding of the cinema.

Narrativity and Formalism

Among his concerns with developing a semiotic approach to film analysis, Metz was also keen to point out its usefulness in reading elements of filmic narrative construction and the formal techniques of style, such as editing, camera movement, the duration of a shot/scene, and special effects. Using a semiotic approach, Metz 1974 argued that narrative constructions in modern cinema were much more advanced than narrative techniques in other media. Metz 1967 looks at the relationship between editing, camera movement, and duration, and how these become decipherable in terms of the semiotic category of the diachronic, looking at the temporal dimension. Metz 1977 also considered elements of special effects, or "trucage"—"trick photography"—as semiological, but also as a technique for drawing in audiences, an element not too distant from his inquiries into spectatorship (see Spectatorship).

Metz, Christian. "'Montage' et discours dans le film: Un problème de sémiologie diachronique du cinéma." *Word: Journal of the International Linguistic Association* 23.1–3 (1967): 388–395.

Christian Metz reviews the technological development of increasing mobility in filmmaking to highlight the semiological importance of mobilizing camera techniques as phrasal organization. Metz cautions that film editing is often privileged over camera movement as a deliberate discourse in film analysis, and argues that both should be conceptualized as explicit cinematic choices.

Metz, Christian. "The Modern Cinema and Narrativity." In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 185–227. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

This chapter is a translation of Metz's article "Le cinéma moderne et la narrativité," published in *Cahiers du Cinéma* in 1966. In this article, Christian Metz provides his argument against the breakdown of narrativity in modern cinema by questioning the analyses of a number of other film critics. Metz works through a number of myths associated with modern cinema in order to construct his own argument that modern film is actually more narrative.

Metz, Christian. "Trucage and the Film." Translated by Françoise Meltzer *Critical Inquiry: A Voice for Reasoned Inquiry into Significant Creations of the Human Spirit* 3.4 (1977): 657–675.

In this article, Christian Metz discusses the various dimensions of *trucages*, which loosely translates into "trick photography" or "special effects." He focuses this article around the effect that *trucages* have on film and the relationships between a film, its

production, and its audience.

Spectatorship

Spectatorship is a somewhat contentious category in film theory and film studies. Debates are ongoing with regards to the conceptualization of the typical or ideal film spectator, as opposed to the variations that exist among empirical audiences. Metz's work on semiotics looks at some of the formal dimensions in the construction of film as a meaningful text, but tied to this is also the question of how the spectator as subject experiences the meanings produced. The subsection Psychoanalysis and the Imaginary Signifier addresses Metz's more specific conception of the relationship between screen and spectator, applying a psychoanalytic lens to this inquiry. This initial section, then, shows how Metz's theory of the "imaginary signifier" can be contextualized in the larger debate around spectatorship. Along with Lacan and psychoanalysis, Metz's theories of spectatorship draw on Casetti 1998, which formulated four types of shot in the cinema using linguistic pronouns. Metz acknowledged Casetti's influence on his work as a point of contrast with his own since he refutes the reliance on personal pronouns. As Allen 1993 and Andrew 1986 show, Metz's writing on spectatorship is based in more general approaches to the study of shifts in media technology, and shifts in the theoretical milieu of his time. Metz's writing on the relationship between spectatorship and speech acts (Metz 1976) fits with the evolving linguistic turn in cultural theory; as well, his look at the extradiegetic portrayal of spectatorship within films themselves (Metz 1989) shows the degree of self-reflexivity emerging around the concept. It is a kind of "mirroring," as he puts it, that seems to lead into Lacanian theorizations of spectatorship that use the concept of the "mirror stage," not unlike the way that Mulvey 1975 applied this concept to the author's theory of the "male gaze." Copjec 1994, Flisfeder 2012, McGowan 2007, and Rose 1986, however, all show how Metz's theory of spectatorship, while useful and influential, commits errors that fit into the larger misinterpretation of early Lacanian psychoanalytic theory.

Allen, Richard. "Cinema, Psychoanalysis, and the Film Spectator." *Persistence of Vision: The Journal of the Film Faculty of The City University of New York* 10 (1993): 5–33.

Richard Allen privileges Metz's (and Baudry's) understanding of film spectatorship as a dream-like experience over other psychoanalytic theories such as primary cinematic identification and mirror-misrecognition, also taken up by Metz and Baudry. Allen extends the oneiric tradition of psychoanalytic film analysis with his own theory of projective illusion.

Andrew, Dudley. "Film and Society: Public Rituals and Private Space." *East-West Film Journal* 1.1 (1986): 7–22.

Dudley Andrew traces different spectatorship experiences through technological and social shifts in the practice of "going to the movies." Andrew isolates Metz's imaginary signifier to the movie theater as a mode of exhibition, unique from media like television, whose atmospheric conditions distract the spectator from the illusion of film.

Casetti, Francesco. *Inside the Gaze: The Fiction Film and Its Spectator*. Translated by Nell Andrew with Charles O'Brien. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

This book by Francesco Casetti is an elucidation of the film spectator through the semiotic framework of enunciation. Christian Metz mentions how Casetti's book inspired his own work in his introduction to *Inside the Gaze*, and Casetti briefly references *Language and Cinema* and Metz's concept of the apparatus in the book.

Copjec, Joan. "The Orthopsychic Subject: Film Theory and the Reception of Lacan." In *Read My Desire: Lacan against the Historicists*. By Joan Copjec, 15–38. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1994.

Copjec identifies errors made by film theorists in the 1960s and 1970s to the interpretation of Lacan and his notion of the gaze, conflating it with the Foucauldian conception of the gaze. Copjec's argument applies to Metz's own theorization of spectatorship and his conception of the "imaginary signifier."

Flisfeder, Matthew. *The Symbolic, The Sublime, and Slavoj Žižek's Theory of Film*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Flisfeder shows how Slavoj Žižek's reinterpretation of Lacan corrects errors made by early Lacanian film theorists. Metz's conception of the "imaginary signifier" is discussed in its conflation of the Lacanian dimensions of the imaginary and the symbolic.

McGowan, Todd. *The Real Gaze: Film Theory After Lacan*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2007.

McGowan charts some of the various applications of Lacanian theory to the matter of film spectatorship and the notion of the "gaze." Drawing on theorists such as Joan Copjec and Slavoj Žižek, McGowan shows how new interpretations of Lacan correct errors made by previous film theorists, such as Metz, applying Lacanian theory to questions of film spectatorship.

Metz, Christian. "History/Discourse: Note on Two Voyeurisms." *Edinburgh'76 Magazine* 1 (1976): 21–25.

This article addresses questions about the way in which fiction films appeal to spectators. Metz argues that films appeal to their audiences in a way that is similar to normal speech acts, through the level of enunciation and what is actually enounced. He also determines the differences between *histoire* (history) and *discours* (discourse).

Metz, Christian. "L'écran second, ou le rectangle au carré (Sur une figure réflexive du film)." *Vertigo: Revue Semestrielle d'Esthétique et d'Histoire du Cinéma* 4 (1989): 126–133.

Metz explores "second screens" as a marker of enunciation. "Second screens" are frames within the frame of the film that make explicit spectator subjectivity by mirroring the situated perspective of the film (i.e., the window in *Rear Window*). Metz draws symbolic connections between these extradiegetic processes and the diegetic moments they accompany within the film.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen* 16.3 (1975): 6–18.

Mulvey's canonical text introduces the concept of the "male gaze," drawing on Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Mulvey's text is comparable to Metz's theory of spectatorship and a useful point of comparison since they share methodological approaches.

Rose, Jacqueline. "The Imaginary." In *Sexuality in the Field of Vision*. By Jacqueline Rose, 167–198. New York: Verso, 1986.

In this piece, Rose shows how film theorists like Metz have taken the Lacanian conception of the imaginary out of its original psychoanalytic context.

Psychoanalysis and the Imaginary Signifier

The introduction of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis into his later work on film spectatorship makes clear sense given his previous work on semiotics. Lacanian psychoanalysis, in particular, offered Metz a clear point of transition, since Lacan famously applied structuralist and semiotic methods into his rethinking of Freud. Throughout his career, Lacan introduced three levels of analysis: the imaginary, the symbolic, and the real. At the time, Lacan's theory of the imaginary was most notably applied by film scholars, especially since it was developed in his essay "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the / Function as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience," or the "mirror stage" essay as it has come to be called. Metz 1975 on the "imaginary signifier" is perhaps his most well-known and read piece of scholarship in the early 21st century. In fact, many, such as Altman 1977, Flitterman-Lewis 1987, Kuhn 2009, and Nowell-Smith 1981, credit Metz for being one of the main pioneers for bringing psychoanalytic theory, particularly of the Lacanian variety, into contemporary film theory and scholarship. Although the theory of the "imaginary signifier" is his most highly regarded contribution, Metz's reference to psychoanalysis also helps to develop questions about filmic reality (Metz 1976)—and here, there is a connection with his writing on phenomenological approaches to film scholarship (see Rhetoric and Phenomenology). He has also looked at the role of fetishism in the form of photography and film (Metz 1985), a point that Rushton 2002 takes up in relation to Metz's theory of spectatorship. Metz's own reading of particular films, such as Fellini's *8½* (Metz 1974), helps to develop his psychoanalytic readings of the mirror construction thesis. As well, his application of categories, like metaphor and metonymy (Metz 1982), in the way that Lacan applied them to speak of the processes of condensation and displacement, also show—as August 1981 points out—where psychoanalytic categories move beyond simply reading the elements of identification in spectatorship that come across in the idea of the "imaginary signifier."

Altman, Charles F. "Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Discourse." *Quarterly Review of Film Studies* 2.3 (1977): 257–272.

Altman reviews issue 23 of *Communications* (entitled *Psychoanalysis and the Cinema*), co-guest-edited and contributed to by Metz. Altman explains psychoanalytic theories of screen as mirror and film as dream, referencing Metz's work on the imaginary signifier and secondary elaboration. Altman offers three critiques for this kind of reasoning by analogy.

August, Bertrand. "Metz's Move." *Camera Obscura: Feminism, Culture, and Media Studies* 7 (1981): 30–41.

Bertrand August argues that not enough attention has been given to Metz's "Metaphor/Metonymy." August highlights the salient points of the article in advance of its full publication in English translation later in the year.

Flitterman-Lewis, Sandy. "Psychoanalysis, Film, and Television." In *Channels of Discourse: Television and Contemporary Criticism*. Edited by Robert C. Allen, 172–210. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

In the sixth chapter of this introductory reader, Sandy Flitterman-Lewis discusses how psychoanalytic theories developed in film theory by Christian Metz and others could be applied to television. Flitterman-Lewis outlines differences between the media of film and television that need to be taken into account, and uses *General Hospital* as an illustrative example.

Kuhn, Annette. "Screen and Screen Theorizing Today." *Screen* 50.1 (2009): 1–12.

Annette Kuhn reflects on *Screen's* evolution as a journal and introduces the themes covered and contributions included in this special anniversary issue. Kuhn references Metz as a contributor who was emblematic of *Screen's* emphasis on psychoanalysis in the 70s and calls for a re-engagement with Metz through the lens of screen metapsychology.

Metz, Christian. "Mirror Construction in Fellini's *8½*." In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 228–234. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Christian Metz applies the theory of mirror construction, the image of a double mirror reflecting itself, to an analysis of Fellini's *8½*. Metz explains that *8½* is a film about the making of *8½* in which Fellini directs the main character Guido as himself, in order to reflect on his own process of filmmaking.

Metz, Christian. "The Imaginary Signifier." *Screen* 16.2 (1975): 14–76.

This is a translation of Metz's article "Le significant imaginaire," published in 1975 in *Communications*. Christian Metz expands on his previous work in "Le film de fiction et son spectateur" by analyzing the symbolic aspects, or the code, of cinematic fiction as a semi-oneiric instance. Metz covers cinema as a good object, the contribution of Freudian psychoanalysis to the study of the cinematic signifier and the aspects of cinema that lend itself to psychoanalysis, the visual and auditory perceiving drives, and cinematic fetishism.

Metz, Christian. "The Fiction Film and Its Spectator: A Metapsychological Study." In *Special Issue: Readers and Spectators: Some Views and Reviews*. *New Literary History* 8.1 (Autumn 1976): 75–105.

This piece is a translation of Metz's article "Le film de fiction et son spectateur (Étude metapsychologique)," published in 1975. Metz employs a Freudian analysis to describe the ways in which film is a mixture of reality, dream, and fantasy. He discusses the effect that watching films has on the spectator and distinguishes the differences between a filmic state and an oneiric (dream-like) state.

Metz, Christian. "Metaphor/Metonymy, or the Imaginary Referent." In *The Imaginary Signifier: Psychoanalysis and Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 149–314. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

In this article, Metz attempts to locate the place that metaphorical and metonymic operations have within particular films. He employs a number of theorists in order to analyze the function of metaphor and metonymy, such as Freud, Lacan, and Jakobson.

Metz, Christian. "Photography and Fetish." *October* 34 (1985): 81–90.

Metz begins this article by outlining the differences between film and photography in order to explain their relation to fetish. After discussing the various elements of both film and photography, Metz concludes that photography is able to become a fetish, while film is more inclined to play on fetishism.

Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey. "A Note on 'History/Discourse.'" In *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*. Edited by John Caughie, 232–241. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Geoffrey Nowell-Smith expands on the problem of subjectivity in the psychoanalysis of film raised by Christian Metz in "History/Discourse." Nowell-Smith comments further on three aspects of Metz's "History/Discourse": film disguised as "history," multiple axes of spectatorship in relation to filmic narrativity, and the cinema as institution.

Rushton, Richard. "Cinema's Double: Some Reflections on Metz." *Screen* 43.2 (2002): 107–118.

Richard Rushton takes up fetishism as theorized by Christian Metz in relation to film spectatorship and the imaginary signifier. Rushton offers an inverted interpretation of the film spectator in which one experiences a loss of self-awareness rather than the fulfillment of a lack, believing they are an other instead of oneself.

Rhetoric and Phenomenology

Along with his writing on semiotics and psychoanalysis, Metz addressed matters of cinematic representation, or, in semiotic terms, elements of connotation, in cinema through a variety of other lenses, most notably rhetoric and phenomenology. Metz's work in this way also responds to Roland Barthes' conception of the rhetoric of the image. Chisholm 2003 notes that Metz turned to rhetoric through his development of cinematic grammar, and through his semiotic examinations of the filmic text. Metz himself sought to go beyond what he saw as the primarily phenomenological approach of someone like André Bazin. However, phenomenological approaches are invoked by Metz 1971 when he moves to discussions about filmic experience, in which case matters of cinematic representation are dealt with in terms of the ideograph. Metz 1970 addresses filmic experience, as well, in terms of the aural and visual relationship in cinema. Metz 1980 classifies the study of sound in cinema in terms of "aural objects." Phenomenological approaches also factor for Metz 1974a and Metz 1974b when aiming to theorize the experience of filmic narratives and its impressions of reality. Chateau and Lefebvre 2014 notes that, although he was not trained as a philosopher, phenomenology is present throughout Metz's work on structuralism, semiotics, and psychoanalysis.

Chateau, Dominique, and Martin Lefebvre. "Dance and Fetish: Phenomenology and Metz's Epistemological Shift." *October* 148 (2014): 103–132.

This article evaluates three periods of Metz's work: his early "filmolinguistic" work (1964–1967), his *pan-semiological* period (1967–1975), and his late psychoanalytic period (1975–1985). The authors look at the role of phenomenology in all three periods, noting that Metz was not trained as a philosopher, but treated semiotics and psychoanalysis as coexisting with phenomenology.

Chisholm, Ann. "Rhetoric and the Early Work of Christian Metz: Augmenting Ideological Inquiry in Rhetorical Film Theory and Criticism." In *The Terministic Screen: Rhetorical Perspectives on Film*. Edited by David Blakesley, 37–54. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003.

Ann Chisholm identifies the ways Christian Metz's early work, primarily *Film Language* (Metz 1974a, cited under Key Texts), invokes rhetoric: initially as a means to develop cinematic grammar, and subsequently as a flexible approach to cinematic discourse, and as a stand-in for connotation. Chisholm encourages rhetorical film theorists to ideologically analyze filmic images in the tradition of contemporary French film theory.

Metz, Christian. "Image et pédagogie." *Communications* 15 (1970): 162–168.

This article is a reprint of findings published by Christian Metz as a consultant on a pilot project that incorporated audiovisual culture into the programming of educational institutions. Metz discusses the sociological culture of the image, and calls for more methodologically robust and meta-textual analysis of image and cinema in the classroom.

Metz, Christian. "Cinema et ideographie." *Cahiers du Cinema* 228 (1971): 6–11.

This article reprints Chapter 6 of Christian Metz's *Langage et cinema*. Metz critiques comparisons other theorists have drawn between cinema and ideographic forms of writing (e.g., Japanese). Metz argues that though cinema and ideography both use

images discursively, they must each be considered contextually and in their multiple, complex forms so as not to make false generalizations.

Metz, Christian. "Notes toward a Phenomenology of the Narrative." In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 16–27. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974a.

Metz seeks to define the phenomenological perception of narrative prior to deliberate analysis. Metz argues that narrative is unconsciously recognized as a closed sequence, a temporal sequence, discourse, the unrealizing instance, and a sequence of events. Metz further specifies characteristics of film narrative.

Metz, Christian. "On the Impression of Reality in the Cinema." In *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. By Christian Metz, 3–15. Translated by Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974b.

Christian Metz builds on the ideas of Roland Barthes' rhetoric of the image to extend observations to the cinema and the elements that allow for an impression of reality. Metz argues that the impression of reality is more powerful in cinema due to its degree of movement.

Metz, Christian. "Aural Objects." In *Cinema/Sound*. Edited by Rick Altman, 24–32. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980.

In this article, Metz marks the fundamental difference between the visual and aural within films. He does so by relying on the distinction between primary and secondary qualities. He argues that primary qualities are the objects or substances, while secondary qualities are attributes that apply to those objects.

Metz on Others

As a contemporary of many influential film scholars, and writing during a time of great development in French film theory, Metz's own thoughts on his peers shed some light on how he perceived his own work in relation to that of his peers. His writing on others also shows his sentiments about other influential film scholars that, in the early 21st century, may not have the same kind of recognition outside of the French context. He writes fondly about Serge Danay, the former contributor and editor of *Cahiers du Cinéma*, in a memorial letter, Metz 1992. Metz 1980 writes about the influence of the philosopher Etienne Souriau, who was also the editor of *Revue d'Esthétique*. Metz 1965a is a review of Jean Mitry's *L'Esthétique et psychologie du cinéma*, the latter portion of which has been translated into English in Metz 1976, which shows how he sees his own work in relation to other theorists of language in the cinema. Reviews, such as Metz 1965b and Metz 1978, look at the works of Laffay and Bonin, and show signs of how Metz also engaged the work of his contemporaries.

Metz, Christian. "Une étape dans la réflexion sur le cinéma: A propos du tome I de *L'Esthétique et psychologie du cinéma* de Jean Mitry." *Critique: Revue Générale des Publications Françaises et Étrangères* 214 (1965a): 227–248.

This article is a book review by Christian Metz of the first volume, *Les structures*, of Jean Mitry's foundational text, *L'Esthétique et psychologie du cinéma*. Metz discusses Mitry's establishment of cinema as a language, or mode of communication, with a cinematographic grammar, and covers his treatment of other concepts like psychoanalytic identification with narrative film.

Metz, Christian. "Le cinema, monde et recit (A propos du *Logique du cinema*, d'Albert Laffay)." *Communications* 5 (1965b): 141–142.

In this review of Albert Laffay's *Logique du cinema*, Metz comments on Laffay's ideas about cinema as world, and cinema as imaginary. Metz recommends the book as an important text for those interested in the theory of cinema.

Metz, Christian. "Current Problems of Film Theory: Jean Mitry's *L'Esthétique et Psychologie du Cinema*, Vol 2." In *Movies and Methods*, Vol. 1. Edited by Bill Nichols, 568–578. Berkeley: University of California Press 1976.

This chapter translates the concluding portion of Metz's review of Mitry's book *L'Esthétique et Psychologie du Cinema* (Metz 1965a). Metz includes a number of useful definitions in order to better clarify Mitry's work and discusses the manifestation of metaphor and symbols within film.

Metz, Christian. "Sur l'Initiation a la graphique de Serge Bonin." *Annales: Economies, Societies, Civilizations* 33.4 (1978): 743–745.

In this review of Serge Bonin's *Initiation a la graphique*, an introductory primer to the sub-discipline of the semiology of graphics, Metz relates the terms explained in the book to five principal semiotic theories, and critiques two weaknesses he finds within semiology of graphics.

Metz, Christian. "Sur un profil d'Étienne Souriau." *Revue d'Esthétique* 3–4 (1980): 143–160.

This article by Metz is in memoriam of Étienne Souriau, a French philosopher who worked in aesthetics and served as editor of *Revue d'Esthétique*. Metz comments on Souriau's scholarly contributions to cinema studies and his support of the discipline as an organizer, administrator, and mentor.

Metz, Christian. "Esquisse." *Cahiers du Cinema* 458 (1992): 42–43.

This article is a brief letter from Christian Metz addressed to Serge Toubiana in memoriam of the late film critic Serge Daney. Toubiana and Daney both contributed to *Cahiers du Cinema* as editors and as writers. The article also includes two photos of Daney, one with Jean-Pierre Leaud and Jean-Pierre Mocky, and one with Nicholas Ray.

Critiques of Metz

Critiques of Metz's semiotic and psychoanalytic approach to film scholarship tend to stress problems in the methodology. Carroll 1977, for instance, takes issue with structural linguistics and Metz's use of semiotics, preferring instead the transformational-generative approach to language developed by Noam Chomsky. Others, such as Carroll 1988, are more critical of the introduction of specifically Lacanian psychoanalytic models into the field of film theory, a point that Carroll later elaborates on more generally with regard to so-called screen theory in his coedited book with David Bordwell, *Post-Theory: Re-Inventing Film Studies* (1996). Meanwhile, Rose 1986 notes that, while Metz has been responsible for introducing psychoanalytic frameworks into film theory, he and others have failed to raise the question which is central to psychoanalysis: that of sexual difference. Cozyris 1980, in contrast, claims that a flaw in Metz's theory is that he doesn't consider the larger social and cultural context in which films are produced, a point that has also been addressed in a large body of cultural studies

research on film and media. McCormick 1975, however, highlights the fact that film theories, like those developed by Metz, will fail to have a significant impact because of the density of their methods.

Carroll, John M. "Linguistics, Psychology, and Cinema Theory." *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* 20.1–2 (1977): 173–189.

In a review of *Film Language*, John Carroll outlines the misunderstandings he holds responsible for a lack of research pursuant to "filmolinguistics" as formulated by Christian Metz. Carroll finds the arguments of Metz and his critics about the validity of "la grande syntagmatique" itself irrelevant to the value of a structural linguistics approach to cinema studies, and calls for application of the transformational-generative approach to film.

Carroll, Noel. "Psychoanalysis: Metz and Baudry." In *Mystifying Movies: Fads & Fallacies in Contemporary Film Theory*. By Noel Carroll, 9–52. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

This first chapter of *Mystifying Movies* narrates the introduction of psychoanalysis into film theory through Jean-Louis Baudry and Christian Metz. Noel Carroll examines Metz's treatment of film as dream in *The Imaginary Signifier* and "The Fiction Film and its Spectator," and presents two critiques of analogizing film and mind as a methodology.

Cozyris, George Agis. *Christian Metz and the Reality of Film*. New York: Arno, 1980.

This book, based on Cozyris' dissertation, investigates the value of Christian Metz's structural semiotic approach to film studies. Cozyris argues that the object under Metz's study is not actually film because Metz does not take account of the sociocultural aspects of film's creation and reception. Cozyris concludes that Metz does not contribute to an understanding of how films communicate.

McCormick, Ruth. "Christian Metz and the Semiology Fad." *Cineaste* 6.4 (1975): 23–25.

Ruth McCormick reviews Christian Metz's *Film Language*. McCormick introduces the cine-structuralist semiology movement, and contrasts its pursuit of scientific objectivity with the situated and political Marxist tradition. McCormick critiques the periodic unintelligibility of *Film Language* in her warning that cine-structuralism needs to be understandable to theorists outside of it in order to last.

Rose, Jacqueline. "The Cinematic Apparatus: Problems in Current Theory." In *Sexuality in the Field of Vision*. By Jacqueline Rose, 199–214. New York: Verso, 1986.

Rose points out that, although Metz and Baudry are recognized for bringing psychoanalytic concepts into film analysis, they have missed out on addressing one of the key elements of psychoanalysis: that of sexual difference.

Interviews

Metz's work in film theory dealt with several highly abstract concepts, from his semiotic work to his application of psychoanalysis to understand the operation of spectatorship. He gave several interviews throughout his career which provide clearer explanations of how to make sense of his conceptual work when it comes to film criticism. Buckland and Fairfax 2017 is a collection of interviews recently translated into English. However, his interviews with Raymond Bellour in Metz and Bellour

1971 and with Sandy Flitterman and colleagues in Metz, et al. 1979 stand out as two instances where Metz is taken to draw out and elaborate on his semiotic approach, and on his application of psychoanalytic and particularly Lacanian interpretations of fetishism and its overlap with semiotics.

Buckland, Warren, and Daniel Fairfax, eds. *Conversations with Christian Metz: Selected Interviews on Film Theory (1970–1991)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017.

This book is a collection of recently translated interviews with Metz, showing his influence and significance in contemporary film theory.

Metz, Christian, with Raymond Bellour. "Entretien sur la semiologie du cinema." *Semiotica: Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* 4.1 (1971): 1–30.

This article is an interview with Christian Metz conducted by Raymond Bellour, another prominent French theorist of cinema. Metz discusses his work in the semiology of cinema, primarily *Essais sur la signification au cinema*. Metz and Bellour debate Metz's categorization of syntagms and the plurality of codes present in cinema.

Metz, Christian, with Sandy Flitterman, Bill Guynn, Roswitha Mueller, and Jacquelyn Suter. "The Cinematic Apparatus as Social Institution: An Interview with Christian Metz." *Discourse: Journal for Theoretical Studies in Media and Culture* 1 (1979): 6–37.

In this interview with Sandy Flitterman, Christian Metz discusses a number of topics surrounding film such as psychoanalysis, fetishism, semiotics, and spectator analysis. He also touches on his thoughts on a variety of theorists and critics such as Jacques Lacan and Norman Holland.

[back to top](#)

Copyright © 2018. All rights reserved.