

Writing Horizontally

What Teaching, Artistic Research and Epistemology Might Have in Common

Lennart Krauss

Introduction

With the increasing significance of knowledge production in the art field *research*, *epistemology* and *education* seem to replace the importance of more traditional aesthetic categories like *genre*, *beauty* and *style*.¹ As Tom Holert points out, the art world in general, art education and related teaching approaches show a deep involvement with a global political economy of knowledge.² My text considers the following questions: When do we act epistemically in educational contexts? And when do we act epistemically in artistic teaching? One answer to this question might be the essay as a didactic form.

I want to tackle some of the inherent aspects of the essay as an epistemological form in relation to educational contexts. First, I want to define the essay and show why my attempt will have to fail if I want to focus the essay epistemically. The specific and dynamic performance of the authorial “I” plays an important part in the reasoning of the essay and makes it impossible to carve a universal definition. While the form of the essay has its origins in literature, I will also discuss the form of the essay film, which has evolved in the previous century. “Through the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the essayistic has increasingly taken the shape of photo-essays, essay films, and electronic essays that permeate the internet as blogs and other exchanges within a public electronic circuitry.”³

Apart from the authorial point of reasoning it is the interstice between images, between image and sound, between different layers of the filmic language that constitutes the playground for the essay film's epistemological potential. Therefore, I will focus on one similarity of the essay in film and literature: the use of transgression as an epistemic and performative tool. Their reasoning is characterized structurally by the transgression of identity-based boundaries in its fragmented form. Furthermore, I will ask if these *acts*, these *actions* are able to initiate educational moments. As a practice-based example I will end with the description of a teaching workshop that I presented in Basel at the University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland for the symposium "Teaching Artistic Strategies: Playing with Materiality, Aesthetics, and Ambiguity".

What could the essay be? And what does it do?

There are numerous attempts to define an essay⁴. One of the most famous definitions was given by Theodor W. Adorno, who has theorized the essay in his famous text "The Essay as Form"⁵ as "indeterminate, interchangeable and heterogeneous", an experimental form that transgresses traditional genre boundaries by risking conjunctions between ideas that would not persist in the academic world (because of its artistic attitude) nor the artistic world (because of its scientific attitude).

Progress in understanding how the essay works can be made only by recognition of the contradictions and inconsistencies in the essay's content and its form, all of which are encoded by the writer and decoded (and constructed) by the reader. The overarching pair of opposites is fiction/nonfiction, including subject/object, science/art, referential/literary.⁶

As a "private form with an eye on the reading public" the essay takes its readers on a walk of thoughts. It is based on processual montage, while it "settles, tentatively, as product."⁷ As a product it can be experienced over and over again. Using and opening multiple perspectives while privileging none, it willfully opens its studying perspective to a

progressive array of cogent observations. The essayist in this regard is a researcher, who deals with a certain topic that can emerge, disappear and oscillate in differing light. Max Bense described the essayist as someone “who turns his subject this way and that, questions, touches, inspects, and reflects upon it thoroughly; who approaches it from different angles, and collects what he sees in his mind’s eye, and formulates in words what his topic reveals under the conditions established by writing.”⁸

In doing so, essays reflect their own mediality, their authorial standpoint, the conditions, and traces of their composited fragments. The resulting argumentation is in any sense unstable and ambivalent. It drifts between the artistic and the scientific, the experiential and the intellectual, decentralizing common notions of knowledge and omniscient positions of expertise. Not just in textual mode, but also etymologically the essay is in essence an *act*.⁹ *It does*.

This is also the reason why definitions have been very difficult and almost impossible. It is mainly due to the essay’s diverse, flexible, self-reflective, and experimental form that it continues to be an undefinable non-genre, an un-methodological method. According to André Belleau, the essay is not a thought, an evaluation or weighting of ideas but a swarm of ideas-words.¹⁰ No wonder defining the essay is problematic.

As a first approach to describe the term *essay* or *essayistic* as an adjective for visual forms of artistic research, we could first take a look at its etymological roots: the term *essay* derives from its Latin origins in the word *exegium* (“to weigh” or “a weight”), its accrual of the meanings “to try”, “to attempt” in Romance languages. Following Michel de Montaigne, the metonymic sliding of the word “essai” in French derives from “a trial” or “an attempt” to name a specific “form of writing” introduced by Montaigne himself, which is *the essay*.¹¹

These few definitions show the difficulty to define what the essay is: they are as broad as the essay appears in its form, tone and subject. Contrary to its claim to bend genre boundaries, the term “essay” is currently being used to describe certain textual or filmic forms in the means of a genre. It therefore *acts* as a genre which bends and surpasses its own boundaries. The epistemic essay is driven by an *epistephilia* of the

author who either strikes out on a journey of his own thoughts in confrontation with differing documents, artefacts, and materials or who experiments in a given setup or procedure. This inevitably produces non-propositional, non-representable knowledge. And it is also the reader of an epistemic essay who produces non-representable knowledge in practicing, experiencing, and thinking through the essay. Regarding educational and scientific expectations in institutional contexts, this presents severe recognition difficulties: knowledge regimes in the scientific realm are focused on representable knowledge that serve a specific purpose.¹² Hence, Tom Holert raises the question whether this “non-representability of certain vulnerable modes of knowledge should be preserved and protected or rather contested and eventually overcome.”¹³

Writing yourself – The “I” as a departure for essayistic reasoning

In the first part of this text, we saw that the essay seems to be difficult to grasp by common definition tools. Since it acts differently, according to the differing thought constellations which it evokes every time we see, hear, or read essay texts, films, or sound pieces. In the second part we want to take a look at the centre of its epistemic origin: the subjective position of the “I” that reasons according to its own thoughts. Most, if not all, accounts of the essayistic also place emphasis on its personal, almost autobiographical nature. As literary critic and philosopher Georg Lukács put it, “the essayist must now become conscious of his own self, must find himself and build something of himself.”¹⁴ He wrote not in order to “pretend to discover things, but to lay open my self.”¹⁵ In the year 1580, after nine years of thinking and writing, Michel de Montaigne published his “Essais”¹⁶, which coined the term. These essays describe a bond between a personal life and the surrounding events in sixteenth-century France. The multiple revisions that characterize these essays (1580, 1588, 1595) testify not only to the constant changes and adjustments of a mind as it defers to experience but also to the transformation of the essayistic self as part of that process. In the introduction, Montaigne states: “I

myself am the subject of this book".¹⁷ The choice to write about oneself was quite unusual at that time and place, especially if one wouldn't consider oneself as an expert in a specific field. He finds that his identity, his "master form", as he calls it, cannot be defined in simple terms of a constant and stable self. Instead, he describes it as a changeable and fragmented thing and claims that the valorization and acceptance of these traits is the only guarantee of authenticity and the only way of remaining faithful to the truth of one's being and one's nature rather than to alien semblances.

The purpose of this endeavour was to gain a greater self-knowledge.¹⁸ For Montaigne, his own "self-testing" was the motivation of his writing: the testing of his judgment, his mind, indeed of his whole being as it is pitted against various problems.¹⁹ The essay proceeds by a paradoxical constitution of object by subject where both are the same: the essayist.²⁰ The self-reflexivity of the form and its author is both inescapable and a source of apprehension: "My own excuse is that I ought in this to have more liberty than others, forasmuch as I write specifically of myself and of my writings, as I do of my other actions; that my theme turns upon itself; but I know not whether others will accept this excuse."²¹ Montaigne puts his claim into practice by internalizing arguments and theories in his essays and by vulgarizing the rhetoric of his texts and the acquisition of knowledge. This concept guaranteed that the subject matter of the essay would be without limitation, infinitely open-ended, the generator of "numberless essays"²². An essayistic vision which consisted of a worldly, accessible literature, considered to be the vehicle of humanistic learning.²³ In doing so, the essay acknowledges and persuades its audience: by developing a persona intended by the writer and perceived by the reader to be trustworthy, intelligent, amusing, or whatever else will be persuasive. The presence of a "you" seems to be taken for granted as an indicator of "audience outreach." The presence of "I", however, is what is most significant: the benchmark of the essay's special means of persuasion which consists in the creation of the persuasive persona.²⁴

Understanding in your own language – The “I” in the essay film

During the twentieth century, many filmmakers such as Robert J. Flaherty and Margaret Mead were using documentary films to portray foreign worlds. Practically, this meant entering a certain field, filming a subject, interrogating it, and producing a voice-over which articulates what can be seen in order to create a consistent explanation. As a form of research that has its origins in the colonial context and as a paternalizing way of representation, these documentary styles have been strongly criticized. The literary essay was rediscovered by filmmakers as a counter-language, an alternative way of representing reality and its contradictions. In their narrations, the notion that images and sound should serve as arguments within a body of evidence or convey participation in strong and authentic emotions is criticized or abandoned. Instead of tying the documentary to the values of representation, truth, or closeness to life, essayistic documentary forms emerged. They question the passion for the real through the contrapuntal compilation of heterogeneous material and techniques of imaginative generation or superimposition of reality traces. Contrary to the documentary conventions, the essay film develops an authorial cinema that is able to produce a variety of linguistic and discursive registers and that applies itself to a range of topics and disciplines, precisely as books do. Film critic and film director Alexandre Astruc predicted a liberation of expression: “The cinema will gradually break free from the tyranny of what is visual, from the image for its own sake, from the immediate and concrete demands of the narrative, to become a means of writing just as flexible and subtle as written language.”²⁵ Cinema is “gradually becoming a language”²⁶ of an author who will be able to tell something about the world in a new way. Even though the voice-over continued to play an important role in many essay films of the 60s and 70s, it shifted its role of enunciating a “truth”. A new way of language organization, a renunciation of selection and hierarchical organization of facts like it is taking place in the essay means an elimination of the traditional conditions for a judgment. As Umberto Eco writes in his text on the open work, “an action presupposes causal relations (and thus explanations), and tells us that fact B occurs by virtue

of fact A. Now, when one writes history (or, as in the narrative tradition, pretends to write it), a causal explanation is already a justification and at the same time a classification according to a certain order of (preconceived, L.K.) values.”²⁷

A different organization of ever shifting truth-producing narrations also implies a shift in the epistemic positioning of the authorial narrator. Through an author assumed to be invisible and a “voice” (i.e. subtitles, voice over etc.) a narrative-didactic figure is present. This authorial “voice” approaches the subject matter not in order to present a factual report as in the field of traditional documentary, but to offer an in-depth, personal, and thought-provoking reflection. At the level of rhetorical structures, in order to convey such reflection, the cinematic essayist creates an enunciator who is very close to the real, extra-textual author. The difference is minor, as the enunciator clearly represents the author’s views and is their spokesperson, even if he hides behind a different or even multiple names or personas. The essay’s authorial speaker may remain a voice-over or appear physically in the film. The text of a knowing individual assumes a humble or limited outlook to efface the authority its very existence claims; the ‘first person observes’ text assumes the third person; the I that speaks, it seems, so honestly to the reader is a created I: the third person ostensibly speaks for no one or for everyone, but actually seeks to make the invisible I persuasive. Eventually, the essay’s contradictions multiply into opposing terms that, again, make the essay appear unclassifiable: subject/object; science/art; referential/literary; fiction/nonfiction. Reading or writing an essay is an act of negative capability. Several sets of opposites must be entertained at one and the same time. The resulting tension – important to the essay’s particular sort of persuasion – is perhaps most dramatically represented in the use of person.²⁸

As the essay combines a confrontation of the self with the commentary processing of worldly artifacts, it seems perfect for the use in school contexts. As an example of the educational use of the film essay in universities, I would like to mention the work of Michael Baute.²⁹ In some of his classes, he showed and thoroughly discussed a certain film. The students were then invited to create a video essay about a certain part

or certain motifs of the film. While creating these video essays on existing films, the students had to make precise decisions in a short amount of time. They had to learn how to relate to a film in the form of voice-over, subtitles and/or text panels that would represent their reading of the film as a commentary narrative. Various relations must be tried out, different procedures practiced. And then the question of the form itself arises: the linguistic form that is developed, the text, the commentary, is only an intermediate goal. After this process, as in any other film production, images and sounds have to be organized.

For the third part of my text, I want to further elaborate on the methods of montage – of the visual and linguistic reasoning inherent in the essay. I will introduce the notion of the interstice and its relation to thinking.

Methods of essayistic reasoning: Interstice, images of thought and transgressive events

When Gilles Deleuze was writing about “Here and Elsewhere” by Jean-Luc Godard, he introduced the concept of the *interstice*, which he described as a spacing “between two actions, between affections, between perceptions, between two visual images, between two sound images, between the sound and the visual.”³⁰ In his conception of cinema as an image of thought, the interstice played a central role. It derived from a technological peculiarity. By breaking the sensory-motor linkages typical of the movement-image, the interval is set free. Through the interval, another technique is born: the irrational cut no longer links images to each other because their material, causal chains are broken and the fissures between them become larger.³¹ In rhetoric figures of irrational cutting, the image which follows another one has to be chosen. The operation of choosing then induces an interstice between the two. “This is not an operation of association, but of differentiation, as mathematicians say, or of disappearance, as physicists say: given one potential, another one has to be chosen, not any whatever, but in such a way that a difference of potential is established between the two,

which will be productive of a third or of something new,”³² recognizes film critic Laura Rascaroli. One recalls that, for Deleuze, the operation of thinking “is not to interpret or to reflect, but to experiment and to create.”³³ Thinking, in this regard, is linked to the new, to the emergent, and is “not external to thought but lies at its very heart”.³⁴ The space in which the new occurs is, in Deleuzian terms, an event that coincides with an act of speculation for the spectator.³⁵ Images are becoming radically external to each other and yet the confrontation between their inside and their outside produces something new, that is, a new *image of thought*.

As we have seen, the epistemology of the essay is perpetuated by the interstice which is able to produce images of thought. But there is a second component which seems to be crucial for the understanding of the essay’s epistemic dynamic. Transgression is a characteristic that the essay film shares with the literary essay, which is also often described as a protean form. Using techniques of horizontal montage, the essayistic line of thought is not necessarily formed through causal connections, but rather through an ordering experience of seeing and hearing, through juxtapositions instead of hierarchizations or divisions. It *acts* between images in the essay film, between words, sentences, and paragraphs in the literary essay, but also *through* them. Essays seem to present a critical epistemology processed by aesthetic, rather than authoritative-persuasive practice. It thus enables a reassessment and reconfiguration of standard, dominant types of knowledge.³⁶ I would like to describe this by shifting the horizon of epistemic action: When we are essayistically engaging with the world, we are writing or filming or speaking horizontally. We are not diving into the depths of originality or universality, but we are wandering through a surface where everything can take place, everything can be seen and everything lies side-by-side. Its epistemology is the adjacency of things, where the epistemic viewpoint shifts from verticality to horizontality.

The educational essay?

As mentioned above, the essay does have its place in educational contexts, cf. Michael Baute's video essay seminars. In many countries, essay writing is used as an exercise in schools. The rather short text demonstrates the student's understanding of a certain subject. It serves as an interpretation in the etymological sense. But essayistic interpretations are not philologically hardened and sober, as Adorno writes.³⁷ Rather, the essay celebrates over-interpretation as opposed to the predictable verdict of calculating reason. Adorno's conception of the essay as a critique of the academic and scholarly appropriate argumentation is rather rare in this regard. Because "nothing can be interpreted out of something that is not interpreted into it at the same time. The criteria for such interpretation are its compatibility with the text and with itself, and its power to give voice to the elements of the object in conjunction with one another."³⁸ The essay in its epistemically driven form is a specific method of artistic inquiry, an oscillating form of constant change. It thus undermines the dominant division of labour into the aesthetic and the epistemological.³⁹ Educational visions of the essay foreground its ability to break the boundaries and conditioning effects of learning itself. It was Montaigne who had the idea of an essay-based, inclusive learning: "He thus initiated, for the immediate future, 'a worldly literature breaking with specialized learning, the literature of l'honnête homme [the cultivated gentleman]' (Hugo Friedrich, 1949), and for the long run, the destiny of the essay as a vehicle of humanistic learning."⁴⁰

I would like to enhance Montaigne's conception with some reflections on methods in the educational vision of Roland Barthes, another prolific figure regarding the practice of the epistemic essay. For his teachings in the Collège de France, Barthes envisioned to "present" a discourse without imposing it, a discourse as a point of debate. For what can be oppressive in the realm of teaching is not the culture it conveys, he says, but the discursive forms through which we propose them. Therefore, his teaching aims to treat discourses in their power-relatedness. As a method, it can be directed only to the means that are suitable to thwart this power, to get rid of it or at least to reduce it. He is

convinced that in writing, as in teaching, the basic operation of *solving* consists in fragmentation, in digression. Or, to use a different word: in the *digression* which combines speaking and listening in performative acts that rely on each other.⁴¹

Acting in between – A teaching workshop in Basel

For the symposium “Teaching Artistic Strategies: Playing with Materiality, Aesthetics and Ambiguity” at the University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland Basel, I conceived a workshop where I tried to initiate educational experiences through the practice of the essay. It was a workshop with a small group of symposium participants and the team. It was held in the main building in a multifunctional seminar room. The room was prepared with a huge table on which I spread out dozens of postcard-sized b/w images. It was my personal image archive consisting of photos of thinkers, pictograms, symbols, signs, and motifs that I used in lecture performances or presentations. Before we looked at these pictures, we played an associative game: one person starts with a term and responds to it, i.e. “When I hear fruit, I say sour.” When another person of the group has an association in response they continue, i.e. “When I hear sour, I say my boss.” After we played for ten minutes, we proceeded to the next step. The group was invited to look at the pile of pictures. I invited the workshop members to pick one image which caught their attention and would provide the starting point of a personal essayistic reflection. In thinking about possible connections and relations, textual “voice-overs” arose, like a personal layer which complements the images and creates links between them. These sentences or words could be written on empty cards, starting with “I...” to emphasize the subjective authorship. More and more links between the image and individual thoughts and experiences were found and a short series of images arose. The operation of selecting is not random, but follows a tentative-fumbling order, beginning with the slow observation of images. The following speculations about possible relations, however, only become fruitful when a relation emerges in the material juxtaposition.

For at first it is not yet a pictorial knowledge but the assumption of a potential relation. In contact with the images, unforeseen references arise, things that are not expected, but which nevertheless, or precisely because of this, harbor epistemic potential. When orders emerge from the images themselves, a different narrative can be told, and a structurally divergent story emerges. After finishing, the participants were asked to pin their narration on the wall, so that every person of the group could see what the other ones had created.

Fig. 1



Courtesy of Lennart Krauss

Turning vertical into horizontal writing

Teaching as a mono-directional way of transmitting knowledge from the knowing to the unknowing, as it has been conceived in recent cen-

turies, is based on the solidifying relation of terms, concepts or ideas with/as images. It seems to be precisely the mobilizing, destabilizing performance of the essay that tells us something about the authors, documents, material, and media involved. If we want to ask about the educational “gain” of essayistic practice, we could list experiences of media-reflexivity and probably knowledge about our self. Beyond that, it is also the self in its epistemic ability to act through transgression, interstice and its own flexible position of authorship that is empowered to engage with the world. We interact with it playfully, acting *evidently* in modes of “thinking with” and “thinking through” as opposed to “thinking of” and “thinking about”. To put it simply: a shift from vertical into horizontal writing.

Notes

- 1 Dragana Stojanovic describes knowledge production in the art field as an educational turn: Stojanovic, Dragana: *Educational Turn in Art. Turning Art into the Production of a New Knowledge*, Zbornik Akademije Umetnosti, no. 5/2017: 56–64.
- 2 Holert, Tom: *Knowledge Beside Itself. Contemporary Art's Epistemic Politics*. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2020, p. 8.
- 3 Corrigan, Timothy: *The Essay Film. From Montaigne, After Marker*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 13–14.
- 4 If not further explained, I use “the essay” to describe the essay as a specific epistemic form. “An Essay” should comprise the wide range of essays in varying domains (epistolary essay, feuilleton essay etc.).
- 5 Adorno, Theodor W: ‘The Essay as Form’, in Rolf Tiedemann, eds.: *Notes on Literature*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1991, 3–24.
- 6 Gordon, Eleanor Risteen: *The authority of the essay. Philosophical, rhetorical, and cognitive considerations of person*. Chicago: University of Illinois. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/51464odbcb3b5caf8be5eec7184ce6b/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>. Accessed 11 January 2023, p. 7.
- 7 Aquilina, Mario: *The Essay at the Limits. Poetics, Politics and Form*. London: Bloomsbury, 2021, p. 1.
- 8 Bense, Max: ‘On The Essay And Its Prose’, in Nora M. Alter & Timothy Corrigan, eds.: *Essays on the Essay Film*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017, 49–59, p. 52.
- 9 Adorno calls it an “aesthetic act”, see Theodor W. Adorno: ‘The Essay As Form’, in Nora M. Alter & Timothy Corrigan, eds.: *Essays on the Essay Film*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017, 60–82, p. 59.
- 10 “L'essai n'est pas une pensée, une évaluation des idées; c'est un essai d'idées-mots”, Belleau, André: ‘Petite Essayistique’. *Liberté* 25, no. 6 (1983): 7–10, p. 9.
- 11 Aquilina, Mario: *The Essay at the Limits. Poetics, Politics and Form*. London: Bloomsbury, 2021, p. 2.

- 12 Institutionalized contexts of education act similarly. In the school system it seems to be representable, documentable knowledge that is being processed through teaching strategies which result in quantifiable assessments.
- 13 Holert, Tom: *Knowledge Beside Itself. Contemporary Art's Epistemic Politics*, p. 257.
- 14 Lukács, Georg von: 'On The Nature And Form Of The Essay', in Nora M. Alter & Timothy Corrigan, eds.: *Essays on the Essay Film*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2017, 21–40, p. 37.
- 15 Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de: *The Essays of Michel de Montaigne*. London: Bell, 1700, p. 254.
- 16 The words *Essai* or *coup d'essai* originally meant the apprentice artisan's work as distinct from the master's, by extension it came to mean "probing", "trying out", "testing" or "trial", cf. Montaigne, Michel de: *Les Essais*. Paris: Gallimard, 2007.
- 17 Montaigne, Michel de: *The Complete Essays*. New York: Penguin Books, 1993, p. 27.
- 18 Chevalier, Tracy, eds.: *Encyclopedia of the Essay*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997, p. 1202.
- 19 Ibid., p. 1203.
- 20 Gordon, Eleanor Risteen: *The authority of the essay. Philosophical, rhetorical, and cognitive considerations of person*, p. vi.
- 21 Montaigne, Michel: 'Michel de Montaigne (Ft. Charles Cotton) – Essays of Michel de Montaigne (Chap. 3.13)'. <https://genius.com/Michel-de-montaigne-essays-of-michel-de-montaigne-chap-313-annotated>. Accessed 26 May 2023.
- 22 Chevalier, Tracy, eds.: *Encyclopedia of the Essay*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997, pp. 1203–4.
- 23 Ibid., p. 1203.
- 24 Gordon, Eleanor Risteen: *The authority of the essay. Philosophical, rhetorical, and cognitive considerations of person*, 2.
- 25 Astruc, Alexandre. 'The Birth of a New Avant-Garde: La Caméra-Style', in: Peter Graham, eds.: *The New Wave*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968, 17–23, p. 18.

- 26 “By language I mean a form in which and by which an artist can express his thoughts, however abstract they may be, or translate his obsessions exactly as he does in the contemporary essay or novel. That is why I would like to call this new age of the cinema the age of *caméra-stylo* (camera-pen). This metaphor has a very precise sense. By it I mean that the cinema will gradually break free from the tyranny of what is visual, from the image for its own sake, from the immediate and concrete demands of the narrative, to become a means of writing just as flexible and subtle as written language.” Ibid.
- 27 Eco, Umberto: *Das offene Kunstwerk*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2016, p. 354.
- 28 Gordon, Eleanor Risteen: *The authority of the essay. Philosophical, rhetorical, and cognitive considerations of person*. 4.
- 29 Baute, Michael & Katja Kynast: ‘Lektüremöglichkeiten schaffen, Autor*innenschaft generieren. Ein Gespräch zwischen Michael Baute und Katja Kynast zum studentischen Videoessay’, in: Egert Bee & Julia Gerko, eds: *Experimente Lernen, Techniken Tauschen. Ein Spekulatives Handbuch*. Weimar: Nocturne, 2020, 313–32; Baute, Michael & Stefan Pethke: ‘Sehen Sprechen Herstellen Gespräch über Seminare zur Produktion filmvermittelnder Filme’, in: *Nach Dem Film* (blog), 2013. <https://www.nachdemfilm.de/issues/text/sehen-sprechen-herstellen>. Accessed 11 January 2023.
- 30 Deleuze, Gilles: *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1989, p. 180.
- 31 Rascaroli, Laura: *How the Essay Film Thinks*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2017, p. 9.
- 32 Deleuze, Gilles: *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1989, p. 179–80. Emphasis in the original.
- 33 Rodowick, David Norman: *Gilles Deleuze’s Time Machine*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997, p. 198.
- 34 Deleuze, Gilles: *Foucault*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988, p. 80.
- 35 Rascaroli, Laura: *How the Essay Film Thinks*, p. 11.
- 36 Holert, Tom: *Knowledge Beside Itself: Contemporary Art’s Epistemic Politics*, p. 258.

- 37 Adorno, Theodor W: 'The Essay as Form', in Rolf Tiedemann, eds.: *Notes on Literature*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1991, 3–24, pp. 4–5.
- 38 Ibid., pp. 3–4.
- 39 Ibid., p. 16.
- 40 Chevalier, Tracy, eds.: *Encyclopedia of the Essay*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1997, p. 1203.
- 41 Barthes, Roland: 'Lecture in Inauguration of the Chair of Literary Semiology, College de France, January 7, 1977'. *October* 8 (1979): 3–16, pp. 14–15.

