

1. Amity Reading

“Documenting Shakespeare: Recording the Un-recordable in Theatre Documentary”

Feature film adaptations of the plays of Shakespeare have unsurprisingly received more attention than documentaries of stage productions. But the corpus of Shakespearian documentary is rich and varied. Released in May 2014, *Now: In the Wings on a World Stage* follows the 10-month international tour of *Richard III*, produced by and starring Kevin Spacey. Like *Looking for Richard*, Al Pacino’s 1996 documentary on the same play, Spacey’s film includes excerpts of rehearsals and performances as well as personal interviews with the cast and production crew. *Shakespeare High* (2011), also produced by Spacey, is a documentary following a group of California high school students as they compete in a Shakespeare festival. *Shakespeare Behind Bars* (2005) documents the 9-month rehearsal process of the Luther Lockett Correctional Center production of *The Tempest*, which was the eighth production of Curt Toffland’s controversial SBB off-shoot of the Kentucky Shakespeare Festival. And these are just to name a few. Though the subject matter of each documentary is arguably unique, they all share a desire to record the un-recordable—a live production of Shakespeare; or perhaps more precisely, a patch-work of instances of a live production. This paper explores the tensions between the documentary genre and the live performance of Shakespeare. What do such films of stage plays seek to document? Insofar as the genre seeks to preserve and present, how does the documentary play with our expectations about recording ‘history’ in all its forms, and what unique implications does this have for the plays of Shakespeare? Who are the audiences consuming these documentaries, and what do they derive from them?

BIO: Amity Reading is assistant professor of English at DePauw University. Her area of specialization is Anglo-Saxon England, with subspecialties in later medieval literature, Shakespeare, and the Renaissance. Her publications are on Anglo-Saxon and later medieval religious poetry, but she remains an active participant in Shakespeare studies through her teaching and her acting.

2. Melissa Croteau

“They kill us for their sport”: Depictions of the Spiritual and Transcendent in the Shakespeare Adaptations of Kurosawa

Religion and art
are parallel lines
which intersect only at infinity,
and meet in God.
—Gerardus Van Der Leeuw

This is the epigraph to Paul Schrader’s well known 1972 monograph *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer*, which, in many ways, is the conceptual starting point for this study of the Shakespeare adaptations of master filmmaker Akira Kurosawa, who receives but one cursory mention in Schrader’s book. Eminent Japanese film scholar Donald Richie has declared that

Kurosawa is the most “modern,” and thereby most “Western,” of Japanese filmmakers in the twentieth century, while Yasujiro Ozu is the most traditionally Japanese. This is a distinction Kurosawa himself loathed. This essay will explore the ways in which *Throne of Blood* (1955), *The Bad Sleep Well* (1960), and *Ran* (1985)—adaptations of *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*, respectively—depict spiritual subjects, such as the witches of *Macbeth*, the ghost of Hamlet’s father, and the sadistic pagan gods of *King Lear*, in manifestly Japanese forms. In moments of spiritual transcendence, Kurosawa uses space and silence, identified by Schrader as a Zen Buddhist technique, to express the supernatural and ineffable. Several scholars have written about the ties between Noh theater, rooted strongly in Shinto and Buddhist traditions, and the *Throne of Blood* and *Ran*, but this study also will examine the expression of transcendence and spirituality accomplished by Kurosawa’s Brechtian use of Noh’s ritualistic conventions, which are chosen over standard Hollywood stylistics. While the director was a self-described humanist who adhered to no religion, Kurosawa’s penchant for moral codes and ethical behavior is evident in every film of his oeuvre, and he uses Shinto and Buddhist elements to articulate these messages. Through the auteur’s consummate use of mise-en-scène, cinematography, sound, and editing, Kurosawa translates Shakespeare’s various portrayals of early modern spiritual beliefs and lore into vivid, distinctly Japanese illustrations of spirituality, including forest spirits, animal demons, Amida Buddha, and transcendent madness, all of which lead to desolation of the soul (one meaning of *ran*) and of the nation.

BIO: Melissa Croteau is an Associate Professor of Film Studies and the Director of Film Studies at California Baptist University. For nearly two decades, she has been teaching university courses ranging from the history and theory of film to Shakespeare and Renaissance culture. Dr. Croteau has presented papers and given lectures on world cinema, Shakespeare on film, and religion in film at numerous international conferences. Her publications include the book *Re-forming Shakespeare: Adaptations and Appropriations of the Bard in Millennial Film and Popular Culture* (LAP, 2013); a co-edited volume entitled *Apocalyptic Shakespeare: Essays on Visions of Chaos and Revelation in Recent Film Adaptations* (McFarland, 2009); an edited collection entitled *Reel Histories: Studies in American Film* (Press Americana, 2008); and essays on the films *V for Vendetta* (2005) and *Hamlet Goes Business* (1986).

3. Samuel Crowl

“Orson Welles and the Riderless Horse”

In his German TV documentary on the making of his film of *Othello*, Orson Welles maintains that films need to begin with what he calls the “riderless horse” shot to immediately capture the viewer’s attention. It is true that most plays open quietly, not quite with a whimper but with dialogue as exposition which allows the audience to gradually settle in their seats, acclimate themselves to the actors on the stage, and adjust their eyes and ears to the performance. Films, however, tend to open with a bang; a dominant visual sequence which gathers us up into the action or arouses our curiosity. With an eye on Welles’s horse, my paper will explore the beginnings of a range of Shakespeare films from Laurence Olivier’s *Henry V* to Julie Taymor’s *The Tempest*. I am interested in the variety of ways these openings use film grammar and rhetoric (elements of film formalism) to suggest how they derive from some obvious or subtle images and themes (elements of literary formalism) in Shakespeare’s text. My paper itself will not follow its own rules of the essay game, however, failing to make a coherent argument by linking my film examples into some overarching theory. I will treat each opening (and elements from the film which follows)

independently and then move on the next example. I plan to draw those examples from Welles Chimes at Midnight, Kozintsev's Hamlet, Brook's King Lear, Branagh's Much Ado about Nothing, Nunn's Twelfth Night, and the aforementioned films by Olivier and Taymor.

BIO: Sam Crowl is Trustee Professor of English at Ohio University where he has taught since 1970. He has been several times honored for distinguished teaching, twice having been chosen by the students to serve as a University Professor. He is the author of five books on Shakespeare in Performance, the most recent being *Screen Adaptations: Hamlet* (Bloomsbury/Arden, 2014).

4. Barbara J. Bono

Untying the knot in *Othello*: Mike Figgis's *Internal Affairs* and "He has no children"

Just after the Menendez brothers shotgunned their parents to death (August 20, 1989), before Rodney King was beaten by the Los Angeles police (March 3, 1991), before O.J. Simpson murdered his wife Nicole Brown Simpson (June 19, 1994), there was *Internal Affairs* (released January 12, 1990). British director Mike Figgis's contemporary *los Angelino* film about how an expert, sleek, and clever bad cop turns an ambitious *latino* IAD officer against his *anglo* wife presciently stirs a stew of racial, cultural, economic and sexual anxieties characteristic of that sprawling west coast city. Figgis, originally a musician who is best known for his 1995 Oscar-nominated film *Leaving Las Vegas*, spent over 10 years with the British experimental theatre troupe *The People Show* and is a notorious innovator with film technique. He also knows his classics. Besides capturing the Los Angeles scene, *Internal Affairs* updates Shakespeare's *Othello*—complete with incriminating panty rather than the handkerchief—by also undoing the heterosexual knot that binds that play, in the process both releasing women's agency and offering a grim analysis of American turn-of-the-century market forces.

BIO: Barbara Bono is Associate Professor in the Department of English at SUNY Buffalo, where she regularly teaches the culture of the early modern period, Elizabethan and Jacobean literature, the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, Shakespeare pedagogy (she trained with the Folger Education Division), and Shakespeare and film. Her scholarship has ranged from genre criticism and new formalism through historicized studies of the sex-gender system and cultural criticism and media study. She is the author of *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Tragedy to Shakespearean Tragicomedy* (1984) and numerous articles on early modern literature, and the recipient of several university-wide teaching awards.

5. Coppélia Kahn

Much Ado in Santa Monica: Film Form in Joss Whedon's *Much Ado*

Joss Whedon, acclaimed for his six-year TV series *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997-2003) and his top-grossing movie *The Avengers* (2012), filmed his adaptation of *Much Ado About Nothing* (2013) at his home in Santa Monica. Rambling, many-roomed, light-filled, the house inspired his treatment of the play as much as did the group of actors with whom he had worked for years. They had often gathered in the house for informal readings of Shakespeare's plays. For Whedon, the house, community, and artistic creativity are interactive and inseparable.

In this paper I will explore connections between Whedon's use of this domestic space and his interpretation of *Much Ado*, which he films as a contemporary realistic comedy. "All of the relations and all of the schemes and all of the plot devices have equal weight," he says, evoking the incessant flow of his camera amongst rooms, actors, and plots. I am especially interested in testing Leo Braudy's distinction between "open" and "closed" with regard to Whedon's camera work. Does he use this domestic space as open, closed, or both? Turning to another question, how does his camera convey his reading of the play as a "noir comedy?" By that term, Whedon seems to mean that the action is love as a cynical game that characters play to the hilt, then abandon to admit (in his words) "that they have decided to need each other."

BIO: Coppélia Kahn, Professor *Emerita* of English at Brown University, is the author of *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (1981) and *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* (1997). In the past decade, her focus has shifted from gender issues to Shakespeare as cultural institution and icon. With Clara Calvo, she is co-editor of *Celebrating Shakespeare: Commemoration and Cultural Memory*, forthcoming from Cambridge University Press in 2015.

6. Rahul Sapra

"*Where Is My Romeo: Female Spectatorship and the Interrogation of Zeffirelli's Romeo and Juliet*"

Abbas Kiarostami's *Where Is My Romeo* (2007) is a 3-minute long film that captures close-ups of female spectators apparently viewing the ending of Franco Zeffirelli's *Romeo and Juliet* (1968). At no point during the 3 minutes Kiarostami provides a glimpse of Zeffirelli's film, but makes us, the intended spectators, view multiple close-ups of the weeping female spectators watching Zeffirelli's film. Kiarostami's film has been read from various perspectives: it has been dismissed as a joke, celebrated as cinema's power to move an audience, perceived as a comment on the state of women in contemporary Iran, and categorized, by Richard Burt and Julian Yates, as a "spin-off" film that leads to a "partial wrecking" of Shakespeare's play. In *Where Is My Romeo* does the audience simultaneously watch two films: Zeffirelli's film and Kiarostami's film? Or is the audience forced to reconstruct Zeffirelli's film through Kiarostami's film? These questions are related to what Laura Mulvey would call "Kiarostami's uncertainty principle" that deliberately makes the audience question the status of the images on screen. Therefore, *Where Is My Romeo* could be analysed in relation to films such as *Close-Up* (1990) and *The Taste of Cherry* (1997) that also leave the audience in a state of suspension. However, *Where Is My Romeo* is a special case, since it anticipates Kiarostami's *Shirin* (2008) that resembles *Where Is My Romeo* both in terms of style and content: *Shirin* not only focuses on female spectators, but like Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* it is a tragic love tale, which is derived from the works of the Iranian poet Nizami Ganjavi, whom Kiarostami has compared to Shakespeare. In his adaptations of these tragic love tales why does Kiarostami keep the spectators gaze away from the visual narrative supposedly portrayed on the screen, and instead attempts to convey the narrative through the reactions of the female spectators apparently watching the visuals on screen? I plan to address some of these questions to examine Kiarostami's cinematic reconstruction and critique of Zeffirelli's *Romeo and Juliet*.

BIO: Rahul Sapra is an Associate Professor (English) at Ryerson University, and he has also taught as a Permanent Lecturer in the University of Delhi. His research interests include Renaissance Literatures, Shakespearean Drama, Literary Theory, and Third-World Cinema. His book *The Limits of Orientalism: Seventeenth-Century Representations of India* (2011) analyses early-modern European representations of India and provides alternatives to Said's discourse of "Orientalism". He is the

Subject Editor for the Film section of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Modernism* (Forthcoming- 330 entries). His current research deals with diverse ways of reading Shakespeare in India by analysing the unexplored areas of Hindi and Punjabi translations, English-language stage productions, and "Bollywood"/Hindi and Punjabi film adaptations (Monograph in progress: *Is Shakespeare a Foreigner in India?*).

7. Dr. Simon Ryle

Shakespeare's e-a-r

This paper explores two illustrative examples of the way Shakespeare has been taken up by modernity. It focuses on the figure of the ear in Shakespeare's poetry, and compares the place that Shakespeare's ear takes in the cinema of Jean-Luc Godard and the psychoanalysis of Jacques Lacan. Richard Wilson (2007) argues that a delimiting conservatism in the research questions put by conventional Shakespearean scholarship is overturned by the French perspective. As my paper investigates, this is especially so with regards to Shakespeare's ear. I consider how Lacan's idea of the orifice as the site at which the subject constitutes itself in a relation with an object of lack, developed during his teaching on Shakespeare, is rethought in Godard's concentration on issues of sound and listening in his adaptation of *King Lear* (1987). As Godard describes his protagonist in that film: "The King who calls himself Lear: e-a-r".

In drawing together Lacan and Godard, I rethink Joel Fineman's suggestion that "for Shakespeare it is specifically the ear that is the organ of the text, of the specifically typographic text, and that is something that must, for now, be postponed, though Shakespeare's sonnet 46 would be one place to begin." (1989, 13). With his "organ of the text" Fineman directs us towards the ambivalent function of ears in Shakespeare's writing – both engines of typographic play, and embodied sites of perception and vulnerability. What is curious is that sonnet 46, which stages a debate between the heart and the eye that is conventional in epideictic sonnets of the Renaissance, seems initially to exclude ears from both the senses and sensibilities under discussion. Following Fineman's tip-off, my paper illustrates how, by turning to the occluded typographic e-a-r-s of the sonnet alongside the insights of Godard and Lacan, one is able to read beyond the speaker's conventional division of interiority (heart) and exteriority (eye). I consider why it might be that the full significance of Shakespeare can only be seen after the fact, in the light of modernity. As Lacan and Godard help us recognize, the possibility of reading Shakespearean epistemologies as a decisive factor in the epistemic formulations of an incipient modernism pivots on the question of Shakespeare's ear.

BIO: Simon Ryle teaches literature and film at the University of Split, Croatia. His monograph, *Shakespeare, Cinema and Desire: Adaptation and Other Futures of Shakespeare's Language* was published by Palgrave

Macmillan in 2014.

8. Niamh J. O'Leary

Ariel on Screen: The Ephemeral in Film Form

Prospero's "brave spirit," Ariel, is the lighter, airier half of the island's native population in *The Tempest*. While Caliban represents earthy, human appetite and attitude, Ariel represents the intangible, often invisible magic of the island. This paper will interrogate how film takes up the challenge of presenting this figure, focusing primarily on how film form is used to craft the spirit's magical presence. I will examine the intersections of film techniques and the text, in particular attending to the songs Ariel sings throughout the play, often while he is working his magic. I hope to focus on Julie Taymor's 2010 film, which has been panned for its jerky, excessive use of stylized visual effects and garbled audio. I will examine this film in the context of Taymor's own oeuvre, and in the context of other major *Tempest* films, in particular Derek Jarman's (1979) and Paul Mazursky's (1982). I will analyze how these filmic design choices work to characterize Ariel as ephemeral and magical, and to what extent they succeed or fail, both in terms of the traditions of this play on screen, and in terms of Taymor's personal film style.

BIO: Niamh J. O'Leary is an Assistant Professor of English at Xavier University in Cincinnati, OH. Her research focuses on representations of communities of women in Renaissance drama, particularly addressing issues of marriage, maternity, and ethnicity; and she also publishes on Shakespeare on film and stage. Her articles have appeared in *Upstart Crow*, *Early Modern Studies Journal*, and *The Shakespearean International Yearbook*. Currently she is co-editing a volume of essays on early modern women's political alliances.

9. Michael D. Friedman

"Livecast as Film: *Coriolanus*"

I am interested in the question of the degree to which one might consider broadcasts such as National Theatre Live, which transmits stage productions from various British theatres via satellite to cinemas and art centers all over the world, to be films. Although these performances are undeniably theatrical, an audience that experiences them in two dimensions on a cinematic screen, complete with some of the techniques of camera work, editing, and sound associated with the "filmic mode," undergoes an experience that combines elements associated with both theatre and cinema. I plan to examine this issue with reference to the Donmar Warehouse production of *Coriolanus* (2013) directed by Josie Rourke and featuring Tom Hiddleston in the title role, which I will compare to the more standard "film" version of *Coriolanus* (2011) directed by and starring Ralph Fiennes. The rising popularity of such "livecasts" suggests that an increasing number of spectators will experience Shakespearean performances through this mode, which is, at present under-theorized. I hope to explore the implications of this trend on the study of Shakespeare on film.

BIO: I teach Shakespeare and other dramatic literature in the McDade Center for Literary and Performing Arts at the University of Scranton. I am the author of several articles dealing with performance criticism of Shakespeare's plays and two books: *The World Must Be Peopled': Shakespeare's Comedies of Forgiveness* (2002) and the second edition of the volume dedicated to *Titus Andronicus* in the Manchester UP Shakespeare in Performance Series (2013). My current research concerns the

theatrical and cinematic history of *Coriolanus*, with a special emphasis on Fiennes' film, which I examine in an article forthcoming in *Literature/Film Quarterly*.

10. William Kerwin

Framing Complaint, Filming Clarence: From Poetry to Film in Two Versions of *Richard III*

I am interested in sixteenth-century poetry and its part in Shakespeare's plays and adaptations of them, and in particular, complaint poetry, the mid-century form made popular by *The Mirror for Magistrates*. In this paper, I am going to look at two film adaptation of one complaint-like speech from *Richard III*, a pre-death speech by Clarence in act one. I draw upon the work of Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener, *Film Theory: An Introduction Through the Senses* (Routledge 2010), especially the sections dealing with "Cinema as Window and Frame" and "Cinema as Door—Screen and Threshold." They see "the framing of the filmic image as its essential element" (8), and I take that idea of the frame in two directions: into the poetic tradition, and into the Olivier (1955) and Loncraine (1995) adaptations of the play. I will first look at some of the constituent framing elements of the complaint tradition, and then the filmic use of doors, windows, frames, and shadows in these two scenes.

BIO: William Kerwin is associate professor of English at the University of Missouri. He published *Beyond the Body: The Boundaries of Medicine and English Renaissance Drama* (2005), and is now working on a study of three genres of English satiric poetry across the sixteenth century: the satiric epigram, complaint poetry, and verse satire. He teaches Shakespeare and other Renaissance literature courses, Literature and Medicine, and Irish literature. He has been teaching Shakespeare on film for about five years.

11. Mariangela Tempera

SHAKESPEARE FROM STAGE TO SCREEN: GABRIELE SALVATORE'S *SOGNO DI UNA NOTTE D'ESTATE* (1983)

In 1981, Gabriele Salvatores directed his adaptation of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for the Teatro dell'Elfo, a Milan-based theatre company. He set the play in modern-day Milan, combined Shakespeare's lines (translated into very colloquial Italian) with new dialogue, and gave the comedy a much darker ending. At the end of its three-year run, the show had been seen by two hundred thousand spectators, a huge number by Italian standards. A group of producers suggested that Salvatores should turn it into a film. Totally unexperienced but determined to create a movie and not merely a filmed version of a theatre production, Salvatores started reading manuals on directing for the screen (he was obviously a quick learner: eight years later, his *Mediterraneo* would win the Academy Award for Best Foreign Film).

The paper will examine how the director adapts his work for the screen, with particular reference to the camera work that guides the attention of the spectators towards details of the action that would have gone unnoticed on stage and that allows him to substitute segments of the text with visual images. It will also explore the relevance of his casting choices as ways of suggesting his interpretation of the text. For example, he transfers to Lisandro and Demetrio the tall-short contrast that Shakespeare so pointedly required for Ermia and Elena, and the undercurrents of same-sex love that some critics have seen in the quarrel between the girls. By casting Gianna Nannini (Italy's Nina

Hagen) as Titania, and involving the fairies in a series of musical numbers, he turns the play into what a critic called a *Rocky Shakespeare Picture Show*.

BIO: Mariangela Tempera is professor of English Literature at the University of Ferrara and director of the Ferrara Shakespeare Centre, which houses a large collection of Shakespeare-related video materials. She is currently working on a dictionary of references to Shakespeare's works in Italian cinema.

12. Scott Hollifield

The Sticking Place: Celluloid Re-Textualization in Roman Polanski's *Macbeth* (1971)

Having shot and edited Roman Polanski's psychologically unnerving character studies *Repulsion* (1965) and *Cul-de-sac* (1966), Gilbert Taylor and Alastair McIntyre proved the ideal creative technicians to realize the director's cinematic approach to *Macbeth*. Abetted by McIntyre's background in sound editing (in league with further collaborators and a distinctive, dissonant score by The Third Ear Band), the film emphasizes the essential conceit of "hearing a play" even as it immerses itself in walking shadows and the bloodiness of foul deeds. Polanski and co-adapter Kenneth Tynan treat the dramatic text as a gateway to Shakespeare's imagination, an aesthetic corroborated by the film's technical solutions to such subjective problems of imagination as nightmare, delusion, and hallucination. As a result, Shakespeare/Tynan/Polanski/Taylor/McIntyre's world-creation thrives at the nexus of stagebound artificiality, medieval period film, and cinematic possibility.

This essay will contemplate two narrative innovations commonly attributed to Shakespeare—the "Banquet" and "Sleepwalking" sequences—filtered dramaturgically through the Tynan/Polanski collaboration and re-textualized in the cinematic language established by Polanski/Taylor/McIntyre in their previous collaborations.

BIO: Scott Hollifield is an Assistant Professor at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas where he teaches World and British Literatures. An habitual gawker at any collision of Shakespeare and cinema, he has composed a monograph on Shakespeare's Chaucerian muse and contributed articles on film to *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation*. His current projects include the article "Dirty Rats, Dead for a Ducat: Shakespearean Accidents in Some Films of James Cagney" and the *Shakespeare and Film Theory* volume of the forthcoming *Shakespeare and Theory* series from Bloomsbury/Arden.

Seminar-Sourced Selective Bibliography

Burnett, Mark Thornton *Shakespeare and World Cinema* (Cambridge, 2013)

Burt, Richard and Julian Yates. *What's The Worst Thing You Can Do To Shakespeare?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Calbi, Maurizio *Spectral Shakespeares*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Crowl, Samuel. *Shakespeare and Film: A Norton Guide*. New York: Norton, 2008.

Donaldson, Peter S. *Shakespearean Films/Shakespearean Directors* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990)

Donaldson, Peter S. "The Shakespeare Interactive Archive: New Directions in Electronic

- Scholarship on Text and Performance,” in *Contextual Media*, ed. Edward Barrett and Marie Redmond (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), pp. 103-127
- Elsaesser, Thomas and Malte Hagener, *Film Theory: An Introduction Through the Senses*. Routledge 2010 [another participant adds of this source: “especially chapter 1, ‘Cinema as Window and Frame.’”]
- Guneratne, Anthony *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity* (Palgrave/MacMillan, 2008).
- Holland, Peter, “Two-Dimensional Shakespeare: *King Lear* on Film,” in *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*, ed. Stanley Wells and Anthony Davies (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 50-68.
- Huang, Alexa and Elizabeth Rivlin, Eds. *Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation*. Palgrave, October 2014.
- Jackson, Russell. *Shakespeare Films in the Making: Vision, Production, and Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.
- Johnson, Randal, and Robert Stam, eds, *Brazilian Cinema*, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995)
- Jorgens, Jack J. *Shakespeare on Film* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976)
- Kidnie, Margaret Jane, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (NY: Routledge, 2009)
- Lehmann, Courtney, and Lisa S. Starks, eds. *Spectacular Shakespeare: Critical Theory and Popular Cinema*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2002.
- Lehmann, Courtney, *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Postmodern* (Cornell & London: Cornell University Press, 2002).
- Metz, Christian. “*Trucage* and the Film.” Trans. Françoise Meltzer. *Critical Inquiry* 3.4 (1977): 657–75.
- Mulvey, Laura. “Kiarostami’s Uncertainty Principle” *Sight and Sound*, June 1998. 24-7.
- Prince, Stephen. *The Warrior’s Camera: The Cinema of Akira Kurosawa*. Rev. and exp. ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.
- Ryle, Simon, *Shakespeare, Cinema and Desire: Adaptation and Other Futures of Shakespeare’s Language* (Palgrave, 2014)
- Sanders, Julie, *Adaptation and Appropriation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006)
- Schrader, Paul. *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer*. 1972. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 1988. Print.
- Stam, Robert, and Alessandra Raengo, eds. *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Adaptation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004. Print.
- Williams, Linda (ed.), *Viewing Positions: Ways of Seeing Film*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1994.