Short Cuts : Robert Altman's Film Adaptation of Short Stories by Raymond Carver

Leonard Sanders

> There is always a moment when the cinema meets the unforseeable or the improvisation, the irreducibility of a present living under the present of narration, and the camera cannot even begin its work without engendering its own improvisations, both as obstacles and as indispensable means.
>
> Gilles Deleuze

INTRODUCTION

Films do not exist in isolation. They exist in an active network of relations and practices. The interrelation of film and literature is the subject of this paper, in particular, film adaptation. My focus will be two stories by Raymond Carver, *They're Not Your Husband,* and *Will You Please Be Quiet, Please*? They were adapted to screen by Robert Altman for his film *Short Cuts* (1993)[1]. Although the emphasis is on textual analysis, I hope to raise issues relevant to the wider cultural context in which the process of adaptation takes place, its position in and contribution to "the field of cultural production"[2]

I will begin with some general observations. In an introduction to *Short Cuts: Selected Stories* by Raymond Carver[3], Altman writes: "Cinematic equivalents of literary material manifest themselves in unexpected ways" (8). Film adaptation, the transposing of material from a literary text, is a procedure which relies on the use of "cinematic equivalents". Taking up the quotation (above) from *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image,* Deleuze alludes to a recognizable moment when "cinema meets the unforseeable or the improvisation" (206). He refers to this particular case as one of "irreducibility", and links it to narration. This notion of

"irreducibility", I think, also has relevance for any discussion on film adaptation; it refers to what cannot be transposed from one media to the other, where cinematic *equivalents* are not possible.

Deleuze further remarks how the camera goes about "*engendering* its own improvisations, both as obstacles and as indispensable means" (my italics, 206). In other words, cinematic 'equivalents' are perhaps in fact cinematic strategies brought into play regarding the literary text, and which engender certain effects, "unexpected" or otherwise. A film based on a literary text, such as a novel or short story, also draws attention to its intertextuality. Cinema, by its engaging with a written language which pre-exists, cannot help but reaccent that language, a byproduct of which is "filmic textuality"[4].

In his book *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation*, Brian McFarlane points out that, in the case of adaptation, many kinds of relation exist between film and literature, and authenticity need not be a main concern[5]. He makes a distinction between those "elements which can be *transferred* and those which require *adaptation proper*, the former essentially concerned with *narrative*, which functions irrespective of medium, and the latter with *enunciation*, which calls for consideration of two different signifying systems"(195). Although narrative would seem to be the best starting point for a comparative study, my interest is in "enunciation", those elements which "involve intricate processes of adaptation because their effects are closely tied to the semiotic system in which they are manifested ..."(20). How do two different "signifying systems" meet, and, more generally, what is the outcome of this interlocking of the "languages" of film and literature[6]. In the adaptation process, elements of the literary text are reworked in different ways; in so doing, they are given different political inflections. For although adaptation is a creative process, it also requires selective interpretation on the part of the filmmaker.

The main points raised are as follows. Firstly, Carver is considered a minimalist, as the author of *Reading Raymond Carver*, notes: "In Carver there is a prevailing absence, a silence, an empty space between the lines that his texts invite us to fill" (1). We might ask how, then, can this "silence", the "empty space between the lines" be effectively realised in the film adaptation, and if so, what 'improvisations' must the camera resort to in order to convey this 'space'. Secondly, as a filmmaker Altman favors the panoramic; in his own words, "In

formulating the mosaic of the film ... I've tried to give the audience *one look*" (my italics, *Selected Stories,* 7). He favors "multiple soundtracks and the anamorphic screen which allows several simultaneous stagings" (Deleuze, 207). Given such marked differences in approach between writer and filmmaker, is any effective collaboration between cinema and literary text at all possible?

Thirdly, concerning those instances where transposition from story to film are not possible, the areas of "irreducibility", where two quite separate signifying systems are brought into play, what in fact is improvised? A good example is to be found in the use of written dialog. We can trace the transfer of an important expression like "They're not your husband", which functions most effectively in Carver's story as a lingustic utterance indicating a point of view, into a cinematic equivalent. This brings up the issue of language in relation to cinematic improvisation. Can cinematic images achieve the nuances of written speech?

Finally, I consider the difference between the way distinctly visual images are produced in the two media and how they may be received. A case in point, *Will You Please Be Quiet, Please*? Adapting parts of this story to screen, Altman resorts to cinematic strategies that require the use of images from art, in this particular scene, paintings, and a certain gendering is the result.

Because they are beyond the scope of this paper, I do not examine in any detail the question of authenticity (fidelity) between the literary text and the film, or its most important relation, narrative. Also the audience (the different ways they interpret and decode a text), and the context within which the film is consumed, i.e. the viewing context (cinema, TV, video). These last two issues are becoming increasingly important in cultural studies.

THE FILM DIRECTOR[7]

Robert Altman anticipates the authenticity (fidelity) issue in the introduction to Carver's selected stories. He clearly states his intention that *Short Cuts* will not be a visual equivalent of Carver's work. He freely admits to having 'taken liberties with Carver's work" (*Selected Stories,* 7) adding, "some purists and Carver fans may be upset"(8). He cites "film's collaborative imperative"(10) and his main concern, which is with the narrative: "I look at all of Carver's work as just one story, for his stories are all occurrences" (7). As a result, in the adaptation process, "characters have crossed over from one story to another; they connect by various

linking devices; names ... have been changed" (7-8)[8]. The locale has been changed, from what is typically known as 'Carver Country', i.e. the Pacific Northwest, to suburban Southern California. New characters have been invented, like Tess and Zoe. Storylines have been extended, in some cases completely transformed. According to Carver's widow, Tess Gallagher, Altman and Barhydt's screenplay "broke the frames on the stories" (*Screenplay*, 9) and enabled the different characters to affect each other's worlds or not.

Reviewers[9] of the film have been quick to point out the effect of such a radical re-visioning of Carver's stories: "(A)ll the film has in common with its source is a feeling for people who are disconnected ...."; or "he doesn't reproduce Raymond Carver's stories so much as his attitude". Such liberties are in keeping with the familiar Altman style of filmmaking. His early training in television (from 1957 to 1965 Altman worked in Hollywood on a variety of TV programs), contributed to his breakthrough film *Nashville* (1975), nominated for several Oscars, and notable for its dense multi-track sound[10] and layered narratives. Recently, *The Player* (1992) and *Short Cuts* the following year, with its all-star cast of twenty-two actors and actresses in nine different stories, is a return to the style of *Nashville*. Above all, Altman is credited with bringing an "explicit intertextuality" to cinema, as part of the so-called 'New Hollywood'[11].

THE SHORT STORY WRITER

Raymond Carver the writer is often associated with the minimalist school of fiction, which came to prominence in the 1970's and he is considered a master of the "minimalist idiom" (Campbell, xi), although the term itself is controversial[12]. Runyon has further pointed out the importance in Carver's stories of the "insistent struggle between saying nothing and saying something"(9), the empty space. Carver writes about characters, ordinary people, who lack a vocabulary that can release their feelings, "unspoken or misspoken words, contrary implications" (Campbell, xi).

In a Carver story there is typically a moment when an ordinary statement becomes crucial. It signals a moment of clarity, where characters are afforded a glimpse into the real nature of their lives. This effect is achieved with clarity and precision of written dialogue, for example "the elisions of (a) character's speech, the ways they glance off each other in conversation"(*Screenplay*, 9). McFarlane

comments that potentially interesting work in the study of different kinds of literary fiction to adaptation remains to be done in this area, of "characteristic diction (degrees of abstraction or concretization, use of trope, etc.) or the relative weight of dialogue and discursive prose" (199) and its bearing on the processes of adaptation. My analysis of the following Carver story looks closely at the enunciation of a line of dialogue from the original short story to the film.

They're Not Your Husband

In Carver's original story, Earl Ober is an unemployed salesman. He goes to the coffee shop where his wife, Doreen, works. Two customers enter and sit next to him at the counter. They make vulgar remarks about Doreen's figure. Says one of the men, "Look at the ass on that. I don't believe it" (*Selected Stories*, 20). Ober acts as if he doesn't know her, pretends he is a stranger when she offers him coffee. A moment later, he leaves.

The next morning he 'sells' Doreen on the idea that she must lose weight, go on a diet. Each morning he counts her lost pounds on the the scales, at night he totals up the tips she has made at the restaurant. After a while Doreen's appearance produces concern at work, and her fellow workers are afraid she is losing too much weight.

> "What is wrong with losing? he said. Don't you pay any attention to them. Tell them to mind their own business. They're not your husband. You don't have to live with them."
>
> "I have to work with them," Doreen said.
>
> "That's right, " Earl said. "But they're not your husband." (24)

In the final part of the story, Ober returns to the coffee shop to see the effect of Doreen's diet on the customers. Not getting the response he expected from customers when he asks, "What do you think of that?" (26), the tables are turned on Earl when one of the other waitresses asks who that joker is (referring to Earl), and Doreen replies matter-of-factly: "He's a salesman. He's my husband" (27) and "shrugs" him off.

According to Ewing Campbell, the qualities of this story are to be found "in the voice, the dialogue, and the revelation of character" (19). The key phrase "they're not your husband", with its strong colloquial emphasis captures in

language the exact moment when Earl dismisses both the concern of other workers for Doreen and her health at the same time. It is linked grammatically with the use of the demonstrative pronoun 'that' to refer to Doreen (as in "Look at ... that" and "What do you think of that?"). This linguistic pattern extends to include a contrast: the third person plural 'They're' used by Earl in "They're not your husband" becomes third person singular 'He's' when Doreen says "He's my husband". In Carver's story, it is language which controls the fluctuation and reversal of point of view here[13].

The adaptation of the story in Altman's film is "made of little pieces of his (Carver's) work that form sections of scenes and characters" (*Selected Stories*, 8). In the first "little piece"[14] Earl Piggot (played by Tom Waits) drives a limo, Doreen Piggot (Lily Tomlin) is a waitress working at a 24-hour cafe. Doreen walks to the counter where Earl is. His cigarette seems to be waiting for her. She takes it but she's suspicious, and asks him:"What are you doin' here?" He replies: "Just give me some coffee will ya, babe?" (*Screenplay*, 21). Doreen starts to walk away but she gives Earl a knowing nudge. He smiles as she walks off.

In another short related scene, Doreen balances three separate orders. Three men are seated at the counter. Through the window we see Earl pull up in a white limo. "What's the menu like, babe?" (32). Another scene cut, then as follows:

INT— 24-HOUR CAFE— DAY

Doreen comes up to Earl at the counter.

Doreen: So what are you gonna order?
Earl: Ah, let's see, baby. I can't read this.
Doreen: Honey, put on your real glasses.
Earl: Oh. (35)

Reaching for the butter behind the counter, Doreen's skirt hikes up giving the three men a good view. One of them says:"...how about that ass." The other replies, "I've seen better." Earl looks on: "*By now he knows this is about Doreen*" is the stage direction in the script. One of the men happens to notice Earl looking on. Earl smiles back like he's one of them. Earl gets up and leaves without Doreen noticing (and a door-to-door salesman takes his place at the counter). She looks outside and sees Earl driving away. Doreen bends over again to reach the butter and suddenly "*it dawns on her what this is all about*" (script direction). She spins

around.

Back at the Piggot trailer in the trailer park, Earl is drunk, and watching TV when Doreen comes home he picks a fight with her.

Earl: Yeah, well, I wish something would come along and change our life.

Doreen: What's that supposed to mean?

Earl: I'm just sick and tired of watching you show off your ass at work... You know a lotta guys don't like a big ass in their face when they're trying to eat....Tell you something, you know I don't know who you think'd want to look at your sad, middle-aged ass anyway. (46-47)

Earl leaves. Later, discussing the matter with her daughter (Earl's step-daughter), who calls Earl a pig, an "asshole", Doreen simply replies; "Well, he's my husband and don't you forget it" (79).

Indeed, "... film is 'wordier'. Sometimes an action demands two lines in film where one serves on the page. Sometimes a written thought or attitude will take a series of actions to translate onto film" (*Screenplay*, 9). Altman comments that "the characters do a lot of storytelling in the film, telling little stories about their lives... many of them are Carver stories....They could be talking about anything, which is not to say the language isn't important, but its subject doesn't have to be X, Y or Z" (*Selected Stories,* 10). Carver's concern for the spoken as it becomes the unspoken is lost in the switching of this line from the male voice to the female. Doreen's "Well, he's my husband" has only a note of weary affirmation, a far remove from the telling negation of Earl's "They're not your husband".

Will You Please Be Quiet, Please?

Ralph Wyman is an ordinary, albeit directionless, young man in Carver's original story. He drifts through his early college career, joins a fraternity, drinks to excess. Suddenly, he starts applying himself to his studies, meets and later marries Marian Ross, a fellow teacher. Both get teaching degrees. On their honeymoon, a trip to Guadalajara, Mexico, Ralph glimpses 'another' Marian, when he observes her on a balcony. The whole incident "put Ralph in mind of something from a film" as though he was witnessing "an intensely dramatic

moment" (*Selected Stories*, 48). A few years into the marriage finds Ralph teaching at his old high school, while Marian is an instructor at a junior college.

One night, while he is grading papers and Marian is in the kitchen ironing, a pivotal moment occurs. It centers around the revelation of Marian's one-night infidelity two or three years earlier, with Mitchell Anderson. Although Marian brings up the topic, by accident almost, "It was an impulse, that's all I can say"(53), Ralph begins an interrogation: "His mind filled with a swarm of accusations....He looked down at his hands and noticed they had the same lifeless feeling they had had when he had seen her on the balcony" (53). He becomes more agitated as she recounts the events of that night with Mitchell Anderson. When Marian says: "He said shall we have a go at it?" Ralph is beside himself with rage.

> "You let him!" he screamed.
> "No, no," she pleaded.
> "You let him! A go at it! Didn't you? Didn't you? A *go* at it! Is that what he said? Answer me!" he screamed. (55-56)

He abruptly leaves the house. And so begins his dark night of the soul, a Malcolm Lowry-style odyssey which takes him to the other side of town, the bars, card games, and a beating-up. The phrase "A *go* at it" continues to torment him. He imagines " a note being passed among his students and it said *Shall we have a go at it*? He thought of Marian ...., Marian crying out, *Go! Go! Go!* (58). Arriving home the next morning, Ralph does reach a reconciliation with Marian. However he is a markedly different person to the one who began the night grading papers.

The adaptation of this story segment to film, although preserving the core utterance "have a go at it" (italicized in Carver's text, and with linguistic variations, i.e. 'have a go', 'a go', and 'Go!') shows fundamental differences. The scene takes place in the Wyman house, mainly interiors of the house and studio. The couple are Doctor Ralph Wyman (Matthew Modine) and his wife Marian (Julianne Moore), an artist. Her paintings are on display throughout the house.

The scene begins with Ralph sitting in a chair with a drink, looking at Marian's paintings. Marian is getting dressed for a barbecue. Ralph brings up the topic of Mitchell Anderson, and sexual transgression. Marian counters: "Jesus, Ralph. That was three years ago"(107). Ralph perseveres:" I want you to tell me

about that night with Mitchell Anderson"[15]. Marian does so. In the course of the ensuing argument, she spills a glass of wine on her dress. She takes her skirt off, and dries it with a hair dryer. She is standing in a split level kitchen, at a level above and in front of Ralph (as though on a platform, or balcony), facing the viewer. She continues to argue with Ralph, naked from the waist down. Ralph comments sarcastically: "What do you think you are? One of your goddam paintings?" He continues his interrogation. Marian finishes drying her skirt. The pivotal lines are as follows (not italicized for emphasis or otherwise, as in the Carver story):

> Marian: Then he said do you want to have a go at it?
>
> Ralph: Jesus, Marian. Do you want to have a go at it? Do you want to have a go at it? Do you want to have a go at it ?! What does that mean, Marian? Do you want to have a go at it? (110)

Marian pulls on her skirt furiously. "Okay, Ralph, you want to know what happened?...we just did it right there in the car". Silently, Ralph gets up and goes outside to light the barbecue.

Altman adopts a technique of associational cuts between the paintings in the studio and Marian's nakedness to establish the visual irony of the scene, an interplay reminiscent of the way paintings are staged in Rainer Werner Fassbinder's film *The Bitter Tears of Petra von Kant* (1972). This cinematic strategy underscores the dialog, but in a different way to that of the original story. The line "Shall we have a go at it" as repeated by Ralph in the short story, gathers gutteral force in its truncated (italicized) form, "A *go* at it!" and finally "*Go!Go!Go!*". The dialog in the film adaptation of these lines is muted, as the doctor repeats the expression four times "Do you want to have a go at it", as though he doesn't fully understand the connotation of the expression itself; moreover, its use by his wife reflects on her vulgarity, a perception reinforced by her paintings. In the film we are made to see feminine sexuality as a "contested terrain" (Adam and Allan, *Theorizing Culture*, 191) through a visual contradiction, one of the common ways in which "the camera ... engenders its own improvisations".

The ending of Carver's story further captures the spoken/unspoken

dimension of Ralph and Marian's relationship, between the dialogue spoken by Ralph from the bathroom to his wife, "Will you please be quiet, please", and the truncated version a little later, "Just be quiet, please". In the film version, Ralph simply exits in silence.

AFTERWORD

An interesting topic raised here is the way in which film figures static visual representation, the "problematic space that film occupies between the established arts of painting and literature"(Peucker,3). Filmmakers often use paintings to shape or enrich the meaning of their works (Altman also does so in *The Player*). According to Angela Vacche in *Cinema and Painting: How Art is Used in Film*, "cinema does not merely reflect back to art history the image it received, but through intertextual activity it rearranges all its outlines, boundaries and priorities" (7). And related to this, how the encounter of cinema and painting "redefines gender roles, expands the dialectic of word and image ...."(7)[16]. A necessary project is to further expand this discussion to encompass the film in all its aspects; such as conditions within the film industry (production history, stars) and the cultural and social climate (the audience, the different roles of the reader and viewer, reception)[17].

NOTES

1. The film *Short Cuts* is based on nine stories and a poem, "Lemonade". The other stories are as follows: *Neighbors; Vitamins; So Much Water So Close to Home; A Small, Good Thing; Jerry and Molly and Sam; Collectors; Tell the Women We're Going.*

2. The phrase is from Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*; he defines "the literary and artistic field as ... a field of positions and a field of position-takings" (34). These "positions" have certain values attached to them and are located in culture in certain ways.

3. *Short Cuts: Selected Stories* by Raymond Carver (with an introduction by Robert Altman) will hereafter be referred to as *Selected Stories* ; and *Short Cuts: The Screenplay* by Robert Altman and Frank Barhydt as *Screenplay.*

4. For a discussion of the theoretical elaboration of "filmic textuality", see Mowitt, Chapter 6, "The Textual Analysis of Film" (141-176).

5. "The insistence on fidelity has led to a suppression of potentially more rewarding approaches to the phenomenon of adaptation" (McFarlane, 10). See also John O. Thompson, " 'Vanishing' Worlds : Film Adaptation and the Mystery of the Original" in Deborah Cartmell et al., eds, *Pulping Fictions* (11-28).

6. For a discussion of the linguistic and cinematic systems of signification as two "languages", see Gerald Mast, "Literature and Film" in Barricelli et al., eds, *Interrelations of Literature* (298-302).

7. Cf. McFarlane: "The novel is a verbal medium and films too are written, but it is usual to regard the director as the chief author of a film. Directors ... can be shown to have their own *é criture* to inscribe films with their own signature as it were" (202). For a discussion of the Derridean relation between film and writing, see Brunette and Wills, *Screen / play*, Chapter Three, "... film: to the extent that it is a language, it is to be considered as a type of writing" (61).

8. Altman and Barhydt "would perform variations like jazz musicians on the Carver stories, inventing their own characters to add to his, getting scenes onto colored note cards that let them visualize the wide mosaic on the wall behind them at the initial production office in Malibu" (*Screenplay*, 9).

9. These reviews are from *Cinemania*, computer software, Microsoft, 1995.

10. Altman is credited, in films like *A Wedding* (1978), of initiating a "second sound revolution". Interestingly, given the sophisticated nature of sound tracks, film criticism tends to concentrate on the visual: "we see ourselves as *spectators* (not auditors) *viewing* (not hearing) motion *pictures* (not sounds)" (Stam 260).

11. David Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, points out "... the art film influenced the 'New Hollywood' of the late 1960s and the 1970s. Everything from freeze frames to slow motion to conventions of gapping and ambiguity has been exploited by filmmakers like ... Altman (*Images*, 1972; *Three Women*, 1977)". A useful account of the New Hollywood is Yvonne Trasker's "Approaches to the New Hollywood" (in Curran at al., *Cultural Studies and Communications*, 213-228).

12. Saltzman's *Understanding Raymond Carver* (172-4) cites Carver in the minimalist tradition. For a discussion of the minimalist controversy, see Randolph Runyon, *Reading Raymond Carver* (2-9). It was a term Carver himself resisted: " ... somebody called me a ' minimalist ' writer (b)ut I didn't like it . There's something about 'minimalist' that smacks of smallness of vision and execution that I don't like" (quoted in Runyon, 4).

13. In *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, Paul Simpson notes that "close-ups, long-shots and tracking shots all have linguistic counterparts in narrative fiction" (12-13). For instance, for writers to obtain a spatio-temporal point of view, "orientational" features of language can function to locate utterances in relation to speaker's viewpoints. Thus, demonstrative pronouns, like 'this' and 'that', are indicators of directionality and location. 'Distals' suggest directionality away from the location of the speaker; 'locative' expressions may act as perspective-framing devices.

14. "The first family we filmed were the Piggotts, Earl and Doreen ... in their trailer park and at Johnnie's Broiler, a classic California coffee shop where Doreen waitresses." Altman, in *Selected Stories* (9-10).

15. Interestingly the character Mitchell Anderson is associated with two different intertextual sources, one in literature, the other in art history. In the original Carver story, Marian recalls: "We were talking about a lot of things that didn't make sense. I can't remember. We were talking about Nietzsche. Strindberg. He was directing *Miss Julie* second semester. And then something about Norman Mailer ... (*Selected Stories*, 54). The film version is as follows: " ... we were talking about a lot of things, a lot of things that didn't make sense ... about religious images and this painter named Larry Rivers and then he said something about Norman Mailer .... " (*Screenplay*, 109).

16. For a full account of the word and image relation, see W.J.T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory*, where he discusses the image/text relation in reference to *Sunset Boulevard*, which "takes a version of the image/text (the division between speech and visual representation) as its explicit theme" (101). Moreover, "The relation of speech to vision in this movie is thus mapped onto ideologemes like the relation of the sexes" (103). For a study of how the image relates to ideological issues, see Downing and Barzagan, *Image and Ideology in Modern/Postmodern Discourse*. Ellen J. Esrock's *The Reader's Eye* provides another approach, arguing that "the psychological mechanisms of film and literature ... are informed by a reductive word/image polarity ... that disguises what might otherwise be ... similitudes" (140).

17. Janet Wolff, "Excess and Inhibition: Interdisciplinarity in the Study of Art" argues that " the necessary project for the study of art is an approach which intergrates textual analysis with the sociological investigation of institutions of cultural production ..." (Grossberg at al., *Cultural Studies,* 713).

WORKS CITED

Adam, Barbara and Allan, Stuart. *Theorizing Culture: An interdisiciplinary critique after postmodernism.* London: UCL Press, 1995.

Altman, Robert and Barhydt, Frank. *Short Cuts: The Screenplay.* Santa Barbara: Capra Press, 1993.

Barricelli, Jean-Pierre and Gibaldi, Joseph, eds. *Interrelations of Literature.* New York: The Modern Language Association of Literature, 1982.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature.* Ed. R Johnson. Polity Press, 1993.

Bordwell, David. *Narration in the Fiction Film.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Brunette, Peter and Wills, David. *Screen / play: Derrida and Film Theory.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Campbell, Ewing. *Raymond Carver: A study of the short fiction.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.

Cartmell, Deborah, I.Q. Hunter, Heidi Kaye and Imelda Whelehan. *Pulping Fictions: Consuming Culture across the Literature / Media Divide.* London and Chicago: Pluto Press, 1996.

Carver, Raymond. *Short Cuts: Selected Stories.* New York: Vintage, 1993.

Curran, James, David Morley and Valerie Walkerdine. *Cultural Studies and Communications.* London and New York: Arnold, 1996.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image.* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. London: The Athlone Press, 1992.

Downing, David B. and Barzagan, Susan, eds. *Image and Ideology in Modern / Postmodern Discourse.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Esrock, Ellen J. *The Reader's Eye: Visual Imagining as Reader Response.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson and Paula A. Treichler. *Cultural Studies.* New York and London: Routledge, 1992.

McFarlane, Brian. *Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Mitchell, W. J. T. *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Mowitt, John. *Text: The Genealogy of an Antidisciplinary Object.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1992.

Peucker, Brigitte. *Incorporating Images: Film and the Rival Arts.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Runyon, Randolph. *Reading Raymond Carver.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1992.

Saltzman, Arthur M. *Understanding Raymond Carver.* Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.

Simpson, Paul. *Language, Ideology and Point of View.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Stam, Robert. *Reflexivity in Film and Literature: From Don Quixote to Jean-Luc Godard.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

Vacche, Angela D. *Cinema and Painting: How Art is Used In Film.* London: The Athlone Press, 1996.