

## 16. THE SLEEPING SPECTATOR: NON-HUMAN AESTHETICS IN ABBAS KIAROSTAMI'S *FIVE: DEDICATED TO OZU*

---

Justin Remes

### I.

In 2006, the actress Tilda Swinton delivered a 'State of Cinema' address at the Kabuki Theatre during the San Francisco International Film Festival. Early in the address, Swinton remembered a conversation with her father: 'Dadda was telling me that his falling asleep in the cinema is a particular honour to the film in question. He was telling me this as a compliment, his having snored through three of the four films released last year in which I appeared' (2006: 111).

How should we understand these remarks? It is tempting to view them as a father's desperate attempt to placate his offended daughter, to spin a series of faux pas into gestures of approval. After all, I can imagine the sceptical look that would appear on my face if one of my students were to say, 'No, no. You don't understand. I was sleeping in class only because you are such a good lecturer!'

On the other hand, even if the comments were ultimately little more than damage control, what if they contain a kernel of truth? Can sleep be an appropriate – or even desirable – response to certain films? Films set out to evoke a diversity of responses: laughter, tears, shock, excitement, sexual arousal. Why not sleep?

The answer might seem obvious. When I laugh or cry or become aroused during a film, I am still engaging with that film. I continue to watch it. But sleep implies that my bond with the film has been severed. I might just as well get up and leave the theatre. This argument has a certain pull for me, particularly

because I have long been adamant that, if I am going to watch a film, I am going to view it from beginning to end without interruption. (As much as it annoys some of my friends and relatives, this means that, unless there is a dire emergency, I refuse to leave the theatre until the credits are over.) In this respect, I am not unlike Alvy Singer, Woody Allen's character in *Annie Hall* (1977), who discovers that a screening of Ingmar Bergman's *Face* (1958) started two minutes earlier and so refuses to buy tickets to see it: 'I can't go in in the middle'. The titular character, played by Diane Keaton, tries to reason with him: 'We'll only miss the titles. They're in Swedish!' But Alvy is unmoved by her pleas: 'I've got to see a picture exactly from the start to the finish, 'cause . . . 'cause I'm anal.'

I have always sympathised with Alvy. A part of me feels that, if I miss just the opening credits of a film (Swedish or otherwise), I have not *really* seen the film. Perhaps this feeling betrays a deep-seated neurosis on my part but it is difficult to overcome. I imagine someone asking me, 'Have you seen Bergman's *Face*?' and having to respond sheepishly, 'No. I only saw part of it. I missed the opening titles in Swedish. How were they?'

## 2.

This pedantic approach to cinematic spectatorship has been challenged by several avant-garde film-makers. Andy Warhol, for example, asserted that his early films were not *meant* to be seen in their entirety. He claimed that those who wanted to view *Sleep* (1963) (which consists of five-and-a-half hours of his lover, John Giorno, sleeping; see Walsh's chapter in this volume) need not come at the start of the screening; rather, they could turn up at 'any time' (Hirschman, 2004: 41). Furthermore, spectators were not required to sit silently throughout the screening; Warhol encouraged them to 'walk around and dance and sing' (Hirschman, 2004: 41). And Warhol advocated similarly unorthodox modes of reception vis-à-vis his film *Empire* (1964), an eight-hour-and-five-minute static shot of the Empire State building. As I have argued in my book, *Motion(less) Pictures: The Cinema of Stasis*, *Sleep* and *Empire* are 'furniture films', 'works that invite a partial, momentary, and distracted glance' (Remes, 2015: 43). Audiences of these films generally attended only part of a screening and casually noticed the film intermittently while eating, drinking, and conversing with fellow spectators. But, to my knowledge, Warhol never explicitly encouraged sleeping during his films. In other words, spectators' eyes may not have been glued to the screen but they generally remained open.<sup>1</sup>

In some ways, Tony Conrad brings us closer to spectatorial slumber with his film *The Flicker* (1965). This thirty-minute, minimalist masterpiece is made up of clear and black frames placed in precise patterns on the filmstrip to engender stroboscopic and hallucinatory effects, and these are paired with

a mesmerising and sinister electronic score. In spite of the apparent poverty of visual information, I regularly see shapes, colours and faces during screenings of *The Flicker*, and this response to the film is quite common: other viewers have reported seeing Catherine wheels, buckyballs, demons, cockroaches, eyes, and 'a lady and boy in garb of old frontier, standing by a stream, apart from a wagon train' (Richmond, 2012; Joseph, 2008: 341). But what interests me most about *The Flicker* here is the fact that Conrad encouraged certain spectators to 'view' this film with their eyes closed (Joseph, 2008: 302).

In fact, I recently screened *The Flicker* in a class in American experimental film, and one of my students claimed that the experience seemed to be a kind of visual assault. She decided to seek respite from the film's relentless flickering light by closing her eyes, only to discover that the film became even more intense with eyes closed. A number of other students had a similar experience, and several chose to watch the film in its entirety with their eyes closed precisely *because* of the overwhelming experience it provided. (For the uninitiated, when one's eyes are closed during *The Flicker*, the flashing lights continue to assault one's eyelids, and the stroboscopic patterns become intensely visceral and destabilising. The experience is comparable to encountering an unbearably loud noise, plugging one's ears, and paradoxically finding that this makes the noise louder.)

Warhol's viewers often look away from the screen (after all, there is little danger of missing something important in *Empire*), and Conrad's viewers often close their eyes during screenings of *The Flicker*. But we have not encountered the elusive sleeping spectator. (While I occasionally enjoy closing my eyes during *The Flicker*, it would be exceedingly difficult for me to fall asleep during the film and, if I did, I shudder to imagine what Kafkaesque nightmares might greet me.)

3.

I have discovered only one film-maker who has directly encouraged spectatorial sleep: Abbas Kiarostami. The eminent Iranian auteur is best known for thoughtful and contemplative works of slow cinema, such as *Close-Up* (*Nemaye Nazdik*, 1990) and *Taste of Cherry* (*Ta'm e guilass*, 1997) (the latter film was awarded the *Palme d'Or* at the 1997 Cannes Film Festival). Like the films of other creators of slow cinema – such as Yasujirô Ozu, Chantal Akerman and Béla Tarr – Kiarostami's films often feature simple *mise en scènes*, long takes with minimal movement, and little or no emotional expressivity (Jaffe, 2014: 3, 138–42). I would argue that this subdued aesthetic reaches its zenith in Kiarostami's experimental documentary *Five: Dedicated to Ozu* (2003; hereafter *Five*). Abandoning the narrative thrust of most of his earlier work, *Five* consists primarily of lengthy static shots of natural environments. As the

title implies, the film is broken up into five segments, all of which were shot on the shores of the Caspian Sea. It will be useful to begin by providing a brief description of each of these segments. (The segments' titles come from Kiarostami himself.)

Part I: Wood

A piece of driftwood is tossed back and forth by the waves until it finally splits in half.

Part II: Promenade

People walk along a promenade in front of the Caspian, occasionally conversing with one another, before eventually exiting the frame.

Part III: Dogs

Tiny specks (barely recognisable as dogs) are seen moving about on the beach.

Part IV: Ducks

A flock of ducks runs across the frame from left to right. One duck rushes back in the opposite direction and is quickly followed by the others.

Part V: Moon and Swamp

For several minutes, the *mise en scène* is bathed in black. Eventually, the full moon is glimpsed, reflected in a pond (see Figure 16.1). Throughout this segment, the audience is enveloped in a rich and textured soundscape of croaking frogs, singing birds, and rainfall.

As the subtitle of the film suggests, the Japanese film-maker, Yasujiro Ozu, was an important source of inspiration for Kiarostami. A number of elements of Ozu's aesthetic can be glimpsed in *Five*, including the contemplative mood,



Figure 16.1 A pond reflects the full moon in Abbas Kiarostami's *Five: Dedicated to Ozu* (2003).

the still camera and the use of music when transitioning from one scene to another. Perhaps the most significant parallel, however, relates to Ozu's use of the 'pillow shot' in which narrative events are punctuated by static shots of objects or landscapes that seem to have no clear narrative significance. The most famous example of this technique appears in Ozu's *Late Spring* (*Banshun*, 1949) in which a shot of a woman lost in thought at an inn is replaced by a lengthy shot of a vase surrounded by shadows. One could argue that Kiarostami is simply removing these pillow shots from their narrative contexts so they become the heart of the film rather than its connective tissue.<sup>2</sup>

A number of scholars and critics have commented on the power and complexity of *Five*. It has been called 'extraordinary' (Andrew, 2005: 73), 'calming' (Jaffe, 2014: 68) and 'profound' (Brown, 2014: 135). What has received less attention, however, are the unorthodox modes of reception that are prompted by the film. Kiarostami has claimed that he would be pleased to see a spectator of *Five* enjoying 'a pleasant nap'. He adds,

I am not joking. You know how annoyed some directors get on finding out that someone has fallen asleep while watching their film. I will not be annoyed at all. I can confidently say that you would not miss anything if you had a short nap. The important thing for me is how you feel once the film is finished, the relaxing feeling that you carry with you after the film ends. That is important. I do not believe in nailing the audience down at all. In certain films, you cannot miss a moment, but when the film is finished, you will have lost the whole film, your nerves, and your time. I declare that you can nap during this film.<sup>3</sup>

## 4.

I find these comments utterly fascinating. How can a film-maker encourage a viewer to lose touch with a film, to surrender to what Matthew Flanagan has called 'narcoleptic spectatorship' (2012: 177)? How can Kiarostami confidently assert that 'you would not miss anything if you had a short nap'? *Of course* you would miss something! In fact, you might miss an entire segment of the film, inadvertently changing the title to *Four*. You might miss the quasi-dramatic catharsis of the piece of wood finally breaking in two, or the whimsical humour of the peripatetic ducks waddling back and forth. Nevertheless, I want to defend Kiarostami's counter-intuitive claim. In a sense, the spectator who falls asleep during *Five* has absorbed the spirit of the film. She or he has given herself/himself over to the work's soothing quiescence, its uneventful tranquillity. Perhaps it is the spectator who struggles mightily to stay awake for the entire film who is missing something. I would argue that *Five*, like *Sleep* and *Empire* before it, is a furniture film. Neither Kiarostami nor Warhol has

any desire to nail us down. We are free to watch as much or as little of the film as we want. We can drift in and out of attentiveness – or consciousness, for that matter – without worrying about what we are missing. When I watch *Five*, I am reminded of a comment by Warhol: ‘I always felt that a very slow film could be just as interesting as a porch-sit if you thought about it the same way’ (Warhol and Hackett, 1990: 260).

There is something sneakily philosophical about Kiarostami’s fondness for cinematic sleep. Does a film exist only in relation to a spectator, a subject who objectifies the film and processes its sensory information? Or does a film exist independently, regardless of whether it is seen or heard? It is almost as if Kiarostami is asserting that *Five* exists and performs its function even (or perhaps especially) if the spectator cannot see or hear it. Or, to put it another way, if *Five* were projected in a forest with no one around to experience it, it would still make a sound. All of this moves us towards a radically non-anthropocentric cinema. *Five* eschews anthropocentrism not only because humans are only marginally present in the film itself – eclipsed as they are by waves, celestial bodies, and quacking ducks – but also because the film is quite content to run without a single conscious observer. In fact, there is a sense in which even the film-maker has disappeared. In a discussion of Part II of *Five* (‘Dogs’), Kiarostami states,

My duty as the director of *Five*, especially this episode, ends precisely when I start the camera. Normally, the director’s role should start when shooting begins . . . How can I explain this role of having no role? . . . I switched the camera on and then I went to sleep . . . When I realized that the director, who was me, could do nothing, I slept.

So not only is the audience encouraged to sleep during *Five* but the director himself slept during the film’s creation. Ira Jaffe’s (2014) response to this authorial absence is perceptive: ‘By going to sleep after setting up the camera, [Kiarostami] not only absented himself from both the shooting and what he terms “the obligation of narration”, but also rehearsed his own death as *auteur*’ (142).

This provisional death results in a film that is much more complex than it initially seems. Kiarostami has called *Five* ‘an open film’, or a ‘half-made film’, one that is co-constructed by the audience. Because of this open-ended and participatory structure, William Brown (2014) has argued that *Five* is actually more complex than a film such as Christopher Nolan’s *Inception* (2010), in spite of the latter’s sophisticated *trompe l’œil* shots, labyrinthine plot, and intricate *mise en abyme* structure of dreams within dreams within dreams. What makes *Five* more complex, according to Brown, is the sheer number of ways in which spectators can engage with the film’s minimalist content. For

Brown, '[a] visually complex film like *Inception* leads to a simple/poor variety of responses, while a visually simple film like *Five* leads to a complex variety of responses' (2014: 136). Geoff Andrew makes a similar argument about Kiarostami's cinema:

For Kiarostami close observation is not about inspecting every little twist in the plot, as some do with mind-bending puzzle films like *The Usual Suspects*, *Memento*, or *Mulholland Dr.* . . . it's a more interactive relationship that he has in mind. It's about venturing into a film's open or empty spaces, and bringing your own imagination, personality, and experience into play with whatever you find there. Thus, simplicity makes for complexity, omission for plenitude. (2005: 78)

Of course, Kiarostami's viewers have no obligation to fill in these empty spaces, just as viewers of *Late Spring* have no obligation to fill up Ozu's vase. As Jaffe puts it, Kiarostami gives a viewer 'the opportunity to build his or her own film' but also 'the freedom *not* to build or attend, freedom simply to drift within stillness and silence' (2014: 142).

But *Five*'s complexity is not limited to the multifarious ways in which we might engage (or not engage) with its content; it is also far more complex in its construction than it initially seems. While each of the film's five segments appears to have the 'authorless' quality of Part II ('Dogs'), in which Kiarostami presses 'Record' and goes to sleep, the reality is more complex. For example, in Part I ('Wood'), it looks as if the driftwood breaking in two is an aleatory natural phenomenon captured by Kiarostami's camera. Kiarostami, however, actually covertly placed a small explosive inside the wood to achieve the effect (Sani, 2013: 16). Additionally, Part V ('Moon and Swamp') looks like a single long take of a pond reflecting the moon. But, in fact, as Selmin Kara (2013) points out in her essay, 'The Sonic Summons', 'The 28-minute pond sequence is constructed from around twenty takes filmed over several months and superimposed onto each other with invisible cuts. Similarly, the soundtrack of the sequence is also carefully crafted, juxtaposing amplified diegetic sounds from different takes during a four-month mixing process' (586–87). It is no wonder, then, that Kiarostami has asserted, '[*Five*] was the most difficult film I ever made, but it doesn't show on the surface' (Jeffries, 2005).<sup>4</sup>

While Kiarostami's active role in shaping the film's content might seem to undermine its non-anthropocentric nature, Kara suggests the opposite is true:

Kiarostami's sound and image editing in *Five* sets duration as a relative, matter- or object-oriented (instead of subject-oriented) term, deflating assumptions about continuity. His long-take night is a rhythmic assemblage, one that takes into account the temporal patterns,

superimpositions, and cadences that might be observable among various nights on the Caspian shore, without privileging the linear logic of human perception. (2013: 590)

The film's indifference to human perception becomes especially salient when one considers its "highly structured" soundtrack – composed of dense, layered, and amplified sounds' (Kara, 2013: 583). In Part V ('Moon and Swamp'), in particular, 'the rhythmic ebb and flow of water, howling wind, crickets, frogs, rain, and thunderstorm, conjures up the vision of a self-contained nature, inassimilable by human medi(t)ation' (Kara, 2013: 583).<sup>5</sup> Kiarostami's aesthetic critique of anthropocentrism is strikingly similar to the one put forth by La Monte Young in *Composition 1960 #5* (1960) in which a performer 'turn[s] a butterfly (or any number of butterflies) loose in the performance area'. When someone named Diane objected to calling this piece music, since 'one ought to be able to hear the sounds', Young responded by saying, 'I said that this was the usual attitude of human beings that everything in the world should exist for them and that I disagreed. I said it didn't seem to me at all necessary that anyone or anything should have to hear sounds and that it is enough that they exist for themselves' (1965: 75).

If the sounds of La Monte Young's butterflies 'exist for themselves', indifferent to the absence or presence of a hearing audience, perhaps *Five* also exists for itself. The film does not need you. A spectator is welcome to become absorbed in the film's evocative visual and sonic textures but he or she is also free to retreat, to lose contact with the film, to drift and fade as landscapes become dreamscapes. Kiarostami creates an intricate dialectic between consciousness and unconsciousness; in his words, *Five* represents 'an interaction of both observation and non-observation, presence and absence' (2005). Once again, the parallels between Kiarostami and Warhol are striking. As Vivienne Dick (1989) writes, regarding Warhol's cinema, 'We can let ourselves be absorbed into a meditative state or we can withdraw. The film will go on nevertheless in its own sweet time' (156).

## 5.

In 1951 Man Ray (2000) wrote, 'The worst films I've ever seen, the ones that send me to sleep, contain ten or fifteen marvelous minutes. The best films I've ever seen only contain ten or fifteen valid ones' (133). Discussions of this quotation tend to focus on Man Ray's thought-provoking claim that even bad films contain 'marvelous' moments – an insight that helps to explain the behaviour of his fellow surrealists vis-à-vis cinema. Think, for example, of the way in which André Breton used to watch only a few minutes of any given film before moving on to another one – or the way Joseph Cornell borrowed less than



twenty minutes of footage from the forgettable Hollywood film *East of Borneo* (George Melford, 1931) for his own found-footage film *Rose Hobart* (1936). I am interested in examining a different dimension of this quotation, however: the way that Man Ray identifies the 'worst films' he has ever seen with those that put him to sleep. Notice how strange this sentence sounds if the reference to sleep is replaced with alternate spectatorial responses: 'The worst films I've ever seen, the ones that shock me, contain ten or fifteen marvelous minutes'. 'The worst films I've ever seen, the ones that turn me on, contain ten or fifteen marvelous minutes.' Yet it is not entirely clear why Man Ray's formulation should sound any less bizarre. Why should one assume that soporific films are bad films? It seems ironic that a surrealist who valorises dreams would see sleep as such an undesirable response to cinema.

Contrast this response with remarks made by Kiarostami shortly before the 1997 release of *Taste of Cherry*:

I absolutely don't like the films in which the filmmakers take their viewers hostage and provoke them. I prefer the films that put their audience to sleep in the theater. I think those films are kind enough to allow you a nice nap and not leave you disturbed when you leave the theater. Some films have made me doze off in the theater, but the same films have made me stay up at night, wake up thinking about them in the morning, and keep on thinking about them for weeks. Those are the kinds of films I like.<sup>6</sup>

Notice the way in which Kiarostami's aesthetic becomes the antithesis of the one embraced by most early avant-garde film-makers. The Dadaists and the surrealists were often interested precisely in taking hostages, in disturbing spectators with provocative and shocking cinematic images. Think of *Le Retour à la Raison* (*Return to Reason*, 1923), for example, in which Man Ray assaults the audience with a hyperkinetic and dizzying series of images: drawing pins, nails, puffs of smoke, naked breasts. Or think of the scandalous content of the films of Luis Buñuel and Salvador Dalí, such as an eyeball being sliced open by a razor in *Un Chien Andalou* (*An Andalusian Dog*, 1929), or the depiction of Christ as a violent rapist in *L'Age d'Or* (*The Golden Age*, 1930).<sup>7</sup> In this context, the reason for the chasm between Man Ray and Kiarostami becomes clear. After all, if a spectator falls asleep during the eyeball-slicing sequence of *Un Chien Andalou*, something has gone terribly wrong. Buñuel and Dalí are taking hostages and, when one is in the middle of a hostage crisis, one must remain alert. *Five*, on the other hand, is a 'kind' film. It is soothing, delicate, beautiful. What better opportunity could there be to heed the advice of John Cage who, in his 1949 Lecture on Nothing, repeatedly intoned, 'If anyone is sleepy let him go to sleep' (1973: ix)?

While Man Ray's unfavourable stance towards cinematic slumber is wide-

spread, there are a handful of figures who have challenged this view. In addition to Kiarostami (and Tilda Swinton's father), the film scholar William Brown offers a sympathetic assessment of spectatorial sleep in a 2011 blog posting in which he attempts to catalogue his own somnolent responses at cinemas: 'During the period from 1 September 2007 to 1 September 2008, I went to the cinema roughly 150 times. I fell asleep during roughly one third of the films that I saw at the cinema.' Brown discovers that the films which put him to sleep (usually art-house films) are often compelling and aesthetically satisfying:

That I do not sleep during blockbusters leads me to believe that I probably do not trust blockbusters; their fast movement may be arousing in terms of being attention-grabbing, but they also enervate me, making me alert and worried that something is about to happen. The art house film, meanwhile, is a friend, or a lover, with whom I feel safe, and in a space that feels safe to me. Since it exposes to me those things that are more intimate and meaningful than does the blockbuster, then I expose to it that which is most private in my life, my sleeping self. (2011)

I must confess that the idea of falling asleep during fifty films in a year is quite alien to me, probably due to my aforementioned neurosis. In over thirty years of film spectatorship, as far as I can recall, I have fallen asleep during only two films: one that I enjoyed (Peter Jackson's *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* [2001]), and one that I disliked (Michael Bay's *Armageddon* [1998]).<sup>8</sup> While this is clearly not a statistically significant sample size, the fact that I fell asleep during an enjoyable film is noteworthy. It suggests that Brown and Kiarostami are right: sleeping during a film need not be an indication of the film's poor quality. In some circumstances, sleep may, in fact, be a compliment.

What are the implications of Kiarostami's fondness of cinematic sleep? At the very least, his comments should prompt film theorists to take sleep more seriously. As Brown (2011) has noted, 'In an age when film studies wishes to map almost every aspect of the film experience – from ideological influence to affective response, from audience feedback to galvanic skin responses, sleeping in the cinema remains an overlooked aspect of spectatorship.' A detailed investigation of sleep in cinema may yield important insights about cinematic spectatorship, aesthetics and phenomenology. Beyond this, Kiarostami's comments raise interesting questions about pedagogy. In my experience, most film studies classes implicitly encourage a single kind of reception: students are expected to watch a film in silence from beginning to end with an alert eye (often while periodically taking notes). But might it not be valuable and informative to encourage a broader range of receptions? During screenings of Andy Warhol's furniture films – such as *Kiss* (1963), *Blow Job* (1964), and *Empire* – I have

told my students to feel free to converse, text and play games with their mobile phones. (A number of students, who were initially sceptical of Warhol's cinema, told me that this approach enabled them to enjoy his films.) During screenings of *The Flicker*, I have encouraged students to close their eyes, look away from the screen, and move to different parts of the room throughout the screening to get a sense of how this alters the film's hallucinatory effects. I am currently preparing to screen *Five* in a world cinema class. Perhaps the time has come for me to encourage my students to fall asleep.

#### NOTES

1. Perhaps one day I shall arrange a midnight screening of *Sleep*, one in which spectators are asked to sleep through the film, thus creating a delicious symmetry between subject and object. (But object of what? The gaze? The gaze has disappeared, hasn't it?)
2. For an exemplary analysis of Ozu's aesthetic, see Nornes, 2007.
3. These quotations come from Kiarostami's *Around Five* (2005), a documentary on the making of *Five* that is included as a special feature in the Kino DVD of *Five*. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from Kiarostami in this chapter are taken from *Around Five*.
4. In its deceptive simplicity, *Five* has deep affinities with another experimental film by Kiarostami entitled *Seagull Eggs* (date unknown). This obscure, yet compelling, short film displays three eggs on jagged rocks at the beach. The waves attempt to steal the eggs, one by one, until, by the end of the film, all the eggs have been captured by the sea. While *Seagull Eggs* looks like a single seventeen-minute shot of nature, the superficial simplicity masks a deeper complexity. Kiarostami actually bought goose eggs, painted them, placed them on the rocks, and recorded hours of footage. The 'long take' of the film is, in fact, composed of almost thirty shots blended together seamlessly. (And the soundtrack of the film was also carefully constructed: Kiarostami added the sound effect of a gull crying out each time an egg was taken by the sea.) See Sani, 2015: 10–15.
5. Kara further argues that *Five's* aesthetic provides an alternative to 'human-centered vision', and she intriguingly links this 'new media ecology' with the recent 'nonhuman turn' in the humanities and social sciences (2013: 583). For more on the non-human turn, see Grusin, 2015.
6. These comments are taken from an interview with Jamsheed Akrami which is included on Criterion's DVD release of *Taste of Cherry*. (The interview was initially recorded for Akrami's 2000 documentary, *Friendly Persuasion: Iranian Cinema After the 1979 Revolution*.)
7. In addition to calling *Un Chien Andalou* 'a passionate call for murder' (Williams, 1996: 200), Buñuel also claims to have put stones in his pockets when the film premiered, just in case he needed to fend off an angry, riotous mob (1983: 106).
8. My mother has informed that the first film I ever saw was Steven Spielberg's *E.T. The Extra-Terrestrial* (1982), which I saw shortly after my birth on 5 June 1982. I cannot recall whether or not I stayed awake for this film.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrew, Geoff (2005), *10* (London: British Film Institute).  
 Brown, William (2011), 'Sleeping in the Cinema', blog posting, retrieved from

- <http://wjrcbrown.wordpress.com/2011/06/21/sleeping-in-the-cinema/> [accessed 23 February 2015]
- Brown, William (2014), 'Complexity and Simplicity in *Inception* and *Five Dedicated to Ozu*', in W. Buckland (ed.), *Hollywood Puzzle Films* (New York: Routledge), pp. 125–39.
- Buñuel, Luis (1983), *My Last Sigh*, trans. A. Israel, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cage, John (1973), *Silence: Lectures and Writings by John Cage* (Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press).
- Dick, Vivienne (1989), 'Warhol: Won't Wrinkle Ever: A Film-Maker's View', in M. O'Pray (ed.), *Andy Warhol: Film Factory* (London: British Film Institute), pp. 154–9.
- Flanagan, Matthew (2012), 'Slow Cinema': *Temporality and Style in Contemporary Art and Experimental Film*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Exeter.
- Grusin, Richard (ed.) (2015), *The Nonhuman Turn* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Hirschman, Ruth (2004), 'Pop Goes the Artist', in Kenneth Goldsmith (ed.), *I'll Be Your Mirror: The Selected Andy Warhol Interviews* (New York: Carroll and Graf), pp. 27–46.
- Jaffe, Ira (2014), *Slow Movies: Countering the Cinema of Action* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Jeffries, Stuart (2005), 'Landscapes of the Mind', *The Guardian* online, 16 April, retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2005/apr/16/art> [accessed 23 February 2015].
- Joseph, B. W. (2008), *Beyond the Dream Syndicate: Tony Conrad and the Arts After Cage* (New York: Zone).
- Kara, Selmin (2013), 'The Sonic Summons: Meditations on Nature and Anempathetic Sound in Digital Documentaries', in C. Vernalis, A. Herzog, and J. Richardson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Sound and Image in Digital Media* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 582–97.
- Man Ray (2000), 'Cinimage', in P. Hammond (trans. and ed.), *The Shadow and Its Shadow: Surrealist Writings on the Cinema*, 3rd ed. (San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books), pp. 133–4.
- Nornes, Abé Mark (2007), 'The Riddle of the Vase: Ozu Yasujiro's *Late Spring* (1949)', in A. Phillips and J. Stringer (eds), *Japanese Cinema: Texts and Contexts* (London: Routledge), pp. 78–101.
- Remes, Justin (2015), *Motion(less) Pictures: The Cinema of Stasis* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Richmond, Scott (2016, forthcoming), *Proprioceptive Aesthetics* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Sani, Mahmoud Reza (2013), *Men at Work: Cinematic Lessons from Abbas Kiarostami* (Los Angeles, CA: Mhughes Press).
- Swinton, Tilda (2006), 'State of Cinema Address: 49th San Francisco International Film Festival, 29 April 2006', *Critical Quarterly* 48, no. 3, 110–20.
- Warhol, Andy, and Pat Hackett (1990), *Popism: The Warhol Sixties* (San Diego, CA: Harvest/HBJ).
- Williams, Linda (1996), 'The Critical Grasp: Buñuelian Cinema and Its Critics', in R. E. Kuenzli (ed.), *Dada and Surrealist Film* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), pp. 199–206.
- Young, La Monte (1965), 'Lecture 1960', *Tulane Drama Review* 10, no. 2, 73–83.