

**Spectators, Audiences, Genres**

Think about the categories used in film studies to differentiate among different spectators and audiences (e.g., the ideal or generic spectator, audiences divided by various sociological or demographic categories, individual spectators). How do the authors from the reading in this unit and the material from lecture approach the difficult problem of audiences and their diversity? Focus especially on Mulvey, Baudry, Stewart, and Gunning.

What are the characteristics of the spectator of classical Hollywood cinema in Mulvey's model? Who has the power of the gaze? Who is the object of the gaze? How does gender figure into this equation? What kinds of interaction does the spectator have with the object on the screen? What pleasure does the audience derive from watching films? What are the psychological foundations of that pleasure? Which films best exemplify Mulvey's model of the cinematic gaze?

Why would the destruction of visual pleasure be a political act, according to Mulvey? If Mulvey is critical of the kind of filmmaking associated with Hollywood, what alternative modes of cinema would she support? What are the limitations of Mulvey's conception of spectatorship?

What other ways of approaching spectatorship do the other readings introduce? How does Stewart distinguish between different categories of spectator in her essay, and what do those categories allow her to discover and understand? What does Tom Gunning mean by the "cinema of attractions"? In what era did this kind of film and spectatorship thrive? In what forms of entertainment and film genres does it survive?

**Authors, Studios, Stars**

What are the basic principles of "auteur theory" as described by Truffaut or Sarris? How should a critic or viewer approach and analyze a film according to the tenets of auteur theory? How would you perform an auteurist reading of a film or group of films? Which films or directors would be the clearest examples for this kind of analysis?

What challenges to auteur theory have been raised since the 1950s and 1960s, when auteur theory was in its heyday? What other models of authorship have been proposed, either by film or literary critics? How do those models undermine or at least offer an alternative to auteur theory?

What are the basic principles of star discourse in film studies? How does a star differ from an actor or a character? In addition to the

films themselves, where is a star persona produced? What are the social and cultural functions of the movie star? Which films or stars best exemplify this star-based approach to film studies?

Who in your opinion is the true author of a film? Is there a true author? If not, how would suggest that audiences and critics think about this issue of authorship in film?

### **New Directions in Film Studies**

Does the digital revolution pose a challenge to a Bazinian definition of realism? How?

What do Bolter and Grusin mean by the term "remediation"? What is the relationship between the various old and new media the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries? What is the role of the author in the process of "remediation"? Does their model imply a different definition of the artist and the act of creation? How is their model of hybrid media different from the idea that artistic media have an essence and a nature (e.g., Bazin's assertion that cinema is a fundamentally realist medium or Eisenstein's position that cinema is montage)?

What does Anne Friedberg mean by the "end of cinema"? What forces are bringing about its demise?

What challenges do newer media like television and new screen cultures like the cell phone present for approaches to cinema studies based on traditional conceptions of film (e.g., on the photographic properties of film stock, on the gathering of audiences in a theater, etc.)?