

Isaac Rooks

What Big Eyes You Have: Animal Point-of-View Shots in Horror & The Limits of Vision

Abstract

Horror films with extant animals serving as the primary antagonists frequently feature point-of-view (POV) shots from the villainous animal's perspective. These fleeting shots provide audiences with a glimpse of an unknowable non-human mode of seeing that has a real-world correlative, one offering tantalizing but frustratingly limited connection with the inscrutable bestial assailants. This article first contextualizes this trope in relation to other instances of POV shots in cinema. In many films the camera's uncanny recreation of vision conveys impaired or deviant perception, leading to its regular use in horror movies. Animal POV shots must also be understood in relation to a larger cultural fascination with the animals' gaze and its potentially disquieting perceived otherness. These threads come together in the animal POV shot, when the audience "sees" through the eyes of the animal for an experience emphasizing flat, un-subjective vision and kinetic movement. While the narrative framing and execution of these shots can have risible results, analysis of this admirably audacious technique offers insight into how anxieties related to human-animal relationships are popularly and visually narrated, as well as how the camera is positioned as a unique means of seeing and knowing the world.

It is 1996, but also a century earlier. Val Kilmer sits on an elevated perch; below, a panicked baboon scampers around the post to which it is staked. Noted cinematographer Vilmos Zsigmond gives this night scene in *The Ghost and the Darkness* (Stephen Hopkins, 1996) an ethereal blue glow. Suddenly, for three seconds, the film cuts to a ground-level shot of the baboon in black-and-white. The frame's edges blur, creating an iris-like masking effect. The next shot returns to the film's standard presentation and reveals the source of this visual disruption. We see a close-up on the eye of the killer lion, the target of this trap. The lion's point-of-view (POV) shot returns for two more seconds. It never reappears in the film.

This article focuses on the use of animal POV shots in horror films, specifically horror films featuring real-world extant animals as the primary antagonists. These POV shots are a common visual trope in such films, but their presence is often fleeting. Within the logic of these films, these shots offer audiences a brief glimpse of an alien perspective with a real-world correlative. In this respect, animal POV shots require unique consideration. If a film features a shot from the perspective of a human,

viewers immediately understand the discrepancy between what they see within the frame and how humans perceive the world. If the shot comes from the POV of a fictional creature, like an alien or cyborg, an obvious suspension of disbelief is already in play. The animal species presented in these films do exist and they understand their environment in ways that humans can only comprehend abstractly, if at all. These films attempt to simulate these experientially unknowable, and therefore potentially un-representable, perceptions, inviting human audiences to see the world (momentarily) through non-human eyes. In trying to create this totally other mode of seeing, these minor shots push against the limits of visual and cinematic representation. These shots exist in a precarious state, which partially explains why filmmakers tend not to linger on them. Serious consideration might reveal their shortcomings. However, the technique persists and recurs, despite always being on the brink of failure and absurdity.

For this essay I limit my focus to fictional horror narratives. These stories, which actively estrange humans and animals, make particularly interesting use of this technique. In tales of human

WHAT BIG EYES YOU HAVE

and animal connection and affection, there are low stakes in “understanding” the animal. When the hulking St. Bernard in *Beethoven* (Brian Levant, 1992) lavishes affection on characters, there is no pressing need to interrogate its motives. In horror narratives, an instinctual, conscious, or mysterious malice drives animals to attack humans.¹ When *Cujo’s* (Lewis Teague, 1983) St. Bernard threatens the life of a woman and her child, the stakes in understanding the animal (to make it stop or defeat it) are higher, and the effort is less likely to succeed. The inscrutable nature of these bestial assailants makes it intriguing that so many of these films take the audience inside the predator’s headspace, offering (frustratingly limited) insight.

I am dividing this article according to three main components. In the first section, I discuss the place of subjective POV shots in film history, theory, and practice. Versions of these shots have been around since cinema’s inception, and attempts have been made to use this technique to foster deep audience-character identification in narrative cinema. However, the uncanny nature of its recreation of vision makes it a more obvious means of conveying impaired or deviant perception. For that reason it features in horror narratives regularly.

The next section addresses human fascination with the animal gaze. In cinema, this often manifests as a preoccupation with the animals’ eyes, the outer boundaries of animal perspectives. Drawing on seminal works by theorists like John Berger, I argue that this preoccupation rests on human fascination with, and anxiety related to, human-animal connections and the perceived otherness of non-human animals. This preoccupation stems not only from the existential and philosophical insight made possible by this estranging gaze, but also from the prospect of its extreme difference.

Finally, there is the point of conflation, where the point-of-view shot takes audiences behind the eye and into the gaze of the animal, with debatable success. Often, when the animal becomes the camera, the experience of being animal takes the form of flat vision and movement. The limitations of this technique should be kept in mind, as its narrative framing and execution can render it laughable. However, these fleeting moments take advantage of the POV’s strange vision, the unknowable and machine-like qualities of animals,

and modern anxieties about the disappearance of animal life, to tell horror stories about the violent return of the natural repressed.

Ultimately, investigation of this technique offers perspectives on the way in which anxieties related to human-animal dynamics are popularly and visually narrated, as humans struggle to understand the animal Other. More broadly, it provides insight into how cinema represents other forms of vision and knowledge. In so doing, it reveals how film positions the camera as a unique means of seeing and knowing the world, one both like and unlike human perception.

The Camera Plays the Eye

For early film theorists and filmmakers, one of the medium’s most exciting qualities was its ability to recreate visuals with minimal human intervention. Dziga Vertov celebrated the *kino-glaz* (“cinema eye”) and the “victory of film over the limitations of the human senses and the world they perceive.”² André Bazin’s seminal “The Ontology of the Photographic Image” positions the mechanical camera as the impartial mediator between biological humans and the natural world they inhabit, offering a new way of seeing that was alike and unlike human perception.³ However, a counter-trend exists. Almost since film’s inception, filmmakers have attempted to link the camera and human perception, to reinscribe the human onto the inhuman lens. This manifests in one of two directions. Using Edward Branigan’s terminology, films either employ point-of-view or subjective “perception” shots.⁴

In 1900, the British film pioneer George Albert Smith experimented with POV in a pair of short films showcasing the then-novel close-up. These films (*Grandma’s Reading Glass* and *As Seen Through a Telescope*) feature shots of characters looking at objects through magnifying devices, followed by enlarged views of these objects framed by circular black masks. While less blatant in its deployment, this article’s opening example similarly uses a circular mask to indicate a gaze focused on an object. In that case, a blurring effect frames the shot, funneling audience attention towards the baboon, the target of a lion whose menace stems from its terrible desire to consume. Such embellishments disrupt the illusion of seeing as one does in real-

life, but Alexander Galloway notes that the POV technique is always an abstract gesture towards vision, not a complete recreation.⁵

In contrast to these are subjective/perception shots, which recreate distorted character vision. Branigan notes they are not so much about *seeing* as they are about *difficulty* seeing.⁶ Steven Shaviro elaborates, stating that these shots are more about motion and tactility than vision – they recreate bodily rhythms and irregular movement.⁷ In these moments, the camera's ability to recreate images clearly needs to be degraded, signifying moments when human characters serve as imperfect mediators. F.W. Murnau's *The Last Laugh* (1924) features an early example, in which a character's drunkenness manifests through a wildly weaving and spinning camera, its focus coming and going, leaving some moments in blurred obscurity. Here the audience experiences a whole-body sense of being the character, one that impedes visual clarity. While I tend to label these animal shots "POVs," they often blend these distinct categorizations. Sometimes, as in the opening example, they clearly mark when audiences enter a new subjective headspace through the use of filters. Yet even shots that leave this shift visually unmarked possess a subjective quality, due to their tendency to emphasize physical movement through space over visual clarity.

Whatever the nature of the first-person shots, filmmakers usually deploy the technique sparingly. However, some use it extensively, seeing it as a means to foster intense audience identification with characters and immersion in the narrative. *Lady in the Lake* (Robert Montgomery, 1946) famously experimented with presenting a feature-length narrative entirely through this technique. In 1953, Julio Moreno wrote a lengthy criticism of *Lady in the Lake*, arguing that it rests on a faulty conflation of visual and verbal expression. The film attempts to replicate literary first-person with a first-person visual, creating an "I-camera." The end result, however, largely excises the protagonist, the audience's source of identification. As Moreno puts it, the film forces audiences to infer a "phantom-protagonist."⁸ This effectively short-circuits the audience's ability to enter the unreal narrative world. Extensive use of the technique need not be doomed to failure; a number of films use it at length and to great effect. Many of the most successful

deployments of the technique recognize and exploit its potential for producing alienation and unease through its departure from cinematic norms and its unseen motivating force.

Those disquieting qualities allow the technique to find perhaps its most regular deployment in the horror genre. It quickly became a visual cliché identified with slasher films in the wake of the iconic opening shot of John Carpenter's *Halloween* (1978). The camera trick also became a piece of evidence deployed in condemning such films. Critics decrying slasher films could cite the frequent use of this "I-camera" to put the audience in the killer's position, claiming that it fosters identification with the murderer.

Carol Clover argues that critics presume this identification too easily and at the expense of other evidence within the films. These critics, in essence, assume that first-person images take precedence over the traditional means through which films encourage identification with classically depicted protagonists. To undercut these critics' arguments, Clover specifically cites instances of animal POV shots in horror films. Referring to such shots from *The Birds* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1963) and *Jaws* (Steven Spielberg, 1975), Clover states: "either... the viewer's identificatory powers are unbelievably elastic or [these] point-of-view shots can sometimes be pro forma."⁹ Would critics really presume that, simply because the audience saw through the eyes of a shark or a flock of birds, they would connect with these animals? More likely, Clover and others argue, the use of such shots in the hugely successful *Jaws* contributed to their repeated use in tales of beast-like, aberrant humans.¹⁰ It simply became what one did, a technique proven to effectively build suspense. And, just as *Jaws* does not presume to communicate some deeper logic behind the shark's motives or create empathetic connections with the shark, *Halloween* and many films of its ilk write off their mentally deranged killers as evil and monstrously inhuman. These moments serve a chilling function, as audiences are linked to these killing machines by occupying the space and perspective of literal machines.

Due to the mechanical quality of the camera's vision, Galloway suggests that the technique most effectively recreates cybernetic perspectives, as in films like *The Terminator* (James Cameron,

WHAT BIG EYES YOU HAVE

1984) and *Robocop* (Paul Verhoeven, 1987). These films foreground and amplify the technological component, rather than effacing it. Galloway's argument makes sense, as the hybrid vision of the camera simulates here the view of subjects that combine the mechanical and the human. Yet these films are notable for their deployment of gimmicks and filters to help these subjective shots "make sense." In the aforementioned examples, digital read-outs overlay the screen, its image further distorted by filters and video effects. Galloway does not account for the way theoretical writings on the animal gaze suggest that theirs is the vision for which cameras provide the most suitable surrogate.

That is not to imply that animal POV shots are always unmarked by obvious filters and special effects, as seen in this essay's opening example. Such tricks actively mark moments when the film enters an alternative mode of seeing, the unmarked "objective" vision of the camera becoming the "subjective" perspective of the animal Other. However, trendsetting films, like *Jaws*, do not feel the need to make this clear distinction. Actually, a useful illustration of how easily the unmarked camera can play the animal's role comes from a particularly effective fake-out in *Cujo*.

When Donna's car first breaks down in *Cujo*, leaving her and her son stranded at a remote auto garage, only the audience knows a rabid dog is loose. Oblivious to the danger, the mother fiddles with her son's seatbelt, her car door open and her leg sticking out into the yard. At first, the camera cuts away to a distant shot of the car from a low-angle; the camera dips lower still to peer out from under the loose wooden slats of a shed door. The film cuts back to the mother and son, entering a conventionally shot back-and-forth dialogue. It then cuts to an angle similar to the previous low shot, only the camera has left its previous hiding place and stealthily glides towards the woman's turned back and up towards her shoulder. Suddenly, with an explosion of noise, *Cujo* pops up at the window on the opposite side of the car. This sequence is a cleverly executed jump scare, and part of its sophistication comes from the complex series of assumptions it requires the audience to make.

POV shots might be unusual, but visual and narrative conventions allow them to be (apparently) recognizable for audiences. When a film cuts to an

unusual angle and conveys information through fluid movement rather than distinct shot selection and editing, the camera appears to become an active (and potentially literal) player in the scene, rather than a passive recording mechanism. The efficacy of the above example further requires the audience to believe that this shot, no different in terms of the image quality than the rest of the film, comes from a dog's perspective. This trick relies on an unarticulated affinity between animals and cameras.

In *Electric Animal*, Akira Mizuta Lippit draws parallels between the way theorists like Roland Barthes and André Bazin conceptualize photography and film, and the way philosophers and critics discuss animals. Since the cinematic technique in question presumes to meld animals and cameras, I shall structure the remainder of this article around what Lippit identifies as two key characteristics shared by animals and photographs. Lippit suggests these qualities allow one to "interpret the animal as a version of the unconscious in nature and the photograph as a technological unconscious."¹¹ First, in terms of their expressive capacities and limitations, animals and photography share a "proximity to the threshold of language [and] a fantastic visuality."¹² Second, animals lack the imagination necessary for subjectivity, in a manner similar to how Barthes suggests photos lack subjectivity due to their connection with the objects they represent.¹³

The Outer Limits of the Animal Gaze

Though animals are wordless, their strange and penetrating gaze has long fascinated writers. John Berger speculates that the exchange of looks between humans and animals "played a crucial role in the development of human society."¹⁴ The fact that animals reserve no "special look for man," simply viewing humans as unexceptional elements of the world, helped humans conceptualize themselves as truly being in the world.¹⁵ Jacques Derrida provides a personal anecdote testifying to the powerful effect of falling under the impartial and unreadable gaze of the animal. In "The Animal That Therefore I Am," Derrida describes being hit by palpable self-consciousness, self-reflection, and self-knowledge when caught naked in front of his cat. While not sensing that the cat is specifically

or critically examining his genitals, Derrida cannot dismiss the fact that the animal “has its point of view regarding me. The point of view of the *absolute other*, and nothing will have ever done more to make me think through this absolute alterity of the neighbor than these moments when I see myself seen naked under the gaze of a cat.”¹⁶

Berger suggests that our powerful fascination with animals comes in part from the alterity to which Derrida alludes. Paradoxically, the similarities humans share with animals allow animals to be categorized as an “absolute other.” Animals exist parallel to humans, alike and unlike and forever distinct and distant because of their lack of, and our dependence upon, language. Berger characterizes the division between humans and animals as “a narrow abyss of non-comprehension.”¹⁷ Neither Berger nor Derrida characterize this as a frustrating or worrying non-comprehension. For them, these living blank slates inspire cognition in crucial ways. However, Berger and Derrida’s description of the animal gaze, with its unreadable, indifferent, and blankly penetrating and revelatory nature, suggests its disquieting potential, a potential explored and exploited in horror films.

Leslie Abramson describes how *The Birds* capitalizes on the unnerving quality of being seen by the animal Other. Amplifying the alterity of its antagonistic animals, *The Birds* focuses on a swarm rather than a single attacking creature. Traveling *en masse* and sharing an apparent hive mentality, they are the “demonic pack animals” that Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (admirably) contend “operate at the greatest distance from humans,” resisting individuation and conceptualization as proper subjects.¹⁸ Without proper individual identity, it becomes easier for the animals to be perceived as “all gaze and nothing else.”¹⁹ Abramson notes that, throughout *The Birds*, characters within the diegetic space react with unease to being so conscious of their subject-status when falling under the flock’s pure and pitiless collective gaze.

The animal gaze can be easily read in these different directions (inspiring or disconcerting) because of its inscrutability. Catherine Russell describes how humans “cannot know what [animals] are thinking, if they are thinking; the eye becomes a mask.”²⁰ In movies, the animal eye often becomes a barrier at which the camera stops,

and which filmmakers in turn fetishize. Abstract representations of the animal gaze often do not operate under the same logic as human eye-match cuts in classic editing. The general face of the animal is often not enough; the eye needs to be foregrounded and framed in close-up. It suggests a need to underline the fact that, within the narrative, the animal is not simply existing (which could be the implication of filming the face), but is, in fact, looking and (possibly) thinking.

Focusing on the eye in this manner provides a tantalizing gesture. Jonathan Burt notes that “the image of the animal’s eye reflects the possibility of animal understanding by emphasizing animal sight. This does not mean that the eye gives any access to what is understood but it does signal the significant participation of the animal in the visual field.”²¹ This ambivalent positioning provides a potentially more nuanced version of the work done by POV shots. There is no presumption of representing that vision. There is a clear acknowledgment of, and respect for, the boundaries in play.

Burt describes how, through eye close-ups, the animal’s look “merges with the look of the camera lens... [and] effectively turns the animal into a camera, a non-human recording mechanism.”²² A clear illustration of this, one which Burt himself references, comes in the horror film *Orca* (Michael Anderson, 1977). Narratively, the film draws explicit parallels between whales and humans. Orcas are ascribed an almost human intelligence; with that comes the potential for malice and the ability to hold a grudge. Early in the film, the (aptly named) killer whale imprints on its human antagonist, a fisherman responsible for the death of the whale’s family. The whale pops its head out of the water. The hunter stands on his boat’s deck, staring out at the whale. To show that the hunter’s gaze is being returned, the film cuts to a close-up of the whale’s eye. Briefly, the hunter’s reflection in the whale’s eye comes into sharp focus as the eye apparently takes a “snapshot” of the hunter. There is a gesture here towards representing the wordless intelligence of this species. Without explanation, the film visually communicates that the whale has imprinted on this human and will remember (and haunt) him.

In the above example, the animal’s eye effectively serves as the lens of an organic camera. Yet with animal POV shots the lens of the eye and camera

WHAT BIG EYES YOU HAVE

fuse and the animal *literally* serves as a camera. There is an admirable audacity to this technique, which presumes to step behind the unknowable mask of the animal eye and represent a wholly other way of being and perceiving. The final phase of this paper offers a more concentrated consideration of the impact of these POV shots in horror.

Ghost in the Machine

If animals' lack of imagination makes it impossible for them to properly develop subjectivity, it also renders them incapable of imagining their own deaths; this leads some to argue that animals can never truly be said to die as individuals. Inspired by this point, Lippit draws parallels between animals and photographs. Barthes claims that subjects, captured on film and converted into photographs, "never die, although they are always represented as 'going to die.'" ²³ This liminal existential status lends photos a ghostly quality. Barthes describes the sensation of allowing himself to be photographed, and thereby turned into an object: "I then experience a micro-version of death... I am truly becoming a specter." ²⁴ Barthes denies that film images possess a comparable haunting quality. He claims that, while film has a referent like photography, film's referent constantly shifts. The subject therefore "does not protest its former existence; it does not cling to me: it is not a specter." ²⁵ Others do not draw the same strict distinction. ²⁶ Film, with its capacity to imitate life and reanimate the past, seems to have an equivalent or greater spectral potential.

I bring up these haunting qualities because I conceptualize films with animal antagonists as an inflection of the ghost story for the modern age. They dramatize the uncanny return of a repressed form of natural life. Berger laments the perceived disappearance of animals from modern society and their replacement with poor substitutes and simulacrum. ²⁷ These films tell stories that bring wild and dangerous animals back into modern life.

Berger's "Why Look at Animals" is a melancholic reflection on the loss of human-animal interaction, specifically their reciprocal exchange of looks. Modernization and development displaced animals from human life, leaving no proper venues where such connections could occur. Most people must settle for the poor substitute of interacting

with captive and domesticated animals, animals that have been culturally marginalized and, in the minds of some, cease to be true animals. ²⁸

In addition to the "false" animals found in zoos and homes, representations of animals in media like film provide complementary simulacra. Several scholars identify an inverse relationship between the number of animals in the real world and the number of animal images on screens. Raymond Bellour observes: "since the turn of the century in all the arts... [we] have observed an increase of importance attached to the representation of animals." ²⁹ This holds especially true for cinema, where "[the presence] of animals... massively exceeds what one would expect." ³⁰ As real animals vanished, the turn of the century's quintessential modern art form compensated with increased spectral substitutes. Given this legacy of body snatcher-like replacement, the 'phantom-protagonist' that attends POV shots becomes wholly appropriate.

From its advent, cinema (like other technologies) incorporated the disappearing animal Other "without processing or integrating its alterity," leaving the medium haunted by the animal presence. ³¹ In the cases animating this study, the medium then tells stories that reanimate the (danger of the) animal Other. Throughout these films, the killer animals are subtly mutable subjects. They are a shifting combination of practical and digital special effects, as well as the spliced together actions of multiple animal "performers" and stock footage. As these animals morph from one form to another, they occasionally take possession of the camera – their technological counterpart.

Berger suggests that people visit venues like zoos in an attempt to recapture this lost interaction. However, zoos inevitably disappoint, because "nowhere in a zoo can a stranger encounter the look of an animal. At the most, the animal's gaze flickers and passes on.... They have been immunized to encounter." ³² In relation to these frustrated denials, the animal POV shots in horror films take on grim and ironic new significance. Human characters in these films find themselves being visually consumed by the animal's gaze before being literally consumed. When this possession takes place, human characters break the fourth wall. In terror, they stare directly at the camera and by extension out at the audience. The characters respond with abject terror to the gaze,

which rushes towards them or moves in some other unconventional way. For the audience, the effect is not totally unpleasant. This alternative regime of vision has a definite appeal. I agree with Clover's assessment that POV shots do not automatically override other outlets for audience identification in these narratives. As with other direct addresses to the audience, these characters' gazes simultaneously acknowledge and dismiss the audience. The audience merely occupies the same space as the narrative subject. However, I think Clover dismisses too quickly the possible mutability of, and play with, identifications that attend the deployment of this technique.

George Romero's *Monkey Shines* (1988) explicitly plays with the attraction of the alternative modes of being represented in these brief POV shots. The film focuses on a physically active man left paraplegic following an accident. An unscrupulous scientist friend gifts him a hyper-intelligent helper monkey. The man becomes psychically linked to the monkey (as one does), causing the monkey to act out the man's murderous anger issues. Sequences where the man dreams from the monkey's perspective periodically illustrate their mental bond. Early in the story, the incapacitated main character, and the audience, experience a vicarious thrill from the monkey's speed and agility, represented by long takes from a rapid-moving, low-to-the-ground camera.

Those moments, like all such animal POV shots, gesture towards an inner life for these animals. However, they do not leave the tantalizing mystery of the eye close-ups. They do not reveal any deeper truth or build empathy, which feeds into Clover's dismissal of the identificatory possibilities of such shots. However, the point is precisely that there is nothing to reveal. If animals are free from subjectivity, it makes sense that the experience of being an animal manifests as flat vision and movement through space.

The technique has the potential to be interesting and effective within the narratives of these films. However, these shots also carry great

risk of failure, absurdity, and the rupture of the narrative. A number of factors can sabotage the deployment of this technique. It might be through overuse. It could be due to ostentatious filters, or some other element of poor technical execution. Narrative framing can also be an issue, as these films tend to employ trashy or absurd B-movie narratives. These factors can disrupt audience immersion (in a way not dissimilar to Moreno's appraisal of *Lady in the Lake*) and make the jarring effect of this technique risible or comic rather than horrifying or disturbing. For example, the plot of *Monkey Shines* strains credulity. *Monkey Shines* was actually the target of an episode of *How Did This Get Made?*, a comedic podcast that lampoons bad films. The hosts made special mention of the "Monkey Cam" ("it's like a GoPro running through the streets") and its ostentatious accompanying orchestral score.³³

In no way does that potential for breakdown diminish these shots as objects of study. That potential for absurdity helps put into perspective how regimes of vision are imagined and projected. It speaks to what audiences can believe is animal vision, and what filmmakers believe audiences will believe. What allowances must be made to code the camera's vision as being an animal's vision? What are the limitations of the audience's suspension of disbelief? As mentioned above, Bazin discusses the camera as a means of visual reproduction free from human interference. It is a device characterized by its lack of inherent personality, intellect, or subjectivity. Within classic narrative cinema these qualities allow the camera largely to efface its placement in the scene and disappear from the audience's imagination. The potential rupture comes from the camera's entering the scene as an actual player. In those instances, its above-mentioned qualities become the basis for its casting, as its mechanical eye plays the role of the organic animal eye. When that happens, those few seconds communicate vastly different modes of sensing and occupying the world. The message is easy to miss, because it can only be delivered without words.

Isaac Rooks is a Graduate School Fellow and Ph.D. Student in the Cinema and Media Studies Division of USC's School of Cinematic Arts. His articles have been published in *MAS Context* and *Spectator*. His research centers on popular ecological media and depictions of landscapes and animals in film, particularly in horror fiction.

Notes

- 1 Some might quibble with my generic terminology here, but I would argue that there is a strong horrific thread running through any narrative made by and for humans, which primarily focuses on a non-human creature seeking to kill, mutilate, and/or devour human beings.
- 2 Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener. *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 85.
- 3 André Bazin, "The Ontology of the Photographic Image," trans. Hugh Gray, *Film Quarterly* 13, no. 4 (1960): 7, accessed July 12, 2012, doi: 10.2307/1210183.
- 4 Alexander R. Galloway, "Origins of the First-Person Shooter," in *Gaming: Essays on Algorithmic Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 45.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 41.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 45.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 62–63.
- 8 Julio L. Moreno, "Subjective Cinema: And the Problem of Film in the First Person," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television* 7, no. 4 (1953): 352, accessed November 8, 2014, doi: 10.2307/1210006.
- 9 Carol Clover, "Her Body, Himself: Gender in the Slasher Film," in *Horror: The Film Reader*, ed. Mark Jancovich (New York: Routledge, 2002), 79.
- 10 Richard Nowell, *Blood Money: A History of the First Teen Slasher Film Cycle* (New York: Continuum, 2011), 92.
- 11 Akira Mizuta Lippit, *Electric Animal: Toward a Rhetoric of Wildlife* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 177.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 163.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 171.
- 14 John Berger, "Why Look at Animals?" in *About Looking* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), 28.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 5.
- 16 Emphasis Added. Jacques Derrida, "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)," trans. David Wills, *Critical Inquiry* 28, no. 2 (2002): 380, accessed November 15, 2014, doi: 10.1086/449046.
- 17 Berger, "Why Look," 5.
- 18 Steve Baker, *The Postmodern Animal* (London: Reaktion Books, 2000), 168.
- 19 Leslie Abramson, "The Savage Audience: Looking at Hitchcock's *The Birds*," *Film History* 41, no. 2 (2001): 21, accessed December 12, 2014, <https://muse.jdu.edu/>.
- 20 Jonathan Burt, *Animals in Film* (London: Reaktion Books, 2002), 41.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 71.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 54.
- 23 Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2010), 173.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 14.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 89.
- 26 For one such discussion, see: Seung-Hoon Jeong and Dudley Andrews, "Grizzly ghost: Herzog, Bazin and the cinematic animal," *Screen* 49, no. 1 (2008): 1–12, accessed November 20, 2014, doi: 10.1093/screen/hjn001.
- 27 According to Freud's animating definition of uncanny, these wild creatures are literally *unheimlich* animals. See Sigmund Freud, "The 'Uncanny,'" in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XVII, trans. James Strachey, (London: The Hogarth Press, 1955): 222.
- 28 Randy Malamud, in his scathing assessment of zoos, argues: "Zoos contain sad animals, constrained animals, displaced animals, but zoo spectators are induced to sublimate this, and *pretend* they are looking at *real* animals." Emphasis added. See Randy Malamud, *An Introduction to Animals and Visual Culture*, (Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 115.
- 29 Raymond Bellour, "From Hypnosis to Animals," trans. Alistair Fox, *Cinema Journal* 53, no. 3 (2014): 14.
- 30 *Ibid.*
- 31 Lippit, *Electric Animal*, 188.
- 32 Berger, "Why Look," 28.
- 33 "Monkey Shines," *How Did This Get Made?* no. 96, podcast audio, Earwolf, MP3, accessed November 11, 2014, <http://www.earwolf.com/episode/monkey-shines/>.