

FILM
CULTURE

IN TRANSITION

HANDS *on* FILM



ACTANTS, AESTHETICS, AFFECTS

BARRY MONAHAN

Amsterdam
University
Press

Hands on Film

To Ciara, Clara and Eliot

Hands on Film

Actants, Aesthetics, Affects

Barry Monahan

Amsterdam University Press



Cover illustration: Image from *Au hasard Balthazar* by Robert Bresson © 1966 Argos Films – Parc Films – Argos Films – Svensk Filmindustri

Cover design: Kok Korpershoek

Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

ISBN 978 94 6372 771 6

e-ISBN 978 90 4854 476 9

DOI 10.5117/9789463727716

NUR 670

© B. Monahan / Amsterdam University Press B.V., Amsterdam 2022

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Table of Contents

List of Images	9
Acknowledgements	11
Introduction	13
1. <i>Themes</i> – The Framed Hand and Being	21
Natural and Supernatural Phenomena: Matter Becoming Consciousness	21
The Nature and Origin of Creativity	36
Determinism and Free Will: Possession, Self-possession, Disposition	50
Modernism: Industrialisation and Technology	63
Gendered Hands	76
2. <i>Symbolism</i> – The Semiotic Hand	91
The Meaningful Hand and Metonymy	91
The Manual as Metaphorical	111
Between Metaphor and Metonym: The Hand and Memory	127
3. <i>Aesthetics</i> – The Stylised Hand: Beauty, Ugliness, Genre	135
Behind the Scenes: Unseen Creative Hands	135
The Stylised Hand on Screen	138
The Camp Hand and the Hand in Camp	163
The Haptic Experience: Screened Sensations	172
4. <i>Narration</i> – Hands Doing and Being	189
Hands as Narrative Actants	189
Slow Hands and Slow Cinema	196
Acting Hands and Set Pieces	202
5. <i>Characterisation</i> – Hands and Identity	211
Cultural Contexts for Creative and Destructive Personalities	211
The Psychopathic Hand	223
Vocational Hands	228
Characters and Labour	232

Manual Details: Emotions and Eccentricities	235
Concealing and Revealing Characters	242
<i>Concluding Case Study – Steven Spielberg’s Jaws (1975)</i>	249
Filmography	253
Index	261

List of Images

- Figure 1.1** Divinely created contorted female hands in *The House is Black* (Forugh Farrokhzad, 1963)
 Film – *The House is Black* by Forugh Farrokhzad
 © 1963 – Studio Golestan 49
- Figure 1.2** The protagonist enjoys her secret manual pleasure in *Amélie* (Jean-Pierre Jeunet, 2001)
 Film – *Le Fabuleux Destin D'Amélie Poulin* de Jean-Pierre Juenet © 2001 – UGC Images – Tapioca Films
 – France 3 Cinéma – MMC Independent GMBH 83
- Figure 1.3** The hand of fate in *Amélie* (Jean-Pierre Jeunet, 2001)
 Film – *Le Fabuleux Destin D'Amélie Poulin* de Jean-Pierre Juenet © 2001 – UGC Images – Tapioca Films
 – France 3 Cinéma – MMC Independent GMBH 84
- Figure 2.1** Bruno takes hold of Caroline's hands in *Le lit* (Marion Hänsel, 1982)
 Film – *Le lit* de Marion Hänsel © 2001 – Pyramide Films 105
- Figure 2.2** Hands trap the cricket, symbolising repressed emotion in Cecil Tang's *The Arch* (1968)
 Film – *The Arch* by Cecil Tang © 1968 – Photo courtesy of www.lesblank.com 107
- Figure 2.3** Workman's gloves inhibit the emotional connection between father and son in *Five Easy Pieces* (Bob Rafelson, 1970)
 Film – *Five Easy Pieces* © 1970, renewed 1998 – Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc. – All Rights Reserved
 – Courtesy of Columbia Pictures 125
- Figure 2.4** Manual touch invokes memory in *Hiroshima mon amour* (Alain Resnais, 1959)
 Film – *Hiroshima mon amour* by Alain Resnais © 1959
 – Argos Films – Como Films – Pathé 129
- Figure 3.1** Hands and the style of German Expressionism in *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (Robert Wiene, 1920)
 Film – *Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari* | *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* by Robert Wiene © 1920 – Courtesy of FILMS SANS FRONTIERES 139
- Figure 3.2** Hands as stylistic elements in *The House is Black* (Forugh Farrokhzad, 1963)

- Film – *The House is Black* by Forugh Farrokhzad
© 1963 – Studio Golestan 147
- Figure 3.3** Stylised destruction of the evil limb in *Dr. Terror's House of Horrors* (Freddie Francis, 1965)
- Film – *Dr. Terror's House of Horrors* by Freddie Francis
© 1965 – Tigon Film Distributors Ltd. 152
- Figure 3.4** Stylised *mise en scène* in Harold P. Warren's *Manos: The Hands of Fate* (1966)
- Film – *Manos: The Hands of Fate* by Harold P. Warren,
1966 – Public Domain 155
- Figure 3.5** Camp hands as functioning *objets d'art* in Jean Cocteau's *La Belle et la bête* (1947)
- Film – *La Belle et la bête* by Jean Cocteau © 1947 –
Lopert Films – Publicity Image 169
- Figure 4.1** The skilled hand in action in Robert Bresson's *Pickpocket* (1959)
- Film – *Pickpocket* by Robert Bresson © 1959 – AGNES
DELAHAIE PRODUCTIONS 195
- Figure 4.2** The pervasive threatening hand in *Dr. Terror's House of Horrors* (Freddie Francis, 1965)
- Film – *Dr. Terror's House of Horrors* by Freddie Francis
© 1965 – Tigon Film Distributors Ltd. 203
- Figure 5.1** Lacenaire presents his criminal and creative hands in *Les enfants du paradis* (Marcel Carné, 1945)
- Film – *Les enfants du paradis* by Marcel Carné © 1945
– Courtesy of Pathé 213
- Figure 5.2** Identification intensified with the silent characters in Lorenza Mazzetti's *Together* (1956)
- Film – *Together* by Lorenza Mazzetti © 1956 – Harle-
quin Productions Ltd. – Courtesy of the BFI National
Archive 230
- Figure 5.3** Characterisation through manual communication in Lorenza Mazzetti's *Together* (1956)
- Film – *Together* by Lorenza Mazzetti © 1956 – Harle-
quin Productions Ltd. – Courtesy of the BFI National
Archive 230
- Figure 5.4** The lovers' manual interactions in *L'Eclisse* (Michelangelo Antonioni, 1962)
- Film – *L'Eclisse* by Michelangelo Antonioni © 1962 –
Courtesy of STUDIOCANAL 235

Acknowledgements

In the first instance I would like to thank Maryse Elliott, Senior Commissioning Editor at Amsterdam University Press, for her guidance, encouragement, and patience throughout the process of bringing this project to completion. Maryse was supported by Julie Benschop-Plokker along the way, and both were indispensable supporters of my work when I most needed it.

From its early incarnations, my erratic and ambitious thinking was focused and challenged by conversations with friends, colleagues, and students. Their generous suggestions and intellectual challenges helped me to mould the idealistic dreamwork into a feasible venture. I am grateful to those in the Department of *Film & Screen Media* at University College Cork, and to others beyond that unit who had wonderful ideas that steered my thinking: these include Graham Allen, Alan Gibbs, Maureen O'Connor, and Edel Semple. I had interesting conversations with my graduate researchers about process and product, during its evolution, and I would like to thank Sandra Costello, Rachel Gough, Tadhg Dennehy, and Nicholas O'Riordan, as well as other inspiring cinema enthusiasts from the same research community: James Mulvey, Marija Laugalyte, and Loretta Goff come to mind immediately. I would like to acknowledge especially Aidan Power, Máire Messenger-Davies, John Davies, Conn Holohan and Seán Crosson for valuable recommendations offered early in the mission.

I am indebted to a large number of people in film archives, holders of private collections and – I add with encouragement but not surprise – from independent, less market-dominant distribution companies, who facilitated my use of the images in this book. Among this cohort of cinephiles are: Alexandre de la Porte (UGC), Jean-Pierre Jeunet and his assistant Marjorie Orth (Tapioca Films), Raphaëlle Quinet (Pyramide Films), Emily and Harrod Blank from Les Blank Films, Margarita Diaz (Sony Pictures), Loli Geneste and Ellen Schafer (Argos Films), Cécile Meyer-Cases (Cité Films), Anne-Sophie Mignot (Films Sans Frontières), John Henderson (Tigon Film Distributors), Jonathan Rechenstein (Pathé), Espen Bale (British Film Institute), Alexane Durand (Studiocanal), Anne-Laure Barbarit (mk2), and Mylène Bresson. Without crucial guidance from Dan O'Connell and incredible generosity of spirit and time by Barry Reilly (both from my home department), there would have been no visual component to this book: I cannot thank them enough for turning it into the final version that it now is.

Friends and family have been at hand for support and encouragement throughout. I want to mention specifically Brian, Sarina, Thomas, Liz,

Christophe, Oisín, Liz, Kevin, Dolores, Stephen, Suzy, Evelyn, Kealan, Peter, Cathy, and my parents, Christy and Etta. The younger generation of family members weren't of much academic help, but they provided a background of hilarity, naughtiness, and fun, without which I (and this endeavour) would have definitely suffered. A big thanks to John, Claire, Joey, and Jessica for abundant provision of this essential energy!

During completion of the book, our son Eliot was born. His arrival awoke in me the memory that no creativity is as wonderful, and that I am profoundly lucky to have Ciara and Clara to share the new learning curve with me. They help me through and listen to moaning, but persist in their kindness... Thank you C Major and Minor!

Introduction

It is a truism that the number of hands on the cinematic screen is approximately twice the number of characters represented in films. This vast quantity of limbs became a challenge early in the present project despite help by friends, colleagues, and students who offered lists of important examples that ultimately became an aggregate filmography of several hundred cases. Having been initially overwhelmed by this unwieldy collection, I eventually found some assurance that the research task might not be so daunting. I began to discern categorical variations on the role played by hands in the cinematic art. Hands were abundantly available for scrutiny, but the list became more manageable by concentrating on appearances that were disposed to analytical attention because of their meaningful value. As the methodology shifted from enumeration to categorisation it invited a two-sided process: by considering what cinema had to say about human hands, it was necessary to reflect upon what that limb could reveal about the art form itself.

The book in front of you uses a familiar *modus operandi*; one in which film is considered in relation to another concept – literature, philosophy, adaptation, history – or objects – cars, guns, costumes, architecture – used to chart the historical and aesthetic development of both medium and mediated. If I have achieved my objective even partially, the proposal that the hand has something of indispensable importance to add to these studies should become explicit. To offer a visual analogy: this book might be conceived as an hourglass. In the top bulb, theoretical ruminations on the cinema lie in layers with wider philosophical questions – ontological, epistemological, and aesthetic – stratified as theses and antitheses. These levels blend as they percolate through the narrow neck of the sandglass, which represents the catalyst of this study: hands. Following that theoretical amalgamation, new ideas and conceptualisations emerge synthetically to shed light on how humankind has used the cinema as a mode of artistic expression to explore what it means to be a sentient, socially participating, and creative individual. Fundamentally this study comprises a series of attempts at justifying why the hand has such a crucial role to play in this process of revelation.

Monahan, B., *Hands on Film: Actants, Aesthetics, Affects*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2022

DOI: 10.5117/9789463727716_INTRO

The hand can be understood as an entity that mediates between the material (body) and the immaterial (mind). Consequently, it carries both literal and metaphorical potential. As an illustration of the former, explaining the evolution of our species in his detailed study *The Hand: How Its Use Shapes the Brain, Language, and Human Culture*, Frank R. Wilson has described the relationship between the limb and the mind and how, over millennia, the refinement in the functioning of each one contributed to the development of the intellect and capability of the other. Geoffrey Beattie has elucidated the diverse possibilities for the hand's capacity for denotative and connotative communication in his work *Rethinking Body Language: How Hand Movements Reveal Hidden Thoughts*. Both of these studies, as well as a host of other noteworthy expositions referenced in this work, testify to the critical importance of the position of the hand in human socialisation, acculturation, and intellectual development.

Two detailed interventions into the field integrate the hand specifically as performing entity within the cultural practices of theatre and film. In her study *The Hand on the Shakespearean Stage: Gesture, Touch and the Spectacle of Dismemberment*, Farah Karim-Cooper considers the Bard's manual representations within the historical contexts of its cultural applications both on stage and in textual and artistic imagery. Closer to home, in his monograph *Farocki/Godard: Film as Theory* Volker Pantenburg offers innovative reflection and astute analysis of the canons of those filmmakers and dedicates a detailed chapter to how hands have played an instrumental thematic (theoretical) and artistic (pragmatic) role in their work. Both studies centralise that part of the human anatomy by justifying the importance of its role in the artists' productions and for wider questions into the nature of *homo sapiens*. These conceptual enquiries are addressed in three further works that consider the position of the hand philosophically, without addressing cultural texts specifically. John Napier's *Hands*, Darian Leader's *Hands: What We Do with Them – and Why*, and *The Hand: A Philosophical Inquiry into Human Being* by Raymond Tallis, present comprehensive narratives that triangulate the relationship between intelligence, existence, and the hand, with a view to stressing the predominant position occupied by the limb in the evolution of humankind. These studies reaffirm and demonstrate that the corporeal entity bears considerable ontological significance in its unique connection to the social, intellectual, and cultural development of the species. Karim-Cooper and Pantenburg's research further testifies to its gestural and communicative flexibilities; qualities that make the hand an ideal subject for aesthetic representation in the plastic arts, literature, theatre, and cinema. To bring the discourses full circle, we need only propose

that the framed, filmed hand might itself have something to contribute to our understanding of how the cinematic medium works.

If such a dialectic is possible then it is best sought at the representational point where unique qualities of film and the hand overlap. As distinct from other representational cultural forms, cinema is endowed with the possibility of presenting the hands both in motion *and* in close-up; characteristics that elevate them to a position of importance exclusively available to the filmmaker. In writing on film's potential to rediscover any common object anew Fernand Léger mentions the hand in passing:

Before the invention of the moving picture no one knew the possibilities latent in a foot – a hand – a hat. These objects were, of course, known to be useful – they were seen, but never looked at. On the screen they can be looked at – they can be discovered – and they are found to possess plastic and dramatic beauty when properly presented. (1974, 97)

In a different context, Antonin Artaud has used the hand as one of a set of things that become meaningfully captured by virtue of isolation within the film frame. The medium charges diurnal objects with a renewed potency and aesthetic value by creating a contextual separation from which they

obtain a life of their own which becomes increasingly independent and detaches them from their usual meaning. A leaf, a bottle, a hand, etc., live with an almost animal life which is crying out to be used. (1972, 65)

This aesthetic magnification of the commonplace article reflects the way we give prominence to the hand on a regular basis. Thus, as we explore the motivations behind our observation of the limb in routine, quotidian circumstances, and as we appreciate its capacity to hold our attention, we might discover why aspects of its cinematic mediation have drawn that subject and this medium together. A possibility emerges from the hand's 'doing and thingness' marked by its location at the point of intersection between *the active consciousness* and *the world in which action occurs*; two characteristics that are fundamentally embedded in the process of film-making. Elements of these cinematic qualities resonate through the film theory writing of Gilles Deleuze and find expression in a discussion of the framed hand at the transitional point between his studies *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* and *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. At the beginning of the second work Deleuze emphasises the aesthetic capacities of the hand and grants it even more potency than the framed face. Setting out the evolution

of his thesis from the movement-image to the time-image he identifies a shift in the focus from the active doer to the passive seer of the representation and points to neo-realism for his main examples. There, he finds a 'pure optical situation' (1994, 2) that indicates a 'crisis of the action-image' where 'the character has become a kind of viewer [...] the situation he is in outstrips his motor capacities on all sides' (*ibidem*, 3). Stating that 'it is as if the action floats in the situation, rather than bringing it to a conclusion or strengthening it' (*ibidem*, 4), the author concludes his introductory section to *Cinema 2* with reiterated concentration on the hand. This, he affirms,

takes on a role in the image which goes infinitely beyond the sensory-motor demands of the action, which takes the place of the face itself for the purpose of affects, and which, in the area of perception, becomes the mode of construction of a space which is adequate to the decisions of the spirit. (1994, 12)

This monograph is a comprehensive study of the history of the human hand on film. By considering hundreds of case studies, it will assess the ways in which filmmakers have framed the hand: for purposes of character and narrative development; with the intention of exploring thematic and philosophical questions; and as a part of the aesthetic construction of their works. Its primary focus is on the valuable and varied ways in which that human feature has enriched the filmic representation. It also explores the ways in which the specific framing and use of the hand in cinema has facilitated thematic interventions into several philosophical, sociological, and theoretical questions about being human. Included in the former category are analyses of how the hand is used on screen for stylistic effect in genres as differently designed as the horror and the romantic comedy; how the hand has been mobilised for dramatic effect in narratives such as the action/adventure thriller and detective film; and how it has been framed in the construction of character and in determining agency in films that, among others, have something to say about working class societies and individuals, as well as race, gender, social mores and communication. In the latter group, the book will excavate the ways in which the cinematic hand can provide inroads into ontological questions about materialism and human evolution; into debates around free will and determinism; and concerning notions of good faith and individual moral and ethical responsibility. It will analyse the cinematic use of the hands by considering five roles that they perform. Each of these categories seeks to work in a dialectical way: firstly, by considering how the hand appears and performs diverse functions on

screen for different filmmakers; and secondly, by focusing on how that cinematic framing might shed light on philosophical and physiological questions about humanity and the hand.

This methodological classification is designed with the intention of offering clarity and in the hope that it will make the book as user-friendly as possible. However, as with any taxonomy, it is beset by two main categorical complications. The first of these is an inevitable, pragmatic tautology: because recognisable characteristics determine the group into which given examples should be placed, these groups in turn come to be redefined by their constituents. An interminable dance of *a priori* and *a posteriori* selection thus produces a permanent state of flexible indeterminacy, one which can only be accepted as unavoidable with such an endeavour. The second difficulty arises when a given example exhibits qualities that might have it reasonably situated in more than one taxonomic group. In these cases, I have used the predominant aspect of the film to assign its category, or else I have simply included the same film in the alternative sections. This has led to some repetition in the films discussed across my thematic sections, however the analytical angle of attack is sufficiently different in revisited case studies and I have attempted to synthesise the key points of the film for readers who may only dip in and out of single segments or chapters. Each of my five fields of exploration is represented by a single chapter.

In Chapter One – *Themes* – I consider how directors have used the hand as primary instrument to explore key ideas in their films. It offers close readings of several films that establish human decision, desire, agency, and potency as their principal concerns, and it presents a variety of ways in which metaphysical and ontotheological questions have been rendered on screen. It looks at films that have something to say directly about the labouring human hand: whether Marxist ideas about industrialisation, Lukács' notion of reification of the working subject, or questions about the changing conditions of work in the modern age. Within the context of debates around free will and determinism, and representations of individuals who suffer manual dispossession, it evaluates films that ask ethical and moral questions about the disempowerment of suppressed, minority, or marginalised individuals and groups. In the second chapter – *Symbolism* – I analyse the hand as a tool of communication, first assessing how the creation of on-screen meaning relates to socially-established codes of expression, and then considering how filmed hands play a role semiotically in the creation of new hermeneutic possibilities. It also looks at a compilation of films that focus on manual movement as a part of denotative or connotative coding, or as it makes meaning through established social hand

gestures, signalling, or conventional sign language. This section works with a tripartite structure and divides representations of the hand into categories of the metonymic, the metaphorical, and specific cases in which both are combined. Chapter Three – *Aesthetics* – deals with pro-filmic hands as creative contributors to the filmmaking process and on-screen hands as stylistic elements. Thus, it considers the manual labour involved in certain aspects of film production as well as paying attention to the tonal qualities generated by different manual effects and designs across various genres. It interrogates some of the recurring ways that filmmakers have used the hand as a stylistic entity and analyses how framing the limb as a thing of beauty or ugliness can create an aesthetic effect that permeates the whole representation tonally. With a view to exploring theoretical writing on film studies by analysts who have considered the Camp aesthetic and the haptic effects of film spectatorship, it uses the hand as a starting point to propose new possibilities of intervention into those areas: in both cases attempting to problematise some of the existing lines of debate. Chapter Four – *Narration* – explores the relationship between the active human hand and plot progression. It considers how on-screen hands have played instrumental roles in the development or suspension of the cinematic story. A brief opening section explains the underlying distinction between the operations that hands perform in every cinematic narrative – merely by ‘doing’ and incidentally moving the plot forward – and those films in which the actions of the hands become a marked object of focus. It explores how, in a powerfully protracted way, the active hands of inactive protagonists are tied to examples of ‘slow cinema’ narration, and the section on that stylistic group uses it as a benchmark in assessing how manual activity – or inactivity – might determine narrative progression in films more generally. The fifth chapter – *Characterisation* – catalogues examples of the use of the hand in providing information for the development of character, and it considers what film personalities do with their hands and how their hands reveal psychological interiority and complexity. The section reads hands as mechanisms that expose unconscious motives, desires, and pathologies, and it scrutinises their role in character formation and revelation: as actants, or as determinants of an existential condition.

In a concluding section, I use Steven Spielberg’s 1975 feature film blockbuster *Jaws* as a case study to consider the five categories set out in the preceding chapters. By analysing it from those different perspectives I hope to show how an application of hand-centric evaluations can shed light on cinematic elements that might otherwise remain hidden. At the same time, this closing piece should expose the problematic tautological nature

of the taxonomy that structures the book. While discrete examples of how the hand is working in a single film justify my categorical distinctions, the overlapping of elements of theme, symbolism, style, narration, and characterisation testifies to the dialectical interconnectedness of manual imagery, framing, referencing, and use for a range of cinematic objectives.

Four lines of investigation are embarked upon here which, for a few reasons, are not brought to satisfactory conclusions. While I acknowledge this – and hopefully justify it reasonably – time and space, and the nature of the debates in question have not permitted fuller closure. Complex and on-going discussions about humanity's relationship with free will and determinism are not resolved in films dealing with that topic and, accordingly, my own findings stop short of a perfect denouement by proposing that cinematic texts play with the indecision rather than try to draw a definite line under the argument. Similarly, I hope that my analysis of aesthetics of Camp cinema does justice to that rich area of investigation – especially as I attempt to justify Susan Sontag's early reading of the style – and that my omitting consideration of a broader range of (contemporary) cases will not leave the reader too frustrated. On the question of how the film spectator is haptically stirred by the viewing experience, I have tried to problematise certain lines of debate without rejecting the concept wholesale. In this respect, I feel that much more must be done that might borrow from writing on the 'paradox of fiction' in elucidating what is, fundamentally, a core ambiguity around our tactile relationship with the screened world. Finally, I mention that consideration of the hand – particularly the detached and self-conscious entity – might have something to add to conceptualisations of character. Rather than propose a definite set of theses in this regard, I suggest that analysis of how the human and animal limb (as the severed but re-animated extremity) is represented might expose important qualities that have something to say about all character construction. These might include, but are not limited to, questions about the anthropomorphic form imitating physical qualities of the living being, and how identification with psychological motivations and intentions might be aroused in the viewer. In all these examples, I hope that more expert and better minds will pursue lines of study only modestly and tentatively begun here.

In considering cinematic hands and how these might inform discussions about our being-in-the-world and our (self) representation on screen, it is hoped that both researchers in film studies and those interested in ontological philosophical questions will be satisfied, theoretically challenged, and informed about a variety of topics in film themes and aesthetics. Readers will hopefully discover a variety of examples of the hand on screen with as

many questions about the ways in which the moving hand is represented and mobilised for interrogative and stylistic effect. Ultimately, readers are invited to consider the meanings offered by this set of representations as they shed light on critical aspects of our being humans who manipulate the world we inhabit.

Works Referenced

- Artaud, Antonin. 1972. *Collected Works: Volume Three*. Translated by Alastair Hamilton. London: Calder and Boyars.
- Beattie, Geoffrey. 2016. *Rethinking Body Language: How Hand Movements Reveal Hidden Thoughts*. New York: Routledge.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1992. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Karim-Cooper, Farah. 2016. *The Hand on the Shakespearean Stage: Gesture, Touch and the Spectacle of Dismemberment*. New York, London: Bloomsbury.
- Leader, Darian. 2016. *Hands: What We Do with Them – and Why*. United Kingdom: Penguin, Random House.
- Léger, Fernand. 1974. 'A New Realism – The Object'. In *Introduction to the Art of the Movies*, edited by Lewis Jacobs, 96–98. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Napier, John. 1980. *Hands*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Pantenburg, Volker. 2015. *Farocki/Godard: Film as Theory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Tallis, Raymond. 2003. *The Hand: A Philosophical Inquiry into Human Being*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wilson, Frank R. 1998. *The Hand: How Its Use Shapes the Brain, Language, and Human Culture*. New York: Pantheon Books.