

Auteur vs. Author: Kubrick's Relationship with Literary Writers

Annie Nissen

The legacy of Stanley Kubrick (1928-1999) and the influence he had on filmmaking and filmmakers is well established. Yet his career has not been without criticism, often leveled at both his choice of subject matter and his directorial approach.¹ This criticism has arisen in part because of Kubrick's unusual position as a filmmaker: from the beginning of his career, he remained largely independent of contractual obligations to studios, giving him creative freedom in his choice of subject matter, and allowing little interference from others in his film direction. His early experience working as a stand-in director on *Spartacus* (1960) is often seen as confirming his decision to retain as much creative control as possible in his future endeavors; even so, he succeeded "in reconciling his own uncompromising requirements with those of the industry."² Critics and biographers often discuss his background as a photographer contributing to the precise vision that he brought to his filmmaking practices and, although he is widely hailed as a visionary filmmaker, negative terms, ranging from "perfectionist" to "control freak," are also attached to this.³ His total control included rare directorial involvement with aspects such as translation, insistence on choosing his own dubbing director, and selecting the foreign voice actors.⁴

The control that Kubrick maintained throughout his career established him as an authorial figure, a film auteur. His progress as director coincided with the rise of the auteur theory in the 1950s and 60s, and Kubrick was classed as such early in his career, displaying many of the elements that defined the film auteur as the main influence over film productions. Equally essential to the definition of a film auteur, Kubrick constructed himself as a director who was not afraid to deviate from mainstream filmmaking practices in subject matter, cinematic form, or in his overall approach to film production. As a result, as Greg

Jenkins points out, he was both “celebrated and chided as an idiosyncratic artist.”⁵ Alexander Walker further describes Kubrick’s auteurism as “conceptual,” explaining that he possessed “a talent to crystallize every film [...] into a cinematic concept” that exhibited his auteur “vision in an unexpected way.”⁶ Although Kubrick’s directing career spanned only thirteen feature films from the 1950s until his death in 1999, the diversity of his oeuvre is astounding, encompassing war films, period and contemporary dramas, horror and science fiction epics, to name only a few of the many genres he tackled.

As diverse as his films are in terms of genre, they do have one thing in common that is far too often overlooked: they are literary adaptations.⁷ Kubrick always relied on literary material for his films, with the exception of his first two. His work, nonetheless, never identifies itself primarily as adaptation, but rather detaches from it through cinematic originality. Literary film adaptation scholars have been more attuned to these dynamics: he has been nominated as an “adapter-auteur”⁸ and, for Elisa Pezzotta, Kubrick’s cinema has become “the example *par excellence* of the fruitful encounter between the two arts,” despite his films “being among the furthest from the written medium” that they adapt.⁹ Kubrick himself was aware of this distance, describing his approach to literary adaptation as “an accidental process, and never one which can be attacked head-on.”¹⁰

And yet Kubrick was himself a writer, actively participating in writing all his films in one way or another, writing for which he was both credited and uncredited. Early in his career, Kubrick described his filmmaking as uniting the roles of “writer, director, and editor” in one, stating in a 1958 interview that “You should try to be one solid entity just like the art you are creating is an individual entity.”¹¹ Not only does this statement highlight his plenary method of filmmaking, it also articulates his view that each film acts as an artistic entity within itself. Considering Kubrick’s penchant for adapting material and the fact that his work is not widely treated as adaptation, his statement here suggests his view of his source material

not as something to be translated to film, but one of seminal generation of film as an independent work of art. Yet, Kubrick's assertion that the director must be a writer, among other things, complicates simplistic views of binary oppositions between literature and film, word and image, writing and directing. That said, Kubrick did not consider himself a screenwriter, frequently refusing this role and hiring others to write screenplays for his films. Beyond his writing and directing, Kubrick's passion for editing his films is widely documented. He identified editing as the most "unique" art form in film, equaling only writing and shooting in filmmaking.¹² His approach to editing was all-consuming, being fully involved and admitting to being merciless with cutting and editing the final product: "Nothing is cut without me. I'm in there every second [...] and have everything done exactly the way I want it."¹³ The control he displayed in the editing room is emblematic of the control that he tried to preserve over his films. His role as film editor can also be likened to his role when working with other writers. Kubrick excelled at revising and, arguably, improving what others had written before him.¹⁴

This chapter examines some ways in which Kubrick worked with writers, particularly with literary writers whose work he adapted. This discussion is not concerned with issues of fidelity, nor with levying judgments on the characters or aesthetics of literary authors and this film auteur. Instead, it analyzes some encounters that Kubrick, the film auteur, had with literary authors and asks whether and how his experiences with writers shaped his approach to filmmaking. Since each and every relationship Kubrick had with literary writers would fill many books, the main focus of this chapter is on Kubrick's working relationship with novelist Vladimir Nabokov during the production of the film *Lolita* (1962), adapted from the author's 1955 novel. This early instance of literary collaboration is formative and also representative of Kubrick's approach to working with literary authors whose work he adapted and indicative of their influence on his filmmaking. Throughout his career Kubrick

experienced continuous conflicts and contests with literary writers, including attempts by authors to reassert their own authority, yet his films were nevertheless shaped by the spirit of their texts,¹⁵ combining his vision with theirs.

First published in 1955 in Paris, Nabokov's novel *Lolita* was initially rejected by American publishers due to its controversial subject matter. When it was finally published in America in 1958, Kubrick and his producer, James B. Harris, obtained the film rights for it for \$150,000, and, in July 1959, they approached Nabokov to write the screenplay for the adaptation. Although Nabokov was ultimately credited as the only screenwriter and even received an Academy Award nomination in 1963, his screenplay was not much utilized for the film. Nabokov himself has stated that there are "just enough borrowings" from his *Lolita* script in Kubrick's adaptation to justify his "legal position as author of the script," but that "the final product is only a blurred skimpy glimpse of the marvelous picture I imagined."¹⁶ The film encountered numerous obstacles during production, not least of which was Nabokov himself. When Kubrick initially asked Nabokov to write the screenplay he declined, with his refusal to accept only strengthened when he learned that changes would need to be made to appease the censors. Censorship concerns often plagued Kubrick's films, but seldom did they interfere with his vision. Seeking to extend his own creative freedom to Nabokov, Kubrick promised Nabokov "a freer hand," and renewed his offer half a year later. Nabokov, who by now had a vision of his own for the adaptation, accepted.¹⁷

Their two visions clashed. In a short essay written for *Sight and Sound* during the filming of *Lolita*, Kubrick propounds his theory of screenwriting: "the dramatizing has to find a style of its own." Advising the screenwriter against using "paper and ink and words," he recommends "working in flesh and feeling" as well as fully grasping the content of the source, so that something different to the novel can be brought out in the film. Addressing the question of how a novel like *Lolita*, whose quality depends so much on Nabokov's prose

style, can be adapted to film, he argues that the quality of writing is merely one element, and that another factor is “the quality of the writer’s obsession with his subject,” including “an understanding of character” as well as “a theme [...] concept and a view of life.” This approach to adaptation as capturing the feeling, structure, authorial passion, themes, concepts, world view, and characters of a novel governs Kubrick’s film adaptations throughout his career. He suggests that the resulting film in some way could possibly be even better than the novel.¹⁸ Not only does Kubrick here display his ambitious belief that an adaptation can be better than its source, even a celebrated one such as *Lolita*, but he also indicates that the writer’s obsessive relationship to his work mirrors that which he himself increasingly displayed as a director.

In direct contrast to Kubrick’s theory of adaptation, Nabokov describes his screenwriting process as granting “words primacy over action, thus limiting as much as possible the intrusion of management and cast” and that he “persevered in the task until [he] could tolerate the rhythm of the dialogue and properly control the flow of the film from motel to motel, mirage to mirage, nightmare to nightmare.”¹⁹ It is clear from this that he had little sympathy with film techniques and conventions or even spoken dialogue and that he saw his task as being one of writing and rewriting until he perceived that his words could control the flow of the film—the editing, as it were.

Nabokov initially had no idea that his views of adaptation were so diametrically opposed to Kubrick’s. Having been given, as promised, the free hand with the screenplay, Nabokov recounts that Kubrick’s “attitude had convinced me that he was willing to heed my whims more closely than those of the censor.” Before starting work on the script, Nabokov met with Kubrick to discuss how to cinematize the novel, a meeting that Nabokov described as “an amiable battle of suggestion and countersuggestion,” in which Kubrick “accepted all my vital points, I accepted some of his less significant ones.” However, the meetings became

less frequent, as did any criticism of the script, so that Nabokov was not feeling “quite sure whether Kubrick was serenely accepting whatever I did or silently rejecting everything.”²⁰ By June 1960, Nabokov nonetheless thought he had finished his screenplay, even though it was 400 pages. He recalls that Kubrick met with him to explain that the screenplay was unworkable as a film, it being “too unwieldy, contained too many unnecessary episodes, and would take about seven hours to run,”²¹ asking him to change and delete several things, some of which he adhered to and others of which he did not. By September, he had sent Kubrick a revised and shortened script, including new sequences and situations, which the director then accepted.

After this, however, Nabokov’s involvement in the film ceased completely.²² He recalls that “nobody insisted on my coming to Elstree” and that “the shooting of the *Lolita* film in England was begun and concluded far beyond the veil of my vanities.”²³ In addition, his unease with film conventions and attempts to overwrite them, as well as his disappointment that *Lolita* did not turn out to be the “marvelous picture [he] imagined,”²⁴ indicate a lack of familiarity with the realities of film production. His belief that his script was the final version, with no changes being necessary, further shows his inexperience with film production processes. At this early point in Kubrick’s career, Nabokov’s position as celebrated literary author might have contractually ensured him more power over the adaptation; at very least he could have been privy to changes that were being made to his script.

Surprisingly, given how little of Nabokov’s script he used in the film, Kubrick expresses directorial deference to literary writers in his essay published during the filming of *Lolita*: “it is his [the director’s] duty to be one hundred per cent faithful to the author’s meaning,” making no sacrifices to this “for the sake of climax or effect.” Perhaps responding to the recent rise of *la politique des auteurs*, he criticizes directors who disregard “the inner

design” of the work, describing this as the point where “the cult of the director” is seen at its worst.²⁵ His respect for the author, however, did not extend to involving him in the production process nor in fidelity to the words of the novel or its plot structures, or, more importantly, to the author’s screenplay. Instead, Kubrick focuses on the “meaning” of the author’s words and the “inner design” rather than the manifest signs of the literary text. Nabokov’s continued involvement with the film production process could have proven problematic for Kubrick. Even if his screenplay was not satisfactory, in contrast to other writers with whom Kubrick had worked before, such a famous, outspoken author might have challenged Kubrick’s interpretation of his “meaning” and the “inner design” of his book. In a theoretical climate where authorial intent still loomed large in literary criticism and the author was still very much alive, Kubrick was unlikely to win any battles over what the other meant or what his “inner design” was. However, by letting Nabokov write the screenplay with only minimal interference from himself and then directing and editing the film with no interference from Nabokov, Kubrick avoided these potential debates and problems. Kubrick could determine what Nabokov “meant” in the novel and ignore what he “meant” in the screenplay. In this way, his literary film adaptation processes prefigured the death of the author that Roland Barthes would proclaim a few years later in 1967.

Intriguingly, for all his attempts to dominate film conventions with words, Nabokov himself realized his limitations as a screenwriter, admitting that “by nature I am no dramatist; I am not even a hack scenarist.”²⁶ Even more intriguingly, he implicitly supported Kubrick’s total control of the film, qualifying that:

if I had given as much of myself to the stage or the screen as I have to the kind of writing which serves a triumphant life sentence between the covers of a book, I would have advocated and applied a system of total tyranny, directing the play or the picture myself, choosing settings and costumes, terrorizing the actors, mingling with them in the bit part of guest, or ghost, prompting them, and, in a word, pervading the entire show with the will and art of one individual.²⁷

This view of absolute control over a production reiterates Kubrick's own theory of himself as a director, even before *Lolita*, and his obsessive directorial practices. However, writing here in retrospect in 1974, Nabokov makes clear that mastery of one's art form is a prerequisite for tyrannical control. That said, Nabokov became, according to his own account and despite his initial reluctance, very dedicated and deeply involved in the screenwriting. Yet he did not believe he was cut out for film (writing), which offers a better explanation of why he did not engage further with the production process.

If Nabokov felt that he had failed as a dramatist and a screenwriter, Kubrick viewed "a writer-director" as "the perfect dramatic instrument," with the mastery of both practices, already done by a few, producing reliably good work.²⁸ Yet, at this point, he did not consider himself able to master writing without the support of literary writers. Prior to working with Nabokov on *Lolita*, Kubrick had shown that he had no objection to hiring novelists inexperienced in film writing to collaborate on his films. For *The Killing* (1956), he hired novelist Jim Thompson, whose style had impressed him, though he had never written a screenplay. Indeed, his admiration for a writer's style appears dominant in his choice of screenwriters, explaining his choice of Nabokov. The choice was not simply aesthetic. Kubrick understood that crediting Nabokov himself as the screenwriter would have given the film more prestige, both with critics and audiences. Indeed, although Nabokov lamented that "only ragged odds and ends of my script had been used,"²⁹ he was credited as sole writer for the film, even though Kubrick had written most of the script. Amidst Kubrick's protestations of fidelity to the author's meaning, Nabokov judged the film as certainly "unfaithful to the original script."³⁰ Thus he was credited for Kubrick's infidelities to his script.

David Hughes describes Kubrick's omission of crediting himself, as a "shrewd rather than generous move," allowing the author "to take either the credit or the blame."³¹

Following the controversy that the book had courted, on which the film capitalized in its

promotional tagline “How did they ever make a movie of *Lolita*?,” crediting Nabokov as the writer of both meant that he would be held partly responsible for the film. It is likely that Kubrick declined any credit for the writing to compensate Nabokov financially for deviating from his script. In addition to the \$40,000 (plus expenses) that Nabokov received for writing it, his contract stipulated that a further \$35,000 would be paid if he received sole credit.³² This clause was possibly inserted following Kubrick’s legal troubles with author-screenwriter writing credits. After *The Killing*, Thompson considered legal action against Kubrick when he was merely credited for the dialogue, whereas Kubrick was credited for the screenplay. He was only placated when he was given another screenwriting position on *Paths of Glory* (1957). Here, however, Kubrick encountered further trouble, as novelist Calder Willingham, also a first-time screenwriter, was hired to rewrite Thompson’s script. Realizing that Kubrick would receive most of the writing credit, Willingham took the case to the Writer’s Guild of America, claiming to have written the majority of the screenplay. The WGA ruled in Willingham’s favor, resulting in Kubrick’s shared writing credit alongside Willingham and Thompson.³³ *Lolita* remains the last and one of his few films in which Kubrick did not receive writing credit at all. The sole credit given to Nabokov for *Lolita* is thus somewhat anomalous.

Until Nabokov saw the film, he was unaware of what had happened to his screenplay. A few days before the *Lolita* premiere in New York, on 13th June 1962, he sat through a private screening, describing his first reaction as a “mixture of aggravation, regret, and reluctant pleasure.” He did not consider that Kubrick had improved his screenplay: “Most of the sequences were not really better than those I had so carefully composed for Kubrick.”³⁴ Yet rather than press the aesthetic equality of his writing to Kubrick’s further, he articulates what he imagines Kubrick’s point of view on the collaboration to be, as well as his own response: “I keenly regretted the waste of my time while admiring Kubrick’s fortitude in

enduring for six months the evolution and infliction of a useless product.”³⁵ Nabokov’s chief disappointment is over his wasted time; rather than accusing Kubrick of toying with him, he presumes that Kubrick was hoping that the screenplay would develop into a useful product. These statements were written years later. At the time the film was released, Nabokov kept his mixed emotions regarding the film largely private, with Kubrick confirming that he “went to a party with Nabokov after the premiere, and he was very jolly and flattering about the film in every respect.”³⁶ Nabokov also hailed the film as “absolutely first-rate” in a *Playboy* interview in 1964. Two years on from the film’s release, however, he was keen to point out that he was not involved with the “actual production” and that, if he had been, he “might have insisted on stressing certain things that were not stressed.” Even as he stated, “All I did was write the screenplay,” he claimed (somewhat inaccurately) that “a preponderating portion of [it] was used by Kubrick.”³⁷

Despite describing Kubrick’s film as “first-rate,” Nabokov unceasingly perceived his own screenplay as an ideal adaptation of his novel, later declaring that, “I shall never understand why he [Kubrick] did not follow my directions and dreams.”³⁸ The faith and pride that Nabokov had in his screenplay, as well as the labor he put into it came to a head when he decided to publish it over a decade later in 1974, even including some scenes from his first draft. He was keen to point out that this decision was made “not in a pettish refutation of a munificent film,” as “aggravation and regret soon subsided,” but that it was rather so as to not waste his work. He did not present it as a superior screenplay, but “purely as a vivacious variant of an old novel.”³⁹ Repeating his admiration for the film *Lolita* “in its own right,” he nevertheless maintained “but it’s not what I wrote.”⁴⁰ Nabokov appeared satisfied that his screenplay was now available to anyone wishing to see what he had written, concluding that it was ultimately able to exist *alongside* the film. Stressing that the publication of his screenplay was not a “belated grudge” or “high-pitched depreciation of Kubrick’s creative

approach,” he explained: “he saw my novel in one way, I saw it in another—that’s all,” going further to admit that his screenplay would not have worked as a film: “infinite fidelity may be an author’s ideal but can prove a producer’s ruin.”⁴¹

Kubrick continued to use existing literature to inspire his filmmaking, explaining that by not writing the story himself, which he was not certain he would be able to do, “you have this tremendous advantage of reading something for the first time,” like a “falling-in-love reaction” which he sought to retain as long as possible while adapting it.⁴² Kubrick’s films, then, were both shaped and characterized by his passion for literature as a reader and adapter, maintained as long as possible from start to finish. His early experiences with literary writers such as Thompson, Willingham, and Nabokov, had by no means dissuaded him from further adaptations and collaborations with writers, although over time he was more direct and undertook more “hands-on” writing himself. With *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968), for example, Kubrick actively joined forces with a popular literary writer and worked with him to create his vision for the film. In this instance, he not only optioned several published stories by Arthur C. Clarke in 1964, he also hired him to write a *new* treatment for the film, incorporating ideas from the stories that interested Kubrick. Even though he describes their joint efforts as “one of the most fruitful and enjoyable collaborations,”⁴³ and Clarke too was largely positive about their relationship, working together also proved challenging for both. Particularly galling for Clarke, as Michael Benson points out, was his exclusion from the financial profits of the film, despite his significance in developing the project.⁴⁴ Joining Clarke’s devaluation in the economics of film profits, his work was further rendered secondary in the release dates. Kubrick wanted the film to precede Clarke’s novel, so as to appear as its source, whereas Clarke expected to publish it prior to the film, as they had originally planned.⁴⁵ When Clarke’s eponymous novel was published shortly after the film was released, he dedicated it “To Stanley,” but was solely credited as its author, allowing

Clarke to reassert independent authority over that writing. Clarke nevertheless stated in retrospect that, as novel and screenplay were written simultaneously, the credit for the novel should have read: “‘by Arthur Clarke and Stanley Kubrick: based on the screenplay by Stanley Kubrick and Arthur Clarke’—whereas the movie should have the credits reversed.”⁴⁶ Throughout his career, Kubrick’s collaborations with writers proved thus contradictory, as he respected and admired them, while simultaneously promoting his vision above theirs in various ways.

As Kubrick’s control over his films developed, and as he gained experience writing for the screen, he decided to forego collaborating with literary writers partway through his filmmaking career and was credited as the sole screenwriter of the two films he made during the 1970s, *A Clockwork Orange* (1971) and *Barry Lyndon* (1975). Asked subsequently whether he liked writing alone or would like to work with a scriptwriter, he replied that he enjoyed working with someone he found “stimulating.”⁴⁷ While of course the nineteenth-century novel *Barry Lyndon* offered Kubrick no opportunity to collaborate with its author William Makepeace Thackeray, this was not so for *A Clockwork Orange*. In this case, several screenplays had already been written when Kubrick acquired the rights. Kubrick chose to disregard them all, including one by its author Anthony Burgess, writing an entirely new script alone. He proceeded similarly with the adaptation of *The Shining* (1980), ignoring a screenplay written by its author, Stephen King. Here, however, he chose to collaborate on the screenplay with novelist and first-time screenwriter Diane Johnson. Yet the author was not entirely dead in the Barthesian sense, birthed solely by the film-auteur. Although Kubrick did not want either “author to adapt his own novel”—that is, to write it for film—he still valued their input in interpreting the meaning of their novels and was in frequent contact with both, asking numerous questions of them while working on the scripts.⁴⁸

Despite Kubrick's obsessive pre-production planning and insistence on having absolute authority over his films, his approach to writing film scripts shows adaptability and openness to change in the process of their development: "Any art form properly practiced involves a to and fro between conception and execution, the original intention being constantly modified as one tries to give it objective realization."⁴⁹ With *Barry Lyndon*, for instance, he recalls that the writing process never really stopped: "However carefully you think about a scene, and however clearly you believe you have visualized it, it's never the same when you finally see it played," requiring new ideas and ways to tell the story.⁵⁰ Moreover, in spite of his control of every aspect of the film, he was not closed to collaborative filmmaking, believing in developing the script continuously along with the actors.⁵¹ The shooting stage and the process of directing actors therefore played an important part in developing Kubrick as a screenwriter.⁵² Encouraged by Kubrick, Peter Sellers was known to improvise on set, not only during *Dr. Strangelove* (1964) but also whilst filming *Lolita*. This makes clear that not all of the changes made to Nabokov's script were Kubrick's, but were the product of collaborations between Kubrick and other filmmakers.

As both Nabokov and Clarke had pitted their authorship and authorial claims against Kubrick's, other writers also attempted to reaffirm authority over their work in different ways. King went further than either when he not only rewrote but also adapted and executive produced *The Shining* as a TV mini-series in 1997. The fact that Kubrick was in possession of the exclusive rights meant that the fate of King's adaptation lay in his hands. Rather than refuse King, Kubrick struck a bargain: in addition to a large pecuniary compensation, King had to refrain from publicly criticizing Kubrick's version and from making any comparisons between the two adaptations.⁵³ Prior to this agreement, King had criticized Kubrick's film, stating that his problems were not with the directing, but "mostly with the scripting"⁵⁴ by Kubrick and Johnson: it was "a film by a man who thinks too much and feels too little."

Having had great expectations for the adaptation and having admired Kubrick for years, he “was deeply disappointed in the end result.”⁵⁵ Despite not being allowed to continue criticizing Kubrick’s version, the act of self-adapting his work was enough to convey the message. Furthermore, overwriting and re-filming Kubrick’s work in a later adaptation could not stop others from comparing them, potentially to King’s critical advantage, as these works pitted the author’s adaptive vision against the auteur’s.⁵⁶

Intriguingly, Kubrick’s reaction to King’s adaptation and Nabokov’s published screenplay are undocumented and neither has interfered with the reputation of his film versions. Jenkins’ view is that, while Kubrick, as adapter, must be viewed as part of a “rhetorical community [...] that unites most if not all adapters,” his films are “unique and personal.”⁵⁷ Yet his films remain imbued with the creativity of other authors. Discussing Kubrick’s adaptation of *The Shining*, Jarrell D. Wright argues that Kubrick did “not merely” adapt the novel, but rather the “themes that King was also developing in the source text.”⁵⁸ We have seen that this is what Kubrick himself claimed about his process of adaptation. Kubrick’s films are composites of literary concepts developed by other writers, actor improvisation, visual imagery developed by cinematographers and special effects departments, mixed with and overseen by his own cinematic vision. Although Kubrick asserted his control over all the writers he collaborated with, both directly and indirectly, he nevertheless gave recognition to the writers whose work imbued his films, albeit not always in the way they wanted. He clearly recognized their authorial abilities and claims over their work, just as they recognized Kubrick’s abilities and claims over his as adapter-auteur.

REFERENCES

Benson, Michael. *Space Odyssey: Stanley Kubrick, Arthur C. Clarke, and the Making of a Masterpiece*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2018.

- Cahill, Tim. "The *Rolling Stone* Interview: Stanley Kubrick." In *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews*, edited by Gene D. Phillips, 189-204. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2001.
- Castle, Alison, ed. *The Stanley Kubrick Archives*. Köln: Taschen, 2016.
- Clarke, Arthur C. *Lost Worlds of 2001*. New York: New American Library, 1972.
- Ciment, Michel. *Kubrick: The Definitive Edition*. London: Faber & Faber, 2001.
- Elliott, Kamilla. *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Gelmis, Joseph. "The Film Director as Superstar: Stanley Kubrick." In *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews*, edited by Gene D. Phillips, 80-104. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2001.
- Gold, Herbert. "The Art of Fiction XL: Vladimir Nabokov, An Interview." In *Strong Opinions*, Vladimir Nabokov, 80-92. New York: McGraw Hill, 1973.
- Hughes, David. *The Complete Kubrick*. London: Virgin, 2000.
- Jenkins, Greg. *Stanley Kubrick and the Art of Adaptation: Three Novels, Three Films*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland Press, 1997.
- Kubrick, Stanley. "Words and Movies." *Sight and Sound* 30, no. 1 (Winter 1960): 14.
- Leitch, Thomas. *Film Adaptation and its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- LoBrutto, Vincent. *Stanley Kubrick: A Biography*. London: Faber & Faber, 1998.
- Magistrale, Tony. *Hollywood's Stephen King*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lolita: A Screenplay*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.
- Norden, Eric. "Playboy Interview: Stephen King." In *Bare Bones: Conversations on Terror with Stephen King*, edited by Tim Underwood and Chuck Miller, 24-56. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1988.

Pezzotta, Elisa. *Stanley Kubrick: Adapting the Sublime*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2013.

Toffler, Alan. "Playboy Interview: Vladimir Nabokov." In *Conversations With Vladimir Nabokov*, edited by Robert Golla, 70-89. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2017.

Varela, Jay. "Conversation with Stanley Kubrick." In *The Stanley Kubrick Archives*, edited by Alison Castle, 166-71. Köln: Taschen, 2016.

Walker, Alexander. *Stanley Kubrick Directs*. London: Abacus, 1973.

Wright, Jarrell D. "Shades of Horror: Fidelity and Genre in Stanley Kubrick's *The Shining*." In *True to the Spirit: Film Adaptation and the Question of Fidelity*, edited by Colin MacCabe, Rick Warner, and Kathleen Murray, 173-94. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Zanotti, Serenella. "Auteur dubbing: Translation, performance and authorial control in the dubbed versions of Stanley Kubrick's films." In *Reassessing Dubbing: Historical Approaches and Current Trends*, edited by Irene Ranzato and Serenella Zanotti, 79-102. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2019.

NOTES

¹ The impact Kubrick's work had, including his style and filmic themes, can be seen in the critical attention he received continuously throughout his career. See, for example, Alison Castle, ed., *The Stanley Kubrick Archives* (Köln: Taschen, 2016).

² Alexander Walker, *Stanley Kubrick Directs* (London: Abacus, 1973), 8.

³ See, for example, Vincent LoBrutto, *Stanley Kubrick: A Biography* (London: Faber & Faber, 1998).

⁴ See Serenella Zanotti, “Auteur dubbing: Translation, performance and authorial control in the dubbed versions of Stanley Kubrick’s films,” in *Reassessing Dubbing: Historical Approaches and Current Trends*, ed. Irene Ranzato and Serenella Zanotti, 79-102 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2019).

⁵ Greg Jenkins, *Stanley Kubrick and the Art of Adaptation: Three Novels, Three Films* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland Press, 1997), 160.

⁶ Walker, *Kubrick Directs*, 7.

⁷ This lack of attention has been addressed by Kubrick Adaptation scholars before, see Elisa Pezzotta, *Stanley Kubrick: Adapting the Sublime* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2013). An MLA International Bibliography count reveals the total number of publications on “Kubrick” to be 720, whereas “Kubrick” and “Adaptation” reveals 244 results. Accessed August 26, 2019.

⁸ See Thomas Leitch, *Film Adaptation and its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 236-57.

⁹ Pezzotta, *Adapting the Sublime*, 3.

¹⁰ Quoted in Walker, *Kubrick Directs*, 20.

¹¹ Interview by Jay Varela, 1958, reprinted in *Kubrick Archives*, ed. Castle, 171.

¹² Interview by Tim Cahill, *Rolling Stone*, 1987, reprinted in *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews*, ed. Gene D. Phillips (2001), 199.

¹³ Interview by Joseph Gelmis, 1970, reprinted in *Stanley Kubrick: Interviews*, ed. Gene D. Phillips (2001), 94.

¹⁴ Kirk Douglas similarly remarked that Kubrick always functioned better if he “got a good writer and worked with him as an editor.” Quoted in Walker, *Kubrick Directs*, 7.

¹⁵ See Kamilla Elliott, “The Psychic Model of Adaptation,” in *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 136-43.

¹⁶ Interview by Herbert Gold, *Paris Review*, 1967, reprinted in *Strong Opinions*, Vladimir Nabokov (1973), 91.

¹⁷ Vladimir Nabokov, *Lolita: A Screenplay*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1997), viii.

¹⁸ Stanley Kubrick, "Words and Movies," *Sight and Sound* 30, no. 1 (Winter 1960): 14.

¹⁹ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, x.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, ix.

²¹ *Ibid.*, x-xi.

²² Kubrick included Nabokov in the casting of *Lolita*.

²³ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, xii.

²⁴ Interview by Herbert Gold, *Paris Review*, 1967, reprinted in *Strong Opinions*, Vladimir Nabokov (1973), 91.

²⁵ Kubrick, "Words," 14.

²⁶ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, ix.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, ix-x.

²⁸ Kubrick, "Words," 14.

²⁹ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, xii.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, xiii.

³¹ David Hughes, *The Complete Kubrick* (London: Virgin, 2000), 89.

³² *Ibid.*, 90.

³³ Similar trouble with writing credits continued throughout Kubrick's career: for example, with Gustav Hasford, whose book Kubrick adapted to the film *Full Metal Jacket* (1987). See LoBrutto, *Kubrick Biography*, 458-90.

³⁴ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, xiii.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Hughes, *Complete Kubrick*, 90.

- ³⁷ Interview by Alvin Toffler, *Playboy*, 1964, reprinted in *Conversations With Vladimir Nabokov*, ed. Robert Golla (2017), 72.
- ³⁸ Gold, interview, 91.
- ³⁹ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, xiii.
- ⁴⁰ Gold, interview, 91.
- ⁴¹ Nabokov, *Screenplay*, xiii.
- ⁴² Cahill, interview, 199.
- ⁴³ Interview by Michel Ciment, 1976, reprinted in *Kubrick: The Definitive Edition* (2001), 177.
- ⁴⁴ Nor was Clarke the only writer who saw his pecuniary remuneration as insufficient: Anthony Burgess is another example. See LoBrutto, *Kubrick Biography*, 367.
- ⁴⁵ See Michael Benson, *Space Odyssey: Stanley Kubrick, Arthur C. Clarke, and the Making of a Masterpiece* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2018).
- ⁴⁶ Arthur C. Clarke, *Lost Worlds of 2001* (New York: New American Library, 1972), 31.
- ⁴⁷ Ciment, interview, 177.
- ⁴⁸ LoBrutto, *Kubrick Biography*, 414.
- ⁴⁹ Kubrick, “Words,” 14.
- ⁵⁰ Ciment, interview, 177.
- ⁵¹ Kubrick, “Words,” 14.
- ⁵² The development of visual imagery, such as in *2001: A Space Odyssey*, was also formative and adaptive of Kubrick’s writing. See Walker, *Kubrick Directs*, 246-47.
- ⁵³ See Tony Magistrale, *Hollywood’s Stephen King* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 198. Magistrale believes that King’s negative opinion was also “hardened” due to continued provocation from fans and interviewers.
- ⁵⁴ Quoted in Magistrale, *Hollywood*, 197.

⁵⁵ Interview by Eric Norden, *Playboy*, 1983, reprinted in *Bare Bones: Conversations on Terror with Stephen King*, ed. Tim Underwood and Chuck Miller (1988), 29.

⁵⁶ With permission from the Kubrick estate and King, Kubrick's film and King's literary text unite in the adaptation of *Doctor Sleep* (2019), based on King's sequel to *The Shining*.

⁵⁷ Jenkins, *Kubrick Adaptation*, 161.

⁵⁸ Jarrell D. Wright, "Shades of Horror: Fidelity and Genre in Stanley Kubrick's *The Shining*," in *True to the Spirit: Film Adaptation and the Question of Fidelity*, ed. Colin MacCabe, Rick Warner, and Kathleen Murray, 173-94 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 186.