

Introduction: Shakespeare shaping modern movie genres

First a Girl is a neglected but charming British movie made in 1935. Its significance in cinema history, when noticed at all, is that it was sourced from a more well-known and oft-adapted German film of 1933, *Viktor and Viktoria*, and was later studied by Julie Andrews in rehearsing the Broadway musical made into a film, *Victor Victoria* (1982), which turned Mary Poppins into a gay icon. Elizabeth (Jessie Matthews) delivers clothes for a fashion house, yearns to be a singer, but fails an audition. So does aspiring Shakespearean actor Victor (Sonnie Hale), who introduces the first of numerous Shakespearean quotations with a speech from *Julius Caesar* delivered in a failed audition. A born loser, Victor is offered a part as a female impersonator in a music hall, but is afflicted by laryngitis. An accidental meeting with Elizabeth gives him an idea: 'You can do something for me. [*She*] Can I? [*He*] Take off those pyjamas. [*She, shocked*] What? [*He*] Put this on ...'. And so Elizabeth becomes Bill, a woman pretending to be a young man impersonating a woman called Victoria in performances. Victor, again quoting from *Julius Caesar*, 'There is a tide in the affairs of men', takes on the role of mentor as 'Bill/Victoria' embarks on a dazzling career. 'She' is of course a smash-hit in the apparently cross-dressed role, and Jessie Matthews's singing and dancing skills are fully showcased. What stretches credulity is how everybody is taken in, since only a myopic Mr Magoo would fail to see the figure as anything but that of a voluptuous woman. It takes nothing less than a nude bathing close encounter to convince the intrigued lothario, Robert, consort of Princess Helen Mironoff, that there is something noticeably unusual about this boy. Wary of making the princess jealous, he maintains the pretence against the evidence of his eyes: 'I'm glad he's a boy.' Now he realises why he had been strongly attracted when putting Bill through the male social rituals of drinking heavily and smoking a cigar in the bar, a scene milked for comedy. 'I can't be a man all my life', Elizabeth laments ruefully to Victor, and elsewhere she declares in a context that is full of gay overtones, 'I'm in love with Robert'. The word

'gay' occurs several times with at least some ambiguity – the refrain of the final song is 'The world is happy and gay' – and androgyny is the obvious, recurrent source for jokes – 'I'm not staying like this all my life', 'Don't you like me as a girl?' – and problematical identity in Victor's rueful 'I've been father, mother, brother, sister to that boy.' Just as suspicions grow and the police are called to attend to the deception encapsulated in the stage conundrum 'He's a girl', Victor recovers his voice and public ignominy is averted. The final performance on stage presents Victor as the female impersonator, thus preventing exposure of the cross-dressed pretender. Later, when a passport is produced for confirming identity, the dialogue runs, 'This passport is for a man' ... 'Yes, but first a girl' ... 'And always a girl'.

The film is replete with Shakespearean lines, from *Romeo and Juliet*, *Hamlet*, *Richard II*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It*, and even *The Rape of Lucrece*. More pertinently, Shakespeare's use of boy actors is drawn by implication into the comedy of paradoxes based on gender, as evidenced in the exchange with Victor: '[*She*] But wait until they see your Hamlet' ... '[*He*] Hamlet? I'll be the greatest Cleopatra the world has ever seen.' There are unmistakable analogies with the figure of Rosalind in *As You Like It*, a boy actor playing a woman pretending to be a youth, while the scenes between Bill and Robert (before he twigs), and Bill and the princess (who intuits the deception), hold the homoerotic overtones of those between, respectively, Viola and Orsino, and Cesario and Olivia in *Twelfth Night*. In filmic terms *First a Girl* is a romantic comedy, a musical comedy, and a backstage musical. But what is its relation to Shakespeare? It is less than an adaptation or an offshoot of a specific play, yet it seems more than a vehicle for just opportunistic quotations. The answer to be pursued in this book is that there is a deeper, structural analogy at work, and that the playfully developed, capacious genre is a composite kind of Shakespearean comedy, taking that term as descriptive of a group of plays whose dominant attitudes to love, motifs, and generic expectations adhere to each other. From *Twelfth Night*, *As You Like It*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* it borrows the disguised heroine, and from these plays combined with *A Midsummer Night's Dream* it borrows the concept of an alternative play-world, in which identity and love become subjects for confusion, contemplation, and eventual clarification. In Shakespearean comedy this has been analysed as the 'green world', and the alternation of 'real' and 'play' spaces equates to the distinction in filmic romantic comedy between 'backstage' action and musical performance. In this sense, Shakespearean comedy can be said to lie behind cinematic comedy of love and its various sub-genres, including musical comedy. It can

be further argued, though it will only be alluded to in this book, that the infusion of Shakespearean romantic comedy into the modern popular mode of cinema has provided a channel for certain conventions of love to take prominence in our own world, suggesting that Shakespeare, both directly and indirectly, has helped create some of our own cultural and psychological paradigms of fulfilled love. At the same time, there is a different, rival conception of love as the product of inter-personal conflict, which feeds into movies from *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing*, inviting separate treatment.

Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan point out that ‘the Internet Movie Database now labels Orson Welles’s *Othello* (1952) as “drama”, and Tim Blake Nelson’s adaptation of the same play, *O* (2001) as “drama/romance/thriller”’.¹ However, another way of looking at the genre of these films could be to classify both as lying within an ‘*Othello* genre’. By extension, other ‘drama/romance/thrillers’, which contain some common elements from a list including love triangle, constructed jealousy, deception, voyeurism, and racial difference, and some element of ‘crime of passion’ (*A Double Life* (1947), *All Night Long* (1962), the theatrical sub-plot in *Les Enfants du Paradis* (1945), and even *Sex, Lies, and Videotape* (1989)) might be classified likewise, rather than ‘drama/romance/thrillers’, even when Shakespeare’s play is not necessarily named or directly visible as a source. I shall not be considering *Othello* itself in this book, but extending the analogy to films that bear a resemblance to Shakespeare’s comedies or to *Romeo and Juliet*, where the plays provide narrative structures for recognisable and influential genres around the subject of love in modern movies. This book argues that Shakespeare’s plays on love significantly influenced and helped to shape some movie genres in the twentieth century, and that the nature of this indebtedness has not gained recognition because it is not always easy to identify or describe. Books proliferate about adaptation of Shakespeare’s plays into films, but very few concentrate on the subject of genre. Part of Shakespeare’s ubiquitous legacy lies in the ways the structural expectations in his plays anticipate, can be adapted into, a range of film genres dealing with love, and in some cases can be claimed as cinematic sub-genres in their own right.

Making such claims risks the twin dangers of overstating or underestimating such an influence and I try to steer a middle course between the two. On the one hand, I certainly do not want to give the impression that every film genre, let alone every film, is influenced by the genres used and partially created by a dramatist who was writing over four hundred years ago. To claim anything like this would run the risk of ignoring the advice of ‘Sam Wo-Toi’ in

the Mike Hammer film noir television series, *Tattoo Brute* (1958), his very existence a small part of the process I am observing: 'It was Shakespeare who so sagely observed the bad effects of protesting too much.' The allusion to *Hamlet* suggests audience recognition even in such an unpromising context, but more to the point is the sentiment itself, since exaggerating the degree of Shakespearean referencing would be as neglectful as ignoring it altogether. Some film genres show more signs of influence than others in terms of their narrative logic. There are a number of movies that evidence important generic similarities, whether these are consciously known to the film-makers or not, while other groups show a pervading, atmospheric, structural, or stylistic influence, suggesting a Shakespearean genre, without necessarily making overt reference to one particular play as model. On the other hand, it would be misleading to follow in the footsteps of some film historians and theorists who at least tacitly give the impression that film is a completely separate medium from theatre, with its own circumscribed history and theoretical grounding, owing little or nothing to earlier dramatic innovations or stage history. We need a corrective to such a view, a mediating account, if only because Shakespeare has been such a central and abiding cultural figure in the history of entertainment that some oblique or direct influences must have entered the dominant mass medium of movies from the 1890s onwards. Sergei Eisenstein, in some ways the father of film criticism and closer historically to the medium's inception than recent theorists, lends some strong support for this view, in his own genial style:

I do not know about the reader, but I have always derived comfort from repeatedly telling myself our cinema is not entirely without an ancestry and a pedigree, a past or a rich cultural heritage from earlier epochs. It is only very thoughtless or arrogant people who could construct laws and aesthetic for cinema, based on the dubious assumptions that this art came out of thin air!²

Eisenstein continues:

Let Dickens and the whole constellation of ancestors, who go as far back as Shakespeare or the Greeks, serve as superfluous reminders that Griffith and our cinema alike cannot claim originality for themselves, but have a vast cultural heritage; ... Let this heritage serve as a reproach to these thoughtless people with their excessive arrogance towards literature, which has contributed so much to this apparently unprecedented art, and most important to the art of viewing – and I mean *viewing*, in both the senses of this term – not *seeing*.

Allardyce Nicoll, in *Film and Theatre*, a book that was pioneering and remarkably comprehensive for its time in the 1930s, points out that it was eight years after the invention of movies in 1895 that attempts were made simply to tell a story in the new medium, let alone group them in genre categories.³ To quote Cartmell and Whelehan's book again, they suggest that 'In the early period of cinema, when film genres were newly emergent, movies were not identified, as they are today, in relation to a specific generic identity'.⁴ Genres emerged later, drawing inevitably on theatre practice, although gradually independent movie genres developed. These have been in a state of flux and modification ever since, with new sub-genres and hybrid genres emerging regularly.

Douglas Lanier, in a brief but penetrating essay, has anticipated some of the problems faced in this book.⁵ In an age when 'Shakespeare on film' is a virtually universal way of teaching the plays, Lanier points out the twin dangers relating to genre study, either of implying an ideological dominance of modern cultural forms such as movies and imposing them inappropriately on an early modern dramatist, or alternatively of giving Shakespeare a transhistorical status that acts as an invidious, qualitative comparison with contemporary culture. This points to the fact that Shakespearean adaptation has always had an ambiguous place in cinema history. Lanier's eminently sensible solution is to resist the pulls in both directions and instead respect the differences between the two areas, the historical and current, refusing to accept one or the other as normative. Perhaps recklessly, my approach will suggest there is a tighter connection between the two than is commonly noticed, and that in many ways Shakespeare can be seen to have laid down in his self-evidently enduring and innovative plays a set of historical 'templates' for genres, which the film industry has adopted without systematically intending it. Even if some of my suggestions may seem offered in a spirit of special pleading, I take the opportunity to advance them, problems and all, to open up a discussion on genre history that links Elizabethan drama with the modern world of movies, for others to explore and perhaps more satisfactorily to trace. This is offered as an 'ideas' book rather than a reference work on 'Shakespeare adaptations' or a comprehensive study in film history. In the words of Keats's 'Ode on a Grecian Urn', 'Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard / Are sweeter', and it is my hope to bring the 'unheard' to a threshold of hearing.

For those who wish to explore other aspects of Shakespearean adaptation into movies, Richard Burt's capacious two-volume *Shakespeares after Shakespeare* offers comprehensive and fascinating guidance,⁶ and pioneering works by Kenneth Rothwell, Samuel Cowl, Russell Jackson, Lanier himself, and many others have been published on filmed versions

of Shakespeare. Burt's work in particular seeks primarily to establish direct Shakespearean sources for adaptations and offshoots in a variety of media, whereas I hope to trace other, indirect lines of influence into movies, relating to narrative shape and genre. It seems desirable to break down boundaries between Shakespeare and modern popular media, returning his works to their intended place as mass entertainment. It seems a good time to remind ourselves of the popular roots of Shakespeare's plays, in a year dominated internationally by events commemorating the 400th anniversary of the death of the 'Man of the Millennium' declared in 2000. I hope that layers of recognition can add richness to response, whether in the context of Shakespeare's plays or of popular movies. Moreover, the matter of influence between Shakespeare and movies is in some senses mutual. While we trace the influence of Shakespeare on film genres, we can also gain an awareness from the derivative films of potential new readings of Shakespeare's plays for contemporary audiences. I seek readers willing to accept a degree of lateral thinking and imaginative leaps, willing to follow some quite speculative trails, and, I hope, to contribute their own suggestions along similar lines, drawing on their individual experience of movies. The benefit may lie in an enhanced understanding of the way literary and dramatic genres interpenetrate with the history of cinema through complex avenues of cultural transmission and adaptation. Given the complexity of the process of following such a trail, it has been difficult to avoid using the word 'elusive' more frequently than is comfortable, and I find myself pleading like Bernardo in *Hamlet*, 'Is not this something more than fantasy?', aware that some will probably answer coldly, 'No'. I plead for generous readers, hoping that the study will illuminate some aspects of both film history and Shakespearean studies that have not received sustained attention, and which may set chiming bells of recognition:

I must have liberty
 Withal, as large a charter as the wind,
 To blow on whom I please, for so fools have;
 And they that are most gallèd with my folly,
 They most must laugh. (*As You Like It*, 2.7.47–51)

After all, my twin subjects, Shakespearean works dealing with love and cinematic comedy and tragedy of love, are in essence both centred on the follies of love.

It should also be made clear at the outset that this book does not focus exclusively or even predominantly on 'the Shakespeare film' as such, defined as a movie clearly signalled as a filmed version of a particular play by Shakespeare. This territory can be categorised as a genre

in its own right, or as a sub-genre of the ‘heritage film’, or what Timothy Corrigan calls the ‘literary film’. Such a movie ‘draws attention to the literary work from which it is derived, presuming either familiarity with that work or at least cultural recognition of its literary status’.⁷ Some of my examples will fall into this category, but by no means all. Nor do I dwell exclusively on works that are known in Shakespeare studies as ‘offshoots’ or ‘derivatives’, those films that adapt Shakespearean material – sometimes drastically but still recognisably – in ways that are designed to be noticed as revisions of the plays.⁸ Such terms openly proclaim that the film-makers are aware of a Shakespearean source text, and although in many cases this will be true, in just as many they do not draw attention to a source, and may indeed be completely unaware of a Shakespearean precedent, mediated as it is through other films. Although inevitably there will be many deliberate ‘offshoots’ cropping up in the discussion, this is not the primary reason for using them in the analysis. Rather, such movies are part of the broader evidence that film genres are influenced or even created by generic blueprints initiated in plays by Shakespeare, sometimes adapted knowingly but often without acknowledgement from the makers or recognition by their audiences. In this sense, influence is seen as an essential part of all culture that has evolved intertextually from historical antecedents and models that themselves have receded from direct view. It also raises the possibility of claiming Shakespeare’s romantic genres – comic and tragic – as mediated influences on our ways of thinking about love in the modern world, despite the fact that other ‘intermediaries’ lie between the source and the output.⁹ Many of our attitudes and conventions surrounding romantic love derive, in this sense, both directly and indirectly from Shakespeare’s plays, and it is in movies that this phenomenon can be most clearly observed.

Influence

As I have intimated, this book is not a consistently sustained ‘source study’ arguing that all film genres ultimately derive from Shakespeare’s precedents. ‘Adaptation’ alone is also not quite the right word to describe the relationship, even after taking into account Cartmell and Whelehan’s ambit claim that ‘At its best an adaptation on screen can re-envision a well-worn narrative for a new audience inhabiting a very different cultural environment, and their relationship to the “origin” may itself change enormously’.¹⁰ Instead, I offer a two-way study of ‘influence’ concentrating on the plays’ continuing, if unobtrusive, presence in film genres, and secondarily on ways in which

our familiarity with these film genres can be used as an interpretive tool to shed light on Shakespeare. Just as his plays have the capacity to reveal new meanings to suit new times, so new times reveal new meanings in his old works, meanings that previous generations of readers and audiences were not attuned to noticing. One thread of the argument is that since Shakespeare's plays had for some centuries been consolidated in cultural and popular consciousness through theatrical practices, traditions of reading and critical analysis, and educational systems, the existence of his plots when organised into overarching generic types expressed a powerful but largely concealed influence on the burgeoning film industry during at least its first fifty or so years into the twentieth century. A second thread suggests that the development of independent cinematic genres such as romantic comedy, screwball comedy, musicals, movies based on disguise, and romantic tragedy created unique opportunities for recontextualising Shakespeare's plays, not only presenting but also distancing them in a fresh, defamiliarised light, revealing them as contemporary texts dealing with issues still alive in the modern world. Like the Ghost of the deceased King Hamlet who comes back to haunt and influence the actions of at least his son, influence can work underground and beyond conscious reach: 'Well said, old mole. Canst work i'th' earth so fast?' (*Hamlet*, 1.5.164). There is, as Jacques Derrida expresses in his own consideration of *Hamlet*, a 'spectral' quality in the nature of influence, as it works through processes of cultural transmission, leaving little material mark but a ghostly impression.¹¹ But the image of the old mole popping up its blind head every now and then might do just as well as images of ghosts and spectres.

Harold Bloom has reminded us that the word 'influence' comes with a 'matrix of relationships', percolating through a filter that he equates with a form of 'tyranny' and overlapping with other contentious terms like 'source' and 'analogue'.¹² A recent literary historian, Robert A. Logan, begins his study of Marlowe's influence on Shakespeare saying 'By "influence," I mean not simply the conscious or subconscious selection of elements in another writer's work but, more significantly, the use(s) to which they are put.'¹³ Logan is happy to draw on 'new notions of boundless and heterogeneous intertextuality'¹⁴ in approaching the subject with a wide remit, having regard to both 'specific and wide influences'¹⁵ and their 'overlapping' relationship with 'sources' that are usually taken to be more fixed:

Sources can be easy to talk about unless they are confused with influences. If sources have traditionally ranged from definite to probable, influences have ranged from definite to possible – in which case they have

been confused with analogues ... Whereas sources have knowingly created a sense of certainty, influences have often stood in the shadows of uncertainty.¹⁶

Influence can be even more subtly and broadly revealed than in relation simply to literary relationships. Porscha Fermanis, writing on the influence of eighteenth-century philosophy on Keats, refers in turn to the work of David Spadafora, who, as Fermanis points out,

has reminded us, on the one hand, an influence can be significant without being overt or explicit; on the other, influence is by no means the only available intellectual tool to hand. Circulating ideas, intellectual currents and various kinds of political unconscious can mould epistemological structures and provide a series of critical foci or contexts for a writer's work.¹⁷

The reference reminds us that history of philosophy uses the notion of influence without the degree of 'anxiety' felt by writers and critics – John Locke's influence on later philosophers is accepted as a perfectly legitimate point of discussion – whereas literary historians are probably more comfortable with the certitude of 'sources', finding influence more difficult to discuss. As scholars we are trained (and as teachers we teach) that it is a duty to acknowledge sources, at least of a textual nature, but influences on the way we think and write are considerably more amorphous, difficult to locate with precision, and therefore less clearly subject to acknowledgement. The task of tracking Shakespearean influence through the centuries down to twentieth-century films is therefore more contentious than finding sources. A range of currents and conduits have carried and modified his plays' influence on succeeding generations and in different media, and I can hope to catch only a small part of the picture.

Jane Austen's novels serve as analogies in a more limited corpus, since they have been used as prototypes and models for some romantic movies, as well as informing the 'rom-com' genre as a whole. Just as Shakespeare took most of his plots from earlier works and forged them into his own, innovatively hybrid generic types like romantic comedy, romantic tragedy, and dramatic romance, so Austen built upon earlier romantic novels and courtesy books, most of them now largely forgotten except by specialist literary historians. Her own works look less original when viewed in the light of her precursors' practice, although still accomplished and perfect in their way.¹⁸ Austen inflected with her own spirit of irony the situations she depicts and plots she constructs, to perfect formulas for a recognisable type of fiction, which has not only survived but grown in celebrity and has led to modern redactions. These novels are part of

the scaffolding for the enormously popular genre of romance fictions in prose, and partly through them Austen's own influence as a much-loved novelist has extended into the genre of 'chick flick' films today. In some cases the influence is conscious and built into a marketing strategy for films. *Emma* and *Clueless*, *Pride and Prejudice* and the Anglo-Indian *Bride and Prejudice*, and even the fictional biography *Becoming Jane*, are films that, as Lisa Hopkins and others have shown, proudly trade on the 'brand' of Jane Austen's novels. In many other cases, however, the influence is almost certainly unconscious and mediated even when it is undeniably close, since the brand has become a recognisable 'Jane-Austen genre'.¹⁹ It is beyond the scope of this book to argue the case of Austen in detail, but such a study would provide an example of the processes that include direct sources, indirect influences, and similarities of genre, linking her novels and later movies. Shakespeare's case is more complex because not just one literary type is involved but several, often leading back to individual plays that have created virtual genres in their own right. At least it seems obvious that screenwriters, and perhaps the film-making industry as a whole, have absorbed literary traditions and performance conditions that include the canonical plays of Shakespeare as shadowy but important cultural influences. This is true even when that influence is not explicitly acknowledged by or even necessarily known to the film-maker, or recognised by viewers, since it has inevitably been percolated through different paths of historical agencies in literature, theatre, music, opera, cinema, and others. It is undeniable that 'media' are 'mediated', and behind some lie prototypes derived from Shakespeare.

Nor is the degree of Shakespearean influence confined simply to Western forms. Japanese Noh dramatists have made similar claims of indebtedness, and Boris Pasternak detected in language at least 'the invisible presence of Shakespeare and his influence in a whole host of the most effective and typical devices and turns of phrase in English', an 'elusive foundation' that he tried to convey when translating Shakespeare into Russian.²⁰ This is not to claim that Shakespeare's works are 'universal', a critical term nowadays shunned, but instead to argue that, for various reasons of transmission of his texts, his pervasive *influence*, however localised, is as close to universal as it can get. At the same time, it will be an inevitable part (but only a part) of my theme that the undoubtedly modern technical and performance possibilities opened up by the mass medium of cinema influenced film versions of Shakespeare's plays, and that the availability of genres, which have been made popular and profitable by the medium, has naturally been exploited in adaptations globally.

There are dangers, of course, in suggesting links between the present and the past and between literature and film, although the rewards may lie in realising the creative possibilities of renewed insight. Stephanie Trigg says as much in the journal *Screening the Past*, in speaking of the problematical nature of interdisciplinary work linking the past (in her case, medieval times) with modern cinema. Trigg warns that interpretation runs the risk of being

too tolerant of loose, or flattening comparisons and analogies between different historical periods, different media, and different academic disciplines. On the other hand, it is only by exploring these possibilities that we can make those periods, those media, and those disciplines talk to each other, to explore the myriad ways we make sense of the past and the present.²¹

The attempt, Trigg suggests, offers ‘a powerful capacity to articulate dynamic, changing relationships between the present and the past’. In the present instance, an extra contribution lies in an enhanced understanding of some ways in which literary and dramatic genres interpenetrate with the history of cinema, through complex avenues of cultural transmission and adaptation, mutually illuminating each other. Just as we find richer resonances in films by noticing a Shakespearean substructure of genre, so Shakespeare’s plays reveal new meanings that emerge from the way they are recontextualised into a different medium and different times.

The concept of influence is not only more general than sources, it is also less fixed. It seems reasonable to distinguish a source as something copied from or consciously imitated, an immediate model, from influence as a process of mediation through other, more direct sources and cultural conduits. To quote Logan again, in exploring a writer-to-writer influence, he suggests:

Only under the best of conditions can an originating text be identified as the cause and an influence as the effect. The originating text passes through the transforming chambers of the writer’s psyche to emerge as a force whose inception can be difficult to recognize: in such a case, one can only guess at the origins of the influence.²²

Logan goes on to argue that influences can range from the cultural to the personal, ‘emotional to intellectual, superficial to deeply psychological, tangible to intangible’, in ways that are ‘not always easy to categorize’. In these senses, the initiating impetus of a Shakespearean play inevitably stands at many removes from a modern film, and there lies between them a set of intervening, intertextual contexts.

Anthony R. Guneratne, presents a more general and abstract model of adaptation, also focused on genre but using a different critical terminology. Guneratne uses the term 'intermediation' to describe Shakespeare's influence on the present:

I use this term to signify the increasing symbiosis between different media, particularly digital media and older technologies such as nitro-cellulose film stock. In *Shakespeare on Film* Judith Buchanan refers to John Dryden's tripartite idea that adaptation could be metaphrase (literal translation), paraphrase (a sense of the text with the author kept in mind), and imitation (wherein some aspect of the original finds reflection), as well as to Dudley Andrew's definition of transmediation as 'the systematic replacement of verbal signifiers by cinematic signifiers.'²³ Adhering to the frameworks Buchanan and Andrew invoke, one might observe that critics of filmed Shakespeare have either chosen to favor the idea that the best adaptations best preserve Shakespeare's dialogue metaphrastically, or gravitate to the other extreme of valuing those that depart as much as possible from the original transmedially. Yet the key idea that a Restoration dramatist and a film theorist share, in this instance, is that words such as those of Shakespeare can be rendered recognizably in another medium, although neither definition is conclusive. Dryden might have further refined his categories and Andrew, as Yuri Lotman and other semioticians might observe, discusses two separate, semiotic transactions (the translation of printed texts into verbal signifiers, and the translation of verbal signifiers into equivalent images), which is not to say that cinema has not been the beneficiary of translatability.²⁴

However inviting Guneratne's model is, I choose not to adopt its theoretical terms, partly because the genre he is analysing is particularly 'the Shakespeare movie', rather than Shakespeare's influence on cinema more broadly. Reflecting on his critical terms, however, I seem to be adopting the model of adaptation as 'imitation', which is the term commonly adopted by Renaissance theorists.

So far as I know, there is only one writer who pursues as relentlessly as I do an argument that Shakespeare has influenced the genres of modern movies, the philosopher-critic Stanley Cavell. In *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage*,²⁵ Cavell explores the fact that between 1934 and 1949 a spate of films appeared dealing comically with a theme that he describes as 'remarriage'. His excavations unearth the influence of Shakespearean comedy and, more particularly, romance, and more particularly still, *The Winter's Tale*: 'the Shakespearean structure surfaced again, if not quite on the stage' in these films, partly, he argues, because of the new-found maturity of motion

pictures soon after the advent of sound, and, second, because of a similarity between Shakespeare's heroines and post-war women:

at the same date there was a group of women of an age and a temperament to make possible the definitive realization of the genre that answered the Shakespearean description, a date at which a phase of human history, namely, a phase of feminism, and requirements of a genre inheriting a remarriage structure from Shakespeare, and the nature of film's transformation of its human subjects, met together on the issue of the new creation of a woman.²⁶

Cavell returns many times to the idea of 'the connection between Shakespearean comedy and a central genre of American comedies', and with other aspects of comparison in mind: 'in Shakespeare this is called the green world or the golden world; in four of the seven major Hollywood comedies of remarriage this world is called Connecticut'.²⁷ The seven films he refers to are, *It Happened One Night*, *The Awful Truth*, *Bringing Up Baby*, *His Girl Friday*, *The Philadelphia Story*, *The Lady Eve*, and *Adam's Rib*, some of which I consider from different points of view in later chapters. I am indebted to Cavell's book in ways that will be reflected in my account, not least because he attempted the speculative kinds of links I draw,²⁸ though I do resist what appears to me as an unnecessarily narrow concentration on remarriage, and on *The Winter's Tale*. Perhaps rashly, my argument will be broader, that Shakespeare was a significant presence behind movie genre history before and well after 1934, and that the influence was pervasive in films dealing with different kinds of love, covering courtship, marriage, and post-marriage. I will also suggest that recognition of the relationship between Shakespeare's romantic comedies, taken as a generically composite set of audience expectations, is mutually illuminating, shedding light first on an area of film indebtedness that has not been sufficiently recognised, and second on the potential for finding new meanings in Shakespeare's plays through fresh readings and performances. Cavell himself showed awareness that the approach has wider implications when he came later to write *Contesting Tears: The Hollywood Melodrama of the Unknown Woman*,²⁹ in which, although the Shakespearean influence is not so prominently presented, it is again seen to be an ingredient behind film melodrama or 'weepies'. Once again he attributes the cause to the emergence of a new female sensibility that invites comparison with some of Shakespeare's heroines.

The fact that there are few sustained accounts other than Cavell's books that employ this genre-based approach partly reflects the difficulty of tracing culturally mediated influences, let alone hypothesising

sources that are not explicit or consciously adverted to by the makers of a film. Well aware of the danger, I try to address it by focusing on the issue of genre predominantly, rather than aspects of echoed language or familiar character types. One who seems willing to use the approach through genre is Harry Keyishian, in his essay 'Shakespeare and Movie Genre: The Case of *Hamlet*'.³⁰ He proposes a metaphor, suggesting that Shakespeare's plays have been adapted into movie genres (such as film noir) as though they are being poured into pre-existing moulds. In some instances at least, Shakespearean plots *were* poured into Hollywood genres like moulds, but it may be possible to go further and suggest that in some cases it was Shakespeare who created the moulds themselves, even before the medium of film was invented. Tony Howard, writing in the same volume as Keyishian, edges towards a similar kind of study of Shakespeare's influence, but his own contribution is limited to acknowledged 'offshoots':

Just as 'Shakespeare' permeates our culture iconographically from cheque cards to cigars, so in mainstream film culture the plays have functioned as myths and sources; they materialise repeatedly and often unnoticed on cinema screens through allusions and variations, remakes, adaptations and parodies. In this broader, culturally important, sense 'Shakespeare film' is not only populated by Olivier, Welles, Branagh and company – Jean-Luc Godard, Jean-Paul Sartre and James T. Kirk are also there, alongside Cole Porter, Katharine Hepburn, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Mel Brooks and Sid James. Here we can only point to a vast terrain of cinematic appropriation, and suggest some historical implications of 'free' Shakespearean film.³¹

The title of Douglas Lanier's essay, 'William Shakespeare Filmmaker', indicates an approach that highlights the intrinsically cinematic techniques used by Shakespeare. He begins with reference to George Méliès's *La Mort de Jules César* (1907), a film lost but described by Robert Hamilton Ball in his indispensable account of Shakespeare in silent movies.³² Shakespeare dreams the assassination of Julius Caesar, wakes up and stabs a loaf of bread, thus releasing his writer's block. Through crude allegory this shows a play not as a product of the stage but as springing from the author's imagination, "'fathering forth" the text as a cinematic entity' in the words of Carolyn Jess-Cooke, borrowing the term from Edward Said.³³ Other films reclaim Shakespeare as a popular artist, separating his works from the literary by showing him exercising an imagination that is 'fundamentally cinematic', not that of a 'theatrical wordsmith'. Lanier also suggests the corollary, that the process of film-making is in some ways 'fundamentally Shakespearean'. 'Linking Shakespeare to film becomes a means for articulating (or

simply accepting) the cinema's considerable ambitions as a media form.³⁴ In another essay, Lanier describes 'post-fidelity' adaptation of Shakespeare into different media as a form of 'rhizomatics' (borrowing the term from Deleuze and Guattari), the creation of new processes by yoking apparently very different rootstocks: In his 'arboreal conception of adaptation', Lanier suggests, 'A rhizomatic structure ... has no single or central root and no vertical structure. Instead, like the underground root system of a rhizomatic plant, it is a horizontal, decentred multiplicity of subterranean roots that cross each other, bifurcating and recombining, breaking off and restarting.'³⁵ It seems that we need metaphors – ghosts, moles, offshoots, rootstocks (and for Deleuze and Guattari, the activities of wasps) to describe the process of creative adaptation. In speaking of transhistorical genres we can add other metaphors such as 'family resemblances' (a focus of Altman's attention),³⁶ rivers, and indigenous songlines. Sometimes, as Samuel Crowl points out, it may be a stray detail in Shakespeare's play – 'an image, metaphor, character, or atmosphere' – that will 'evoke in the film director a resonance with a particular movie genre',³⁷ but in such cases it may be that the Shakespearean reference points to a distant source for the movie genre itself. In 'Shakespeare's imbrication with cultural processes of adaptation',³⁸ Shakespeare's texts are not reverently treated as privileged 'sources', but rather as 'collaborators' in a mutual act of re-creation and new creation. Cartelli and Rowe, who give close analytical attention to the 'cultural processes' involved in adaptation, also describe them in terms of 're-framing of earlier framings' that can be inserted into a variety of '*citational environments*'.³⁹ Among these are genres.

Genre

There are always genres. There are always aesthetic forms. And they always possess their own logic. Even when films were new, they deployed generic and aesthetic conventions from photography, from the theatre, from popular stories, and from numerous other forms of art, entertainment and representation.⁴⁰

Generally speaking, a basic theory of genres was established in classical times, mainly by Aristotle, and revived in the humanist recuperation of classical knowledge of the Renaissance.⁴¹ Since then they have never gone away, although critical attention to the subject has periodically waxed and waned. Shakespeare worked knowledgeably with the ancient genres in mind, but he also consciously expanded the range by breaking the 'rules' in developing mixed and hybrid forms, such as in what later

came to be described as tragi-comedy. History plays, adapting English chronicle and classical historical sources to the stage, were more or less invented by Shakespeare. In these, ignoring Sir Philip Sidney's critical admonitions against 'mongrel tragi-comedy' and 'mingling kings and clowns' on stage,⁴² he included figures like Falstaff in company with Prince Hal. They could end almost randomly with marriage (*Henry V*) or death (*Richard II*). Another example of Shakespeare's generic experimentation is his staging of pastoral, a genre classically confined to poetry, in stage plays such as *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale*. He was also not above ridiculing his own practice of mixing genres, in the words of Polonius: 'The best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral, scene individable or poem unlimited. Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light. For the law of writ and the liberty, these are the only men' (*Hamlet*, 2.2.398–403). Film-makers later inherited, at least tacitly through the intermediary of theatrical practice, the legacy of Shakespeare's experiments in genre, and far from creating new generic types in a vacuum, they built upon precedents from history. The ancients invented a dramatic category called comedy, presided over by the muse Thalia, which was mainly satirical in nature, inviting laughter at the behaviour of lower social classes. Shakespeare learned from his contemporary John Lyly in expanding the range to foreground love in aristocratic circles, creating romantic comedy (comedy derived from relationships between the sexes). Some modern literary historians have pinpointed even more particularised sub-genres within romantic comedy, such as 'epithalamic comedy', representing 'the moments between marriage and consummation'.⁴³ Movies accepted comedy of love as a dominant genre, but have continued to evolve into bifurcated sub-genres such as 'rom-coms', melodrama, musical comedy, screwball comedy (which I will characterise as 'odd-couple' romantic comedy), and others. Meanwhile, the more classical, satirical conception of comedy as ridiculing low life continued into films as sub-genres like satire, black comedy, farce, comedy thrillers, parody films, sex comedies, and so on. The reasons for such apparently endless splintering of dominant genres into niche categories has more to do with marketing the films to consumer expectations than with genre theory, a complication that Shakespeare's example had again anticipated. In the First Folio his plays are categorised as comedies, histories, and tragedies, while the title pages of Quarto plays made finer distinctions suggesting the mingling of these overall genres: *King Lear* was variously printed as a 'History' and a 'Tragedy', *Hamlet* was a 'Tragical History' on the 1603 Quarto title page, *The Merchant of Venice* was a 'Comedy' in the

Folio but a 'Comical History' on the Quarto, *Love's Labour's Lost* is given a finer discrimination as a 'Pleasant Conceited Comedy'. In the Induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* the action to follow is described to Christopher Sly as a 'pleasant comedy' designed to alleviate melancholy, but even he shows some awareness of different kinds of comedy available to Elizabethan audiences:

SLY Marry, I will, let them play it. Is not a comondy a Christmas gambold or a tumbling-trick?

PAGE No, my good lord; it is more pleasing stuff.

SLY What, household stuff?

PAGE It is a kind of history.

It would seem that Shakespeare anticipated the need for more descriptive sub-genres, to draw on his audience's experience and guide their expectations of what is to come.

A recent, brief, and convenient definition of 'genre movies' (a term subtly different from 'genre in movies', although this is not especially important in this context) is given by Barry Keith Grant:

Put simply, genre movies are those commercial feature films which, through repetition and variation, tell familiar stories with familiar characters in familiar situations. Popular cinema is mostly composed of genre movies – the kind of films most of us see, whether we 'go to the movies' or 'to the cinema', or watch films on DVD or videotape at home. Throughout film history genre movies have comprised the bulk of filmmaking practice, both in Hollywood and other national countries, the films that are made, distributed and exhibited in commercial venues everywhere are overwhelmingly genre movies.⁴⁴

'Repetition and variation' lies at the heart of classical and Renaissance conventions of genre too. Shakespeare and his First Folio editors were fully conversant with genres in drama of their time and, as students of a humanist education, they also generally drew on classical theory for the roots and sub-divisions of epic, poetry drama and tragedy, comedy, and pastoral. In the making of twentieth- and twenty-first-century films there is a similar relationship to Shakespeare's genres as there was between Shakespeare and the classical ones. In both cases the source genre is vestigially present as an historical survival, but treated over time as ripe for transforming, adapting, and hybridising.

For the most part the field covered in this book is mainly what is known as 'Hollywood movies', a term that denotes a meta-genre in its own right.⁴⁵ It includes box-office, commercial films, mainly emanating from the American industry based on a studio system such as

Hollywood (and some examples from Bollywood), rather than independent, privately financed works. The dominant time frame has emerged here (rather than being initially chosen) as covering films from the early history of the medium, especially the 1930s (when 'talking pictures' became a mass medium), through the 1940s and 1950s, though occasionally I have ranged forwards in time where it seemed relevant to show surviving influence. The reason for this focus on earlier films is mainly that it seemed increasingly clear to me, and has also been argued by some film historians, that in the first half of the twentieth century the mainstream, traditional Hollywood genres, viewed as relatively discrete categories, were in the process of developing their own micro-histories and repertoires of 'classic' filmic sources. Dominant movie genres were being established and consolidated by repetition, in a concentration of substantially similar, 'recycled script films', which formed the basic corpus for later developments.⁴⁶ A potent reason behind this was marketing, which was made easier when groups of films could be publicised as conforming to a basic 'formula' that is 'constructed or marked for commercial consumption', building upon 'those aspects of representation that entail the generation of expectations'.⁴⁷ After the 1950s, the drive for novelty led to hybridity and the self-conscious mixing of genres into an apparently endless proliferation of new sub-genres. The process no doubt reflected the increasingly experienced sophistication of movie-going audiences, as well as the industry's voracious appetite for changing well-worn, potentially exhaustible patterns. In the earlier period, then, we would expect to find a more conservative assimilation from theatrical traditions, and from the kind of tried and tested performance modes offered by the long, received history of Shakespeare production, rather than from the necessarily brief history of film itself. Indeed, some of the very earliest movies were filmed stage performances of Shakespearean plays. In time, these inherited conventions of genre became a 'sediment' in both senses of that word: matter that settles and remains at the bottom of a liquid, and the geological meaning of 'particulate matter that is carried by water or wind and deposited on the surface of the land or the bottom of a body of water, [which] may in time become consolidated into rock'.⁴⁸ The process of gradual sedimentation was occurring markedly in the first few decades of cinema history, and after the 1950s Shakespeare had become so deeply embedded in the medium that the influence is less immediately visible. It does seem an observable fact, confirmed by developments in film theory from the 1970s onwards, that after the mid-century movies become more intertextually entwined, as there grew a large enough corpus to provide cinema history and theory with its own landmarks and reference points within the medium. The

periods equate roughly with the distinction often made between ‘classic Hollywood’ from the 1920s to the 1940s when major genres were clarified and developed in a relatively orderly way, and ‘New Hollywood’ (from the mid-1970s onwards) when genres multiplied, hybridised, and bifurcated into sub-genres, although there are enough exceptions to make this generalisation rather loose.⁴⁹ If the Shakespearean influence as a ‘sediment’ still remained, it had become so naturalised within films that it had become not direct ‘source material’ but a distantly visible, though still palpable presence. This process of a steady and partial submerging of the Shakespearean influence made it seem more necessary, by an act of critical hindsight and preservation, to enshrine obvious and often conservative adaptations of his own works in one genre all their own, the ‘Shakespeare movie’, as a sub-genre of the ‘heritage’ film.

Even in the earliest stage in the history of movies (though late in his own posthumous career), Shakespeare had a foothold.⁵⁰ From 1899 we have a precious few seconds that remain from an original four minutes, showing the death of King John, played by the great actor-manager Herbert Beerbohm Tree. It was shot on 68-mm film, not from the stage but in a movie studio with a painted background. This can be seen as among the first close-ups in moving pictures, as Kenneth Rothwell points out in *Early Shakespeare Movies: How the Spurned Spawned Art*.⁵¹ It was shown at the same time as the opening of the stage production at Her Majesty’s Theatre, London, no doubt as publicity.⁵² The king dies in histrionic fashion on his throne, clutching his throat and arching his body in agony, as the film material itself threatens to disintegrate before our very eyes (which it does after less than a minute). In a strange and certainly unintended way, the flickering image mirrors the words being spoken by John in the written text at this point (though obviously only mouthed in the silent clip):

I am a scribbled form, drawn with a pen
Upon a parchment, and against this fire
Do I shrink up. (*King John*, 5.7.32–4)

It seems like a statement applying to the medium itself, and those brought up in the 1950s will have amusing memories of this literally happening by accident before their very eyes, caused by the overheating of highly inflammable celluloid. Scenes from Shakespeare provided equally pioneering and auspicious moments for the new technical form. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, made in the United States in 1909 by Vitagraph, was filmed outdoors in a literal forest (or at least woodlands) under natural light. Among other camera tricks, it shows the disappearance and reappearance of Puck, who also puts a girdle round the earth not in forty

minutes but about four seconds. Illusionism in the play is matched by the technical capacity for ocular magic offered by the medium.

Shakespeare holds an equally honourable place in the movie history of those nations that experimented early with moving pictures, since there are snippets, scenes, and even longer versions of his plays during the first years of the century.⁵³ In France in 1900, a three-minute segment was shown of Hamlet duelling with Laertes, the hero being played by the famous Sarah Bernhardt, thus still today demonstrating another achievement shared with Shakespeare's plays, the ability to bring back the dead from their graves and change their gender. Ghostly voices came to emerge from Edison wax cylinders being played behind the screen simultaneously. The Paris Exposition, where this film first showed, was the basis for the Société Film d'Art, which was committed to 'rehabilitating film's unsavoury reputation',⁵⁴ bringing to middle-class audiences Shakespearean high culture in the medium whose roots lay in working-class entertainment.⁵⁵ The famous Méliès brothers produced a ten-minute slice of *Hamlet* with Georges sharing the role of the Prince. Scenes from *Richard III* appeared in America in 1908 and 1912, and the earliest surviving full feature film (1 hour 33 minutes) made in America was *Richard III*, which has only recently been rediscovered.⁵⁶ Meanwhile, other brief versions of Shakespeare appeared from Italy and Germany as well as France, the United States and Britain. Between 1908 and 1912, Vitagraph in Brooklyn produced 'one-reelers' of many Shakespeare plays, no doubt also designed to overcome a class stigma hanging over the new medium, thus introducing a fruitful and creative tension between the demotic roots of the filmed entertainment and the high-art cultural capital of Shakespeare's works.⁵⁷

The foothold gained by Shakespeare in the first few years in the history of the film medium must also have contributed an influence towards the creation of movie genres, before these had clearly formed. There was nothing in the medium itself at that stage to make any particular genres intrinsically predictable, and they evolved through other channels. It was influences from other, established cultural areas that filtered into movies, and gradually coalesced around some recognisable genres: 'The genres of early cinema are mostly adapted unthinkingly from other sources, mainly popular ... music hall, the variety theatre and vaudeville, the circus, the fairground, itinerant theatre, the amusement arcade.'⁵⁸ Hilary Radner points out that 'Plays, novels, Biblical tales, and epic poems were all revisited in cinematic narratives',⁵⁹ and, a little higher on the social scale of culture, though still having roots in popular entertainment, came Shakespeare's plays. There gradually emerged the broadest possible understanding of genre, 'defined as an empirical

category that serves to name, differentiate, and classify works on the basis of the recurring configurations of formal and thematic elements they share'.⁶⁰ John Frow describes a genre as a 'system', within which individual examples share some formal features, topics, thematic structure, 'implication' (background knowledges), rhetorical functions, and sometimes physical settings.⁶¹ In the first twenty or so years, film genres were only emerging under the influence of established performing arts.

The title of an interesting contribution to film studies, Vera Dika's *Recycled Culture in Contemporary Art and Film: The Uses of Nostalgia*,⁶² encapsulates aspects of my argument: Shakespeare is constantly present as 'recycled culture' in films, and a part of the effect of his presence is a kind of historical nostalgia. Indeed, at least two recent books attribute the surge of Shakespeare on screen and stage in the 1990s partly to a *fin de siècle* spirit.⁶³ However, in fact the content of Dika's book, which draws extensively on the works of Fredric Jameson, refers mainly to films quoting films or reflecting the eras in which they were made, and does not look back to influences from times before movies existed. Only very rarely does this book, and other works of literary theory, refer to earlier drama, literature, art, and culture. For example, Barry Langford's prime aim of presenting 'historical contexts' for film pertains exclusively to the history of cinema.⁶⁴ Meanwhile, 'the ghost in the machine' lies in surviving traces and memories of Shakespeare behind film genres. Plays like *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet*, for example, offered to the new medium fully fledged, familiar genres within viewers' experience, so they were well placed to generate countless imitations. Moreover, they already occupied the space towards which the medium of film was headed, 'at the intersection of high and mass culture'.⁶⁵ The relationship was both contestatory and symbiotic. In silent films, his name was invoked to give legitimacy and respectability to the new plebeian form of entertainment,⁶⁶ but the association in turn gradually rescued Shakespeare from Victorian notions that his plays were the preserve of an upper bourgeoisie who could afford to attend the theatre, returning him to his Elizabethan popular status. Much later, during the 1990s, filmed versions of plays such as those by Kenneth Branagh and Baz Luhrmann, decisively brought the plays to a young, mass audience. The set of paradoxes highlight the chameleon nature of these plays, capable of generating apparently infinite varieties of adaptation. A related paradox is the capacity of each play, on the one hand, to be 'globalised' by multinational Hollywood companies, as evidenced by Michael Hoffman's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1999), and yet, on the other, 'localised' in, for example, the Indian adaptation of *The Comedy of Errors*, *Angoor* (1988) or the Singaporean variation

on *Romeo and Juliet*, *Chicken Rice War* (*Jiyuan qiaohu* (2000)). Given all these unique qualities, and narratives familiar from endless performances, the Shakespeare corpus provided the new medium of cinema with a set of well-developed genres perfect for appropriation. We can begin to speak confidently in terms of the more famous of Shakespeare's plays creating the pattern of 'repetition and variation' based on familiarity and surprise that would qualify each as a major generic influence behind films, even when they make no explicit reference to Shakespeare.

There is another, and rather different, way of seeing Shakespeare as part of the history of genres in movies. It can briefly be proved that he has made his way into almost every conceivable film genre identified within the medium, and there are not many other cultural forces of which this can be said. So-called 'mega-genres' describe groups through technical and industrial aspects, and here we might list some with their Shakespearean significances. Defined in terms of length, the early adaptations were one-reelers of eight, twelve, or twenty minutes, and Shakespeare was immediately adapted, sometimes by condensing a play into a whole reel by relying on its familiarity, or presenting a well-known episode where the context in the play was already known. The same contextual knowledge could also be presupposed in silent films, where the image is dominant and could be presumed to invoke a narrative. Later, the plays also effortlessly found their way into audio-visual movies in the 1930s, because of their primacy of language. In terms of funding sources, over the history of cinema the plays have been sponsored by large Hollywood and Bollywood studios, small independent companies, and television stations, by teams or solitary auteurs, private companies, national arts councils, and self-financed by novices and amateurs. In black and white, Laurence Olivier's *Hamlet* won Academy Awards in 1948, while in colour *Shakespeare in Love* did the same in 1999. Virtually every language in the world is represented among the body of adaptations, since they had already been translated as plays. Below these mega-genres, more popular genres are encountered as soon as we walk inside a video rental library. We spot groupings and look around for the ones we know we enjoy. These categories owe little to taxonomical rigour, and the logic behind them depends on the librarian's wish to guide customers quickly to their favourite form of entertainment, but one thing they have in common is amenability to incorporating Shakespeare's plays, sometimes in parody. I set myself the challenge of finding examples in a conceptual video library, using as a basis the genres listed comprehensively on a detailed website written and edited by Tim Dirks, called 'Film Genres: Origins and Types'.⁶⁷ My version below is vulnerable in the obvious sense that it mixes up genres and

sub-genres, but in itself the listing reflects the fact that genre creation is always in a state of flux, redefinition, and finessing.

- Epic (*Julius Caesar* (1953))
- War (*Henry V* (1944))
- Murder (*Richard III* (1996))
- Crime and Gangster (*Men of Respect* based on *Macbeth* (1991))
- Thrillers, Psychological Thrillers (*A Double Life* referencing *Othello* (1947))
- Film Noir (Orson Welles's *Macbeth* (1948) and *Othello* (1952))
- Western (*Jubal* based on *Othello* (1956))
- Science Fiction (*Forbidden Planet* based on *The Tempest* (1956))
- Musicals (*Kiss Me Kate* (1953) and *West Side Story* (1961))
- Horror (Polanski's *Macbeth* (1971))
- Children's Animations (*The Animated Shakespeare* (1994) and *The Lion King* recalling *Hamlet* (1994))
- Romantic Comedy (*Much Ado About Nothing* (1993))
- Romantic Tragedy or Melodrama (*Romeo and Juliet*)
- Grunge (*Tromeo and Juliet* (1996))
- Disaster (*The King Is Alive* referencing *King Lear* (2000) and Jean-Luc Godard's *King Lear* (1987) set in Chernobyl)
- Teen-Flick (*10 Things I Hate About You* based on *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Much Ado About Nothing* (1999) and *She's the Man* based on *Twelfth Night* (2006))
- Samurai (*Throne of Blood* based on *Macbeth* (1957))
- Supernatural (Any number of witches from *Macbeth*)
- Zombies (*Warm Bodies* partly based on *Romeo and Juliet* (2013))
- Road Movies (*My Own Private Idaho* (1991) based on *I Henry IV* is sometimes grouped here)
- Erotic and Pornographic (*The Secret Sex Lives of Romeo and Juliet* (1969))
- Lesbian (*Macbeth: The Comedy* (2001); *Better than Chocolate* (1999) was marketed as 'a lesbian *Midsummer Night's Dream*')
- Gay (*Were the World Mine* (2008) clearly referencing the *Dream*)
- Cult (Jarman's *The Tempest* (1979) and his *Angelic Conversation* (1985), based on the Sonnets)
- Avant-Garde (Coronados's *Hamlet* (1976) and his *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1985))
- Sports Films (arguably the most unlikely genre in Dirks's list, covered by *O*, the basketballing version of *Othello* (2001), and versions of *Twelfth Night* including *She's the Man* (2006) and its Indian remake set in the cricketing world, *Dil Bole Hadippa!* (2009))

There are of course any number grouped under family, drama, classics, biography, nostalgia, festival, specific national outputs (or just world), or some others that come to mind. Contemplating such a list, most critics who write on Shakespeare movies would conclude that the play is grafted on to a pre-existing movie genre (and probably this is how directors work in practice),⁶⁸ but I entertain the other possibility that the apparent ease with which Shakespeare can be adapted in this way is partly explained by the fact that his plays have had some part in the creation of these movie genres.

The list above reveals problems about genre theory itself. For example, the groupings are not all along the same line of abstraction. Some are derived from literature (comedy, drama, fantasy, romance), some refer to a setting (western, road) or subject matter (war, sports, disaster, supernatural), others are predicated on the recurrence of certain empirical elements (musicals), still others target an audience (children's, lesbian, gay), others refer to affectiveness and emotions aroused in audiences (melodrama sometimes known as 'weepies', erotic, thrillers, horror), and so on. Viewed from a distance, such lists begin to resemble the well-known, apparently arbitrary classificatory system of animals offered by Borges from 'a certain Chinese Encyclopedia', *The Celestial Emporium of Benevolent Knowledge*. Secondly, we immediately realise that many actual films can be grouped under two or more headings, and that potentially all films are hybrid in genre.⁶⁹ Bollywood is not alone in creating movies that consciously draw on many of the groups (though its eclecticism was inherited from Parsi popular entertainment rather than Western sources). This suits the Shakespeare industry, as Carolyn Jess-Cooke has suggested, since even apparently orthodox Shakespearean film adaptations do more than simply representing the original play. Instead they negotiate 'prior conceptions' of the play across 'historical periods and media' (and genres, we might add). They demonstrate that 'adaptation is both a collaborative and hybrid exercise, often involving the superimposition of a number of texts ... Adaptation theory invariably visits the idea of textual transposition'.⁷⁰ However, the main point to note at this stage is not that the allusive frameworks offered by genres should be more self-consistent, nor that Shakespeare 'invented' such genres, but that his plays have been shaped to fit these diverse groups. Since there are so many of them, I feel licensed in quixotically adding more, based on the influence of individual plays by Shakespeare. The primary aim, though, is not to proliferate categories nor seriously suggest we need new ones, but rather to uncover a strand in the historical creation of genres that has escaped close attention – the Shakespearean precedents.

Writers for the screen

Other reasons help to account for the ubiquitous presence of Shakespeare in cinema history. The educational system in different countries favoured and created an iconic status for his texts and created definable audiences, before and during the period of the rise of the film industry. The Newbolt Report of 1921 is a cornerstone of postcolonial theory, used to explain the conspicuous dominance of Shakespeare's works (among other English classics) in schools and universities, not only in Britain but also in its current and former colonies like India and the United States, two countries that quickly established themselves as powerhouses in the development of cinema.⁷¹ In the United States especially, one of the most numerous catchment areas for movies lies among college students, most of whom can be relied on to study Shakespeare and to recognise without prompting the dominant markers of his most celebrated plays.⁷² In addition, and for different reasons dating further back in history and hinging on reception by national writers in different cultures, the Shakespearean presence entered countries that had never been under British rule. Germany's most famous literary figures in the Romantic period, Goethe and Schlegel, virtually appropriated him as part of their own national identity, the former through his translations and literary influence, the latter through his criticism and scholarship. Following their lead, Shakespeare's plays steadily became absorbed into the national theatrical repertoires. *Hamlet* was the flagship play – '*Deutschland ist Hamlet*' ('Germany is Hamlet') famously proclaimed the poet Ferdinand Freiligrath in 1844.⁷³ In the early twentieth century, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with its potential for surrealistic effects, influenced the Middle-European generation of Max Reinhardt who re-created the play on film in its tonal complexity, with effects of visual strangeness and magical realism.⁷⁴ In Japan, Shakespeare's drama infiltrated more local theatrical traditions such as *Noh* and *Kabuki*,⁷⁵ and fed into Japanese films through Akira Kurosawa's example. Reasons for this process of cultural appropriation have been called 'an excruciatingly complicated and yet exceptionally enticing question',⁷⁶ whose answer lies in the work of a series of distinguished scholar-translators, from Tsibouchi Shoyo (1859–1935), who was himself a novelist, playwright, and critic. Shoyo and others recognised that 'there are various technical respects in which Shakespearean poetic drama is closer to traditional Japanese drama like *Noh* or *Kabuki* than it is to modern western realism'.⁷⁷ In Russia the story may have been complicated by the hostility of Tolstoy and later Stalin,⁷⁸ but the translation of eight plays and the Sonnets by Boris Pasternak cemented the presence there, to the extent that the most

prominent film-maker, Grigori Kotsintsev, after his early and radical saturation of these plays in his theatrical training, felt confident enough to make magnificent Russian versions of *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. Poland, another great film-making nation, had accepted *Hamlet* as politically 'the Polish Prince' in the nineteenth century, and the broader appreciation of Shakespeare persisted through communist and democratic regimes alike, down to the publication of Jan Kott's book, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, which was enormously influential in its own right beyond Poland.⁷⁹ In the light of processes such as these, and related national assimilations of Shakespeare into colonial and non-colonial countries, it is not at all surprising to detect his presence at every level of the increasingly international and popular industry of film-making. Shakespeare became a recurrent reference point for plots, themes, and character types, and his plays also deeply influenced the national film styles. His plays provided a set of globally recognised generic patterns. The one country that to some extent resisted was France, under the influence of its own centuries-old antagonism to its island neighbour across the Channel, and also enshrining the generally negative views of Shakespeare held by some of its own revered writers. Voltaire, for example, regarded *Hamlet* as 'monstrous', and Molière preferred to represent French contemporary society and issues, rather than looking to the past or to England for his sources and material. Besides, he thought he could do better than the English master of comedy. As a result, it might be argued, the whole ethos of French cinema is distinctively different from that of other major film-making nations, partly because it developed without the central influence of Shakespeare's plays.

More subtly than educational, literary, and theatrical processes, there may be an extra and all-important reason for a sometimes stealthy and indirect infiltration of Shakespeare into box-office films, especially in Hollywood. The mediators between the old and the new are the endless ranks of professional screenwriters, who unobtrusively underpin all aspects of the industry, and to them Shakespeare as a writer is their great antecedent and mentor, self-evidently the most successful writer for popular entertainment who has ever lived. Journeymen screenwriters rarely achieve the fame of their literary equivalents whose books appear under their own names, and they usually come to public attention only when something goes wrong, such as the anti-communist witch-hunts in 1950s Hollywood. The strike of the Writers Guild of America in 2007–8 crippled the whole movie industry in the United States and made their importance plain to all. More often, they are simply ignored or neglected as individuals, and their contributions to film-making are taken for granted, both by the industry and by film theorists, whose main

concentration is upon the image rather than the word. Confirmation came from a screenwriter who gave Groucho Marx many of his best lines. The obituary of Irving Brecher reports:

During the Writers Guild of America strike of 2007, he made a video in which he urged the writers not to settle. 'Since 1938, when I joined what was then the Radio Writers Guild, I have been waiting for the writers to get a fair deal. I'm still waiting. As Chester A Riley would have said, "What a revoltin' development this is!" But he only said it because I wrote it.'⁸⁰

Another who puts the case is John Logan in his BAFTA and BFI Screenwriters' Lecture in 2011: 'There is a notion that what cinema is, is pictures, sweet and nuanced visual storytelling, it certainly is that. But it is also language, it is also characters expressing themselves through dialogue, and dialogue has become so devalued in movies. I want speeches, I want language, tripping language, I want nuance.'⁸¹ The one area that might be an exception, the auteur movie, seems, on the contrary, to prove the rule, since in this case it is the directorial role that is considered that of an author, and the writing is once again subsumed beneath the filmic concerns of creating visual illusions and effects. It is significant that one of the greatest auteurs of all, Orson Welles, was steeped in Shakespeare and his films show their deep influence in all aspects of genre, language, and imagery.

In terms of the unsung, backroom screenwriters, times may not have changed all that much in four hundred years of performance practice. One of the most learned scholars of Elizabethan drama, G. K. Hunter, has pointed this out in a rare foray into film studies:

What about the role of the writers, those inborn élitists? The Elizabethan system, like the Hollywood one, put them at the bottom of the status pile, for if the actors were dependent on the owner, the writers in their turn were dependent on the actors, who approved the flat fee for a script written to their standards. In consequence the writer had no share in the ballooning success of a great hit, and so had no great investment in team loyalty ... At the beginning of mature drama in the 1580s and 1590s we find an inevitable clash between the humanist dream of eloquence as a passport into the élite and the reality that the money extracted from an undifferentiated public was the only money available. These writers started by supposing that the artisans of acting would be bowled over by the condescension of their betters, and were disgusted to discover that this was not the case.⁸²

Shakespeare himself became an exception since he was not only a writer but an actor and sharer in the companies he worked for, but, as Hunter points out, other journeymen writers like Robert Greene were more representative of the unsung scriptwriters and more equivalent to

Hollywood's, sometimes resentful at their lack of recognition when, as Robert Greene complained, players were seen to 'get by scholars their whole living'.⁸³ Indigent Cambridge scholars in particular offered their services to write plays for the Elizabethan stage, in some desperation to earn meagre wages. Hunter concludes:

when we look at the accounts of Faulkner's, Fitzgerald's, or Nathaniel West's film-writing careers, we see the same sense of self-betrayal as Greene displays. From their point of view, Hollywood is run by 'uncultured' persons who cannot appreciate good writing when they see it, who hire mere hacks to rewrite the master's prose in a form more suitable for their vulgar purposes.⁸⁴

Books have been written about the process of adapting novels into movies, but invariably the centre of attention is the textual source (whether from 'classics' like Dickens, Austen, Tolstoy or 'popular' texts by Chandler, Spillane, Fleming), and not the screenwriter's contribution. Even the most thorough study, *The Encyclopedia of Novels into Movies*, gives little or no information about the latter, leaping from source text to finished movie without considering in any depth the intermediary role of screenwriting.⁸⁵ My interest here is fleeting rather than systematic, since it is their general involvement in the process of making a movie to fit a popular genre that matters to my argument, not their individual quirks, output, and styles.

Most screenwriters, as professionals, bring to their jobs a knowledge of earlier literature, and aspirations to match it. They usually have some training in an appropriate field of writing and experience of reading, often as journalists, dramatists, budding creative writers, students, or occasionally as teachers of literature. Although it is difficult to ascertain through statistics, scriptwriters can all be assumed to be reasonably well-read and to have tertiary experience of classical drama and literature. Writers for films understandably use their literary knowledge whenever they can get away with it, often 'smuggling' it into the scripts they write, and with incongruous results. *Body and Soul* (1947), a film noir about a boxer, is an unexpected place to find William Blake's poem beginning 'Tiger, Tiger, burning bright' quoted and requoted as a leit-motif. It was unlikely to have been the choice of either the director or the producing company (Enterprise, later MGM), given the lowly status of such B-movies, but that of the writer alone. In this case it was Abraham Lincoln Polonsky, and his background is instructive. Polonsky also wrote and directed *Force of Evil* (1948) (not to be confused with Welles's *Touch of Evil*), but when he came to write in the 1950s he had to use a pseudonym, since as a self-confessed Marxist and member

of the Communist Party he was targeted and blacklisted by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Polonsky had studied English at the City College of New York, and after a brief time in the merchant navy he graduated from Columbia Law School and practised as an attorney, before writing for movies. Later still he was a union organiser. He also wrote several novels. When MGM took over stock from the bankrupt Enterprise Studios, Louis B. Mayer dropped *Body and Soul* from their list, no doubt because of its overt criticism of capitalism but also perhaps partly because Polonsky's Blakean references (if they were consciously noticed) may have been regarded as a little highbrow for the vehicle. To this day, the University of California Riverside offers a prize for fiction named after Polonsky. His career may not have been so inconspicuous as those of many thousands who have written for movies, but it is probably not untypical in its close connection with literature.

Watching *The Simpsons*, with its dense network of literary, political, and cultural references, convinces one that nowadays the large fleet of backroom writers are likely to be literature graduates from universities, hoping to augment their income or even earn a living. Nobody *but* such a person could have added this, for example, to episode 15 of series 15, *Co-Dependants' Day*. Moe the barman serves the newly alcoholic Marge and her more frequently bibulous husband Homer with wine rather than the more expected Duff beer:

MOE All I got's this old stuff here. Chateau Latour 1886. Ah I should just throw this out.

MARGE No, it'll have to do. [*He pours, they drink from wine glasses*]

MOE That'll be four bucks. Now in a step I perhaps should have taken initially, let me look up the value of that bottle in this wine collectors' guide here [*reads*] ... Oh what have I done? Oh, let me dry my tears on this lost Shakespeare play [*sobs and crunches volume clearly named The Two Noble Kinsmen by William Shakespeare*]

The Two Noble Kinsmen is not entirely by Shakespeare since he collaborated with John Fletcher, and it may not be 'lost', but it is certainly one of Shakespeare's least well-known plays, and the reference suggests a student of literature wrote the lines in *The Simpsons*. More evidence of journeymen screenwriters' saturation at least in *Hamlet* comes from the cult science fiction television series *Star Trek*, where we find among titles of episodes Shakespearean quotations such as *The Undiscovered Country*, *The Conscience of the King*, *Thine Own Self*, *Remember Me*, and *Mortal Coil*. More accidentally, we find *Measure for Measure* as the title of a film in a series about 'Guns of the Civil War'. And even *Star Wars* is full of quotations. *Doctor Who* in 2007 built an episode called

'The Shakespeare Code' around the Doctor returning to Shakespeare's England and exercising a decisive influence on the plays to come. Not only is this another example where many of the allusions, and the general temporal enigmas explored, could not have occurred without the input of an informed writer, but it also shows the deep imbrication of Shakespeare in popular culture of the twentieth century and beyond.

Of course Shakespeare is not the only reference point for these sometimes gratuitous writers' intrusions. In the film noir *The Big Sleep* (1946), we find this rather extraneous piece of 'comic relief' when the hero emerges from the bedroom:

BACALL So you do get up. I was beginning to think perhaps you worked in bed like Marcel Proust.

BOGART Who's he?

BACALL You wouldn't know him. A French writer.

BOGART Come into my boudoir.

Writers can mischievously insert pointed references to their own enforced effacement, and even sly jokes at their own expense. Whether or not philistine movie moguls controlling the industry know or care, the writers at the bottom are often keen to display their erudition in scripts. This exchange comes in *Eyes in the Night* (1942), again a minor B-movie in the noir genre, depicting a blind detective, 'Mac', who has a guide dog called Friday:

BUTLER Are you blind?

MAC Blind as a bat.

BUTLER Oh I'm sorry.

MAC Why? Milton and Homer were blind, weren't they?

BUTLER Yes sir, but they complained about it.

MAC Oh, they did?

BUTLER Yes sir. 'Oh loss of sight of thee I most complain. Blind among enemies. Oh worse than chains, dungeons, beggary or decrepit age.'

MAC [*chuckles*] Milton, eh? ... Don't stand around spouting poetry ...

The digressive quotation from Milton's *Samson Agonistes* in this dialogue between a 'hard-boiled' detective and a butler draws attention to the writer's role within films, while obliquely suggesting viewers are 'blind' to their contribution. Other Hollywood writers conspicuously lament their 'invisibility' in the system. Billy Wilder in particular, when he came to be a director, did not forget the writer's plight:

Billy Wilder's characters are frequently trapped in language, creatures of words ... Many work with words for a living: the writers (or in two cases songwriters and a film producer) of *The Lost Weekend*, *Sunset Boulevard*,

Ace in the Hole, *Kiss Me Stupid*, *The Front Page* and *Fedora* all struggle to complete just one more project.⁸⁶

Sunset Boulevard (1945) shows the screenwriter as a professional with lofty literary judgement and aspirations, trapped in a system that requires slavish mediocrity to fashion and obeisance to ‘stars’,⁸⁷ while *The Lost Weekend* (1950) focuses on an alcoholic and bankrupt writer experiencing the professional hazard of writer’s block. Both films use Shakespearean quotations in contexts of nostalgic envy, quietly bemoaning or celebrating the position of creative writers in an intertextual tradition lying behind movies. The frustrations of writers in the film-making process are revealed in the number of movies that place such a self-referential or orphic character at the centre of the plot – *Paris When It Sizzles* (1964) and *Breakfast at Tiffany’s* (1961) being a couple of the obvious examples, while in *The Last Time I Saw Paris* (1954), significantly based on a short story by F. Scott Fitzgerald, the central character is yet another frustrated, alcoholic novelist. Within the Hollywood system, Paul Dehn, who wrote several of the James Bond films and also *Planet of the Apes*, adapted both *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Macbeth*, demonstrating original insights especially into the latter. Ever since Merchant Ivory’s *Shakespeare Wallah* (1965), many films from the Indian subcontinent have liberally quoted from Shakespeare in the oddest places: the apparent decline of his cultural influence is lamented in Deepa Mehta’s *Bollywood/Hollywood* (2002) by the elderly grandmother.

Few cinema commentators even mention, let alone analyse, the position of the writer or that person’s educational background, and invariably the concentration lies on directors, who often deliberately obscure the writer’s contribution in order to aggrandise their own role. The writers sometimes hit back. In the middle of an inadvertently comic film from 1936, *Murder with Pictures*, where a murder is detected through press photographers taking ‘pictures’, we hear the startling lines,

- Shakespeare’s wearing your hat.
- If you’d been wearing it, you’d be dead.

The camera pans to reveal a bust of Shakespeare on which a casually placed hat now has a bullet hole through it. Once again, there is a sardonic, almost coded writer’s comment here, suggesting that if Shakespeare were a contemporary screenwriter, he would be just as neglected and his words as mangled as any of the others. Exactly this point is made in the very weird *Witch Hunt*, made in 1993 but set in 1953, satirising McCarthy’s Hollywood ‘witch-hunts’ from the point of view of film noir writers. Shakespeare in person is resurrected from the

grave as a sycophantic screenwriter, his words from *Macbeth* are shamelessly plagiarised. Among other things, it is a reference to the adversities suffered through history of writers for the screen, linking them up with their great exemplar, Shakespeare. Similar sentiments were expressed by the German/Danish Douglas Sirk, a director rather than a writer, but a man highly educated in three different universities. He directed *Magnificent Obsession* (1954) and *All That Heaven Allows* (1955) for Universal-International Pictures, and his comments indicate not only the same kinds of partially concealed conflict between the studios and the actual makers of films, but also between a literary education and popular art:

As a theater man, I had to deal with high art. I would play farces and comedy to make money, and classics for the elite. But we were trying to escape the *elitaire*. So slowly in my mind formed the idea of melodrama, a form I found to perfection in American pictures. They were naive, they were that something completely different. They were completely Art-less. This tied in with my studies of the Elizabethan period, where you had both *l'art pour l'art* and you had Shakespeare. He was a melodramatist, infusing all those silly melodramas with style, with signs and meanings. There is a tremendous similarity between this and the Hollywood system – which then I knew from only far away. Shakespeare had to be a commercial producer. Probably his company or his producer came to him and said, 'Now, look, Bill, there's this crazy story – ghosts, murder, tearing the hair, what-do-I-know. Completely crazy. It's called Magnificent Ob... no, *Hamlet* it was called. The audiences love this story, Bill, and you have to rewrite it. You've got two weeks, and you've got to hold the costs down. They'll love it again.' So, my God! A director in Hollywood in my time couldn't do what he wanted to do. But certainly, Shakespeare was even less free than we were.⁸⁸

The suggestion behind Sirk's comments is that such tensions between art and commerce can be creative and can also lead to novel uses of the material garnered from studying Shakespeare, in this case connections made between Shakespeare's works and cinematic melodrama.

Finally, in focusing specifically on works dealing with love, I have in mind a broader aim than simply establishing a scholarly line of influence leading from an early modern dramatist to modern movies. For over a century, cinema, as the most internationally popular and accessible art form dealing with emotions, has shaped our attitudes to love, our ways of conceptualising and possibly even of 'feeling' its many-splendoured powers. Meanwhile, in the three hundred years before the invention of cinema, this kind of psychological and cultural power had been exerted by Shakespeare as the dominant popular writer of all time and in virtually

every country in the world. His unique brand of romantic comedy, allied with the genre of romantic tragedy in *Romeo and Juliet*, have provided the Western world (and beyond) with a set of dominant assumptions about what love is and how it operates. Linking up the two forces, Shakespeare and movies, reveals an irresistible influence over our own emotional lives and the ways in which we construct our narratives of love. It will be a refrain I shall repeat with differences in this book that Shakespeare rarely, if ever, uses characteristics of genre as ‘mere’ conventions, but rather he constantly invests them with the kinds of emotional significances and justifications that give them a human dimension, shedding light and providing a language through which to understand and articulate our own experiences. Nowhere is this more evident than in the most conspicuously artificial and superficially fictional genre attributes of romantic comedy and romantic tragedy, such as expectations of happiness or disaster, the proximity of music and love, ways in which love is a negotiation between strong characters in initial conflict, disguise and mistaken identity as ways to explore love relationships, and so on. The genres he more or less created, by fusing elements of different kinds such as romance, comedy, and tragedy, have found their way into our own tacitly held narratives of love that we use to shape our emotional expectations and interpretations. Shakespeare helped to prioritise some paradigms of love in his comedies, tragedies, and romances, each of which was, at some times brazenly and at others surreptitiously, absorbed into movies, which in their turn have contributed to our own convenient fictions and living attitudes to love.

Notes

- 1 Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan, *Screen Adaptation: Impure Cinema* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 86.
- 2 Sergei Eisenstein, ‘Dickens, Griffith, and Ourselves’ (alternatively titled ‘Dickens, Griffith, and Film Today’), in *Film Form* (1942). There are various different translations of this passage available, and here I use the words in Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (eds), *Film Theory and Criticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004 [1974]), 444.
- 3 Allardyce Nicoll, *Film and Theatre* (London: George G. Harrap, 1936), 18.
- 4 Cartmell and Whelehan, *Screen Adaptation*, 86.
- 5 Douglas Lanier, ‘“I’ll Teach You Differences”: Genre, Literacy, Critical Pedagogy, and Screen Shakespeare’, in Anthony R. Guneratne (ed.), *Shakespeare and Genre: From Early Modern Inheritances to Postmodern Legacies* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 257–70.
- 6 Richard Burt (ed.), *Shakespeares after Shakespeare: An Encyclopedia of the Bard in Mass Media and Popular Culture*, 2 vols (Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press, 2007).

- 7 Timothy Corrigan, *Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989), 93.
- 8 The critic most interested in this process is H. R. Coursen: see, in particular, *Shakespeare Translated: Derivatives on Film and TV* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005).
- 9 The word is used by Anthony R. Guneratne in *Shakespeare, Film Studies, and the Visual Cultures of Modernity* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). See also the essays by diverse writers in Guneratne's edited collection, *Shakespeare and Genre: From Early Modern Inheritances to Postmodern Legacies* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
- 10 Cartmell and Whelehan, *Screen Adaptation*, 23.
- 11 Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, transl. Peggy Kamuf (London: Routledge, 1994).
- 12 Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).
- 13 Robert A. Logan, *The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 9.
- 14 Logan quotes this phrase in turn from Stephen J. Lynch, *Shakespearean Intertextuality: Studies in Selected Plays and Sources* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998), 1.
- 15 Logan, *The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry*, 17.
- 16 Logan, *The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry*, 13.
- 17 Porscha Fermanis, *John Keats and the Ideas of the Enlightenment* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 12. See also David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 388.
- 18 See, for example, Penelope Joan Fritzer, *Jane Austen and Eighteenth-Century Courtesy Books* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997).
- 19 The argument is followed up by Lisa Hopkins in *Relocating Shakespeare and Austen on Screen* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); and see Linda Troost and Sayre Greenfield (eds), *Jane Austen in Hollywood*, 2nd edn (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2001). See also Cartmell and Whelehan, *Screen Adaptation*, ch. 6.
- 20 Boris Pasternak, 'From "Notes of a Translator"', in Carl J. Proffer (ed.), *Modern Russian Poets on Poetry* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1976).
- 21 Stephanie Trigg, 'Transparent Walls: Stained Glass and Cinematic Medievalism', *Screening the Past*, 26 (2009). Online: www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/26/early-europe/stained-glass-cinematic-medievalism.html.
- 22 Logan, *The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry*, 12.
- 23 Judith Buchanan, *Shakespeare on Film* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005), 3–5.
- 24 Guneratne, *Shakespeare, Film Studies*, 43–4.
- 25 Stanley Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Hollywood Comedy of Remarriage* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981).

- 26 Cavell, *Pursuits of Happiness*, 20.
- 27 Stanley Cavell, *Cavell on Film*, ed. by William Rothman (New York: State University of New York Press, 2005), 306, 96.
- 28 See also another critic who takes similar confidence from Cavell's approach, Leland Poague, 'Cavell and the Fantasy of Criticism: Shakespearean Comedy and *Ball of Fire*', *CineAction*, 9 (Summer 1987), 47–55.
- 29 Stanley Cavell, *Contesting Tears: The Hollywood Melodrama of the Unknown Woman* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
- 30 Harry Keyishian, 'Shakespeare and Movie Genre: The Case of *Hamlet*', in Russell Jackson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 72–84.
- 31 Tony Howard, 'Shakespeare's Cinematic Offshoots', in Russell Jackson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 295–313, 295.
- 32 Robert Hamilton Ball, *Shakespeare on Silent Film: A Strange Eventful History* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1968), 36–7.
- 33 Carolyn Jess-Cooke, *Shakespeare on Film: Such Things as Dreams Are Made of* (London: Wallflower Press, 2007), 33, quoting from Edward Said, 'On Originality', in *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 135.
- 34 Douglas Lanier, 'William Shakespeare, Filmmaker' in Deborah Cartmell and Imelda Whelehan (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Literature on Screen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 61–74, 63.
- 35 Douglas Lanier, 'Shakespearean Rhizomatics', in Alexa Huang and Elizabeth Rivlin (eds), *Adaptation, Ethics, Value* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 21–40, 28.
- 36 Rick Altman, *Film/Genre* (London: British Film Institute), ch. 6.
- 37 Samuel Crowl, *Shakespeare and Film: A Norton Guide* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2008), 155.
- 38 Lanier, 'Shakespearean Rhizomatics', 23.
- 39 Thomas Cartelli and Katherine Rowe, *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), 26, 29.
- 40 Steve Neale, *Genre and Hollywood* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 213.
- 41 For a general account, see Rosalie Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).
- 42 Sir Philip Sidney, *A Defence of Poetry*, in Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan van Dorsten (eds), *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 114.
- 43 Adrienne L. Eastwood, 'Between Wedding and Bedding: The Epithalamic Sub-Genre in Shakespeare's Comedies', *Exemplaria*, 22 (2010), 240–62.
- 44 Barry Keith Grant, *Film Genre: From Iconography to Ideology* (London: Wallflower Press, 2007), 1.
- 45 See Neale, *Genre and Hollywood*, 255.
- 46 See Neale, *Genre and Hollywood*, 246 ff.

- 47 Neale, *Genre and Hollywood*, 252.
- 48 www.encyclopedia.com/topic/sediment.aspx.
- 49 See Cartmell and Whelehan, *Screen Adaptation*, 89–90.
- 50 The most recent account of silent Shakespeare films is by Judith Buchanan, *Shakespeare on Silent Film: An Excellent Dumb Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- 51 Kenneth S. Rothwell, *Early Shakespeare Movies: How the Spurned Spawned Art* (Chipping Campden: International Shakespeare Association, Occasional paper no. 8, 2000).
- 52 See Eddie Sammons, *Shakespeare: A Hundred Years on Film* (London: Shephard-Walwyn, 2000), 62. The extract can be viewed on the videotape *Silent Shakespeare* (British Film Institute).
- 53 See Ball, *Shakespeare on Silent Film*.
- 54 See Prakash Younger, 'Film as Art', in William Guyon (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Film History* (London: Routledge, 2011), ch. 3.
- 55 Rothwell, *Early Shakespeare Movies*, referring to David A. Cook, *A History of Narrative Film* (New York: Norton, 1996), 51.
- 56 Issued on videotape by Kino Video (New York, 2001), restored by the American Film Institute.
- 57 See Hilary Radner, 'Film as Popular Culture', in William Guyon (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Film History* (London: Routledge, 2011), 16. On the larger issues of the culture debates in film history, see Patrick Brantlinger, *Bread and Circuses: Theories of Mass Culture as Social Decay* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983); and, of course, the classic essay by Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (1936), in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, ed. Hannah Arendt, transl. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken Books, 1968).
- 58 Michael Channan, *The Dream That Kicks: The Prehistory and Early Years of Cinema in Britain* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 34–5.
- 59 Radner, 'Film as Popular Culture', 17.
- 60 Raphaëlle Moine, *Cinema Genre*, transl. Alistair Fox and Hilary Radner (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 2.
- 61 John Frow, *Genre* (London: Routledge, 2006).
- 62 Vera Dika, *Recycled Culture in Contemporary Art and Film: The Uses of Nostalgia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- 63 Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray (ed.), *Shakespeare, Film, Fin de Siècle* (London: Palgrave, 2000); Susan Bennett, *Performing Shakespeare: Shifting Shakespeare and the Contemporary Past* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- 64 Barry Langford, *Film Genre: Hollywood and Beyond* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005).
- 65 Paul Coates, *Film at the Intersection of High and Mass Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- 66 Kenneth S. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), ch. 1 *passim*.

- 67 Tim Dirks, 'Film Genres: Origins and Types'. Online: www.filmsite.org (accessed 5 March 2009).
- 68 See, for example, Maurice Hindle, *Studying Shakespeare on Film* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 88–90.
- 69 Ira Jaffe, *Hollywood Hybrids: Mixing Genres in Contemporary Films* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008).
- 70 Jess-Cooke, *Shakespeare on Film*, 53.
- 71 See, for example, Ania Loomba, *Shakespeare, Race, and Colonialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Barrie Wade and John Shepherd, 'Shakespeare in the Curriculum: Direction by Content' (dealing with the Newbolt Report), *Educational Studies*, 19 (1993), 267–74.
- 72 For the many and ambiguous factors lying behind the saturation reception of Shakespeare in the United States, see Michael D. Bristol, *Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 1990), although Bristol's argument is perhaps lacking in not taking into account the cinematic contribution from Hollywood.
- 73 See Manfred Pfister, 'Germany Is Hamlet: The History of a Political Interpretation', *New Comparison: A Journal of Comparative and General Literary Studies*, 2 (Autumn 1986), 106–26.
- 74 See Jack J. Jorgens's analysis of Reinhardt's *Dream* in *Shakespeare on Film* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991), ch. 2.
- 75 See Kuniyoshi Munakata, 'Hamlet' *Noh Style: Collected Versions 1982–1990* (Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1991).
- 76 See Tetsuo Kishi, *Shakespeare in Japan* (London: Continuum, 2005), preface.
- 77 Kishi, *Shakespeare in Japan*, ch. 1.
- 78 See Leo Tolstoy, *On Shakespeare and on Drama*, transl. V. Tchertkoff (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1906 [1903]); Eleanor Rowe, *Hamlet: A Window on Russia* (New York: New York University Press, 1976).
- 79 Jan Kott, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary* (London: Methuen, 1965); Krystyna Kujawińska-Courtney, 'From Kott to Commerce: Shakespeare in Communist and Post-Communist Poland', in Krystyna Kujawińska-Courtney and R. S. White (eds), *Shakespeare's Local Habitations* (Łódź: Łódź University Press, 2007), 13–33.
- 80 Ronald Bergan, 'Obituary: Irving Brecher', *Guardian*, 12 March 2009.
- 81 Available to British viewers through the British Film Institute website, and otherwise there are some excerpts (including the section quoted) on YouTube: www.youtube.com/watch?v=jm0TN2fqTMs (accessed 7 June 2015).
- 82 G. K. Hunter, 'The Making of a Popular Repertory: Hollywood and the Elizabethans', in John Batchelor, Tom Cain, and Claire Lamont (eds), *Shakespearean Continuities: Essays in Honour of E. A. J. Honigmann* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1997), 247–58, 249–50.
- 83 Robert Greene, *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1592), quoted in Hunter, 'The Making of a Popular Repertory', 250.
- 84 Hunter, 'The Making of a Popular Repertory', 250.

- 85 John C. Tibbetts and James M. Welsh (eds), *The Encyclopedia of Novels into Movies* (New York: Facts on File Inc., 1998).
- 86 Gregg Rickman (ed.), *The Film Comedy Reader* (New York: Limelight Editions, 2001), 237.
- 87 See Daniel Brown, 'Wilde and Wilder', *PMLA*, 119.5 (2004), 1216–30.
- 88 'Two Weeks in Another Town', Interview with Douglas Sirk, *Bright Lights Film Journal*, 6 (1977), now available online: www.brightlightsfilm.com/48/sirkinterview.php.