Pázmány Péter Catholic University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Kinga Földváry

COWBOY HAMLETS AND ZOMBIE ROMEOS

SHAKESPEARE IN GENRE FILM

Summary of Habilitation Thesis

Budapest

2020

Outline of the thesis

The thesis submitted for the habilitation procedure is the manuscript of my forthcoming volume, *Cowboy Hamlets and Zombie Romeos: Shakespeare in Genre Film*, to be published by Manchester University Press in 2020. The primary aim of the volume is to offer a new method of interpreting screen adaptations of Shakespearean drama, focusing on the significance of cinematic genres in the analysis of films adapted from literary sources. The central argument is rooted in the recognition that film genres may provide the most important context informing a film's production, critical and popular reception as well. The volume is organised into six chapters, discussing films that form broad generic groups. Part One comprises three genres from the classical Hollywood era (western, melodrama and gangster-*noir*), while Part Two deals with three contemporary blockbuster genres (teen film, undead horror and the biopic). The analyses underline elements that the films have inherited from Shakespeare, while emphasising how the adapting genre leaves a more important mark on the final product than the textual source. The volume's interdisciplinary approach means that its findings are rooted in both Shakespeare and media studies, confirming the crucial role genres play in the production and reception of works in literature as well as in contemporary popular visual culture.

The Introduction presents the volume's main thesis, arguing for a genre-based interpretation of film adaptations of literary works, pointing out the advantages of such a method over the traditional fidelity-based approach. It reflects briefly on the historical development of genre studies, and on the absence of genre as a central element from both mainstream and more recent adaptation criticism, particularly Shakespeare on screen studies. During the past decade, Shakespeare adaptation research has turned increasingly towards new media and the destabilisation of several fundamental concepts, including film, adaptation, even Shakespeare, or the changes associated with the digitally networked participation characterising contemporary cultural production and consumption. The concept of the rhizome and its use in rhizomatic adaptation criticism is also considered, and the applicability of the concept for the genre-based research exemplified by the volume is pointed out. The chapter, however, confirms its belief in the broad applicability of generic categories, and encourages the use of this method of adaptation analysis for screen products based on non-Shakespearean literary sources as well. The final section of the chapter describes the criteria of selecting the films included in the volume, and offers a brief overview of the book's structure.

Chapter One (Will in the Wild West: western adaptations of Shakespeare) analyses six Shakespeare adaptations that display elements of the western genre. The chronological arrangement of the films highlights the socio-historical context of their original production, from the optimistic post-war western's belief in progress and reconstruction, through the psychologically inflected 1950s films' anxieties about the moral dissolution within the family sphere, to a comic variant from the 1960s. From the late 1960s, a so-called spaghetti western exemplifies the formula's renewed vitality in European filmmaking, and the chapter ends with a 1970s road movie displaying the influence of revisionist westerns. The analyses comment on the use of the western's iconography and narrative formulas, and several core themes and concerns of the genre are also discussed, including the significance of the frontier in the American imagination, the Wild West's paradoxical representations as either garden (even Garden of Eden) or desert, and the controversial interpretations of tradition versus progress. The analyses also highlight a number of subtle changes in the characteristic gender roles within the western, showing how the seemingly clichéd, often marginalised female roles exemplify broader social concerns and trends.

Chapter Two (Shakespeare the tearjerker: from woman's film to global melodrama) gives a brief overview of the various interpretations and definitions of melodrama, reflecting on the term's associations with music, excessive emotions and the centrality of the female body. It also argues for a more complex understanding of the melodramatic mode, liberating it from the common criticism of triviality and stylistic excess. The examples range from a so-called woman's film from the 1930s, which foregrounds the female sacrifice and thus centralises the moral teaching embedded within the Shakespearean text, through a British social melodrama from the post-war period, where the moral issues are interconnected with racial anxieties. Another melodramatic adaptation from the 1990s, set in the Midwestern farmlands, emphasises the genre's associations with feminism, particularly ecofeminism. The last section of the chapter argues that the melodramatic features of the Bollywood film industry show many similarities with the Western iterations of melodrama, and with the help of a British-Asian melodramatic adaptation, exemplifies the generic hybridity characterising this particular diasporic film market.

Chapter Three, the final section in the first Part of the volume (Dark-minded Othellos, mobster Macbeths: *film noir*, gangster, gangster *noir*) discusses the common debates concerning the *film noir* as a genre. Based on the clearly recognisable core elements of the group, the chapter argues for the practical applicability of the label, placing it within the context of the thriller and the gangster genre, both of which show considerable overlaps with *noir*. After

the examination of two classic examples of 1940s *film noir*, both displaying a central interest in male psychology, anxiety and crime, the second half of the chapter looks at post-war gangster films, one from the 1950s, another from 1990, a significant moment in the revival of the gangster genre. These films' visuality continues to bear clear traces of the *noir*, but the increased role of violence, together with the protagonists' changed moral stance, mark them as different from the earlier products. The final example comes from the twenty-first century, an indie neo-*noir* production, which employs the generic elements of the police drama as well as the gangster film. The range of films examined in the chapter offer convincing proof both for the continued influence of the gangster and *noir* formulas, and for their ability to adapt to the given socio-historical context.

Moving on to contemporary blockbuster cinema, Chapter Four (Back to school, Will: Shakespeare the teen idol) examines the teen film, one of the most significant genres dominating the global film industry since the 1990s. After a brief overview of the socio-economic background of the genre's recent popularity, the chapter focuses on the common features of the group, from character types, typical settings, the role of the soundtrack and the characteristically decontextualised use of textual fragments, through a tendency to present heterosexual romance as ideal, to the genre's reflection on authority figures, both in the school environment and within the family. Beside the best known examples of the genre, which all employ the romantic comedy's narrative structure, the chapter discusses one tragic teen drama and two independent queer productions as well, highlighting their darker social messages which set them apart from the more light-hearted iterations of the formula. The chapter also argues against the common criticism that teen films are dumbed down versions of literary masterpieces, pointing out the ways in which these adaptations are consciously shaped to cater for the interests of their target audience.

Chapter Five (Shakespeare the undead) presents the most common arguments behind the recent revival of the subgenres of horror featuring undead characters, particularly vampires or zombies. It also looks at the historical development of the representation of the cinematic undead, pointing out the symptomatic changes that clearly set these post-millennial creatures apart from the classic variants. Looking at several examples of vampire Shakespeare adaptations, the chapter comments on possible reasons why only a few specific source texts are predominantly adapted into horror films. It is also observed that the majority of the films examined within the chapter are comic adaptations, with one notable exception; some of them are low-budget, even amateur productions, although the films with lower production qualities are no less creative in their appropriation of the Shakespearean dramatic texts. Most films

within the group display clear self-reflexive features, and they are also characterised by melancholy or nostalgia for the past. The chapter also examines similarities between the way teen films and undead horror adaptations deal with the source text's authority, emphasising the generational connections between the groups. Several critical connections among Shakespeare criticism, adaptation studies and the undead are also presented.

Chapter Six (Will, Bill, and the Earl: versions of the author in contemporary biopics) discusses the best-known biographical films featuring William Shakespeare as a character, rather than as author of the source text. Like teenpics and undead horror films, the biopic is not a new genre, but its popularity underwent a spectacular revival during the 1990s. Another similarity between the three genres can be noticed in their tendency to undermine the Bard's textual and cultural authority, and the way they employ fragmented quotations in anachronistic and ahistorical ways, in line with the postmodern era's predilection for pastiche. All biopics discussed are based on scholarly interpretations of some aspects of Shakespeare's life and oeuvre, from a Freudian understanding of authorial inspiration, through a theory of the syphilitic Shakespeare, to the Oxfordian theory of authorship. Most of these films can also be seen as generic hybrids, mixing the biopic's conventions with elements of the romantic comedy, the thriller, or television edutainment. At the same time, they also illustrate the genre's tendency to be rooted in two historical eras, authenticating their narratives with historical references to the early modern era, including several literary authors from the age, while attracting the interests of millennial and post-millennial audiences with the use of contemporary visual or thematic elements.

The conclusion looks back on the six main chapters of the volume and reflects on their findings, pointing out a number of features in the cinematic products that can only be explained by a genre-based analysis. The chapter also confirms the broad applicability of the method exemplified here for the interpretation of other literary adaptations, and opens up the discussion to consider the endemic presence of generic categories in contemporary popular visual culture and elsewhere. It also comments on the constantly changing forms of the Shakespeare phenomenon and the potential roles of Shakespeare in cultural production and consumption today.

Summary of the research findings

The central argument of the thesis concerns film adaptations based on William Shakespeare's work, and it aims to provide a theoretically sound, yet also pragmatic system of categorising these works of art that have previously been considered secondary, derivative works, and typically classified according to their so-called proximity or distance from their source text. The novelty of the volume is in its use of a genre-based interpretation as an organising principle for a systematic interpretation of Shakespeare film adaptations, instead of the usual fidelity criticism practised by most scholars in the past decades. The volume also highlights Shakespearean elements in several lesser-known films, hoping to generate critical attention towards them, and in this way it may contribute to the revaluation of works that have not commonly been considered within the field of Shakespeare on screen studies.

The study of genres in itself is of course not a new field within cinema studies, let alone literary criticism, and therefore a genre-based study may appear somewhat outdated in the twenty-first century. More specifically, the importance of film genres in the interpretation of adaptations is not a completely new discovery either, but in order to understand the state of affairs today, it is crucial to look back on how film genre studies gained acceptance in academic research. Taking its cue from literary genre analyses, the systematic theoretical study of cinematic genres became widespread in the 1970s, in response to the *auteur* theory that dominated post-war criticism. Genre studies then found popular support for its thorough and enlightening readings of a number of classical Hollywood genres, particularly the western, *film noir* or the musical. Edward Buscombe,[1] Steve Neale,[2] Rick Altman,[3] and others pointed out how a common set of conventions dominate – and conversely, even retrospectively define – the production and interpretation of films and popular culture in general. Later, however, some of the very same critics raised their doubts concerning the existence of genres themselves – whether genres only exist because we talk about them, or if they can truly be found in an abstract and ideal form as well. Altman's *Film/Genre* investigated the issue with an uncompromising critical thoroughness,[4] yet his provocative conclusions – that it is indeed criticism that creates and upholds generic concepts – did not result in a complete dismissal of genre study. Even if partly out of habit, reference to genres is still commonplace practice in all three pillars of film study (production, reception and criticism), and whether this means that genres have always been here, or that they are here to stay, it makes them eminently useful in general descriptions and classifications of films.

At the same time, it is also important to acknowledge that twenty-first-century film and media theory has moved beyond traditional descriptive uses of genre theory, and using some of the conclusions, and even more of the burning questions of earlier research, investigates the constantly changing fields of digital media and previously unexplored relationships between consumers of popular culture.[5] Within adaptation studies, both theoretical and more pragmatic investigations have lately been turning towards new media, trying to gauge the impacts of a fundamentally changed consumer environment, the appearance of users and prosumers on the market, and a whole line of such research fields that require our attention. The very same explorations have also been taken up by Shakespeare studies, making a genre-based reading of Shakespeare adaptations a seemingly dated enterprise, but one which nonetheless needs to be completed, I would argue, to fill a gap that should by rights have been filled decades ago. This is what I have undertaken to accomplish in this volume, in the hope that my findings will prove useful even in a considerably changed media environment compared to the one that produced most of the films discussed here.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that even in the light of these new investigations, the continued relevance of genre as an analytical category remains unchallenged. Not only do viewers still rely on generic labels in defining or describing the products they encounter as recipients, but creators and critics also fall back on these categories as reference points, even if the categories themselves have undergone significant change over the decades. Moreover, if we accept that we live in the aftermath of an algorithmic turn in visual culture,[6] and contemplate the new processes of selection or organisation of various products as achieved by various types of algorithms, we keep coming back to genre as a crucial element. Based on our previous viewing patterns, streaming providers offer us new films that we may enjoy; online video sellers suggest additional films we should buy; the Internet Movie Database mentions further examples of what we might be interested in – and if we look carefully at these recommendations, it is easy to see the elements of genre that are running through them. Observations such as these can be directly connected to the findings of this volume, confirming that investing our energies in genre studies has pragmatic benefits even in the twenty-first century. A deeper understanding of how many elements of a work of art may be connected to its genre will hopefully also enable us to develop new approaches and research methodologies when it comes to archiving, digitising, labelling and trying to make sense of the vast amounts of material at our disposal.

Although the concentration on genre and the organisation of the volume may suggest that film genre is a clear and straightforward concept in itself, unfortunately, this is very far from the case. Quite the contrary: the difficulty of finding any generally acceptable definition

for the notion of genre reveals the complexity of forces at work behind audience choices and marketing decisions, which all find expression in generic labels. What further complicates the theoretical background of genre-based studies is the fact that despite its many branches and several outstanding authors, genre theory does not offer an easily generalisable overview of the basic criteria that could be used in the characterisation of all genres. There is a similar uncertainty regarding the acceptance of certain genres as genres per se, as opposed to seeing them as stylistic features, thematic elements or other descriptive criteria (melodrama and *film noir* being two such problematic, though commonly used, terms). At the same time, the fact that genres as labels are recognised and employed by producers and critics as well as consumers in a more or less consistent manner, makes it clear that genre as a term (and its application to a set of commonly agreed concepts) is perfectly apt in describing production and consumption patterns of commercial cinema.

This approach, though, does not mean that each and every (or indeed any) film could or should be put into a single genre category, particularly as the purity of genres has long been debated (and refuted) by genre theory as well as commonplace viewing experience.[7] Investigating genre in an altogether different context, Jacques Derrida's 1979 lecture entitled 'The Law of Genre' may be consulted for an apt illustration of how an acceptance of generic hybridity is not inimical to a genre-based approach. In his philosophical account, Derrida describes the law of genre as 'a principle of contamination, a law of impurity, a parasitical economy', speaking 'of a sort of participation without belonging – a taking part in without being part of, without having membership in a set'.[8] This 'sort of participation' is an ideally tentative description of what the average viewer often experiences when encountering commercial cinema: seeing a product that gives the impression of unity and relative originality, while it also displays a number of elements familiar from previous works. Moreover, this familiarity, although it creates expectations which may or may not be fulfilled by the product, also allows consumers to acquire a set of interpretational tools that accumulate, but do not expire or lose their relevance even if tested on further products. The seemingly disorganised, but intricately associated, network of both interpretive frameworks and the works they are abstracted from may in turn recall another theory, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's concept of the rhizome,[9] brought to bear on Shakespeare criticism by Douglas Lanier. As Lanier argues, 'a rhizomatic conception of Shakespeare stresses the power of those ever-differentiating particulars – specific adaptations, allusions, performances – to transform and restructure the aggregated Shakespearean field into something forever new'.[10]

Subscribing to this understanding of Shakespeare-related moving images as equally participating in and contributing to an infinite and endlessly changing field, what this volume intends to show is how certain elements of genres, some of them central, others marginal, may be present even in films that are primarily known as adaptations based on Shakespeare's work. As a result, we may only do justice to a teen adaptation such as *10 Things I Hate About You* (1999, dir. Gil Junger) if we realise that the reason why it has discarded the Shakespearean dialogue lies precisely in its participation in the genre of the teen film. In the same way, an alternative ending to an originally tragic plot may be explained by the need to create a convincing *denouement* for a western, where the hero is obliged to ride off into the sunset, as happens in *Johnny Hamlet* (1968, dir. Enzo G. Castellari). Similarly, the distinctive camerawork of a romantic comedy, maximising the star appeal of celebrity actors, will override critical concerns for more subtle character development or narrative tension present in the source text.

On the level of individual film analyses, the volume can also offer innovative elements, particularly by pointing out intricate connections between seemingly disparate entities, through what we call, for want of a better term, their common genre. Regarding these films as adaptations of Shakespearean drama would not in itself explain, for instance, the increased (or decreased) role of certain characters in the films, and gender roles provide a particularly interesting case in point. In the western and in the gangster-*noir* groups, females have often been reduced to one of two types: the innocent, passive, patient and loving wife material, confined to the domestic environment; or its opposite, the alluring and passionate, active and often dangerous, but socially isolated, lover, *femme fatale* or prostitute with a heart of gold. Depending on which era we are talking about, these films may allow us to sympathise even with the marginalised woman, but the narrative will not include her in the happy ending. The melodrama, on the other hand, expands on female roles and often grants women a chance to tell their own side of the story as focalisers or even narrators, both in the early woman's film and in the late twentieth-century television melodrama. What is more, by placing Anglo-American melodramas side by side with their counterparts rooted in the Eastern cinematic tradition, we may note the correspondences between the underlying narrative patterns, characterisation and stylistic features of these classical genres. Each of these genres, aware of their broad embeddedness in the social imaginary, also play a dual role in reinforcing the finite number of choices within social interactions: on the one hand, representing the stereotypical plotlines, but also confirming these as idealised or feared resolutions of conflicts, their power based on precisely the fact of their broad dissemination.

The industrial background that led to the creation of generic cycles in the Hollywood studio era is well known and extensively discussed in historical film studies. The social and economic factors of the 1990s, however, were equally significant in bringing about a cinematic boom worldwide, and creating a new wave of screen Shakespeares along the way. Yet what Part Two of the volume argues is that beside this shared industrial background, certain aesthetic features characterising post-1990s adaptations in the revived new genres allow us to see them as a coherent group, which systematically reflect on their own era of creation. One of these features is a desire to reinterpret the inherited stories through an in-depth psychological identification with characters and conflicts. This is what we can observe in the way Shakespeare is approached by high school students, who tend to apply the plays' words directly to their own everyday trials and tribulations. This need for identification also explains the rise of the humanised undead, who are no longer the monstrous Others of civilisation, but are represented as victims of an oppressive and inhuman society, whose institutions are most likely to betray their citizens. In these narratives, Shakespeare regularly appears to provide guidance on how to embrace one's victimhood, but more importantly, how to find the inner strength for fighting back against the real monsters and proving that humanity can be found in the unlikeliest forms. Neither do contemporary biopics emphasise greatness or canonical status in the authors they bring to life on the screen, but focus on the pains and losses, shortcomings and failures of their subject, who turns out to be just as much of a human being as the average viewer the films wish to educate and entertain at the same time.

Another common feature of films made since the 1990s directly concerns a central challenge of adaptation studies: how the written text is transmitted into the visual format. The era's artistic production subscribes to the postmodern tendency to embrace the irreverent and playful, revelling in decontextualised and recontextualised textual fragments. This, on the one hand, challenges the pessimistic visions of the loss of the text, since the text is clearly here to stay. Neither is this an example of what Douglas Lanier calls the 'post-textual' Shakespeare, where Shakespeare appears in purely visual images that contain 'not a single word from Shakespeare's text …, despite the fact that they depend for their effect on being identified as "Shakespearean"'.[11] What the seemingly random and piecemeal insertion of classical quotations into new texts showcases is a conscious strategy, which clearly illustrates how readily contemporary popular and visual culture absorbs and repurposes inherited materials according to its momentary needs.

Yet, for all their irreverence and superficial engagement with their canonical source, these films also illustrate a continued interest in the authorship debate, not so much in the

biographical reality of the person who wrote what we call the Shakespearean *oeuvre*, but more in terms of the power and glory of creation itself. In the age of fifteen-minute fame, when creating or destroying reputations can happen at a viral speed, the Shakespeare phenomenon and its survival in education, elite and mass culture, and particularly in scholarship, provides us with an intriguing and enduring challenge but also endless fascination. In terms of a contemporary understanding of authorship and the creative process, this consistent link between Shakespeare and lived experience is an inherently conservative one, which nonetheless fits our own cultural context. Even if the Romantic image of the author survives in visual representations, the notion of such a singularly powerful imagination whose output would be based on his own inner talent finds less acceptance than the image of an ordinary human being whose life resembles our very own. As a compromise, contemporary representations tend to emphasise his position as a channel, a mediator, who relies on an interpretive community. This meta-cinematic message in turn is what all genre films appear to convey: Shakespeare may no longer be our idol, and he is certainly no superhero, but his stories continue to help us tell our own stories, fight our own battles, find our own voices.

Selected publications related to Shakespeare on screen studies

1. „Brush up your Shakespeare". Shakespeare-adaptációk műfaja négy *Makrancos hölgy* tükrében, *Apertúra*, II. évf. 4. szám (2007 nyár).

2. „Much Ado about Something? Shakespeare for the New Millennium", in *HUSSE10-LitCult: Proceedings of the the HUSSE10 Conference, Literature & Culture volume*, szerk. Földváry Kinga, Almási Zsolt, Schandl Veronika, Debrecen: Hungarian Society for the Study of English, 2011, pp. 296–301.

3. „Shakespeare Bollywoodban", *Filmszem*, II. évf. 4. szám (2012. december 21), *Shakespeare adaptációk*, pp. 5–13.

4. „'Brush up your Shakespeare': Genre-Shift from Shakespeare to the Screen", in *Reinventing the Renaissance: Shakespeare and his Contemporaries in Adaptation and Performance*, szerk. Sarah Annes Brown, Robert I. Lublin and Lynsey McCulloch, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 47–62.

5. „Postcolonial hybridity: The making of a Bollywood Lear in London", in *Shakespeare: Journal of the British Shakespeare Association*, Special Issue: Global Shakespeare. September 2013 (volume 9, number 3, 2013), pp. 304-12. DOI: 10.1080/17450918.2013.816350

6. „Lear királyné száriban – *Life Goes On*", in *Ki merre tart? Shakespeare Szegeden 2007–2011*, szerk. Kiss Attila Atilla és Matuska Ágnes, Jate Press, Szeged, 2013, pp. 179–92.

7. „Irodalmi adaptációk – Shakespeare, a legitim szerző és pop-kulturális ikon", in *Filmszem*, IV. évf. 1. szám (2014. március), *Irodalom a vásznon*, pp. 37–47.

8. „Mirroring *Othello* in genre films: *A Double Life* and *Stage Beauty*" in *Shakespeare on Screen: Othello*, szerk. Sarah Hatchuel és Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 177-194. ISBN: 9781107109735

9. "From Cycles to Series—Shakespeare's History Plays Adapted to the Small Screen", *Focus: Papers in English Literary and Cultural Studies*, 2014, pp. 84-96.

10. "Serial Shakespeare – The Case of *Star-Crossed*." *Between* [Online], 6.11 (2016): n. pag. (22 pages). http://ojs.unica.it/index.php/between/article/view/2073.

11. "Popular Media and the Future of the Shakespearean Canon", in *Hradec Králové Journal of Anglophone Studies*, Vol. 3:2 (2016), volume editors: Kinga Földváry, Anthony R. Guneratne, Bohuslav Mánek, Jan Suk, pp. 55-62.

12. "Ghost Towns and Alien Planets: Variations on Prospero's Island", in *Shakespeare on Screen: The Tempest and Late Romances*, szerk. Sarah Hatchuel és Nathalie Vienne-

Guerrin, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017, pp. 251-68. ISBN: 978-1107113503

13. „Élet és/vagy halál? Megváltozott befejezések Shakespeare-adaptációkban", in *Élet és halál Shakespeare életművében: 400 éves jubileum*, szerk. Almási Zsolt, Fabiny Tibor, Pikli Natália, Budapest: Reciti Kiadó, 2017. *pp. 159-172.*

14. „Áltörténelmi ál-Shakespeare adaptáció: Jancsó Miklós: A zsarnok szíve, avagy Boccaccio Magyarországon", in *Built Upon His Rock - Kősziklára építve: Festschrift Dávidházi Péter 70. születésnapjára*, szerk. Panka Dániel, Pikli Natália, Ruttkay Veronika, Budapest: ELTE BTK Angol-Amerikai Intézet, Anglisztika Tanszék, 2018, pp. 113–119. ISBN: 978-963-284-944-7

15. „Localizing a Global Myth: Contemporary Film Adaptations of *King Lear*", in *Local and Global Myths in Shakespearean Performance*, szerk. Aneta Mancevicz and Alexa Alice Joubin, Reproducing Shakespeare sorozat, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 213-27, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-89851-3

16. '*The Tyrant's Heart*: Hungarian pseudo-history in a pseudo-Shakespearean adaptation', *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance*, 11:2 (2018), pp. 153–64, doi: 10.1386/jafp.11.2.153_1

17. „Trendy or topical? Sexual politics and panopticism in the 2016 BBC Midsummer Night's Dream", in *Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Journal of English Renaissance Studies*, 2019 Vol. 99(1) 137–146, online megjelenés: 11 April 2019, DOI: 10.1177/0184767819835553.

18. „Fragmented Shakespeare in SF TV: The Case of *Westworld*", *Foundation: The International Review of Science Fiction*, Vol. 48:3, number 134, 2019, special issue: Winter's Tales: Shakespeare and Science Fiction, pp. 8–18.

Notes

[1] Esp. E. Buscombe, 'The Idea of Genre in the American Cinema', *Screen*, 11:2 (1970), 33–45.

[2] S. Neale, *Genre* (London: British Film Institute, 1980); S. Neale, *Genre and Hollywood* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

[3] R. Altman, 'A Semantic/Syntactic Approach to Film Genre', *Cinema Journal*, 23:3 (1984), 6–18.

[4] R. Altman, *Film/Genre* (London: British Film Institute, 1999).

[5] E.g. P. Young, 'Film Genre Theory and Contemporary Media: Description, Interpretation, Intermediality', in R. Kolker (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Film and Media Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 224–59.

[6] Cf. W. Uricchio, 'The Algorithmic Turn: Photosynth, Augmented Reality and the Changing Implications of the Image', *Visual Studies*, 26:1 (2011), 25–35.

[7] Cf. J. Steiger, 'Hybrid or Inbred: The Purity Hypothesis and Hollywood Genre History', in B. K. Grant (ed.), *Film Genre Reader IV* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2012), pp. 203–17.

[8] J. Derrida, 'The Law of Genre', trans. A. Ronell, *Critical Inquiry*, 7:1, Special Issue: *On Narrative* (1980), 55–81, 59.

[9] G. Deleuze and F. Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).

[10] D. Lanier, 'Shakespearean Rhizomatics: Adaptation, Ethics, Value', in A. Huang and E. Rivlin (eds), *Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 21–40, p. 31.

[11] D. M. Lanier, 'Post-Textual Shakespeare', in P. Holland (ed.), *Shakespeare Survey*, vol. 64: *Shakespeare as Cultural Catalyst* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 145–62, p. 145.