

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

RUSSELL JACKSON

## Introduction: Shakespeare, films and the marketplace

The romantic comedy *Shakespeare in Love* (1998) wittily puts the dramatist into the world of show business. Shakespeare's relationship with the theatre manager, Henslowe – and through him with 'the money' – is the occasion for a multitude of jokes referring to the entertainment industry of late sixteenth-century London in terms of its equivalent four hundred years later. In one moment of crisis Henslowe is even on the point of giving birth to a great cliché. 'The show must . . .' he starts, and Shakespeare completes the phrase by urging him impatiently to 'Go on.' The moment passes, unnoticed by either of them. The tension between the artist and the marketplace has always been a good source of humour in drama and fiction and on film, and the story is usually told in terms of the crassness of the producers and the crushed idealism of the 'creative' department. This is true to the experience of many artists, not least those writers and directors who worked in Hollywood at the height of the studios' powers. Writers and directors have often given accounts of their dealings with the 'front office' in which the latter's functionaries figure as craven, sentimental and reactionary, a characterisation many in the industry would of course dispute.<sup>1</sup>

On a less personal and anecdotal level, analysts of culture are reluctant to allow that commercial films can be effectively radical. In his study of the cultural politics of Shakespearean interpretation, *Big-Time Shakespeare* (1996), Michael Bristol ruefully observes that 'the cultural authority of corporate Shakespeare has nothing to do with ideas of any description'. Perhaps one might argue that if 'ideas' are defined less restrictively, the tension between 'Shakespeare', ideas and big business has yielded an engaging variety of cinematic results.<sup>2</sup>

The chapters in this *Companion* reflect the variety of ways in which Shakespeare's unique status – both as a complex of poetic and theatrical materials and a cultural icon – has been married to the equally complex phenomenon of the cinema. Shakespearean films are discussed in this volume from different points of view and in different contexts: as reflections of the business and craft of film-making; in terms of cinematic and theatrical genres; as the work of particular

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

RUSSELL JACKSON

directors; and in relation to wider issues of cultural politics. Themselves part of the history of the reception of Shakespeare's plays, the films also have a significance in any account of the aims and effects of the cinema.

In fact the number of films made from Shakespeare's plays is relatively small, although the 'Shakespeare factor' in cinema has been enhanced by the numerous 'offshoots' – films, like *Shakespeare in Love*, that draw on Shakespearean material without claiming to perform any one of the plays. In the first century of moving pictures, Shakespeare's plays played an honourable but hardly dominant role in the development of the medium. Some forty sound films have been made of Shakespearean plays to date, but it has been estimated that during the 'silent' era – before synchronised dialogue complicated the business of adapting poetic drama for the screen – there were more than 400 films on Shakespearean subjects. These took their place in an international market unrestricted by considerations of language and (consequently) untroubled by the relatively archaic dialogue of the originals. Like the films of other 'classics', they conferred respectability on their makers and distributors, while providing an easily transportable rival to the pictorial, melodramatic mode of popular theatre. As a working definition of the 'classic' in this context, it is hard to better that provided by an American trade paper, the *Nickelodeon*, in 1911:

'Classic' is here used in a rather loose and unrestricted sense, as it generally is used by adherents of the photoplay, meaning vaguely a kind of piece that is laid in a bygone era and one which aims to evoke some kind of poetic and idealistic illusion differing from that illusion of mere reality with which photoplays are ordinarily concerned. 'Costume play,' 'historical piece,' 'poetic drama,' variously convey a similar idea.

The story will be familiar and drawn from fiction, poetry, drama, history or the Bible, and such 'photoplays' will be costly, requiring 'an expensive outlay of costumes and scenic effects' and 'deep and careful research into the manners and customs of the era depicted'. Above all they call for a 'producer' with 'the eye of an artist and the mind of a poet'.<sup>3</sup> When this was written Shakespeare was more firmly embedded in popular culture than he is some nine decades later. The plays (or at least a few of them), heavily adapted to accommodate lavish realistic staging and show off the star actors' performances in leading roles, were a staple of actor-managers' theatre. Painters in the persistently popular narrative mode could confidently exhibit and sell works based on favourite characters, scenes and situations, and illustrated editions of the *Works* had their place on family bookshelves. At the same time a more earnest, less richly upholstered Shakespearean experience could be found in the touring activities of idealistic companies such as those of F. R. Benson and Ben Greet, or in the many annotated and more or less scholastic editions marketed for the general reader and the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## Introduction

schoolroom. Many silent Shakespeare films claim either to replicate or at least represent stage performances: such are the fragment showing Sir Herbert Beerbohm-Tree in *King John* and the 1911 film of F. R. Benson's company on stage at Stratford-upon-Avon in scenes from *Richard III*.<sup>4</sup> Some films either emulate theatrical values while offering more convincing (or at least more portable) equivalents of stage productions, or combine both aims with a more sensitive use of the new medium: subtler acting and the use of locations in the 1913 British *Hamlet*, with Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson, offer a case in point. Perhaps the decisive moment in the development of Shakespeare films is reached when film-makers cease to rely on the audience's prior knowledge of plays (or even specific performances) or such extra-filmic devices as a narrator or lecturer. Luke McKernan suggests 1916 as a watershed year, citing the production of a *King Lear* (produced by Edwin Thanhouser) and a lost *Macbeth*, both made in the USA.<sup>5</sup> This increased confidence may also be reflected in the greater freedoms taken by a group of German-produced films which combine Shakespearean material with elements not to be found in the plays: Svend Gade's remarkable *Hamlet* of 1920, Dmitri Buchowetski's *Othello* (1922) with Emil Jannings and Werner Krauss and Peter Paul Felner's version of *The Merchant of Venice* (1923).<sup>6</sup>

Nevertheless, Shakespearean films and other 'classics' were hardly a staple of the new and burgeoning cinema business: it was comedy, melodrama, the Western and the exotic historical romance that were regarded as bankable. By the 1920s the making and selling of films entailed increasingly high outlays and correspondingly high risks, and there was already an 'undeclared' trade war between the United States and Europe.<sup>7</sup> It was their prestige value or the power of a particular personality that recommended Shakespearean projects to film companies, or at least overcame their reluctance. None of the first wave of Shakespearean sound films was a financial success. The 1935 Warner Brothers' *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was announced as inaugurating a series to be made with its distinguished co-director, Max Reinhardt, but after its failure at the box-office nothing came of these plans. The opulent *Romeo and Juliet* directed by George Cukor and produced by Irving Thalberg at MGM was an expensive showcase for Thalberg's wife, Norma Shearer. Paul Czinner's British production of *As You Like It*, starring Elisabeth Bergner and Laurence Olivier, with sets by Oliver Messel and music by William Walton, was no more of a success, for all its lavish production values. Olivier's wartime *Henry V*, released in 1944, came as an early glimmer of one of the false dawns that recur in the history of the British film industry's presence in the worldwide market. The appeal of classic material performed by British (and therefore 'authentic') talent was undoubtedly overestimated. The same director's *Hamlet* (1948) was a successful 'prestige' undertaking for the producer J. Arthur Rank, but after *Richard*

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

RUSSELL JACKSON

*III* in 1956 the proposed *Macbeth* was stopped in its tracks by Rank's accountants.<sup>8</sup> Roger Manvell, reviewing *Hamlet* on its appearance, summed up the limitations of a film that – like many others of the time – might well be a *succès d'estime*, but would never make good money outside Britain (and perhaps not even there):

Like other major British pictures, this film to a certain extent labours under the weight of a calculated technique, and so loses the heart and the sweat of passionate feeling. Months of planning become too evident; everything seems too meticulous. Nevertheless, there is a nobility in the production, a desire to give everything that the studio can muster to make Shakespeare effective on the screen at a cost of half a million pounds.<sup>9</sup>

Less earnest, less self-consciously 'classic' Shakespeare films might stand a chance, but it would be a decade before they arrived.

The breakthrough seemed to come with Franco Zeffirelli's *The Taming of the Shrew* (1966) and *Romeo and Juliet* (1968). Shakespeare was established in the context of popular international cinema and potentially impressive profit: in the USA alone *Romeo and Juliet* earned fourteen times its negative costs. (One yardstick of box-office success is that a film should make at least two-and-a-half times the cost of making the master negative.)<sup>10</sup> The success of Kenneth Branagh's modestly financed *Henry V* (\$5m. negative cost) in 1989 appears to have inaugurated a new wave of confidence in Shakespearean projects, enhanced by the same director's *Much Ado About Nothing* (1994), which cost only \$8m. to make and grossed over \$22m. in the USA on its initial theatrical release. The films following immediately in the wake of these two seem not to have fared so well. Branagh's four-hour, full-length *Hamlet*, made for \$18m., earned little more than \$4.4m. in its first release in the US domestic market, which remains a crude but reliable index of the financial fortunes of English-language films. (Zeffirelli's 1991 *Hamlet* grossed approximately \$20.7m.)<sup>11</sup> By June 1999 *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (directed by Michael Hoffman) and an 'offshoot' of *The Taming of the Shrew* (*Ten Things I Hate About You*) had recently been released, and a number of other feature-film versions of Shakespeare were either about to be released (Kenneth Branagh's musical version of *Love's Labour's Lost*) or in post-production (*Titus Andronicus* and a *Hamlet* set in modern-day New York). Branagh had also announced his intention of filming *Macbeth* and *As You Like It* in the near future.

The general wisdom – or fervent hope – of 1999 seemed to be that the phenomenal successes of Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet* (1996) and John Madden's romantic comedy *Shakespeare in Love* (1998) would enhance audience interest in the works of the playwright. In May 1999, Fox Searchlight, the distributors of Hoffman's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, were reported to be targeting

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## Introduction

'mature females' in its initial US theatrical release, hoping that their own 'romantic comedy' would benefit from that audience's lack of interest in the much-hyped *Star Wars* 'prequel'.<sup>12</sup> What is always hoped for though is the all-important shift from one section of the market to another, the crossover that can move a Shakespeare film out of the 'niche' or (worse) art-house sector. If a project has cost relatively little to produce (as has been the case with most Shakespeare films) but turns out to have the broad appeal that justifies increased distribution, the investors have been blessed with good fortune. Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet*, with its youth appeal and Leonardo DiCaprio as Romeo, must have seemed like a winner from an early stage. Although its budget was a relatively modest \$14.5m., it was given the 'wide' opening regularly employed with much bigger films: the distributors opened it on 1,276 screens in the USA, grossing over \$11m. in the first weekend. (In the same season Branagh's *Hamlet* opened on three screens initially, and made only \$148,000 in its first weekend, although more cinemas showed it and more money was made in subsequent weeks.) If the money spent on a film has been commensurate with even a modest degree of box-office success – over \$10m., say – and it still remains stubbornly in its niche, no one will be made rich by it, but nor will they be surprised. The sums quoted above should be put in the perspective of the really big earners and spenders: setting aside really 'high concept' and 'summer blockbuster' films, a popular comedy might reach nine figures on its first release (*Mrs Doubtfire*, \$219,195,051) and an earnest, 'quality' drama can edge into the same league (*Schindler's List*, \$96,060,353). Revenue from video rentals and sales may provide some comfort – Shakespeare films have a long shelf-life at least in the educational market – but the better part of these profits is often mortgaged in advance to pay for the making of a low-to-middle budget film.<sup>13</sup>

Some unusual angle on the material, and attractive or quirky casting – usually combining Hollywood stars with actors of recognised 'classical' theatre background – seem indispensable for an acceptable degree of success with Shakespeare in the popular cinema. But modest budgets do bring with them a welcome freedom from the industry's grosser absurdities and constraints. As one American actor remarked to me while working on a Shakespeare film, 'It's nice to know that no one in an office somewhere is going to say, "Hey, this is boring. Let's blow up a building."' At the same time, these films (like any others) are likely to be dependent on international funding, and consequently answerable to the suggestions, if not diktats, of producers with an eye on the US market. The 'independent' distributors in Hollywood, such as Miramax, invest mainly in relatively low-budget films, often made outside the USA. The movies are typified by their 'attention to theme, character relationships and social relevance' and targeted at a market somewhere between the art-house and the 'mainstream'. They set themselves apart from the simplifications and marketing orientation of the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

RUSSELL JACKSON

'high concept' film.<sup>14</sup> Release on video provides one element of a film's revenue, but it is the initial theatrical release in the USA – the attraction of a large cinema-going audience, often on the first weekend – that is usually taken as indicative of a film's financial success. The situation is not necessarily or indeed usually one of conflict between writers or directors and dollar-hungry 'suits': the makers of films want to have their work seen by as many people as possible, and the producers may have artistically valid suggestions to make. However, given William Goldmann's adage that in Hollywood 'NOBODY KNOWS ANYTHING', it is really one informed guess that is being pitted against another.<sup>15</sup> Compromise in the direction of sentimentality (especially in the ending) and characterisation (only certain kinds of complexity being thought acceptable at a given time) can entail a film's being refashioned to an overall pattern known to find favour. 'Buddy' movies, tales of personal triumph over adversity and heart-warming celebrations of a vaguely defined sense of communality, are more likely than searching analysis of any kind.

Participation in the marketplace entails a degree of compromise with what the potential purchaser is known to want. Definitions of the viable commercial film have usually been in terms of character, story and duration: attractive, interesting people will encounter difficulties and overcome them, probably making allies and fending off adversaries, and take something less than two hours to do so. Although the gurus of mainstream screenplay-writing vary in their recommended strategies, there is general agreement that what sell best in the USA (and consequently in most markets worldwide) are stories containing ideas rather than ideas turned into stories.<sup>16</sup> Shakespeare films – even of the tragedies – are not immune to the cruder Hollywood imperatives. The title character – a producer – in Robert Altman's satire *The Player* (1992) provides a list: 'Certain elements we need to market a film successfully . . . Suspense, laughter, violence, hope, heart, nudity, sex, happy endings – mainly happy endings.' In the academic study of Shakespeare happy endings, together with anything else that might smooth the path of the plays' characters, have long been out of favour. (So that Branagh's *Much Ado*, for example, consigns its characters to happiness more readily than most recent critical readings or stage productions of the play have done.) Moreover, dramatic 'character', constructed on a psychologising basis in the manner of Stanislavsky and his heirs, has been treated with suspicion as an unhistorical imposition from the popular theatre and cinema. Publicity statements about characters and their 'journey' through the play/film tend to be cast in terms of modern self-improvement literature. Michele Pfeiffer, for example, observes in a note to the script of Michael Hoffman's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1999) that Titania's affair with Oberon is 'somewhat tempestuous', and that 'a relationship with Bottom is very liberating in its simplicity' – an analysis innocent (like the film itself) of the darker imaginings that have haunted academic criticism

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## Introduction

and many stage productions at least since 1964, when the English translation of Jan Kott's *Shakespeare our Contemporary* was published.<sup>17</sup> Even when the writer of a Shakespearean screenplay is not being threatened by the front office with the formulas of plot and characterisation prized by Hollywood and its leading players (both actors and producers), he or she is more likely to be constructing than deconstructing.

It is in advertising that the Shakespeare film is likely to present itself most stridently in terms of the broadest attractions. Publicists (over whom the director usually has limited influence) have often striven to depict Shakespearean films as products of a familiar – and therefore welcome – kind. Thus, the campaign book for the 1956 British release of Orson Welles's *Othello* includes these proposals for advertising headlines:

THE MIGHTY STORY OF THE TRAGIC MOOR  
RECREATED BY ORSON WELLES IN ALL ITS SPLENDOUR!  
THE STORY OF LOVE . . . OF ONE WHO LOVED NOT WISELY BUT TOO  
WELL!  
SPECTACULAR DRAMA OF JEALOUSY . . . MURDER . . . RETRIBUTION!  
POWERFUL . . . MAGNIFICENT . . . ELECTRIFYING . . . SPELLBINDER!  
BRILLIANT . . . FABULOUS . . . DRAMATIC SENSATION

In a similar vein, and printing selected words from the reviews in extra large type, a flyer for the British release of Richard Loncraine and Ian McKellen's *Richard III* in 1996 promised an 'EXCITING . . . ADVENTUROUS . . . THRILLER' (a description not far removed from its makers' aims).

The tactics adopted for an appeal to a more sophisticated audience are subtler. In 1935 the US campaign book for Max Reinhardt's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* offered a strategy 'designed exclusively for premiere engagements' suggesting ways in which the film could be turned into a social and cultural event: 'The exploitation of THE DREAM should follow the same unflinching Reinhardt formula. Get the best people interested. Socialites and cultural leaders gladly lend the prestige of their names to promote Reinhardt and Shakespeare.'

Cinema managers were urged to 'SELL ENTERTAINMENT by direct advertising and publicity. SELL CULTURE by under-cover propaganda, personal sales work and indirect and inferential advertising and publicity.' The British publicity office also made much of the star-power of the film and its lavish production values, and urged the headlining of Reinhardt and Shakespeare, 'the greatest money-names of the theatre'. This theatrical pedigree was duly emphasised in the advertising together with the listing of the stars and the usual disclosure of behind-the-scenes facts ('More than 600,000 yards of cellophane were used for the ballets; Titania's train required 90,000 yards of gossamer strands alone').<sup>18</sup>

Similar material, with varying degrees of stridency, could be cited for most of

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

RUSSELL JACKSON

the Shakespearean films. The sums invested are relatively small and, as with distribution, no great outlay is hazarded unless a film looks as though it might ‘cross over’. These are films that it is hard to label as sequels (no one has yet attempted a *Wars of the Roses* sequence of feature films) or to advertise in the terms used for *Lethal Weapon IV* on its British release in 1998: ‘The faces you love, the action you expect.’ At different stages in its progress from preparation to studio floor, and through post-production to its audience, a film has to be presented to a succession of potential buyers: first to the major distributors, then by them to the distributors in different territories, who in turn must sell it to their own clients, the exhibitors. The promotional films used for this then give way to trailers for theatrical use, which are put together from available footage by editors and directors who have no connection with the original work. Direct reference is less likely to be made now than in the 1930s to the high cultural status of Shakespeare or of the period the film is set in. The identity of the principal actors and the scale of the production are usually the main selling points. Love interest (or sex) and action may be emphasised, and the film’s director may even have to argue strongly for the exclusion of particular images or scenes that would take away the element of surprise when the movie itself is shown.

Films made from Shakespeare’s plays exist at a meeting-point between conflicting cultural assumptions, rival theories and practices of performance, and – at the most basic level – the uneasy and overlapping systems of theatre and cinema. As Manfred Pfister points out in *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*, film partakes of the nature of narrative as well as dramatic texts.<sup>19</sup> Beyond this, the dramatic form of the originals favours metadramatic devices, makes use of techniques akin to (and absorbed in) post-Brechtian ‘alienation’, and returns theatre to a presentational mode that predates most of the sophisticated literary narratives that cinema emulates. There will always be a conflict of techniques as well as of value systems when these Renaissance plays form the pretext for movies.

The relationship between Shakespearean films aimed at the mass market and the academic study of the plays has always been tense. In the early decades of the century, film-makers anticipated the accusation of desecrating what were routinely treated as secular scriptures. More recently, the interrogation of the cultural functions of the plays themselves and their interpretation has resulted in some directors being taken to task for harnessing one hegemony (Shakespeare as a figurehead of conservative anglocentric culture) to another (international big business). An academic disinclination to celebrate harmonies and resolutions has made the unifying efforts of mainstream cinema suspect and stimulated sympathy for the determinedly *avant-garde*. To this can be joined the long-established distrust of the cultural politics of mass entertainment films as



## Introduction

powerful generators of false consciousness. This suspicion extends in some cases into a fundamental suspicion of the medium itself: Walter Benjamin's indictment of the film as a factor in 'distraction' of the viewer has been particularly influential.<sup>20</sup> But deconstruction or other forms of refusal to accept complicity are not likely to result in traffic jams in the multiplex car park or substantial underwriting from the producers. Consequently, many commentators have favoured the Shakespearean films of such directors as Derek Jarman (*The Tempest*, 1979) or Christine Edzard (*As You Like It*, 1992), who have refused to make commercial success a priority. Orson Welles's problematic relationship with the established formulas of filming and the business practices of the industry has resulted in his being posthumously recruited as an early postmodernist. Kenneth Branagh's whole-hearted participation in the marketplace has probably contributed to a tendency for his films to be discussed in terms of their cultural politics as much as (or rather than) according to any technical or aesthetic measure. Alternative sources of finance, often including government grants (in Europe but not in the USA) or co-production deals with television 'arts' producers, have supported such projects as *Prospero's Books* (1991) by a director (Peter Greenaway) who professes no interest in the popular cinema. There is also an 'alternative' world of Shakespeare on film beyond even the art-houses, inhabited by what Richard Burt identifies as 'queer' Shakespeare.<sup>21</sup>

For better or worse, Shakespearean films continue to appear in the multiplexes and on the shelves of the video stores. Since the early 1980s the revolution in home video has made most (if not all) of the sound-era Shakespeare films widely available, not least to the scholars who used to hunt down showings in film clubs and revival houses, or arrange to watch them in the study rooms of libraries and archives.

It is probably as much of a mistake to ask whether 'film' can do justice to 'Shakespeare' as to reproach 'Shakespeare' with being inappropriate material for 'film'. Neither are stable entities, reducible to a simple set of definitions, but two bundles of techniques and opportunities that may be mixed together with more or less enjoyable and impressive results. We can no more pronounce that *Hamlet* (for example) essentially means one thing or another, and that a particular film fails to capture this quality, than we can object that Shakespearean drama jeopardises essentially filmic virtues. Nor are 'film' and 'Shakespeare' the same in every 'territory' mapped out by distributors. Moreover, a director, actor or film might be ignored in one country and revered in another, just as a play may have a resonance in (say) Russia, that it lacks elsewhere. On the other hand, we can identify the intentions of writers and directors or the behaviour of larger groups (production companies, their publicists, audiences) by reference to the texts they started from and the congruence of the results with interpretations in circulation when the film was made. The audiences appealed to or implied in the films are

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-63975-0 - The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film

Edited by Russell Jackson

Excerpt

[More information](#)

RUSSELL JACKSON

an important object of study, but the same arguments turn up in widely different social and political contexts. Few would argue with a director who declares ‘If you’re making a Shakespeare film for a contemporary audience, you have to make sure that they don’t get bored.’ Many would have echoed the anxiety of a prospective producer offered a *Merchant of Venice* project: ‘It is impossible to use Shakespeare’s exact words in a film that will be two hours long. It is ridiculous and absurd and will at best end up as nothing but a literary experiment. Such experiments are impossible now, when we can make at best only forty-two films a year.’ The first of these statements is by Richard Loncraine, co-director of a *Richard III* set in the context of 1930s fascism, and the second by Dr Josef Goebbels, responding in 1944 to a proposal by the director Veit Harlan.<sup>22</sup>

The producers and directors of Shakespeare films – like any others – gamble on their sense of what the viewing public is used to, and what (all being well) it will find a welcome surprise. This is as true of the varieties of ‘alternative’ cinema as of the mainstream. There will always be movies that address their audience by saying ‘You thought Shakespeare was like this – well, he is and we’ve captured it on film.’ There are also, at the end of cinema’s first century, plenty that say ‘You didn’t think Shakespeare could be like this, did you?’

## NOTES

- 1 On the business of Hollywood in the ‘classic’ period, see Thomas Cripps, *Hollywood’s High Noon. Moviemaking and Society before Television* (Baltimore, 1997), which includes an invaluable ‘Bibliographical Essay’. An incisive recent account of the screenwriter’s way of life is John Gregory Dunne, *Monster. Living off the Big Screen* (New York, 1997). Tom Dardis’s *Some Time in the Sun* (New York, 1976) deals with the ‘Hollywood years’ of Fitzgerald, Faulkner, Huxley and other authors.
- 2 Michael Bristol, *Big-Time Shakespeare* (London, 1996), p. 101. The context is a discussion of the reception of Kenneth Branagh’s *Henry V*. See also Barbara Hodgdon, *The Shakespeare Trade. Performances and Appropriations* (Philadelphia, 1998).
- 3 Quoted by William Uricchio and Roberta E. Pearson, *Reframing Culture, the Case of the Vitagraph Quality Films* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1993), p. 50. See also the works by Robert Hamilton Ball and John Collick listed in ‘Further reading’, pp. 314–17 below.
- 4 In 1999 The British Film Institute released *Silent Shakespeare*, a video transfer of eight early films in its collection. See below, ‘Filmography’, p. 318.
- 5 Luke McKernan and Olwen Terris, eds., *Walking Shadows. Shakespeare in the National Film and Television Archive* (London, 1994), p. 5.
- 6 Gade’s *Hamlet* has been widely discussed: see Ann Thompson’s essay in Lynda E. Boose and Richard Burt, eds., *Shakespeare, the Movie. Popularising the Plays on Film, TV and Video* (London, 1998), and J. Lawrence Guntner’s chapter below. On the other films the best sources are Robert Hamilton Ball, *Shakespeare on Silent Film* (London, 1986) and the notes in Kenneth S. Rothwell and Annabelle Henkin Melzer’s *Shakespeare on Screen: an International Filmography and Videography* (London, 1990). *Othello* is currently available on video in a badly hacked version (at least thirty