

William Leahy

### “Exit Pursued by a Zombie”: The Vampire We Desire, the Shakespeare We Reject

The novel *Shakespeare Undead*, written by Lori Handeland and published in 2010, is a rather extraordinary literary mash-up which reconfigures the plot of the hugely successful film *Shakespeare in Love*—with one major difference. That difference is quite profound, however, as Shakespeare appears as a vampire in an early modern London bedevilled by zombies intent on killing him. Shakespeare is helped in his battle against the rampaging mob of zombies by the cross-dressing Kate, who, it turns out, is a *chasseur*, a hunter of zombies. Kate and Will act out the scenario first realized in the film, as she (dressed as a boy *à la* Gwyneth Paltrow) inspires him to overcome his writer’s block and a Romeo and Juliet story is subsequently played out between them, albeit surrounded as they are by brain-devouring and undead monsters. Handeland’s novel is not exactly part of the burgeoning genre of recent classics re-written as novels inhabited by zombies and vampires (mash-ups) such as *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (Austen and Grahame-Smith), *Alice in ZombieLand* (Carroll and Cook), and *Jane Slayre* (Brontë and Erwin), but could quite easily have been entitled *Shakespeare in Love with Zombies*. It is a sign of the success of this new genre that Handeland herself has written a follow up, a mashed-up version of the *Tempest*, appropriately called *Zombie Island*. As in the film, the Shakespeare presented to the reader in *Shakespeare Undead* is a highly romanticised characterisation of the author: dashing, handsome, eroticised, and highly individual. This is no surprise, given that generally speaking, this is the *version* of Shakespeare that our culture has inherited from the Romantics and is one we seem loath to dispense with. Indeed, it is a sign of the seductive power of the romantic *Weltanschauung* that we remain so transfixed by such a version of Shakespeare in this post-romantic age.

In the novel, the zombies, perhaps more than anything else, reveal this romantic construction of Shakespeare in their otherness to that which the character represents (both inside and outside of the text), for the zombies are (as is generally the case in this genre) an “implacable army of primitive, unreasoning humans, set on destroying civilization and turning all ‘normal’ people into sub-humans such as themselves” (Paffenroth 19). Shakespeare is the opposite of this: refined, civilised, reasoning, and with a wish to civilise and educate humanity through his writings. The zombies are literally brainless, and are as such the other of Shakespeare’s genius. This conflict reveals not just the romantically constructed nature of Shakespeare in the novel, however. It also points toward an understanding of the ways in which our culture desires a certain version of Shakespeare and in the very same moment denies a different, equally valid version that is anything but romantic. Furthermore, it points to an understanding of the reasons for a rejection of a whole field of study which posits this de-romanticised Shakespeare as a more accurate portrayal of the world’s greatest writer.

The first meeting of Will and Kate in *Shakespeare Undead* turns out quite badly for Will; or so at first it seems. Kate, disguised as a boy/man, is roaming early modern London hunting and killing zombies in her role as *chasseur*. In one of her battles with the zombies, in the dark of night she inadvertently ‘kills’ Shakespeare, “slicing Will’s neck from ear to ear” (16). Kate has no idea at this point who she has killed, nor that Will cannot in fact be killed as he is one of the undead, a vampire. Will recovers after Kate has departed, only to be confronted by more zombies whom he fights alone until, sometime later, Kate returns to help him despatch them. After a scene filled with confusion, misunderstanding, and the first signs of sexual attraction (that is, a quintessentially Shakespearean scene), Kate and Will part, she wondering how he could still be alive and he wondering who this attractive young boy who spends his time killing zombies could be. In this scene we also witness the first signs of the romantic and (homo) eroticised portrayal of Shakespeare: “The moon came free of the clouds, canting across the lad’s face, and Will’s breath went sharp and hot in his chest. He was so damn beautiful. *Mine eye hath played the painter and hath stilled thy beauty’s forming table of my heart; my body is—* Will forced himself to stop” (32-33). And similarly, from Kate’s point of view: “Mouth gentle, he teased his tongue along the seam of my lips then swirled it within. Shocked, I gasped, and my bound breasts brushed his chest, catching fire despite how they itched from the bonds” (38).

While this scene neatly plays with the homoeroticism apparent in the sonnets and some of the plays (a theme continued through much of the novel), it is also the first instance of Shakespeare meeting his muse; of his being inspired in a paradigmatically romantic fashion to become creative through the feelings produced by this encounter. This also demonstrates the way in which the novel is in its turn inspired by *Shakespeare in Love*, as (like the film) before this meeting Will had been struggling with his writing: “Because his writing of late was not writing at all. Of late, his writing was mostly staring” (5). As such, this is the first indication that the version of Shakespeare we are witnessing in this novel is a romanticised one in that inspiration is the foundation of creation/writing. This characterisation is fortified by Kate’s description of Will when she believes she has killed him: “Who had the man I’d just killed been? Distracted with thoughts of the handsome stranger—I hadn’t seen much, but what I’d seen had been quite lovely—” (18). Thus, Will begins to fit the romantic stereotype for the writer/artist; handsome, erotic, inspired, creative, bookish, reliant on feeling and imagination, and given his nature as a vampire, eternally marginalised and misunderstood—classic romantic traits. Furthermore, in what could be regarded as a typically Byronic form of romanticism, Shakespeare in this novel is *sexy*:

How could I resist a man who spoke words of saintly beauty through lips that tasted of sin? Or the way he looked at me, the way he touched me, the way he kissed me—Ah, the kisses. They were like brandy-wine—sweet and strong. Intoxicating. Addicting . . . His mouth was soft, the kiss quite hard, his hands at my waist so cool. (135)

For Kate he is irresistible: “One instant he was a dreamy-eyed writer spouting poetry to my dunshaded breasts, and the next he was a warrior, drawing a concealed weapon to release those breasts from captivity” (136). And for Kate he is manly: “He was all long legs and slim hips. Muscles rippled beneath my hands . . . Those muscles were as long and lean as the rest of him. He was much stronger than he looked, than he felt” (141). Handeland wittily combines these sexy/creative elements when she writes, “every time Kate came near, he couldn’t find a quill fast enough” (113).

For anybody aware of the portrayal of William Shakespeare in *Shakespeare in Love*, none of this comes as a surprise. This is true, despite the ways in which this description (and Joseph Fiennes’s appearance as Shakespeare in the film) hardly corresponds to the only reliable representation of Shakespeare in existence, the Droeshout engraving from the *First Folio*, an engraving which does not present us with a “handsome, dashing . . . Will” (150). What is surprising perhaps, or at least would have been surprising not so long ago, is that this is a portrayal not just of the world’s greatest writer, but of a *vampire*; traditionally, not only undead, but murderous, monstrous, and grotesque. The vampire presented to us here in the shape of Will Shakespeare is certainly undead, but he possesses none of these other traits. Indeed, he is the opposite of all of these, being noble, handsome, moral, and sexy. He is not Dracula then, he is something else, some other kind of vampire; but what kind of vampire is he, and how is this a believable representation of a literary descendant of the beast from Transylvania?

According to Milly Williamson, “[t]hroughout the twentieth century, the depiction of the vampire becomes increasingly sympathetic” and the “vampire genre shifts significantly in the mid-to-late twentieth century, with the vampire character, more often than not, acting as the narrator, or at least the narrative point of view” (28). Central to this shift away from fear of vampires to sympathy for them—what could be characterised as a shift from *Dracula* (1897) to *Twilight* (2005)—were the *Vampire Chronicles* novels of Ann Rice (1976+), films such as *Interview with the Vampire* (1991, based on one of Rice’s novels) and *The Lost Boys* (1987) and television series such as *Buffy The Vampire Slayer* (1997-2003) and its offshoot *Angel* (1999-2004). Williamson articulates this process: “Dracula no longer holds centre stage in the world of vampires. The twentieth century produced a new generation of morally ambiguous, sympathetic vampires who lure audiences with the pathos of their predicament and their painful awareness of outsiderdom” (29).<sup>1</sup> Williamson believes that this latest incarnation of the vampire has links to our culture’s view of the romantic persona of Lord Byron, to his status as “glamorous and rebellious outcast”, and to the “idea of a public that adores a famous figure of notorious repute” (30). Whatever the connection to the romantic poet, it is certainly true to say that the dominant vampire character of this particular cultural moment is a romanticised version: namely, Edward Cullen of the *Twilight* series of books and films (in which he is played by Robert Pattinson). Williamson interestingly quotes fans on this difference between Dracula and the Cullen-type of vampire, Dracula being generally regarded as “a monster,” as “mean and nasty,” as “a

villain” (59-60). Compare this to another fan commenting on the other kind of vampire: “I just absolutely loved him ... the romantic type ... you know he was a soulful creature” (57). This is the type of portrayal that we see of Edward Cullen in *Twilight*, and that of Will Shakespeare the vampire in *Shakespeare Undead*: soulful, dreamy, and romantic. Furthermore, this is precisely the portrayal we see of Shakespeare in *Shakespeare in Love*. Therefore, this construction of Shakespeare as the romantic Cullen-like vampire perfectly fits the already existing model our culture desires of Shakespeare the romantic author, the soulful creature who could produce works such as the *Sonnets*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Hamlet*. This is the sympathetic Shakespeare, Will of *the works*: the distracted, marginalized genius/author. But the suggestion that this is Will of the works assumes there is at least one other version of Shakespeare. In order to understand the nature of this other version, it is necessary first to contemplate the role of Will’s other in *Shakespeare Undead*: his enemies, the zombies.

As Boluk and Lenz point out, “[u]nlike the vampire or werewolf, the zombie does not have a long literary tradition preceding its emergence in film” (3). This in itself would make the zombies an interesting and apt other for Shakespeare in the novel, given the fact that he is regarded as the greatest writer who has ever existed and that his works are over 400 years old. In film, zombies do have some tradition, however, and those in the Handeland novel are an interesting bridge between “old school” and “new school” representations of zombies. They are old school in the sense that they are raised from the dead by a necromancer who then forces them to do his bidding. Such forms of zombies appeared in the first films of the genre, as in the 1932 classic, *White Zombie*. New school zombies, on the other hand, tend to be created by a biological virus of some kind and are thus not really undead at all, as in the 2002 film, *28 Days Later*. In *Shakespeare Undead* they are an interesting mixture: raised from the dead by a necromancer as in early representations, but mistakenly thought by the general population to be plague victims, more akin to contemporary representations. Whatever their constitution, they work effectively as the other of a romanticised and vampiric Shakespeare in ways articulated by Kim Paffenroth: “zombies carry a greater sense of dread because vampires and werewolves can be seen as desirable, potent, intelligent, virile creatures whom one might like—in some ways at least—to become; a mindless ghoul condemned to wander aimlessly across an empty, ruined earth seems much less attractive” (18).<sup>2</sup> This otherness works in a number of ways in the novel, not least in the sense that, in contrast to a human being who is regarded in our global culture as an inherently civilising force and as a special and unique individual, namely Shakespeare, “[z]ombies are the only humanoid threat that will bring about the end of civilisation by turning all of us into them” (18). Furthermore, zombies wish to make us literally brainless, whereas Shakespeare is regarded as one whose works will improve our intellect, will in essence enlarge our brain capacity. Shakespeare is a unique, extraordinary individual, in contrast to a zombie who is, as Paffenroth continues, “an animated, human corpse with way below human intelligence, coordination and speed” (24). Shakespeare is the very best of us; the zombie is us “in all our hungry, grasping, mindless simplicity” (24). Simply put, the zombie sensibility is the diametric opposite of the romantic sensibility, and within the text of the novel the zombie functions as the other of the romanticised vampire, Shakespeare. However, outside of the text, in our culture as a whole, this zombie sensibility does not function in this way with regard to Shakespeare. Rather, there exists an alternative version of Shakespeare himself that functions very much as this other of the mythical, romantic version.

One can go to just about any book on or about Shakespeare and find him characterised to a greater or lesser extent as a romanticised figure. In general, he exists as such in scholarly books about his life and his plays, in television documentaries, in films and in novels and plays covering aspects of his life and career. One finds the romanticised writer in most places one looks—for example, in novels such as *The Sonnets: A Novel*, by Warwick Collins: “I burnt my nightly hours as he [the Earl of Southampton] inferred, confined to my small room, bent over my formal rhythms, counting the beats on my fingers, feeling for that thread of sense which would hold together the discreet observations and soaring praises they would contain” (37). Or, again: “As I have found in the past, intense emotion sometimes drives the pen with a certain lucid force” (127). Such is also the case in *The Final Act of Mr Shakespeare* by Robert Winder: “He could not accurately have told anyone how he passed the next several hours. He was lost in his own creative reverie. In a rapid hand that skated across the white paper like a bird landing on water, he mapped out his scenery” (194). One can find him in scholarly books such as Jonathan Bate’s *The Genius of Shakespeare*, the title itself articulating

the romantic conceptualisation of the author. Indeed, Bate goes further than claiming Shakespeare was a genius when he claims that the “idea of the original genius emerged as a way of explaining the phenomenon of Shakespeare” (184). James Shapiro, in his recent *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare*, drops the word “genius” and replaces it with “imagination”; “As an aspiring actor, Shakespeare must have displayed a talent for imagining himself as any number of characters onstage. When he turned to writing, he demonstrated an even more powerful imaginative capacity, one that allowed him to create roles of such depth and complexity” (313). One finds him in films such as the aforementioned *Shakespeare in Love*, perhaps the apotheosis of this dominant cultural trend. However, it is true to say that this romantic conceptualisation of Shakespeare—the object of bardolatrous desire, perhaps best exemplified by Harold Bloom’s hyperbolic *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*—on the whole derives from his works *alone*. The plays and poems, heavily influenced by the readings of the romantic poets, themselves have been instrumental in constructing the romantic Shakespeare that dominates our culture and, as Marjorie Garber writes, “author[ize] a rhetoric of hero-worship” (129). This process has been most clearly articulated in the short, seminal essay “Bardolatry: or, The Cultural Materialist’s Guide to Stratford-upon-Avon,” by Graham Holderness, who believes that “bardolatry, the worship of Shakespeare” is constituted by “the liturgical properties of a religion” (3). This is summed up well by Warwick Collins when he writes in his “Afterword” that for him Shakespeare’s mind is “revealed to us most directly in the poems themselves” (255). This romantic conceptualization of the writer is all well and good, of course. But this portrayal, this dominant romanticised Shakespeare that enables him to be portrayed as a romantic vampire in *Shakespeare Undead*, is equally founded in a denial of another version, one founded in records rather than in plays and poems.

The romantic Shakespeare that dominates our global culture consists, Michel De Certeau would say, of his “narrated reality” (186), of iteration and reiteration, of, as I have written elsewhere, “the constant and continual saying and repeating that something is true, rather than in the actual object of truth itself” (120). The constant refrain, iterated and reiterated, is that the truth of Shakespeare, the truth of this author, lies in his works, in the words on the page, “in the poems themselves.” However, this refrain I would contend actually delivers the author we desire rather than the author as such (the “object of truth”). This undisturbed telling, this citing and reciting, constitutes the truth content of Shakespeare the single, romantic genius/author rather than anything “real.” However, of course this author Shakespeare existed not merely in literature (the works) but in reality and is recorded in all sorts of ways within this reality. Given this, the author we find in the works will always only be partial and only through consulting the records can we complete him *really*. The problem here however, is that in these records we do not find the romanticised Shakespeare of the works; in the records we find rather a Shakespeare different from that which appears in *Shakespeare Undead* not only in his being human rather than a vampire, but in him being a human of a very different kind from that romantic figure we think we know.

One step in examining this notion of the “real” author is to return to the Droeshout engraving. This is a depiction of a very ordinary and perhaps rather unattractive looking man—not the romantic hero we find described as dashing and erotic in films and in literature; certainly not Joseph Fiennes. And when we examine the records of Shakespeare’s life, generally speaking we find him deeply involved in business dealings and not in literary pursuits. Indeed, as Diana Price reminds us, the very first record in existence of “Willelmus Shackspere” in London in 1592, has him lending £7 to a certain John Clayton (15). Price reproduces a number of records of this type, which in many ways clarify for us what Will *of the records* actually spent his time doing. Thus, she relates how, in 1597 Shakespeare is listed as “owing taxes” in Shoreditch, London, and as purchasing “New Place, a big house, for at least £60” in Stratford-upon-Avon” (15-16). In 1598, he is “listed as owing taxes again, this time in Bishopsgate,” and in Stratford is “cited for hoarding grain during a famine” (16). In the same year he is again recorded “as a tax defaulter” and as receiving “ten pence for selling a load of stone” (16). In the following year, he becomes a shareholder in the Globe theater and in 1600 “takes action to recover his 1592 loan to John Clayton” (16). In 1602, he buys land and a cottage; in 1604 he “sells malt to Philip Rogers” and lends him two shillings. He then “sues Rogers to recover the amount owing plus damages” (17). In 1605 he “invests £440 in tithes” (17) and in 1608 he “sues a man named John Addenbrooke for a debt of £6 plus damages” (18). In 1614 he “is listed as a landowner in Stratford, and his name appears in a series of documents concerning the proposed pasture enclosures

in nearby Welcombe” (19). Finally, in 1616, “Lawyer Francis Collins draws up and witnesses Shakspeare’s last will, which makes detailed provisions for the distribution of real estate, clothes, silver, and other assets. Shakspeare’s wife is left ‘the second best bed’” (19). These are just some of the business dealings on record for Shakespeare, where we see him speculating, buying and selling property and such like. We find him constantly busy as a money-lender, and as very willing to go to court to claim any money lent that was not repaid on time and with interest. We find him as a tax evader and someone fined for hoarding grain. We find an encloser of land. We find a man who, it seems, left his wife and children for many years to spend his life in London. In short, we find not a glamorous rebel, not a soulful and distracted creature, not a figure of sympathy and admiration. Instead, we find the other of all of that, a rather pinched and selfish money-maker, a mean-spirited and petty litigant; an individual who could not in any way be constituted as *sympatisch*, never mind glamorous. We find not the Shakespeare we desire; we find the author we (wish to) reject.

The theoretical trajectory developed here is not one that seeks to “disintegrate” Shakespeare, as it were. It is not to suggest for one moment that the William Shakespeare recorded in those historical documents did not write the works traditionally attributed to him, as has been claimed by various books and films for many years. It is not to suggest that the works were written by someone with a more glamorous and rebellious reputation such as, for example, the 17<sup>th</sup> Earl of Oxford, Edward De Vere. Nor, for that matter, Christopher Marlowe. Rather, this is to suggest that we in fact have two authors in Shakespeare, *Will of the works* and *Will of the records*. In such a scenario, one can begin to understand how alternative authors of the De Vere type come to be suggested, given that his lifestyle seems more akin to that prompted by a consideration of the works of Shakespeare (and not the records). Indeed, the Shakespeare envisaged in *Shakespeare Undead* resembles De Vere of the records much more than it does Shakespeare of the records. And perhaps, as much as we wish to ridicule and dismiss such claims for alternative authors, it is in fact, as Andrew Bennett suggests, our culture’s attachment to the notion of the romantic author—and particularly to our addiction to the notion of Shakespeare as a romantic author—which gives rise to these claims. It is, in many senses, our rejection of the author who exists in the records that prompts a desire for an author who is reflected in his works, particularly in works that are so highly regarded. One could take this further in the sense that in many ways this rejection of Will of the records is the “Death of the Author” taken to its logical extreme. Or more, that what our culture participates in here is not so much the death of but rather the murder of the author. For our culture, the records “kill” the desired author and thus he must be reanimated—brought back to life by our necromantic power—using the works to do our business. The plays and poems kill off Will of the records and we are left with that cultural object of desire—the romantic Will of the works.

In various ways the scenario that is developed here is one that fits comfortably into the landscape prepared for us by Michel Foucault in his seminal essay, “What is an Author?” Foucault famously summoned Shakespeare to help him answer his question, and the consideration of the dual nature of the Bard in this current study helps us understand Foucault’s thoughts more readily. When contemplating the problematic nature of the author’s name, Foucault writes:

If I discover that Shakespeare was not born in the house that we visit today, this is a modification which, obviously, will not alter the functioning of the author’s name. But if we proved that Shakespeare did not write those sonnets which pass for his, that would constitute a significant change and affect the manner in which the author’s name functions. If we proved that Shakespeare wrote Bacon’s *Organon* by showing that the same author wrote both the works of Bacon and those of Shakespeare, that would be a . . . type of change which would entirely modify the functioning of the author’s name. The author’s name is not, therefore, just a proper name like the rest. (106)

For Foucault, the duality of the author’s name is apparent in the fact that the proper name (of the author) is different from the “author function” (of the author’s name); the former refers to the man (of the records) while the latter refers to the way that name functions in our culture (in Shakespeare’s case as “genius” and so on). And what Foucault alludes to, though he does not say it explicitly, is that it is the works of the (dead) author which determine the author function, and that in Shakespeare’s case these works have displaced or perhaps redefined the man: the author function has triumphed over the proper name. This does not mean the proper name is insignificant—indeed, Foucault would be interested to know that there is no evidence to suggest that Shakespeare was in fact born in the house that we visit today—merely that it is the author function that our culture constructs and determines and

which is, therefore, a constantly evolving and culture-specific entity. Its power is clear in Shakespeare's case, as the author function has come to determine what Shakespeare *is* for us—Will of the works rather than Will of the records.

Of course, one of Foucault's significant arguments in his essay is that one of the main constituents of the author function is its inherent drive to constrain interpretation, in its classificatory function. Foucault writes that such "a name permits one to group together a certain number of texts, define them, differentiate them from and contrast them to others. In addition, it establishes a relationship among the texts" (107). We can see this clearly where Shakespeare is concerned, in that the works are regarded as those of one, single and autonomous author. But interestingly for this current study, Foucault goes on to write:

the author . . . is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction. In fact, if we are accustomed to presenting the author as a genius, as a perpetual surging of invention, it is because, in reality, we make him function in exactly the opposite fashion. One can say that the author is an ideological product, since we represent him as the opposite of his historically real function . . . . The author is therefore the ideological figure by which one marks the manner in which we fear the proliferation of meaning. (119)

Returning directly to Shakespeare then, we can see that the author function operates by limiting the proliferation of meaning, thus determining the priority of one version of Shakespeare—the romanticised version—at the cost of the other, perhaps more real version of the proper name, Will of the records.

*Shakespeare Undead* is a work of generic fiction that attempts to meet the perceived demands of a young, modern, and not necessarily Shakespeare-literate readership. As such, it is perhaps not surprising that the version of Shakespeare that is delivered is this unified and romantic one. However, in its emphasis upon the centrality of otherness it unconsciously comments upon and helps to expose such dominant conceptualisations of the romantic author. Within the context of the genre, it would be possible—were there time and space—to perceive other interesting and related tensions here. For in rejecting a real Will of the records and desiring a mythical Will of the works, we could be said to be rejecting the original vampire Dracula—threatening, villainous, cruel, unromantic—and instead demonstrating a craving for Edward Cullen—handsome, unique, romantic, and safe. In this, we show ourselves to be hopelessly *and unthinkingly* in love with a mythical creature, the Sweet Swan of Avon, the romantic, mythical Shakespeare, much like Bella Swan is hopelessly in love with Edward Cullen in *Twilight*. The fact that she does love him so does not mean that evil vampires (and real Shakespeares) do not exist. Rather, it suggests that for an immature and impressionable teenage character to work in a believable fashion in a piece of generic fiction, a romantic and sympathetic love object is necessary. In a wider context, this would suggest that our culture's desire for a romantic and sympathetic Shakespeare similarly demonstrates immaturity and naivety. *Shakespeare Undead* unwittingly reveals all this—an inability to cope with the reality of Shakespeare as he appears in the historical records and an overwhelming desire for Shakespeare the author to resemble that which we construct from his works. The novel helps us understand the workings of the author function and shows how it provides us with a Shakespeare untouched by ambiguity and complexity. The author function does not provide us with the Shakespeare we deserve, exactly; rather, with the Shakespeare that will reassure us—even if that Shakespeare is undead.

William Leahy  
Brunel University

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Editor's note: See also Ananya Mukherjea's "My Vampire Boyfriend: Postfeminism, 'Perfect' Masculinity, and the Contemporary Appeal of Paranormal Romance" in the Spring 2011 issue of this journal.

<sup>2</sup>Editor's note: For another discussion of Shakespeare and zombies, see Christian Moraru's "Zombie Pedagogy: Rigor Mortis and the U.S. Body Politic" in the Spring 2012 issue of this journal.

## Works Cited

- 28 *Days Later*. Dir. Danny Boyle. 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox. 2002. Film.
- Angel*. WB Television Network. 1999-2005. Television.
- Austen, Jane, and Seth Grahame-Smith. *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies*. Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2009. Print.
- Bate, Jonathan. *The Genius of Shakespeare*. London: Picador, 1997. Print.
- Bennett, Andrew. "On Not Knowing Shakespeare (and on Shakespeare Not Knowing): Romanticism, the Authorship Question and English Literature." *Shakespeare and his Authors: Critical Perspectives on the Authorship Question*. Ed. William Leahy. London: Continuum, 2010. 11-22. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. London: Fourth Estate, 1999. Print.
- Boluk, Stephanie and Wylie Lenz, eds. "Introduction: Generation Z, the Age of the Apocalypse." *Generation Zombie: Essays in the Living Dead in Modern Culture*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2011. 1-17. Print.
- Brontë, Charlotte, and Sherri Browning Erwin. *Jane Slayre*. New York: Gallery Books, 2010. Print.
- Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. WB Television Network. 1997-2003. Television.
- Carroll, Lewis and Nickolas Cook. *Alice in Zombieland*. Naperville: Sourcebooks, 2009. Print.
- Collins, Warwick. *The Sonnets: A Novel*. London: Friday Fiction, 2008. Print.
- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2002. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987. 101-120. Print.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Profiling Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
- Handeland, Lori. *Shakespeare Undead*. New York: St Martin's Griffin, 2010. Print.
- . *Zombie Island*. New York: St Martin's Griffin, 2012. Print.
- Holderness, Graham. "Bardolatry: or, The Cultural Materialist's Guide to Stratford-upon-Avon." *The Shakespeare Myth*. Ed. Graham Holderness. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988. 2-15. Print.
- Interview with the Vampire*. Dir. Neil Jordan. Geffen Pictures. 1994. Film.
- Leahy, William. "Shakinomics: or, the Shakespeare Authorship Question and the Undermining of Traditional Authority." *Shakespeare and his Authors: Critical Perspectives on the Authorship Question*. Ed. William Leahy. London: Continuum, 2010. 114-124. Print.
- Meyer, Stephanie. *Twilight*. London: Atom, 2005. Print.
- Moraru, Christian. "Zombie Pedagogy: Rigor Mortis and the U.S. Body Politic." *Studies in Popular Culture* 34.2 (Spring 2012): 105-128. Print.
- Mukherjea, Ananya. "My Vampire Boyfriend: Postfeminism, 'Perfect Masculinity, and the Contemporary Appeal of Paranormal Romance.'" *Studies in Popular Culture* 33.2 (Spring 2011): 1-20. Print.
- Paffenroth, Kim. "Zombies as Internal Fear or Threat." *Generation Zombie: Essays in the Living Dead in Modern Culture*. Eds. Stephanie Boluk and Wylie Lenz. Jefferson: McFarland, Inc, 2011. 18-26. Print.
- Price, Diana. *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography: New Evidence of an Authorship Problem*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001. Print.
- Rice, Ann. *Interview with the Vampire*. New York: Random House, 1976. Print.
- Shakespeare in Love*. Dir. John Madden. Miramax. 1998. Film.
- Shapiro, James. *Contested Will: Who Wrote Shakespeare*. London: Faber and Faber, 2010. Print.
- The Lost Boys*. Dir. Joel Schumacher. Warner Brothers. 1987. Film.
- Twilight*. Dir. Catherine Hardwicke. Summit Entertainment. 2008. Film.
- Winder, Robert. *The Final Act of Mr Shakespeare*. London: Abacus, 2010. Print.
- White Zombie*. Dir. Victor Halperin. United Artists. 1932. Film.
- Williamson, Milly. *The Lure of the Vampire: Gender, Fiction and Fandom from Bram Stoker to Buffy*. London: Wallflower, 2005. Print.

**William Leahy** is Head of the School of Arts at Brunel University, London, UK. He has published books on Elizabethan Processional Literature and Shakespeare and Authorship. He has published articles on these subjects as well as on Shakespeare's History Plays and Shakespeare and the Common Man. He additionally writes fiction, poetry, and journalism.