

Questions for Breakout Discussion Groups on 9/23/2022

1. Would it be useful to treat serialized TV dramas as a cinematic version of serialized literary 'long fiction' that arrives, as so many novels in the 19th century did, in a series of episodes, but with the additional alteration that more than one 'ghost writer' is involved with each new episode [as is the case for certain *crowd-sourced* digital fiction]?
2. Maybe *The Sopranos* phenomenon is best viewed as a cinematic product that *is an artwork*, but an artwork that only has *makers* not *authors* (as Paisley Livingston claimed for some films [e.g., the Big John example from our first reading this week])? Does this solve the problem that Lackey is focused on: how to distinguish TV dramas that are artworks from feature length films that are *also* artworks?
3. What are some TV series that you think *are artworks* and why?
4. Remember Paisley Livingston's distinction between films that emerge from a collective authorship, others that emerge from an individual authorship, and others that have makers but no authors. With these three options in mind, try to think of examples of **TV Dramas** that fall in each of these three categories.
5. What does your group think of Roland Barthes claim that literary artworks **have no authors**, but rather, in a novel it is not the person who *wrote the novel* who one should regard as the author. Rather, he says that it is better to think of the novel as being presented **by the language** in which it is presented? What are some reasons to accept this view? What are some reasons to reject this view?
6. Is *8 ½* a film about the making of a film, or a film that *is the making of a film*? Does this distinction matter to you, the viewer? Does it make the film more or less interesting to you?
7. What does the ending of *8 ½* mean?