



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Shakespearean Cinemas / Global Directions

Burnett, M. (2020). Shakespearean Cinemas / Global Directions. In R. Jackson (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Screen* (pp. 52-64). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108367479>

Published in:
The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Screen

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
Copyright 2020 Cambridge University Press
This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Open Access
This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

4

MARK THORNTON BURNETT

Shakespearean Cinemas/Global Directions

Once pushed to the sidelines of scholarly enquiry, world cinema is increasingly seen as central to the field of Shakespeare on film. As a wealth of examples begin to be appreciated, so do new methodological approaches present themselves. In this chapter, I consider several directions through the field while acknowledging that no one interpretive method can do justice to the variety of filmic engagements with Shakespeare across the globe. What this chapter suggests, instead, is that different approaches have different utilities and that combining a spectrum of modes of understanding illuminates a corpus of material that only now is being critically integrated. Inside the discipline of Shakespeare and film studies, the world Shakespeare film has traditionally featured only in terms of a small sample of figures; one methodological approach, therefore, has been predominantly auteur-based.¹ This chapter begins with the auteur approach while recognising that it needs to be supplemented. Accordingly, I suggest here additional strategies which privilege regional perspectives, time-bound moments of production and reception, the woman practitioner, and the place of particular plays in the adaptive process. Using examples throughout, I hope both to contribute to the evolving screen canon while making visible the methodological challenges and joys necessarily entailed in any encounter with world Shakespeare.

World Shakespeare films have conventionally been illustrated through discussion of Russian and Japanese auteurs, Grigori Kozintsev and Akira Kurosawa. In his pairing of films, *Gamlet/Hamlet* (1964) and *Korol' Lir/King Lear* (1971), Kozintsev distinctively draws upon recognisably bleak and northern environs, with Estonian locations discovering the players as in thrall to larger, inhuman forces and profoundly implicated in their worlds. That this has a political complexion is clear from the wide-shot processions of peasants that haunt *Korol' Lir* and the presence in *Gamlet*

of communist-style busts of Claudius. As John Collick notes, this is a cinema primarily interested in the relation between 'populist themes' and the 'corrupting processes of absolute power'.² Across the two films, the effects of an unrelenting system upon the individual take on an elemental dimension. *Korol' Lir* is cut through with raging fires and scenes of carnage, while the costs of inhabiting a hostile landscape are graphically realised in the silhouettes of lonely figures toiling up a hillside or the spectacle of Lear (Yuri Yarvet) emerging from parched grasses nibbling on a wizened vegetable. *Gamlet* is cast in the same mould, with Hamlet (Innokenti Smoktunovskii) frequently lensed against the oppressive castle's walls, which are studded with forbidding faces. For Ophelia (Anastasiya Vertinskaya), a sense of incarceration is powerfully suggested in shots of her stifling black ruff and of a parrot in a cage: she is hemmed in by custom and convention. Yet this is not to deny both films' efforts to endorse something more ameliorative. *Gamlet* concludes with a funeral procession in which the titular protagonist is taken out of the castle towards the sea, suggesting release. It is on a rocky beach that Hamlet delivers an affirmatively angled 'To be, or not to be' soliloquy, and it is over the ocean that we witness a seagull rising upwards, the sign of Ophelia's departing spirit. Similarly, in *Korol' Lir*, the recurrence of the motif of water in scenes centred on the care of Lear hints at compassion and even resistance, these associations being reinforced in the transformative smiles of Cordelia (Valentina Shendrikova) and the flute playing of the Fool (Oleg Dahl) that continues in the midst of devastation. Symbol, place and tonal detail belong with a rich *montage* that hinges on a dynamic conception of social interrelations.

If Kozintsev's films take place in semi-mythical northern landscapes, Kurosawa's unfold in intensely localised environments. His *Throne of Blood* (1957), an adaptation of *Macbeth*, and *Ran* (1985), an adaptation of *King Lear*, take codes and conventions from Japanese history and tradition: in this regard, it is notable that *Ran* bases itself on the *jidai geki*, meaning 'period drama', and that *Throne of Blood* exploits its connections to the *ge-koku-jo*, the narrative of a retainer who dispatches his superior only to assume his power. Above all, it is in the use of stylised modes culled from Noh theatre that *Throne of Blood* and *Ran* reveal a local purchase; when these come into conflict with realist action sequences, suggestive cinematic effects follow.³ For example, because they are consequent upon the destruction of his troops, in the more theatrically oriented scenes in the rocky wastes devoted to Hidetora/Lear's (Tatsuya Nakadai) madness in *Ran*, the wild and colourful appearance of the protagonist appears inseparable from a mask or persona.

Likewise, when Asaji/Lady Macbeth (Isuzu Yamada), who, for much of *Throne of Blood*, is marked by a Noh-like stillness and poise, breaks with formality and is seen frantically washing, it is the conjunction of different representational idioms that impresses. Via such processes of cultural reorientation, Shakespeare emerges as a continually evolving repository of meaning. Transposition and reinvention – because they take place in languages other than English – direct attention back to the valences of the Shakespearean word. Hence, *Ran*'s reworking of Cordelia into the figure of Saburô (Daisuke Ryû), the brusque-speaking youngest son who challenges his father, prompts us to reflect on his precursor's relative lack of language. Similarly, *Throne of Blood*'s detailing of horses running wild presses us to recall the conjuration in *Macbeth* of horses that 'flung out, / Contending 'gainst obedience'.⁴ The same might be said for *The Bad Sleep Well* (1960), Kurosawa's less well-known dystopian adaptation of *Hamlet*, which is set in modern-day Tokyo and utilises *film noir* to examine corporate corruption. The film echoes the play's rhetorical expressions of madness in the embittered scowl of Nishi/Hamlet (Toshirô Mifune), struggling with familial obligations. The compelling character of all three films resides precisely in Shakespearean conjurations and in a productive meshing between thematic suggestion and visual experience.

A more recent entrant into the Shakespeare and world cinema auteur category is Indian director Vishal Bhardwaj, whose trilogy of Shakespearean adaptations has garnered international acclaim. *Maqbool* (2004), or *Macbeth*, innovatively transposes the action of the play by taking Mumbai as its location and subject, substituting for royalty the citizens of the city's underworld, mobster Abbaji/Duncan (Pankaj Kapur) and Maqbool/Macbeth (Irfan Khan), his henchman. Other inventive interpolations include the sequence centred on a visit to a *dargah* (the shrine of a *sufi* saint). As the song of the *qawwals* or singers gathers pace, it becomes self-evident that the address to the godhead simultaneously illuminates the developing intimacy between Maqbool/Macbeth and Nimmi/Lady Macbeth (Tabu), mistress to Abbaji/Duncan: so is the 'Bollywood' convention of the pilgrimage enlisted to highlight spiritual-sexual friction. In *Omkara* (2006), or *Othello*, creativity is at work in the ways in which Omkara (Ajay Devgan), a *bahu bali* or political enforcer in Uttar Pradesh, is presented as, in the words of an objector, a 'damned half-caste', the offspring of a 'bloody slave girl'. Refracting political discussion about India's systems of classification, the identification forms part of the fabric of the film, being affirmed in light-dark cinematography (Dolly/Desdemona [Kareena Kapoor] is distinguished by her fair complexion) and references

to Krishna, the 'Dark Lord' of the Indian epics. Constructions of racial divisions are read through other classic stories in such a way as to point up the film's contemporary sensitivities. In a more controversial transposition, *Haider* (2014) shifts the action of *Hamlet* to Kashmir in the 1990s, situating itself in a contested regional space marked by an ongoing history of insurgency. Innovative is the trajectory traced by Haider/Hamlet (Shahid Kapoor) himself: first glimpsed in a green bomber jacket, he is later seen in chequered Kashmiri *pheran*, the garment of choice for Kashmiri separatist leaders, suggesting a radical alteration to how he envisages his *dharma* or duty in relation to his political allegiances. Haider/Hamlet's 'To be, or not to be' dilemma – whether to join the forces of resistance or to submit to subordination – is at the core of the film, and it is only at the close, when he walks away from the blood-strewn, snowy cemetery, that an alternative scenario is suggested.

In such modifications, rewritings and amplifications, the auteur status of Bhardwaj is made abundantly manifest. Yet Bhardwaj's *oeuvre*, like that of Kozintsev and Kurosawa before him, could be differently inflected and assessed. For example, his films might equally well be approached inside a regional perspective: certainly, in India, as recent studies attest, the plethora of film adaptations of Shakespeare, across many Indian languages, is finally gaining overdue recognition.⁵ A regional approach is facilitative in several ways. Dudley Andrew notes that the concept of a 'regional cinema' nicely demonstrates how films inhabit local and global or 'glocal' spheres of interaction, and his argument seems particularly applicable to two Asian adaptations, *Go!* (dir. Yukisada Isao, 2001), from Japan, and *Jarum Halus* (dir. Mark Tan, 2008), from Malaysia.⁶ Both films centre on conflicted relations between nations and cultures and illustrate how Shakespeare, in Asia, can be marshalled interrogatively to ventilate issues around race, identity and history. An adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* concerned with unstable and occluded constituencies, *Go!* (dir. Yukisada Isao, 2001) centres on the plight of the *zainichi*, as represented in Sugihara/Romeo (Yôsuke Kubozuka), those individuals of Korean descent who fled the Japanese occupation of Korea and who can be marginalised in present-day Japanese society. So it is that the school gates in the film, the basketball court and even Sakurai/Juliet (Kou Shibasaki) herself operate as ciphers of antipathy, reinforcing the concern of *Go!* with the legacies of the past. The film opens with an on-screen quotation – 'What's in a name? That which we call a rose / By any other word would smell as sweet' (2.1.85–6) – but replaces it quickly with Sugihara/Romeo's embittered voiceover: 'Race, homeland, nation, unification . . . makes me sick', he states. The litany of terms, it is implied,

constitutes Sugihara/Romeo's translation of Juliet's question from a vexed Korean-Japanese point of view. Even when Sugihara/Romeo does reveal himself, it is to a hostile reception: 'Pop told me ... Don't go out with Koreans ... blood of ... Koreans ... is dirty', Sakurai/Juliet protests. For all it may be discounted, then, nomenclature, as in *Romeo and Juliet*, is seen to function in insidiously adversarial ways. Yet, as its title and dynamic *mise-en-scène* make clear, the film is ultimately concerned with embracing a better society. At the end, Sugihara/Romeo and Sakurai/Juliet leap over the school gates in a shared confrontation with barriers. The simultaneous exclamation – 'What am I? ... I'm me!' – discovers Sugihara/Romeo rejecting the *zainichi* label and claiming his own mode of selfhood. And, via the concluding detail of snow falling on 'Christmas Eve', *Go!* symbolically incorporates into its Japanese vision western paradigms of new beginnings and, notably, the implied reparation of colonial injustice.

With *Go!*, therefore, personal emancipation can be celebrated inside national-cultural histories and tensions, and this involves both a rejection of patriarchal prejudice and an affirmation of self that is not constrained by political praxes. The opposite scenario is developed in *Jarum Halus*, a Malaysian adaptation which, set in contemporary Kuala Lumpur, centres on the Chinese Daniel/Othello (Christien New) as the central figure of alterity. A successful executive at 'Eco-Tech', Daniel/Othello shows authority, confidence and skill, as illustrated in his leading colleagues through 'the new electronic system' and his key role in welcoming the company's German partners. He is as vital to 'Eco-Tech' operations as the 'Valiant Othello' (I.3.48) is to maintaining Venetian supremacy. Adding to the sense of Daniel/Othello's meritocratic rise is the wonderfully sewn handkerchief – the title, *Jarum Halus*, refers to needlework – gifted to Mona/Desdemona (Juliana Ibrahim) as a token of his love. Informing Mona/Desdemona that the handkerchief is the work of his mother, Daniel/Othello explains, 'different pieces of fabric became one masterpiece ... I look at my life like this', his use of a tailoring analogy suggesting his successful integration into Malay society. But *Jarum Halus* gradually reveals that Daniel/Othello is actually adrift in a system that, historically, has been geared, as Jacqueline Lo writes, to protect 'Malay political and cultural supremacy' against 'non-Malay interests'.⁷ Repeated shots of the signature buildings of Kuala Lumpur – the Petronas Twin Towers (headquarters of the global energy company), the Kuala Lumpur Tower (a communications hub from which phases of the moon are observed in preparation for Ramadan) and the UMNO skyscraper (the leading political party and promulgator of pro-Malay policies) – suggest

adversarial forces of religion, government and globalisation as well as reinforcing Daniel/Othello's status as 'outsider'. Betrayed by Iskander/Iago (Razif Hashim), who has played upon Daniel/Othello's doubts about his own identity, the protagonist murders Mona/Desdemona, asking, in Cantonese, 'Please wait for me a little longer. I'm coming to find you'. Invoking a Buddhist concept of the passage between worlds, Daniel/Othello finally articulates himself as 'alien' and 'other'. The integrated utopia longed for in the handkerchief is affirmed only in Daniel/Othello's fantasy of the afterlife.

Neither *Go!* nor *Jarum Halus* attracted sustained attention in Japan or Malaysia, nor have these examples of Asian Shakespeare impacted on the field of Shakespeare and film studies. This is despite the fact that, as Alexa Alice Joubin notes, the 'first decade of the new millennium was for Asian cinematic Shakespeares as the 1990s had been for Anglophone Shakespeare on film'.⁸ Joubin is reflecting here on big-budget martial arts Shakespeare films such as *The Banquet* (dir. Xiaogang Feng, 2006), a Chinese adaptation of *Hamlet*, but her comment reminds us of the need methodologically to recognise not only regional perspectives but also production and reception contexts as part of the warp and weft of the meanings of world cinema. Two films – *Hamile: The Tongo 'Hamlet'* (dir. Terry Bishop, 1965), from Ghana, and *Shakespeare Must Die* (dir. Ing K., 2012), from Thailand – suggest the validity of attending to a particular understanding of place *and* momentum. *Hamile* owes its genesis to a stage production of *Hamlet* at the University of Ghana, Legon, which was later made as a feature film by the Ghana Film Industry Corporation, a state-of-the-art production facility backed by Kwame Nkrumah, president of the newly independent Ghana, as part of a programme of artistic and cultural development. Not surprisingly, then, the film is preoccupied with a thematics of place, this showing itself in the dialogue (references to cities such as 'Timbuktu' [England] and 'Sokoto' [Vienna], geographically north of Ghana, suggest a will to situate Ghana at the imaginative centre of a networked African universe) and in the set, a specially built compound constructed to include arches, towers, individual chambers and steps – a type of amphitheatre in the round. In keeping with the film's ethos, the characters wear *kente* textiles, a traditional form of Ghanaian dress that was popularised by Nkrumah and came to function as a signifier of the nation's newly liberated status. To quote Joe de Graft, the director of the stage production, the film concatenated the pride and exuberance of Ghana in the early 1960s: 'there was an outburst of enthusiasm for our own way of doing things', he states.⁹

Shakespeare Must Die also taps into the *zeitgeist*, although in radically contrasting fashion. The film comprises two *Macbeth* narratives –

a theatrical production of *Macbeth* and a second *Macbeth* unfolding in the external world – which, in a tumultuous denouement, merge as one. Via the trajectory of *Macbeth*, the film constructs Thaksin Shinawatra (the controversial politician who served as Prime Minister of Thailand from 2001 to 2006) as morally and institutionally corrupt, offering up a critical vision bolstered by a representational allegiance between Thai theatre and radical comment. In this way, the film both springs from, and makes an ideological intervention in, its own political milieu. Telling, therefore, is the figuration of Mekhdeth/*Macbeth* (Pissarn Pattanapeeradej) as the ‘butcher’ of theatrical tradition – terror-racked, wild-eyed, oily, self-satisfied and cowardly. Referencing the volatility of its circumstances of making, *Shakespeare Must Die* privileges flashes of red (indexing the street clashes between rival political groupings, the ‘Red Shirts’ and the ‘Yellow Shirts’, that rocked the country between 2008 and 2010) and positions the witches against documentary footage of a ruined, post-agitation Bangkok. The film’s most visceral and violent summoning of history occurs when the production’s director is taken away by a gang of red-scarfed thugs who subject him to an extended lynching. As a representative of ‘Shakespeare’, the director ‘must die’. Here, the film harks back to the Thammasat University Massacre. On 5 October 1976, students staged a satirical play which, judged to constitute an act of *lèse majesté* because of a supposed hanging scene, provoked a furious response: armed groups supported by the military entered the university and 300 students were subsequently killed. *Shakespeare Must Die*, then, rehearses histories past and present as part of its make-up, representing both an intervention in current politics and a species of trauma cinema that endeavours to make up for derelictions of memory through re-visitation and re-enactment.

Any approach to Shakespeare and world cinema that privileges the moment of production and reception will bring into play a range of histories. That is, how particular examples have been received and subsequently distributed must be an interpretive concern; in particular, reflecting on why some films (such as *Hamile* and *Shakespeare Must Die*) disappear from view after an initial showing or indeed non-showing can be helpful in understanding the contingencies and arbitrariness with which a canon evolves. In *Hamile*, the rebellion of Laertu/Laertes (Kofi Yirenkyi) is envisaged as a dangerous uprising (a grassroots political movement) from below – in the savannah, villagers emerge from and disappear into the trees – and, in February 1966, just five months after the film was released, President Nkrumah himself was overthrown by the police and military. *Hamile* was, along with other films produced by the

Ghana Film Industry Corporation, confiscated as an example of work that fed the president's personality cult, and no further screenings in Ghana were authorised. Echoing its own internal narrative, *Shakespeare Must Die* was in turn censored – screenings in Thailand were prohibited – by the Thai Film Censorship Board.¹⁰ The narrative was officially perceived as fomenting discontent and jeopardising national security. Despite appeals and public protests, the ban continues. Both *Hamile*, which for many years was thought lost and survives only in a unique Library of Congress copy, and *Shakespeare Must Die*, which subsequent to the ban has only been seen at film festivals outside Thailand, are entries in Shakespeare and world cinema which bear witness to the effect of specific fields of reception or, rather, non-reception – praxes of censorship that dictate their relative invisibility on the critical scene.

Shakespeare Must Die is additionally distinctive in that it is helmed by Ing K., a female director. Included in the soundtrack to *Shakespeare Must Die* are extracts from the Rimsky-Korsakov symphonic suite, *Scheherazade*, based on *The Arabian Nights*, in which a sultan's new wife avoids execution by entertaining her husband with stories. Aligning herself with a woman who reverses a death sentence, Ing K. reflects self-consciously through the score on her own status as a female artist. Certainly, the few world Shakespeare films directed by women demand an approach that attends to a nexus of gender, creativity and directorial emphasis. As *Alegres Comadres* (dir. Leila Hipólito, 2003), a Brazilian adaptation of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *El Triunfo/The Triumph* (dir. Mireia Ros, 2006), a Spanish adaptation of *Hamlet*, answer to this imperative. As *Alegres Comadres* is set in the nineteenth century and is filmed in the town of Tiradentes in the Brazilian state of Minas Gerais. Responsive both to the British heritage film and a utopian tendency in recent Brazilian cinema, it applies a palette of bright, primary colours, invests in wide-screen shots of blue skies, and invokes numerous temporal referents (such as the Maria Fumaça steam train) to declare its affiliations with a nostalgically infused vision of the national past. *El Triunfo/The Triumph* is also historically angled. Unfolding in the Barcelona neighbourhood of *El Ravel* in the 1980s, and prioritising a world that is eclipsed in shots of dark-lit narrow alleyways and puddled gutters, the film centres on Gandhi/Claudius (Juan Diego), a local crime boss and ex-legionnaire, and his memories of the wars in Spanish Morocco. The Hamlet figure, Nen (Antonio Fernández Montoya), a young *rumba catalana* singer, aspires to escape and make his mark in music: the 'triumph' in the title refers to his ambitions for a better life.

These films bear comparison in the ways in which they prioritise women's roles and perspectives. Doing so, they point up intersecting forces of gender, nation and agency. In *As Alegres Comadres*, Ana Lima/Anne Page (Talita Castro) is realised as a cipher for a variety of independent behaviours, suggesting how she functions as a test case for the possibility of non-conformity. Hence, in scenes of love-making with Franco/Fenton (Daniel Del Sarto), she demonstrates self-determination, rejecting parentally chosen suitors. Tellingly, these scenes unfold externally, rather than domestically, affirming the ways in which, as Julianne Pidduck notes, the transgression by the seemingly 'passive woman' of the 'threshold' in the heritage film endorses a 'desiring female gaze'.¹¹ Moreover, individual will is stamped with national associations. Thus, the appearance of Ana Lima/Anne Page in blue in the masque, flanked by characters in green and yellow, situates her as a metaphor for national unity: yellow, green and blue are the Brazilian flag's dominant colours. (Even before the masque, Ana Lima/Anne Page tries on green and yellow costumes, the idea being that national colours are implicated in her own destiny.) Consistently occupying the centre of the frame, Ana Lima/Anne Page expresses a free-wheeling spirit that is synonymous with the Brazil of modernity. By contrast, in *El Triunfo/The Triumph*, Barcelona is presented as a world divided along national and racial lines. Via scenes involving gang mayhem, the film captures the post-EU tensions of the metropolis, highlighting forces of immigration, and accompanying instabilities, that run counter to Spanish/European policy. In particular, as part of its vision of a Spain caught between the old and the new, *El Triunfo/The Triumph* accentuates the role of Ahmed/Fortinbras (Ahmed Krim), the new kingpin who supplants Gandhi/Claudius' rule. Adapting the film from a *Hamlet*-inspired novel by Francisco Casavella, Ros reflects, in interview, 'I did try to introduce a woman's point of view ... changing the method of narration, inventing new situations, writing some of the songs, and playing up the emotive rather than the physical'.¹² Certainly, Ros' gendered imprint is seen multiply – in a screenplay that departs from the novel, for instance, and in the foregrounding of Chata/Gertrude (Ángela Molina) as a woman buffeted between conflicting local, familial and romantic demands. As screenwriter, she introduces site-specific vernacular spins on Shakespearean language and, as composer, mediates the prose of the novel via the score.

Specifically, in providing the film with Catalan-language music, Ros speaks for a resurgence of Catalan cinema spearheaded by women practitioners and a growing attention to secessionist initiatives. In this film of remembering a former Barcelona, Ros flags the forces at play in the post-

Franco shift to democracy; in the same moment, her adaptation of *Hamlet* illuminates the multiple roles she is obliged to undertake as a creative – as woman, Catalanian and Shakespearean interpreter.

Clearly, Ing K., Hipólito and Ros all find in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* energies and applications that meet their distinctive ambitions and instincts. This invites us to consider the place of particular plays in the adaptive process. What continuities and discontinuities emerge when we take into consideration play-specific trajectories of interpretation? As earlier parts of this chapter have indicated, *Macbeth* is a well-visited port of call for politically responsive world filmmakers, and here one might suggest that *Throne of Blood* and *Shakespeare Must Die* allegorise, through *Macbeth*, narratives of a political rise and fall that prove immediate and resonant in Japanese and Thai contexts. Equally clear is the frequency with which *Romeo and Juliet* is returned to: *Go!* is but one example of a host of adaptations that envision the Shakespearean narrative of ‘star-crossed lovers’ in relation to deterritorialisation, urbanisation, demographic shifts, generational conflict and local realignments of gender and race. *Romeo and Juliet* partners with societies caught on the cusp of transition, arguably because the play itself is concerned with a coming of age. Yet it is *Hamlet* to which world filmmakers gravitate with a particular urgency: across all of the world’s film industries, adapting *Hamlet* gives access to an eloquence not always permitted to practitioners as speaking subjects and, in conditions of seeming impossibility, allows for the possibility of representation. Cinematic *Hamlet* adaptations matter globally because pertinent conversations cannot always be held publicly, and the play is often mediated in the belief that the word and image can serve an interventionist, transformative purpose. The *Hamlet* story, transferred to the screen, enables social and political critique, to the extent that play can appear more barbed and weaponised than previously conceived.

Two examples – the first German and the second Slovakian – illustrate the multiple attractions of the play to world filmmakers. *Der Rest ist Schweigen/The Rest is Silence* (dir. Helmut Käutner, 1959) is set in the Ruhrgebiet, the industrial heartland of West Germany, and revolves around the identity crisis of John H. Claudius (Hardy Krüger) who returns home after twenty years in exile as Harvard University academic. John/Hamlet is a philosophy professor with research specialisms in Heidegger and Sartre, a plot update consonant with his involvement in existentialism. The film is distinctive in the ways it gradually unveils Johannes Claudius/Old Hamlet as having been pushed by his scheming brother into allowing his steelworks empire to manufacture armaments for the Nazi cause, becoming, in his son’s estimation, a ‘mass murderer’. The film is

structurally arranged so as to highlight a pervasive collective guilt, with rebuffs and forgetfulness continually forestalling John/Hamlet in his mission to reveal the hidden narratives that shaped his family's involvement. So it is that the sins of the father are visited on the son, with John/Hamlet's psychologically vulnerable and dissatisfied state being linked to a traumatic sense of complicity. In this connection, the reverberations of the film's title multiply. In particular, 'silence' conjures both those things that are unmentionable and 'cover-ups', extending the play's concerns. There is an echo of this Shakespearean meaning in the opening credits. As the title comes into view, splashes of crimson – in what is a monochrome palette – wash over the lettering, suggesting victimisation, accountability and violence. Beginning with the words of the play's end, *Der Rest ist Schweigen* contemplates worlds after defeat and what is entailed in speaking to and about repressed histories.

Der Rest ist Schweigen invites comparison with the later Slovakian *Hamlet* adaptation, *Cigán/Gypsy* (dir. Martin Šulík, 2011), in that this film, too, is concerned with accountability, legacies and effects. In the wake of the collapse of communist systems and state socialism, *Cigán* situates the action of *Hamlet* in a Roma shantytown in Richnava, Eastern Slovakia, investing in scenes of desperation and disempowerment. Looming large as a thematic is the fate overtaking traditional communities in the late twentieth and early twentieth centuries, with *Cigán* charting the residues of a post-communist moment and identifying material need as the agent that shapes the lives of the most marginalised of Central and East European populations. So it is that Adam/Hamlet (Jan Mizigar) inhabits a shantytown on a scarred hillside; the 'goodly frame, the earth' (2.2.289) appears a 'sterile promontory' (2.2.290), unforgiving and inimical. In particular, the film uncovers systems of racism that are shadowed in expressions of emasculation and processes of economic humiliation. Forced to leave school and take on the breadwinner role to help his mother, Adam/Hamlet is consistently rebuffed in his efforts at improvement – subject to police brutality or ostracised from casual employment. Throughout, the protagonist faces rejection, either from the ethnomusicologists/players, who promise an engineering scholarship and then fail to deliver, or from Julka/Ophelia (Martina Kotlarova) who is sold to a 'Czech guy', blighting Adam/Hamlet's romantic aspirations. When Adam/Hamlet stabs Žigo/Claudius (Miroslav Gulyas) to death, there is no sense of an alteration in his circumstances. In the closing tableau, Adam/Hamlet, waiting at a bus stop, is still caught in a cycle of need, still bound for nowhere. The snow falls, with key Hamletian

questions about how to be and how to act finding no reply in an evocative but despairingly open-ended tableau.

To encounter Shakespeare in world cinema manifestations is to encounter a myriad of possibilities for understanding the plays and the ways in which the dramatist's work is engaged with through adaptation. It is to begin to appreciate some of many uses to which the plays are put and to be sensitive to the local and global significances of Shakespearean authority. This chapter has suggested a series of directions through Shakespeare and world cinema: the routes taken often overlap, but in that overlapping is a necessary attentiveness to the powerful work of adaptation. World Shakespeare films invite a different conception of Shakespeare, one that highlights the ongoing ways in which cinema generates new stories in order to resolve old histories or, alternatively, generates new stories in order to countenance histories still in the making.

Notes

1. The 'auteur' is generally understood as an individual artist possessed of a distinctive vision and credited with significant works across a career.
2. John Collick, *Shakespeare, Cinema and Society* (Manchester and New York, Manchester University Press, 1989), 129, 141.
3. Noh is a traditional Japanese musical-theatrical form characterised by stylised gestures and dance movements, masks and a declamatory delivery of dialogue.
4. William Shakespeare, *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York, Norton, 1997), 2.4.16–17. All further references to Shakespeare's plays are to this edition and appear in the text.
5. Poonam Trivedi and Paromita Chavravarti, eds., *Shakespeare and Indian Cinemas: 'Local Habitations'* (London and New York, Routledge, 2018).
6. Dudley Andrew, 'Islands in the sea of cinema', in Kevin Rockett and John Hill, eds., *National Cinemas and World Cinema* (Dublin, Four Courts, 2006), 15.
7. Jacqueline Lo, *Staging Nation: English Language Theatre in Malaysia and Singapore* (Hong Kong, Hong Kong University Press, 2004), 15.
8. Alexa Alice Joubin, *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2009), 12.
9. Joe de Graft, 'Interview', in Bernth Lindfors, ed., *Africa Talks Back: Interviews with Anglophone African Writers* (Trenton and Asmara, Africa World Press, 2002), 77.
10. See 'Press release', www.Shakespearemustdie.com.
11. Julianne Pidduck, *Contemporary Costume Film* (London, BFI, 2004), 26.
12. Interviews between Mireia Ros and Mark Thornton Burnett (1 and 8 December 2017).