

SHAKESPEARE, MADNESS, AND MUSIC



SCORING INSANITY IN CINEMATIC ADAPTATIONS



Kendra Preston Leonard

Shakespeare, Madness, and Music

Scoring Insanity in
Cinematic Adaptations

Kendra Preston Leonard



THE SCARECROW PRESS, INC.

Lanham • Toronto • Plymouth, UK

2009

Published by Scarecrow Press, Inc.

A wholly owned subsidiary of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
<http://www.scarecrowpress.com>

Estover Road, Plymouth PL6 7PY, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2009 by Kendra Preston Leonard

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Leonard, Kendra Preston.

Shakespeare, madness, and music : scoring insanity in cinematic adaptations, 2009.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8108-6946-2 (pbk. : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-8108-6958-5 (ebook)

1. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616—Film and video adaptations. 2. Mental illness in motion pictures. 3. Mental illness in literature. I. Title.

ML80.S5.L43 2009

781.5'42—dc22

2009014208



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

To Karl Rufener

An ever-fixed mark
That looks on tempests and is never shaken

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>A Note on the Text</i>	ix
1 Shakespeare, Madness, and Music	1
2 Hamlet	7
3 Ophelia	35
4 Lady Macbeth	69
5 King Lear	97
6 Edgar	117
<i>Afterword</i>	127
<i>Appendix A: Films Referred to in the Text</i>	129
<i>Appendix B: Selected Film Productions and Adaptations of Hamlet, King Lear, and Macbeth</i>	131
<i>Bibliography</i>	139
<i>Index</i>	149
<i>About the Author</i>	153

Acknowledgments

*T*o those listed here, I can no other answer make, but, thanks, and thanks: Byron Adams; Ruth Benander; Carol Brobeck; Linda Carmona; Amada Eubanks Winkler; Jessie Fillerup; Donna Fournier and the staff of Swarthmore College's Underhill Music Library; Eric Hung; Linda Hunt and the staff of Swarthmore College's McCabe Library; Melissa Kramer and the staff of Bryn Mawr College's Canaday Library; Karen and Winston Leonard; Jessie Ann Owens; Karin Pendle; Karl Rufener; the staff of Yale University's Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library; and the members of the 2008 Folger Shakespeare Library Shakespeare on Screen in Theory and Practice Seminar: Thomas Cartelli, Annalisa Castaldo, Rebecca R. Chapman, Alexander C. Huang, Farrah B. Lehman, Michael Noschka, Katherine Rowe, Amy E. Scott-Douglass, Jonathan L. Sircy, and Kay H. Smith.

I am also grateful to my editor at Scarecrow Press, Renée Camus, and the outstanding staff there.

Research for this book was supported in part by the Folger Shakespeare Library.

A Note on the Text

*U*nless otherwise noted, all references to Shakespeare's plays are from the Folger Shakespeare Library Edition, edited by Barbara A. Mowat and Paul Werstine (New York: Washington Square Press, 1992).

All references to the plays are notated as Act, Scene, Line(s); thus, 2.2.224 would be Act 2, Scene 2, Line 224.

Shakespeare, Madness, and Music

In 1899, Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree, a noted stage actor and producer in London's West End, directed and acted in what is today the earliest extant example of Shakespeare's work on film. Since Tree's production, there have been countless Shakespearean films, ranging from the earliest Vitagraph tableaux¹ to Svend Gade's *Hamlet: The Drama of Vengeance*, in which Danish actress Asta Neilson plays the title role as a female Hamlet; from Kenneth Branagh's "full-text," four-hour *Hamlet* to highly modernized adaptations designed to appeal to young audiences, such as Baz Luhrmann's *Romeo + Juliet*; and from what Shakespeare and popular culture scholar Richard Burt calls "Schlockspeare," including the *Hamlet* spoof *Strange Brew* and *The Tempest's* reimagining as *Forbidden Planet* to "ShaXXXpeare," or Shakespeare-inspired porn with typically bad puns in the titles like *A Midsummer's Night Cream* and *The Taming of the Screw*. Of all of Shakespeare's plays, his three political tragedies stand out as having been put on film more often than any others: *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. The Internet Movie Database lists more than one hundred films of or adapted from *Hamlet*, more than seventy *Macbeths*, and over thirty *King Lears*.²

These three plays share a number of thematic elements. They all ultimately focus on crises of family and power and involve a recurring early modern trope: madness. As Duncan Salkeld notes, "In the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, personal crisis is invariably linked to political crisis." Personal crisis, in turn, frequently takes the form of "distraction," or madness. Madness in early modern drama, as Salkeld sees it, is "a fairly conventional matter."³ Indeed, madness, he writes,

seems to belong in English Renaissance tragedy. It lends a distinctive pathos of inexorable self-destruction to plays which might otherwise be merely violent. But madness in the age of Shakespeare was not merely a playwright's

Senecan device. It was put to more sophisticated uses. In the first place, its personal and moral implications were enormous. . . . Madness is not a consequence of sin, like judgement, but contemporaneous with it, deferring judgment even for the most determined villain. But the insane in Renaissance tragedy were not merely victims of a brutal society; they were also violent, murderous and politically dangerous. Blood may have blood, as the revenge maxim went, but madness will have blood too.⁴

Such a perilous condition had to be diagnosed and checked on the stage as it was in London's streets, where the "disaffected," "melancholic," and truly insane were rounded up and confined to the notorious Bethlem Hospital, later widely known as Bedlam. Within the plays, observers like Polonius, Gertrude, and Lady Macbeth's physician all provide identification for the diseases affecting their protagonists. Polonius serves as a mediator between actors and audience when he diagnoses Hamlet with the "very ecstasy of love" (2.1.114), assuming the prince to be in the mold of other early modern lovers. Lady Macbeth's doctor also serves as the interpreter of her actions, at first approaching them clinically: "This disease is beyond my practice" (5.2.62) and then from a spiritual direction, not knowing, as early modern audiences did not know, whether such behavior was medical disease, a natural reaction to an emotion or shock, otherworldly possession, or some combination thereof.⁵

Foul whisperings are abroad: unnatural deeds
Do breed unnatural troubles: infected minds
To their deaf pillows will discharge their secrets:
More needs she the divine than the physician. (5.2.75–79)

Following identification, madness in Shakespeare is then quarantined, with varying results: Lady Macbeth's women are charged with watching her; she ends a violent and bloody suicide. Ophelia does not seem violent and is not explicitly imprisoned, although Claudius tells Horatio to "Follow her close; give her good watch" (4.5.79); she passively allows herself to drown. Lear is exiled; when he returns to his reason, he dies of grief.

As common as they may be, these states of madness go far beyond their initial readings to hold thousands of told and untold secret histories of characters, social conventions, and political conditions. Madness, as constructed by Shakespeare and his contemporaries, was a wider canvas on which to detail those materials that could not be otherwise expressed: sexual desire and expectation, political unrest, and ultimately truth, as excavated by characters so afflicted.

Michel Foucault notes in *Madness and Civilization* that madness in literature and art appears around the late 1400s and becomes pervasive in art thereafter.⁶ While it was sometimes used in the theater as a device for pratfalls,

wordplay, humiliation humor, physical humor, and other entertainment for audiences, madness—often conflated with foolery—had “still other powers: the punishment it inflicts multiplies by nature insofar as, by punishing itself, it unveils the truth.”⁷ This is certainly the case in Shakespeare, whose fools, madmen, and madwomen all “[remind] each man of his truth.”⁸ The madnesses of Hamlet, Ophelia, Lady Macbeth, King Lear, and Edgar all serve to provide the truth in their respective plays: to themselves, to other characters, and to the audience.

Carol Neely has written extensively about the manifestations of madness on the stage, stating that not only was madness a common trope, but that its verbal and physical signs could be easily discerned by the audience. “Madness in these tragedies is dramatized through a peculiar language more often than through physiological symptoms, stereotyped behaviors, or iconographic conventions although these are present,” she writes, going on to note some of these behaviors and conventions of mad speech: “Onstage and off, madness is diagnosed by observers—first laypersons and then, in some cases, specialists. The period’s audiences participate with onstage watchers in distinguishing madness from sanity and from its look-alikes: loss of grace, bewitchment, possession, or fraud.”⁹

Music has long been associated with madness; in the late fifteenth century, Hieronymus Bosch included a lute-playing nun and singing monk in his painting *The Ship of Fools* (1490–1500). It was often used as a visible and audible symptom of a victim’s disassociation from her—most cases of madness on the early modern stage involve women—surroundings and societal rules and her loss of self-control. Leslie Dunn writes that Ophelia’s singing, perhaps the most famous example of the relationship between madness and song (although the same device is used by Edgar as he feigns madness in *King Lear*, it is Ophelia whose mad singing is most known), “reflects the broader discourse of madness in early modern English culture, with its persistent associations between music, excess, and the feminine.”¹⁰ Shakespeare mines contemporary culture to outfit his fools, madmen, and madwomen with widely known songs, ranging from the pious to the bawdy; even characters not traditionally associated with the performance of song in their madness—such as Lady Macbeth or Hamlet—are provided with rhymes and other devices that mimic the rhythms of recognizable ballads, nursery songs, and street calls. According to John Long,

A part of Hamlet’s antic act is his use of ballad tags, usually when he is acting the fool to the top of his bent. But his songs are in themselves rational enough; they are simply fragmentary scraps, for the most part, of old, familiar, popular songs like those sung and spoken by Lear’s Fool. When Polonius comes to tell Hamlet about the arrival of the players

(2.2.425–39), Hamlet replies with a scrap of an old ballad, “Jep[ht]ha, Judge of Israel.” He quotes a line from another old song, “For O, for O, the hobby-horse is forgot,” as an example of the brevity of human grief (3.2.144–45). After the play-within-a-play ends, he bursts into what seems to be a song stanza, “Why, let the stricken deer go weep”—a reference to Claudius’ discomfiture—closely followed by what seems to be a song about Damon and Pythias. This, too, refers to Claudius.”¹¹

Long suggests that even Hamlet is meant to sing these lines, writing that, “If Hamlet is acting as the court jester, as I believe he is, it would be in character for him to sing.”¹²

Songs for the Shakespearean stage were preserved primarily through oral tradition, although some, such as Hamlet’s “hobby-horse” song, existed as printed music at the same time of the plays’ initial performances.¹³ One major collection of transcriptions was housed at the Drury Lane Theatre, which oversaw its publication and dissemination among the theater world until a fire burned the building to the ground in 1812. Distraught by the loss of manuscripts chronicling the songs’ history, an amateur musician known only as Dr. Arnold interviewed actors from Drury Lane in order to reconstruct the songbooks, particularly Ophelia’s songs.¹⁴ As the theater became less tied to “heritage” productions in general, the songs associated with the plays were likewise altered, revised, reimagined, replaced, or removed. By the time early cinema began adapting Shakespeare’s plays, the musics used to accompany madness were often a far cry from their origins in the streets and homes of London.

Early silent films of the play were accompanied by a house pianist or organist who selected suitable—sometimes ironic—pieces to accompany the action. With titles like “Sorrow” and “Lovers’ Embrace” and “Grand March,” these short works could be used for any number of films. In some cases, they were meant to be ironic or satiric while still conveying information about the plot. For example, in George L. Fox’s early (c. 1869) version of *Hamlet* for the nickelodeon:

After a duet of Thomas Moore’s “You’ll Remember Me,” in the second scene, Ophelia sings and dances the minstrel tune “The Girl with the Golden Switch.” The third scene features Marcellus and Bernardo singing “Beautiful Night,” an offstage chorus intoning “Johnny Fill Up the Bowl,” and Hamlet warbling “I’m a Native Here.” The mousetrap induces the chorus to sing “Shoo Fly,” and the graveyard scene features both “Five O’clock in the Morning” and “Why Do I Weep for Thee?”¹⁵

It is clear that for many of these early cinematic adaptations, music was not used to carry the sophisticated metatextual meanings that many of the

playtexts' original songs had done. The use of music as a signifier for deeper meaning would return only with large-scale collaborations between composers and filmmakers, a convergence that took place after the Second World War with Laurence Olivier and William Walton's work for *Henry V* (1944). Olivier and Walton established what was to become the norm for Shakespearean adaptations on film: a carefully synchronized score that emphasized or illuminated key points in the plot, character development, and events. With the release of Olivier's 1948 *Hamlet*, Shakespearean madness was for the first time accorded a fully scored symphonic treatment. While in some cases directors and composers had contemporary source materials to work with, as in Ophelia's songs, much of the music associated with madness in these films is original to the film and the interpretations of those involved in creating them. Even the treatment of the "original" songs is subject to the temperament of the filmmakers and the social norms of audiences. Just as Phyllis Rackin reminds us that the "female characters we encounter in Shakespeare's plays are not the same ones that appeared in the original productions," the early modern tunes occasionally employed in Shakespearean film adaptations are not those that audiences heard at the Globe or the Rose. They are laden with additional meaning and interpretations lacquered on by centuries of use and reuse; today they are relics, whereas to contemporary audiences they were part of the everyday soundscape of life.

As this study shows, changing social and scholarly attitudes toward the plays, their characters, and the condition that falls under the early modern catch-all of "madness" have led to a wide range of musical accompaniments, signifiers, and incarnations of the "distractions" feigned by Hamlet and Edgar, the disassociation experienced by Ophelia and Lear, and the hallucinations that plague Lady Macbeth. This book does not purport to be a comprehensive catalogue of the uses of music in every filmed version of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*. Rather, it focuses on the several most widely distributed and viewed adaptations of these three plays for the cinema. The musics for these adaptations of Shakespeare's three great political tragedies are fascinating indicators of culture, society, and the thoughts and ideas of individual directors, composers, and actors. They allow us, in the words of the playwright, to understand more fully the methods in the madness we see on the screen.

NOTES

1. Kenneth S. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 7.
2. Internet Movie Database, <http://imdb.com>.

3. Duncan Salkeld, *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 2.
4. Salkeld, *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, 80.
5. "Unlike sanity," Neely notes, "madness is not defined as the opposite of sane and is not exclusively a medical condition. It is seen as an extension of, a kind of excess of, the normal." Carol Thomas Neely, "Recent Work in Renaissance Studies: Psychology: Did Madness Have a Renaissance?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1991): 778.
6. Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Vintage Books, 1988), 15.
7. Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, 30.
8. Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, 14.
9. Carol Thomas Neely, *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), 49–50.
10. Leslie C. Dunn, "Ophelia's Songs in Hamlet: Music, Madness, and the Feminine," in *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*, ed. Nancy A. Jones and Leslie C. Dunn (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1994), 52.
11. John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Histories and Tragedies* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1971), 113.
12. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music*, 113.
13. Louis C. Elson, *Shakespeare in Music* (Boston: L. C. Page, 1901), 122.
14. Elson, *Shakespeare in Music*, 234; and William Chappell, *Popular Music of the Olden Time*, vol. 1 (Whitefish, Mont.: Kessinger, 2004; reprint of 1859), 236.
15. Rick Altman, *Silent Film Sound* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 220.

Hamlet

The Ghost (Old Hamlet) has just departed, though his voice still urges Hamlet, Horatio, and Marcellus to swear secrecy about his appearance. Amid a frenzy of words, thoughts, and questions, Hamlet conceives a plan:

Here, as before, never, so help you mercy,
How strange or odd some'er I bear myself
As I perchance hereafter think meet
To put an antic disposition on (1.5.191–92)

With these words to his courtiers, the audience knows a truth unknown to the royal court of Denmark: that Hamlet is not truly mad, despite his behaviors and words to the contrary. It is crucial knowledge that enables the audience to understand Hamlet's actions over the next several hours of performance. However, Hamlet's madness has been a point of dramatic variance since the earliest portrayals of the prince, both in terms of actors' approaches and musical perspectives.

While there are few records as to what kind of aural accompaniments early stage Hamlets had, there is a considerable amount of material relating to the visual aspects of the tradition, all of which inform and influence the film versions of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Contemporary criticism and accounts of Richard Burbage, who likely originated the role, indicate that he wore black for the entire play, indicating Hamlet's lengthy mourning and insistence on forcing mourning customs on the court.¹ David Garrick, the foremost player of Hamlet in the eighteenth century, created a strong Hamlet, omitting a number of passages in the text that link the prince to indecisiveness and delayed action, a tactic later used by a number of filmmakers. His Hamlet was not mad as much as frightened nearly to death by the Ghost's appearances

and admonitions.² Robert Hapgood notes that Garrick's followers, particularly Edmund Kean, played up Hamlet's affected madness to an extreme, screaming and crawling about on the stage in an attempt to unnerve Claudius all the more.³ Actor Henry Irving crossed "the border between pretended lunacy to 'real frenzy,'" offering a significantly different reading of the play.⁴ Still later Hamlets, including American Edwin Booth, played the madness in a less impassioned manner. Victorian Hamlets were required to be as "princely" as possible, reflecting a British national love affair with the royal family. Sarah Bernhardt, the first Hamlet on film (produced in 1900 with accompanying wax cylinders for sound), was praised for her Hamlet, who was characterized by Bernhardt, according to contemporary Elizabeth Robins, as "light-hearted, light-footed, quick to act, ready with laughter." As Robins notes, "In accordance with the wholesome popular conviction that melancholy not brilliantly justified is either dullness or mere indigestion, Madame Bernhardt, knowing her public well, gives the people a Hamlet who is sad, so to speak, with his tongue in his cheek."⁵ Hers was clearly not a melancholic, brooding Hamlet but one of antic—what male observers viewing the performance through a traditional gendered lens might have termed "hysterical"—action. More recently, Mark Rylance prepared for the role by visiting Broadmoor Hospital for the mentally ill in order to study madness in its true forms, a throwback to the nineteenth century, when such "research" was undertaken by women preparing to play Ophelia.⁶

Over time, Hamlet's actions and performed madness became not only interpretative puzzles for actors and directors but also for critics and psychoanalysts; Sigmund Freud famously argued that Hamlet's troubles were all due to his Oedipus complex. The popularity of such "insights" into the "lives" of characters on the stage was enormous, and theatrical productions—and later films—were expected not only to deliver the plot with good acting but to infuse performances with carefully considered and integrated references to recent research and current interpretative trends. It was in this atmosphere that Laurence Olivier produced his *Hamlet* in 1948.

OLIVIER: *HAMLET* (1948)

Laurence Olivier's film was the first *Hamlet* shot as a full-length feature with fully integrated sound and has been a powerful force responsible for shaping many of the productions that followed it. Although Hapgood rightly observes that "Olivier's *Hamlet* has dated badly," and current audiences could find it hard to relate to the overacting and dramatic gestures borrowed from Olivier's 1937

stage performance, it was a monumental achievement in the history of Shakespearean film. For the first time in the cinema, audiences overheard the machinations of Claudius and Polonius alongside Hamlet, heard Hamlet's interior thoughts, and received information conveyed by an orchestral score created to promote the director's vision of the work and the roles that inhabit it.

Olivier's film is based primarily on Tyrone Guthrie's 1937 staging of the play, in which Olivier played the title role.⁷ Guthrie's production, like many of the same period, was burdened with an application of Freud's Oedipus complex as a driving motivation for Hamlet's actions, drawn primarily from Ernest Jones's *Essay in Applied Psycho-Analysis*.⁸ It is not a film that encourages much sympathy with the characters. Despite the grand declamation and breast-beating action of the primary actors, the film retains a coldness and lack of intimacy with its audience. Hapgood notes "something withheld as well about Olivier's performance. His face is at times mask-like. It is true that voice-overs reveal his inmost thoughts. But he does not confide them to us; the audience is placed in the position of eavesdroppers, overhearing what he is thinking and feeling."⁹ Because of this distance between protagonist and audience, the use of music in illuminating Hamlet's thoughts and actions is especially relevant. For audiences both contemporary to the film and those who view it as a historical artifact, understanding the music that delineates Hamlet's state of mind and actions is crucial. Audiences seeing the film in 1948 would have been familiar with the use of incidental music in the theater, still a common practice at the time; they also would have been able to hear the obvious leitmotif technique that composer William Walton used to help clarify the actions and ideas shown. Modern audiences likewise will understand the motivic music's use. More sophisticated viewers will even more fully appreciate the inclusion of music during scenes and transitions in this film, as they have become attuned to it and expect music that illustrates at least some aspect of the material on screen.

Olivier's film version of *Hamlet* naturally carries over a number of quirks from his stage work and earlier film experience. As Bernice Kliman has pointed out, Olivier's production is more a fantasy on themes of *Hamlet* rather than a true film of the play. This is due mostly to the nature of film at the time and its somewhat uneasy mingling with the values and traditions of stage productions. She writes, "the relationship between stage and film was somewhat more complicated; the film is a hybrid form, not a filmed play, not precisely a film, but a film-infused play or a play-infused film, a form Olivier conceived as being the best possible for presenting the heightened language of Shakespeare."¹⁰ Shakespeareans note that the text is heavily cut, omitting a number of major soliloquies, not to mention entire scenes and characters. For Olivier, however, the text is fluid and can be altered and reshaped at will; it is due no

privilege, and a goal of the film is simply telling the story in a dramatic fashion. The result of Olivier's approach is that his *Hamlet* is very idiosyncratic.

In an interview with Kenneth Tynan, Olivier discussed this approach:

I thought it was the absolute resolution of all the problems concerning Hamlet. At least, it gave one a central idea which seemed to fill the great vacuum left by all the crossed ideas about Hamlet, what he really was, what he really wasn't, whether he was a man of action, whether he wasn't a man of action. He could safely be a man of action under the auspices of that particular idea, that he couldn't kill the king because, subconsciously of course, he was guilty himself.¹¹

Much of the film focused on Hamlet's apparent inability to relate normally to women: an unhealthy, obviously oedipal relationship with his mother is introduced early on in the film via a lingering mouth-to-mouth kiss between the two, and it is continued through Gertrude's ever solicitous stroking of Hamlet's brow, hands, and torso. (Eileen Herlie, in the role of Gertrude, was twenty-eight years old at the time of filming, while Olivier was forty-one, and Jean Simmons, playing Ophelia, was sixteen.) Hamlet's intensely sexual confrontation with his mother in her chamber in the film's staging of 3.4 is likely on its way to consummation when it is interrupted by the Ghost.

Olivier's alterations to the play are significant: the "nunnery scene" takes place before the "to be or not to be" speech; secondary plot lines are eliminated; and Olivier's editing attempts to reconcile what some critics and readers view as Shakespeare's own confusion of events. James Hirsch writes of Olivier's cuts:

He transposed the "To be" passage and the nunnery passage. The "To be" passage thus no longer occurs in the midst of an eavesdropping episode. And as Jack Jorgens has noted, the painfulness of Hamlet's encounter with Ophelia during the nunnery episode now provides a rationale for the suicidal melancholy Hamlet expresses in his subsequent "To be" speech. . . . In Olivier's film Hamlet does not devise the plan to catch the conscience of the King until after the "To be" monologue.¹²

According to Richard Burt, "adaptation does not mean that one author substitutes for the other (film director for playwright), but that the authorship of a given adaptation is always in question." There is no doubt that this is Olivier's *Hamlet*, not Shakespeare's.¹³

For purists, the film fails: it is neither an accurate portrayal of the play nor a particularly compelling interpretation of the original material. Few viewers

today are likely to agree with the now-dated psychoanalytic approach to Hamlet's relationships with Gertrude and Ophelia, or more particularly that Hamlet was a weak man. However, the elements designed to help audiences understand the language of the play and its altered sequences were popular among the 1940s cinema-going demographic, and it is considered a classic of filmed Shakespeare. Olivier mixed high and low approaches to the play, including voice-over narration, as in the film's opening, in which Olivier's own personal interpretation famously condemns Hamlet as "a man who could not make up his mind," and a streamlined cast and plot. For his part, Walton's obvious leitmotifs help viewers keep track of characters and events as the drama unfolds.

Having previously worked with Walton on two prior Shakespearean adaptations, *As You Like It* (1936) and the propagandistic wartime *Henry V* (1944), Olivier again selected the British composer to create the music for his new film. Despite the glamour of working with Olivier and the opportunity for broadening his audience base, Walton took on film projects primarily because of the financial appeal, writing: "I've several things, chiefly commercial, on foot. . . . So I shall be able financially to keep my head, I hope, well above water for the time being."¹⁴ He found working on *Henry V* difficult and declared the subject matter "pretty grim." He also felt rushed to complete the music after numerous delays in production, and he was frustrated and angry when the recording of the piano score by Roy Douglas, who orchestrated the score, went unused.¹⁵ Walton's work on *Hamlet* seems to have been tempered by this experience: instead of writing long and difficult-to-track musical accompaniments for action sequences, as he had done for *Henry V*, Walton composed a number of set pieces that could also later be performed in concert settings without any loss of coherence. He was also apparently less emotionally involved in creating the music for *Hamlet*, describing it merely as "not uninteresting." He later called the concert arrangements of the music for *Hamlet* "frightfully dull," recalling that he "had to do nearly an hour of appropriate but otherwise useless music" for the film.¹⁶

Walton's music for *Hamlet* is used in approximately one-third of Olivier's film. Much of it is employed to move from scene to scene or to establish the mood of a scene rather than to accompany spoken dialogue. In this way, the music is much as it would be in a stage production using incidental music; it is entirely nondiegetic. Walton follows two established musical conventions in creating the motivic score for *Hamlet*: those of the high-brow opera and the middle-brow silent film. In operatic fashion, each of the characters is assigned an individual and distinct leitmotif that allows audiences to follow their arrivals, temperaments, and actions. This technique, known as *Gesamtkunstwerk*,

or “integrated artwork,” stems from Richard Wagner’s operas of the late nineteenth century and was widely accepted by filmmakers across the European continent as an appropriate use of music in film. As Scott Paulin writes:

The notion of film as a *Gesamtkunstwerk* dates back to the silent era. According to David Bordwell, the Wagnerian model, with which filmmakers including Sergei Eisenstein and the French Impressionists (including Abel Gance) were sympathetic, allowed an analogy to be made from the relationship between music and drama in opera, to the relationship between cinema (defined as the visual elements and techniques specific to film) and narrative in the motion picture.¹⁷

Audiences were used to film music running the gamut of intent and intensity, from the recorded equivalents of nickelodeon accompaniments to the more mature and serious scores contributed to the war effort by Walton and Ralph Vaughan Williams. Yet critics of the time often found that music detracted from the spoken word. Charles Hurtgen writes of Walton’s and Olivier’s *Henry V*: “Although Burgundy’s long speech was set to music, Henry’s ‘Once more into the breach’ (the music stopped following the second line) and Saint Crispin’s passage were unaccompanied, so that the music of the verse was permitted to soar as upon Shakespeare’s stage”¹⁸

To this end, Olivier tried to privilege *Hamlet*’s—and Hamlet’s—text over any kind of musical dramatics, and for the most part succeeded. Walton’s music for *Hamlet* establishes mood and character and provides an aid within the film to help guide the audience, for whom Olivier’s editing and rearranging of the traditional text may have been disorienting. Thus, in scenes with multiple actors present, Hamlet’s words are unaccompanied, so that they might better stand out from the crowd. In solo moments, however, such as the soliloquies, Hamlet’s text is weighted enough to garner accompaniment even when music is not indicated in the text; this contrasts greatly with the comparatively unmusical treatment of Ophelia’s decidedly musical text. However, in these cases, both Olivier and Walton were still criticized for interfering with the flow of the spoken word. Hurtgen comments that with all of the other operatic conventions occurring in Walton’s score, Hamlet’s soliloquy “To be or not to be” was turned into a recitative due to the overuse of accompanying music.¹⁹

Music is initially established in a descriptive role at the very outset of *Hamlet* and is used thereafter as what Anahid Kassabian terms “identifying music,” that which not only fills the traditional role of the leitmotif in indicating a character’s presence, emotions, and actions but can also be part of an evocation of “period, time, depth of field, and certain sociological factors.”²⁰ The film’s opening shot shows the turbulent sea surrounding Elsinore, and the accompanying music matches the visual image in perfect synchronicity, with

waves crashing to heavily accented dissonances and fading to weak resolutions. The lack of strong cadences aurally foreshadows Olivier's interpretation of Hamlet as indecisive and unable to affect closure. In an interpolation between 1.1 and 1.2, the film introduces the audience to the main characters in a visual and aural tour of Elsinore, presenting objects and locations that serve later as important markers of place and scene. This tour's music is the first time the motifs that contribute to Walton's score are heard: as each item comes into visual focus, representing its owner/inhabitant, it is provided with an individual and easily distinguishable theme. Hamlet himself, indicated by the chair on which he later lounges and sulks, is characterized by a chromatic, wandering line with unexpected suspensions, ripe for variation as events progress.

Although Susan McClary has written about the use of the chromatic to represent "the sultry, slippery, seductive female who taunts and entraps, and who needs to be brought back under tonal domination and absorbed," Walton's chromaticism here unquestionably represents Hamlet.²¹ Olivier felt that Hamlet was, famously, "a man who could not make up his mind," and indeed everything signifying the prince is of a vacillating nature.²² The chromaticism serves to support Olivier's thesis about Hamlet: while he is a complex and intelligent individual, he is indecisive and cannot settle on a single course of action. The theme is usually presented in a low register, marking the gravitas of Hamlet's situation as well as reinforcing his masculinity. Throughout the film, Hamlet's theme serves as an aural landmark for decisions being and not being made by the prince.

Olivier's Hamlet is shown presenting the outward signs of madness beginning with his appearance in Ophelia's closet, which she narrates in a voice-over in the film while the action described by the text is played mutely for the camera (2.1.77–84). Hamlet appears to be distracted; he walks as if through liquid, his feet moving slowly across the floor as he stumbles forward to Ophelia. His eyes are staring, his mouth hangs open, and his gestures are exaggerated. Rather than support the idea that Hamlet is in fact mad, however, the music here overwhelmingly reinforces the conclusion that this is Hamlet's first instance of feigning distraction. The music is a recognizable variation of the earlier Hamlet theme. Instead of the usual presentation, however, there is a quick transition using its motifs, and then a section of background music underneath Ophelia's narration that is more active than the actors' own gestures and motions on screen, representing the activity of Hamlet's mind, deliberately planting the seeds of his apparent madness in Ophelia's mind. There is a rapidly ascending scalular line that plateaus and then climbs again as Hamlet touches his brow as Ophelia relates, "He falls to such perusal of my face" (2.1.90). Walton reserves higher registers for the women of the play, and when Hamlet's motif is then heard in the highest register yet, the indication is that in his consideration of

Ophelia he is regarding her from a sympathetic or even sisterly point of view. After a false climax, the music rapidly descends once more, and Hamlet's face takes on a new look of objectivity and decision. He takes his leave, "with his head over his shoulder turned" (2.1.95), and the music is again his theme in a higher register but ending with a lower and darker thematic statement in dissonant doubled winds, and the camera focuses on Ophelia's face just as "the last bended their light on" her (2.1.100). Hamlet has returned to his less sympathetic, more misogynistic self and in this scene has made his farewells to Ophelia as an individual. His mind, falling into the lower pitch areas of his normal theme, is now exclusively bent on revenge. Olivier's somewhat bizarre physical portrayal of Hamlet's disturbed state here is convincing, but the continuously noncadencing music using the primary motif of his theme, signifying an open-ended series and not a singular event, leads to the interpretation of this scene that he is quite sane, and that his thoughts—albeit unspoken—are intent upon making his performance believable and compelling. Hamlet knows that Ophelia, directed in this adaptation as controlled by and loyal to her father, will report his strange behavior.

Ophelia's closet scene is one of the few instances in which speech and music are given equal space and attention in the film; usually the text, as cut and altered as it is, is privileged above any peripheral material. In this scene, then, Olivier and Walton's intention is not just that of incidental music, but an aural counterpart to Ophelia's words that is just as important for the audience to understand. Even a musically inexperienced audience would have no trouble hearing Hamlet's motif amid the embellishment in the score for this scene. While the musical material surrounding the theme and even altering it may indicate some disquiet in Hamlet's mind, it is the disquiet that accompanies making unpleasant decisions—in this case, bidding Ophelia an unacknowledged farewell before playing out his scheme on the court at large—rather than the madness he affects in just the next scene.

Hamlet's "fishmonger" scene with Polonius (2.2.172–219) is entirely unscored, and Olivier's delivery and body language make it clear without music that he is in control of his faculties and playing Polonius for the fool. After rejecting Ophelia and leaving her abandoned at the bottom of the stairs (this scene is discussed in detail in the following chapter), Hamlet rushes up to a parapet. Once Claudius and Polonius have exited, Hamlet's theme, again dark and low, is interpolated with a rising scalar figure to propel the audience to his perch. An incongruously major fanfare and cadence at the top of the stairs gives way to Ophelia's theme and a transition that uses stock stage figures to represent the turmoil of Hamlet's mind, heard concurrently with a shot of the raging sea at the castle's base. The camera "enters" Hamlet's head, providing the audience with his point of view, when his theme returns in its original

form. The music is still present in the first line of Hamlet's soliloquy "To be or not to be," once again offering an aural form of his indecisiveness with its chromatic ambiguity. As Hamlet draws his dagger with the words "To die, to sleep," the monologue becomes internalized. Hamlet speaks no more, but his "thoughts"—the remainder of the soliloquy—are heard as a voice-over. As soon as Olivier stops actively speaking as Hamlet, his theme returns, vacillating between his choices. At "to sleep, perchance to dream," however, the theme is abruptly terminated in an ascending run between "sleep" and "perchance." At that very moment, Hamlet realizes the possible postmortem perils of suicide. Hamlet again begins talking aloud. Musically, this is Hamlet's most decisive moment; considering "what dreams may come," he terminates his ambivalence of action and begins to formulate his plan for "The Mousetrap." When the music returns at the end of this scene, the primary theme is inverted and far more resolute in its tonality. As Hamlet leaves the parapet, it is clear what his action will be.

Hamlet's theme appears several more times in the film, always during transitions between scenes. The presentation is uniformly low in register and without variation or alteration of the primary motif. The madness affected prior to the playing of "The Mousetrap" is cast off entirely, and Olivier's Hamlet is straightforward and determined from his return to Denmark until the final scene of the film, which ends with Hamlet's body being borne to the parapet.

Ultimately, Walton creates an accurate sonic portrait of Olivier's interpretation of the Dane. He is moody but not mad; indeed, his own analysis of his situation pushes him to become decisive. The music is applied carefully to the soundtrack of the film, present when necessary but never used in favor of Hamlet's words. Despite Olivier's cuts, Hamlet's lines are privileged in a way no other characters' are (for more on this, see the discussion of Ophelia and her music in this production in the following chapter). Hamlet's music reflects his mental state for the audience: it does not temper the audience one way or another in judging the prince, as the pomposity and extradiegetic music used to indicate the presence of Claudius is intended to color the audience's perception of the grasping, self-important king.

KOZINTSEV: *HAMLET* (1964)

Grigori Kozintsev's *Hamlet*, filmed in 1964, is set in a dark and barbaric Denmark. Peasants and courtiers alike suffer; *memento mori* appear everywhere, reminding each person of his or her impending death. Hamlet,

played by Innokenti Smoktunovsky, is described by Kenneth S. Rothwell as “so virile and decisive that his struggle against Claudius and Polonius has been allegorized as an Aesopian attack on Stalin.”²³

The focus of Kozintsev’s production is the submission of “hamletism,” or lethargic melancholy. “The actual figure of the Danish Prince receded into the background,” Kozintsev writes of traditional Russian approaches to the play, and “‘Hamletism’ became the topic for debate.”²⁴ Stage Hamlets changed according to social and political conventions from weak, doubting men to strong ones to lackadaisical ones as frequently as philosophical fashion dictated. Before long, hamletism and the character of Hamlet had little to do with one another as the former was so altered from its origins. In the early decades of the twentieth century, Kozintsev laments, “Hamletism came into fashion. Mystic clarity became boulevardier banality. In the tourist bars in Montmartre, they sat on coffins to drink and threw their cigarette butts into a skull.”²⁵ Kozintsev believed in neither this Hamlet nor the one on the analysts’ couch: his Hamlet suffers from wounds to his psyche, but they do not stem from oedipal urges or self-loathing. Unsited for court life, this Hamlet cannot reconcile his intellectual studies and learning at Wittenberg with his faith, which is much needed at Elsinore. It is, Kozintsev concludes, “the tragedy of those who gave too much swing to their wit. The time came when thought led to suffering.”²⁶

In Kozintsev’s film, the playtext is highly cut, omitting traditionally included scenes such as the first appearance of the Ghost and, notoriously, Hamlet’s confession to the guards and Horatio that he will “put an antic disposition on.” This singular omission raises the question of Kozintsev’s interpretation of Hamlet’s madness, although archival notes by the director clarify the point for scholars: his madness, even here, is feigned. Scenes are also transposed to further the director’s view of Hamlet as a hero, albeit an unstable one, rather than as a hesitant and insecure man. As in Olivier’s film, the text is given its full weight but not always its authored place; the result is a unique view of the action that purists might abhor but naïve viewers will find easy to understand; it is immensely powerful in its own dark way. Kozintsev, writing on his interpretation of the play, discusses the timeline as affecting the nature of the plot. If viewed as episodes from over twenty years from Hamlet’s arrival at Elsinore until his death, the audience sees a much more pragmatic and less self-doubting man. Instead, he is one who is collecting evidence slowly but surely with growing hatred and a developing plan for revenge.

The music for Kozintsev’s production was composed by Dmitri Shostakovich, who had already composed music for two different productions of *Hamlet* before he worked on the 1964 film: once in 1932 for a parody version, and once with Kozintsev for a stage production in 1954. Shostakovich

created several themes for the score that are frequently linked to his other symphonic music: Hamlet's theme has been associated with the Thirteenth Symphony ("Babi Yar") and in particular with the failure of the state to provide for its people.²⁷ The theme is a fairly typical Shostakovichian diatonic melody of close intervals and unexpected wide leaps. It is resolute, presented most often by the brasses or low winds, and while subject to variation is not as tonally ambiguous as Walton's theme for Olivier's film. For Shostakovich, the work may have represented a quick side job, but in the best practices of film composers (and in his own experience, having played piano for silent films as a young man), he created a score with clear character motifs and text-based atmospheres and timbres. Comparing these two major productions, J. Lawrence Gunther praises Shostakovich's score in comparison to Walton's, ultimately putting the blame on a director who does not fully comprehend the possibilities of an organic score written by an interested and involved composer: "Walton's musical score is subordinated to Olivier's visual imagery, but Dmitri Shostakovich's score counterpoints, highlights, and comments on the action itself, transforming each shot into a microcosmic *Gesamtkunstwerk*, a unified work of art in image and sound."²⁸

During his encounter with the Ghost, Smoktunovsky's Hamlet is obviously in anguish; his physical gestures indicate that he cannot bear the news he has received. In Ophelia's closet scene, Hamlet is clearly facing a crisis of faith; as Kozintsev felt, this young Hamlet, newly uncloistered from his university studies, is unready for the life of the court. His theme is played at a faster than usual tempo and is accompanied by constant and unexpected pizzicato chords interrupting the winds and brass. These sharp interpolations of his normal thought are mirrored in his actions: a wide-eyed stare and an attempt to frame Ophelia's face with his hand are convincing symptoms of distraction. As Bernice Kliman writes, in this scene, "we see what has happened—without, it seems, the mediation of anyone's sensibility."²⁹ The lack of Hamlet's text informing Horatio of his plan to feign madness could render the audience almost incapable of determining that Hamlet is anything but mad, yet Shostakovich's score illustrates the contrary. The music provides a partial sensibility here: the repeated statements of Hamlet's theme, at different pitches and timbres, illustrate that his presence and behavior is at once familiar and strange to Ophelia—the theme is not altered—but his actions, caught in musical space by the abrupt changes in pitch level, timbre, and accompaniment, are new and unexpected. However, as disturbed as Hamlet is in this scene, finding himself in a court changed for the worse, he is still ultimately in control of his thoughts: his theme is never presented in inversion or retrograde. Instead, its variations indicate that Hamlet does struggle with but in the end retains his identity.

Kozintsev's directing sends Smoktunovsky's Hamlet to physical places outside of the usual range of courtiers to indulge his state. Where Olivier's Hamlet walked about inside Elsinore's more populated halls, forcing observers to note his condition, this Hamlet tucks himself away in corners and on rocky outcroppings of the castle walls, hardly the desirable stages for showing one's "madness" to the court. He allows Polonius to come to him; this is the more wily and knowing Hamlet who has now observed the ways of the court. The fishmonger scene is heralded by three sharp chords, the same borrowed from the Thirteenth Symphony, and Hamlet's theme. This presentation does not reflect Hamlet's mental state so much as it does Polonius's; the audience does not even see Hamlet until the music is mostly finished. To Polonius, Hamlet is to be approached with caution, hence the "warning" chords that precede and then overlay Hamlet's theme. Polonius has some trepidation as he begins to question the prince, but with the end of Hamlet's theme and the interrupting chords, he becomes more relaxed in his conversation.

As Hamlet speaks with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, he is sane and cognizant enough to speak of his own melancholic removal from common court life. The music under the "What a piece of work is man" monologue is more stable than that of the closet scene or even Polonius's questioning. It is steady in rhythm, lacking the interruptions of those two earlier scenes, and cast in a major key, as if Hamlet is about to shed his guise of madness and "return" to his saner self. Joyous, carnivalesque music surrounds the arrival of the players, and Hamlet's spirits seem lightened with it. In order to feed Claudius more false information, however, he tells Rosencrantz and Guildenstern with some anger in his voice that his madness is variable, and he is able to put it off amid the festivities in the courtyard below.

The music reveals that Hamlet is in complete control of his mind again during the players' scene. Kozintsev places the "O what a rogue and peasant slave am I!" speech amid the Player King's recitation; it is part of a larger meditation on Hamlet's part as to not only his grief but also his vow to the Ghost. As he thinks, he drums his fingers on the players' drum, out of sync with the drumbeats in the score that serve to shadow the internal drama taking place. "Had he the motive and the cue for passion / That I have?" (2.2.566–67), Hamlet asks himself, responding with "Fie upon't, foh! About, my brains!" (2.2.594–95). His theme is clear and overwhelms the sounds of the players and observers in the courtyard; with this mental clarity, the idea for "The Mousetrap" is conceived. Hamlet is at once exhausted and energized by his self-control and prescience of thought; he continues to beat the drum with determination as the music celebrates, albeit darkly, the players' proposed performance.

Kozintsev sets the "To be" speech as internal monologue. Hamlet wanders over and around rocks at the edge of the sea, drawn into himself. His

theme is repeatedly heard; clearly the audience is to understand that these thoughts are Hamlet's alone, and part of his greater melancholy. Although he carries a dagger at his side, he makes no motions to indicate that he is prepared to cast himself into death, as Olivier's posturing did. This Hamlet, at this moment, is completely disaffected but not suicidal. The monotone in which he speaks and the repetitive nature of the presentation of the theme at this point illustrate a lack of connection even with his own plan to catch Claudius: it is a low point in the plan, and time has wearied him. He can function only enough to climb the stairs back to Elsinore.

As the film comes to its climax, Hamlet's theme is not heard; the duel is not, after all, about him, but about justice and evil. When Hamlet tells Laertes "I am punished with a sore distraction" (5.2.231), he is speaking the truth of his melancholy, but not his pretended madness. The music of the duel pits the court, represented by showy fanfares, against the righteousness of the Ghost, whose pulsing theme in the low brass is heard as the fight ends in triumph for his revenge. Only as Hamlet leaves the hall, assisted by Horatio, does his own theme return; the ghost has had satisfaction and Hamlet is released from his vow. His theme, now representing his own death by treachery, is steady, quiet, and dark; with the prince's final words, it fades out. Hamlet's body is borne out of the castle grounds with a military variation of his theme, reinforcing Fortinbras's assessment of him. Sharply punctuated by chords, as at the film's opening, this variation is a musical rite for the royal dead of Denmark: first Old Hamlet, and now the prince.

As Kliman notes, Kozintsev's desire to create a "righteous, heroic" Hamlet resulted in the removal of many of Hamlet's speeches, nearly all of the puns and witticisms, and any repetitious materials, leading to the significant altering of the text's plot and tone. "The suggestion that his mind may be unhinged remains," Kliman writes, but "without the wit and humor Shakespeare associates with Hamlet's real or pretended madness."³⁰ Ultimately, the combination of this interpretation with the music that represents Hamlet's mind provides audiences with the understanding that this is not a Hamlet who could not make up his mind, but one who had to carefully control it and wait for the right moment to act. "[H]e feigns madness," writes Kozintsev to Smoktunovsky, "and the fearlessness of the thoughts he expresses before the forces of terrible power takes your breath away. He is not a tender young man at all, but a heretic who attacks, burning with the intoxicating joy of struggle."³¹ With depression characterized by the Hamlet theme, and manic anxiety and distraction by the pizzicatos plucking relentlessly around it, the score confirms what Smoktunovsky's acting projects: the prince may be alternately canny and inactive, and suffer from emotional extremes, but he is indeed only "mad north-northwest."

ZEFFIRELLI: *HAMLET* (1990)

Franco Zeffirelli's 1990 *Hamlet* had an all-star cast, including Mel Gibson as Hamlet and Glenn Close as Gertrude. Like Olivier, Zeffirelli cut the text by two-thirds, eliminating the political drama that is ultimately driven by the personal crises of the characters. Unlike Olivier, however, Zeffirelli chose to use a cast that had little experience with Shakespeare. In one behind-the-scenes featurette, Gibson reveals during a coaching session that he does not know that Shakespeare equates "to sleep" with "to die" in the "to be or not to be" speech. He initially thinks these are two separate options for Hamlet.³² Zeffirelli indicates that in creating a new film of *Hamlet*, he wanted to portray the prince as an "action hero," and deliberately cast the Shakespeare-naïve Gibson in a move to make that characterization more obvious to audiences. The result is a rash and dynamic Hamlet whose plans are delayed only because of his metaphysical self-doubt. The film was scored by Ennio Morricone, known for his prodigious output of film music and relationship with director Sergio Leone in films such as Clint Eastwood's "Man with No Name" series. The choice of hiring Morricone to score *Hamlet* was an appropriate one for Zeffirelli; Kathy M. Howlett has argued that this production frames the text with "familiar patterns from a popular American film genre, the Western," writing that, among other things, "Zeffirelli engages his audience in Hamlet's revenge tragedy through associations with the American gunslinger and myths of the American West, a marriage of genres that captures essential elements within the Quarto 1 version of Hamlet."³³

Howlett parses the film's lean text as a matter of simplification for audiences' sakes: "Zeffirelli's decision to diminish political and social entanglements also accommodates the frame of the film Western, in which the interactions of society are personal and archetypal, and not political."³⁴ Characters too are simplified and become stereotypes. Played by Close, Gertrude is young and carefree. She and Alan Bates's Claudius form one of Shakespeare's happiest couples. Gibson's Hamlet is petulant and sulky even before the appearance of the Ghost; he is inflamed with jealousy. As Douglas Brode has noted, this is the most oedipal of all *Hamlets*, surpassing even Olivier's version: "Zeffirelli extends the oedipal impulse to an almost obscene limit. Hamlet speaks his famous lines to his mother not only while beside her on the bed but literally mounting her. If he weren't sidetracked by the realization that someone else [the Ghost] is in the room, this Hamlet would surely rape Gertrude."³⁵ Hamlet is resentful of his mother's happiness and willing to believe anything that took the form of charges against Claudius. He is manic in a modern sense of the word: anxious, overstimulated, and eager to act. Thus his "antic disposition" is not the melancholy of Olivier or Smoktunovsky, but a boiling rage

that is parlayed into a forced lunacy that does not ring true to Polonius's interpretation of its cause as love-sickness.

Not only does Zeffirelli borrow the concepts of space, such as the wide-open range, the iconography of the horseman, the archetype of the loner, and the male body from westerns, but also the soundscape. Morricone's music, which is often countered with long periods of silence or sound effects mimicking the wind or sea, is a highly sophisticated tool that enables even naïve viewers to immediately comprehend the drama and action taking place before them.

The music for this *Hamlet* is a curious mix of the theatrical and the would-be diegetic. The film opens with an extended fanfare in the brass, with an underlying piano *agitato*. As the camera moves from titles to a view of Elsinore and its denizens, the piano and brass are replaced by an organ, working a theme over a pedal point. Just as abruptly, though, the piano returns. Throughout the film, Morricone uses brass to indicate the presence of Claudius and Gertrude, but winds, piano, or percussion, including wind and sea machines, to accompany Hamlet's actions. Whether Morricone intended this aural introduction to represent a blend of cues depicting older and modern styles and instruments in the film is unknown. To a naïve listener it is an intriguing mix, but to the experienced listener it could be used for almost any dramatic film set in a desolate place where life is hard and sons and parents collide over the future; Denmark stands for the Dakota Territories.

Morricone gives Hamlet a singular theme: a rising figure based on a pentatonic scale, first used during the Ghost scene as Hamlet makes his way to the parapet and then bends Horatio and the watch to swear their oaths of silence. Particularly evocative of neither the medieval nor the modern, Hamlet's theme is instead redolent of the western film's stock pitch-set for the Other, usually a "good Indian"—a Native American character who works with the hero to punish injustice. The only nondiatonic motif in the film's score, it hints at Hamlet's self-imposed isolation and peculiarity among the rest of the court. The ascending quality of the theme could represent his struggle to deal with ambition and his desire to rise above the foulness of his father's murder and what he sees as the revoltingly giddy and sexual behavior of his mother and uncle, but it is also traditional for Morricone; similar motifs in other scores are built the same way. The composer's habit here likely takes precedence over any attempt at an abstract construction of a character's desires.

Hamlet's first appearance showing his feigned madness in Ophelia's closet is witnessed here by Polonius from a balcony. The same music that marked Hamlet's determination to revenge the Ghost is present here, even in the same form and range. His motif is clear and deliberately placed: he is quite sane and unaware that he is being watched by anyone other than Ophelia. He is testing

out his act on her and using it to break his ties with her before using this behavioral escape clause to wreak havoc through the rest of the court.

Hamlet's madness is effective and highly visual: he goes about half-shod, clothed in strange garb; he reads constantly but rips pages from the books; he mumbles and talks to himself; he stares wide-eyed and lets his mouth hang open. In contrast with the more subtle Hamlets preceding this film, Zeffirelli's Hamlet is a showman, and the perfect Hamlet for a naïve audience, an audience so inexperienced in Shakespeare and theater that it would not recognize Olivier's or Kozintsev's Hamlets as mad in a modern sense. Zeffirelli wants a modern Hamlet, albeit set in a medieval Denmark, whom audiences can identify as a man of action. The result is an uneven one; at times Gibson's Hamlet is entirely modern, but at other times he is directed to engage in behavior that would be understood as mad only when judged against much earlier standards.

After Claudius has fled from "The Mousetrap," Hamlet's feigned madness takes on a sign of actual madness that would be recognizable to early modern audiences after Claudius has fled from *The Mousetrap*, in particular a sign of feminine madness: he sings. For a brief moment, caught between his excitement at catching the king and his purposed antic disposition, Hamlet dances and sings with the players on the stage even as the room empties around him. Morricone sets Hamlet's lines from 3.2.284–86 to diegetic music played by the troupe's musicians:

Why, let the stricken deer go weep,
The hart ungalled play,
For some must watch while some must sleep,
Thus runs the world away.

For Hamlet to indulge himself so much as to sing here, he must be aware that such a manic outburst will only lead to greater belief in his mental instability, and for him to express it in the traditional female purview of song is to demonstrate that he is even farther "gone" than the court thought before. Only the cessation of the music and his immediate return to sarcasm alert the audience that he is still in full command of his faculties and ever more prepared to act.

Ultimately, however, this is a Hamlet played for modern audiences, for whom the use of song means little and for whom the score is taken for granted—a generation that expects music throughout a film but often little understands its immense potential. The use of music to indicate Hamlet's exilirating step toward true mania is likely not recognized outside of a select group of cognoscenti, who will recognize it as appropriate for this Hamlet, the Hamlet as mercurial action hero.

BRANAGH: *HAMLET* (1996)

Kenneth Branagh's 1996 *Hamlet* is intended to impress: shot on 70 mm film, its text is a conflation of several sources: it is based primarily on the First Folio text, with some materials included from the Second Quarto and "in a few cases emendations by modern editors of the play," such as the choice of "solid" rather than "sullied" in 1.2.³⁶ With exteriors shot at Blenheim Palace, home to the Duke of Marlborough, and enormous interiors created at one of the largest studios in Britain, the production is lavish: the cast features some of the most well-known stage and screen actors of the late twentieth century; the set design, props, and costumes are sumptuous and redolent of late nineteenth-century wealth and power; and the cast of extras numbers in the hundreds in order to provide the epic scale of Branagh's vision.

Of his score for Branagh's *Hamlet*, composer Patrick Doyle notes: "It was very difficult to find a way in the film, the acting was so wonderful, the text is immaculate, Shakespeare. . . . Kenneth always said to keep the music as simple as possible, to help to present it, help to bring the audience nearer, to make it more accessible and understandable."³⁷ At the same time, Branagh has said he wanted a score for his film that would have an "epic nature and scale, [even] Zhivagoian."³⁸ Branagh describes the process as one that was ongoing during filming and editing: "Patrick and I have an ongoing conversation which is really me continuing to express my view of the play, describing moments and how they'll be presented."³⁹ The result is a highly organic score, so tightly knit in terms of thematic material and development that some critics have derided it as dull.

To create a simple score with a sense of grandeur, Doyle employs a primary theme throughout the film, presented in diverse orchestrations and culminating in its performance as the elegy *In Pace*, sung over the end titles by Plácido Domingo. Rather than attaching this dirge to any one particular character, Doyle uses it more broadly, foreshadowing all of the play's eight deaths. It is used as a fanfare, in the background as Hamlet and Ophelia are shown entwined in bed, when Laertes returns to France, and even when Hamlet is shown going about his normal court duties. Because of what *Filmtracks* calls a "curious lack of a strong, character-centric thematic structure to the score," the audience is exposed only to variations of the theme, provided through altered orchestrations, forms, and fragments.⁴⁰ Doyle's secondary themes for Hamlet, Ophelia, and Claudius are all drawn from this primary set of gestures.

Hamlet's theme, which opens in its first hearing with horns and a line in the low strings, is introduced by a five-note motif. It is fully orchestrated and smoothly executed without rests or accents to mar the melodic line. It is, for all practical purposes, static for many of its appearances: its use at the wedding

celebration of Gertrude and Claudius; Hamlet's "what a piece of work is man" (2.2) and "How all occasions" (4.4) speeches; when Hamlet visits Ophelia in her closet; before the duel begins; and at Hamlet's death. Hamlet's theme is significantly varied from its initial setting only three times in the film: during the fishmonger scene in 2.2; in 3.4 when Gertrude tells Claudius of Polonius's death; and during the 3.1 soliloquy. The music accompanying the soliloquy points only to Hamlet's sanity and rational despair, what Russell Jackson describes as "the 'Wittenberg' mode of his mind, intellectually trained, reflective." The theme is structurally augmented while played by reduced forces, and is set in a much higher register than normal, illustrating the strain Hamlet bears in containing his knowledge, plans, and actions until the right moment.⁴¹ New percussive elements are introduced at seemingly random intervals and in irregular groupings, adding to the unpredictability of the scene and score, and underlying Hamlet's own anxieties. This carefully constructed variation speaks not to Hamlet's instability, but rather his tight control on himself and his internal struggle to retain it.

When Hamlet is judged as mad by observers, as by Polonius in the fishmonger scene (2.2) and by Gertrude after Hamlet has spoken to her in her closet (3.4), his theme is neither richly orchestrated and performed without interruption, as it is before he hears the Ghost's tale, nor under pressure, causing it to lengthen and become thin, as it is following the "To be" soliloquy in 3.1, but is presented in a marchlike manner, with sparse orchestration and off-beat accents from the winds. To an audience familiar with Branagh's other films and Doyle's scores for them, the harmonic language here is instantly recognizable as that used in Branagh's 1991 *noir* thriller *Dead Again* to represent heightened anxiety.⁴² Doyle uses this approach in scenes where an aural echo of the textual tension can intensify the audience's understanding or appreciation of the situation. The audience for this *Hamlet* knows, thanks to the inclusion of Hamlet's "antic disposition" comment and Hamlet's overacting of his supposed condition, that this is a Hamlet who never loses his reason. Indeed, the combination of his keen mind and theatrical bent create a madness that is extreme to the point of camp, as when Hamlet surprises Polonius with the skull-faced mask and drags out his "words, words, words" into a "positively playful" parody of clear speech.⁴³ Therefore, the musical effect here is not to indicate Hamlet's sanity to the audience, or even to reassure them of it, but rather to emphasize the discomfort and dangerous tension Hamlet is constructing within the court by means of his behavior. When Gertrude informs Claudius of Polonius's death, this rhythmically altered music appears for a second time. Although Hamlet himself is not present, he is the topic of their frantic and frightened conversation; again his actions have caused a dissonance and unrest in the usually smooth course of palace politics, revealed in the treatment of his theme.

Doyle's major theme is altered only one other time, in this case serving to clarify Hamlet's own discourse on his seeming and truly felt instabilities. In

3.1, Branagh's Hamlet is unaccompanied during the soliloquy up until line 69. At that point, the soliloquy, which seems to be both an honest dissertation on Hamlet's emotions and a provocation addressed to Claudius and Polonius, who are listening behind a two-way mirror, gains the faintest of accompaniments in the form of dry, dead drumbeats and hurried figures in the winds based on the primary theme. As Hamlet continues the speech, the wind figures become single chords, culling from the melodic elements of the theme a sparse line akin to a Schenkerian reduction of the theme. As Hamlet approaches the mirror with his dagger, the drumming becomes more insistent, driving toward the textual cadence of "the dread of something after death" (3.1.78). As Hamlet voices this sobering thought, the register of the thematic reduction drops suddenly and the full orchestra enters beneath Branagh's recitation. The drums are now allowed full resonance and vibration, and with the orchestra they accent the ends of lines. A cadence in the upper strings marks the end of the soliloquy. At the beginning of the speech, Branagh plays Hamlet as a man who has already decided that suicide is not an option, but whose rigorous training at Wittenberg demands his thorough examination of the matter. As he works his way through the soliloquy, the music matches his increasing confidence in both his decisions to reject suicide and to press on in his investigation of Old Hamlet's death. Hamlet's transformation from questioner to answerer is heard in the strictly reduced thematic line—and its omission of secondary or trivial embellishments—and increasing presence of the drums, all of which end in a strong cadence, albeit pianissimo and in a very high register, at the end of the speech. He is melancholy, but there is no madness in this scholar-prince.

Although Doyle's score borrows from his earlier works and is based on a small selection of musical ideas, it succeeds at conveying the director's overall conception of the film as both a monumental and smoothly elegant rendering of the play. In fact, because it is so uncluttered, the score can represent many things at once through metadiegetic significations and cues. It is a score that assumes an audience familiar with the play, from the foreshadowing of its mournful opening to the use of its various themes as markers of intention and opportunity. It allows the text to be heard, and above all emphasizes—as does the direction and use of a conflated text—the notion of the tragedy of *Hamlet* as one not only of families or the aristocracy, but of an entire nation.

ALMEREYDA: *HAMLET* (2000)

Filmmaker Michael Almereyda was best known for his campy horror movies before turning to *Hamlet* in 2000. His *Hamlet* is set in New York City; Denmark is a corporation, and Claudius, Gertrude, and Hamlet reside at the Hotel

Elsinore in luxurious suites. The corporate headquarters and hotel are acquitted with high-end technology and perks, including twenty-four-hour video surveillance, wiretapping equipment, and more. Permanently attached to his pixelvision camera, Hamlet is a filmmaker wanna-be, a proto-video blogger whose only viewers are himself and the audience.

The film stars Ethan Hawke and uses a cast of experienced actors who were mostly unfamiliar with Shakespeare, with the notable exceptions of Diane Venora, who had played both Ophelia and Hamlet, and Liev Schreiber, who had taken a turn as the prince on stage. Almereyda intended to construct a *Hamlet* that would speak to modern audiences accustomed to sound bites, flashbacks, and the chrome-and-glass aesthetic of slick Manhattan businesses. He also decided to brush away filmic precedent: "I read that there were something like 19 silent versions," he said of previous *Hamlets* in an interview, before erroneously describing and then dismissing one of the most celebrated films among those silents, Bernhardt's: "One of Edison's first films was Sarah Bernhardt's *Hamlet*. Now, if you count a film of a middle-aged woman with one leg, standing still, as a version of *Hamlet*. . . ." Despite his inclination to ignore previous *Hamlets*, Almereyda borrows heavily from Rome's Societa Italiana Cines' 1908 and 1910 versions. As Judith Buchanan notes, "such introspection is far from being new to Shakespearean film-making. Ninety years before Ethan Hawkes' moody adolescent Hamlet became an amateur film-maker, an Italian cinematic version of Hamlet's ghostly father had already beaten him to it by explicitly demonstrating *his* interest in the process of cinematic exhibition and repetition."⁴⁴ In the Italian *Amleto*, Old Hamlet's ghost lures his son into a cave, where he shows projections of his death. Almereyda more readily admitted basing his ideas for the film on Orson Welles's *Macbeth*, shot in record time and with considerable intensity, as well as the Finnish *Hamlet* spoof *Hamlet Goes Business*, which also sets the film in a modern, corporate world.⁴⁵ Despite the excellent cinematic heritage Almereyda hoped to give his production, the film is rendered nonsensical in plot and character actions due to the directorial decisions and extreme cuts to the text.

Almereyda and Hawke, working together, decided to make the setting more "authentically" American and believable for audiences by using an entirely American cast: "There were no RSC (Royal Shakespeare Company) grads. . . . We had a nice combination of people who considered themselves experts and people who considered themselves amateurs." In fact, comments by both men indicate that their own understanding of Shakespeare was as unclear as Mel Gibson's was in Zeffirelli's production. Hawke comments that "the interesting thing about it is, Shakespeare is obviously pre-Method acting. The subtext of the characters is all right there in the writing,"⁴⁶ and Almereyda admits that, when it came to an important element of the play, "We kind of

dropped the ball on the madness issue. Hamlet wasn't mad, he was feigning madness. I mean, he was dangerously depressed, which is a kind of madness, but the whole element of him acting goofy, we downplayed that, or maybe it just eluded us, and stuff that we shot in that direction, we didn't use. One key figure for Ethan was Kurt Cobain, who wasn't crazy, but suffered a particular form of depression, or just being overwhelmed with reality."⁴⁷

While having Venora on hand as a "resident dramaturge" helped the actors in their comprehension of the text, the text was far from sacred. Hawke awkwardly defends the decisions to alter the order of or omit significant materials—again expressing his naivety, or perhaps willful distortion in regard to the text—saying, "people who get all caught up thinking [Shakespeare] intended it a certain way are wrong because he never published the plays. The plays were published after he was dead. He just produced them, and that's why there are all these discrepancies. He was just writing. He had like a Hamlet file with all the things in it. When people say, 'you can't move the soliloquy over here.' It's not for sure that he published it and said, 'this one goes here.'"⁴⁸ The result of this approach to the text is a very casual interpretation of even the most important themes of the play. In the filmmakers' attempts to make some issues more obvious to an inexperienced, postmodern audience, Hamlet's traits of introspection and accusative playwriting are transformed into a "To be" soliloquy that takes place under banners reading "Action" and "Go Home Happy" in a Blockbuster store, and "The Mousetrap" is presented as a video montage that features, among other things, clips from *Rebel Without a Cause* and the infamous porn film *Deep Throat*. Other clips include the monk Ticht Nhat Hanh speaking about his idea of "interbeing," a choice Almereyda explains as "the one modern pre-recorded voice, I'd like to think, that Shakespeare wouldn't consider an intrusion," although he does not discuss what he thinks Shakespeare would have thought about the other insertions found in the final product.⁴⁹

Because neither Almereyda nor Hawke was comfortable with any of Hamlet's distracted scenes, which they saw simply as Hamlet "acting goofy," much of the material is simply removed. Hamlet explains neither the Ghost's appearance nor the encounter's impact on him, simply ending his post-Ghost lines with

And therefore as a stranger gave it welcome.
There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio
Than are dreamt of in our philosophy. (1.5.165–67)

There is no "antic disposition," revealed or otherwise. Although Hamlet pays a visit to Ophelia at her apartment and gives her his love poem ("Doubt that the stars are fire"), Ophelia's description of the distracted prince is omitted, as

is Hamlet's admission that he is "but mad north-northwest." However, Hamlet's fishmonger scene with Polonius is retained. The scene is viewed from the point of view of a security camera, filming Hamlet on his way to Claudius's office with a gun concealed in a camera bag. Instead of being stationed and ready to query Hamlet on his odd behavior, Polonius encounters Hamlet in a hallway in the Denmark Corporation's building. The scene is truncated, lasting only ten lines, and is witnessed only by the audience; Claudius does not see what transpires between the two as Polonius attempts to discern Hamlet's mental state. Hamlet's "mad" replies to Polonius are cast here as sarcasm rather than the truthful or insinuated babble of a fool; Hamlet brushes Polonius off in his haste to shoot Claudius, and the scene fails to indicate any solution for Hamlet's revenge other than blunt assault. Had Claudius been present in his office, this Hamlet would surely have shot him on sight, end of situation.

Almeryda's Hamlet is depressed, even truly suicidal, as illustrated in the early fragments of the "To be or not to be" soliloquy, during which he holds a gun at his head and places it in his mouth while repeatedly reciting the first line. He is also narcissistic, trusts no one, and is given to immature and sullen moments, but at no point can he be described as mad. His suspicion of and antagonism toward Polonius have no basis, due to the substantive cuts made to the text. Although Polonius tries to convince Gertrude and Claudius that Hamlet has lost his reason, he has no grounds to do so; his actions are much more about protecting his daughter from an unknown threat than the interests of the crown—or in this case, the Denmark Corporation.

Because Almeryda and Hawke "dropped the ball on the madness issue," there is little to discuss in regard to explicit musical indicators of Hamlet's madness. However, even with all of the suggestions of his distraction removed from the text, Hamlet's overall musical treatment does warrant some examination. Almeryda's production includes two scores, which although entwined in the film are obviously—and marketed as—separate soundtracks. One of these is a fairly typical soundtrack of atmospheric music by composer Carter Burwell with excerpts from Tchaikovsky, Mahler, and Gade; the other is popular music used diegetically in the movie.⁵⁰ Almeryda takes pride in having included a work by Gade (whom Almeryda touts as "an authentic Dane"), but the work in question is Gade's early overture *Efterklange af Ossian* (*Echoes of Ossian*), which, based on Gaelic myth, is hardly a work conveying any motivic or extramusical inferences for the scenes in which it is employed. Neither does Mahler's First Symphony have any connotations of the text or content, particularly for sophisticated listeners familiar with the music.⁵¹ Burwell's music often seems to have subtle relationships with the scenes in which it is used, but relationships that must be teased out by viewers conscious of the musical techniques employed. It is often difficult to discern the reason for or object of the

score. As Mark Burnett has noted, Burwell's repeated minimalist loops represent Hamlet's stasis and the prison of Denmark, but they are used without apparent regularity or any kind of noticeably discernable structure.⁵² Rather than linking them directly to the vacillating thoughts of the characters, the music instead serves as bland aural wallpaper without added meaning. The fishmonger scene has simple minor chords underlying it, accompanied by an irregular drumbeat, indicating not Hamlet's fury or fantastical behavior, but Polonius's misgivings.

As Hamlet watches video of himself reciting "To be or not to be" with his gun, the underlying music again contains an oscillating bass figure and somber melody. The melody, frequently repeated in Hamlet's scenes, low in register and slow to resolve, helps to create the impression that Hamlet's suicidal thoughts at this point are quite serious, and the indeterminacy of the bass figure paints Hamlet's own uncertainty about his emotions and actions. By the time he actually finishes the soliloquy, though, the background music is different: although the screenplay calls for "stentorian music," the background sounds are again a series of chords and drumbeats against the sounds of *The Crow II: City of Angels* playing on monitors in the Blockbuster store in which the scene is set. It is difficult to read this as an interpretation of Hamlet's mood or his intentions, other than to further imply Hamlet's mood swings and lack of self-awareness in his presentation of madness.

In comparison with the "art music" used in Almereyda's *Hamlet*, the popular music used in the film seems to be much more carefully chosen for its affect and in some cases is included with great craft. Laertes's departure from Elsinore is accompanied by blues guitar, establishing a gentle sadness in the parting, and is recalled by Ophelia in her own mental crisis. A scene with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern at a club has the DJ pumping out Primal Scream's "Slip Inside This House," which reveals to the listener the motivation of Hamlet's two friends.

Finer worlds that you uncover
Plant the path you want to roam
Live where you're heart can be given
And your life starts to unfold
You think you can't you wish you could
I know you can, I wish you would
Trip inside this house as you pass by
Trip inside this house as you pass by⁵³

The strength of some of the popular music only highlights the randomness of the pre-existing art music chosen for the soundtrack and the low impact of Burwell's score. Although the sonic landscape of this *Hamlet* is rich

with potential, it ultimately offers little information about the text, characters, or action. Instead, it muddies the waters, undermining directorial competence and adding to its already confusing visual and textual presentations.

CONCLUSION

For the most part, filmmakers adapting *Hamlet* have chosen to follow a traditional interpretative path. While these many cinematic Hamlets may be suffering from psychological complaints ranging from melancholy in its early modern sense to oedipal jealousy in its Freudian construction, they ultimately neither satisfy the requirements to be judged mad in the time of the play's origins nor those of the present day. All of the directors discussed here, regardless of whether they keep Hamlet's "antic disposition" line, make it very clear when the prince is behaving in the guise of one distracted and when he is true to his own nature.

However, all of the films examined here also employ musical cues to one degree or another to further emphasize Hamlet's state of mind. By almost uniformly including an unvaried—or only slightly varied—and highly identifiable presentation of Hamlet's primary theme during those scenes in which his "antic disposition" is played for maximum effect, directors and composers for all of these adaptations of *Hamlet* introduce an aural stability to the entire *mise-en-scène*. This stability, regardless of whether it is consciously recognized by viewers, serves as a grounding point for the character's actions: while his physical actions and words may seem "off," there is nonetheless an underlying force that positions Hamlet as adhering to a rational plan all along. Although the approaches used in these adaptations differ widely from one another, there are several constants at work. The scores for all five films employ traditional, diatonic harmonic language that always ultimately ends with a recognizable and unambiguous cadence, usually of the dominant-tonic variety; stable identifiers or leitmotifs that track with the characters to whom they are assigned; and even in Almereyda's multiply-scored adaptation, a predominance of nondiegetic and metadiegetic music in relation to the film's music as a whole. These factors indicate that although the active portrayal of Hamlet's adopted madness and the environs in which it is set over the last sixty years may have changed, the basic techniques and approaches for scoring the character and his actions have not. Composers continue to provide music in an "art" style of Western culture that relies on the conventional effects of text-painting and traditional perceptions of diatonic music as an overlying commentary to communicate the method in Hamlet's madness.

NOTES

1. Robert Hapgood, ed., *Hamlet*, Shakespeare in Production (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 9.
2. Hugh Kelley, "Prologue to the Romance of an Hour," *Town and Country Magazine*, 1774, quoted in Hapgood, *Hamlet*, 15.
3. Hapgood, *Hamlet*, 25–26.
4. Hapgood, *Hamlet*, 37.
5. Elizabeth Robins, "On Seeing Madame Bernhardt's Hamlet," *North American Review* 171 (December 1900): 908–19.
6. Hapgood, *Hamlet*, 84.
7. Anthony Davies, "The Shakespeare Films of Laurence Olivier," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*, ed. Russell Jackson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 170.
8. Hapgood, *Hamlet*, 68.
9. Hapgood, *Hamlet*, 6.
10. Bernice W. Kliman, *Hamlet: Film, Television, and Audio Performances* (London: Associated University Presses, 1988), 23.
11. Kenneth Tynan, "The Actor: Tynan Interviews Olivier," *Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 2 (1966): 83.
12. James Hirsch, "To Take Arms against a Sea of Anomalies: Laurence Olivier's Film Adaptation of Act Three, Scene One of *Hamlet*," EnterText 1.2, <http://people.brunel.ac.uk/~acsrrrm/entertext/hamlet/hirsh.pdf>.
13. Richard Burt, ed., *Shakespeare after Mass Media* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 112.
14. Michael Kennedy, *Portrait of Walton* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 89.
15. Susanna Walton, *Behind the Façade* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 95–96.
16. Kennedy, *Portrait of Walton*, 139.
17. Scott D. Paulin, "Richard Wagner and the Fantasy of Cinematic Unity: The Idea of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* in the History and Theory of Film Music," in *Music and Cinema*, ed. James Buhler, Caryl Flinn, and David Newmeyer (Hanover, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 2000), 64.
18. Charles Hurtgen, "The Operatic Character of Background Music in Film Adaptations of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1969): 57.
19. Hurtgen, "The Operatic Character of Background Music in Film Adaptations of Shakespeare," 63.
20. Anahid Kassabian, *Hearing Film: Tracking Identifications in Contemporary Hollywood Film Music* (Routledge: New York: 2001), 57.
21. Susan McClary, in Catherine Clément, *Opera, or the Undoing of Women* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), xiii.
22. *Hamlet*, dir. Laurence Olivier, DVD, Carlton International Media, 1948.

23. Kenneth S. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 175.
24. Grigori Kozintsev, *Shakespeare: Time and Conscience*, trans. Joyce Vining (New York: Hill and Wang, 1966), 109.
25. Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 130.
26. Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 164.
27. John Riley, *Dmitri Shostakovich: A Life in Film*, Kinofiles Filmmakers' Companions (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005), 96.
28. Lawrence Gunther, "Hamlet, Macbeth, and King Lear on Film," in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*, ed. Russell Jackson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 121.
29. Kliman, *Hamlet*, 100.
30. Kliman, *Hamlet*, 110, 111.
31. Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 252.
32. Featurette "Mel Gibson: To Be or Not to Be," *Hamlet*, dir. Franco Zeffirelli, DVD, Warner Bros., 1990.
33. Kathy M. Howlett, *Framing Shakespeare on Film* (Athens: Ohio University Press), 20.
34. Howlett, *Framing Shakespeare on Film*, 21.
35. Douglas Brode, *Shakespeare in the Movies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 137.
36. Kenneth Branagh, *Hamlet: Screenplay, Introduction, and Film Diary* [Film Diary by Russell Jackson] (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), 174.
37. Sijbold Tonkens, interview with Patrick Doyle, *FilmScore*, www.filmscore-monthly.com.
38. "Commentary," *Hamlet*, dir. Kenneth Branagh, DVD, Warner Bros., 1996.
39. Mark Thornton Burnett and Ramona Wray, "Branagh on the Bard," *Shakespeare, Film, Fin de Siècle* (New York: St. Martin's, 2000), 175.
40. *Filmtracks*, www.filmtracks.com/titles/hamlet.html.
41. Branagh, *Hamlet: Screenplay, Introduction, and Film Diary*, 197.
42. Doyle also reuses the cue from Hero's memorial in Branagh's *Much Ado About Nothing* when Hamlet requests a scene from the Player King.
43. Branagh, *Hamlet: Screenplay, Introduction, and Film Diary*, 197.
44. Judith Buchanan, *Shakespeare on Film* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson, 2005), 51.
45. Richard von Busack, "Great Dane in the Morning," *Metroactive*, from the May 25–31, 2000, issue of *Metro*, www.metroactive.com/papers/metro/05.25.00/hamlet-0021.html.
46. Jeffrey M. Anderson, "Interview with Ethan Hawke and Michael Almereyda," *Combustible Celluloid*, www.combustiblecelluloid.com/inthawke.shtml.
47. Cynthia Fuchs, "Interview with Michael Almereyda," *PopMatters*, www.popmatters.com/film/interviews/almereyda-michael.shtml.
48. Anderson, "Interview with Ethan Hawke and Michael Almereyda."
49. Michael Almereyda, *William Shakespeare's Hamlet* (London: Faber and Faber, 2000), ix.

50. Almereyda, *William Shakespeare's Hamlet*, 135.
51. Kendra Preston Leonard and Ruth Benander, "Bounded in a Nutshell: The Limitations of Music as Guide in Almereyda's *Hamlet*," unpublished paper, 2004.
52. Mark Thornton Burnett, "'To Hear and See the Matter': Communicating Technology in Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000)," *Cinema Journal* 42, no. 3 (2003): 48–69.
53. Primal Scream, "Slip Inside This House," *Screamadelica*, 1991.



Ophelia

*O*f all of Shakespeare's characters suffering from or feigning madness, Ophelia is the most discussed and analyzed in the scholarly literature. Her disempowerment at the hands of Polonius, Claudius, and finally Hamlet, coupled with her broadly coded descent into madness, makes her a compelling figure for those studying her role as a woman, a lunatic, or both together. The text delineates Ophelia as a young woman of aristocratic but not royal birth who has been reared by her widowed father and is obedient to him in all things. She is close to her older brother, Laertes, and while she appears to be somewhat naïve, she is not so innocent that she cannot joke with him about his sexual behavior when he is away at school. She has been courted by Hamlet and has accepted his attentions. She has little sense of self-worth and displays no particular ambitions, and as a result, she is easily manipulated throughout *Hamlet* by the men who would use her: as a piece of bait, a lover, an informant. She has few options but to accept their direction and, in being thus treated as an infant, has little mind for herself. She is confused by the events surrounding her already when the play opens, and as she is increasingly pushed to do the bidding of others, her understanding and control of that situation lessens exponentially until her mind cannot accept any more requests, any more directives, any more confusion. By the time she begins her journey into madness, she has been instructed to break off her relationship with Hamlet, then to reengage him in order for others to discern his state of mind, and finally, by Hamlet himself, to consider their previous relationship—whatever its extent—null and void. When Hamlet kills her father, Ophelia is left completely directionless; her reason fails.

Unlike Hamlet, the nature of whose melancholy is still a topic of much debate, Ophelia's mental condition at the time of her "mad scene" (4.5) is

unquestionable. Audiences are provided not only with Ophelia's own cues indicating madness, but also the testimony of the characters observing her: Gertrude, Claudius, the attending Gentleman, and Laertes all diagnose her illness as easily as they might a broken limb. Physically, Ophelia's condition is encoded by gestures widely used on the early modern stage: she "beats her heart" (4.5.5) and "winks and nods and gestures" (4.5.11); these were all commonly accepted physical symptoms of women's mental illness—specifically feminine erotomania—in early modern England.¹ Her actions are overtly sexual and disjointed, and her language is fraught with symbols of feminine instability. As Elaine Showalter suggests, "Her flowers suggest the discordant double images of female sexuality as both innocent blossoming and whorish contamination; she is the 'green girl' of pastoral, the virginal 'Rose of May' and the sexually explicit madwoman who, in giving away her wild flowers and herbs, is symbolically deflowering herself."² She is "divided from her fair judgment" (4.5.86) and "distract" (4.5.3), a condition unto itself, according to Carol Thomas Neely. "Ophelia's madness is represented almost entirely through fragmentary, communal, and thematically coherent quoted discourse," writes Neely. "She recites proverbs, formulas, tales, and songs that ritualize passages of transformation and loss—lost love, lost chastity, and death."³

Alison Findley writes that accounting for Ophelia's use of language is crucial to understanding her mixed speech and music. "The play shows clearly that Ophelia does not have the speech and writing which Hamlet uses to cope with mental crisis. While Hamlet is 'as good as a chorus' (3.2.240), Ophelia has only a tenth of the number of lines he speaks. She does not appear able to discuss her distraction in a rational way and turns her suffering inwards on her body. . . . The gentleman says that her 'speech is nothing'—it is implied that she can express herself only physically."⁴ And musically: despite her delusions and behavior during her crucial scene, Ophelia is nonetheless evidently in enough control of her mind to attempt to communicate through symbolic and musical means. Because Ophelia's quotes are from common knowledge that would have been well-known to contemporary audiences, the meaning of her spoken lines would have been plain for early modern theater-goers. A contemporary audience would have well understood that Ophelia's gift of fennel and columbine to Claudius was an insult, as these represented flattery, foolishness, and adultery (4.5.180). To Gertrude she gives a commonly known abortifacient, rue, which was also associated with adultery. Finally, she declares that all innocence has been lost when there is no one to whom she can give her daisy, the symbol of such. Indeed, more than one careful reader makes the claim that the text hints that Ophelia is pregnant; she and Gertrude are to wear their rue "with a difference" (4.5.181–82): Gertrude's difference being to admit her sin; Ophelia's to remove the effects of hers.⁵

Musically, Ophelia's text was equally as transparent to contemporary audiences. Although, as David Lindley notes, the exact sources for all of Ophelia's songs have not been found, they "clearly belong to the popular ballad tradition."⁶ English stage history records that, in Shakespeare's time, the actor playing the part almost always sang as much of the part as he could, using tunes including "Bonny Sweet Robin" or "Robin Is to the Greenwood Gone;" and "Walsingham," all of which appeared in William Chappell's *The Ballad Literature and Popular Music of the Olden Time*, a source for music for a number of theater productions during the time.⁷ Ophelia's song "Bonny Sweet Robin" is a lament for a dead lover (although "robin" was also slang for a penis, and used frequently in songs in this context). In "Walsingham," in which she sings "How should I your true-love know / From another one? / By his cockle hat and staff, / And his sandal shoon" (4.5.48–51), Ophelia alters the gender of the song's original protagonist in order to sing of the departure—by abandonment, followed by death—of a male lover. Interspersed with these fragments and variations on more serious airs, Ophelia sings the entire text of one bawdy song, "To-morrow is Saint Valentine's day," just one example of a common seventeenth-century ballad-type describing the seduction of a woman by her employer or social superior.⁸ This in particular is easily understood: here's a woman who has been seduced and abandoned. Ophelia herself could well be the maid let in "that out a maid / Never departed more" (4.5.55).

The very act of singing is also important in marking Ophelia's condition. Susan McClary writes that "women who sang [of their own accord] in public . . . were regarded as courtesans and were pressured to grant sexual favors in exchange for being permitted to participate in cultural production."⁹ For presumably chaste women, song was the purview of the madwoman, and this aspect of a disturbed woman's behavior was especially emphasized on the stage. Audiences who may have missed the actor's initial physical cues would certainly have recognized the character as distracted by her insistence on singing in the presence of Claudius and Gertrude.¹⁰ As Leslie Dunn has shown, Ophelia's singing is an act of bravery in addition to one of torment: "In Shakespeare's dramatic construction of Ophelia as madwoman, the discourse of music has a privileged place: Ophelia's songs dominate her mad scene, not only in their profusion, but in their disruptive and invasive power. From her first entrance Ophelia uses singing to command attention and confuse response, frustrating Gertrude's attempts to contain her utterance within the bounds of polite conversation."¹¹ Dunn's reading of Ophelia as a "figure of song" places her well within "the broader discourse of music in early modern English culture, with its persistent associations between music, excess, and the feminine."¹² Thus music—or reference to it—provides Ophelia with a certain power even in her dishevelment. Michel Foucault has written that the role of the fool or

madman in early modern drama is often that of the truth-teller: “he speaks love to lovers, the truth of life to the young, the middling reality of things to the proud, to the insolent, and to liars.”¹³ Indeed, this is Ophelia’s role beginning with the onset of her madness in 4.5. “Ophelia’s madness is represented almost entirely through fragmentary, communal, and thematically coherent quoted discourse,” writes Carol Thomas Neely. “She recites proverbs, formulas, tales, and songs that ritualize passages of transformation and loss—lost love, lost chastity, and death.”¹⁴ None of her words are trivial; all of them impart information or serve to move the plot forward.

Over the course of time, the musicality of Ophelia’s role has been subjected to the influences of changing taste and stage practices. In the early modern period, the role was played by a boy or young man able to accompany himself on a lute. Women first took on the role in the eighteenth century, at which point it appears that Ophelia’s songs were no longer self-accompanied, although they may have been supported by a small theater ensemble.¹⁵ During the first part of the eighteenth century, much of Ophelia’s bawdier text was officially censored, and singers, rather than actresses, were cast in the part. In the late nineteenth century, the increasing interest in realism in theater led to actors—including the famed Ellen Terry, in her preparation for the role—being encouraged to visit asylums for the mentally ill and to study the women there in order to better portray Ophelia’s madness.¹⁶ By this time, actors considered the part an essential element of the repertoire and singers were rarely, if ever, engaged for the role. Stage practices at this time commonly included Ophelia’s full text with the songs presented musically, usually unaccompanied.

Modern filmmakers, however, have not generally followed the old stage practices for Ophelia’s songs, instead relying on a cappella singing for Ophelia herself and new music to accompany her other scenes. There are several explanations for this discontinuity in Ophelia’s musical presentation. While staging and acting techniques were often imported wholecloth into silent films from the stage, sound, of course, was not. Silent adaptations of Shakespeare only rarely had accompanying sheet music or sound cylinders (Sarah Bernhard’s *Hamlet* was accompanied by these). More often, cinemas employed organists, pianists, or small orchestras to accompany the films shown there; the majority of these relied on canned cues that could be repurposed for a number of different movies. As discussed in chapter 1, short works with titles like “Sorrow,” “Lovers’ Embrace,” and “Grand March” could be used in any number of films—sometimes ironically or satirically—to convey information about the plot. Early films of *Hamlet*, such as George L. Fox’s nineteenth-century version for the nickelodeon, frequently used generic or satiric music to accompany the action.¹⁷

It is likely, then, that Ophelia's scene was given a predictable treatment by a performer using "Melancholy" or "Turmoil" cues rather than any reference to the songs the actor would have sung had she been on stage. As film and sound technology developed, directors and producers sought out specialist composers to write new music for their productions. During the transition from silence to sound, these composers were frequently those behind the canned music for silent pictures, but as it became clear that Hollywood offered the chance to earn significant money, high-profile "art" composers such as Aaron Copland, Virgil Thomson, and other classically trained musicians began working in the field. They, too, were more focused on the creation of new music—written to provide a full-length, organic score for each film—than in representing Shakespearean characters with the music originally associated with them. Catherine Clément rightly observes that actors in tragic roles like those of Ophelia and Lady Macbeth are specifically directed to perform with coded female attributes and that the use of music enhances this performance by its traditionally feminine status.¹⁸ However, Ophelia's tunes, when they remain, are obscured, cut, or eliminated in favor of spoken presentations, reducing the power and impact of Ophelia's vocality.

Before delving into Ophelia's cinematic musical representations, it is important to consider her appearance in film. Ophelia's character has a rich visual history. Elaine Showalter has written eloquently on Ophelia's progression from a stock stage figure to a romanticized representation of mental illness in women in the Victorian period.¹⁹ As Showalter notes, modern visual incarnations of Ophelia are heavily influenced by the obsession of Pre-Raphaelite painters with her death, and their depictions of a chaste and sorrowful Ophelia have permeated the consciousness of filmmakers and audiences alike. Paintings by Burne Jones, Delacroix, Hebert, Hughes, Millais, Rossetti, and Waterhouse all show a young woman with luxurious long hair, often dressed in the white or blue of the Virgin Mary. She carries flowers or is otherwise surrounded by them, and is pictured in a passive pose, leaning on a tree or against Polonius, or lying on the ground or in the water, often with a wide-eyed, unknowing stare. José Mesa Villar explains that all of these visual artists were compelled to create Ophelias who were pitifully insane and clearly the victims of accident, not suicides. Considering Ophelia's near-universal pose and the artists' intentions, he writes that artists viewed Ophelia as having been "brought up as an eternal infant," leading to a particular artistic style. "The aesthetics found in Millais' canvas are intimately linked to the so-called *culte des invalides* which, basically, consists of the Victorian association between consumptive female looks and notions such as 'purity' and 'social distinction.'" According to Villar, the painters tried to influence audiences' (viewers') opinions

on the cause of Ophelia's death: "Millais' Ophelia cannot be considered to have committed suicide because this notion would deprive her of the sense of virtue that the artist wanted to provide her with."²⁰ This fragile, delicate, and infantilized Ophelia appears repeatedly in cinematic adaptations of *Hamlet*. Although different productions and actors bring their own nuances to the role, the Victorian fantasy of Ophelia dominates.

OLIVIER: *HAMLET* (1948)

As discussed in the previous chapter, Olivier's *Hamlet* is fraught with Freudian analyses and serves as an exercise in the application of Ernest Jones's oedipal reading of the play. Hamlet spends as much of his time trying to reconcile his contrary feelings about his mother as he does in pursuing revenge for his father.

Hamlet's relationship with Ophelia is likewise troubled, albeit in the opposite way from his strangely intimate connection with Gertrude: he is aloof with Ophelia, as though her physically female presence is distasteful to him. Indeed, Ophelia's role in Olivier's film is cut to only 803 words of the 1,233 in the First Folio, and her appearances in the film are limited to those necessary because she has lines. Peter Donaldson notes that Olivier's staging of 3.1 is influenced by Dover Wilson's interpretation of the scene, in which Hamlet overhears Polonius instructing Ophelia in her role: because his erotic ideal is embodied in his mother, and because of this foreknowledge that Ophelia is a pawn in Claudius's and Polonius's game, Hamlet has no more use or respect for her.²¹ Ophelia becomes the least important of the play's four major characters, leaving Gertrude as the only "surviving" woman, long before Ophelia's actual death. As Kenneth S. Rothwell writes in his overview of Olivier's film, "Hamlet shows only coldness without a trace of tenderness for the poor, beleaguered young woman, who remains the ultimate female victim."²²

In the film's musical introduction to the primary characters, Ophelia's doorway is shown after the camera settles on Hamlet's chair and the entrance to Gertrude's chamber. As the camera turns to the arched opening to her bedroom, Hamlet's somber and ambiguous theme modulates into Ophelia's, a modal, folklike tune carried by the oboe. Ophelia's theme is one redolent of the imagined idyllic pastoral Albion. Of all of the musical material in *Hamlet*, it is the most unlike Walton's usual language. Instead, it is closer in construction to that of Ralph Vaughan Williams, whose collection and use of folk songs and their elements was widely known and possessively labeled as "English" by contemporary audiences. Concert-going viewers would have recently

heard Vaughan Williams's Oboe Concerto (1944) and his music for the film *The Loves of Joanna Godden* (1946), both of which feature folk-song-like elements, the "pastoral" Dorian mode, and the oboe to indicate the spirit of nature and the countryside. A departure from Walton's usual jazz-influenced or more harmonically progressive pieces, Ophelia's theme is pleasant but not very instructive as to her character, the first indication that her traditional expressive and controversial musicality will be subverted during the film.

Hamlet's theme lends itself well to ambiguity, further development, and increased complexity, a representation of Hamlet's own intellect and personality. In contrast, throughout the film, Ophelia's plaintive melody remains mostly unchanged from its original hearing, implying a simplicity of mind and character. While Hamlet's motivic material changes and progresses in complexity and character during the film, Ophelia's theme is only minimally varied in tempo and orchestration, even when she is depicted in the deepest throes of madness, dashing across the brook in which she will die. In the scheme of the symphonic score, she is denied the musical agency granted to Hamlet and even to Claudius, whose motifs warn audiences of his evil—albeit occasionally conflicted—ways and scheming plans.

In addition to his lack of desire to create more significant music for Ophelia, Walton later reused her theme without alteration for his 1954 opera *Troilus and Cressida*, indicating that her music was conceived as a more general product than that of Hamlet. It apparently contained so little meaning that its later employment for Cressida, a vastly different character, was not a concern to the composer. Walton's own take on the reuse was to justify his practices by comparing them to Shakespeare's own: "Of course, Shakespeare repeats himself the whole time, battle after battle after battle."²³ For Walton, it was the same with Shakespeare's female characters: men warrant musical complexity and individual treatments, but one generic gesture is sufficient for all of the plays' women.²⁴

After its initial introduction during the tour of the castle, Ophelia's theme is next heard in the transition from Hamlet's "fishmonger" conversation with Polonius (2.2.169–220) to the scene between Hamlet and Ophelia in which he denies his relationship with her (3.1.91–150). She moves in a slow, dream-like fashion from her chamber into the lobby. The script reads "Ophelia fades in," and indeed, she appears at first translucent and ghostlike, her presence only gaining corporeal significance as she comes into the view of the men who control her life and, by extension, the gaze of the audience.²⁵ Although her gown has a high neck, the upper portion is made of mesh, creating the appearance of a low-cut dress. The camera is leveled at her breasts as she approaches it, a view broken only when Polonius hands her the book from which she is to read, and later she pulls out Hamlet's remembrances from the

lower neckline. As he tells her “get thee to a nunnery,” Olivier’s own gaze travels from Ophelia’s face to (hidden) cleavage and back again a number of times, while she uses her hand to cover as much of her chest and throat as she can. Hamlet physically bullies her in the scene, tossing away her book and pinning her hands early on, then later throwing her on the stairs. Here, the male gaze of the director clearly sexualizes her as an adult woman in direct contrast to her costuming and acting, in which she is dressed and directed as a young and innocent girl. This is the first of many contradictory elements in Olivier’s treatment of Ophelia; generally speaking, she is infantilized by his directions to Simmons to play the role as an innocent, but is accorded a highly sexualized visual approach, with the camera’s gaze lingering over her legs, shoulders, and breasts.

Her music is at first unaltered from its initial introduction. Unlike scenes in which Hamlet’s dialogue is the focal point and privileged to the exclusion of background music, the music continues beneath Polonius’s instructions to Ophelia to “read upon this book” (3.1.49–50). When Polonius tells his daughter, “Ophelia, walk you here,” the music changes, modulating upward and introducing a dissonance to Ophelia’s theme, indicating a small but significant loss of innocence by complying with her father’s instructions to dupe Hamlet. However, this minor alteration doesn’t change the ultimate representation of Ophelia’s in music: a simple mind, incapable of the complex thoughts Hamlet has and that his music indicates, in a pretty body, subjected repeatedly to Olivier’s objectifying gaze. Walton then introduces elements of Hamlet’s theme, including its characteristic chromaticism, into the overall mix, privileging Hamlet’s musical material over Ophelia’s, and indicating the importance and blamelessness of Hamlet in the scene. While he may be mistrustful and unsure of his own mind, he is the victim in this scene; his words are not undermined by altered thematic material. The scene itself is moved forward from its normal location in the play to preface Hamlet’s “To be or not to be” soliloquy, and Olivier’s emphasis on Hamlet’s mental state rather than the emotional interplay between the pair discounts the importance of Ophelia’s reaction to the encounter.²⁶

The scene is played in a traditional manner, with a timorous Ophelia, suspicious and domineering Hamlet, and lurking Polonius and Claudius. Jean Simmons, who played Ophelia in the film when she was just sixteen years old, can hardly be described here as distracted. Nevertheless, her actions foreshadow her later scenes as she physically fetishizes the remembrances when she tries to return them to Hamlet, turning them over and over nervously in the same manner she later uses with her flowers and herbs. When the music resumes at the end of the scene, after Claudius and Polonius have exited, still leaving her weeping on the stairs, it recalls Ophelia’s theme briefly in a lower

register and without the solo oboe. It is clear that though damaged emotionally by her encounter with Hamlet, Ophelia has not yet lost her reason. Simmons's performance indicates that Ophelia here is merely unhappy, and the consistency of her theme, unchanged from its origins, corroborates this interpretation. By setting her theme in the lower register, the music at the end of this scene depicts Ophelia's still sound psychological condition. Her emotions are "low," and her theme has been transposed from its previously higher pitch to one that is literally lower, or depressed, in relation to its original statement.

As the camera retreats from a distraught and weeping Ophelia, lying on the staircase and grasping at the stone, it again presents the male gaze from Hamlet's point of view: this time, in keeping with Olivier's Freudian direction, she is not lovely but an impure wretch unworthy of attention. This scene is a definitive example of Mulvey's conception of the male gaze: Ophelia is subjected to "devaluation, punishment, or saving of the guilty object" by Hamlet as she is first cast aside (devalued) and brutalized (punished) and then told to retreat from Elsinore altogether (an attempt at mercy or salvation).²⁷ The script repeatedly describes Hamlet's actions with her (and with Gertrude) as "fling[ing] her" to the floor (or, in Gertrude's case, the bed).²⁸ Ophelia's musical treatment reflects this violence and gaze, creating a male aurality in which the perspective and prerogative of the male has the utmost value. Ophelia's accompaniment is undercut with—devalued by—Hamlet's theme, and as she remains alone and ignored on the stairs, suffering in her punishment, her music is again displaced in favor of his as the camera rushes up the dark staircase on his way to his monologue. His actions and thoughts are thus signified as paramount; his theme introduces and accompanies his next action, in which the ambiguity of the music and Hamlet's thoughts are, for the first time, clearly shown in parallel.

While it is true that the play is subtitled *The Tragedy of the Prince of Denmark* and not *The Tragedy of the Court of Denmark*, the reactions of those involved are lost in Olivier's all-consuming, all-media focus on his role. That Ophelia's theme is structured to give way so easily to that of Hamlet's as the camera moves up the stairs indicates as well that Ophelia's distress and role are secondary or even tertiary in importance to the personal melodrama of the prince. In this scene, it is clear that Hamlet's actions in rebuking Ophelia and distancing himself from her Polonius-driven manipulations take precedence over Ophelia's burgeoning distress. Because of the editing of the text that moves Hamlet's most famous soliloquy to the next scene, his music overtakes hers; her single soliloquy, "O what a noble mind is here o'erthrown!" (3.1.164–75) is eliminated. This treatment, both the cuts made to Ophelia's role and her simplistic and unchanging theme, again indicate that for Olivier and Walton, Ophelia is a pretty diversion within the play, not to be taken seriously in the overall structure of the work or given

screen time beyond what is absolutely necessary. As Carol Chillington Rutter notes, with her soliloquy omitted, Ophelia is viewed as a body rather than a person, and this is certainly true with consideration to the camera's gaze in regard to Ophelia.²⁹ As the film progresses, Ophelia is increasingly silenced by the men around her in the play and by those controlling her character from outside of it through the male gaze and aurality, supporting this view of her disempowerment.

The overt pastoralism of Ophelia's musical material returns with the onset of her madness in 4.5. Her distraction is not immediately evident: she is first shown inquisitively plucking a flower out of the brook. However, the scene is deceiving. She soon begins to scream, and in a bit of cinematic foreshadowing runs across the willow that "grows aslant" the stream and into the castle. As before, her music is subject to a limiting factor that disprivileges her song, speech, and action. Her theme here is slightly altered in its accompaniment; instead of the static, supporting strings used when it is introduced, the stability of Ophelia's theme is now lessened by the repeated patterns of rising sixteenth notes from the other winds. This minor adjustment to the accompaniment is the only time her theme is varied, and it is only minimally indicative of Ophelia's own unsteady and anxious mind. As her mood rapidly shifts and her screaming gives way to a vacant smile, the music changes to match it on the surface, with the oboe line relaxing in tempo. However, the active figures beneath the oboe continue, providing the audience with a Mickey-Mousing score that illustrates Ophelia's two minds as she runs into a chamber in Elsinore to confront Gertrude. The overall effect is one of little difference from her music earlier. The gentle modal tune of the oboe is most prominent, and the sixteenth-note figures underneath could just as well represent the flowing water of the brook as they could Ophelia's mental disquiet. Her emotions and their impact on the action of the play are downplayed by the music; as a disturbed woman whose role will soon come to its end, there is little motivation for Walton to write new material. The dismissive male aurality of the scene's score begins to diminish Ophelia's importance, even in this crucial scene, before she even addresses Gertrude. As before, the male gaze is obvious: Ophelia's dress hangs off her shoulders, and her bodice is loose and decorated with flowers; the camera's focus again is her breasts.

Ophelia's singing of popular and bawdy songs is one of the key elements in constructing her madness on stage. The songs she sings are necessary clues to her unresolved relationship with Hamlet and her understanding of what has happened around her at Elsinore; when her vocality is altered, it considerably reduces the impact and importance of her character. At the beginning of 4.5, Olivier omits Ophelia's first stanza of song, taken from

“Walsingham,” but does have her sing “He is dead and gone, lady, / He is dead and gone, / At his head a grass-green turf, / At his heels a stone” (4.5.29–32) to the traditional tune associated with it. As in the earlier scene between Hamlet and Ophelia, Ophelia is directed in a contradictory manner that both derides her character’s maturity while emphasizing her physical beauty. The song is interpolated with an infantilely pitched crying, which is juxtaposed by Olivier’s sexualizing shot of Ophelia’s bare upper thigh while she writhes on the ground.

In her continuation of the song, Olivier changes Ophelia’s lines from “Which bewept to the ground did not go” to the more obvious “Which bewept to the grave did go” (4.5.39) to emphasize that, at this moment, Ophelia is focused on her father’s death rather than Hamlet’s actions toward her. The point that she is *not* thinking of Hamlet is driven home even further with the virtual omission of Ophelia’s second song, “To-morrow Is Saint Valentine’s Day,” the very clear narrative of a woman who has lost her virginity to a man she trusted who then—in a common double standard—shuns her for having done so:

To-morrow is Saint Valentine’s day,
All in the morning betime,
And I a maid at your window,
To be your Valentine.
Then up he rose and donned his clo’es,
And dupp’d the chamber-door,
Let in the maid, that out a maid
Never departed more.



By Gis, and by Saint Charity,
Alack, and fie for shame!
Young men will do’t if they come to’t,
By Cock, they are to blame.
Quoth she, “Before you tumbled me,
You promised me to wed.”
(He answers.)
“So would I ’a’ done, by yonder sun,
And thou hadst not come to my bed.” (4.5.48–55, 58–66)

As Dunn writes, “For Ophelia to sing such a lyric, especially in front of her lover’s parents, is shocking. My point, however, is the fact that Ophelia sings is just as indecorous as what she sings, and in some ways even more disturbing, because of the surplus of meaning that inheres in her singing voice,

and the power that voice-in-music gives her.”³⁰ Clearly Olivier was so uncomfortable with this power that he all but omitted it. Ophelia does sing a small excerpt of “Saint Valentine’s Day” but it occurs after she has been placed under Horatio’s watch, and only Horatio and the two sailors delivering Hamlet’s letter to him hear her—even the film’s viewers cannot clearly hear or understand her. She paces about her terrace, picking up and setting down flowers; her music, like that at the end of her scene with Hamlet, is unchanged from her appearance earlier in the act. Ophelia sings as she is walking away from Horatio and the soldiers and away from the camera. Her words are muffled to the point of abstracting the song and reducing it to a vague tune, and it fades rapidly while the focus of the camera is on the three men. Horatio speaks over Ophelia’s singing, dismissing it entirely and then leading the sailors away from Ophelia, leaving her on her own. The fact that Olivier first removes this song from its original setting in front of the entire court and then later shortens its full performance and obscures its meaning both eliminates Ophelia’s own sexuality and diminishes the roots of her madness. Here Olivier and not just Walton creates a male auralty by discounting song as a signifier of madness and squeamishly hiding the possible personal meaning of the song for Ophelia. This Ophelia is a sad but minor inconvenience to the court, not a voice of earthy truth in recounting her experiences with Hamlet and her observation of the goings-on at Elsinore. The opportunity that the original text creates to more fully explain Ophelia’s bewildering actions is removed by Olivier’s editing in order to focus more on the adventures of Hamlet with the pirates. In fact, Ophelia’s material is cut short while Olivier interpolates an interlude of fighting ships and a swashbuckling Hamlet only mentioned in the play but shown with great drama and swagger on the part of Olivier in the film. This episode reinforces the primacy of Olivier himself in the film and the disinterest he has in the role of women in the play.

Ophelia sings from “Walsingham” again (but still very briefly) before and after bequeathing her flowers to Gertrude, Claudius, and Laertes. Before she gives the flowers to the assembled group, she again sings while facing away from the camera, making her words difficult to understand and easily ignored by players and viewers alike. Visually, she appears in the scene as a potential seductress, offering Laertes a kiss that threatens to go into decidedly nonsisterly territory. She is physically depicted through her loose and revealing clothes and the camera’s focus on her breasts as a sexualized object, but since Ophelia, for Olivier, cannot actually *be* a sexual being, her words to such effect are purged or dominated by the words of the men present. Even when Ophelia interrupts Claudius and Laertes’s conversation, her singing—“Bonny Sweet Robin,” with its double entendres, in which “robin” stands for “penis”—is once more covered up by speech, this time by Laertes’s own male rhetoric.

Only when she resumes speaking in prose as she doles out the flowers does Olivier let the camera come back to her face to allow her voice to be heard. Walton's music retains its barely altered accompanimental figures, and her own vocality is eliminated as needless. In the last instance of Ophelia's singing, she again has her back to both the character audience and the viewer, and as before her song is scarcely heard. Gertrude, Claudius, and Laertes watch her leave the castle without a single gesture, physical or musical, that indicates their concern. Ophelia looks back twice to see if they are following her to help her or give her comfort, but when she realizes they are not, her arched eyebrow indicates that she knows that their minds are made up. From this point onward, the court—even her own brother—considers her pitiable but unimportant. She tells them, from a distance, "God be with you," and very deliberately exits the room. The accompanimental figure for her theme becomes an ascending cadential sequence that finally resolves when Gertrude begins her announcement of Ophelia's death. Ophelia's theme is heard once more in an augmented fashion as Gertrude speaks. As it was in the introduction, it is accompanied by static strings and the augmentation is broad enough that a typical audience might not even notice that it is the same music. As the still-living Ophelia floats past the camera in a singular moment of grotesquerie, she sings, but not unsurprisingly, her words are distorted and broken up with childish giggles and sighs, giving her no final true words at all. Instead, basing the shot on Millais's painting, Olivier has turned her into an embodiment of the Pre-Raphaelite painters' vision: lovely, chaste, and silent.³¹

In Olivier's film, Ophelia's death is quite obviously accidental; the singing, childlike creature in the water lacks the knowledge and determination to commit suicide. Instead, she has been rendered speechless and breathless by Gertrude and the placid pastoralism that marked her living actions, and it is possible that during this scene, the music refers more to Gertrude's mental state than Ophelia's. Gertrude is either an apparent witness, although this has been shown to be unlikely, or has just received the news herself.³² Her own mind is in flux, trying to decipher the recent events at her court. It is not surprising that Gertrude's words are given more musical import than Ophelia's; throughout the film, Ophelia's appearances and text have been omitted to place her at the very bottom of the order at Elsinore. Even the Gravedigger (First Clown) sings uncensored: his song is allowed a full and lusty hearing as a preamble to Ophelia's burial (5.1.61–64).

In directing Simmons as a primarily childlike and innocent Ophelia, Olivier abnegates much of her power. In the brief moments that Ophelia's sexuality is hinted at—the shot of her bare leg on the stone floor, her off-the-shoulder nightgown—it is exclusively seen through the male gaze, a view that privileges Hamlet, Horatio, Laertes, and Claudius well above the women of

the court. In taking away the eloquence and meaning of her songs, Olivier cuts away even more of Ophelia's substance, creating a woman who is never actually heard. In the music that signifies Ophelia and her traumas, the male gaze is applied in an aural form that, alongside its visual counterpart, objectifies Ophelia through its simple pastoralism, its lack of development or variation, and its casual treatment as a work that could be easily reused for other Shakespearean women Walton also saw as unimportant—or as the “frailty” that is woman—and denies her her most important attribute—her voice of truth in a court of lies.

KOZINTSEV: *HAMLET* (1964)

Kozintsev's Ophelia, played by Anastasiya Vertinskaya, is one of the most passive Ophelias on the screen. In her early scenes, she is depicted as utterly dependent on Polonius, not unhappily following his advice and instructions about her interactions with Hamlet. She is placid, wide-eyed, and innocent; when she is used by Polonius and Claudius to test Hamlet's sanity, she is more confused than hurt. Yet Kozintsev's treatment of Ophelia is not centered, as Olivier's was, on the male hero; instead, it stems from a rather feminist viewpoint that takes into account the male hegemony of Ophelia's world. Kozintsev writes that Ophelia's male keepers “give her no peace,” keeping her in a state where she is “confused and understands nothing. Elsinore chains her to the lifeless ceremonial.”³³ Indeed, she is followed and tended to constantly by a group of older women, her duennas, from whom she never seems to escape for a moment's privacy or introspection. Like Olivier's Ophelia, Kozintsev's is stripped of a number of her lines. His cuts are made with more deliberation than Olivier's and considerably more thought about Ophelia as an integral character. Kozintsev decides that Ophelia's silence is a manifestation of her father's and brother's control over her: “They do not permit her to realize her own feelings.”³⁴

The score for the film was equally accorded significant thought, both by Kozintsev and Dmitri Shostakovich, its composer. At this point in his tumultuous career, Shostakovich had essentially stopped writing music for the cinema, which, like Walton, according to Elizabeth Wilson, he considered “an annoying distraction from his main life's work.”³⁵ However, with a number of monumental post-Stalin works behind him, including the Thirteenth Symphony, he returned to film music to create five new scores, two for Kozintsev. Kozintsev believed Shostakovich's music to be an essential element of the film, writing that “Shostakovich's music serves as a great example to me. I could not

direct my Shakespearean films without it. . . . In Shostakovich's music I hear a virulent hatred of cruelty, of the cult of power, of the persecution of truth."³⁶ His work for *Hamlet* is particularly engaged and provides a significant additional perspective to the film's text, perhaps because of those very issues. As J. Lawrence Gunther writes, "Shostakovich's score counterpoints, highlights, and comments on the action itself, transforming each shot into a microcosmic *Gesamtkunstwerk*, a unified work of art in image and sound."³⁷ In instances where the text and action speak alone, there is no sound but that of the diegesis; the score is included only when there is something substantial it can contribute to the audience's understanding of a scene or action.

Early in the film (1.3.60–145, heavily edited), Ophelia's first appearance is accompanied by a halting, relentlessly diatonic figure whose diegesis stems from a dance lesson presided over by one of the duennas. Kozintsev was direct and particular about the music for this scene and how it would be used later in the film. As he wrote to Shostakovich,

May I beg you to compose a short number?—"The Dance of Ophelia," the beginning of the scene in Polonius's house. An old woman is teaching various dances to Ophelia. . . . Ophelia learns the steps by heart under her directions.

We want to show how they denaturalize the girl. (The term is stupid, of course, but nothing else comes to mind.) And here is how the figure is conceived: a sweet girl, half a child, whom they turn into a doll—a mechanical plaything with artificial movements, a memorized smile, and the like.

. . . In later mad scenes, it will be possible to repeat and develop the theme.³⁸

Indeed, Ophelia in this early scene could already be an automaton: her dance is rhythmic but stilted, consisting of held balletic poses and deep bows or curtsies. Even her hair, pulled up into a tight bun, resembles that of a classical ballerina. She dances alone, and there is no indication that the dance, in its final form, is one shared between partners. Although the woman in charge of the lesson mimes plucking a lutelike instrument, the sound is that of a celesta, played squarely in time and without artistic inflection. The hesitant and slow pace of the theme can be heard as the playing of an amateur or inexperienced player, or that of a creaky music box; it is fittingly mechanical and devoid of emotion for a young woman who obeys the orders given to her with little questioning and no resistance. As Carolyn Abbate has noted, "associations between soulless playing and music machines have remained common," and the audience is intended both to hear the soullessness of Ophelia's keepers in this scenario of forced artistic practice and to see Ophelia as an automaton, the "obedient instrument" of the dance.³⁹ Ophelia has no emotion on her face as

she dances: this dancing is neither pleasurable nor unpleasant, but a duty, just as much as heeding her brother's words or obeying her father are later in the scene. The only emotive clue Shostakovich gives in Ophelia's dance music is the use of a tritone in the seventh bar of the dance tune. Shostakovich frequently used the tritone in his works to suggest the macabre or an impending catastrophe: it appears most notably in the funereal introduction to the final movement of the Fourth Symphony and throughout the Seventh Symphony ("Leningrad"), always undermining a more heroic theme or otherwise destabilizing the prevailing tonality. This musical instability, traditionally associated with evil and chaos, hints not only at the transgressions of her father and Claudius in using Ophelia without concern for her humanity but also at Ophelia's own mental volatility and the turmoil it will later bring to the play.

In a highly visual adaptation of 2.1.87–112, the scene in which Ophelia tells Polonius of a visit Hamlet has made to her as she was sewing in her closet, what Ophelia describes is portrayed through music and action. Kozintsev elegantly shows the audience through visual and musical signs that Ophelia is thinking positively of Hamlet and is optimistic in her relationship with him, despite Polonius's warnings. Her thoughts are signified by her long gaze at Hamlet's portrait while reciting his poem, "Doubt that the stars are fire," which he has written on its reverse. The music that accompanies Ophelia during this action first seems to be a new tune, a courtly melody played by strings with long, slurred phrases and a sense of calm; for the first time, she is not scored with the music of the automaton, but given music that goes beyond the mechanical bars of her earlier confinement. However, its implications of grace and gentility are interrupted by the abrupt entrance of the celesta in the second phrase. The music assigned to the celesta is, as it was in the dance lesson, square and rigid in its presentation, and full of chromaticism and dissonances that clash with the string music. These two competing themes and timbres represent Ophelia's mind and heart: the legato strings are her individualistic love for Hamlet and the contentment she feels in contemplating her relationship with him, while the celesta is a constant and discordant reminder of her duty to her father and her required obedience to him, manifested in her mechanical and unemotional behavior. Her love appears to win out when the celesta fades away and then returns in consonance with the strings as she reads Hamlet's poem, and the music becomes Ophelia's personal theme for Hamlet.

However, when Hamlet then appears before Ophelia "with his doublet all unbraced," her musical signification of him is necessarily changed. The variation connotes her emotions perfectly: it is announced with a portentous roll of the timpani as Hamlet staggers into her room and is presented in a lower register, a dark and murky motif in the basses. As Hamlet retreats from Ophelia, his own theme emerges from a brief fanfare. At this point, it becomes ap-

parent that Ophelia's personal Hamlet theme is a variation on Hamlet's primary motif, devoid of its more striking dissonances and chromaticism. From this development, the audience can infer a number of things about Ophelia's state of mind and her view of Hamlet. She believes Hamlet to be much less complex than he actually is, indicated by the lack of complexity in her simplified and mild variation of his motif. While she is aware of the dichotomy of wanting to love Hamlet and having to answer to her father's commands, she believes that she will at some point be able to satisfy both desires, signified by the initial dissonance and later consonance of the competing materials and timbres: the celesta's music is altered to fit Ophelia's musical characterization of Hamlet. Finally, as Hamlet plays out his first attempt at establishing his madness in Ophelia's chamber, she begins to realize that she does not know him or understand him nearly as well as she believed previously: his chromaticism and complexity are in stark contrast to her earlier imaginings. Forced to reconsider her entire understanding of the man she thinks she loves, she is surprisingly unshaken, or she could be so inured to reversals of order and the odd behavior of the men around her that she no longer notices such alterations in them.

It is important to note that Kozintsev's editing of Boris Pasternak's translation of the text supports this reading of a sheltered, inexperienced, and ultimately innocent Ophelia. His screenplay omits a number of passages that could be read as indicators of a sexual relationship between Ophelia and Hamlet, starting with the striking of "Conception is a blessing, but, as your daughter may conceive, friend, look to't" (2.2.201–3). Hamlet's own text during his confrontation with Ophelia is also cut so as to preserve some gentleness in the relationship: he neither condemns himself as mad nor rages at her for her womanly traits. Although Ophelia's soliloquy is omitted, it is not for the purposes of glamorizing Hamlet's own emotion, but rather to both continue the characterization of this Ophelia as exceptionally childlike, even in her adult elegance; and as an edit to advance the action more quickly.

When Ophelia, still in her ornate funeral garb, searches for the "most beauteous majesty of Denmark," the music that accompanies her calls to mind the soundtrack of a suspense film. Long shots of Ophelia are surrounded with soft light to lessen the stark setting and to make Ophelia more pathetic than manic or agitated. Low-pitched strings repeat a mostly stepwise pattern in tremolos with accompanying pizzicatos that regulate the tempo and offer the replication of footfalls in a solemn march, and the winds swirl up and down in a flurry of activity. The tension created between these two orchestral groupings illustrates Ophelia's anxiety and rising loss of control; time moves on without pause, the strings buzz with anticipation and nervous energy, and the winds represent her thoughts, in constant motion and without rest. As she

enters the chamber where she will speak with Claudius, the martial rhythm and tremolos remain, but now there is a brief melody layer above them, a variation of Ophelia's earlier theme. Before she encounters Gertrude and Claudius, Ophelia is framed by the handrail support posts on a staircase, the bars of a domestic prison in which she is unsteady on her feet and appears not to know where she is. The music of anxiety reaches its peak here, both in terms of register and volume, with a passage that rises through the winds and ends loudly just before Gertrude addresses Ophelia.

When Gertrude questions her, Ophelia responds in song, using the traditional melody of "Walsingham." Her ladies in waiting trail her, repositioning her veil as if her clothing alone will protect her modesty and prevent her from speaking so strangely to the king and queen. The celesta theme suddenly returns after she states, "My brother shall know of it," but it is clear that within the film, only Ophelia hears it, a reminder of her duty as a daughter (4.5.70). She abruptly starts dancing in the hall, performing the same steps shown earlier during the first introduction of the celesta theme, then languidly makes her way to the stairs to exit the room as the anxiety music emerges from the dance tune. As she departs the hall, Ophelia begins to undress herself, and once out of doors, she sings "To-morrow Is Saint Valentine's Day" (4.5.48) again to the traditional tune assigned it. No one hears her song this time except the audience.

There is no evidence at all in this adaptation that Hamlet and Ophelia have had a physical relationship, or even much of a romantic one. He has given her tokens, including a portrait of himself with his poetry inscribed on the back, but overall, this Ophelia has not had much direct contact with Hamlet—she is too watched over by her personal court of duennas to have had any opportunity to do so. What then to make of the inclusion of "Saint Valentine's Day" in this production? If the celesta music represents Ophelia's court persona—the dutiful Ophelia who takes her dancing lessons, obeys her father, and is modest and proper in all things—then the sung music must stand for Ophelia's own vocality. She sings these songs with her own voice, unaccompanied. She has internalized the songs as much as the stilted, formal music of the celesta is external to her. For the brief moments when she sings to her own chosen tunes, Ophelia is allowing herself to project her innermost feelings and desires. Regardless of whether her relationship with Hamlet has been sexual (in this film, clearly it has not been), she has desired that aspect of it (perhaps unconsciously), and it is played out in her vocal performance. Ultimately, too, the mix of musical textures and meanings in the scene indicates Ophelia's confusion and instability. The rigid divisions in which she compartmentalized her emotions before her father's death are breaking down, and their thematic representations are beginning to blend, with nothing to keep them separate. Even

as she sings “Saint Valentine’s Day,” the celesta interrupts again at the end of the first verse, keeping her from singing anything more compromising or inappropriate and, along with the duennas from whom it originates, hastening her up the stairs and away from the castle’s exit.

When Ophelia appears for the second time, she staggers into a room full of Laertes’s co-conspirators, guards, and assorted nobles. The music that marks her entrance is a low pulsing immediately followed by the celesta. It no longer plays her dance music but employs the pitches from the dance tune in a high-register, oscillating figure interpolated with descending chords of various composition, mirroring perfectly Vertinskaya’s weaving about the crowd. In fragmenting the celesta theme, Shostakovich leads the audience to understand that Ophelia’s understanding of the world around her has been irretrievably splintered as well. The celesta and orchestra are heard in turn as Ophelia makes her way through the soldiers to her brother, Claudius, and Gertrude, a pattern of “call and response” that John Riley notes is also used in Shostakovich’s Fourteenth and Fifteenth Symphonies and the Michelangelo Suite.⁴⁰ She gathers twigs from in front of a fireplace and hands them out as her flowers to the guards standing nearby. Because she does not recognize those around her, she does not present her flowers with the point of inveighing against Claudius and Gertrude; in fact, Kozintsev omits a number of her lines from the scene, including her dispersal of fennel and columbines, two of the more damning flowers in her bouquet. She does sing “Bonny Sweet Robin” (4.5.186) briefly before disappearing from the camera’s view; it is the last time the audience sees her alive. Her vocality, unaccusing and gentle, speaks to her personal fantasy, in which a more serious relationship with Hamlet has caused her bittersweet pain, rather than the machinations of Polonius and Claudius or even her father’s death.

The last time the audience hears Ophelia’s music, it is the unstable harmonies of the celesta accompanying a long shot of her body beneath the water of the brook where she has died. This Ophelia too suffers an accidental death; she is far too innocent to have committed suicide. After the image of her body, the music changes to an ascending orchestral line, and the camera tracks the flight of a gull—Ophelia’s soul—as it wings its way skyward and away from Elsinore. Gertrude’s description of her death is cut completely, lending Ophelia’s drowning an even more sorrowful aura of loneliness, as there is no one to mark it or offer an elegy, however brief.

Kozintsev’s Ophelia, like his Hamlet, is in many ways pitiable. Kliman notes that Ophelia’s innocence is an essential part of the Russian interpretation (or, some would argue, alteration) of *Hamlet*: “Pasternak and Kozintsev, in the Russian tradition, make Ophelia totally pure and naïve. . . . She is an innocent flower, blasted by the rot in Claudius’s kingdom.”⁴¹ Kozintsev’s respect for her character is obvious in his nonobjectifying visual treatment of her, and even

more aptly demonstrated in his concern and involvement in the creation for her music, which perhaps defines her more than any other medium in the film. In the end, Kozintsev appears to be trying to protect Ophelia from the court and from her inevitable end. He commissions Shostakovich to compose music that isolates her from the more cruel dealings of the court, even as it hampers her own personal development; his shots frame her every action sympathetically and humanely; and his edits, while censoring her sexuality, correspond with those in Hamlet's text to create a gentler, less physically fraught relationship between them. The sense of relief in the seagull scene is almost palpable; Kozintsev believes that Ophelia has escaped. Her madness is predicated on the irresolvable conflict she faces in her need to trust her father and her desire to trust Hamlet; her loyalties ultimately divide, and her mind cannot find a solution. "Madness is happiness for Ophelia," wrote Kozintsev on the character. "She has lost her reason and found happiness."⁴²

Music is used to frame these spheres of need and desire. The celesta is the formal, obedient Ophelia who was courted with respect by the prince. The orchestral music associated with her decline and madness is her own mind as an observer sees it; her songs are her own. This is an Ophelia not only ill used, but ill suited for the politics of the court. In her madness, she is finally content, unaware of her surroundings, lost in flowers and music that comforts her.

ZEFFIRELLI: *HAMLET* (1990)

Zeffirelli's Ophelia, played by Helena Bonham-Carter with great verve, is, like her filmic predecessors, infantilized by the director, her text shortened to a mere 456 words, her appearance reduced to that of a pouty adolescent. Her visual appearance is undoubtedly derived straight from the anonymous "T. E. Monogrammist" painting *Ophelia* of the late nineteenth century.⁴³ Although Rothwell views her as having "[scrapped] the Millais-like romanticism of Jean Simmons's golden-tressed Ophelia in the Olivier version to resituate the role squarely in the context of our contemporary feminist militancy," and "feisty even when driven mad by her men," there is little visual or musical evidence to support his assertion.⁴⁴ As Carol Chillington Rutter notes, Bonham-Carter's Ophelia "comes straight out of Saxo Grammaticus, via Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelites. . . . The child in her is hiding out in her awkward motor coordination. . . . But her face is older than her movements and too old for her dress. Her rough, unbleached wool smock, her raw-linen tabard worn like a school pinafore, her embroidered white bonnet tied up under her chin over thick, dark plaits that hang down to her waist—all infantilize an Ophelia whose face constantly registers the thoughts and emotions of a woman."⁴⁵ And

as for “*her men*,” she is never shown as the dominant party in any of her relationships, nor is she sought after or adored as is Gertrude. They are not “*her men*”; as in most productions, she is entirely at their disposal.

This Ophelia is disaffected from her first scene, when she plays with needlework, rolls her eyes, and picks at her fingernails as Laertes advises her about Hamlet. She, like the prince, is sulky. Her behavior in trying to prove her maturity instead allows the audience to see how juvenile she really is. She trails after her father and brother in a hapless way, looking for equal treatment but receiving none. By diminishing her adult capacities but allowing her to believe she has them, Zeffirelli makes this Ophelia ripe for madness.

Ophelia begins her singing long before she succumbs to madness. In fact, she is singing “To-morrow Is Saint Valentine’s Day” even as she threads a needle for her sewing just before Hamlet enters for the closet scene. Surrounded by her ladies and maids, this particular Ophelia likely picked up the bawdy song from them; Hamlet’s dishevelment and exposed body frightens her, and it is obvious that the pair has not been physically intimate. In a discussion about the film, Mel Gibson admitted that he could not imagine Ophelia in a physical relationship with Hamlet, describing himself as “shocked when asked if Hamlet and Ophelia had a sexual relationship. Ophelia is still a child.” While Hamlet is thirty in this production, “Ophelia is fourteen years old and just beginning to awaken sexually. . . . She is too young to be sexual, and besides, Hamlet would never use her in that way.”⁴⁶

Aside from Gibson’s ridiculous dismissal of young women’s sexuality in general, he assumes that any such relationship would be predatory on Hamlet’s part, denying Ophelia any sexual agency of her own. Zeffirelli apparently agrees, directing Bonham-Carter as a childish Ophelia unready for the relationship described in the lyrics. Ophelia’s song in this scene, truncated by Hamlet’s appearance, does not serve to further illuminate the audience or the court as to the nature of their relationship. For her, it is merely a ditty sung by a young woman who has not given thought to its meaning or moral. It is not surprising, then, that Ophelia willingly gives Claudius the letters she has received from Hamlet and follows his instruction in baiting her erstwhile suitor. The encounter, using a heavily cut 3.1, loses much of its meaning. Zeffirelli breaks up this scene, removing Hamlet’s “Get thee to a nunnery” command and placing it instead later in the film, just before the performance of “The Mousetrap.” Ophelia is denied her soliloquy “O, what a noble mind is here o’erthrown!” and Claudius does not discuss Hamlet’s madness as a threat to the body politic. Although Hamlet declares that Ophelia has made him mad, it is her music that plays after the dialogue has ended: she is the more affected by it. Yet she is not overwhelmingly traumatized by Hamlet’s invective against womankind; her motif, heard in this scene for the first time, is one of confused sadness but not heartbreak. With her text so cut, Zeffirelli’s deliberately immature Ophelia has

no recourse or ability to speak in words; her music can only indicate a fraction of her emotions. When Hamlet approaches her at the players' performance, she is no longer puzzled by his strange actions but merely annoyed. As he asks to lay his head upon her lap, she rolls her eyes and purses her lips, signs of irritation rather than distraction.

Ophelia's loss of reason begins at the end of "The Mousetrap" and comes into fullness at the death of her father by Hamlet's hand. It is just after Hamlet's brutal kiss at the end of "The Mousetrap" that this Ophelia breaks down, as opposed to Simmons's Ophelia, who begins to lose her mind with her rejection by Hamlet. Not understanding Hamlet's directive to "Get thee to a nunnery," which has been moved to be part of Hamlet's dialogue with Ophelia during and after the play instead of during 3.1, she finds herself increasingly bewildered and unable to comprehend what is going on around her. Rutter writes that this Ophelia is very close to Foucault's fool: "her eyes brim with tears, but they have lost understanding. . . . Her cerebral Ophelia goes mad not when she loses Hamlet but when words lose their meaning. She is the true philosopher in this Elsinore, and when knowledge fails, Ophelia is brain-dead."⁴⁷ But Ophelia has not completely lost her reason here; the audience knows this because although she is crying, she is neither visually nor verbally incoherent, as Hamlet was during his acting at madness; nor does the score indicate the distress that it will when Ophelia is finally, completely mad. It takes the ensuing murder of her father to give Bonham-Carter's Ophelia the final push into madness, and the music reflects this. Ophelia's entrance in the materials drawn from 4.5 is after a transitional bit of incidental music that uses first strings in a repetitive pattern as Hamlet's ship sails away, and is interrupted by a pipe in a dissonant key, signifying that while Hamlet may escape his journey unharmed, Ophelia will not so easily weather hers. The use of dissonance here is especially important; elsewhere in the film the music is overwhelmingly tonal or modal, filling in spaces in which Foley sounds were not sufficient to create an aural atmosphere. For the first time, the audience is given a hint that something is truly wrong with a character's mental well-being.

Ophelia begins her mad scene by singing to and sexually teasing a guard; no members of the court can hear her rhythmic declamation of "Walsingham." Instead, Gertrude watches from her chamber window, unable to discern what Ophelia is saying; the fact that she might be singing instead—which would cause serious concern if handled with any authenticity in Zeffirelli's medieval setting—cannot be transmitted to Gertrude at all. Like Olivier, Zeffirelli dismisses the weight of Ophelia's words by obscuring their impact and altering their delivery to the court. As she approaches Gertrude, Ophelia's lines from "Walsingham" allow the audience to understand without a doubt that her distress is caused by Polonius's death:

He is dead and gone, lady,
 He is dead and gone,
 At his head a grass-green turf,
 At his heels a stone. (4.5.29–32)

Neither Gertrude nor Claudius nor Horatio hear her sing again from “To-morrow Is Saint Valentine’s Day” as she exits. Only the audience is privileged enough to hear this particular song in its occurrences in the film, removing it from its use as a clue to Ophelia’s real or imagined relationship with Hamlet.

When Ophelia’s second mad episode takes place, the dissonant piping heard in the first is missing; only the strings remain, oscillating gently under the dialogue. Like the Ophelia of Kozintsev’s production, this Ophelia is happy in her madness. She gives her “flowers”—bones and straw—to the assembled crowd, but in a reversal of the traditional disbursement. Instead of giving fennel and columbines to Claudius in an accusation of his adultery, she gives these to Gertrude. Gertrude, who normally receives rue, watches as Ophelia gives this herb to Claudius. Perhaps in her directorially created innocence and distraction, Ophelia no longer remembers the associations her chosen flowers and herbs have; surely Zeffirelli knows their meanings, despite his changes to the text. Yet Laertes gets rosemary and pansies: somehow this Ophelia knows that he will be the keeper of her memory and thoughts, now that she cannot keep them herself.

The last images of Ophelia alive show her running and skipping through a meadow on her way to the brook where she will drown. She is shown in the water only from a distance, her status uncertain. The music accompanying this image is one of consonance: the mode of the pipe and strings now blend in a pastoral piece of incidental music that is neither joyous nor anguished: again uncertainty dominates. What is for certain is that this Ophelia has had very little to say or do in this adaptation. Although she has not been subjected to the sexualizing male gaze of Olivier’s film, she has nonetheless been significantly diminished in her femininity and agency. Because of Zeffirelli’s dismissal of her importance through cuts to her text and the unrecognized and unused implications of her musical vocality, she ultimately serves neither as Foucault’s knowing fool nor as a particularly compelling character in her own right.

BRANAGH: *HAMLET* (1996)

Kenneth Branagh’s *Hamlet* may have been disingenuously billed as “full-length,” but it does do something no other cinematic productions of the play

intended for widespread release does: it is the film in which Ophelia retains her one soliloquy, “O, what a noble mind is here o’erthrown!” (3.1).⁴⁸ In addition, Branagh’s Ophelia has 1,233 words and is on screen for thirty-five minutes, more than in any other film of the play.⁴⁹ This Ophelia, portrayed by Kate Winslet, was given weight and substance that carried over into directorial decisions of setting and style, including nude scenes that undeniably establish her control over her own sexuality and that her decision to engage in a physical relationship with Hamlet is a mature one.

In his commentary on *Hamlet*, Branagh relates that a key reason for deciding to set his adaptation in the nineteenth century was to allow for “the severe treatment of the mentally disturbed.” This opens the way to graphically depict Ophelia’s water-shock “therapy” and the many constraints that keep her bound and partially controlled within the palace. The shock factor seems compelling here: Branagh and Russell Jackson, who also appears on the commentary, note that at one time they planned to have Winslet squat on the floor and urinate at Gertrude’s feet, all the more to emphasize Ophelia’s madness. Although Branagh dismissed this idea as ultimately inappropriate and distracting for the audience, his main concern when discussing Ophelia is her “sickness of soul” in Claudius’s Denmark, a “dangerous and shifting place.”⁵⁰

Unlike other Ophelias on film, this one is accorded both her soliloquy and all of her musical material, giving her the most text and longest screen time in any major filmed *Hamlet*. Her madness is constructed to stem very obviously from the apparent results of her rejection of Hamlet compounded by Polonius’s death. In the earliest parts of the film, she is shown as adult beyond her father’s and brother’s assumptions; she has had a discreet consensual sexual relationship with Hamlet since his return to Denmark for his father’s funeral and is well aware of the machinations of court politics.

Doyle has said that he created the primary theme for *Hamlet* by twining Hamlet’s theme and Ophelia’s theme together; however, analysis reveals the reverse. Rather than establishing two distinct melodic motives that combine into the funereal *In Pace* sung at the end of the film, Ophelia’s material—in the very few instances in which it can be delineated as such—is obviously drawn from this primary theme. In fact, Hamlet’s theme, Ophelia’s theme, and the primary theme used throughout the film are so close as to be only subtle variations on one another, not distinct entities. Ophelia is musically marked only by the higher register in which the theme appears when she is present in a scene, and the use of violins rather than brass to carry the melody. These factors reduce the ability of the score to offer any indications of Ophelia’s madness, instead focusing its affect on the tragedy as a whole.

Ophelia is musically characterized by the score in the traditionally stressful scenes that introduce her as an individual and serve as a prelude to her mad-

ness. In describing Hamlet's visit to her closet (2.1), she is very frightened of his actions and of having caused them by obeying Polonius's order not to "give words or talk with" Hamlet. Ophelia is nearly hysterical and fraught with self-blame, but the music does not reflect her emotions. Rather, Hamlet's motif is played by horns as Polonius tries to comfort his daughter; his actions, rather than hers, are the cause of worry and foremost in Polonius's mind. This focus changes, however, when Polonius forces Ophelia to read Hamlet's letter to her in front of Claudius and Gertrude. Her motif is heard in the violins—her instrument—and at the higher pitch that indicates the music refers to her grief, not that of those around her. When she finally breaks down and can read no further, the violins' motif merges into the full primary theme of the film, foreshadowing its multiple unhappy endings. Finally, when Hamlet and Ophelia are together in 3.1, the primary theme is constant and unvarying despite the emotional maelstrom in which the pair engages; this steadiness of the *In Pace* material can only, again, sum up the lost happiness of the court as a whole and the coming calamities that end the play. Ophelia's soliloquy flows directly from her confrontation with Hamlet, and unsurprisingly the music remains calm and controlled, ever present beneath her words. Winslet plays the scene as an Ophelia who understands that forces external to her knowledge are at work but who is unable to puzzle out the intricacies of what is happening.

The treatment of Ophelia's musical texts in Branagh's film is fascinating. While all of the song lyrics from the First Folio are retained, they are presented in unconventional ways, departing from the approaches of previous films. Branagh's Ophelia neither sings her songs to their traditional tunes nor drops the musical aspect altogether. Ophelia's incipient madness is shown when she sees Polonius's body being carried away from "the neighbor room." Shrieking, she tries in vain to reach her father across a barrier of a metal gate and strong attendants; she only declines from there. When the audience next sees her, it is from above, looking alongside Gertrude and the physician (here portrayed by a woman) down into a padded cell constructed off the set's great hall. Although Branagh states that "one of the things I find most heartbreaking is the song she will sing about her father," she does not actually sing until Laertes is present. When she is initially released from her cell, still buckled into a long gown with a straitjacket's tied sleeves and a protective cap, Ophelia recites the words to "Walsingham" without pitch but in a spoken, chantlike manner. As she grows increasingly agitated during her audience with Gertrude, she moves from chanting "Walsingham" to singing "Saint Valentine's Day." The connection between her madness and her inability to control her actions and words is correlated with her vocality. As she becomes more frantic, she adopts more of the early modern attributes of the mentally distracted; she sings a bawdy song, her actions become lewd, and she begins to run from her keepers, taunting

them to come after her. The audience witnesses the symptoms of Ophelia's distraction progress both within the play time and over historical time: moving from quietude to singing and manic physicality in the space of several lines would be well understood by an early modern audience; the final step to wild flailing brings the visual expectations of madness into the present day.

In Ophelia's second appearance in the scene, she communicates almost entirely in song or in very songlike speech. Presenting all of her imaginary herbs and flowers to Laertes, she plaintively sings using text from "Walsingham." In a variation on other films that allow Ophelia to sing, however, Branagh's version does not use the traditional tune to the song but replaces it with a new melody composed by Doyle specifically for the scene. Ophelia begins the song with the first phrase of the original song, adding a rising step and transitioning into Doyle's interpolation. The new material recalls fragmentary material from Ophelia's earlier motive and follows the same musical shape as the primary theme for the film. This new song is very much in keeping with Doyle's usual harmonic language, with phrases that begin with stepwise motion around a single tone followed by a large leap upward and a downward progression.⁵¹ An instrumental arrangement of the melody follows as Ophelia returns to her padded cell to stare at the walls.

The alteration of the music Ophelia sings serves only to move her musical vocality into the same time period as the rest of the production; it neither denies nor even obscures her vocality or text. All of her words are unquestionably clear, as are the meanings Branagh's interpretation has given them. While the decision to change Ophelia's melodic presentation of her songs is unusual among films that retain the musical aspects of her role, it preserves the early modern intention of equating seemingly uncontrolled and public singing with distraction.

ALMEREYDA: *HAMLET* (2000)

Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet*, set in twenty-first-century New York, features Julia Stiles as Ophelia. Stiles, who has spent much of her career in updated Shakespearean film adaptations including *10 Things I Hate About You* and *O*, was cast as a teen favorite with name recognition. Despite Almereyda's description of Stiles as having a "calm seriousness, a sense of unbudgeable inner gravity," the Ophelia he directs her to create is without gravitas, alternately independent and babyish in her presentation.⁵²

Ophelia, depicted in this adaptation as a photographer and—presumably, given her age and activities—a college student, has an uneven relationship with

Laertes and Polonius. She relies on them when she is tired of being self-reliant, and tolerates them with petulance, complete with eye-rolling and pouting lips, and even slight confusion at times. In her discussion with Laertes extracted from 1.3.5–50, it is clear that she is fond of her brother, and familiar enough with him that her jibes about his own sexual behavior are neither shy nor defensive. With her father, Ophelia is at once rebellious and dependent, arguing with him about her relationship with Hamlet and insisting on living alone in slum housing, yet allowing him to neaten up her clothing like a small child. In creating one of the most sympathetic and caring Poloniuses in film, Bill Murray approaches the role as an overanxious father rather than as the king's primary courtier, and the edits made to the film allow him to fill that role with great finesse. Judith Buchanan aptly describes Stiles's Ophelia as "a surly, depressive but ultimately grimly bully-able waif of a teenager, resentful but silent in the face of the infantilising treatment she receives from her father (who insists on tying her shoe-laces and turns up at her apartment carrying balloons)." ⁵³ "Silent" is a key word here: Stiles has fewer lines as Ophelia than any other actress in a major film production of the play: she has but 447 words.

From almost her first scene, Ophelia is surrounded by water; shots in Polonius's suite in the Hotel Elsinore often frame the ocean beyond the windows, and she waits for Hamlet by the fountain in the hotel's lobby. When Polonius tells Gertrude and Claudius that "your noble son is mad," he does so at the hotel's swimming pool; Ophelia stands beside it, fantasizing about plunging in while the adults talk around her. As she prepares to return Hamlet's tokens—including a pile of letters, sketches, and a rubber duckie—she again passes the hotel's fountain, its falling water an extension of her tears. Her destiny, known to viewers, is provided in even these early scenes. Yet she is, for most of the film, quite sane. There is no early loss of reason. Hamlet's appearance in her closet becomes a wordless visit to her apartment, where he leaves her his poem ("Doubt that the stars are fire"), they embrace, and he rushes out as Polonius enters with birthday balloons and cake for Ophelia, who is not disturbed so much as irritated with her suitor. Even at "The Mousetrap," she sighs and rolls her eyes, annoyed but neither frightened nor worried about Hamlet's treatment of her. In her body language, this Ophelia seems to be saying "so are all men like this, inconstant." She is a sister to Beatrice in this regard, exasperated with men.

Ophelia's music is curious. In a film where there are few characterizations through musical themes, nor an entirely coherent soundtrack, Ophelia is provided with an aural landscape more than any other figure but Claudius. In Almereyda's interpretation of the closet scene, Ophelia is first seen alone, hanging newly developed photographs to dry in a makeshift darkroom. The music fades in and out, like a radio station that won't quite come in. It is at

first repetitive, a dotted figure and bells looping, a technique used frequently by composer Carter Burwell in his part of the film's score. When Hamlet enters the apartment, the audience is shown a turntable, its power light glowing red, indicating that the music is diegetic, originating from Ophelia's stereo. However, while the background figure repeats as if the needle is stuck, a trumpet melody enters and plays over it, moving beyond the two-bar underlying phrase. This, too, becomes "stuck," repeating over and over as Hamlet and Ophelia embrace. When Polonius comes up the stairs to the apartment and interrupts the couple, nondiegetic music enters on top of the diegesis of the stuck record. Minor chords and an ascending melodic line replace the diegetic music entirely, but the music repeated, while brief, offers the first glimpse into Ophelia's mind. As she tells Polonius, she doesn't know what to think about her relationship with Hamlet. The relationship, like her music at this point, is confusing, full of repeated gestures of tokens and poetry but without further steps or resolutions. She's stuck on him, musically speaking.

After being caught with a listening device during her attempt to return Hamlet's letters to him, Ophelia flees his suite on bicycle, returning to her apartment to burn her photographs of him. The music here does not speak to her highly emotional state, but it is the same music used to indicate the presence of the Denmark Corporation and its general malaise. While she is individually hurt by both her father and putative lover, it is the condition of Denmark as a whole that is heard to be suffering. The music continues as Hamlet leaves messages on her answering machine entreating her to "get thee to a nunnery." The music remains the same after the jump to the next scene, in which Hamlet enters the Blockbuster video store and rents movies from which to create "The Mousetrap." Ophelia's own anguish, like her words, is silenced; the corporate whole overshadows any individuality she might otherwise project.

Almereyda's Ophelia clearly loses her mind because of her father's death. Polonius, played in this production as, ultimately, a protector of his children, has been her guiding force. Although she has been hurt by Hamlet's actions, her behavior showing annoyance and exasperation toward him at "The Mousetrap" indicates to generations of younger women that she is "over him." She realizes her folly in having trusted him, and her grief for the relationship has turned to anger.

Ophelia's quite public breakdown occurs at a cocktail party at the Guggenheim Museum, amid spiraling balconies and champagne toasts. Accosting Gertrude with a pleading demeanor, Ophelia quickly gives way to wordless screaming that echoes through the museum. She tunelessly recites part of "To-morrow Is Saint Valentine's Day" before being hauled off by security guards. Instead of pitying her, Gertrude and Claudius see her as a threat

to their upscale event, and she is removed. There is no music to accompany her scene, only the ambient noise of the party. Rather than allowing her madness to be signified traditionally by singing, Almereyda has her scream, perhaps his interpretation of a modern-day equivalent of distracted vocality.

Ophelia appears in a quiet corridor for the remainder of her scene. Laertes, newly arrived, holds her closely, and she seems to recognize him. Her flowers are Polaroids, tossed into the air for invisible recipients. She never approaches Claudius and Gertrude nor makes eye contact with either of them. There is nondiegetic music to accompany her words, a soft and slow guitar line, but it is not the tune that traditionally accompanies Ophelia's song: instead it is reminiscent of the music that played diegetically the last time she and her brother were together. The scene is cut short, but the music is an integral part of it; the music, not Ophelia's knowing dispersal of her "flowers," represents what mental clarity she retains. Although she cannot lucidly grasp her current situation, she nonetheless recalls her conversation with Laertes prior to his departure for France earlier in the film. The audience is reminded as well at this point that this was a tight-knit family; although Polonius used Ophelia against Hamlet, he believed he was doing so primarily for her own good and only secondarily to further his investigation for Claudius's benefit. The death of her protector and memories of the family's last happy moments together resound within Ophelia's distraction.

Almereyda's Ophelia is given the fewest lines of any film *Hamlet* discussed up to this point. Nor does she receive her traditional elegy provided by Gertrude. Instead, Gertrude only says to Laertes that his sister is drowned, and only the audience sees a security guard pull her body from the hotel fountain. This Ophelia is most obviously a suicide; there are no heavy skirts or long weeds to pull her to an unwitting death. Although she is perhaps the least poorly used and most cared-for Ophelia of all the cinematic *Hamlets*, and is provided with subtle yet canny nondiegetic accompaniments, she is the one least allowed to speak, to sing, to be heard, and to be seen. If this production is a reflection of modern life, then the voices of women have never been more silenced.

CONCLUSION

This analysis of Ophelia's music and vocality in modern films of *Hamlet* reveals a number of similarities among the productions. Women make up only 7 percent of the film industry's population of directors, and they are more often placed in charge of lower-budget productions than are male directors, so it is no surprise that every filmed *Hamlet*—generally a costly endeavor—has been

directed by a man.⁵⁴ (Even Asta Nielsen, who formed her own production company to play Hamlet as a woman masquerading as a man, had to have the film directed by Svend Gade and Heinz Schall.) Female film composers are even rarer; Mikael Carrsson of the online journal *Music from the Movies* wrote in 2004 that “only 2.4 percent of the 500 top-grossing films in the USA in the past five years [have] been scored by female composers.”⁵⁵ Indeed, with the exceptions of Kozintsev’s feminist reading of her character and Branagh’s production, which in privileging Shakespeare allows for the full inclusion of female characters’ voices, the male purview is clearly on display. This sphere of power necessarily includes control over every element of Ophelia’s presentation, from the camera’s gaze on her to her songs and musical depictions.

For Kozintsev, Ophelia is a delicate creature who fulfills the role of Foucault’s truthful fool as well as that of canary in the mineshaft, predeceasing the rest of the court as an early warning as to their inevitable fates. Independent only in her madness, she is her own salvation. The formal, regimented music that serves as the boundary of her approved life is overthrown for the rustic song, grown wild without the court’s strictures to enclose it. This Ophelia’s vocality rejects the court-imposed artifice that has made her a mechanized woman in favor of finding her true being—as sorrowful as it is—in older, simpler music. Ophelia’s undressing and casting off her metal corsets mirrors this vocal independence, reinforcing the metaphor of being released from a cage. This unusually feminist interpretation of Ophelia confronts traditional portrayals of her as weak minded and unfettered to reality; here her vocality is returned to her with contrasting music to emphasize even more the deliberateness of her song and the ultimate meaning of her public singing. Passive at the beginning of the film, she becomes one of its strongest characters prior to her death. As a parallel to Kozintsev’s intellectual Hamlet, she is an alternate hero for the play, finding her own way out of an impossible position.

Branagh’s approach to Ophelia is neither particularly dismissive nor feminist. In his desire to privilege Shakespeare’s words above all else, Ophelia’s texts are necessarily whole. They are accorded serious weight in his production of *Hamlet*; there are no pirates to obscure Ophelia’s songs, nor a fixation on Hamlet that forces her words offscreen. However, Branagh problematizes Ophelia’s songs by explicitly showing the range of physicality between Hamlet and Ophelia. In doing so, Branagh causes the supertextual images of the pair in bed to override the text’s more ambiguous offerings; in effect, he decides the meanings of Ophelia’s songs himself, rather than allowing the audience to do so on its own terms. Ophelia’s voice is not literally silenced, but the mysteries of her songs’ meanings are eliminated by the director’s condescension to the audience.

However, the majority of filmic Ophelias have been directed in similar and unfortunate ways. Without deviation, Olivier, Zeffirelli, and Almereyda treat Ophelia in similar fashion by infantilizing her, limiting her intelligence, and eradicating both her spoken and sung vocality. If in Olivier's film she is only partially disempowered, she has become all but mute property by the time Almereyda has finished his adaptation. Carol Chillington Rutter has noted that with her soliloquy omitted, Ophelia is viewed as a body rather than a person, and this is certainly true in all three of these films.⁵⁶ As each of these films progress—and as films of *Hamlet* are created over time—Ophelia is increasingly silenced by both the men around her in the play and those controlling her character from outside of it through cuts and direction, supporting this view of her disempowerment. This conforms as well with Laura Mulvey's analysis that the fragmentation of women in film negates their role of fully developed characters and renders them objects to be manipulated for both the male characters in the film and the audience. Ophelia is fragmented in exactly this way when her text and voice are removed—she becomes a decorative object in the films rather than a meaningful participant.⁵⁷ The fact that her text is so telling as to the situation and yet still excised indicates an undeniable position on the part of these directors that she is, ultimately, disposable.

NOTES

1. Elaine Showalter, "Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism," in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (London: Methuen, 1985), 80.
2. Showalter, "Representing Ophelia," 81.
3. Carol Thomas Neely, *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), 51.
4. Alison Findlay, "Hamlet: A Document in Madness," in *New Essays on Hamlet*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett and John Manning (New York: AMS Press, 1994), 197.
5. Graham Holderness, "Ofelia: Laurence Nowel: Excerpta Quaedam Danica (1565)," *Early Modern Culture* 3 (2003); and Alex Epstein, "By the Way, Ophelia Is Pregnant," www.craftyscreenwriting.com/ophelia.html.
6. David Lindley, *Shakespeare and Music* (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), 155.
7. Robert Hapgood, *Hamlet: Prince of Denmark* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999), 232–33.
8. Vic Gammon, *Desire, Drink, and Death in English Folk and Vernacular Song, 1600–1900* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 23–26.
9. Susan McClary, in Catherine Clément, *Opera, or the Undoing of Women* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), xvi.

10. Maurice and Hanna Charney, "The Language of Madwomen in Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3, no. 2 (1977): 453.

11. Leslie C. Dunn, "Ophelia's Songs in *Hamlet*: Music, Madness, and the Feminine," in *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*, ed. Leslie C. Dunn and Nancy A. Jones (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1994), 50.

12. Dunn, "Ophelia's Songs in *Hamlet*," 52.

13. Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Vintage Books, 1988), 14.

14. Neely, *Distracted Subjects*, 51.

15. David Bevington, *This Wide and Universal Theater: Shakespeare in Performance Then and Now* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 17.

16. Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830–1980* (New York: Virago Press, 1987), 92; and Ellen Terry, *Ellen Terry's Memoirs*, ed. Edith Craig and Christopher St. John (Christabel Marshall) (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1969), 122.

17. Rick Altman, *Silent Film Sound* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 220.

18. Clément, *Opera, or the Undoing of Women*, 5.

19. Showalter, *The Female Malady*, 11.

20. José María Mesa Villar, "Musings from Ophelia's Watery Voyage: Images of Female Submission, Shakespeare's and Millais' Drowning Maiden," in *SEDERI* 14 (2004): 223–24.

21. Peter Donaldson, "Olivier, Hamlet, and Freud," *Cinema Journal* 26, no. 4. (1987), 33.

22. Kenneth S. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 58.

23. Susanna Walton, *Behind the Façade* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 143.

24. While the reuse caused some raised eyebrows among those who knew Walton well, the connection is not discussed in depth either by critics or Walton biographers. Walton, *Behind the Façade*, 97.

25. *Hamlet* post-production shooting script, May 11, 1948, dir. Laurence Olivier, Folger Shakespeare Library, Prompt Ham. Fo. 7, 71.

26. Olivier moves lines 3.1.99–162 to come before Hamlet's soliloquy, 3.1.64–96.

27. Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," in *Feminist Film Theory: A Reader*, ed. Sue Thornham (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 65.

28. *Hamlet* post-production shooting script, Prompt Ham. Fo. 7, 74, 74, 112.

29. Carol Chillington Rutter, "Snatched Bodies: Ophelia in the Grave," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (1998): 302.

30. Dunn, "Ophelia's Songs in *Hamlet*," 59.

31. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen*, 55.

32. Kaara Peterson, "Framing Ophelia: Representation and the Pictorial Tradition," *Mosaic* 31, no. 3 (1998): 4.

33. Grigori Kozintsev, *Shakespeare: Time and Conscience*, trans. Joyce Vining (New York: Hill and Wang, 1966), 216.
34. Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 216.
35. Elizabeth Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 369.
36. Grigori Kozintsev, *The Complete Works*, vol. 11, 155–56, quoted in Wilson, *Shostakovich*, 371.
37. J. Lawrence Gunther, “*Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* on film,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*, ed. Russell Jackson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 121.
38. Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 255–56.
39. Carolyn Abbate, “Outside Ravel’s Tomb,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 52, no. 3 (1999): 478–79.
40. John Riley, *Dmitri Shostakovich: A Life in Film*, Kinofiles Filmmakers’ Companions (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005), 97.
41. Bernice W. Kliman, *Hamlet: Film, Television, and Audio Performances* (London: Associated University Presses, 1988), 109.
42. Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 216.
43. Peterson, “Framing Ophelia,” 14.
44. Rothwell, *A History of Shakespeare on Screen*, 134–35.
45. Rutter, “Snatched Bodies,” 304.
46. Michael P. Jensen, “Mel Gibson on *Hamlet*,” *Shakespeare on Film Newsletter* 15, no. 2 (1991): 1.
47. Rutter, “Snatched Bodies,” 306.
48. Kenneth Branagh, *Hamlet: Screenplay, Introduction, and Film Diary* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), 81.
49. In purely numerical terms, Olivier’s Ophelia is accorded 803 words, Franco Zeffirelli’s 456, and Michael Almereyda’s a scant 447. Olivier’s Ophelia gets 23:15 minutes, Zeffirelli’s 14:15, Almereyda’s 13:13, and Branagh’s 35:00.
50. “Commentary,” *Hamlet*, dir. Kenneth Branagh, DVD, Warner Bros., 1996.
51. Other examples of this device in Doyle’s work include his setting of “Sigh No More, Ladies” in *Much Ado About Nothing*, dir. Kenneth Branagh, 1993; and “Weep You No More Sad Fountains” in *Sense and Sensibility*, dir. Ang Lee, 1995.
52. Michael Almereyda, *William Shakespeare’s Hamlet* (London: Faber and Faber, 2000), 137.
53. Judith Buchanan, *Shakespeare on Film* (Harlow: Pearson, 2005), 237.
54. Martha M. Lauzen, “The Celluloid Ceiling: Behind-the-Scenes Employment of Women in the Top 250 Films of 2005,” http://moviesbywomen.com/stats_celluloid_ceiling_2005.php.
55. Mikael Carlsson, “Women in Film Music,” www.iawm.org/articles_html/carlsson_women_in_film.html.
56. Rutter, “Snatched Bodies,” 302.
57. Mulvey, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” 63.

Lady Macbeth

*L*ady Macbeth is arguably the richest character in a play ostensibly devoted to her husband's rise and fall. In many ways, Lady Macbeth, like Ophelia, is a product of early modern observations and conventional wisdom about unstable womanhood and the madness that manifests from that condition. According to Kathleen McLuskie, "family relations were the focus of a great deal of emotional energy and the primary source of both pleasure and pain"; as a result, "women were more susceptible to mental illness than men."¹ Certainly, as we have seen, Ophelia's madness is driven by events in both her actual family and the virtual extended family of the court. Lady Macbeth, too, is motivated to first act consciously out of family loyalty, which leads to her own mental collapse and madness rooted in the damage done both to others and to her own domestic situation. Moreover, Lady Macbeth and Ophelia are joined by the liquids of human life. Fluids—which in the form of tears, amniotic fluid, or menstrual blood were taken as signs of women's variable nature—surround them both.² While Ophelia finds release from her madness in water, Lady Macbeth's is forged in the blood of men. Her obsession with the "damned spot" (5.1.37) on her hands and Duncan's "silver skin laced with golden blood" (2.3.131) keeps her firmly within the womanly sphere where such liquids point to her lack of manliness, despite her passionate demands to be taken as an equal to her husband ("unsex me here," 1.5.48). In addition, both women are essentially caught between multiple roles; in Lady Macbeth's case, as Irene Dash notes, the conflict is between being obedient, subservient, and supportive and being the kind of woman who can be equated in passion and ambition with men, in that being capable of morality separates men from beasts.³ Both Lady Macbeth and Ophelia express their madness through fragmented speech, inexplicable gestures, and words that plainly or implicitly damn the

men associated with them. Ultimately—although whether by deliberate act or accident is a continual matter of interpretation—they both are responsible for their own deaths.

Joanna Levin has written that Lady Macbeth represents the entire spectrum of unnatural womanhood within the early modern world, bridging the categories of witch and hysteric:

the witch, the bewitched, and the hysteric were synchronic categories brought together under the auspices of a complex struggle for religious and political authority at the outset of King James's English reign. This contextualization argues against a view of the hysteric as a reclaimed version of demonic femininity; positioned as antithetical and analogous constructs, the demonic woman and the hysteric each sought to explain "disorderly" womanhood, and to enforce (if also to differentiate between) modes of masculinist control. Depending on a topos of perverse or corrupted maternity/sexuality, the satanic female and the hysterical mother existed on a close continuum.⁴

Lady Macbeth is an amalgam of the disorderly, chaos-inducing, and potentially powerful witch, calling on spirits for aid and strength, and the passive wife, who urges her husband to act while only acting herself when he is unable to do so. As Levin notes, "Lady Macbeth begins the play by invoking evil spirits and ends in a fit of hysterical somnambulism."⁵

According to Marjorie Garber, the supernatural ties Shakespeare gives to Lady Macbeth, and her ensuing madness, place her in a position even more horrific than that of Macbeth: "in a way the disintegration of Lady Macbeth is even more disturbing than that of Macbeth himself, because it is so sudden and more complete." As Garber observes, "where with Macbeth vision and illusion invaded the real world of daylight, in Lady Macbeth's case the deeds of reality, the murders of Duncan, Banquo, and Lady Macduff, usurp the night-time realm of dream."⁶ Peter Stallybrass writes: "Witchcraft in *Macbeth* . . . is not simply a reflection of a pre-given order of things: rather, it is a particular working upon, and legitimation of, patriarchal hegemony."⁷ Stallybrass notes that Lady Macbeth is first equated with the witches through her own practice of witchcraft, her hailing of Macbeth by his titles, as did the witches, and by her "equivocal relation to an implied norm of femininity."⁸ This linkage between Lady Macbeth and the weird sisters is a connection that continues into film and the use of music in films of *Macbeth*. Only Foucault, separating the two, writes of Lady Macbeth as another in the long line of early modern and Shakespearean truth-speakers driven mad not because of her evil urgings to Macbeth, but because of her later recognition of the further consequences and actions taken because of her prior ruthlessness:

To the moral world, also, belongs the *madness of just punishment*, which chastises, along with the disorders of the mind, those of the heart. But it has still other powers: the punishment it inflicts multiplies by nature insofar as, by punishing itself, it unveils the truth. The justification of this madness is that it is truthful. Truthful since the sufferer already experiences, in the vain whirlwind of his hallucinations, what will for all eternity be the pain of his punishment. . . . Truthful, too, because the crime hidden from all eyes dawns like day in the night of this strange punishment; madness, in its wild, untamable words, proclaims its own meaning; in its chimeras, it utters its secret truth; its cries speak for its conscience. Thus Lady Macbeth's delirium reveals to those who "have known what they should know," words long uttered only to "dead pillows."⁹

Amanda Eubanks Winkler has written extensively that *Macbeth's* witches, both in their original context and in the Davenant interpolations, are provided with indications for music and dancing.¹⁰ In contrast, there is no direct evidence that music of any kind was to be associated with Lady Macbeth, either in the Folios or Quartos or in Winkler's investigation of stage practices surrounding the mad on the early modern stage, although music was indicated or provided for in the cases of more sympathetic characters, both male and female, suffering from "lovesickness." However, there is a case to be made for the inclusion of at least some song in Lady Macbeth's text. George Stewart, writing on performance practices of the sleepwalking scene (5.1), points out the rhythmic incongruity in the scene of "The Thane of Fife / had a wife / where is she now?" (5.1.44–45), hypothesizing that, as in *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, Shakespeare is placing "bits of verse and short rhymed tags in the mouths of his mentally disturbed characters." Stewart goes on: "We have only to remember Ophelia, Lear's fool, and Hamlet and Edgar in their scenes of pretended madness."¹¹ Stewart bolsters his claim for Lady Macbeth's musical signifier of her madness by citing a potential source for her lines, the contemporary ballad "The Battle of Otterburn." This ballad, recorded in Francis Child's *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, celebrates the Scottish victory at the 1388 battle that took place during the border wars between Scotland and England. The ballad first appears in 1550, and was later reprinted as a popular broadside. The second stanza is "The Earl of Fife / withouten strife, / He bound him over Solway / The great would ever together ride / That race they may rue for aye."¹² Although the ballad does not appear in Ross Duffin's collection of the plays' putative songs, *Shakespeare's Songbook*, Stewart convincingly claims that the ballad would have been widely known and thus accessible to Shakespeare.¹³ A further linguistic connection between the ballad's language and that of Lady Macbeth is the use of "trouble and strife" to stand for "wife." Eric Partridge traces the rhyme to the sixteenth-century proverb "He that hath a wife

hath strife.”¹⁴ These correlations suggest, then, that Lady Macbeth’s lines are based on “The Battle of Otterburn” and could well have been sung to that tune or any other with the appropriate rhythmic structure. As with Ophelia, bits of song serve to mark a woman’s madness. However, because neither “The Ballad of Otterburn” nor any other tunes have been definitively associated with Lady Macbeth, filmmakers and film composers have been entirely free to create musical landscapes for Lady Macbeth without any kind of musical tradition dictating or even influencing their work.¹⁵

This is not to say that the music for various Lady Macbeths is not problematic or reliant on older stereotypes. As Catherine Clément has written, the use of coded musical gestures exists to help establish the performances of gender identity and the characteristics associated with such identities. Music enhances this performance by its traditionally feminine status; in all four of the films of *Macbeth* discussed here, it is Lady Macbeth who is most consistently framed by music, both in her scenes early in the play and the scene depicting her madness. Following stage traditions, and historical interpretation and criticism, the film scores fall along the fault line separating the demon Lady Macbeth from her human counterpart.¹⁶

In performance, Lady Macbeth has been both damned for her blood-thirsty ambition and rehabilitated as a supportive wife. At the time of *Macbeth*’s premiere, she was associated through the inclusion of martlets or housemartins (“the temple-haunting martlet,” mentioned by Banquo in 1.6.6) with Mary Queen of Scots, who, although the mother of the ruling James I, was remembered as a foe of the English throne.¹⁷ To Samuel Johnson, she was “merely [that is, completely] detested,” writes Russ McDonald, noting that prior to Sarah Siddons’s more human depiction of Lady Macbeth in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the character was “played as monstrous, the ‘fiend-like queen’ to which Malcolm refers in the last scene, a virago who commands the will of her fearful husband and tempts him to murder and despair, thereby destroying her own sanity.”¹⁸ Later audiences saw a different depiction, however. As Phyllis Rackin observes, the “Victorians’ Lady Macbeth may have been guilty of regicide, but, like all good women, she was motivated by ambition for her husband’s advancement.”¹⁹ Ellen Terry, who “described Lady Macbeth as fragile and womanly but perforce played her as grand and tragic,” writes McDonald, added ever more elements that humanized the queen. “The extensive documentation surrounding Terry’s assumption of the part—notebooks, diaries, play texts, memoirs, photographs, a celebrated oil painting, and other records—indicate that she worked up very deliberately the fragile creature that Siddons had described but may or may not have realized.”²⁰ Indeed, Siddons appears not to have played Lady Macbeth in this manner. As Georgianna Ziegler notes, in the Westall portrait of Siddons

as Lady Macbeth, she is “an Amazonian heroine, terrible in her defiance.”²¹ Wearing a turban and a togalike outfit of robes and over-dresses, she is tall, solidly muscular, and stands with her hands clenched into fists. She is not, in any sense, delicate. Terry’s performance was the first to physically realize Siddons’s—and her own—vision of the character.

Ziegler has written that the dichotomies of characterizing Lady Macbeth on stage can be easily found in our own day. Writing on a 1994 *Tatler* magazine promotional spread, Ziegler notes that a trio of actresses posing in modern dresses as Lady Macbeth “reflects the conflicted nature of contemporary society toward the position of women. On the one hand, they are still ‘dedicated followers’ in a man’s world, still dressing to attract male attention, still killing with their looks. On the other hand, they are allowed their own ‘singular ambition’; women in the nineties are assertive *and* attractive, the advertisement reassures us.” However, Ziegler notes, this all depends on “the position of the woman. If she is too near ‘the throne,’ assertiveness can be seen as threatening.”²²

It should come as no surprise, then, given the juxtapositions referenced by Ziegler, that filmmakers and composers have also chosen to treat Lady Macbeth in one of these two ways, following either a pre-Siddons demonization, in which Lady Macbeth is aurally equated with the witches and other forces of evil, or a post-Siddons, Terry-influenced humanization, providing an aural subtext that casts the queen from a less vituperative interpretation and into one more encompassing of the weaknesses of human nature. All four of the films discussed here come down solidly on one side or the other, leaving little ground for more ambiguous or nuanced readings of the character. To date, more than fifty versions of *Macbeth* have been made for the cinema or television. The first widely distributed *Macbeth* with complete sound, however, was Orson Welles’s 1948 production.

WELLES: *MACBETH* (1948)

Welles had previously produced *Macbeth* in 1936 for the Classic Branch of the Works Project Administration’s Negro Theater, a version famously known as the “Voodoo *Macbeth*.” Set in Haiti, this production was accompanied by music by a number of composers, including an African witches’ dance by Asadata Dafora and other incidental music by Porter Grainger, James P. Johnson, and Joe Jordan, the project’s music director.²³ Virgil Thomson composed “sound effects” designed to be heard between acts, and also orchestrated the music by other composers—much of it for percussion alone.²⁴ Despite critical acclaim

for this Caribbean adaptation, Welles created a more traditionally set *Macbeth* for his 1948 film of the play, using an all-white cast—including Jeanette Nolan as Lady Macbeth and himself in the title role—and returning the action to Scotland. French composer Jacques Ibert, best known for his orchestral works *Divertissement* (1920) and *Escales* (1924), was commissioned to write the score.

Welles's film of *Macbeth* is rightfully famous: rehearsed and performed as a stage play, it was shot in just twenty-one days. As Olivier did with *Hamlet*, Welles took considerable liberties with the playtext. He rearranged scenes; he added the character of the Holy Man, giving him many of Ross's lines and introducing an element of religious strife into the plot; he also gave Lady Macduff a new speech; and, perhaps most strikingly, transposed a considerable amount of dialogue into internal monologue.²⁵ In his adaptation, the story not only illuminated the pitfalls of ambition; it also set pagan practices and witchcraft against a pious but still-brutal Christianity given to Duncan and his lieutenants. According to Bernice Kliman, Welles "asserts that the Christian religion which was attempting to supersede the older religion had gained little if anything of civilised mercifulness."²⁶ Filming on an arresting German Expressionist-style set, Welles positioned the Macbeths and their trials against a bleak and miserable backdrop of jagged cliff edges, stairs cut into rock, and barren rooms. As Michael Anderegg has observed, "Welles constructed a deliberately deglamorized world for *Macbeth*; the whole production has a lean and hungry look."²⁷

Welles originally intended much of the music of the film to be diegetically ascribed to the witches, calling in the script for them to be musicians: "The Third strikes up a little tune on a queer, ancient sort of flute. . . . The Second beats out the slow rhythm on a drum, the First plays a harp."²⁸ Later in the film, the "music of the three" was to be heard again as Macduff revealed to Macbeth the facts of his birth, indicating the fulfillments of the witches' prophesy.²⁹ Ultimately this proved unfeasible, but Welles was obviously very concerned with the use of the score in relation to the actions of the film. Understandably, given Welles's intentions for the music's weight, Ibert followed the film closely with his score, writing that during the process, he was "studying every movement of the characters, the tone of dialogue, the technique and rhythm of the pictured scenes."³⁰ The resulting score contains two major themes—"The Witches' Theme" and "Marching Armies"—and a number of shorter, "Mickey-Mousing" set pieces of incidental music, many of which were closely related or used variations of a common motif while trying to literally translate the filmic action into musical action.³¹ Clearly influenced by the "March to the Scaffold" and "Witches' Sabbath" movements of Hector Berlioz's 1830 *Symphonie Fantastique*, Ibert's score includes several minor-key marches, hints of the traditional four-note *Dies Irae* motif of the Latin requiem

mass, and swirling, repeated patterns that, like Berlioz's, build in tempo and dynamic to climactic points.

The film opens with the witches gathered around their cauldron, reciting a spell and creating a clay figure of Macbeth. Dressed in long robes, with long hair, the three work over their boiling pot as steam from it or fog surrounds them. As soon as one has uttered the name "Macbeth," the credits begin rolling as white text on a black background. The witches' weird jig is presented for the first time, interrupted by brass fanfares that later come to represent the Christianity and governance of Duncan. It is the first aural hint of the conflict between religions portrayed throughout the film. The dotted rhythms of the jig are completely subsumed by the fanfare as the credits end, mirroring the play's outcome of order—as imposed through the Christian rule of Malcolm—over the chaotic paganism embraced by Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. The witches' jig is established at this point as one of Ibert's two primary themes, and it is used throughout the film to indicate the presence of the unnatural or evil, not just the physical presence of the witches themselves.

As Macbeth and Banquo approach the witches for the first time, they are shrouded by the fog and seem to have control of it, making it move about and wax and wane. The weird sisters are marked by their vocality, which in contrast to the deep and stable voices of Macbeth and Banquo are shrill and uneven, oscillating between registers and causing the men to question their gender. Underneath their speech is a highly chromatic line in the oboe and piano, high-pitched string tremolos, and fragmented motifs that, along with the use of bells and xylophone code the music as "eerie" or "unnatural." In this scene, shrieking sounds, both vocal and instrumental, also aurally cast the witches as unnatural and animalistic, the primitive pagans the Holy Man wishes to banish.

Lady Macbeth is introduced in the film in a scene featuring an amalgamation of extracts from her response to Macbeth's letter—"Glamis thou art, and Cawdor" (1.5.1–32)—and her declaration of her desire of power—"unsex me here" (1.5.45–61). Like the weird sisters, she is clad in a long robe and wears her hair down and loose. She lies on her bed, writhing and stroking her body in sexual arousal at the thought of her husband's newfound recognition and the possibilities for the realization of their further ambitions. As she makes her request for masculine power, she rises from her bed, still caressing her breasts, goes to a castle window and, with seemingly supernatural power, draws down the night and raises the fog. As Jane Adelman writes, "Insofar that her milk nurtures the evil spirits, Lady Macbeth localizes the image of maternal danger, inviting the identification of her maternal function itself with that of the witch. . . . Lady Macbeth and the witches fuse at this moment, and they fuse [again] through the image of perverse nursery."³² The implication is obvious that, like the three crones, Lady Macbeth is of the unrepressed pagan

stock at odds with Duncan's Christianity and desires power from beings and methods his Holy Man hopes to destroy.

Just as Welles links Lady Macbeth and the witches through visual similarities, Ibert's music unmistakably equates the witches and Lady Macbeth with one another, demonizing them as a whole. As Lady Macbeth reads Macbeth's letter, and during her following interior monologue, fragments of the witches' dance music are used to link her aurally with the witches. The chromaticism of the witches' dance and motifs are heard underneath her monologue, equating her desires for unnatural power with those used by the witches in the opening scene. This introduction to Lady Macbeth and her association with the witches establishes an aural context for her prior to her mad scene, and it prepares viewers for further musical linkage of the weird sisters with her depravity and madness.

Lady Macbeth's mad scene (5.1) is one of the few scenes Welles retains from the traditional playtext. The doctor and gentlewoman watch from behind a rock-cut staircase as Lady Macbeth descends, presumably from her chambers. As she begins to descend the stairs, the dotted rhythmic motif of the witches' jig can be heard underneath the dialogue between the doctor and the gentlewoman. The reference to the jig ends and Lady Macbeth wrings her hands in silence. As she begins to speak, however, her voice moves from its usual low tones to a higher-pitched sing-song, mimicking that of the witches as they cast their spells. Even more remarkably, she sings the lines "The Thane of Fife / had a wife" (5.1.44). Because it is unlikely that either Welles or Ibert were aware of the similarity of these lines to those from "The Battle of Otterburn," it is not surprising that the tune assigned to Lady Macbeth during this scene is new. It is a simple antecedent-consequent phrase, almost monotonal except for a rise of a fourth from "The" and "Thane" from B₃ to E₃, and a drop to D₃ on "wife." There is no final cadence on the tonic; the musical lines function as the first phrase of a two-phrase stanza that would have a final cadence after another two lines. The rhythm is simple and based on the natural speech rhythm of the lines.

Her final lines of the scene—"Where is she now?" delivered in sing-song speech—are directed to Macbeth himself, who has arrived on the scene. After embracing him, Lady Macbeth pulls away and, shrieking, runs from him. The witches' jig begins again, with the interrupting brass fanfares, as MacDuff's soldiers begin to move Birnam Wood to Dunsinane. This brief scene leads directly to a shot of Lady Macbeth, accompanied by the witches' dance, making her way along an outer wall of the castle. Elements of the jig and references to Berlioz's "March to the Scaffold" continue as she pauses at the edge of a parapet, the dotted rhythms increasing in tempo and volume as she prepares to hurl herself to her death. Her scream, as she falls, replicates that of the witches in their initial calling of Macbeth.

Lady Macbeth's extended vocality—expressed in her singing, songlike speech, and screams—is a broad signifier of her madness; the additional attachment of her condition to the music of the weird sisters' dance further indicts her as having been unnatural from the start and that madness is her punishment. While her sleepwalking alone indicates mental disturbance, Lady Macbeth's use of song and songlike expression in public shocks those around her as highly inappropriate, further indicators that she has lost her reason. Her singing is not complex, but musically very simple and fragmentary; her thoughts are incomplete, and her song fades away as her childish rhyme of "Fife" and "wife" gives way to her own confused memories—"Where is she now?"—of the slaughter of MacDuff's wife and children. Like Ophelia, Lady Macbeth's vocality and madness combine to position her as a truth-teller in her court, a position for which she is punished, ultimately, by an ambiguously self-determined death. Unlike many cinematic Ophelias, however, Welles's Lady Macbeth is never silenced by those around her, nor by the camera and microphone. To the contrary, her singing and speech are constructed within the context of the scene to be easily heard by both the film's audience and the audience comprised of the doctor, gentlewoman, and Macbeth. This is one of the less altered scenes of the entire film: Welles's edits leave Lady Macbeth's text complete while shortening the doctor's final speech to take into consideration Macbeth's own presence and watchfulness.

It is clear that Welles viewed Lady Macbeth's madness as brought on by misdeeds or the witnessing thereof, what Carol Thomas Neely describes as an insanity "viewed as a God-inflicted condition—as possession, sin, punishment, and sometimes disease, which confirmed the inseparability of the human and the transcendent."³³ Welles's further equation of the non-Christian with evil leads to the musical casting of Lady Macbeth as doubly damned. By using the weird sisters' dance music to accompany Lady Macbeth's descent into madness and later at her suicide, Ibert musically demonizes her along with the pagan witches through the use of their irregular and unstable rhythmic motif; the placement of the melody in the top registers of the violin, creating a shrill or shrieking timbre; and the underlying borrowings from Berlioz and the *Dies Irae* motif in the bass. Lady Macbeth's musical character all but shouts of unnaturalness, violent distraction, and death.

KUROSAWA: *THRONE OF BLOOD* (1961)

Akira Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*, originally titled *Kumonosu jô*, or *Spider's Web Castle*, was completed in 1957 and released in the United States in 1961.

Transposed to feudal Japan, this adaptation of *Macbeth* takes place in the overgrown and dangerous Spider's Web Woods and at Spider's Web Castle, one of the ruling Great Lord's fortifications. Finding an "evil forest spirit" or witch—a stand-in for *Macbeth's* trio of weird sisters—in the woods as they travel home from victories in battle, Washizu (*Macbeth*) and Miki (*Banquo*) are given hints about their futures; the action from there unfolds much as in the play.³⁴

Highly stylized, *Throne of Blood* combines elements of traditional Japanese Noh theater with *Macbeth*. The film includes Noh's requisite three pine branches, four pillars, and Shinto arch, which serve to frame much of the action; the presence of a "doer" (*Shite*) and "observer" (*Waku*)—Washizu and Asaji (*Lady Macbeth*), respectively—as well as a battle and a ghost, a role fulfilled by Miki. Kurosawa became fascinated with the aesthetic of Noh after the Second World War, writing, "During the war I had been starved for beauty, so I rushed headlong into the world of traditional Japanese arts as to a feast. . . . I went to see Noh for the first time. I read the art theories the great fourteenth-century Noh playwright Zeami left behind him. I read all there was to read about Zeami himself, and I devoured books on the Noh."³⁵ Paula von Loewenfeldt notes that the film is also structured into three sections of *jo/ha/kyū*, or introduction/destruction/haste, haste including "Miki's murder, the banquet scene, Asaji's miscarriage, the witch's second prediction, Asaji's madness, the assault on Cobweb Castle, and, finally, Washizu's bizarre execution at the hand of his own men."³⁶ Noh forms also influence the appearance of the characters, particularly Asaji. In helping the actors create their characters, Kurosawa notes, "I showed each of the players a photograph of the mask of the Noh which came closest to the respective role; I told him that the mask was his own part." For Toshiro Mifune, this was the mask of a warrior. To Asaji, "I showed the mask named *Shakumi*. This was the mask of a beauty no longer young, and represented the image of a woman about to go mad."³⁷ Asaji's lack of facial emotions nod to this use of masks to portray female characters, and her ritualized movements, including her small, heel-to-toe steps, also come from the controlled action of the Noh theater. In addition, the film's composer, Masaru Sato, employs both of Noh's most universal musical aspects: a group of instrumental musicians known as *hayashi* or *hayashi-kata*, who play the transverse flute (*shinobue* or *takebue*) and three percussion instruments traditional to Noh; and the chorus, or *jiutai*.

Throne of Blood falls into two categories of Noh plays. It is a "wig drama," in which the primary female character drives the action, and a drama of spirit possession.³⁸ The first incarnation of the film as a wig drama is obvious: as Robert Hapgood notes, "Physically, Asaji is virtually immobile while, mentally, she never stops forging ahead toward her goals."³⁹ As the instigator of Washizu's evil deeds, Asaji fulfills a traditional role of the Noh woman who is,

as in several Noh plays, the motivator of psychological and physical action, “a cruel-hearted woman driven by a dominating will, who possesses the power to dominate men.”⁴⁰

A close reading of the visual and aural elements assigned to Asaji’s character finds that *Throne of Blood* is also a spirit possession drama in which Asaji’s behavior can be attributed to possession by the witch or a kindred entity bent on punishing Washizu and Miki (representing aggressive, male mankind as a whole) for their human arrogance. Like Welles, Kurosawa and Sato demonize their Lady Macbeth character by connecting her to supernatural evil, both visually and aurally, in their case using the conventions of Noh’s approach both to women in general and to its trope of spirit possession. As discussed above, the concept of the immoral woman as a temptress is common in Noh drama, which drew heavily from the precepts of Mahayana Buddhism, and Asaji as a woman is already considered “endowed with evil passions” regardless of whether she is possessed; by acting on these passions, she is ripe for possession, almost always denied the opportunity for enlightenment, and punished with possession and madness.⁴¹ As Etsuko Terasaki writes, “These women are treated as the ‘other’ of society. They often appear as madwomen or victims of spirit possession, the symptoms of which are their desires, aspirations, longings, regrets, and guilt.”⁴² Although Asaji denies that she is possessed when Washizu accuses her of it, the music and sounds Sato uses in connection with her belie her words. These diegetic sounds and Sato’s music for the film link the witch and Asaji together as blatantly evil figures and suggest that Asaji’s actions come from her possession by the witch or one of its kind. Thus Asaji’s madness truly begins long before *Throne of Blood*’s version of the 5.1 hand-washing scene; in fact, the mad frenzy of that scene is the result of incurable insanity, a spiritual punishment for her possessed behavior. As Richie writes,

In equating Asaji with the witch (who also believes in a wicked world, as in: “If you choose ambition, then choose it honestly, with cruelty . . . if you would make a mountain of the dead, then pile it to the sky; if you would shed blood, let it run as a river”) and with the Noh, Kurosawa suggests that the rite, the ritual, man’s idea of the world, the rigid, the formal, the pattern of life endlessly the same—that this is the opposite of the free, the human. The static, the full-formed, is negative. The only positive is that which chooses faith, which chooses to believe and does so in the face of reason, history, experience and the world as it seems.⁴³

Spirit possession has a long history in Japanese literature and theater, dating from *The Tale of Genji* (*Genji Monogatari*), attributed to the eleventh-century noblewoman Murasaki Shikibu, and the earliest Noh plays, many of which were based on episodes from *Genji*. Of spirit possession as a recurring

trope in Japanese works, Doris Bergen writes that “*mono no ke* (possession) [is] a predominantly female strategy adopted to counter male strategies of empowerment” including physical violence and female subjugation.⁴⁴ Spirit possession, she writes, “expresses not merely the conflict of an individual but a larger crisis not acknowledged by society.”⁴⁵ Possession in literature was attributed to unresolved conflicts, emotional and intrapersonal; feelings of guilt; being over-emotional; and seeking power, love, or other conditions inappropriate to one’s station. Noh characters could also be possessed by spirits wishing to communicate with a third party, to punish a third party, or to remove a character from a painful or subordinate situation. Herbert E. Plutschow notes that spirits trying to communicate with the living world use this technique frequently in Noh: “The spirit’s disguise may be seen as a dramatic means of spirit possession, whereby the spirit identifies itself through a living being.”⁴⁶ Many Noh plays using the trope of spirit possession focus on placating the spirit or offering prayers for its tortured afterlife. The theme of past actions having found closure is often featured in opening and closing chants: in *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* (*Sonezaki Shinū*), the narrator’s prelude precedes the action and marks the end of the drama by reciting “No one is here to tell the tale, but the wind that blows through Sonezaki Wood transmits it.”⁴⁷ In *Throne of Blood*, peace comes to the region only after Washizu’s defeat and the razing of Spider’s Web Castle—in a sense, an exorcism of all of the evils perpetrated there. The film’s opening narration echoes that of the traditional Noh drama, that nature alone now bears witness to past pain and atrocity: “Within this place / Stood once a mighty fortress / Here there lived a proud warrior / Murdered by ambition.”

The witch provides the necessary supernatural grounding for a spirit possession play. The witch’s visual and aural presence establishes those parameters for Asaji’s later appearance in the film, and the witch’s extended camera time allows viewers to absorb the symbolism surrounding her, in order to better correlate it with Asaji’s during her scenes. Before the witch in the forest appears to Washizu and Miki, she establishes her relationship with nature by creating an atmosphere of unease through its ghostly presence in the labyrinthine forest, generating a storm and causing Washizu and Miki to become lost. Her laughter echoes through the forest, which grows more densely filled with fog each moment. A hut appears, surrounded by skulls and other bones of fallen warriors, and before the spirit appears, she can be heard, singing of men’s vanity, ambition, and death. This androgynous spirit is gendered as female only through Washizu and Miki’s reference to it as “she,” originating from the model of the malevolent and untrustworthy woman of Noh. She is dressed in pale clothes and shown with a spinning wheel and skein of yarn, and clearly represents not only the three weird sisters of *Macbeth* but also the three fates of Classic lore: as she spins, Clotho-like, she fashions Washizu’s and Miki’s destinies.

The music associated with the witch is both instrumental and vocal. Immediately before her laughter first sounds, there is a common musical gesture from Noh in the flute and drums that is repeated when she disappears: all three drums play at once, and the flute sounds a single long pitch followed by a quick drop and then a rise to an overblown pitch higher than the first. As the witch vanishes, the instrumental score repeats the flute motif. Replicated in a tonal setting, the gesture is dissonant and unresolved, musically mirroring the uncertainty of the situation. The witch's song is also inflected with Noh practices: almost monotonal, low in pitch and hoarse, it is sung in the same manner as a Noh actor presenting a speech.⁴⁸ Evelyn Tribble has written that Sato's use of Noh motifs estranges the listener from everyday sound, creating horror where it would not normally occur: "Kurosawa uses a repeated pattern of orienting responses that represent human responses to fear in an environment rendered unfamiliar and strange because of an originary act of violence. In these cases familiar, natural sounds are rendered terrifying because of their capacity to evoke the unknown." She continues, establishing the aural signifiers of the spirit, "The most obvious example of this pattern is the sound of the spirit in the woods. This scene begins with a long exterior shot, with the sounds of the Noh flute and percussion underscoring the diegetic sounds of rain and galloping horses. Rain, thunder and lightning mark this space; the forest is inhospitable to human beings. This long sequence plays off several recurring sounds: rain, thunder, horses galloping and whinnying, the shouts of the men as they attempt to gain control of the space."⁴⁹

These sounds are used again to provide musical signification for Lady Asaji, imbuing her with the cruelty and unnaturalness first attributed to the witch in the forest. As Richie writes, even the sounds of Asaji's physical presence connect her to the spirit: "the sounds which both women make—the squeak of Asaji's *tabi* [sandals], the sound of her kimono dragging, the slight clatter of the witch's spinning-wheel, her rustlings in her reed hut—are sounds which one strongly associates with the Noh."⁵⁰ Asaji, in her first appearance, is obviously a replication of the stylized posture, dress, and mannerisms of the witch. Also clad in white—a signifier of death and mourning in Japanese culture—and with her hair down and mostly loose, Asaji sits almost immobile, avoiding all eye contact with Washizu as she prophesizes Miki's treachery. Once the Great Lord (Duncan) has arrived at Washizu's fortress, Asaji's insistence that Washizu kill him strengthens. It is here that Washizu accuses her of spirit possession—a madness preliminary to her hand-washing scene. The music that was first heard in the forest as Miki and Washizu approached the witch is used again here, indicating that his diagnosis is correct, despite her words to the contrary. Although Washizu suspects Asaji's motives are supernaturally influenced, the music continues, indicating that her power over Washizu does not diminish even in the face of his mistrust.

As Asaji pushes Washizu closer and closer to the murder of the Great Lord, her music and the sounds associated with her persist in echoing and imitating the music first assigned to the witch; Asaji's own body and its surroundings become a musical instrument through which the witch's motifs are broadcast. A nondiegetic flute motif is followed by a diegetic bird cry that follows the pitch pattern of the spirit's motif; Asaji's *tabi* make small noises that replicate the flute motif; and the final screech of the owl, as Asaji finally convinces Washizu to commit the crime, is also in the same pitch range and rhythmic pattern as the flute motif that binds Asaji and the witch together. Her words goading Washizu, "Ambition makes the man," come from the witch's warning virtually unchanged; every action she makes, word she speaks, and sound or music around her cement Asaji's relationship with evil.

Asaji's final scene is a brief adaptation of *Macbeth's* hand-washing scene. Not surprisingly, both visual and aural reminders of Asaji's connections with the witch are again present. Noh drums beat and flutes compete in a dissonant, unsynchronized barrage of the initial flute motif as Washizu strides through the castle, seeking Asaji, who has gone mad from the stillbirth of their child and her recognition of her actions, an extension of the traditional trope of the "imperfect mother" among Lady Macbeths. He finds her crouched behind a kimono stand, much like the witch in her hut, her hair loose and wild, showing facial emotion for the first time in the film. She has cast off her virtual *Shakumi* mask; her loose hair and unbalanced countenance now correspond with the *masukami* mask, or "long hair," used to signify "suffering and deranged women."⁵¹ According to Eric C. Rath, her facial alteration parallels a change of masks, revealing "the transformation of a seemingly innocent character into a deity or demon," or vice versa.⁵² Viewing the film, Kozintsev wrote that even Kurosawa found the scene true to its theatrical origins: "Kurosawa has said that Machiko Kyo played the mad scene precisely according to theatrical tradition. Dressed in a white kimono and with a white masklike face, she sat beside a bronze vase and ceaselessly washed invisible blood from her fingers. Only her hands moved, like white moths in an ominous dance."⁵³

Asaji's obsessive washing takes place in silence; after staring at her in bewilderment, Washizu turns away from her. The startling silence and complete lack of music in this encounter between Asaji and Washizu reveal that Asaji is no longer an instrument of possession but, like other Noh women who have brought about destruction, has gone mad in the realization of her actions. As in the case of *Sotoba Komachi*, a classic Noh play that also recounts the unmitigated cruelty of a woman, Asaji's final scene "signifies a public display of the secret guilt [she] harbors in her unconscious. She is full of fear and hate for what she has done in the past; her state of mind is ambivalent and conflict-

ual.”⁵⁴ Her power over Washizu has come to an end. She is no longer linked with the prophetic witch but suffers alone.

Like Welles’s *Lady Macbeth*, *Lady Asaji* is included in a grouping of the “unnatural” other that both diminishes her femininity by showing her desire for a nontraditional power for women and emphasizes the danger that women pose to the stability of a man, household, or kingdom. Both as a woman and as a victim of possession, Asaji is far more evil than Washizu himself, and the visual and aural Noh tropes that are applied to her character both within and outside of the diegesis serve as constant reminders of both her role in the drama as the diabolical tempter of Buddhist men and the malevolent desires she shares with the witch. Because Asaji is characterized exclusively through visual and aural Noh tropes that associate her with the only other clearly coded evil role, her character is ultimately limited to a stereotype of the ambitious woman that is, unfortunately, recognizable in any culture.

POLANSKI: *MACBETH* (1971)

Roman Polanski’s treatment of *Macbeth*, famously financed by Playboy Enterprises and its founder Hugh Hefner, is a radical departure from its predecessors. Unlike Welles’s or Kurosawa’s adaptations of the play, in which the supernatural and *Lady Macbeth* are condemned for their unnatural states, Polanski’s offers the first humanizing approach to the character found on film. The sympathetic nature of the film is apparent from the beginning. The sounds that accompany the witches in their scene before the main titles—the call of gulls—is that of the natural, everyday world rather than the supernatural realm. In their first encounter, *Macbeth* and *Banquo* treat the weird sisters with kindness. There is nothing sinister or eerie in their presentation: they are three women obviously living on the fringes of society, relying on one another and their nanny-goat for shelter and sustenance. Neither *Macbeth* nor *Banquo* is surprised by their fortune-telling, as if such a thing is both mundane in this still-superstitious time.

Polanski’s *Lady Macbeth*, played by Francesca Annis, is clearly modeled after Ellen Terry’s vulnerable and feminine *Lady Macbeth* as opposed to the overtly evil women of Welles’s and Kurosawa’s productions. In fact, a number of visual references to Terry’s stage *Lady Macbeth* indicate that Polanski was familiar with Terry’s portrayal of the character, and his character concept for her likewise stems from Terry’s theory that she is “fragile and womanly.”⁵⁵ As Bernice Kliman writes, “One might contrast Francesca Annis’s womanly sexuality with the demonic sexuality—the orgasmic writhings—that other *Lady*

Macbeths use to control their husbands”; certainly she is in great contrast to Jeanette Nolan in Welles’s film.⁵⁶ The connection to Terry extends into the visual as well. Polanski’s Lady Macbeth is frequently dressed to match the famous John Singer Sargent portrait of Terry crowning herself: a long green dress falls to her feet, and her red hair is often long and loose or braided into two long plaits. To further the picture of her gentle, feminine nature, Polanski portrays Lady Macbeth as matter of fact, essentially kind, and excited about her husband’s future, seeing no wrong in continuing what has become the status quo method of attaining kingship. In her first appearance, as Annis’s Lady Macbeth reads Macbeth’s letter, she expresses wonder and delight over the witches’ prophecies, petting her wolfhounds as she does so. Her musings on her husband’s weaknesses are neither innocent nor elaborately evil but, like much of the tone of the film, calm and not overly passionate.

Polanski’s employment of the Third Ear Band—an innovative London-based collective that drew from numerous traditions, including Renaissance forms and instrumentation, Indian ragas, and electric strings—led to the development of a soundtrack that included reasonably accurate attempts at period-appropriate accompaniments for the film. Julie Sanders asserts that this period-approximate music is used to “lull audiences into a false position of comfort [which collapses] as the camera pans out to the hostile environment” in which the film is set, but this is not the only reading of the use of this music. Indeed, the relationship between the music, the settings in which it is used, and its link to Lady Macbeth create a framework around her in which she is a highly sympathetic character.⁵⁷ Strings, both plucked and bowed, recorders, oboes, drums, and folklike vocals not only place the film in time and location but also address the scale of the events and characters involved in them: there are no sweeping orchestral motifs or twentieth-century dissonances here to indicate the morality or lack thereof of the Macbeths, but instead a soundscape that reminds the audience of the brutality and still-developing cultural and ethical codes and expectations of a pre- or early-Christian Scotland. The script indicates that Polanski and his co-author, cultural critic Kenneth Tynan, put considerable thought into the use of music and musical style in the film. Their cues marking the entrance and exit of music—even noting the duration of the music—are explicit and deliberate. Polanski and Tynan write music cues for Lady Macbeth more than any other single character; music serves as a prologue and postlude to her texts above all other speeches and scenes, with one remarkable exception: her sleepwalking scene.⁵⁸

While the weird sisters have a clear, repeated motif played by traditional and modern instruments that appears nondiegetically when Macbeth encounters them both on the heath with Banquo and in their cavern as they brew the potion to call up details of his fate, Lady Macbeth has no singular theme to

mark her scenes. She is never marked as in league with the supernatural, a potential witch herself, or in any way unnatural, as previous filmic Lady Macbeths have been. Instead, she is accompanied in the majority of her appearances by diegetic music that is reasonable to assume would have been present during her scenes, set in the time period Polanski has chosen. During the feast for Duncan, her entertainment includes a small group of musicians—playing a lute, wind instrument, and drums—who play throughout the feast and for the dancing after the meal. Duncan’s attention to Lady Macbeth indicates his pleasure at her hospitality, of which music is an important element. In her dance with him, Lady Macbeth is the perfect hostess, and the music contains no foreboding: like Lady Macbeth herself, the music is firmly within the realm of the domestic and practical. Even the performance of Banquo’s young son, Fleance, of a song using lyrics (anachronistically) from Chaucer’s “Merciless Beauty” is without real foreshadowing; his song is charmingly performed and welcomed by an unsuspecting Duncan and a Lady Macbeth who truly believes that the misdeeds of her husband will go no further than Duncan’s execution.

Nondiegetic scoring is effectively segregated from the hominess of Lady Macbeth’s hired musicians and their folklike tunes, presenting a significant contrast between her musical coding and that of the witches and Macbeth himself. During Macbeth’s journey to Duncan’s chamber (2.1.44) in which he imagines or hallucinates a dagger pointing the way, the music provided by the Third Ear Band has little in common with the earlier lute and drum dances; instead it is reminiscent of György Ligeti’s chamber music. Using tremolo strings in high registers, sharp accents at seemingly random intervals, repeated phrases, the accompaniment for this scene “squeaks and gibbers,” buzzing as Macbeth tries to steel himself for the task ahead. As he actually commits the murder, the same music is used again, but integrated with period instruments and percussion to create an atmosphere of adrenaline-filled terror and expectation. Lack of a tonal center or an easily understood structure makes the music an aural counterpart to Macbeth’s uncertain actions and emotions.

The militaristic drumming of Malcolm’s troops as they march to war is the only diegetic music heard after the murder of Duncan, in stark opposition to the domestic music of Lady Macbeth. While the witches’ theme is used as their prophecies are fulfilled, it appears only briefly, beginning and ending abruptly. Duncan’s death and both Macbeths’ culpability in it obviously deliberately coincide with the end of the civilized, period-approximate music associated with Lady Macbeth. These aural changes indicate that her sphere of domestic stability and pragmatism also ends at this point; where in Duncan’s death she urges and assists her husband in following his predecessors’ brutal methods and tactics for gaining power, she is left unconsulted and powerless as Macbeth continues without fear to execute his rivals. Lady Macbeth, represented by structured music and

standard musicians of the time, stands for order and rule within her domicile. When the boundaries of what is acceptable to her are broken by Macbeth, she no longer has a place within that order.

Given this linking of Lady Macbeth, music, and domestic rule, it is no surprise that her sleepwalking scene is entirely devoid of nondiegetic sound. Again coiffed like Terry with braids, Annis is nude but is framed as childlike and fragile in her madness, the camera emphasizing her tiny figure against the larger frames of the bed, the nurse, and the doctor. Her speech is more confused than angry or damning; the nurse and doctor are clearly sympathetic. The silence that surrounds her imbues her with a state of victimhood that music or extraneous sound would undermine by referring back to her previous control. The removal of the music that previously coded Lady Macbeth as a capable, culturally and politically aware woman in charge of her home and as a helpmeet to her husband recasts her as powerless over her own thoughts and actions, and without the external power that allowed her to guide Macbeth and her court before Duncan's death.

Ultimately, the canny use of disparate styles and instrumental blends in this *Macbeth* accomplishes the humanization of Lady Macbeth even beyond Annis's highly sympathetic portrayal of the character. The three primary aural themes used in the film—Lady Macbeth's hired performers and their period instruments, the witches' theme, played by a blend of period and modern instruments, and Macbeth's eerie late-twentieth-century-influenced accompaniments—separate these three factions and present them as unallied. By uncoupling Lady Macbeth's actions and thoughts from those of the witches, Polanski creates a new approach to filmic *Macbeths*, releasing both the thane's wife and the weird sisters from their label of "unnatural." Instead, he suggests through the use of Macbeth's alien scoring that it is perhaps Macbeth who is the most unnatural and maddest of all in his quest for power.

MORRISETTE: *SCOTLAND, PA.* (2001)

Billy Morrisette's clever and darkly comic adaptation of *Macbeth, Scotland, Pa.*, was an indie hit at the Sundance Film Festival in 2002 and has since gained a cult following. Set in small-town Scotland, Pennsylvania, in a fast-food restaurant, Macbeth becomes Joe McBeth, known as Mac, a disaffected thirty-something slacker who is married to the smarter and more ambitious Pat. Both Mac and Pat work for Norm Duncan, who runs the burger joint in the economically depressed town. McDuff is the police lieutenant who comes to town to investigate when Duncan turns up dead in the restaurant's deep-fryer.⁵⁹ Mac

and Pat take over the restaurant but are undone by Mac's paranoia surrounding his friend and co-worker Banko. Pat's madness manifests itself in her despair at her husband's sudden distantness, although Morrisette parallels the traditional somnambulist hand-washing with Pat's waking obsession with a (healed) grease burn caused by Duncan's splash into the fryer.

As a couple aspiring to be middle class, Mac and Pat are not unappealing. Pat, as portrayed by Maura Tierney, is clearly the brighter of the two, and for most of the film she is more sympathetic than her husband, played by James LeGros. Pat drives her husband's actions mainly through physical manipulation and sexual rewards, but her straightforward, unpolished sensibilities certainly speak to audiences who have been likewise underemployed or have gone unrecognized for their contributions in menial jobs. "We're not bad people, Mac," Pat says early in the film, "just underachievers." Morrisette constructs the film in such a way that the audience roots for the McBeths. By casting the McBeths as unfairly treated antiheroes, Morrisette positions the audience to want them to succeed with their renovated, modernized drive-thru and menu ideas. Although McDuff, played by Christopher Walken, is also a sympathetic character—he dreams of opening a vegetarian restaurant himself—he is the catalyst for Mac and Pat's self-destruction. Morrisette's adaptation changes the *Lady Macbeth* character the most. Usually, as Marjorie Garber writes, "the disintegration of *Lady Macbeth* is even more disturbing than that of *Macbeth* himself, because it is so sudden and more complete," but in this film Mac's paranoia is far more dramatic than Pat's attempts to calm her nerves and cool her burning hand.⁶⁰ Indeed, Pat's physical plight is dramatized in several scenes, as she purchases burn ointment from the pharmacist, puts her hand under running water at home, and plunges it into ice at the restaurant; but she is denied the sleepwalking confessions of traditional *Lady Macbeths*.

As Thomas Cartelli and Katherine Rowe have written, much of the music in *Scotland, Pa.* comes in the form of diegetic and nondiegetic "Rock Blocks" of several songs in a row by the same band, primarily Bad Company.⁶¹ Cartelli and Rowe point out that the Rock Blocks mediate elements of nostalgia and the evolution of musical narrative, recalling an era when sound and music originated from "once-separate vernaculars of film, TV, and radio" and reminding viewers of the changes since that time.⁶² While popular music, which plays almost constantly in the first half of the film and slightly less in the second, does set the film in a blue-collar town in the 1970s and prompts such identification with age-appropriate listeners and viewers, it also serves a strongly narrative purpose: every major action and scene is accompanied by a rock song with corresponding lyrics, some ironic, others not. Mac and Pat have sex accompanied by Bad Company's "Ready for Love"; Mac swaggers to the band's antiheroism in the song "Bad Company" as he plans Duncan's murder. A pop

celebration of the better things in life, “Beach Baby,” accompanies the montage of the McBeths’ rise in status after buying out Duncan’s restaurant.

Although the Rock Blocks and popular music of the period are used throughout, a considerable amount of nondiegetic music informs the atmosphere of the film. In the first act, it is associated strictly with Mac and the three “hippie” witches with whom he gets stoned at the local fairgrounds, and it reappears only when they are present. Mac is alone when he encounters the witches, who also show up at the restaurant and in the woods when Mac is hunting with Banko and other friends; he never tells Pat about them. As Garber notes, “What Shakespeare did with the weird sisters was make them into an emblematic state of mind—again, the onstage and unmetaphored counterpart of the ambiguous and powerful Lady Macbeth.” In Morrisette’s black comedy, they are instead the confused, stoned or drunk, and often incoherent voices of Mac’s mind, not Pat’s.⁶³

The music of the film supports this reading of Mac’s connection with the weird trio. Buried deeply in the background during their scenes together is conventional “suspense-building” music, hinting at Mac’s ill-fated future actions. Its minor modality, circling string motifs, and otherworldly bells—which descend in pitch from high, tinkling “fairy bells” during Mac’s first meeting with the witches to low and foreboding tubular bells as he carries out his plan to murder Banko—could all be lifted from the score of a Hitchcock movie. Despite its stereotypical elements, the music that surrounds Mac outside of his Rock Blocks is suggestive of his descent from basic humanity to insanity, allowing the audience to hear the tension that builds in his mind from the murder of Duncan through the conception of his plan to shoot Banko to the final showdown with McDuff from atop the restaurant. These are elements of Mac’s story alone, and in associating Mac, rather than Pat, with the witches, Morrisette creates a shift in the common interpretative and musical paradigm of *Macbeth* adaptations.

Until the second act, Pat’s accompaniments are mostly the same as her husband’s, except for his scenes with the witches: through the music that follows their actions, they are signified as a single entity. After Duncan’s murder, which takes place about halfway through the film, Pat’s music becomes disassociated from Mac’s. Although there is considerable and frequent “bleed” of one scene’s music into other scenes, the music that frames the two is more often radically disparate: while he continues to live in the world of the Rock Blocks and narrative songs, her music takes a more traditional turn toward classical film scoring. Mac’s music continues to locate him in a deluded comfort zone—believing that everything will be fine—but Pat’s segregation from the popular period music indicates that she is being cut off from Mac’s confidences and is on her own path to her end. Pat’s physical obsession with the grease

burn on her hand is meant to replicate Lady Macbeth's with Duncan's blood, but both the text of *Scotland, Pa.* and the scoring used to frame Pat's madness locate her distress much more emphatically on the emotional break with her husband.

Pat's music is clearly intended to depict her estrangement from Mac and her growing anxiety over his actions, McDuff's presence, and the lingering pain she appears to feel from the grease burn. Pat is stronger than her husband, and more capable of dealing with the complexities of their situation as McDuff begins to close in; her music contains none of the otherworldliness of the music that accompanies Mac and the witches or Mac alone as he sinks deeper into his paranoia. Instead, the film uses a different, albeit also formulaic, musical trope to accompany Pat until her final, climactic scene. High strings and drumming start most of her nondiegetic music, which expands to include a piano after short introductions. The strings and piano play brief, minimalist figures that grow in volume and frequency of repetition as Pat's desperation over their situation and his refusal to communicate with her increases. Hindered by her husband's refusal to rely on her intelligence as well as by his resulting lack of competent independent thought, his visions of the witches, and his paranoia—all quite possibly alcohol- and drug-induced—Pat slips from her position as the scheme's mastermind to that of unwilling, if not uninformed, accomplice. By the time Mac kills Banko and sees his ghost at a restaurant party, Pat's music has reached *Psycho*-like status, with the strings shrieking and the piano repeating its figures incessantly and loudly. It is her terror that is represented, not Mac's. Despite his actions that push her into a secondary role, her emotions—particularly her anxiety and overwhelming desire to fix the situation, something Mac disallows by shutting her out—are at the core of the film's tension.

At the film's denouement, Pat is provided with two themes, both nondiegetic: her minimalist accompaniment from earlier scenes, and a Three Dog Night song, "Never Been to Spain." The lyrics of the first stanza comment on Pat's condition and foreshadow her coming actions:

Say the ladies are insane there
And they sure know how to use it
They don't abuse it
Never gonna lose it

Pat's madness, which is manifested as a very deliberate calm on the part of Tierney, will be the means of her end; she will not inflict it upon her husband, nor anyone else, and in her mind she knows it will not otherwise end: she has no other options.

As Pat comes to realize what her husband has done, as well as her own role in their actions, her music becomes dominant over Mac's and the music locates them in opposite spheres: while now Pat, in a moment of rational thought (albeit grounded in her insanity), is part of the present, accompanied by metadiegetic music of the period, her more traditionally filmic music of fear has transferred to Mac, who, caught in his own fear, cannot coolly relocate himself in the present as she has done.

Near the end of the film, Pat makes martinis at home to "Never Been to Spain," which is briefly interrupted by her earlier minimalist motif when the shot cuts to the restaurant where Mac, cooking for the witches, has realized that he is no longer in control of the situation and can no longer hold out against McDuff. Their musics have been swapped. Back at the McBeths' home, "Never Been to Spain" resumes and continues its narrative work as Pat calmly finishes a martini and cuts off her hand with a kitchen cleaver. The sound of the cleaver splitting her cutting board ends the song, and her minimalist music returns with a cut to Mac plunging to his death from the roof. Ultimately, Pat has chosen a solution under her own control, whereas Mac has not.

By musically linking Mac, rather than Pat, with the witches, and by privileging Pat's motifs and songs above Mac's, even in scenes in which he is the focus and she is absent, Morrisette hints that Pat's journey from logic to madness and finally to a grotesque combination of them both is the true focus of the film's drama. Mac, whose scenes contain frequent musical bleed-over from other characters or scenes, is the catalyst in the plot but not its final antihero. That honor goes to Pat, and it is emphasized by the boldness of her final actions. Ultimately, the use of the metadiegetic popular music as narrative in conjunction with more traditional film-score soundscapes allows for a highly nuanced presentation of Pat's mental descent to madness.

CONCLUSION

Analysis of the music for these major adaptations of *Macbeth* seems to indicate a shift in filmic approaches to Lady Macbeth that replicates the change from pre- to post-Siddons interpretations that occurred within the role on the stage. Both Welles and Kurosawa drew on older traditions of their respective theatrical heritages in linking their Lady Macbeths with evil supernatural forces. Although Welles sets early Christianity in opposition to paganism and Kurosawa plays on historical belief in spirit possession, both create films in which there is a clear moral imperative for Lady Macbeth/Asaji to disassociate herself from witches' powers; that she does not do so condemns her. Musically she has

no autonomy apart from the witches: both films employ music that is essentially the same for both Lady Macbeth and the witches, emphasizing the moral proximity of their roles. Ibert, in composing the “Witches’ Theme,” and Sato, in using recurrent aspects of accompanimental Noh music and sound, engineer an aural identity for Lady Macbeth and Asaji in which, no matter their words or appearance, they are signified as inherently malevolent.

Why these two earlier films should have drawn on earlier theater traditions is uncertain. As Rowe has written, “audiences have not always understood Lady Macbeth in exclusively negative terms. Indeed, her figure was for a long time tied to a model of assertive American femininity.”⁶⁴ Although Rowe addresses specifically American audiences here, the same is true for audiences in Britain as well, as demonstrated above by Rackin. It is true that Welles and Kurosawa created and set their *Macbeths* during periods in which women had limited personal and professional autonomy, but there is little in the films’ texts or scores to suggest that they chose to construct strong, albeit irredeemable, Lady Macbeths as either a reaction to or against contemporary societal norms. Rather, these adaptations both revolve around two key tropes, both of which are traditional to pre-Siddons stagecraft: that of the monstrous female and the romanticization of feudal society. In adopting the concept of the noble past as a dramatic device—Welles in order to create a more obvious dichotomy between the new Christian forces of morality and the old ways of the pagans, and Kurosawa to hang his film on the framework of both typical Noh drama and that of the established honor codes of the samurai—it is possible that the filmmakers’ use of a Lady Macbeth in collusion with supernatural forces appeared appropriate. Clearly both films would have been entirely different had their respective Lady Macbeths been cast as anything other than purely evil.

While the score for *Throne of Blood* is more creative in its use of references to the older theatrical tradition, both Kurosawa’s and Welles’s films are essentially “heritage” productions, relying on musical cues and techniques already familiar to audiences and thus easily parsed by viewers. Considering that Welles’s film was the first *Macbeth* with full sound and that Kurosawa’s appeared about a decade later, these traits may be partially attributed to the relative age of the films. Nonetheless, both films are problematic in their reliance on convenient male-dominated stereotypes of women whose origins or behaviors place them outside the societal norm. That the scores for the films support this troubling approach reveals a mentality among film composers of this period to maintain this status quo through the use of music.

Perhaps due to growing social consciousness about the depiction of women in various media, later adaptations of *Macbeth* provide Lady Macbeth with greater autonomy and depth of character than those of Welles and Kurosawa, indicative of film’s own pre- to post-Siddons shift. Polanski’s film, which

premiered in 1971, ten years after Kurosawa's, can be seen as representative of the transfer between the earlier filmmakers' more stylized and traditional positioning of women and films that were produced as second-wave feminism swept the Anglophone world. Kliman notes that the film, "produced at the time of the beginning of the women's movement, reflects the moment in history when women, to free themselves from sexist society, avoided make-up and burned bras."⁶⁵ Polanski's *Lady Macbeth* is perhaps the most "natural" of the four discussed here, given the context in which she is situated: she is the intelligent and politically aware lady of a great house during a period when life was, as Hobbes would have it, for the most part, "poor, nasty, brutish and short." Because Polanski locates the witches as supernaturally touched but still very much "inhabitants of the earth," they are reduced in power, and by uncoupling *Lady Macbeth* from the imagery and music of the witches, he shows that she, too, is more human and less threatening.

As Kliman writes of the witches: "the crudeness of their clothing makes them seem like desperate peasants who have turned to magic; their living arrangements, with sacks and burrows, goats and pails, domesticate them, as much as the household details of Inverness, with dogs and chickens and pigs, domesticate Macbeth and Lady Macbeth."⁶⁶ However, this domesticity is all the weird sisters share with this *Lady Macbeth*. From a musical point of view, whereas they make their own (primarily tuneless) music by singing and humming, she commands it from professionals. Although being reliant on others for music might seem to indicate that this *Lady Macbeth* is lacking in a kind of creativity or power, Polanski's chosen medieval setting negates this view. Rather, she is in control of her household and its personnel; as a patron rather than a performer, she is a figure of hierarchical authority—one who can pay for entertainments in her household. This command marks her as a more independent *Lady Macbeth* than Welles's or Kurosawa's: in many ways, she calls the tune.

Pat of *Scotland, Pa.* is also a *Lady Macbeth* born of second-wave feminism, albeit one created retroactively by the distance of time. By drawing on familiar images and sounds of the 1970s, Morrisette creates in Pat a smart, sexy, and self-directed woman. Pat, as an entirely autonomous *Lady Macbeth*, is a step removed from Polanski's *Lady Macbeth* in two directions: she is entirely independent of the witches in every way, and she does not share the domesticity Polanski attributes to his vision of the character. While Polanski's *Lady Macbeth* controls the music that accompanies her public life—particularly that of the banquet prior to Duncan's murder—Pat controls the music that surrounds her at important private junctures: convincing Mac while she has sex with him to kill Duncan and as she prepares to cut off her hand and, perhaps inadvertently, end her life.

In the two more recent adaptations, music plays a role not only as a signifier of individual character aspects, but also as an indicator of character hierarchy and control. As *Macbeth* adaptations are created under the auspices of postmodern philosophies, cultural assumptions, and approaches, new possibilities for Lady Macbeth emerge, including Lady Macbeths who control their own destinies and are conceived of as individuals rather than constructs, wholly owning their music and other artistic expressions without conflation with other abstract or embodied evils, unnaturalness, or womanly weakness.

NOTES

1. Kathleen McLuskie, "The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare," in *Shakespeare, Feminism, and Gender*, ed. Kate Chedgzoy (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 41.
2. Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993), 25.
3. Irene G. Dash, *Women's Worlds in Shakespeare's Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997), 161.
4. Joanna Levin, "Lady MacBeth and the Daemonologie of Hysteria," *English Literary History* 69, no. 1 (2002): 22.
5. Levin, "Lady MacBeth and the Daemonologie of Hysteria," 38.
6. Marjorie Garber, *Dream in Shakespeare: From Metaphor to Metamorphosis* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1974), 115–16.
7. Peter Stallybrass, "Macbeth and Witchcraft," in *Focus on Macbeth*, ed. John Russell Brown (New York: Routledge, 2005), 190.
8. Stallybrass, "Macbeth and Witchcraft," 196.
9. Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Vintage Books, 1988), 30.
10. Amanda Eubanks Winkler, *O Let Us Howle Some Heavy Note: Music for Witches, the Melancholic, and the Mad on the Seventeenth-Century English Stage* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 34–35.
11. George R. Stewart Jr., "A Note on the Sleep-Walking Scene," *Modern Language Notes* 42, no. 4 (1927): 236.
12. Francis J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1882), 289.
13. Ross Duffin, *Shakespeare's Songbook* (New York: Norton, 2004).
14. Eric Partridge, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), 912.
15. The BBC's 1983 production, directed by Jack Gold, saw Lady Macbeth singing the rhyming lines to a single pitch.
16. Catherine Clément, *Opera, or the Undoing of Women* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 5.

17. Phillipa Berry, *Shakespeare's Feminine Endings: Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies* (London: Routledge, 1999), 120.
18. Russ McDonald, *Look to the Lady: Sarah Siddons, Ellen Terry, and Judi Dench on the Shakespearean Stage* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005), 39.
19. Phyllis Rackin, *Shakespeare and Women* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 121.
20. McDonald, *Look to the Lady*, 95.
21. Georgianna Ziegler, "Accommodating the Virago: Nineteenth-century Representations of Lady Macbeth," in *Shakespeare and Appropriation*, ed. Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer (London: Routledge, 1999), 122.
22. Ziegler, "Accommodating the Virago," 119.
23. Federal Theatre Project, Library of Congress, Music from Production of Macbeth, Finding Aid Box 1278; accessed online at <http://memory.loc.gov>.
24. Federal Theatre Project, Library of Congress, Music from Production of Macbeth.
25. *Macbeth*, dir. Orson Welles, Republic Pictures, 1948; restored version, 2000, distributed by the BBC.
26. Bernice Kliman, *Macbeth*, 2nd ed., *Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 123.
27. Michael A. Anderegg, *Orson Welles, Shakespeare, and Popular Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 62.
28. Orson Welles, *Macbeth* shooting script owned by Lou Lindsay (film cutter), Folger Shakespeare Library, 1154 Box 11, Folder 9, June 16, 1947, R-4.
29. Welles, *Macbeth* shooting script, R-71.
30. Jacques Ibert, "Notes by Composer," *Film Music* 8 (November–December 1948): 11.
31. Charles Hurtgen, "The Operatic Character of Background Music in Film Adaptations of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1969): 61.
32. Jane Adelman, "Fantasies of Maternal Power in *Macbeth*," in *Cannibals, Witches, and Divorce: Estranging the Renaissance*, ed. Marjorie Garber (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 93.
33. Carol Thomas Neely, *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), 47.
34. *Throne of Blood* (*Kumonosu jō*), dir. Akira Kurosawa, 1957, Toho International.
35. Akira Kurosawa, *Something Like an Autobiography* (New York: Vintage Books, 1983), 147.
36. Paula von Loewenfeldt, "Weaving the Spider's Web: Interpretation of Character in Kurosawa Akira's *Throne of Blood* (*Kumonosu-jō*)," in *Performing Shakespeare in Japan*, ed. Minami Ryuta, Ian Carruthers, and John Gilles (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 90–91.
37. Stephen Prince, *The Warrior's Camera: The Cinema of Akira Kurosawa* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991), 146.
38. Peter Lamarque, "Expression and the Mask: The Dissolution of Personality in Noh," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47, no. 2 (1989): 160.

39. Robert Hapgood, "Kurosawa's Shakespeare Films: *Throne of Blood*, *The Bad Sleep Well*, and *Ran*," in *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: the Plays on Film and Television*, ed. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 243.
40. Etsuko Terasaki, *Figures of Desire: Wordplay, Spirit Possession, Fantasy, Madness, and Mourning in Japanese Noh Plays* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 76.
41. Terasaki, *Figures of Desire*, 270.
42. Terasaki, *Figures of Desire*, 12.
43. Donald Richie, *The Films of Akira Kurosawa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 119.
44. Doris G. Bergen, *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), xix.
45. Bergen, *A Woman's Weapon*, xx.
46. Herbert E. Plutschow, *Chaos and Cosmos: Ritual in Early and Medieval Japanese Literature* (Boston: Brill Academic, 1990), 234.
47. Plutschow, *Chaos and Cosmos*, 253.
48. Richie, *The Films of Akira Kurosawa*, 118.
49. Evelyn Tribble, "'When Every Noise Appalls Me': Sound and Fear in Macbeth and Akira Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*," *Shakespeare* 1, no. 1 (2005): 85.
50. Richie, *The Films of Akira Kurosawa*, 118.
51. Eric C. Rath, *The Ethos of Noh: Actors and Their Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center/Harvard University Press, 2004), 15.
52. Rath, *The Ethos of Noh*, 13.
53. Grigori Kozintsev, *Shakespeare: Time and Conscience* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1966), 30–31.
54. Terasaki, *Figures of Desire*, 116.
55. McDonald, *Look to the Lady*, 95.
56. Kliman, *Macbeth*, 206.
57. Julie Sanders, *Shakespeare and Music: Afterlives and Borrowings* (Cambridge: Polity, 2007), 147.
58. Roman Polanski and Kenneth Tynan, *The Tragedy of Macbeth* screenplay, Folger Shakespeare Library, Folio PR 2823 A23, 1972, 3/3 (14), 4/6 (22).
59. Billy Morrisette, *Scotland, Pa.* (Sundance, 2002).
60. Garber, *Dream in Shakespeare*, 115–16.
61. Thomas Cartelli and Katherine Rowe, *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen* (Cambridge: Polity, 2007), 109.
62. Cartelli and Rowe, *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen*, 119.
63. Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Parthenon Books, 2004), 698.
64. Katherine Rowe, "The Politics of Sleepwalking: American Lady Macbeths," in *Macbeth and Its Afterlife*, ed. Peter Holland, *Shakespeare Survey* 57 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 127.
65. Kliman, *Macbeth*, 216.
66. Kliman, *Macbeth*, 202.

King Lear

Although Shakespearean critics including Charles Lamb, Samuel Beckett, and Peter Brook have at one time or another termed *King Lear* “unperformable,” this late tragedy is nonetheless a staple of the theater repertory, and there have been more than twenty film and television versions since its first adaptation in 1909. Lear’s madness, uniformly read as entirely authentic to the character, is both difficult to stage or film and yet crucial to the play’s power. As Josephine Bennett writes, “An understanding of Lear’s madness is essential to a serious interpretation of the play and to any understanding of its structure.”¹ His descent can be read a number of ways, from a sociological macroview to a biblical allegory; once again, “personal crisis is invariably linked to political crisis.”² Stanley Cavell suggests that “we see in the progress of Lear’s madness a recapitulation of the history of civilization or of consciousness; from the breaking up of familial bonds and the release of offences which destroy the social cosmos (3.4) to the fragile replacement of revenge by the institution of legal justice (3.4) to the corruption of justice itself and the breaking up of civil bonds (4.6).”³ At the same time, Arthur Kirsch sees *King Lear* as an adaptation or meditation on the book of Ecclesiastes: “The Preacher in Ecclesiastes speaks over and over again of the heart, occasionally of the ‘heart of the wise’ or ‘of fooles’ (7:6), but most often of his own: ‘And I haue giuen mine heart to search & finde out wisdome’ (1:13); ‘I thought in mine heart’ (1:16); ‘And I gaue mine heart’ (1:17); ‘I said in mine heart’ (2:1); ‘I soght in mine heart’ (2:3). The Preacher’s experience of the heart suggests many of the major motifs as well as the specific language of *King Lear*.”⁴ Although directors of film adaptations of *King Lear* have taken various approaches to the text, the weight placed on Lear’s madness and the clarity with which it is depicted are universally understood to be critical.

Like the madness experienced by the other two truly mad figures examined in this book, Ophelia and Lady Macbeth, Lear's affliction is aptly summed up in Foucauldian terms: his "madness still occupies an extreme place, in that it is beyond appeal. Nothing ever restores it either to truth or to reason. It leads only to laceration and thence to death."⁵ Despite Lear's brief and partial return to sanity late in the play, Foucault's words hold true; Cavell notes that even as Lear returns to partial sanity, "He has come to terms with Goneril and Regan, with filial ingratitude; he has come back from the way he *knew* madness lies. But he has not come to terms with parental insatiability (which he denounced in his 'barbarous Scythian' speech [1.1.116], and which Gloucester renounces in 'the food of thy abused father's wrath' [4.1.22]). He has not come back to Cordelia. And he does not."⁶ Lear's madness informs the tenor of the work's emotions through the very end of the play. As Kirsch writes, "It focuses instead, and relentlessly, upon the shattering of the heart and upon actual human deterioration—the physical 'eyes' anguish' (4.5.6) of Gloucester's maiming, the emotional 'eye of anguish' (4.3.15) of Lear's madness. Nor does the Fifth Act of the play bring relief as it does in *Hamlet*. There is no recovery from sorrow and grief at the end of Lear, and there is no suggestion of the 'special Providence' that Hamlet, in his luminous reference to Matthew, sees in the fall of a sparrow."⁷

Marjorie Garber notes that Lear, as a political figure gone mad, occupies a special place in the pantheon of Shakespeare's mad characters. He is somewhat but not entirely like the fool: "Most evidently, and perhaps most importantly, madness permits the maddened victim to speak the truth, like a licensed fool, and be *dis*believed. A madman or madwoman is a sublime version of a fool—in the confines of the theater. He or she can echo the prevailing madness of the world, speaking through the onstage audience to an audience in the theater, asserting, proclaiming, or establishing contestatory and unwelcome 'truths' about the human condition."⁸ As Garber observes, it was easy for contemporary audiences to understand the political and social commentary behind the "truths" while the actors and playwright managed to avoid official censorship: "Shakespeare's play thus has a direct and pertinent topicality to the political issues of his day, a topicality few in his contemporary audiences could miss, although many viewers today will need to be reminded of this historical context."⁹

According to Kirsch, *Lear* raises "large religious, as well as political and social, questions." As Kirsch observes, "critics have contended that *Lear* is locked in combat with Elizabethan conceptions of Providence and order, and one influential Marxist critic has maintained that the play constitutes both a specific criticism of Elizabethan ideology and a denial of what he calls 'essentialist humanism.'" Kirsch notes, however, that "Shakespeare's tragedies are,

above all else, plays of passions and suffering that we eventually recognize as our own, whatever their social, political, or religious contingencies may have been in the Renaissance. However we may interpret the particular ideological questions *King Lear* seems to pose, it is the universal human anguish that gives rise to them upon which Shakespeare primarily focuses and to which audiences have responded for nearly four hundred years.”¹⁰

The performance of this anguish relies heavily on the use of madness as a device signifying the mind broken by overwhelming sorrow and grief. In keeping with the madness both real and feigned portrayed in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, Lear’s is displayed through commonly known signifiers; historically, these are visual and declamatory, as no contemporary sources for music, original or interpolated, appear to exist outside of Edgar’s folk songs. “Visually,” writes Salkeld, madness “is displayed on the surface of the body, in its disguises, its disarray and its nakedness, as conventional meanings are thrown into contradiction.”¹¹ The adaptations considered here do rely on the more obvious physical gestures associated with the loss of reason, including weeping, beating his heart, and actions apparently unconnected to speech and thought—many of the same symptoms used to mark or “diagnose” Ophelia (as discussed in chapter 3). However, Bennett notes that Lear’s madness is predicated on three tropes, only one of them physical: his obsession with Poor Tom’s nonexistent daughters, who represent his own three children (beginning at 3.4.52); his act of stripping (3.4.115); and his persistence in thinking Poor Tom is an ancient philosopher (beginning at 3.4.162).¹² Carol Thomas Neely concurs, writing, “Madness in these tragedies is dramatized through a *peculiar language* more often than through physiological symptoms, stereotyped behaviors, or iconographic conventions although these are present”¹³ (emphasis added).

Bennett’s and Neely’s observations, along with the lack of a robust history of performance practice—such as that for *Hamlet* or *Macbeth*—makes clear that Lear’s confused and agonized speech is necessarily the guiding force behind the understanding and portrayal of his madness. As he rages at the storm and the cruel world of his own making, Lear himself notes: “My wits begin to turn” (3.2.73). In the following scene, having encountered Edgar, who is disguised as Poor Tom, Lear projects his own troubles onto the other man, ignoring Kent’s saddened appeals to reality and the Fool’s desperately joking attempts to contain Lear’s thoughts:

Lear: Has his daughters brought him to this pass?—
Couldst thou save nothing? Wouldst thou give ’em all?

Fool: Nay, he deserved a blanket, else we had been all shamed.

Lear: Now all the plagues that in the pendulous air
Hang fated o’er men’s faults light on thy daughters?

Kent: He hath no daughters, sir.

Lear: Death, traitor! Nothing could have subdued nature
To such a lowness but his unkind daughters.
Is it the fashion that discarded fathers
Should have this little mercy on their flesh.
Judicious punishment! 'Twas this flesh begot
Those pelican daughters. (3.4.68–81)

As the conversation continues into Edgar's hovel, Lear fixes on him as a "noble philosopher" (3.5.183), calling him a "learnèd Theban" (3.4.165) and a "good Athenian" (3.4.193), later casting him as the "learned justice" (3.6.21) for the mock trials of Goneril and Regan. Without the kind of implied directions given to Ophelia to hand out her flowers, real or imaginary, or to Lady Macbeth to wash her hands, actors in the role of Lear must use his words to construct the effects of his madness in a manner visible to an audience.

TELEVISED *LEAR*

While *King Lear* has been realized on film much less often than *Hamlet* or *Macbeth*, it has been more frequently adapted for television. These television productions are, as Peter Holland writes citing Jack Jorgens, of the theatrical mode: they have "the look and feel of a performance worked out for a static theatrical space and a live audience."¹⁴ There are two particularly notable television versions of the play in this model. The first is Peter Brook's 1953 production directed for television by Andrew McCullough and starring Orson Welles in the title role, which was commissioned by the arts-centered television program *Omnibus*, a weekly program supported by the Ford Foundation which ran from 1952 to 1961 and was hosted by Alastair Cooke.

The television film is a lean production. Brook rehearsed with actors for just three weeks before the performance was shown live on October 18, 1953. The broadcast took place from a fairly bare set, surrounded by cameras set on a circular track. Brook eliminated the subplot involving Edmund and Edgar and cast Poor Tom as a new, separate character. Introducing the play to the audience, Cooke states, "Peter Brook said that if he'd had three hours, it would still be seventy-three minutes." Cooke then describes the changes made for this special performance: "[Elizabethans] expected a play to run for four hours, so in order to rest the chief actors, they invented the subplot, the bane of all schoolboys. This brought on the second shift of actors. Well, Peter Brook has simply taken the subplot and thrown it out the window. But everything that bears on the tragedy of Lear is in this version."¹⁵

Virgil Thomson, whose other scores for Omnibus films, particularly *The Plow That Broke the Plains* and *The Louisiana Story*, were to make his music famous across the nation, composed the musical cues for the production. These cues, most of which last less than a minute, consist primarily of a drum and horn motif that indicates the grasp of power and its shift from Lear to his daughters and finally to death; indeed, it does not offer any commentary on Lear's madness, or even accompany it in any significant way. Thomson noted that the scoring of the production was haphazard: Brook asked for seven new cues the night before filming; Welles improvised during the performance and added lines from *Richard III*, throwing off Thomson and his chamber ensemble of eight, all of whom were listening for dialogue cues; and the sound engineer threw in "a crash of thunder" in case the musicians had problems. The Thomson Foundation considers his work for the Brook's production "incidental music" rather than a full score.¹⁶ Later Thomson would write that he had "salvaged from my own *King Lear* a funeral march used in Jean Giraudoux's *Ondine*."¹⁷ Rarely seen today, the Omnibus *Lear* is more an artifact of Welles's and Brook's early careers than a significant part of the Shakespearean film repertoire.

The other made-for-television *Lear* worth mentioning is the 1983 production directed by Michael Elliott. Including John Hurt as the Fool and Diana Rigg as Regan, the work was essentially a vehicle for the ageing Laurence Olivier, who wrote the script and starred as Lear.¹⁸ The last major role for Olivier, this *Lear* was also the last Shakespearean film specifically made for network television. Like Brook's 1953 production, this is a filming of a staged play, albeit one taking place in a studio rather than on an actual theater stage. Although it uses a fuller text (and retains those baneful subplots) and has the benefit of a much larger budget, evinced by the opulent costuming and sets, it is nonetheless not cinematic. As R. Alan Kimbrough writes of the inevitable comparisons between this production and those intended for the cinema, "Some critics' attention to Olivier's *Lear* would foster such comparisons. 'Make no mistake, this is a *King Lear* designed carefully for television, not for the theatre,' wrote John J. O'Connor. Catherine Hughes labeled it 'an ideal television adaptation'; Bill MacVicar found it 'an uncommonly well thought-out and produced play for television.'"¹⁹ Kimbrough continues, citing just one indication of the film's destined medium: "The cause-effect [implied] is typical: 'Designed as a tv film rather than a movie, [Olivier's *Lear*] was filmed mainly in close-up.'"²⁰ Michael Andereggs sums up the difference, comparing it to the Brook productions of 1953 and 1971:

The Olivier *Lear*, in contrast, employs the specifically televisual strategy of the multipart set unit to construct a coherent, self-contained, "realistic"

environment, replete with a variety of “cinematic” touches—real horses, a dead rabbit, background movement, and so on. Though both productions are powerful and moving renditions of Shakespeare’s greatest tragic play, it is the made-for-television version that has the feel of filmed theatre, while the National Theatre version, paradoxically, features television itself as a star.²¹

The music, too, is written for a television production rather than a full-scale cinematic release. Cues were composed by Gordon Crosse in the manner of incidental music, as is perhaps more appropriate for a filmed play; there is no sustained score. Most of the cues are fanfares, ascending scales, and drumrolls, accompanied by the characteristic swirling sound of wind machines, all borrowed from stock musics used to indicate royalty, rain or wind, and general tension and sorrow. As in the Omnibus production, the sound effects of the storm cover much of the music during that crucial scene. Like the 1953 production, this filmed play is a monument to its stars and a useful record capturing Olivier’s approach to the role, as well as production values and styles of the period.

KOZINTSEV: *KING LEAR* (1971)

Kozintsev’s *Lear*, like his *Hamlet*, was filmed in black and white using Boris Pasternak’s translation of the play; it is set in a brutal and stark world, emphasizing the human capacity for evil.²² As with his *Hamlet*, the score represents a collaboration between Kozintsev and Shostakovich. The director first wrote to Shostakovich about the production in May 1968: “the usual period has elapsed [and] I ask you once again for a favour, to compose the music for a film. The film in question this time is *King Lear*.” Kozintsev writes that to sweeten the deal, “there will be much less music in this film than there was in *Hamlet* and there won’t be any noise of horses’ hooves”—a reference to the overly loud Foley sounds in the film that had initially drowned out some of the score.²³ Although ill health caused Shostakovich some concern about joining the project, he eventually wrote about seventy cues, about half of which, according to John Riley, were used in the final cut of the film.²⁴ Commenting on the appearance of Shostakovich’s late style throughout the film, Riley observes that the “long crescendi of ‘The Storm (Beginning)’ is a gesture associated with disaster in the Eighth, Eleventh, and Thirteenth Symphonies, the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Quartets, and *Sofia Perovskaia*. It also features a twelve-note row, often seen as a symbol of death in his work.”²⁵

The music for *Lear* was to be quite different from the music Shostakovich had composed for *Hamlet*. Kozintsev was fairly specific in his instructions,

written in December 1969: "The place and character of the music are different from the music for Hamlet. There should be no stylization of antiquity. It should be the language of contemporary art which you use to express the contemporary world. Main themes are born with far-away echoes long before they take definite shape. Something is in the air: a humming, anxious breathing, the march of time."

Although he was insistent that he "did not want to have themes for the main characters in Lear," Kozintsev did require thematic material for what he dubbed the "call of life," which late in the film was accompanied by the "call of death."²⁶ The call of life, he explained to Shostakovich in the same letter, would begin with a crude version played by a beggar, and would gradually transform into something grander and more symphonic, affecting the characters as they heard it; it is the first instance of diegetic music used in the film, as a beggar in the opening sequence blows a perfect fifth on an animal horn. Kozintsev also asked for "war music" depicting the battles he planned to film, but Shostakovich declined. Instead, the composer offered Kozintsev a wordless choral "lament" to express the suffering of not only the principal characters, but also the people of Lear's ruined kingdom. Ultimately, Kozintsev wrote of the music overall, "The music does not accompany the shots, but transforms them. . . . The music should be the voice of the author."²⁷ For the storm in particular, he was even more direct, and cites both the genius of Shostakovich's music and the lack of adequate translation for the need for an overwhelming score at this point:

"Blow wind! Blow until your cheeks crack! / Pour rain in buckets"—even if spoken with all possible feeling and at the top of one's voice it does not convey the impact of the original. The Russian translation (in all versions) is not comparable to the triumphal "Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! rage! blow!" . . . I have seen great actors play Lear but I have never yet been lucky enough to hear the magnificence of this alliteration. But I have heard something similar and of equal weight in the tragic *forte* passages in Shostakovich's symphonies.

In this scene the voice should belong to music. Music is nearer to the original. What sort of music should it be? . . . The rumbling of darkness moving over the earth. Music from the past, man's prehistory? . . . Or a foreboding of the future, of what might happen if the powers of evil are not held in check?²⁸

The music that marks Lear's madness is present exclusively in the storm scene from its beginning until Lear, the Fool, and Kent enter the hovel where Edgar, posing as Poor Tom, is also sheltering from the rain (3.2.1–85). As Erik Heine has noted, the music for the storm scene is unique in three ways: it is

one of only two places—along with Lear’s division of his kingdom—in the film that the entire orchestra is used, as opposed to smaller ensembles.²⁹ The music for the storm is also one of the only cues that incorporates Shostakovich’s customary “DSCH” (D-E $\flat$ -C-B natural) motif by itself without the surrounding structure of an octatonic scale, which is used frequently in other cues and particularly in the music for the Fool’s pipe. Finally, the storm scene contains two prominent iterations of serial pitch sets (one twelve tone, the other consisting of ten pitches) played by the flute. The contrast between the call of life’s stable, open perfect fifth played on a single horn and the use of the entire orchestra, coupled with the use of two nontonal techniques, creates a destabilizing effect on the music for the scene.

Crescendos in the brass and rolling timpani nondiegetically reinforce the storm’s intensity as, before the first part of Lear’s speech, wild horses run and turn restlessly in confusion at the storm’s approach. As Lear begins to speak, a clear motif emerges, comprising a long brass crescendo followed by four short, martial chords.³⁰ The motif expands during this first episode of Lear’s rant (3.2.1–11), adding a syncopated rhythmic element that includes an ascending seven-note pitch set string ostinato. Heine observes that these elements combine to create a hypnotic pattern: the “music of this section becomes repetitive, almost trance-like, and reflects the swirling and relentlessness of the storm.”³¹ At the very end of the passage, a single trumpet line enters over a static accompaniment, driving the unrelenting rhythms to an end without a tonal resolution. This dramatic and tense scene clearly represents both the forces of the storm and Lear’s own thoughts; the tightly focused turmoil of the orchestra mimics Lear’s insatiable rage and the thoughts that torment him in his madness. The ascending string ostinato mirrors the increasing intensity of the storm as Lear, the Fool, and Kent are caught in the deluge before making their way to the hovel. As they enter, the lack of tonal resolution serves as a preparation for the continuation of the act and of Lear’s madness.

Once Lear, the Fool, and Kent are inside, the music ends, and the depiction of Lear’s madness must become reliant on the spoken word and physical gesture. Played by Estonian actor Jüri Järvet (credited as Yuri Yarvet), Kozintsev’s *King Lear* begins the film as a dynamic, active man, hardly frail or weak. He strides through his castle with vigor and determination, decisively ordering his staff about and demanding immediate responses from them. As the film progresses, Järvet portrays Lear’s waning physicality and his eventual descent into madness through the use of subtle gestures and alterations to his speech patterns. Järvet, who spoke little Russian prior to the filming of *King Lear*, memorized his lines in Russian, finding the Russian translation of the play more poetic than an Estonian translation provided him by Kozintsev.³² There is no hesitation in Lear’s words in the first two acts, yet as he leaves Regan’s

castle, his very language seems to falter at times, the sign of a troubled mind. Following the furor and whole-body gestures of the storm scene, Järvet quiets his body language and allows himself the occasional pause and linguistic stumble. By the time Kent convinces him to rest in the hut, he has become an old man. There is no more energy in his body to sustain the kind of violent physical acts that accompanied his speech, or the dense, militant music of the storm. As Kozintsev wanted, Shostakovich created music for the storm that serves as the voice of the scene even more than Lear's translated speech. The contrasting timbres, harmonic suggestions, and patterns of the score conjure "Blow, winds" as much as any spoken eloquence.

BROOK: *KING LEAR* (1971)

Brook's cinematic adaptation of *King Lear* is contemporaneous with Kozintsev's; the two directors were in fact in touch while they worked on their films during the late 1960s and early 1970s.³³ Like Kozintsev, Brook filmed his production in black and white. Also like Kozintsev, Brook initially sought ways to make the text more transparent for his primary actors, although Paul Scofield, cast as Lear, was already recognized as an important and skillful interpreter of Shakespeare. As J. G. Saunders explains, first Brook and producer Michael Birkett "cut from the text certain passages which they regarded as 'completely unnecessary.' Then, after making further cuts, they presented their script to Ted Hughes, asking him to treat it as though it were a 'foreign classic' and to translate it into his own idiom—into a language which seemed to him to be expressive of the story as he saw it, in his own right as a poet."³⁴ In the end, however, Brook was unsatisfied with the Hughes "translation" and abandoned it for a cut edition of the standard playtext. According to Birkett, "the greatest passages in the play . . . have a force and emotional power that no translation, no paraphrase can possibly match."³⁵ Brook's adaptation eliminated whole scenes, interpolated a song from *Twelfth Night* for the Fool in 3.2, and graphically showed the usually offstage deaths of Goneril, Regan, and Cordelia, the snap of whose neck at the end of the noose is highly audible.

Brook also chose to use a spare set and the wind- and snow-swept Danish countryside, just as Kozintsev elected to do in his version; actors wrapped in furs atop stout ponies emphasize the inhospitable nature of the land. These similarities call into question how much the two men might have influenced one another: Kozintsev and Brook knew they "were both about to make a film of Shakespeare's tragedy" in 1967, according to Kozintsev's diary of his *Lear*; Kozintsev had seen Brook's *Lear* on stage; the two corresponded about the

“power of dislocalized space on the screen”; and Brook saw stills from Kozintsev’s shoot while on location in Denmark.³⁶ Ultimately, however, the films are quite different. Brook took as his inspiration Jan Kott’s well-known essay “*King Lear* or Endgame,” applying its Beckett-influenced philosophies to create a brutal, violent world in which redemption and consolation are unknown. R. B. Parker notes that the “main source for Brook’s *mise-en-scène* was, of course, his own famous stage production,” using “glaring light” and suggesting the “abstract space” that would allow for the harshness of Brook’s vision.³⁷ As Brook, writing to Kozintsev in 1969, sums it up: “I am sure from what I understand of your intentions we are both trying to tell the same story. But with very different means within very different cultures.”³⁸

Anthony Davies calls Brook’s *King Lear* a “drastic innovation” that “makes Shakespeare’s play a revelation of the grotesque rather than a tragedy,” and in doing so rebels against previous theatrical and filmic productions.³⁹ One of the primary means of this rebellion was the general lack of music, which Brook intended to be completely absent, a goal many critics accept as fact, including Vincent Canby, who reviewed the film at its premiere, stating: “There is no music in this land, only crude sound effects.”⁴⁰ Kenneth S. Rothwell writes that the film is “without any softening non-diegetic music on the soundtrack, only unbearable silence.”⁴¹ However, during *Lear*’s madness, the sound effects, created by artificial means rather than through the use of recorded natural sound, provide a perhaps inadvertent metadiegetic soundtrack that underscores *Lear*’s madness and the circumstances that surround both him and his small retinue during the scene. As *Lear* abandons his horses and stalks out into the storm, followed by the Fool, wind machines provide a soundscape that is overly obvious in its manmade rhythms and patterns. After the first four lines of 3.2, a wholly tonal drone appears under the more natural sound effects of the storm’s rain. The drone, complete with audible overtones, provides a background that can be experienced by a close listener as a musical accompaniment. The effects used for thunder serve as rhythmical, percussive instruments, emphasizing beats within the text and establishing a regular meter for the entirety of the text extracted from 3.2.1–40 in Brook’s cuts. As *Lear*, the Fool, and Kent enter the hovel, a phrase of piping can be attributed to neither the Fool nor the storm; it appears to be nondiegetic music. The piping’s high pitches, flutelike timbre, and gentle melody contrast with the wrath of the storm and indicate that it has for the most part passed, and that *Lear* will find peace and calmness within the enclosure. However, after a period of apparent lucidity on *Lear*’s part—Scofield depicts him as at first weary and resigned, and then violent and brutal toward the Fool and those around him, including his horses, rather than truly mad until 3.4—the sound effects of the storm return to frame the actions of both *Lear* and Edgar. A low, rough hissing sound, ac-

accompanied by an effect much like violins playing tremolo to replicate the buzzing of flies, and an easily recognizable ascending set of pitches—coming ostensibly from the roar of the storm—serve as a destabilizing and unquestionably musical soundtrack for the scene, in which Lear’s madness takes the form of growing confusion until he finally falls asleep.

Created by well-known sound recordist Bob Allen, whose techniques included experimental and technologically sophisticated methods of mixing sound, *Lear*’s sound effects and their musical outcomes illustrate the emotions Scofield’s exhausted Lear must experience before his collapse near the end of 3.6.⁴² His performance of “Blow, winds,” recalls the opening scenes of the film, in which Lear appeared quite ready to die. Now, in the storm, he lies on his back, face to the winds and rain, and groans along with the drone beneath the words, as though it is a great difficulty to force the words out into the air. The unaltering low pedal point beneath his words frames them as static and redolent of death: Lear, at this point, has reached the greatest point of his depression and anguish yet. It will be surpassed only by Cordelia’s death. It is clear that at this time, Lear is still sane. His physical gestures and delivery of lines after he has risen from his prone rant are careful and calm; he speaks kindly and normally to the Fool before going with Kent to the hovel, asking in compassionate tones if he is cold. The sounds underneath the scene—the superficial layers of rain and wind sounds and the drone beneath—are steady and even, supporting Scofield’s portrayal of Lear’s momentary mental clarity.

Although the pipe’s melody heard as the group enters the hovel suggests a period of lighter mood, it is fleeting, and the sounds that follow depict Lear’s true madness and hint at Edgar’s sources for his performed insanity (see chapter 6). For Lear, the sounds of wind, the deep-pitched scratching or growling sound, the intense buzzing noise, and the recurring motif of ascending tones from within the storm’s overall effect all contain evidence for his final mental failing, as does the camera work in this sequence. As the camera jumps erratically, comes in and out of focus, speeds up, and engages in extreme close-ups while the sound plays out, the audience is provided with both a visual and aural sense of Lear’s own experience. His confusion is visceral: his ears ring; he is distracted—in both the early modern and present senses of the word—by his emotional pain while his thoughts repeat themselves without end or resolution; his vision blurs and his eyes dart rapidly in fright from face to face and all that surrounds him. The sound of the scene only ends when Lear is unconscious; the audience is then released from hearing and seeing as he does.

The employment of extreme sound effects in Brook’s production has its roots in historical performance practice. Keith Sagar has noted that a number of productions of *Lear* in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries employed extensive sound effects, much like Brook’s treatment of the storm scene. He

cites an 1860 production by Kean which had, just in the storm scene, “a heaving sea in the background, ‘trees were made to see-saw back and forth, accompanied with the natural creak! creak! attending the operation, every infernal machine that was ever able to spit fire, spout rain, or make thunder’ was used, and coloured transparencies bathed Lear in ‘continual-changing supernatural tints.’” According to Sagar, “At the end of the century Irving was able to produce such realistic thunder that he became completely inaudible. As late as the 1940s both Olivier and Gielgud performed Lear against distractingly realistic storms.” At this point, Sagar concludes, “We realize that Lear can create a far more impressive storm in our imaginations than could possibly be created by spectacle and sound-effects, and that any attempt at these would be redundant.”⁴³ While Brook was aiming for this storm in the mind’s eye and left the film mostly musically unaccompanied to achieve his Beckettian vision, the end result is, for the careful listener, quite the opposite.

KUROSAWA: *RAN* (1985)

Ran, whose title means “chaos,” is loosely based on *King Lear* and both modifies and reflects the Shakespeare work.⁴⁴ Stephen Prince writes that the film was “inspired by Kurosawa’s researches on medieval Japanese history. He became fascinated by a warlord reputed to have had three excellent sons and wondered what would have happened if the three had been, instead, bad.”⁴⁵ Kurosawa himself notes the film’s basis in the legends of Motonari Mori (1497–1571), who lived during the Sengoku period and is credited as the originator of the “three arrows” parable used in the film.⁴⁶ By applying the outline and details of *Lear* to this saga, replacing Lear’s daughters with sons and adding motivations and complex backstories for the sons’ wives, Kurosawa created an epic with rich backgrounds, secret loyalties and plots, and complete destruction of a family. As Robert Hapgood notes, “Analogous features continue throughout, yet in the latter part they are subsumed under the overarching revenge plot of Lady Kaede, plus subplot excursions into the sufferings of Lady Sué and Tsurumaru and the manoeuvres of the rival chieftains.”⁴⁷

Although a number of details are different, as Hapgood rightly states, several important elements of *King Lear* remain in *Ran*, including the madness of the Lear figure, the old warrior Hidetora. During the course of the film, Hidetora finds himself lost in a windstorm (filmed during a typhoon), while nearby the armies of his sons Taro and Jiro fight a bloody battle for control. “On the grassy plain,” writes Stephen Prince, “he hallucinates a ghostly army of his victims, rising up to surround and condemn him.”⁴⁸

Like *Throne of Blood*, *Ran* pays homage in countless ways to the Noh heritage of Japanese theater, including its employment of silence and music. The nontextual elements of Noh in *Ran* are crucial to understanding Kurosawa's development of the Shakespearean text into something that is at once similar and radically reenvisioned. According to Peter Lamarque, "The character of King Lear can be studied and understood through a careful reading of Shakespeare's play. But the text of a Noh play provides only one element in the development of the play's characters. So integrated is a Noh performance between music, dance, poetry, mask, costume, and, above all, mood and atmosphere that characterization cannot be comprehended through any single element in abstraction."⁴⁹ As James Goodwin writes, the use of masklike makeup during Hidetora's madness frames his condition for Japanese audiences in a way wild dance or movement might do for Western cultures:

In appearance, Hidetora has become less a man than the mask of a man. Following Kurosawa's instructions, the makeup on Tatsuya Nakadai has passed through three phases, with each phase based on specific images in the repertory of Noh masks. In the first, the makeup is lightest and most naturalistic in suggesting the face of a vigorous but aged leader. With banishment, anxiety and exhaustion deeply mark Hidetora. For the final stage of terror and madness, the makeup becomes an impasto that sculpts a rigid image on the face. The Lord's facial coloration has turned emphatically unnatural.⁵⁰

In addition to the visual cues of Noh, as Saviour Catania has written, Kurosawa relied on the use of Noh-inspired silence and the *nohkan*—the traditional Noh flute—explaining that the flute's appearance serves as a metaphorical arrow that "screams out . . . the piercing of Hidetora's heart."⁵¹ The primary motif of this music for the flute consists of a grace note ascending to a long, held pitch, which then slides upward to a brief final note.

With the exception of this Noh-inspired melody for the *nohkan*, Toru Takemitsu's score, heavily influenced by Debussy, Messiaen, and Mahler, draws far more from Western art music influences than Masaru Sato's did for *Throne of Blood*. As Peter Burt observes, Takemitsu embraced "Western culture, and in particular Western music," largely shunning native Japanese instruments and musical forms.⁵² Takemitsu agreed largely with Kurosawa's request that he use a full Western orchestra and Western idioms so that the score would be "more universal." Takemitsu did suggest incorporating various preexisting forms of music and silence found in Noh to a greater extent, but he was strongly discouraged from doing so by Kurosawa in his quest for a more widely recognizable musical language to accompany the film's East-West literary hybridity. Kurosawa, stating that "*King Lear* was Shakespeare's most 'cosmic' play," was

adamant that the music follow Western conventions, and in fact played Mahler's *Song of the Earth* over the daily film rushes in order to give Takemitsu an idea of the sound he wanted. Kurosawa then instructed Takemitsu to "go beyond Mahler" in the score: to create an even more emotionally powerful and moving musical environment for the film's images.⁵³ In the end, Takemitsu used the *nohkan* sparingly and composed the motif described above for it in the style of traditional Noh motifs rather than using existing works. The motif contains the shape of a customary Noh gesture for the flute but hints at Western diatonicism; it sounds both familiar (in the tonality it suggests) and alien (from a timbral standpoint) to audiences attuned to the diatonic orchestral score that surrounds its uses.

Hidetora's deepest madness stems from his inability to commit *seppuku*, or ritual suicide, in order to die with some small shred of dignity after his men have been slaughtered by Taro's and Jiro's forces. During the attack that precedes and transitions into *Ran's* equivalent of the storm scene, all diegetic sound is dropped in favor of the orchestral score. Although Takemitsu did not want to score the scene, believing that it would have more power with the vocalizations of the actors shouting and screaming in the fight, Kurosawa insisted on a dense and complex Mahlerian aural background.⁵⁴ "We did fight a lot about this," Takemitsu recalled; in the film's final cut, the full orchestra is employed, with solos for winds and bells.⁵⁵ Takemitsu establishes a stepwise diatonic melodic motif (in C major, D-C-B-C), which is inverted, augmented, varied, and repeated for different tonal centers as the music modulates in the styles of late German Romanticism and French Impressionism. The influences from both Debussy and Mahler are evident in the use of the four-note motif, the harmonic language that surrounds it, and the orchestration, including the use of Asian-inspired flute and bells. Takemitsu breaks with the Western orchestral texture only rarely to include very brief interludes of Nohlike flute and drum music using the now familiar ascending flute motif. Hidetora's madness is expressed by the constant emphasis of the diatonic leading tone, which changes constantly due to the ever modulating music. Represented by a never resolving seventh-scale degree, Hidetora's search for suicide, meaning, or stability is futile; quite literally, he cannot reach the "final."

Aural diegesis returns with the sound of a gunshot as Jiro betrays Taro, killing him and further propelling Hidetora's madness. At the end of the battle, Hidetora walks out of the burning castle keep to the sound of drumrolls and woodblock accents identical to those heard as he divided his kingdom and banished Saburo and Tango. The four-note motif from the battle fades and is replaced by an almost inaudible string line beneath wind machines, the shimmer of cymbals, and other percussion as Hidetora walks out onto the plain into the windstorm. As he gathers flowers, Ophelia-like, Hidetora is accom-

panied by a continuous roll on the tympani, which creates a new tonal center as the strings and winds move in ambiguous but tonal patterns in registers high above the drum. This new texture ends when the Fool begins to sing, both explicating Hidetora's vision for audiences and attempting to bring Hidetora to his senses by pointing out the incorporeal quality of his terrors.

The music that accompanies Hidetora's mad wandering on the plain is clearly representative of both his internal mental state and his belief that he is in hell. Kurosawa described the music he wanted for the scene as an aural depiction of spiritual suffering: "The music superimposed on these pictures is, like the Buddha's heart, measured in beats of profound anguish, the chanting of a melody full of sorrow that begins like sobbing and rises gradually as it is repeated, like karmic cycles, then finally sounds like the wailing of countless Buddhas."⁵⁶ Takemitsu uses the low, measured rolls of the tympani to signify the Buddha's heartbeat, while the strings and winds are the musically translated sobs of his pain. Likewise, the tonal ambiguity of the melodic patterns represents Hidetora's confusion and lack of a center. He is forced to continue living in a boundless sphere of uncertainty and instability; the high, almost unheard melody in the strings is stripped of meaning and functions as an aural metaphor for the escalation of terror and confusion in Hidetora's mind.

The tension between the score's Western elements and those influenced by Noh provides a remarkable means of identifying and tracking Hidetora's mental state. Takemitsu continuously positions Western music as a device that fulfills the audience's expectations, while using music from Noh for the film's diegesis and thus giving its characters a musical approach separate from that provided for the audience alone. During Hidetora's descent into madness during the battle, the orchestral music fills the role that confused words or actions might otherwise have by presenting appropriate tonal instability. While this orchestral accompaniment for the battle is highly evocative of Hidetora's restless, uncentered mind, its later textures and lack of clear melodic devices signify all that is alien to him as he wanders the plain, ripping flowers and grasses from the earth, when placed in contrast to the sharp, brief *nohkan* motif. Only the sounds of what is real to Hidetora as a character—traditional Japanese music and song—are able to break through his confusion; only the indigenous *nohkan* and Kyoami's singing reconnect Hidetora to sanity, however tenuous. Thus, the Western orchestral score does not always necessarily reflect the actions or emotions of the characters, but rather what audiences expect to hear as accompaniment to the film. Hidetora's more normal bearing and straightforward language in response to Kyoami's singing and, later, Tsurumaru's flute-playing indicate that these aural markers cause him to remember his actions and those of his sons and retainers with clarity, thus returning him to a stable and reliable, albeit painful, state of mind. The authenticity of Hidetora's sanity, then,

is both rendered true and framed by the sounds of music more authentic to him, rather than what an audience would expect in seeking musical representation authentic to filmic convention.

Takemitsu's score for *Ran* is complex and multilayered, catering to both domestic and international audiences with a wide range of expectations for cinematic scoring. In offering musical conceptions for both Hidetora's madness and the dynamics that temporarily alleviate it, the score does "go beyond" the traditional treatment of films of this era.

CONCLUSION

The three cinematic adaptations of *King Lear* discussed here all employ music and sound to complete the visual and nonspoken aural presentation of Lear's madness. That madness never exists in a vacuum, always requiring—for film-going audiences, at least—aural signification. Perhaps because Lear does not traditionally have music associated with him, Brook, Kozintsev, and Kurosawa sought to emphasize his confusion and anguish by using the sounds of the storm and music that mimics its violent nature to serve as metaphors for Lear's own mind. Like the music for many cinematic Hamlets, music for Lear's madness uniformly attempts to musically interpret the imbalance of the character's mind through harmonic or melodic instabilities and frequent unexpected movement. Yet because Lear is mad in truth, the music must also explicate his lack of sanity and ability to plot and plan as Hamlet does. In Shostakovich's score, this is accomplished partially through the use of twelve-tone serial writing using complex twelve- and ten-note sets, which he then contrasts with the simple perfect fifths of the "call of life." Takemitsu, while drawing on older harmonic languages for most of the score for *Ran*, interpolates sounds of the West and the East as a mechanism for depicting Lear's inability to focus on anything but his own pain. Both Shostakovich's and Takemitsu's scores avoid obvious resolutions, resolution being indicative of a solution or closure of some kind. Brook's soundscape is unique in its deliberate omission of standard instrumental film scoring, but it too exploits the lack of a decisive finality to draw attention to Lear's—and *Lear's*—psychologically wrenching ending.

These scores serve as a primer for understanding audience expectations in terms of sound and drama. Not a single cinematic Lear experiences his madness in silence, nor are any allowed to use the text alone to conjure the storm: it is always physical and audible for audiences to rely on for their comprehension of the scene. The image of Lear wandering and shouting in the storm provided by the playtext is enormously compelling. Despite the eloquence of Shakespeare's

words, directors have almost universally chosen to accentuate the scene's drama and power with music and/or sound. However, few adaptations use music and sound to depict Lear's madness as those productions by Brook, Kozintsev, and Kurosawa do; instead, they focus on the literal drama conjured by the text and interpreted externally. Furthermore, as illustrated by several more recent adaptations—including Jocelyn Moorhouse's *A Thousand Acres*, based on the Jane Smiley novel, and the Patrick Stewart vehicle *King of Texas*, directed by Eli Udel—a growing number of directors all but eliminate Lear's madness, transforming it into more commonplace afflictions: drunkenness, sunstroke, senility. While the most lasting and critically acclaimed adaptations of *Lear* remain faithful to the concept of Lear's madness, clearly the expectations of an audience saturated with soundtracks for everything from waking in the morning to the news to "life" (as iPod advertisers would have it) require innovative and complex aural accompaniments to make—much less extend—its impact.

NOTES

1. Josephine Waters Bennett, "The Storm Within: The Madness of Lear," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 13, no. 2 (1962): 137.
2. Duncan Salkeld, *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 2.
3. Stanley Cavell, "The Avoidance of Love: A Reading of *King Lear*," in *Shakespeare: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1945–2000*, ed. Russ McDonald (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004), 348.
4. Arthur Kirsch, "The Emotional Landscape of *King Lear*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1988): 156.
5. Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Vintage Books, 1988), 31.
6. Cavell, "The Avoidance of Love," 348.
7. Kirsch, "The Emotional Landscape of *King Lear*," 155.
8. Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Parthenon Books, 2004), 678.
9. Garber, *Shakespeare After All*, 651.
10. Kirsch, "The Emotional Landscape of *King Lear*," 154.
11. Salkeld, *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, 60.
12. Bennett, "The Storm Within," 140–41.
13. Carol Thomas Neely, *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), 49–50.
14. Peter Holland, "Two-Dimensional Shakespeare: *King Lear* on Film," in *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*, ed. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 50, citing Jack Jorgensen, *Shakespeare on Film* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 7.

15. *King Lear*, dir. Peter Brook/Andrew McCullough, DVD, Critics' Choice Video, 2004.
16. Virgil Thomson Foundation, www.virgilthomson.org/works.html.
17. Virgil Thomson, *Virgil Thomson: An Autobiography* (New York: E. E. Dutton, 1966), 396.
18. *King Lear*, dir. Michael Elliott, DVD, Kultur, 1984.
19. R. Alan Kimbrough, "Olivier's *Lear* and the Limits of Video," in *Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews* (Hanover, Conn.: University Press of New England, 1988), 227.
20. Kimbrough, "Olivier's *Lear* and the Limits of Video," 229.
21. Michael A. Anderegg, *Cinematic Shakespeare* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), 173–74.
22. *Korol Lir*, dir. Grigori Kozintsev, DVD, Ruscico, 2004.
23. Grigori Kozintsev, *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy*, trans. Mary Mackintosh (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 58.
24. John Riley, *Dmitri Shostakovich: A Life in Film*, Kinofiles Filmmakers' Companions (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005), 104.
25. Riley, *Dmitri Shostakovich*, 104.
26. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 246.
27. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 242–43.
28. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 51.
29. Erik Heine, "The Film Music of Dmitri Shostakovich in *The Gadfly*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*" (doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2005), 126.
30. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 51.
31. Heine, "The Film Music of Dmitri Shostakovich in *The Gadfly*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*," 302.
32. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 77.
33. *King Lear*, dir. Peter Brook, DVD, Columbia Pictures, 2004.
34. J. G. Saunders, "'Apparent Perversities': Text and Subtext in the Construction of the Role of Edgar in Brook's Film of *King Lear*," *Review of English Studies* 47, no. 187, New Series (1996): 317.
35. Anthony Davies, *Filming Shakespeare's Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 148.
36. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 22–23, 26, 240.
37. R. B. Parker, "The Use of 'Mise-en-Scène' in Three Films of *King Lear*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (1991): 77.
38. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 241.
39. Davies, *Filming Shakespeare's Plays*, 143.
40. Vincent Canby, review of *King Lear* (1971), *New York Times*, November 23, 1971. <http://movies.nytimes.com>.
41. Kenneth S. Rothwell, "Classic Film Versions of Shakespeare's Tragedies: A Mirror for the Times," in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean Elizabeth Howard (London: Blackwell, 2003), 247.
42. "Bob Allen," Wellington Audio Association Inaugural Annual Report, March 2007, www.waa.org.nz.

43. Keith Sagar, "King Lear in the Theatre," www.keithsagar.co.uk/Reading/Shakespeare/index.html.
44. *Ran*, dir. Akira Kurosawa, DVD, Criterion, 2005.
45. Stephen Prince, *The Warrior's Camera: The Cinema of Akira Kurosawa* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991), 284.
46. Robert Hapgood, "Kurosawa's Shakespeare Films: *Throne of Blood*, *The Bad Sleep Well*, and *Ran*," in *Shakespeare and the Moving Image*, ed. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 236.
47. Hapgood, "Kurosawa's Shakespeare Films," 235.
48. Prince, *The Warrior's Camera*, 286.
49. Peter Lamarque, "Expression and the Mask: The Dissolution of Personality in Noh," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47, no. 2 (1989): 158.
50. James Goodwin, *Akira Kurosawa and Intertextual Cinema* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 208.
51. Saviour Catania, "Wailing Woodwind Wild: The Noh Transcription of Shakespeare's Silent Sounds in Kurosawa's *Ran*," *Literature Film Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (2006): 2, www.salisbury.edu/lfq/.
52. Peter Burt, *The Music of Toru Takemitsu* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 23.
53. Max Tessier, trans. Dorna Khazeni, "Interview with Toru Takemitsu," *La revue du cinema*, September 1985, reprinted in the insert booklet for *Ran*, dir. Kurosawa, Criterion, 2005, 19.
54. Charlotte Mitchell Zwerin, *Toru Takemitsu: Music for the Movies*, DVD, Kultur Video, 2007.
55. Zwerin, *Toru Takemitsu*.
56. Akira Kurosawa, *Ran*, trans. Tadashi Shishido (Boston: Shambhala, 1986), 56.

Edgar

*L*ike Hamlet, Edgar feigns madness, signifying it through word and song. In taking on the moniker of Tom O'Bedlam, Edgar identifies himself as a beggar from London's notorious Bethlem Hospital, more commonly known as Bedlam, which restrained its "patients" in abominable conditions.¹ To be a Bedlam Beggar, a Bedlamite, or a Tom O'Bedlam—the terms were used interchangeably—was to be instantly identified in early modern English society as one who claimed to be discharged, albeit not cured, from the institution. As Edwin Fuller Torrey and Judy Miller write, "Shakespeare, like most educated men of his generation, was knowledgeable about and intrigued by insanity, as represented by the patients discharged from Bethlem Hospital."²

For contemporary audiences, Edgar's self-naming in this manner would have been sufficient to indicate the particulars of his planned madness, which he does in 2.3:

I will preserve myself, and am bethought
To take the basest and most poorest shape
That ever penury in contempt of man
Brought near to beast. My face I'll grime with filth,
Blanket my loins, elf all my hair in knots,
And with presented nakedness out-face
The winds and persecutions of the sky.
The country gives me proof and precedent
Of Bedlam beggars who with roaring voices,
Strike in their numbed and mortified arms
Pins, wooden pricks, nails, sprigs of rosemary,
And, with this horrible object, from low farms,
Poor pelting villages, sheep-cotes, and mills,

Sometime with lunatic bans, sometime with prayers,
 Enforce their charity. "Poor Turlygod! poor Tom!"
 That's something yet. "Edgar" I nothing am. (2.3.1–21)

Edgar's madness is as calculated as Hamlet's, but the emotional toll it takes on him, as an innocent unfairly condemned by his father, is much greater. Unlike Hamlet's performance, which draws considerably from the theater, Edgar's, as Alexander Leggatt writes, is "closer to the real thing with Poor Tom. . . . In one sense the naked madman is another performance, a role created by Edgar. Yet in a way this reflects social reality, given the common belief at the time that Bedlam beggars like Tom were frauds trying to evade the law by counterfeiting madness. There is in fact less sense of performance here than in Hamlet's antic disposition."³ Yet Shakespeare does not indicate Edgar's madness solely through the invocation of Bedlam: he also imbues Edgar with the knowledge of demons, by whom Edgar pretends to be tormented; he then casts him further into his projection of madness by giving him song.

Edgar's false madness is especially redolent of diabolical possession: in 3.4 he states that "the foul fiend follows" him (3.4.50), and later in the scene he calls the demons by name, listing Smulkin, Modo, Mahu, and Flibbertigibbet, who walks the night blinding and maiming people, torturing animals, and spoiling food (3.4.122–52). Still later, he states to Lear that his sole purpose is to "prevent the fiend and to kill vermin" (3.4.168). As Carol Thomas Neely notes of this attribute, "As Diccon did in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, characters appropriate supernatural rituals for secular ends, especially Edgar in his role as Poor Tom."⁴

William C. Carroll finds that there was a "standard Bedlam 'look,'" which included partial nudity, a filthy appearance, an ox horn used as a drinking vessel, and signs of self-mutilation, all elements later used by Shakespeare for Poor Tom.⁵ William Elton observes, "Counterpointing the lunatic king's alterations, Edgar's noble and unsuspecting nature becomes Poor Tom's depraved confusion." While Lear cannot comprehend the situation in which he finds himself and seeks a kind of blind yet vicious justice, Edgar must appear to grapple with more personal crises, brought on by the temptations of the demons that supposedly inhabit his body: "suicidal temptation afflict[s] his nakedness, while the deadly sins, especially lechery, assail his imagination."⁶ These physical characteristics and the apparent struggle between morality and corruption locate Edgar in a performative sphere in which few references, songs, curses, or words—particularly those invoking witchcraft—are inappropriate. Thus Shakespeare is able to play to both King James and his subjects at once. Edgar's madness calls upon common knowledge (and to some degree ridicule) of Samuel Harsnett's 1603 *Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures, to withdraw the harts of her maiesties*

Subjects from their allegiance, and from the truth of Christian Religioun professed in England, vnder the pretence of casting out devils. Indeed, as Peter Ackroyd notes,

The feigning of madness by “poor Tom,” for example, is amplified by allusions to Samuel Harsnett’s account of apparent diabolic possession [the *Declaration*]; in front of large crowds the Jesuit priests summoned forth various unclean spirits from the bodies of women. Shakespeare also uses the names of the devils that were invoked on this occasion. He also borrows the language of possession. It was a way of intimating that Tom’s madness is feigned, just as the Jesuit priests are engaged in what Harsnett describes as “the feat of juggling and deluding the people by counterfeit miracles.”⁷

To further secure James’s interest in the play, Shakespeare introduces additional occult workings, including references to magic (3.4.64), charms which Edgar recites to keep away the demons (3.4.127–30), and Edgar’s imagining of witches’ canine familiars (3.6.69–78).

As was appropriate for a madman of the period, and doubly so for one conjured out of ballads and broadsides already extant, Edgar also projects his madness through song. As he did for Ophelia, Shakespeare does for Edgar, knowing that audiences would be well aware of the connotations of seemingly random snippets of popular pieces normally heard in streets and taverns. Although Carroll states that the “earliest references to the Poor Tom figure, or bedlamites more generally, say little or nothing about Tom’s singing,” the identification of the mad with song, as shown in chapter 3, was widely held.⁸ According to Leslie Dunn, song “functions as a highly theatrical sign of Ophelia’s estrangement from ‘normal’ social discourse, as well as from her ‘normal’ self.”⁹ Song has a similar function for Poor Tom.

Edgar’s songs—Carroll counts eight instances in which he appears to sing—are not all identified, but some are unquestionably from contemporary ballads, including “Come o’er the burn, Bessy,” and “Through the sharp hawthorn.”¹⁰ However, modern cinematic productions often omit parts of Edgar’s text, including songs, insert new musical material, or single out prose for musical treatment.

KOZINTSEV: *KING LEAR* (1971)

In Kozintsev’s film, after the symphonic turmoil of Lear in the storm (see chapter 5), he, the Fool, and Kent enter the hovel where Edgar and perhaps twenty other men and boys shelter from the weather.¹¹ Leonard Merzin, as Edgar, plays up the physical attributes of madness throughout the scene: he

rolls his eyes, chews on the straw from the floor, shakes, hides himself along the wall, under the straw, and calls on the demons taunting him. Unlike the other men in the hovel, who are bundled with clothes to keep away the cold, Edgar is nearly naked, covered in mud and filth. He crawls on the floor, moans and cries wordlessly, and breathes heavily through his mouth. He is the quintessential early modern madman, and he makes himself more conspicuously mad than the other displaced persons around him. It appears that only this most shocking performance brings Lear to him, rather than the others in the hovel.

Kozintsev asked Shostakovich to compose new tunes for Edgar's songs from the play, noting that the original tunes were lost. He directed that they should be "like English folksongs in character, and unaccompanied." In an undated letter to the composer, he further explains that "these are not even musical numbers but rather part of Poor Tom's vocabulary—one moment he is humming, the next muttering and then he wails."¹² On receiving Shostakovich's settings of the text, Kozintsev writes to him: "They are exactly what I wanted to hear with a wailing, folk-like quality. I want if possible to avoid anything at all loud, solemn and pathetic. We must try to find a tone which is rather sorrowful, mournfully human."¹³

Although much of his prose is cut, Edgar sings three times in Kozintsev's adaptation of 3.4: "Through the sharp hawthorn blows the cold wind (3.4.50–51)," "Pillicock sat on Pillicock Hill. Alow, alow, loo, loo (3.4.82–83)," and "But mice and rats and such small deer / Have been Tom's food for seven long year" (3.4.146–47). In addition to adding realism and resonance to Edgar's act as Poor Tom, his songs serve other purposes as well, particularly as they are set in this film. The texts chosen for inclusion are all taken from existing ballads or rhymes and deal specifically with power, both gendered and societal.

As numerous scholars have noted, "Through the sharp hawthorn" is a reference to an older ballad or rhyme¹⁴ invoking pagan beliefs of the tree's protective power from evil, its use as a gathering place by the supernatural, and its connections to sexuality and sexual prowess, as the hawthorn was preferred for Maypoles.¹⁵ Hawthorns were also used by Britons to divide lands; "haw" still carries the meaning "hedge" in rural areas. Written works by Sir John Maundeville (published 1357–1371) and Edmund Spenser (1552–1599) offer poetic lines on the hawthorn and its properties, and music for Shakespeare's text is extant, although whether it is the same that was used on stage is unlikely.¹⁶ "Pillicock sat on Pillicock Hill" is an obvious play on Lear's use of "pelican," but as Eric Partridge notes, it is drawn from common slang for a penis and female genitalia: "The usual *langue-verte* explanation is that *Pillicock* (*penis* [cf. *pin*] + *cock*) = penis, and that *Pillicock-hill* = pudend; but more probably *Pillicock* = male generative organs (*pill* = 'testicle'; *i* euphony-convenient; *cock* 'penis')

and *Pillicock-hill* = the mount of Venus + the *pudendum muleibre* itself. It is a common error, even among the less ‘innocent’ of Shakespeare’s commentators, to over-simplify his subtle sexuality.”¹⁷ Several folklorists and Shakespearean scholars assert that “Pillicock” predates Shakespeare’s usage as a ballad.¹⁸ It later lost its original meaning and was recorded in *Gammer Gurton’s Garland* (1784) by Joseph Riton as a nursery rhyme.¹⁹ Finally, “small mice” is a direct quote from the seventeenth-century metered romance *Bevis of Southampton*, itself based on poetry from the thirteenth century; the use of “deer” to indicate small mammals (rather than deer as today’s audiences might think of them) is a holdover from the German *Tier*, meaning any animal.²⁰

By selecting these three songs for Edgar, Kozintsev emphasizes their roles as commentary on both Edgar’s and Lear’s madness and positions of lost power. Edgar summons the hawthorn as part of his feigned fear of the demons that pursue him: “The foul fiend follows me,” he states, and “Through the sharp hawthorn blows the wind” (3.4.50–51). In the context of the lines that follow, it appears that the hawthorn has lost its power to keep the “fiend” from Edgar; regardless of his use of its protective magic, the tree cannot stand up to the pursuit of the demons, whom Edgar continues to “see” and name as the scene progresses. This mighty tree, like Lear, has lost its efficacy as a talisman; unlike the hedge the hawthorn was often trained into, it has no use as a divider of property or boundary-marker.

Like the fallen hawthorn, the “Pillicock” that sits *on* “Pillicock Hill” is useless; that it “sits on” indicates a passivity that can be interpreted as impotence. This phrase’s lack of an active construction indicating a position of power or penetration also posits rejection or refusal by the owner of the “hill.” The most obvious commentary here is Lear’s lack of male power over female: the loss of control over his grown daughters, who deny him admittance and will not allow his dominance of them.

In “But mice and rats and deer,” his last song, Edgar’s actions deliberately reinforce his status as a wandering madman after having possibly revealed too much knowledge of the cast assembled around him in the hovel. By singing text from a well-known and widely circulated romance, Edgar returns to his guise of the poor, hungry wretch released from Bethlem to beg. Kozintsev’s inclusion of this song also prompts Lear to examine the starving and cold men surrounding him, reminding him of his former privileges and rank.

Shostakovich’s music for these three songs is simple and angular; while not exactly reminiscent of the modal folk tunes of Britain, it is nonetheless plain and affecting. Edgar is constantly vocalizing during the scene, often in a pattern of song-speech-wordless vocalization, and equally often brings his fingers, straw, hair, and other objects to his mouth as he does, again stressing his madness as signified by inappropriate orality and vocality. Ultimately, the settings of

Edgar's songs matter less than the fact Kozintsev chose these particular lines of the several ballads in the playtext for Edgar to sing, thus emphasizing their role as oblique but recognizable commentaries on the way the loss of power, the methods by which this loss was sustained, and the madness or performance thereof have affected Edgar and Lear.

BROOK: *KING LEAR* (1971)

Like Kozintsev's Edgar, the one portrayed by Robert Lloyd in Peter Brook's adaptation is first indicated as mad through his unkempt appearance: he is mostly nude, shaking, and wide-eyed.²¹ Added to these primary physical signifiers are his sudden, darting movements and whispered delivery of text. In these, Edgar shares a number of characteristics with his respective Lear, who is also shown as mad through his darting eyes and unsteady motions.

As he did for Lear, Brook, collaborating with sound recordist Bob Allen, creates a soundscape for Edgar that represents his mental state during his mad scene. As in the case of Lear, Allen's structures for sound provide a perhaps inadvertent musical score for Edgar's appearances. The sounds from wind machines frame Edgar's entrance and mark him as equally storm-battered as Lear; however, the clear piping that immediately prefaces his entrance is noticeably man-made, hinting at Edgar's manufactured insanity. A buzzing noise and a drone figure underneath Edgar's dialogue, which is significantly reduced and rearranged. The buzzing is much like flies, an aural reference to the "Lord of Flies" (Beelzebub) and the demons Edgar claims to see around them in the darkness. Edgar's truncated self-description (3.4.91–107) is punctuated by short, unnatural eruptions of thunder, and the drone beneath his words grows both louder and higher in pitch as he reaches the end of his monologue, when he becomes more animated and clutches Lear's tunic.

Edgar sings only once in this adaptation: "Come o'er the burn, Bessy" (3.6.27), one of the few ballads from *Lear* for which there is extant music dating from the appropriate period and which would have been familiar to contemporary audiences.²² Edgar's singing, however, does not follow the traditional tune but was apparently improvised by Lloyd. Lloyd's new tune is not stylistically unsuitable, but Edgar's singing at this point is curious, since he has spoken as if prose so many of the previous song cues retained in the script. Edgar's line from the song is not played for comic effect, as it would be in a production using the full playtext, in which the Fool sings back the next three lines, but it adds an additional layer of signification to Edgar's simulation of madness. That it occurs so late in relation to Edgar's first appearance indicates that it is an afterthought. That it is the single line that receives musical treat-

ment makes it unique, but its musicality appears to be a casually added attribute that remains a superficial display of a disturbed mind rather than carrying any further meaning.

KUROSAWA: *RAN* (1985)

In *Ran*, Kurosawa creates an amalgamation of Edgar and Gloucester in the blind musician and Buddhist ascetic Tsurumaru.²³ Tsurumaru's character is also drawn from Zeami's *Semimaru*, in which a royal youth born blind is abandoned to become a solitary priest and *biwa* (lute) player living in a hut. He has a single encounter with his mad and wandering sister, Sakagami, who, despite his pleas, leaves him to continue her journeys.²⁴ Tsurumaru, the similarly abandoned son of the former holder of the Second Castle, lives an austere life in his hut, where he has become a master of the *nohkan* and is visited by his sister Lady Sué. Lady Sué later leaves Tsurumaru to find his flute for him and is beheaded by Jiro's forces acting on Lady Kaede's command.

However, departing from the story of *Semimaru*, Tsurumaru is not born blind but is blinded as a youth by Hidetora. His reappearance in Hidetora's life as the Great Lord finds himself lost within his own lands acts as a physical manifestation of the heretofore hallucinatory ghosts of Hidetora's victims. Tsurumaru is introduced to the audience in a shot that frames him using the rough doorway. The shot clearly shows two colorful flutes beside him, foreshadowing the role music will play in this exchange between the men as well as in Tsurumaru's later appearances. Full of rage that years of meditation have apparently not suppressed or eliminated, Tsurumaru states that "not for one day have I forgotten, not one night have I slept in peace" since Hidetora blinded him.

Tsurumaru offers to play for his guests in lieu of hospitality, but the music he produces with his flute is forced and unpleasant, an insult and potential threat to its audience of one. He begins by stating the tense and angular Noh-influenced motif that opens the film: a short grace-note ascending to a higher pitch, climbing higher still and then trailing down and away through a bending of pitch. The following melody is atonal and unpredictable, requiring the player to overblow pitches for the desired shrieking effects concentrated in the *nohkan*'s highest ranges. The melody does not come to rest, nor is there any kind of resolution or cadence implied; it ends only when Hidetora has smashed his way out of the hut. Tsurumaru's playing in this scene shows his tight control of his emotions and actions; while he does not physically threaten Hidetora, the music he proffers contains enough frustration and pain to send the old man reeling away and back into the field. Tsurumaru's "madness" is

unyielding anger that does not abate. The music's unreleased melodic tension, its range, and the force with which it is made are all heard as this anger, which even Tsurumaru's Buddhist lifestyle has not tempered.

Saviour Catania has written that Tsurumaru's music at this point brings him closest to his Shakespearean counterparts: "In his Gloucester-like blindness, Tsurumaru also contends with the silent song of Edgar/Poor Tom's self-tormenting 'nightingale' (3.6.30)—for Tsurumaru's wailing woodwind emulates his unheard scream that he has never ceased playing since Hidetora blinded him."²⁵ Catania believes that his response to Tsurumaru's music is a kind of catharsis for Hidetora, and "as clear an indication as any that Hidetora, by looking once again with his ears, finally attains Gloucester's gift of seeing others 'feelingly' (4.6.145)."²⁶ However, both men react with hostility toward one another, rather than penitence or forgiveness. The continued aggressive quality of Tsurumaru's playing marks him as far more spiteful than Edgar is, and Hidetora's antagonism toward Tsurumaru does not support Catania's assertion that the Great Lord has yet changed his view of his place in the world in relation to others. His music expresses anger and frustrations that remain unresolved even at the end of the film.

CONCLUSION

In these three adaptations of *King Lear*, Edgar's madness is left relatively unexplored and unscored. There are a number of reasons this might be the case: perhaps because Edgar is a man, or perhaps because his madness is not the subject of speculation among other characters, or because it is not as long-lived as that of Hamlet or Ophelia. However, the most obvious reason for Edgar's madness to be overlooked or slighted is its position in the playtext. Edgar's rantings, songs, and rhymes follow Lear's storm scene without pause, and as Lear's is the most central story of the play, it is understandable that his madness is emphasized. Edgar's feigned insanity is fully signified by all of the known early modern markers of the condition, but while his text reiterates for the audience the topics that distract both Lear and himself, it does not offer new information in the way Ophelia's songs may, nor suggest his true nature to those around him, as Hamlet does with his wordplay. In short, Edgar's madness is obvious but does not significantly further the play's plot, depth, or meaning. For early modern audiences, Edgar's madness was entertainment, particularly in places where Edgar and the Fool interact with one another in contemporary song and rhyme, two familiar, comical stage figures every viewer would know. For modern productions, regardless of their settings, Edgar is integral to the play, but his madness no longer conveys the humor and

familiarity it once did, and it is difficult to treat. Time has in fact diminished Edgar, the texts, and music given to him.

NOTES

1. A full history of Bethlem, or Bedlam, can be found in Jonathan Andrews, *The History of Bethlem Hospital* (New York: Routledge, 1997).
2. Edwin Fuller Torrey and Judy Miller, *The Invisible Plague* (Piscataway, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 13.
3. Alexander Leggatt, "Madness in *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and Early Modern England," in *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's King Lear*, ed. Jay L. Halio (New York: G. K. Hall, 1996), 132–33.
4. Carol Thomas Neely, *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004), 46.
5. William C. Carroll, "Songs of Madness: The Lyric Afterlife of Shakespeare's Poor Tom," in *King Lear and Its Afterlife*, ed. Peter Holland, Shakespeare Survey 55 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 82–83.
6. William Elton, *King Lear and the Gods* (San Marino, Calif.: Huntingdon Library, 1966), 87.
7. Peter Ackroyd, *Shakespeare: The Biography* (New York: Random House, 2005), 447.
8. Carroll, "Songs of Madness," 83.
9. Leslie C. Dunn, "Ophelia's Songs in *Hamlet*: Music, Madness, and the Feminine," in *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*, ed. Nancy A. Jones and Leslie C. Dunn (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1994), 51.
10. Carroll, "Songs of Madness," 86.
11. *Korol Lir*, dir. Grigori Kozintsev, DVD, Ruscico, 2004.
12. Grigori Kozintsev, *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy*, trans. Mary Mackintosh (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 204.
13. Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 204.
14. G. Wilson Knight, *The Wheel of Fire* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2001), 206.
15. James G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (New York: Gramercy Books, 1993), 75.
16. Carroll, "Songs of Madness," 86.
17. Eric Partridge, *Shakespeare's Bawdy* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003), 207.
18. Louis C. Elson, *Shakespeare in Music* (Boston: L. C. Page, 1901), 244; Gordon Williams, *Shakespeare, Sex, and the Print Revolution* (London: Continuum, 1996), 43; also Richard Mercer Dorson, *The British Folklorists: A History* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1999), 71.
19. Matthew Grenby, *Children's Literature* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 39.
20. Helen Cooper, *The English Romance in Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 31.
21. *King Lear*, dir. Peter Brook, DVD, Columbia Pictures, 2004.

22. F. W. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), 180–81.
23. *Ran*, dir. Akira Kurosawa, DVD, Criterion, 2005.
24. Zeami Motokiyo, *Twenty Plays of the No Theatre*, trans. Susan Matisoff, ed. Donald Keene (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), University of Virginia Library Electronic Text Center, <http://etext.virginia.edu/japanese/noh/KeeSemi.html>.
25. Saviour Catania, “Wailing Woodwind Wild: The Noh Transcription of Shakespeare’s Silent Sounds in Kurosawa’s *Ran*,” *Literature Film Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (2006): 5, www.salisbury.edu/lfq/.
26. Catania, “Wailing Woodwind Wild,” 6.

Afterword

Tracking the association of music and madness beyond Shakespeare's bare wooden O and onto the celluloid and digital memories of film provides a unique view of the transformations *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear* have undergone in the seventy years since Olivier's *Hamlet*. As filmmakers have slowly departed from the aesthetic of the "heritage" Shakespearean film as established by Olivier and the BBC's complete-works productions, there has been a slow but undeniable dissolution of the traditional link between inappropriate performative behaviors, primarily singing, and madness. Despite the loss of this specific behavior, however, the majority of films considered here nonetheless demonstrate connections between madness and music in both diegetic and nondiegetic ways. Although Julia Stiles's Ophelia is all but silent—and certainly never sings—in Almereyda's adaptation of *Hamlet*, her state of mind is still indicated to some degree by the music that frames her scenes. The nonresolving, fluctuating melodic and tonal qualities of the nondiegetic score that mark her early inability to make decisions, followed by the elegiac guitar music that can be heard in her single mad scene, offer the audience a hint of her emotions. When singing is not usually part of a role, as with Lear, music is used almost universally to signify the character's condition and emotions. This is also true for Hamlet, Lady Macbeth, and even Edgar, whose song is often eliminated in favor of plain speech.

The scoring for these Shakespearean tragedies has both changed and remained much the same as Walton's work for *Hamlet*. More traditional productions, invoking the "heritage" films of the past, often retain the scoring practices of earlier periods: leitmotivic writing is coupled with atmospheric aural background music, resulting in a largely nondiegetic soundtrack that is present from start to finish. Doyle's score for *Hamlet* epitomizes this kind of score, providing

musical cues and support through time-honored gestures for the actors' actions and emotions: when drumming serves for heartbeats or martial resolve, rhythmic irregularities indicate unrest or a disturbance in the natural order of the world.

For films that depart from the traditional models, the uses of music and the kinds of musics used are far more idiosyncratic. Kozintsev's collaborations with Shostakovich resulted in scores that, while leitmotivic, also employ sophisticated musical signifiers that provide unusual depth to both the diegetic and nondiegetic music for *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. The pop and rock—and mostly diegetic—musical accompaniments in Almereyda's *Hamlet* offer far more context and information about the characters and the scenario, and they are more relevant to the film's aesthetic than Burwell's score.

As indicated in chapter 1 and by the list in appendix B, there are hundreds of adaptations for television, cinema, and the Web of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*, all with their own widely varied aural accompaniments. "Madness" and its musics are malleable, able to bend to fit countless interpretations and approaches. While this book has explored the best known of the cinema's offerings, there are countless productions ripe for similar investigation. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern could not make Hamlet's "much music, excellent voice" speak, but as scholars we might sound the music of Shakespearean adaptations from its lowest note to the top of its compass.

Appendix A: Films Referred to in the Text

Select performers and distributors are included where known.

As You Like It. Dir. Paul Czinner. Perfs. Henry Ainley (Exiled Duke), Felix Aylmer (Duke Frederick), Elisabeth Bergner (Rosalind), Laurence Olivier (Orlando), Leon Quartermaine (Jacques), Sophie Stewart (Celia). Inter-Allied, 1936.

Dead Again. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. Perfs. Kenneth Branagh (Roman Strauss/Mike Church), Andy Garcia (Gray Baker), Emma Thompson (Grace/Margaret Strauss). Paramount Pictures, 1991.

Forbidden Planet. Dir. Fred M. Wilcox. Perfs. Anne Francis (Altaira “Alta” Morbius), Leslie Nielsen (Commander J. J. Adams), Walter Pidgeon (Dr. Edward Morbius). Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1956.

Hamlet. Dir. George Fox. c. 1869.

Hamlet. Dir. Clément Maurice. Perf. Sarah Bernhardt (Hamlet). 1900.

Hamlet. Dir. Svend Gade and Heinz Schall. Perf. Asta Nielsen (Hamlet). Asta Films, 1920.

Hamlet. Dir. Laurence Olivier. Perfs. Felix Aylmer (Polonius), Eileen Herlie (Gertrude), Laurence Olivier (Hamlet), Jean Simmons (Ophelia), Basil Sydney (Claudius). J. Arthur Rank Film Distributors, 1948.

Hamlet. Dir. Grigori Kozintsev. Perfs. Innokenti Smoktunovsky (Hamlet), Anastasiya Vertinskaya (Ophelia). United Artists, 1964.

Hamlet. Dir. Franco Zeffirelli. Perfs. Alan Bates (Claudius), Helena Bonham-Carter (Ophelia), Glenn Close (Gertrude), Mel Gibson (Hamlet), Ian Holm (Polonius), Paul Scofield (Ghost). Warner Bros. Pictures, 1990.

Hamlet. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. Perfs. Brian Blessed (Ghost), Kenneth Branagh (Hamlet), Richard Briers (Polonius), Julie Christie (Gertrude), Derek Jacobi (Claudius), Kate Winslet (Ophelia). Sony Pictures Entertainment, 1996.

Hamlet. Dir. Michael Almereyda. Perfs. Ethan Hawke (Hamlet), Bill Murray (Polonius), Diane Venora (Gertrude), Sam Shepard (Ghost), Julia Stiles (Ophelia). Miramax Films, 2000.

- Hamlet Goes Business*. Dir. Aki Kaurismäki. Perfs. Pirkka-Pekka Petelius (Hamlet), Esko Salminen (Klaus), Kati Outinen (Ofelia). All've AG, 1987.
- Henry V*. Dir. Laurence Olivier. Perfs. Felix Aylmer (Archbishop of Canterbury), Laurence Olivier (Henry V). Eagle-Lion Distributors Limited, 1944.
- King John*. Dir. Herbert Beerbohm Tree. Perfs. Herbert Beerbohm Tree (King John). British Mutoscope and Biograph Company, 1899.
- King Lear*. Dir. Andrew McCullough. Perf. Orson Welles (King Lear). Columbia Broadcasting System, 1953.
- King Lear*. Dir. Peter Brook. Perfs. Susan Engel (Regan), Anne-Lise Gabold (Cordelia), Paul Scofield (King Lear), Irene Worth (Goneril). Altura Films International, 1971.
- King Lear*. Dir. Grigori Kozintsev. Perfs. Oleg Dal (Fool), Jüri Järvet (King Lear). Artkino Pictures, 1971.
- King Lear*. Dir. Michael Elliott. Perfs. John Hurt (Fool), Laurence Olivier (King Lear), Diana Rigg (Regan). Mobil Showcase Theatre, 1983.
- King of Texas*. Dir. Uli Edel. Perfs. Marcia Gay Harden (Mrs. Susannah Lear Tumlinson), Patrick Stewart (John Lear). Turner Network Television (TNT), 2002.
- The Loves of Joanna Godden*. Dir. Charles Frend. Perf. Googie Withers (Joanna Godden). General Film Distributors, 1947.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Orson Welles. Perfs. Roddy McDowell (Malcolm), Jeanette Nolan (Lady Macbeth), Orson Welles (Macbeth). Republic Pictures, 1948.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Roman Polanski. Perfs. Francesca Annis (Lady Macbeth), Jon Finch (Macbeth). Columbia Pictures, 1971.
- A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Dir. Stuart Canterbury. Adam and Eve Productions, 2000.
- O*. Dir. Tim Blake Nelson. Perfs. Josh Harnett (Hugo Goulding), Mekhi Phifer (Odin James), Julia Stiles (Desi Brable). Lions Gate Films, 2001.
- Ran*. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. Perfs. Tatsuya Nakadai (Lord Hidetora Ichimonji), Shinnosuke "Peter" Ikehata (Kyoami). Orion Classics, 1985.
- Romeo + Juliet*. Dir. Baz Luhrmann. Perfs. Claire Danes (Juliet), Leonardo DiCaprio (Romeo), John Leguizamo (Tybalt), Harold Perrineau (Mercutio), Pete Postlethwaite (Father Laurence). 20th Century Fox Film Corporation, 1996.
- Scotland, Pa.* Dir. Billy Morrisette. Perfs. James LeGros (Joe "Mac" McBeth), Maura Tierney (Pat McBeth), Christopher Walken (Lieutenant McDuff). Lot 47 Films, 2001.
- Strange Brew*. Dir. Rick Moranis and Dave Thomas. Perfs. Rick Moranis (Bob MacKenzie), Max von Sydow (Brewmeister Smith), Dave Thomas (Doug MacKenzie). MGM/UA Entertainment Company, 1983.
- The Taming of the Screw*. Dir. Jim Powers. Notorious, 1997.
- 10 Things I Hate About You*. Dir. Gil Junger. Perfs. Heath Ledger (Patrick Verona), Julia Stiles (Kat Stratford). Buena Vista Pictures, 1999.
- A Thousand Acres*. Perfs. Jessica Lange (Ginny Cook Smith), Jennifer Jason Leigh (Rose Cook), Michelle Pfeiffer (Rose Cook Lewis), Jason Robards (Larry Cook). Buena Vista Pictures, 1997.
- Throne of Blood*. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. Perf. Toshiro Mifune (Taketori Washizu). Criterion Collection, 1957.

Appendix B: Selected Film Productions and Adaptations of *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*

*F*ilms are listed in chronological order. Selected performers and distributors are included where known.

HAMLET

- Le Duel d'Hamlet*. Dir. Clément Maurice. Perf. Sarah Bernhardt (Hamlet). 1900.
Hamlet. Dir. Georges Méliès. 1907.
Hamlet. Dir. Luca Comerio. Milano Film, 1908.
Hamlet. Dir. Henri Desfontaines. Perfs. Jacques Grétilat (Hamlet), Colonna Romano (Gertrude). Société Générale des Cinématographes Éclipse, 1908.
Amleto. Dir. Mario Caserini. Perf. Dante Cappelli (Hamlet). Cinès, 1910.
Hamlet. Dir. William George Barker. 1910.
Hamlet. Dir. August Blom. Perfs. Aage Hertel (Gertrude), Alwin Neuss (Hamlet). Motion Picture Distributors and Sales Company, 1910.
Hamlet. Dir. Charles Raymond. Perfs. Constance Backner (Gertrude), Dorothy Foster (Ophelia), Charles Raymond (Hamlet). Barker, 1912.
Hamlet. Dir. E. Hay Plumb. Perfs. Gertrude Elliot (Ophelia), Johnston Forbes-Robertson (Hamlet). Gaumont British Distributors, 1913.
Amleto. Dir. Arturo Ambrosio. Perf. Hamilton Revelle (Hamlet). 1914.
Hamlet. Dir. W. P. Kellino. Davison Film Sales Agency, 1915.
Amleto. Dir. Eleuterio Rodolfi. 1917.
Hamlet (also *Hamlet, The Drama of Vengeance*). Dir. Svend Gade and Heinz Schall. Perf. Asta Nielsen (Hamlet). Asta Films, 1920.
Hamlet (TV). Dir. Basil Adams. Perfs. John Byron (Hamlet), Patrick Macnee (Laertes), Margaret Rawlings (Gertrude), Sebastian Shaw (Claudius). 1947.

- Hamlet*. Dir. Laurence Olivier. Perfs. Felix Aylmer (Polonius), Eileen Herlie (Gertrude), Laurence Olivier (Hamlet), Jean Simmons (Ophelia), Basil Sydney (Claudius). J. Arthur Rank Film Distributors, 1948.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Albert McCleery. Perfs. Ruth Chatterton (Gertrude), Maurice Evans (Hamlet). Columbia Broadcasting System, 1953.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Kishore Sahu. Hindustan Chitra, 1954.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Alf Sjöberg. Sveriges Radio, 1955.
- Hamlet, Prinz von Dänemark*. Dir. Franz Peter Wirth. Perf. Maximilian Schell (Hamlet). Emerson Film Enterprises, 1961.
- Hamlet at Elsinore* (TV). Dir. Philip Saville. Perfs. Michael Caine (Horatio), Christopher Plummer (Hamlet). National Educational Television, 1963.
- Hamile*. Dir. Terry Bishop. Perf. Ghana Film Industry Corporation, 1964.
- Hamlet* (also *Gamlet*). Dir. Grigori Kozintsev. Perfs. Innokenti Smoktunovsky (Hamlet), Anastasiya Vertinskaya (Ophelia). United Artists, 1964.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. John Gielgud. Perfs. Richard Burton (Hamlet), Hume Cronyn (Polonius), John Gielgud (Ghost), Eileen Herlie (Gertrude). Warner Bros. Pictures, 1964.
- Hamlet*. Dir. David Stivel. Proartel S.A., 1964.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Tony Richardson. Perfs. Marianne Faithful (Ophelia), Anthony Hopkins (Claudius), Nichol Williamson (Hamlet). Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1969.
- Hamlet*. Dir. David Giles. Perf. Ian McKellen (Hamlet). British Broadcasting Corporation, 1970.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Peter Wood. Perfs. Richard Chamberlain (Hamlet), John Gielgud (Ghost), Michael Redgrave (Polonius). Hallmark Hall of Fame Productions/National Broadcasting Corporation, 1970.
- Hamlet*. Dir. René Bonnière and Stephen Bush. Crawley Films, 1973.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Julian Pringle. Sydney National Theatre Company, 1974.
- Hamlet*. Dir. José Rubens Siqueira. Teatro Popular do Sesi, 1975.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Celestino Coronado. Perfs. Quentin Crisp (Polonius), Helen Mirren (Ophelia/Gertrude). Essential Productions, 1976.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Jean Delannoy. 1978.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Renaud Saint-Pierre. 1979.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Rodney Bennett. Perfs. Claire Bloom (Gertrude), Derek Jacobi (Hamlet), Patrick Stewart (Claudius). British Broadcasting Corporation/Public Broadcasting Service, 1980.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Károly Esztergályos. MAFILM, 1983.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Ragnar Lyth. Perf. Stellan Skarsgård (Hamlet). 1985.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Roland Kenyon and Rod MacDonald. 1987.
- Hamlet* (also *Gamlet*). Dir. Gleb Panfilov. 1989.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Pierre Cavassilas. Institut National de l'Audiovisuel, 1990.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Franco Zeffirelli. Perfs. Alan Bates (Claudius), Helena Bonham-Carter (Ophelia), Glenn Close (Gertrude), Mel Gibson (Hamlet), Ian Holm (Polonius), Paul Scofield (Ghost). Warner Bros. Pictures, 1990.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Kirk Browning and Kevin Kline. Perfs. Kevin Kline (Hamlet), Diane Venora (Ophelia). Public Broadcasting Service, 1990.

- The Animated Shakespeare: Hamlet* (Video). Dir. Natalia Orlova. Perf. Tilda Swinton (Ophelia). Soyuzmultfilm/British Broadcasting Corporation, 1992.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Jotaarkka Pennanen. Yleisradio, 1992.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Goswin Moniac. 1994.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. Perfs. Brian Blessed (Ghost), Kenneth Branagh (Hamlet), Richard Briers (Polonius), Julie Christie (Gertrude), Derek Jacobi (Claudius), Kate Winslet (Ophelia). Sony Pictures Entertainment, 1996.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Campbell Scott. Perf. Campbell Scott (Hamlet). Cowboy Booking International, 2000.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Michael Almereyda. Perfs. Ethan Hawke (Hamlet), Bill Murray (Polonius), Sam Shepard (Ghost), Julia Stiles (Ophelia), Diane Venora (Gertrude). Miramax Films, 2000.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Peter Brook. Perf. Adrian Lester (Hamlet). BBC Worldwide, 2002.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Nicolas Stemmann. 2002.
- Hamlet* (Video). Dir. Mike Mundell. Perf. William Houston (Hamlet). Edgehill Publishing, 2003.
- Hamlet* (Video). Dir. Lukasz Barczyk. Telewizja Polska, 2004.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Stephen Cavanagh. Perf. Stephen Cavanagh (Hamlet). Derry Film Initiative, 2005.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Justin Clow. 2005.
- Hamlet* (TV). Dir. Felipe Gutiérrez. TV UNAM, 2005.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Max Honert. In One Media, 2005.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Aaron Hendren. 2007.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Alexander Fodor. FilmAnnex, 2007.
- The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*. Dir. Oscar Redding. A Poor Theatre, 2007.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Aleksandar Rajkovic. 2007.
- Hamlet*. Dir. Nigel Tamm. Remix Culture, 2008.

HAMLET ADAPTATIONS

- Colonel Heeza Liar Plays Hamlet*. Dir. John Randolph Bray. Paramount Pictures, 1916.
- Oh'Phelia*. Dir. Anson Dyer. 1919.
- Edgar's Hamlet*. Dir. E. Mason Hopper. Goldwyn Distributing Company, 1920.
- Khoon-E-Nahak*. Dir. K. B. Athavale. Excelsior Film, 1928.
- Hamlet: Act I, Scene V*. Dir. Margaret Carrington and Robert Edmond Jones. Perf. John Barrymore (Hamlet). 1933.
- Khoon Ka Khoon*. Dir. Sohrab Modi. Perf. Sohrab Modi (Hamlet). Minerva Movie-tone, 1935.
- The Immortal Gentleman*. Dir. Widgely R. Newman. Perf. Rosalinde Fuller (Ophelia/Juliet/Lady). Equity British Films, 1935.
- To Be or Not to Be*. Dir. Ernst Lubitsch. Perfs. Jack Benny (Joseph Tura), Carole Lombard (Maria Tura). Masterpiece Productions, 1942.

- Strange Illusion*. Dir. Edgar G. Ulmer. Producers Releasing Corporation, 1945.
- Der Rest ist Schweigen*. Dir. Helmut Käutner. Europa-Filmverleih AG, 1959.
- The Bad Sleep Well*. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. Perf. Toshiro Mifune (Koichi Nishi). Criterion Collection, 1960.
- Ophélie*. Dir. Claude Chabrol. New Line Cinema, 1962.
- Enter Hamlet*. Dir. Fred Mogubgub. Perf. Maurice Evans (Hamlet). Janus Films, 1965.
- Johnny Hamlet*. Dir. Enzo Castellari. Transvue Pictures, 1968.
- One Hamlet Less*. Dir. Carmelo Bene. Ital-Noleggio Cinematografico, 1973.
- Angel of Revenge/Female Hamlet*. Dir. Metin Erksan. Perf. Fatma Girik (Hamlet). Ugur Film, 1976.
- Hamlet Goes Business*. Dir. Aki Kaurismäki. Perfs. Kati Outinen (Ofelia), Pirkka-Pekka Petelius (Hamlet), Esko Salminen (Klaus). Al'Ve AG, 1981.
- To Be or Not to Be*. Dir. Mel Brooks. Perfs. Anne Bancroft (Anna Bronski), Mel Brooks (Dr. Frederick Bronski), Christopher Lloyd (Capt. Schultz). 20th Century Fox Home Entertainment, 1983.
- Strange Brew*. Dir. Rick Moranis and Dave Thomas. Perfs. Rick Moranis (Bob MacKenzie), Dave Thomas (Doug MacKenzie), Max von Sydow (Brewmeister Smith). MGM/UA Entertainment Company, 1983.
- Hamlet we wsi Glucha Dolna* (TV). Dir. Olga Lipinska. 1985.
- Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. Dir. Tom Stoppard. Perfs. Richard Dreyfuss (The Player), Gary Oldman (Rosencrantz), Tim Roth (Guildenstern). Buena Vista Home Video, 1990.
- Discovering Hamlet*. Dir. Mark Olshaker. Perfs. Kenneth Branagh (as himself), Derek Jacobi (as himself), Patrick Stewart (as himself), Sophie Thompson (as herself). PBS Home Video, 1990.
- Renaissance Man*. Dir. Penny Marshall. Perfs. Danny DeVito (Bill Rago), Gregory Hines (Sergeant Cass). Buena Vista Pictures, 1994.
- The Lion King*. Dir. Roger Allers and Rob Minkoff. Perfs. Matthew Broderick (Adult Simba), Jeremy Irons (Scar), James Earl Jones (Mufasa). Buena Vista Pictures, 1994.
- The Fifteen Minute Hamlet*. Dir. Todd Louiso. Perf. Philip Seymour Hoffman (Bernardo/Horatio/Laertes). Cin-ciné 19, 1995.
- Green Eggs and Hamlet*. Dir. Mike O'Neal. 1995.
- In the Bleak Midwinter*. Dir. Kenneth Branagh. Perfs. Richard Briers (Henry Wakefield), Joan Collins (Margaretta D'Arcy), Michael Mahoney (Joe Harper), Jennifer Saunders (Nancy Crawford), Julia Sawalha (Nina Raymond). Sony Pictures Classics, 1996.
- Let the Devil Wear Black*. Dir. Stacy Title. Perfs. Jacqueline Bissett (Helen Lyne), Mary-Louise Parker (Julia Hirsch), Chris Sarandon (Jack's Father). Trimark Pictures, 1999.
- Hamlet_X*. Dir. Herbert Fritsch. Koppfilm, 2003.
- Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. Dir. Joey Zimmerman. Oracle Films, 2005.
- The Banquet*. Dir. Feng Xiaogang. Dragon Dynasty, 2006.
- Hamlet 2*. Dir. Andrew Fleming. Perf. Steve Coogan (Dana Marschz), Catherine Keener (Brie Marschz), Elisabeth Shue (as herself). Focus Features, 2008.
- Hamlet A.D.D.* Dir. Bobby Ciraldo and Andrew Swant. Brownmark Films, 2009.

KING LEAR

- King Lear*. Dir. J. Stuart Blackton and William V. Ranous. Perf. William V. Ranous (King Lear). Vitagraph Company of America, 1909.
- King Lear*. Dir. Ernest C. Warde. Perf. Frederick Warde (King Lear). Pathé Exchange, 1916.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Royston Morley. 1948.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Andrew McCullough. Perf. Orson Welles (King Lear). Columbia Broadcasting System, 1953.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Walter Tillemans. Belgische Radio en Televisie, 1969.
- King Lear*. Dir. Peter Brook. Perfs. Susan Engel (Regan), Anne-Lise Gabold (Cordelia), Paul Scofield (King Lear), Irene Worth (Goneril). Altura Films International, 1971.
- King Lear*. Dir. Grigori Kozintsev. Perfs. Oleg Dal (Fool), Jüri Järvet (King Lear). Artkino Pictures, 1971.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Edwin Sherin. Perfs. James Earl Jones (King Lear), Raul Julia (Edmund), Paul Sorvino (Gloucester). Public Broadcasting Service, 1974.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Tony Davenall. Perf. Patrick Magee (King Lear). Independent Television (ITV), 1976.
- King Lear* (Video). Dir. Alan Cooke. Kultur, 1982.
- King Lear*. Dir. Michael Elliott. Perfs. John Hurt (Fool), Laurence Olivier (King Lear), Diana Rigg (Regan). Mobil Showcase Theatre, 1983.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Richard Eyre. Perf. Ian Holm (King Lear). Public Broadcasting Service, 1997.
- King Lear* (TV). Dir. Brian Blessed. Perfs. Brian Blessed (King Lear), Hildegard Neil (Fool). Cromwell Productions, 1999.
- King Lear* (Video). Dir. Trevor Nunn. Perf. Ian McKellen (King Lear). Public Broadcasting Service, 2008.

KING LEAR ADAPTATIONS

- Le Roi Lear au village*. Dir. Louis Feuillade. Kleine Optical Company, 1911.
- The Yiddish King Lear*. Dir. Harry Thomashefsky. Jewish Talking Picture Company, 1934.
- King Lear*. Dir. Jean-Luc Godard. Perfs. Woody Allen (Mr. Alien, uncredited), Julie Delpy (Virginia, uncredited), Jean-Luc Godard (Professor Pluggy, uncredited), Norman Mailer (The Great Writer, uncredited), Burgess Meredith (Don Learo, uncredited), Molly Ringwald (Cordelia, uncredited), Peter Sellers (William Shaksper Junior the Fifth, uncredited). Cannon Film Distributors, 1987.
- A Thousand Acres*. Dir. Jocelyn Moorhouse. Perfs. Jessica Lange (Ginny Cook Smith), Jennifer Jason Leigh (Rose Cook), Michelle Pfeiffer (Rose Cook Lewis), Jason Robards (Larry Cook). Buena Vista Pictures, 1997.

- Ran*. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. Perfs. Shinnosuke "Peter" Ikehata (Kyoami), Tatsuya Nakadai (Lord Hidetora Ichimonji). Orion Classics, 1995.
- King of Texas*. Dir. Uli Edel. Perfs. Marcia Gay Harden (Mrs. Susannah Lear Tumlinson), Patrick Stewart (John Lear). Turner Network Television (TNT), 2002.

MACBETH

- Duel Scene from Macbeth*. Dir. Unknown. 1905.
- Macbeth*. Dir. J. Stuart Blackton. Perfs. Louise Carver (Lady Macbeth), William V. Rannous (Macbeth). Vitagraph Company of America, 1908.
- Macbeth*. Dir. André Calmettes. Perf. Paul Mounet (Macbeth). 1909.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Mario Caserini. Perfs. Dante Cappelli (Macbeth), Maria Caserini (Lady Macbeth). Cinès, 1909.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Frank R. Benson. Perfs. Constance Benson (Lady Macbeth), Frank R. Benson (Macbeth). Co-operative Cinematograph, 1911.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Arthur Bouchier. Perfs. Arthur Bouchier (Macbeth), Violet Vanbrugh (Lady Macbeth). Filmindustrie Heidelberg, 1913.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Séverin-Mars. Perfs. Georgette Leblanc (Lady Macbeth), Séverin-Mars (Macbeth). Société Française des Films Éclair, 1915.
- Macbeth*. Dir. John Emerson. Perfs. Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree (Macbeth), Constance Collier (Lady Macbeth). Triangle Distributing Corporation, 1916.
- Macbeth*. Dir. H. B. Parkinson. Perfs. Russell Thorndike (Macbeth), Sybil Thorndike (Lady Macbeth). British Exhibitors' Films, 1922.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Heinz Schall. 1922.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Thomas A. Blair. Perf. David Bradley (Macbeth). 1946.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Orson Welles. Perfs. Roddy McDowell (Malcolm), Jeanette Nolan (Lady Macbeth), Orson Welles (Macbeth). Republic Pictures, 1948.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. George More O'Ferrall. Perfs. Patrick Macnee (Malcolm), Stephen Murray (Macbeth). British Broadcasting Corporation, 1949.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. David Greene. Perfs. Katharine Blake (Lady Macbeth), Patrick Macnee (Macduff), Barry Morse (Macbeth). Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1955.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Claude Barma. 1959.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Alessandro Brissoni. Radiotelevisione Italiana, 1960.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Paul Almond. Perfs. Zoe Caldwell (Lady Macbeth), Sean Connery (Macbeth). Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1961.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Alan Burke. 1965.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Michael Simpson. British Broadcasting Corporation, 1966.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Barry Boys. Perfs. Earle Hyman (Macbeth), Stacy Keach (Banquo). NET-TV, 1968.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Roman Polanski. Perfs. Francesca Annis (Lady Macbeth), Jon Finch (Macbeth). Columbia Pictures, 1971.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Werner Schroeter. Hessischer Rundfunk, 1971.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Unknown. West German Television, 1974.

- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Franco Enriquez. Radiotelevisione Italiana, 1975.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Hacho Boyadzhiev. Bulgarian National Television, 1978.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Arthur Allan Seidelman. Perfs. Jeremy Brett (Macbeth), Piper Laurie (Lady Macbeth). 1981.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Kirk Browning. Perfs. Maureen Anderman (Lady Macbeth), Philip Anglim (Macbeth). 1982.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Béla Tarr. 1982.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Pauli Pentti. Villealfa Filmproduction Oy, 1987.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Charles Warren. Thames Television, 1988.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. John Croezen. 1990.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Jeremy Freeston. Perf. Jason Connery (Macbeth). CJP Public Relations, 1997.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Michael Bogdanov. Perfs. Sean Pertwee (Macbeth), Greta Scacchi (Lady Macbeth). Channel Four Films, 1998.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Paul Winarski. Showcase Films, 1998.
- Macbeth* (TV). Dir. Gregory Doran. Perfs. Diane Beck (Lady Macduff/Witch), Antony Sher (Macbeth). Royal Shakespeare Company, 2001.
- Macbeth* (Video). Dir. J. Bretton Truett. Perf. J. Bretton Truett (Macbeth). Mythicnet, 2002.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Bo Landin and Alex Scherpf. Scandinatime Films, 2004.
- Macbeth*. Dir. Geoffrey Wright. Perfs. Steve Bastoni (Banquo), Victoria Hill (Lady Macbeth), Sam Worthington (Macbeth). Arclight Films, 2006.

MACBETH ADAPTATIONS

- When Macbeth Came to Snakeville*. Dir. Roy Clements. General Film Company, 1914.
- Le Rideau rouge*. Dir. André Barsacq. 1952.
- Joe Macbeth*. Dir. Ken Hughes. Perfs. Paul Douglas (Joe MacBeth), Ruth Roman (Lily MacBeth). Columbia Pictures Corporation, 1955.
- Throne of Blood*. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. Perf. Toshiro Mifune (Takatori Washizu). Criterion Collection, 1957.
- Men of Respect*. Dir. William Reilly. Perfs. Dennis Farina (Bankie Como), Rod Steiger (Charlie D'Amico), Stanley Tucci (Mal), John Turturro (Mike Battaglia). Columbia Pictures, 1991.
- Macbeth horror suite di Carmelo Bene da William Shakespeare*. Dir. Carmelo Bene. Radiotelevisione Italiana, 1997.
- Wyrd Sisters*. Dir. Jean Flynn. Perfs. Christopher Lee (Death), Jane Horrocks (Magrat). Cosgrove Hall Films, 1997.
- Macbeth on the Estate* (TV). Dir. Penny Woolcock. Perfs. James Frain (Macbeth), Susan Vidler (Lady Macbeth). 1997.
- Macbeth in Manhattan*. Dir. Greg Lombardo. Perfs. Nick Gregory (William/Macbeth), David Lansbury (Max/Macduff), Gloria Reuben (Claudia/Lady Macbeth). The Asylum, 1999.

Rave Macbeth. Dir. Klaus Knoesel. Nighthawks Pictures, 2001.

Macbeth: The Comedy. Dir. Allison L. LiCalsi. Tristan Films, 2001.

Scotland, Pa. Dir. Billy Morrisette. Perfs. James LeGros (Joe “Mac” McBeth), Maura Tierney (Pat McBeth), Christopher Walken (Lieutenant McDuff). Lot 47 Films, 2001.

Someone Is Sleeping in My Pain: An East-West Macbeth. Dir. Michael Roes. 2002.

Maqbool. Dir. Vishal Bharadwaj. Perf. Irrfan Khan (Maqbool). Yash Raj Films, 2003.

Macbeth. Dir. Bryan Enk. 2003.

ShakespeaRe-told: Macbeth (TV). Dir. Mark Brozel. Perfs. Keeley Hawes (Ella Macbeth), James McAvoy (Joe Macbeth). British Broadcasting Corporation, 2005.

Macbeth 3000: This Time, It's Personal. Dir. Geoff Warren Meech. SuperGun Cinema, 2005.

Never Say Macbeth. Dir. Christopher J. Prouty. Vanguard Cinema, 2007.

This Is Macbeth. Dir. Greg Watkins. 2008.

Bibliography

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Abbate, Carolyn. "Outside Ravel's Tomb." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 52, no. 3 (1999): 465–530.
- Ackroyd, Peter. *Shakespeare: The Biography*. New York: Random House, 2005.
- Adelman, Jane. "Fantasies of Maternal Power in Macbeth." In *Cannibals, Witches, and Divorce: Estranging the Renaissance*, ed. Marjorie Garber. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- . *William Shakespeare's Hamlet*. London: Faber and Faber, 2000.
- Altman, Rick. *Silent Film Sound*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Anderegg, Michael A. *Cinematic Shakespeare*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- . *Orson Welles, Shakespeare, and Popular Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Anderson, Jeffrey M. "Interview with Ethan Hawke and Michael Almereyda." *Combustible Celluloid*, May 4, 2000. www.combustiblecelluloid.com/inthawke.shtml.
- Andrews, Jonathan. *The History of Bethlem Hospital*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Bargen, Doris G. *A Woman's Weapon: Spirit Possession in the Tale of Genji*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.
- The Battle of Otterburn. www.8notes.com/scores/5803.asp?ftype=gif.
- Bennett, Josephine Waters. "The Storm Within: The Madness of Lear." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 13, no. 2 (1962): 137–55.
- Berry, Phillipa. *Shakespeare's Feminine Endings: Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Bevington, David. *This Wide and Universal Theater: Shakespeare in Performance Then and Now*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- "A Book of Old English Ballads: The Battle of Otterburn." www.sacred-texts.com/neu/eng/boeb/boeb24.htm.

- Branagh, Kenneth, ed. *Hamlet by William Shakespeare: Screenplay, Introduction, and Film Diary*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- Brauner, David. "'Speak Again': The Politics of Rewriting in *A Thousand Acres*." *Modern Language Review* 96, no. 3 (2001): 654–66.
- Brode, Douglas. *Shakespeare in the Movies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Brook, Peter, and Geoffrey Reeves. "Finding Shakespeare on Film, from an Interview with Peter Brook." *Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 1 (1966): 117–21.
- Buchanan, Judith. *Shakespeare on Film*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson, 2005.
- Buhler, James, Caryl Flinn, and David Newmeyer, eds. *Music and Cinema*. Hanover, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 2000.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. "'To Hear and See the Matter': Communicating Technology in Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000)." *Cinema Journal* 42, no. 3 (2003): 48–69.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton, and John Manning, eds. *New Essays on Hamlet*. New York: AMS Press, 1994.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton, and Ramona Wray. *Shakespeare, Film, Fin de Siècle*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000.
- Burt, Peter. *The Music of Toru Takemitsu*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Burt, Richard, ed. *Shakespeare after Mass Media*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- . *Unspeakeable ShaXXXpeares*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.
- von Busack, Richard. "Great Dane in the Morning." *Metroactive*, May 25, 2000. www.metroactive.com/papers/metro/05.25.00/hamlet-0021.html.
- Callaghan, Dymrna, ed. *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- Canby, Vincent. "*King Lear* (1971)." *New York Times*, November 23, 1971.
- Carlsson, Mikeal. "Women in Film Music." *International Alliance for Women in Music*. www.iawm.org/articles_html/carlsson_women_in_film.html.
- Carroll, William C. "Songs of Madness: The Lyric Afterlife of Shakespeare's Poor Tom." In *King Lear and Its Afterlife*, ed. Peter Holland. Shakespeare Survey 55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Cartelli, Thomas, and Katherine Rowe. *New Wave Shakespeare on Screen*. Cambridge: Polity, 2007.
- Catania, Saviour. "Wailing Woodwind Wild: The Noh Transcription of Shakespeare's Silent Sounds in Kurosawa's *Ran*." *Literature Film Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (2006). www.salisbury.edu/lfq/.
- Cavell, Stanley. "The Avoidance of Love: A Reading of *King Lear*." In *Shakespeare: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1945–2000*, ed. Russ McDonald. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.
- Cefalu, Paul A. "'Damnéd Custom . . . Habits Devil': Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Anti-Dualism, and the Early Modern Philosophy of Mind." *English Literary History* 67, no. 2000 (2000): 399–431.
- Charnes, Linda. "Dismember Me: Shakespeare, Paranoia, and the Logic of Mass Culture." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (1997): 1–16.
- Charney, Maurice, and Hanna Charney. "The Language of Madwomen in Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3, no. 2 (1977): 451–60.
- Chedgzoy, Kate, ed. *Shakespeare, Feminism and Gender*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

- Child, Francis J. *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1882.
- Clément, Catherine. *Opera, or the Undoing of Women*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Cooper, Helen. *The English Romance in Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Dash, Irene G. *Women's Worlds in Shakespeare's Plays*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997.
- Davies, Anthony. *Filming Shakespeare's Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . "The Shakespeare Films of Laurence Olivier." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*, ed. Russell Jackson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Davies, Anthony, and Stanley Wells, eds. *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Desmet, Christy, and Robert Sawyer, eds. *Shakespeare and Appropriation*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Donaldson, Peter. "Olivier, Hamlet, and Freud." *Cinema Journal* 6, no. 24 (1987): 22–48.
- Dorson, Richard Mercer. *The British Folklorists: A History*. London: Taylor and Francis, 1999.
- Duffin, Ross. *Shakespeare's Songbook*. New York: Norton, 2004.
- Dunn, Leslie C. "Ophelia's Songs in Hamlet: Music, Madness, and the Feminine." In *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*, ed. Nancy A. Jones and Leslie C. Dunn. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1994.
- Elson, Louis C. *Shakespeare in Music*. Boston: L. C. Page, 1901.
- Elton, William. *King Lear and the Gods*. San Marino, Calif.: Huntington Library, 1966.
- Epstein, Alex. "By the Way, Ophelia Is Pregnant." *Crafty Screenwriting*. www.crafty-screenwriting.com/ophelia.html.
- Federal Theatre Project, Library of Congress. <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/fedtp/ftsmth00.html>.
- "Filmtracks." www.filmtracks.com/titles/hamlet.html.
- Findlay, Alison. *A Feminist Perspective on Renaissance Drama*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Fiske, Roger. *English Theatre Music in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Vintage Books, 1988.
- Foulkes, Richard, ed. *Shakespeare and the Victorian Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Frazer, James G. *The Golden Bough*. New York: Gramercy Books, 1993.
- Fuchs, Cynthia. "Interview with Michael Almereyda." *PopMatters*. www.popmatters.com/film/interviews/almereyda-michael.shtm.
- Gammon, Vic. *Desire, Drink, and Death in English Folk and Vernacular Song, 1600–1900*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Garber, Marjorie. ed. *Cannibals, Witches, and Divorce: Estranging the Renaissance*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

- . *Dream in Shakespeare: From Metaphor to Metamorphosis*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1974.
- , ed. "Fantasies of Maternal Power in *Macbeth*." In *Cannibals, Witches, and Divorce: Estranging the Renaissance*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- . *Shakespeare After All*. New York: Parthenon Books, 2004.
- Goodwin, James. *Akira Kurosawa and Intertextual Cinema*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Grenby, Matthew. *Children's Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Gunther, J. Lawrence. "Hamlet, Macbeth, and King Lear on Film." In *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*, ed. Russell Jackson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Halio, Jay L., ed. *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's King Lear*. New York: G. K. Hall, 1996.
- Hapgood, Robert. ed. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Shakespeare in Production. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . "Kurosawa's Shakespeare Films: *Throne of Blood*, *The Bad Sleep Well*, and *Ran*." In *Shakespeare and the Moving Image*, ed. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Heine, Erik. "The Film Music of Dmitri Shostakovich in *The Gadfly*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*." Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2005.
- Hirsch, James. "To Take Arms against a Sea of Anomalies: Laurence Olivier's Film Adaptation of Act Three, Scene One of *Hamlet*." *EnterText* 1.2. <http://people.brunel.ac.uk/~acsrrm/entertext/hamlet/hirsh.pdf>.
- Holderness, Graham. "Ofelia: Laurence Nowel: Excerpta Quaedam Danica (1565)." *Early Modern Culture* 3 (2003).
- Holland, Peter. ed. *King Lear and Its Afterlife*. Shakespeare Survey 55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- , "Two-Dimensional Shakespeare: *King Lear* on Film." In *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*, eds. Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- , ed. *Macbeth and Its Afterlife*. Shakespeare Survey 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Howlett, Kathy M. *Framing Shakespeare on Film*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2000.
- Hurtgen, Charles. "The Operatic Character of Background Music in Film Adaptations of Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1969).
- Ibert, Jacques. "Notes by Composer." *Film Music* 8. (November–December 1948). Internet Movie Database. www.imdb.com.
- Jackson, Russell, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Jensen, Michael P. "Mel Gibson on Hamlet." *Shakespeare on Film Newsletter* 15, no. 2 (1991).
- Jorgens, Jack. *Shakespeare on Film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Kallendorf, Hilaire. *Exorcism and Its Texts: Subjectivity in Early Modern Literature of England and Spain*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Kassabian, Anahid. *Hearing Film: Tracking Identifications in Contemporary Hollywood Film Music*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

- Keller, James R., and Leslie Stratyner, eds. *Almost Shakespeare: Reinventing His Works for Cinema and Television*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2004.
- Kennedy, Michael. *Portrait of Walton*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Kimbrough, R. Alan. "Olivier's *Lear* and the Limits of Video." In *Shakespeare on Television: An Anthology of Essays and Reviews*, ed. J. C. Bulman and H. R. Coursen. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1988.
- Kirsch, Arthur. "The Emotional Landscape of *King Lear*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1988): 154–70.
- Kliman, Bernice. *Hamlet: Film, Television, and Audio Performance*. London: Associated University Presses, 1988.
- . *Macbeth*. 2nd ed. *Shakespeare in Performance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Knight, G. Wilson. *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy*. Trans. Mary Mackintosh. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- . *Shakespeare: Time and Conscience*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1966.
- . *The Wheel of Fire*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2001.
- Kurosawa, Akira. *Ran*. Trans. Tadashi Shishido. Boston: Shambhala, 1986.
- . *Something Like an Autobiography*. New York: Vintage Books, 1983.
- Lamarque, Peter. "Expression and the Mask: The Dissolution of Personality in *Noh*." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47, no. 2 (1989): 157–68.
- Lauzen, Martha M. "The Celluloid Ceiling: Behind-the-Scenes Employment of Women in the Top 250 Films of 2005." *Movies By Women.com*. http://moviesbywomen.com/stats_celluloid_ceiling_2005.php.
- Leggatt, Alexander. "Madness in *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, and Early Modern England." In *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's King Lear*, ed. Jay L. Halio. New York: G. K. Hall, 1996.
- Leonard, Kendra Preston, and Ruth Benander. "Bounded in a Nutshell: The Limitations of Music as Guide in Almereyda's *Hamlet*." *Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association Conference*, San Diego, 2005.
- Levin, Joanna. "Lady MacBeth and the Daemonologie of Hysteria." *English Literary History* 69, no. 1 (2002): 21–55.
- Lindley, David. *Shakespeare and Music*. Arden Shakespeare. London: Thomson Learning, 2006.
- Lippincott, H. F. "*King Lear* and the Fools of Robert Armin." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (1975): 243–53.
- von Loewenfeldt, Paula. "Weaving the Spider's Web: Interpretation of Character in Kurosawa Akira's *Throne of Blood* (*Kumonsu-jō*)." In *Performing Shakespeare in Japan*, ed. Minami Ryuta, Ian Carruthers, and John Gilles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Long, John H. *Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Histories and Tragedies*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1971.
- MacDonald, Michael. "The Medicalization of Suicide: Laymen, Physicians, and Cultural Change, 1500–1870." *Milbank Quarterly* 67, Supplement 1 (1989): 69–91.
- . "Ophelia's Maimèd Rites." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (1986): 309–17.

- McDonald, Russ. *Look to the Lady: Sarah Siddons, Ellen Terry, and Judi Dench on the Shakespearean Stage*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005.
- McLuskie, Kathleen. "The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare." In *Shakespeare, Feminism, and Gender*, ed. Kate Chedgzoy. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Mellers, Wilfrid. *Harmonious Meeting: A Study of the Relationship between English Music, Poetry, and Theatre, c. 1600–1900*. London: Dennis Dobson, 1965.
- Mesa-Villar, José María. "Musings from Ophelia's Watery Voyage: Images of Female Submission in Shakespeare's and Millais' Drowning Maiden." *SEDERI* 14 (2004): 227–37.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." In *Feminist Film Theory: A Reader*, ed. Sue Thornham. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Neely, Carol Thomas. *Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- . "'Documents in Madness': Reading Madness and Gender in Shakespeare's Tragedies and Early Modern Culture." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1991): 315–38.
- . "Recent Work in Renaissance Studies: Psychology: Did Madness Have a Renaissance?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (1991): 776–91.
- O'Brien, Robert Viking. "The Madness of Syracusan Antipholus." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 2.1, no. 3 (1996): 1–26.
- Olivier, Laurence. *Hamlet* Post-production Shooting Script, May 11, 1948. Folger Shakespeare Library.
- Parker, R. B. "The Use of 'Mise-en-Scène' in Three Films of *King Lear*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42, no. 1 (1991): 75–90.
- Partridge, Eric. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- . *Shakespeare's Bawdy*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2003.
- Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Paulin, Scott D. "Richard Wagner and the Fantasy of Cinematic Unity: The Idea of the Gesamtkunstwerk in the History and Theory of Film Music." In *Music and Cinema*, ed. James Buhler, Caryl Flinn, and David Newmeyer. Hanover, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 2000.
- Peterson, Kaara. "Framing Ophelia: Representation and the Pictorial Tradition." *Mosaic* 31, no. 3 (1998): 1–24.
- Plutschow, Herbert E. *Chaos and Cosmos: Ritual in Early and Medieval Japanese Literature*. Boston: Brill Academic, 1990.
- Polanski, Roman, and Kenneth Tynan. *Macbeth*. 1971. Sony Pictures.
- . *Macbeth* Screenplay. Folger Shakespeare Library, Folio PR 2823 A23, 1972, 3/3 (14), 4/6 (22).
- Poole, Adrian. *Shakespeare and the Victorians*. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2004.
- Primal Scream. *Screamadelica*. Creation Records, 1991.
- Prince, Stephen. *The Warrior's Camera: The Cinema of Akira Kurosawa*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Rackin, Phyllis. *Shakespeare and Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Rath, Eric C. *The Ethos of Noh: Actors and Their Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center/Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Richie, Donald. *The Films of Akira Kurosawa*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Riley, John. *Dmitri Shostakovich: A Life in Film*. Kinofiles Filmmakers' Companions. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2005.
- Robbins, Elizabeth. "On Seeing Madame Bernhardt's *Hamlet*." *North American Review* 171 (December 1900): 908–19.
- Rosenbaum, Ron. *The Shakespeare Wars: Clashing Scholars, Public Fiascoes, Palace Coups*. New York: Random House, 2006.
- Rothwell, Kenneth S. "Classic Film Versions of Shakespeare's Tragedies: A Mirror for the Times." In *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*, ed. Richard Dutton and Jean Elizabeth Howard. London: Blackwell, 2003.
- . *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Rowe, Katherine. "The Politics of Sleepwalking: American Lady Macbeths." In *Macbeth and Its Afterlife*, ed. Peter Holland. Shakespeare Survey 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Rutter, Carol Chillington. "Snatched Bodies: Ophelia in the Grave." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (1998): 299–319.
- Ryle, Simon. "Filming Non-space: The Vanishing Point and the Face in Brook's *King Lear*." *Literature/Film Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (2007): 140–47.
- Sagar, Keith. "King Lear in the Theatre." www.keithsagar.co.uk/ReadingShakespeare/index.html.
- Salkeld, Duncan. *Madness and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- Saunders, J. G. "'Apparent Perversities': Text and Subtext in the Construction of the Role of Edgar in Brook's Film of *King Lear*." *Review of English Studies* 47, no. 187, New Series (1996): 317–30.
- Seng, Peter J. "An Early Tune for the Fool's Song in *King Lear*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9, no. 4 (1958): 583–85.
- . *The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Shohet, Lauren. "The Banquet of Scotland (PA)." In *Macbeth and Its Afterlife*, ed. Peter Holland. Shakespeare Survey 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830–1980*. New York: Virago, 1987.
- . "Representing Ophelia: Women, Madness, and the Responsibilities of Feminist Criticism." In *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Smith, Emma, ed. *Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Stallybrass, Peter. "Macbeth and Witchcraft." In *Focus on Macbeth*, ed. John Russell Brown. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Sternfeld, F. W. *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

- Stewart, George R., Jr. "A Note on the Sleep-Walking Scene." *Modern Language Notes* 42, no. 4 (1927): 235–37.
- Stoddard, Helen. "Auteurism and Film Authorship Theory." In *Approaches to Popular Film: Popular Film and Cultural Distinctions*, ed. Joanne Hollows and Mark Jancovich. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1995.
- Stoppard, Tom. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. New York: Grove, 1991.
- Terasaki, Etsuko. *Figures of Desire: Wordplay, Spirit Possession, Fantasy, Madness, and Mourning in Japanese Noh Plays*. Ann Arbor.: University of Michigan Press, 2002.
- Tessier, Max. "Interview with Toru Takemitsu." Trans. Dorna Khazeni. *La revue du cinéma*, September 1985; reprinted in the insert booklet for *Ran*, dir. Kurosawa, Criterion Collection, 2005.
- Thomson, Virgil. *Virgil Thomson: An Autobiography*. New York: E. E. Dutton, 1966.
- Thornham, Sue, ed. *Feminist Film Theory: A Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Tonkens, Sijbold. "FilmScore Interview with Patrick Doyle." *FilmScore*. www.filmscoremonthly.com/features/sijbold3.asp.
- Torrey, Edwin Fuller, and Judy Miller. *The Invisible Plague*. Piscataway, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2001.
- Tribble, Evelyn. "'When Every Noise Appalls Me': Sound and Fear in *Macbeth* and Akira Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*." *Shakespeare* 1, no. 1 (June 2005): 75–90.
- Tynan, Kenneth. "The Actor: Tynan Interviews Olivier." *Tulane Drama Review* 11, no. 2 (1966): 71–101.
- Uéno, Yoshiko. *Hamlet and Japan*. New York: AMS Press, 1995.
- Virgil Thomson Foundation. www.virgilthomson.org/works.html.
- Wadsworth, Frank W. "'Sound and Fury': *King Lear* on Television." *Quarterly of Film Radio and Television* 8, no. 3 (1954): 254–68.
- Walker, Elsie. "A 'Harsh World' of Soundbite Shakespeare: Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000)." *EnterText* 1.2 (Spring 2001): 317–40.
- Walton, Susanna. *Behind the Façade*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Walton, William. *Hamlet*. Manuscript Score. Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
- Welles, Orson. *Macbeth* Shooting Script (Lou Lindsay). Folger Shakespeare Library, 1154 Box 11 Folder 9, June 16, 1947, R-4.
- Wellington Audio Association Inaugural Annual Report. "Bob Allen." March 2007. [www.waa.org.nz/images/WAA%20Annual%20Report%20\(2007\).pdf](http://www.waa.org.nz/images/WAA%20Annual%20Report%20(2007).pdf).
- Wells, Stanley, ed. *Shakespeare on Film and Television*. Shakespeare Survey 39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "Tom O'Bedlam's Song and *King Lear*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (1961): 311–5.
- Williams, Deanne. "Mick Jagger *Macbeth*." In *Macbeth and Its Afterlife*, ed. Peter Holland. Shakespeare Survey 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.

- Winkler, Amanda Eubanks. *O Let Us Howl Some Heavy Note: Music for Witches, the Melancholic, and the Mad on the Seventeenth-Century English Stage*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Yang, Mina. "East Meets West in the Concert Hall: Asians and Classical Music in the Century of Imperialism, Post-Colonialism, and Multiculturalism." *Asian Music* 38, no. 1 (2007): 1–30.
- Zeami Motokiyo. *Twenty Plays of the No Theatre*. Ed. Donald Keene. Trans. Susan Matsoff. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970; University of Virginia Library Electronic Text Center, etext.virginia.edu/japanese/noh/KeeSemi.html.
- Ziegler, Georgianna. "Accommodating the Virago: Nineteenth-Century Representations of Lady Macbeth." In *Shakespeare and Appropriation*, ed. Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Zwerin, Charlotte Mitchell. *Toru Takemitsu: Music for the Movies*. DVD. Kultur Video, 2007.

FILMS

- Almereyda, Michael. *Hamlet*. DVD. Miramax, 2000.
- Branagh, Kenneth. *William Shakespeare's Hamlet*. DVD. Warner Brothers, 1996.
- Brook, Peter. *King Lear*. DVD. Columbia Pictures, 2004.
- Brook, Peter, and Andrew McCullough. *King Lear*. Critics' Choice Video, 2004.
- Elliott, Michael. *King Lear*. Kultur, 1984.
- Kozintsev, Grigori. *Hamlet*. DVD. Ruscico, 2004.
- Kozintsev, Grigori. *King Lear*. DVD. Ruscico, 2004.
- Kurasawa, Akira. *Ran*. Criterion Collection, 1985.
- . *Throne of Blood*. Toho International, 1957.
- Morrisette, Billy. *Scotland, Pa.* DVD. Sundance, 2002.
- Olivier, Laurence. *Hamlet*. DVD. Carlton International Media, 1948.
- Welles, Orson. *Macbeth*. Republic Pictures, 1948. Restored version, 2000. DVD. Distributed by the BBC.
- Zeffirelli, Franco. *Hamlet*. DVD. Warner Brothers, 1990.

Index

- adaptation, 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 30, 38, 40, 50, 52, 57, 58, 60, 65, 74, 78, 82, 83, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93, 99, 105, 112, 113, 120, 122, 124, 127, 128, 133, 135, 137; for television, 73, 97, 100–2
- Allen, Bob, 107, 122
- Almereyda, Michael, 25–30, 60–63, 65, 127, 128, 129, 133
- Amleto*, 26, 131
- Annis, Francesca, 83–84, 86, 130, 136
- As You Like It*, 11, 129
- Asaji, 78–83, 90–91
- ballad, 3–4, 71–72, 119–22; “The Battle of Otterburn,” 71–72, 76; “Bonny Sweet Robin,” 37, 46, 53; “Come o’er the burn, Bessy,” 119, 122; “Robin Is to the Greenwood Gone,” 37; “Through the sharp hawthorn,” 119, 120, 121; “(To-morrow Is) Saint Valentine’s Day,” 37, 45, 46, 52, 53, 55, 57, 62; “Walsingham,” 37, 45, 46, 52, 56, 59, 60. *See also* music, folk; music, popular
- Banquo, 70, 72, 75, 78, 83, 84
- Bernhardt, Sarah, 8, 26, 38
- Bethlem (Bethlehem, Bedlam) Hospital, 2, 117
- Bonham-Carter, Helena, 54–57
- Branagh, Kenneth, 1, 23–25, 57–60, 64
- Brook, Peter, 97, 100–102, 105–8, 112–13, 122–23
- Buddhism, 79, 83, 111, 123–24
- Burwell, Carter, 28–30, 62–63, 128
- dance, 4, 49–50, 85, 109; as indicator of madness, 22; witches’, 73, 76, 77
- Doyle, Patrick, 23–25, 58, 60, 127
- Duncan, 69, 70, 74–76, 85–86, 87–89, 92
- Edgar: madness of, 3, 5, 71, 106–7, 117–25; music and, 3, 99–100, 103, 106–7, 118–19, 120–21, 122–23, 123–24; Tsurumaru as, 123–24
- Foley, 56, 102
- Freud, Sigmund, 8, 9, 30, 40, 43
- gaze, 41–44, 47–48, 57, 64
- Gesamtkunstwerk*, 11–12, 17, 49
- Gibson, Mel, 20, 22, 26, 55
- Hamlet (character): Branagh, Kenneth as, 23–25; female, 1, 8, 26, 38; Gibson, Mel as, 20, 22, 26, 55; Hawke, Ethan as, 26–28; madness

- and, 2, 3, 5, 7–30; music and, 3–4, 11–15, 16–19, 20, 21–22, 23–25, 28–30; Olivier, Laurence as, 9–15; relationship with Gertrude and, 10, 20; relationship with Ophelia and, 10, 13–14, 17, 21, 23; sexuality and, 10, 20, 23; Smoktunovsky, Innokenti as, 16–19
- Hamlet* (films), 1, 5, 8, 10, 7–30, 11–15; parodies of, 1, 4
- Hamlet* (play), 1, 9
- Hawke, Ethan, 26–28
- Hidetora, 108–12, 123–24
- Ibert, Jacques, 74–77, 91
- King James I, 70, 72, 118–19
- King Lear (character): madness and, 2, 3, 5, 97–112; music and, 101–5, 106–8, 109–12
- King Lear* (films), 1, 5, 97, 100–12
- King Lear* (play), 1, 3, 71, 97–99
- Kott, Jan, 106
- Kozintsev, Gregori, 15–19, 22, 48–54, 57, 64, 82, 102–6, 112–13, 119–22, 128
- Kurosawa, Akira, 77–83, 90, 91–92, 108–13
- Lady Macbeth: Annis, Francesca as, 83–84, 86, 130, 136; Asaji, 78–83, 90–91; madness and, 2, 3, 5, 39, 69–93, 98, 100, 127; music and, 3, 39, 71–72, 76–77, 78–81, 84–86, 87–90, 91, 127; Nolan, Jeanette as, 74, 84; parenthood and, 75, 78, 82; Pat McBeth, 86–90, 92; sexuality of, 75, 83, 87; Siddons, Sarah as, 72–73, 90, 91; suicide of, 2, 90; supernatural nature of, 70, 73, 75–76, 79–81, 85, 88, 90–91, 92; Terry, Ellen as, 72–73, 83–84, 86; Tierney, Maura as, 87–90, 92–93
- LeGros, James, 87
- Leone, Sergio, 20
- Macbeth (character), 70, 75, 76, 77, 84–86; Joe McBeth, 86, 87, 88, 89; LeGros, James as, 87; Mifune, Toshiro as, 78; Washizu, 78–79, 80–81, 82–83; Welles, Orson as, 74, 75, 76, 77
- Macbeth* (films), 1, 5, 26, 70, 72, 73, 74–93
- Macbeth* (play), 1, 70, 71, 72, 73, 78, 80, 83
- madness: Edgar and, 3, 5, 71, 106–7, 117–25; Hamlet and, 2, 3, 5, 7–30; in the early modern period, 1–4, 22, 30, 35–38, 60, 69–71, 98–100, 117–19, 121; in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, 38, 58, 59, 72; in the twentieth/twenty-first century, 26–28, 62–63, 87, 89; King Lear and, 2, 3, 5, 97–112; Lady Macbeth and, 2, 3, 5, 39, 69–93, 98, 100, 127; and music, 3–5, 11–15, 16–19, 20, 21–22, 23–25, 28–30, 36, 37–39, 40–65, 71–72, 76–77, 78–81, 84–86, 87–90, 91, 127, 101–5, 106–8, 109–12, 99–100, 103, 106–7, 118–19, 120–21, 122–23, 123–24; Ophelia and, 36, 37–39, 40–65; and women, 2, 3, 35–38, 42, 69–93. *See also* suicide
- Mahler, Gustav, 28, 109–10
- McBeth, Joe, 86, 87, 88, 89
- McBeth, Pat, 87–90, 92–93
- McCullough, Andrew, 100
- Messiaen, Olivier, 109,
- Millais, John, 39–40, 47, 54
- Moorhouse, Jocelyn, 113
- Morricone, Ennio, 20–22
- Morrisette, Billy, 86–90
- “The Mousetrap,” 4, 15, 18, 22, 27, 55, 56, 61, 62
- music: chromaticism in, 13, 15, 42, 50–51, 75–76; diegetic, 15, 21, 22, 28, 49, 62–63, 74, 79, 81–83, 85, 87–90, 103, 110–11, 127–28; experimental, 107; folk, 3–4, 71–72, 119–22; in the early modern stage,

- 4, 7, 11, 12, 36–37, 71–72, 120;
instrumentation, 21, 49, 59, 60, 75,
78, 81–82, 84, 85, 86, 106, 109, 112;
madness and, 3–5, 11–15, 16–19, 20,
21–22, 23–25, 28–30, 36, 37–39,
40–65, 71–72, 76–77, 78–81, 84–86,
87–90, 91, 99–100, 101–5, 106–8,
109–12, 118–19, 120–21, 122–24,
127; metadiegetic, 25, 30, 90, 106;
mode, 40, 44, 56, 88, 121;
nondiegetic, 11–12, 30, 62–63, 82,
84, 85–86, 87–88, 89, 104, 106, 127,
128; pastoralism in, 40, 44, 47, 48,
57; popular, 3–4, 71–72, 119–22;
serialism, 104, 112. *See also* ballad;
Sato, Masaru; Shakespeare, music in;
Shostakovich, Dmitri; Takemitsu,
Toru; Third Ear Band
- Nielsen, Asta, 1, 65
Noh, 78–83, 91, 109–11, 123
Nolan, Jeanette, 74, 84
- Olivier, Laurence, 9–15
Ophelia: as an automaton, 49–50;
Bonham-Carter, Helena as, 54–57;
directorial censorship of, 14, 38, 39,
40, 43, 44–46, 47, 48, 51, 54, 55,
56–57, 61, 63, 65; Gertrude and, 36,
37, 44, 46, 47, 52–53, 56, 57, 58, 59,
62, 63; in visual art, 39, 54; madness
and, 36, 37–39, 40–65; music and,
36, 37–39, 40–65, 72, 77, 119, 124,
127; Simmons, Jean as, 10, 42–43,
47, 54, 56; soliloquy, 43–44, 51, 55,
58, 59, 65; stage practices, 3–4,
36–38, 44; Stiles, Julia as, 60–61,
127; Terry, Ellen as, 38; Vertinskaya,
Anastasiya as, 48, 53; Winslet, Kate
as, 58, 59
- Polanski, Roman, 83–86
Polonius, 2, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25,
28–29, 35, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 50,
53, 55–56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63
- possession, 2, 3, 77, 78–80, 81, 82, 83,
90, 118–19
- Ran*, 108–14, 123–24
Royal Shakespeare Company, 26
- Sato, Masaru, 78, 79, 81, 91, 109
sexuality, 2; Edgar and, 120–21; female,
37; Hamlet and, 10, 21, 51; Lady
Macbeth and, 69, 70, 75, 83, 87, 92;
male, 35, 61, 87, 120–21; Ophelia
and, 36, 42, 45, 46, 47, 51, 52, 54,
55, 56, 57, 58
- Scotland, Pa.*, 86–90
Shakespeare: edits to, 9, 10, 12, 19, 27, 49;
madness in, 2–3, 5, 7–30, 36, 37–39,
40–65, 71, 98–99, 117, 118, 119,
120–21; music in, 4, 37, 38, 120–21
Shostakovich, Dmitri: DSCH, 104;
Hamlet (score), 16, 48–49, 50, 128;
King Lear (score), 102–3, 112, 120,
121, 128; Michelangelo Suite, 54;
serialism and, 102, 104, 112; *Sofia
Perovskaia*, 102; String Quartet No.
13, 102; String Quartet No. 15, 102;
Symphony No. 4, 50; Symphony No.
7 (“Leningrad”), 50; Symphony No.
8, 102; Symphony No. 11, 102;
Symphony No. 13 (“Babi Yar”), 102;
Symphony No. 14, 54; Symphony
No. 15, 54; tritone and, 50
- Siddons, Sarah, 72–73, 90, 91
silent film, 4, 11–12, 17, 26, 38, 39
Simmons, Jean, 10, 42–43, 47, 54, 56
Smoktunovsky, Innokenti, 16–19
Spider's Web Castle. *See Throne of Blood*
Stalin, Josef, 16, 48
Stiles, Julia, 60–61, 127
suicide, 80, 110; Hamlet and, 15, 19, 25;
Lady Macbeth and, 2, 69–70, 76, 77,
88, 90; Ophelia and, 39–40, 47, 53,
63, 69–70
- Takemitsu, Toru, 109–10, 111, 112
Terry, Ellen, 38, 72–73, 83–84, 86

- Third Ear Band, 84, 85. *See also* music, experimental
- Thomson, Virgil, 39, 73, 101
- A Thousand Acres*, 113, 130
- Throne of Blood* (*Kumonosu jô*), 77–83, 91, 109
- Tierney, Maura, 87–90, 92–93
- Troilus and Cressida*, 41
- Tsurumaru, 108, 111, 123–24
- Twelfth Night*, 105
- Vaughan Williams, Ralph, 12, 40–41
- Vertinskaya, Anastasiya, 48, 53
- vocality: Edgar and, 121; *King Lear* and, 110; *Lady Macbeth* and, 77; Ophelia and, 39, 44, 47, 52, 53, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65; witches and, 75, 81
- “Voodoo *Macbeth*,” 73–74
- Walton, William, 5, 9, 11–13, 14, 15, 17, 40–41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 127
- Washizu, 78–79, 80–81, 82–83
- Welles, Orson, 26, 73–77, 79, 83, 84, 90, 91, 92, 100, 101
- Winslet, Kate, 58, 59
- witchcraft, 3, 70, 74, 75, 76, 78, 118
- witches (weird sisters), 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 119
- Zeffirelli, Franco, 20–22, 26, 54–57, 65

About the Author

Kendra Preston Leonard is the author of *The Conservatoire Américain: A History* (Scarecrow Press, 2007). She has published her work in *Women and Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture*, *Notes*, and the *Journal of the International Alliance for Women in Music* and has presented her research regularly in scholarly journals and at conferences, including those of the American Musicological Society, the Society for American Music, the International Alliance for Women in Music, Women in French, the British Shakespeare Association, and the Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association. She was the recipient of a Visiting Fellowship at the Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library at Yale University in 2009. Her most recent work includes “‘The Future Is the Past’: Music and History in *Firefly*” in *Science Fiction/Fantasy Television and History* (McFarland, 2009), “Silencing Ophelia: Male Aurality as a Controlling Element in Olivier’s *Hamlet*,” in *Scope* (2009), and “Topsy-Turvy Victoriana: Locating Life and Death in *Corpse Bride*” in *Aether* (2009). Among her research interests are French and American musical interaction, music in film and television, and women in music.

