

SAVIOUR CATANIA

“The Beached Verge”: On Filming the Unfilmable in Grigori Kozintsev’s *Hamlet*

“But one drop of blood shed is equal to an ocean.”¹
Andrey Tarkovsky

Introduction

While much critical commentary on the filming of *Hamlet* is explicitly apprehensive of the play’s cinematic unsuitability, none is perhaps as categorically adamant about its daunting difficulties as J. Blumenthal’s belief that the tragic protagonist is unfit for film narrative: “Hamlet would be untranslatable because of the verballity of his experience.”² Indeed, even a less drastic critic like Barbara Hodgdon who readily admits that Grigori Kozintsev’s *Hamlet*³ (1964) “does achieve some of Shakespeare’s effects,”⁴ likewise emphasises its literary source’s non-visual qualities: “*Hamlet* is a ‘head play’, in that much of the action (or, rather, the questioning about whether to act and when) takes place in the imagination and is expressed primarily in language. Because of this, Hamlet’s physical role has a commanding stasis.”⁵ The echo of G. Wilson Knight’s

remark is unmistakable especially in the final epithet: “Instead of being dynamic, the force of Hamlet is, paradoxically, static.”⁶ Given this unequivocal consensus on *Hamlet* having what Robert A. Duffy calls “un-filmic tendencies,”⁷ one can easily presume that Kozintsev’s version shares with other filmed *Hamlets* the inevitable shortcomings of any such doomed attempt to film Shakespeare’s unfilmable text.

Nor are the various short reviews and articles on Kozintsev’s *Hamlet* more sympathetic to its merits. A typical example is Dwight Macdonald’s comment on its anaemic rehashing of what distinguishes its most prestigious predecessor: “The chief trouble is that it is staged in the academic style as was Olivier’s *Hamlet* (from which it has borrowed freely, as the device of having Hamlet’s soliloquies take place in his head, or rather on the sound track, a gimmick perhaps, but not a bad one; but I wish those roaring seas around the castle hadn’t also been borrowed).”⁸ In what follows I intend to explore the complex problem of filming Shakespearean monologues, but not without focusing first on the Kozintsev “borrowing” which troubles Macdonald most—the stormy seas crashing against the castle rocks. In the process I hope to demonstrate that, far from being a mere borrowing from Olivier, Kozintsev’s sea-rock setting accrues a central thematic suggestiveness that is crucial to an understanding of the Russian *Hamlet* as a Shakespearean film adaptation.[**videoclip 1**] For Kozintsev’s beach replaces Shakespeare’s castle as the location for three major sequences: the Hamlet/ghost meeting, the “To be or not to be” soliloquy, and Hamlet’s death-scene. The importance of this shift from castle to beach can hardly be exaggerated, since the interpolated beach sequences become the very means whereby Kozintsev makes Shakespeare’s “head play” think in predominantly visual images. This statement can be viewed in truer perspective through an analysis of these

three sequences beginning with Hamlet's encounter with the ghost of his father.

Lethal Fluidity: A Sea-Ghost of Mortal Billowing

Any consideration of the Hamlet/ghost meeting would reveal that its relocation from battlements to beach entails more than just a change of scene, for the interaction of seascape and phantom creates a visual network of thematically expressive links and synapses. A case in point is Kozintsev's subtle morphing of the ghost's appearance in terms of the beach setting as a means of conveying visually the hidden sickness of the body politic—the “disease [which] is not visible.”⁹ This political dimension is central to Kozintsev's interpretation of *Hamlet*, since for him Shakespeare's play is pivoted on the poison of politics: “the infection was injected not only in the bloodstream of the rightful king of Denmark but also into the circulatory system of society. Everything was infected.”¹⁰ Consequently, Kozintsev creates images oozing political poison. Consider, for instance, just one Kozintsev detail, the ghost's cape, and how it undulates like a wave.[**videoclip 2**] By shooting the beach phantom in slow motion, Kozintsev accentuates the cloak's fluidity, thereby hinting visually that what Hamlet confronts is a spirit of the billowing sort—one that casts its billowy pall over the whole of Elsinore. For Kozintsev's phantom billows its Shakespearean “blasts from hell”¹¹ through every fabric in the realm, from the dead king's black banners to the dying Claudius's exotic tapestries. Nor are Gertrude's fatal hangings or Ophelia's mourning veil spared these unheavenly airs. As Jack J. Jorgens notes: “Billowing cloth is continually linked in the film with death.”¹²

What should be stressed, however, is that such mortal billowing has its origin in the beach's *genius loci*. For Kozintsev, not content with simply making the ghost less “a

spirit of health [than] goblin damn'd" (1, 4, 40), endeavours to render its unhealthiness quintessentially Shakespearean by creating his version of Horatio's phantom of the sea-abysse—one whose undulating movement rightly reeks of the deadly "cliff [...] flood" (1, 4, 69-70). Consequently, Kozintsev's billowing fabrics accrue deep watery associations: they signify, in fact, a specific kind of death—the liquid one that their billowing subtly suggests. Dying of lethal liquid, Kozintsev's royal victim returns in ghostly shape as a billowing emissary of the sea of death. The billowing cloth connection which the director establishes with Ophelia is thus proleptic of her death by drowning and, in the case of Gertrude and Claudius, of their own death by liquid poison. What he visualises through the billowing cloth motif, with its suggestion of a lethal fluidity, is the Shakespearean concern with images of fluid death. The imagery of liquefaction looms large in *Hamlet* whether in the Gravedigger's tanner speech (5, 1, 164-66) or Hamlet's first soliloquy. Indeed, what Hamlet initially soliloquises about is his suicidal lust to liquefy his life: "O that this too too sullied flesh would melt, / Thaw and resolve itself into a dew..." (1, 2, 129-30). Kozintsev could have hardly conceived a more thematically apt beginning than that of having Hamlet gallop into the film with his cape fluttering in the wind. Since this image functions ominously as a premonition of the beach phantom, its implication is that Hamlet seems to be riding the crest of the latter's billowing breath spurning him on to a poison death. As Kozintsev says: "Poison brings this story to a close. And poison begins it."¹³

In no way, of course, should this imply that Kozintsev interprets literally Shakespeare's imagery of poisonous fluidity. "Other poison," he says, "of far greater potency has long destroyed the spiritual organism."¹⁴ Or again: "Spiritual leprosy was caused by the microbe of careerism."¹⁵ So, just as Jan Kott's politics penetrate theatrical

costumes to reach the “anxiety and sensibility” beneath, so do Kozintsev’s manipulate the beach ghost of poisonous billowing as a way of attaining what he calls “inner action.”¹⁶

What the core of *Elsinore* discloses is a court dissolving into nothing. Hence the aptness of the billowing death theme: banners, cloaks, veils, sails, tapestries—everything seems as vacuous as the wind. Just as Shakespeare reduces rotten Denmark to the “quintessence of dust” (2, 2, 308), Kozintsev conveys an analogous *angst* by focusing on what can be termed the “windy suspiration”(1, 2, 79) of a dying state. It is a measure of Kozintsev’s achievement as film adapter to have created out of the billowing ghost image such an intricate network of recurrent visual imagery rooted in Shakespearean allusions and resonances. Once Kozintsev appropriates Horatio’s sea-ghost image, he develops it into a reiterative means whereby he can transform the play into a film.

It is essential, however, to state that Kozintsev’s interest in Horatio’s sea-wraith has profound roots in Russian theatre.¹⁷ That Vsevolod Meyerhold’s unstaged *Hamlet*, with its humanised vision of the ghost as a shivering sea-phantom, appealed greatly to Kozintsev is quite evident from his *King Lear* diary.¹⁸ However Kozintsev, refraining from domesticising the humanness of the Meyerholdian spectre, supplies him with no Tarkovsky handkerchief to wipe the “still seeping”¹⁹ poison. Instead, though clearly moved by Meyerhold’s *emploi* notion of the ghost as a Pantalone of the frozen shore,²⁰ Kozintsev opts for a ghostly apparition reeking of inscrutability. It is meaningful to note that, when comparing V. Yegorov’s and Edward Gordon Craig’s wildly divergent sketches for the set design of Constantin Stanislavsky’s 1911 *Hamlet* production at the Moscow Art Theatre, Kozintsev focuses on the unearthliness of Craig’s concept: “You would not have found any history or geography in Craig’s sketches. There was no ‘place of action’ or ‘epoch’: they

all expressed one and the same thing—mystery.”²¹ This sense of mystery which Kozintsev finds missing in Yegorov’s sketches is another crucial reason behind his decision to exchange Shakespeare’s battlements for a Meyerholdian beach whose Craig-like properties would make it possible to delve filmically deeper into the supernatural event which Horatio describes as “wondrous strange” (1, 5, 172).

In “Questionable Shape”: The Speculative Spatiality of Phantomland

Significantly, what attracts Jorgens’s attention in Kozintsev’s beach-phantom sequence is its spatial strangeness: its “perspectives are confused,” Jorgens says, because “we expect that it will be Hamlet who will move below in the foreground and the ghost who will be high up and distant.”²² Reversing such understandable audience expectations, Kozintsev creates, however, a cinematic spatiality weirder than Jorgens describes it: a reversed reversal that confuses us even further. This occurs through Kozintsev never showing Hamlet descending from among the arches towering above the phantom; instead he suddenly cuts to Hamlet on the surging beach looking up at the phantom, now unaccountably looming high above him. A previous cut makes things even more perplexing, since it shows the phantom stalking in the opposite direction. **[videoclip 3]** Such unexpected results jolt us into an awareness of these two cuts, for they disrupt what the French realist André Bazin would call the scene’s “spatial unity”²³ or structural continuum in order to establish their own spatially warped substitute. The beach-phantom sequence, as Kozintsev conceives it, transcends his notion of cinematic space as an imaginary one, a kind of spatiality which, he says, “one can create [...] by speculation.”²⁴

What Kozintsev creates here is the speculative spatiality of a phantom dimension. Hence the more disquieting dislocation within that shot of the camera panning past Hamlet, seemingly to the further reaches of the shore, but only apparently so—for suddenly the ghost’s outstretched arm irrupts into the frame from behind and above Hamlet to appropriate the beach location. **[videoclip 4]** Kozintsev’s moving camera does not retain a dramatic spatial continuity, thereby transforming even on-screen spatiality into an area of uncertainty. Barbara Leaming remarks that Kozintsev’s initial shot of the castle as a watery reflection without a physical embodiment plunges us into a “cinematic space of the unknown and the unknowable”²⁵; and true enough her observation finds its most expressive extension in the beach-phantom sequence.²⁶

Still, this is only half the point; for Kozintsev’s beach location accrues through such shadowy spatiality a spatial weirdness equivalent to that of Shakespeare’s battlements. The Shakespearean castle of Elsinore is, in fact, no less bizarre than its Inverness counterpart for, as in *Macbeth*, space here becomes a vortex where time fragments. Significantly, it is on the ramparts that midnight paradoxically strikes without striking. Marcellus claims that it has struck, but neither Hamlet nor Horatio seems to have heard it (1, 4, 3-4). It is through such contradictory statements that Shakespeare builds his oxymoronic battlements, leaving them eerily tottering on a gaping temporal hole. Hence Hamlet’s cry, “The time is out of joint” (1, 5, 196). However, just as time is disjointed in Shakespeare, so is space in Kozintsev. Kozintsev resorts to disjunctive editing in the beach-phantom sequence to spatialise, and hence to render in concrete visual images, Shakespeare’s verbal concern with temporal disjointedness in *Hamlet*. His beach-phantom sequence is in this respect a cinematic example of what the Russian formalist Viktor

Shklovsky calls *ostranemie*, the aesthetic process of “defamiliarising [or] estranging” objects.²⁷ Kozintsev estranges the beach location by defamiliarising it in the Shklovskian sense of “making it strange,”²⁸ and once more visually to evoke key Shakespearean themes in *Hamlet*.

This is also quite apparent in the way Kozintsev integrates the strangeness of both the beach and its visitant. Consider, once again, how he handles the ghost’s physical appearance. He follows Shakespeare in presenting the ghost as Horatio describes him to Hamlet: “Armed at point exactly, cap-à-pie” (1, 2, 200). Moreover, Kozintsev graces the ghost with a Meyerholdian feature: a pair of profoundly sad eyes that recall Meyerhold’s moving vision of the Shakespearean phantom as “a ghost on whose cheek a tear of gratitude freezes.”²⁹ However, Shakespeare’s military phantom has a similar countenance, for Horatio describes its facial expression as being “more in sorrow than in anger” (1, 2, 230). Through Meyerhold’s influence, then, and the discovery at the Hermitage of an ambiguous face of “proud suffering”³⁰ forged on a steel helmet, Kozintsev creates an ambivalent phantom of Shakespearean martial sadness. It is through this paradoxical physiognomy that Kozintsev creates in analogous visual terms the baffling nature of what Hamlet defines as the ghost’s “questionable shape” (1, 4, 43). However, this is equally true of the beach location where Kozintsev invokes the apparition; for as we have seen, the shape of the beach’s spatiality is no less questionable. Both ghost and beach are intermeshed aspects of a material reality which Kozintsev defamiliarises in order to capture the Shakespearean mystery he admired in Craig’s *Hamlet* sketches. Kozintsev’s haunted beach is illogical spatiality itself: an attempt to chart in cinematic terms that which lies beyond Hamlet’s ken: “The undiscover’d country, from whose bourn / No traveller returns

[...]” (3, 1, 79-80). It is necessary at this point that we consider the thematic aptness of Kozintsev’s decision to exchange once again a Shakespearean location within the castle for this beach and make it a locus for the “To be or not to be” soliloquy.

On “Lethe Wharf” in Static Action: The Geography of Metaphysical Paralysis

It is quite reasonable to assume that Kozintsev’s relocation of Hamlet’s existential soliloquy to the haunted beach could have been inspired by its vision of life as “a sea of troubles” (3, 1, 59). Admittedly, Shakespeare’s sea metaphor could have provided Kozintsev with the solution to his major problem about the soliloquy setting having to “reveal the link between the hero’s spiritual life and the material world.”³¹ Still Kozintsev, striving for what Charles Eidsvik evocatively calls the “sight [of] insight,”³² transcends the mere illustration of Shakespearean imagery by transforming the beach location into Hamlet’s inner landscape. For Hamlet, in fact, land’s end becomes synonymous with life’s edge. Kozintsev’s Hamlet recalls in this respect Shakespeare’s Timon whose spiritual crisis likewise manifests in terms of a figure pitched on a “beached verge.”³³ Consequently, though Kozintsev changes Shakespeare’s Hamlet into a beach wanderer he still preserves his essence as a philosophical borderer perilously perched on the edge between life and death—but he reworks this border state in terms of a defamiliarised beach edge analogous in its disjunctive spatiality to Shakespeare’s time-warped battlements. The transition from castle to beach is therefore anything but gratuitous. On the contrary, by its disjunctiveness, Kozintsev’s beach border becomes a powerful means whereby “the undiscover’d country” obsessing Hamlet could be filmically glimpsed.

Consider, for example, that moment when Kozintsev first pans with Hamlet leaving frame right, and then cuts to pan with him again entering frame left.[**videoclip 6**] Such a juxtaposition of two panning movements, while suggesting by its integrated fluidity an unbroken spatial continuity, concurrently affirms by its pivotal cut and the diametrically opposed exit from and entrance into the frame that this is also a broken space, and visually opaque. The suggestion is of an oxymoronic dimension where, since left and right can be bizarrely interchanged, the strolling Hamlet remains rooted to the same place. The effect Kozintsev conveys is of a spaceless space that renders Hamlet's wandering ultimately static. It is through its paradoxical spatiality that Kozintsev's beach is made to embody Hamlet's metaphysical paralysis. Hedged between the contraries of life and death, Hamlet fulfils the ghost's prophetic words by becoming an inert watery plant:

And duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed
That roots itself in ease on Lethe wharf,
Wouldst thou not stir in this... (1, 5, 32-34)

Viewing life, as it were, from Charon's skiff, Hamlet is a living dead thing, hence the antithetical geography of Kozintsev's beach where surging waves ritually flow in and ebb away. By their suggestion of motion in stasis, the seesaw waves embody Hamlet's personality as Knight interprets it, "wavering, oscillating."³⁴ On Kozintsev's beach then, Hamlet treads on what Jacques Derrida labels in his essay on the ghostliness of *Hamlet* "the virtual space of spectrality"³⁵—a territory of existential antitheses where Hamlet's walk becomes the stroll of an essentially static soul.

Rather than reflecting Hamlet's spiritual sickness, Kozintsev's beach partakes of it both spatially and elementally, and to such an extent that it becomes its actual embodiment.

This is a crucial point, for as Blumenthal cogently argues: “it is not enough that...thoughts can be photographed; photographing them must bring them to life.”³⁶ However, contrary to Blumenthal’s own expectations that such a process would be filmically impossible with *Hamlet*, this is exactly how Kozintsev handles cinematically the beach location. For Kozintsev’s beach is fundamentally a reworking of what T. S. Eliot finds lacking in *Hamlet*, the “objective correlative”³⁷ which Kozintsev senses in the “Lethe wharf” image. Out of Shakespeare’s soporific Hades river, Kozintsev moulds a beach of paradoxes, where waves of inert energy help him film the unfilmable: Hamlet in static action. Much as Akira Kurosawa does with the *Macbeth* wood in *Kumonosu-jo* (Toho, 1957), which Kozintsev considers “the finest of Shakespearean movies,”³⁸ Kozintsev transforms the beach into the essence of his film. The beach is the space of Hamlet’s and the ghost’s tragedy, and hence the landscape of their being.

Sights of Insight: Hamlet as a *Rückenfigur*

The aesthetic principle underlying Kozintsev’s choice of setting for the “To be or not to be” soliloquy is now more clearly understandable. For the essential problem of Shakespearean monologues on film, as Kozintsev evidently sees it, is not ultimately a question of whether to retain them wholly or partially, nor of whether they are spoken or voiced-over. More crucially, Kozintsev sees it as being essentially a problem of code-breaking, since he conceives Shakespearean soliloquies as “scenes in code.”³⁹ This is an intriguing concept, since what Kozintsev sees as being coded in a Shakespearean soliloquy is the clue to “the thought behind the whole tragedy.”⁴⁰ Hence his definition of the Shakespearean soliloquy as “an entrance into...the essence of the action.”⁴¹ Only by cracking the soliloquy code can

one open the door to Shakespearean perception or what Kozintsev calls “the way to the interior.”⁴² For Kozintsev then, direction becomes detection: “You have to try out a multitude of hypotheses until the main clue has been found.”⁴³ Worth mentioning is that Kozintsev settled for the beach as the setting for the “To be or not to be” soliloquy after experimenting with various other locations.⁴⁴ His choice was finally determined by his belief that the rocky Crimean beach could be made to embody and partake of the metaphysical issues at stake. The soliloquy setting, like any other film setting for that matter, should therefore become, quoting Blumenthal again, “both the battleground where the conflict rages and the very incitement to conflict.”⁴⁵ Hamlet’s beach trek is nothing less than a confrontation with his solitary self. Kozintsev’s Hamlet brings to mind the *Rückenfigur* of Caspar David Friedrich’s painting *Monk by the Sea* (1809-10).⁴⁶ Like Friedrich’s loner, Hamlet is often a figure caught from behind whose gaze away from the viewer and into the horizon or the rocks transforms the beach scenes into seascapes of interiority.[**videoclip 7**] That sight connotes insight in the film is attested by Kozintsev’s own admission that his real preoccupation during the filming of the “To be or not to be” soliloquy was “to link the rhythm of the cine-camera’s movements with the main character’s train of thought.”⁴⁷ In fact, what Kozintsev’s camera captures in its movement is Hamlet’s spiritual aloneness.

For Kozintsev’s is a world where Hamlet wanders for the most part lonely in a crowd. Significantly, there is a dire need in Kozintsev’s Hamlet to return to the rocky beach whose comfort he seeks in his death-scene. Admittedly, Horatio does accompany the dying Hamlet to the beach, but the focus is not their relationship. Kozintsev’s interest lies in considering Hamlet as a figure apart. Arm outstretched, in explicit evocation of the beach

phantom, Hamlet clutches the rocky surface. It is a probing gesture, a variant of Hamlet's meditation on the looming rock in the "To be or not to be" sequence. Again, just as Hamlet's gaze into this rock is hidden from us, so is his last look into the seascape, for in both cases he remains a *Rückenfigur* whose contemplative stare we can view mostly from behind and/or at a distance. Hence the expedient of hardly ever showing close-ups of Hamlet. The beach-death sequence synthesises the visionary essence of earlier seascapes, and thus accrues their "inner dynamism,"⁴⁸ that aesthetic quality Kozintsev admired in Kurosawa's *Macbeth* adaptation. Consider as a final example how Kozintsev hints at Hamlet's spiritual immersion into the boundless ocean through the reiteration of that crucial image of the castle's watery reflection. Kozintsev could have hardly imagined a more fitting ending for his *Hamlet* than this image of liquid disembodiment—for it is through pondering on imponderable seascapes that his tragic hero reaches out for something infinite.

The beach sequences are the heart of Kozintsev's *Hamlet*, the ones that make most apparent the reason behind Kozintsev's choice of the Sovscope epic 75mm film format. As Bernice W. Kliman observes, "The visual expansiveness of frames filled with sea provide little means to grasp the extent of the image."⁴⁹ But this is exactly the effect Kozintsev wanted. By making us see less, the more he expands the image, the more Kozintsev makes us share intimately Hamlet's incomprehension of the illimitable. Kozintsev's *Hamlet* is an intimate revelation of a dark mind of epic proportions. To rephrase Shakespeare, Kozintsev presents us with "a king of infinite space...bounded in a nutshell" (2, 2, 254-255). The key to Kozintsev's achievement as film adapter of *Hamlet* is evidently this ability to visualise analogously Shakespeare's paradoxical verballity.

Notes

- ¹ Andrey Tarkovsky, *Time within Time: The Diaries, 1970-1986* (London: Faber, 1994), 379.
- ² J. Blumenthal, "Macbeth into Throne of Blood," *Sight and Sound* 34.3 (1965), 195.
- ³ Grigori Kozintsev, dir. *Hamlet (Gamlet)*. Perf. Innokenti Smoktunovski, Michail Nazwanov, Eliza Radzin-Szolkonis, Anastasia Vertinskaya. Videocassette. Castle Hendring (HEN 2211).
- ⁴ Barbara Hodgdon, "'The Mirror up to Nature': Notes on Kozintsev's *Hamlet*," *Comparative Drama* 9.4 (1975), 310.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, 309.
- ⁶ G. Wilson Knight, *The Wheel of Fire: Interpretations of Shakesperian Tragedy* (1930; rpt. London: Methuen, 1983), 41.
- ⁷ Robert A. Duffy, "Gade, Olivier, Richardson: Visual Strategy in *Hamlet* Adaptation," *Literature/Film Quarterly* 4.2 (1976), 142.
- ⁸ Dwight Macdonald, "Hamlet," in *Focus on Shakespearean Films*, Charles W. Eckert, ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 149.
- ⁹ Grigori Kozintsev, *Shakespeare: Time and Conscience*, trans. Joyce Vining (London: Dennis Dobson, 1967), 138.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 170.
- ¹¹ William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Arden Shakespeare, Harold Jenkins, ed. (London: Methuen, 1982). 1, 4, 41. Subsequent references to this edition are given after quotations in the text.
- ¹² Jack J. Jorgens, "Image and Meaning in the Kozintsev *Hamlet*," *Literature/Film Quarterly* 1.4 (1973), 309.
- ¹³ Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 170.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 169.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 170.
- ¹⁶ Kozintsev, *King Lear: The Space of Tragedy*, trans. Mary Mackintosh (London: Heinemann, 1977), 10.
- ¹⁷ Another possible source of the Kozintsev beach phantom was suggested to me by Judith Buchanan in her plenary lecture on the Rodolfi-Ruggeri silent *Amleto* (1917) at the recent Globe 'Hamlet on Screen' Conference (28 April 2001).
- ¹⁸ See Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 106.
- ¹⁹ Tarkovsky, 381.
- ²⁰ I am using the term 'emploi' in the Meyerholdian sense of the internalised individualisation of a dramatic role's traditional significance; see also Vsevolod Meyerhold, *Meyerhold on Theatre*, trans. Edward Braun (London: Methuen, 1969), 279-80.
- ²¹ Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 135.
- ²² Jack J. Jorgens, *Shakespeare on Film* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), 231.
- ²³ André Bazin, *What is Cinema?* Vol. 1, trans. Hugh Gray (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 50.
- ²⁴ Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 80.
- ²⁵ Barbara Leaming, *Grigori Kozintsev* (Boston: Twayne, 1980), 112.
- ²⁶ For the notion of dislocating filmic spaces, I am also indebted to David Bordwell's perceptive analysis of *Vampyr* in *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 93-116.
- ²⁷ See Viktor Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, eds. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965), 3-24.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹ Meyerhold, 280.
- ³⁰ Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 264.
- ³¹ Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 114.
- ³² Charles Eidsvik, "Thought in Film: The Case of Kozintsev's *Hamlet*," *West Virginia Philological Papers*, 26 (1980), 82.
- ³³ William Shakespeare, *Timon of Athens*, ed. H.J. Oliver (London: Methuen, Arden Edition, 1963), 5,1, 215.

-
- ³⁴ Knight, 41.
- ³⁵ Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (London: Routledge, 1994), 11.
- ³⁶ Blumenthal, 191.
- ³⁷ T.S. Eliot, *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (London: Methuen, 1920; rpt. 1960), 100.
- ³⁸ Kozintsev, *Shakespeare*, 29.
- ³⁹ Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 34.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ⁴¹ Ibid.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ Ibid.
- ⁴⁴ For detailed information on Kozintsev's experiments with these locations see Ibid., 114-15.
- ⁴⁵ Blumenthal, 191.
- ⁴⁶ For a filmic *Rückenfigur* prefiguring Kozintsev's Hamlet, see Angela Dalle Vacche's insightful comments on the Ellen/beach sequence in F.W. Murnau's *Nosferatu* in *Cinema and Painting* (London: Athlone Press, 1996), 171-78.
- ⁴⁷ Kozintsev, *King Lear*, 115.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., 11.
- ⁴⁹ Bernice W. Kliman, *Hamlet: Film, Television, and Audio Performance* (Madison, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1988), 90.