Recreating Hamlet in Cinema

A Comparative Analysis of Laurence Olivier, Kenneth Branagh, and Michael Almerida's Adaptations

Khosro Sina[1], Neda Saidi[2]

Introduction

William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* stands as a cornerstone of the Western literary canon and remains one of the most frequently adapted and reinterpreted texts in the history of global cinema. With its rich psychological complexity, philosophical depth, and political undertones, *Hamlet* has continuously invited filmmakers to reshape it for their own times and mediums. This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of three pivotal cinematic adaptations: Laurence Olivier's *Hamlet* (1948), Kenneth Branagh's *Hamlet* (1996), and Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000). Each of these adaptations represents a unique vision and ideological stance, responding to the historical, cultural, and technological contexts in which they were produced.

Rather than treating these films as mere reproductions of Shakespeare's text, this research examines them as interpretive acts that engage in a dynamic dialogue with the source material and with the dominant discourses of their respective eras. The analysis focuses particularly on the shifting representations of power, identity, and surveillance across these three adaptations. These thematic axes serve to illuminate how cinematic form becomes a vehicle for critical commentary on contemporary society. As the study argues, each adaptation is not just a retelling but a cultural artifact, articulating specific anxieties, aspirations, and ideological investments. By situating the films within a theoretical framework that includes intertextuality,

1. Assistant Professor, Cinema Dept., Faculty of Art and Architecture, Kurdistan University, Sanandaj, Iran.   khosro.sina@uok.ac.ir
2. Ph.D. candidate in Communication Sciences, Department of Communication Sciences, North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran   nedasaidi@gmail.com

discourse analysis, and adaptation theory, this paper demonstrates the capacity of *Hamlet* to function as a discursive mirror through which successive generations have examined themselves.

Methods

This study adopts a qualitative and comparative methodology, grounded in three principal theoretical frameworks. First, the research applies Eneste's theory of cinematic ecranisation, which categorizes adaptation changes into reduction, addition, and transformation. This approach allows for the systematic identification of structural and narrative deviations in each film compared to the original play. By analyzing these deviations, the study gains insight into how form and content are shaped by medium-specific constraints and artistic choices.

Second, the concept of intertextuality, as formulated by Julia Kristeva and expanded by Robert Stam, is employed to explore the network of textual and cultural references embedded within each adaptation. This includes both vertical intertextuality (with the source text and previous adaptations) and horizontal intertextuality (with contemporary cultural texts, genres, and ideologies).

Third, the study draws on Michel Foucault's discourse analysis, particularly his theories on power, identity construction, and surveillance mechanisms. By examining how these Foucauldian categories are visualized and reconfigured in the films, the research illuminates their socio-political functions. Finally, Linda Hutcheon's theory of adaptation as social action provides a meta-framework for understanding adaptation as a culturally situated, ideologically loaded practice. These combined methodologies allow for a comprehensive reading that transcends textual fidelity and instead emphasizes cultural function.

Findings / Results

The comparative analysis reveals striking divergences in how each adaptation conceptualizes *Hamlet*, not only narratively but also ideologically and aesthetically. Olivier's *Hamlet* (1948), created in the immediate aftermath of World War II, is marked by a somber, introspective tone. It omits much of the political intrigue present in the play, notably the subplot involving Fortinbras, and focuses instead

on Hamlet's internal psychological turmoil. Influenced by German Expressionism, the film employs stark lighting, deep shadows, and claustrophobic compositions to mirror Hamlet's fractured psyche. Freudian subtexts—particularly the Oedipal dynamics between Hamlet and Gertrude—are foregrounded, aligning the film with postwar anxieties around trauma, repression, and identity dissolution. The film's minimalist set design and monochrome palette further emphasize existential isolation and emotional paralysis.

In contrast, Branagh's *Hamlet* (1996) restores the full text of Shakespeare's play, presenting an unabridged, four-hour spectacle in lavish 19th-century costuming and décor. Unlike Olivier's inward turn, Branagh's adaptation is expansive and overtly political. Set in an opulent palace replete with mirrors and reflective surfaces, the mise-en-scène symbolizes both the grandeur and the duplicity of monarchical power. Branagh's Hamlet is a political actor as much as a philosophical one—an agent of disruption against a decaying elite. The use of flashbacks, dynamic camera movements, and a fast-paced editing rhythm contribute to a cinematic style that is both theatrical and modern. Branagh's adaptation resonates with late-20th-century disillusionment with authority, power structures, and historical narrative itself.

Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000), set in contemporary New York City, radically recontextualizes the play within the framework of digital capitalism and surveillance culture. Here, Denmark is a multinational corporation, and Claudius is its CEO. The royal court is transformed into a media empire, and Hamlet becomes a digital filmmaker who documents, edits, and broadcasts his inner turmoil. Traditional forms of royal espionage are replaced by closed-circuit television, handheld cameras, and security footage, invoking Foucault's panopticism and Zuboff's surveillance capitalism. Identity, in this adaptation, is no longer stable or introspective but fluid, performative, and mediated through screens. The fragmentation of self, the ambiguity of truth, and the loss of historical continuity are central concerns, aligning the film with cyberpunk aesthetics and postmodern epistemologies.

Together, these adaptations reveal that power in *Hamlet* evolves from a divine and patriarchal order (Olivier) to political and institutional manipulation (Branagh) to technocratic and algorithmic control (Almereyda). Identity, likewise, shifts from an internalized psychological struggle to a politicized public role, and finally to a

digitized, performative construct. Surveillance morphs from human observation to ideological spectacle to technological omnipresence. Each film thus not only reinterprets *Hamlet* but also reframes its themes to interrogate their own historical moments.

Discussion & Conclusion

The findings affirm that cinematic adaptations of *Hamlet* serve not merely as aesthetic projects but as socially embedded discursive interventions. Using Hutcheon's model of adaptation as social action, the study argues that each film mobilizes *Hamlet* as a vehicle for ideological critique and cultural self-reflection.

Olivier's postwar *Hamlet* grapples with the psychological aftermath of conflict and the collapse of old moral orders. It translates the existential despair of the mid-20th century into a visual and narrative language of isolation and inner fragmentation. By omitting political complexity, the film redirects focus toward the individual subject, aligning with a period marked by trauma, uncertainty, and moral rebuilding.

Branagh's adaptation, on the other hand, functions as a grand historical allegory for the disillusionment of the post-Cold War world. In its political grandiosity and stylistic maximalism, it echoes anxieties around leadership, truth, and institutional corruption. The return to textual fidelity in this version becomes, paradoxically, a means of asserting interpretive control and reclaiming cultural authority amidst global ideological flux.

Almereyda's *Hamlet* stages a radical departure not only in content but in cinematic language. It reflects the epistemic shift of the 21st century—marked by information overload, media saturation, and loss of ontological certainties. Hamlet's soliloquies become video diaries, and action unfolds through mediated lenses, suggesting that in the age of digital reproduction, identity and truth are perpetually deferred. The film's intertextuality with cyberpunk cinema (e.g., *Blade Runner*, *The Matrix*) further situates it within a genealogy of technological skepticism.

This study underscores the capacity of *Hamlet* to serve as a cultural palimpsest—constantly rewritten to speak to the ideological needs and technological vocabularies of each era. The adaptations analyzed herein reveal not only the resilience of Shakespeare's text but also the dynamism of film as a medium for historical commentary. They demonstrate that adaptation is not about fidelity but

about functionality—how texts are retooled to engage contemporary audiences in critical dialogue.

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of these three adaptations illustrates that *Hamlet* on screen is never just Shakespeare; it is always Shakespeare refracted through the lenses of psychology, politics, and media. These films constitute a historiography of adaptation—each rewriting the Prince of Denmark to interrogate the world that remade him.

Keywords: Hamlet, film adaptation, comparative analysis, intertextuality, discourse analysis, adaptation as social action

References

Baral, M. (2024). "Shakespeare on Screen: A Cinematic Exploration of Laurence Olivier's 1948 Hamlet Adaptation." *Journal of Film Studies,* 36: 2, pp. 677-89. https://doi.org/10.3126/litstud.v37i1.63010

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and Simulation.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Blade Runner (1982). Directed by Ridley Scott. United States: Warner Bros.

Cartmell, D. (2018). "Re-Imagining Hamlet: Global Cinema and the Politics of Adaptation." *Shakespeare Studies,* 42:1, pp. 199-217. https://doi.org/10.3126/litstud.v37i1.63010

Cook, P. J. (2011). *Cinematic Hamlet: The Films of Olivier, Zeffirelli, Branagh, and Almereyda.* Ohio University Press.

Eisenstein, S. (2019). *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory.* Edited and Translated by J. Leyda, New York: Harcourt.

Eneste, P. (1991). *Cinematic Entextualization Theory.* Jakarta: Gramedia.

Fiorato, M. (2017). "Performing through Forms: Hamlet in Olivier and Branagh's Films." *Shakespearean Performance Journal,* 29: 3, pp. 120-138.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Translated by A. Sheridan, New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977.* Edited by C. Gordon, New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1982). *The Subject and Power.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and Its Discontents.* Translated by J. Strachey, London: Hogarth Press.

Hamlet (1948). Directed by Laurence Olivier. United Kingdom: Two Cities Films.

Hamlet (1996). Directed by Kenneth Branagh. United Kingdom/United States: Castle Rock Entertainment.

Hamlet (2000). Directed by Michael Almereyda. United States: Miramax Films.

Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation.* New York: Routledge.

Hutcheon, L. (2022). *Adaptation as Social Action.* New York: Routledge.

Kranz, D. L., & Mellerski, N. C. (Eds.). (2008). *In/Fidelity: Essays on Film Adaptation.* Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art.* Translated by T. Gora, New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1986). "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (pp. 34-61). Columbia University Press.

McDougal, S. (2018). *Shakespeare and Cinema: Adaptations and Transformations.* New York: Routledge.

Minority Report (2002). Directed by Steven Spielberg. United States: 20th Century Fox.

Murray, T. (2021). *Shakespearean Adaptations and Political Allegories.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

The Matrix (1999). Directed by Lana & Lilly Wachowski. United States: Warner Bros.

Putri, R. T. (2021). *An Analysis of Ecranisation Process of Intrinsic Elements in Novel to Film "Five Feet Apart" by Rachael Lippincott.* Universitas Negeri Medan. Ph.D. dissertation. https://doi.org/10.5195/cinej.2024.639

Sanders, J. (2019). "Postwar Cinema and the Psychological Hamlet: A Study of Olivier's 1948 Film." *Cinematic Shakespeare,* 15: 2, pp. 82-99. https://doi.org/10.3126/litstud.v37i1.63010

Turkle, S. (2023). "Always-on/Always-on-You: The Tethered Self." In *Social Theory Re-Wired* (pp. 485-495). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003320609-64

Zuboff, S. (2020). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* New York: Public Affairs.