Relevance of Shakespeare for film–adaptations from 'then' to 'now': a study

Ritu Mohan

Contact

Rao Pahlad Singh College of Engineering and Technology, India
rmbairagi@gmail.com

Abstract

Shakespeare is likely the single playwright whose writings have been most frequently adapted for the big screen. Shakespeare films as a genre originated from the several directors who have brought his plays to the big screen across the years. Shakespeare is well-known around the world because he addresses common human emotions including enmity, rage, love, and envy. His "themes" are universally adaptable to any language, nation, or culture. Shakespeare's history in film, from the silent age to the present, has, after all, been in the search for the finest ways to extend Shakespeare's brilliance into unexplored seas by integrating the verbal with the visual imagination. Without a question, several of these films succeed in giving both beginner and seasoned viewers more than a passing glance at Shakespeare's stories and characters. According to a research on Shakespeare's reception in international cinema, all of these adaptation and appropriation processes are "sub-sets" of the greater field of influence, reception, and intertextual studies. In a diverse and ever-evolving cultural mosaic, all cinematic representations convey the same message. The current study attempts to answer certain questions within this framework, such as why Shakespeare is still relevant in popular culture. When there is so much contemporary literature that may be adapted, why is he still relevant in global cinema? Why are his creations admired and enduring all throughout the world?

1. Introduction

Shakespeare's works are a vital part of the world's literary heritage having a distinctive universal appeal. Shakespeare didn't spend his life in libraries but in the streets of London for he was concerned with the

aesthetics of life. His plays, instead of being temporal, ascertained timeless and become the indistinguishable part of lingua franca from context to context and genre to genre. All generations and cultures therefore have their own reasons for liking Shakespeare. In the era of globalization, Shakespeare's cultural capital has experienced an invigorating transformation. No matter how many forms Shakespeare and his plays have taken over the centuries and across the globe, Shakespeare appears as the founder of the culture and the carrier of the civilization. Tracing the facts which are evident in these discussions, Shakespeare clearly remains an important part of our lives. But while these debates can reveal how Shakespeare is deployed across the socio-political spectrum, they also offer a chance to interrogate the mode of his entry into our world.

In this context, Farzand, Mariyam of Forman Christian College in her article "Shakespearean Tragedy: An Exploration" opines:

> As we continue to study and appreciate the works of Shakespeare, we are reminded of the timeless relevance of his tragedies. Whether it be in the realms of ambition, jealousy, or the consequences of feuds, Shakespeare's exploration of these themes continue to resonate with audiences, serving as a testament to the enduring power of English literature. Shakespearean literature is not merely relics of the past; it is living work that continues to engage, provoke, and inspire readers and audiences around the world (2023).

The question of how Shakespeare becomes part of our lives is fundamentally related to the question of what he does for us once he is there – the manner of his entrance affects the role he plays in our debates. Once we start to look at Shakespeare's presence in today's world, it becomes clear that we know him through the performance of his plays, whether on film, on stage or in the classroom. All this shows the popularity of Shakespeare's characters in local habitations because the study and experience of Shakespeare on stage leads to a better understanding of the plays; the meaning embedded in the text can come to life and reach out and touch everyone. The recent glut of Shakespeare in global culture, and the media's reaction to it, suggest that the prevailing desire to understand his works as a source of universal and timeless wisdom overlooks the more interesting lesson about how popular culture has currently chosen to focus on the Bard (Mandal, 2010, p. 148).

2. 'Culture' of Shakespearean Literature

The domain of human interaction between life and literature known as culture is one in which the gap between the ideal and the real is minimized. Literature therefore is the purest manifestation of human culture. The values that make life worthwhile are nourished, preserved, protected, and fertilized by it. Immersion in Shakespeare is the first step on a path from blatant self-interest to unrestrained comparison, when one feels the pain of every person as if it were their own. That is why Shakespeare is not only highly revered and studied all over the world as a definitive author of the English language, but he is imitated and customized almost as frequently. Shakespeare has an enduring attraction that makes every reading of his works become a journey of discovery just as much as the initial discovery was the first reading. Shakespeare is an intense instruction in the enlightenment of the heart, intellect, and soul.

Shakespeare's works become firmly rooted in the collective human mind because of the sweeping soul and awe-inspiring recognition that cut beyond time and space barriers. Shakespeare has a prominent place in each country's cultural history because his works inspire universal reverence; in fact, his works have almost been canonized as the most ideal representation of human nature. Hazlitt, as cited by Chopra, says, "Nothing but Shakespeare, not even any book on Shakespeare, just Shakespeare… Shakespeare is enough for us." (Chopra, 2011, p. 4).

Many Shakespeare admirers have agreed and will continue to agree with Hazlitt throughout history. Great literature that navigates the business of life receives an equally broad applaud in the age of globalization as does business. Shakespeare's works are a significant component of the global literary history and have a recognizable, all-encompassing appeal. Shakespeare was interested in the aesthetics of life and his works' preservation of the tempo and rhythm of existence is an appeal for its preservation.

Shakespeare led an exciting life. He spent his life on London's streets and roadways rather than in libraries. This is why his works are experienced and felt in the streets of daily life instead of "enjoying" the "dusty immortality of libraries"– the pulsing sensitivities of yesterday, today, and future. He wasn't a university wit, and neither Oxford nor Cambridge thought much of him because of his "little Latin, less Greek," even though both institutions granted honorary degrees to Ben Johnson. He was a terrific traveler on life's high path - "a true aristocrat in his mind" – as

much as aristocrat in his simplicity as simple in his aristocracy (p. 21).

Shakespeare was the greatest proponent of love, especially love for people and life in all of its manifestations. Shakespeare was really concerned about life's aesthetics, thus the majority of his works make a case for preserving this rhythm through preserving the flow and rhythm of existence. Shakespeare's cosmic sense of sacredness for everyone has been described as his love of life and mankind. As Stanley Wells pertinently observes:

> "Shakespeare gives us a sense of the cosmos, of an unexplained and inexplicable infinity, but he gives us a sense too, that every human being has his place in this cosmos, the right to develop his talent to express his emotions, to realize his own being to its fullest extent (Wells, 1994, p. 27).

Shakespeare has been a source of inspiration and excitement for artists, authors, poets, and intellectuals all around the world in addition to being a source of fun for artists, writers, poets and thinkers of the world. Shakespeare has had such a profound influence on so many eminent poets and intellectuals that his multifaceted assimilation and cross-cultural perspectives have been incorporated into their social and cultural writings, taking on new dimensions and increased importance. Sir John Gielgud, who lived and understood Shakespeare, corroborates this openness of approach: "There are answers in this man Shakespeare to every contemporary question. There is religion without dogma, humor without mere facetiousness tragedy with grotesque horrors and a simplicity and knowledge of human nature unsurpassed..." (Gielgud, 1960, p. 52).

Shakespeare is cherished by people of many ages and cultures for various reasons; many of his admirers do not seek to diminish the importance of other great writers, but rather to highlight Shakespeare's superiority as a universally pleasing author. Perhaps no other writer in history has possessed such a diverse appeal, shared in the pleasure of literature in the broadest fraternity, and conveyed virtually the entirety of life's wisdom at the same time in a way that enlightened and enthralled readers who love both literature and life.

"Why Shakespeare" is the question that Gerald M. Pinciss asks in his book, with the same title. Many facets of Shakespeare's art, as this book's illustrations show, serve as a fitting response. It should be acknowledged, however, that this issue has plagued every Shakespeare reader up to the point when he or she catches a glimpse of the limitless riches hidden within his or her works, which transforms the load on his or her

mind into the delight on their spirit. This universal joy has enabled man to break through the barriers of time and space, win the empathy of all civilizations, and inspire creative discourse about the nature of man and his place in the universe among all cultures, even those with seemingly opposing views on life. Shakespeare's appeal is truly magnificent and is absolutely no intimidation or coercion in this persuading. As effortlessly as "leaves" come "to a tree," so do Shakespeare's writings grab the readers' internal sympathy and expand their sense; his verse falls on the soul like dew on the meadows.

Shakespeare's writing contained such charm that the ten blank verses in which his characters mostly expressed themselves did not shake one's sense of realism. Although this brilliant artist must have pursued his profession without any sense of modesty or self-importance, one cannot help but be in awe and astonished by him.

Shakespeare is different from the rest in this way. Shakespeare rekindled ancient Greece's fascination with humanity, and scarcely any other poet in the history of literature across the world was such a close observer of human nature. If he so desired, he could create fairies and spirits. If he didn't widen the scope of his plays' references, it's possible that he thought the way the human world was shown couldn't be fit according to his worldview. It should not be forgotten that readers of plays also discover the outside world, but they also discover the outside world as perceived by an artist. Every play is a distinct pattern that the artist imposes on the immense disorder of the outside world and the turbulent instability of the inner world. Both writers and film makers have a human nature, just as there is a human nature in the society around them. Experience, affection, and a secret force have joined these two. This coupling produces new offspring that have proven to be masterpieces.

But, is it still "Shakespeare" if the iambic pentameter is altered or removed entirely? This question may also be asked in relation to the poetry and context. How do the modern (or traditional) Elizabethan surroundings and/or attire enhance or detract from the story? The choice of genre, depiction, and "straight" readings (adaptations that keep Shakespeare's early modern English and relatively conventional clothes) all raise additional issues. It hasn't really been fashionable to talk about faithfulness or to link the adaptation to its original source and vice versa. In fact, such comparisons are believed to be pointless. But in the age of globalization, Shakespeare's cultural centre has undergone an inspiring makeover. It has a good variety of manifestations from culture to culture and a decent amount of significance. Shakespeare's constant univer-

sality across established traditions and contemporary popular culture is where this relevance comes from. Instead of being only momentary, his plays have become timeless and have assimilated into a variety of contexts across platforms, genres, and graphical styles. Shakespeare's writings were no longer constrained by colonial baggage due to this transforming process.

Shakespeare's plays, more than those of any other British author, have resonated across cultures sufficiently for adaptations to rouse them even after four hundred years; therefore it is not appropriate to look exclusively for cohesions of reactions between civilizations from a Shakespearean standpoint. The emphasis has been on Shakespeare's writing, Shakespeare's framework, Shakespeare's language, Shakespeare's play, and Shakespeare's criticism, even though the range of responses may be too great to comprehend. The inventive efforts of adaptations, translators, critics, players, and others' work that were distinct from Shakespeare's own, have contributed to the enormousness of several Shakespeares around the globe. Additionally, today's global audience recognizes a Shakespeare that is significantly different from the "one" that the Elizabethan audience encountered four hundred years ago.

During probing Shakespeare's relevance – especially of his tragedy *Hamlet*, in the Indian context, Satyam Kumar (2022) finds that:

> Acquaintance with Shakespeare's plays secured the literary sensibility of the elite Indians in the eyes of the colonial masters. This was also one of the reasons why most of the newly English educated people wanted to devour all the works of Shakespeare, along with the other classics of English literature. This gave them a new cultural identity and secured their place in the elite social circle of the Britishers (60).

Going back to earlier critics, one may now pursue unique, collaborative, and really cross-disciplinary studies because in this development, one learns about the various Shakespeares from the perspectives of various actors, adaptors, and audiences from all over the world. Numerous attempts have been made over the past four centuries to uncover a hint about Shakespeare's enormous creative abilities, as D.C. Biswas observes:

> The striking peculiarity of Shakespeare's mind was its generic quality, its power of communication with other minds, so that it contained a universe of thought and feeling within itself... He was nothing in himself, but he was all that others were, or that they could become. He not only had in himself the germs of every faculty and feeling, but he could follow them by anticipation

intuitively, into all their conceivable ramifications, through very change of fortune or conflict of passion or turn of thought. He had 'a mind' reflecting ages – past and present (Biswas, 1979, p. 115)

3. Shakespeare in Films

Shakespeare's career on film, from the 19th century to present, has still been a search for the finest ways to substitute verbal storytelling with visual creativity, as an extension of Shakespeare's intelligence into a wide range of depths. Many films undoubtedly succeed in giving viewers, both young and old, more than a passing glance of Shakespeare's stories and characters. According to a research on Shakespeare's reception in international cinema, all of these adaptation and appropriateness processes are "sub-sets" of the greater practice of influence, reception, and intertextual readings. In a diverse and dynamic cultural mosaic, all films evoke a similar response.

Jonathan Dollomore and Alan Sinfield, in *Political Shakespeare*, assert that Shakespeare is a well-known social figure, and adaptations of his plays are attempts by the authors to lend Shakespeare's cultural legitimacy to their own positions of power. Arguing from the perspective of cultural Materialism they say:

> …almost like a religious relic, he [Shakespeare] constitutes a powerful cultural token. Shakespeare's plays are one site of cultural production in our society – they are one of the places where our understanding of us is worked out and, indeed, fought out. A culture is a signifying system through which … a social order is communicated, reproduced, and explored. This signifying system has continually to be produced – social orders and cultural orders must be seen as being actively made: actively and continuously, or they may quite quickly break down. … Shakespeare's plays constitute an influential medium through which certain ways of thinking about the world may be promoted and others impeded, they are a site of cultural struggle and change (Dollomore and Sinfield, 1994, pp. 154–5)

Similarly, in *Interpreting Shakespeare on Screen*, Deborah Cartmell agrees that translating books for the big screen is simpler than doing Shakespeare. Novels often include elements that make them well-suited for the big screen, like first-person narration, concurrent action, narrative

frames, and pre-established locales (Cartmell, 2004, p. 4). Shakespeare, according to him, presents more potential issues for film adaptations than do the novels. Given that Shakespeare involves not just two but three different media forms–literature, stage, and film–certainly some of the concerns that Shakespearean films raise must go a step farther than those raised by novel-to-film adaptations (p. 5).

What, for instance, sets apart a film and the play on which it is based? Is the movie hoping to have a theatrically, honest, or creative dialogue with the play? Should academics be fluent in the lingo of the three disciplines – literature, drama, and film – all at once? Despite current ideas on novel-to-film and Shakespeare-to-film adaptations, all of them are challenging to take into account, partly because literary writings rely on words to express their history whereas filmic texts primarily rely on the visual. According to Cartmell, there are glaring issues that apply to all cinematic adaptations of both Shakespeare and books. Most of the time, these worries may be found in lively debates on topics like spectatorship, "high" and "low" culture, and fidelity (p. 7).

In this concern, Prof. R.S. White in his book *Shakespeare's Cinema of Crime* says,

> The Shakespearean influences as I trace it works not through explicit quotation but instead through details which might appear isolated 'shreds and patches' in themselves– individual narrative incidents, character types, thematic emphases, prevailing atmosphere, certain kinds of denouements hinging on poetic justice, and so on. However, the accumulated evidence taken all together suggests something more comprehensive; the whole is greater than the parts in contemplating the 'package' of film noir in relation to that of the tragedies. (White, 2012, p. 9)

Shakespeare and his plays have been better understood in the perspective of contemporary society when the influence of socio-historical circumstances on Shakespeare's plays is systematically examined. An examination of the style in which a particular play has been read or performed, exposes the underlying issues and possibilities that the text raises among successful competitors. In his outline of the term "literary anthropology", Wolfgang Iser enunciates that one can read a society through its responses to literature: "If a Literary text does something to its readers, it also concurrently discloses somewhat a lot them. Literature thus turns into a divining rod; locating our dispositions, desires, inclinations, and eventually our overall makeup" (Iser, 1978, p. 3).

In studies of Shakespeare's afterlife, the idea of literary anthropology

is implicit; through reading Shakespeare, one discovers something about oneself. Or, as Marjorie Garber states, "Shakespeare makes modern culture and modern culture makes Shakespeare." (Garber, 2004, p. xiii). That is why, he adds, Shakespeare has been developed as one of the greatest "dividing rods" in literature, enlightening the pre–suppositions and values that demonstrate up in criticism, adaptations, and performances of plays (p. xiii.). Iser explains that a reader's response to a text emerges from the "gaps" that make up the "no–man's land of indeterminacy" between conflicting opinions of a text, averring that "these gaps gives the reader a chance to build his own bridges… the unformulated connections between the particular views" (p. 9–10).

Shakespeare's plays have an inherent flexibility that makes them open to an immensely broad range of interpretations. Some texts devour more "gaps" than others. Shakespeare's ongoing popularity offers him such control by which interpretation may be explored across national and historical borders; this perception of cultural familiarity makes him an excellent candidate for studies of reception. By looking at criticism's evolution across time and how it relates to a particular play or character, one may track their legacy. The few works that had been written on the issue before the emergence of the new generation of Shakespeare on cinema research tended to focus on only one facet of traditional film theory – such as Andre Bazin's concept of "spatial strategy", which is used in Andrew Davis's *Filming Shakespeare's Plays* (1988) – he used this one notion as a tool to decipher the significance of certain adaptations, never giving up on the pursuit of fidelity.

However, in 1989, British scholar John Collick published his revolutionary book *Shakespeare, Cinema and Society*, in which he explains the hegemony that had been pervasive in Shakespearean film scholarship:

> The need to ensure that readings of Shakespeare conform to the understanding of the plays formulated in Britain during industrial revolution, and at the height of Empire, has determined the nature of Shakespeare film criticism so far. The demand for a personal consensus between the reader and the writer, and the demarcation of correct and incorrect responses to the text, conditions the way in which Shakespeare films are created and understood. A film of a Shakespeare play is regarded in the same way as reading … the task of the director is to understand and articulate the values truths that are supposedly embodied in the poetry.(Collick, 1989, p. 4)

Shakespeare, according to Collick, is genuinely multicultural; hence his perspective on Shakespearean film stands out clearly from these

earlier readings. His name refers to a wide range of cultural practices and meanings, including film, art, theatre, poetry, learning, and history; he is not merely a precise character from literature. A Shakespearean film is therefore not a hermetically sealed work with a predetermined set of meanings; rather, it is the culmination of several discourses drawn from these diverse realms of production (p. 8). The effort being made at the time in literary criticism, especially in the Shakespeare critical anthologies that placed a strong emphasis on philosophy, was matched by this thought such as *Political Shakespeare* (eds. Sinfield and Dollilore), *Alternative Shakespeares* (ed. Drakakis), and *The Shakespeare Myth* (ed. Graham Holderness).

A subfield of cultural studies known as cultural materialism emerged from the Marxist writings of Raymond Williams and Louis Althusser. When viewing filmic Shakespeare from a cultural perspective, one must always consider how the hegemonic forces of dominant discourses and elite culture are at work in these adaptations while the films immediately exploit, undermine, and struggle against these influences by usurping and co-opting the Shakespearean text to uphold novel philosophies (Massai, 2005, p. 5).

In order to analyze the politics of Shakespearean adaptations, new critical paradigms are mostly helpful. For instance, Sonia Massai has argued that traditional paradigms must be abandoned in order to reach a more nuanced understanding of the politics of cross-cultural adaptations and discover the framework for comprehending the dynamic interaction between well-established modes of critical production and novel appropriation strategies (p. 6). In addition, how these films function as films rather than as Shakespearean adaptations is a hot topic of controversy. Since the expressive power of film is well established, the main problem facing film adaptations is how to handle the language used. While the film directors edit, alter, reorganize, reallocate talks and negotiations, choose unusual places, and do all kinds of things to the texts, they are nonetheless careful of adding their personal arguments. In actuality, they are typically more concerned with removing words, and the majority of films only keep one-third or even half of the lines. However, film directors feel quite free to introduce music and are a little less hesitant to interpolate other materials. In those movies, however, Shakespearean dialogues seem effective indeed.

4. Types of film-adaptations

Three major categories may be used to organize all adaptations. First, there are those who completely follow the text and others who don't (or only partially, if they do). We can see the kaleidoscopic diversity the filmmakers of the 20th century brought to their portrayal of Shakespeare's plays just by taking a cursory look at the pretty impressive yet varied list. Each filmmaker appears determined to depict his own reaction to Shakespeare, enhancing the tremendous diversity of the dramatist's mental universe.

Shakespeare's plays were taken for granted in the second group of films, which did whatever they pleased with them. Shakespeare is sometimes interpreted wholly subjectively by the filmmakers, while other times, only the Bard's name is used, and the resulting work has only a passing resemblance to the original play. The variations are justifiable since Shakespeare wasn't a screenwriter but rather a verbal playwright who relied on the metaphorical and associative power of language.

Another way to group Shakespearean adaptations is to divide them into three different presentation styles: dramatic, realistic, and filmic. Because they often only capture a fundamentally theatrical staging of the film based on a play, the theatrical modes among them tend to have a more negative than positive link to aesthetic cinema theories (Mandal 153). The realistic approach on the other hand, adopts and accepts the 'regular grammar' of cinema, which is frequently heavily influenced by the traditional Hollywood style. The requirements of an original script tend to be more important in this category, which combines theatrical and cinematic techniques.

Critics have given the third category of films somewhat better and elusive than the others. Here, there is a propensity to completely modify the source material with the main goal of using all of the resources and potential of film. The suggested advancement of an auteur perspective, which is now favored among cinema reviewers, makes this method more attractive even when the original screenplay is delegated to the medium. It won't be out of place to claim that Shakespeare's plays have emerged as unquestionable literary masterpieces to conclude the subject. They have undergone extensive interpretive and bibliographic explication, leading to the creation of a vast body of centrifugal literature in addition to their own literary canonization.

Shakespeare's plays have been adapted into nearly every imaginable form of art, but film appears to have had the biggest impact. However, it is challenging to pinpoint the precise number of changes that have been done, and that number is rising alarmingly quickly practically every year. In reality, the recent influx of fresh adaptations in popular commercial plays demonstrates the film industry's enthusiasm in bringing Shakespeare's works back to the general public. Unless an effort is made to clearly determine the subtle and fundamental difference which divides the two mediums in their presentation of dramatic content, there may be an ambiguity in deciding the level of accomplishments or distinctions the adaptations of Shakespeare's play at least must possess. These distinctions fundamentally alter the interaction between the audience and the delivered content because they go beyond variations in presenting style. This reflection is primarily motivated by the actuality of "target audiences" affecting rendering in the target culture.

5. Conclusion

A filmmaker has to portray an "experimented" Shakespeare in different ways due to commercial demands. It is an effort somewhere to free him from a particular language and culture as a result, expanding the reach of his brilliance far beyond his own textual and cinematic productions. Shakespeare is positioned as a vernacular writer by the modern socio-political aspects that the directors in their various films have incorporated since Shakespeare had been a significant component of popular culture both in his own time and in the present. However, because these films are being created with some freshness and alterations, the reviewers snicker about the qualities of these adaptations in relation to their rationale.

Shakespearean plots, even ones that are only loosely based on one of the Bard's plays, are not a guarantee of an excellent movie; instead, it all rests on the director's vision for the picture, the actors' performances, and the technical crew's proficiency. These discussions can be helpful to academics and practitioners of appropriation and adaptation who are interested in how Shakespeare's status as high culture has slipped into common comprehension. Such performances may potentially gain more in the process than they lose, reviving popular cultural engage-

ment with Shakespeare in terms appropriate to the plays' original intent as mass entertainment. The localization of the Bard, a cross-cultural arrangement, creates a paradigmatic translation process that shows how pliable and flexible cultural boundaries can be.

Shakespearean plays are being adapted into films that exist at the intersection of contrasting cultural presumptions, competing theories and performing practices, and, at their most fundamental, the tense and overlapping systems of theatre and cinema. To put the processes of Shakespeare's alterations into perspective, the multifaceted adaptation aims to radical transform a "text" in rhythm with the whims of the given spatio -temporal setting. The recent influx of fresh adaptations in popular commercial plays, in fact, demonstrates film industry's enthusiasm in bringing Shakespeare's works back to the general public. Unless an effort is made to clearly determine the subtle and fundamental difference which divides the two mediums in their presentation of dramatic content, there will likely remain ambiguity regarding exactly what Shakespearean cinema ought to seek to accomplish. These distinctions fundamentally alter the interaction between the audience and the delivered content because they go beyond variations in presenting style. This reflection is ultimately motivated by the reality of "target audiences" affecting rendering in the target culture.

References

Biswas, D. C. (1979). *Shakespeare in His Own Time.* Macmillan.

Bazin, A. (1978). *Orson Welles: A Critical View*. Elm Tree Books.

Chopra, V. (2011). *Shakespeare: The Indian Icon*. The Readers Paradise.

Collick, J. (1989). *Shakespeare, Cinema and Society*. Manchester University Press.

Davies, A., Stanley, W. (1994). *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: the Plays on Film and Televison.* Cambridge University Press.

Dollomore, J., Sinfield, A. (1994) *Political Shakespeare*. Manchester University Press.

Farzand, M. (2023, October 10). Shakespearean Tragedy: An Exploration. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373924221_Title_Shakespearean_Tragedy_An _Exploration_of_Hamartia_Hubris_and_Catharsis

Garber, M. (2004). *Shakespeare After All*. Anchor Books.

Gielgud, J. (1960). *The Ages of Man: A Shakespeare Anthology.* William Heinemann.

Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kumar, Satyam. (2022). Evaluating the Relevance and Significance of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in Indian Context. *The Creative Launcher*, 7(6), 57-65.

Mandal, S. (2010). *Film and Fiction: Word into Image*. Rawat Publication.

Massai, S. (2005). *World–Wide Shakespeares: Local Appropriations in Film and Performance*. Routledge.

Reeves, G. Finding Shakespeare on Film from an Interview with Peter Brook. In. G.M & M.C. (Ed.), *Film Theory and Criticism*. (pp. 24-36). Oxford University Press.

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

Warner, S. (2001). *Shakespeare and Feminist Performance: Ideology on Stage*. Routledge.

White, R. S. (2012). *Shakespeare's Cinema of Crime: Macbeth, Hamlet and Film Genres including Maqbool, Omkara and Eklavya*. The Shakespeare Association.