

Hamlet in Lithuania:
The Symbolic Productions by Eimuntas Nekrošius and Oskaras Koršunovas

Simas Šakenis

Expos 20: Why Shakespeare?

Professor Jeffrey R. Wilson

December 16, 2018

By the time the spectators enter the theater to watch *Hamlet* by Oskaras Koršunovas, the performance is already underway - nine leading actors are present on stage. Each of them is sitting at a typical dressing room make-up table and staring at the mirror before them (see Figure 1). The mise-en-scene has no resemblance to the royal court of Elsinore whatsoever - nine dressing room tables and chairs are the only objects on stage, the costumes are all black and very inelaborate. When people have gathered and the audience lights go down, the actors suddenly start whispering the question “Who are you?” over and over again. Out of frustration that the reflections in mirrors that they are addressing are only asking back the same question instead of answering it, actors start raising the tone until each of them is desperately yelling the words as loud as they can. Suddenly, they turn at the audience one by one and freeze for a few moments, as if realizing for the first time that they were being watched this whole time. They get up, throw the chairs away from them, and start hastily rearranging the tables: the action begins.

This is the opening of one of the most acclaimed productions of *Hamlet* in Lithuanian theater, “Hamlet with a touch of genius” as it was deemed by one of the reviewers.¹ Given that the country does not have a centuries-old tradition of staging Shakespeare and that the development of its theater in the 20th century was marked by the five-decade period of Soviet indoctrination, it can be rather surprising that staging Shakespeare’s most famous tragedies could spread the names of Lithuanian theater directors around the world. Yet two productions of *Hamlet* - one made by Eimuntas Nekrošius in 1997 and the already introduced 2008 production by Oskaras Koršunovas - did receive an extraordinary recognition both on the national and international levels. Nekrošius’ *Hamlet* was chosen to be the closing performance of the Globe to Globe festival in 2012, where it was called “legendary” and praised as “one of the most celebrated Shakespearean productions of our age”.² Koršunovas’ *Hamlet* received its

international acclaim while touring some of the world's most prominent theater festivals and venues, such as BOZAR Center for Fine Arts in Brussels (Belgium), Theater Olympics in Beijing (China), Taiwan International Festival of Arts in Taipei (Taiwan), "Teatro di Roma" in Rome (Italy), "Euro-Scene" in Leipzig (Germany), NET in Moscow (Russia), "Temporada Alta" in Gerona (Spain), and Athens & Epidauros Festival (Greece), among many others.³ A very natural question may arise here: why are these two Lithuanian productions of *Hamlet* so successful? Why Lithuania and why *Hamlet*?

Currently, there is little scholarship devoted to answering these questions directly. Existing writing, most of which is in the form of critical reviews of the productions, is more concerned with giving an overview of what's at work in the two Lithuanian *Hamlets*. For example, in her review of Nekrosius' *Hamlet*, Birgit Beumers accentuates the director's ability to use theatrical devices in such way that "the text and its meaning are stripped to the bone".⁴ Ann Thompson, on the other hand, critiques the production's pretentiousness, its lack of dialogue with the audience, and "unclear" imagery.⁵ Reviewing Koršunovas' *Hamlet*, Roger Ellis outlines how the director "turns Shakespeare's narrative into a play-within-a-play" and states that the raising of "questions of self-identity, self-deception, and pretense makes his *Hamlet* strangely relevant".⁶ Where other reviewers do not raise the broader questions of Lithuania's success with Shakespeare, Ellis suggests that the popularity of Lithuanian theater directors in the international festival circuit may be explained by the fact that "their mise-en-scene is highly visual, physical, and expressive".⁷ In noting this, Ellis comes closest to answering the general question of this essay, however, there is no elaboration of the idea following this statement in his piece. While offering many valuable insights into the artistic language of Nekrošius and Koršunovas in their

productions of Shakespeare's tragedy, these scholars do not really tackle the question of what it is about the confluence of *Hamlet* and Lithuanian theater that leads to such a successful outcome.

In this essay, I argue that the metaphorical theater of Lithuania is particularly well-equipped to present *Hamlet* in new and revealing ways while the tragedy itself is considered to be in an age of textual exhaustion. Having been staged for centuries, *Hamlet* demands novelty and inventiveness in the visual expression which is very much the expertise of Lithuanian theater-makers as they have been trained to convey meanings through symbolic images in trying to avoid Soviet censorship. A close examination of Nekrošius' and Koršunovas' productions of *Hamlet* reveals how the two readings of Shakespeare's tragedy are encoded in the visual clues and metaphors devised by Lithuanian directors, while looking at the effects of Soviet censorship on Lithuanian theater explains why the works are so expressive through theatrical devices in the first place. As argued in this essay, it is their ability to offer a refreshing perspective on *Hamlet* to the audience of the 21st century, to provoke active interpretation, and reveal the subtleties of Shakespeare's text that makes Nekrošius and Koršunovas stand out from the rest.

I. Novelty in *Hamlet*

The four centuries worth of reading, discussing, and appropriating Shakespeare's tragedy does indeed "weigh heavily on those who tackle *Hamlet*"⁸ today. As described by scholars Sonya Freeman Loftis, Allison Kellar and Lisa Ulevich in *Shakespeare's Hamlet in an Era of Textual Exhaustion*, a very common cultural anxiety among people who stage, perform, interpret, or teach *Hamlet* nowadays is that there is simply nothing more left to say, that we have "exhausted the interpretive possibilities of Shakespeare's most popular tragedy"⁹. In light of this shared sense of *Hamlet*'s textual exhaustion there emerges a natural desire to experiment, to

disassemble and transform the original text as much as required in order to keep people interested and get the much-needed reassurance that *Hamlet* is still alive.¹⁰ This “remake it to save it” agenda is acutely indicative of the “Post-Hamlet” era that we find ourselves in. The modern adaptations with Hamlet as a robot, Hamlet with space aliens, Hamlet declaring himself “not Hamlet”¹¹, Hamlet in non-traditional spaces¹², or those rewriting Ophelia to fit the context of feminism¹³ or mental disability¹⁴ are all channeling the idea that *Hamlet* is in need to be reframed. The irony here is that the more we depart from the original in the pursuit of making the tragedy relevant to our times, the more we feel that the “true” *Hamlet* is used up and overdone. As noted by Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, this creates a closed loop of some sort: “experimentation begets exhaustion, which begets yet more experimentation”.¹⁵

What becomes truly novel in this context is the approach we may call “post-experimentation”, an antidote to the unending departure from and rewriting of the original. It’s not that there is suddenly a new idea revealed about the tragedy after years or decades of experimentation - perhaps it is true that everything significant about *Hamlet* has already been said. The major blind spot, though, is that it’s not all about *what* you say - it is the *way* you say it that can make an enormous difference, especially in mediums like theater. While the words that the characters speak in the play are set in stone, there is no constraint whatsoever on how ingeniously Shakespeare’s ideas may be conveyed via the use of visuals and other theatrical devices. Thus, instead of constantly trying to rewrite *Hamlet* so that it reflects the concerns of a modern day world (which is how contemporary theater-makers and writers are approaching the play¹⁶), one has to reread *Hamlet* and seek to convey some of the original ideas in novel and creative ways, to uncover the essence of the tragedy by means of symbolic, imaginative expression. Even if the interpretative possibilities of *Hamlet* may be exhausted, one can never

run out of ways in which this multitude of interpretations may be presented to the audiences. It is this inward trajectory towards the original text, the seeking to capture its depths instead of transforming and subverting it that differentiates the “post-experimentation” approach from plain experimentation.

Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich point out that “the fear of cultural exhaustion is the endpoint at which things begin anew”¹⁷, as the experimentalism is “destined to burn itself out”¹⁸. The trend of radical and subversive adaptations of *Hamlet* does indeed clear up the space for subtle and revealing productions of the tragedy, and while all this noise is still around us, it is extremely refreshing to be offered a deep, symbolic, and insightful perspective on the play. For this reason, the true novelty in staging *Hamlet* in our age lies not in the unexpected or shocking reframing of the tragedy, but in the subtle and suggestive visuals, the revealing messages that are hidden or encoded in the mise-en-scene. The demand for a visually rich, metaphorical theater is, therefore, very high. As it turns out, these are the perfect conditions for Lithuanian theater-makers to enter the game of staging the “timeless” tragedy.

II. Metaphorical Theater of Lithuania

One of the major influences on the development of Lithuanian theater during the Soviet era was censorship. In order to be shown, virtually every theater production or any kind of stage performance had to be first approved by the designated officials and, if any inconsistencies with the ideology were found - edited according to the instructions of the censors.¹⁹ According to Jonas Jurašas, one of the more prominent theater-makers of that time, censors “would insist on pitiless distortion of the play’s innermost meaning”, seeing many of the motives in his work as politically dangerous.²⁰ Even a play about a famous love story from the 16th-century Lithuanian

history, *Barbora Radvilaitė*, was regarded as a “symbol of individual freedom, love of the fatherland, and of the conflict between the individual and society”. The director was accused of “nationalism, religious mysticism and exaggerated spirituality”.²¹

While Jonas Jurašas did not see a possibility of continuing his artistic work under the constraints of Socialist realism and ended up fleeing to the West, other artists kept looking for ways of bypassing the censorship apparatus. This urge to express genuine feelings and ideas in such way that, on the surface level, they would not seem inconsistent with the ideology led to the adoption of Aesopian language - “the use of allusion, allegory, or coded meaning to conceal inadmissible content”.²² According to Goda Dapšytė, a scholar that has investigated the influence of Soviet censorship on Lithuanian theater, the mastering of Aesopian language and the emergence of metaphorical theater (which she calls a “by-product” of the censorship²³) could be recognized as the most valuable heritage that the Soviet era has left in Lithuanian artistic tradition.²⁴ She points out that the metaphorical expression that once seemed to be a “temporary trend”²⁵ (in a 1979 article a theater critic Dovydas Judelevičius notes that “features of metaphorical theater could be found in the works of virtually all active theater-makers of the time”²⁶) became a “dominant norm” in Lithuanian theater in the post-Soviet era.²⁷ In fact, as Lithuanian theater-makers started to gain prominence in the international festival circuit after the country restored its independence, the symbolic visuals and revealing metaphors became the descriptors of the signature style of Lithuanian directors.²⁸ Both Eimuntas Nekrošius, referred to as “one of the founders of metaphorical theater tradition in Lithuania” by Dapsyte²⁹, and Oskaras Koršunovas, a member of the same generation of theater-makers that developed their artistic tastes during the years of Soviet occupation, have this metaphorical expression engraved deeply

into their theatrical DNA. It is for this reason that their *Hamlets* are so visual, symbolic, and revealing.

III. *Hamlet* by Eimuntas Nekrošius

Eimuntas Nekrošius' *Hamlet*³⁰ is a production that precisely fits the description of what we established as a "post-experimental" approach - it does not aim to shock the audience with a radical new framing of the tragedy but instead seeks to uncover some of the core meanings of Shakespeare's play via symbolic visualization. Very integral to Nekrošius' reading of *Hamlet* is the impression of coldness that the production aims to create. The use of materials like metal, ice, or glass (which most of the stage objects are made from) creates a sense of hostility and coldness that is not only an attribute of the "nippy and eager air"³¹ that surrounds Elsinore, but also an encapsulation of the great emotional tension and angst that has filled the royal court. The large circular saw hanging above the stage throughout the performance is a constant reminder of the terrible murder that has been committed by Claudius and of the danger that is not going away no matter what the King does (see Figure 2). Its unreachability and unassailable existence also create allusions to it being a God-like figure, an ultimate judge whom one can never hide from.

Another important element in Nekrošius' production is the use of drizzling rain, both as a force of erosion and as an intervention from the heavens. A recurring motif in the performance is when a drum is placed right at the center of the stage and the water droplets falling from above start hitting it producing a ticking sound which no human has a hand in creating (see Figures 3, 4). It is in this very immaterial, bodiless form that the ghost's first appearance to Marcellus and Horatio is illustrated by Nekrošius. This is also how Hamlet's death is portrayed at the end of the play: after saying his famous words "the rest is silence"³² Hamlet firmly grabs the drum and falls

with it on the ground, ceasing the ticking sound, which symbolized him being alive, irrevocably. The tragic ending of the play is amplified by the symbolic closing scene of the production: King Hamlet desperately tries to take away the drum from the hands of his deceased son in order to put it back where the water droplets could hit it, but without being able to do so, completely overcome with grief, he starts hitting the drum with his own hands as the curtains close with Verdi's "La Forza del Destino" playing in the background (see Figure 5).

The production is filled with visual clues that highlight the various underlying meanings in Nekrošius' interpretation of *Hamlet*. For example, during his first few appearances on stage Hamlet behaves like a child demanding attention from his mother, in a way, re-evaluating how close to him Gertrude still is: he lets his trousers slip down and waits for Gertrude to put them back on (see Figure 6); he makes strange sounds and swings on a chair like a child waiting to be stopped (see Figure 7). It is only during his first encounter with the ghost that Hamlet is turned into a grown man: King Hamlet rubs his son's hands and feet against a large block of ice - a metaphor of preparing the prince for the harsh reality he will have to face and the burdensome responsibility that is going to be laid upon him (see Figures 8, 9).

Nekrošius creates a very memorable spectacle in the scene where the famous "To be or not to be" soliloquy is delivered. A large lantern made of ice is hung on the circular saw above the center of the stage and is slowly melting due to the heat of the candles (see Figure 10). Wearing a shirt made of very light, paper-like substance, Hamlet steps underneath the lantern and, as he goes on to deliver the soliloquy, the water droplets falling from the melting ice keep wetting his shirt and making it slowly disintegrate. By the end of the monologue, Hamlet's shirt is almost completely torn apart, making him stand both literally and metaphorically undressed before the audience (see Figure 11). It is by means of these suggestive visuals that Nekrošius

symbolizes how Hamlet's innermost struggle is exposed in this soliloquy, how a mere thought about the "undiscover'd country, from whose bourn / No traveller returns"³³ takes away all safety and courage from the protagonist and strips him down to the very core of his soul.

Other visual statements that Nekrošius makes in the production include Voltemand and Cornelius behaving like pet dogs to the King and Queen (see Figures 12, 13), Hamlet looking "inside" Claudius through the two paper tubes as a symbol for "I see a cherub that sees them"³⁴ (see Figure 14), Hamlet carefully crumbling coal on white sheets of paper and blowing the black dust - "some dozen or sixteen lines"³⁵ inserted into the "Murder of Gonzago" - into the players' faces (see Figures 15, 16), Hamlet sitting as a priest in the confessional when a play is about to be performed for Claudius to expose the King's deadly sin (see Figure 17), and a number of others. It is through all these powerful images that Nekrošius speaks to his audience throughout the performance, metaphorically revealing the depths of Shakespeare's tragedy. As a result, his *Hamlet* is both close to the original and extraordinarily novel.

IV. *Hamlet* by Oskaras Koršunovas

Oskaras Koršunovas' *Hamlet*³⁶ is quite different in its overall aesthetic from Nekrošius' staging of the tragedy, but at its core is the same "post-experimental" aim to engage with the original text instead of trying to subvert it. The fundamental questioning of self-identity in the opening scene (introduced at the beginning of this essay) establishes right away that the production is focused on one of the central themes of Shakespeare's tragedy - the question of honesty and deception. Koršunovas' decision to set the play in an environment that resembles a theater backstage³⁷ is very congruous with this framing of the tragedy - the unmasking that Hamlet seeks to do with most of the play's characters is directly analogous to the experience of

an actor who exits the stage and leaves the sight of the audience: a performer on a backstage. The very fact that all characters are constantly being surrounded by the mirrors of the nine make-up tables immediately prompts questions of self-analysis: which one of the reflected images is of one's true self, if any? The notion of being "fake" is also represented through the use of makeup. For instance, before his first conversation with Claudius and Gertrude, Hamlet paints his face in white, putting on a mask of some sort, and cleans it off only when everybody leaves the stage and he is about to deliver a soliloquy (see Figure 18). It is very clear from Shakespeare's text that Hamlet is suppressing his feelings in this particular scene³⁸ and Koršunovas' use of makeup is an example of how such an idea may be conveyed metaphorically through the use of visuals.

Another feeling that keeps coming up while watching Koršunovas' production is the suspicion that everyone, including Hamlet, is being deceived, that some major hazard is always lurking around. Two mysterious animal-like creatures - one with a glowing red nose resembling a mouse (see Figure 19) and the other with a huge rat's head (see Figure 20) - appear on stage occasionally to sneak around the play's characters or observe the stage action from the side. This element of Koršunovas' interpretation stems from one of the many ambiguities that Shakespeare has - perhaps intentionally - left in *Hamlet*: the relatively undeveloped and almost *too-good-to-be-true* personality of Horatio. As acknowledged by Darius Meškauskas, a performer of Hamlet in Koršunovas' production, the director's idea was to portray Horatio as a spy secretly sent by Fortinbras.³⁹ There is, of course, no line in the play that could be directly indicative of this, so the idea had to be transmitted symbolically: we see Horatio carrying the glowing red nose that was previously worn by the mouse creature (a spy?) and when we hear the drum sounds from the Fortinbras' army in the background, Horatio pantomimes beating the drum and marches according to the rhythm (see Figure 21). Another detail in Shakespeare's text that supports this

interpretation is the fact that Horatio is the only one of the main characters who does not die in the end. Koršunovas' production, therefore, ends with Horatio turning off the lights of every character's dressing room table one by one, while the marching music is playing in the background. Also, it is Horatio who says "The rest is silence" - originally a phrase of Hamlet - to close the performance. With this, Koršunovas does not leave the audience doubting who has the control in the end and who is the real beneficiary of Elsinore's massacre (see Figure 22).

While these are a few of the more noticeable and provocative visual statements that Koršunovas makes in his *Hamlet*, the production is also full of subtle visual details that enrich the reading of Shakespeare's text. The portrayal of Ophelia, for example, is flavored with suggestive imagery. Koršunovas makes her first appear on stage singing a Japanese song and performing a ritual with flowers, showcasing her affinity towards nature and beauty (see Figure 23); her meeting with Hamlet after the "To be or not to be" soliloquy is very clearly portrayed as a setup by Polonius and others, as the stage is carefully decorated with flowers and all the characters are overseeing the action (see Figure 24); Ophelia's breakdown after the "nunnery" scene is illustrated with an allusion to a funeral - she is lying on the ground while other characters are throwing flowers on her body as if she was being buried (see Figure 25); her drowning is depicted with Gertrude spilling a glass of water in her face (see Figure 26). These and other visual clues arguably contain most of the interpretative substance in Koršunovas' reading of *Hamlet*. Just like the production of his Lithuanian predecessor, Koršunovas' *Hamlet* is an example of how inventive metaphorical visualization can breathe new life into a seemingly exhausted tragedy. Koršunovas lets modern theater adapt to the 17th-century play, not the other way around.

V. Saving *Hamlet* (and others)

Are we done with *Hamlet*? Is our historical moment ready to announce the death of the Prince? The success of the two Lithuanian productions and the analysis of their novel method of approaching the exhausted tragedy should make one skeptical. Influenced by the tradition of a highly metaphorical theater of their country, the two Lithuanian directors tapped into the virtually unlimited source of artistic novelty in staging the “classics” - conveying old ideas in new ways. In the age filled with desperate experimentation and subversive rewritings of Shakespeare’s most popular play, Nekrošius’ and Koršunovas’ “post-experimental” *Hamlets* stand out as tremendously successful productions that do not aim to radicalize or deform the tragedy’s innermost meanings. Their return to the original text and inventive visualization of some of its core ideas enables them to offer a fresh perspective on the tragedy without contributing to the modern day anxiety that we have reached the end with the Dane.

Retelling Hamlet’s story through the use of symbolic visuals and highlighting the various underlying meanings via suggestive imagery is, perhaps, not as easy as repurposing the tragedy for some trendy concern of the modern times - be it robots, aliens, or feminism. It is also not at all clear that Lithuanian theater-makers would have mastered this kind of metaphorical expression were it not for the strict ideological constraints put up by the censorship of the Soviet regime. It is, however, important to recognize that this “post-experimental” approach of Lithuanians could be carving out a path for the future of staging *Hamlet*, as well as all other dramas that are or will be in danger of becoming exhausted. With this, we may be uncovering the formula for success in the 21st century’s theater - be inventive in *how* you tell the story, not in *what* story you tell.



Figure 26

¹ Raymond Zhou, "OKT's Hamlet is back with its touches of genius," China Daily USA, last modified March 9, 2016, http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2016-03/09/content_23797612.htm.

² "Hamlet: Meno Fortas", Shakespeare's Globe London (2012), October 26, 2012, <http://globetoglobe.shakespearesglobe.com/plays/hamlet/english-45>.

³ "Užsienio kritikų išliaupsintas Koršunovo „Hamletas“ sugrįžta į Kauną", Oskaras Koršunovas Theater, accessed November 25, 2018, <https://www.okt.lt/uzsienio-kritiku-isliaupsintas-korsunovo-hamletas-sugrizta-i-kauna/>.

⁴ Birgit Beumers, "Erosion Through Time: The Rest Is Not Silence: The Lithuanian 'Hamlet' of Eimuntas Nekrosius," *TheatreForum - International Theatre Journal*, (Winter-Spring 1999): 68-74.

⁵ Ann Thompson, "Reviving Hamlet? Nekrošius' Lithuanian 'Classic,'" in *Shakespeare Beyond English: A Global Experiment* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 2013), 298-300.

⁶ Roger Ellis, "'Hamletas,' Oskaras Korsunovas's Staging of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet': Angst in Elsinore," *Slavic and East European Performance* 30, no. 2 (Spring 2010): 17-28.

⁷ Ellis, "'Hamletas,' Oskaras Korsunovas's Staging of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet': Angst in Elsinore," 18.

⁸ Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, "Introduction," in *Hamlet* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006), 2.

⁹ Sonya Freeman Loftis, Allison Kellar, and Lisa Ulevich, "Introduction: Post-Hamlet," in *Shakespeare's Hamlet in an Era of Textual Exhaustion* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 1.

¹⁰ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 3.

¹¹ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 3.

¹² Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 18.

¹³ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 19.

¹⁴ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 16.

¹⁵ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 4.

¹⁶ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 9.

¹⁷ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 8.

¹⁸ Loftis, Kellar, and Ulevich, "Introduction," 8.

¹⁹ Goda Dapšytė, "Teatras ir Cenzūra – Nenutrūkstamas Ryšys," *Kultūros barai*, no. 4 (2009): 44.

-
- ²⁰ “Lithuania: ‘Censoring Shakespeare’,” *Index on Censorship* 4, no. 3 (Fall 1975): 77.
- ²¹ “Lithuania: ‘Censoring Shakespeare’,” 78.
- ²² “Self-censorship,” in *The Oxford Companion to the Book*, ed. Michael F. Suarez, S.J. and H. R. Woudhuysen (Oxford University Press, 2010).
- ²³ Goda Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis Lietuvos Teatro Diskurso Raidai” (PhD diss., Lietuvos Muzikos ir Teatro Akademija, 2015), 75.
- ²⁴ Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis,” 121.
- ²⁵ Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis,” 121.
- ²⁶ Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis,” 115.
- ²⁷ Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis,” 121.
- ²⁸ Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis,” 122.
- ²⁹ Dapšytė, “Sovietinės Cenzūros Poveikis,” 125.
- ³⁰ Meno Fortas, *Hamlet*, directed by Eimuntas Nekrošius, 1997, <https://www.lrt.lt/mediateka/irasas/50178/william-shakespeare-v-sekspyras-hamletas>.
- ³¹ HORATIO 1.4
- ³² William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. A.R. Braunmuller (United States: Penguin, 2001), 5.2.341.
- ³³ 3.2 UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY
- ³⁴ Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 4.3.47.
- ³⁵ Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 2.2.480.
- ³⁶ OKT, *Hamlet*, directed by Oskaras Koršunovas, 2008, <https://www.lrt.lt/mediateka/irasas/54476/v-sekspyras-william-shakespeare-hamletas> (part 1), <https://www.lrt.lt/mediateka/irasas/54526/v-sekspyras-william-shakespeare-hamletas> (part 2).
- ³⁷ Ellis, “‘Hamletas,’ Oskaras Korsunovas’s Staging of Shakespeare’s ‘Hamlet’: Angst in Elsinore,” 17.
- ³⁸ Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 1.2.
- ³⁹ Ellis, “‘Hamletas,’ Oskaras Korsunovas’s Staging of Shakespeare’s ‘Hamlet’: Angst in Elsinore,” 25.