

TUDOMÁNYOS DIÁKKÖRI KONFERENCIA 2021
SAPIENTIA EMTE - CSÍKSZEREDAI KAR

The Recipe of a Great Adaptation

Csíkszereda

2021

Contents

Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	2
1. The Prejudice	2
2. Theories.....	3
3. Thesis.....	6
4. The Analysis	7
Conclusions.....	24
Bibliography	28

Abstract

Since the apparition of cinematography and filmmaking, literature has been the main source of inspiration for filmmakers. They have adapted novels, plays, short stories and more, into the world of cinema, reshaping it to fit into the new medium. This means *translating* the language of literature to the language of cinema. Literature and cinema have different characteristics when it comes to expressing some aspects, which leads to film directors reshaping the source text. Also, the question of fidelity has been the main concern of theoreticians, until other professionals, such as George Bluestone, Linda Hutcheon, and Robert Stam came up with new ways of comparing the source text and the film adaptation of a particular literary work.

The goal of this paper is to analyze and compare Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and its 2005 film adaptation, keeping in focus the different contexts and changes introduced by the film director. The film of Mark Brozel, made for a BBC miniseries called *Shakespeare Retold*, recontextualizes the story of Macbeth, placing it into a different temporal and spatial context, into a twentieth century restaurant in Glasgow, while also transforming Macbeth, the noble warrior, into a professional chef, and the kingdom of Duncan into a high-end restaurant.

What are the changes introduced by the film director? What purpose do these changes serve in order to create or re-create a character? Are these changes based on the original text, or they are something unique, created by the film director?

Focusing on the questions mentioned above, this paper will shed light on the particularities of the film adaptations of Mark Brozel's *Macbeth* (2005), part of BBC's Shakespeare Retold series, with the applied methodology of comparative analysis, comparing the film to Shakespeare's play, with the aim of identifying the changes made by the film director and explaining the reason for these changes, with special focus on storytelling, characterization, and symbolism.

Introduction

Cinematic adaptations of novels, plays, and other genres of literature have always formed part of our everyday lives. Whether we have seen a film in the cinema or a series at home on a TV channel, there is a high chance of it being an adaptation. According to *A Dictionary of Film Studies*, “[i]t is claimed that adaptations account up to 50 per cent of all Hollywood films” (5, 2012), which means that from the 786 films produced in North America, in the year 2019¹ 393 films are adaptations. This not only shows that there is a need for adaptations in the entertainment industry but also lead to several scientific discussion about the relationship between adaptation and its source of inspiration. Nowadays, there are many theories discussing the phenomena of cinematic adaptations and the possible problems they have had to face throughout the years.

1. The Prejudice

One of the most prominent problem cinematic adaptations have had to overcome is the prejudice of literature as the film’s source being superior that the adaptation itself. Robert Stam formulates this as the “historical anteriority and seniority: the assumption, that is, that older arts are necessarily better arts” (2005, 4). However, it is safe to say that since then, cinema has also proved its worth and place, by elaborating artistic modes of cinematic expression and creating masterpieces like *Citizen Kane* (Orson Welles, 1941), *Schindler’s List* (Steven Spielberg, 1993), *The Shawshank Redemption* (Frank Darabont, 1994) and many others. This leads to the question: what is an adaptation? This might seem like a simple question, however, it has more layers to it, with multiple possible definitions given by several theorists. In Sarah Cardwell’s definition, “[a]daptation, according to the traditional comparative model, is the process of adapting one original, culturally defined ‘standard whole’ in another medium” (2002, 19). In this definition we can find a few expressions, which might need clarification like “the process of adapting”, “culturally defined ‘standard whole’” or “another medium”. The first expression suggests the many meanings the word *adaptation* can have. According to Hutcheon, the word has three meanings, the first one being the *standard* understanding of the word. When we hear the word itself, we usually think of the piece of art itself, be it a film, play, or even videogames,

¹ <https://www.statista.com/statistics/187122/movie-releases-in-north-america-since-2001/>

or as Hutcheon says: the “formal entity or product” (2013, 8). The second meaning of adaptation refers to the “process of creation” which means “(re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation” (Hutcheon 2013, 8). The third case is what she calls the “process of reception, adaptation is a form of intertextuality” (2013, 8) referring to Genette and his theory of intertextuality, but also to the case of palimpsest: “we experience adaptations (as adaptations) as palimpsests through our memory of other works” (2013, 8). The second expression refers to the fact that the text itself is the center, and the adaptations are linked individually to this center. Cardwell gives the example of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, which is in itself, as a literary work, also an adaptation based on a preexisting Scottish folk tale, still, it is not viewed as an adaptation. This phenomenon is what Cardwell calls the “cultural orthodoxy” (2002, 18) which puts literature in a protective space, provides a sort of shield which shouldn’t be penetrated, moreover, as she expresses it: “[it] ought to be defended” (2002, 32). The third expression, root for many interesting discourses, is the problem of the different media and the transition between them. When we talk about literature and cinema we can immediately see the difference between the two media, one being mainly verbal while the other is a mixture of different aspects of different media. This difference is what Stam called “The Automatic Difference” (2005, 16), that is, these differences are so obvious that by the creation within either of the two branches of art means different procedures and end products. While literature operates with words, and sentences, the medium of cinema is a mixture of music, photography, cinematography, acting, and visual effects. This phenomenon is called “hypermediacy” (2000, 31) by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin.

2. Theories

Now that we know what adaptation means and what differentiates cinema from literature, we can look for some sort of a structure to classify the different types of adaptations. Dudley Andrew in his work *Concepts in Film Theory* (1984) distinguishes two types of adaptations, in relation with their source. The first type is the one which tries to achieve faithfulness and thus naming its source as “signified” (1984, 96), which is the case of Franco Zeffirelli’s *Hamlet* (1990), where the setting, characters, costumes and language are faithful to the narrated time in the original. The other type appears when the original text was only a source of inspiration, in which the source is the “referent” (1984, 96), just like in the case of Taika Waititi’s *Jojo Rabbit* (2019), which took the inspiration from Christine Leunens’ *Caging Skies*

(2004) but introduced significant changes regarding characters and story. According to Andrew's theory, there are three types of procedures, by which one can create an adaptation, naming these procedures "borrowing, intersection, and fidelity of transformation" (1984, 98).

According to Andrew, "borrowing" is the most frequent type of adaptation, not only in cinema but in all the other arts. Using this procedure, the artist – in our case the film director – borrows the main idea of an already existing text, giving it a new context or shape. An example for borrowing is the before mentioned *Jojo Rabbit* (2019), as its aim was to represent the film director's idea in connection with its source of inspiration *Caging Skies* (2004).

In the case of "intersecting" the focal point is on the way the adaptation reflects the original work. Andrew develops André Bazin's metaphor, saying that "the original artwork can be likened to a crystal chandelier" (1984, 99) while the adaptation is like "a crude flashlight". The crystal chandelier is appreciated for its intricate design, whereas the latter one is appreciated for its capability of revealing things in the dark. What "intersecting" actually means is that it allows the original work to evolve in the medium of cinema, as Andrew formulates it: "An original is allowed its life, its own life, in the cinema" (1984, 100).

The last type is called "fidelity and transformation" (1984, 98), or "transforming sources" (1984, 100), it refers to the act of reinterpreting an important idea or notion from the source text and introducing it to the medium of cinema. Borrowing and fidelity of transformation are similar, in the sense of both take an idea or aspect and create a film based on that idea, however, there is a difference in degree of fidelity, as the fidelity of transformation is the closest to the source. An example for the third type is Franco Zeffirelli's *Hamlet* (1990), which is faithful in terms of time and space, but also in terms of being faithful to the language of the original play.

Talking about fidelity to the source of inspiration we have to mention one of the most discussed problem of adaptation theory, the question of fidelity. According to Stam, "[a] 'faithful' film is seen as uncreative, but an 'unfaithful' film is a shameful betrayal of the original" (2005, 8), which creates a paradoxical situation similar to the one in the *Catch-22* novel. Hutcheon argues that the "critical orthodoxy in adaptation studies" (2013, 7) was the fidelity approach, as she highlights, particularly, when the analyzed work is part of the main canon. She gives the example of Pushkin and Dante; however, Shakespeare is also part of this canon, thus the fidelity approach should be the way to analyze it. Not every adaptation is a success, as Stam puts it: "some adaptations are definitely better than others" (2005, 14), which also implies that fidelity is highly subjective but also based on experience. This approach was

questioned and somewhat disaffirmed by contemporary theoreticians, saying that this approach is not the right one to use while analyzing an adaptation.

Other theories and ways of analyzing have been proposed by professional, such as Robert Stam's idea to apply Gérard Genette's theory of transtextuality to the case of cinematic adaptations. Genette in his theory distinguished five types of transtextual relationships, all of which could be applied to the case of adaptations.

The first type is "intertextuality" (2005, 27), which can be found in numerous films, by means of quotations or allusions. As Genette clarifies it, this "was explored some years ago by Julia Kristeva" (1997, 1). In Genette's definition, it is "a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts" (1997, 1).

The second type is called "paratextuality" (2005, 28), which refers to the connection between the text and its titles, subtitles and other elements. As Genette defines it, *paratext* "provides the text with a (variable) setting and sometimes commentary" (1982, 1). This means that by the appearance of titles, subtitles or other elements that summarize, foreshadow or even supplement the text, the readers might already presuppose certain aspects of the text. According to Stam, this can also be discovered in the case of films, where *paratexts* are the different interviews with the film director and actors but also posters, commentaries given by the creators of the movie, and also the *director's cut* version of the film, which includes deleted scenes and the commentaries mentioned before.

The third type of Genettian transtextuality is "metatextuality" (2005, 28), which refers to one text being in relationship with another, by means of talking about it, such as reviews and analyses. The criterion is that one text evaluates or comments on another text "of which it speaks without necessarily citing it" (1997, 4), as Genette points it out, this type of transtextual relationship is often regarded as critique or review. Needless to say, there are many reviews and critiques about films and adaptations, written for magazines, newspapers, blogs, or even vlogs.

"Architextuality" (2005, 30) refers to the direct or indirect categorization of the text by the titles or subtitles, or as Genette defines it, the "relationship that is completely silent, articulated at most only by a paratextual mention, which can be titular [...] or most often subtitled" (1997, 4). According to Genette, the paratext gives the text a generic status, the text might refer to itself – by the means of titles or subtitles – as part of a specific genre. However, there are some works of art which classify themselves as part of a genre, however, they do not fit into the criteria of the genre. Genette gives the example of Dante's *The Divine Comedy*, which is not exactly a comedy. These titles trigger some expectations in the readers, in the case of cinema, the viewers. In the case of films, some directors choose to keep the title of the source,

whereas others change it to something entirely different, as Stam gives the example of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* in Francis Ford Coppola's adaptation entitled *Apocalypse Now* (1979) (2005, 30). In the case of this paper, one of the film directors changed the title of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, namely Akira Kurosawa, who changed it to *Throne of Blood* (1957).

The fifth and last type of intertextuality is called "hypertextuality" (2005, 31), which is – as Stam formulates it – "the relation between one text [...] to an anterior text" (2005, 31), the former one being the "hypertext" and the latter one the "hypotext" (2005, 31). The "hypertext" extends, explains or gives a new point of view about another text, which is the "hypotext" itself. According to the author, this type of transtextuality is the most appropriate and relevant in the case of adaptations, if we consider that the adaptation is the "hypertext" and its source novel is the "hypotext". "Filmic adaptations, in this sense, are hypertexts derived from pre-existing hypotexts which have been transformed by operations of selection, amplification, concretization and actualization" (2005, 31). From Stam's explanations we can see that Genette's transtextuality can be applied to the case of adaptations, which can replace the long criticized, and somewhat subjective theory of *fidelity approach*.

Another important aspect of adaptations, which is the change of context within different adaptations. As Hutcheon claims "even moving within the same one [same medium], always means change" (2013, 16), that is, the re-adaptation of the same work within the medium of cinema means change, as film directors, usually, do not wish to repeat the same work with no changes at all. This leads to the question of *recontextualization*, which means the change in temporal, spatial, ways of representing characters, or even change in structure. In the case of this study, Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (1600) was adapted by Mark Brozel in 2005, within BBC's miniseries entitled *ShakespeaRe-Told*. In this case the characters are professional chefs, and the *kingdom* for which they *fight* is an elegant restaurant in Glasgow. This meant changing the language used in the play, to fit the time of the 21st century, but also changing some aspects of the story itself to seem plausible in the new context, as we will see in the actual analysis.

3. Thesis

The goal of the analysis below is to compare Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and its 2005 film adaptation, keeping in focus the different contexts and changes introduced by the film director. The film of Mark Brozel, made for a BBC miniseries called *Shakespeare Retold*, recontextualizes the story of *Macbeth*, placing it into a different temporal and spatial context,

into a twentieth century restaurant in Glasgow, while also transforming Macbeth, the noble warrior, into a professional chef, and the kingdom of Duncan into a high-end restaurant. The analysis especially focuses on the changes introduced by the film director, on the purpose these changes serve in order to create or re-create the characters, time, space, action and style.

4. The Analysis

The first scene starts with a longshot of a junkyard, seagulls can be heard and seen in the sky. The camera moves to the left, while a music starts playing, which is a hint at the effects of events and decisions on the main characters Macbeth and Lady Macbeth. The music is a Bee Gees hit from 1977, entitled Night Fever, and the most audible part of the lyrics is: “I got fire in my mind, I get higher in my walkin’ And I’m glowin’ in the dark Give you warnin’” (BBC *Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*, 2005, 0:28-0:34). The lyrics talks about fire in the mind, which could refer to the mental state of the characters, when the characters, at the end of the film, respectively in the drama, go insane. At this point the camera still moving and, in the meantime, panning to the left, a red garbage truck enters the frame, and we can hear that the music is coming from that truck. In the next shot the camera cuts to a closeup of the front of the truck, where the camera starts panning upwards, showing for the first time the three witches in the form of three garbagemen. We can hear them turn the radio off, stopping the music and the start talking about the sandwiches they eat. The discussion is shown by an extreme close-up of each of their faces, bringing the viewers into an uncomfortable position. They talk with their mouth full, creating a disgusting effect in the viewers, which is in contrast with the way they speak, as they talk about their sandwiches in a very elegant manner: “What’s yours, Mo? Egg mayonnaise and ketchup. Beautiful.” (0:39-0:42)/ “Corned beef and anchovy. Very classy” (0:56-0:58). So far, the text has nothing to do with Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* in any sense of speaking, only the number of characters are the same. However, from the next line the script is parallel with the play, as the same information can be found in the play. One of the garbagemen, Baz, asks: “So, when are we out again?” (1:07-1:08) which is similar to the first line of the first act and first scene: “When shall we three meet again?” (Shakespeare 2013, 1). Baz in his next lines uses the same peculiar word *hurly-burly* as in Shakespeare’s play, which is also in contrast with the fact that he is a simple garbageman. All these contrasts make the viewers question the whole situation, and creates an uneasy feeling. Baz and Mo, the *second garbageman* start enumerating all the nasty things they have to clean up, including bones, guts, fish heads and “[s]kins of

haggises” (1:22-1:23) which is a smart reference to the fact that Macbeth is a folk tale of Scottish origin, and haggis is a traditional Scottish dish. This enumeration can be linked to the part in the play, when the first and second witches are being called by their *familiars*: “I come, Graymalkin. Paddock calls” (9-10), where Graymalkin is a cat, and Paddock is a toad. “To meet the kitchen warrior” (1:35) says Mo, which is just like in the original play: “There to meet with Macbeth” (Act 1. Scene 1. line 8). Baz also says “[t]he cooking brave hart” (1:36-1:37) which is a reference to another film directed by Mel Gibson entitled *Braveheart* (1995), which tells the story of the Scottish hero William Wallace. These markers “kitchen warrior” and “cooking brave hart” also draw a parallel between the film and the play, as originally Macbeth is a soldier, and calling a chef a soldier or warrior creates a link with the original play. During this conversation, the camera shows the three garbagemen in either an extreme close-up of one of them, or frame two of them into a close-up shot, which makes this scene peculiar, underlining the strangeness of the garbagemen. After the conversation the third garbageman is shown in an extreme close-up as he burps into the face of the viewers, when the camera immediately cuts to the front of the truck, as the wipers and radio suddenly turns on, and the three garbagemen look at each other confused, asking who did that. This scene underlines the otherworldliness of the three *witches*, hinting that they do have supernatural power. The next frame shows the garbage truck through a long-shot, showing the darkening sky as a storm is coming, which is an archetype of trouble coming, foreshadowing the chain of unfortunate decisions and events.

The next shot introduces one of the main characters in the film, Macbeth. This time, the camera is inside a fridge he just opened, in the foreground we can see a number of beers. He reaches in, and moves a bottle of beer out of the way, and takes out a bottle of milk. This act goes against our expectations, as we could not see the milk bottles, and Macbeth looks tired, which creates the expectation that he is going to drink a beer. This is a reference to the lines of Lady Macbeth in act 1, scene 5, when she is reading the letter from Macbeth, writing about him meeting the three witches. She knows Macbeth well enough to know that he will not act in favor of the prophecy: “Yet do I fear thy nature;/ It is too full o’ th’ milk of human kindness/ To catch the nearest way” (16-18). The *milk of human kindness* refers to Macbeth being a kind person, which is exactly what would hold him back of acting in order to fulfill the prophecy. This motif of Macbeth drinking milk is a reoccurring motif, which symbolizes his state of mind and change in personality. In the background we can hear a TV, more importantly, a cooking show, which Macbeth watches. The chef from the show is actually Duncan, the current proprietor of the restaurant, being famous enough to have his own TV show, which suggests that he is wealthy,

famous, and probably a good chef. As Macbeth turns away from the TV, we can see a little smirk on his face, suggesting either happiness or annoyance.

In the next few minutes the main characters and their status are introduced by a montage, showing Duncan in a luxurious car, a Mercedes. From these few shots we get to see Duncan's wealth from the car he owns and the fact that he has a driver. The next shot introduces Lady Macbeth, showing her from the back, sitting in front of a mirror putting on makeup. We can see that she is confident and determined, just like Macbeth while taking on his white smock. Lady Macbeth is shown precise and perfectionist, while she checks the layout of the table. From the reaction of the young waiter, who previously set the table, we can see that Lady Macbeth is a somewhat strict and precise woman, with high expectations towards the people working below her. Her perfectionism is shown by her measuring the distance between the cutlery with a tape-measure. Macbeth is kissing on the cheek a man who just came in, later on he is revealed to be Macbeth's best friend Banquo, who tells him "Mad boy" (3:32), Macbeth responding with "But you love me" (3:34), which truly indicates that their friendship is rock-solid. In the next shot we can see a circular and tight staircase, big enough to fit one person at once. Macbeth is coming from downstairs and Lady Macbeth is coming down from upstairs. They meet in the middle and kiss each other, and Macbeth decides to go down the stairs, so that his wife can go down. The previous scene showed the relationship of Macbeth and Banquo, while this shows Macbeth and Lady Macbeth's relationship. They are happy and love each other, not arguing on simple things, being a lovely couple, as we can even hear them laughing, while going down. The frame cuts to the interior of the restaurant, Macbeth and his wife entering from the right side of the frame, holding hands. Moreover, we can see Lady Macbeth grabbing her husband's backside, which emphasizes their happiness in a piquant way. Lady Macbeth goes to greet the guests, so we can see that she is the *Maître D'* of the restaurant, the person who greets the guests and handles reservations. Macbeth leaves the room, looking at his wife with a smile on his face, and goes into the kitchen.

The next scene is a little pause in the montage, showing the atmosphere in the kitchen and the relationship of Macbeth and his colleagues. We can see Macbeth going in the kitchen, singing a song, looking joyful. This tells us that he loves being a chef, cooking is a passion for him, and he feels joy while working. While he sings, he is sharpening a large knife, which foreshadows the terrible deed he will do in the future with a knife. This action is shown in a close-up shot to emphasize its future importance. The knife-magnet, holding several other big knives is a circle so the knives are pointing towards the center of the circle, creating the illusion of a target with Macbeth's head in the center suggesting that he is also going to die by a knife.

When the refrain comes they all sing together, showing that they are more than colleagues, they are friends. At the end of the song, a pig's head is being put in front of him, to process it for cooking. Before he starts, he asks for three of his colleagues, naming them. One of the chefs working here is distinct from the others, as he wears a black gown and a bandana on his head, Macbeth even calls him "Bandana Boy" (4:55). Later on, we find out that Bandana Boy is actually Malcolm, the son of Duncan, who is learning to become a chef just like his father, so he can inherit the restaurant. Macbeth tells them the first rule of a kitchen, which is respect, not just towards each other, but towards the food they make. He then praises the pig for being noble and intelligent, thus, it deserves respect as "it died for us" (5:14). He shows them, teaches them how to correctly process the pig's head, cutting off the ears, peeling the skin off, cutting out its tongue and brain. During this scene, we can see that the others listen closely to what Macbeth says, showing respect, but the viewer can also notice that Macbeth can handle a sharp knife really well. He explains that harvesting the most out of the head "in a word, is respect" (5:57-5:58). What he says afterwards is interesting and I can see a connection between those words and Macbeth's surname, as he is called Joe Macbeth. "Anybody can make it in a kitchen if they've got the guts and the passion. It's not what their background is or their history" (6:01-6:07), which suggests the circularity of the whole story that can also be found in the play, in the very first line of the witches: "When shall we three meet again?" (Shakespeare 2013, 1). The word *again* might refer to the fact that the witches have done this before, which also implies that they might do it again in the future, as the saying goes, *history repeats itself*. The fact that Macbeth's surname is Joe also suggests that he is just a man, as in the American slang they say *an average Joe*, meaning an average person. Because he says that *anybody* is capable of becoming a great chef, regardless of their background, might also refer to the fact that this story has already happened before, and will happen again after this ended. With this scene, we could see the general atmosphere of the kitchen and the relationship of the people working there.

The montage continues with a waiter bringing out to the guests some nicely prepared food. In this scene another important character is introduced as the Server of the restaurant, the person who handles orders and makes sure that every customer is satisfied and comfortable. He is Peter Macduff, a key figure of the film and the play.

After the customers are gone and the restaurant closes, Macbeth and Banquo go to a pub to drink and talk about a long day of hard work. During this conversation Banquo mentions the cooking show of Duncan, who made "[r]abbit stuffed with black pudding, wrapped with Parma ham" (10:24), which turns out to be Macbeth's recipe. Moreover, Banquo mentions that "[t]hey're always yours, Joe. Jealous?" (10:28-10:29). This scene introduces the base conflict

in the film, the fact that Duncan is using Macbeth's recipes to maintain his own fame, which makes Macbeth angry and jealous. Although Macbeth tells that the dish is not even his, he just learnt it from "a mad old crone halfway up a mountain in Cumbria" (11:30), we can still see a repression of Macbeth's true feelings, with a resigning smile. After this conversation and the arrival of Duncan to the restaurant, we can see Macbeth and Banquo coming back to the restaurant. The lighting is somewhat yellowish green, but as soon as they arrive in to the back alley of the restaurant, next to the trash containers, the lighting changes to a predominantly blue color, and it starts to rain. This highlights the arrival of the three garbagemen. In the play, the first time we see Macbeth and Banquo is in act one, scene three, when Macbeth and Banquo arrive from a battle, and meet the three witches, just like the two chefs arriving to the restaurant and meeting the garbagemen. Because of an incident Joe Macbeth and Billy Banquo almost got crushed between the garbage truck and a container, which prompts a discourse between them and the bin men. One of the garbagemen answers to Joe's shouts in a very calm manner: "You're Joe Macbeth" (13:30), which surprises him. The third and nameless witch starts the prophecy: "Twinkle, twinkle little star. How I wonder what you are. Three of them, Joe. Three Michelin Stars coming your way. [Baz continues] And that's not all. [Mo] Oh, no. [Continues the third witch] The restaurant. [Mo] The whole caboodle. [Baz] It's going to be yours, Joe" (12:40-12:55).

In this prophecy the three *witches* tell Macbeth that he is going to be the owner of the restaurant, and get the third Michelin Star. In the play, instead of the three Michelin Stars, the witches predict that Macbeth will be the "Thane of Cawdor" (Shakespeare 2013, 52), and that he will be a king "hereafter" (53). The witches use the word hereafter, which means some time in the future, and do not give a specific date on which he will become king. This might indicate that Macbeth did actually have control over his fate, forcing the time of him becoming a king in the near future. As Jim Packer said, "since Macbeth is a play primarily about *will*, about action in time and the overwriting of Fate" (Jim Packer, 2006, *A Dialectics and Aesthetics of Tragic Will and Fate*, 158) the question whether Macbeth is the victim of the witches and his wife's influence, or he did have control over the happenings has always been present in studies of the play. If we take into consideration the fact that the witches did not tell the exact date on which he will become king, might mean that he *urged his fate*, by killing Duncan, and becoming the king. After the prophecy, Banquo asks the witches to foretell his fate: "To me you speak not. If you can look into the seeds of time / And say which grain will grow and which will not, / Speak, then, to me who neither beg nor fear / Your favors nor your hate" (60-64). In the film Banquo also asks the garbagemen about his future: "Oh, yeah? What about me?" (BBC

Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth, 2005, 12:56-12:57), to which they answer “[l]ess happy than him. [Baz] And yet more happy” (12:58-13:00), which is the same line, as in the play “[n]ot so happy, yet much happier” (69). Joe and Billy enter the building to find there Duncan, who tells them the good news that they got the third Michelin Star. On the faces of Joe and Billy we can see a bit of disbelief and then utter happiness. This disbelief might indicate that they are shocked, as the garbagemen foretold that the restaurant will receive the third star. When the garbagemen left, both of them looked confused and then joyful, indicating that they do not necessarily believe what was told to them. But as they hear the good news, we can see Macbeth looking in a weird way at Ella Macbeth, indicating that his thoughts are about him becoming the owner of the restaurant.

After some general conversation, Duncan announces that he will leave the restaurant to his son, Malcolm. The camera cuts to Ella and Joe, so we can see their reaction, as they suddenly become uneasy and a bit tense, signifying that they do not agree with Duncan’s decision. Duncan also says jokingly: “Of course, if I go under a bus tonight, the boy won’t be ready and the place will be yours” (16:27-16:30), which indicates that Joe still has a chance to become the owner. While Duncan says these lines, the focus shifts to Ella in the background, which draws our attention to her, and indicates that she heard what Duncan said. To this joke, Joe says that Duncan has a Mercedes, in which he came to the restaurant, so “[c]hances of you being run over by a bus is zero” (16:39-16:41), with a smile on his face. This sentence is very important, as we get a little peek into Joe’s thoughts, he knows that Duncan will not die because of an accident, so in order for Macbeth to become the owner, something must be done. This idea can be found in the play, in act one, scene four: “If chance will have me king, why, chance may crown me / Without my stir.” (Shakespeare 2013, 157-159), which indicates that he is thinking about *stirring chance*, getting involved in forming his fate.

The next two scenes are closely connected, and show only Macbeth and Ella, talking and plotting the murder. On the roof of the restaurant the snowball effect starts, by the two of them talking about Malcolm, how he is not ready to become a true chef. They call him a “hairdresser” (17:15), because of his looks, and that he does not care about food and cooking with such a passion as they do. “One star to three in two years, and how many shifts has Duncan done in that time?” (17:26-17:29), asks Ella, to which Joe answers “Not many” (17:32), signifying that he did the lion’s share of the job, it was Joe who made the restaurant famous. “You know, you have worked so, so hard to make this place what it is. And whose face is going to be in the papers tomorrow, Joe? Not yours” (17:34-17:42). In the next scene, Joe and Ella are in their room, drinking champagne, and Joe tells his wife the prophecy of the bin men. In

the play *Lady Macbeth* is alone and reading the letter of his husband, telling the meeting with the witches, and what they foretold, whereas, in this film, they are talking to each other face to face. Joe talks about how they foretold getting the three Michelin Stars, and that it would be all his. An interesting suggestion of Duncan not being a true chef is, when Joe asks what time it is, to which Ella answers that it is 3 o'clock in the night. Joe is tired and does not know what day it is and says: "Chefs don't sleep. That's part of it" (18:39-18:40), and the fact that Duncan is killed in his sleep indicates that he is not as good of a chef as Macbeth is, in fact, throughout the film we never see Joe sleeping. After this conversation, Ella starts talking about how Duncan takes advantage of him and doesn't pay him enough: "He milks you for everything you've got and he pays you in charm and blarney" (18:41-18:44). As she starts speaking about how Duncan uses him, a mysterious piano music begins. Ella goes on and on about how unfair it is of Duncan to do so. In the next shot we can see Joe's face in an extreme close-up, as Ella says that he is "too full of the milk of human kindness" (19:00-19:02), which is the exact same line as in the play: "It is too full o' th' milk of human kindness" in the fifth scene of the first act (Shakespeare 2013, 17). During her speech, Ella enters the frame, so she is behind Joe, out of focus. She speaks directly into his ear, emphasizing that she is of high influence over Joe: "What kind of a man is it who doesn't feel humiliated in the position you're in?" (19:14-19:19) putting emphasis on the word humiliated, to evoke the feeling of anger in Joe, who starts to breathe heavily and his eyes start tearing up. Meanwhile, the focus shifts to Ella's face, highlighting that she is in control now. In the play, *Lady Macbeth* uses similar words to influence Macbeth: "When you durst do it, then you were a man" (Act 1, Scene 7, Line 56). Joe shouts, and angrily shoves Ella on the bed, and as a response, she starts kissing him, and while Joe is kissing her neck, she continues plotting the murder. This scene suggests that Ella is using her feminine powers to influence and control Joe, who suddenly stops, realizing what her wife is talking about. "Don't pretend you don't know what I'm talking about. You didn't tell him about the bin men, did you? You didn't tell him because you're thinking what I'm thinking. I can read your face like a book" (20:02-20:18). These lines suggest that Ella knows Joe better than anyone else, and the fact that he is not protesting underlines that she is right. He was thinking about killing Duncan, he had the exact same thoughts, only he kept them for himself. This supports the idea of Macbeth being in control over his own fate and actions, he only needed some confirmation from someone he can trust, his own wife. The line "I can read your face like a book" appears in the play in the same context and with the same intention "[y]our face, my thane, is a book where men may read strange matters" (Act 1, Scene 6, Lines 73-74). In the play we can read the same idea, because she says that "strange matters" can be seen on

Macbeth's face, thus he was thinking about plotting against the king, and how he could fulfill the prophecy. The next shot pans over Joe's arm, which is full of red scars, and on the shoulder, the tattoo of a pig's head. The pig head is a reoccurring motif of the film, which symbolizes the king, the person who is in charge of the restaurant. In the early scenes, we saw Macbeth cutting to pieces a pig head, which foreshadows the killing of Duncan, and the tattoo on his shoulder, like a badge of rank, suggesting that he is a leader, and will actually become the person in power. The scars emphasize Macbeth being a hard worker, who physically suffered to reach his current status. The panning shot stops at their heads next to each other, Macbeth's head being upside down. This shot is like an illusion, as we can only see their heads, and partially Macbeth's body, looking like they are one entity, with two heads. This suggests that they act like two sides of a coin, being very similar, with little differences. Ella says "[m]en don't get run over by buses. [Joe] No" (20:55-20:59). These lines suggest that they are committed and know that they have to kill Duncan, they are in this together.

The following day Joe is visibly worried, while his friends are singing while working, he just stares into nothing, as if thinking about something. He has to fire the two dishwashers, who like him, and enjoy working for him, because Ella found two immigrants from the former Yugoslavia to work as the dishwashers. These two characters will be the scapegoats in Ella's plan. Joe goes to the same fridge we saw in the first scene with, to drink some milk. As he takes the bottle of milk out, it breaks and spills on the floor as Malcolm enters the room. Joe is stressed and angry, and orders him to clean the milk up. The fact that Joe does not drink milk indicates a change in his behavior and way of thinking, he is not full of *the milk of human kindness* anymore. The next day they have to cook a celebratory dinner for Duncan and some food critics, so they have to do their best. Joe gives out the orders, but he does it in a different matter than before. He is not singing, he frowns, gives the orders in an aggressive manner and says: "I want Duncan Docherty to eat the meal of his life" (24:36-24:39), he even slams the metal table a few times to give emphasis to his words. Meanwhile Duncan arrives with some guests and is greeted by Ella, he hands her his wallet and phone, who puts the wallet in her pocket, and then places it into the pocket of one of the Yugoslavian dishwashers. Following Ella's actions, we can see her plan; she hired these immigrants to create a diversion in order to cover their tracks. Joe and the others are working hard in the kitchen, cooking all sorts of delicacies, such as lobsters. Roddy starts joking with the living lobster when Joe intervenes and uses the same method Duncan said the other day, the meat tastes better, when the animal is calm, so he calms the lobster and talks in a gentle manner with it, before piercing its head with a knife, while saying "[i]t's going to be just fine" (27:44-27:46). As the knife pierces the head, it makes a horrible

cracking sound, which shakes Joe, as it reminded him the foul deed he will commit this night, the sound of a knife entering the body of a living creature. Billy notices Joe's struggle and asks whether he is okay, to which Joe answers "[a]ye. I am fine" (27:54). The way he answers creates the feeling that he is reassuring himself, and not Billy, which indicates the inner struggle he has to go through. Duncan is enjoying the meal prepared for him when Ella says that the other guests want to see and congratulate to the chef. Duncan takes on a clean apron when Ella, sticking her hand into the meal, starts to make his apron dirty with smudges of the sauce. For a glimpse, we can see the realization on Duncan's face. When chefs work, they get dirty, a clean apron might indicate to the guests that he was not the real chef behind the meals. Ella even says "[n]ow you're the real thing" (29:15), indicating that it was Joe all along who made the restaurant and Duncan famous, however, Duncan is the person who receives all the fame and applause. In a following scene, Ella comforts Joe: "You've done this. You're a knifeman, Joe. You know how it feels" (30:41-30:46), she mentions that everything is prepared, he just has to commit the murder and they will get everything. In this scene we get a mention of their past, that they had a child, who passed away as a baby, which left Ella traumatized.

The night of the murder has come, and Joe is sending everyone home, so the building is fairly empty. When he is alone in the kitchen, and turns the lights off, the same eerie and mysterious music begins to play, which is always present, when the two characters are plotting the murder of Duncan. He picks the gloves of one of the new janitors carefully, not touching them with his hands, so he does not leave his fingerprints on them, and takes a large knife from the circular knife-magnet. Ella is also doing her part of creating fake evidence, by using Duncan's mobile to call one of the Yugoslavian janitors, cleaning it from her fingerprints, and throwing it into one of the nearby garbage bins. The missing wallet and phone of the victim and the recently made call to one of the immigrants will divert the suspicion of the officials from them. Although, this is, so far, a solid plan, the *scapegoats* are still in the same town, whereas, real murderers would have fled from the town, possibly, from the country. In order to make them flee, she calls the hotel they are staying in, and pretends to be "from Immigration" (37:12), that is, she works for the Immigration Office and tries to find two illegal immigrants. In the next shots we can see the two Yugoslavians running out from the hotel, as they are in fact illegal immigrants. She goes back to the restaurant to find Joe with the big, black gloves and the knife breathing heavily, preparing for the murder. A long shot shows him standing at the bottom of a staircase, being lit from the back, his face cannot be seen. The same, mysterious music starts playing, as he starts climbing the stairs, coming towards the camera, until we can see his face in a close-up, looking determined, but also nervous, breathing heavily. The next shot shows a

white door as the camera slowly creeps towards it, Joe enters the frame from the left side, his heavy breathing is still audible. Joe stops in front of the door, when the editing picks up a faster pace, and with a cut, a group of football fans are shown on the streets, shouting loudly in the night. Ella is on the roof looking at them, a man standing alone on the streets notice the fans shouting. A shiny doorknob and Joe are shown, the chanting of the fans is becoming faster and faster, which creates suspense, but also emphasizes the hesitation of Joe, as if the fans are rooting for him to enter the room and kill Duncan. The lonely man starts shouting and howling, as the camera cuts to the slightly open door, suggesting that Joe entered the room. The insane shouting also replaces the death scream of Duncan, as he is being murdered by his friend. Neither in the play, nor in the film the killing is shown. This is a technique used to emphasize the horror of killing someone by letting the audience's imagination do the visualization. As Marina Favila discussed in an article entitled *Mortal Thoughts and Magical Thinking in Macbeth* (2001) saying that "by removing the murder, Shakespeare creates the ultimate scene of terror as it is left to our imagination" (Favila 2001, 14). Someone who is familiar with the original text, might try to search for Macbeth's monologue before the killing, while he talks about Duncan being his friend and his "kinsman" (Shakespeare 2013, Act 1, Scene 7, 13). This monologue is not present in the film by a concrete speech, but the same feelings of inner struggle can be *read* on his face. In the play, Lady Macbeth told Macbeth that he has to leave the knife near Duncan, so no one knows who killed him, but he refuses to go back, as he is still shaken by the events so Lady Macbeth takes the knife back to the dead body. How is this implemented into the film? Why does Ella need to go into the room in which Duncan has been killed? The answer involves Ella's plan and the two Yugoslavian immigrants. She wants to make sure that both of the immigrants are the first suspects, so she tells Joe to get the other pair of gloves and another knife and make it look bloody. Joe says the same thing as Macbeth in the play: "I'll go no more. / I am afraid to think what I have done" (Act 2, Scene 2, 65-66); "I can't go back in there. Ella, I can't" (40:24-40:28). She takes the second knife and stabs the lifeless corpse of Duncan to create wounds and to make the knife filthy with blood. A shot shows both of them washing their hands, while the familiar music starts playing and Ella says that "[a] little water and we're clean" (40:17-40:19) just like in the play, where she tells Macbeth to wash his hands. The motif of Lady Macbeth/Ella washing their hands often reoccurs in both the play and the film, during some events the camera quickly cuts for a few seconds to a sink, where Ella is rubbing her hands under the flow of the water.

After the killing, Ella and Joe sit on the bed for a few minutes, next to each other, not talking, only staring with a blank face. Ella goes to bed but Joe cannot sleep, he stares at nothing,

not moving a muscle. In the play it is mentioned by Macbeth that he heard a voice say “Macbeth shall sleep no more” (Shakespeare 2013, Act 2, Scene 2, 57). He is troubled by his conscience and the fact that he killed his king and close friend just to become powerful. In the morning the first thing Ella does is washing her hand with soap, and finds Joe still sitting and staring, when he says “[i]’ll never sleep again” (BBC *Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*, 2005, 43:49-43:50). Until this point, Joe always wore white clothes, his tank top is white, just like his apron, but this time he wears a dark grey t-shirt, suggesting the beginning of his inner corruption. In the play, after the discovery of Duncan’s corpse, Lady Macbeth pretends to be shocked by the events and asks “[w]hat, in our house?” (Shakespeare 2013, Act 2, Scene 3, 102-103), just like in the film: “Murdered? Here?” (BBC *Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*, 2005, 45:27-45:28).

After this scene another character is introduced, who, so far, hasn’t been shown that much yet, who works in the restaurant, close to the bottom of the hierarchy. He and Joe are alone in the locker-room, talking about the death of Duncan. This man, later we learn he is called Johnny Boy, is worried that he will be the main suspect of this crime, as he had already been to jail for murder before. Joe tries to calm and reassure him that everything will be fine. Johnny Boy mentions that he also killed someone, using the same method, stabbing them with a knife. Joe tries to calm his colleague but doing so he also tries to calm himself: “Look, you’ve done your time in jail. The slate’s clean. That’s the way it works isn’t it? Isn’t it?” (45:59-46:11). On Joe’s face there is visible struggle, he tries to hide his panic and despair, he hopes that he can be forgiven, if he is caught. Obviously, the man answers that “[i]t never leaves you” (46:14), meaning that the killing will always haunt him, he will feel remorse and distress. This scene is shot in a close-up of their faces, emphasizing the delicate subject they are discussing. In the background we can see metal lockers and there is only one source of lighting, from above, highlighting the facial expressions, but also creating a closed space and atmosphere. The shot changes to show Joe from the side, so we can see in the background Banquo, letting a man in the locker-room. The tall man, wearing a black trench coat, white shirt and a black tie appears to be an important person. He starts asking some questions from Joe about the murder of Duncan, and reveals that he is a *copper*, a detective, trying to solve the case of Duncan Docherty. He sits next to Joe on the ground, and being a taller man, he seems bigger in the frame, suggesting his superiority. He asks him “[w]hat did you think to the old man?” (46:49-46:50). The camera cuts to a close-up of Joe’s face, slowly closing in as he answers: “If I’d died an hour before Duncan Docherty...I’d have died a happy man. Now...it’s as if everything that was important in life has gone. Nothing can ever be serious again.” (47:02-47:24), which are the exact same lines as in the play: “Had I died an hour before this chance, /I had lived a blessed

time; for from this instant/There's nothing serious in mortality" (Shakespeare 2013, Act 2, Scene 3, 107-109), the only difference being the fact that in the film, Macbeth uses modern language, so it fits into the context of the film. There is a subtle difference in tone of this speech between the two *Macbeths*. In the film, these lines seem sincere and serious. This is emphasized by the camera movement, slowly closing the distance between the camera and the actor. On the other hand, in the play, Macbeth enters the scene by uttering these lines, when there are a lot of other characters present, like an actor performing his role. We can sense some sort of irony in the play, as these lines seem like an overreaction to the events, there are no sincere emotions behind them. In the film, he seems truly sorry and shaken, he cannot handle the aftermaths of the murder. This *overdramatization* is present in the film, during the press conference, where Ella expresses her sadness and emotions to the journalists, and announces that the restaurant will remain functional. She cries, her voice is choking. A journalist asks the same question that the detective had asked from Joe, how does she feel about Duncan's death, to which she replies: "It's as though everything that was important...has gone...out of life. And nothing can be serious again" (48:04-48:14). After this reply, Banquo is shown with a look of realization on his face. He realized that these are the exact same words Joe used when the detective questioned him. When Ella utters the words "out of life", we can see Joe, next to him mimicking the same words, as if he was a prompter. This scene underlines the previous scene, and strengthens the genius of the film director, Mark Brozel, and the brilliance of the actor, James McAvoy. They tricked me, and made me believe that he was sincere about being sad, but this scene proved otherwise. This all goes according to their plan, they even learned what to answer to this specific question. They show sadness and remorse, however, deep inside, they rejoice and feel victorious.

After the interview Ella and Joe are watching the news, the announcement of the possible suspects. Joe is wearing a gray shirt, buttoned mostly up. Ella is frantically filing her nails, with an empty gaze. Filing one's nails is also an act of cleaning hands, which is the main reoccurring motif of Ella in the story. A loud knock is heard on the kitchen doors, and as Joe opens them, a man, also wearing a trench-coat, enters the kitchen, calling Joe "Michelin Man" (49:43), as he is now famous, now he gets the fame of being a three Michelin Star chef. The man opens some cupboards and investigates the counters, while saying: "Here's how it is. You can confess now and we can work it out, vis-à-vis how to play it to the satisfaction of us both, or I can do my four hours of scrunting about and come up with everything you could have fessed up to four hours previous" (49:55-50:12). At a first glance both Joe and the audience thinks that this man is working for the police, and knows that Joe is the killer of Duncan. The

man makes a reference to *The Merchant of Venice* and mentions Shakespeare himself, when he says that “[i]t is only proper that I admit at this juncture that I am more likely to look kindly on the sins of the confessee, than the sins of a bloke what has made me work for my pound of flesh, if you’ll excuse my Shakespeare” (50:18-50:28). The expression “my pound of flesh” is a reference to Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* (1600), meaning the payment someone gets by punishing others. As Joe does not answer, the man starts to guess what his *sins* are, and starts listing the common problems restaurants have to face or hide, like the presence of cockroaches and rodents. This sentence clarifies to both the audience and Joe that this man is not working for the police, he is here to inspect the cleanliness of the kitchen. Joe calms down with a smirk on his face. The inspector leaves and Joe starts to laugh, finding the situation amusing. This laughter foreshadows the madness Joe falls into, he laughs with the laugh of a mad man. In the next scene, the mental state of Ella is shown, as she is singing and applying makeup on her face and singing. During this scene there are multiple jump-cuts made, where Ella is washing her hands furiously, suggesting that she cannot forget the horrible deed she and Joe committed. These two scenes highlight the changes unfolding in both Joe and Ella, how they wanted to become the owners of the restaurant and the cost they had to pay to get it, sacrificing their mental health. For a few seconds, the camera cuts to the junkyard with the same garbage truck we have seen at the beginning of the film. The wind blows heavily, garbage is flying in the air, in the background the dark clouds are more prominent and closer than in the first scene, suggesting the bad things happening in Ella and Joe’s life.

In the next scenes the director beautifully shows the changes of Ella and Joe, both from their behavior alone, but also their interaction with their surroundings and each other. Joe’s clothing still represents his soul, this time he wears a dark gray tank-top, instead of the usual white one. Ella is sitting on the bed, staring into nothing and occasionally biting her nails. Her mind is in the process of a decadence, which is only shown by subtle gestures and upcoming habits. Joe takes out a glass of milk to drink, but the milk in his mouth turns into blood. He cannot drink milk anymore, he is not the innocent person he used to be. In the background we can hear him on the television talking about preparing rabbits: “After poaching, it looks something like this.” (54:01-54:05). During these lines, Joe is looking at the picture of Duncan, the camera cuts to a close-up of the picture at the moment Joe’s voice from the TV says “it looks something like this” signifying that he actually *poached* Duncan. Another scene from the beginning of the film is repeated, when Ella and Joe meet at the spiral staircase, they do not kiss, the barely look at each other, and go in different directions, suggesting the conflict between them. As Joe enters the kitchen, he is not singing, nobody does, only the sharpening of a knife

is heard. He is frying some meat in a pan, when suddenly the pan fills up with boiling blood, almost covering the pieces of meat. Joe is hallucinating blood wherever he goes, just like in the drama, when Macbeth hallucinates a dagger in front of him, with the handle pointing towards him. In the play he realizes what he sees is “[a] dagger of the mind, a false creation/ Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain” (Shakespeare 2013, Act 2, Scene 1, 50-51). Blood is a reoccurring leitmotif of the play, which is present in multiple scenes, both before the killing, but after it these motifs are more prominent: “Mine eyes are made the fools o’ th’ other senses/ Or else worth all the rest. I see thee still,/ And, on thy blade and dudgeon, gouts of blood,/ Which was not so before. There’s no such thing. It is the bloody business which informs/ Thus to mine eyes” (56-61). These lines foreshadow the killing Joe will commit. In the case of the film, the motif of blood hallucinations is connected to Joe, as he was the one who actually took a man’s life, whereas, the motif of washing and cleaning hands over and over again, is connected to Ella, who wants to be free from the thought of the murder. In an upcoming scene Ella mentions to Joe that he has changed, he is not being himself. Joe’s words sound like he regrets murdering Duncan. In the play, in act 3, scene 2 Macbeth talks to himself: “[h]ow now, my lord, why do you keep alone,/ Of sorriest fancies your companions making” (10-11) and comes to the conclusion of “[w]hat’s done is done” (14). In the film the two characters are discussing their problems among each other, coming to the same conclusion, this time uttered by Ella: “What’s done is done” (BBC *Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*, 57:04).

Another important moment that is slightly changed in the film is Macbeth visiting the three Witches to ask for their prophecy. In the play Macbeth goes to the Witches after the death of Banquo, whereas, in the film, Banquo is the first who tries to speak with the garbagemen. However, they do not seem to appear for Banquo, the garbagemen are different when he wants to ask some questions, they say there are no other bin men working here. This also emphasizes the bin men’s otherworldliness and the fact that Banquo is aware of the foulness behind the killing of Duncan and Joe’s sudden change in behavior. However, when Joe is sleeping in the alley, the bin men do come and speak to him, signifying that he is the target of the supernatural powers swinging his fate out of balance. He does not even ask, they know what he wants to do and tell him to “[w]atch out for the big waiter” (58:25), that is, “[b]eware Macduff” (Shakespeare 2013, Act 4, Scene 1, 81). In this scene, the binmen are shown taking the garbage out from the containers, swirling and moving past Joe and the camera, as if we were in the middle of it. This represents the Witches’ dance around the cauldron, in the process of dealing with supernatural powers to take a look into the future. The Witches tell Macbeth that he will only be harmed, when the “Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinane Hill” (Shakespeare 2013,

Act 4, Scene 1, 106) will come to him. The point of telling such an impossible thing to Macbeth is to make him confident about his position and future, to flatter himself that nothing bad will ever happen to him. As the film is set in Glasgow, in a city, there are no woods near the restaurant, so the film director changed the prophecy to be the following: “Pigs will fly before anything happens to you. [Mo] Pigs will drop on your head before you’re harmed.” (BBC *Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*, 59:23-59:27).

The third Act of the play starts with Banquo’s soliloquy: “Thou hast it now – king, Cawdor, Glamis, all/ As the Weïrd Women promised, and I fear/ Thou played’st most foully for ‘t” (1-3), uttering his suspicion directly to the audience, making it clear that he is aware of Macbeth’s part in the murder of King Duncan. In the film, the elements of recognition are scattered among the scenes. Banquo is present in all key moments when Joe and Ella talk about Duncan, he notices their reaction and the *foulness* behind it, by facial expressions, the actor suggests to the viewers that Billy suspects that Joe killed Duncan. In a scene, when he and Joe inspect the items brought by the butcher, he starts talking about the function of the liver: “It stores stuff, it processes, sends out what other parts of the body need, cleans the blood” (BBC *Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*, 1:00:15-1:00:20). All this information is known to Joe, who, half amused, half annoyed, answers to Billy, that he knows these things. However, Billy continues: “Yet it’s so delicate. Ten seconds too long in the pan and you’ve blown it, haven’t you? Totally blown it” (1:00:28-1:00:34), while repeating “[t]otally blown it” Billy looks in the eyes of Joe, not breaking eye contact for a few seconds. Billy, indirectly suggests to Joe that he knows the truth, who does not seem to understand the implication. To make sure, Billy keeps pushing and announces that they are expecting another baby. “All boys so far. So, another boy would be good” (1:00:49-1:00:53), with this information he makes clear to Joe that he knows the prophecy, that his sons will own the restaurant for generations. At this moment Joe understands the message, and a troubled look appears on his face, similar to the look before the killing of Duncan. In the kitchen, in front of their colleagues, Joe shames his best friend, and states that he owns the kitchen, he is the head chef calling the orders and having absolute power over others. Although the tension is obviously present, they seemingly make peace, Billy tells him about his custom with his son; in the afternoon, they usually go cycling in the woods, far from the city. This gives Joe the idea of getting him and his son killed. Joe is shown in a close-up, while asking whether he thinks about the prophecy of the bin men, to which Billy answers “[n]o, never” (1:04:26). Billy’s answer is obviously a lie, as he wanted to talk to the bin men in a previous scene and Joe saw him doing so. Joe is aware that Billy lies to him, so he asks whether Billy will go cycling in the morning. Joe is shown in an extreme close-up, suggesting

that he came to a decision, and will get his best friend killed. In the next scene Joe is wearing a black tank top, even darker than his previous attires were, talking to Johnny Boy on the phone to kill Billy and his son.

The apparition of Banquo's ghost can be considered the climax, the turning point of the play, from where there is no return for Macbeth. During a supper, the ghost of Banquo appears for Macbeth, signaling the pinnacle of his hallucinations and also acts as a reminder of what he has done. In the film, Joe and Ella invite everyone who works in the restaurant to a breakfast, to show their appreciation for their hard work. This is the scene where Billy Banquo's ghost appears to Joe, who is wearing black shirt and black trousers, suggesting that his madness and corruption came to a point of total control over his soul. The ghost of Billy, wearing a white T-shirt with a bullet hole in his chest, looks in the eyes of Joe, who shouts to leave him alone confusing and scaring everyone at the table. Throughout the scene Ella does not look at Joe, even when she is talking to him, just stares in front of her with an empty gaze. The downward spiral of Joe has begun, and after this, his decisions will only get worse and worse. His behavior changes drastically, even physically harming a customer who was not satisfied with the food. Peter Macduff and Malcolm plot against Joe, suggesting that they have also become suspicious of Joe. Joe blackmails Johnny Boy to kill Macduff, to prevent the bin men's prophecy from fulfillment. In this scene he is drinking a beer instead of a glass of milk, which also emphasizes that the "milk of human kindness" is long lost in him.

Ella is on the precipice of a mental breakdown, talking to herself. She tells us and to herself how they lost their baby. We get to know that the boy was a premie and lived only "three more days, and nights" (1:15:14) after his birth and that Ella had held him only once. This event clearly traumatized Ella, who managed to suppress her feelings, however, the recent, strong emotions around her evoked and amplified the trauma, causing Ella to suffer a mental breakdown. "The size of the coffin...It was so small...It made me laugh" (1:15:54-1:16:04) while saying these lines, she smiles and cries at the same time, being in a clash of emotions. The close-up shot of Ella's face cuts to two persons standing out of focus. This shot emphasizes her feelings and shows that she stopped perceiving the real world, she is thrown by a sudden wave of emotions. Ella stands in the doorway of the restaurant, staring the wall, and fidgeting with her fingers and talking to herself. In the meantime, in a dark room a bed is shown with people sleeping under a white duvet. As the camera creeps closer, two shots are fired and blood starts spreading across the duvet. Johnny Boy killed Macduff's family without knowing it. This leads to the last scene of Ella, as during the night, she climbs to the roof of the restaurant, cleaning her hands with a soap, to jump down. As she jumps, the cry of the same man is heard

who shouted while Joe was killing Duncan. Roddy tells Joe about the death of his wife, who says that he feels nothing about it. This reaction of Macbeth is present in the play in the form of a short but memorable speech. His answer to this news is that “[s]he should have died hereafter” (Shakespeare 2013, Act 5, Scene 5, 20), which suggest that Macbeth feels nothing about the loss of his wife, he lost the ability to feel emotions towards other people. In the meantime, Macduff learns about the murder of his family and decides to kill Joe with his own hands. He takes a knife from the circular magnetic knife-holders and searches for Joe in the kitchen. Macduff rushes to stab Joe, who ducks out of the way and says that nobody can hurt him, as the bin men told him in the prophecy that “pigs fill fly” before he gets hurt, he is confident, he thinks that he is immortal. As he says that he is immortal the sound of a helicopter is heard, landing on top of the building. Just like the bin men foretold, “[p]igs will drop on your head before you’re harmed”, because in British slang the police are also called *pigs* and they are *flying* with a helicopter. Joe realizes this and becomes frenzy: “Pigs are landing on my head” (1:23:38-1:23:41). He drops his knife and tears his apron apart, shouting at Macduff to stab him in the chest, knowing that the prophecy of the bin men is fulfilled, he is going to die.

As the last breath leaves Joe’s body, the camera cuts to the junkyard and the garbage truck, showing it from the side, with a clear blue sky in the background. Another cut shows the empty locker room of the restaurant and the music of the same cooking show, *Dining at Docherty*, is heard in the background. In the TV we can see Malcolm preparing the same dish, “[r]abbit stuffed with black pudding and wrapped in Parma ham” (1:25:06-1:25:08), his father made in the same show. Malcolm even says that it is his father’s receipt, suggesting that they removed even the memory of Joe Macbeth from the common knowledge. With a cut we can see Malcolm smoking in the alley, as the three bin men are looking at him, tilting their head and leaving on the garbage truck. As the vehicle leaves the frame, we can see Freddy, the son of Billy Banquo, on his bicycle, also looking at Malcolm, as the shot fades out and the film ends.

In these last shots the director included the other part of the witches’ prophecy, that Banquo’s sons will be kings. The circle is complete, but as a Möbius-strip, it folds back into itself, creating an ever-repeating pattern, which is signaled by Shakespeare by the first lines of the witches, who are planning to *meet again*, and their prophecy, is only half complete with the death of Joe.

Conclusions

As we could see from the analysis, the film *Macbeth* (2005) directed by Mark Brozel shares similarities with Shakespeare's play, regarding its themes and motifs shown by means of cinematography. This adaptation, using Dudley Andrew's typology, fits into the second type meaning that the film's main goal was not to be faithful to Shakespeare's play in the sense of time and space, use of language. The drama is only a source of inspiration, called "referent" (Andrew 1984, 96), which took some elements of the play and transformed it into a new work of art. The main characters of the play are present in the film, only supplemented by first names like Joe and Ella Macbeth, Duncan Docherty, Billy Banquo, and Peter Macduff. Andrew created a typology for the different ways of adapting a preexisting text, the most suitable being the process of "borrowing" (1984, 98). "Borrowing" means the act of selecting the main ideas of the text and giving it a new context. In the case of Mark Brozel's *Macbeth* (2005) the film director chose to keep the main characters of Shakespeare's play but also introduced new ones, like Johnny Boy, who kills both Banquo and Macduff's family, instead of the Murderers.

Robert Stam talks about Genette's theory of different intertextualities and searches for adequate *phenomena* in the world of films. The case of *hypertextuality*, is suitable for the Brozel's *Macbeth*, the film being the "hypertext" expanding the original text called the "hypotext" (Stam 2005, 31). It expands the play by giving it not only a new medium but also a new context, by placing it into the early 2000's Glasgow. Intertextuality is present throughout the film, starting with the first scene where the three bin men are talking about Macbeth, calling him "the cooking brave heart" (1:36-1:37), which is a reference to Mel Gibson's film entitled *Braveheart* (1995). In a scene there is even a direct reference to Shakespeare himself, specifically, his play entitled *The Merchant of Venice* (1600). These are references only to films and literature, there are more to be found in the film, from famous chefs to songs. The film also has architextual features, given its title and the title of the whole miniseries of films in which it can be found. The miniseries is titled *ShakespeaRe-Told*, which creates the assumption of seeing Shakespeare's dramas in a different way. This expectation is met, as all the plays in the series are recontextualized into the modern, 21st century world. In the case of this *episode's* title, the possible expectations are partially met, in connection with its genre, as the play is a tragedy, however the film is a mixture of different genres. It is a tragedy because of its theme, ending, and the fall of the main characters Joe and Ella. It can also be considered a crime film,

shown from the perspective of the criminals, we can see how the murders are planned and executed to end by the unveiling the truth and finding the culprits being tortured by conscience.

Recontextualization can have multiple purposes, one being the most obvious, to avoid repetition. Before the year 2005, there have been many filmic adaptations of Macbeth, both faithful creations and others that took inspiration from Shakespeare's drama. As Linda Hutcheon states, "[a]daptation is repetition, but repetition without replication" (Hutcheon 2013, 7) meaning that the film director repeats the pattern of the source text, however, s/he does not wish to tell the story as it is in the play. By recontextualization the film becomes somewhat independent from its source creating a new approach of the story. The whole purpose of the collection in which this film takes place, the *ShakespeaRe-Told* series is about *retelling* the classics of Shakespeare by putting it into a contemporary space and time, thus bringing it closer to the audience. One could argue that the problem with Shakespeare's play is that it is distant from the contemporary world regarding the language used and some of the plots. This problem is eliminated by the recontextualization of these classics, so it gets closer to the 21st century audience by means of everyday language usage and recontextualization of the characters, giving them new roles in today's society. It might seem that this endangers the very thing that makes Shakespeare's plays unique and dramatic, however, with the help of cinematography this aspect is transposed and kept. When language seems plain and easy to understand, the frames and camera movements replace the emotional power of dramatic speeches and soliloquies, and create a visually compelling and suggestive picture, which emphasizes the facial expressions of the actors. When Joe talks about his inner thoughts and feelings, the camera creeps closer to the actor's face creating a very tight shot, the background is barely visible, if at all. His facial expressions express his thoughts and feelings better than his actual words, which offers a more humane and easily understandable person to the viewers, as everyone can instinctually read emotions from gestures and behavior. This leads to the next merit of the film; the actors' performance. The main characters Joe and Ella Macbeth, played by James McAvoy and Keeley Hawes, are portrayed in a plausible way that it feels lifelike. Their emotions are clear and real, when they cry we feel the reason behind it, when they deceive someone, not so attentive viewers are deceived as well. The character development is plausible and gradual, the triggered emotions are responses to either the outside world or to their inner thoughts and feelings. The past of Ella gradually comes to the surface amplified by the events achieving a climax in her suicide. The knowledge given by the bin men to Joe undergoes a process of consideration and influence from other characters ending in decisions made out of either panic, fear, or greed. The three bin men Bo, Mo, and the third man played by Ralph Ineson, Richard Ridings, and Charles

Abomeli portray a unique understanding of the Three Witches. The three bin men have a brighter collective character than the witches in the play. They are not bringers of death but represent temptation for people who are easily influenced, they offer information about the future in a hazy manner so they are not to blame for the poor decisions other make. Their otherworldliness is represented by the way they speak, which is in contrast with their profession. The language they use is the closest to Shakespeare in the whole film, although they also use everyday language but the fact that they use allusions, metaphors, and ambiguous statements makes them feel otherworldly and more *dramatic* than other characters.

The problem the film director had to face while recontextualizing Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is the fact that in the 21st century, there are no kings and kingdoms in the traditional sense of the word. Brozel had to find a hierarchy, which was independent from the outer world and there were multiple people within the hierarchy with the possibility of climbing it. The restaurant is a good choice as it has a strict hierarchy with a person in the position of ultimate power, the head-chef and owner of the restaurant. The owner of the restaurant not only has power over other employees but he is also the representative face of the place, he receives every media attention, he defines the whole restaurant. This system also allows Joe to be the successful but barely recognized person, who actually makes the business famous, which ultimately allows the possibility of becoming jealous and greedy. By recontextualization the story not only gets closer to today's audience, but it also achieves the status of "myth" (Genette 1984, 98), as Genette stated, by the work being reinterpreted over and over again.

As the film does not try to be faithful to its source text, the reason behind analyzing the film from the point of view of fidelity is lost. The film *retells* the story rather than recreating it in the new medium, thus it cannot and would not be faithful to its source in the sense of space, time, characters, and language. The film director recontextualizes Shakespeare's drama to offer a new viewpoint of the known story and characters, the title of the series also suggests this notion of offering something new to the viewers of a known story. All these aspects abolish the possibility of a discourse about the fidelity of Mark Brozel's *Macbeth* in connection with Shakespeare's play, if we talk about the question of fidelity in its traditional, general understanding. If we take Andrew's typology of fidelity levels as basis of discourse, some features can be mentioned. Although, even Andrew himself mentioned that the second level, namely the level of "spirit" (1984, 100) is impossible, in the case of Mark Brozel's *Macbeth* this level of faithfulness can be found. The overall tone of the film evokes the same feelings one might have had while reading the source play. The gradual regression into greed and madness are masterfully represented by various tools, cinematography being one of them.

If one were to question the role of such an adaptation, we can see that their main feature is to show and emphasize a particular idea present in the original text by focusing on the chosen aspect of the story, characters or events, in one word to reinterpret the original text. In the case of Brozel's *Macbeth*, Ella's trauma is highlighted, which gives ground to her madness. In the play we get some indications that she had had a baby before but died at a young age: "I have given suck, and know/ How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me" (Shakespeare 2013, Act 1, Scene 7, 62-63). In the film they say that it was their child, a boy who died as an infant, which deeply scarred Ella's mental health. This trauma is the *soil* of her madness, which leads to her death. Another emphasized aspect of the story is the fact that it is presented as a circular, repeating pattern. The Witches did similar things before, similar events have happened because of their intervention. Their prophecy suggest that Malcolm will be killed by Banquo's son, who shall be king. In the film, the last scene strengthens this idea by showing Billy's son looking at Malcolm, while the three bin men are leaving the alley on their garbage truck, also looking at Malcolm.

This repetition is not only on the level of the story repeating itself, but also on the level of screen adaptations of *Macbeth* starting from James Stuart Blackton's *Macbeth* from 1908 to the most recent adaptation from 2018, directed by Kit Monkman. According to the International Movie Database (IMDB) there are 80² movies entitled *Macbeth* not taking into consideration any possible TV-series, which would increase this number even more. This huge number of cinematic adaptations strengthens Andrew's idea of a story becoming a myth in the medium of cinema itself, and still Mark Brozel's view on *Macbeth* is one of a kind with outstanding performances and cinematic solutions to achieve a certain level of drama and a feel of Shakespeare to create its own *feel* of *Macbeth*.

² https://www.imdb.com/find?q=macbeth&s=tt&ttype=ft&ref=fn_ft

Bibliography

- Andrew, D. 1984 *Concepts in Film Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bolter, J. D., Grusin, R. 2000 *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, MIT Press.
- Brozel, M., 2005 *BBC Shakespeare Retold, Macbeth*.
- Cardwell, S. 2002 *Adaptation Revisited, Television and the Classic Novel*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Genette, G. 1997 *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Newman, C., Doubinsky, C., University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.
- Hutcheon, L. 2013 *The Theory of Adaptation, second ed.*, Routledge, New York.
- Kuhn, A., Westwell, G. 2012 *A Dictionary of Film Studies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Stam, R. 2005 *Literature and Film, A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation* (ed. Robert Stam, Alessandra Raengo), Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Shakespeare, W., 2013 *The Tragedy of Macbeth* (ed. Mowat, B. A., Werstine, P.), *Folger Shakespeare Library*, Simon & Schuster, Washington, DC.