

T.C.
İSTANBUL 29 MAYIS ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MÜTERCİM VE TERCÜMANLIK ANABİLİM DALI

**METİN ERKSAN'IN FİLM UYARLAMASI *KADIN
HAMLET*'TE YORUMLAYICILARIN ELEŞTİREL BİR
ANALİZİ**

**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERPRETANTS IN
METİN ERKSAN'S FILM ADAPTATION *KADIN HAMLET*
(THE FEMALE HAMLET)**

(YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ)

Selen ŞAHİN

Danışman:
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Banu TELLİOĞLU

İSTANBUL
2022

T.C.
İSTANBUL 29 MAYIS ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MÜTERCİM VE TERCÜMANLIK ANABİLİM DALI

**METİN ERKSAN'IN FİLM UYARLAMASI *KADIN
HAMLET*'TE YORUMLAYICILARIN ELEŞTİREL BİR
ANALİZİ**

**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERPRETANTS IN
METİN ERKSAN'S FILM ADAPTATION *KADIN HAMLET*
(THE FEMALE HAMLET)**

(YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ)

Selen ŞAHİN

Danışman:
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Banu TELLİOĞLU

İSTANBUL

2022

T.C.
İSTANBUL 29 MAYIS ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Anabilim Dalı Çeviribilim (İngilizce) Yüksek Lisans Programı'nda 010519YL07 numaralı Selen ŞAHİN'in hazırladığı "A Critical Analysis of Interpretants in Metin Erksan's Film Adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)" konulu yüksek lisans tezi ile ilgili tez savunma sınavı, 06/07/2022 günü 11:00-12:00 saatleri arasında yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin başarılı olduğuna oybirliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Banu TELLİOĞLU
Kırklareli Üniversitesi
(Tez Danışmanı ve Sınav Komisyonu Başkanı)

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Nilüfer ALİMEN
İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sinan Okan ÇAVUŞ
İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi

BEYAN

Bu tezin yazılmasında bilimsel ahlak kurallarına uyulduğunu, başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda bilimsel normlara uygun olarak atıfta bulunulduğunu, kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir tahrifat yapılmadığını, tezin herhangi bir kısmının bu üniversite veya başka bir üniversitedeki başka bir tez çalışması olarak sunulmadığını beyan ederim.

Selen ŞAHİN

06.07.2022

ÖZ

Metin Erksan'ın Film Uyarlaması *Kadın Hamlet*'te Yorumlayıcıların Eleştirel Bir Analizi

Bu yüksek lisans tezinin amacı Metin Erksan'ın film uyarlaması *Kadın Hamlet*'i (1976) Lawrence Venuti'nin film uyarlamaları üzerine yapılan çalışmalara rehberlik etmek amacıyla sunduğu metodolojiyi kullanarak eleştirel bir bakış açısıyla incelemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda çalışma ünlü film uyarlamasındaki biçimsel ve tematik yorumlayıcılara odaklanmaktadır. Uyarlamanın biçimsel yorumlayıcıları mekan, Erksan'ın çekim üslubu, intikam ve baba sevgisi gibi motifler açısından incelenmiştir. Sonuçlar bahsedilen motiflerin ve mekanın uyarlamaya kaynaklık eden William Shakespeare'in *Hamlet*'i ile yapısal bir eşdeğerlik ilişkisi içinde olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Erksan'ın bu uyarlamasındaki çekim üslubunun ise önceki edebi uyarlamalarıyla aynı doğrultuda olduğu açıktır zira bunların hemen hepsinin ana karakterlerin ölümünü içeren trajik sonları vardır. Uyarlamanın tematik yorumlayıcıları karakterlerin cinsiyet kimliklerine odaklanılarak incelenmiştir. Sonuçlara göre Erksan'ın esas olarak non-binary bir Hamlet tasvir ettiği iddia edilebilir ki bu da yönetmenin kaynak malzemedan uzaklaştığı en temel noktaya işaret eder. Ancak uyarlamanın başlığı ve Hamlet'in heteroseksüel ilişkisi gibi uyarlamadaki non-binary tasviri kesintiye uğratan örnekler de mevcuttur. İncelemenin sonuçları uyarlamada Erksan'ın, kendi toplumsal cinsiyet ideolojisini ortaya koyan tematik yorumlayıcıları biçimsel yorumlayıcılara kıyasla çok daha ağırlıklı olarak kullandığını açıkça göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Biçimsel Yorumlayıcılar, Tematik Yorumlayıcılar, Metin Erksan, *Kadın Hamlet*, Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Non-binary

ABSTRACT

A Critical Analysis of Interpretants in Metin Erksan's Film Adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)

The aim of this MA thesis is to critically examine Metin Erksan's film adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) (1976) using the methodology offered by Lawrence Venuti to guide research on film adaptations. Within this aim, the study concentrates on the formal and thematic interpretants in the famous film adaptation. Formal interpretants in the work have been investigated in terms of the setting, Erksan's filming style, and motifs like revenge and paternal love. The results reveal that the mentioned motifs and the setting have a structural equivalence relationship with the source material, namely William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. When it comes to Erksan's filming style, his work is certainly in line with his previous literary adaptations because they often have tragic endings involving the death of the main characters. Thematic interpretants in the work have been examined with a specific focus on the gender identities of the characters. According to the results, it could be claimed that Erksan mainly portrays a non-binary Hamlet, which is his major diversion from the source material. However, there are also some instances such as the title of the adaptation and the heterosexual relationship of Hamlet, which interrupt the non-binary portrayal. The results of the analysis have clearly shown that Erksan's application of thematic interpretants outranks his application of formal interpretants in the adaptation, which reveals Erksan's gender ideology.

Key Words: Formal Interpretants, Thematic Interpretants, Metin Erksan, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Gender, Non-binary

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Banu Telliolu for her guidance during my MA thesis stage. Without her support and guidance, this MA thesis would not have been possible.

I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murat Seçkin who makes me aware of the existence of the film *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). Without his excellent knowledge of cult films and recommendation, I would not find a MA thesis subject to write about.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my dear mother and father Ümit Şahin and Mehmet Ali Şahin who never stop providing me with emotional and psychological support. I am also thankful for my brother and sister Onur Şahin and Merve Şahin. Also, Alp Demir Şahin, my little bundle of joy, deserves thanks for giving me hope about the future and life in general.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my dear partner Ziya Çağrı Yeni who has constantly heartened me since the day we met. He makes it possible for me to believe in myself no matter what.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEZ ONAY SAYFASI	ii
BEYAN	iii
ÖZ	iError! Bookmark not defined.
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
1. ADAPTATION AND TRANSLATION STUDIES	4
1.1 Basic Problems and Arguments	4
1.2 At the Intersection: Translation Studies and Interrelating Disciplines	8
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	18
3. FEMALE HAMLETS: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW	23
4. METİN ERKSAN’S <i>KADIN HAMLET</i> (THE FEMALE HAMLET)	28
4.1 On Erksan’s Adaptation	28
4.2 Literature on Erksan’s <i>Kadın Hamlet</i> (The Female Hamlet)	33
5. INTERPRETANTS IN METİN ERKSAN’S <i>KADIN HAMLET</i> (THE FEMALE HAMLET)	48
5.1 The Source Material	48
5.2 The Adapted Work	56
5.3 Interpretants in Erksan’s <i>Kadın Hamlet</i> (The Female Hamlet)	58
5.3.1 Formal Interpretants	59
5.3.2 Thematic Interpretants.....	61
CONCLUSION	66
REFERENCES	68
APPENDIX	73
ÖZGEÇMİŞ	76

**A Critical Analysis of Interpretants in Metin Erksan's Film
Adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)**

INTRODUCTION

Translation proper has been the focal point of Translation Studies for a long time. In fact, the discussions concerning translation proper are so prevalent in the field that the fact that translation in essence involves adaptation has been neglected. This is interesting since it is now a widely accepted idea in Translation Studies that translators are cultural experts who, using the source materials selected by themselves or their commissioners, create target materials which become “facts of the culture that would host them” as Gideon Toury suggests (Toury 2012, 18). Therefore, translators are thought of as experts who take into consideration the skopos and function of the translation project (Vermeer 2000, 230) as well as the expectations of the receiving audience and adapt source materials accordingly to create target texts. This means that all translation activity inevitably involves certain strategies that are not very different from techniques used in adaptations. The idea can be taken even further to suggest that all translation activity can be considered adaptations. Such a view might offer a couple of benefits to Translation Studies. First of all, as Hu Gengshen asserts, adopting an approach that considers translation as an activity involving adaptation, selection, and decision-making might result in more conscious translation practices (Gengshen 2003, 283). Secondly, if we accept the idea that any translation activity includes adaptation, the hierarchy between the original and the translation dissolves in the theoretical sense.

Can Adaptation Studies which has quite recently emerged as a sub-discipline of Film Studies offer new perspectives to translation scholars? The question should be answered both in the affirmative and negative. The new field has certainly got the potential to enrich the way we think about translation. As Venuti affirms (Venuti 2007, 29-30) it gives us an opportunity to evaluate translation as a decontextualization and recontextualization process, just like adaptation. On the other hand, Adaptation Studies fails to offer a systematic methodology. In other words, there is no precise methodology

that allows the study of adaptations as cultural objects on their own (Venuti 2007, 25). Besides, as Milton claims the field has not yet been able to offer useful concepts and terms that could broaden the perspective of researchers. The terminology in the field of Adaptation Studies, for instance, is so vast that it creates problems with its various terms used in different meanings (Milton 2009, 51). In this sense, one might argue that Translation Studies might be of great help for scholars of Adaptation Studies since it has much to offer to Adaptation Studies both methodologically and terminologically. In short, as John Milton states a greater interaction should be formed between Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies (Milton 2009, 51) and both fields might benefit from such an interaction.

Starting from the idea that ties between Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies should be strengthened, the present study aims to contribute to the growing literature in Translation Studies that focuses on adaptations and to reveal how the newly emerging field of Adaptation Studies could benefit from the perspectives offered by scholars of Translation Studies, particularly Lawrence Venuti. Venuti's study titled "Adaptation, Translation, Critique" will be used as the general theoretical framework of the case study, which will focus on Metin Erksan's famous adaptation, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet).

The rationale behind the selection of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is manifold. One facet is related to the popularity of the source text. Shakespeare's plays have never lost their popularity throughout the world as they have universal themes that are still relevant to today's way of living. Because Shakespeare reflects human nature in the face of tragic and comic situations, his works are likely to continue to be adapted in days to come. Therefore, such a popular Shakespearean play and its adaptations deserve to be reviewed again and again from different perspectives. Shakespeare's plays are also very popular in Turkey. Since the first translation of *Hamlet* in 1881 by Mehmed Nadir, there have been numerous *Hamlet* translations and adaptations in Turkish literature, cinema, and theatre. There are many faithful renditions of *Hamlet* in Turkish as well as multiple rewritings both for the stage and the cinema. As Hilal Erkazancı Durmuş suggests *Hamlet* translations and adaptations are strategic in terms of the transformation of Turkish people and culture. They can also be regarded as reflections of westernization attempts (Durmuş 2020, 122). Finally, the recent passing of the talented Turkish actor

Fatma Girik also called my attention to her films once again. Being both the leading actor and the producer of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Girik became the first female Hamlet on the Turkish silver screen. In short, this unique production is extraordinary in many ways and worth studying in the context of Translation Studies. I further believe that the lack of extensive studies in the field necessitates such an effort and that the concepts and methodology offered by Lawrence Venuti could be of help to critically evaluate Erksan's adapted version of Hamlet in a different light.

It is also necessary to admit that the study has got certain limitations. First of all, the second part of the critical analysis that looks at the thematic interpretants in the work provides a non-binary reading of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), which reveals my own thematic interpretant as a critic. As Lawrence Venuti suggests, the critic's own application of interpretants are only potentially correct (Venuti 2007, 38-39). Secondly, there is sufficient amount of examples related to the non-binary portrayal of Hamlet although it is possible to find examples in the adaptation revealing traditional binary roles as well. These examples might well contrast with my non-binary reading.

The study has got five chapters in total. The introduction section includes general remarks about translation and adaptation activities as well as the objectives, rationale, and limitations of this study. The first chapter attempts to offer an overview of the basic problems and arguments put forward by theorists working in the field of Translation Studies on adaptation and their solutions as to how we can approach adaptation within the framework of Translation Studies. The chapter also aims to portray how respectable researchers from other disciplines such as Literature, Theatre, and Film Studies benefit from Translation Studies. The second chapter offers the theoretical framework, namely Lawrence Venuti's theoretical contributions on how to critically analyze adaptations. Therefore, his ideas on formal and thematic interpretants¹ will be studied in detail. The third chapter provides a historical overview of female Hamlet representations in Europe and the United States as well as in Turkey. The fourth chapter gives background information about Metin Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), which is the subject of my analysis. The chapter also explores the other critical analyses of *Kadın*

¹Since I did not come across the Turkish translation of the word interpretants in my literature review, I preferred to translate the source word as "yorumlayıcılar", which I believe has a similar meaning to the source word.

Hamlet (The Female Hamlet) by a couple of Turkish scholars. The fifth and the final chapter includes an analysis on Erksan's source material and the critical analysis of formal and thematic interpretants in his adaptation titled *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). The conclusion section presents the outcomes of this study.

1. ADAPTATION AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

1.1 Basic Problems and Arguments

The issues of adaptation and how to approach adaptation within the framework of Translation Studies have attracted the attention of theorists and researchers from the field of Translation Studies since the 1990s. It may be important to look at the main problems and suggestions made by these people for this study, who approach the issue of adaptation from different perspectives since such an overview will help us view the early and latest problems as well as the early and latest solutions presented.

The first problem presented by translation theorists is the lack of precise methodology related to the field of film adaptation. Venuti (2007) believes that the study of film adaptation has been hindered by a lack of a rigorous methodology that enables the examination of adaptations as cultural objects on their own. The problem might be related to conceptual and institutional factors. Literary texts are given a higher value which marginalizes adaptations, and literature departments favor the source materials and authorship. Accordingly, film adaptations are usually evaluated in terms of adequacy to the source material or literary texts. This inevitably creates a faulty understanding on the part of the critic and results in the idea of adaptations being unfaithful to the writer's expressive aspirations. According to Venuti, this understanding is especially common in the adaptations of influential literary texts because there are many comments and very few authoritative interpretations about them. The communicative model, which is based on evaluating film adaptations based on their adequacy to the source material and concluding that film adaptations reflect a corrupted communication of the writer's expressive ambitions, has recently been replaced by a view that regard adaptations as forms of intertextuality (Venuti 2007, 25-26). However, a new problem arises since the new attitude is also biased valuing film adaptations over literary texts. Venuti asks how

one can call an adaptation as original if it involves various intertextual and intersemiotic connections with prior materials as well as the literary text it adapts (Venuti 2007, 27).

The second problem identified by translation scholars is the harsh limitations of translation proper that hinder a broad perspective towards adaptation. Nord (1994) states that a harsh limitation of translation proper against adaptation is not helpful for the practice and professional translation teaching. The idea of translation proper is based on equivalence, and its introduction to Translation Studies occurred in the 1960s. Later on, it was understood that entirely linguistic equivalence among the elements of the language system was an insufficient criterion, especially for texts that have complicated structures (Nord 1994, 59). Generally speaking, text-producing procedures are welcomed in non-literary texts rather than literary translations, which are expected to be faithful to the source text. For Nord, the problem is that these practices do not correspond to the adjustments that might be necessary for the translation process (Nord 1994, 61).

The third and the most frequently stated problem is the lack of interaction between Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies. Milton (2009), for instance, asserts that there must be a greater dialogue between the two disciplines (Milton 2009, 51). He illustrates the lack of communication between two fields referring to Julie Sanders' work *Adaptation and Appropriation* (2006). Sanders' book becomes something similar to Holy Scripture in Adaptation Studies, however its theoretical references are mainly from post-structuralist ideas, and it overlooks the significance of translation in Adaptation Studies (Milton 2009, 55). In short, according to Milton, Adaptation Studies borrows theories from other areas and has not been able to build its own theoretical framework or develop satisfying methodological tools (Milton 2009, 56). Translation Studies, in this sense, has got much to offer to Adaptation Studies.

The last problem derives from the complexity and redundancy of translation theories as well as the negligence of the very fundamental problems regarding the activity of translation, which is primarily based on the adaptation and selection of translators. Gengsch (2003) claims that translation theories keep on reproducing by focusing on philological, hermeneutic, and communicative aspects of translation, however, many scholars are dissatisfied with current theories because they believe that current translation theories are messy and unorganized declarations. Thus, a different and translator-centered approach is necessary for Translation Studies (Gengsch 2003, 287-288). According to

him, theoretical attempts should be made to examine adaptation and selection in a systemic way by referring to the translational eco-environment (Gengschen 2003, 283). In order to do so, Gengschen asserts, it is necessary for Translation Studies to go back to the original departure point such as what is translation, who translates, why they translate to understand translator behaviors (Gengschen 2003, 289-290).

There are a bunch of different arguments about the solutions for the basic problems mentioned above. Venuti, for instance, proposes a new methodology to critically examine film adaptations starting from a clear parallelism between translation and adaptation. To begin with, he highlights this parallelism as a commonly repeated yet not effectively studied concept. This parallelism becomes quite clear when both translations and adaptations decontextualize and recontextualize their prior materials. That means both translations and adaptations enact interpretations (Venuti 2007, 28-30). These interpretations are created by implementing a category, which involves formal and thematic interpretants. An interpretation is created in translations by using interpretants, which reconcile the source culture/language and the receiving culture/language. In other words, interpretants act as a technique of selecting the source text and turning it into the translation (Venuti 2007, 31). Furthermore, For Venuti, interpretants are significant to examine adaptations too. An interpretation is created in adaptations, by using interpretants which reconcile source materials and the medium and the circumstances of production. In other words, interpretants act as a technique of selecting prior materials and changing them into adaptations by means of the multimedial decisions made by adapters. To detect the interpretants, the critic needs to concentrate on the shifts, insertions, omission, and substitutions in the adaptation in comparison to its prior materials. The critic aims to explain the interpretive operations of the film adaptation by uncovering important formal and thematic qualities of the materials, especially what the adapter decides to adapt, exclude, or translocate (Venuti 2007, 33).

Nord believes that a functional perspective could solve the problems mentioned above and thus contribute to the translation theory and translator training. To illustrate, Nord gives examples on titles that contain allusions to *Henry V* by Shakespeare and *Wuthering Heights* by Emily Bronte. *Fair Stood the Wind from France* and *Wuthering Depths* as titles reveal that a reference to a translated book would never be able to have the same communicative effect as a citation from a work from the reader's own literary

canon. Going back to the titles, Nord states that the translator first finds predetermined and possible functions of the source title and then makes decisions on which functions and which hierarchical order should be targeted in the production of the target title. The hierarchical order and target functions serve as instructions for the translation process. The structure of a functional perspective relies on any transfer procedure which gives way to a functional target text. It is the purpose of the translation, in other words the *skopos*, which is determinative while figuring out the transfer procedures to be used in the translation process (Nord 1994, 61-62). Nord believes that *skopos* as a rule is very general. It might even mean the translator has got the liberty to any translation *skopos* for a specific source text. In order to avoid this, the concept of loyalty is introduced by Nord into the functional approach. It is supposed to set boundaries for various imaginable translation *skopoi*. This helps the translator to conform to the writer's communicative intentions and the readers' anticipations. When it comes to faithfulness, it is only specified by culture-specific traditions which are dominant in the culture communities included. After the functional analysis, the translator tries to discover the functions which are achieved in the source-culture situation by the source text either as a whole or detachable in-text by comparing them to the functions necessary for the target text. Adaptation, according to Nord, is one of the transfer methods that can be used if there is any chance of achieving the same functions by the target text in its target culture situation (Nord 1994, 63).

Nord proposes five steps to follow when using the functional approach for translation practice. First, a specific translation problem is detected and studied with respect to its function in the text and target situation. This leads to making a decision on whether the translation should be adapted to target culture norms or regenerate source culture traditions in the source text. Next, the linguistic tools that will be used are determined based on the decision as well as register and style, etc. Finally, if there are many options about various tools, translators might decide depending on their individual stylistic preferences. Fewer constraints on the side of situation and tradition mean there is more room for individual preference decisions. Nord believes that the functional approach is both consistent and inclusive. It does not differentiate literary or non-literary translation. Also, it embraces all forms as long as they have a certain function and depend on loyalty (Nord 1994, 65-66).

Milton claims that Venuti's theoretical contributions will be of help to solve the problem of precise methodology which is apparent in works about film adaptation. Venuti's work grants a terminological and conceptual basis for viewing film adaptations. Milton states that by using translation theory to support his idea of interpretant, Venuti created a path that Translation Studies should take. This path necessitates Translation Studies to take a supportive role in the advancement of Adaptation Studies, which could be carried out by translation and adaptation scholars when they attend joint conferences, publications, and courses of both disciplines. As a result, constructive relations between Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies would be created. Translation Studies should play a major role in the advancements of Adaptation Studies, and it seems Translation Studies is willingly ready to take on this role (Milton 2009, 56).

Hu Gengshen focuses on translation as practice and states that a more informed translation practice could be achieved if an approach which merges selections, adaptations and decision making is adopted. When translators know how to adapt, they get better at decision making and selecting. Gengshen draws an analogy between translational eco-environment and Darwinian principles of adaptation (Gengshen 2003, 283). The translation process has got two phases. In the first phase, the translator is selected by the translational eco-environment. In the second phase, the translator selects and makes decisions about the final form of the target text. These two phases give the translator a dual identity by being both the selectee and selector (Gengshen 2003, 284-285). Gengshen believes that the Darwinian principles which are applicable to the natural world could also be applied to humanities, including translation. Translators translate because they have the urge to do so. They need to fulfill their needs of food and housing. They improve their abilities to survive in their occupation. All these are related to the natural needs of a translator. That means Darwin's principle on the survival of the fittest also clarifies the translator behavior by providing the perspective of the nature of human beings (Gengshen 2003, 289-290).

1.2 At the Intersection: Translation Studies and Interrelating Disciplines

Adaptation is at an intersection point with Translation Studies, Literature, Theatre, and Film Studies. This section, thus, aims to offer an overview of how respectable researchers

from these disciplines benefit from Translation Studies. The works of these researchers will be very briefly examined as they play a secondary role in the literature review of this MA thesis.

In his study titled “Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals”, Patrick Cattrysse (1992) attempts to illustrate the relevance of polysystem theory for film adaptations. He believes the polysystem theory could be a promising way to take action in order to develop a theory of film adaptation. Stated by Cattrysse, the idea of studying film as translation originated from the lack of systematic theories about film adaptation as well as the fact that Translation Studies and Film Studies focus on the conversion of the source text into the target text under certain invariance or equivalent conditions (Cattrysse 1992, 54).

For Cattrysse, the polysystem method is an encouraging means to begin improving a theory of film adaptation for a number of reasons. First, there is no need to do research from scratch as the results of previous studies can be built into the methodological program. Second, new perspectives of film integration that have not been considered could be taken into consideration with the help of the polysystem approach such as the analysis of selection policy of the source material and the analysis of the corpus of film adaptations. Third, the polysystem approach prevents traditional and normative description of film adaptation which is based on finding adequacy relations between the adaptation and the source text. Therefore, it expands the field of Film Adaptation Studies, which is mainly concerned with whether film adaptations are faithful to the source text or not. Finally, the polysystem approach enables studying the adaptations of non-literary materials such as letters, radio, television plays, etc (Cattrysse 1992, 59-60). However, Cattrysse also underlines possible inconveniences related to the polysystem approach. According to him, it does not provide an analytical means for analyzing and comparing film texts. Moreover, some of the theoretical concepts such as norms, models, and systems need more articulation. Nevertheless, these inconveniences do not pose a risk for methodology (Cattrysse 1992, 61).

Several sources are used simultaneously at different levels for the production of film adaptations, and film adaptations are not limited to one source. In this sense, according to Cattrysse, film adaptations should be analyzed within a set of discursive practices considering multiple former discursive practices in their general historical

context (Cattrysse 1992, 61). All in all, every film production, for Cattrysse, is some kind of film adaptation. There is no reason why the polysystem approach cannot help improve film adaptation theory as well as film theory as a whole. Films could be analyzed as particular kinds of translation of previous practices together with experiences in reality (Cattrysse 1992, 66-67). Reducing the concept of translation to a transfer process of cross-linguistic elements is worthless. That is why Cattrysse thinks that the extent should be stretched to a contextualistic semiotic viewpoint (Cattrysse 1992, 68).

Ton Hoenselaars (2006), in his study titled “Between Heaven and Hell: Shakespearian Translation, Adaptation, and Criticism from a Historical Perspective”, tries to illustrate that in Adaptation Studies the sacred position of writers, especially those who could be considered as writers of canonical texts, begins to change and Shakespeare is no exception. Hoenselaars calls attention to the new perspective on translation, which defies a writer-centered approach. The Romantic idea that regards the writer as genius was the reason why a source-oriented manner dominated translation. It is not surprising to notice that this idea also echoes in Venuti’s statement (Venuti 2007, 26) about literature departments where romantic presumptions about writership reign. Hoenselaars states that the conventional writer-oriented view of translation changed. The source text and translation are considered as the products of historically particular occurrences which are determined and promoted by linguistic, extra-linguistic, political, and cultural factors (Hoenselaars 2006, 50-51).

It is evident that Shakespeare and his works create a canon in literature. This canonical state of Shakespeare and his works seemed like an impenetrable wall. As Hoenselaars suggests, dropping the textual and writer-oriented approach to Shakespeare in the past two hundred years led to a recognition of the translator as an intermediary in historically particular moments and a significant representative of a complicated exchange process. If translators justify themselves, they might be free to claim certain freedoms. That means Shakespeare is not lost in translation anymore (Hoenselaars 2006, 52-54).

For Hoenselaars, translation has always been political. In Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, John of Gaunt’s speech about the description of England actually comes from John Eliot’s *Ortho-Epia Gallica* (1593), which shows that Shakespeare grants John of Gaunt a proto-British quality. That is why Hoenselaars believes that now is the time to think

about the perception of translating the nation instead of writing the nation (Hoenselaars 2006, 61-63). Two ideas come to mind in the light of Hoenselaars' statements. The former idea is related to Venuti's ideas (Venuti 2007, 42) on how solely focusing on the political aspects of translation and adaptation might reduce them and hinder interpretive prospects. The latter is Hoenselaar's statement brings out Shakespeare's identity as a translator. As a final statement, Hoenselaars explains that the studies on Shakespeare and translation show that it is possible to study linguistic and political matters and more extensive cultural issues raised by this process. However, the challenge is to investigate a more focused relationship between the translation of a literary text and its culture (Hoenselaars 2006, 64).

The relationship between translation and adaptation was addressed as early as the 1980s. Studying their translation, adaptation, and interpretation, Franz H. Link (1980) attempts to present a detailed portrayal of dramatic texts in his study titled "Translation, Adaptation and Interpretation of Dramatic Texts." Link states that translation, adaptation, and interpretation of dramatic texts are interdependent. However, Link claims that even if their interconnection is known, there is no systemic articulation of the interconnection between them. Link attempts to show that because of this interconnection dramatic texts are complex by nature, and it is necessary for playwrights, translators, dramatic advisors, stage managers, and scholars to collaborate in the making (Link 1980, 24).

Link touches upon the issue of the translations of dramatic texts. A particular aspect of translating dramatic texts into foreign languages stems from the fictional concurrency of the audience's language and the drama's language. Writers use the language of their time, and translators translate them into another language in which they are specialized. As Link states, this is not a problem. When the play is translated in a later period, however, translators will use the language of their time again. This translation will be an interpretation of the play whose language is established by its time and society (Link 1980, 30). Much later, in 2007, Venuti will also state that second order creations such as translations and their source materials have got an interpretive relationship as well as an interrogative one (Venuti 2007, 25).

While talking about adaptation, Link's focus is on the adaptation of theatre plays to the stage. Link states that the adaptation of a dramatic text means is the translation of an idea from one medium of art to another (Link 1980, 43). The text is fixed, but it has to

be expressed on stage. According to Link, there are two ways of communication to keep in mind. The former is the text performed as similar as possible to what the writer had in mind. The latter is adapting the text in a way that is parallel to the experience of the audience. In the former case, the audience would perceive the play depending on their experience which would be different from what the writer's intended meaning. In the latter case, the performance of the text would eliminate the hermeneutical divergence. These two possibilities include interpretation, and one is related to what the writer wants to communicate, and the other is related to what level of communication the audience has (Link 1980, 43-44).

Link claims that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is a rewriting of *Urhamlet*. Shakespeare probably thought he could offer a better interpretation of the historical Hamlet story. That has been the reason why there are many rewritings in drama history (Link 1980, 45). Link's statement catches the attention, and apart from Hoenselaar's statement which brings out Shakespeare's identity as a translator, Link grants Shakespeare the titles of rewriter, interpreter, and adapter.

In her work titled "Collisions, Diversion and Meeting Points", Katja Krebs (2014) asserts that Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies are interwoven, and both should make use of each other's conceptions and methodologies in order to improve more precise approaches both for adaptations and translations (Krebs 2014, 6). She states that translation and adaptation are inseparable and essential elements of our global, local, political, and cultural practices. According to Krebs, it is now more significant to comprehend the effect of translation and adaptation have on the construction of culture and politics (Krebs 2014, 1). Thus, translation and adaptation are not mere spectators in the course of cultural relations (Krebs 2014, 2). It seems to us that Krebs highlights the political side of translation and adaptation which is opposed to Venuti's ideas on how interpretive prospects are decreased by ideological criticism (Venuti 2007, 42).

According to Krebs, the differentiation between translation and adaptation is not possible. Both are interdisciplinary by definition and address the phenomena of building cultures via rewriting. However, there are some misconceptions about translation and adaptation. Krebs believes that academic and western discourse tend to judge translation depending on equalness and likeness whereas adaptation is seen as a creative model, rewriting, or commentary of a source text. However, both in translation and adaptation

practices, reinterpretation and relocation are widespread. Even so, they are regarded as almost like two opposite poles (Krebs 2014, 3). I believe that this idea is resonant with Venuti's opinions (Venuti 2007, 29) on how translation and adaptation are differentiated even if they both are derivative productions. Overall, Krebs states that because they are cousins to each other, Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies might contribute much to each other both in practical and theoretical ways and they cannot exist independently (Krebs 2014, 6).

In her work titled "Definitions, Dyads, Triads and Other Points of Connection in Translation and Adaptation Discourse", Márta Minier (2014) describes another resemblance that translations and adaptations share: the dual and triple taxonomies which are apparent in both Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies. Minier begins with illustrating the similarities between translations and adaptations and points out the lack of communication between Translation and Adaptation Studies (Minier 2014, 13). Minier states that her purpose in writing her study is to bring Translation and Adaptation Studies together while keeping in mind the existing research in these fields which might legitimize the current separation between the two disciplines (Minier 2014, 15).

Minier underlines the fact that translation and adaptation assist in describing each other and they are both used as parallels in portraying intrinsic qualities of the other. They both exist in various categorizations of the other as subcategories (Minier 2014, 19). For Minier, translation is totally new work, and it has got a significant role in the reception of a specific source text as well as its afterlife. Adaptation also has got the same function. Adaptation contains putting work in a new habitat, and it includes interlingual translation in a new cultural and linguistic context. While the scholars of film adaptation struggle with fidelity discourse, Translation Studies fights with the idea of equivalence (Minier 2014, 21-22). As a result, Minier refers to the contextual elements of adaptation such as the why, how, and when in contrast with vain efforts of fidelity. Similarly, Minier offers the idea of when, what, who, and how of the reworking course in translation as opposed to the idea of equivalence (Minier 2014, 23).

Minier believes that what brings together Translation and Adaptation Studies is intertextuality. The thoughts about intertextuality erase the duality of source text and translation. Translation has got its own afterlife and using terms such as target text and target language alludes to the ending of textual production with translation. Minier uses

the term receiving culture to clear this misconception because translation is welcomed by a different group of people and obviously it produces different readings. The intertextual perspective helps the receiver to query the duality of translation and original. The original could be reproduced, and other texts might be involved in it (Minier 2014, 23).

When it comes to dyads in translation and adaptation, Minier refers to foreignisation and domestication as notions that act as the ends of a spectrum in interlingual translation, which are put forward by Venuti. Similarly, immediacy and hypermediacy act as two separate ways of the process of remediation in the field of media, which are presented by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin. Minier creates an analogy between foreignisation and hypermediacy as well as domestication and immediacy (Minier 2014, 24). Just as Minier mentions dyads in translation and adaptation, there are also triads in both fields. Wagner, Andrew, Desmond and Hawkes, and Cahir have their own triple taxonomies on adaptation as well as Dryden has his own triple taxonomy on translation. Minier believes that the three different perspectives on translation affected the way we consider translation and adaptation. The method of articulation and the extent taken from the source are focal in the creation of the new text (Minier 2014, 28).

Minier finalizes her work by admitting that the fidelity and equivalence-focused perspectives might have a precious contribution to research on case studies related to translation and adaptation. However, readings which concentrate on intertextuality and transtextuality as well as intermediality and transmediality enhance the modern way of thinking about translation and adaptation (Minier 2014, 31).

Dennis Cutchins (2014), in his study titled “Bakhtin, Translation and Adaptation”, attempts to show how translation and adaptation are interrelated by adopting the Bakhtinian perspective with a specific focus on intertextuality. Cutchins states that Bakhtin perceives languages more extensively than most, and there may be different languages used depending on districts, jobs, age, etc. According to Cutchins, all languages such as children used at school, family languages, and professional languages must be translated for the people who do not participate in these groups. This idea indicates that people undertake acts of translation nonstop. (Cutchins 2014, 36).

Cutchins believes that literature constantly understands itself as relative, not as absolute, and it creates numerous readings. Literature, for Bakhtin, needs interrelationships with other languages. What people do when they use various languages

is called translation acts. This consciousness empowers adaptation theory since adaptations are translations or reworkings of existing texts which are carried out freely into new languages. Moreover, this approach puts adaptation at the center of the study of literature because literature is a consequence of translation (Cutchins 2014, 38). It would not be incorrect to for us to say that adaptations are free translations of existing texts into other languages, and this is how literature is concerned with both adaptation and translation. However, such a view, according to us, disregards other ways of adaptation by focusing only on texts and literature.

Cutchins expresses that Bakhtin makes it possible for adaptation to become something more than an imitation and inferior copy (Cutchins. 2014, 39). Cutchins gives an example from Rainer Maria Rilke's attitude towards the translation of his book. Rilke believes that translation is parallel to writing poetry. The poet translates an idea based on experience and the translator translates it into another language based on a reading. Both acts of translation depend on comprehension (Cutchins 2014, 40-41).

Cutchins believes that humans of this century translate more and encounter adaptations. When trying to find an answer to one of the most essential questions of Adaptation Studies such as what is adapted one finds himself/herself in confusion. Some researchers believe that it is the essence of a text that is adapted, and other researchers claim that all adapted texts should be divided and perceived as small fragments (Cutchins 2014, 41-42). However, Cutchins finds both ideas inadequate. He believes Bakhtin's opinions on intertextuality can be useful (Cutchins 2014, 43).

After studying Minier's and Cutchins' works, it is possible to assert that just like Minier believes intertextuality brings Adaptation and Translation Studies together, Cutchins also refers to intertextuality as the conference of the meanings. Intertextuality refers to the negotiation of all meanings, containing meanings produced by adaptations, in complicated networks of intentional and unintentional meanings. Adaptation is about the effect of one text upon the other, and it is intentional on the part of the writer/speaker/performer and accepted by the audience. Cutchins believes that the generation of readings which is the trademark of literary thought is carried out by the relationships between adaptation and its source texts including similarities and differences between the two. The meaning of a text is in relation to other texts, and any literary text has got an abundance of meanings (Cutchins 2014, 44).

Cutchins refers to Laura Bohannon's experience with Tiv people when she had a research trip to West Africa. Tiv people wanted her to tell a story about her culture. After rereading *Hamlet*, Bohannon told a story about Hamlet and was surprised by the reactions of the Tiv people. The elderly Tiv people found Gertrude's quick marriage to Claudius suitable. The appearance of King Hamlet as a ghost was considered as a prophecy from a witch. Polonius was murdered, for Tiv people, as a result of his foolishness (Cutchins 2014, 45). All in all, Tiv people perceived the story by transforming and adapting upon themselves. Even if Bohannon was afraid that Hamlet story she told would make no sense to Tiv audience, Tiv people were able to effect a sound reading of *Hamlet*, which is in contrast with Bohannon's traditional reading. For Cutchins, this is an excellent example of Bakhtin's beliefs on literary texts brimming with meaning. Any kind of interpretation and retelling or adaptation of a text opens doors for more intentional and unintentional meanings. The text, the writers, the performers, the listeners, and readers of a text bring about the renewal of the text. Accordingly, the text is constantly negotiated (Cutchins 2014, 46).

Bohannon was retelling and translating *Hamlet*. There were a lot of things for her to keep in mind including Shakespeare's words, her own reception of the play, Tiv culture, the individuals whom she was telling the story, limits, and opportunities of the target language, etc. This creates a complicated kind of negotiation, which Bakhtin could call a dialogue. Bakhtin believes that language is in the boundary between one person and another. This fact might connect or separate individuals. When languages communicate with each other, this promotes literature (Cutchins 2014, 47). The traditional reading of *Hamlet* by Bohannon was something close to a myth meaning a story with a sole meaning. Her translation transfigures *Hamlet* from a myth and brings it to the realm of the abundance of meaning. This turns *Hamlet* into literature. As a result of considering literary meaning as something negotiated and relative, Cutchins says Bakhtin claims that a humane way of perceiving the world will take the stage (Cutchins 2014, 48).

According to Cutchins, it is not possible to estimate the meanings which are produced by translations. Translation cannot transmit all the intentional meanings but at the same time, it cannot prohibit the production of new and unintentional meanings. (Cutchins 2014, 49). An adaptation is the result of a dialogized text with a specific understanding, and it is always negotiated through its boundaries. If a film adapter decides

to work on a literary text, they must negotiate with tons of elements such as specific readings that they have, the traditions of cinema and literature, the anticipations of the audience, popular readings that might be seen as correct readings. The power and meaning of a text derive from the communication of all its boundaries. The interrelationship with reality gives an artistic text power. Cutchins believes that the power of an adaptation is also related to its interrelationship with source texts (Cutchins 2014, 50). Adaptation researchers deal with the boundaries of texts and the ways texts interdetermine those boundaries. Adaptations are the texts that share boundaries with particular former texts. The interaction of the languages makes the meaning of a given item in adaptation come into being. How interrelated texts and contexts collaborate with or against each other in their boundaries must be understood (Cutchins 2014, 51).

Cutchins states that the issue of fidelity in the early films was related to reality. In adaptations, it became fidelity to a source text. If an adaptation mates a person's experience of the original text, this adaptation can be called as good. However, no person's experience with a text can be similar to another. For Bakhtin, as stated by Cutchins, infidelity is an opportunity to create new art. Infidelity is redeemed by the capability of language to produce unintentional meanings (Cutchins 2014, 52).

Cutchins concludes his study by stating that literary texts have an abundance of intended and unintended meanings. Adaptation might or might not embrace these meanings, but it is certain that adaptation as an act produces more meanings for prospective participants. Cutchins believes that Bakhtin's profound understanding of language and translation brings adaptation closer to translation and enables us to consider adaptation as a kind of translation. Studying adaptations means the examination of a fundamental part of all artistic efforts (Cutchins 2014, 59).

All in all, studies documented above focus on the similarities of translation and adaptation and underline that Translation Studies is an undeniably beneficial discipline for interrelating disciplines such as Film Studies, Adaptation Studies, Literary Studies, Theatre Studies, and Media Studies. These interrelating disciplines are connected with Translation Studies because to do research on these disciplines, the researchers should think about the concept of translation one way or another.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Among the many scholars who contribute to the growing literature on adaptation in Translation Studies, Venuti stands out as the scholar who attempts at a systematic critical analysis of adaptations and offers a methodology. Venuti's methodology is versatile as it blankets all source materials and their second-order creations. These, of course, include translations and adaptations. Although other scholars emphasize the parallelism between translations and adaptations, they have not attempted to put forward any sort of systematic methodology which could be embraced by both translation and adaptation researchers. As Milton suggests Venuti's theoretical contributions help solve the methodological problems that are apparent in film adaptations by providing a terminological and conceptual basis for considering film adaptations (Milton 2009, 56).

When it comes to the relationship between second order productions and their source materials, Venuti states that the relationship between the two is not communicative, instead it is hermeneutic (Venuti 2007, 25). I believe that understanding the term hermeneutic is critical to comprehend Venuti's remarks. In the dictionary of Merriam-Webster, the term hermeneutic refers to "the study of the methodological principles of interpretation (as of the Bible)".² Venuti also feels the necessity to clearly define the term and states that the term hermeneutic should not be considered as something tethering the meaning and form of the source materials. It is interpretive as well as questioning in a way that unveils the social and cultural circumstances of source materials, translations, and adaptations (Venuti 2007, 25).

Venuti criticizes the communicative model, which is a writer-centered approach on adaptations. The communicative model relies on valuing the source materials over second-order productions such as adaptations. Therefore, film adaptations are assessed depending on their adequacy to the literary text, which results in considering film adaptations as disloyal productions to the writer's expressive desires. The critics adopting this model also adopt an authoritarian perspective on literary texts and search for this one and only interpretation in the films (Venuti 2007, 25-26).

²"Hermeneutic," Merriam-Webster, accessed February 21, 2022, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hermeneutic>.

The developments in the field of Film Studies bring about changes to the communicative model. Adaptations started to be seen as forms of intertextuality. Referring to Robert Stam's ideas, Venuti states that adaptations are considered as interpretations of prior materials including transforming operations which are in harmony with agents specific to films as mediums. Accordingly, the interpretation is determined by a number of factors including cultural and historical occasions. However, Venuti still finds this new perspective on adaptations faulty as it is a reversed version of the communicative model overvaluing the film adaptation over the literary text. There are two reasons why Venuti thinks Stam's hermeneutic model is incompetent. For Stam, film adaptations are original and different. Venuti highlights the definition of adaptation as second-order productions. It is not possible to consider adaptations original because they have various intertextual and intersemiotic connections to prior materials including the literary texts they adapt. For Stam, adaptations have objective materiality to the discourses, giving them a perceivable form. Venuti claims it is not possible to talk about objective materiality when those discourses are thought to be ideological, and the critic mainly interprets them with an ideological perspective. Therefore, this hermeneutic model prescribes a critical methodology on the grounds of a political stance, and the critics adopting this model expect the films to attribute to one and only ideology (Venuti 2007, 26-28).

The parallelism between adaptation and translation is often mentioned in the related literature, however, for Venuti, it has not been studied in detail (Venuti 2007, 28). Translation and adaptation are categorized as derivative compositions in the sight of the law. When it comes to the practice, however, this categorization is changing. Translators are expected to deliver a target text that has a one-to-one resemblance with the source text; they are not expected to omit anything and are only allowed to make additions which are essential to make the target text comprehensible in the target culture and language. Adaptations, on the other hand, have got the liberty to grow away from their prior materials. Nevertheless, as Venuti declares, translations inevitably include interpretations, which naturally change the form and meaning of the source texts. This does not mean that there will be no formal and semantic affinity between source and target texts. Such affinities are liable to the needs of interpretive efforts that are designated by translating language and culture (Venuti 2007, 29).

As to the similarities between translation and adaptation, Venuti asserts that both translation and adaptation decontextualize their prior materials. The translator disintegrates, reorganizes, and dislocates the signifiers that form the source text. In this process, three source language contexts get lost including intratextual, intertextual, and reception. These three contexts are constitutive because they are needed for the signifying process of the source text. They prop meanings, values, and functions and cannot stay untouched in the shift to a different language. A film adaptation, on the other hand, creates an interpretation by divorcing its prior materials from their contexts. These contexts are determinative in meanings, values, and functions of the materials. The functions of the materials include literary, dramatic, musical, and nonfiction texts and visual forms. Adaptations tend to decontextualise these materials in a complicated way due to alteration in medium (Venuti 2007, 29-30).

Apart from decontextualizing, Venuti mentions another similarity of translation and adaptation, which is recontextualization. Both translation and adaptation recontextualize their prior materials. Translation reinscribes the source text in a way it is comprehensible in the receiving culture and relocates it in different languages, literary traditions, cultural values, social organizations, and historical periods. Venuti states that the translator creates an interpretation in the receiving language that increases the cultural differences so that the translation signifies in the target situation. Similarly, a film adaptation recontextualizes its prior materials in a complicated way due to the change into a different medium with different customs, practices, and requirements of production as a film form. Acting, directing, the careers of the director and actors, financial and political factors, the hierarchical state of values, notions, and representations in the cultural condition where the adaptation is performed transform the recontextualization process (Venuti 2007, 30).

At this point I find it necessary to explain Venuti's concept of interpretants. Venuti asserts that an interpretation is written by utilizing a category that compromises between the source culture and language and target culture and language. The aforementioned category involves two types of interpretants: **formal** and **thematic**. While formal interpretants contain a correlation of equivalence or a specific style, thematic interpretants contain codes. The translator's utilization of interpretants leads to the decontextualization and recontextualization processes, dislocating intertextual connections in the source

language and culture with a receiving intertext, concerning target language and culture which are integrated into translation (Venuti 2007, 31).

Venuti suggests that in order to critically analyze adaptations, a thorough analysis on interpretants is necessary. Interpretants help the film to create an interpretation by compromising between its prior materials and the medium and its circumstances of production. It is a method used by filmmakers to choose prior materials and convert them into adaptation by means of multimedial options. As I have stated earlier, the interpretants in adaptations can be formal and thematic. Formal interpretants contain a relation of equivalence, style, and a concept of genre. Thematic interpretants, on the other hand, include codes, values, and ideologies (Venuti 2007, 33).

Venuti does not neglect the role of the critic too. The critic needs to concentrate on changes such as additions, deletions, and substitutions which become evident compared to its prior materials. The purpose is to investigate the interpretive operation of the film and to reveal which formal and thematic features of the materials were chosen to be adapted or omitted by the filmmaker. Spotting a change reveals the critic's use of an interpretant, which could also be formal or thematic (Venuti 2007, 33). Venuti underlines that while studying adaptations as interpretations of prior materials, the interpretants which are employed by filmmakers should not be refused or be declared unacceptable by critics. No translation should be compared to the source text because of various losses or gains arising from the translation process. Similarly, no film adaptation should be compared to its prior material because of the complex procedures it operates. There are a bunch of elements that Venuti lists so that one can avoid having judgments that overlook historical aspects including the contexts of the translation and adaptation, the conventions of translating and filmmaking, social conditions related to reading and watching (Venuti 2007, 35).

Additionally, Venuti asserts that the interpretants that are used in film adaptations can be complementary and non-complementary. They are complementary if they jointly have a general interpretation written in the prior materials. They are non-complementary if they end up contrasting interpretations that may be comprehended differently by different viewers. In the end, it is the viewer's interpretant that determines the evaluation of the importance of an adaptation whether academic discourse predominates the popular forms of reception vice versa (Venuti 2007, 35). Venuti believes that Pierre Bourdieu's

differentiation between elite and popular taste could be useful in that sense. Different aesthetics of production might charm different audiences and aesthetics of receptions. The elite taste stands for the ability to set boundaries between art and life while the popular taste targets deleting boundaries by sympathizing with characters as if they are real people. Some adaptations employ elite taste and others might provide popular taste. There are some instances that include both or popular taste might appeal to those who have elite taste and vice versa. What Venuti calls attention to is that these aesthetic categorizations must be expressed clearly depending on multiple factors such as formal, thematic, cultural, social when they are used in film studies (Venuti 2007, 37).

By recontextualizing prior materials, translation and adaptation transform them in a way that they change their importance. Venuti underlines the fact that using interpretants to build a new context does not only have an interpretive effect but also a questioning one. Once an interrogation starts it should not stop at the prior materials; they can be used to study translations or adaptations together with cultural practices and forms that form them as well as institutions and traditions that they are depending on. Additionally, what he believes is that the application of interpretants by the translator and filmmaker as well as the critic's own application of interpretants refer to nothing more than potential. It is an assumption about the translator's and filmmaker's use of the interpretants and needs the critic's use of interpretants that highlights questioning impacts (Venuti 2007, 38-39).

It is necessary for us to mention that determining the critic's stance regarding the prior materials and the adaptation is vital because a critical analysis is performed depending on the stance of the critic as well as the steps the critic will take. As Venuti highlights the critic's aim should be explaining the interpretive operation carried out by the film and showing the important formal and thematic qualities of the materials including both the parts that the adapter decided to adapt in a certain way and the parts that the adapter decided to exclude or replace. It is essential for the critic to concentrate on shifts, additions, deletions, and substitutions in the adaptation compared to the prior materials. According to Venuti, spotting a shift between the prior materials and adaptation requires some effort to fix the form and meaning of prior materials in order to find a similarity or discrepancy within the adaptation and mirrors a particular interpretant implemented by the adapter. Finding a shift also uncovers the critic's own

implementation of an interpretant. The critic's interpretants allow the deduction of the adaptation's interpretants through choosing particular qualities and operations to analyze and treating them depending on the critic's own methodology (Venuti 2007, 33-34). Venuti also recommends the critic to use a critical dialectical method which will help stand clear of prioritizing prior materials or translations and adaptations. However, he also highlights the faults with current critical tendencies in literary and cultural studies. The fault, Venuti believes, is that they prevent interpretive possibilities by reducing them to political positions (Venuti 2007, 42).

As stated earlier, Venuti's methodology will guide me as a critic throughout my attempt to analyze the formal and thematic interpretants in Metin Erksan's film adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). I should point out here that my application of Venuti's methodology of formal and thematic interpretants and my employment of a critical dialectical method without prioritizing the source material or the adaptation refer to the formal interpretants while the specific focus on gender refers to the thematic interpretant in this study.

3. FEMALE HAMLETS: A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Hamlet has been staged and filmed many times in accordance with the prevailing technologies and social and intellectual tendencies of the period in which it was adapted. Depending on the wishes of the adapter, there were those who aimed to stay close to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as well as those who shaped *Hamlet* according to their own interpretations. That is why it is easy to understand why there are many adaptations based on *Hamlet*. It would not be incorrect to say that all adaptations of *Hamlet* exist side by side in the Shakespeare palette just like colors in a color palette.

It is as usual to witness a male Hamlet on stage or film screen as it is to witness a female Hamlet. Thus, the concept of a female Hamlet is neither strange nor unusual. The reason for this is partly because of Shakespeare's portrayal of Hamlet. Shakespearean Hamlet is unable to act because of his indecision. He is in an intense dilemma and depression that go against the widely accepted manly behaviors associated with determination, taking instant actions, and insusceptibility. He could be considered as *less*

of a man (the emphasis is mine), and this leads us to query his gender roles. Consequently, many female Hamlets have appeared on stage and the silver screen. Examining the various female Hamlets will help us understand their historical development. This historical overview of female Hamlets both on theatre stage and the silver screen will include the representations of female Hamlets around the world as well as the representations of female Hamlets from Ottoman period to the present-day Turkish context.

Female Hamlets are represented by actors since the 1700s.³ According to the British newspaper *The Guardian*, the earliest presentation of a female Hamlet was carried out by Charlotte Charke.⁴ Charke was an eighteenth-century actor famous for playing many male characters.⁵ Adile Aslan Almond states that Fanny Furnival played Hamlet in 1741 and became the first female Hamlet placed on record in history. Sarah Siddons, Elizabeth Inchbald, Jane Powell respectively played Hamlet in 1775, 1780, 1796 (Almond 2021, 388). In his book titled *Performing Hamlet: Actors in the Modern Age*, Jonathan Croall states that the American actor Charlotte Cushman played Hamlet in 1861, and Isabella Pateman played Hamlet in the 1880s (Croall 2019, 43). However, I believe that it was with Sarah Bernhardt that a new era started in the history of female Hamlets. According to *The Guardian*, not only did Sarah Bernhardt follow many other female Hamlets' steps by playing Hamlet on stage in 1899 but she also appeared in a short film as a female Hamlet in 1900. Bernhardt became the first woman to play a female Hamlet in a film.⁶ Nûpelda Tütüncü asserts that Bernhardt received a lot of criticism for her performance, and in response to criticism, she even wrote a letter to the editor of the London Daily Telegraph which was published on 16 June 1899.⁷ As stated by *The Guardian*, in 1920, a silent German film that included a female Hamlet was played by

³ It is crucial to state that I aim to provide a non-binary perspective in this study without assigning genders. Thus, I specifically use the word actor as it refers to a person who acts in a play, movie, television show et cetera.

⁴ For more information, see Appendix 1.

⁵ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

⁶ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

⁷ Nûpelda Tütüncü, "Kadın Hamlet: Olmak Ya Da Olmamak," *Sosyalbilimler*, April 29, 2017, <https://www.sosyalbilimler.org/kadin-hamlet-olmak-ya-da-olmamak/>.

Asta Nielsen.⁸ The film portrayed Hamlet as a woman who was raised as a boy. According to Adile Aslan Almond's article, the film was based on Edward P. Vining's book *The Mystery of Hamlet: An Attempt to Solve an Old Problem* (1881). Also, Eve Donne became the first female Hamlet to be broadcasted on the radio in 1923 (Almond 2021, 388).

After Sarah Bernhardt's performance on stage in 1899, there had not been any female Hamlets until Frances de la Tour went on the stage as a female Hamlet in London in 1979 as a part of a promenade production (Croall 2019, 43). The next female Hamlets stated by *The Guardian* are Ruth Mitchell and Angela Winkler who performed *Hamlet* in 1992 and 2000 respectively.⁹ Also, Abke Haring played Hamlet as a woman in the play *Hamlet vs Hamlet* in Amsterdam in 2014.¹⁰ Maxine Peake played Hamlet in 2014 as a man confined in a female body (Croall 2019, 118). According to Amanda Parris, in 2017 the director Ravi Jain cast a female actor, Christine Horne, to play Hamlet at Toronto's Theatre Centre.¹¹ The play is performed in both American and English Sign Language and shows the possibilities of what can be produced on stage. Two actors Michelle Terry and Ruth Negga played Hamlet in 2018.¹² While Terry performed it in Shakespeare's Globe, Ruth Negga performed it at Dublin Theatre Festival. Natasha Tripney states that especially Terry, who is still the artistic director of Shakespeare's Globe, tried to create a gender-blind casting for *Hamlet*.¹³ As reported by *The Guardian*, Tessa Parr became the

⁸ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

⁹ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

¹⁰ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

¹¹ Amanda Parris, "What If Hamlet Were a Woman? This Toronto Theatre Company Dares to Ask Why Not," CBC, April 28, 2017, <https://www.cbc.ca/arts/what-if-hamlet-were-a-woman-this-toronto-theatre-company-dares-to-ask-why-not-1.4090219>.

¹² "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

¹³ Natasha Tripney, "Hamlet, Thy Name Is Woman: Why Michelle Terry's Globe Is Staging Post-Gender Shakespeare," *Independent*, May 16, 2018, <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre-dance/features/hamlet-globe-michelle-terry-shakespeare-gender-blind-cross-cast-as-you-like-ensemble-deaf-a8350886.html>.

next female Hamlet in 2019 at Leeds Playhouse.¹⁴ Finally, Cush Jumbo was supposed to play Hamlet in 2020 at London's Young Vic.¹⁵ Robert Dex asserts that the production is delayed because of the coronavirus pandemic.¹⁶ According to Dan Meyer, Cush Jumbo started to deliver a live stream performance of Hamlet on 28 October 2021.¹⁷ In the playbill for the play, Jumbo is seen with a very short haircut and a leather jacket.¹⁸

When it comes to the representations of female Hamlets around the world, the tendency of adapters is to display female Hamlets on stage. Only two actors, Sarah Bernhardt and Asta Nielsen, were seen as female Hamlets in film adaptations. Both Sarah Bernhardt and Asta Nielsen were cross-dressed. However, the difference is Nielsen's Hamlet is presented as a woman raised as a boy. I believe that there might be several reasons why there are very few female Hamlets appearing in film adaptations around the world. First and foremost, *Hamlet* is the longest play written by Shakespeare. According to the Guinness World Records website, *Hamlet* has got 4042 lines.¹⁹ That means it could take four hours to play it. Such a long duration might have been seen as a challenge for film adapters. Another reason is *Hamlet* has got a canonical status in theatre. Showing a female Hamlet on the silver screen might have been a risk for filmmakers. Finally, the adversities of adapting a theatre play into a film, because of change in medium, might have intimidated the film adapters. Especially if this Hamlet was a female Hamlet, it would involve change in gender too.

There are a number of Turkish female Hamlets both seen on theatre stage and film screen. The first female Hamlet appeared in the Ottoman era. Savaş Arslan states that Siranuş (also known as Siyanüş) became the first female Hamlet and performed it in

¹⁴ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

¹⁵ "Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo -in Pictures," *The Guardian*, accessed March 3, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

¹⁶ Robert Dex, "Cush Jumbo: Hamlet 'Not the Show It Would Have Been' Three Years Ago," *Evening Standard*, October 5, 2021, <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/cush-jumbo-hamlet-play-shakespeare-three-years-pandemic-b958850.html>.

¹⁷ Dan Meyer, "Cush Jumbo Stars In Live Streaming *Hamlet* at London's Young Vic, Starting October 28," *Playbill*, October 28, 2021, <https://playbill.com/article/cush-jumbo-stars-in-live-streaming-hamlet-at-londons-young-vic-starting-october-28>.

¹⁸ For more information, see Appendix 2.

¹⁹ "Longest Shakespeare play," Guinness World Records, accessed May 19, 2022, <https://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/69571-longest-shakespeare-play>.

Tbilisi in 1901 (Arslan 2008, 159). According to Meral Akkent, it is also important to note that Siranuş was also the first Armenian female actor who played Hamlet.²⁰ In one of the photographs of her Hamlet performance, Siranuş is even seen holding a sword.²¹ Ayla Algan was another female Hamlet. İnci Bilgin states that between 1962-1965, Algan performed Hamlet as a result of Muhsin Ertuğrul's initiation. According to Bilgin, Ertuğrul's production presented "a counter-Elizabethan perspective by making a woman play the role of a man" (Bilgin 2015, 67). Algan played Hamlet clad in menswear (Almond 2021, 388). As stated by Bilgin, yet another female Hamlet showed up in Metin Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). In this 1976 production, Fatma Girik played Hamlet. Girik's performance was different from the previous representations of female Hamlet because it overthrew the male Hamlet with a female Hamlet played by an actress (Bilgin 2015, 67). Erksan's film offered a strong female Hamlet in modern clothes and setting. Almond informs that much later, in 1994, Müge Gürman directed the play *Hamlet*. Gürman's play included two actors playing Hamlet. One of the actors was dressed like Charlie Chaplin, and the other one wore feminine clothes. According to Almond, this representation aimed to show Hamlet's split personality (Almond 2021, 388-389). As stated by Box Office Türkiye, by keeping up with today's trends, the final female Hamlet appeared on Turkish video content platform Gain in 2021. Elit İşcan played the daughter of a head coachman Hazar, which has got the same initials as Hamlet.²² The series *Hamlet* was directed by Kaan Müjdeci and looks into the changing power balance and the collapse of the Danish kingdom in the sixteenth century through today's coach kingdom in the Prince Islands.²³

It can be concluded that the early female Hamlets in the Turkish context tended to be more conventional. However, starting from the 1970s, female Hamlets appeared to be more radical questioning gender identities and social status. Siranuş and Ayla Algan played male Hamlets in female bodies. In Erksan's adaptation, on the other hand, Fatma

²⁰ Meral Akkent, "Merope Kantarcıyan (Siranuş)," İstanbul Kadın Müzesi, accessed May 19, 2022, <http://www.istanbulkadimuzesi.org/merope-kantarcıyan-siranus>.

²¹ For more information, see Appendix 3.

²² For more information, see Appendix 4.

²³ "Kaan Müjdeci, Gain'de Yayınlanacak Hamlet Dizisi Hakkında Konuştu," Box Office Türkiye, accessed May 9, 2022, <https://boxofficeturkiye.com/haber/kaan-mujdeci-gain-de-yayinlanacak-hamlet-dizisi-hakkinda-konustu--3608>.

Girik asserted a powerful female identity in a female body. Müge Gürman's adaptation brought a whole different perspective to Hamlet with two identities, masculine and feminine, putting forward the question "Why not both?"(the quote is mine). The final female Hamlet, which is seen in Kaan Müjdeci's adaptation, changes Hamlet's gender as well as social status. This is a different perspective on female Hamlets because she is of a different social standing existing as the daughter of a head coach. Perhaps, now is the time to think about lower class female Hamlets.

As Mina Urgan suggests, thought predominates in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (Urgan 2010, 248). Thought cannot be attributed to men only. For this reason, the journey of the female Hamlet continues from the eighteenth century to the present day. It would not be a surprise to see that this journey will take even longer. When all of the representations of female Hamlet are considered, it becomes evident that Sarah Bernhardt, Asta Nielsen, and Fatma Girik are the only ones who performed female Hamlets on the silver screen, and they are likely to be ancestors of prospective female Hamlets.

4. METIN ERKSAN'S KADIN HAMLET (THE FEMALE HAMLET)

4.1 On Erksan's Adaptation

Metin Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) has been an extraordinary yet controversial adaptation since its pre-production stage. The media coverage in its pre-production stage, the financial and censorship problems of its production period, the mixed reviews on the film such as appraisal from some and condemnation from others, and Metin Erksan's contradictory statements regarding the source text of the adaptation gave *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) a controversial quality. As stated by Murat Kirişçi, even the title of the film was a matter of debate as it was thought that *İntikam Meleği* should be added to *Hamlet* so that it would attract the attention of the filmgoers.²⁴ In order to avoid confusion, it is significant to note that in this study I will refer to Erksan's

²⁴ Murat Kirişçi, "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekinsinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

film as *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) which is the title on the cover of the DVD version of the film released years later.

I strongly believe that Metin Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) has got several unique characteristics that help it stand out amongst other female Hamlets. To begin with, Erksan presented the originally male Hamlet as a female Hamlet in a female body and clothes. Even if she wears masculine clothes from time to time, which could be a part of her personal style, she does not hide her gender. According to the film critic Murat Kirisci, other film and theatre adaptations portray Hamlet as a female character; however, characters in these female Hamlet portrayals hide their femininity and represent themselves as males depending on the scenario.²⁵ In Erksan's film, female Hamlet does not need to hide the fact that she is a woman. Second, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) portrays the third female Hamlet, played by Fatma Girik, to appear on the film screen after Sarah Bernhardt and Asta Nielsen. From this point of view, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) becomes a significant milestone in the history of cinema. Third, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is the first representation of a female Hamlet in a color talkie. Both Sarah Bernhardt and Asta Nielsen's films were silent and in black and white. Because they can watch a female Hamlet in a color talkie, the audience is able to catch a glimpse of her red washed world filled with vengeance in color. In addition, Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) includes the first female Hamlet who found her voice on the film screen in both literal and metaphorical sense. For us, all these characteristics of Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) make it extraordinary and worthy of attention.

Such a unique production like *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) had media coverage with news stories before even it was made. Metin Erksan was already an established filmmaker, and Fatma Girik was already a respected actor. As a result, news stories related to Erksan's then upcoming *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) took their place in the newspapers. One news story, according to Kirisci, reported that Fatma Girik was expected to shave her head to play female Hamlet.²⁶ It was rehearsed, and Girik had

²⁵ Murat Kirişçi, "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekinsinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

²⁶ Murat Kirişçi, "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekinsinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

pictures with a fake shaved head. However, Girik did not like the way she looked without hair. Even though she agreed to do so, she changed her mind and did not cut her hair to play Hamlet. Erksan tried to persuade her by insisting that she should go bald. However, Erksan's attempts to convince Girik were not successful. Such news stories gave the film a tabloid-like aspect.²⁷

In the pre-production stage, the film's title became a thought-provoking subject. In his interview with Can Anamur for the DVD of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Erksan states that he did not prefer naming his adaptation *Dişi Hamlet*.²⁸ Instead, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) became the title of the film. According to Murat Kirişçi, however, the film was named *İntikam Meleşği* in the end because it was thought that the audience would not show interest in the film if it was named *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet).²⁹ By looking at Metin Erksan's interview with Can Anamur, I believe that this information has been confirmed. Erksan states that "One of the producers of the film added *İntikam Meleşği* to *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)."³⁰ According to Kirisci, the title *İntikam Meleşği* always appeared on the film's posters and lobby cards. The title *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) was written on the cover when the film was released as DVD years later. Indeed, the two posters of the film titled *İntikam Meleşği Hamlet* and the DVD cover titled *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) validate these views.

İnci Bilgin states that *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) received poor reception both from the critics and general audience. First and foremost, it did not reach international filmgoers (Bilgin 2015, 67). The film mainly stayed within the borders of Turkey as an eccentric adaptation, except for being screened in a few international film festivals according to MUBI website.³¹ Second, as İnci Bilgin states, Erksan was criticized for reorganizing the story of *Hamlet* in Turkish context and presenting a female Hamlet which resulted in an underdeveloped film (Bilgin 2015, 67). Kirisci supports this idea by stating that Erksan also admitted that *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) was

²⁷ For more information, see Appendix 5.

²⁸ Metin Erksan Söyleşisi," interview by Can Anamur, 2007, Video, 14:49.

²⁹ Murat Kirişçi, "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekinsinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

³⁰ "Metin Erksan Söyleşisi," interview by Can Anamur, 2007, Video, 14:49.

³¹ "The Angel of Vengeance," MUBI, accessed May 12, 2022, <https://mubi.com/films/the-angel-of-vengeance-the-female-hamlet/awards>.

left incomplete.³² Third, the financial conditions of the 1970s in Turkey were compelling. As Kirisci says Turkish cinema had a lot of financial troubles at the end of 1970s.³³ Cansu Begüm Erkoç, in her MA thesis, mentions how market stagnation and censorship affected Turkish cinema (Erkoç 2018, 44-45). Finally, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) became a cult film as it also appeared more than once on Turkish TV.³⁴ However, critics such as Savaş Arslan (Arslan 2008, 161) declare that *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) became a failed art film. Erksan's representation of Hamlet's story only created a surrealistic melodrama with open air bedrooms and unmanned orchestras merged with bloody and brutal vengeance (Arslan 2008, 157).

The censorship did not stop chasing *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) even years after it was televised. When it was broadcasted on TRT in the 1980s, it was understood that some scenes were cut off.³⁵ The scenes in question included Girik's performance of Timur Selçuk's "Pireli Şarkı" which has got its lyrics from Orhan Veli's poem "Pireli Şiir" *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)'s leading actor's reaction to the incident was harsh. Describing this censorship incident as a great disrespect, Fatma Girik sent a protest letter to Doğan Kasaroğlu, the general manager of TRT at the time.³⁶ The letter included Girik's queries about TRT's broadcasting principles, the bad quality of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) copy on TV, and disrespect to the audience etc. She asked for immediate answers to her letter. Whether she had received any response remains unknown. The reason for censorship, as Almond claims, might have originated from the fact that Selçuk is a leftist, and Kanık is a socialist artist (Almond 2021, 395).

I find Metin Erksan's statements about the origin of the adaptation deeply confusing. In his interview with Can Anamur for the DVD of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) which takes place in Beyoğlu in 2007, Erksan clearly manifests that *Kadın*

³² Murat Kirişçi, "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekinsinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

³³ Murat Kirişçi, "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekinsinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

³⁴ "Hürriyet Gazetesi Kelebek Eki 11 Haziran 1987- Fatma Girik'in Başrolünü Oynadığı Film İkinci Kez Ekranda GZ63737," Gökçe Koleksiyon, accessed May 31, 2022, <https://www.gokcekoleksiyon.com/urun/hurriyet-gazetesi-kelebek-eki-11-haziran-1987-fatma-girikin-basrolunu-oynadigi-film-ikinci-kez-ekranda-gz63737>.

³⁵ Derya Bengi, Twitter Post, January 24, 2022, 2:24 p.m., <https://twitter.com/deryabengi/status/1485574265550344195/photo/1>.

³⁶ For more information, see Appendix 6.

Hamlet (The Female Hamlet) is an exact adaptation of Shakespeare.³⁷ Moreover, in the intro of the film William Shakespeare is seen as the writer.³⁸ However, in the same interview, Erksan told a different story about the origin of his adaptation. When Erksan was asked why he chose to create a female Hamlet, he refers to the difference between the text he chose to adapt and the text Shakespeare chose to write about. He claims that Shakespeare was inspired by a twelfth-century Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus who compiled Icelandic legends and Danish stories. This book was written in Latin, published in 1514, and was translated into English in 1567, and Shakespeare read it. The book included various stories, and Erksan believes Shakespeare decided to use a story about Hamlet and created his play. On the other hand, Erksan chose to use another story that was not chosen by Shakespeare and therefore is different from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The story which Erksan is inspired by unfolds as follows: Denmark and Norway are at war. Hamlet the king of Denmark and Fortinbras the king of Norway wage a war against each other. King Hamlet dies and the grim news arrives in Denmark. Gertrude the queen of Denmark gives birth to a child. She is a baby girl. However, Danish law does not allow Gertrude to remain on the throne if she gives birth to a girl. Gertrude exhorts her midwife and one of her relatives to hide the fact that she gives birth to a baby girl. They raise this baby girl as a boy dressing her in male clothes. Surprisingly, King Hamlet arrives in Denmark and proves that he is not dead. Gertrude is happy to see her husband. Gertrude reveals the truth by stating that she keeps the throne with the help of this lie. King Hamlet decides not to acknowledge his people about this lie and he decrees that the girl should dress and behave like a boy. In the interview Erksan asserts that the rest of the story is completely similar to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

The criticism brought to *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) does not change the fact that the film will remain as a milestone both in the history of international and Turkish cinema. As Bilgin suggests it was quite an innovative act for 1976. It challenged the male Hamlet by presenting a female character played by Fatma Girik. In addition, it became one of the early instances of postmodern parody in Turkish cinema (Bilgin 2015, 67). Kirisci highlights the fact that *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is a film filled with

³⁷ "Metin Erksan Söyleşisi," interview by Can Anamur, 2007, Video, 14:49.

³⁸ For more information, see Appendix 7.

surprising, interesting, and fun scenes.³⁹ Also, as Duygu Aytaç suggests it is rather exciting to witness possibly the most famous of the characters questioning human existence being played by a woman.⁴⁰ Also, Erksan's portrayal of Hamlet makes it possible for a woman to survive without conforming to the roles cast by society. According to Tütüncü, "To be or not to be" (the quote is Tütüncü's) a woman is not important for Hamlet because the message given with a female Hamlet is more significant.⁴¹ As Tütüncü says being able to question this and being Hamlet mean breaking a social chain for women. I believe that despite all its criticism, Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) brings a colorful and vocal representation of a female Hamlet to life. Even though the film suffered financial crisis and censorship, it was able to make a breakthrough in Turkish cinema. In Erksan's words, "It was a courageous attempt to make a film like that."⁴²

4.2 Literature on Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has always been the intersection of sets such as Literature, Adaptation, Translation, Film, and Post-Translation Studies. Scholars from these disciplines including İnci Bilgin, Adile Aslan Almond, Cansu Begüm Erkoç, Savaş Arslan, and Hilal Erkazancı Durmuş examined different representations of *Hamlet* in the Turkish context in their individual works. Their publications pay attention to *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) as well. These studies broadened my horizon with their precious comments and reviews and inspired us to analyze Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) in more depth. Thus, this section aims to overview the works of the above-mentioned scholars who studied Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) with a critical stance.

³⁹ Murat Kirişçi. "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?," Öteki Sinema, July 5, 2016, <https://www.otekisinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

⁴⁰ Duygu Aytaç, "Yeryüzündeki Kızların En Mükemmel Hakkında Yanlış Düşünüyorsun," 5Harfliler, May 14, 2015, <https://www.5harfliler.com/hamlet-olmanin-cazibesi-ve-kadin-hamletler-yeryuzundeki-kizlarin-en-mukemmel-hakkinda-yanlis-dusunuyorsun/>.

⁴¹ Nûpelda Tütüncü, "Kadın Hamlet: Olmak Ya Da Olmamak," Sosyalbilimler, April 29, 2017, <https://www.sosyalbilimler.org/kadin-hamlet-olmak-ya-da-olmamak/>.

⁴² "Metin Erksan Söyleşisi," interview by Can Anamur, 2007, Video, 14:49.

İnci Bilgin's article (2015) studies the transformation of Hamlet readings in Turkey. Bilgin makes use of Homi K. Bhabha's ideas on cultural hybridity as framework. Cultural hybridity meditates on the cultural uneasiness of Turkey which is located at the intersection of western and eastern cultural identities. After clarifying her methodology, Bilgin dwells on the process of adaptation. She states that the process of adaptation necessitates creating a conscious conversation with another text and making an interpretive contribution. This means adaptation aims at making the adapted text appropriate to the recently introduced context (Bilgin 2015, 65). Bilgin's description of the adaptation process reminds us of Venuti's ideas on the interpretive relationship between source materials and their second order productions (Venuti 2007, 25).

Bilgin's article highlights the relationship between Tanzimat era, adaptations, and Shakespearean plays. She states that the history of adaptation in Turkish literature goes a long way to Tanzimat, which means reorganization. From Tanzimat onwards, adaptation has been a controversial issue because of the lasting debate on Westernization and Easternization. Bilgin highlights the fact that the Turkish audience did not meet with any Shakespearian plays until Westernization attempts began. She believes that Hamlet has got a special place in Turkish theatre as it is the most commonly staged Western play, thus it becomes a canon for the Turkish audience (Bilgin 2015, 65-66).

In her analysis on *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Bilgin brings a few new perspectives to *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). First, as Bilgin claims, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) gives the Oedipal complex a female perspective and calls for a psychoanalytical feminist reading. Second, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) provides a feminist context by decolonizing the women in the play. Accordingly, by excluding the quotation in the source play "Frailty, thy name is woman", *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) destroys the patriarchal viewpoint (Bilgin 2015, 68). Finally, Bilgin states that *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) starts a new era for adaptations such as the Easternization of the British context (Bilgin 2015, 69). Also, Bilgin focuses on two deconstructive measures of Erksan. The former deconstructive strategy is that Erksan put western and eastern contexts side by side and demanded a challenge. The latter deconstructive aspect is to make a film out of a play. Adapting a play into a film involves translation in an intercultural sense and transfer in intergeneric and intersemiotic senses. This means that it is not a matter of just a mere change of medium process (Bilgin 2015,

69-71). Bilgin ends her article by stating that the conception of producing postcolonial and feminist adaptations for *Hamlet* challenges oppressive elements of Shakespeare's text. This goes hand in hand with developments in Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies after the 1960s and 1970s respectively by playing with the source text in a way that it conforms with the target culture (Bilgin 2015, 73).

Adile Aslan Almond's article (2021) points out that Metin Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is a politically educated and secular analysis. Almond aims to bring updates to the criticism on *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) and Metin Erksan by referring to the application of modernization as a theme and device (Almond 2021, 388). I feel that while doing so, Almond's article does not follow a specific methodology, which might be considered a major weakness.

Before analyzing *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Almond focuses on Metin Erksan filmography that includes many adaptations such as *Susuz Yaz* an adaptation of Necati Cumalı's work, *Ölmeyen Aşk* an adaptation of Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights*, *Şeytan* an adaptation of William Friedkin's *Exorcist*. Almond believes that as a director Erksan focused on focal issues in Turkey as well as his creative inclinations. By referring to Gülşen Sayın's views, Almond asserts that Erksan was a representative of Turkish cinema between the 1960s and 1970s, who concentrated on domestication in terms of content and structure which came along with a dynamic sense of socio-political undertaking (Almond 2021, 389).

In her analysis, Almond points out that Erksan's film fits into the category of commentary, one of the three kinds of adaptation put forward by Geoffrey Wagner, which means changing the source text in order to tell one's own perspective extensively (Almond 2021, 390). She, then, analyzes *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) by spotting the superior positions of gender and nationality which both go way beyond their usual connotations. According to Almond, Erksan attempts to highlight the feminine and masculine qualities of Hamlet, and Erksan's Hamlet "transcends female/male dichotomy" in terms of gender (Almond 2021, 391). Because Hamlet is the most powerful person in the film, Erksan tries to transverse sexual orientation assumptions. Giving some specific examples from the film, Almond states that in terms of nationality the flags in the wedding scene might symbolize the quality of *Hamlet* as an international and transnational play.

The surname of Hamlet is “Evren” and this might refer to the idea of reaching the universal after arriving at the national (Almond 2021, 391).

Almond states that there are clear political and feminist allusions in the film. When it comes to political allusions, according to Almond, showing Hamlet as a smoking, assertive, bikini-wearing woman means Erksan has got a secular position on the scale of secularism and Islamism. Almond also suggests Erksan removes any religious symbolism in his adaptation (Almond 2021, 392). However, I have compelling evidence to refute Almond’s assertions. If Erksan’s point was to remove religious symbolism, he would not shoot the funeral scene of Hamlet’s father using Islamic terms with an imam. Another example that Almond gives is that in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, there is a prayer scene after the court play. However, Erksan’s adaptation does not include such a scene. Almond believes that Erksan removes the comedic elements of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* to highlight a political perspective (Almond 2021, 392). This is yet another point that I have to disagree with Almond. They are very few, but the comedic scenes do exist in Erksan’s adaptation. One example is when Hamlet performs “Pireli Şarkı”, Hamlet turns back and points their buttocks to the audience. The audience watching Hamlet perform inside the film as well as us being the spectators of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) cannot help but laugh at this. To give more examples about the political perspective, Almond states that Hamlet’s father goes against the usual ghost appearance, which would be a figure in white cloth, and instead makes Hamlet’s father wear a suit. This could be the representation of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who is the father of modern Turkey and advocates wearing modern clothes (Almond 2021, 392). As for feminist allusions, Almond believes that Hamlet seems like an unconventional woman for the Muslim and conservative audience of the time. Erksan’s Hamlet does not have an existential crisis or philosophical aspects like Shakespeare’s Hamlet. Erksan’s Hamlet is self-assured and self-confident. What Almond asserts is that creating a character like this is significant when feminism was taking its early steps those days (Almond 2021, 393).

Almond pays specific attention to the madness scenes of Erksan’s film. When Hamlet is seen spilling a box of red paint on Orhan’s painting, one could understand that Erksan reorganizes the elements of the original play in unusual ways (Almond 2021, 393). Another example given by Almond is the scene where Hamlet plays the trumpet. The trumpet which belongs to the Danish court is used to show Hamlet’s madness. Also, for

Almond, the hyperbolic acting of Fatma Girik might highlight the origin of the film, namely Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. She also draws attention to the scene where Hamlet approaches Gönül and Kasım while they were sleeping on hammocks. Almond states that Hamlet is clad in a knight costume, which might be a reference to the play and its medieval setting. In addition, in her outdoor bedroom, Hamlet wears a red dress, which mirrors Gönül's attractive looks (Almond 2021, 394). Hamlet wants *tuluat* performers on the stage and this is one of the examples of adaptation to the local context. The song which is played before the play belongs to Timur Selçuk. Selçuk composed Orhan Veli Kanık's poem "Pireli Şiir". Selçuk is a leftist, and Kanık is a socialist artist. What Almond believes is that the socio-political atmosphere of Turkey is embedded in the film (Almond 2021, 395).

Almond concludes that Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is an interpretation with avant-garde perspective and melodrama qualities, and it erases Denmark and Fortinbras in order to apply the Turkish political atmosphere into his adaptation. She states that *Hamlet* has always been a modernization tool for Turkey. Referring to Saliha Parker and Savaş Arslan's claims, Almond asserts that *Hamlet* translations and productions reflect Turkish history of politics and culture as well as the division between secularism and Islamism. However, she criticizes Parker and Arslan because they disregard Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) in their studies (Almond 2021, 396). In her final sentences, Almond observes that Erksan's political views are embedded in the work but not stated openly because of the political chaos of 1971. Hamlet's father symbolizes Atatürk, and Hamlet grieves for the long-lost father. Kasım and Orhan's father are jesters trying to usurp power and wealth. Hamlet is the face of modern Turkey, an educated and free woman. Hamlet misses her father and hates the people who are unrighteous owners of her father's place. For Almond, this creates a surprising analogy. Almond suggests that what is transmitted as a message with *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) could be the complexities of political appropriation in developing countries especially when these countries are conservative with an aspiration to be liberal (Almond 2021, 397).

The most extensive study on *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is carried out by Cansu Begüm Erkoç (2018). Erkoç aims fill a gap in the literature by analyzing current paradigms on adaptations and evaluating Erksan's film *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female

Hamlet) (Erkoç 2018, 1). Erkoç refers to the current state of Adaptation Studies and announces that Adaptation Studies has now been liberated from debates of loyalty and originality, and it has broadened its horizon by making use of various fields such as literature, cultural studies, and semiotics (Erkoç 2018, 2). However, she does not mention Translation Studies as a discipline that might offer opportunities to broaden perspectives in Adaptation Studies.

Interestingly enough, Venuti's ideas (Venuti 2007, 25-26) on how literary texts are given a higher value than second-order productions like adaptations resurface themselves once again even if Erkoç does not refer to Venuti in her MA thesis. Instead, referring to the list of ideas of Robert Stam and Alessandra Raengo on adaptation and literature, Erkoç claims that the perception which is based on giving literature a higher status compared to cinema has existed for a long time. Erkoç lists the reasons for this tendency as follows. One of the reasons for this might be the fact that literature is an older art. Similarly, a certain literary work is considered superior to an adapted film. Also, cinema is thought to have a lower status as it only attracts the eye, not the mind. Another reason is that films are considered as lacking depth because they could only produce the most apparent meaning. Moreover, shooting and watching a film is underestimated and both activities are considered something easier to do compared to writing and reading a literary work. The creative output and commentary of the directors are also neglected. The last reason is films are associated with lower-class people because they entertain the common people. Literature, on the other hand, is associated with high taste and upper-class people as having access to education has always been a luxury for those who have enough money to afford it. Accordingly, it leads to the idea of considering adaptations as basic and corrupted versions of literary texts. Erkoç highlights that these ideas on the higher position of literature, as opposed to cinema, affected Adaptation Studies deeply (Erkoç 2018, 6-10).

Just as Translation Studies breaks free from loyalty discussions, it is obvious that Adaptation Studies is also advancing from what Erkoç suggests in her study. Erkoç states that Adaptation Studies has evolved from the issues of faithfulness to the source material into the intercultural and intertextual aspects of adaptations (Erkoç 2018, 4). Erkoç believes that the use of moralist words while thinking about adaptations could be the reason why adaptations are considered inferior in the past. That is why a definition for

the word “original” must be created. There are two types of concepts concerning originality. One of them is explained in the context of creation. Originality means being free from any kind of similarity to other texts. The other one is explained in the context of invention. Originality, in this sense, is uniting existing meanings and words in a way that forms a matchless work. This idea of originality does not disregard intertextuality. Referring to Robert McFarlane’s ideas Erkoç asserts that it is easy to differentiate the second definition of originality as it does not really overrate the original over the adapted (Erkoç 2018, 14-17).

Erkoç refers to Robert Stam’s views and states that absolute loyalty is impossible because of the switch of the medium in adaptations. New work is dissimilar to the original and accordingly, it has got its own originality. Film adaptations require directors to make decisions in the shooting process such as costumes, decors, time period, etc. It is out of question to expect the director to follow every single detail in the source material. Films have got certain limitations, and these include budget and duration. These are not the concerns of the writers as they do not have the boundaries that the directors face. Erkoç states that the idea of loyalty is centered on this question for Stam: “Loyalty to what?” and this brings Stam to Derrida’s idea of deconstruction. The source material and the adaptation do not have any hierarchical relationship. They are two innovative works. Loyalty, in this sense, is all about keeping the essential notion of the story. Cinema has got a lot of versatility, but the most important point is the director’s approaches and viewpoints. Intertextuality creates a long-lasting dialogue in the context of adaptation and is a more important notion in adaptation (Erkoç 2018, 17-21). Thus, from what Erkoç summarizes it is possible to understand how the film theorist Stam and translation theorist Venuti’s ideas correspond, and accordingly how Adaptation and Translation Studies communicate with each other. According to Venuti (Venuti 2007, 30), filmmakers can change and tailor source materials, build plots, characters, settings and constitute different intertextual and intersemiotic connections as well as the anti-hierarchical relationship between source material and adaptations.

Erkoç uses the term intercultural as the core principle of her study. For Erkoç, the term intercultural should be carefully defined. It involves the interchange of ideas and cultural norms in intercultural societies (Erkoç 2018, 27). Erkoç underlines that films reflect the cultural background of their directors. The decisions that the director gives

while making a film depends on his culture. Adaptations involve more than one cultural context, in this sense, intercultural adaptation means intertwining references to distinct cultures (Erkoç 2018, 29). Erkoç believes that when it comes to adapting Shakespeare's works on screen, three steps take place concurrently. First, Shakespeare's work is translated. Second, the medium is altered from words to pictures. Finally, a cultural adaptation takes place so that the modern Turkish audience can relate the story that dates back to the sixteenth century (Erkoç 2018, 30-31).

As her methodological framework Erkoç makes use of the sociologist Stuart Hall's encode and decode theory. Erkoç states that translating the source material from one language to another as well as one cultural sphere to another are the chief points of the adaptations (Erkoç 2018, 33). At this point, Erkoç mentions Stuart Hall's encode and decode theory. According to the theory, the encoder creates the meaning, and the decoder devours it (Erkoç 2018, 34). What codes mean is determined by the social perceptions and the mutual approach of the society. Among a number of codes, visual codes are the most relevant for the films because from the very early scenes of a film, the audience is introduced to visual codes. In adaptations, the encoder is the director, not the writer of the source text. The culture of the source material and adaptation are not similar, and accordingly, their codes, decoders, and receiver are not the same (Erkoç 2018, 35). Erkoç states that the adaptation and the source material can be of the same cultural background, but still, because of the differences in time periods, the perception of the audience may vary. Adaptations are continuously encoded and decoded in many contexts (Erkoç 2018, 36). The new audience, according to Erkoç, commentates on the recreated film version of the source material with the help of their culture. The director's background, as well as the social context of the audience, is varified and this influences the connection between the source material and adaptation. As the comments are diversified, the adaptation becomes distant from the source material (Erkoç 2018, 37).

When explaining the concept of globalization Erkoç refers to the fact that adaptations create a connection between two cultures, and this connection leads to interculturality (Erkoç 2018, 38). Erkoç believes that globalization originates from the associational transit between two nations. The interchange of cultures is one of the primary parts of globalization. While the interaction between cultures could create new

existence, it could also be the reason why cultures might lose their endemic elements. That means globalization is the destruction and construction of cultures (Erkoç 2018, 39).

Erkoç finds it important to assert that Erksan both penned the script and retranslated the play. That means Erksan's film is a commentary about *Hamlet* (Erkoç 2018, 46). At this point, it might be useful to mention that Erksan did not entirely retranslate the play. One valid evidence for my statement emerges when the gravedigger sings. In the scene, the gravedigger digs Orhan's grave. At the same time, the gravedigger sings a song which is taken from Sabahattin Eyüboğlu's translation of *Hamlet* for Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları (Shakespeare 2021, 141-142).

In her analysis, Erkoç states that the form of Erksan's film differs from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The opening scene reveals the difference. In Erksan's film, the audience knows who killed Hamlet's father from the very first scene. Another difference takes place in the scene where Hamlet breaks a mirror while talking to Kasım and Gönül. Erkoç states that in Erksan's film Ophelia's madness is transmitted to Hamlet herself. The next difference to consider is that while Shakespeare's Hamlet is in a constant state of questioning what is happening around him, Erksan's Hamlet seems stronger (Erkoç 2018, 47-49). It seems necessary for me to add here that Erksan's Hamlet also questions everything around her, however, I believe, this does not make Erksan's Hamlet more clever or stronger than Shakespeare's Hamlet. According to Erkoç, the next difference is that Erksan's film only concentrates on Hamlet's revenge lacking characters like Horatio and Fortinbras as well as the details like the war between Norway and Denmark (Erkoç 2018, 50). Another difference is because Hamlet's father reveals that Kasım killed him, Hamlet acts as a part of her plan and behaves madly. Shakespeare's Hamlet is distressed and gets away from being logical. He gets mad gradually and does not really understand what illusion and reality are. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is a tragedy whereas Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is a tragedy based on revenge (Erkoç 2018, 50-51). Apart from the differences, Erkoç detects some similarities between Shakespeare's and Erksan's works as well. According to Erkoç, the ending of Erksan's film is worth mentioning because there is a similarity between both Shakespeare and Erksan. In both stories, Kasım and Claudius kill their wives unknowingly. Also, both uncles are killed by Hamlets (Erkoç 2018, 49). The play and the film both are told by the third-person narrator (Erkoç 2018, 50).

In her analysis regarding character functions, Erkoç states that Hamlet and Orhan are significant to study. She claims that before acting mad, Hamlet wears masculine clothes, and it suits Hamlet's personality. When Hamlet starts acting mad, she starts wearing feminine clothes. However, wearing female clothes does not change her masculine behaviors. Erkoç believes that unlike Shakespeare's Hamlet, Erksan's Hamlet is a strong character. Hamlet is quite dominant in the film, but Orhan seems very passive. Orhan remains silent during the film, which is different from Shakespeare's Ophelia. What is clear for Erkoç from Orhan's personality is that he is full of agony because of not being loved by Hamlet. According to Erkoç, this refers to the turbidity between gender differences. Erksan amazes the Turkish audience that is used to male domination with the presence of a female Hamlet as well as meets the expectations with Hamlet's masculine behaviors (Erkoç 2018, 51-53).

When it comes to the setting and decor, Erkoç claims that Erksan creates an outdoor setting such as Hamlet's open-air room to show Hamlet's loneliness. Indoors are shown in a way that characters seem so little in it which might signify the captivity of wealth (Erkoç 2018, 54). Erkoç also calls attention to the décor by stating that the scene that shows Hamlet as a conductor may refer to the missing side of her (Erkoç 2018, 58). In addition, for Erkoç, especially the pink door of Hamlet's room on the sand refers to her mad behaviors of her which is what she wants to be associated with. The wedding scene of Kasım and Gönül includes many flags belonging to different countries, which highlights universality. Also, Erkoç states that a big earth model is seen behind Hamlet in the scene where she talks about killing her uncle in the forest. These might also refer to the universal quality of the play *Hamlet*. (Erkoç 2018, 57). However, when the adaptation is watched carefully, it is easy to notice that the earth model is actually behind Halil, one of her servants.

By referring to the importance of costumes and colors, Erkoç states that costumes play a big role in Hamlet's moods. Hamlet prefers feminine clothes when acting mad, but apart from those scenes, she wears masculine clothes (Erkoç 2018, 57). This is yet another statement I have to disagree with. Through the end of the film, Hamlet meets with Kasım and walks on the table wearing feminine clothes such as a bra top, necklace, and embroidered robe. It is obvious from the scene that she does not act mad. Erkoç also suggests that colors are important for Erksan. Red could be associated with Hamlet and

symbolizes revenge and betrayal in Erksan's film. Blue could be associated with royalty and family because this color is especially seen when Hamlet and her mother and uncle come together. Sometimes blue and red are seen intertwined, so royalty is sabotaged by betrayal (Erkoç 2018, 61).

Music, according to Erkoç, is also significant for the dramatic effect of the film. Erksan uses Shostakovich's "Hamlet" to refer to the international quality of the play *Hamlet*. Timur Selçuk's "Pireli Şarkı" which is the composed version of Orhan Veli's poem is used specifically because it gives a certain message. Hamlet is going to overpower her uncle just like the fleas devour the elephants in the song. "Makber" is the composed version of Abdülhak Hamit Tarhan's poem. Erkoç states that this song shows Hamlet's loyalty to her roots even though she is educated abroad (Erkoç 2018, 63-64).

When it comes to camera angles, Erkoç highlights that they have got specific importance in Erksan's film. On the one hand, the camera generally focuses on Girik's face to show Hamlet's feelings. On the other hand, the camera generally shows Kasım's face from a low angle, and Kasım is portrayed as someone scary. Also, in the scene where Hamlet walks on the table while talking to Kasım, she seems superior and Kasım is looking up to talk to her. This means Kasım is an unimportant person in the eyes of Hamlet (Erkoç 2018, 64).

In the content of the film, Erkoç highlights that Erksan employs both local and global elements and believes that many intercultural examples can be found in the film. First, in Erksan's film, the urge to take revenge makes Hamlet a passionate woman. Both the Turkish culture and the English society in Shakespeare's time value family greatly. Second, when Hamlet breaks a mirror in front of Kasım and Gönül, Erksan uses this superstition to merge a universal superstition with a local Turkish superstition. Third, people from different social classes are bound to have an impossible love. By using this cliché, Erksan serves both Turkish culture and the universal side of Shakespeare's play. The last example given by Erkoç is the majority of characters in the film have got Turkish names except for Hamlet. One of the comments of Erkoç is Erksan tries to focus the attention on Hamlet as opposed to other characters. Another comment by Erkoç is Erksan also wants to preserve the international quality of the play and highlights her alienation and loneliness this way (Erkoç 2018, 68-70).

After evaluating Erksan's adaptation as an intercultural adaptation (Erkoç 2018, 72), in her conclusion, Erkoç states that *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is a commentary. There is a connection between the source text and the film, but the differences are also apparent. Erkoç believes that the biggest change is the gender of Hamlet, and this challenges the audience to have a different perspective on cultural and gender norms. Erksan creates a female Hamlet with masculine characteristics, and he does it on purpose. He puts forward a translation and adapts the cultural codes of Shakespeare's England into Turkish culture (Erkoç 2018, 74).

Savaş Arslan creates a detailed portrait of *Hamlet* adaptations in Turkey by highlighting their political attitudes. Arslan aims to manifest how *Hamlet* adaptations in Turkey refer to the cultural transformation traumas as well as the representation of Hamlet as the Westernizers' hero (Arslan 2008, 157). Arslan asserts that *Hamlet* has been considered as a symbol of Westernization, modernism, and secularism. He believes *Hamlet* is a typical contemporary political allegory in Turkey, thus a lot of translations and adaptations of *Hamlet* in Turkey are related to opposition ideology together with republican discourse. These productions are affected by changing cultural, political, and social atmosphere too (Arslan 2008, 158).

At one point in his work, referring to an adaptation of *Hamlet* which is staged in Müjdat Gezen Theatre in 2007, Arslan claims that creating a queer Hamlet is not a progressive act because Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has always been a part of the republican discourse in Turkey, which favors modernization and secularism over conservatist and religious opinions (Arslan 2008, 158). It seems important to voice my objections to this claim. First of all, even if LGBTQI+ community can openly assert their sexual identities in some of the world countries, there are still hate crimes committed against LGBTQI+ community in Turkey. Therefore, it is indeed a progressive act to portray a queer Hamlet in a country like Turkey, regardless of the fact that such an interpretation has been staged elsewhere before. Secondly, there seems to be no correlation between being queer and supporting the republican discourse since one can adopt the republican discourse, which values modernization and secularism, and still disapprove of queerness.

Arslan asserts that a changing conception of Shakespeare showed itself with *Kadın Hamlet: İntikam Meleşi* (The Female Hamlet). Even if it introduced new social changes like urbanization, migration, and democratization, this version repeated the

duality of secularism and religion (Arslan 2008, 160). According to Arslan, on the other hand, Metin Erksan considerably changed the source text to create *İntikam Meleği: Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), and this makes Hamlet a modern hero in this surreal melodrama which combines melodramatic elements of Turkish cinema and Erksan's artistic desires. Also, for Arslan, Hamlet's American education and Kasım's involvement with the American mafia reflect the dreams of creating a Hollywood film and republican attitude to look up to the West (Arslan 2008, 161-162).

After bringing the multiple adaptations and translations of *Hamlet* together, Arslan speaks of the problematic aspects of westernization in Turkey in his analysis without specifically using any methodology. Arslan states that turning its face to the west with the help of Kemalism and encouraging people to be inspired by the west, Turkey saw *Hamlet* as a model. To do this, vernacularization was used, and Western elements are transfigured into Turkish culture. This resulted in the purification and discrimination of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* even in the most faithful translations and adaptations. Also, intentional and arbitrary shifts occurred in the adaptations and translations of *Hamlet*. Arslan claims that the upper-class translators and adapters who worked on Shakespeare's *Hamlet* wanted Hamlet to speak what they were wishing for and exact a top-down modernization (Arslan 2008, 164).

Arslan finalizes his article with a proposal that might bring innovation to *Hamlet* adaptations. He proposes a new interpretation of *Hamlet* which would be an Islamist one. Arslan concludes by stating Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) still highlight an insistent patriarchal discourse and interrogate Hamlet's masculinity, and if a really edgy adaptation of *Hamlet* is planned to be created, it must exclude paternal drama which forces the republicans to position themselves within an opposition discourse. This would create a new possibility to be or not be (Arslan 2008, 165).

Hilal Erkazancı Durmuş investigates how multiple extratextual discourses shape the retranslations and post-translation rewritings of *Hamlet* in the Turkish cultural circles. Durmuş asserts that such an investigation will disclose how specific translations of *Hamlet* arouse discourse which played an important part in Turkey's self-image transformance. In her work, Durmuş focuses on Post-Translation Studies which is further developed by Edwin Gentzler. Durmuş states that imagology will be a beneficial tool in

her analysis in order to comprehend a discourse of national representation (Durmuş 2020, 121).

Durmuş begins with referring to the ideas of Bassnett, Lefevere, and Gentzler by stating how much a text's image could be more powerful than the text itself, and a post-translational turn in Translation Studies focuses on the image established by a rewriter who plays with and reproduces a source text. Accordingly, when a text is translated into a new image, the narratives within the text are reshaped radically (Durmuş 2020, 120). Referring to the ideas of Gentzler, Durmuş asserts that post-translation rewriting becomes more related to thinking and translation of an image than retranslating words. Thus, the post-translational turn concentrates on speaking after a translation instead of carrying it across. (Durmuş 2020, 121).

Durmuş states that *Hamlet* is re-membered and dis-membered in Turkish literary circles, and the narratives that escort it affected the Turkish nation's image of itself (Durmuş 2020, 134). Durmuş's statement originates from Julie Tarif's concept of re-memberment and dis-memberment. Durmuş asserts that when re-memberment is employed, the readers are reminded of the literary heritage of the source text. The source text survives within the mind of the receiving culture. When a literary text is retranslated, it can shape the literary system of the receiving culture because it incites further translations and original writings as well. On the other hand, as Durmuş explains, when dis-memberment is employed, the source text is extrapolated and commodified. What Durmuş believes is in Turkey, *Hamlet* is re-membered because some retranslations of *Hamlet* kept the style of the source text and the source text's high status. However, some post-translation writings organized the source text in a way that it communicated the political and social conditions of the time period (Durmuş 2020, 122).

Durmuş highlights that translators and rewriters reframe a source text. Also, extratextual material regarding a dramatic work frames the translated version from a specific perspective (Durmuş 2020, 126). In this sense, in her review of discourse about *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Durmuş refers to Tony Howard, İnci Bilgin, Gülşen Sayın, and Savaş Arslan's opinions of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). Durmuş refers to Tony Howard's ideas which reveals that Erksan's adaptation is in accordance with Kemalist policies. That means Howard frames *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) within the modernization of Turkey. Durmuş also supports Howard's ideas by stating that

Turkish theatre left women out until the Turkish Republic was proclaimed (Durmuş 2020, 129-130). However, because of the fact that Şiranoğlu was able to perform Hamlet in the Ottoman period, Durmuş's statement may not be entirely accurate. According to Durmuş, İnci Bilgin, on other hand, asserts that Erksan's adaptation reframes *Hamlet* in a feminist context and builds a modern image of Hamlet defying patriarchal values. Bilgin believes the film deconstructs *Hamlet* by rejecting the cultural domination of the west. For Bilgin, the film employs cultural hybridity which resonates within the image of Turkey swinging around being European and Asian. Durmuş states that Gülşen Sayın disagrees with a feminist discourse on the film and believes the film was a reaction to the requirements of the film market. Sayın asserts that *Hamlet* was indigenized and recreated by the sources of Turkish culture that include the codes of Eastern European, Middle Eastern, and Islam. An example for this could be the urge to take revenge, especially a blood revenge, in Erksan's film. Sayın also correlates Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) with a transformation step where the imported texts are resolved in the target culture and as a result the target culture starts to create its own texts. Finally, Durmuş calls attention to Arslan's statements about how the film differs from the other adaptations of *Hamlet* which involve westernization. Durmuş assumes that these extratextual commentaries cooperate within a general narrative of shaping Turkey's self-imagination as a country situated between Europe and Asia. Thus, Erksan's rewriting of *Hamlet* suits Turkey's image that reforms its western self and other in its own changing social and political contexts (Durmuş 2020, 129-130).

Durmuş concludes by stating that the individual discourses on *Hamlet*'s Turkish retranslations and post-writings can circulate broader narratives that nourish into the renegotiation of the national self-images. Nearly all of the discourses related to Turkish translations of *Hamlet* are grounded on the idea of the other in the structure of Turkish self-image. (Durmuş 2020, 133). Durmuş believes that Gertzler's ideas related to post-translation rewriting shows how texts are in circulation from source to target and beyond as well as texts to images. Durmuş states that Gertzler's ideas have been very effective for her work's attempts at searching beyond retranslation. She highlights that most of the Turkish versions of *Hamlet* are rendered into images, sound, setting, and dance. These made a contribution to *Hamlet*'s meaning in the Turkish context. These images had a big

role in designing the cooperative Turkish identity in different time periods (Durmuş 2020, 134-135).

Overall, as a result of my overview and critical analysis on the works of these respectable scholars who studied *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), I conclude that although they are all inspiring reviews, the corpus in general contains a few drawbacks. First of all, there is a lack of methodology in some of these studies. I, on the other hand, aim to put Venuti's methodology into practice and carry out a systematic analysis. Second, very few of these studies make use of the concept of translation. The method I will use is based on the concept of translation. Another shortcoming is the low number of studies focusing on gender. My study will hopefully fill this gap as well as all the above-mentioned gaps.

5. INTERPRETANTS IN METİN ERKSAN'S *KADIN HAMLET* (THE FEMALE HAMLET)

5.1 The Source Material

Source materials, in Venuti's words prior materials, are the previously created works that adaptations have got hermeneutic and interrogative relations with. The adapters implement their own formal or thematic interpretants and create adaptations. Because all types of adaptation have their own own viewers and critics, those viewers and critics apply their own interpretants to formulate hermeneutic relations and their interrogative impacts. That is why it is necessary to investigate Metin Erksan's prior material, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, as the first step of my analysis.

It is accepted by literary historians that Shakespeare definitely created *Hamlet* by adapting a prior material into an Elizabethan theatre play, and there have been several different opinions about the source of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. However, it is now almost certain that Hamlet, as a story, dates back to the twelfth century. The first opinion is that Saxo Grammaticus' *Gesta Danorum* is the source on which Shakespeare based his *Hamlet*. Grammaticus' work explains the history of Danish people starting from the prehistoric period to the late twelfth century. *Gesta Danorum* includes sixteen books, and in book three, Amleth is introduced, who bears similarities to Shakespeare's Hamlet.

Amleth's story unfolds as such:⁴³ King Rørik of Denmark appoints Horwendil and Fengo, two brothers, to rule Jutland. After a while, Horwendil marries Gerutha, the daughter of King Rørik. The married couple has Amleth as their first and only child. Both the marriage and the desire to be the only leader of Jutland make Fengo envious. As a result, Fengo kills his brother Horwendil and marries Gerutha. Amleth pretends to be mad by wearing rags and speaking nonsense in order to protect himself from Fengo's violence. When Amleth's behavior casts doubts, Fengo tries to trap him to confess his revenge plans. First, a pretty woman is used to entice him, but she stays loyal to Amleth. Then a spy listens to the dialogue between Amleth and his mother, in which the mother states that she feels remorse and Amleth admits his revenge plans. Amleth recognizes the spy and kills him. Amleth throws the spy's body in a sewer for pigs to eat it. Then Fengo expels Amleth to England with two guardians carrying a letter ordering the king of England to execute Amleth. Amleth changes the letter with another one, which states the execution of the guardians and the marriage proposal to the English princess. Later, Amleth returns to Denmark in disguise in the middle of his funeral and hunts down sleeping Fengo. Because Amleth injured himself with his sword, servants made the sword harmless by pegging it to its scabbard. Amleth changes this noneffective sword with Fengo's sword and kills him. Eventually, he becomes the king.

Saxo Grammaticus' Amleth story resembles Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, but some differences cannot be ignored.⁴⁴ To begin with, there is no ghost appearing in the Amleth story. Also, the murderer uncle is revealed from the beginning of the story. Third, there is no theatre play in the Amleth story. In addition, no gravedigger makes an appearance. Additionally, the character Laertes is absent in the story. Furthermore, unlike Hamlet, Amleth does not have melancholic tendencies or soliloquies. Last but not least, Amleth does not die but survives as a king.

Another opinion related to the source of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is that the play might be based on a former play called *Ur-Hamlet*. The title also supports this idea

⁴³ "Saxo's Legend of Amleth in the *Gesta Danorum*," British Library, accessed March 21, 2022, <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/saxos-legend-of-amleth-in-the-gesta-danorum>.

⁴⁴ "Saxo's Legend of Amleth in the *Gesta Danorum*," British Library, accessed March 21, 2022, <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/saxos-legend-of-amleth-in-the-gesta-danorum>.

because *Ur-Hamlet* means original Hamlet or earliest Hamlet.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, none of the copies of *Ur-Hamlet* survive, and the writer of the play is unidentified. It is thought to have been written by either Thomas Kyd or William Shakespeare. Still another opinion regarding the source of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is that Shakespeare translated François de Belleforest's French version of the story of "Amleth" into his own language by creating an improved version of the source material. This opinion, I believe, resonates with Ton Hoenselaars' suggestion that Shakespeare has got a translator identity (Hoenselaars, 2006, 63). Similarly, Franz H. Link also refers to Shakespeare's roles as a rewriter and interpreter (Link 1980, 45). After reviewing various opinions about the source of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, my conclusion is that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was inspired by another formerly created work. This means that the source material of Erksan's *Kadin Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), namely Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, has got a hermeneutic relationship with a former text and thus, Shakespeare himself might indeed be considered an adapter for sure.

With this in mind, we can now turn to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and offer details of the plot. The play was originally titled *The Tragedie of Hamlet*, which reveals that there will be sad events involving death. It consists of five acts. The characters include Hamlet, the ghost, Gertrude, Claudius, Polonius, Ophelia, Laertes, Horatio, Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, and Fortinbras.

The first act of *Hamlet* starts with two watchmen waiting in the castle battlements when Marcellus and Horatio show up. They start talking about a thing appearing at night. A ghost appears with its visor and truncheon, which looks similar to the late King Hamlet. Horatio tries to speak with it, however; the ghost stalks away. Horatio states that the ghost wears the same armor when the King fights Norway. Upon the request of Marcellus, Horatio tells about what happened earlier. King Hamlet and the king of Norway laid a wager about who could kill the other first. King Hamlet won the wager and took some of Norway's land. Fortinbras, the son of the late king of Norway, made preparations to reclaim the land and take his father's revenge. Horatio adds that it is a bad omen to see such a ghost and Hamlet should know what happened. Claudius delivers his inaugural

⁴⁵ "Reference to early *Hamlet* play in Lodge's *Wit's Misery*, 1596," British Library, accessed March 21, 2022, <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/reference-to-early-hamlet-play-in-lodges-wits-misery-1596>.

speech to the court explaining he married Gertrude one month after his brother's death and became the king. Claudius sends two courtiers to Norway to convey a message to Fortinbras' uncle. The message requests the king of Norway to stop Fortinbras attacking Denmark. Claudius wonders why Hamlet is still in mourning. Gertrude also tells him to stop wearing black. Both Gertrude and Claudius urge Hamlet to stay in Denmark instead of attending his school in Germany. Hamlet accepts the offer. Happy with this answer, Gertrude and Claudius leave. When left alone, Hamlet wishes to die, laments for his father's death, curses his mother's quick marriage to Claudius. Horatio enters with Marcellus and Bernardo. Horatio tells Hamlet about the ghost. Bewildered, Hamlet agrees to face the ghost at night. Elsewhere, Laertes gets ready to leave for France. Laertes warns Ophelia about Hamlet's social status and the possibility of Hamlet marrying someone else. Ophelia states that she will keep these warnings in mind. Polonius enters and bids farewell to his son. Laertes leaves, and Polonius asks what Ophelia and Laertes talked about. Ophelia states that they talked about Hamlet. Polonius tells Hamlet only wants to have an extramarital affair with her, and she should stop seeing Hamlet. Ophelia promises not to see Hamlet again. At night, Hamlet, Horatio, and Marcellus wait for the ghost. The ghost appears and beckons Hamlet. The ghost states that it is Hamlet's father and needs revenge otherwise it will be doomed and burned in flames of hell. The ghost also reveals the murderer is Claudius who poured poison in King Hamlet's ear while sleeping in the garden. The ghost specifies the revenge plan by stating that Hamlet should not avenge his mother. Hamlet swears to obey the ghost, and the ghost disappears at dawn. Going back to Horatio and Marcellus, Hamlet makes them swear not to tell anyone about what they have witnessed. Hamlet states that he will pretend to be mad.

In act two, Polonius sends Reynaldo to France to give money to Laertes and spy on him. Ophelia arrives and tells what Hamlet did to her. Hamlet grabbed her, sighed heavily, and spoke nothing. Because Ophelia distanced herself from Hamlet upon his request, Polonius believes Hamlet goes mad out of his love for Ophelia. After the conversation with Ophelia, Polonius rushes to tell Claudius what happened. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, Hamlet's friends from Germany, are invited to Denmark by Claudius and Gertrude. They believe that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern might find out Hamlet's strange behaviors. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern promise to convey any information about Hamlet's behaviors. Polonius arrives with the courtiers reporting that the king of

Norway stopped Fortinbras from waging war against Denmark. The king of Norway also sends his request stating that Claudius should create a safe passage so that Fortinbras' army could attack the Poles. Polonius tells Claudius and Gertrude that Hamlet is mad for Ophelia. To prove it, Polonius shows Hamlet's letter to Ophelia. They decide to watch Hamlet and Ophelia when they meet. Agreeing on the plan, Claudius and Gertrude leave, and Polonius has a conversation with Hamlet. Hamlet answers Polonius' questions in a very irrational way. Hamlet wishes Polonius was honest as a man selling fish and asks whether he has got a daughter. Hamlet ridicules Polonius for not understanding what he says and being very protective of his daughter. Polonius only concentrates on the fact that Hamlet mentions Ophelia and makes sure that he is madly in love with her. Polonius asks what Hamlet is reading, and Hamlet replies how silly and sickening the old men are. Polonius agrees with this insult and suggests that Hamlet should take some fresh air and leave him. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern arrive. Hamlet is happy to see them. Hamlet asks why they have come. At first, they claim that they only wanted to see Hamlet, but later they admit they came upon the request of Claudius and Gertrude. A traveling troupe approaches the castle. Hamlet also states that his uncle-father and aunt-mother are beguiled by his madness because he is part-time mad. Hamlet welcomes the actors, and requests one of the players to give a speech about the fall of Troy and the death of the king and queen of Troy. First, Hamlet starts reciting the speech, and then one of the actors takes over. The actor was so moved by the speech that he shed tears. He asks actors if they can perform *The Murder of Gonzago* the next day with an addition of short speech that will be given by Hamlet himself. Left alone, Hamlet accuses himself for not taking any action against his uncle. Even an actor can be moved by a fictional character and cry, but Hamlet does nothing about this father's murder. He calls himself unmanly and a woman of poor morality. He fears that the ghost might be lying. To clear his doubts, Hamlet decides to force Claudius to watch a play which resembles to the murder of his father. If Claudius is guilty, his reaction will give him away.

In act three, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern meet Cladius and Gertrude and tell them they could not find why Hamlet is in melancholy. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern state that Hamlet is very enthusiastic about actors. Polonius and Gertrude agree to watch the play. Polonius and Claudius observe Hamlet and Ophelia's meeting secretly. Polonius directs Ophelia to hold a prayer book and walk around. Hamlet enters and starts speaking

to himself. He thinks of committing suicide to end his sufferings. Ophelia arrives to give Hamlet's love tokens. Hamlet states he had not given her anything. Hamlet claims both he had loved her and he had not loved her. Hamlet suggests Ophelia go to a nunnery and claims that women make monsters out of men because they seem more beautiful than they actually are. Hamlet also claims marriage is terrible and if Ophelia is supposed to get married, she needs to choose a fool to marry with. Hamlet leaves, and Ophelia is convinced Hamlet is truly mad. Polonius and Claudius appear. Claudius states that Hamlet's bizarre behaviors are not related to madness or love, but a great sadness. Claudius considers sending Hamlet to England for a change. Polonius still believes Hamlet is madly in love with Ophelia. Polonius suggests Hamlet and Gertrude should meet after the play because Gertrude can understand the reasons behind Hamlet's behaviors. When Hamlet is with his mother, Polonius will be watching them secretly. Hamlet instructs the actors how he wants them to perform the play. Hamlet requests Horatio to watch the reactions of Claudius, and Horatio agrees to do so. Together with a Danish march, the audience arrives. Claudius asks how Hamlet is. Hamlet states he eats as well as a chameleon. Hamlet asks Polonius about his past as an actor, and flirts with Ophelia. The actors start performing a variant of *The Murder of Gonzago*. The actor queen swears she would never remarry, and the actor king states she would change her mind once he is dead. The actor queen states it is impossible for her to remarry. Hamlet asks Gertrude about her feelings about the actor queen's statements. Gertrude states she finds them exaggerated. Hamlet states the play is called *The Mousetrap*. The actor king goes to sleep and his brother pours poison into his ear. Unable to bear the play, Claudius rushes out of the room and so does everybody. Hamlet and Horatio agree that Claudius' reaction reveals the fact that he is guilty. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern arrive and tell Hamlet that Claudius is disturbed by the play, and Gertrude wants to talk to him. Polonius appears and states he will escort Hamlet to Gertrude's room. Hamlet states that he wants to be alone. Hamlet speaks to himself saying he is so frustrated with his mother, but he will not punish her. Claudius meets Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. Claudius states that Hamlet is truly mad and is a threat to Denmark's throne. Claudius wants Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to escort Hamlet to England. They agree to do so. Polonius arrives to state that he will spy on Hamlet and Gertrude's conversation, and it is a good idea to do so because mothers always bestow privilege on their children. Claudius is left alone. He

believes he is cursed because of killing his own brother. He cannot ask forgiveness while possessing what belongs to his brother. Eventually, he kneels and starts praying. At that moment, Hamlet arrives with his sword, but cannot kill him. If he kills Claudius at this exact moment, there is a chance that he might go to heaven. Hamlet decides to kill Claudius when he commits a sin so that he ensures Claudius goes to hell. Hamlet believes that Claudius' prayers will be useless, and Claudius is also aware of the fact that he is not sincere while praying. Hamlet leaves to visit Gertrude in her room. In Gertrude's room, Polonius instructs Gertrude to state that Hamlet's behaviors are unacceptable. Gertrude faces Hamlet and tells him that he greatly disturbed Claudius. Hamlet verbally attacks Gertrude by stating that she married her husband's brother and offended his father. Gertrude is in fear of her life and cries for help. Polonius raises his voice behind the curtains, and Hamlet realizes someone is hiding there. Hamlet thinks that could be Claudius. Hamlet stabs the curtain and tells he has found a rat. Terrified, Gertrude states that his action is rash and bloody. Hamlet says it is as rash and bloody as killing a king and marrying his brother. Hamlet states what Gertrude has heard is the fact. Hamlet lifts the curtains and sees that he killed Polonius. Calling Polonius a fool, Hamlet continues to attack his mother. Hamlet shows the pictures of king Hamlet and Claudius to his mother. He mentions how his father is far superior to Claudius. Gertrude begs him to stop because Hamlet helps her to see how much her own soul is unlikeable. Hamlet continues to curse her until the ghost appears to speak to Hamlet. Unable to see it, Gertrude believes Hamlet is indeed mad. The ghost reminds Hamlet his main purpose is to take revenge not to attack his mother and disappears. Hamlet admits that he is not mad and only pretends to be mad. Hamlet tells Gertrude to stop sleeping with Claudius and not to reveal what Hamlet admits to Claudius. Gertrude promises to do so. Leaving the room, Hamlet wishes Gertrude good night and drags Polonius' corpse.

In act four, Gertrude tells Claudius that Hamlet killed Polonius. Claudius states that Hamlet should be sent to England immediately and they need to explain what happened to the court and people. Claudius tells Rosencrantz and Guildenstern what Hamlet did and asks for help. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern find Hamlet and ask where the corpse is. Hamlet accuses both of being spies for Claudius. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern bring Hamlet to Claudius. Claudius asks the whereabouts of the corpse. Hamlet reveals where he hid it. Claudius asks the attendants to find it. Claudius tells

Hamlet to leave for England with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. Hamlet accepts the offer. When he is left alone, Claudius discloses his plan which involves the killing of Hamlet. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern will convey the order of Claudius to England. Meanwhile, the armies of Fortinbras approach to attack Poland via passing through Denmark. Fortinbras sends his captain to receive the permission of the king of Denmark. The captain encounters Hamlet and his friends on the way to their ship to England. Hamlet asks why the armies are marching on. The captain states that the Norwegian armies will fight against Poland over a small territory. Hamlet realizes for a small piece of land huge armies march and get ready to fight. He is disgusted with himself for delaying taking revenge for his father's murder. He encourages himself to stop postponing and take a bloody revenge from Claudius. Meanwhile, Ophelia walks around the castle singing old songs and wearing flowers. Claudius states that Ophelia's sorrow is related to her father's death, and people start speculating about Polonius' untimely death. Laertes breaks into the castle with commoners who want him to be the king. Laertes wants to take his father's revenge. Ophelia seems clearly mad and distributes flowers to people in the room. Claudius requests Laertes and the commoners to listen to his version of events. If they think Claudius is guilty, he will give up on his crown. If not, Claudius will help find the murderer. Horatio meets with some sailors carrying Hamlet's letter. In his letter, Hamlet states his ship is seized by pirates, and he is the only one to be taken as a prisoner by the pirates who bring him back to Denmark. Hamlet also has written letters for Gertrude and Claudius and asks Horatio to transmit them safely. Horatio follows the sailors who will take him to Hamlet. Claudius tells Laertes that Hamlet killed Polonius and is plotting against him. A messenger arrives to give Hamlet's letter. Claudius learns Hamlet will return. Claudius encourages Laertes to avenge Hamlet. Claudius and Laertes make a plan to kill Hamlet in a way that looks like an accident. In a duel, Laertes will use a sharp sword whereas Hamlet will use a blunt one. Furthermore, Laertes will poison his sword. If none of these work and Hamlet wins the duel, Claudius will offer Hamlet a cup of poisoned wine. Gertrude arrives at the scene to report Ophelia is drowned in a brook.

In act five, two gravediggers talk about Ophelia's death and whether to bury her in a Christian graveyard. Hamlet is surprised to see one of the gravediggers is singing while digging. Horatio states because he did this for many times, the gravedigger remains callous. Hamlet asks whose grave they are digging, and the gravediggers state that it

belongs to a dead woman. Hamlet finds a skull and holds it. He learns the skull is Yorick's, king Hamlet's jester and feels terrified. The cortege arrives for Ophelia's funeral. Hamlet realizes Ophelia died. Laertes resents the priest who states that because she has a powerful family, she has a proper Christian burial. Laertes jumps into the grave to hold Ophelia in his arms. Hamlet comes forward and jumps into the grave stating he loved Ophelia so much that he could be buried with her. Hamlet states Laertes comes to the funeral only to whine. Laertes and Hamlet are pulled apart by the attendants. Hamlet leaves, and Horatio follows him. Claudius reminds Laertes to be calm and wait for revenge. Hamlet tells Horatio what happened on the way to England. Hamlet checked the letter that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern carry and changed it stating that the messengers should be killed, which are Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. The next day, pirates came in and took Hamlet. Osric comes and butters up Hamlet for a while. He asks Hamlet if he could duel with Laertes. Hamlet accepts the duel and Osric leaves. The court gathers to watch the duel. Hamlet asks Laertes to forgive him because he killed Polonius in a moment of madness. Laertes states he will not forgive him until an elderly tells him to do so, but he accepts Hamlet's love. Swords arrive, and Laertes chooses the sharp and poisoned sword. Hamlet strikes once, and Claudius offers the poisoned wine, and Hamlet declines. When Hamlet strikes for the second time, Gertrude drinks the poisoned wine despite Claudius' warnings. Laertes states it is against his conscience to injure Hamlet with the poisoned sword. Laertes injures Hamlet, and then they somehow shuffle swords. Hamlet strikes Laertes with the poisoned sword. The queen falls on the ground and dies. Laertes admits that he is dying because of the poisoned sword and Claudius poisoned the sword and the wine. Hamlet, with a violent anger, forces Claudius to drink the rest of the poisoned wine. Claudius cries for help, but nobody helps. Before Hamlet and Laertes die, they forgive each other. Fortinbras who achieved victory over Poland arrives. Hamlet tells Horatio that he is dying, and he should tell their bloody story to the rest of the world. Horatio agrees to tell. Hamlet's wishes Fortinbras to be the king of Denmark. Fortinbras orders that Hamlet should have a proper burial as a soldier.

5.2 The Adapted Work

Metin Erksan is both the scriptwriter and the director of the adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) (1976). The cast of the film includes actors such as Fatma Girik, Sevda Ferdağ, Reha Yurdakul, Orçun Sonat, Ahmet Sezerel, and Yüksel Gözen. The film lasts eighty-six minutes. In his adaptation, Erksan is inspired by Shakespeare's play *Hamlet*. The majority of the characters in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* exist in Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* too. However, Erksan preferred to switch the genders of the main characters in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* such as Hamlet and Ophelia. Instead of creating a male Hamlet and a female lover for Hamlet, Erksan preferred to present a female Hamlet with a male lover Orhan.

It is useful to mention the concept of reception of the audience stated by Venuti to analyse Erksan's adaptation. By referring to Pierre Bourdieu's ideas, Venuti states (Venuti 2007, 37) that some adaptations appeal to elite taste, while others appeal to popular taste. Elite taste relies on creating intertextual and intersemiotic connections both by appreciating cultural traditions and paying attention to possible unusual forms and themes, whereas popular taste is based on the application of formal and thematic interpretants in a way that achieves identification and handles themes conventionally. In this sense, Erksan finds a middle course between elite and popular taste in his adaptation. On the one hand, Erksan portrays a female Hamlet, which is unconventional and as well as intertextual in the sense that he pays tribute to former female Hamlets. This quality of the adaptation makes it appeal to the elite taste. On the other hand, Erksan focuses on the theme of revenge by treating a repeated theme in a conventional way, and this quality of the adaptation makes it appeal to the popular taste too. Thus, I believe that elite and popular elements appear and operate in Erksan's adaptation.

With this in mind, we can now turn to Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) and offer the details of the plot. Kasım kills his brother Ahmet and gets married with Ahmet's widow Gönül. Devastated by Ahmet's death and frustrated by Gönül's quick marriage with Kasım, Hamlet starts to question who killed Ahmet. In the meantime, Ahmet's ghost is seen by the servants of the household. The servants tell Hamlet what they saw, and Hamlet decides to face with the ghost. When the ghost and Hamlet meet, the ghost tells Hamlet that his murderer is Kasım and urges Hamlet to take revenge from him. Hamlet makes a plan, and according to the plan Hamlet will pretend to be mad to understand whether the murderer is Kasım or not. Hamlet starts acting mad, which

astonishes Gönül, Kasım, and Orhan. In an attempt to understand the reason for Hamlet's behaviors, Hamlet's friends are invited and Orhan's father tries to speak to Hamlet. However, all these attempts fail. Hamlet also breaks up with Orhan, which breaks Orhan's heart. When Rezzan and Gül arrive, Hamlet decides to stage a play to see the reactions of Kasım. The play involves the murder of a king, and while watching it Kasım is appalled by the murder scene of the play, which clears Hamlet's doubts. Gönül tries to have a private conversation with Hamlet to understand her behaviors, and Orhan's father spies on them. After realizing that they are spied on, Hamlet kills Orhan's father who is hid behind curtains and reveals that Ahmet's murderer is Kasım. Kasım convinces Hamlet to go to the United States. Kasım meets with Rezzan and Gül and requests them to take Hamlet to the United States and give a secret letter to a man who is supposed to kill Hamlet. Hamlet captures the letter and goes back to home to kill Kasım. Orhan commits suicide in a pond. Orhan's brother Osman decides to take revenge from Hamlet. To take his revenge, Osman shoots Hamlet in the forest. After hearing the news, Gönül and Kasım rush to the scene. Kasım shoots Gönül by mistake, and Hamlet kills Kasım.

5.3 Interpretants in Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)

This section attempts to unveil the hermeneutic relationship between Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) and to investigate both interpretive and interrogative aspects of this hermeneutic relationship between the two works. As stated earlier, the interpretants in adaptations can be formal and thematic. Formal interpretants are related to the relationship of equivalence such as structural equivalence kept between the film and adapted materials, a specific style such as qualities that represent the works of the director, and the conception of genre which requires handling and alteration of the adapted materials. Thematic interpretants, on the other hand, include ideologies, values, and codes. Thematic interpretants are related to the political stance which mirror the concerns of a particular social group, the ethical discourse and cultural gusto that has been adopted by the filmmaker and his audience, and the interpretation of previously adapted materials.

5.3.1 Formal Interpretants

Two motifs including revenge and paternal love govern both Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), which creates a relation of structural equivalence between the two works. The most salient application of formal interpretants on the level of structural equivalence in *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is that the focal motif in the film adaptation is revenge. It seems that both Shakespeare and Erksan center on revenge stories, especially bloody ones. Another formal interpretant on the level of structural equivalence between Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is created based on the motif of paternal love. Both Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Erksan's *Hamlet* cherish their fathers. Out of their love and high opinions of their patriarchs, they take slow but firm steps to realize their revenge plans. Thus, a relation of structural equivalence is created with Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) this way.

Erksan's preferences related to the setting prove that there is an application of formal interpretants and thus a structural equivalence between Shakespeare's play and Erksan's adaptation. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is set in Elsinore Castle, which is a safe and remote place that can be easily guarded. Similarly, Erksan sets the adaptation in a remote house away from the city. Even if they can be seemingly different, these two settings have functional similarities. Both Shakespeare's and Erksan's setting build up a secluded atmosphere which is only occupied by specific groups of privileged people and their servants. A structural equivalence relationship between Shakespeare's and Erksan's settings thereby surfaces itself. Also, in Shakespeare's text, king Hamlet's ghost meets with Hamlet in the castle battlements at night. In Erksan's adaptation, Ahmet's ghost meets with Hamlet on a platform which is made of logs. The logs are designed in the shape of castle battlements with gaps. This is yet another formal interpretant which has got a structural equivalence relationship with the prior material. In addition, in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, king Hamlet is killed in his garden with poison poured into his ear. However, in Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), Hamlet's father is killed with a rifle in the forest. Erksan's adaptation is set in contemporary times, and he accordingly recreates his modern version of this murder scene. Although a rifle is preferred instead of poisoning, the murder theme is kept, which indicates a structural

equivalence relationship between the prior material and the adaptation. Moreover, the forest versus the garden reveals a structural equivalence relationship, both of which are open-air places.

Erksan intentionally deviates from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, when he employs a bunch of insertions, which do not correspond to the source text and could also be considered as the implementation of formal interpretants on the level of structure. Even if these insertions seemingly make a difference between the source text and the adaptation, they somehow create a structural equivalence between the two products. First of all, there is a remarkable difference between Shakespeare's play and Erksan's adaptation in terms of the murder scene of Hamlet's father, which might even affect the reception of the viewers. Erksan deliberately shows who killed Ahmet in the very first scene of his adaptation, and it is a significant shift from Shakespeare's text. Erksan's audience has a chance to immediately identify the murderer and has no remaining suspense. In Shakespeare's text, it is only when Claudius kneels and repents the viewers make sure that Claudius is the murderer. Despite this difference, there is still a structural equivalence relationship between Shakespeare's text and Erksan's adaptation in the sense that the identity of the murderer is revealed. Second, a group of actors who travel to perform in Shakespeare's text turn into tuluat actors in Erksan's adaptation. Even if these two kinds of actors differ from each other in the way they perform their art, they have an equivalence relationship in terms of function. This could be thought of as another kind of formal interpretant on the structural level because it is clear that there is a parallelism between Shakespeare's troupers and Erksan's tuluat performers as both are actors. Finally, Timur Selçuk's "Pireli Şarkı" is performed before the play "Gonzago'nun Öldürülmesi" in Erksan's adaptation, which is another deviation from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. However, there is a structural equivalence relationship between accusatory implications of Hamlet to Claudius in Shakespeare's play and "Pireli Şarkı" in Erksan's adaptation in the sense that both function as latent messages directed to Hamlet's uncle. Of course, these latent messages refer to the upcoming vengeance. As a result, this could be considered as a kind of formal interpretant on the structural level as well.

The final formal interpretant is related to Erksan's filming style. According to Venuti (Venuti 2007, 33) formal interpretants might include a specific style, which refers to a typical set of formal qualities that characterize the productions of a director. The fact

that Erksan has adapted many tragic literary works into films shows us that Erksan has got a style which is based on creating adaptations with tragic endings often involving the death of the main characters. As Cansu Begüm Erkoç suggests Erksan adapted *Binnaz* (1959), a play by Yusuf Ziya Ortaç, into a film. *Ölmeyen Aşk* (1966) is Erksan's film adaptation of Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (Erkoç 2018, 45). Adile Aslan Almond also highlights that *Susuz Yaz* (1963), which is Necati Cumalı's story, was also adapted by Erksan. Another adaptation by Erksan is *Şeytan* (1974), which is an adaptation of William Fredkin's film *Exorcist* (Almond 2021, 389). Also, *Kadın Hamlet* (1976) is an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. When the plots of all these adaptations are studied, it is possible to detect one common aspect, which is the death of at least one of the main characters. Hamza, one of the main characters in *Binnaz* (1959), is killed by Ahmet Efe.⁴⁶ Similarly, in *Ölmeyen Aşk* (1966) Yıldız dies.⁴⁷ *Susuz Yaz* (1963) also includes the death of Osman.⁴⁸ In *Şeytan* (1974) Tuğrul Bilge dies at the end of the film.⁴⁹ *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is yet another film adaptation by Erksan, and at the end of the adaptation many main characters die. Thus, it would not be incorrect to say that Erksan's career brims with adaptations with tragic endings and his specific filming style is based on making film adaptations of literary works or other films with tragic endings often including death scenes.

5.3.2 Thematic Interpretants

Before analyzing thematic interpretants in Erksan's film adaptation, it is crucial to overview the advancements related to women's and LGBTQI+ rights in the United States and Europe because I believe that Erksan was heavily influenced by these advancements. With the arrival of 1970s, the second wave of feminism was on the rise first all over the United States and then Europe. Demanding equality, the second-wave feminism

⁴⁶ "Yerli Film Hikayesi: Binnaz," Salt Araştırma, accessed June 10, 2022, <https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/41032>.

⁴⁷ Sabahattin Bilgiç, "Ölmeyen Aşk (1966), Dergi İlanı ve Metin Erksan," Sinematik Yeşilçam, June 2, 2020, <https://sinematikyasilcam.com/2020/06/olmeyeyen-ask-1966-gazete-ilani-ve-metin-erksan/>.

⁴⁸ "Susuz Yaz Filmi Nerede Çekildi? Konusu Nedir?," Tarih Çantası, accessed June 9, 2022, <https://www.tarihcantasi.com/susuz-yaz-filmi-nerede-cekildi/>.

⁴⁹ "Şeytan (film, 1974)," Wikipedia, accessed June 9, 2022, [https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Şeytan_\(film,_1974\)](https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Şeytan_(film,_1974))

scrutinized sexuality, family and domestic life, working conditions, reproduction rights, and inequalities related to legal matters.⁵⁰ Starting with a report from the Committee on the Status of Women whose chair was Eleanor Roosevelt, the second-wave feminism was visibly manifested with the help of the book *The Feminine Mystique* by Betty Friedan. Civil Rights Act of 1964 banished gender and racial discrimination in the workplaces. Gloria Steinem, on the other hand, worked for reproduction rights including abortion. The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) passed the US senate in 1972.⁵¹ Title IX, which promotes equal participation in education programs and activities passed in 1972, and *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court Decision on abortion law was a milestone in women's reproduction rights. Once again, in America in the 1970s, a big transformation in the rights of gays and lesbians took place. What started as bringing visibility to the rights of gays and lesbians evolved into riots as a result of a police raid in Stonewall Inn.⁵² This led to the first gay pride march in 1969. In 1973, homosexuality was removed from the list of psychiatric illnesses in American Psychiatric Association.⁵³

In Erksan's film, thematic interpretants, which include ideologies, values, and codes, are extremely visible. It is obvious that those thematic interpretants are based on Erksan's gender ideology. Erksan portrays a strong female Hamlet. He characterizes Hamlet as an assertive, strong, and self-opinionated woman. Erksan's female Hamlet deliberately shifts from traditional feminine image with her androgynous clothing and manners. These qualities endow Erksan's female Hamlet with a non-binary identity. It is obvious that second-wave feminism coinciding with LGBTQI+ rights in the 1970s shaped Erksan's gender ideology and accordingly his application of thematic interpretants in *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). Both movements broadly took place in North America. That could be one of the reasons why Erksan portrays Hamlet as a woman who

⁵⁰ "Feminism, Second Wave," Encyclopedia, accessed May 22, 2022, <https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences/applied-and-social-sciences-magazines/feminism-second-wave#:~:text=Second%20Wave%20feminism%20applies%20to,embrace%20the%20voting%20rights%20movement.>

⁵¹ Linda Napikoski, "1970s Feminism Timeline," ThoughtCo., August 8, 2019, <https://www.thoughtco.com/1970s-feminism-timeline-3528911>.

⁵² "Gay Pride," Wikipedia, accessed May 22, 2022, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gay_pride.

⁵³ Allison Turner, "#FlashbackFriday – Today in 1973, the APA Removed Homosexuality From List of Mental Illnesses," Human Rights Campaign, December 15, 2017, <https://www.hrc.org/news/flashbackfriday-today-in-1973-the-apa-removed-homosexuality-from-list-of-me>

was educated in the United States. Perhaps, what Erksan had in mind was a female Hamlet who had been influenced by the advancements related to women's and LGBTQI+ rights when she was a student in the United States. Departing from Shakespeare's text by shifting the gender of an iconic character like Hamlet, Erksan incorporates a female Hamlet into queer politics. As Nikki Sullivan suggests by queering the straight sex it is possible to steer away from fixed concepts about sexuality and gender as the supposed basis of social relationships and identity (Sullivan 2003, 134). Even if Erksan's female Hamlet has seemingly got a heteronormative relationship with Orhan, she defies her traditional gender role and gender representation by being the female portrayal of an iconic male character. On top of that, her attitudes and clothing also contribute to her defiance of traditional gender role and gender representation. Erksan's female Hamlet wears both feminine and masculine clothes. She is vengeful and assertive as well as emotional and vulnerable. Overall, Erksan's female Hamlet is not afraid of asserting who she is. She embraces her masculine and feminine sides. Most importantly, she is not a woman hiding underneath masculine clothes. As opposed to other studies, which highlight that Hamlet is feminized when she acts mad, what I believe is that there is no absolute relationship between Hamlet's clothing and behavioral patterns. Her spirit flames with vengeance to rescue her father from purgatory; however, she is sensitive enough to mourn for the tragic death of Orhan, her lover. That means by queering Hamlet, Erksan might have tried to move away from stable concepts about gender. Moreover, Erksan might have wanted to put forward his own gender ideology by underlining the fact that gender is like a spectrum.

Erksan's thematic interpretants do not only manifest themselves in Erksan's female Hamlet. In this sense, it would be a necessity to investigate the way Erksan portrays Orhan. Similar to Erksan's female Hamlet who does not abstain from demonstrating her true self, Orhan seems to be quite at peace with his gender identity too. Just like Hamlet is not specifically masculinized by highlighting her masculine qualities, Orhan is also not specifically feminized as a character who lacks masculinity. What is considered to be the characteristics of fragile masculinity which is related to the fear of falling short of stringent and traditional masculine standards (DiMuccio and Knowles 2020, 25) such as having a lower-class status, showing emotions openly, and taking a preserving role in a romantic relationship do not effeminate Orhan. Hamlet and Orhan are

of different social classes, and the fact that Orhan is from a lower class compared to Hamlet does not hurt his masculinity. He loves Hamlet and is not afraid to declare it. He tries to preserve his relationship with Hamlet. Unlike Ophelia, who is his counterpart in Shakespeare's work, Orhan is not the puppet of his father and Hamlet's uncle. Orhan tries to understand and empathize with Hamlet's feelings, which Ophelia fails to do. Orhan holds onto his love for Hamlet even when he is warned by his father and brother to stay away from her. When Hamlet tells she never loved him, Orhan is deeply hurt. Overall, Erksan creates Orhan in a way that he defies traditional masculine standards, which reveals Erksan's thematic interpretants on gender ideology.

Most of the studies on *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) tend to examine the gender issues in the adaptation from a binary perspective. However, I believe that Erksan's portrayal of characters does not have any specific binary gender emphasis. In Erksan's adaptation, both Hamlet and Orhan are on good terms with their own gender identities. In other words, they both embrace and accept their own gender identities. Both believe that there are no faults with the way they look and behave. Most importantly, they are comfortable in their own skin when it comes to accepting their feminine and masculine sides. Thus, masculinity in femininity and femininity in masculinity seem to dissolve in Erksan's adaptation, and this is the most dominant thematic interpretant in the work. It should be noted here that in fact Shakespeare's Hamlet exhibits feminine qualities from time to time throughout the play. However, his femininity, which is portrayed as a weakness in character, has a negative connotation. This makes it difficult to conclude that Shakespeare provides a non-binary perspective in his play. Erksan, on the other hand, reconciles feminine and masculine qualities in the same character because Erksan's Hamlet does not suffer from femininity or masculinity. That is exactly why I find Erksan's gender perspective non-binary compared to that of Shakespeare.

As a critic, one applies their own interpretant, finds the hermeneutic relation between prior materials and adaptation, and opens doors for interrogative effects. Such a critic watches Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) and notices that Hamlet is not at peace with Gönül's sexuality. To illustrate, Erksan's Hamlet constantly condemns Gönül's quick marriage to Kasım by saying:

Beyinsiz bir hayvan bile erkeğinin ölüm acısını daha fazla çeker. Babamın mezarı başında döktüğü yaşlar bile gözlerinde kurumadı. Şimdi aynı kadın bir haram döşeğinde yatıyor. Azgın ve kudurmuş bir aceleyle amcamın günah dolu yatağına koştu. (Even a brainless animal would suffer more in the face of the death of its mate. The tears she shed at my father's grave have not yet dried but she is now lying on a haram bed. She rushed to my uncle's sin-filled bed in a furious and raid hurry.)⁵⁴

The accusations do not end with a single statement. Hamlet openly criticizes Gönül and becomes prudish stating:

Azgın bir şehvet senin aklını kör etmiş. Bir insan süprüntüsüne karşı duyduğun cinsel aşkın esiri olmuşsun. (A raging lust has blinded your mind. You have become a prisoner of sexual love for a piece of human trash.)⁵⁵

As we can see, Erksan's non-binary Hamlet makes hateful remarks against Gönül and her sexuality. Clearly most readers would expect a Hamlet who could at least try to empathize with Gönül and to understand the reasons behind her quick marriage. In other words, one can assume that a non-binary character like Hamlet must naturally be far away from being prudish. The truth is that a character can be non-binary, but it does not mean that the character cannot be prudish at the same time. Obviously, Metin Erksan chose to keep the major character's above-mentioned behavior exactly as it is in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* who reproduces the patriarchal approach that restricts female sexuality, especially a mother's sexuality. In short, Hamlet's accusing Gönül for her untimely marriage does not really contradict with a non-binary reading of the adaptation.

Overall, I have studied Erksan's *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) from my own ideological perspective. In this sense, the non-binary reading of *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) is my own thematic interpretant. It should be also admitted that there are a couple of aspects of Erksan's adaptation that go against the non-binary portrayal of Hamlet. The first aspect is the title of the adaptation. Erksan preferred to name the adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) instead of naming it in a more non-binary way. The other aspect is Hamlet's heterosexual relationship with Orhan. Despite many

⁵⁴ Translation is mine.

⁵⁵ Translation is mine.

examples that reveal Erksan's non-binary portrayal of Hamlet, there are also these kinds of elements that go against the non-binary profile, which reveal that traditional binary roles are still embraced in some parts of the adaptation. These two aspects clearly contradict with my interpretations. Nevertheless, I believe, my critical analysis like every interpretation leaves room for fruitful discussions on how to interpret Erksan's handling of the gender issues in his work.

CONCLUSION

The Scandinavian story of Amleth has been in fact a chain adaptation cycle for centuries. Saxo Grammaticus became the first to pen it in the twelfth century, and this act is also a kind of adaptation. The story somehow attracted Shakespeare's attention and he created his adaptation *Hamlet* between 1599 and 1601. Centuries later in 1976, Metin Erksan adapted Shakespeare's version. It is clear that the chain adaptation cycle of Amleth is likely to extend.

This MA thesis attempts to prove that Translation Studies is capable of offering much to Adaptation Studies. Just as Venuti highlights, fidelity and intertextuality discourses on adaptations do not cater for the problems of Adaptation Studies (Venuti 2007, 28). Studying adaptations necessitates an exhaustive critical methodology, which is built on the parallels between translation and adaptation. Venuti bases his critical methodology on two important concepts; namely the concepts of formal and thematic interpretants. Following Venuti's guidelines, this study aims to critically examine the formal and thematic interpretants in Metin Erksan's cult film adaptation *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet). In order to display the formal interpretants, the study focuses on the setting, a couple of important motifs, and Erksan's filming style. Selected examples from the film are presented and analyzed, and the results show a structural equivalence between Shakespeare's play and Erksan's adaptation in terms of motifs, and settings, and Erksan's filming style which characterizes his typical works.

Thematic interpretants are analyzed with a specific focus on the director's handling of gender identities of characters because they, as Venuti suggests, reveal the adapter's values and ideologies, are especially capable of stimulating interrogative effects and mark major diversions from the source material. The evidence gathered from the

adapted material show that although Erksan's adaptation is titled *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet), the masculine and feminine aspects of the major characters come together and blend. In other words, it is clear that masculine and feminine features are brought together in both Hamlet and Orhan. Therefore, it can be claimed that in dealing with the characters' gender identities, Erksan adopts a non-binary position, which is apparent throughout the film. The fact that genders of major characters are switched but their gender identities are portrayed in a non-binary way extends its impact until the end of the film and marks Erksan's most significant diversion from the source material. This tendency also clearly reveals Erksan's ideology on gender. Taking all of the above-mentioned findings in consideration, one can conclude that thematic interpretants in the work outrank the formal ones.

Kadın Hamlet (The Female Hamlet) is a multifaceted work, which has attracted the attention of researchers from different disciplines such as Translation Studies, Film Studies, Literature, Politics, and Adaptation Studies. Accordingly, *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) has been examined and analyzed by esteemed researchers from different perspectives in multiple studies creating an accumulation in *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) corpus. This MA thesis critically focuses on the application of Venuti's concepts of formal and thematic interpretants and a non-binary reading of the adaptation, which will hopefully make a valuable contribution to this corpus. The expanding *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) corpus could possibly bring along new ways of thinking about Erksan's cult film adaptation.

REFERENCES

- Almond, Adile Aslan. "Adapting Hamlet to the Turkish Screen" In *Volume 5 Dialogues between Media* edited by Paul Ferstl, 387-398. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110642056-030>
- Arslan, Savaş. "Turkish Hamlets." *Shakespeare* 4, no. 2 (2008): 157–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450910802083468>.
- Aytaç, Duygu. "Yeryüzündeki Kızların En Mükemmeli Hakkında Yanlış Düşünüyorsun." 5Harfliler.com, May 14, 2015. <https://www.5harfliler.com/hamlet-olmanin-cazibesi-ve-kadin-hamletler-yeryuzundeki-kizlarin-en-mukemmeli-hakkinda-yanlis-dusunuyorsun/>.
- Bengi, Derya. Twitter Post. January 24, 2022, 2:24 p.m. <https://twitter.com/deryabengi/status/1485574265550344195/photo/1>.
- Bilgiç, Sabahattin. "Ölmeyen Aşk (1966), Dergi İlanı ve Metin Erksan." *Sinematik Yeşilçam*. June 2, 2020. <https://sinematikyesilcam.com/2020/06/olmeyen-ask-1966-gazete-ilani-ve-metin-erksan/>.
- Bilgin, İnci. "Hamlet in Contemporary Turkey: Towards Postcolonial Feminist Rewrites?" *Multicultural Shakespeare: Translation, Appropriation and Performance* 12, no. 27 (2015): 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mstap-2015-0006>.
- Box Office Türkiye. "Kaan Müjdecı, Gain'De Yayınlanacak Hamlet Dizisi Hakkında Konuştu - Haberler." Accessed May 9, 2022. <https://boxofficeturkiye.com/haber/kaan-mujdecı-gain-de-yayınlanacak-hamlet-dizisi-hakkında-konustu--3608>.
- British Library. "Reference to Early Hamlet Play in Lodge's Wit's Misery, 1596." Accessed March 21, 2022. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/reference-to-early-hamlet-play-in-lodges-wits-misery-1596>.
- British Library. "Saxo's Legend of Amleth in the Gesta Danorum." Accessed March 21, 2022. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/saxos-legend-of-amleth-in-the-gesta-danorum>.
- Cattrysse, Patrick. (1992). "Film (Adaptation) as Translation: Some Methodological Proposals." *Target* 4, no. 1 (1992): 53-70. DOI: 10.1075/target.4.1.05cat.
- Croall, Jonathan. *Performing Hamlet: Actors in the Modern Age*. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2019.
- Cutchins, Dennis. "Bakhtin, Translation and Adaptation." In *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*, edited by K. Krebs, 36-62. New York/London: Routledge, 2014.
- Dex, Robert. "Cush Jumbo: Hamlet 'Not the Show It Would Have Been' Three Years Ago." *Evening Standard*. October 5, 2021.

<https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/cush-jumbo-hamlet-play-shakespeare-three-years-pandemic-b958850.html>.

DiMuccio, Sarah H, and Eric D Knowles. “The Political Significance of Fragile Masculinity.” *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 34 (2020): 25–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2019.11.010>.

Encyclopedia. “Feminism, Second Wave.” Accessed May 22, 2022. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences/applied-and-social-sciences-magazines/feminism-second-wave#:~:text=Second%20Wave%20feminism%20applies%20to,embrace%20the%20voting%20rights%20movement>.

Erkazancı Durmuş, Hilal. “Discourses on Hamlet's Journey in Turkey.” *Transcultural: A Journal of Translation and Cultural Studies* 12, no. 1 (2020): 119–38. <https://doi.org/10.21992/tc29464>.

Erkoç, Cansu Begüm. “Metin Erksan’s *The Female Hamlet* As An Intercultural Adaptation.” MA thesis., İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, 2018. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>.

Erksan, Metin. “İntikam Meleği | Kadın Hamlet (Tek Parça).” *YouTube* video, 1:18:01. March 5, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ysw7eEiuuSE&t=942s>

Erksan, Metin. “Metin Erksan Söyleşisi.” Interview by Can Anamur. 2007. Video, 14:49.

Gengshen, Hu. “Translation as Adaptation and Selection.” *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 11, no. 4 (2003): 283-291. DOI: 10.1080/0907676X.2003.9961481

Gökçe Koleksiyon. “Hürriyet Gazetesi Kelebek Eki 11 Haziran 1987- Fatma Girik’in Başrolünü Oynadığı Film İkinci Kez Ekranda GZ63737.” Accessed May 31, 2022. <https://www.gokcekoleksiyon.com/urun/hurriyet-gazetesi-kelebek-eki-11-haziran-1987-fatma-girikin-basrolunu-oynadigi-film-ikinci-kez-ekranda-gz63737>.

Guinness World Records. “Longest Shakespeare Play.” Accessed May 19, 2022. <https://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/69571-longest-shakespeare-play>.

Hoenselaars, Ton. “Between Heaven and Hell: Shakespearian Translation, Adaptation, and Criticism from a Historical Perspective.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36, no. 1 (2006): 50–64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3508735>.

Kadın Hamlet. 1976. DVD. Directed by Metin Erksan. Bağcılar, İstanbul: D Yapım Reklamcılık ve Dağıtım.

Kirisci, Murat. "Kadın Hamlet Niye Kadın?" Öteki Sinema. July 5, 2016. <https://www.otekisinema.com/kadin-hamlet-niye-kadin/>.

Krebs, Katja. "Collisions, Diversion and Meeting Points." In *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*, edited by K. Krebs, 1-9. New York/London: Routledge, 2014.

Link, Franz H. "Translation, Adaptation and Interpretation of Dramatic Texts." In *The Languages of Theatre Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*, edited by O. Zuber, 24-50. Amsterdam: Pergamon, 1980.

Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, s.v. "actor," accessed May 19, 2022, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/actor>.

Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, s.v. "hermeneutic," accessed February 21, 2022, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hermeneutic>.

Meyer, Dan. "Cush Jumbo Stars in Live Streaming Hamlet at London's Young Vic, Starting October 28." Playbill, October 28, 2021. <https://playbill.com/article/cush-jumbo-stars-in-live-streaming-hamlet-at-londons-young-vic-starting-october-28>.

Milton, John. "Translation Studies and Adaptation Studies." In *Translation Research Projects 2*, edited by Anthony Pym & Alexander Perekrestenko, 51-58. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 2009.

Minier, Márta. "Definitions, Dyads, Triads and Other Points of Connection in Translation and Adaptation Discourse." In *Translation and Adaptation in Theatre and Film*, edited by K. Krebs, 13-35. New York/London: Routledge, 2014.

MUBI. "The Angel of Vengeance." Accessed May 12, 2022. <https://mubi.com/films/the-angel-of-vengeance-the-female-hamlet/awards>.

Napikoski, Linda. "1970s Feminism Timeline." ThoughtCo. August 8, 2019. <https://www.thoughtco.com/1970s-feminism-timeline-3528911>.

Nord, Christiane. "Translation as a process of linguistic and cultural adaptation." In *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 2*, edited by Cay Dollerup & Annette Lindegaard, 59-67. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1994.

Parris, Amanda. "What If Hamlet Were a Woman? This Toronto Theatre Company Dares to Ask Why Not | CBC Arts." CBCnews. CBC/Radio Canada, April 28, 2017.

<https://www.cbc.ca/arts/what-if-hamlet-were-a-woman-this-toronto-theatre-company-dares-to-ask-why-not-1.4090219>.

Salt Araştırma. “Yerli Film Hikayesi: Binnaz.” Accessed June 10, 2022. <https://archives.saltresearch.org/handle/123456789/41032?mode=full>.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Translated by Sabahattin Eyüboğlu. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2021.

Sullivan, Nikki. *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*. New York, NY: New York University Pr, 2003.

Tarih Çantası. “Susuz Yaz Filmi Nerede Çekildi? Konusu Nedir?.” Accessed June 9, 2022. <https://www.tarihcantasi.com/susuz-yaz-filmi-nerede-cekildi/>.

The Guardian. “Thy Name Is Woman: Female Hamlets from Sarah Bernhardt to Cush Jumbo - in Pictures.” Accessed March 3, 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/gallery/2014/sep/26/female-hamlets-sarah-bernhardt-maxine-peake-in-pictures>.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies--and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co., 2012.

Tripney, Natasha. “Hamlet, Thy Name Is Woman: Why Michelle Terry's Globe Is Staging Post-Gender Shakespeare.” *The Independent*. Independent Digital News and Media, May 16, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre-dance/features/hamlet-globe-michelle-terry-shakespeare-gender-blind-cross-cast-as-you-like-ensemble-deaf-a8350886.html>.

Turner, Allison. “FlashbackFriday – Today in 1973, the APA Removed Homosexuality From List of Mental Illnesses.” *Human Rights Campaign*. December 15, 2017. <https://www.hrc.org/news/flashbackfriday-today-in-1973-the-apa-removed-homosexuality-from-list-of-me>.

Tütüncü, Nûpelda. “Kadın Hamlet: Olmak Ya Da Olmamak.” *Sosyal Bilimler*. April 29, 2017. <https://www.sosyalbilimler.org/kadin-hamlet-olmak-ya-da-olmamak/>.

Urgan, Mina. *İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi*. 6th ed. İstanbul.: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2010.

Venuti, Lawrence. “Adaptation, Translation, Critique.” *Journal of Visual Culture* 6, no. 1 (April 2007): 25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412907075066>.

Vermeer, Hans J. “Skopos and Commission in Translational Action.” In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 221-232. London: Routledge, 2000.

Wikipedia. “Gay Pride.” Accessed May 22, 2022.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gay_pride.

Wikipedia. “Şeytan (film, 1974).” Accessed June 9, 2022.
[https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Şeytan_\(film,_1974\)](https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Şeytan_(film,_1974)).



APPENDIX

Appendix 1



Charlotte Charke (Photograph: Alamy)

Appendix 2



Cush Jumbo as Hamlet (Photograph: Dean Chalkley)

Appendix 3



Siranuş in Hamlet

Appendix 4



Elit İşcan as the last female Hamlet

Appendix 5



Fatma Girik rehearses *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet) with a fake shaved head

Appendix 6



Fatma Girik reacts to the censorship carried out by TRT to her scenes in *Kadın Hamlet* (The Female Hamlet)

Appendix 7



William Shakespeare is seen as the writer in the intro of Kadın Hamlet (The Female Hamlet)

ÖZGEÇMİŞ			
Adı, Soyadı	Selen	Şahin	
Bildiği Yabancı Diller ve Düzeyi	İngilizce		
Eğitim Durumu	Başlama- Bitirme Yılı	Kurum Adı	
Lise	2007	2011	Keşan Anadolu Lisesi
Lisans	2011	2015	İstanbul Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı
Yüksek Lisans	2019	2022	İstanbul 29 Mayıs Üniversitesi Çeviribilim (İngilizce)
Doktora	-	-	-
Çalıştığı Kurum/lar	Başlama - Ayrılma Yılı	Çalışılan Kurumun Adı	
1.	2016	2019	Üsküdar Üniversitesi
2.	2019		İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi
Yayınlar	<p><i>Çin El Sanatları (Tarihi, Kullanılan Teknikler ve Hakkındaki Efsaneler)</i> Yazan: Hang Jian – Guo Qihui Çevirmen: Selen Şahin 1. Baskı Aralık 2017 ISBN: 978-975-343-995-4</p> <p>Kazan Kazan Gelecek Yazan: Huang Weiping – Ding Kai – Lai MingMing – Liu Yijiao – Song Yong – Liu Kejia Çevirmen: Selen Şahin 1. Baskı Ocak 2018 ISBN: 978-605-67162-2-5</p>		
Tarih: 06/07/2022			
İmza:			
Adı Soyadı: Selen ŞAHİN			

