

DOĐUŐ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

MA IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON

SHAKESPEARE'S *HAMLET* AND ITS TURKISH TRANSLATIONS

BY ORHAN BURİAN, SABAHATTİN EYÜBOĐLU, AND CAN YÜCEL

MA Thesis

Üzeyme Hacıođlu

201189016

Thesis Advisor:

Assoc. Prof. Gülően Sayın

İstanbul, January 2017

DOĐUŐ UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

MA IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON

SHAKESPEARE'S *HAMLET* AND ITS TURKISH TRANSLATIONS

BY ORHAN BURİAN, SABAHATTİN EYÜBOĐLU, AND CAN YÜCEL

MA Thesis

Üzeyme Hacıođlu

201189016

Thesis Advisor:

Assoc. Prof. Gülően Saym

Jury Members

Assist. Prof. Oya Berk

Assist. Prof. Őirin Tufan

İstanbul, January 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ÖZET	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. RECEPTION THEORY IN TRANSLATION STUDIES	2
3. SHAKESPEARE AND ELIZABETHAN PERIOD	6
3.1. Socio-cultural, Political and Historical Background	7
3.2. Characteristics of Elizabethan Drama	10
3.3. Summary of <i>Hamlet</i>	13
4. HISTORY OF <i>HAMLET</i> TRANSLATIONS IN TURKEY	17
5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE TARGET TEXTS	22
5.1. Power Struggle	22
5.2. Gender Roles	30
5.3. The Individual's Dilemma	42

6. CONCLUSION	55
WORKS CITED	59
BIOGRAPHY	62



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Gülşen Sayın for her invaluable contributions, patience and encouragement throughout my thesis process. Her wholehearted support and guidance have made this thesis possible.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to all my instructors at English Language and Literature Department at Dođuş University.

Finally, I would like to give special thanks to my loving family especially my dear sons Can and Mert for their endless support, tolerance and encouragement throughout my thesis process.

ABSTRACT

This thesis takes Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as the source text and compares its Turkish translations by Orhan Burian (1944), Sabahattin Eyüboğlu (1965), and Can Yücel (1992) as the target texts in light of Reception Theory which is one of the reader-oriented critical theories. This study first focuses on what Reception Theory is from the perspective of Translation Studies; next, it looks through Elizabethan period and socio-cultural, political and historical background of the sixteenth century England, characteristics of Elizabethan drama and summary of *Hamlet*. Then, having summarized history of *Hamlet* translations in Turkey, this study compares the above mentioned target texts. As Reception Theory requires the detailed analysis of the target cultural norms, the three target texts and their socio-cultural, political and historical backgrounds in the twentieth century Turkey are analyzed in terms of the main themes of the source text: power struggle, gender roles, and the individual's dilemma. While "Power Struggle" part deals with the fight for power between two opposing forces in the Kingdom of Denmark, the second part, "Gender Roles" takes the women characters to the center, and deals with the prejudice towards them; lastly, "The Individual's Dilemma" discusses the meaning of the individual's existence and the choice he makes between two alternatives that seem equally undesirable. However, the target texts in the Turkey of the 40s, 60s and the 90s look similar to or differ from one another at times compared to the source text since the translators are the members of the target society, and thus exposed to those periods' socio-cultural, political and historical developments.

Reception Theory enables the translators to fill in the blanks and indeterminacy of the source text apt for their 'horizon of expectations' during the reading process as the theorists Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss assert because there is no more an ideal reader as it is solely the writer of the source text. Thus, it is possible that a text may be interpreted and formed variously by different readers or even by the same reader when read in different times. As translators are the first readers and interpreters of the source text, it would be natural for them to interpret and translate the source text under the influence of their own socio-cultural, political and historical background.

Keywords: Translation Studies, Reception Theory, William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Orhan Burian, Sabahattin Eyübođlu, Can Yücel.

ÖZET

Bu tez, okuyucu odaklı eleştirel kuramlardan biri olan Alımlama Estetiği Kuramı temelinde çevirinin önemini vurgulayarak Shakespeare'in *Hamlet* metnini Orhan Burian'ın 1944 yılında, Sabahattin Eyüboğlu'nun 1965 yılında ve Can Yücel'in 1992 yılında Türkçe'ye çevrilmiş erek metinleri ile karşılaştırmayı amaçlar. Bu çalışma, öncelikle Çeviribilim açısından, Alımlama Estetiği Kuramı'nın temel ilkelerine, ikinci olarak Elizabeth dönemi ile onaltıncı yüzyıl İngiltere'sinin sosyo-kültürel, siyasi ve tarihi arka planına, Elizabeth tiyatrosunun özellikleri ve *Hamlet* metnini şekillendiren temel çatışmalar üzerine odaklanır. Üçüncü olarak, farklı çevirmenler tarafından Türkçe'ye çevrilen *Hamlet* metninin çeviri tarihçesi kısaca özetlenir. Son olarak, kaynak metin ve yazıldığı dönem incelendikten sonra, üç Türkçe erek metin, yirminci yüzyıl Türkiye'sinin sosyo-kültürel, siyasi ve tarihi arka planında "Güç Mücadelesi", "Cinsiyet Rollerini" ve "Bireyin İkilemi" başlıkları altında irdelenir. "Güç Mücadelesi", Danimarka Krallığı'ndaki iki muhalif güç arasındaki iktidar mücadelesini ele alırken, "Cinsiyet Rollerini" kadın karakterleri ve onlara yönelik önyargıları ele alır ve son olarak "Bireyin İkilemi", bireyin varlığının anlamı ve Hamlet karakterinin aynı derecede istenmeyen iki varoluş biçimi arasında karar vermeye çalışmasını zaman zaman Türkiye'deki benzer ya da farklı alımlamaları öne çıkararak tartışır. Ancak, 40'lı, 60'lı ve 90'lı yıllara ait erek metinler birbirleriyle karşılaştırıldığında zaman zaman benzeşmekte ya da ayrışmakta oldukları gözlemlenir; çünkü çevirmenler de erek toplumun üyeleri olarak bu dönemlerin sosyo-kültürel, politik ve tarihi koşullarına maruz kalmaktadırlar. Alımlama

Estetiđi Kuramı, kuramcılarını Wolfgang Iser ve Hans Robert Jauss'un ileri sürdüđü gibi, okuma sürecini esnasında okuyucuların 'beklenti ufkuna' göre boşlukları ve belirsizlikleri doldurmalarına olanak tanır. Bu nedenle bir metnin farklı okuyucular tarafından ve hatta aynı okuyucu tarafından farklı zamanlarda okunması durumunda farklı yorumlanması ve oluşturulması olasıdır. Bu çalışmada ele alınan erek metinler 1940'lar, 1960'lar ve 1990'lar Türkiye'sinin soyo-kültürel, politik ve tarihi bağlamında ele alınmış ve birbirleriyle karşılaştırılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çeviribilim, Alımlama Estetiđi Kuramı, William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Orhan Burian, Sabahattin Eyübođlu, Can Yücel

1. INTRODUCTION

This comparative study articulates one of the reader-oriented critical theories, namely, Reception Theory, in the nexus of translation and cultural studies with the aim of analyzing socio-cultural, political and historical background of the twentieth-century Turkish society when William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was translated into Turkish in different decades, namely the 1940s, 1960s, and the 1990s. To serve this purpose, the target texts of Orhan Burian (1944), Sabahattin Eyübođlu (1965), and Can Yücel (1992) will be analyzed regarding socio-cultural, political and historical practices that affect the translation process in the above mentioned decades. In other words, the major principles of Reception Theory will be implemented on the themes of the source text, such as power struggle, gender roles and the individual's dilemma both in the source and target texts.

This study, having initiated the major principles of Reception Theory, will move to socio-cultural, political and historical background of the source and target texts, namely Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and its Turkish translations, and finally, it will compare and contrast above mentioned three different target texts with each other.

2. RECEPTION THEORY IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

German literary scholar and theorist Wolfgang Iser (1926-2007) is one of the founders of Reception Theory that was formulated in the 1960s and proposed that meaning can only be produced by the readers of a text. For Iser, a literary text should be analyzed within the reading process since that literary text is activated by his/her reader. Iser focuses on the relationship between the author and the reader, and declares that each reader has various ways of reading, and there cannot be an ideal reader because the only ideal reader is the author himself/herself (29). The ideal reader is very fictional and nothing to do with reality.

On this subject Iser states:

[...] if only because an ideal reader is a structural impossibility as far as literary communication is concerned. An ideal reader would have to have an identical code that of the author; authors, however, generally recodify prevailing codes in their texts, and so the ideal reader would also have to share the intentions underlying this process. And if this were possible, communication would then be quite superfluous for one only communicates that which is not already shared by sender and receiver. (28-29)

The ideal reader is not possible because a literary text is created by his/her reader's mind through the process of reading. In Iser's view, "it is in the nature of texts to allow a spectrum of possible readings". (Selden 56). Therefore, various meanings of the same literary text may emerge even read by the same reader, that's why, each reading at first or second reading may have various effects on the reader. Thus, Iser declares "reading activity that is guided by the text; this must be processed by the reader, who is then, in turn, affected by what he has processed" (163). The interaction or the "dialectical relationship" (56) between the literary text and the reader may be guided variously at each reading at various times under various

conditions. The reader should be in the center all the time since his/her knowledge plays a great role during the process of reception. Iser declares:

[...] the literary work has two poles, which we might call the artistic and aesthetic: the artistic pole is the author's text and the aesthetic is the realization accomplished by the reader. In view of this polarity, it is clear that the work itself cannot be identical with the text or with the concretization, but must be situated somewhere between the two. (21)

While reading a fiction, the reader faces with subjectivity of a literary text regarding the characters, setting and so on. At that case, how does a reader can formulate the theory in a literary text? Even that fictitious text has traditions, ways of living, behavioral styles, beliefs similar to real life. Thus, the reader should apply the socio-cultural, political and historical elements, shortly, all the ideology into the text to grasp the artistic pole. Furthermore, the reader should fill in the blanks left by the author, whether those blanks are consciously or unconsciously left. In Iser's view, those blanks and indeterminacy in literary texts are used to enable the reader to grasp the artistic pole and intensify the aesthetic pole (21). This situation brings about the possibility that the reader's own world view may be modified as a result of internalizing, negotiating and realizing the partially indeterminate elements of the text" (58); to use Iser's words, reading "gives us the chance to formulate the unformulated" (58). In literary translation, the blanks and indeterminacy give space to fill in both for translators of the source text and readers of targets text. It may also be defined as the death of the author but not a physical one, and the birth of the reader.

Another German literary scholar and theorist who is crucial for Reception Theory is Hans Robert Jauss (1921-1997). He was a scholar in University of Konstanz, as well. Both Iser and Jauss are considered to be the founders of the theory. Jauss aims at defining translator's

reproduction with “horizon of expectations”, in other words, “the criteria readers use to judge literary texts in any given period” (53), or the time a reader faces with a text, he or she considers his/her horizon of expectations which reminds a specific emotional attitude. As Chris Baldick defines it as:

horizon of expectations, a term used in Reception Theory of Hans Robert Jaus to designate the set of cultural norms, assumptions, and criteria shaping the way in which readers understand and judge a literary work at a given time. It may be formed by such factors as the prevailing conventions and definitions of art (e.g. *decorum), or current moral codes. Such 'horizons' are subject to historical change, so that a later generation of readers may see a very different range of meanings in the same work, and revalue it accordingly. (116)

For Jaus, the aesthetic pole of a literary work is subjective. Yet, it is still related to the its reader’s experience and values. Reader desires a new literary text to correspond to earlier literary text read by reader so far, looks for familiarity. If there is familiarity, it corresponds to his/her horizon of expectations and even if there is no familiarity, reader makes an effort to grasp the text and motivates reader to encounter new information which leads also the reconstruction of horizon of expectations. The prejudices are broken and reshaped instantly.

How should a literary text be interpreted, then? Jonathan Culler states it as:

A work is an answer to questions posed by a ‘horizon of expectations’. The interpretation of works should, therefore, focus not on the experience of an individual reader but on the history of a work’s reception and its relation to the changing aesthetic norms and sets of expectations that allow it to be read in different eras. (123)

To put it in the context of Translation Studies, it means that a translator’s attempts to analyze a source text will depend on the questions which his/her own cultural environment allows him/her to raise. At the same time, the translator will seek to discover the questions which the source text itself was trying to answer in its own dialogue with the time it was produced.

Therefore, as stated in the above quotation by Culler, readers of *Hamlet* in the 1600s, 1940s, 1960s and 1990s differ a lot, and hence the concentration should be not on an individual reader but the historical changes affecting the reading public rather than the individual reader. A well-known saying defines that there are a thousand Hamlets in a thousand people's eyes.

For centuries, translation activity has always been considered as a linguistic act basically and merely depending on language competence and it has been a great concern whether it is related to any other disciplines through the history of humankind. Many theorists in Translation Studies deal with the link between source text and its reproduction, in other words, target text. This study can be exemplified as an comparative study since it aims to deal with the source text and three different target texts from the perspective of Reception Theory which opens a new path in Translation Studies by emphasizing the socio-cultural, political and historical background of the source and target texts.

3. SHAKESPEARE AND ELIZABETHAN PERIOD

William Shakespeare (1564-1616) who is well-known for his world famous sonnets and plays, is considered to be the best poet and playwright of all times. He was born in Stratford upon Avon as a son of a rich man, John Shakespeare and Mary Arden, and grew up there. He was one of the eight brothers. He went to a grammar school and learnt Latin there. Yet, after his graduation from the grammar school, he did not attend university but got married to a mature woman named Ann Hathaway at the age of 20 and they had children. His longing for a theatrical career never left him in peace and he moved to London leaving his family there. At the very beginning of his career, he took his chance as an actor but acting was never then at its best, that is why, it was never considered to be a prestigious profession. He had a fame in acting but he never appeared in prestigious roles as heroes in his tragedies. In due course, he preferred to advance in writing as a poet and lastly as a playwright under the protection of Lord of Southampton as the other artists of that time.

As for Shakespeare's most important characteristic, he is not different from a philosopher in his capability to utilize his characters together with their both senses and mentality that can be adapted to any human being. As Victor Hugo indicates:

Shakespeare is the biggest source of pride of England. England brought up Cromwell in Politics, Bacon in Philosophy and Newton in Science. Yet, Cromwell is dishonoured with brutality and Bacon with inferiority. As for Newton, his structure is about to be shaken. Shakespeare is clear and a superior genius different from the others. There are Copernic and Galilee superior to Newton, Descartes and Kant superior to Bacon, Danton and Bonaparte

superior to Cromwell. Yet, there is no one superior to Shakespeare. (qtd. in *Hamlet, Macbeth, Tarla Kuşu* 7-8)¹

Shakespeare and his poetry and drama cannot be analyzed out of the Elizabethan socio-cultural, political and historical context since as a poet and playwright, Shakespeare produced numerous masterpieces during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. In fact, this period is considered to be one of the most prolific periods of English Literature. To be able to understand the spirit of the source text, it would be right to seize the spirit of the period, and thus, the socio-cultural, political and historical background of the source text should be analyzed in details.

3.1. Socio-cultural, Political and Historical Background

Elizabeth (1533-1603) was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. To be able comprehend the Elizabethan period, the reign of Henry VIII of England should be clarified first. Henry became king at the age of eighteen and married to the Spanish king's widow daughter Catherine of Aragon because the kingdom of Spain was the most powerful kingdom then and that marriage would gain favor a lot. Mary was born as the first child of Henry VIII. In a few years, Henry VIII fell in love with Anne Boleyn and desired to marry her. But his desire was not approved by Catholic England and Spain. Moreover, his proposal was precisely rejected by the leader of the Catholic Church, the Pope, who praised the king for executing the Protestants besides setting Martin Luther's all books on fire. Henry VIII was constantly honoured by the Pope as the defender of the Catholicism. Henry annulled his

¹ Translated by the author.

marriage to Catherine of Aragon and married Anne in 1533 in secret and Anne gave birth to Elizabeth at the same year. Their marriage was annulled by the Church and Elizabeth was declared as illegitimate. In a short time, Henry VIII married Jane Seymour and she passed away days after giving birth to Edward in 1537. Henry VIII ruled the kingdom until his death in 1547, and after his death, Edward became king at the age of nine and ruled the kingdom until his death in 1553. Edward VI desired Lady Jane Grey, Henry VIII's sister's granddaughter, to be the next ruler of England as his heir, excluding his half sisters Mary and Elizabeth. After Lady Jane Grey was proclaimed as queen, Mary and Elizabeth deposed her in nine days and Mary ascended to the throne as the first woman to be a queen. Unlike his half brother Edward VI who was Protestant, Mary was a devout Catholic, she reformed the Catholic Church and executed many Protestants deserving of her fame as "Bloody Mary". She married Philip of Spain but her reign lasted only five years and she had to leave the throne in 1558 to her half sister and successor Elizabeth since Mary died without a child.

Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, was crowned as Queen of England and Ireland at the age of twenty five after her Protestant half brother Edward VI's reign (1547-1553) and her half sister Catholic Mary I's reign (1553-1558). Elizabeth I was the second Protestant ruler and her reign was referred as the "Golden Age". Elizabeth never married nor had a child. She adopted a more moderate ruling unlike Mary I during her reign (1558-1603). Yet, Elizabeth's father Henry VIII started the English Reformation to be able to marry Elizabeth's mother, Anne Boleyn, denied the authority of the Pope and separated the Church of England from the Roman Catholic Church which led to Protestantism in England. Henry VIII became the head of the Church of England. Though his love affair and desire to have a male heir were the spark of the English Reformation, there were also other pioneer

events occurring in Europe. Martin Luther, German professor of theology, rejected the Roman Catholic Church's oppressive practices and questioned the authority of the both Pope and church in his work named *Ninety-five Theses* in 1517. Also, the invention of printing press, Bible's translation into native languages, access to Bible and also other works of leading scholars led people especially middle and working class into questioning taboos that remained untouchable for so many years. Even the unquestionable issues came to be broken. There were also other factors such as scepticism, questioning the authority, the decline of feudalism and increase of nationalism, awakening in law and knowledge that enabled the order reshape. Though Henry VIII's love affair and his annulment of his marriage were perceived as the major reasons of the English Reformation, it was the outcome of ongoing European Protestant Reformation as well the theological radicalism in England then.

Furthermore, except for the English Reformation, the English The Renaissance reshaped the people regarding arts, literature, music, architecture, science and politics. It began in Florence in the fourteenth-century and formed a new ideology called Humanism which focused on a person's capacity for self-realization through reason. Moreover, it was both an intellectual and a cultural awakening that centered on individualism, classical learning (the culture of ancient Greece and Rome), secularism and rejections of dogmas. The transformation that took place in Italy moved to England a century later around the sixteenth century with the works of leading artists such as William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, Sir Thomas Moore, Francis Bacon and so on. Elizabethan period was inevitably reshaped by Henry VIII's declaration of independence from the Roman Catholic Church, and giving a start to the English Reformation and Renaissance. Also, the common use of printing press enabled to the transformation of values of that time.

3.2. Characteristics of the Elizabethan Drama

When it comes to dealing with the characteristics of Elizabethan literature, it was obvious that the major literary genres were drama and poetry. The Queen herself was highly educated and wrote some poems during her lifetime. William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson were the leading playwrights. As London was not allowed for performances, the touring companies performed their plays all over England except for London. There were four different theatres. First, The Hall Stage was not for public but for aristocracy and the stage was at one end of the hall or a dining hall at the universities such as Oxford and Cambridge or at the Inns of Court such as London School of Law. It did not differ from the medieval stage and had a raised platform with a back curtain. The scenery and technology (trap-doors, scene and sound effects) were used. Second type was The Inn Yard and used for public performances. Inn keepers encouraged the professional actors to perform their plays at their inns to attract more and more customers. The inn rooms with inner balconies were opened to a rectangular stage in the yard. There was a raised platform with a curtain at the back. The Public Theatre was the third type, and it was the first successful and permanent theatre, opened outside London in 1576 by James Burbage, who performed Shakespeare's tragic heroes in his plays. These public theatres were followed by the many of them such as The Curtain (1577), The Rose (1587), The Swan (1595), The Globe (1598), The Fortune (1599), and the Red Bull (1605) and The Hope (1613). Those public theatres had three floors with a rounded space and those three sides overlooked the stage whereas the stage and its upper balcony were used by the actors and musicians. Most of Shakespeare's plays were performed at the public places with full capacity. There was a hierarchical order;

if there were poor people, they had to stand. In subsequent years, public theatres were followed by the private theatres. They were not for common people but for aristocrats and nobles. Plays were performed at nights, that is why, artificial lighting was utilized to illuminate the theatre. Furthermore, scenery, visual and sound effects were used, too. The tickets were higher for common people. The theatre owners did their best to please their viewers. The ticket prices differed with time, the ones who desired to watch performance away from the crowd paid more while the ones watching with the crowd paid less. A better view of stage meant more money.

One of the major characteristics of the theatres of that time was that those companies employed only male players but no woman players, and hence the female parts were acted by adolescent boy players due to their broken voice and dressed in women's costumes. Performances were acted in the afternoon, what is more, the stage was lightened with candles when it was a long performance and the weather darkened.

The playwrights were all male but not female and they were self made men who worked hard to achieve and created their own fortune. Shakespeare who had no even a university education was one of them. Some of them were highly educated at the leading universities of that time such as Oxford and Cambridge. Both William Shakespeare and Ben Jonson started their career as actors and took place in some plays at the very beginning of their careers. Playwrights wrote plays in collaboration with teams of two, three or even more except for Shakespeare and Jonson. Thus, many of playwrights had to share income with other members of team and had to face with struggle and poverty throughout their lives. Once a

play was sold to a company, playwrights had no control on it regarding even revision or publication. Most playwrights wrote plays in verse form to be performed gently on stage. It was unfortunate that majority of those plays were not printed and lost, solely minority of them survived.

Elizabethan drama covered the history plays that reflected not only England but also Europe then and power struggle in history belonging to Marlowe, George Peele, Shakespeare and so on. Comedy was another genre performed during that period. Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton gave typical examples that satirized London life. However, the most famous genre was tragedy that focused on human suffering. Thomas Kyd, Marlowe and Shakespeare wrote great tragedies. Shakespeare's greatest tragedies *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth* were all written and performed in that period and the leading themes were based on human suffering, revenge, power struggle and so on.

The playwrights wrote plays in verse form to be performed on stage, used at times a stylish language known as rhetorical language and at times a traditional language more colloquial with slang. Elizabethan freedom of expression brought the playwrights closer to vagueness and ambiguity. The playwrights wrote plays based on either an action or a character combined with monologues and dialogues. Various metaphors, conceits, imageries and puns were successfully adapted to the texts. Shakespeare was a person of genius, he used irregular sentences, unexpectedly starting, pausing and stopping in unrhymed blank verse and iambic pentameter. One of the popular dramatic genres of the period was the Revenge Tragedy.

Revenge Tragedy [is] a kind of tragedy popular in England from the 1590s to the 1630s, following the success of Thomas Kyd's sensational play *The Spanish Tragedy* (c.1589). Its action is typically centred upon a leading character's attempt to avenge the murder of a loved one, sometimes at the prompting of the victim's ghost; it involves complex intrigues and disguises, and usually some exploration of the morality of revenge. Drawing partly on precedents in Senecan tragedy, the English revenge tragedy is far more bloodthirsty in its explicit presentation of premeditated violence, and so the more gruesome examples such as Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* are sometimes called 'tragedies of blood'. Notable examples of plays that are fully or partly within the revenge tradition are Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, Cyril Tourneur's *The Revenger's Tragedy*, John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* and John Ford's *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. A more famous play drawing on the revenge conventions is Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. (Baldick 216)

3.3. Summary of *Hamlet*

Before dealing with history of *Hamlet* translations in Turkey it would be right to give a brief summary of the source text. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is accepted as one of the leading tragedies of both English and World Literatures. It was written at uncertain date between 1599 and 1602. It is based on a character named Amleth from a medieval Scandinavian legend. Set in five acts, the play takes place in the Kingdom of Denmark.

Highly educated Prince Hamlet is the protagonist of the play. He is the son of the late King Hamlet who is murdered by his own brother Cladius. Cladius becomes the present King of Denmark and marries the Queen Gertrude in a short time. Hamlet is both upset and puzzled about his father's death and mother's marriage. Polonius's daughter Ophelia is in love with Hamlet but she is warned by his father and brother Laertes. Hamlet's devout friend Horatio tells Hamlet that he has seen a ghost who resembles the former king on the castle at nighttime. Hamlet demands to see that ghost immediately. The ghost appears to Hamlet that night and reveals the reality and demands him to take revenge. From then on, Hamlet realizes

that his father was murdered by his uncle to seize the throne, and Hamlet's suffering starts. He makes plans to take revenge as soon as possible. Yet, as a highly educated person raised with a humanistic approach, Hamlet keeps questioning himself and his plans.

In Act Two, Ophelia reveals that Hamlet came to her room half-naked behaving so oddly. Polonius blames Hamlet and his behaviours due to his love towards Ophelia and tells it to King Claudius and Queen Gertrude in a rush. King Claudius and Queen Gertrude demand Hamlet's friends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to investigate the reason of his behaviours. Polonius talks to Hamlet to reveal the truth whereas Hamlet pretends he is mad while scorning him. He salutes his friends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern with kindness but thinks that they also spy on him. As soon as they tell him that they have come with a group of actors, Hamlet decides on performing a parallel play based on the Ghost's story to reveal whether King Claudius is guilty or not.

In Act Three, Polonius demands Ophelia to talk to Hamlet to seize his behaviours while he and King Claudius are watching them. Hamlet and Ophelia enter and Ophelia tends to give Hamlet's belongings back. Yet, Hamlet blames her for immorality. Having witnessed Hamlet's reactions, King Claudius is convinced that Hamlet is not mad due to love. In the meantime, the play is performed and King Claudius leaves the room as soon as he sees the murder scene of the king by pouring poison into his ear. From then on, Hamlet is certain that King Claudius is utterly guilty. Queen Gertrude talks to Hamlet to question his improper behaviours while being watched by Polonius after the curtain. Hamlet stabs that spy thinking that it is King Claudius. Due to the fear that Hamlet may kill him at any time, Claudius sends

him with his friends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to England with a letter that requests Hamlet's execution as soon as possible.

In Act Four, having learnt his father's death, Ophelia loses her control. When Laertes is informed about his father's death and sister's madness, he comes back. He is convinced that Hamlet is the only one who is responsible for this mess. Hamlet comes back from England surviving from King Cladius's wicked plan. However, King Cladius makes new plans on Hamlet and proposes Hamlet and Laertes a challenge in which Hamlet will be poisoned by wine at the end. Queen Gertrude comes in informing Ophelia's unclear death whether it is a suicide or not.

Finally, in Act Five, Hamlet realizes that Ophelia is the one being buried and proclaims his love to Ophelia at the graveyard scene. Furthermore, Hamlet tells his devout friend Horatia how he has replaced King Cladius's letter with another copy that leads to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's death instead of him. The conversation is interrupted by Osric who informs Hamlet about fencing challenge to Laertes. Despite Horatio's objection to accept the challenge, Hamlet accepts it. At the very beginning of the challenge, Queen Gertrude, who demands to celebrate Hamlet's success, raises the poisoned wine glass which is set for Hamlet by King Cladius and drinks it. Moreover, Hamlet is wounded by Laertes's poisoned blade and they change weapons and this time Laertes is wounded by Hamlet's poisoned sword. Queen Gertrude dies claiming that she has been poisoned by that wine. Laertes reveals King Cladius's wicked plans when he is about to die and Hamlet kills King Cladius rashly. On hearing Fortinbrss's arrival to Elsinore, Hamlet proclaims the Norwegian prince as his

successor. Horatio is the only one to survive and narrate the whole happenings from the beginning. Since all Danish members of royal family are dead, Fortinbras ascends the throne.

As the summary shows, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is full of universal themes and motives, suchs as the power struggle between the rulers (King Hamlet and Claudius), struggle of young people (young Hamlet, Ophelia, Laertes, Fortinbras and Horatio) against their parents and the adult values, vulnerability and victimization of the women (Ophelia and Gertrude) by the patriarchal system, and finally, the individualization process of the young people in a cruel world.

Having focused on the summary of *Hamlet*, the history of *Hamlet* translations in Turkey and the translators of the source text will be resolved in details.

4. HISTORY OF *HAMLET* TRANSLATIONS IN TURKEY

Shakespeare was always one of the most influential poets and playwrights whose works influenced authors all over the world and were frequently translated and performed. Performance and translation adventure of his masterpieces dates back to the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century. Gülşen Sayın states “once the signs of dramatic texts were deciphered and the influential power of theatre on the masses was recognized, the Ottoman court was bothered by the political content of Shakespeare’s works” (21) and the performances were banned. The Ottoman Sultan, Abdulhamid II did not let *Hamlet* and other tragedies of Shakespeare to be performed in 1889 as they were perceived as a threat to monarchy (Paker 1986: 91). In due course, Shakespearean works were read by means of their translations in French and performed by minority groups such as Greeks and Armenians. As Muhsin Ertuğrul, the father of modern Turkish theatre, points out, with the end of Abdulhamid’s reign in 1908, doctor Abdullah Cevdet had first *Hamlet* translation published in his own printing office named İctihad in Cairo, Egypt (qtd. in *Hamlet, Macbeth, Tarla Kuşu* 6).² Furthermore, Vasfi Rıza Zobu states that translation made by Abdullah Cevdet was not suitable to be performed on stage and that source-oriented translation and the language used in text made it complicated for performance (qtd. in *Hamlet, Macbeth, Tarla Kuşu* 10-12).³ As Arslan Kaynardağ declares Abdullah Cevdet’s translation was performed by Ertuğrul for the first time in Odeon Theatre in 1911-1912 and he both directed and starred in Hamlet character on stage. Ertuğrul translated *Hamlet* from German into

² Translated by the author.

³ Translated by the author.

Turkish in 1929 and his translation was not source-oriented but performance-oriented (qtd. in *Hamlet, Macbeth, Tarla Kuşu* 14-16).⁴

Muhsin Ertuğrul's reformist acts coincide with the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Now, there was a need for a national language different from the Ottoman Turkish Language that is an amalgam of three languages: Arabic, Persian and Turkish. As a very important part of Mustafa Kemal's reforms Latin letters were adapted into Turkish, and a new alphabet was formed for a newly born Turkish Republic on November 1st 1928. Previously used Perso-Arabic script was replaced by modern Turkish letters. From then on, both written and spoken languages were used by many citizens of the Turkish Republic. Ottoman Turkish language was only written, and literary language was mostly used by either the ruling class, or educated elites, or the minorities. However, a new Turkish language written in Latin letters was easy to read and write, and thus gained widespread acceptance in every region of Turkey.

Just after four years, the Turkish Language Association/TDK was founded on July 1932 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk to make both academic and linguistic research on the Turkish language, and publish the products based on research. For example, official Turkish dictionaries, writing guides, linguistics books and many other types of books were planned to be published because members of the young republic knew that it was a shared language that would make us a nation. Hasan Ali Yücel was appointed as the eighth president of the association and his studies became a turning point for the development of national identity, literary and cultural repertoire of the young Turkish Republic. He was the Minister of

⁴ Translated by the author.

Education and also the president of the Turkish Language Association between the years 1938-1946.

Tercüme Bürosu (Translation Bureau) was founded under the protection of the Ministry of Education, and the Minister Hasan Ali Yücel. The main aim of founding the Translation Bureau was to make Turkish nation love reading and writing in their own language. The Translation Bureau was formed by literary leading figures of the Turkish Republic. Its official organ *Tercüme* was first published on May 19, 1940. As Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar states that the translations made then intended to enrich the Turkish language as well as culture by overstepping the limits of the translations made in the period of Tanzimat (qtd. in Rifat 38-39).⁵ Undoubtedly the Bureau contributed to spreading out the major social and cultural principles of the West.

In 1941, the first academic version of *Hamlet* was translated into prose from by senior students and research assistants assistants of English Department of Istanbul University under the supervision of Halide Edip and Vahit Turhan” (Sayın 23). Yücel and his colleagues made a great contribution for creating literary and cultural repertoire since *Tercüme*, the first translation journal, began its broadcasting life by his efforts. Orhan Burian (1914-1963), whose translation is included in this dissertation, was a writer, translator, and a scholar, Professor of English Literature in Ankara University, was also a member of *Tercüme*, and translated many classics exclusively Shakespeare’s works into Turkish between 1938 and 1946. He translated *Hamlet* in 1944. His way of using language was simple in his source-oriented prose translation. Another leading writer and translator was Sabahattin Eyüboğlu

⁵ Translated by the author.

(1908-1973). He translated *Hamlet* in 1965. Instead of previous verse translations, his translation is the first poetic prose translation in Turkish and its linguistic simplicity made it performance-oriented translation. “Eyüboğlu’s translation has been the most frequently used version of the *Hamlet* text, both on stage and in the teledramas of the television channels” (Sayın 24).

In subsequent years, as Shakespearean translation process went on with other translators, cultural transfer kept on coming true with different versions. In 1982, Professor Bülent Bozkurt of Hacettepe University translated *Hamlet*. In 1992, one of the most distinguished literary poets and “Turkish interpreter” with his own statement, Can Yücel translated *Hamlet*. His target-oriented and verse translation was made in his unique style which could also be referred as colloquial and from time to time slang language. As Sayın points out in her article titled “Shakespeare in Turkish Cinema: A Cultural Transfer from Hamlet to the Angel of Vengeance”:

Although Turkish people welcomed the eighties with another Revolution in 1980, fortunately it was another productive decade in the reception of Shakespeare’s plays. In the 1980s and 1990s, almost all of Shakespeare’s plays were translated into Turkish and they were performed on the stage with different interpretations. (24)

As it is mentioned before, a liberalization movement in translation policy took place in the 90s with Yücel’s translation. He deliberately preferred to be a visible interpreter in Turkish. He ignored word for word fidelity in translation and came closer to adaptation.

Now, the universal themes mentioned before will be analyzed in the Turkish translations of *Hamlet*, putting an emphasis on the translator’s own socio-cultural, political and historical

environment. At the same time, the translator will seek to discover the questions which the source text itself was trying to answer in its own dialogue with the time it was produced.



5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE TARGET TEXTS

5.1. Power Struggle

To start with power struggle, setting is the Kingdom of Denmark who is ruled by Claudius after the death of late King Hamlet. Prince Hamlet who is son to the late and nephew to the present King is a student of Wittenberg University and the time he hears his father's death, he rushes into Denmark and remains there. After the death of King Hamlet and his mother's followed marriage, Hamlet feels disappointed from deep inside. In short, the play opens in a pessimistic gloomy tone, and the words of a watchman, Marcellus, enhances the negative atmosphere of the setting.

MARCELLUS: Something is rotten in the state of Denmark. (1. 4. 2)

Marcellus is a soldier who is responsible to defend both the kingdom and royal family. Yet, even a soldier starts questioning the system and declares that the state but not the society is rotten. The Danish castle symbolizes not only Denmark but also the other countries being ruled by monarchy which is based on a system of government ruled by a monarch under the claim of divine right. The king and royal family is far away from the society and they are just interested in power struggles. Class distinction is prominently common. Thus, Shakespeare uses the word "something" but not a definite word such as monarchy. Even readers are expected to grasp what "something" means in that context.

On the other hand, Modern Turkish Republic was founded just after the collapse of Ottoman Empire besides the collapse of sultanate. The form of government in which citizens hold the power to elect their representatives, in other words, republicanism is a new regime in Turkish Republic. What is needed for society is an awakening regarding culture. From that point of view, Burian is a crucial figure who is assigned with rendering from source text to target text, in other words, from source culture to target culture for a newly born country. Burian uses “bozukluk” instead of “rotten” and minimalizes the criticism since “bozukluk” which means absence of order whereas rotten means something defective and decayed to an extreme degree. But he still preserves the ambiguity with “bir” and enables readers to fill in the blanks and indeterminacy according to their horizon of expectations. Because Burian is also a member of target culture, he aims at questioning for each member of society while creating a literary and cultural repertoire.

MARCELLUS: Danimarka'nın gidişinde bir bozukluk var. (Burian 1. 4. 9-10)

In Eyüboğlu's translation, who is another leading figure who contributed a lot to Turkish literature and theatre, instead of the word “bozukluk”, a stronger adjective is preferred. First of all, what differs Eyüboğlu's target text from that of Burian's is Eyüboğlu's translation is based on performability of translated text. While Burian's translation is for reading, Eyüboğlu's translation is for both reading and performing on the stage. The Revolution of 1960 is a cornerstone in Turkish history. It brings freedom both for literature and arts and forms a prolific period between 1961 and 1969. Eyüboğlu translated *Hamlet* in 1962. He pays attention to the verse format and phonetics. He prefers “çürümüş”, word for word

translation for “rotten” and also “Danimarka krallığında” for “in the state of Denmark. He is loyal to source text regarding semantics. He is more interested in phonetics and converts the canonical sentence into inverted sentence which is more apt for phonetics, intonation and performability.

MARCELLUS: Çürümüş bir şey var Danimarka krallığında. (Eyüboğlu 1. 4. 10)

Orhan Burian’s translation in 1944 is a cultural awakening project. It is a source-oriented translation to be read by readers. Thus, it was reprinted in the following years. Yet, translation of Eyüboğlu in 1965 is a performance-oriented translation to be performed for viewers except for reading. Turkish readers and viewers were enlightened by both reading and watching Shakespeare’s plays in due course as Sayın states “Shakespeare’s texts were translated in this period as a part of national project, namely, the cultural awakening of a country” (Sayın 23).

Moreover, that cultural enlightenment led to another prolific period in the 1980s and 1990s. After the Revolution of 1980, almost all Shakespearean plays were translated and performed on the stage with various adaptations and it continued in the 1990s. Can Yücel’s translation in 1992 coincides with that period. Yücel doesn’t describe himself as a translator because he asserts that what he does is not translation but rendering what he grasps from source text and source language and its utterance into target text and target language. When it comes to

dealing with Yücel's translation of this sentence, he is not source-oriented but target-oriented.

MARCELLUS: Bir ufunet var gibi devletin Danimarkasında! (Yücel 1. 4. 10)

He uses "ufunet", an Ottoman word for "rotten" and "devletin Danimarkasında" for "in the state of Denmark". His word choice together with punctuation usage is distinctive since he does not use an apostrophe in "Danimarkasında" and utters an exclamation mark at the end of the sentence different from source text. Furthermore, the use of "gibi" leaves a commentary on meaning, and readers are expected to fill in the blanks and indeterminacy according to their horizon of expectations. Lastly, Yücel uses inverted sentence not to lose phonetics and intonation.

It is certain that people of Denmark are not pleased with power struggle and they even criticize and protest royal family. Laertes whose father was killed by Hamlet accidentally is about to arrive at the Danish palace to take revenge of his father Polonius. People of Denmark follow Laertes without having an idea of what is being in real. They chant slogans against the system unconsciously.

MESSENGER: Save yourself, my Lord.
 The ocean (overpeering of his list)
 Eats not the flats with more impiteous haste
 Than young Laertes, in a riotous head,
 O'erbears your officers, the rabble call him Lord,
 And as the world were now but to begin,
 Antiquity forgot, custom not known,
 The ratifiers and props of every word,

They cry Choose we! Laertes shall be King,
Caps, hands, and tongues, applaud it to the clouds,
Laertes shall be King, Laertes King. (4. 5. 2-12)

As understood from the source text, people of Denmark would like to have a voice in system against absolute monarchy. The speech also represents the causes and effects of that time. The monarch's authority is questioned and shaken with the Renaissance and foundation of parliament. Nationalism peaks as a result. Thus, new upheavals and wars come true; everything regarding faith, authority and so on was questioned. The Messenger warns the King about an upcoming chaos. Everything related to the past even customs are forgotten. People protest and chant slogans against the King and monarchy. They shout that they have right to choose their King and Laertes will be the new king of Denmark. Shakespeare prefers "shall" to define certainty in future.

It may be assumed that the nature and sum of all interpretations by source-culture interpreters will not be identical with the nature of all interpretations by source-culture interpreters will not be identical with the nature and sum of all interpretations by target-culture interpreters. If these interpretations are different, there is no intrinsic need for transmitting a particular source-culture interpretation to the intended target-culture. (There may be culture- and/or case- specific reasons and therefore a skopos for doing so, e.g. because the translators are told that the preservation of a source-text meaning/structure is the highest value in translating . But such culture-and/or case-specific restrictions do not enter into a general theory.) (Vermeer 78)

As Hans J. Vermeer ,who is the founder of Skopos Theory, states above, Burian's first "skopos" is culture- and case-specific since he aims at cultural enlightenment of readers in a newly born country which lacks literary and cultural repertoire. It is obvious that Burian is loyal to semantics of source text whereas he converts verse into prose. Thus, verse and phonetics in text disappear. He uses "ayak takımı" word for word translation for "rabble" and keeps harsh criticism about people of Denmark. Burian prefers "Biz seçtik, Laertes kral

olacak” for “Choose we! Laertes shall be King.” Determination and rebellion emerge with the word “Biz seçtik” and auxiliary verb “shall” which delivers obligation or requirement.

BEY: Kaçıp kendinizi kurtarın efendimiz. Genç Laertes baş kaldırıp askerlerinizi önünden öyle bir sürdü ki kıyısından içerilere doğru atılan deniz bile düzlükleri daha müthiş bir hızla silip süpürmez. Ayak takımı onu kendilerine baş edinmişler; sanki dünya şimdi kuruluyormuş, her sözün dayanıp güvendiği gelenekler unutulmuş, görenekler yokmuş gibi “Biz seçtik, Laertes kral olacak” diye bağırıyorlar. Külahlar, alkışlar, feryatlar göklere ilan ediyor: “Laertes kral olacak, Laertes kral!” (Burian 4. 5. 16-25)

As for Eyüboğlu, his “skopos” is performability of *Hamlet* text and he keeps the verse format and phonetics. Furthermore, he is also source-oriented with linguistic simplicity. He uses “halk” for “rabble” and wipes out harsh criticism different from Burian’s translation. Yet, like Burian, he uses “Biz seçtik, Laertes kral olacak, ” for “Choose we! Laertes shall be King.” Rebellion in people of Denmark is reflected with his translation.

HABERCİ: Kralım, kaçın kurtarın kendinizi!
Taşan denizler daha çabuk dolduramaz ovayı
Genç Laertes ve arkadaşlarından.
Böylesine devirip geçemez ordularımızı!
Halk kral diye alkışlıyor kendisini,
Ve sanki dünya yeniden doğuyormuş gibi
Herkes unutmüş geçmişi, gelenekleri,
“Biz seçtik, Laertes kral olacak,” diyorlar.
Şapkalar, eller, diller yırtıyor havaları:
“Laertes kral olsun! Laertes kral!” (Eyüboğlu 4. 5. 6-16)

On the other hand, at first sight, Yücel differs from Burian and Eyüboğlu regarding word choice. As Burian prefers “efendimiz” and Eyüboğlu “kralım” for “Lord”, Yücel prefers “devletlim”. It sounds more Ottoman and close to reception of people of Turkey. He prefers ayak-takımı for “rabble” like Burian. However, unlike other two translators, he prefers

“İsterük! İsterük! Laertes kral olacak! for “Choose we! Laertes shall be King.” He prefers more common and populist reception for Turkish people.

HABERCİ: Kaçın kurtarın canınızı, devletlim.
Genç Laertes, bir serdengeçti gürhunun başında, inanın,
En küheylan dalgalara bile yukardan bakasıya,
Düzleri amansızca kasıp kavuran okyanustan bin beter,
Önüne kattı hassa alayınızı. Ayak-takımı yeller esen başına
Baş etmiş onu, dünya sanki bugün dünya olmuş,
Her kelamın oldum-bittim tutumağı, dayanağı sayılan
Onca gelenek süprülmüş, onca görenek silinmiş gitmiş gibi
“İsterük! İsterük! Laertes kral olacak! Diye bağırışıyorlar.
Şapkalar uçuşuyor, eller havada, yeri göğü inletiyorlar
“Laertes Kral olacak! Kral olacak! Kral olacak!” diye. (Yücel 4. 5. 10-20)

Different from the first two speeches by a soldier and messenger, we encounter with Gertrude, Queen of Denmark. She is a member of royal family and wife to the late King Hamlet and present King Claudius. Her marriage to his ex husband’s brother in a short time reflects power struggle since she supports the system to keep her position.

QUEEN: How cheerfully on the false trail they cry.
O this is counter you false Danish dogs. (4. 5. 13-14)

Queen gets too angry whenever she realizes common people protesting dynasty and supporting Laertes. As she is the member of the ruling class, she does not approve but criticize and scorn common people of Denmark. Even the words preferred by Shakespeare define her anger and patronizing style. While defining Laertes, “false trail” is preferred. According to the reception of that time, Queen, in other words, the ruling class, believes that the kingdom must be ruled or dominated by male who has blue blood unlike common people and it cannot be even judged by anyone. Besides, she uses “Danish dogs” for people of Denmark.

Burian uses “yanlış iz” for “false trail” and keeps criticism and even inverted translation of first sentence depicts how she is furious and adds an exclamation mark at the end. Burian translates “how cheerfully” as “ne de canla başla” to define confusion of Queen.

KIRALİÇE: Yanlış izin peşinden ne de canla başla koşuyorlar! Ah, sizi hain Danimarka köpekleri! Avda ters yolu tutturmuşsunuz. (Burian 4. 5. 1-3)

Eyüboğlu uses “yanlış iz” for “false trail”, as well. His translation is also inverted with an exclamation mark at the end. He translates “how cheerfully” as “ne candan”. His translation is source-oriented like Burian’s.

KRALİÇE: Ne candan havlıyorlar yanlış izin peşinde!
Hey, hain Danimarka köpekleri, ters kokudasınız! (Eyüboğlu 4. 5. 17-18)

Lastly, Yücel, like Eyüboğlu, prefers “yanlış iz” for “false trail” and “nasıl da keyifle” for “how cheerfully” and he ends his inverted first sentence translation with an exclamation mark. Yet, unlike Burian and Eyüboğlu, Yücel prefers using a slang expression “bre kancık” for “false” not “hain”. His style is too colloquial and vulgar for a member of dynasty.

GERTRUDE: Yanlış iz süresiye, nasıl da keyifle havlıyorlar!
Hey, ters yöne koşuyorsunuz, bre kancık Danimarka Köpekleri!
(Yücel 4. 5. 21-23)

It is obvious that on purpose or not Yücel translation differs from Burian and Eyüboğlu as it is obviously seen in Gertrude’s speech. As Gideon Toury declares that “translation activities should rather be regarded as having cultural significance” (qtd. in Venuti 198). If “norms systems of the target culture are triggered and set in the motion”, the translation is “acceptable” just like Yücel’s and “shifts from the source text would be an almost inevitable price (qtd. in Venuti 201).

5.2. Gender Roles

The source text *Hamlet* is based on Hamlet, the protagonist, and his inner world which keeps questioning the meaning of life, death and existence all the time. The readers of the source text encounter with mostly his point of view. He is trapped in the power struggle and in that context there are solely two women who communicate with him and affect him in turn. The first one is Gertrude, Queen of Denmark and mother of Hamlet and the other one is Ophelia, Hamlet's lover. Throughout the play, his relationship with them is formed in that power struggle. He is furious at his mother due to her marriage to his uncle in a short time just after his father's death. As for Ophelia, he is furious at her since he thinks she cooperates with his enemies, and thus he sees her as a traitor. In fact, in Hamlet's personality, Shakespeare reflects the general prejudice of the sixteenth century against women. It can be said that this negative reception or prejudice of that time is also seen throughout the play.

As it has already been stated earlier in this dissertation, *Hamlet* is a revenge tragedy. That revenge is also directed to female characters and the nature of it is different from that of the authority. The male dominated society of the Elizabethan period rules over females by discriminating and looking down on them. They are perceived as second class citizens and restricted into their domestic world even if it is a palace. Women characters are just responsible for their marriage, husbands and children. During their marriage and even after death of their husbands, both their loyalty and chastity are questioned not only by their husbands and children but even also by society. To be able to define a woman as unchaste in the sixteenth century England is so common. To be clearer about the ideology of that time,

the English Reformation must be grasped in detail. As a result of the English Reformation, the Church of England was separated by Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism was founded in England after it was ruled under Catholicism and the authority of the Pope for centuries. The Queen Elizabeth I was the first woman ruler to have been Protestant. Yet, having lived under the authority and principles of Roman Catholic Church and the Pope, some effects of Catholic practices and beliefs can be easily seen in the play. On this point, Juliette Dusinberre stresses on the double standards regarding the chastity of women, and points out:

The elevation of chastity in women which had its origin in orthodox Catholic ideology, and was ratified imaginatively by the poetry of courtly love, was a class ideal related to property. When the Puritans attacked the double standard they attacked a class system and a class-based morality. Shakespeare's theatre criticises the assumptions involved in the double standard. (51)

As stated above, "virginity is more cherished among the upper classes who have more property to dispose of" (52).

Throughout the text, regarding feminine chastity and faithfulness, the most offensive words of Hamlet are as follows:

HAMLET: Let me not think on't: Frailty, thy name is woman. (1. 2. 5)

Here, Shakespeare uses a witty metaphor "frailty" to define "woman". He would like his readers to comprehend Gertrude from his point of view since his mother marries his uncle Cladius, the present king of Denmark in a short time. First of all, he questions why he marries

in a few months just after his father's speculative death. Secondly, he questions why his mother marries such a man who is characteristically different from his father because the late King is a man of honour in nature whereas the present King is dishonourable in thought and deed. Hamlet, the protagonist of Shakespeare's play reflects the ideology being held that time. The women and their chastity were questioned via a relationship with a man whether they were single, married, remarried or widow. The Queen's chastity is questioned by his son Hamlet as a socio- ideological reflection of that time.

According to Reception Theory, a literary text should be evaluated within the reading process, then activated, and what is more, even modified by readers. When it comes to dealing with the translation of Hamlet's words in the target texts, it is seen that Burian, Eyüboğlu, and Yücel transfer the same meaning to their translations according to the changing translation strategies of their own periods.

HAMLET: Düşünmeyeyim daha iyi. Ey ruh düşkünlüğü, senin adın kadın olmalı!
(Burian 1. 2. 2)

In Burian's translation, the setting of the target text is completely different from the source text. Burian renders the source text in a newly formed republic after the abolishment of sultanate in the 1940s, in a man-centered secular system which cares about the needs of the individuals. The woman figure is relatively more positive than that of the source text, and is not seen as a second class citizen any more. The relatively positive point of view is reflected in Burian's translation of the word "frailty" as "ruh düşkünlüğü". The certainty given with "is" in the source text is at least reduced to a word of a questioning mind "olmalı". In other

words, that usage in the source text is converted into possibility with “olmalı” in the target text. He stresses that possibility with an extra exclamation mark at the end. However, it should be stated that “ruh düşkünlüğü” is neither a very common term in the spoken Turkish nor it sounds natural in a dialogue no matter how Burian translated the play to be read, not to be performed on the stage.

Similarly, in Eyüboğlu’s translation, the same positive attitude is observed because his sentence structure in the target text again reflects the questioning mind of the protagonist.

HAMLET: [...] Düşünmesem daha iyi.
Kadın zaaf demekmiş meğer! [...] (Eyüboğlu 1. 2. 28-29)

In the 1960s, Humanism is still in the center of the target culture as it can be perceived in Eyüboğlu’s translation. He prefers “zaaf” for “frailty” and uses an extra word “meğer” to lessen the certainty of the source text. Like Burian, he stresses that possibility with an exclamation mark. Eyüboğlu’s translation is more adequate than that of Burian’s as it is both a common word in Turkish, and it sounds natural in a dialogue. In other words, “speakability” (Bassnet 102) of Eyüboğlu’s sentence is higher than that of Burian’s.

As for Yücel’s translation, he prefers a colloquial language as it appears in the word “n’ olur”, and adds two extra exclamation marks at the end of each sentence. Furthermore, he prefers “döneklik” which means quality of being unworthy of confidence for “frailty” and his word choice adds a very vulgar and negative meaning to define a woman.

HAMLET: Düşünme, n'olur!.. Kadın, döneklik senin adın!.. (Yücel 1. 2. 9)

In fact, Yücel's translation is the most insulting one compared to the first two translations. However, his translation is the most poetic of the three because as a poet translator he adds internal rhyming to his target sentence in the rhyming words, "kadın" and "adın".

Furthermore, the woman figure of the Elizabethan period and her chastity was under discussion and it is reflected in *Hamlet* successfully. Also, according to Catholic belief, the biggest duty is towards God and family. Loyalty is the most important value between the wife and husband and from that point of view, *Hamlet* can be perceived as a Catholic text. The play's major theme is revenge, as well, and it appears towards the end of the Act One in the following words of the Ghost.

GHOST: If you hast nature in thee bear it not;
 Let not the royal bed of Denmark be
 A couch for luxury and damned incest.
 But howsoever thou pursuest this act,
 Taint not thy mind; nor let thy soul contrive
 Against thy mother aught; leave her to heaven,
 And those thorns that in her bosom lodge,
 To prick and sting her. Fare thee well at once; (1. 5. 33-7)

Through the end of Act One, Hamlet encounters with his father's ghost and his suspicious death is clarified with his explanations. The time he learns the reality, he realizes that it is not an ordinary death but a planned murder by his uncle Cladius. The Ghost wishes Hamlet to take revenge of him from King regarding his marriage to Queen as soon as possible. Shakespeare uses "incest" which means sexual relations between close relatives. It is not moral for Gertrude, the wife of the late King Hamlet and Cladius, the brother of the late King

Hamlet. They are too closely related to be legally married. Moreover, the Ghost, by saying “my most seeming-virtuous Queen” (1. 5. 31) he is sure that the Queen is unchaste due to her unloyalty. The Ghost thinks that Queen deserves to be in heaven afterlife and warns Hamlet not to give harm and says “leave her to heaven”.

When we come from the sixteenth century England to the twentieth century Turkey, Burian translates “incest” as “zina” which means a sexual intercourse between who is married and someone is not his/her wife or husband. While Shakespeare prefers “incest” to declare Gertrude and Cladius cannot be legally married due to the close relationship between them, Burian comments on the relationship with his word choice “zina” and he implies that Gertrude is still married to the late King Hamlet and their relationship cannot be called as marriage but betrayal. Although Burian prefers Turkish words, this time he prefers an Arabic word “zina”. Burian translates “my most seeming-virtuous Queen” as “benim o kadar faziletli gözüken Kırالیçemi” (1. 5. 16-17) Shakespeare uses “leave her to heaven” and his saying is translated as “Onu tanrıya havale et” by Burian. The positive meaning of the word “heaven” is replaced with “Tanrı” and that positive meaning is lost in the target text. Lastly, Burian translates “Fare thee well at once;” as “Sana, yolun açık olsun diyeyim!” with an exclamation mark to stress the speech. Shakespeare’s poetic verse is lost with Burian’s prose translation.

HAYALET: Eğer sende evlatlık duygusu varsa elini kolunu bağlayıp durma: Danimarka’nın hükümdar yatağının iğrenç bir zevkle, lanetlik bir zinaya döşeklik etmesine razı olma, Yalnız, bu iş için hangi yola başvurursan vur, sakın annen hakkında bir fenalık düşünme; içinden, onun zararına olacak bir niyet geçirme. Onu Tanrıya havale et; bırak onu kendi göğüsündeki dikenler iğnelesin. Sana, yolun açık olsun diyeyim!
(Burian 1. 5. 18-1)

Unlike Burian’s translation of “incest” as “zina”, Eyüboğlu prefers “haram” which means something prohibited in Islam. Surprisingly enough, Eyüboğlu uses an Arabic word which is loaded with Islamic reference. In Islamic belief, loyalty in marriage is very important and a Muslim should not do anything which is forbidden such as incest. He does not use word for word translation of “incest” but prefers “haram” to lessen the negative meaning of that word. He translates “my most seeming-virtuous Queen” as “melek görünüşlü kraliçem” (1. 5. 25) and attributes a divine and supernatural feature to the meaning. “Fare thee well at once;” is translated as “Tanrıya emanet ol!” when someone is wished a safe journey in Turkish culture. Moreover, Eyüboğlu adds an exclamation mark to put an emphasis.

HAYALET: Kanın coşkun akıyorsa eğer damarlarından
 Boyun eğme olup bitenlere!
 İzin verme Danimarka tahtının
 Lanetli bir haram döşeği olmasına!
 Ama yapacağını ne türlü yaparsan yap,
 Anana el kaldırıp kirletme elini!
 Bırak, Tanrı görsün hesabını,
 Kendi içindeki dikenler kanatsın vicdanını!
 Ama hemen gitmeliyim ben, Tanrıya emanet ol! (Eyüboğlu 1. 5. 30-4)

As for Yücel’s translation, he prefers “zina” for “incest like Burian. He translates “my most seeming-virtuous Queen” as “benim sözde iffetlinin iffetlisi ecem” (1. 5. 5) and like Eyüboğlu, he translates “Fare thee well at once” as “Allas’marladık artık!”. His translation can be perceived as not formal but informal for a king. His translation is both colloquial and religious in Turkish culture. Furthermore, Like Burian and Eyüboğlu, he adds an exclamation mark at the end, as well.

HAYALET: Bir damla oğulluk duygusu varsa sende, oğul,
 Danimarka'nın kral döşegi, göz yumma n'olur,
 Bırakma, bu kahrolası fücür ve zina yatağı olsun!..
 Öcünü nasıl alacaksan al, ama aklında tut yine,
 Aklına mukayyet ol ve de anan olan kadına
 Can düşmanı olma! Allahlara bırak onu,
 Onu kendi vicdanındaki dikenlere emanet et,
 Onlar dağlasın yüreğini!.. Allas'marladık artık! (Yücel 1. 5. 4-14)

In the meantime, Hamlet assumes that he is also being deceived by Ophelia whom he loves. He is sure that she conspires with the King and his loyal follower Cladius and Cladius's son, Laertes. His assumptions leads him to look down on Ophelia and questions her honesty which means chastity and her fairness about chastity. As Dusinger states "Hamlet mocked Ophelia's chastity because she assumed 'devotion's visage' in her prayers, to deceive him, commanded by her father and Cladius. The harsh 'are you honest?' –meaning chaste– represents a logical progression of thought [...]" (75). Just after his question, Ophelia becomes Hamlet's victim related to "nunnery" speech and its double meaning because it is an English slang used for "brothel". Nunnery is a place in which a community of nuns reside for life under religious vows as explicit meaning whereas it also means a place in which men pay money to have sex with women as implicit meaning. During Elizabethan Period, male dominated society and life were started to be questioned by the Humanists but it was obvious that the position and nature of women could not be altered so hastily since it had deep roots in Catholic belief. Hamlet aims at taking revenge on Ophelia and chooses "nunnery" to attribute how she is unchaste. In fact, he uses a metaphor to compare Ophelia with a woman of ill fame and advises her not to give birth to sinners, in other words, her children. Sinners and children metaphor is another harsh metaphor used in the speech.

HAMLET: Get thee to a nunnery. Why wouldst thou be a breeder of sinners?
 (3. 1. 8-9)

As far as the target texts are concerned, Burian translates “nunnery” in this sentence as “manastır”. He does not use the implicit meaning of “nunnery”. It is possible that Burian prefers solely the explicit meaning of “manastır” not to reflect Shakespeare’s negative attribution to the figure of women and also not to show him as a hater of women. In Turkey, on the other hand, after the foundation of republic, women got many rights even before the 1940s and were respected in each field. Burian may have translated it as “manastır” not as “genelev” on purpose. Also, he translates “a breeder of sinners as “günahkar insan”.

HAMLET: Git, bir manastıra çekil. Ne diye günahkar insan yetiştirip duracaksın? (Burian 3. 1. 13-14)

Like Burian, Eyüboğlu translates “nunnery” as “manastır”. He translates “a breeder of sinners” as “günah çocukları”.

HAMLET: Git, bir manastıra gir! Ne diye günah çocukları besleyeceksin? (Eyüboğlu 3. 1. 6-7)

Like Burian and Eyüboğlu, Yücel translates “nunnery” as “manastır”, as well. And he translates “a breeder of sinners as “günahkar”. Unlike Burian and Eyüboğlu, he does not use “yetiştirip durmak” and “beslemek” but uses “peydahlamak” for “be”. His verb choice is so colloquial for a prince who belongs to royal family. He adds a negative hyperbole on his verb choice.

HAMLET: Git, bir manastıra kapan! Bir alay günahkar peydahlayacaksın da ne olacak? (Yücel 3. 1. 2-3)

According to Reception Theory, to be able to understand the text better, the ideology lying between the lines should be revealed first. Thus, it should not be forgotten that although *Hamlet* was written immediately after the English Reformation it has still deep roots related to Catholic beliefs. The play is located in Denmark which was a Protestant country then. Ophelia's burial ceremony and both the clowns and the priest's speeches reflect Catholic beliefs since committing suicide is considered to be a mortal sin and objection to be buried with last religious rites.

After Polonius's death and Hamlet's denial of his love, Ophelia loses her sanity and at the very beginning of Act Five, two clowns enter the scene commenting on Ophelia's death whether it is a suicide or not. They state that the one who commits suicide is accepted to object to God and he/she should be buried in somewhere unblest, not in a Christian cemetery. They add that last funeral rites cannot be done for her. The priest talks to Laertes, brother of Ophelia, and explains the situation.

PRIEST: Her obsequies have been as far enlarg'd,
As we warrantise, her death was doubtful,
And but that great command o'ersways the order,
She should in ground unsanctified have lodg'd,
Till the last Trumpet. For charitable prayer,
Shards, flints, and pebbles, should be thrown on her:
Yet here she is allow'd her virgin rites,
Her maden strewments, and the bringing home
Of bell and burial. (5. 1. 4-12)

When it comes from the sixteenth century England to the twentieth century Turkey, there may be some ideological shifts in target texts due to the abolishment of the caliphate in 1924 as well as the foundation of secular republic. To start with Burian's reception, Burian translates "her death was doubtful," as "Ölümü şüpheliydi:" He prefers "virgin rites" as

“bekaret çelenkleri” since there is no one-to-one correspondence in Turkish culture and Islamic belief. As stated in Reception Theory, this blank is filled with Burian, the translator of the source text first and the readers of the target text. To give an example, if a young woman dies without getting married, a wedding dress is put on her coffin to represent her chastity in Turkish culture but no virgin rites are applied. In Islam all the religious rites are applied even he/she passes away in his/her bed or commits suicide. Burian translates “and the bringing home Of bell and burial” as “mezarına kadar da çanlar çalarak getirilip gömülüyö”, Shakespeare uses home to declare she is being buried in a Christian cemetery but Burian does not use that detail in his translation.

PAPAZ: Cenaze merasimini salahiyetimiz el verdiği kadar uzattık. Ölümü şüpheliydi: hükümdar iradesi kilise nizamı üstünde olmasa, mahşer gününe kadar, takdis edilmemiş bir toprakta gömülü kalması gerekirdi; ruhuna hayır dua edileceğine üstüne çanak kırığı, taş, çakıl yağdırılırdı. Halbuki işte izin verdik: tabutuna bekaret çelenkleri asıldı, genç kızlarınki gibi onun da üstüne çiçekler serpildi, mezarına kadar da çanlar çalarak getirilip gömülüyor. (Burian 5. 1. 4-12)

Now, let us see the same words of the Priest in Eyüboğlu’s translation

PAPAZ: Ancak bu kadar geniş tutabildik töreni,
Yetkimiz ölçüsünde. Nasıl öldüğü anlaşılamadı.
Yukarıdan gelen emirle geleneği bozmasaydık,
Kutsal topraklar dışında yatacaktı
Mahşer gününe kadar. Dualar yerine
Marsıklar, kırıntılar, çakıllar yağacaktı üstüne.
Oysa burada bakire çelenkleri, çiçekleriyle
Öz yurduna kavuşuyor, çan sesleriyle. (Eyüboğlu 5. 1. 15-22)

Eyüboğlu translates “her death was doubtful,” as “Nasıl öldüğü anlaşılamadı.” Like Burian, Eyüboğlu translates “virgin rites” as bakire çelenkleri, çiçekleriyle” and stresses on her

chastity and also to fill in the gap as Burian does. He prefers “Öz yurduna kavuşuyor, çan sesleriyle.” for “and the bringing home Of bell and burial”. His word choice is similar to Shakespeare’s since Eyüboğlu uses “öz yurt” for “home”, what is more, as a translator he gives the detail of her burial in a Christian cemetery unlike Burian.

Lastly, Yücel translates the sentence “her death was doubtful” as “Ölüm şekli hayli karışık”. He adds an extra word “hayli” to dramatize the situation. He translates “virgin rites” as “bekaret çiçekleri” to fill in the cultural blank as both Burian and Eyüboğlu do. In his translation, there cannot be seen the translation of “bringing home” he never mentions the details of Christian cemetery. Yücel skips that detail and puts a triple dot at the end of the sentence. It is possible that Yücel does it on purpose and would like his readers to fill in the blank according to their “horizon of their expectations”.

RAHİP: Salahiyetimizin hududunu zorlayarak ancak bu kadar
Geniş tutabildik töreni. Ölüm şekli hayli karışık.
Büyük yerden gelen emir görenekleri bertaraf
Etmeseydi, bu hatun kişi, mecburen, kutsanmamış toprakta
Yatardı mahşere kadar. Hayır duaları yerine de
Çömlek kırıkları, çakmaktaşları ve çakıllar yağdırılırdı
Üstüne. Şimdi ise bekaret çiçekleri serpiliyor ve
Çan sesleriyle gömülüyor... (Yücel 5. 1. 28-3)

5.3. The Individual’s Dilemma

As a member of royal family, Hamlet is highly educated and, what is more, he is a philosophical character who constantly questions people around him, himself and his being. He lives in a dilemma and does not know what to do exactly. Since the plot is based on a

revenge motive, he feels responsible to take revenge of the late King Hamlet from the present King Cladius. Yet he longs for peace in his kingdom and he is aware that he is the only one to bring it back to the Kingdom of Denmark. Moreover, he feels disappointed due to his mother, the Queen Gertrude because she marries Hamlet's uncle in two months and betrays his father and thus Hamlet constantly questions her mother's marriage to such a man who lacks loyalty, nobility, honour and so on. He is aware that the present King Cladius has nothing to compare with the late King. Apart from Cladius and Gertrude, he also feels dissatisfied regarding Ophelia who is deeply devoted to Hamlet. Hamlet assumes that he is also being betrayed by Ophelia since she collaborates with traitors without knowing that she is being used by them as a tool. Therefore, Hamlet thinks of Horatio as his truest and the most faithful friend .

That socio-cultural, political and historical events that shaped values, beliefs or ideas, in other words, ideology of that period is successfully transferred to the play by Shakespeare. The reception of that time is embedded between the lines of the text, and they are reflected both by Hamlet character as an official receptor of that culture and the playwright of the source text. Hamlet, the protagonist of the play, represents the individual who questions and tries hard to understand the meaning of his existence in such a chaotic and relative world that keeps changing. He is confused and does not exactly know what to do, how to do and whom to depend on. Hamlet himself faces a dilemma and has to make a choice between two equally unsatisfactory situations which appear to have no correct answer. To be able to understand Hamlet better, the ideology of the sixteenth century England should be analyzed in detail. As it is mentioned earlier in Reception Theory, it is ideology that shapes the writer's reception which will be transferred to the work in turn. First of all, together with

the English Renaissance and Reformation, everything was upside down. The absolute submission to both monarchy and religious authority was replaced by skepticism, the doctrine that the truth of all knowledge must always be in question or doubt was in force. What is more, the conflicts among people in Elizabethan England mostly resulted in a chaotic atmosphere, corruptions and unfortunately in wars. The worldly concerns and even the inner world of being were started to be questioned. Not only the society but the each member of that society was under doubt. Unlike skepticism and relativity, it was the starting point for Humanism that centers on an individual's capacity for self-realization through reason. The tragedy of *Hamlet* was written in such a historical background. Therefore, Shakespeare in this play focuses on the atmosphere which is highly sensitive to starting conditions and a small change may yield a very different outcome as it occurs in the play. He focuses on Hamlet as a character and his inner world which is overcrowded with ongoing and unsolvable questions which lead to tension throughout the revenge tragedy.

The play starts with a symbolic question below and it is obvious that Shakespeare would like his readers to question what is really going on in the Kingdom of Denmark. Barnardo is a soldier who is on duty as a watchman in the castle. He cannot see another soldier named Francisco and even Francisco, the next watchman would like him to reveal himself and asks him who it is. In the Kingdom of Denmark, nobody feels safe ironically and everybody watches and doubts the others. As the present King, Cladius tries hard his authority not to be questioned and weakened, he charges his loyal followers to sustain the so-called system. Yet, he is unaware that something tragic is about to happen. The very first questions symbolizes and reveals the doubtful and insecure atmosphere. That first dialogue between Barnardo and Francisco reflects the ideology of the dramatic context, and secondly the skeptic and chaotic atmosphere about to reveal in the play.

BARNARDO: Who's there?
 FRANCISCO: Nay answer me. Stand and unfold yourself.
 BARNARDO: Long live the King.
 FRANCISCO: Barnardo?
 BARNARDO: He. (1. 1. 1-5)

On the other hand, it can be claimed that there are some social, political and ideological similarities between the sixteenth century England and the twentieth-century Turkey. For example, with the abolishment of sultanate and caliphate and successively with the foundation of the new Turkish parliament, Turkish people demanded for more rights which led to a philosophy asserting human dignity, and man's capacity for fulfillment through reason. It was the beginning of Turkish Humanism. As Özlem Berk states, "during the 1940s translations of certain classics were prepared with explanatory notes in order to be used in high school. They included [...] *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare, translated by Orhan Burian" (8). Unlike Eyüboğlu and Yücel, Burian's translation has a foreword more than fifteen pages based on the play as well as footnotes almost on each page. Moreover, at the end of the play, there are some questions regarding each act, and lastly there is a part for actors and actresses who would like to perform the play on stage. It is obvious that Burian's translation is a source oriented translation since he prefers word for word translation.

BERNARDO: Kim var orada?
 FRANCISCO: Yok, sen cevap ver. Dur, kimsin söyle.
 BERNARDO: Yaşasın kral.
 FRANCISCO: Bernardo, sen misin?
 BERNARDO: Evet. (Burian 1. 1. 1-5)

Burian was a member of *Tercüme* and contributed a lot with his other colleagues to make a culture repertoire besides literary repertoire in a newly born country. He was a crucial figure for Turkish Humanism and translation played a great role throughout that period. As Itamar Even-Zohar argues on the terms from “import” to “transfer”

When goods – material or semiotic – are imported, if they are successful on the home market, they may gradually become integral part of the target repertoire. This occurs if we can observe that they may have become obvious, self-evident, for the target group, indeed indispensable for life. Such indispensability is manifest not necessarily in any explicit stand, but in the integration of the goods and the repercussions of their absence. I would like to call the state of integrated importation in a home repertoire “transfer”. Transfer, in short, is the process whereby imported goods are integrated into a home repertoire, and the consequences generated by this integration. (qtd. in Paker 2002: 169)

Similarly, Eyüboğlu was a member of Turkish Humanism which started in the 1940s. He made great contributions to the literary and culture repertoire of Turkish Republic. As Berk declares Sabahattin Eyüboğlu (1908-1973) was “perhaps the most important representative of the humanistic discourse in Turkey” (8). Moreover, he plays a great role as a result of both his source-oriented and performace-oriented translation for Turkish readers and viewers.

BERNARDO: Kim var orda?
 FRANCISCO: Yoo, sen söyle. Dur orda! Tanıt kendini.
 BERNARDO: Yaşasın kral!
 BERNARDO: Bernardo sen misin?
 BERNARDO: Benim. (Eyüboğlu 1. 1. 1-5)

As for Yücel, Yücel’s culture specific language differs from the other translators centered on the source language. Yücel focuses on target culture and transfers the whole dialogue as it is interpreted in Turkish culture. He translates “Stand and unfold yourself” as “Dur orda,

parolayı ver”, Burian and Eyüboğlu’s translations look similar. Burian translates it as “Dur, kimsin söyle.” and Eyüboğlu translates the same sentences as “Dur orda! Tanıt kendini.”.

BARNARDO: Kim var orda?
 FRANCISCO: Sen söyleyeceksin! Dur orda, parolayı ver!
 BARNARDO: Yaşasın Kral!
 FRANCISCO: Barnardo musun?
 BARNARDO: Benim, ben. (Yücel 1. 1. 1-5)

Another scene that reveals the individual’s dilemma best is Hamlet’s well-known “To be or not to be” soliloquy. Hamlet, in this scene, is alone and gives a soliloquy to reveal his thoughts and feelings about Queen Gertrude’s indifference to the death of the late King Hamlet and her hasty marriage to the present King Cladius. Andrew Cecil Bradley states that what is implied here is “a sickness of life, and even a longing for death, so intense that nothing stands between Hamlet and suicide except religious awe” (98). His desire not to live or to commit suicide is only prevented by religious awe because suicide is accepted as a mortal sin in Christianity especilly in Catholicism. Hamlet never quits questioning meaning of life and he finds no meaning in his. Here his dilemma to commit suicide or not is witnessed. The effects of the chaotic period ongoing in England come into existence in Hamlet’s inner world.

HAMLET: Oh, that this too too solid flesh, would melt,
 Thaw and resolve itself into a dew:
 Or that the everlasting had fix’d
 His canon ’gainst self-slaughter. O God, O God!
 How weary, stale, flat and unprofitable
 Seems to me all the uses of this world!
 Fire on’t! Oh fie, fie, ’tis an unweeded garden
 That grows to seed: things rank, and gross in nature
 Possess it merely.that it should come to this:
 But two months dead: nay, not so much; not two, (1. 2. 20-29)

When it comes to dealing with the social-cultural, political and historical events and their results in Turkey, a new period begins with Turkish Humanism which is based on reason. Turkish people start reading more and more, and through translation get introduced with various cultures and their values, and as a result of this, a new Self-realization and cultural identity construction process starts.

Depending on the principles of Reception Theory, when a foreign text is transferred to Turkish literature and language, readers are expected to fill in the gaps according to their own cultural codes, in other words, according to their “horizons of expectations”. As far as Hamlet’s soliloquy is concerned, as a Turkish reader and translator, Burian translates “ this too too solid flesh” as “şu et yığını” and gives that negative meaning with his word choice “yığın”. However, his translation is not word for word translation this time. Yet, he transfers that negative reception into Turkish so successfully. While Shakespeare uses lowercase letter for “the everlasting”, Burian prefers capital letter for “Tanrı” which is Turkish. Furthermore, he translates “self-slaughter” as “kendi canına kıyma” not as intihar probably due to its Arabic origin. Burian mostly prefers pure Turkish liberated from Arabic and Persian as far as possible.

HAMLET: Ah! Şu et yığını keşke erise, erise de bir damla çiy haline gelse. Yahut, Tanrı kendi canına kıymayı insana yasak etmeseydi. Yarabbi, Yarabbi! Bu dünyanın her hali bana ne kadar bitmiş, bozulmuş, ne kadar tatsız boş geliyor. Yazık ona, yazık! Yolunmıyan otları tohuma kaçmış bir bahçeyi andırıyor. Tabiatta ne kadar yabancı, zararlı şey varsa içini sade onlar bürümüş. Böyle olacaktı ha! Öleli daha iki ay geçti. Yok, o kadar bile değil, iki ay bile değil. (Burian 1. 2. 5-14)

As for Eyübođlu, he aims at forming a literary and cultural repertoire like Burian. He translates "this too too solid flesh" as "bu katı, kaskatı beden" and uses an intensifying adjective to give that negative meaning of "too too". Eyübođlu translates "the everlasting" as "Tanrı" like Burian. He prefers using pure Turkish in his translation, too. He prefers "kendi kendini öldürme" not "intihar" for "self-slaughter"

HAMLET: Ah bu katı, kaskatı beden bir dađılsa,
Eriyip gitse bir çiy tanesinde sabahın!
Ya da Tanrı yasak etmemiş olsa
Kendi kendini öldürmesini insanın!
Tanrım, Ulu Tanrım! Ne bunaltıcı, ne berbat,
Ne tatsız, ne boş geliyor bu dünya bana!
Ah ne iğrenç, ne iğrenç! Bakımsız bir bahçe ki
Azgın bitkileri tohuma kaçmış,
Pis, kaba ne varsa tabiatta sarmış içini.
Bu muydu olacak iki ay sonra ölümünden?
O kadar bile değil, iki ay bile olmadı. (Eyübođlu 1. 2. 10-20)

Lastly, Yücel translates *Hamlet* in the 1990s after a prolific period regarding literary and cultural repertoire. Yet, it is a period when almost all Shakespearean works are translated into Turkish. Yücel focuses on traditional cultural codes of Turkish society. He translates "this too too solid flesh" as "şu taş gibi beden" and "everlasting" as "Kadir-i Mutlak" which is an Arabic word. He prefers not "çiy tanesi" but "çiy danesi" which belongs to Anatolian culture.

HAMLET: Keşke şu taş gibi beden tozoluverse şu an,
Eriyip veya bir çiy danesine dönüşürse,
Keşke kendi canına kastı Kadir-i Mutlak

Nehyetmemiş olaydı böyle! Yarabbim,
 Nasıl da tatsız, boş ve yavan, nasıl da nafîle
 Gözümde, indimde şimdi şu dünyanın dünyalığı!
 Yuf olsun! Yuf!... Bir bahçe ki yaban otlar bürümüş.
 Ne varsa tohuma kaçmış, çürümüş ve pespaye,
 Hem de iki ay içinde!.. Yok, o kadar da olmadı... (Yücel 1. 2. 27-1)

Another speech uttered by Hamlet reveals his dilemma once more while he is talking to Rosencrantz, a friend of Hamlet brought up with. King Cladius and Queen Gertrude call Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to find out the reason of Hamlet's transformation. It is obvious that the leading principle of relativity in the sixteenth century England is reflected in Hamlet's words. He questions if there is absolute truth or not. He asserts that it is thinking that makes it good or bad. In the sentence "to me it is a prison", "it" symbolizes Denmark where he feels trapped. Denmark is a prison to Hamlet whereas it is not to Rosencrantz, and that is why he thinks that there is solely relative truth.

HAMLET: Why then 'tis none to you' for there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so: to me it is a prison. (2. 2. 5-7)

On the other hand, in Turkey of the twentieth century, the philosophy of relativity is effective as a result of European Humanism which led to Turkish Humanism. The Turkish readers welcomed a new world and various interpretations of that world. Their horizon of expectations was opened to a new world and varied with various interpretations of that world. Burian's *Hamlet* translation in the 1940s can be read as a reflection of this new world. He translates Hamlet's words about the relativity of truth, "there is nothing good or bad: but thinking makes it so" as "iyi yahut kötü diye bir şey yoktur, onu öyle gösteren düşüncedir". Moreover, he translates "it is a prison" referring to Denmark as "burası bir zindan".

HAMLET: Eh, öyle ise sizin için değil. Çünkü iyi yahut kötü diye bir şey yoktur, onu öyle gösteren düşüncedir. Bana göre burası bir zindan. (Burian 2. 2. 1-3)

As far as Eyüboğlu and his *Hamlet* translation in the 1960s are concerned it is obvious that Turkish Humanism increasingly goes on. Both Turkish readers and viewers welcome Eyüboğlu's source-oriented translation based on performance with his poetic prose translation unlike Burian's source-oriented translation based on reading with prose translation. Eyüboğlu translates "there is nothing good or bad: but thinking makes it so" as "dünya ne iyidir ne de kötü, düşüncenize bağlıdır iyilik kötülük" and "it is a prison" referring to Denmark as "dünya zindan". He translates "it" not as Denmark but the world.

HAMLET: Size göre hava hoş öyleyse. Zaten dünya ne iyidir ne kötü, düşüncenize bağlıdır iyilik kötülük. Bana göre dünya zindan. (Eyüboğlu 2. 2. 19-21)

Lastly, the third translation is Yücel's *Hamlet* in the 1990s. His translation coincides with another prolific period with full of translations of Shakesperean works. He does not follow any formal ideology but he translates it freely with poetic style. He focuses on the cultural codes of Turkey and culture specific language. He translates "there is nothing good or bad: but thinking makes it so" as "iyi dediğiniz de kötü dediğiniz de fikir mahsulüdür hepsi nihayet" and "it is a prison" referring to Denmark as "burası bir hapisane"

HAMLET: Sizin için öyle olabilir, iyi dediğiniz de, kötü dediğiniz de fikir mahsulüdür hepsi nihayet. Ama bana sorarsanız, burası bir hapisane. (Yücel 2. 2. 8-10)

Finally, as explained here, the most striking words that reflect the individual's dilemma is "to be or not to be" speech uttered by Hamlet. He cannot decide on what to do; to go on

living which means nothing for him or to commit suicide. From the very beginning of the play, Hamlet tries hard to find out what is “rotten” in Denmark. Whenever he discovers the mystery about his father’s death, the late King Hamlet, he hesitates to take action; to kill the present King Cladius or not, to seize the throne or not, to change the “rotten” system or not, to feign madness or not and so on. He desires to die or to sleep to free himself from his suffering. Yet, he does not know what will happen after sleep, in other words, afterlife and that is why, he respects his existence. Hamlet is the man of reason and dilemma. As a reflection of that period, he is both a humanist and a skeptic. He suffers from others’ unpardoned sins, and hence, longs for his salvation. He feigns madness and the reason of his madness is questioned and investigated by every one in the play. The reception of madness then is explained as it follows:

Reference to madness was not made from the court of modern reason, madness was not judged to be inextricably associated with unreason –on the contrary in the late Middle Ages and in the Renaissance period madness was associated with particular sacred forms of knowledge which were considered to provide insights into the human condition.
(Smart 8-9)

HAMLET: To be or not to be, that’s the question:
Whether ‘tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous Fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
And by opposing end them : to die to sleep ;
No more ; and by a sleep, to say we end
The heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks
That flesh is heir to ? ‘tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wish’d. To die to sleep,
To sleep, perchance to dream ; ay, there’s the rub,
For in that sleep of death, what dreams may come,
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause. There’s the respect
That makes calamity of so long life:
[...] (3. 1. 5-18)

On the other hand, as it is mentioned before, it is the beginning of Turkish Humanism. Burian translates the most striking words “To be or not to be, that’s the question:” as “Yaşamak mı, yoksa ölmek mi, mesele bunda. He transfers “to be or not to be” contrasting with ”yaşamak mı, yoksa ölmek mi” and uses two different verbs, one is negative whereas the other one is positive. Moreover, he translates “To die to sleep, To sleep perchance to dream” as “Ölmek, uyumak: belki de rüya görmek!” His source-oriented translation is apt for the formal ideology of the young Turkish Republic in the 1940s.

HAMLET: Yaşamak mı, yoksa ölmek mi, mesele bunda. Kör talihin sapanlarına, oklarına zihninde tahammül göstermek mi daha mertçe olur, yoksa kaygıların ummamına karşı siahlanıp onları yok etmek mi? Ölmek: uyumak. O kadar! Bir uykuyla kalb üzüntüsünü, tabiatın bedene miras olarak verdiği bin bir acıyı sona erdiriyoruz diyebilmek, candan gönülden istenecek bir son olur. Ölmek, uyumak: belki de rüya görmek! Ya, dert orada: çünkü, bu fani kalıbı üstümüzden sıyırıp attıktan sonra , o ölüm uykusunda kim bilir ne rüyalar görürüz düşüncesi bizi durmaya mecbur ediyor. Yaşamak felaketini uzatan, işte bu düşünce.
[...] (Burian 3. 1. 1-1)

As for Eyüboğlu’s translation, 60s is a very prolific period regarding translations. He translates “To be or not to be, that’s the question:” as “Var olmak mı, yok olmak mı, bütün sorun bu!”. He transfers “to be or not to be” contrast with”var olmak mı, yok olmak mı”, he uses solely one verb with its positive and negative form. Furthermore, he translates “To die to sleep, To sleep perchance to dream;” as “Uyumak, ama düş görebilirsin uykuda,”. Similarly, he is the follower of the formal ideology to create a literary and cultural repertoire leading to national repertoire.

HAMLET: Var olmak mı, yok olmak mı, bütün sorun bu!
Düşüncemizin katlanması mı güzel,
Zalim kaderin yumruklarına, oklarına,

Yoksa direktip bela denizlerine karşı
 Dur, yeter! Demesi mi?
 Ölmek uyumak sadece! Düşünün ki uyumakla yalnız
 Bitebilir bütün acıları yüreğin,
 Çektiği bütün kahırlar insanoğlunun.
 Uyumak, ama düş görebilirsin uykuda, o kötü!
 Çünkü o ölüm uykularında,
 Sıyrıldığımız zaman yaşamak kaygısından,
 Ne düşler görebilir insan, düşünmeli bunu.
 Bu düşüncedir uzun yaşamayı cehennem eden.
 [...] (Eyüboğlu 3. 1. 23-9)

Lastly, 90s is the peak point for Shakespearean translations in Turkey. Yücel's translation precisely differs from the first two translations. He is famous for his interpretation of "To be or not to be, that's the question" and he translates it as "Bir ihtimal daha var, o da ölmek mi dersin?" He uses solely one verb with its negative meaning. Moreover, he prefers an inverted and interrogative sentence unlike Burian and Eyüboğlu. As a poet, his translation is target language and culture-oriented, and even fairly unique regarding the cultural codes. He translates "To die to sleep, To sleep perchance to dream" as "Öldün diyelim, uyudun, Uyudun iyi ama, ya rüya görürsen." He uses a conditional sentence in his translation, which is very common in Turkish colloquial. Yücel, in this translation, forces the limits translator's visibility, and comes closer to adaptation.

HAMLET: Bir ihtimal daha var, o da ölmek mi dersin?
 Ecep hangisi, nefesine destur deyip karayazımın
 Oklarını, güllerini sineye çekmek mi, yoksa
 Bu bela deryasına karşı isyan etmek mi
 Yaraşır insan olana? Öldün diyelim, uyudun,
 Herşey de bitti ve uyuyarak bir kalemde son verdin
 Tekmil kalp-ağrılarına ve o tenkafesimize musallat
 Binbir kahra, binbir acıya, kim istemez ki bu akıbeti
 Hem de can-ı gönülden? Öldün diyelim, uyudun,
 Uyudun iy' ama, ya rüya görürsen. İşte işin püf yanı!
 Bu ölümlü dağdağadan yakayı sıyırdıktan sonra,
 O ölüm uykusunda kimbilir ne olmadık düşler
 Göreceksin, bir düşün! İşte bu kaygıdır zaten
 Ömrü onca uzun bir felaket haline getiren!
 [...] (Yücel 3. 1. 5-18)

6. CONCLUSION

Having focused on Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as a source text first, and then its Turkish translations by Orhan Burian (1944), Sabahattin Eyüboğlu (1965), and Can Yücel (1992) within the framework of Reception Theory, it is obvious that there is neither good nor bad translation regarding three different target texts formed by three different translators who have different horizon of expectations depending on their cultural target context. Therefore, in this comparative study, instead of criticizing or dictating how translation should be done, the emphasis is placed on depicting how translators or interpreters grasp the source text and transfer it into the target language and culture and lastly how the readers grasp the translated texts within the framework of Reception Theory as it gets the translator, reader and their reception to the center.

In the light of the Reception Theory, this study deals with the socio-cultural, political and historical background of the target culture and the translator, and analyzes to what extent they are reflected in the target texts, namely three *Hamlet* translations. Orhan Burian is an academic translator of the 1940s, and he is a member of *Tercüme* which aims to make Turkish citizens read and write in their own language liberated from Arabic and Persian. Burian works hard to transfer the world's masterpieces into translated literature which will lead to form a translated literature repertoire as well as to encourage Turkish writers to write in western literary traditions. As Even Zohar states, "since a young literature cannot immediately create texts in all types known to its producers, it benefits from the experience of other literatures, and translated literature becomes in this way one of its most important

systems” (qtd. in Venuti 194). Burian focuses on source text and source language, and that is why, his translation is source-oriented. He prefers being invisible in the target text and makes almost word for word translation as a part of the skopos set by *Tercüme* or formal ideology of the time. His prose translation of *Hamlet*, the greatest western work of all times, is produced to be read by Turkish readers, particularly students at high schools. He mostly uses pure Turkish purified from Arabic or Persian languages. For example, to avoid a foreign spelling in a Turkish word, unlike Eyüboğlu and Yücel, Burian translates the word “king” as “kiral” and writes it with an “ı”, probably according to Turkish spelling rules of that time.

Similarly, Eyüboğlu aims at raising the country to the level of more civilized western countries through the medium of translation to form firstly a national identity and subsequently national repertoire in Turkish. Eyüboğlu translates *Hamlet* in the 60s, in the period of Turkish Humanism when it makes its peak. As a translator, he uses pure Turkish and prefers being visible with his performance-oriented target text although his translation is source-oriented like Burian’s translation. Yet, unlike Burian, Eyüboğlu makes a poetic prose. He does not use long sentences but short sentences in a linguistic simplicity. His translation is performance-oriented and peculiar both to be performed on the stage and read, and hence it has always been preferred by the Turkish directors.

As for Can Yücel, he is the most distinctive of the three. Unlike Burian and Eyüboğlu, as a poet translator, he focuses on target language, target culture, and the target text. He is precisely visible with his target-oriented verse translation. He pays attention to render both meaning and the spirit of the text in Turkish. Thus, his style is colloquial and from time to

time even vulgar but lyrical and poetic. He uses distinctive writing and punctuation marks, inverted sentences, idioms, Arabic and Persian words and so on. His translation flourishes with his unique style liberated from any rules or any formal ideology though he is the son of an influential figure, Hasan Ali Yücel.

Furthermore, Can Yücel does not demand himself to be called as a “translator” which means a person who is charged with translating from one language to another language in its simplest form, but he prefers calling himself the “Turkish interpreter”, namely, “Türkçe söyleyen”. For him, translation and culture are strictly bound to one another and cannot be isolated from one another, and hence, interpretation and cultural transplantation are indispensable for Yücel’s translations.

During the reading process of the source text, translators have different horizon of expectations because they are the members of the target culture and therefore they fill in the blanks and indeterminacy of the source text with their own target cultural background. Eventually, it is assumed that when their target texts are read by the target readers who have the same horizon of expectations with the translators, the target texts can be more easily understood by them, and the skopos is achieved because Reception Theory is focused on more socio-cultural, political and historical changes or ideology that affect the reading process. Since the author is the creator and ideal reader of his text, in each reading the text will be reshaped firstly by translators of the source text and finally the readers of the target text.

To conclude, Orhan Burian, Sabahattin Eyübođlu, and Can Yücel are the members of the target language and culture and translate *Hamlet* in different decades; namely, 40s, 60s and 90s with different interpretations which are shaped by socio-cultural, political and historical events occurring that time. Target text readers read the creative reproduction of three different *Hamlet* texts continuing to evolve in each reading by each reader. Needless to say, each translation activity should be respected whether the translator is visible or invisible, the translation is source-oriented or target-oriented, or the translated text is adequate or acceptable and not be judged as good or bad. Each translator is the first reader and literary critic of the source text, and whether he/she is called translator or interpreter, their efforts should not be ignored since they contribute a lot to the repertoire of translated literature in Turkey.

WORKS CITED

Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford U Press, 2001. PDF.

Bassnett, Susan. "Translating for the Theatre: The Case Against Performability."

TTR : traduction, terminologie, redaction 4. 1(1991): 99-111. Print.

Berk, Özlem. "Translating the West": The Position of Translated Western Literature within the Turkish Literary Polysystem." *RiLUnE* 4 (2006): 1-18. Print.

Bradley, Andrew C. *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London: Macmillan, 1992. Print.

Culler, Jonathan D. *Literary Theory*. Oxford U Press, 2000. PDF.

Dusinberre, Juliet. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*. London: Macmillan, 2003. Print.

Hamlet, Macbeth, Tarlakuşu. İstanbul: İstanbul Şehir Tiyatroları, 1962. Print.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978. Print.

Paker, Saliha. "Hamlet in Turkey." *New Comparison* 2 (1986): 89-108. Print.

Paker, Saliha. *Translations: (Re)shaping of Literature and Culture*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi UP, 2002. Print.

Rifat, Mehmet. *Çeviriyi Düşünenler**. İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık, 2008. Print.

Sayın, Gülşen. "Shakespeare in Cinema: A Cultural Transfer from Hamlet to The Angel of Vengeance (1976)" *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance* 4. 1 (2011): 17-37. Print.

Selden, Raman, Peter Widdowson, and Peter Brooker. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. 4th. ed. London, New York: Prentice Hall: n.p., 1997. Print.

Shakespeare, William, and Can Yücel. *Hamlet*. İstanbul: Adam Yayınları, 1992. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. London: Penguin, 1994. Print.

Shakespeare, William, and Orhan Burian. *Hamlet*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1995. Print.

Shakespeare, William, and Sabahattin Eyuboğlu. *Hamlet*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2016. Print.

Smart, Barry. *Michel Foucault*. N.p.: E. Horwood, 2004. PDF.

Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 2001.
Print.

Vermeer, Hans J. *A Skopos Theory of Translation*. Heidelberg: TextconText Verlag,
1996. Print.



BIOGRAPHY

Üzeyme Hacıođlu was born in İstanbul in 1978. She graduated from Pertevniyal Anatolian High School in 1997. She got her undergraduate degree in English Language and Literature at Dođuş University with full scholarship between 1997 and 2002. She started MA in Translation Studies programme of the Department of the English Language and Literature in 2011. She started her teaching career in 2002 and still teaches English in an Anatolian High School in İstanbul.

