T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME



REVERBERATIONS FROM THE CRUCIBLE: A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF PATHOS IN SHAKESPEARE'S FOUR GREAT TRAGEDIES

PHD DISSERTATION

YEŞİM DENİZ ALTAY

1701306027

İSTANBUL, JUNE, 2023

T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE PROGRAMME

REVERBERATIONS FROM THE CRUCIBLE: A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF PATHOS IN SHAKESPEARE'S FOUR GREAT TRAGEDIES

PHD DISSERTATION

YEŞİM DENİZ ALTAY

1701306027

ORCID NO: 0000-0003-3111-0256

SUPERVISOR

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DR. DİDEM TUNA

İSTANBUL, JUNE 2023

T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL ÜNİVERSİTESİ

DIRECTORATE OF INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student's name-surname, who is a graduate student at the Department of English Language and Literature and whose student number is 171306027 has presented her thesis titled "Reverberations From the Crucible: A Translation-Oriented Semiotic Analysis of Pathos in Shakespeare's Four Great Tragedies" and it has been accepted by the jury approved by the Institute of Social Sciences on …….. by its decision numbered ……as a PhD Dissertation unanimously / by the majority of voting.

Thesis Defense Date:

Name-Surname		**Signature**
Thesis Supervisor	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Didem Tuna	
Jury Member	Prof. Dr. C. Günseli İşçi	
Jury Member	Prof. Dr. Sündüz Öztürk Kasar	
Jury Member	Prof. Dr. Erendiz Özbayoğlu	
Jury Member	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Kuleli	

T.C.

İSTANBUL YENİ YÜZYIL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

PHD PROGRAMME

ETHICAL STATEMENT

In this project, I prepared my manuscript in accordance with the thesis writing rules of the Institute of Social Sciences at Istanbul Yeni Yüzyıl University and I hereby declare that;

- I have obtained the data, information and documents provided within the thesis within the framework of academic and ethical rules,
- I have submitted all information, documents, evaluations and results in accordance with the requirements of scientific ethics and moral rules,
- I have cited all works that I have used in the project by appropriately referring to my sources,
- I have not made any changes to the data used,
- The work I present here is original, and if found otherwise, I declare that I accept all loss of rights that may occur.

.... / .... / 2023

YEŞİM DENİZ ALTAY

PREFACE

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Günseli Sönmez İşçi, who mentally and spiritually contributed to the writing of this thesis. I am grateful to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Didem Tuna, for her constant encouragement for my studies in the field of semiotics and invaluable scholarly guidance. Her embracing spirit in the study of semiotics of translation extended the scope of this thesis. I also would like to express my gratitude and heartfelt thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Kuleli for his earnest guidance, exquisite scholarly vision in drama studies and invaluable feedback for the dissertation. The writing of this thesis would not be possible without the diligent mentorship of my dissertation committee members, with special thanks to Prof. Dr. Erendiz Özbayoğlu who contributed to the thesis with her expertise in mythology and Prof. Dr. Sündüz Öztürk Kasar, one of the preeminent pioneers in semiotics of translation, who provided the theoretical framework for the thesis.

İSTANBUL, 2023 YEŞİM DENİZ ALTAY

ÖZET

CADI KAZANINDAN YANKILAR: WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'İN DÖRT BÜYÜK TRAGEDYASINDA PATHOS'UN ÇEVİRİ ODAKLI GÖSTERGEBİLİMSEL ÇÖZÜMLEMESİ

YEŞİM DENİZ ALTAY

ORC-ID: 0000-0003-3111-0256

Pathos tragedyada öncelikli olarak hamartia olarak adlandırılan ve karakterin düşüşüne yol açan karakter kusuruyla ilgilidir. İkincil olarak tanrı-baba figürünün ölümüne dair acıyı ifade eder. Tiyatro tarihi açısından bakıldığında, pathos hem Dionysos'a yakılan ağıtları hem de ölen ataya saygıyı ifade edebilmektedir. Ancak Erken Modern dönemde sadece Dionysos ritüelleri cadı kazanı imgesiyle özdeşleştirilmiştir. Shakespeare tiyatrosunda pathos, dikkat çekici bir şekilde tiyatronun doğuşuna ilişkin bu iki zıt özelliği, yani atayı onurlandırma ve cadılıkla özdeşleştirilen Bakkha ritüllerinin izlerini barındırmaktadır. William Shakespeare'in dört büyük tragedyası *Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello* ve *Kral Lear*'a ilişkin bağlamların göstergebilimsel çözümlemesinde aynı anda tiyatronun kökenine bu iki ize de rastlanmaktadır. Shakespeare'in dört büyük tragedyasında pathos ölen atayı onurlandırma ve cadı kazanı zıtlığı üzerine kurulmuştur. Pathos'un göstergebilimsel çözümlemesi, Rifattere'in hipogram kavramına uygun olarak Erken Modern dönemde cadılıkla ayrımcılığın bağlantısını ortaya koymaktadır. Bu tezin bütüncesini Shakespeare'in dört büyük tragedyası ve tragedyaların farklı Türkçe çevirileri oluşturmaktadır. Tragedyalardan incelenen her bir bölüm için ayrıca bir çeviri önerisi de sunulmaktadır. Tezin amacı, Shakespeare eserlerinde pathos üzerinden cadılık korkusunun göstergebilimsel bir çözümlemesini yapmaktır. Kaynak metin ve çevirilerinin çözümlenip karşılaştırılmasında Jean-Claude Coquet'nin Söyleyenler Kuramı, Sündüz Öztürk Kasar'ın Yükümsüz Özneler Tipolojsi, Paris Göstergebilim Okulu çalışmalarından çeviri göstergebilimi alanına uyarladığı gerçeğe uygunluk kipleri ile bilmece kavramı ve Çeviride Anlam Evrilmesi Dizgeselliği kullanılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Shakespeare'de pathos, cadı kazanı, ataya tapma, çeviri göstergebilimi, Söyleyenler Kuramı

ABSTRACT

REVERBERATIONS FROM THE CRUCIBLE: A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF PATHOS IN SHAKESPEARE'S FOUR GREAT TRAGEDIES

YEŞİM DENİZ ALTAY

ORC-ID: 0000-0003-3111-0256

Pathos denotes the painful events in a tragedy, mostly marked by hamartia, a defect that causes the downfall of a character. It is alternatively related to the death of father-god figure. Concerning drama history, pathos is alternatively defined both through the mournings of Dionysus and or honouring of dead ancestors. To contrast, the crucible sign has been defined only through Dionysus and the rituals of Bacchae in the Early Modern context. Shakespearean pathos strikingly retains the two characteristics on the birth of drama: Honouring ancestors versus Dionysiac practices, namely witchcraft. In the semiotic reading of *Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello* and *King Lear*, these two characteristics can be revealed. Shakespearean pathos was crafted to be at the opposite poles: the crucible sign (witchcraft) or the dedication to a dead ancestor. The semiotic reading of pathos may also reveal the discriminative gaze on witchcraft in concordance with Rifaterre's concept of hypogram in Early Modern period. Four great tragedies and their Turkish translations constitute the corpus of this thesis. In addition, a translation is proposed for each context analyzed in the tragedies. The aim of this thesis is to carry out a semiotic analysis of the fear of witchcraft in Shakespearean pathos. The framework will be based on Jean Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation, Sündüz Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-Subjects, the concept of enigma and veridictory modalities that Öztürk Kasar adopted from the studies of Paris School of Semiotics and her Systematics of Designification in Translation.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Shakespearean pathos, crucible, honouring ancestors, semiotics of translation, Theory of Instances of Enunciation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE ..... **i**

ETHICAL STATEMENT ..... **ii**

PREFACE ..... **iii**

ÖZET ..... **iv**

ABSTRACT ..... **v**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **vi**

LIST OF TABLES ..... **viii**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... **x**

INTRODUCTION **11**

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK **26**

1.1. Enigma 26

1.2. Veridictory Modalities 27

1.3. Theory of Instances of Enunciation 28

1.4. Typology of Non-Subjects 29

1.5. Systematics of Designification in Translation 31

2. A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *OTHELLO* 33

2.1. Summary of *Othello* 33

2.2. Enigmas in *Othello* and its Translations 34

2.3. Mythological and Iconographic Allusions in *Othello* and its Translations 63

2.4. Veridictory Modalities in *Othello* and its Translations 85

2.5. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *Othello* 88

2.6. Songs in *Othello* and its Translations 95

2.7. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *Othello* and its Translations 99

3. A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *HAMLET* 103

3.1. Summary of *Hamlet* 103

3.2. Enigmas in *Hamlet* and its Translations 104

3.3. Mythological and Iconographic References in *Hamlet* and its Translations 151
3.4. Veridictory Modalities in *Hamlet* and its Translations 171
3.5. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *Hamlet* and its Translations 176
3.6. Songs in *Hamlet* and its Translations 181
3.7. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *Hamlet* and its Translations 186
4.A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *KING LEAR* 188
4.1. Summary of *King Lear* 188
4.2. Enigmas in *King Lear* and its Translations 189
4.3. Mythological and Iconographic Allusions in *King Lear* and its Translations 211
4.4. Veridictory Modalities in King Lear and its Translations 227
4.5. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *King Lear* and its Translations 229
4.6. Songs in *King Lear* and its Translations 242
4.7. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *King Lear* and its Translations 247
5.A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *MACBETH* 256
5.1. Summary of *Macbeth* 256
5.2. Enigmas in the Source and Target Texts 257
5.3. Enigmas in *Macbeth* and its Translations 270
5.4. Mythological and Iconographic Allusions in *Macbeth* and its Translations 282
5.5. Veridictory Modalities in *Macbeth* and its Translations 300
5.6. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *Macbeth* and its Translations 304
5.7. Songs in *Macbeth* and its Translations 313
5.8. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *Macbeth* ad its Translations 315
CONCLUSION 321
BIBLIOGRAPHY 339

LIST OF TABLES

Page No.

Table 1: The Corpus of the Study 15

Table 2: Four Components of the Enunciating Instance in the Production of Discourse 28

Table 3: Systematics of Designification in Translation 31

Table 4: Example 1 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 42

Table 5: Example 2 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 47

Table 6: Example 3 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 51

Table 7: Example 4 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 54

Table 8: Example 5 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 57

Table 9: Example 6 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 61

Table 10: Example 7 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 74

Table 11: Example 8 for Translation Comparison Analysis 76

Table 12: Example 9 for Translation Comparison Analysis 80

Table 13: Example 10 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 83

Table 14: Example 11 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 86

Table 15: Example 12 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 93

Table 16: Example 13 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 94

Table 17: Example 14 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 97

Table 18: Example 15 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 101

Table 19: Example 16 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 132

Table 20: Example 17 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 136

Table 21: Example 18 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 138

Table 22: Example 19 for Translation Analysis and Comparison 144

Table 23: Example 20 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 146

Table 24: Example 21 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 160

Table 25: Example 22 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 167

Table 26: Example 23 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 168

Table 27: Example 24 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 172

Table 28: Example 25 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 180

Table 29: Example 26 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 182

Table 30: Example 27 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 184
Table 31: Example 28 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 198
Table 32: Example 29 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 202
Table 33: Example 30 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 204
Table 34: Example 31 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 208
Table 35: Example 32 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 220
Table 36: Example 33 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 222
Table 37: Example 34 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 225
Table 38: Example 35 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 229
Table 39: Example 36 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 235
Table 40: Example 37 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 238
Table 41: Example 38 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 245
Table 42: Example 39 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 249
Table 43: Example 40 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 250
Table 44: Example 41 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 252
Table 45: Example 42 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 270
Table 46: Example 43 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 272
Table 47: Example 44 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 275
Table 48: Example 45 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 278
Table 49: Example 46 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 287
Table 50: Example 47 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 290
Table 51: Example 48 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 293
Table 52: Example 49 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 297
Table 53: Example 50 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 301
Table 54: Example 51 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 306
Table 55: Example 52 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 310
Table 56: Example 53 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 313
Table 57: Example 54 for Translation Comparison and Analysis 317
Table 58: Meaning transformations in *Othello* 323
Table 59: Meaning Transformations in *Hamlet* 327
Table 60: Meaning Transformations in *King Lear* 330
Table 61: Meaning transformations in *Macbeth* 334

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ST: Source text

TT: Target text

INTRODUCTION

No Beast is there without glimmer of infinity,
No eye so vile nor abject that brushes not gainst
lightning from on high, now tender, now fierce.

Victor Hugo, *La Legende des siecles*

The focus of the argument of this doctoral thesis is the tragic element of pathos and its manifestations in Shakespeare's four great tragedies, namely *Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello,* and *King Lear*. Jean-Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk, Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-195), Sündüz Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-Subjects (2007, pp. 3-6), the concept of enigma and verdictory modalities (Greimas and Courtés 1982, p. 369) that Öztürk Kasar adopted from the studies of Paris School of Semiotics (Öztürk Kasar, 2009, p. 170) and her Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p. 154; Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172) constitute the theoretical framework of this study. The steps to semiotic reading will be a study of enigmas; elaborating mythological and iconographic references and allusions; reading the signs of magic and madness through transformations of subjects, signs of insanity or antic disposition; carrying out a semiotic analysis of songs in relation to pathos and finally evaluating the crucible image as a sign in relation to discriminatory discourse. In *Othello*, the representations of the crucible image are tied to Othello's mother's handkerchief. The relationship between magic and Othello's madness signifies the crucible of the witches. In *Hamlet*, magic and the crucible image are represented through the arrival of the Ghost father. Prince Hamlet's strained relationship with magic is critical in the building of suspense in the text. The relationship with *Macbeth* and magic is evident because Hecate, the queen of witches, arrives as an embodiment of magic. The crucible image in *Macbeth* exists in the text both physically (as the Weird Sisters boil the cauldron) and as a sign through which the modern readers may grasp why magic was a critical issue for the Early Modern readers. In *King Lear*, the crucible sign is both existent (as this is a pagan kingdom) and lost because King Lear's calls to pagan gods are unanswered. The two sisters (Regan and Goneril) seem to represent the sign because King Lear openly calls them "centaurs", as followers of Dionysus. It can be assumed that tracing the crucible sign in characterization in relation to madness and magic may elaborate the Early Modern prejudice to the practices of old-time deities, which later was expressed as witchcraft,

all inclusive. As far as the feelings of pity, fear, and devastation (pathetic elements) in Shakespearean tragedies are concerned, *Metamorphoses* of Publius Ovidius is a significant source of Shakespeare's theatre. Therefore, the relationship between mythological and iconographic allusions and the pathetic structure in Shakespearean texts will be studied in the scope of this thesis. By studying mythology and iconography, it may be possible to put the signs under the two categories: "honouring ancestors" and "driving away demons." A new study as exemplified in this thesis on Shakespearean pathos is necessary because the idea of "honouring ancestors" was a mainstream political thought upon which Early Modern politics[1] was founded. It is therefore critical to know how mythological and iconographic footnotes were supported or negated.

The footnotes of Shakespearean tragedies exemplify how demons may be at work in the human world. "Identification of demons" was the practice of the newly-founded Protestant state, the church and law.[2] Therefore, the practice itself was a tool to exemplify and elaborate on the ways of the old-time demons, mostly rooted in iconographic and mythological information in four tragedies. A semiotic reading of Shakespearean pathos, apart from the intense pain and fear associated with it, could similarly provide room for a new reading on discrimination in the English Renaissance. It is deducible that prejudice against certain ethnic and religious groups swept over Early Modern England because the state itself was obsessed with the "identification of the demons". The identification of evil spirits or demons that "rejects the logic of causality" (Eagleton, 2010, p. 84) was almost an impossible task. The fight between good and evil must have showed up in the ways that certain groups of people were demonized. Therefore, the concept of evil and how it was perceived in the Early Modern world provides room for a semiotic reading of discrimination, based on Julia Kristeva's *abject* (1982, p. 18), an extensive description of driving away what is dissimilar in Shakespeare's great tragedies.

As an element in drama, pathos denotes the pain or the painful situations presented in a tragedy (Rees, 1972, pp. 1-11). The analysis of pathos in the mimetic

[1] See Anglo, Sydney, The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda https://www.escholar.manchester.ac.uk/
[2] See ed. Montesano, Maria, Witchcraft, Demonology and Magic, p. 86

theory may be considered secondary because the emphasis is on catharsis, as the purification of wild feelings for a better society as explained in Aristotle's *Poetics.* In the classical drama study, the element of pathos and catharsis go together. Pathos, in relation to the birth of drama through Dionysiac practices, pertains to the death of wine god, Dionysus, mostly symbolized by the season winter. The suffering and the painful events in the tragedy as a genre may be traced in the worshipping practices of the Greek god of wine. In Greek and Roman tragedies, pathos does not take place on the stage through a mourning ritual but may take different forms such as lines written for the chorus. In Renaissance drama, the function of the chorus is not the same with the Greek and Roman drama. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, for example, there is no mourning for King Hamlet because the presentations and representations of the father-god figure provides only the background to the text. There is pathos in Shakespearean Hamlet as the mourning of the dead-father but in a very different context than Roman and the Greek world.

Pathetic structure, in Shakespeare's tragedies, provides a mixture of idealization of a father-god figure and mourning (borrowing from the mourning rituals of Dionysus) for the loss of it. Similarly, Scotland loses King Duncan and the events unfold as the country is driven to Macbeth's reign (marked by magic) while mourning for him. Macbeth is no father-figure for Scotland because he manages the kingdom through the prophecies of the Weird Sisters. In *King Lear*, the connection between the loss of a father figure can be traced back to King Leir's father. King Leir (earlier versions of the text) almost worships his father and builds a monument of Janus to honour him. Shakespearean Lear does not mourn for his father on the stage but this does not mean that Shakespearean pathos is not at work. *King Lear* is the most pathetic tragedy of all because King Lear dies without finding a new-father figure. He is no father-god figure, either because he divides his kingdom to be more honoured as a king but loses all in search of more. Cordelia refuses to give more honour to her genealogy and starts the downfall.

Macbeth and *Othello*, on the other hand, may share the same line through which we may hear "the reverberations from the crucible". In *Othello,* the decadence of genealogy in the household of Brabantio provides the background to the pathetic structure because Desdemona rejects marrying a white man instead of Othello the

Moor. She refuses to honour her genealogy like Cordelia, and death of the father-god figure is shared by four great tragedies. This line of negative presentation, touching upon the mourning rituals of the wine god Dionysus brings up the idea of rebirth. After the wine god was cooked in the cauldron for rebirth, spring arrives. The cauldron or the crucible is a symbol for rebirth, in a way that would be repelled in Early Modern thought. King Macbeth's associations with magic can be traced back to the cauldron and Lady Macbeth's associations with Bacchae are there to signify the pathetic relationship with magic in an inescapable way.

The other sign of the coin, which may reveal the traces of honouring the ancestors may explain how a religious character like Hamlet and a pagan king like Lear may have in common in terms of pathetic structure. Hamlet's associations with magic are blurry while King Lear is openly pagan. They both mourn the loss of a father-god figure. They are both crafted within the same sphere. The negative representations of magic, commonly shared in four great tragedies, can be read in complete concordance with the societal and religious norms concerning Early Modern age. On the other hand, it may be too limiting to call the contrast between the honouring of the ancestors and the supernatural as binary because pathos was crafted through mixing of these notions.

Since every text is a mosaic of quotations, (Kristeva, 1969, p. 66) mythological characters in Shakespearean texts may provide the background to Shakespearean pathos. In Macbeth, for example, it is possible to read traces of Circe, Medusa or Medea because these are the oldest mythological characters through which one may study intertextuality and discriminative gaze. The reverberations from the crucible reveal the voices that were categorized according to the norms of the Early Modern world in a very negative way. The discriminative gaze may have stretched out to the witch hunt. The songs of the witches that were hushed in that world, may be heard today out of the smokes of the crucible to tell us about the stories of the old for a new world.

Consequently, through a semiotic gaze in Shakespearean tragedies, two opposing pillars of Elizabethan politics show up as honouring the ancestors and identifying demons. Therefore, studying the structure of pathos (both positively and

negatively presented) may show traces of the Early Mo*d*ern gaze to the now-submerged cultures, which may provide material in the study of racial, gender, and religious discrimination. The study of mythical and biblical allusions in great tragedies is important because, these signs have historically been gazed as opposites. In semiotics, it is possible to embrace conflicting notions such as honouring of the ancestors and witchcraft. It may then be possible to read pathos as a signifier with both positive and negative possibilities in meaning, like the reverberations of dark and light imagery in Shakespeare's great tragedies.

Enigmas in texts are challenges that cannot be easily identified or explained like Hamlet's ghost father. Since the study of pathos in Shakespeare is inevitably related to elusiveness of the supernatural forces, enigmas, mythological and iconographic allusions and references, veridictory modalities (Greimas and Courtés, 1982, p. 369), signs of insanity or antic disposition will be studied both in the original texts and in their translations. In addition, a selection of songs will be studied as examples of subject transformations. As the last step, the manifestations of evil will be evaluated on the chosen texts *Othello, Hamlet, Macbeth* and *King Lear* under the subheading of discrimination.

In the Table below, the list of original Shakespearean tragedies and their translations is given.

Table 1: The Corpus of the Study

The title of the tragedy	**The name of the translator**	**The date of publication**	**Publishing House**
***Othello* (ST1)**		1997	Bloomsbury
TT1	Bülent Bozkurt	2018	Remzi Kitabevi
TT2	A. Vahit Turhan & Turan Oflazoğlu	2001	İz Yayınevi
TT3	Ülkü Tamer	1964	Varlık Yayınevi
TT4	Orhan Burian	1996	Meb Yayınevi
***Hamlet* (ST2)**		2003	Thomson Learning
TT1	Halide Edib-Adıvar & Vahit Turhan	1943	İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları

TT2	Sabahattin Eyüboğlu	1974	Remzi Kitabevi
TT3	Orhan Burian	1995	Meb Yayınevi
TT4	Bülent Bozkurt	2013	Remzi Kitabevi
***King Lear* (ST3)**		2001	Thomson Learning
TT1	İrfan Şahinbaş	1959	Maarif Basımevi
TT2	Emine Ayhan	2019	Alfa Edebiyat
TT3	Bülent Bozkurt	2020	Remzi Kitabevi
***Macbeth* (ST4)**		2003	The Arden Shakespeare
TT1	Orhan Burian	1946	Meb Yayınevi
TT2	Bülent Bozkurt	2019	Remzi Kitabevi
TT3	Sabahattin Eyüboğlu	2020	İş Bankası Yayınları

The target texts in the corpus were selected non-randomly; they are the translations made by academics and not retranslations for the stage. It is not expected from actors to use plays as they are because in the theatrical world, alterations in translations are not uncommon. The extensive semiotic reading of pathos covers both the academic source texts and their translations requires. in depth analysis.

The study of the pathetic structure of texts in mythological and iconographic data is crucial for four great tragedies of Shakespeare. *Metamorphoses* of Publius Ovid is one of the primary sources for the mythological allusions in Shakespeare's art. Geneva Bible (mostly Apocrypha) and King James Bible are mostly shown as the source for iconographic data (Hamlin, 2013, p. 2). Mythological and iconographic data from the great tragedies will be evaluated based on Julia Kristeva's perspective on the concept of Early Modern history and discrimination.

According to Kristeva's theory of intertextuality, every artistic text is "a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (1966, p. 85). In Kristevan sense, concepts of the individual and the cultural are bounded by "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality, in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts" (1969, p. 66). Moreover, society is in a conflicting position because "the concept of text as ideologeme determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the

text of) society" (1969, p. 37). According to her theory, signifiers are plural, full of historical meaning directed not so much to stable signifiers as to the domain of other signifiers. In this respect, a study of Shakespeare's four great tragedies may additionally reveal the discriminative signs in English society.

Similarly, as stated by Riffaterre, the concept of the nucleus of a text is hypogram, which could be "a word, a sentence, an idea, or a historical event already existent in a culture's literature or cultural schema" (1983, p. 76). Concerning the argument in this thesis, the hypogram in Western culture is the *crucible.* A close reading of Renaissance society may reveal that witches, owners of crucibles, or cauldrons allude to the deepest fears of the people as well as the red line for the state. Mythological and iconographic signs, in this respect, act as signifiers that are full of the historical data for a study of abject (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18) of witches and witchcraft. According to Kristeva, knowledge belonging to the West and Christianity is "managed by the Other, 'subject' and 'object' that push each other away, confront each other, collapse, and start again—inseparable, contaminated, condemned, at the boundary of what is assimilable, thinkable: abject" (1982, p. 18). As Kristeva claims, in Shakespearean pathos, characters that were presented as abject (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18), labelled as "demons", exist because their identification was crucial for the English society. In other words, the production of historical knowledge in Kristevan sense is *only* in terms of identifying the abject since driving the "demons" away had been a significant part of English history.

In this r*e*spect, based on mythological and iconographic footnotes, Shakespearean pathos may provide ways of manifestations of the *abject* (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18) in Renaissance theatre. Greek and Roman mythology constitutes the basis of Western culture. Shakespeare borrowed the idea of "honouring ancestors" from Publius Ovid, who himself was a follower of "emperor worship" religion (Scott, 1930, pp. 43-49). Ovid did not worship Isis, Kybele, or Dionysus, but Emperor Augustus, whose lineage was Julian Trojan (Derks, 1998, p. 30). The genealogy of the Julian family was connected to Mars and Venus, out of whom Caesars were born (Derks, 1998, p. 30). Aeneas is the most famous of them, whose mother was Venus (Derks,1998, p. 30). Therefore, it can be said that the honouring of genealogy and worshipping the emperor were the result of Rome rule under Julius Caesar. Therefore,

the idea that ancestor power should also be respected found its way in the rituals of ancestral worship and the idea of *transformation* from the practices of the Dionysian cult. According to Michael Grant, "all of us have mental and verbal symbols which we use for the concise expression of our ideas; and the myths, which seem so elaborated and complicated to us, richly fulfilled the role for the ancients" (1954, p. 231). Ovid's vivacious imagination, preoccupation with love and the supernatural (1954, p. 234) seem to have impressed Shakespeare in such a way that mythology could provide the positive source for pathetic structure in Shakespearean tragedies. However, how Shakespeare used the supernatural in Ovid may carry a hidden agenda to identify and label the demons from the old in concordance with Renaissance politics. Shakespeare's effort to produce a makeshift mirror to label the demons in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* consists of "tales of magic changes of shape" (1954, p. 231). Ovid's legendary people in mythology are "transformed into animals, or birds, trees, flowers or stones" (1954, p. 231), an idea despised in Early Modern England.

Shakespeare, similarly, does not seem to have favoured the idea of transformation, although he used it vastly in tragedies. The notion of changing shapes was initially associated with the Dionysian cult. The idea of transformation was, therefore, abhorred in Renaissance society because involvement with the supernatural was no different than siding with the devil. The Greek god Dionysus, who took different shapes of animals by imitating them for rebirth in a trance, provides one of the earliest sources to the birth of Greek drama.[3] Since Dionysus means born twice, he was able to transform himself during wine-drinking, ecstatic dancing, and animal sacrifice with his followers, who were sometimes confused with witches (Russell, 1982, p. 31). Therefore, this practice was not acceptable in Christian theology because any living being born again, like ghosts in great tragedies, was considered demonic.

In English Renaissance, there were "protestant writers who equated 'real life' fairies with demons" (Oldridge, 2016, p. 5). It was "James I who took this position in his Daemonologie (1597)" (2016, p. 5). In the Roman world, the idea of "honouring the ancestors" was not favoured much, and the culture of democracy in Rome did not provide much room for the idea.[4] However, it formed the basis of Early Modern

[3] For more information see Sevda Şenel, Dünden Bugüne Tiyatro Düşüncesi
[4] See Michael Grant, Roman Literature, 1954.

ideology that reached its peak around the perspective of the following ruler: James I, and the demonization of the practices in old cultures, notably Greek.

Similarly, society disliked witches because of their association with the supernatural. The dislike for the "witches" dates back to classical literature where characters like Medea or Circe, the sorceress (Russell, 1982, p. 31), exist. The depiction of women as abominable witches who, like Lamias in Greco-Roman thought, Lilith in Hebrew, seduced men in their sleep and killed infants. Dionysian women similarly existed as archetypes presumably to stop men from forming genealogy (Russell, 1982, p. 31). In addition, "the harsh tradition of Roman law was one of the foundations upon which medieval prosecution of witchcraft was based" (1982, p. 31).

Moreover, the linking of sorcery with witchcraft in Graeco-Roman thought is also the source of European witchcraft (Russell, 1982, p. 31). The Greek idea of *daimon*, possibly the etymological source of European demons, came to be known as ultimately having dark qualities when Plato's pupil Xenocrates "shifted the dark qualities of the gods onto demons" (Russell, 1982, p. 31). It was how the idea of bad spirits or demons came about, along with the practice of witchcraft. Consequently, the festivals of Dionysus became "a blueprint for the rites allegedly practised by the medieval witches" (Russell, 1982, p. 31). Shakespearean pathos mirrors the strong Elizabethan revolt against the idea of rebirth (in Dionysian practices) and transformation of the soul as the damnation of witches.

For this reason, Shakespeare seems to have eliminated the positive presentation of the theme of rebirth deriving from Dionysian practices because in Early Renaissance society in England, prosecution of witches was also practised.[5] The effect of Greek culture is usually dominant in Renaissance studies, although the negative presentation of transformation is visible in the mythological allusions in the four great tragedies. Description of doomed Centaurs as King Lear's daughters, Hamlet's blaming her mother for not being like Niobe, Lady Macbeth's Dionysian expression to crush her baby's head in a moment of ecstasy, and the prophecies of Macbeth's witches are all

[5] See B. Russell, Jeffrey, A History of Witchcraft, Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans, Thames and Hudson, 1980

negative examples from Greek culture. They could act as warnings that "evil doings" that existed in the past could be very harmful to English society. In this respect, in tragedies, the discriminative perspective can be traced to Shakespeare's perception of the idea of transformation and about its structure.

Pathos, in great tragedies, is crafted in such a way that it reflects the involvement and prejudices of the Protestant English society against mythological tales from the past. Therefore, "exploiting the immense tragic -sometimes comic potentialities of the myths and the moral dilemmas latent in them" (Grant, 1954, p. 231) was almost a practice. Shakespeare categorizes the mythological stories to his purpose. Mythological characters concerning the Bacchus cult and the figures who went against the genealogy of Greek Gods (like the doomed King of Lapith, who fathered Centaurs) would constitute the "abject" in Shakespearean tragedies. For example, Niobe, who finally turns to stone after crying too much because she loses all her heirs, is Hamlet's example to Queen Gertrude. Niobe respects the idea of genealogy in a kingdom. The rage of Prince Hamlet is noble (he dies as a noble without being accused of baseness), while Othello is severely condemned of the baseness of his ethnic background and a demon. Prince Hamlet's constant remembering of his father after his funeral, King Lear's building of the monument of Janus (in the history of King Leir, the old recycled text), Macbeth's foreshadowing King James I through Banquo are more or less the issues centering around the concept of honouring nobility and ancestors.

The mythological allusions in *Othello* that refer to the Middle East provide another link to the discriminative perspective of the Elizabethans because Ottomans were continually at war with Europe. The negative image of a Turk then is present in Shakespeare's *Othello* because it was openly stated by King James I in his famous poem "circumcised turban'ed Turks".[6] The word malignant was added by Shakespeare, meaning "devilish" in complete concordance with the tone of the poem. In this respect, starting Early Modern practices of the witch hunt, the English Renaissance is based on

[6] See Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor Daniel J. Vitkus Shakespeare Quarterly Vol. 48, No. 2 (Summer, 1997), pp. 145-176. For the whole text of the poem see https://www.bartleby.com/262/5.html. Please note that the word "malignant" was added to the excerpt in *Othello* by Shakespeare himself.

the elusive concept of "abject", as Kristeva claims (1982, p. 18). Transformation as the base of tragedy and the idea of worshipping ecstasy was prominently the odd one out.

Honouring ancestors, in this respect, constitutes the "fair" side of great Shakespearean tragedies because the Tudor ideology beginning with Henry VIII, very much rested on the idea of making secure connections with the distant past. King Henry VIII's politics was mostly dependent upon the king's obsession with King Arthur legend (Michelsson, 1999, p. 66). Therefore, Tudor politics embraced the idea of "honouring ancestors", although in Christianity before the Renaissance, the Roman idea of worshipping the emperor was strongly disliked as discussed by Michael Grant in *Roman Literature.* King Henry VIII aimed to break apart from the Roman Catholic Church to found the Anglican Church. Therefore, he needed ancestors from the past to legitimize his church, including King Arthur legend.[7] It was the successor of Queen Elizabeth I, King James I, who wrote a book titled *Demonology* to help his people identify demons to keep their Protestant faith safe and support his church (Mabilliard, 2000, p. 1).

In this respect, Shakespearean pathos in great tragedies reflects the diversity of views concerning the birth of tragedy (Carlevale, 2005, pp. 77-116). For some drama scholars, God Dionysus's rebirth opposing the honouring of ancestors and heroes is the beginning of structured Greek tragedy (Taplin, 2005, pp. 75-76). In *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, both stories on the Dionysian cult (the story of Centaurs) or Niobe (on honouring ancestors) are present.

Turning the other side of the coin, "the foul" in Shakespearean tragedies, namely elements of Dionysian drama, constitute the dark component of pathos because the Tudor ideology of honouring ancestors exists as the ideal. Consequently, certain characters were presented as "demons" for the very purpose of "identification of demons" in tragedies. Therefore, the focus of this study will be on the pathetic value of characters like King Lear's daughters, Queen Gertrude, Lady Macbeth, Macbeth's witches, Desdemona, and Othello. These characters act as the harmful components of the dark representation of pathos, which does not comply with the political norms of Elizabethan society. By tracing negative representations of pathos, madwomen in

[7] See Arthurian legend in the Seventeenth Century, Brinkley, Roberta Florence, 2015, Routledge

Shakespeare’s tragedies express themselves through the practices of the Bacchus cult, an inferior religious practice to "honouring the ancestors (Dodd, 2013, p.32). Characters from different ethnical groups and religions like Othello (including converts) constitute another strain of discrimination.

Similarly, by borrowing from the Greek Dionysian cult, Shakespeare's portrayal of certain women could be considered as the practice of identification of demons. For example, Lady Macbeth's portrayal as a mother who would crush her baby's head is nevertheless a demonic description of a female. It implicitly refers to the worshipping of Dionysian women who would become ecstatic and tear their baby's bodies for a possible rebirth (Tuna, 2000, p. 117). Hamlet also likens her mother to Niobe (Kybele) mockingly at his father's funeral, who later marries his uncle. Calling her mother's actions "frailty" is also a way of demonizing women that reoccurs in four tragedies. It is also critical to note that Othello's Desdemona is a demonic portrayal of a woman from the very beginning because she commits treason against her blood. However, she was the symbol of purity before losing herself to the witchcraft of Othello. In *King Lear*, for example, he calls his daughters Centaurs as if they were born out of Ixion, the doomed King of Lapith, to turn in a wheel of fire, symbolizing the dangers of ecstasy (Tuna, 2000, p. 123).

From Shakespearean perspective, King Lear's daughters who betray their fathers are relatively described as dark elements of pathos, as they scroll through the basest of human emotions that leave Lear speechless and lead him to madness. Inside madness in the Kristevan sense, there are possibilities for a study of discrimination because the presentation of madwomen like Lear's daughters or Lady Macbeth as the followers of Dionysus manifests a reason-bestial dichotomy about the dual structure of Shakespearean pathos.

Strong women in four great tragedies do not take their power from reason but from bestial emotions as threats to genealogy. In this respect, Shakespeare's portrayal of them resembles witches' magic from the Greek word *mageia*, referring to the Persian priestly caste whose practices have formed the basis of European witchcraft[8]. The mythological figures Medea and Circe have formed the basis of witchcraft in medieval

[8] See Michale D.Bailey, Historical Dictionary of Witchcraft, 2003, xxvi

Christian Europe.[9] These two figures seem to have represented the idea of witchcraft for such a long time that they almost became archetypes. Their supernatural powers consequently had them labelled as "devils" because, for early Christian authorities, magical practice "became fully demonized".[10] This was the main reason why identification of devils became a practice in English society. The witches represented so much more than "human malice"[11] in Christianity.

Othello, the Moor, for example, comes from a questionable ethnic and religious background, which may be the reason for his depiction as a black male who could conjure magic. In this respect, "honouring genealogy" means the exact opposite of old-time witches. Othello's wife, Desdemona, who betrays her father, the witches of Macbeth, Queen Gertrude, must have been gazed at as disguised faces of demons to seduce Christians in the Elizabethan perspective. Consequently, as Stephen Greenblatt suggests, the audience in Early Modern times brought the trend of getting rid of the old ways in politics to create a new society. The manifestation of self-fashioning, which is inevitably "achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile" (Greenblatt, 1980, p. 9), is worth studying. The range of demons to be identified was mostly culturally and mythologically speaking from the old (Mabilliard, 2000, 1). Shakespearean theatre, according to Dollimore, is based on a "conception of subjectivity legitimately identified in terms of a materialist perspective rather than one of essential humanism" (Dollimore, 1984, p. 249). In this respect, the theatre was in no way free of politics and prejudices of the era. As claimed by Gorley Putt, "Jacobean drama like a crucible for all the laughter, politics, agonies, ruptures, brutalities, news items and sheer nonsense and old wives tales tossed into it " (Putt, 1981, p.12) served as the source to solid black and white thinking. Therefore, if we look at the great tragedies as traces left in the crucible of history, a semiotic reading of the characters and images may reveal the structure of the English Renaissance society.

If the idea of foulness in tragedies points out "identification of demons" in the Elizabethan world, there is the dark component of pathos under the subheading of "discrimination" within the theme of the crucible. As the title of the thesis,

[9] ibid
[10] See Michale D.Bailey, Historical Dictionary of Witchcraft, 2003, xxvii
[11] See Michale D.Bailey, Historical Dictionary of Witchcraft, 2003, xxv

"Reverberations from the crucible: A translation-oriented semiotic analysis of Shakespeare's Four Great Tragedies" suggests, the image of a crucible or the cauldron, mostly used by "witches" in old times to conjure magical potions is the focus. The crucible metaphorically refers to the melting pot of the old-time witches and sorcerers. Therefore, a symbolical playing of the crucible like a bell will reveal reverberations from ancient times when magic was produced. The alternative to the classical depiction of history as the crucible, the deeper and darker resonation of the crucible of the old-time witches, from the mythological tales is the focus for a semiotic reading of the abject. Hearing the voices hushed up in Shakespearean theatre will ultimately reveal traces of the perspective that remodelled the English Renaissance society. The crucible, then, may be the source of negative mythological and iconographic depictions in Shakespearean tragedies. It also refers to the history of English drama, which serves as the background to Shakespeare's theatre. Shakespearean pathos, then, includes othering of Bacchae and the image of the crucible as the abject. A semiotic reading of the fear of the dead, witchcraft, magic, madness concerning the dark component of pathos equals to listening to the voices of demons and devils that had long been silenced. The aim of a semiotic analysis of magic as manifested in Shakespearean great tragedies is to trace the fear of the supernatural and figure how it may have been meaningful to Early Modern audience and readers. The notion seems to be long forgotten for today's readers but keeping faith and not surrendering oneself to the witches were survival issues in the Early Modern world. A semiotic reading of Shakespearean pathos and a better understanding of the supernatural in the Early Modern sense may be a good start to understand why discrimination in Shakespearean four great tragedies exists. The supernatural may not be well understood without a thorough reading of pathos. The fear and the suffering in Othello, Hamlet, Macbeth and King Lear stretch out to today's readers who may not know what to do with magic in relation to texts. It provides the starting point to understand why discrimination (as we gaze today) may have been very influential to manage people through fear and suffering. The fear of the witchcraft may be gazed as "a management system" for a country that had been through religious disputes in the time that these texts were produced. Shakespearean pathos, in this respect, partly acts like a mirror to its society because it exemplifies the labyrinths of fear made for its people, interestingly both in

pagan and Christian contexts. In the four great tragedies, the fear of the supernatural and discrimination are linked but in an implicit way. A semiotic reading of pathos may clarify what is elusive through its reading steps, one of which is discrimination.

1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this study, semiotic analysis of the four great tragedies, namely Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello and King Lear will be studied using the analytical steps below, and the translations will be evaluated based on data obtained from the application of the semiotic method. The theoretical framework for the thesis will be based on the concept of enigma (Öztürk Kasar, 2009, 170), Veridictory Modalities (Greimas and Courtés, 1982, p. 369), Jean-Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk, Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-195), Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-Subjects (Öztürk Kasar, 2007, pp. 3-6) and Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p. 154; Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) to analyse Shakespeare's four great tragedies and their translations. The possibilities of enunciation in translated literature, as well as the very essence of the sources as the background to it, will be the focus.

1.1. Enigma

Enigmas are more than details in a narrative in that they may not be easily solved or understood because they may deceptively look unimportant or taken for granted. Moreover, enigmas may exist in the text for the purpose of misleading the reader. In any case, enigmas are not easily identifiable or readily available to the reader. They sometimes function as traps to cover up a mystery that is really hard to define. In this thesis, enigmas constitute one of the steps of semiotic analysis because in Shakesperean four great tragedies, the use of enigmas is directly related to magic and witchcraft. In *Hamlet*, for example, the Ghost is a major enigma because it retains the possibility of bringing both good and evil. It is known to be apparent with the help of magic, which is also hard to define. Shakesperean pathos is never free of use of magic or witchcraft because the negative potential meaning is realized through the crucible of the witches, a collective sign for all the "magical" practices that have ever existed in history. The positive potential meaning is realized through Ovidian perspective of honouring of the ancestors, which is embodied in the character Banquo, the forefather to James I.

According to Öztürk Kasar, keeping enigmas unsolvable is a technique along with the discursive techniques such as seconding or diverting the reader to create a tension:

Enigmas affect the discursive organization of a literary text. If there are enigmas, there are also maneuvers to keep them unsolvable. Some discursive techniques contribute to this by functioning in two ways; either by seconding the reader (techniques like anticipation, bait, fusion of discourses, partial response, etc.) or by diverting the reader (techniques like lure, suspension of the truth, retarding the truth, false response, digression, silence—at the very moment when the enigma could be revealed— double meaning, equivocality, etc.). Sometimes, these techniques are used alternatively to create a tension (2009, p. 170).[12]

In the case of four great tragedies, enigmas act as traps for the readers through magic, necromancy or boiling potions in the crucible. A clear definition of such practices cannot be found in tragedies, which makes them unsolvable at times.

1.2. Veridictory Modalities

"Veridictory modalities (being and seeming) contribute to the production of meaning in the story […]. Veridictory category plays a capital role in the literary text, especially when enigmas are in question" (Öztürk Kasar, 2009, p. 169). A study of veridictory modalities in four great Shakesperean tragedies is meaningful since the pathos requires the differentiation between seeming and being because of magic:

> By seeming is meant the positive term of the schema of manifestation on the semiotic square onto which the modal category of veridication is projected. The term *seeming* is in a relation of contrariety with that of *being* (understood, in this sense, as the positive term of the schema of immanence). The double operation, which has the effect of asserting the terms of *seeming* and *being,* produces the complex veridictory term named truth (characterizing a state of which one says that it "seems" and it "is" at the same time" (Greimas, Courtés, 1982, pp. 271-272).

[12] Unless otherwise stated, the English translations of conceptual and theoretical framework of our study are taken from Associate Professor Didem Tuna's ELL 671 (Methods in Semiotics of Translation) lecture notes.

Magic may cause things or the people to look different from what they are. As an example, since magic brings about the idea of transformation, what seems evil like in the form of the Ghost father may reveal the truth about the regicide. The semiotic gap between seeming and being may be said to be exemplified most strikingly in Macbeth because what seems to be moving trees of Birnam Wood with the help of magic turns out to be the real-life soldiers who have come to put an end to the reign of King Macbeth.

1.3. Theory of Instances of Enunciation

The Theory of Instances of Enunciation can be used to analyse the immediate discourse at the time of speaking, taking in the center its producer and their state of body and mind.

Table 2: Four Components of the Enunciating Instance in the Production of Discourse

<table>
<tr>
<td rowspan="3">Domain of Autonomy of the Enunciating Instance</td>
<td>INSTANCE OF BASIS
(FUNDAMENTAL COMPONENT)
Body
Perception
Phusis/ nature/</td>
<td rowspan="2">IMMANENT INSTANCE
(IMMANENT COMPONENT)
Forces acting inside the enunciating instance:
1. Drives
2. Passions</td>
<td rowspan="3">Domain of Heteronomy of the Enunciating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILTERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCEPTUALIZING INSTANCE
(JUDGMENTAL COMPONENT)
Mind
Judgment
Logos/ mind</td>
<td>TRANSCENDENT INSTANCE
(TRANSCENDENT COMPONENT)
Forces acting on the enunciating instance:
1. of cosmic nature
2. of symbolic nature</td>
</tr>
</table>

(Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189; Tuna & Çelik, 2020, p. 18)

Coquet's theory enables both the translator and the reader to focus on the "enunciating instance" as the producer and receiver of discourse. In the domain of autonomy, the perception is achieved through five senses; in other words; the body is the gateway to the world. What is perceived through the five senses passes through a filtering process and is transformed into judgment in the mind as conceptualizing instance. In the heteronomy domain, drives and passions as forces acting from inside and those of cosmic and symbolic nature acting from outside are involved (Öztürk

Kasar, 2012, p. 430). All these fundamental, judgmental, immanent and transcendent components have a contribution to make in the production and reception of discourse.

Producer and receiver of a discourse may behave in different ways based on the interference of the above-mentioned factors. Coquet's division of instances into three as subjects, non-subjects, and quasi-subjects (Coquet, 2007, p. 37; Coquet, 2020; Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189) enables the reader to analyse the mental states of the speakers through individual and mutual speeches, diction, register, broken sentences and positionality of speakers:

Subject: Instance behaving consciously and facultatively and capable to make judgments. They say and assume the responsibility of their discourse.

Quasi-Subject: Instance placed in the stage of passage between the subject capable to make judgments and the non-subject devoid of this capability. The subject waking up because of a nightmare can be defined within this context. The quasi subject becomes subject as soon as they regain consciousness.

Non-subject: Instance leaving their position of a consciously and facultatively meaning-producing one. They temporarily or permanently lose their capability to judge and cannot assume their words.

Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189) is significant in the semiotic reading of pathos in four great Shakesperean tragedies because the connections between enunciating instances produce the tension in the tragedies. Moreover, the transcendent instance of both cosmic and symbolic nature is the sphere that magic is born out of. It was believed that good or bad fortune were both given by gods that are today known to be belonging to mythological stories. In *King Lear*, for example, the protagonist relies on cosmic nature in verbal expression because there are many references to the forces above him like Jupiter or Hecate. On the symbolic level, King Lear is a fallen king who ultimately turned into "nothing", which may have deeper philosophical inclinations.

1.4. Typology of Non-Subjects

Because of the immanent and transcendent components affecting their perceptions and judgments, the enunciating instance may no longer be able to behave

consciously and facultatively. In other cases, the subject may be devoid of the capability to judge because of a disease, because of the influence of some substances or by nature. According to the typology of non-subjects propounded by Öztürk Kasar (2017, pp. 190-194) the situations that may transform a subject into a non-subject are classified as follows:

- Absence or insufficiency of consciousness (children: until about 7 years-old)
- Lack of consciousness due to pathological situation (mental patients, individuals with Down's syndrome or autism, sleepwalkers, loss of consciousness because of psychological shocks)
- State of being out of consciousness because of medicinal substances (Patients under anesthesia, state of delirium before waking up from anesthesia, patients using medicine that causes delirium or suicidal tendency)
- State of being out of consciousness because of some chemical substances (drunken or intoxicated people, those using drugs or substances causing addiction)
- States causing physical instability (states originating from an immanent instance of drive-type -such as hallucination or long term hunger and thirst causing delirium or disorders caused by hormone level changes- / states originating from an immanent instance of passion-type -such as euphoria, dysphoria, physical instabilities caused by vertigo, nausea, car sickness or sea sickness, physical instabilities caused by a transcendent instance and cosmic phenomena that change the subject's mood and hence their judgments
- State of submissiveness to a transcendent instance (religion, society with its general acceptances, party in some countries, blood feud, vendetta, "honor" killings, suicide bombers, questionings under pressure or torture, people under hypnosis or in trance and those who believe in black magic)
- Robotized subject (those repeating their owner's voice like a parrot or programmed to accomplish a duty like a robot without asking any questions)

- An identity reduced to one single function "form-subject" (institutional form-subject: those who give up everything to devote their lives to an institutional -political, religious, etc- mission such as friars, nuns, monks, etc. / individual form-subject: those who give up everything else to devote their lives to an individual mission such as a mother devoting her life to her handicapped child)

The classification shows that it is important to evaluate the discourse based on its producer and context. The analysis of the "metamorphoses" of characters in four great tragedies is dependent on how individual and mutual speeches are analysed. It is critical to analyse the mental states of protagonists in each tragedy through their discourses, like in Lady Macbeth's famous scene, that reveal the explicit non-subject. King Lear as a character, for example, sways from being a subject to a non-subject in the fourth act. Coquet's classification of subjects (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-190) is eligible for the analyses of mental states and positionality of speakers which is prone to change, based on diction, register, broken sentences, etc. However, expecting the display of explicit non-subject may be a mistake because the "journey" that turns the protagonist from a subject to a non-subject is equally critical to the semiotic reading of pathos.

1.5. Systematics of Designification in Translation

Systematics of Designification in Translation (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p. 154; Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) is a classification of semantic changes through nine steps, going from over-interpretation of the meaning to wiping- out of the meaning, showing translator's tendencies to transform the meaning in translation at different levels and with different results.

Table 3: Systematics of Designification in Translation

	DESIGNIFICATIVE TENDENCIES	OPERATIONS	RESULTS	FIELD OF SIGNIFICATION
1	**Over-interpretation of the meaning**	Producing an excessive commentary on the meaning of the original text or making explicit a meaning that is implicit in the original text	Excessive translation Excessive meaning	MEANING (Within the field of meaning of the sign)

2	**Darkening of the meaning**	Making ambiguous or obscure a meaning that is clear in the original text	Ambiguous meaning	
3	**Under-interpretation of the meaning**	Providing incomplete information, producing insufficient meaning	Incomplete translation Insufficient meaning	
4	**Sliding of the meaning**	Producing a possible meaning that is potential but not actualized in the context of the original text or creating a connotation not evoked by the original text	Other meaning	PERI-MEANING (At the limits of the field of meaning of the sign)
5	**Alteration of the meaning**	Producing a false meaning that is not completely irrelevant to the meaning in the original text	False meaning	
6	**Opposition of the meaning**	Producing a meaning that is contrary to the meaning in the original text	Opposing meaning	
7	**Perversion of the meaning**	Producing a meaning that is totally irrelevant to the meaning in the original text	Anti-meaning	MEANINGLESSNESS (Outside the field of meaning of the sign)
8	**Destruction of the meaning**	Producing an utterance that is devoid of meaning; in this case, meaning is out of the question, but there is some residue of the intended translation material.	Meaninglessness	
9	**Wiping out of the meaning**	Wiping out of the significative unit. This tendency leads to the absence of translation. This is the complete elimination of the formation of sign and meaning, where no traces of the meaning remain and the sign is completely wiped out.	Non-translation Absence of sign	

Systematics of Designification in Translation (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p. 154) is eligible for use in evaluating the source and target texts comparatively to see to what extent the signs constituting the original text are reflected in translation. The systematics is especially meaningful for the comparative semiotic reading of Shakesperean pathos in the source and target texts within the framework of this study as well as the double-meaning and elusiveness in Shakespearean verbal expressions. In relation to the pathos in tragedies, the signs concerning magic, madness, transformation, collectively the crucible signs and their translations may be evaluated

and re-evaluated in terms of designification, to spot the meaning transformations and their consequences in the target texts.

2. A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *OTHELLO*

2.1. Summary of *Othello*

Before Othello begins his relationship with Desdemona, Roderigo has been courting with her. One night, Iago warns Roderigo that Desdemona has secretly married Othello. Iago is furious with Othello for disregarding him for a lieutenant's job. Instead, Othello chose Michael Cassio, and Iago cannot stand this. Iago urges Roderigo to hope to get the love of Desdemona. He knows Senator Brabantio, Desdemona's father, who is charmed by Othello's orientalist tales but after Desdemona elopes with Othello, he starts to consider Othello as the other and develops hatred. Iago and Roderigo wake Brabantio and talk about the escape of Desdemona. The father calls soldiers to arrest Othello. At that moment, Brabantio is going to a night meeting of the Senate because of the Turkish invasion fleet in Cyprus.

Brabantio urges the council to take revenge on Othello, but he has just been announced as commander of the soldiers to fight against the Turks. Othello explains how his military success affected Desdemona and helped with the pursuit of her love. Desdemona later defends her marriage, and she goes with Othello to Cyprus. Lieutenant Cassio escorts her with Emilia, Iago's wife.

Othello announces that the Turkish fleet was taken over by the sea storm, and they will have a celebration. Roderigo understands that he lost Desdemona, but Iago tells him to challenge Cassio. Montano, the governor, is wounded while protecting Cassio. Othello accuses Cassio and rips him off his official title.

The next day, Cassio asks Desdemona's help to get his title back, who agrees to help. Iago tries to poison Othello's mind by stating that Desdemona's interest in Cassio is meaningful. Othello ultimately gets furious when Desdemona cannot find the first gift (a handkerchief) with strawberry motifs on it. The handkerchief was given to Othello by her mother in her deathbed as a legacy. Iago had convinced Emilia, his wife, to take it. Iago secretly hides Desdemona's handkerchief, which is later

discovered by Cassio. When Desdemona asks Othello to give Cassio's title back, he suspects her betrayal. Iago and Othello listen to a talk between Cassio and his mistress, Bianca, when he gives it to Bianca to copy. Othello's anger causes an epileptic fit and ultimately orders Iago to kill Cassio. Desdemona fails to understand Othello's mood change as he strikes Desdemona. She sings her famous "Willow Song" to mourn the death of her husband's love before sleep.

Meanwhile, Iago persuades Roderigo to attack Cassio. He secretly wounds Cassio and accuses Roderigo of killing him. Othello, then, comes to his sleeping wife's bedroom to strangle her with a pillow for committed adultery. Everybody comes to the murder scene as Othello defends himself. It is Emilia who ultimately comprehends what has happened before being stabbed and killed by Iago. He is arrested and sent to trial after Othello wounds him and commits suicide. The play ends with Cassio's commencement of his status as Governor of Cyprus.

2.2. Enigmas in *Othello* and its Translations

Enigmas in Shakespeare's tragedies will be studied because they are directly related to pathos as feelings of fear, pity, and sorrow take over the reader. The feelings revolving around enigmas are describable. Regarding the level of intensity, readers may concentrate on enigmas not because they realize pathetic structure of the tragedies but because "dual" nature of Shakespearean pathos attracts them. Therefore, how enigmas are functioning in a literary text is mostly dependent upon how readers perceive them. It is, therefore, worth using Table of Designificative Tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) as a guide in this context. Enigmas in narration may act as traps that the writer sets up for the readers rather than the main characters. They may be studied using the method both for literary and translation analyses. It is critical to use semiotic analysis when enigmas are modelled around mythology and iconography because the anticipation of good or evil is directly related to what is "elusive" in such stories. Anachronism in an old text, similarly, contributes to the construction of enigmas because there is always a precedent to the story which could have cuddled up either good or evil like in mythological and iconographic images:

> It is just as obvious that in the classical narrative, on the other hand, reconstitution is most often not only possible, because in those texts narrative

> discourse never inverts the order of events without saying so, but also necessary, and precisely for the same reason: when a narrative segment begins with an indication like "Three months earlier, ..." we must take into account both that this scene comes after in the narrative, and that it is supposed to have come before in the story: each of these, or rather the relationship between them (of contrast or of dissonance), is basic to the narrative text, and suppressing this relationship by eliminating one of its members is not only not sticking to the text, but is quite simply killing it (Genette, 1983, p. 35).

It is not possible to predict whether what is anticipated will come true or not, also because of the very nature of enigmas. It is claimed by Sündüz Öztürk Kasar that the relationship between enigmas and the discursive organization of a literary text is inseparable:

> Enigmas affect the discursive organization of a literary text. If there are enigmas, there are also maneuvers to keep them unsolvable. Some discursive techniques contribute to this by functioning in two ways; either by seconding the reader (techniques like anticipation, bait, fusion of discourses, partial response, etc.) or by diverting the reader (techniques like lure, suspension of the truth, false response, digression, silence-at the very moment when enigma could be revealed-double meaning, equivocality, etc.) Sometimes, these techniques are used alternatively to create a tension (Öztürk Kasar, 2009, p. 170).

While considering enigmas, it is a must to consider narrative structure(s) because they may come up as a surprise like Othello's death. Death, for Othello, is an enigmatic element, which surprises the reader at the end because "evil ends in evil" in Shakespearean pathos. The suicide of the Venetian general in public after the murder of Desdemona is striking enough to claim Othello's relationship with the evil. The discriminative gaze of Iago or Othello's strained relationship with his past is worth

considering in this respect. Therefore, Othello's character portrayal as torn between retrospection and anticipation constitutes the discursive pattern of the text. Inescapably, his perception of reality is on two opposite poles as his anticipation of a bright future of the Venetian general clashes with the nostalgia. He is almost tied to his dead mother's apron strings which is the basis to his psychology:

That handkerchief
Did an Egyptian to my mother give,
She was a charmer and could almost read
The thoughts of people. She told her, while she kept it.
'Twould make her amiable and subdue my father
Entirely to her love; but if she lost it
Or made a gift of it, my father's eye
Should hold her loathed and his spirits should hunt
After new fancies. She, dying, gave it me
And bid me, when my fate would have me wive.
To give it her. I did so, and – take heed on't!
Make it a darling, like your precious eye! –
To lose't or give't away were such perdition
As nothing else could match. 3.4. (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 244-245)

The inability to live as a character leads him to make ambiguous relationships with the past, present, and future. All of that finally leads to the cruel murder of his wife:

What noise is this? Not dead? not yet quite dead?
I that am cruel am yet merciful,
I would not have thee linger in thy pain.
So, so. 5.2. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 312)

It is also possible to say that the effect of discriminative strains of Venetian society is directly related to anticipation in the text. General Othello's inability to have a balance of the past, present, and future is worth considering in this respect. His psychology is the production of a fantasy of taking past, present, and the future relationships for granted as if his insight is crystal clear because "the very ideas of retrospection or anticipation, which ground the narrative categories of analepsis and

prolepsis in "psychology" take for granted a perfectly clear temporal consciousness and unambiguous relationships among present, past and the future" (Genette,1983, pp. 78-79).

In connection to Othello's fight with the concepts of death and evil, an enigma in the text is his destiny. In fact, in Othello's case, perdition is the major enigmatic element. The elusiveness of evil in the Renaissance gaze adds to the fear of the perdition of Othello. Therefore, evil remains an enigma to the end, with considerable effect on suspense. Enigmas in Othello, on the other hand, are not easily describable like in the example of Hamlet's ghost father. Therefore, the identification of evil remains a mystery to the end. The enigma in the text is related to the revelations of who "will end in evil".

The examples of description and manifestation of evil in the text are visible in their relation to enigmas. It is possible to say that the description of evil in the text is introduced to the reader by the character Iago, who warns Desdemona's father, Brabantio, on the evil consummation of Desdemona and Othello. His mixture of obscene vocabulary and devilish jargon in Christianity suggests awaking "the snorting citizens with the bell" (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 122) because this marriage by nature is against their religion. Therefore, the townsfolk rise to drive the devil away with the church bell as the reverberations from it tells them to.

It is a big warning for the citizens because Venetian genealogy would get destroyed when the devil will make a grandsire of Brabantio. In this case, Iago's conflicting descriptions of Othello's position both as a Venetian general and "a devilish" character who steals the daughter of a true Venetian by his questionable ethnical past is against the anticipation of the reader. Brabantio cannot verbally express his reasons to oppose to the marriage but echoes Iago's implicit description of Othello as a devil like a parrot. What the reader would typically expect from a father whose daughter marries a man that he does not want, is to list his reasons why he does not choose to have the mighty general of Venice as his son-in-law. On the contrary, Brabantio quickly yields to Iago's description of Othello as the devil. The crucible imagery is at work in the background of the text.

Similarly, he reacts against the marriage, by calling him "too true an evil, gave she is (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 126). It is the moment when the Venetian Duke announces that there is a Turkish threat for the whole Mediterranean, including the holy land Cyprus, Venetians feel obliged to choose between "devils". As Ottomans are more significant threats to their society than Othello, they opt for him for the perilous position as the protector of the second Jerusalem, Cyprus. It shows how opportunist Venetian politics were useful in that society, even when it comes to opposing an unwanted member. Contrary to the anticipation of readers, as enigmas are traps set for the readers rather than the characters, Venetian citizens quickly take the side of Othello, just because of the urgent defence of the second holy place in Christianity. It is then possible to claim that the *devil* in Venice changes shape according to the wishes of their politicians in the background of Shakespeare's Othello.

Although Othello is the protector, Iago is not satisfied with the way that Venetian state embraces "the devil" to drive "Ottomans" away. He insists on calling Othello devil partly because he is not happy with his choices as a general:

> For 'Certes,' says he,
> 'I have already chose my officer.'
> And what was he?
> Forsooth, a great arithmetician,
> One Michael Cassio, a Florentine,
> A fellow almost damned in a fair wife
> That never set a squadron in the field
> Nor the division of a battle knows
> More than a spinster – unless the bookish theoric,
> Wherein the toged consuls can propose
> As masterly as he. Mere prattle without practice
> Is all his soldiership – but he, sir, had th'election
> And I, of whom his eyes had seen the proof
> At Rhodes, at Cyprus and on other grounds,
> Christian and heathen, must be be-leed and calmed
> By debitor and creditor. This counter-caster
> He, in good time, must his lieutenant be

And I, God bless the mark, his Moorship's ancient! 1.1. (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 116-117)

Iago is a severe critic of the marriage between Desdemona and Othello as a manipulator because his constant allusions on the colour of Othello's skin and the general's blurry genealogy reveals the discriminative perspective of Venice on the outsiders. The discriminative gaze of Venice is embodied in Iago when they all move to Cyprus. Presumably, Iago considers the Venetian state as siding with the devil Othello. He severely criticizes Othello's picking of Cassio as his ancient. Contrary to the anticipation of the readers, Iago is both against Othello and the Venetian state, and he goes on echoing discriminative jargon of Venice streets. He does not want to side with the state, either. When he negotiates with Roderigo on Desdemona's love, he refers to the blackness of the devil again in his expression "Her eye must be fed, and what delight shall she have to look on the devil" (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 177). Although Desdemona's priority is "his visage in his mind" (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 151), she cannot convince anybody. Iago goes on extracting poison from countless descriptions and allusions to the devil through Othello.

Iago's concoction of poison out of discriminatory discourse is effective because Venetian soldiers and its people are familiar with the jargon. It is the common ground for the enunciation in the text as well as the source of enigmas. As the peak of opposite poles in the text, Desdemona's pious and patriotic character is the target. It is because Iago's description of malice is a combination of good Desdemona and evil Othello, and the future of the couple is not predictable. The end of Othello and Desdemona's marriage is contrary to the anticipations of the reader because they can overcome hardships in corrupt Venice but get drowned in the holy land Cyprus. If the people of Venice in Cyprus had not internalized Iago's descriptions good and evil manifested Christian society, there would be no tragedy of *Othello*. The descriptions of evil in the readers' minds may be a game changer for the reading of the whole tragedy.

Contrary to the expectations of modern readers again, Iago's implicit efforts to drive the devil(s) away from society in Venice are effective because his target audience (the townsfolk in Venice) is obsessed with distinguishing good from evil. Therefore, enigmas in *Othello* are directly linked with the identification of Othello and Desdemona as evil. Iago is sure that his traps will "catch-all" because driving the devil

away itself is an enigma. Obsessed with evil, Venetian society is in so much fear that the threat of Turks is visible in the text. The fear manifests itself almost as the embodiment of hell for them. Consequently, Desdemona's innocence yields to malice:

> Divinity of hell! When the devils will the blackest sins put on,
> They do suggest at first with heavenly shows
> As I do now. For whiles this honest fool
> Plies Desdemona to repair his fortune,
> And she for him pleads strongly to the Moor,
> I'll poor pestilence into his ear:
> That she repeals him for her body's lust.
> And by how much she strives to do him good
> She shall undo her credit with the Moor-
> So will I turn her virtue into pitch
> And out of her own goodness make the net
> That shall enmesh them all. 2.3. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 202)

The blurry descriptions of evil as the mixture of good and evil are so strikingly intimidating that, to drive the perdition away, enigmatically, Othello victimizes Desdemona. Desdemona's good intentions mix with evil as the play goes on. Othello's Venetian side fails to see her innocence in adultery because the poison does not only work on Othello. It is the societal norms based on black and white thinking rooted in a continuous search of evil. On Iago's terms, Desdemona's innocence is just another example of evil at work because it disguises itself in the form of good behavior of a woman. In such a society, Desdemona does not have any chance to defend herself because the Venetians do not severely criticise Iago and Othello's descriptions of her as a woman without integrity on the island.

Othello's association with witchcraft at the beginning of the text is also contrary to the anticipations of the readers. It is also the sword of Damocles of Desdemona because the societal norms of Venice act on suspicion of the devil rather than the proof. Othello's anger and his distant ethnical relations make him a strong candidate for the association with the devil and witchcraft. Therefore, Iago, to make himself accountable to others, needs to stress that he is a man of sanity and in no way associated with the devil: "Thou know'st we work by wit and not by witchcraft" (Shakespeare, 1997, p.

203). Then, it becomes easier for him to convince people that evil is away from him. As a result, his society's constant effort to drive evils away makes a catastrophic combination of potions for Othello's mind:

The Moor already changes with my poison
Dangerous conceits are in their nature poisons.
Which at first are scarce found to distaste
But with a little art upon the blood
Burn like mines of sulphur. 3.3.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 229)

It is Desdemona who first senses the dangers of Othello's troubled mind because she has an idea of innocent love. Presumably, she seems to know the devil that strangles her: "Heaven keep that monster from Othello's mind" (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 251).

However, Desdemona's prayers are not enough to drive devils away from Othello's mind because, under Iago's manipulative tactics, along with the discriminative gaze of the Venetian society, his mind becomes a battleground for the fight between good and evil. He religiously sticks to the descriptions of Iago about Desdemona and looks for evil inside her. It is then presumable that he will convince himself about finding evil:

This argues fruitfulness and liberal heart,
Hot, hot, and moist. This hand of yours requires
A sequester from liberty, fasting and prayer
Much castigation, exercise devout.
For here's a young and sweating devil, here
That commonly rebels. 3.4. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 243)

He ultimately comes up with confessions as proof of adultery because there seems to be none as far as Desdemona's and Cassio's relationship is concerned. Interestingly, his search for proof resembles the way that priests blame the witches and then make them confess without proof. Most certainly, after the confessions, most witches were hanged, if not burnt at stake. Finding the proof for adultery not committed by Desdemona and Cassio is as impossible as priests trying to find proof for witchcraft. Therefore, the general sees the handkerchief as the magical way to

extract the truth from Desdemona's mouth. Othello's pain intensifies as his imagination tortures him by scenes from sexual intercourse between Cassio and Desdemona:

> Handkerchief! Confessions! Handkerchief! -To confess and be hanged for his labour! First to be hanged, and then confess: I tremble at it. Nature would not invest herself in such shadowing passion without some instruction. It is not words that shake me thus. Pish! Noses, ears, and lips. Is it possible? Confess! Handkerchief! O devil! 4.1. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 256)

It is not clear whether it is Iago, the character portrayed as "the evil of evils" who is going to face an evil fate, the Venetian state, Desdemona, Cassio, or Othello himself. It is highly predictable that Desdemona will get killed because women who are "suspects" in adultery stories are likely to lose their lives because of the stigma itself. Desdemona's death is predictable by the audience because adultery is a common concept in patriarchal societies. It is also predictable that Cassio is likely to get killed because it was claimed by Othello that he is involved in adultery. The rest is dependent on how the writer will present enigmas to the reader.

Table 4: Example 1 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Othello: That handkerchief	**Othello:** Bu çok kötü.
Did an Egyptian to my mother give,	O mendili bir çingene kadın anneme vermiş.
She was a charmer and could almost read	Kadın büyücüymüş, düşünceleri okuyabilirmiş.
The thoughts of people. She told her, while she kept it.	Anneme demiş ki, "Bu mendil sende olduğu sürece
' Twould make her amiable and subdue my father	Kocan seni hep sevecek,
Entirely to her love, but if she lost it	Gözü senden başkasını görmeyecek.
Or made a gift of it, my father's eye	Ama onu kaybeder veya başkasına verirsen
Should hold her loathed and his spirits should hunt	Kocan senden soğuyacak ve yeni aşklar arayacak."
After new fancies. She, dying, gave it me	Annem de ölürken o mendili bana verdi
And bid me when my fate would have me wive.	Ve dedi ki, "Gün gelip evlendiğinde bunu karına ver."
To give it her. I did so, and – take heed on't!	Ben de öyle yaptım,
Make it a darling, like your precious eye! –	Onu sevgilin bil ve gözün gibi sakın diye.
To lose't or give't away were such perdition	

As nothing else could match. 3.4 (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 244)	O mendili kaybetmek veya başkasına vermek Eşi benzeri görülmedik bir uğursuzluk getirir. (Shakespeare, 2018, p.120)
TT2 **Othello:** Hata: O mendili Bir Mısırlı vermiş anneme, Büyücüymüş, neredeyse insanın aklından geçeni okurmuş; Anneme dediğine göre, yanında bulundukça Sevimli kalırmış Büsbütün bağlarmış kendine; ama yitirirse, Ya da armağan ederse birine, Babam onu hor görürmüş, Gönlü yeni arzular peşine düşermiş. Annem onu ölürken bana verdiydi, Bir gün karım olursa, ona vermemi söylediydi o mendili. Ben de öyle yaptım. Ona dikkat et, gözbebeğin gibi koru; Eşi görülmedik bir yıkım olur Onu yitirmek ya da başkasına vermek. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 75)	**TT3.** **Othello:** İyi etmemişsin. O mendili bir Mısırlı vermiş anneme, büyücü bir kadın. Herkesin aklından geçeni okuyan biri. Verirken demiş ki, annem o mendili yanında taşıdıkça kocasına güzel görünecek, babamın da sevgisi gün geçtikçe artacak. Öyle söylemiş. Ama annem onu kaybeder ya da birine hediye ederse kocasının gözünden düşecekmiş. Büyülü bir mendil. Annem ölürken bana verdi onu. Eğer evlenirsem karıma vereyim istedi. Ben de öyle yaptım. Onun için dikkat et; gözbebeğin gibi koru o mendili. Eşi görülmemiş bir felaket olur onu kaybetmek; ya da bir başkasına vermek. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 54)
TT4 **Othello:** İyi etmemişsin. O mendili anneme bir Mısırlı vermiş. Büyücü imiş ve insanın aklından geçenlerin hemen hepsini söyleyebilirmiş. Anneme o mendil yanında bulundukça sevimli kalacağını ve babamı tamamen kendine bağlı tutacağını; fakat onu kaybeder yahut birine hediye ederse babamın onu sevmez olup yeni arzular peşinde koşacağını söylemiş. Annem ölürken bu mendili bana verdi; kısmet olup evlendiğim zaman onu karıma vermemi istedi. Ben de sözümü tuttum. Ona dikkat et, gözbebeğin gibi koru. Onu kaybetmek yahut başkasına vermek, benzeri görülmemiş bir felaket olur. **(**Shakespeare, 1996, p. 79**)**	**Proposed Translation** **Othello:** Kusur işlemişsin. O mendili anneme veren kadın, o kadar iyi bir biliciymiş ki, neredeyse insanın ciğerini okurmuş. Anneme o mendil elinde oldukça, çekici görünüp babamı elinde tutacağını söylemiş. Ancak kaybederse ya da hediye verirse, Babamın artık ona tiksinerek kem gözle bakacağını ve Kötü ruhların etkisinde başka zevkler peşinde koşacağını söylemiş. Ölüm döşeğinde mendili bana verirken söz verdirdi Eğer evlenme talihine erişirsem, karıma vermemi söyledi. Ben de öyle yaptım, dikkatli ol. Gözbebeğin gibi koru onu. Onu birini verir ya da kaybedersen, ölmekten beter olursun. Eşsiz bir mendildir o.

The context in Table 4 and its translations is the description of the supernatural in Othello's gaze. Contrary to Brabantio's description of love charms as tokens of evil magic, he associates himself with a kind of magic that was passed onto him by his mother. In this context, the handkerchief is a sign that can be considered as an enigma because it is associated with magic and the future of the couple. In the first original text and its translations, it is possible to see that the translation of the "Egyptian charmer" is critical. Translating the Egyptian charmer as "büyücü" (magician) in TT1, TT2, TT3 and TT4 may be considered as under-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Egyptian charmer could well be an allusion to Egyptian Sybil in the following lines of Othello's speech that makes the mythological and iconographical knowledge visible. Sybils were mythical women, mainly from the Mediterranean, including North Africa (there was a Libyan Sybil). They had the gift of prophecy and furious and abandoned in love. They had the gift of eternal life but not eternal youth (Hadfield, 2017, p. 295). The charmer, in this respect, may be a follower of the Egyptian Sybil, who had served the temple of Apollo to be seized by him in the state of prophetic fury (Hadfield, 2017, p. 295). Although Othello calls her Egyptian, she is also called the Palestinian and the Babylonian Sybil, whose name covers a vast geographical area (Hadfield, 2017, p. 295). The connotations of the word Sybil, *sibulla* in Greek,[13] meaning the prophet, is worth considering in this respect. The words charmer may be replaced by the word "bilici" in Turkish[14] , which is also an allusion to wise women in Anatolia. In this respect, the theme of prophecy will also be covered in the translation. The translation of the word takes us to the link with the Anatolian sibylline oracles. The Hellespont is the eighth[15], which is the most famous of them.

In English, the word charm is also connected to sexual attractiveness, which takes us mythologically to the love goddess Venus, who also inhabits in Cyprus and uses the strawberry symbol for love like in the handkerchief of Othello sewn by a Sybil. The Egyptian Sybil and the charmer then could well be belonging to the same

13 www.shakespeareswords.com

14 For the mythological connection between Cybele the wise woman, Artemis, Diana and the Nordic Edda, see Daughters of the Inquisition: Medieval Madness: Origins and Aftermath by Christina Crawford

15 For more information see The Elements of History from the Creation of the World, to the Reign of Constantine the Great by William Howell

Apollonian cult. In either case, both the mythological and iconographic depth in translations may be worth looking at. In this respect, the relationship between the word "bilici" and the Anatolian cult of Cybele is worth considering with a special emphasis on Othello's association with his mother's culture.

In the translation TT2, "charmer" was translated as "büyücü" in Turkish, a word that could have negative connotations and an insult in Turkish. Desdemona's father openly accuses Othello of witchcraft (büyücü) that refers to dark magic condemned by monotheistic religions. Othello clearly respects the magic of the old woman, and his word choice describes a charmer as a follower of the Sybil. It also points to a detail often overlooked in *Othello* readings. Othello's deep psychic connection with the charmer may give us hints about how he sees both the island of Venus and love. Magic and love, in Othello's eyes, is related to the frenzy Egyptian Sybil and the Roman god Apollo. In this respect, studying the limbo world of love and hatred in his soul has its roots in both mythology and iconography. Othello's hatred of "being a horned man" in mythological terms refers to Apollo's daughter Diana's transformation of Acteon into a "horned man" upon seeing the goddess naked.[16] Diana is the opposite of Venus, and Dionysus, who is the half-brother to Apollo, effeminate wine god with horns in his head turns into a subject of mockery in this respect.[17]

Interestingly, Shakespeare chooses to link Othello's heart into the Apollonian cult as well as cult of Venus but not to Libyan Sybil and the cult of Zeus-Amun Ra, symbolized by a ram with horns.[18] Shakespeare's perspective in Othello, therefore, is very Roman because the Greek gods Dionysus and his followers were damned in the great tragedies rather than respected. It may be challenging to get clear on how Othello sees the magic of old women because Shakespeare's use of mythology is on a dual basis. It may be worth remembering that Othello's deep psychic connections relate to Apollo rather than Dionysus.

[16] See *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* by Alan Cameron (p.281)
[17] For more information on the cults of Apollo v.s. Dionysus see Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy* and George Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens*
[18] Here it is critically important to see the connection between the Libyan sybill as the oldest of all, In and the cult of Zeus-Amun-Ra. the mother of Libyan sybill is said to be Posedion's daughter Lamia and Zeus is the father. See *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* by Alan Cameron (p.120)

In TT1, on the other hand, the word "çingene", meaning gypsy in Turkish was preferred with a footnote to clarify how Egyptians were understood in Shakespeare's time. TT1 word choice is out of the mythological and iconographic understanding of the Sybils. However, it is an interpretation from the form of the word in Shakespeare's time, and it was supported with a footnote. The word "çingene" in Turkish may have negative connotations, it would be a sliding of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Connotations of the word as well its relation to Othello's immanent instance could be worth considering.

Another word to focus concerning the translations above is that concerning Othello's father, "his spirits " description is wholly erased in all translations, and there is wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) in all translations. The description is critical in terms of mythology because clearly "bad spirits" are the focus. It is possible to claim that the charmer refers to dysdemons in Greek mythology, which the modern English word demon may be a derivative of. 19 Although eudemons were good spirits in Greek mythology, it may have later formed into the word demon, a word that is also existent in Desdemona's name (Deis+Demon). When bad spirits are not translated, they cause a wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), leaving the whole mythological connections, that could reveal the roots of Othello's conflicts aside. In the light of the prophecy of the Sybil and the charmer, the husband would be hunted by bad spirits when the handkerchief of love-charm, bearing the symbol of Venus, is lost. In the gaze of the English Renaissance, there are stereotypical women demonized as the followers of Dionysus but not Apollo. Othello's Sybil, then, is not an evil spirit seized by Apollo. The bad spirits belonged to the Dionysian cult because the followers are free women with their uncontrolled powers of prophecy.

The interpretation of the word Sybil will also tell us a lot about translators' choices. In other words, it is dependent on the translator to decide whether Sybils are associated with evil or not. The negative portrayal of wise women from old cultures, such as in Othello's deep connections with the North-African culture of his mother, is critical in the construction of meaning. The same is valid for the concept of

19 For more information see *The Oxford Handbook of Happiness*. Susan A. David, Ilona Boniwell, Amanda Conley Ayers (Eds).

womanhood in the text because whether to see it as evil or not is critical. If we look at how Venetian women are discriminated in the text for evil doings in the Christian gaze, the most striking examples are from Iago, who is the over-ambitious soldier of Othello. He does not hesitate to use an image of unmarried women to insult Cassio for his unmanly behaviour of bookishness. Cassio's intelligibility is insulted through women who did not choose to marry. Such women would have implicitly gazed as outsiders of society. Therefore, the translation of the word "spinster" is critical because it also has the potential to reveal the translator's perspective of the discriminative gaze in the text. Translation of the allusion to Cassio "almost damned in a fair wife" requires an analysis of how Iago uses womanhood to insult men in the text.

In the excerpts below, the translation comparison analysis, the focus will be on the images that Iago uses, to belittle Cassio, the lieutenant. One of them is the image of a spinster that he used as a derogative word for unmarried women. Looking at how discriminative discourse manifests itself in Iago's talk will reveal that spinsters are secret threats to the very order of male-dominated societies. Therefore, the use of female imagery between Iago and Cassio's ego gratification and translations are critical to their relationships within the concept of the crucible of the witches. The demonized people, cultures, and forms of worshipping seem to be up in the sleeve of Iago, mirroring the simmering structure of Venetian culture. Unmarried women, spinsters, in that respect, echo witches in Iago's portrayal.

Table 5: Example 2 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Iago: For 'Certes,' says he,	**Iago:** "Ben"demiş, "yaverimi çoktan seçtim"
'I have already chose my officer.'	Kimmiş peki seçtiği adam?
And what was he?	Hesapçının teki.
Forsooth, a great arithmetician,	Michael Cassio diye bir Floransalı.
One Michael Cassio, a Florentine,	Fettan bir yosmayla başı belada.
A fellow almost damned in a fair wife	Savaş alanına tek bir birlik sokmamış.
That never set a squadron in the field	Ev kadınları ordu düzeninden ne kadar anlarsa
Nor the division of a battle knows	O da o kadar anlıyor. Ama teorik bilgi dersen onda bol.
More than a spinster – unless the bookish theoric,	Toga'lı senatörler bile kat kat iyidir ondan.
Wherein the toged consuls can propose	Laf bol, eylem sıfır. Askerliği bu kadar.
As masterly as he. Mere prattle without practice	

Is all his soldiership – but he, sir, had th'election And I, of whom his eyes had seen the proof At Rhodes, at Cyprus and on other grounds, Christian and heathen, must be be-leed and calmed By debitor and creditor. This counter-caster He, in good time, must his lieutenant be And I, God bless the mark, his Moorship's ancient! 1.1 (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 116-117)	Ama sonunda seçilen o oldu. Oysa benim askerlik becerimi sınamadığı yer kalmamıştı Othello'nun: Rodos'ta, Kıbrıs'ta, her yerde, Hristiyan'ın, imansızın karşısında Gördü beni. Ama sonuçta ne yaptı? Rüzgarımı kesti, o yaz bozcuya karşı Elimi kolumu bağladı. Anlayacağın yaverlik bu musahip bozuntusuna kaldı. Bana da Tanrı'nın işine bak, Mağripli hazretlerinin bayraktarlığı düştü. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 20)
TT2 **Iago:** "Açıkçası" diyor, "Ben seçtim subayımı." Seçtiği de kim? Büyük bir hesapçı, doğrusu, Michael Cassio diye biri, Floransalı, Güzel bir kadın yüzünden neredeyse başı dertte; Hiçbir bölüğün başına geçmemiş şimdiye dek, Savaş düzeninden, evde kalmış bir kız kadar Anlar ancak, -tüm bilgisi kitaptan- Togalı konsüller bile becerir o kadarını; işte değil, sözde Bütün askerliği. Fakat, beyim, seçilen o; Bana gelince, Rodos'ta, Kıbrıs'ta ve başka Hristiyan ve dinsiz topraklarda, kendi gözüyle Gördüğü halde başardıklarımı, Yelken indirip dinmem gerekiyor yazıcılıkta: Bu hesap uzmanı, emir subayı olsun çok geçmeden Bense-Tanrı esirgesin-Arap hazretlerinin çavuşu. (Shakespeare, 2001, pp. 9-10)	**TT3** **Iago:** Ben yâverimi çoktan seçtim. demiş. Yaveri de kim olsa beğenirsin? Sözde büyük bir aritmetikçi, Cassio adında bir Floransalı. Güzel bir kadına rastladı mı mutlak başı derde girer. Ama daha savaş alanında bir manga, askere bile kumanda etmemiştir; zaten savaş düzenini de bilse bilse ancak kocamış bir kız kadar bilir. Haa, kitabî lâflara gelince, bak onları ezbere okur, Eee, diyeceksin kî, o kadarını harmaniyeli Konsüller bile yapar. Bu adamın bütün askerliği boşu boşuna çene çalmaktan ibaret. Ama sonunda o seçildi yine de. Benim Rodos'da, Kıbrıs'da, Hristiyan ülkelerinde, barbar topraklarında neler başardığımı kendi gözleriyle görmüştür. Yine de soluğumu kesti; bütün aritmetik para saymak olan bu adamı kendine yâver yapsın; ben de, Tanrı her türlü nazardan korusun, Arap efendimizin çavuşu olup çıkayım'. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 5)
TT4 **Iago:** "Doğrusunu isterseniz adamımı seçmiş bulunuyorum" diyiverdi. Seçtiği de kimmiş? "Sözde usta bir hesapçı, Floransalı Michael Cassio adında biri; her güzel kadınla başını belaya sokacak bir adam. Ne kıtaya kumanda etmiştir ne de harp düzenini ihtiyar bir kızdan daha fazla bilir. Sade kitaplardan nazariye ezberler bunu ise harmanili devlet adamları da onun kadar ustalıkla becerir. Onun bütün askerliği bir iş görmeden gevezelik etmektir. Yine de efendim, o seçildi.	**Proposed Translation** **Iago:** "Kralım adına"demiş hazret, "Ben çoktan seçtim adamımı". Yaveri de ne menem bir şey bilsen, Cassio adında Floransalı bir hesapçının teki. Güzelin en namuslusunu bile yoldan çıkaracak cinsten, Ömründe savaşa gidip, bir manga askerle bile vuruşmamış,

İktidarımı Rodos'ta, Kıbrıs'ta diğer Hristiyan ve barbar topraklarda kumandana gösterdiğim halde ben, hasıraltı oldum. Bir zimmet-matlup katibinin gerisinde kalmaya mahkûm edildim. Bu hesapçı, vakti gelince, onun muavini oluyor, bense-Allah nazardan korusun! Mağripli efendimizin çavuşu kalıyorum. (Shakespeare,1996, pp. 19-20)	Savaş düzenini çıkrıkçı kadınlar kadar kurar. Amma ağzı o kadar iyi laf yapar ki, Ahkam kesmeye gelince, devlet adamına cübbeyi ters giydirir. Gevezelik bol, hareket sıfır. Beş para etmez askerliği Ama aldı rütbeyi, işte Gözleriyle gördüğü halde Othello, Rodos'ta Kıbrıs'ta, Hristiyan ve barbar topraklarda başardıklarımı, Talim edecekmişim hesabı kitabı tutmaya, Alıp Allah affetsin Mağripli hazretin çavuşluğunu oturdum aşağı, Paşamız yükselirken yaverlik makamına.

The context in the source text and translations of the speech is the explicit use of discriminatory discourse and how Iago uses the words for his benefits. In this case, the signs spinster, bookishness, Christian/heathen division can be considered as enigmas because readers need to analyse what Iago means by relating Cassio's promotion to them. Iago's use of discriminative strains in Venetian society is so implicit that it can be considered as far-fetched in the first reading. Iago's way of making certain people "abject" is an indication of his abuse of people. In the source text, Iago is the master of the discriminatory discourse, who puts war and soldier skills in the first place because he does have respect for the "bookish" people. Therefore, Cassio is like a spinster in his gaze, who would comfortably live inside closed doors. He explicitly states that he does not have much respect for the members of the consuls or the elderly people. They would talk about wars taking place and not fight. In his speech, he discriminates the educated people, the consuls or the representatives of the country and finally unmarried women. Iago discriminates the ones that he does not think are important, and he is clinging on the practice of making others "abject" (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18) in the eyes of others not only as a personal choice but as an indication of the social system. Therefore, how he discriminates the people around, including Othello, is critical to the study of discriminative discourse.

The word "spinster" was translated in TT1 in Table 5 as "ev kadınları" (housewives), in TT2 "evde kalmış bir kız" (an unmarried girl), in TT3, "kocamış bir kız kadar" (an old girl), in TT4 "ihtiyar bir kız" (a very old girl). None of the translators

chose to use "kız kurusu", which is the derogative word spinster in Turkish. In TT1, alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). is in question, the translation not being totally irrelevant. The word spinster refers to an unmarried woman of a certain age, not too old but not too young. Housewives, on the other hand, are almost always percieved to be married women, except widowers. In TT2, "evde kalmış bir kız" is not an example of a designificative tendency. In TT3, "kocamış bir kız" is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) as in "ihtiyar bir kız" in TT4. In this respect, focusing on the crucial job of older unmarried women before the Industrial Age [20] would be an alternative. The spinsters earned their living on the wheel of wool and threading. Instead of reproducing the same discriminative discourse that Iago implements into the text, the emphasis could be on the "job of the old women" rather than their age or marital status.

In Greek mythology, concerning Shakespearean pathos, a spinster's spinning wheel introduces the dangers of ecstasy because it was King of Lapith who was doomed to burn in a spinning wheel. (Tuna. E, 2000, p. 123) Like the crucible, the spinning wheel is a symbol for women outside the society. Alternatively, the word spinster could be translated as "çıkrıkçı kadınlar" (women who spin the wheel) with an emphasis on the spinning job that they were doing.

The second use of women to insult Cassio is through his mistress in the expression of "a fair wife". In TT1, "Fettan bir yosma " (a seductive jade) is an over-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, "her güzel kadınla başını belaya sokacak bir adam" turns Cassio into a foolish Casanova who cannot control himself. Iago undoubtedly refers to this because, in the war times, men who would not control themselves would be inappropriate. "Güzel bir kadına rastladı mı başı mutlaka belaya girer" in TT3, is another form of saying that he cannot control himself in the presence of women. Either way, "fair wife" was translated as "güzel kadın" (beautiful woman) with an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because Iago openly states that Cassio steals "wives of other men," and the translation of wife in Turkish as "eş" (wife) was erased entirely. In TT2, similarly "güzel bir kadın yüzünden nerdeyse başı belada" refers to one single

[20] According to historical sources unmarried old women did the spinning of wool by hand to earn a living. www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spinster

relationship that does not make Cassio a Casanova. There is again an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Table 6: Example 3 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Iago: Divinity of hell! When the devils will the blackest sins put on, They do suggest at first with heavenly shows As I do now. For whiles this honest fool Plies Desdemona to repair his fortune, And she for him pleads strongly to the Moor, I'll poor pestilence into his ear: That she repeals him for her body's lust. And by how much she strives to do him good She shall undo her credit with the Moor- So will I turn her virtue into pitch And out of her own goodness make the net That shall enmesh them all. 2.3 (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 202)	**Iago:** Cehennemin ilahiyatı der ki, En kötü günahı işleyeceği zaman şeytan En masum suratını takınırmış, Tıpkı benim yaptığım gibi. Şimdi bu saf budala, Unvanını geri almak: için- Desdemona'ya yalvarınca, O da hemen gidip Mağripli'yi sıkıştırınca, Ben de adamın kulağına zehri akıtırım. "Kadın Cassio'ya tutuldu, Onun için aracı oluyor" derim. Desdemona ne kadar ısrarcı olursa, O kadar soğuyacak Mağrip\i ondan. Kendi erdemiyle batağa saplanacak yani kadın. Onun iyiliğinden öyle bir ağ öreceğim ki, Hepsi içine düşecek sonunda. (Shakespeare, 2018, pp. 83-84)
TT2	**TT3**
Iago: Ey cehennemdeki tanrısallık! Şeytanlar en kara günahları işlemek isteyince. İlkin cennet görünüşleriyle ayartırlar tıpkı Şimdi benim yaptığım gibi. Çünkü bu dürüst sersem, Durumunu düzeltmek için Desdemona'ya bas vururken, Kadın da ısrarla Arab'a dilekte onun için, Ben şu zehiri Arabın kulağına akıtırım;onu Kendi şehveti için istiyor Desdemona derim. Kadın Cassio'ya iyilik etmek için çırpındığı ölçüde Kendi değerini düşürecektir Arabın gözünde. Böylece namusunu katran gibi karartacağım onun; Ve kendi iyiliğinden, hepsini içine alan bir ağ öreceğim. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 52)	**Iago:** Cehennemin de bir kutsallığı var işte böyle. Şeytanlar hele adama en büyük günahı işletmeye bir karar versinler, bak önce o günahı nasıl sevap diye gösterirler. Tıpkı benim yaptığım gibi! Bu namuslu salak, kalkıp Desdemona'ya gidecek şimdi, kocasına yalvarsın arsın istiyecek. Ben de Arap'a varıp fitili veririm. Karısının Cassio'yu sevdiği için böyle yalvardığını söylerim. Ne kadar yalvarırsa Arap'ın gözünden o kadar düşer. Namusunu katran gibi karartayım da görsün o. Temiz kalbinden öyle bir ağ kuracağım ki, hepsi yakalanacak. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 36)

TT4	Proposed Translation
Iago: Ah cehennemin bu ilahi tarafı! Şeytanlar en büyük günahları işletecekleri zaman, benim şimdi yaptığım gibi, bu günahları ilahi bir şekilde göstermekle işe başlarlar. Bu namuslu sersem, Desdemona'ya vaziyetimi düzeltmesi için baş vuradursun; Desdemona onun namına Mağripli'ye ısrarla rica ettiği sırada, ben Othello'nun kulağına karısının, Cassio'yu kendi keyfi için eski mevkiine getirmek istediğini söyler, bunu zehir gibi içine akıtırım. Kadın Cassio'ya iyilik etmeye çalıştığı nispette Mağripli'nin gözünde kendi değerini düşürür. Onun faziletini böyle kapakara bir hale sokacağım, merhametinden hepsini avlayacak bir ağ kuracağım. (Shakespeare, 1996, p.53)	**Iago:** Cehennem ilahları! Şeytanlar insanın alnına günahların en karasını çalmaya bir niyet etsinler, tıpkı cennetten çıkma gibi davranırlar. Aynen şimdi benim yaptığım gibi. Şimdi bu budala Desdemona'nın eteklerine ahvalini düzeltmek için yüz süre dursun, Othello'ya yalvar yakar olunca kadın,adamın kulağından derinliklerine kıyamet alameti zehri akıtırım.Karısının Cassio'ya gönül düşürdüğü için onun namına yakardığını söylerim. İyilik ettikçe Cassio'ya, gözünden düşecek Mağripli'nin. Onun alnına kara çalacağım. Merhametten maraz doğacak, hepsi oltaya gelecek!

The context in Table 6 and its translations is the use of evil spirits by Iago. In the translations of Iago's infamous speech, it is critical to analyse the words that exemplify malice in his terms. Iago starts his monologue with an address to "divinity of hell" (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 202) which is a sign that can be considered as an enigma. It is implicit which deities Iago addresses to. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. Iago calls them for help to accomplish his plan. By calling them "divinity", he also confesses that he yields to powers outside Christianity, which must be in multiple numbers. It may remind today's reader of Roman or Greek deities, which seem to exist in Iago's mind, along with Christian thinking. Shakespeare's portrayal of such an evil character, therefore, is inescapably linked to a study of mythology, and a collection of pagan deities. Iago's choice of "divinity in hell" and the translation of such an address is critically important. Translators in the table above translated the address as follows: In TT1, it is "cehennemin ilahiyatı", an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because ilahiyat in Turkish means "Tanrı bilimi" (theology) rather than a group of deities as Iago suggests. In TT1, there is an allusion to the practise of magic rather than a description of deities that Iago addresses to. In TT2, it is "Ey cehennemdeki tanrısallık", to reflect the praise of Iago to deities in hell. In this translation, too, the addressee is missing, and it is almost impossible to make the connections with Iago's past. There is an example of the darkening of the meaning in this translation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, it is "cehennemin de bir kutsallığı var işte böyle", (there is divinity in hell) by

alluding to the "sacredness" in hellish practice. In this respect, it can be said that there is a sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, it is "Ah cehennemin bu ilahi tarafı" (Ay, the divine side of hell), which is a gratification of deities in hell. In the proposed translation it is "cehennem ilahları" (deities in hell) because, in Christianity, the multiplicity of deities does not exist since it is a monotheistic religion.

It is not possible to say that the meaning is completely erased in any of the translations because what Iago means by addressing to hell is not crystal clear. However, none of the translations gives any clue that Iago might have well addressed the pagan deities from Roman culture. Both Iago and Othello say, "By Jove" (Jupiter in Greek mythology), that is an indication that Iago's hellish friends would be one of them.

In TT1, "devils" was translated as "şeytan" which is the singular form of the word. However, in TT2, TT3 and TT4 the plural form of the word is kept and was translated as "şeytanlar" (devils). In this respect, the translation of the plural form of the word devil as "şeytan" is an example of under-interpretation of meaning because it provides incomplete information and produces insufficient meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172)

Lastly, the translation of the word "pestilence" is worth considering because it has a direct connotation with the bubonic plague that seems to have swept over the world in Shakespeare's lifetime. It is interesting to note that pestilence will metaphorically be poured into Othello's ear by Iago. In TT1 and TT2, the sentence was translated as "kulağına zehri akıtırım" (I'll pour pestilence into his ear) by interpreting pestilence as poison. In TT3, on the other hand, translation is "zehir gibi içine akıtırım" (I'll pour it into him like poison) as an example of over-interpretation of meaning because it produces an excessive commentary on the meaning of the original text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, on the other hand, it is "fitili veririm" meaning "building a fire under someone"[21] which is another over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172). In TT4, the use of the idiom changes the imagery completely because it brings forward the fire imagery that simply does

[21] www.tureng.com

not exist in the original text. Since the use of fire imagery is contrary to pestilence, it was possibly The Great Fire of London that destroyed pestilence, therefore TT4 is an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Choices may vary according to translators' strategies. The translation of pestilence as "zehir" (poison) in Turkish does not bear the iconographic connection because, in Christian thinking, pestilence is one of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse.[22] Therefore, adding the idiom "kıyamet alameti" (a harbinger of Doomsday) as a choice in the proposed translation may be a way to refer to one of the worst illnesses in history that signalled the arrival of Doomsday.

Devils, pestilence, and divinity in hell are all connected to mythological and iconographic sources, so they may be worth considering in the translated text. Either by using footnotes or creative thinking, mythological and iconographic data can be retained in translation. In very old texts like Shakespeare's tragedies, countless allusions from mythological sources like *Metamorphoses* of Ovid may be worth considering. Translation strategies that do not leave footnotes for the readers concerning mythological and iconographic data exist according to translators' various strategies because reading and translating are acts of switching through possibilities of meaning.

Table 7: Example 4 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

Source Text	**TT1**
Iago: The Moor already changes with my poison Dangerous conceits are in their nature poisons. Which at first are scarce found to distaste But with a little art upon the blood Burn like mines of sulphur. 3.3 (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 229)	**Iago:** Zehirim şimdiden işlemeye başladı Mağripli'ye. Tehlikeli fikirler özünde zehirden farksızdır; Başta hiç belli olmaz zararları, Ama kana karıştıkları anda Kükürt ocağı gibi yanmaya başlarlar. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 108)
TT2	**TT3**
Iago: Arap Verdiğim zehirle değişmeye başladı bile. Tehlikeli düşünceler aslında zehirdirler;	**Iago:** Verdiğim zehirle Arap'- ın nevri döndü zaten. Tehlikeli düşünceler ilk bakışta zararsızmış gibi gözükürler, ama hele bir kana

[22]According to the information given, pestilence was among The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. www.dictionary.com

Pek tatsız gelmezler önce; Ama biraz karıştılar mı kana, Kükürt ocakları gibi yanarlar: (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 68)	karışsınlar da seyret sen, nasıl kükürt ocakları gibi tutuşuyorlar. **(**Shakespeare**,** 1964, p. 49**)**
TT4 **Iago:** Zehrim Mağriplide tesirini göstermeye başladı zaten. Şüphe uyandıran fikirler, ilk önce hiç tatsız, gelmezler ama, tabiatları icabı zehirdirler; kana biraz tesir ettiler mi kükürt ocakları gibi yanarlar. (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 70)	**Proposed Translation** **Iago:** Zehirli iksirim şimdiden içine çökmeye Mağripli hazretlerinin. Şüphenin mayası şurup misali, Acısını tadarken fark edene aşk olsun. Kana dokunmaya görsün bir hele, Kükürt madenleri sönük kalır yanında.

The context in Table 7 and its translations is Iago's building hell for Othello. The word poison can be considered as an enigma because "nature's poisons" are not evident in the text, and readers may not immediately guess how Iago will manipulate Othello. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. In the translation of this excerpt, the translations of three words are critically important, that is, the Moor, poison, and mines of sulphur. In TT2 and TT3, the Moor is "Arap" (Arabic) in Turkish, which may lead to numerous discussions on the ethnical identity of the character Othello. Even today, it is not possible to say exactly which ethnic identity Othello belongs to. On the modern stage, the character is portrayed as a black male. It is misleading to approach Othello as belonging to the Arabic race because North-African lineage is a mix and match of different cultures and religions.[23] It may be worth reconsidering because the translation of "Moor" as "Arap"(Arabic) may have misleading connotations, which could be an example of the alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Either way, "Mağripli" (from Moorish land) could be another option for the Moor because there is clear evidence in the text that Othello is from Mauretania, the Moorish land.

The second word to consider is poison. All the translators chose to translate it as "zehir" (poison), which is the denotation level translation of the word. All translators preferred to translate mines of sulphur as "kükürt ocakları" (sulphur pots) without any meaning transformations. In this context, "kükürt potası" (sulphur pot) would also be

[23] For more information see https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/reference/people/who-were-moors/

an alternative translation. The pot or "pota" in Turkish is a direct allusion to the image of the crucible, that we can use to hear hushed voices in history. However, all the translator choices, including the translation pot or the crucible, are examples of under-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the source text, it is the "mines of sulphur" (kükürt madenleri) that Iago talks about, a possible allusion to mines of sulphur in Cyprus. In this respect, source text gives information on Iago's intentions in a more stressed way. The character Iago, in this respect, has an evil way of approaching the forces in hell. He tries to make use of them to fulfil his wicked aims by begging the pagan deities that were mostly demonized by monotheistic religions. The forces that Iago wants to see at work, infamously use magic to accomplish their tasks. The way that Othello changes into a madman is the work of the forces acting outside him because he cannot shield himself against Iago's discriminative tactics that seem to be coming from the crucible of history, where his perdition stems from. Therefore, Iago dominates over Othello because he is confident and ruthless in using evil magic in words to manipulate people in his society.

Othello, on the other hand, is so thin-skinned when it comes to identity issues, including his manhood. In his private life, general Othello is Eastern, as he explains his love life through his mother's handkerchief. Iago's evil magic overcomes the magic in the handkerchief that Othello is so deeply connected to because of Othello's lack of insight. A westerner (Venetian) in mind, an easterner (North African) in heart, Othello's transformation deprives him of the magic of his mother's culture. Iago, on the other hand, is successful in exceeding the norms of Christianity because he makes use of "the evil magic" of pagan deities. The magic of the wise women who would be able to see the future cannot work for him, so his lack of insight into his mother's culture ultimately destroys him. The magic of old day Sybils is a standpoint for Othello because perdition takes over his soul when he loses control of his nature. In order words, his Eastern gaze, and his respect to the maker of the silk handkerchief means nothing to Desdemona because he fails to read and explain traces of Eastern cultures of North Africa in himself.

Table 8: Example 5 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST **Othello:** Hot, hot and moist. This hand of yours requires A sequester from liberty, fasting and prayer Much castigation, exercise devout. For here's a young and sweating devil, here That commonly rebels. 3.4.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 243)	**TT1** **Othello:** Sıcak! Sıcak ve nemli. Bu ele ne gerekir biliyor musun? Gönül işlerinden uzak durmak, Düzenli ibadet, oruç tutup dua etmek, Günahlardan arınmak gerekir. Aksi halde bu küçük ve terli şeytan Kolayca baştan çıkar. Güzel bir el bu, açık bir el. (Shakespeare, 2018, pp. 118-119)
TT2 **Othello:** Sıcak sıcak, terli; sizin bu eliniz Ayrı kalmayı gerektirir özgürlükten, Ve oruç tutmayı, dua etmeyi, Hayli çile çekmeyi ve sofuca ibadeti; Burda genç, terli ve şık sık baş kaldıran Bir şeytan var da ondan: iyi bir el, Açık bir el. (Shakespeare, 2001, pp. 74-75)	**TT3** **Othello:** Sıcak sıcak, terli. Bir köşeye çekilip vakt'ni oruçla, duayla geçirmelisin. Bu el bunu gösteriyor. Çünkü başkaldıran genç, ateşli bir şeytan var burada. îyi bir el, apaçık. **(**Shakespeare**,** 1964, p. 53**)**
TT4 **Othello:** Sıcak, sıcak ve terli! Sizin bu eliniz dünyadan çekilmek, oruç tutup dua etmek ister; fazla terbiyeye ve sofu temrinlere muhtaç! Çünkü burada, çok kere azgın çıkan, genç ve terli bir şeytan var. iyi bir el, açık bir el! (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 78)	**Proposed Translation** **Othello:** O kadar sıcak ve terli ki bu el, Sahibi oruç, ibadet ve duayla inziva çilesinde bu eli arındırmazsa, Genç ve terli bir şeytana, uyup baştan çıkacak.

The context in this speech is Othello's description of evil in Desdemona's hands. The sign "devil" is an enigma because Othello echoes Iago's perspective in an implicit way to refer to Desdemona's hand. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. In this excerpt, it is possible to see that Othello's gaze on Desdemona had changed into a bad one because the way he describes her hand parallels with the description of the devil. The words "here is a young and sweating devil here" is a clear statement that Othello demonized his wife without finding the proof of adultery. Her hand, in his gaze, is not the hand to tie him to castigation and devout as he wishes to assert himself as Venetian Christian. When Desdemona's piousness is lost, in his gaze, he begins to look for the devil inside her because he is a subject of Venice, who automatically echoes misogynistic strains. Othello's obsession with finding the devil

in her hands is reminiscent of his Christian upbringing because the opposite of a pious Christian woman would only be "the whore of Venice". Therefore, violence stems from Othello's black and white thinking. Consequently, Othello turns violent when the only connection with his native land, the handkerchief, is lost because he is torn between binary logos of Venetian society and his natural bonds. He realizes that his dream will not come true.

No one, except Iago, can analyse drives that cause him to commit murder. Iago is the one who could see Othello's constant pain that stems from his being cut-off from his native land. In the speech, when he describes his psychic connection with the Sibylline belief, it is possible to see that Othello's close ties with the past are embodied in the handkerchief that he gives to Desdemona. As a Christian Venetian, he cannot reach out to his mother's culture. Therefore, the handkerchief symbolically contains Othello's past. It is vital to remember that Othello and Desdemona's love starts because of the stories about faraway lands that belonged to his past. In this context, it is critical to remember that Othello's being a non-subject starts with slavery. He had fallen slave to Barbary pirates, as he claims, who often cooperated with the Ottomans. Othello's hatred for the Ottomans was later used by the Venetians to turn him into another form of slavery. Othello that Desdemona knows is also a psychological slave because his psychic connections were ripped long before they met. Fascinated by his stories, Desdemona thinks she knows Othello well enough, but perdition in his soul destroys them both.

The division between Othello's mind and body is a dangerous one, not because he is unable to think logically because his drives and passions are inside him waiting to come out. It is because he had left the belief system of his mother's culture behind, and Othello's expression of his nature was only possible through the handkerchief. Therefore, after certain suspicions are brought about by Iago, the loss of the handkerchief turns it into a do or die issue. The reason why Othello looks for the devil in Desdemona's hand is her hand's inescapable connection with the magic handkerchief.

It is, then, critical to look at how this scene was translated in Table 8 with an emphasis on "the sequester from liberty". In TT1, it is "gönül işlerinden uzak durmak"

(staying away from love matters) as an example of over-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017,172). In the source text, Othello implicitly states that he wants Desdemona to be less open to others. In TT2, it is translated as "özgürlükten uzak kalmayı" (staying away from liberty), which does not embody a meaning transformation. Likewise, in TT3, the translation is "bir köşeye çekilmeyi (seclusion)" with no meaning transformation. In TT4, it is "dünyadan çekilmek" (staying away from this world) which is again an example of over-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation, it is "inzivaya çekilmek" (the cloister) because of the iconographic connotation to being almost a saint-like lover and piety. Othello gives Desdemona her last chance to purify herself and drive the devil away from her hand. The hand that will hold the holy handkerchief should be spotless in his gaze. Othello does not seem to have realized that the devil also lives inside him. All the pain from his past was in Desdemona's handkerchief.

The second phrase to look at in this context is the word "castigation". The word itself is very interesting because it covers a vast range of meanings on self-discipline, self-correction, and self-denial. Self-denial, on the other hand, is more fitting in the context behind this scene because Othello himself has been living through self-denial that is going to cost his wife her life.

In TT1, the translation of castigation is "Günahlardan arınmak gerekir" which is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Castigation also means severe moral or corporal punishment. In TT2, it is "çile çekmek" (suffering) by referring to the religious cloister in the Turkish context. No meaning transformation is observed in the translation of this sign in TT2 because the connotations of the word castigation cover the idea of suffering for one's religion.[24] In the Turkish context, the word refers to the seclusion of the dervishes who were famous for living secluded lives for worshipping. The translator's choices here interestingly refer to Othello's Eastern side, that he had to deny being able to work with the Venetians. However, as it can be deduced from Othello's speech, the kind of worship that Othello advises Desdemona is Christian. The translators' choices remarkably reveal the conflict in Othello's mind. Through translators' choices, not the source text,

in this context, it is possible to see the structure of Othello's limbo world that he feels uneasy in. Unaware of the devil inside him, as the psychic energy that was bottled up inside for years, Othello's effort to drive the devil away from Desdemona in Cyprus results in a domestic murder on the love island of Venus. Therefore, the religious context offers possibilities to the translator to focus both the "phusis" and "logos[25] in Othello. In the geographical context, they are divided into the Eastern and the Western.

In TT4, on the other hand, we come up with a meaning close to "terbiye" (self-discipline). However, TT4 is an example of under-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p .172) because castigation is much more serious than self-discipline. The proposed translation uses the translation "inziva" (cloister) referring to the suffering of both the dervishes and their cloister to refer to Othello's Eastern background. It can be claimed that "inziva" would not be enough to cover castigation, and "çile" would be added. However, in this context, inziva çilesi (suffering in the cloister) would be an over-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the meaning of cloister is added.

All in all, the translators' choices, in this scene, are critically important to set the religious context because Othello's devil lies in them. It is critical to note how the translator is going to describe them determines the enunciation in the translation. Othello is a character who got lost in the religious, geographical, ethnical maze that disables him from reaching out to nature. Throughout history, his native land had belonged to Persians and Egyptians with their pagan religions, Christian culture, as well as Ottomans with their Muslim culture.[26] The feeling of perdition, therefore, is the source of his uncontrollable anger and murder drives. It is because he does not know where to stand in this maze, he clings onto his mother's fascination with the world of Sybils as the female prophets, although they are long forgotten. Paradoxically, although he lacks insight into his psychology, Othello is true to the description of his feelings. Perdition catches his soul, like fire in hell. Here, Othello's voice comes from the crucible of history, as the devil in his mind unfolds itself in his limbo world.

[25] Ibid
[26] For more information see *Othello* (2017) William Pechter (Ed). Norton Critical Editions.

Table 9: Example 6 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Othello: Handkerchief! Confessions! Handkerchief! -To confess and be hanged for his labour! First to be hanged, and then confess I tremble at it. Nature would not invest herself in such shadowing passion without some instruction. It is not words that shake me thus. Pish! Noses, ears and lips. Is it possible? Confess! Handkerchief! O devil! 4.1. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 256)	**Othello:** -İtiraflar… Mendil! Önce söylet sonra ipe çek. Hayır, önce as sonra söylet. Tir tir titriyorum. Gerçekliğine inanmasa, yalnız lafla böyle titremez insan. İğrenç! Burunlar; kulaklar, dudaklar! Mümkün mü? Söyle! Doğruyu söyle! Mendil! O, iblis! (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 130)
TT2	**TT3**
Othello: -İtiraflar.-Mendil! İtiraf ettirip, yaptığına karşılık asmalı.Önce asmalı, sonar itiraf ettirmeli; düşündükçe titriyorum. Belli bir şey sezdirmek istemese, böyle karanlık bir tutkuya bürümez kendini doğa. Beni böyle sarsan sözler değil. Tüh! Burun buruna, kulak kulağa, dudak dudağa. Nasıl olur? -İtiraf ha?-Mendil ha?- Ah,iblis! (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 82)	**Othello:** Mendil! İtiraf ettirmeli! Mendil! İtiraf ettirip asmalı! Yok yok, önce asıp sonra itiraf ettirmeli! Aklıma geldikçe titreme basıyor her yanımı. Sebepsiz yere titrer mi insan? Beni böyle titreten, kelimeler değil! Ah, yan yana, burun buruna, dudak dudağa! Mümkün mü? İtiraf ha? Mendil ha Ah, şeytan! (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 60)
TT4	**Proposed Translation**
Othello: Mendil...itiraflar...mendil! İtiraf ettirip sonra, yaptığına karşılık asmak. Yahut. önce asmalı, sonra itiraf ettirmeli. Düşündükçe- titriyorum. Sahiden bir -şey' olduğunu bilmese tabiat bu kadar derin bir heyecana tutulmaz. Beni böyle sarsan kelimeler. Değil. Puh! Burun buruna, kulak kulağa Nasıl olur? İtiraf etti ha? Mendil ha? Ah, iblis! (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 86)	**Othello:** Mendil! İtiraf! Mendil! Önce itiraf ettirip sonra asmalı! Yok, önce asıp, ölürken itiraf ettirmeli: Bu titreyen ben miyim? İnsan doğası pusulasız bu gizli tutkuya teslim olmaz ki! Sözlere kulaklarım tıkalı benim. İğrenç! Burun, dudak, kulak derken! Bu mümkün mü? Günah çıkar! Mendil demek! Seni şeytan seni!

The context in Table 9 and its translations is the identification of evil through the handkerchief, which can be considered an enigma. Therefore, translations of this context were evaluated. The last translation comparison in the enigma section is a scene where Othello loses grip on everything. Othello's change is not on the surface, but it is skin-deep. For the first time in the text, it is possible to see traces of uncontrollable anger in Othello. His diction changes according to his negative feelings. We no longer have adamantine general Othello but a man who has an internal dialogue with himself exactly like a child.

As for the content of the speech, Othello's internal dialogue is full of the fear of the devil that would come and hunt him. It is Cassio whom he regards as guilty. Either way, he tries to drive the devil away with the confessions and punishment that

would come right after. He is unsure of the punishment as he is unsure of himself. He conflicts with his nature because he cannot believe that he is the one who trembles. Inside Othello's deep fear, the fear of the devil dominates because of the conflict in him. He is very aware of the fact that he is just about to surrender dark desires in his nature, but he does not know how to find his way. He also clearly states that he is not affected by the words of Iago and others. In this speech, it is possible to see that unshaken general Othello who desperately tries to identify the devil to drive it away. Therefore, he is suspicious of adultery that may never have taken place. However, he fails to identify the devil in himself, and *perdition* catches his soul again.

In the translation analysis, there are critically essential words to translate like "confess", "devil", and "pish". The word confess was translated as "itiraflar" (self-revelations) by all translators. However, when we take the conflict in Othello's soul and his desire to drive the devil away into consideration, it could be claimed that Othello wants Cassio to confess that he is acting on the side of the devil. Since the iconographic context in this speech is implicit, the word confess may be read in two ways, and the translation (itiraflar) preserved signs. Othello is not sure of how to punish the devil, before or after hanging. Possibly, making them confess while hanging is a ruthless punishment because, in this context, they are likely to die before they fully confess. Othello wants to send the devils to hell because he sees himself complete as a dedicated Venetian by having done service to the state and Christianity. He must also be taking power from his position as the ruler of the love island of Venus and the second Jerusalem of the Christian world.[27] His desire to drive the devil away is inescapably linked to his Venetian existence. The iconographic link to Othello's gaze becomes more explicit as the action moves to the end of the text.

The second word to consider is the word "pish". It is an expression that is used to abhor in something or somebody. In TT1, it was translated as "iğrenç" (disgusting), which is free of designificative tendencies. In TT2, on the other hand, it was translated as "Tüh" (Alas), in TT3 as "Ah"(Ay), in TT4 as "Puh" (Alas) as examples of perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

[27] See Kingdoms of the Crusaders: From Jerusalem to Cyprus, Peter W.Edbury, 1999

"O, devil" is the last exclamation of the whole speech, and there is great stress on the word. In TT1, it is reflected as "O, iblis", (Oh, demon), in TT2 as "Ah, iblis" (Ay, demon), in TT3 as "Ah, şeytan" (Oh, Satan), in TT4 as "Ah, iblis" (Oh, demon). The last words express Othello's anger on top of his lungs, and the sentences reflect the scorn and curse. Therefore, a dimension of expression was added to the name of the devil. "O, devil" was translated as "Seni şeytan seni!" in the proposed translation because, in this expression, it is possible to see that Othello had finally identified the devil as Cassio. This sentence parallels the gesture of pointed finger to the devil. After this scene, there is no point of return for Othello since uncontrollable forces in his nature are unleashed.

2.3. Mythological and Iconographic Allusions in *Othello* and its Translations

The relationship between Shakespeare's *Othello* and Ovid's Metamorphoses is critical because references to mythological stories like Jove, Janus, Diana, Hero, and Leandros are existent in four great tragedies. Jove (Zeus) and Janus (a Roman god facing both the past and the future) are the two Roman god names that are both repeated by Othello and Iago. For example, "the Immortal Jove" says Othello while claiming Desdemona's name as fresh as Dian's visage. The whole worshipping jargon revolves around Roman deities except Othello's references to Propontic and Hellespont, which could be an indirect allusion to Persian King Xerxes. The king is known to have Hellespont beaten by iron chains to tame it in *Histories* by Herodotus. The study of the mythological data proves itself to be essential to the reception of the text mythologically, historically and geographically, because none of them are related to his identity as a Venetian general. However, the transformations of the characters in the book are supernatural examples from Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* The transformation from a person to stone like Niobe or an animal like Cynus into a swan out of grief are striking examples. In this context, for example, both Desdemona and Emilia are often conceived as swans because they both die singing like Cynus. Consequently, it is crucial to focus on how Othello was described in the text. An old black ram is a name given to Othello by his fellow since his skin colour is black and contrary to Desdemona's white skin.

Zounds, sir, you're robbed, for shame put on your gown!
Your heart is burst, you have lost half your soul,
Even now, now, very now, an old black ram
Is tupping your white ewe! Arise, arise,
Awake the snorting citizens with the bell
Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you,
Arise I say! 1.1 (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 122)

It is interesting to note that unlike a Venetian, he is associated with an animal with an indirect allusion to the savageness of his diverse cultural background. The text's distinct geographical background is ultimately outside Europe but in the Mediterranean:

> The play is quite specific about the Mediterranean background, mentioning Spain, Barbary, Egypt, Rhodes, the Pontic and Propontic seas, Mauretania, Jerusalem, Aleppo, Arabian trees, etc. and it reminds us some two dozen times of its location in Cyprus without really adding to the sketchy information given by Cinthio - namely, that the Venetians maintained forces there and sent out the Moor as their commander. (Honigmann, 1997,11)

In Honigmann's view, therefore, there is a problem with certain connections between mythology and geography because Jove gets repeated so many times in the text while the goddess Venus is non-existent although "legend Aphrodite (or Venus) rose from the sea near Paphos, on the west coast of Cyprus" (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 11). The island is not described as belonging to Venus in the Shakespearean version of the story of Othello:

> A strange oversight, in a tragedy of love? Desdemona is 'sport for Jove' (2.3.17), Othello talks of 'Jove's dread clamours' (3.3.359), and no one remembers Venus! (Honigmann, 1997, p. 11)

Othello's association with a black ram is not linked to the *Metamorphoses* of Ovidius but Eastern mythology because of the text's exoticized background of the East.

Mostly depicted as a coal-black male, Othello's description as a black ram is worth considering because, in the Elizabethan gaze, an African could only be black. Contrary to Shakespearean view, North-African peoples are "tawny" not black when compared to Englishmen because 'black' was often applied 'loosely, to non-European races, little darker than many Europeans' (Honigmann, 1997, p. 15).

Moreover, Shakespeare identified Turks as a threat to Cyprus (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 11). The description was mystical enough in the Renaissance gaze.

It is questionable whether the English audience had a clear distinction between Arabic and other North African tribes. They could have different shades of dark skin because they were not familiar with the geography of North Africa. The fact that Mauritania, an old Roman name for the North African region, could have inhabitants of different races like Arabs, Muslims, and even Jews with a mixture of Egyptian culture makes the roots of Othello questionable:

> Barbary was situated in north Africa, between Egypt and the Atlantic; the inhabitants were Arabs and Berbers (hence 'Barbary'), and mostly 'tawny' rather than black, as is confirmed by Figure 1. (Honigmann,1997, p. 14)

Therefore, Othello's depiction as a coal-black man may be the result of the discriminative perspective of the West. Othello's associations with a black ram in a derogative way refer to his pagan past. In ancient Berber religion, for the peoples of North Africa, a bull or a ram would be a subject of animal worshipping and is the symbol of Libyan Sybil.28Solar and lunar deities of Egyptians similarly dominated the traditional Berber religion. The reference to pagan deities of sun and moon by Othello himself as well as coupling holy animals with his name by Iago could be implicit ways of referring to his ties with the ancient cultures of North Africa. It is, therefore, interesting to see the fact that Othello mostly sees himself as a Venetian but continually refers to pagan deities of the land he came from.

Berber was a Roman word for "barbarian". The cult of Amun-Ra was the main religion as well as the Ram God of Siwa, essential in Libya.[29] These pagan religions

[28] See Cameron, Alan. Greek Mythography in the Roman World.
[29] Ibid

were also related to the historical importance of the island of Cyprus, and Othello's close geographical connections with his past tend to act as the sword of Damocles. All these are on Othello's head when he leaves Venice to fight with the Ottomans.

Othello's perspective as a Venetian general seems to be at odds with Ottomans, who come to conquer the second Jerusalem of Christianity. Protecting the island from a siege is the embodiment of his Venetian existence as well as a man. Since Desdemona is a very patriotic and a pious woman, Othello's war stories kindle the love between them. A failure in the protection of the holy land would cause both a professional and a domestic disaster for Othello. Othello reflects his fear for losing his faith by disguising it in the form of the male fight of the Ottoman soldiers:

> Why, how now, ho? From whence ariseth this?
> Are we turned Turks? and to ourselves do that
> Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites?
> For Christian shame, put by this barbarous brawl;
> He that stirs next, to carve for his own rage,
> Holds his soul light: he dies upon his motion.
> Silence that dreadful bell, it frights the isle
> From her propriety. 2.3.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 193)

There are openly stated traits of discrimination against Turks that pertain to the deepest fears of Othello, who was once presumably a slave of the Ottomans. Therefore, Othello's relationship with the Eastern world is limited to his mother's handkerchief. Ironically, what Othello venerates and despises in the East is the devil for him because of the love and hate relationship concerning the root of his "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 195). Therefore, his love for Desdemona is wholly dependent on his dead mother's love. In other words, the disappearance of the handkerchief and Othello's loss of control coincide. Desdemona ultimately turns into a demon in his gaze.

Rethinking Desdemona's presentation in the text, it can be said that contrary to her angelic beauty and submissive nature, her name suggests exactly the opposite. Etymologically speaking, the name Desdemona may symbolize a demonic deity. Dei: God/ Demona: Demon. The name is derived from Greek dysdaimon meaning "ill-

fated" or "ill-starred".[30] When we think ill-starred characters in Greek mythology, we come across Acteon, who learnt healing and prophecy from the Muses and his sister Macris, who was the nurse of the wine God Dionysus.[31] The ill-star is another description of Sirius that Greeks were fearful of because its appearance would bring plague.[32] The mythological connection of Desdemona with the ill-star is Macris, the sister of the infamously ill-starred Acteon, who brought Dionysus up, is enough for the association with the devil in Renaissance gaze. Regarding the demonology of King James, a character's connection with the Dionysian mythology would instantly defame a female character in the Early Modern English society. Therefore, although the character Desdemona is of good-will, she cannot escape from her fate.

Her name also is connected to the Moon, through which Othello confesses that it can fuel anger in men. Therefore, in character Othello's gaze, Desdemona symbolizes more than a wife whose love is connected to the psychic power of the Moon. To describe his anger for adultery, he uses a negative description of Dardanelles, named as Hellish Sea, in ancient times because it took the lives of Hero and Leandros. This mythological reference to the Pontic Sea (the Black Sea, the connecting parts with Dardanelles in modern-day Turkey) is critical because Othello describes his anger to Desdemona in Eastern terms. He claims that it will never stop until the revenge (or the sea) sucks it all up:

> Never, Iago. Like to the Pontic sea
> Whose icy current and compulsive course
> Ne'er keeps retiring ebb but keeps due on
> To the Propontic and the Hellespont:
> Even so my bloody thoughts with violent pace
> Shall ne'er look back, ne'er ebb to humble love
> Till that a capable and wide revenge
> Swallow them up. Now by yond marble heaven
> In the due reverence of a sacred vow
> I here engage my words. 3.3.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 239).

[30] See Ovid, The Metamorphoses
[31] Ibid
[32] Ibid

His pouring anger on Dardanelles resembles Persian King Xerxes33, who angrily commanded his soldiers to beat Dardanelles with iron chains to tame the waves. At the beginning of the text, when Iago describes why Othello picked up Cassio as his lieutenant, he uses the term for "Certes," which means "certainly". Certes was written in capital letters in the quotation. Regarding Othello's ethnic background, a tongue-slip would make it Xerxes, who had Hellespont beaten by iron chains. It could then be a reference to the famous Persian king meaning "in the name of Xerxes" rather than certainly. In addition to these mythological allusions, there are iconographic allusions used to describe and hurt Desdemona. Before killing her, Othello mocks her piousness: "You have the Office opposite to Saint Peter and keep the gate of hell!" (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 279). After the murder and right before his suicide, Othello's use of iconography is striking. There is an indirect reference to the biblical story of Judas, who revealed Jesus Christ to Roman soldiers with a kiss.34 However, Othello's description of the kiss as the harbinger of betrayal and death is enough to regard the scene to iconography. The description of a kiss before dying reminds of the most famous biblical story of betrayal as well as martyrdom:

I kissed thee ere I killed thee: no way but this;
Killing myself, to die upon a kiss. 5.2. (Shakespeare,1997, p. 331)

The last mention of mythology will be on the description of "a malignant and a turban'd Turk" a direct quotation from the poem of King James I to praise Le Panto War. The poem gives us a clear perspective of James I, who also produced a book to identify demons. Calling Turks "malignant" is an apparent reference to the practice of the identification of demons[35] . It could be deduced that Turks and demons seem to be under the same category in the Shakespearean gaze. The word "malignant" ultimately refers to the "devil" that Othello tries to destroy with the consent of the Venetians. Therefore, Othello's veneration of the handkerchief as the embodiment of his "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 195) is disillusionment and the symbolic forces acting outside him bring him death.

[33] www.shakespeareswords.com [22.09.2021]
[34] See Hannibal Hamlin, The Bible in Shakespeare, 2013
[35] Note that Shakespeare added the word meaning "devilish" in Renaissance context www.shakespearewords.com (19.05.2020)

As a religious expression, "the turban counts as a symbol of the Muslim faith, like the Christian cross" (Shakespeare, 1997, p.17). The symbolical meaning of Othello's murder of a Muslim in Aleppo for the state is the background of his suicide. It is the robotized Venetian Othello that kills as a lack of real link to his "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 195). Therefore, until the end, Othello has no fixed identity also possibly because Shakespeare "wanted him to be a man of mystery" (Shakespeare, 1997, p.17)

Therefore, Othello's assertion of himself as a Christian Venetian is questionable from the very beginning. He seems to be too much involved in magic in the handkerchief. Iago, on the other hand, is more consistent in his actions, although he acts in an evil way. Othello sways side to side when it comes to psychic experience. His confusion he describes as "perdition" turns him into a man who could not be trusted:

Is he a devout Christian, or is his Christianity only skin-deep? Pondering these questions, we notice two difficulties. First, that as Iago's poison enters his mind, he seems to change more completely than other tragic heroes: we must not confuse his earlier and later self. Second, that we cannot believe him when he speaks about himself, any more than we trust Iago's self-revelations (Honigmann, 1997, p. 19)

It is possible to claim that Othello was taken as a slave by the Ottomans. His desire to be recognized as a true Venetian by the state is evident. It also shows that he seeks legitimacy, not the natural link of his existence not in the East, but the West:

> We cannot prove Othello to be a Christian convert, but the play prompts us to speculate about his mysterious past and its effect on his multi-layered personality. Is there a connection between his Christianity, his choosing to serve Venice and his marriage to a white woman? Taking these probably consecutive steps he came ever closer to assimilation into an alien culture The inner need for assimilation only grows clearly visible towards the end - pathetically, when he addresses Gratiano as 'uncle' ('I scarce did know you, uncle', 'Uncle, I must come forth', 5.2.199, 252), claiming a kinship that we knew nothing about and that has

> ceased to have meaning; tragically, when he recalls that in Aleppo once he killed a Turk who 'Beat a Venetian and traduced the state' (5.2.350). In Aleppo this had signified his total identification with Venice, but now he is the killer and the killed, forever trapped in his divided loyalties. (Honigmann,1997, pp. 22-23).

In Shakespearean tragedies, "uncertainty is of the essence" (Shakespeare, 1997, p.19). The unidentified components of Othello's existence intensify the pathetic structure of the text while portraying religious and mythological "mysteries". Shakespeare's audience was familiar with Greek and Roman deities while a close encounter with North-African belief systems was possibly out of the question. Consequently, Othello's references to pagan mythology and deities clash with his commitment to Venice and Christianity. It is, therefore, puzzling to see that Othello wants to be 'holier than the pope' (Shakespeare, 2007, pp. 22) while his pagan past evokes intimidation:

> Some critics think of him as a Christian convert and ascribe his tone to this cause: he. Others counter that by calling the malignant, tur- banned Turk a 'circumcised dog' (5.2.351—3) he proves that he was not born into the Muslim faith, hence was born a Christian, since turbans were symbols of the Muslim religion and circumcision one of its rites. Why, though, make the Muslim faith the only alternative to Christianity? Could 'the Othello music' not point in another direction, to a more primitive worship of sun and moon and elemental forces of Nature, overlaid by later Christian imagery and attitudes? Othello's first account of the handkerchief (3.4.57-77) associates his parents with an undefined paganism, reminiscent of the witch doctors of north Africa (Honigmann, 1997, p. 22)

Othello's "dark existence", therefore, resembles dark potions that Iago concocts, which has all components to drive a man mad. Taking the side of the

Venetians does not solve Othello's problems but intensifies them. Lack of insight into his past dominates over the last scenes almost explicitly. In one scene, he is Christian, and in the other, he returns to his indigenous culture and his old beliefs, all coming from the crucible of history:

> Othello, then, is neither the 'noble Moor' nor 'the noble Moor later replaced by the brutal egotist': any formula along such lines omits too many of the complexities of his nature, as for instance the tensions between his Christianity and his more primitive or 'pre- Christian' drives (which may be ancestral voices heard from far, or his own personal past resurfacing). (Honigmann, 1997, pp. 24-25)

In other words, Othello's perceptive problems concerning the reality around him similarly set traps like Iago, as he regularly travels back and forth. Othello's zigzagging among cultures, religions, and mythological references brings total disillusionment for him. Like his mother's handkerchief that ties him to the East, his healthy bonding with the past is entirely illusionary. Like pieces of missing jigsaw puzzles, the components do not fit each other. The clashes between his idealization of his mother's culture and commitment to the state are visible to the end that changes him into a madman:

> In short, it helps to think of 'the real Othello' as a time traveller, burdened like every human being with too much psychic luggage, a man hidden from us by slander, misunderstanding, idealization, self-deception and all the other mental manoeuvres with which we refuse to face the facts. Except that there are very few 'facts' where our knowledge of Othello is concerned, only impressions, intuitions, surmises, most of which have to be cancelled or modified as the play proceeds. Desdemona, who believed that she knew 'the real Othello', who saw his visage 'in his mind' (1.3.253), misrepresents him as confusingly as Iago, from a different angle - albeit, we may like to think, from one that gives her a better

> insight. But it remains a too narrow angle, occluding important parts of Othello that are visible to the audience — hence 'My lord is not my lord' (3.4.125). She has never fully known him; perhaps no one properly 'knows' him. (Honigmann, 1997, p. 25)

Getting to "know" Othello from his portrayed self is also illusionary because of the inconsistencies of his past. Othello's perception of the present, is then, faulty if not wholly blindfolded. His divided self becomes the source of evil as he fails to have a reconciliation between his past and the present. His lack of insight and his inability to make peace between the forces inside crush him. It is because he *feels* obliged to fight against verbal abuse of Iago and raise himself above his Venetian fellow soldiers in Cyprus at all costs, he has hubris or hamartia in dramatic terms. The island, an important place for Christians, destroys both Othello and Desdemona simply because they do not "match" in the gaze of Venetians. Othello's reinforced identification as a Christian Venetian is unhealthy because he wants to reidentify himself as a Venetian through a woman like the Virgin Mary. It looks like Othello wishes for a rebirth with his military successes because he has symbolically identified himself with his mother and her culture. It is, however, his body that betrays him because he will never look like a Venetian. The violence in Othello is out of Pandora's box the moment he understands that such rebirth will never be possible.

It cannot be said that Othello's narration of his past is trustable because it looks like a collection of different jigsaw puzzle pieces that do not match: So we can only guess about Othello's past and, by extension, about the man we see. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 23). Moreover, his 'role-playing' increases our difficulties (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 23). Othello's narration of mish-mash from his Eastern past and his constant stress on the service to the Venetian somewhat delete each other. Othello, as a character, then is almost incapable of enunciation in terms of identity because he needs to be *read and studied* in terms of different characteristics of diverse geographical regions. The complexity of Othello, as well his conflicts, make him vulnerable in the society that he desperately clings on to:

> More so than in most of the tragedies, the hero's past plays an integral part in the present, yet what do we know of Othello's past? We have access to it through his 'narrative self-fashioning', unreliable as evidence. His longest narrative, placed in context, attempts to impress the Duke and senators by explaining how he impressed Desdemona (1.3.129ff); the narrative within the narrative, allegedly the same story, had a different auditor and, one assumes, a less forensic presentation, so that in various ways it could not be the same story. The present inevitably reshapes the past, and in addition the narrator may reveal that he failed to understand events as they happened. 'Her father loved me, oft invited me' (1.3.129): whatever he may have said, Brabantio certainly did not love Othello as a prospective son-in-law. In his narratives of his father and mother (3.4.57ff.) and of the incident in Aleppo, Othello's 'editing' of the past for an ulterior purpose is even more transparent (Honigmann, 1997, pp. 22-23).

Othello, then becomes the abject that needs to be driven away, rather than the powerful master of narrative in the West. According to the Domains of Autonomy and Heteronomy of the Instance of Origin (Öztürk Kasar, 2012, p. 430), our five senses function as the instance of basis and in the heteronomy domain of enunciating instance. There is the immanent instance representing the forces acting within the instance of origin and the transcendent representing the forces acting on the instance of origin. (Öztürk Kasar, 2012, p. 430). Othello's link with *"phusis"*, (Öztürk Kasar, 2012, p. 430), or his connection with the culture of Barbary, is illusionary because he can only express North-African culture through the handkerchief. However, he is unable to use the psychic energy in his nature because he yields to the discriminative discourse that places his *black existence* in the second place. He sees himself as a threat to Venetian presence because of his colour. Therefore, he is unable to overcome the conflict between "phusis" and logos (Öztürk Kasar, 2012, p. 430).

Table 10: Example 7 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

Source Text	**TT1**
Iago: Zounds, sir, you're robbed, for shame put on your gown! Your heart is burst, you have lost half your soul, Even now, now, very now, an old black ram Is tupping your white ewe! Arise, arise, Awake the snorting citizens with the bell Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you, Arise I say! **1.1. (**Shakespeare,1997, pp. 121-122)	**Iago:** İsa hakkı için, soyuldunuz bayım. Hemen giyinseniz iyi olur. Yüreğiniz paramparça, ruhunuzun yarısı gitti. Şu anda, şimdi, tam şu sırada, Koca bir kara koç sizin ak kuzunuza biniyor. Davranın, kalkın! Çanları çalın; Horlayan yurttaşları uyandırın. Şeytanın kayınpederi oluyorsunuz. Durmayın, kalkın. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 23)
TT2	**TT3**
Iago: Soyuldunuz beyim, soyuldunuz; ne olur, Elbisenizi giyin, yürekten vurdular size; Canınızın yarısı gitti; şimdi bile, Şimdi, şu an, kara bir koç koç Atlıyor ak kuzunuza. Kalkın, kalkın, Çan çalarak uyandırın horlayan yurttaşları, Yoksa şeytan sizi dede yapacak, Kalkın diyorum. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 12)	**Iago:** Soyuldunuz efendim, soyuldunuz. Birşeyler giyin üstünüze; yüreğinizi deştiler, ruhunuzun yarısını kapıp kaçtılar. Tam şu anda, evet evet, tam şu anda kocamış bir kara koç, sizin beyaz kuzunuza atlıyor. Kalkın, kalkın, horlıyan şehirlileri çan çalıp uyandırın, yoksa şeytan sizi dede yapıverecek. Kalkın, diyorum. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 7)
TT4	**Proposed Translation**
Iago: İnanınız ki efendim, soyuldunuz. Allah rızası için üstünüzü başınızı giyin, can evinize girdiler, yan canınızı çaldılar. Hatta şimdi, şu anda yaşlı bir kara koç, beyaz koyunuzla çiftleşiyor. Kalkın, kalkın! Horlıyan şehirlileri çan çalıp uyandırın, yoksa şeytan size büyük baba yapacak, kalkın diyorum! (Shakespeare,1996, p. 6)	**Iago**: İsa adına yemin ederim, soyup soğana çevirmişler sizi efendim! Giyinin de bari Hristiyan şerefinize daha fazla leke sürülmesin. Kalbinizi çıkarıp, ruhunuzun yarısını çalmışlar. Tam da şu an yaşlı bir kara koç sizin beyaz kuzuyla meleşmekte, Uyanın, uyanın! Horlayan şehir efradını çanla uyandırın, Şeytanın size dede yapması an meselesi, Kalksanıza ahali!

The context in Table 10 and its translations is the association of Othello and Desdemona's marriage with the evil which can be considered as an enigma. Therefore,

the translations of this context were evaluated. Iago uses mythological allusions to support his argument as Poseidon is the uncle to Hecate, and Theophane is transformed into an ewe. In the translations above, it is possible to see that in TT1, the exclamation "Zounds" is "İsa hakkı için" (For the love of Jesus Christ). Translation in TT1 is an example of over-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the name Jesus Christ does not appear in the source text. However, the exclamation "Zounds!" is a direct reference to the five wounds of Jesus Christ [36].

In the other translations, translators either chose to omitted the iconographic sign or tried to replace it with similar exclamations from Turkish. In TT2, it is "ne olur" (pity me) as an exclamation as an example of under-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), while in TT3 it is omitted from the context through wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017,172). In TT4, on the other hand, the exclamation "İnanınız ki" (let me assure you) exists to reflect Iago's efforts in assuring Brabantio, Desdemona's father. In this respect, the exclamation "Zounds" was translated as "İsa adına" (In the name of Jesus Christ). The reason why he starts the talk with an iconographic sign serves Iago's purposes to light the candle to arise Brabantio. Iago also adds the word "for shame" to his words. The reference is iconographic because he would implicitly be referring to Christian shame. "Allah rızası için" (for the love of God) in TT4 is an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the meaning in the iconographic sign is altered.

Iago's evil purpose is visible through his effort to label Othello and Desdemona's marriage using the mythological allusion of the black ram and the white ewe. Iago implicitly refers to the intercourse between Poseidon and the Thracian princess Theophane.[37] Iago is not evil only in trying to lessen the importance of their marriage by openly referring to their devilish intercourse. He manipulates Brabantio's way of approaching the marriage. Othello and Desdemona were both described as beasts, and the mythological references concerning them are deliberately within iconographic context. The exclamation at the beginning of the speech, therefore,

[36] Zounds is a short form of the wounds of Jesus Christ
[37] Dictionary of Classical Mythology, R. March, Jennifer, Oxford Books, p. 467. Also see Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.117: Hyginus, Fabula 118

contradicts with the mythological context. Iago's speech reflects the two opposing worlds together to anger Brabantio to such a degree that he would destroy Othello with the help of the townsfolk.

The reference to the future grandchild in the expression “the devil will make a grandsire of you" is to the golden ram, Crius Crysomallus.[38] Iago's efforts to tell what happened between Othello and Desdemona are nothing more than sabotaging the marriage through mythological references. Since mythological figures are labelled as ancient demons from history, Poseidon is the uncle to Hecate, who is almost the personification of witchcraft in Western thought. Othello is then associated with Poseidon, the god of the sea. In his speech, however, Othello's relation to witchcraft is revealed subtly to both Brabantio and the townsfolk. For sure, the talk of Hecate would have a very negative effect on the Renaissance gaze.

In the translations of "black ram and white ewe" (kara koç ve ak kuzu) referring to Poseidon and Theophane, reference to mythology is implicit in Iago's speech. The description of the intercourse between Othello and Desdemona is so open that it would anger a father. It would not be an overestimation to assume that Brabantio somewhat understands Iago's reference to the devil before he subtly refers to the birth of Crius Crysomalus.[39] The possibility of the birth of a golden ram, from a human being, would only be the work of magic in the Christian context. Therefore, Iago can get what he desires through his text with iconographic and mythological allusions as the identification of the devil in the text. It is not always possible to translate mythological and iconographic allusions openly because replacing "black ram and white ewe" with "Poseidon and Theophane" would be an example of over-interpretation of the meaning. In this respect, the use of footnotes would be appropriate for extended information.

Table 11: Example 8 for Translation Comparison Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Othello: Why, how now, ho? From whence ariseth this?	**Othello:** Ne oluyor burada, hey? Türklere mi döndük ki biz,

[38] *Dictionary of Classical Mythology,* R.March, Jennifer, Oxford Books, p. 467. Also see Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.117: Hyginus, Fabula 118
[39] Ibid

Are we turned Turks? And to ourselves do that Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites? For Christian shame, put by this barbarous brawl; He that stirs next, to carve for his own rage, Holds his soul light: he dies upon his motion. Silence that dreadful bell, it frights the isle From her propriety. 2.3. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 193)	Osmanlı'nın yapamadığını Kendimize yapıyoruz? Hristiyanlık aşkına, Bırakın bu barbarca kavgayı. Canını seven kılıcını indirsin, derhal! Kımıldayan ölmüş bilsin kendini. Susturun şu korkunç çanı! Adayı ayağa kaldıracak! (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 76)
TT2 **Othello:** Hey, ne var? Nerden çıktı bu? Türk mü olduk yoksa, Tanrı'nın Osmanlılara Yaptırmadığı şeyi mi yapıyoruz kendimize? Hristiyanlığınızdan utanın, kesin bu vahşi kavgayı. Hırsını dindirmek için ilk davranan Canına değer vermiyor demektir; Ölecektir kımıldar kımıldamaz. Susturun şatonun çanını, adanın huzuruna. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 47)	**TT3** **Othello:** Nedir bu hal? Bu da nereden çıktı? Osmanlılarla döğüşemediniz diye birbirinizi mi yiyeceksiniz? Allah korkusu yok mu sizde? Vahşîler gibi bu döğüşme de he oluyor? Elini ilk kaldıran kendi kuyusunu kazdı demektir? Kıpırdamayın, gebertirim! Biri de gidip şu çan gürültüsünü kessin, adayı uykusundan uyandıracak. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 32)
TT4 **Othello:** Ne oluyor? Bu iş nereden çıktı? Kendi düşmanımız kendimiz mi olduk ki Tanrının Osmanlılara yaptırmadığı şeyi biz yapıyoruz. Hristiyanlığınızdan utanın. Bu barbarca kavgayı bırakın. Yoksa, hırsına yenilip ilk harekete geçecek olan canına değer vermiyor demektir: Kımıldar kımıldamaz ölecektir. Şu korkunç çanı susturun. Sükûnet içindeki Adaya korku salıyor. (Shakespeare, 1996, pp. 46-47)	**Proposed Translation** **Othello:** Ne bu haliniz? Nereden çıktı bu kargaşa? Türkler'e mi döndük te, Tanrı'nın Osmanlı'ya yasakladığını kendimize yapıyoruz? Sizde biraz Hıristiyan edebi varsa, bu barbarca kavgayı durdurursunuz. İntikama davranan Eceline susamış demektir, Son duasını edemeden gebertirim. Susturun şu koca çanı, neredeyse adayı temellerinden sarsacak.

The context in Table 11 and its translations is the description of "turning Turk," which can be considered as an enigma. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. The most controversial speech in the text Othello takes place after Iago fuels a fight between Cassio, Roderigo, and the soldiers under Othello's command after a long drinking session at night. The event takes place right after they learn that a storm destroyed the Turkish fleet. They drink to celebrate this success. Therefore, there is a

Turkish context in the background of the scene. It also echoes discrimination of Othello's reprimand of his soldiers. He refers to "turning Turk" of the soldiers. It may be an allusion to especially Janissaries in the Ottoman era who were mostly Christian converts.[40]

Othello, then, presents the idea of conversion as an undesired way of existence. He openly accuses his soldier of behaving like Turks, who would go beyond the limit that God sets for them. Although Othello is very angry and assertive in this scene, it is unclear what he means by the limits set by God to Ottomans. He may be referring to brotherhood between Janissaries, the Sultan's soldiers all belonging to Bektashi sect. It was, therefore, strictly forbidden for them to murder one another. The limits set to the Ottomans by God would equal to the murder of the brother and the brotherhood. Othello may be meaning that his soldiers attempt to become "worse than" the Ottomans by murdering each other.

In the absence of a credible explanation, and such ambiguity in meaning, it would be a problem to translate the reference to the Crescent, namely, the Ottoman Empire. The historical allusions in this speech also echo Othello's Eastern gaze that he seems to be at war with. Othello's manifestations of war with the Ottomans refer to his war with the Eastern world since he desperately tries to belong to the Venetian world. He immediately reminds his soldiers of their Christian existence by saying "for Christian shame."

In translations, it is possible to see that very interesting choices are evident. According to Mesut Kuleli, "reconstruction of literary meaning in translations is the mission of the translator who should also be a good reader and analyser of signs" (Kuleli, 2018, p. 36). In the translations of TT1, TT2, TT3, and TT4, the expression "turning Turk" was translated in different ways. As an example, in TT1 there is not an example of a designificative tendency because "Türklere mi döndük, yoksa?" is the word by word translation of the sentence. TT2 is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017,172) because the word turn is replaced by "become" and "Türk mü olduk, yoksa?" (Have we become Turks?). It may be worth considering that "turning Turk" is an extended metaphor concerning Othello's motives

[40] See David, Nicolle, *The Janissaries*, 1997, pp. 4-5

as a character. In TT3, "Osmanlılarla döğüşemediniz diye birbirinizi mi yiyeceksiniz?" and in TT4 "Kendi düşmanımız kendimiz mi olduk ki" are both examples of alteration of the of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172), since the meaning that is conveyed is not irrelevant.

Othello's critical view of his soldier as the protagonist in a great tragedy refers to his hamartia because *pride* as a Venetian general is a mask that covers his scars from the East. Othello, is then, subconsciously at war with himself reflected in his expression "turning Turk" because the Venetian general only conforms with the political view of Venetian Republic. In TT4, on the other hand, "turning Turk" is non-existent and "Kendi düşmanımız kendimiz mi olduk yoksa?" (Have we turned into enemies of ourselves?) is the sentence changed. In this context, Othello's revolt and anger against Turks who controlled most of the Mediterranean and his native land, North Africa, would be erased. Othello's anger against Turks, reveals his fear of "perdition". In TT3, the use of "Osmanlılarla dövüşemediniz diye birbirinizi mi yiyeceksiniz?" (Are you going to fight with yourselves because you could not fight with the Ottomans?) instead of the sign "turning Turk" is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

There are two other expressions to consider for the translation of this speech. The first is "Christian shame." In TT1, it was translated as "Hristiyanlık aşkına" (for the love of Christianity), which is an example of over-interpretation of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the word love does not exist in the source text. In TT4 and TT2 it was translated as "Hristiyanlığınızdan utanın" (You should be ashamed of your Christianity) with no meaning transformation. In TT3, on the other, the expression as "Allah korkusu yok mu sizde?" (Have you no fear of God?) is again an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172) because there is excessive commentary concerning the sign.

In the proposed translation, shame, then, was replaced by (edep) in general Othello's speech. In the original text, Othello's threat to the attacking soldiers by saying, "Holds his soul light, he dies upon his motion" was translated as "Eceline susamış demektir/ Son duasını edemeden gebertirim!" (I will slaughter, he, who, holds his soul light, without the last prayer). In the original text, there is no reference to

praying to put stress on Othello's warning; it exists as an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172). The one who dies without a last prayer is more likely to go hell in the Christian context. Tragically, he behaves the same way to Desdemona and does not let her pray for the last time. The way that Othello labels the angry soldiers as taking ways of the devil is interestingly like Desdemona's. Othello's punishment for them would be sending them to hell without the last prayer. When he "believes" that Desdemona is guilty of adultery, Othello, in a similar way, lets her die without a last prayer to go directly to hell.

Table 12: Example 9 for Translation Comparison Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Othello: Never, Iago. Like to the Pontic sea Whose icy current and compulsive course Ne'er keeps retiring ebb but keeps due on To the Propontis and the Hellespont: Even so my bloody thoughts with violent pace Shall ne'er look back, ne'er ebb to humble love Till that a capable and wide revenge Swallow them up. Now by yond marble heaven In the due reverence of a sacred vow I here engage my words. 3.3.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 239)	**Othello:** Asla,Iago! Nasıl ki Pontus Denizi'nin Buz gibi suları hiç geri dönmez Dosdoğru Propontis ve Hellespont'a akarsa, Benim kanlı düşüncelerim de olanca hızıyla, Asla arkaya bakmadan, aşka geri dönmeden, Uçsuz bucaksız, engin bir intikama kavuşana kadar Yola devam edecek. (Shakespeare, 2018, pp.114-115)
TT2	**TT3**
Othello: Asla,Iago. Nasıl Karadeniz'in Buzlu akıntısı, ve şaşmaz gidişi Çekilme nedir bilmeden tutarsa yolunu Marmara ve Çanakkale'nin, benim Kanlı düşüncelerim de, sert adımlarla İlerleyecek hiç ardına bakmadan; Zavallı aşka hiçbir zaman alçalmayacak Geniş, kavrayıcı bir kin yutuncaya dek onları. İşte şu mermer gök hakkı için, Kutsal bir yeminin gerektirdiği saygıyla And içiyorum dediklerimi yapacağıma. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 72)	**Othello:** Asla, lago. Karadeniz'in buzlu, sert akıntısı hiç durmadan nasıl Marmara'yı, Çanakkale'yi boylar, benim kanlı düşüncelerim de öyle.' Ârdınâ bile bakmadan öfkeli adımlarla ilerliyecek, bir daha dönmiyecek aşkın yanına. Müthiş bir intikam hepsini yutuncaya kadar. Şu mermer göğün, üstüne yemin ederim ki, ağzımdan ne çıktıysa yapacağım. (Shakespeare,1964, pp. 51-52)
TT4	**Proposed Translation**

Othello: Asla Iago. Nasıl Karadeniz'in buzlu akıntısı ve sert cereyanı, kesilmek nedir bilmeden, dosdoğru Marmara ve Çanakkale'yi boylarsa, benim kanlı düşüncelerim de öyle müthiş adımlarla ilerliycek, asla geriye bakmıycak, asla kuvvetten kesilip alçalarak aşka doğru gelmiycek: Ta büyük ve kudretli, büyük bir intikam ne var ne yok hepsini birden yutuncaya kadar. Nur içinde parlıyan şu gök hakkı için. (Shakespeare, 1996, p.75)	**Othello:** Asla Iago. Nasıl Karadeniz'in dondurucu akıntısı kaynağına hiç dönmeden doğruca Marmara ve Çanakkale'ye akar, Benim kanlı düşüncelerim de zemberekten boşanırcasına akacak. Hiç ardına bakmayacak ve asla dönmeyecek ikiyüzlü aşkın yanına. Ta ki yüce intikam kudretiyle onları içine çekene dek. Sözüm söz, yeminim yemin, mukaddesat namına Şu mermer gök kubbe şahidim olsun.

The context in Table 12 is the description of Othello's *anger* through Eastern geographical context, which can be considered as an enigma. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. It is also the first speech that Othello describes himself through his nature. The excerpt explains the greatness of Othello's revenge because he is almost sure that Desdemona committed adultery. Othello uses Eastern geographical imagery to explain the greatness of his anger and revenge, although he fully associates himself with the Venetians. He explains how his "bloody thoughts" will proceed like the seas Pontus (Black Sea) and Propontis (Marmara Sea) to Hellespont (Çanakkale) with the Eastern geographical context. He refers to "phusis" instead of logos (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189) that he will surrender to his drives and passions. In this respect, from this speech on, Othello leaves the sphere of logos behind. His nature, torn as the East and the West, is abused by the latter. For Othello, the sphere of logos (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189) represents the West because he is a robotized subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 194) of the Venetian Army.

Interestingly, his drives and passions ironically exemplified by the Eastern Sea imagery (seas that take place in the Ottoman land, ironically) are destructive for Desdemona, who represents Venetian piousness and patriotism. The battle that takes place between lovers starts in Othello's soul first because he cannot be not *faithful* to his nature. The way that he approaches the handkerchief issue is as explosive as his anger. However, Othello's heartfelt adoration to Eastern silk, the charmers, the sibylline prophecies does not stop him from committing murder. The ties to her mother's beliefs signal a nature symbolically divided into two. Therefore, Desdemona cannot understand which Othello talks about what time. Perdition, as exemplified in

Othello's reaction, parallels with the perdition of the handkerchief. Othello is an alien to his soul, who has scars back to his departure from North Africa.

Therefore, translations of the speech into Turkish are critically important. The first challenge is to translate the geographical names. The translator of TT1, in this respect, chose not to translate the names of the seas Pontic (Karadeniz), Propontis (Marmara), and Hellespont (Çanakkale). TT1 translational choices may be using the original Elizabethan names. Othello's bloody thoughts are revealed through Ottoman Sea imagery. These translations preserved signs.

In the translational context, the speech that foregrounds Desdemona's murder to announce the death of "humble love" is challenging to translate because the denotation of humble (modest) denotes "alçakgönüllü", the one who does not boast in Turkish. It cannot be what Othello means about Cassio and Desdemona's love. It is a good idea to concentrate on the connotations of the word then. Humble also means low or ignoble that is more apt for the context.Translators have adopted different strategies in the translation of this word. TT1, TT3, TT4 are examples of wiping out of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172). In TT2, on the other hand, the sign, "zavallı" (poor) that belittles love is introduced as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172). In the proposed translation, the connotations of the word "humble" and its place in the whole speech was interpreted. Othello uses the word as an insult for the imagined lovers, and there is great stress on the low qualities of love. Othello undoubtedly feels deceived and calling Desdemona's love humble is also an allusion to frailty. Therefore, the Turkish equivalence of the word humble is "ikiyüzlü" (frail) because, without deceit, love would not be humble in the Elizabethan context.

Another critical word to translate was "by yond marble heaven" which is "beyond marble heaven" in modern English. It had long been a discussion for the readers what Shakespeare might have meant with the expression. Othello means the skies, but it is still unclear why heaven is called marble. Mythologically speaking, it refers to the shiniest part of the sky where the stars are positioned.[41] In the translations of this word, in TT2 it is "mermer gök" which bears no meaning transformation as in

[41] See John Milton's *Paradise Lost,* p.77

TT3 as "mermer gök" (marble skies). TT4 as "nur içinde parlayan" (in divine radiance), is an example of over-interpretation of meaning. The word marble and "gök kubbe" (skydome) may also be free of designificative tendencies if the mythological reference to skydome is explained with a footnote. The reference is to Atlas in mythology, who would hold different spheres in celestial skies, including the marble. In this context, the word marble would not look awkward in translations of Turkish because the missing link of the iconographic and mythological allusions is made more apparent to the readers.

The next iconographic sign to look for is "in the due reverence of a sacred wow." TT2 is "Kutsal bir yeminin getirdiği saygıyla" which reflects the sentence in English. Therefore, it bears no designificative tendency. In TT4, there is wiping out the meaning Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), and in TT3 the word "wow" (yemin) is an example of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation, the expression "mukaddesat namına" was added for emphasis.

Table 13: Example 10 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST **Othello:** I kissed thee ere I killed thee: no way but this; Killing myself, to die upon a kiss. 5.2.(Shakespeare,1997, p. 331)	**TT1** **Othello:** Öldürmeden önce öpmüştüm seni. Şimdi bana düşen, seni öperken ölmek. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 196)
TT2 **Othello:** Öldürmeden önce seni öpmüştüm; tek yol var tek: Kendimi öldürerek, bir öpücük uğruna can vermek. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 122)	**TT3** **Othello:** Öldürmeden önce öpmüştüm seni. Yine öyle olacak. Öldürürken kendimi de, işte can veriyorum bir öpüşün üstünde. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 92)
TT4 **Othello:** Seni öldürmeden öpmüştüm, başka türlü olamaz, kendimi öldürürken de bir pusenin üstünde can vereceğim. (Shakespeare, 1996, p.133)	**Proposed Translation** **Othello:** Ölüm öpücüğü verdim sana, Tek yol kaldı artık bana, Son öpücüğün uğruna Kıyıyorum işte cana.

The context in Table 13 in translations is Othello's kisses of Desdemona. Both kisses have iconographic meaning which can be considered as enigmas. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. The last iconographic details of this chapter

are from the last words of Othello. After killing Desdemona, Othello feels like waking up from a dream and realizes what he had done. He tries to describe the importance of the kiss that he gave to Desdemona as the kiss changes meaning after killing her. The obscurity of meaning in this speech occurs because "kiss" is used twice in this short speech. It looks like each kiss has two different meanings in terms of iconography. The first kiss, the kiss before dying, is Desdemona's farewell to Othello, and Othello's oath not to return to love is broken with it. Othello cannot stop himself from kissing Desdemona for the last time because she kisses him to show that he is the one. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 331) Therefore, Othello's last kiss and the act of killing sanctify their love and turn Desdemona into a martyr.

The second kiss that Othello dies upon is the kiss to sanctify and celebrate their holy love because Desdemona is now the martyr while Othello realizes the traitor inside him. He now feels like Judas Iscariot and kills the traitor inside him to sanctify their love. The attempt of suicide is not to kill the Venetian inside him but the Eastern one like the man from Aleppo. While dying upon a kiss, like Jesus Christ, he becomes a love martyr-like Desdemona. Othello's "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189) desires to become a Venetian martyr as he wishes to be holy.

In the translation analysis, it is possible to say that except for TT2, rhyming and poetic diction in this speech was not the focus in translations. As for the iconographic allusions, "I kissed thee, ere I killed thee," could be interpreted as Othello's label to Desdemona's betrayal. In the proposed translation, therefore, this quotation was translated as "ölüm öpücüğü" (the kiss of death) to parallel the iconographic idea. To put it in other words, Othello describes betrayal through the iconographic gaze. In translations, signs were preserved. His love relationship with Desdemona is not meaningful through the magic of the handkerchief and the Eastern material in his "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189). Othello's last attempt to sanctify their love is through the Christian context only as he dies to become a true Venetian. He does not attempt to kill the Venetian inside him that he almost worships, but the Eastern nature that he describes as "perdition." Eventually, perdition catches his soul for the last time before the kiss of death and his last kiss for Desdemona. The context can be described within the context of martyrdom.

2.4. Veridictory Modalities in *Othello* and its Translations

It is critical to study the veridictory square in the text *Othello* because keeping secrets, lies, and deceit is directly related to the plot. Explaining the causes behind such actions may provide a better grasp of the text's pathetic structure. The synopsis of *Othello* is an intricately interwoven one since Iago's evil aims tend to complicate the speakers' intentions and the plot ending with the murder.

The theory on the veridictory square was developed by Greimas and Courtés, which takes the following into account:(1) the evaluating subject, (2) the object being evaluated,(3) the specific characteristic evaluated in the object,(4) the veridictory categories: true (being+seeming), false (not-being+not seeming), illusory (not being+seeming) and secret (being+not-seeming). Under the light of the description of Greimas and Courtés, it is possible to clarify the veridictory states of the characters (Greimas & Courtés, 1982, p. 369). In this study, the veridictory state to focus on will be true (being+seeming), as exemplified in Desdemona and Othello's mental states.

Desdemona's position as a character in the text is vague from the very beginning because her pious existence is changeable both in the Eastern and the Western male gaze. In the Western gaze, as pronounced by Iago, she becomes a woman who would betray both the father and the husband. Iago has no belief in Desdemona's innocence, and his constant poisoning of Othello adds to the effects that cause domestic murder. The relationship between seeming and being is worth considering in this respect. In the text, it is clear Desdemona never commits adultery, but the way that things seem to be, are made worse in the gaze of the husband by Iago. The seeming relationship between her and Cassio is nothing but a fantasy of Iago and Othello. The difference between the two main characters also lies in the relationship between seeming and being. It is only Iago who knows that accusations made to Desdemona's pious and innocent character are false. Things are not the way they seem to be in the relationship between Othello and Desdemona.

In Othello's gaze, Desdemona turns into a demon because she seemingly commits adultery with Cassio, a lieutenant of the Venetian army. It is because things seem to be at odds with Desdemona's future; she would fall victim to the men's gaze. In the text, none of the males, including Othello himself, question the unhealthy

attitude towards truth. Consequently, the marriage of Othello and Desdemona falls prey to the misunderstanding of truth revealed at the end of the text.

It is possible to ask why patriarchy looks at Desdemona the way that Iago does because the validity of accusations is accepted beforehand when it comes to a woman's virtue. For patriarchy, women cannot be innocent since they caused the fall of Adam. Desdemona's innocence is out of the question when it comes to societal norms, and the husband is very likely to be believed rather than the wife. Therefore, Desdemona is innocent, but she seems to be the lover to Cassio in the eyes of men in the text.

It is a problem in the relationship of seeming and being in men: All men in the text, including her husband, tend to believe in what is right in the male gaze (seeming) rather than being (reality), which can be considered as a gap. Therefore, the translations of this context were evaluated. It is critical to see that it is Emilia, her lady, in waiting, who reveals the truth to all the males in the text right before she dies. Male gaze as far as the relationship between seeming and being is concerned is likely to produce erroneous knowledge because perceiving truth through gossips and defaming a woman, let alone killing by murder, is typical in a patriarchal society.

Table 14: Example 11 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Iago: I have rubbed this young quat almost to the sense And he grows angry. Now whether he kill Or Cassio him, or each do kill the other, Every way makes my gain. Live Roderigo, He calls me to a restitution large Of gold and jewels that I bobbed from him As gifts to Desdemona It must not be. If Cassio do remain He hath a daily beauty in his life That makes me ugly; and besides, the Moor May unfold me to him-there stand I in much peril. No, he must die. Be't so! I hear him coming! 5.1. (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 296-29)	**Iago:** Bu sivilceyi yeterince sıktım artık, Patlamaya hazır İyice baş verdi. İster o Cassio'yu öldürsün, ister Cassio onu, Ya da ikisi de birbirini, hepsi benim çıkarıma. Roderigo yaşarsa, Desdemona'ya armağan diye Ondan tırtıkladığım altın ve mücevherlerin hesabını soracak. Bu olmamalı Cassio sağ kalırsa, O kadar yakışıklı ve ağzı laf yapan biri ki, Ben yanında çirkin kalıyorum. Ayrıca, Magripli içyüzümü açıklayabilir ona. O zaman canım tehlikede demek. Hayır; Cassio mutlaka ölmeli. Hah, işte geliyor. (Shakespeare, 2018, pp. 165-166)

TT2	**TT3**
Iago :Şu küçük sivilceyi öyle bir kaşıdım ki, Kabardıkça kabarıyor öfkesi İster o Cassio'yu öldürsün, ister Cassio onu, Birbirlerini öldürsünler isterse, hepsinde de, Ben kazanırım: Roderigo sağ kalırsa, Kendisinden Desdemona'ya armağan diye, Sızdırdığım altınları, mücevherleri Geri ister bir bir; buna meydan vermemeli. Cassio sağ kalacak olursa, Hayatının öyle parlak bir güzelliği var ki, Beni çirkin gösteriyor. Sonra, Arap beni Onunla yüzleştirebilir, tehlikedeyim bu bakımdan, Hayır, ölmesi gerek, öyle olsun, geliyor işte. **(**Shakespeare, 2001, p. 104)	**Iago:** Öyle bir kızıştırdım ki, şu sarsak tüysüzü, barut kesildi. İster bu Cassio'yu öldürsün, ister Cassio bunu. İsterlerse de birbirlerini şişlesinler, yine ben kârlıyım bu işte. Roderigo sağ kalırsa, Desdemona'ya hediye diye, sızdırdığım altınları, mücevherleri bir bir geri ister. Meydan vermemeli buna. Ya Cassio sağ kalırsa? Hayatının öyle bir güzelliği var ki, çirkin kalıyorum, yanında. Üstelik, olur a, Arap onunla yüzleştirmeye kalkar beni. Tehlikeli bir şey. Onun için, Cassio da ölmeli. Geliyor galiba. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 78)
TT4	**Proposed Translation**
Iago: Bu ahmak delikanlıyı iyice kızıştırdım., parlamaya başlıyor. Şimdi istet o Cassioyu, ister Cassio onu, ister ikisi biribirini öldürsün: hepsi de benim kazancımdır. Eğer Roderigo sağ kalırsa, benim kendisinden Desdemonaya hediye diye sızdırdığım altın ve mücevherleri tamamen ödememi istiyecek, buna meydan, vermemeli. Eğer geride Cassio kalırsa, hayatının temiz, bir güzelliği var ki beni çirkin gösteriyor; Othello olanları ona anlatarak beni ele verebilir. Bu bakımdan büyük bir tehlike içindeyim. Hayır, Cassio'nun ölmesi lâzım, öyle - olsun. Geliyor.(Shakespeare, 1996, p. 111)	**Iago:** Bu gencin sırtını öyle bir sıvazladım ki, Öfkesi kıvama gelmek üzere. İster Cassio onu öldürsün, ya da o Cassio'yu Her şekilde karlıyım Roderigo yaşarsa Desdemona'ya vermek için kendisinden aldığım altın ve mücevherleri geri ister. Bu olamaz. Cassio yaşarsa, hayatının güzelliği beni çirkin bırakacak. Ayrıca Mağripli'nin beni ele verecek olması büyük tehlike. Hayır, o ölmeli. Öyle olsun bakalım! Geldiğini duyuyorum.

The context in Table 14 and its translations is the unraveling of Iago's secrets to manipulate Cassio, Roderigo, and Othello. In this context, the speech is an example of the difference between seeming and being. Therefore, translations of this context were evaluated. Whatever seems in *Othello* is different from the truth because Iago's constant efforts to turn every opportunity to his advantage are critical. This speech of Iago is the proof that he plays with people's minds to reach his ends. The picture in which Iago paints Cassio, Roderigo, and Othello's thoughts, or seeming in the context

of veridictory modalities (Greimas & Courtés, 1982, p. 369), is very different from the truth in the speech. In TT1 and TT2, the first lines are examples of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because of the word "quat," which has two implications. It both means a young person and a pimple. After the opening lines, the rest of the speech is about Roderigo that Iago tries to manipulate, so, presumably, the meaning changes.

In translations TT3 and TT4, on the other hand, there are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning. In TT3, "quat" was translated as "sarsak tüysüz" (clumsy young boy) while in TT4 "ahmak delikanlı" (dumb boy). In the source text, there is no direct reference to Roderigo's dumbness, but in TT4, because of over-interpretation of the meaning, the word was added. Similarly, in the expression that Iago calls Cassio, "He hath a daily beauty," there is over-interpretation of the meaning in TT1. "O kadar yakışıklı ve ağzı laf yapan biri ki "(he is such a good-looking man and a fine speaker) gives excessive commentary on the meaning of the source text. In TT2, the translation is "hayatının öyle parlak bir güzelliği var ki" (the beauty of his life is radiant) as an example of the sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172). Similarly, in TT4, "hayatının temiz bir güzelliği var ki" (the beauty of his life is so pure), the translation is an example of the sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, there are no designificative tendencies.

2.5. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *Othello*

The focus of the transformations of the subject is the "anger" of Othello, often stated in the text. He was often described as the "angry Moor" by Venetians. It is not clear whether this anger leads him to commit murder based on Iago's poisonous comments on his wife. Either way, the character Othello goes through a transformation that may be studied using the concepts of subject and non-subject in Jean Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 184). Othello introduces himself by referring to his service to the Venetian state and manifests himself into a subject: "My parts, my title, and my perfect soul shall manifest me rightly." (Shakespeare, 2011, p. 276)

It is possible to see traces of hubris in this quotation; Othello asserts himself as a subject who has total control of his actions both to the Venetians and to his soldiers. Based on Coquet's perspective, only somebody who knows what they are saying, who are conscious of their words, who can take the responsibility of what they say can be "I" – the subject (Coquet, 1984, p. 3)."[42] Non-subject, in this respect, refers to temporary or permanent situations in which the person may not have that consciousness and thus may not take the responsibility of their words. Therefore, it is worth studying a subject like Othello turning into a non-subject under the attack of constant manipulation. He gradually loses his ability to judge as the text moves on. Othello's in-betweenness lies in the fact that he turns slowly from a subject to a non-subject whose inability to judge results in a domestic murder. In the classification of Typology of non-subjects by Öztürk Kasar (2007, 3-6), it is possible to bring the reasons behind the existence of a non-subject in a text, which may further contribute to the textual analysis in detail.

By genealogy, Othello is not a natural-born Venetian. He turns into a Venetian through his service to the Venetian state. In the text, it is not crystal-clear which service he had done to the state. Praise from his fellow soldiers reveals that his service is related to the killings of Ottomans. Did Othello have the chance to question the orders from the Venetian state? Clearly, no. Then "his service" must be related to his famous "anger" used in killings of enemies. The character Othello is described in two ways by the Venetians: Being angry and noble.

Consequently, his anger must have been put into "good use" since the extermination of Ottomans is a do or die issue. They were the greatest enemies of Venetians at the time. He becomes so successful that they give him the island of Cyprus to manage as a token for his future service against the Turkish threat. It would then be possible to classify Othello, not as a subject, but he who would do anything to accomplish his duty. Defending Cyprus at all costs against the Turkish threat is the peak of his commitment to the Venetian State:

[42] Unless otherwise stated, the English translations of conceptual and theoretical framework of our study are taken from Associate Professor Didem Tuna's ELL 671 (Methods in Semiotics of Translation) lecture notes.

> The Turks took Cyprus from the Venetians in 1570-3 and, though heavily defeated by a Christian navy at the Battle of Lepanto (1571), henceforth dominated the eastern Mediterranean. Shakespeare may not have known it when he wrote Othello, but the loss of Cyprus signaled the decline of Venice; the Venetians ceded Crete to the Turks in 1669 and ceased to be a significant force at sea. (Honigmann, 1997, p. 8)

Othello's commitment to Venice comes with a deep hatred of Turks, who constantly threaten the Venetian existence in the Mediterranean as well as his position as a general and his life. The reputation of women in Venice is so contrary to the conduct of Desdemona that Iago abuses this discriminative strain to its "deadly effect". In his view, Venetian wives look and behave like courtesans:

> I know our country disposition well —
> In Venice, they do let God see the pranks
> They dare not show their husbands. 3.4. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 221)

Consequently, Desdemona becomes a figure to put to the test in cunning Iago's gaze. At the same time, Othello begins to echo Iago because he is a Venetian, and "the city's reputation for sexual licentiousness helps to convince him.”:

> I took you for that cunning whore of Venice that married with Othello. 4.2.(Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 91-92)

To analyse the motives behind the murder, a description of Othello's anger may give hints. The Venetians had described Othello's rage in connection with his Moorishness as they identify him as "the angry Moor." From Venetian perspective, his ethnic background from a hot country like North Africa could be an explanation of anger since it may have adverse effects on the temperament. However, his genealogy dating back to a North-African tribe and his passion would be the explanation of his shift from a subject to a non-subject without direct reference to an external force.

Referring to Domains of Autonomy and Heteronomy of the Instance of Origin by Jean Claude Coquet, the link to "immanent instance" as the classification of "the

forces acting inside the instance of origin as the sphere of drives and passions" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189) may be meaningful for the study of *Othello*. The study of the enunciating instance in Shakespeare's *Othello* then may reveal the fact that Othello is a character who falls under the control of bodily drives. The handkerchief that he gives to Desdemona, then, is the symbol of his mother's homeland because "phusis" is related to both cosmic and symbolic nature (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189). The loss of the handkerchief vexes Othello so much that it almost starts Othello's transformation into a non-subject after an epileptic fit.

The handkerchief initially belonged to an Egyptian charmer who could almost read the thoughts of people. She gave it to Othello's mother for her to be more attractive in the eyes of her husband. In case she lost it, gave someone as a gift, the husband would transform into a cheating husband to look for other women. It is the embodiment of Othello's obsessions:

> That's a fault. That handkerchief
> Did an Egyptian to my mother give,
> She was a charmer and could almost read
> The thoughts of people. She told her, while she kept it
> 'Twould make her amiable and subdue my father
> Entirely to her love; but if she lost it
> Or made a gift of it, my father's eye
> Should hold her loathed and his spirits should hunt
> After new fancies. She, dying, gave it me
> And bid me, when my fate would have me wive,
> To give it her. I did so, and – take heed on't!
> Make it a darling, like your precious eye! –
> To lose't or give't away were such perdition
> As nothing else could match. 3.4. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 244)

Therefore, Othello's receiving the handkerchief at her mother's death bed and Desdemona's possession of it are also symbolical. Othello also confesses that there's magic in the web of it because a Sybil had sewn it during a prophetic fury. The worms who made the silk thread were hallowed, that is, honoured as holy, dyed inside mummified maiden's hearts to obtain the colour of strawberries on the handkerchief:

'Tis true, there's magic in the web of it.
A sibyl that had numbered in the world
The sun to course two hundred compasses,
In her prophetic fury sewed the work;
The worms were hallowed that did breed the silk
And it was dyed in mummy, which the skilful
Conserved of maidens' hearts. 3.4. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 245)

Othello's description of the handkerchief may give us hints on his perspective on marriage, but is the magic inside the handkerchief enough to explain his transformation into a murderer? The accusations of Brabantio prove to be true since Othello is now, in his deep relationship with the handkerchief, away from the sphere of logos, the conceptualizing instance (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189; Tuna & Çelik, 2020, p. 18). Othello was once cursed to be a witch who turned Desdemona into a traitor. Witches have alternative ways of thinking, whose judgement is affected by "immanent instance" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189). Although Othello's rage is evident in the text, the references related to his deep connection with his North-African past are often vague. The handkerchief, then, is both the source of his anger and the commitment to symbolical forces in his "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189). Othello, in this respect, is on the roller coaster of drives and passions stemming from the conflict between his "fashioning" as a subject by Venice and his non-Venetian existence. A deep, psychic connection to his North-African past is the background to the plot in the text.

Othello is also described as "an old black ram" by Iago in a derogative way. He refers to the colour of his skin and the age gap between him and Desdemona. Roderigo, on the other hand, describes him as "a lascivious Moor" with a direct allusion to sexual impurity as opposed to Desdemona. It is critical to see the discriminative gaze in Roderigo's words because "the Moor Othello" is both related to sexuality and his blood. The implication is that there is something sensual potentially threatening to the existence of Venice. Therefore, in the very description of Othello and Desdemona's rebellious love, although being described as noble and valiant, Othello is labelled implicitly as an enemy to the state. The couple unites when the father Brabantio yields to the circumstances, although he goes on accusing Othello of witchcraft. The

connection with the past of Othello exists with its geographical, mystical, and psychic inclinations.

The transcendent instance in Shakespeare's Othello is the moon because there are references by Othello to the movements of the moon before the murder. According to Typology of Non-Subjects (Öztürk Kasar, 2007, pp.3-6), change in the mood according to the movements of the moon is among the states originating from an "immanent instance of passion type" (Öztürk Kasar, 2007, pp.3-6). Before singing the song, after his so-called epileptic fit, Desdemona intuitively feels the subject transformation in general Othello, who, concerning his ethnical background, shows submissiveness to a "transcendent instance" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189).

The context of this speech and its translations is the description of Venetian women as associated with evil because they do not fear God while committing adultery.

Table 15: Example 12 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST **Iago:** I know our country disposition well — In Venice, they do let God see the pranks They dare not show their husbands. 3.3.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 221)	**TT1** **Iago:** Ben ülkemiz insanını iyi tanırım. Venedik'te öyleleri vardır ki, Kocalarından sakladıkları yosmalığı, Tanrı'ya göstermekten çekinmezler. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 101)
TT2 **Iago:** Bizim oralıların huyunu İyi bilirim ben; Venedik'te Fettanlıklarını Tanrı'nın görmesine aldırmazlar da, Kocalara göstermekten korkarlar. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 64)	**TT3** **Iago:** Gözünüzü açın, memleketimiz insanlarının huyunu iyi bilirim. Venedik'te kadınlar fettanlıkları için tanrılardan korkmazlar kocalarından korkarlar. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 65)
TT4 **Iago:** Ben, bizim Venedik'i iyi bilirim. Orada kadınlar, karıştırdıkları haltları Tanrının görmesine bir şeycik demezler de, kocaları görecek diye ödleri kopar. (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 46)	**Proposed Translation** **Iago:** Bizim oralıların huyunu iyi bilirim ben. Venedik'te kadınlar, kocalarından sakladıklarını Tanrı'nın görmesine aldırmazlar.

The context of this speech and its translations in Table 15 is the description of Desdemona as a Venetian courtier who could easily cheat on her husband. Iago's description of Venetian women is the background of Othello's transformation into a non-subject. Therefore, translations of this context were evaluated. Iago's constant stress on misogynistic views in Venetian society exists in the text for a reason. Iago tries to say that Venetian women are loose in relationships, and they may have a lot of secrets concerning love relationships. Iago implicitly refers to the infidelity of Venetian women because his manipulative tactics will be most effective when he sews seeds of suspicion in Othello's heart. However, in translations TT1, TT2, and TT3, Iago's implicit way of talking about the looseness of women in his society is made explicit. In this respect, all are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The translation of the word "pranks" as "yosmalık" in TT1 and "fettanlık", TT2 and TT3 are all examples of how Iago's implicit strategies to talk about infidelity are made explicit in translation. In TT4 on the other hand, there is sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the Turkish idiom "karıştırdıkları haltları" may mean other forms of mischief along with infidelity. In the proposed translation, a simple explanation such as "kocalarından gizlediklerini" (the things they hide from their husbands) is based on Iago's claim on the infidelity of Venetian women.

Table 16: Example 13 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST I took you for that cunning whore of Venice that married with Othello.4.2. (Shakespeare, 1997, p. 279)	**TT1** **Othello:** Venedikli o sinsi orospuyla karıştırmışım seni, Hani Othello'yla evlenmişti. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 151)
TT2 **Othello:** Othello'yla evlenen O Venedikli kurnaz kahpe sandım sizi. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 94)	**TT3** **Othello:** Ben sizi Venedikli şu kurnaz orospu sanmıştım. Hani Othello'yla evlenen (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 69).
TT4 **Othello:** Ben sizi Othello ile evlenen o Venedikli düzenbaz kahpe zannettim (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 100)	**Proposed Translation** **Othello:** Sizi Othello'yla evlenen şu Venedikli kurnaz fahişeye benzettim.

The context in Table 16 is mocking of Desdemona's piousness and fidelity to echo Iago's description of Venetian courtiers as an indication of Othello's transformation into a non-subject. Therefore, translations of this context were evaluated. It is the first time that Othello verbally attacks Desdemona in front of others. Othello almost openly claims that Desdemona's infidelity is real, and examples of designificative tendencies may not be expected since the sentence looks explicit. However, Othello does not openly say that Desdemona is not faithful to her husband but texts with words. He says he "took" her for another woman and apologizes beforehand. Translations TT1 and TT4 are both examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the word "cunning" was translated as "sinsi" (insidious) in TT1 and "düzenbaz" (mischievous) in TT4. There is an excessive commentary on the original text in translations. Therefore, even in a sentence so clearly stated, there may be over- interpretations. In TT2, TT3, and the proposed translation, signs were preserved.

2.6. Songs in *Othello* and its Translations

Willow Song

The poor soul sat sighing by a sycamore tree,
Sing all a green willow;
Her hand on her bosom, her head on her knee,
Sing willow, willow, willow
The fresh streams ran by her, and murmured her moans;
Sing willow, willow, willow
Her salt tears fell from her, & soften'd the stones;
Sing willow, willow, willow
Sing all a green willow must be my garland.
Let nobody blame him; his scorn I approve,
I call'd my love false love; but what said he then?
Sing willow, willow, willow
If I If I If I court moe women, you'll couch with moe men. 4.3. (Shakespeare,1997, p. 291)

The scope of this chapter allows the reader to focus on the symbolical meaning of the lyrics used in songs. Songs in Shakespearean theatre have a deep symbolical

significance. Desdemona's Willow Song is one of the best examples to give when it comes to both suspense and foreshadowing. Shakespeare adapted the lyrics from a folk song whose persona is male. Shakespeare's use of the song as the version sung by the maid Barbara foreshadows psychic changes in Othello, indicating that Othello and Desdemona's love will be lost forever.

The couple reaches the peak of mystical experience when Desdemona starts to sing her famous "willow song" with numerous references to mythology and iconography. However, the "willow tree" in the text is the symbol of transcendent instance that explains the symbolic nature. It is also the source of psychic experience. In Desdemona's Willow Song, its relationship with psychic power makes the willow tree the symbol of psychic change. Initially, the song gives the depiction of possibly a druid in its original form, that is in a trance rather than a lady mourning for her lost lover. The song is a sad one, not because it is a lament for love. The druid (as described in a state of trance) is also using the word "willow" as a mantra. The maid of Desdemona's mother, Barbara, whose name resembles the Barbary Coast as reminders of Othello's geographical past, sang the song. The maid Barbary's lover goes mad, and she dies singing the song. Willow Song is also a prophetic one to remind us of the prophetic fury of the Sybil, who made the handkerchief because it signals the psychic change. Therefore, the song foreshadows the domestic murder that is going to take place. The trance of the druid, Othello's epileptic fit, and the prophetic fury of the Sybil of the East seem to overlap as the embodiment of psychic forces that surround the couple (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189).

The weeping willow tree then becomes the symbol for Desdemona's psychic experience, originally growing in Babylon as a traditional symbol of tears and sadness (McNeil, 2009, p. 12). The song's mesmerizing effect not only comes from the broken heart of the maid Barbara but her name. The association of her name to Othello's North-African past is striking. "The garland," meaning both prize and garland to wear on the head, may refer to Babylon where the willow tree first originated from. Sycamore, on the other hand, is the tree of life in Judaism.

Moreover, in Egyptian mythology, two sycamore trees are believed to be present at the entrance of heaven, and between them stands Ra, the sun god. Among

the deep web of cultures, legends, and psychic spheres of the text *Othello*, geographical resemblances as well as mythological and iconographic connections exist. Therefore, Othello's transformation into a non-subject who strangles her wife, and his relationships with the transcendent instance, is evident in "The Willow Song.

The context in this song and its translations is the transformation of the female lover into a madwoman because of lost love. In this context, the psychic change turns the woman into a willow tree that constantly sheds tears as a significant sign concerning antic disposition. Therefore, translations of this context were evaluated. As explained above, both willow and sycamore trees are sources for psychic change and trance. Desdemona associates herself with Barbara, the maid, because she is about to lose her love. Her association with the supernatural is apparent through the willow tree and the song.

Table 17: Example 14 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Desdemona: The poor soul sat sighing by a sycamore tree, Sing all a green willow; Her hand on her bosom, her head on her knee, Sing willow, willow, willow The fresh streams ran by her, and murmured her moans; Sing willow, willow, willow Her salt tears fell from her, & soften'd the stones; Sing willow, willow, willow Sing all a green willow must be my garland. Let nobody blame him; his scorn I approve, I call'd my love false love; but what said he then? Sing willow, willow, willow If I If I If I court moe women, you'll couch with moe men. 4.3. (Shakespeare, 1997, pp. 291-292)	Desdemona: "Oturmuş incirin dibine bahtsız kadın, Söylüyordu şarkısını, mahzun, kırgın. "Ağlama söğüt, ağlama sen. Eli bağrında, başı dizinde, Ağlama söğüt, ağlama sen. Akıp giderken dere yanı başında, İnliyordu sanki onun ağzından. Ağlama söğüt, ağlama sen. Taşlar eriyordu gözyaşlarından. Ağlama söğüt, ağlama sen.' "Yeşil söğütten olsun ama çelengim." Onun suçu yok, Ne dediyse haklı, "Aşkın yalanmış deyince sevdiğime, İnanmazsın onun bana dediğine: Ben kadın peşinde koşup durdukça, Sen de erkek alıver gitsin yanına" (Shakespeare, 2018, pp. 161-162)
TT2	**TT3** Desdemona: İç çekerdi zavallıcık bir ağacın altında,

Desdemona: Kız zavallı iç çekerek bir çınarın dibinde, Söyleyin söğüdü oy söğüdü söğüdü. Göğsüne koymuş da ellerini, başı dizinde, Söyleyin söğüdü oy söğüdü söğüdü. Sular akardı, derdini kızın mırıldanırdı, Söyleyin söğüdü oy söğüdü söğüdü. Tuzlu gözyaşları düşer, taşları yumuşatırdı "Söyleyin söğüdü, ay söğüdü, söğüdü." "Söyleyin yeşil söğüt benim çelengim olsun. Kınamasın onu kimseler, varsın beni hor görsün… " "Dedim hayırsız sevgili ne dedi inanmazsın Söyleyin söğüdü oy söğüdü söğüdü Kaç kadınla gezersem, onca erkekle yatarsın." (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 101)	Yeşil salkım söğüt Elini kalbine koymuş, bası dizinde durmakta, Ey salkım salkım salkım söğüt Derdini mırıldanarak akıp giderdi ırmaklar, Yeşil salkım söğüt Taşları yumuşatırdı gözünden damlıyan yaslar Ey salkım salkım salkım söğüt Ona kusur bulmasınlar, ne yaparsa yapsın bana Ona hayırsızsan, dedim, o bana ne dedi bakın Yeşil salkım söğüt Kaç kızla kırıştırırsam onca erkekle yatarsın. Ey salkım salkım salkım söğüt Mezarıma çelenk olsun yeşil salkım salkım söğüt. (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 75)
TT4 **Desdemona:** Zavallıcık bir ağacın altına oturmuş iç çekiyordu; Söğüt yeşil söğüt deyin. Eli göğsünde, başı dizindeydi; Söğüt söğüt söğüt deyin. Taze ırmaklar yanında afayor, iniltisini mırıldanıyorlardı; Söğüt söğüt söğüt deyin. Gözlerinden akan tuzlu yaşlar taşları yumuşatıyordu. (Söğüt söğüt söğüt deyin.) Deyin, yeşil söğüt bana çelenk olsun. Onu kimse kabahatli bulmasın: beni hor görsün, makbulüm. Sevgilime hiyanet dedim: o karşılık ne dedi? Söğüt söğüt söğüt deyin. Eğer ben kadınların peşinden gidersem, iyi ya. sen de daha çok erkekle yatarsın. (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 108)	**Proposed Translation** **Desdemona:** Zavallıcık iç çekerek otururdu bir çınarın altında Hep söğüt türküsünü söylerdi Eli göğsünde, başı dizinde Hep söğüt, söğüt,söğüt derdi Taze ırmaklar yanından akarken İnilderlerdi onun gibi Hep söğüt, söğüt,söğüt derdi Gözyaşlarının tuzu taşları bile yumuşatırdı Hep söğüt şarkısını söylerdi Yeşil söğüt çelengim olsun derdi Ona kusur bulmasınlar, ne yaparsa kabulum Ona aşkın yalan dedim, bakın bana ne dedi? Söyleyin şarkısını söğüdün Ben kadınlarla flört edersem, sen de beni erkeklerle aldatırsın.

In Table 17, TT1, there is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning. "Söylüyordu şarkısını, mahzun, kırgın" (She was singing her song sad and broken) does not exist in the source text and provides excessive commentary on the sign. The

expression "sing, willow, willow, willow" was also translated as "Ağlama söğüt, ağlama sen" (Do not cry, willow) as an example of the over-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). of the meaning. In TT2, there are no examples of designificative tendencies. In TT3 and TT4, however, there are examples of wiping out of the meaning because the sycamore tree does not appear in translations at all. In TT1, it was translated as incir (fig tree) because of the link to "ficus sycamorus" with a footnote. In TT2 and the proposed translation, the translation is "çınar" in Turkish, meaning the maple tree, and no meaning transformations can be observed here.

2.7. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *Othello* and its Translations

It is interesting to study the name Othello if we refer to his description as a witch by Desdemona's father, Brabantio. Although some sources show the name Othello as the short form of Otto in Italian, the etymology of the word "Moor" is known to be used as a counterpart to Othello's first name. According to J. Madison Davis and A. Daniel Frankforter, 'Moro' may also mean 'mulberry' which has been related tenuously to the strawberries of Desdemona's handkerchief (Frankforter, 1995, p. 687). The writer of the first version of *Othello*, Cinthio, calls him simply, 'the Moor.' It is speculative that Othello is an Italianizing form of Othman (Osman), the founder of the Ottoman empire (Frankforter,1995, p. 687). In the Renaissance gaze, the name would mean anybody coming from diverse ethnic and religious origins from the East since they had very little information on the people outside Europe. Moreover, as Stephen Greenblatt claims, the Elizabethans had very little information on the cultures of Turkish and Jewish populations around the world. However, Shakespeare "did not have his Jewish characters swear by Muhammad, as fifteenth-century English text wrights did" (Greenblatt, 2017, p. 4).

Seventeenth-century Venice, when *Othello* was written, was a place where Jews were locked up in ghettos at night. (Greenblatt, 2017, p. 4). Therefore, the character Othello, in the Renaissance gaze, is susceptible to be labelled as *the other*.

The text *Othello* begins with the shouting of Iago to Brabantio, Desdemona's father, to curse about the marriage of Venetian General Othello. Iago knows that the father would not approve of the consummation between them. Consequently,

Brabantio accuses Othello of stealing his daughter's love with spells and witchcraft, which he learnt from his native land. Therefore, from the very beginning of the text, Othello's ethnic background becomes the source of witchcraft and the "demonized" culture of the East.

On the same night that the couple gets married, it is made clear that there is a Turkish threat moving towards Cyprus, and General Othello needs to get there to protect Cyprus, an important place for Christians as the second Jerusalem. Interestingly, protection of the second Jerusalem is the job of "noble and valiant Othello" of Venice. Any reference to the ethnic background of him by the state is not visible. The state of Venice regards Othello as a Venetian because he is involved with the job of driving "the devil away" for Christianity.

To study the "demons" in *Othello* Julia Kristeva's theory on abject (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18) may be helpful. At the beginning of the text, Othello is demonized by Brabantio, the father of Desdemona, by accusing him of witchcraft. This indirect allusion to Othello's ethnicity and stress on the geographical differences may suggest that in the Renaissance gaze, the demons come from the East. In the eyes of Brabantio, Othello is both a thief and a witch to cast spells on others. Desdemona's marriage is a difficult one because her father fears "the demonic" side of her husband's existence, and her husband is unaware of the demon inside him. Who is the devil in Othello's nature, then? The demon inside Othello dies when he associates himself with an Ottoman in Aleppo at the end of the text.

The evil that Venetian society would like to keep away unravels itself when Iago has Desdemona's handkerchief stolen by his wife, Emilia. To lead Othello into thinking that Desdemona has a relationship with his lieutenant Cassio, Iago sets a trap for all. It becomes crystal clear that Othello venerates the handkerchief, and loss of the sanctified item starts the downfall of the loving couple.

After getting convinced by Iago on the betrayal of Desdemona and Cassio, Othello has fever and sleep that would be analogous to an epileptic fit. Therefore, madness appears in the text with the fever, while Othello's character turns into a "feverish" one. In Venice, "feverish temper" is often considered to be linked to the

ethnic origin with a direct allusion to hot weather and dangerous desires. Othello's "phusis" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 195) is "foreign" to the Renaissance gaze.

The island Cyprus itself is, like Othello, can be described as a deep web of civilizations and cultures. Like Othello 's mind, the past of Cyprus is a mix and match of the effects of old cultures. In Shakespeare's Othello, the winners of the power struggle are the Venetians. The choice of the island of Cyprus as the background to the of the text *Othello* is, therefore, striking. The crossroads to pagan religions as the conquering of the island by King Xerxes, early existence of Jewish culture, and the effect of crusaders and Knights Templar make the island a unique place (Frankforter, 1995, p. 23). For Othello, however, the island itself refers to his deepest fears belonging to the demonized cultures in the Western gaze. Inside this fusion of cultures, Othello's ethnicity exceeding his Venetian existence is there to haunt him.

At the end of the text, all fears of Othello are on the stage when he pronounces the name of an eastern city called Aleppo. A city in northern Syria on which was the centre of a Hittite Kingdom prospered under Byzantine rule and at various times was taken or besieged by the Arabs, Seljuk Turks, Mongols, Crusaders, and Saladin (Frankforter, 1995, p. 23). It is the holy city that Othello remembers before dying. His description of killing the Ottoman in Aleppo is precedent to his suicide. Therefore, the combination with Aleppo's historical and cultural diversity, the reasons for Othello's suicide is visible through his conflicts.

Table 18: Example 15 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**
Brabantio: O, heaven, how she got out? O, treason of the blood! Fathers, from hence trust not your daughter's minds, By what you see them act.-Is there not charms By which the property of youth and maidhood May be abused? 1.1.(Shakespeare, 1997, p. 127)	**Brabantio:** O, Tanrım! Evden nasıl çıkmış acaba? O, kendi kanım ihanet etti bana! Babalar, asla güvenmeyin kızlarınıza bundan böyle! Saf görünüşlerine aldanmayın. Büyü olmasın! Genç ve iffetli kızları kandırmak için büyü yaparlar diye duydum. (Shakespeare, 2018, p. 27)
TT2	**TT3**

Brabantio: Tanrım! Nasıl çıkmış evden? Kanımın ihaneti ah! Babalar, bundan böyle , Davranışlarına bakıp Bel bağlamayın kızlarınızın aklına! Gençliğin ve kızlığın mayasını bozan Büyüler var, değil mi? (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 14)	**Brabantio:** Hey Tanrım, nasıl da sıvıştı evden? İnsana kendi soyu ihanet ediyor, ha? Babalar, bundan sonra kızlarınızın hareketlerine bakıp da hemen karar vermeyin, akıllarından neler geçiyor, anlaşılmaz. Gençliği de, kızlığı da mahveden büyüler var, değil mi? (Shakespeare, 1964, p. 8)
TT4 **Brabantio:** Yarabbi,, nasıl da dışan çıktı? Ah, kendi kanı insana hıyanet etsin ha! Babalar, bundan sonra görünüşe aldanıp kızlarınızın aklı var sanmayın! Gençliği de, kızlığı da bozan büyüler olacak değil mi? (Shakespeare, 1996, p. 9)	**Proposed Translation** **Brabantio:** Aman Tanrım! Nasıl çıkabildi evden? Demek insana kendi soyu ihanet edebiliyormuş! Babalar, bundan böyle kızlarınızın aklına, iyi hallerine güvenmeyin! Genç kızlığı tutan büyüler yok mudur?

The context in Table 18, this translation is the description of the treason of blood by Desdemona. In this context, magic and witchcraft reflect the strains of discriminative discourse in Venetian society. Therefore, translations of this context were evaluated. The evil jargon that Iago uses to manipulate Brabantio is also existent. He immediately describes Othello in terms of witchcraft and magic that steals his daughter's integrity and loyalty to blood. Brabantio's description of evil in this context is entirely Western because he yields to Iago's story of their marriage as a devilish one. In TT1, there are no examples of over-interpretation of the meaning while in TT2, the "charms by which the property of youth and maidhood may be abused?" translates as " gençliğin ve kızlığın mayasını bozan büyüler var, değil mi?" (are there not charms that will decay youth and maidenhood?). The word decay does not take place in the source text. It is an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3 and TT4, there are no designificative tendencies.

3. SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *HAMLET* AND ITS TRANSLATIONS

3.1. Summary of *Hamlet*

At the beginning of the text, Prince Hamlet returns to Denmark from Wittenberg, where he studies Protestant theology. He is educated to become a scholar, but the circumstances around his father's death, King Hamlet, cause him to stay in Denmark. However, he is suspicious of his father's sudden death because his uncle, now King Claudius, and his mother, Queen Gertrude, marry too soon after the funeral.

Prince Hamlet is informed about an apparition that visits the soldiers during the night watch. The Ghost does not agree to speak to Horatio, but Prince Hamlet is anxious to learn whether or not it will talk to him. The Ghost's revelations point out a murder with poison while the king is sleeping in the orchard. Prince Hamlet is reluctant to believe in what the Ghost says about the murder, but he agrees to take revenge.

Meanwhile, Ophelia, whom Prince Hamlet is interested in, is sent to him. In the speech that he makes with Ophelia, he openly accuses her of mischief. Polonius claims that it could be because of his prolonged love affair with Ophelia. King Claudius wishes to learn more about Prince Hamlet's madness. His childhood friends, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern are given the mission.

The players who come to stage plays to entertain the people in the palace give Prince Hamlet the chance to test the murder using an old play, titled "The Death of Gonzago". Prince Hamlet quickly tests the reactions of King Claudius because he furiously leaves the hall. Queen Gertrude calls for Hamlet to discuss the issue with him. In an angry fit, Prince Hamlet stabs Polonius instead of King Claudius. The reappearance of the Ghost points out the murder of King Claudius.

The order to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern is quickly given to go to England with Prince Hamlet, including an order of execution for him. Quick-witted, Hamlet changes the paper to blame Rosencrantz and Guildensternfor treason. Upon returning to Denmark, he learns that Ophelia has gone mad after the murder of Polonius. King Claudius orders a duel between Hamlet and Laertes. Gertrude enters to reveal the news that Ophelia has drowned.

Before the duel starts, King Claudius puts poison on the tip of one sword and one poisonous pearl in the wine cup. Either way, Prince Hamlet is destined to die. It is now Queen Gertrude who dies by mistake because she drinks from the poisonous cup. Hamlet gets wounded with the poison on the sword. Laertes confesses that there is a conspiracy to kill Hamlet. He stabs Claudius right after. Hamlet begs Horatio to remember and tell his story. As drums play, Prince Fortinbras of Norway is announced as the next king of Denmark.

The details in this summary were chosen to support the semiotic reading of enigmas in *Hamlet*. The representations of magic as an old-time concept in Early Modern thought are critical to study in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* because the elusiveness behind "magic" overweighs as a pathetic element. Since Prince Hamlet is a religious figure who lives through conflicts as a Protestant, the Ghost's arrival is also a major enigma that may also have intertextual links (such as different versions of the Bible) concerning religious beliefs. Finally, the poisoned union in the wine cup is the only allusion that may be studied in the examples chosen in this thesis. Studying the metaphorical dimensions of the sign union may reveal the religious symbolism behind the anti-baptism in the gaze of King Claudius. The poisoned wine cup may be read as the poisoning of the blood of Jesus Christ in Christianity.

3.2. Enigmas in *Hamlet* and its Translations

In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, enigmas are divided into two by depicting the Ghost of Hamlet's deceased father and the manifestation of evil. The old king was poisoned poured into his ear by his brother, Claudius. It was a suspicious death. Poisoning of King Hamlet while sleeping is an enigma revealed by the Ghost, which may have both implicit and explicit connotations for the readers. The negative gaze on magic in Early Modern thought provides the framework for Shakespearean pathos. Therefore, from the beginning of the text, there is a mystery surrounding the death of King Hamlet, which is explicitly tied to the fear of witchcraft and poison. The connotations of the sign may be implicit for the readers today, but the elusiveness of the supernatural may still add to the effect of the enigma as a pathetic element. None of the enigmas, including the Ghost, is readily identifiable to the reader. Prince Hamlet, therefore, is suspicious of murder after the revelations. Hamlet's adverse reactions to the newly

founded state are often regarded as "bouts of madness" by the palace. Unsure of which version of the story to trust, Prince Hamlet seriously suspects this untimely death that changed everything for him. In a maze of obscurity his fellow soldiers talk about an apparition that visits the place during the night watch in the castle. Prince Hamlet's dearest friend Horatio is told to address him because he is a scholar:

> What art thou that usurp'st this time of night
> Together with that fair and warlike form
> In which the majesty of buried Denmark
> Did sometimes march? By heaven, I charge thee speak. 1.1. (Shakespeare, 2006, p. 226)

The manifestations of enigmas in the source text reveal that Hamlet's failure to trust the palace's people serve as the background. Both people in the palace and the country are prone to change because it is a time of distress rather than serenity:

> *Hamlet* opens with soldiers on guard at night in a scene full of perturbation and anxiety. It is nervousness about the apparition which predominates, of course, 'this thing', 'this dreaded sight', looking exactly like the late king in full armour. It is an ominous thing, and the sceptic Horatio, who is quickly converted, fears that it ' bodes some strange eruption to our state'. The state is already in turmoil, being hastily put on a war footing. (Edwards,1994, p. 40)

In this respect, enigmas are closely linked to the mental states of Prince Hamlet, who lives on the brink of losing the grip of reality. It is, therefore, worth defining how enigmas and the Ghost of King Hamlet are related. In Shakespeare's times, seeing an apparition would be defined as losing faith.[43] Hamlet's encounter with the supernatural, therefore, could be regarded as a secret test for his faith, although he is a scholar from Wittenberg. Since the prince is almost suspicious of himself, he cannot be sure who the Ghost might be or what purposes might have drawn it near the soldiers. Hamlet's suspicions and existential problems, including his fear of loss of faith, intensify the effect of enigmas as traps set for readers. In Hamlet, pathos is implicitly

[43] See Shakespeare's Christianity The Protestant and Catholic Poetics of Julius Caesar, Macbeth, and Hamlet, Beatrice Batson (Ed), pp.75, 76, 82, 83.

related to enigmas. Like the Ghost father, Hamlet is between life and death because he constantly thinks of suicide. As Phillipe Edwards puts it, the meaninglessness that Hamlet describes is hard to understand for the people around him:

> Prince Hamlet in black carries into the court (in 1.2) that memory of the dead king which Claudius and Gertrude are anxious to erase. His grief, he says, is real not assumed, unlike (he implies) the emotions being expressed around him. But the most determined candour could scarcely reveal in public what he pours out when he is alone: his feeling of total despair, of *taedium vitae*, of the weary meaninglessness of ' all the uses of this world'. He has no wish to continue living, but divine law forbids suicide. (Edwards, 2003, p. 41)

The relationship between the supernatural and the Ghost is an enigma with a profound impact on the suspense of the text. The readers learn that the apparition belongs to the deceased king Hamlet although Prince Hamlet fails to recognise him at first sight. As Prince Hamlet's suspicions go on while talking to the Ghost, the readers experience the duality in the presentations of the enigmas surrounding the spirit:

> Though it is specific explanation - why the Ghost has come - and a specific course of action - what the Ghost wants him to do - that he seeks, his words have a wider perspective. The Ghost may have some secret, some unimaginable truth to bring relief from those 'thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls', an explanation why things are as they are and a directive for meaningful action. To his demands in both their specific and their general senses he receives, or thinks he receives, a more than sufficient response. (Edwards, 2003, p.43)

The Ghost could be the devil who came to steal the prince's faith. The Ghost, in this respect, could be the representation of a perverter of faith. For Renaissance readers, perversion was the most severe subject put on stage. Hamlet's suspicions in this respect parallel how readers would approach an apparition. In Shakespearean

dramas, uncertainty is the matter that revolves around enigmas. The representation of Hamlet, the deceased king, is a remarkable example of it.

The mystery concerning the Ghost is so elusive that one could easily suppose that the devil might have stolen the form of the old king. The reader may assume that the perverter might have come instead of King Hamlet to steal Prince Hamlet's faith. Hamlet is often considered as the play inside the play because Prince Hamlet uses the play Death of Gonzago to test the reactions of King Claudius. Hamlet's staging of the Death of Gonzago is a far-fetched connection for the readers because there is no hint that Claudius murdered his brother until he stops the play and leaves the hall angrily. Behind clouds of suspicions, Prince Hamlet jumps from one mental state to another. As stated by Harold Bloom, no "single character in the plays, not even Falstaff or Cleopatra, matches Hamlet's infinite reverberations" (Bloom, 1999, p. 384), which constitutes the source for the pathetic structure.

Suspense in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is also dependent upon how readers approach enigmas. The Ghost, as stated above, could refer to King Hamlet, who was murdered, or to the devil in the form of the deceased king. As stated by Stephen Greenblatt, the Early Modern religious authorities made distinctions between witchcraft and the work of evil which shows the desire to have control over the newly emerging society. The fear of "being possessed" by a demon was intense also because of the uncanny nature of the supernatural already existent in the Renaissance world As Greenblatt puts it, "Demonic possession was something more: it was utterly strange – a fearful visitation of the perverted spiritual presences of the other world – and at the same time uncannily intimate" (1988, p. 103). Consequently, the elusive nature of the supernatural is dominant all through the text. However, the supernatural exists in a text for the very purpose of the fulfilment of the anticipated or remains as opposed to the anticipation. Readers will be led to think about enigmas as suspense elements that may work in various levels of meaning (Tuna & Kuleli, 2017, p. 38). It is, therefore, worth considering how long they are suspended in the source and target texts. The contribution of enigmas to the universe of meaning in *Hamlet*, rather implicitly, refers to how Renaissance readers would approach the world of the supernatural. As the dark component of pathos, enigmas in *Hamlet* relate to the theme of the supernatural. The Catholic doctrines would not dismiss the possibility of a ghost that would come

without evil purposes. In this respect, the idea exists for Early Modern readers who have been through a religious dispute. As Greenblatt puts it, "rivalry among elites competing for the major share of authority was characteristically expressed not only in parliamentary factions but also in bitter struggles over religious doctrine and practice" (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 96).

Enigmas are worth studying in this respect because they exemplify how Shakespeare's theatre *presents* the supernatural as an elusive concept. The Ghost itself, as the leading enigma in the text, raises suspicions about the very concept of the supernatural. In the Renaissance readers' minds, grappling with evil would bring the possibility of the loss of faith. As stated by Stephen Greenblatt, the conflicts between the social dynamics and religion in Early Modern society were marked by "the attempt by the established and state-supported Church of England to eliminate competing religious authorities by wiping out pockets of rivalrous charisma" (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 96) which eventually brought the condemnation of the supernatural. Either in the Protestant or Catholic view, the revelations of the Ghost in the text refer to "rottenness" in the Kingdom of Denmark because of the suspicions revolving around the death of King Hamlet. Therefore, the connection between Prince Hamlet's suspicions and the fear of the supernatural serves as the background of the text. Finding the answer to the real identity of the Ghost, both for Hamlet and the reader, is critical to the reception of the text:

> This corrosive inwardness—the hallmark of the entire play and the principal cause of its astonishing, worldwide renown—is glimpsed even in his first frantic response to the Ghost, and it is reinforced by the Ghost's command, "Remember me." From this perspective, what is at stake in the shift of emphasis from vengeance to remembrance is nothing less than the whole play. (Greenblatt, 2013, p. 208)

In *Hamlet*, how the Ghost is perceived by the readers is a significant matter. Horatio, Marcellus, and other soldiers tend to stay away from it because they are unsure whether it is the Ghost of King Hamlet or the devil in the form of a ghost. First,

the soldiers presumably feel intimidated because they would not like to be associated with anything belonging to the underworld. Second, there is a new king on the throne, and attachment to the dead king may vex the new ruler. Therefore, starting from the very beginning of the text, the fear of evil and the danger of losing one's faith constitute major enigmatic elements. According to the Renaissance perspective, the Ghost may be harmful to one's faith in many ways, and any encounter with the supernatural would be labelled as serving the devil in the Shakespearean sense.

In connection with *Hamlet*'s pathetic structure as a text, the Ghost retains the characteristics of an enigmatic element until King Claudius confesses the crime. The mystery surrounding the old king's death is a major enigmatic element and the underworld because the people in Denmark do not seem to have understood that he was poisoned before he died. Consequently, the reader cannot be sure whether Hamlet will be deceived by evil or if it is the ghost father speaking the truth to him. The old king was given a proper burial without further investigation on the death. It is Prince Hamlet who suspects and openly talks about the strange and the sudden death as well as the hasty marriage. As he is caught between the idea of idealization and damnation, bitterness mixed with melancholy may indicate that he is mentally unstable. However, Prince Hamlet's reactions spring from a source that is deep but not necessarily about madness:

> Why is all this? Because his father has suddenly died and his mother has speedily taken a new husband. Too slight a ground for despair? Hamlet's protestations are extreme. To call Claudius a satyr - a lecherous goat-like creature - does not make much sense to an audience who has just seen the new king efficiently managing his courtiers and the affairs of the nation. His mother's remarriage makes him call in question the constancy of all women. 'Hyperion to a satyr!' 'Frailty, thy name is woman! ' Such passionate attachment to his father, such contempt for his uncle, such disgust with his mother, may seem pathological, what Eliot would call ' in excess of the facts'. Hamlet's indignation does indeed go deeper than the 'facts' but its source is not morbid. (Edwards, 2003, p. 41)

The revelations of the Ghost on his death, on the other hand, are not immediately valid for Prince Hamlet. In this respect, Hamlet's madness is modelled upon the fear of losing faith and becoming subservient to evil. Moreover, the deepest fears of the Renaissance readers are mirrored both in Prince Hamlet's search for the truth/devil or the fear of losing his Protestant faith. As the Ghost starts talking about what had happened, he speaks in Catholic jargon, introducing the idea of purgatory, a notion dismissed in Wittenberg:

I am thy father's spirit,
Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night,
And for the day confin'd to fast in fires,
Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature,
Are burnt and purg'd away. But that I am forbid
To tell the secrets of my prison-house,
I could a tale unfold whose lightest word
Would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood,
Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres.
Thy knotted and combined locks to part,
And each particular hair to stand an end
Like quills upon the fretful porpentine.
But this eternal blazon must not be
To ears of flesh and blood. List, list, 0 list!
If thou didst ever thy dear father love 1.5. (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 216-217)

The revelation of the truth by the Ghost exists outside the boundaries set by the Early Modern perspective because the end of the text clearly shows that they were true. The modern reader may grasp the underlying truth in Elsinore because it is visible that people in the palace behave as if they were puppets of King Claudius. Prince Hamlet's melancholy is not welcome in the castle because there is now a new state as well as a new marriage. Therefore, the apparition could not have been a good one in the gaze of his fellow soldiers. The fear of *being possessed by evil* is also a pathetic element that is shared by four great Shakespearean tragedies because staying away from the supernatural was the subject matter for Early modern society. As claimed by Stephen Greenblatt, "in cases of possession, compelled by a spectacular spiritual counterforce to speak out and depart" took place while "witchcraft then was distinct from

possession" (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 99). The belief system in the Renaissance world was contrary to the existence of the supernatural. Prince Hamlet and his fellow soldiers are reluctant to approach the apparition. In the Renaissance gaze, superstition, necromancy, and practice of magic equaled anti-Christ because they believed their souls would forever be damned in this way. Moreover, in Prince Hamlet's case, speaking with the dead father would echo necromancy, a practice strictly condemned by Christian authorities.[44] Witchcraft, necromancy, and conjuring magic were crimes and sins in Renaissance England.[45]

The Ghost would function as an enigma in relation to the expectations of the readers in the presence of a supernatural being. In the time of Shakespeare, Prince Hamlet's calling his dead father from the underworld would echo necromancy. Therefore, the Ghost comes on its own, without a visible act of necromancy on the stage. Such an act would be strictly banned by Christian authorities at that time. As claimed by Stephen Greenblatt, severe punishment was imposed upon any association with the supernatural because witchcraft was an offence along with demonic possession of a man:

> The same state church that sponsored the attacks on superstition in A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures continued to cooperate, if less enthusiastically than before, in the ferocious prosecutions of witches. These prosecutions, significantly, were handled by the secular judicial apparatus – witchcraft was a criminal offense like aggravated assault or murder – and hence reinforced rather than rivaled the bureaucratic control of authority. The eruption of the demonic into the human world was not denied altogether, but the problem would be processed through the proper secular channels. (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 98)

[44] See Week 1 video Magic and Superstition in Christian Europe/ Magic in the Middle Ages / Coursera
[45] See Shakespeare's Demonology: A Dictionary by Marion Gibson and Jo Ann Esra, pp.311-312; see also: Witchcraft Act of 1542, Witchcraft Act of 1562 (An Act against Conjurations, Enchantments and Witchcrafts.) https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/private-lives/religion/ overview/witchcraft/ http://statutes.org.uk/site/the-statutes/sixteenth-century/1563-5-elizabeth-1-c-16-an-act-against-conjurations-inchantments-and-witchcraft/

In any case, *the lack* of a cause that would bring the Ghost onto the stage intensifies the effect of suspense, enigmas, and pathetic structure. Prince Hamlet's reactions to the revelations of the murder by the new king Claudius are worth considering in this respect. Forever suspicious of himself and the truth, Hamlet tests the reflexes of King Claudius using drama. Until that point, the prince suspects how he thinks and feels as well as his fellow soldiers around him. The truth is revealed by the Ghost before King Claudius confesses that he murdered his brother and founded the new state on fratricide.

The paradox concerning the revelation of the truth is striking because necromancy and any psychic connection with the dead are strictly banned. Readers can see that it is the ghost king who had come to visit Prince Hamlet, not an evil soul in the form of his father. In this respect, the mystery surrounding the arrival of the Ghost functions as a minor enigma that readers may or may not consider while reading.

Hamlet's suspicion of the truth and fear of losing his faith is, therefore, a major enigma because pathetic structure depends on it. Encounter with the supernatural, whether it is witchcraft, superstition, or necromancy, is labelled as negative components of pathos, as mentioned before. In the Shakespearean gaze, the supernatural could only be the harbinger of an evil soul, which takes its roots from the condemnation of old and mythological figures.

It is deducible that Shakespearean pathos and fear of the supernatural are closely linked in the structural patterns of enigmas. Therefore, Hamlet's suspicions on the "identity" of the Ghost are deep-rooted in how the English society in Shakespeare's time looked at the old beliefs, paganism, psychic world, and Christianity as a religion. As Stephen Greenblatt puts it, the head of religious authorities in England at that time was the king or the queen, who could not be expected to embrace the supernatural as it was: "Spiritual potentia will hence-forth be distributed with greater moderation and control through the whole of the Anglican hierarchy, at whose pinnacle sits the sole legitimate possessor of absolute charismatic authority, the monarch, Supreme Head of the Church in England" (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 97).However, Shakespearean pathos and the enigmatic structure of Hamlet are so interwoven that we see Prince Hamlet's faith being put to the test, although he was raised as a Protestant scholar from Wittenberg.

It is unclear whether the prince will be tempted by the supernatural or not to the end of the text. The pathetic and enigmatic structure is, therefore, directly related to how suspense functions throughout the text. The difficulty of having a detailed description of evil and its ways, as well as the constant fear of losing one's Christian faith, constitutes the core of Shakespearean pathos in *Hamle*t.

The effect of enigmas mostly relies on puzzling the reader with the elusiveness of the supernatural. Had Shakespeare written an end that revealed the possession of Prince Hamlet by evil and the loss of his faith, the book would probably not attract so much attention. On the contrary, suspense in Shakespeare's Hamlet is about *the fear* of being possessed by the supernatural. It is because the suspicion and the intimidation in the text are fuelled by the possibility of Prince Hamlet's Christian soul being stolen by the devil; it also has deeper inclinations for the feigned madness. His actions in the palace were labelled as "mad" as if an evil soul possessed him.

In the earliest original text, Hamlet was a necromancer who would conjure magic to call his deceased father.[46] Prince Hamlet's association with magic exists at the intertextual level in Shakespeare's tragedy. In this respect, pathos in Hamlet is in direct relation with the enigmatic structure because how the readers will see the supernatural is critical in the building of suspense.

In this respect, it may be argued whether Shakespearean pathos for the modern reader will be less effective because the relationship between the supernatural and religion has utterly changed. As stated by Stephen Greenblatt, demonization was a strategy that involved labelling practices and religious rituals outside the Church of England:

> This strategy – the reinscription of evil onto the professed enemies of evil – is one of the characteristic operations of religious authority in the early modern period and has its secular analogues in more recent history when famous

[46] See English Translation of "Gesta Denorum" by Saxo Grammaticus (Book III): https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1150/1150-h/1150-h.htm

> revolutionaries are paraded forth to be tried as counter revolutionaries. (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 98)

Therefore, the Ghost, the supernatural, and the uncanny as negative components of Shakespearean pathos are still at work. As Stephen Greenblatt suggests, Prince Hamlet's associations with necromancy and his "desire to speak with the dead" [47] are still the major enigmatic elements. They leave the audience with doubts and suspicions reminiscent of the earliest Hamlets' association with the magic in the earliest surviving Amleth copy.[48]

> The basic though not the immediate source of *Hamlet* is a twelfth-century story of Amleth in Saxo Grammaticus's *Historiae Danicae,* which was first put into print in 1514.1 It is remarkable how much of the primitive legend survives through the successive redactions into Shakespeare's masterpiece. Amleth's father, who has defeated the king of Norway in a duel, is murdered by his brother Feng, who takes his brother's widow, Gerutha, to wife. The murder is not secret. To protect himself and avert suspicion from his plans, Amleth starts acting as an idiot, but his speeches are such a perplexing mixture of shrewdness and craziness that tests are devised for him. (Edwards, 2003, p. 1)

To put it in another way, the mentality that demonizes the supernatural may be invisible in the text, but the intimidation aroused around enigmas is so intense that whether they will meet the audience's expectations or not is almost a secondary issue. The text between Shakespeare's Hamlet and Amleth, called Amleth by Belleforest, emphasizes the savagery of pre-Christian times:

> Between Saxo Grammaticus and *Hamlet* lies a French version of Saxo's story by François de Belleforest, published in his *Histoires Tragiques* in 1570 (followed

[47] See Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation Of Social Energy In Renaissance England p.1
[48] See Amleth in Gesta Denorum by Saxo Grammaticus (Book III) https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1150/1150-h/1150-h.htm

by many later editions). It does not appear that the Hamlet story was translated into English until 1608. Belleforest is most conscious of the unchristian savagery of the tale and pointedly remarks that it all happened in pre-Christian times. (Edwards, 2003, p. 2)

Therefore, the clash between the pagan and the Christian perspectives is already present at the intertextual level without necessarily referring to the Early Modern thought. Either way, the context "there is something rotten in Denmark" (Shakespeare, 2006, p. 259) refers to the rottenness of a dead body or the "foul" evil that has arrived to contaminate Christian Denmark. It is also interesting to see that "madness" as a theme is prominent in a version called Ur-Hamlet, whose "authorship of the earlier play" is *surprisingly "*not known":

> The *Ur-Hamlet,* which was about the revenge of a son for his murdered father, had a ghost urging Hamlet to take revenge, and must have included the assumed madness of the hero, which is among the irreducible constituents of the old story. (Edwards 2003, p. 3)

On the other hand, there is an example of a minor enigma concerning the first murder of Hamlet by Polonius, Ophelia's father. Contrary to the expectations of the readers, Claudius does not die first when Prince Hamlet considers killing a human. The presentation of the character Hamlet is directly related to the enigmatic structure because both major and minor enigmas function through his actions. It is not only Prince Hamlet who sees the Ghost. Barnardo, Marcellus, and Horatio share the fear that it may bring foulness into the kingdom because it leaves the castle as soon as the cock crows. According to customs, the dawn is considered to be a holy time that Jesus Christ rises according to the Christian belief, which disables all charms and magic:

> It faded on the crowing of the cocck
> Some say that ever' gainst that season comes
> Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated
> This bird of dawning singeth all night long,
> And then, they say, no spirit dare stir abroad,

The nights are wholesome, then no planets strike,
No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,
So hallowed and so gracious is that time 1.1.(Shakespeare, 2006, p. 234)

In the soldiers' gaze, bringing the good to the kingdom by the Ghost is just an illusion because the Ghost is intimated by dawn as the symbol of the birth of Jesus Christ. Similarly, the famous quotation, "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark" (Shakespeare, 2006, p. 259) by Marcellus, is a direct reference to the foulness of the underworld that the Ghost must have arrived from. Referring to the foulness of the state founded on fratricide by Claudius, rottenness in Denmark points out to the emergence of evil.

On the other hand, Prince Hamlet's encounter with the supernatural may puzzle the reader as an example of a minor enigma because he describes his artery as hard as Nemean Lion, born out of Typhon and Echidna, mother and father of all monsters. The mythological link can be found in *Metamorphoses* by Publius Ovidius as a supernatural being that could change shape. When the tone and the diction of the speech of Hamlet and the soldiers are analysed, it can be said that the mythological link may be interpreted as Hamlet's first encounter with the supernatural because he wants his arteries to get as impenetrable as the Nemean Lion's skin, an implicit reference to Heracles. It is contrary to the expectations of the reader that Prince Hamlet speaks outside a jargon accepted by Wittenberg scholars.

Prince Hamlet's presentation as a character is full of conflicts and ambiguities that add to how major and minor enigmas function in the text. It is because Prince Hamlet both lives in the past and present to find the truth. He lacks a clear sense of temporality like Othello, who travels in time back and forth. Therefore, Prince Hamlet's attitude towards discovering the truth seems to have been modelled upon retrospection and anticipation. For this reason, he lives in a world of fantasy that he idolizes his deceased father. As stated by Genette, the unambiguous relationships between past, present, and future are closely linked to clear temporal consciousness, while the opposite would bring ambiguity. As stated by Genette the very ideas of retrospection or anticipation, which ground the narrative categories of analepsis and prolepsis in "psychology", take for granted a clear temporal consciousness and unambiguous relationships among present, past, and the future" (Genette,1983, pp. 78-

79). This situation gives the pathetic display almost a surreal sense because Prince Hamlet does not quite understand whether he is in a dream or living through reality:

To be, or not to be – that is 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 heartache and the thousand natural shocks
That flesh is heir to:' tis a consummation
Devoutly to be wished – 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.(Shakespeare, 2006, p. 304)

The arrival of the Ghost may be read as the embodiment of Hamlet's fears and conflicts. Therefore, his encounter with the spirit is indescribable because the elusive nature of the supernatural makes the truth impossible to pin down. For this reason, Hamlet has difficulty in believing the Ghost about the murder of King Hamlet. The palace people and their playfulness add another dimension to the mind play *staged* by King Claudius to cover up the murder of King Hamlet. *Hamlet,* concerning pathos and functions of enigmas, is impressive because they refer to the impossibility of having a clear description of evil. Consequently, Prince Hamlet decides to go beyond religious limits to test his faith in the presence of evil as the harbinger of the truth into the kingdom.

Hamlet's constant stress on sleep and death mirrors out that he considers his father's being murdered in his sleep. It is also an indication that King Hamlet might have died without the last prayer. Hamlet's questioning of his faith before meeting the Ghost in this respect is striking. Speaking on pathetic terms, the so-called dialogue between Prince Hamlet and the supernatural is an intense suspense element. Hamlet's philosophical questioning of life in his famous "to be or not to be" soliloquy reveals

his intimidation of the encounter with the supernatural and his reluctance to believe the Ghost's existence. According to Christian theology in the Renaissance era, all supernatural beings were related to demons that existed to steal the faith of true Christians. Demons and the devil point out the pathetic structure because the former is rooted in mythological tales while the latter is in the Bible. Therefore, as the embodiment of the uncanny in Hamlet, the Ghost constitutes the dark side of pathos.

Prince Hamlet's quest for finding the truth is reflected in the philosophical questioning of his existence. Quotations from his famous soliloquy, "to die; to sleep, perchance to dream," are signs that he is anxious to know *beyond* life and fearful of losing his faith. The sleep of death may refer to his father's destiny in Elsinore. He is also suspicious that demons may have haunted his father before he died because he did not have a chance to pray for the last time. Hamlet is in the limbo world between life and death, sorcery, and faith, as well as truth and lies. His encounter with the Ghost is related to the functioning of suspense. Until the end of the text, Prince Hamlet has suspicions about life and death. His questioning of life and swaying from one mental state to another intensifies the effect of enigmas as major pathetic elements.

Hamlet is a play that is paradoxically constructed to reflect the mind and body dichotomy in Prince Hamlet's character because he is trained to become an ideal Renaissance man. To our surprise, superstition[49] in the Christian sense is like a call of the wild for Hamlet, the scholar from Wittenberg. Instead of avoiding the supernatural at all costs, he takes the toll almost like a test for his faith. He willingly encounters the supernatural without knowing its true essence. Therefore, Prince Hamlet cannot be sure whether the disturbed soul of his father reveals the truth, or a demon has come to steal his faith.

For the Renaissance readers, testing of a Wittenberg scholar's faith in the supernatural would resemble damnation. Since Prince Hamlet is not sure of his prospects, the readers may interpret elusiveness in the way that they look at the supernatural. After the sword fight between him and Laertes, the reader learns that the

[49] See Week 1 video Magic and Superstition in Christian Europe/ Magic in the Middle Ages / Coursera

revelations of the Ghost were accurate, as well as the validity of Prince Hamlet's suspicions.

The Ghost reveals that the father was poisoned in his sleep in the garden, which may refer to the creation story in Genesis in the Bible. One may consider King Hamlet as Adam, Gertrude as Eve, and Claudius as the devil who stole their faith. The Ghost describes the foundation of the new kingdom by Claudius with very harsh descriptions. The use of the sign *seduce* is worth considering. It labels the new king as resembling the devil who seduced Eve in the garden of Eden by referring to "shape of heaven" and "celestial bed":

> Ay, that incestuous, that adulterate beast,
> With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts—
> O wicked wit, and gifts that have the power
> So to seduce! —won to his shameful lust
> The will of my most seeming-virtuous queen.
> O Hamlet, what a falling off was there,
> From me, whose love was of that dignity
> That it went hand in hand even with the vow
> I made to her in marriage, and to decline
> Upon a wretch whose natural gifts were poor
> To those of mine.
> But virtue, as it never will be mov'd,
> Though lewdness court it in a shape of heaven,
> So lust, though to a radiant angel link'd,
> Will sate itself in a celestial bed
> And prey on garbage. 3.1. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 218)

The last lines of the speech may be read as a description of the garden of Eden. The similarity between the sleep of Adam and Eve and their seduction is striking. Eve was poisoned in the ear by the devil with his words. In this respect, the poisoning may be read metaphorically, which can refer to losing faith. The symbolism in the text, reflected in the iconographic link, constitutes the pathetic use and effect of enigmas on the reader. Shakespeare's subtextual use of mythology and iconography in this respect mirrors the supernatural. It strikingly adds to the enigmatic structure of the text. In this

respect, the original sin constitutes the background of Hamlet, which paradoxically refers to the first murder by Cain50, who killed his brother. The Ghost describes his murder by using Christian jargon because according to the revelations of the Ghost, King Hamlet did not have any chance for repentance, which is defined as the most painful experiences for a Christian soul:

Thus was I, sleeping, by a brother's hand
Of life, of the crown, of queen at once dispatch'd,
Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin
Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd
No reck' ning made, but sent to my account,
With all my imperfections on my head.
O horrible! O horrible! Most horrible! 1.5. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 220)

Since the first murder is the most repeated reference in Shakespeare's four great tragedies[51], it may be stated that the presentation of the character Claudius turns him into a stereotype that continually deceives the people of Denmark. Moreover, the king's description is a direct reference to the first murder:

O, my offence is rank it smells to heaven;
It hath the primal eldest curse upon't,
A brother's murder. 3.3. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 314)

King Hamlet's murder is grounded upon a religious context that makes the arrival of the Ghost even more striking. The suspense element concerning Cain and his lineage is as elusive as the arrival of the Ghost because he and his followers are forever doomed in the Christian context.[52] Since Hamlet's reference to the first murder in the graveyard is an implicit reference to the supernatural:

That skull had a tongue in it and could sing once:
how the knave jowls it to the ground as if it were
Cain's jaw-bone, that did the first murder! (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 77)

Prince Hamlet's reluctance to face King Claudius is worth considering in this respect because he constantly questions evil. Hamlet's indecisive attitude elongates the

50 See Shakespeare's Christianity: The Protestant and Catholic Poetics of Julius Caesar, Macbeth, and Hamlet, Beatrice Batson (Ed), pp.7-8
[51] Batson, pp.5-6.
[52] See King James Bible, Genesis, (4.4)

effect of enigmas on the reader because he will die as soon as he gives up the psychological fight with the household of Denmark. His quest for truth in this respect is against the one who founded a new state in Denmark through fratricide. It is worth considering the iconographic reference to the first murder because how pathos is structured is dependent on it:

> The story of Cain and Abel is brought into the play during this scene (105) and appears again twice (3.3.38 and 5.1.65).1 That first murder shattered the human family; it resulted from and betokened man's falling away from God. The identification of Claudius with Cain - which he himself makes - gives us the context in which we should put the ' unreasonable ' bitterness of Hamlet, though as yet he knows nothing about any murder. (Edwards, 2003, p. 41)

Hamlet also hesitates to murder his uncle while praying, fearing that he will directly go to heaven. Since there is no purgatory in the Protestant view, he probably wants his uncle to die without *faith* as Cain loses his faith after the first murder.[53] In this respect, King Hamlet's existence in purgatory and Prince Hamlet's losing his faith act as components to major enigmas in the text. These concepts sub-textually refer to the dark component of pathos. When taken into consideration, mythological and iconographic references in *Hamlet* act as borders to the reader. There is a very negative description concerning Elsinore in the text. There is "something rotten in Denmark" (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 215). The new state of Claudius, with the association with the supernatural, is the exact opposite in Shakespearean context because of the land's association with the supernatural.

Prince Hamlet's view of Denmark echoes Barnardo's expression on the rottenness of the kingdom because he claims that the kingdom was possessed by evil who can hide the truth and manipulate people for his benefit. The hypocrisy of King Claudius and his sneaky behaviour is not a part of the enigmatic structure. It is easily deducible that the one who marries the queen of Denmark with a hasty marriage after the old king's funeral should at least be a pragmatic person seeking profit.

[53] See King James Bible, Genesis, Book 4, (4:4)

Hamlet's description of him, on the other hand, adds mystery to the characterization. Neither the audience nor Prince Hamlet is sure that King Claudius murdered King Hamlet. Therefore, Prince Hamlet's description of King Claudius as Cain indicates that Christian Denmark was possessed by a supernatural being who could poison people in the ear. Consequently, Prince Hamlet's aim turns it into a crusade to get Christian Denmark back from the hands of King Claudius, who obtained the kingdom with a suspected fratricide.

As mentioned above, referring to the first murder, the Kingdom of Denmark, in the rule of King Claudius, is no different than a Christian dystopia because it turns the kingdom into a pagan land with the help of magic. Therefore, the pathetic structure of *Hamlet* is interwoven with enigmas. Iconographic and mythological dimensions similarly contribute to the elusive nature of enigmas. In this respect, the Ghost can both symbolize good and evil because it is not easily describable.

The revelations of the Ghost turn Claudius into the embodiment of Cain, which refers to the first murder. In this perspective, the usurpation of the Christian kingdom may be considered, although King Claudius is seen as a praying Christian on the stage. The enigmatic function of The Ghost can also be better viewed when we consider how the Early Modern audience looks at the encounter with the supernatural. In the first versions of *Hamlet*, Prince Hamlet was a student of necromancy rather than a student in Wittenberg. It may be claimed that versions like Ur-Hamlet or Amleth in Gesta Denorum by Saxo Grammaticus give us a better view of evaluating the relationship between Prince Hamlet and the supernatural.

The practice of necromancy, later condemned by the Anglican Church, especially during the reign of King James I, is a part of black magic. Hamlet's apprenticeship as a clergyman is often taken for granted but his "bookishness" is a subtle sign that he could be a necromancer if he chose. The aim of it was to bring the dead back from the underworld. The learned men could only practise it, that is, the clergy who could read and write Latin.[54] Earlier versions of *Hamlet* may reveal that before the Renaissance, the writers were free to present a Nordic Prince in a mythological story as a necromancer. However, the Danish prince seeking revenge to

[54] See Week 2 Video in Magic in the Middle Ages titled Necromancy: When demons spoke Latin.

give his father's disturbed soul a rest is presented in the Christian context. In this respect, Shakespeare's use of the Ghost as an enigmatic element is not a reference to the pagan tradition but to the use of the Ghost in another text by Belleforest.[55] Either out of the pagan traditions or the effect of Seneca on Shakespearean tragedies, the Ghost refers to the vengeance of a son:

> It is even possible that Belleforest helped to suggest the Ghost; for, as pointed out by Stabler he twice refers to the shade (ombre) murdered man. When Amleth finally dispatches his uncle, he bids him report to his brother in the underworld that his son has avenged him, so that his shade may rest in peace (son ombre s'appaise). From a metaphorical shade to a visible speaking ghost is an immense imaginative leap and one for which Belleforest alone could provide no adequate springboard. But the errand to the underworld is of a kind to gratify the vengeful spirits of Seneca, whose vogue could facilitate the leap; and a tradition once established, dramatist wishing to bring a ghost on to the stage might well find in Belleforest suggestions for its use. The Ghost in Shakespeare's Hamlet, unlike Belleforest's shade, is not mentioned at the end, but they have a common the need for vengeance from a son, who seeks to give the spirit rest. (Jenkins, 2003, pp. 93-94)

In the Shakespearean text, however, the Early Modern perspective on necromancy is so dominant that the Ghost suddenly and abruptly comes to the stage. In *Hamlet*, no magic is associated with the arrival of the supernatural because all magic was strictly forbidden on the stage, as stated above. Therefore, Shakespeare's Hamlet is not a necromancer but a young student who helplessly tries to save his kingdom. In this respect, even the arrival of the Ghost is an enigma because it is impossible to guess if it is King Hamlet or a supernatural being who had come to convert Prince Hamlet into a heretic.

[55] See preface to The Arden Edition *Hamlet* (2003),Harold Jenkins (Ed).

Prince Hamlet's encounter with magic is worth considering because all magic is the job of heretics in the Renaissance view.[56] Therefore, his questioning of human existence and his encounter with the supernatural is the reflection of dilemmas in his attitude towards life and death. As proposed by Lake, "Hamlet believes in an omnipotent Christian God, and accordingly also in the devil" (Lake, 2016, p. 512). However, the representations of the ways of the devil are the critical problem in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The elusive nature of the supernatural and the protagonist's desire to drive the devil away from the kingdom that he would inherit from his father, King Hamlet, also add to the enigmatic structure and suspense. The plot consequently revolves around keeping faith and Hamlet's existential questioning. Prince Hamlet is now torn between acting like a son for vengeance and avoiding the evil because the Ghost brings the news from the underworld as well as intimidation:

> In Hamlet, Shakespeare wrote another play about a man trapped in a phantasma or hideous dream between the acting of a dreadful thing/ and the first motion a moment "when the genius and mortal instruments/are then in council and the state of man/Like to a little kingdom, suffers then/The nature of an insurrection. (Lake, 2016, p. 511)

It may then be worth asking why the Ghost reveals the truth. In the Christian context, as mentioned above, the involvement with the supernatural would result in the damnation of Prince Hamlet, and he would not be able to save the kingdom from the hands of King Claudius. However, Prince *Hamlet* is not presented as a necromancer. For this reason, there is a broken link in the presentation of the major enigma, the Ghost. Therefore, the relationship between the supernatural and Hamlet is vaguely and loosely presented, which brings forth ambiguity to the enigmatic structure.

Hamlet's existential desire to learn more than he was given by religion points out to the fact that he feels obliged to think like a Protestant. In earlier texts, as mentioned above, the character has a pagan past directly related to the damnation of

[56] See Week 1 video Magic and Superstition in Christian Europe/ Magic in the Middle Ages / Coursera

the supernatural in the Christian sense. However, it should be noted that the supernatural constitutes the basis for tragedy:

> Tragedy, then, has been derived from three chief kinds of source: (i) The dithyramb: that is, the cult of Dionysus. With this is usually, though not always, associated the idea of a *satyri\on,* a performance by goat-like satyrs (*tragôidia = tragón ôidê,* 'song of goats') (2) Other orgiastic or mystery rituals more or less identifiable with or comparable to the Dionysiac: for example, the Eleusinian mysteries. This variant often goes with a desire to find a more *serious* or "tragic" source than the goat-like satyrs can provide. (3) The cult of the dead; or, to give it its specifically Greek title, hero-cult. Connected with this is an emphasis on the scenes of lamentation and the like (*thrênoi, kfimmoi)* in our extant tragedies. (Else,1965, p. 12)

In Shakespearean tragedies, negative characters were associated with witchcraft, and the damnation of the supernatural is existent. Reverberations from the crucible of witches mark the borderline between the world of reality and the imaginary in Early Modern England. The same attitude is visible in the portrayal of Prince Hamlet as a character because the reader may not, at first hand, realize that the abrupt arrival of the Ghost at Elsinore could reflect the hero-cult, another association of the birth of tragedy with the supernatural. Analysing the Ghost, therefore, as a major enigma in the text, may reveal the ideas behind the implicit pathetic structure of Hamlet.

Shakespeare's Hamlet as a tragic character cannot and will not make use of the supernatural with a reference to the runic necromancy of Scandinavia. It is worth remembering that regarding the origins of tragedy, the arrival of a ghost would echo ancestor-worship rituals that could not be removed from the text:

> The most impressive evidence in favour of the origin of tragedy in hero-worship consists in the occurrence in many plays of scenes in which a tomb-ritual is

enacted, or a solemn lamentation performed; and to these must be added a few scenes in which the ghosts of the dead appear. (Pickard,1966, p. 106)

Therefore, there is a clash in the text between "previously pagan" non - Shakespearean Hamlets and the Protestant scholar who wishes to avoid all supernatural because tragedy contains elements contrary to the Early Modern view of the supernatural. According to George Thomson, ancestor worship, as marked by the arrival of a ghost of the ancestor, is unmistakably related to the idea of magic:

> The ancestor-worship characteristic of the early phases of tribal society is at once an expression and a confirmation of the authority exercised by the tribal elders. It is magical rather than religious. No prayers are addressed to the totem, only commands. The worshippers simply impose their will on it by the compelling force of the ritual act, and this principle of compulsion corresponds to a condition of society in which the community is still supreme over each and all of its members. The more advanced forms of worship develop in response to the rise of a ruling class - hereditary magicians, priests, chiefs and kings. The totem is now tended with prayer and propitiation, it assumes human shape, and becomes a god. The god is to the community at large what the chief or king is to his subjects. (Thomson, 1980, p. 15)

Therefore, the Ghost and Prince Hamlet's indecisiveness are counterparts that contrast the new kingdom. He embraces the opportunity of having a close encounter with the Ghost because his search for truth is directly related to the origins of tragedy. Therefore, Prince Hamlet's situation between life, death, and the supernatural is worth considering as it serves as the background to pathetic structure and enigmas:

> O that this too too sullied flesh would melt,
> Thaw and resolve itself into a dew,
> Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd
> His canon 'gainst Self-slaughter. Oh God! Oh God!

How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable
Seem to me all the uses of this world !
Fie on't, ah 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-
So excellent a king, that was to this
Hyperion to a satyr, so loving to my mother
That he might not beteem the winds of heaven
Visit her face too roughly. Heaven and earth,
Must I remember? Why? She would hang on him
As if increase of appetite had grown
By what it fed on; and yet within a month-
Let me not think on't—Frailty, thy name is woman-
A little month or ere those shoes were old
With which she follow'd my poor father's body,
Like Niobe, all tears — why she-
Oh God, a beast that wants discourse of reason
Would have mourn'd longer—married with my uncle,
Father's brother—but no more like my father
Than I to Hercules. Within a month,
Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous tears
Had left the flushing in her galled eyes,
She married- O most wicked speed! To post
With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!
It is not, nor it cannot come to good.
But break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue. 1.2. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 187-190)

The Ghost reveals the truth contrary to the famous Protestant belief that purgatory does not exist because Shakespeare scholar Stephen Greenblatt claims in his renowned book *Hamlet in Purgatory* that "there is a need for ghosts". The elusiveness behind the concept points out the difference between Protestantism and Catholicism as purgatory. Hamlet's Ghost, the afterlife, and the enigmatic nature of the existence of the supernatural are directly related to enigmas. The supernatural in *Hamlet* is

dependent upon "the status of providential signs and prodigies indeed the testimony of a ghost" (Lake, 2016, p. 511). It is because such testimony is not trustworthy, the indecisiveness of Hamlet parallels the fear of the supernatural in the text.

It is interesting to note that the identity of the Ghost is the source that the enigmatic structure of the play is born out of. Consequently, the building of suspense in *Hamlet* as a text may be worth considering. The readers may or may not be aware of the pagan Hamlet's representations as well as the first introduction of the Ghost in Ur-Hamlet. Since enigmas are designed to trap and puzzle readers and sometimes ultimately overthrow their expectations, the broken enigmatic link concerning the Ghost in Hamlet gives room to many ways of reading and translation.

Shakespeare's Hamlet owes many of its characteristics to the duality and the pathetic structure of the text. Prince Hamlet suffers for the sole reason of losing the kingdom that he would inherit one day. A semiotic analysis of enigmas and pathos may reveal the duality in the plot's main argument as well as the characterization marked by presentation and representation of "foul and fair." *Hamlet's* pathetic structure is designed to operate at different levels because the text's suspense element is vaguely described. The enigmatic meaning behind the broken link and the relationship between the plot and the text's pathetic structure may be the source of Prince Hamlet's existential questioning. The Ghost in the text appears in such a way that it serves the enigmas and the pathetic structure in the text.

Moreover, the philosophical, psychological, and physical burden of Prince Hamlet requires a more in-depth inquiry. It can be claimed how uncertainty, all through the text, functions in the production of meaning as well as the fascination of spirits in the English theatre:

> He saw that he could draw upon a range of traditions, including not only the classical Hades and the famous Hell but also the banished realm of Catholic Purgatory. He saw, too, that uncertainty—including perhaps his own uncertainty—about the very possibility of ghosts was itself valuable theatrical capital. More than anyone of his age, Shakespeare grasped that there were

> powerful links between his art and the haunting of spirits. (Greenblatt, 2013, p. 157)

The study of pathos, in this respect, may serve as a shortcut to amend the link with the earliest surviving Amleth copy. The pagan prince is non-existent in Shakespeare's text because black magic was strictly forbidden in the Early Modern Society and the Church of Anglican, as stated before. As stated by A.C. Bradley, the Elizabethan idea of ghosts that appear suddenly and unexpectedly has a considerable effect on the suspense of the text because it is also a part of the grotesque in the text:

> What appears grotesque is the part taken by the Ghost, and Hamlet's consequent removal from one part of the stage to another. But, as to the former, should we feel anything grotesque in the four injunctions 'Swear!' if it were not that they come from under the stage - a fact which to an Elizabethan audience, perfectly indifferent to what is absurdly called stage illusion, was probably not in the least grotesque? And as to the latter, if we knew the Ghost-lore of the time better than we do, perhaps we should see nothing odd in Hamlet's insisting on moving away and proposing the oath afresh when the Ghost intervenes. (Bradley, 2007, p. 370)

The pagan context exemplified in the quotation above is grotesque because the link with the ancestor-worship cult is not explicit in the text. It was replaced by the Protestant view that seems dominant in the presentation of the young prince and the representation of faith in the text because the ghost's intervention is presented as Prince Hamlet's first encounter with the supernatural. The role of this in the pathetic context is reluctance and uncertainty. His first murder, as opposed to King Claudius, results in the *accidental* death of Ophelia's father, Polonius, because his internal conflicts cause him to be impulsive:

> Queen: What wilt thou do? Thou wilt not murder me?
> Help, ho!
> Polonius**:** What ho! Help!
> Hamlet**:** How now? A rat! Dead for a ducat, dead.

(Thrusts his rapier through the arras.)

Polonius**:** (Behind) Oh, I am slain.

Queen: O me, what hast thou done?

Hamlet: Nay, I know not.

Is it the king? (Lifts up the arras and discovers Polonius, dead.)

Queen: O what a rash and bloody deed is this!

Hamlet: A bloody deed. Almost as bad, good mother,

As kill a king and marry with his brother. 3.4. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 320-321)

The attraction of the text comes out of Prince Hamlet's so-called "disposition" that is at work in various levels of meaning because his mental state reflects his encounter with the supernatural. This clash is born of the dichotomy of mind and body because he wishes to rely on his mind rather than the body. He despises the way that King Claudius and Queen Gertrude rely on their bodily drives. The enigma of the supernatural in Denmark, embodied in the form of the Ghost, may or may not be a product of black magic. There are no definite answers, as Greenblatt claims in Shakespeare's Hamlet because the very existence of Prince Hamlet and the Ghost recalls "a deep psychic disturbance":

> The questions the figure raises, at once theological, psychological, and theatrical, are ones to which Shakespeare never provides definitive answers; rather, he prefers to keep the issues alive by staging ghosts in a variety of guises and from shifting perspectives.17 Each of these stagings has its own distinct and subtle meanings, but there are three fundamental perspectives to which Shakespeare repeatedly returns: the Ghost as a figure of false surmise, the Ghost as a figure of history's nightmare, and the Ghost as a figure of deep psychic disturbance. (Greenblatt, 2013, p. 157)

When we take Stephen Greenblatt's description of self-fashioning, the Early Modern Period in England was far from embracing the intimidation that the supernatural would bring because the gaze focused on driving "the unwanted away" (Greenblatt, 1980, p. 9). In this respect, there will always be "demons" that Hamlet, as

a character of the Early Modern period, needs to drive away. Quoting from Stephen Greenblatt, looking for "alien, strange, or hostile" (Greenblatt, 2005, p. 9) is rooted in the Renaissance perspective. In his view, "threatening Other, heretic, savage, witch, traitor, Antichrist must be discovered or invented to be attacked and destroyed" (Greenblatt, 1980, p. 9).

The Ghost, in this respect, with or without functioning as an enigma, stretches out to the social dynamics of the Renaissance society. As stated by Stephen Greenblatt, the clashes between religious measures and the supernatural "are part of an intense and sustained struggle in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England to redefine the central values of society" (Greenblatt,1988, p. 95). Therefore, the end of *Hamlet* may puzzle the readers, both marking the total failure of the character Hamlet as the future king and his "self-fashioning" as a true Protestant. The Ghost's revelations were accurate, but prince Hamlet would not change "his method" in madness.

Interestingly, the supernatural is not driven away from Denmark because the Ghost visits the queen's chamber right after Hamlet murders Polonius. Either innocent or guilty, Hamlet bears the burden of having an encounter with the Ghost and the madness that comes with it in the gaze of people in Elsinore. The study of magic, either in the form of old wives' tales or mythological, religious practices, may refer to the encounter with the supernatural at the very core of Hamlet's antic disposition.

Table 19: Example 16 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT 2**
Ghost: I am thy father's spirit, Doom'd for a certain term to walk the night, And for the day confin'd to fast in fires, The foul crimes done in my days of nature Are burnt and purg'd away. But that I am forbid, To tell the secrets of my prison-house. I could a tale unfold whose lightest word Would harrow up thy soul, freeze thy young blood, Make thy two eyes like stars start from their spheres, Thy knotted and combined locks to part, And each particular hair to stand an end Like quills upon the fretful porpentine. But this eternal blazon must not be To ears of flesh and blood. List, list, O list! If thou didst ever thy dear father love- 1.5. (Shakespare,2003, pp.216-217)	Hayalet: Ben babanın ruhuyum. Sağlığımda işlediğim cinayetler ateşe temizlenip af oluncaya kadar, ben bir müddet, gündüzleri yanmağa, geceleri dolaşmağa mahkumum. Eğer zindanımın esrarını söylemekten men'edilmiş olmasaydım sana öyle bir hikaye söylerdim ki en küçük kelimesi ruhunu alt üst eder, genç kanını dondurur, gözlerini iki yıldız gibi mahreklerinden dışarı fırlatırdı. Toplu saçlarının her kılı hırçın bir kirpinin dikenleri gibi dimdik olurdu. Fakat ruhlar aleminin esrarı, etten kandan kulaklara söylenmez.- Dinle, dinle, ah dinle; -Eğer aziz babanı hiç sevdinse (Shakespeare, 1943, pp. 21-22)	Hayalet: Ben babanın ruhuyum senin ve bir süre için Mahkûmum geceleri karanlıkta gezmeye, Gündüzleri ateşler içinde kalmaya, Yanıp tükeninceye dek işlediğim günahlar. Açıklamam yasak olmasaydı eğer Yaşadığım zindanın sırlarını, Öyle şeyler anlatırdım ki sana, Tek kelimesi aklını başından alır, Kanayan kanını donduruverirdi, Gözlerin iki şaşkın yıldız gibi Fırlardı yuvalarından, O bukle bukle saçların ayırılıp birbirinden Diken diken kıllarına dönerdi Ürkmüş bir yaban kirpisinin. Ama et ve kandan kulaklara duymak yok Ruhlar dünyasının sırlarını. Dinle dinle ama dinle! Sevgili babanı gerçekten sevdinse eğer… (Shakespeare, 1974, pp. 34-35)
TT 3	**TT 4**	**Proposed Translation**
Hayalet: Ben senin, babanın ruhuyum. Sağlığımda işlediğim iğrenç günahlar ateşte yanarak temizleninceye kadar bir zaman, geceleri dolaşmaya, gündüzleri de aç aç ateşler içinde yanmaya mahkumum. Zindanımın sırlarını söylemem yasak edilmeseydi öyle hikâye anlatabilirdim ki en	Hayalet: Ben babanın ruhuyum. Doğal ömrüm süresince işlediğim suçlar Yanıp temizleninceye kadar, bir süre Geceleri dışarda dolaşmaya Gündüzleriyse alevlerde çile doldurmaya mahkûmum.	Hayalet: Ben ruhuyum babanın. Yaşadığım sürece işlediğim büyük günahlar Yanarak temizleninceye kadar Geceleri bir süre daha böyle dolaşmaya mahkumum, Zindanımın sırlarını açmak yasak olmasaydı eğer,

ehemmiyetsiz bir kelimesi yüreğini parçalar, genç kanım dondurur, gözlerini yıldızlar gibi yuvalarından uğratır, birbirine bağlı örgülerini darmadağınık edip herbir telini ürkek: kirpinin dikenleri gibi dimdik kaldırırdı. Ama, ebediyetin sırrını etten kemikten kulaklara duyurmaya izin yok. Dinle dinle, ah dinle! Eğer aziz babanı hiç sevdinse… (Shakespeare, 1995, p. 35)	Cezaevimin sırlarını söylemem yasak, Ama öyle bir şey anlatacağım ki sana, Her kelimesi ruhunu altüst edecek, Körpe kanını donduracak, İki gözünü birden, Koruyucu kürelerinden fırlayan yıldızlar gibi Yerlerinden uğratacak; Toplu, düzenli saçların, dağılacak, Taciz edilen kirpinin okları gibi Her tel dimdik olacak. Ama sonsuzluğun sırları Etten kemikten kulaklara açılamaz. Dinle, dinle, ne olur, dinle! Eğer aziz babanı biraz olsun sevdiysen… (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 68)	Öyle bir hikâye anlatırdım ki sana, Tek kelimesiyle bile ruhun alt üst olur, Genç kanın donar, gözlerin yuvalarından uğrar, Taranıp, örülmüş saç tellerinin her biri Dürtülmüş kirpinin dikenleri gibi dimdik olurdu. Ama etten kemikten yapılma kulaklara göre değil, Sonsuzluk işaretleri. Dinle, dinle, ah dinle! Eğer sevgili babanı biraz sevdinse.

This context in Table 19 has been at the root of the portrayal of religion in *Hamlet*. Therefore, in translations, the first sign to look at is "foul crimes," for which translators used different signs for Turkish translation because the sign "foul" may have connotations with evil. TT4, in this sense, is an example of wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the translation of the sign referring to the existence of purgatory was translated as "işlediğim suçlar"(the sins I committed) in which the sign "foul" is erased. In Shakespearean tragedies, it is especially important to focus on the dichotomy between foul and fair. These notions form a primary leitmotif, which has reverberations that serve as a subtext to the plot. In TT2, on the other hand, there is an alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) Table with a difference because the sign "crimes" was translated as "günahlar", which means "sins" in English. It is unclear whether the Ghost refers to sins or real crimes like murder, theft, or felonies. In TT3, on the other hand, the same phrase was translated as "iğrenç günahlar" (disgusting sins) as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because a false meaning is

produced, but it is not completely irrelevant to the context in the original text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

In this sense, the phrase "foul crimes" may refer to sins rather than wicked crimes like murder, as an example. In other words, the word "foul" may well emphasize sinfulness. Shakespeare's use of the words foul and fair as leitmotifs reverberate in four great tragedies. TT1, in this respect, is an example of an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because "foul crimes" was translated as "işlediğim cinayetler" (the murders I committed). However, there is no explicit sign that the old king was guilty of a foul murder like this one. It may be claimed that using the sign "cinayet" (murder) is an interpretation of the sign foul. In this respect, it refers to nothing other than manslaughter, but the sign's scope cannot be that narrow. In Shakespearean tragedies, the sign foul has a deep meaning that may refer to a vast range of definitions.

The second sign to consider is "harrow up," a direct reference to "a cultivating toolset with spikes, teeth, or disks and used primarily for breaking up and smoothing the soil."[57] It is interesting to note that the harrow was an instrument used by Adam to plant the soil. Although the sign "harrow up" means "torment or vex," the reference to planting and harvest can be considered an indirect reference to the original sin. It is, therefore, worth considering the connotations of the sign concerning the existence of the supernatural. When we take the sign harrow's etymological roots, it is mostly associated with gathering, plucking, or snatching.[58] In this respect, the Ghost points out "a story" that will snatch his decidedly Protestant soul. When we read the sign harrow by referring to the instrument, it takes us to the creation myth in Genesis. The Ghost acts like the chorus in Greek tragedies, which will warn the protagonist or comment on the dangers.

In TT1 and TT4, the sign "harrow up" was translated as "alt üst olmak" (to be harrowed), which covers both the literal and figurative usage of the sign. The implicit reference to the myth of creation is retained.

[57] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/harrow [04.05.2021]
[58] Ibid

In translation TT2, the sign "harrow up" was translated as "aklını başından alır" (drive mad). In this context, it is an example of an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because madness is an implicit reference to "harrowing up" of one's soul. In the enigmatic context, madness is one of the explicit references that the Ghost makes. In TT3, the phrase was translated as "yüreğini parçalar" (ripping off one's heart), which is an example of destruction of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the source text, there is no reference to one's heart but one's soul. The imagery of ripping one's heart (yüreğini parçalar) simply does not exist.

The last sign to consider is "eternal blazon," a phrase coined through two far-fetched terms. In translations TT3 and TT4, the term was translated respectively as "ebediyetin sırrını" (the secret of eternality) and "sonsuzluğun sırları" (secrets of eternality), as examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The sign blazon does not explicitly refer to secrets. In translations, TT1 and TT2, on the other hand, "ruhlar aleminin esrarı" (the secret of the realm of spirits) and "ruhlar aleminin sırları" (the secrets of the realm of spirits) were used, respectively. Both translations are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase "eternal blazon" cannot only be considered as a reference to the realm of spirits and the supernatural. After all, blazon means "armorial bearings, coat of arms"[59] that can be accepted as a meaningful connection with Shakespeare's world or "ostentatious display". On the contrary, what the Ghost means by "eternal blazon" is quite unclear because *eternal* and *blazon* are not frequently used together. The sign eternal refers to life after death, but what about blazon? The meaning of "the coat of arms, a title given to a family", is "the principal part of a system of hereditary symbols dating back to early medieval Europe, used primarily to establish identity in battle."[60] In this respect, the sign can be interpreted as an emblem or sign of the eternal rather than secrets. For this reason, in the proposed translation, the translation of the sign emblem (işaretler) was preferred.

The existence of the Ghost as an enigmatic element owes much of its effect on suspense, and the reader is just on the brink of catching a supernatural grip, precisely

[59] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/blazon [03.05.2021]
[60] https://www.britannica.com/topic/coat-of-arms [03.05.2021]

like the young prince does. In this respect, explicit translation strategies may sometimes contradict the handling of the supernatural as major enigmas in Shakespearean tragedies.

Table 20: Example 17 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Marcellus: It faded on the crowing of the cock. Some say that ever 'gainst that season comes Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated, The bird of dawning singeth all night long. And then, they say, no spirit dare stir abroad. The nights are wholesome, then no planets strike, No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm, So hallow'd and so gracious is that time. (1.1.Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 176-177)	Marcellus: Horoz öter ötmez silindi gitti. Bazıları der ki, İsa'nın doğumu tes'it edildiği mevsimde seher kuşu bütün gece ötermiş; ve yine derler ki, o zaman hiç bir ruh dışarıda dolaşamazmış. Geceler o kadar mübarekmiş! O vakit ne seyyare çarpar, ne peri zapteder, ne de cadı büyüsü tutarmış. O mevsim o kadar mukaddes ve lûtufkârmış. (Shakespeare, 1943, p.6)	Marcellus: Evet,kayboluverdi horoz ötünce, İsa'nın doğum bayramları yaklaşınca, Bütün gece ötermiş bu sabah kuşu. Hiç bir ruh çıkamazmış o zaman dışarı, Tertemiz olurmuş geceler, Ne yıldızlar ne cinler çarpar, insanı, Ne de cadıların büyüsü tutarmış. Öylesine kutsal,uğurlu günlermiş onlar. (Shakespeare, 1974, pp. 13-14)
TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Marcellus: Horoz ötünce gözden siliniverdi. Bazıları der ki: Müncimizin doğumunun kutlandığı mevsim gelince, muhakkak seher kuşu bütün gece ötermiş; bu mevsim öyle mübarek öyle hayırlıymış ki, o vakit etrafta hiçbir habis ruh dolaşamazmış; geceler selametle geçer, seyyareler çarpışmaz, büyücüler büyü yapmaz olurmuş. (Shakespeare, 1995, p.13,14)	Marcellus: Horozun ötüşüyle yok oldu gitti. Dediklerine göre, her yıl, aynı dönemde, Kurtarıcımızın doğum günü kutlanırken, Bu şafak kuşu bütün gece ötermiş, Ve o sırada hiçbir ruh yerinden kımıldayamazmış. Geceler tekin olur, gezegenler çarpmazmış; Periler insana ilişmez, büyücülerin büyüsü kalmazmış Öyle uğurlu, Öyle kutsal bir vakit olurmuş bu.	Horoz öter ötmez kayboldu. Derler ki kurtarıcımızın doğumu kutlandığı zaman, Bütün gece öttüğünde şafak kuşu Ne bir ruh dolaşmaya cüret edermiş Geceyi yarmaya, ne de gezegenler, Cadıların büyüsü tutmaz olur, Ecinniler gezinemezmiş. Öylesine uğurlu, yüce zamanlar onlar.

	(Shakespeare, 2013, p.43)	

The way that Marcellus describes the supernatural in Table 20 is closer to the description of evil in the Christian sense, which is witchcraft.[61] Marcellus claims that evil doings will be ineffective when the Early bird sings all through the night before the birth of Jesus Christ. The holiness is attributed to the night because it is without "the presence of evil". Marcellus apparently is afraid of the arrival of evil and faith loss due to a close encounter with it. He refers to the night between December 24 and 25 when holy natality occurs. It is the time, according to Marcellus, when "no soul will move", as the Ghost does.

Consequently, his commitment to the Christian description of Denmark clashes with Prince Hamlet's encounter with the supernatural. His wish to go beyond Christian authorities' limits turn The Ghost into a major enigma. Prince Hamlet's limbo world signals the perspective of the Early Modern period,[62] which focuses only on the intimidation brought by the Ghost, not the possibility of its bringing truth.

The dichotomy between the supernatural as the evil and belief was manifested. The phrases to look at would be "our Saviour's birth,", spirit and "no planets strike." Except for TT4, "our Saviour's birth" was translated as "İsa'nın doğumu" (the birth of Jesus Christ) or "İsa'nın doğum bayramları" (festivities of the birth of Jesus Christ). They are examples of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, however, the phrase was translated as "kurtarıcımızın" (Our Saviour's) as the translation of the phrase. In TT4, Marcellus stresses the concept of being saved by Jesus Christ.[63] It contrasts with the arrival of the Ghost from the land of the supernatural. As the background to Ghost's existence, "sinfulness"[64] and "being saved"[65] are the concepts to consider. The rottenness that comes to Denmark[66] may be read as a reference to the land of the dead and the arrival of the Ghost and witchcraft.

[61] See Shakespeare's Demonology: A Dictionary by Marion Gibson and Jo Ann Esra p.204 and 205
[62] Ibid
[63]See Shakespeare's Christianity: The Protestant and Catholic Poetics of Julius Caesar, Macbeth, and Hamlet
ed. Beatrice Batson
[64] Ibid
[65] Ibid
[66] See the phrase by Barnardo "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark" Act I, Scene IV, (67)

The rejection of witchcraft complies with Julia Kristeva's concept of the abject (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18), which may explain the intensity of fear concerning the Ghost. In Greenblatt's terms67, the supernatural should be excluded from society for self-fashioning, and demonization is a necessary tool. This pre-existing notion may stop the reader from thinking that the Ghost could also be the harbinger of truth. The traces of demonization of the supernatural and the fear may be studied in the Early Modern period's readings and translations. In other words, the crucible of the witches, the demonization of the supernatural, symbolically reveals the resonations from Early Modern History.

Table 21: Example 18 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hamlet: To be, or not to be, that is 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	Hamlet: Var olmak, yahut yok olmak — İşte iş burada; acaba zalim feleğin okuna, taşına göğüs germek mi, yoksa, bu mihnet deryasına karsı koyarak hepsine nihayet vermek mi daha asil bir hareket olur? - Ölmek, uyumak, hepsi bu kadar; ve bir uyku ile bütün kalb ağrılarını, vücudun varis olduğu binbir tabii derdi dindirebilmek,: -İşte varlığımızın müştak olduğu bir netice! Ölmek,- uyumak; -uyumak! Belki de rüya görmek: _ Ahh, işte güçlük burada! Çünkü ruhumuz bu fani kalıptan sıyrılıp ölüm uykusuna daldığı an ne rüya görebileceğimizi kim bilir? İşte bizi düşündüren bu; uzun ömür felâketine katlandıran bu. Yoksa kim, bir yalın hançer ile hayata nihayet vermek varken, zamanın darbelerine ve istihfafına, zalimin zulmüne, mağrurun küstahlığına, reddedilmiş aşkın sızılarına, adaletin sürüncemesine, mevki	Hamlet: Var olmak mı, yok olmak mı, bütün sorun bu! Düşüncemizin katlanması mı güzel, Zalim kaderin yumruklarına, oklarına, Yoksa diretip belâ denizlerine karşı Dur, yeter! Demesi mi? Ölmek, uyumak sadece! Düşünün ki uyumakla yalnız Bitebilir bütün acıları yüreğin, Çektiği 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. Kim dayanabilir zamanın kırbaçına? Zorbanın kahrına, gururunun çiğnenmesine,

[67] See Renaissance Self-Fashioning p.9 by Stephen Greenblatt

That makes calamity of so long life. For who would bear the whips and scorns of time, Th'oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, The pangs of dispriz'd love, the law's delay, The insolence of office, and the spurns That patient merit of th'unworthy takes, When he himself might his quietus make With a bare bodkin? Who would fardels bear, To grunt and sweat under a weary life, But that the dread of something after death, The undiscovere'd country, from whose bourn No traveller returns, puzzles the will, And makes us rather bear those ills we have Than fly to others that we know not of? Thus conscience does make cowards of us all, And thus the native hue of resolution Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought, And enterprises of great pitch and moment With this regard their currents turn awry And lose the name of action. 2.2.(Shakespeare,2013, pp. 276-277)	sahiplerinin hakaretine, liyakat ehlinin liyakatsizler tarafından tezyifine katlanır? Kim bu yüklere tahammül eder, ömrün meşakkatleri altında terler, inler, eğer o keşfedilmemis, o hudutlarından hiç bir seyyahın geri dönmediği âlem, o ölümden sonraki şeyin dehşeti irademizi şaşırtmasa? Bütün bunlar bize, bilmediğimiz fenalıklara atılmaktansa, içinde bulunduklarımıza katlanmağı tercih ettiriyor. İşte hepimizi korkak yapan bu şuurumuzdur; ve işte bu endişeler azim ve kararımızı solduruyor, tüketiyor; yüksek ve mühim teşebbüsler bu sebepten dolayı mecralarını değiştiriyor, faaliyet vasıflarını kaybediyorlar.- Sus artık!- Ophelia güzel peri dualarında benim günahlarımı da yad et. (Shakespeare,1943, pp. 50-51)	Sevgisinin kepaze edilmesine, Kanunların bu kadar yavaş Yüzsüzlüğün kadar çabuk yürümesine, Kötülere kul olmasına iyi insanın Bir bıçak saplayıp göğsüne kurtulmak varken? Kim ister bütün bunlara katlanmak Ağır bir hayatın altında inleyip terlemek, Ölümden sonraki bir şeyden korkmasa, O kimsenin gidip de dönmediği bilinmez dünya Ürkütmese yüreğini? Bilmediğimiz belâlara atılmaktansa Çektiklerine razı etmese insanı? Bilinç böyle korkak ediyor hepimizi: Düşüncenin soluk ışığı bulandırıyor Yürekten gelenin doğal rengini. Ve nice büyük, yiğitçe atılışlar Yollarını değiştirip bu yüzden, Bir iş, bir eylem olma gücünü yitiriyorlar. Ama sus, bak, güzel Ophelia geliyor. Peri kızı dualarında unutma beni, Ve bütün günahlarımı. (Shakespeare,1974, pp.73-74)

TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Hamlet: Yaşamak mı, yoksa ölmek mi, mesele bunda. Kör talihin sapanlarına, oklarına zihninde tahammül göstermek mi daha mertçe olur, yoksa kaygıların ummanına karşı silahlanıp onları yok etmek mi? Ölmek: uyumak. O kadar! Bir uykuyla kalb üzüntüsünü, tabiatın bedene miras olarak verdiği bir acıyı sona erdiriyoruz diyebilmek, candan gönülden istenecek bir son olur. Ölmek, uyumak: belki de rüya görmek. Dert orada: çünkü, bu fâni kalıbı üstümüzden sıyırıp attıktan sonra, o ölüm uykusunda kim bilir ne rüyalar görürüz düşüncesi bizi durmaya ediyor. Yaşamak felaketini uzatan, işte bu düşünce. Yoksa- insan bir hançerle kendi işini kendi halledebilirken — zamanın sillesine hakaretlerine, zalimin haksızlıklarına, kendini beğenmişin küstahlıklarına karşılıksız kalan aşkın ıstırabına, kanunun ihmaline, mevki sahibinin kibrine, sabırla gösterilen liyakatin değersizlerce hor görülmesine kim tahammül ederdi? Meşakkatli bir hayatın yükü, altında inleyip ter dökmeye kim razı olurdu? Ne çare ki, ölüm- sınırlarını aşan yolculardan hiçbirinin geri gelmediği o bilinmez. ülke — ardında da belki bir şey vardır korkusu, zihnimizi şaşkın ederek bizi, bilmediğimiz musibetlere düşmektense içinde olduklarımıza tahammül ettiriyor Düşünmek, işte hepimizi böyle korkak ediyor; azmin gürbüz rengi tereddüdün soluk gölgesiyle hasta bir renk alıyor. En büyük en mühim teşebbüsler, bu düşünce yüzünden, mecralarını değiştiriyor; bir fiil adını almaktan çıkıyorlar. Ama, dur bakayım! Güzel Ophelia ha!	Hamlet: Var olmak ya da olmamak, mesele bu. Gözü dönmüş talihin sapanına, oklarına, İçin için katlanmak mı daha soylu, Yoksa, bir dertler denizine karşı silaha sarılıp Son vermek mi onlara? Ölmek, uyumak… Hepsi bu… ve bir uykuyla Yürek sızısına ve bedeni bekleyen Binlerce doğal darbeye son verdik diyebilmek. Hangi insan gönülden istemezdi bu bitişi! Ölmek, uyumak… uyumak, belki rüya görmek. Ha! İş burda. Çünkü o ölüm uykusunda, Şu fani bedenden sıyrılıp çıktığımızda, Göreceğimiz rüyalar bizi duraksatır ister istemez. İşte felaketi onca uzun ömürlü kılan da bu Kim katlanırdı yoksa zamanın kırbaçlarına, küfürlerine, Zorbanın haksızlığına, kibirli adamın hakaretine? Hor görülen aşkın acılarına, adaletin gecikmesine, Devlet görevlisinin kendini bilmezliğine; Sabırla bekleyen erdemli kişinin, Değersiz insanlardan gördüğü muameleye, İnsan yalın bir hançer darbesiyle hesabı kesebilecekken?	Hamlet: Var olmak ya da olmamak? İşte bütün mesele bu. Kör talihin sapan ve oklarına göğüs germek mi daha asilce olur yoksa dertler denizinde kulaç atmak ve sona ersin diye mücadele etmek mi? Ölünce, yani uyuyunca her şey biter mi? Bir uykuyla mı sona erer canı bekleyen hayatın binlerce sarsıntı ve üzüntüsü? Kim istemez böyle bir sonu? Ölmek, uyumak; uyumak ve rüya görmek belki de İşte orda bir durmalı. Ölüm uykusunda bu ölümlü bedenden sıyrıldığımızda ne rüyalar görülür kim bilir? İşte budur uzun bir yaşamın felaketine, zamanın kırbaç ve iğnelerine, zorbanın haksızlığına, kibirlilerin hakaretlerine, şaşan adalete Aşkın gözden düşmesine, devlet görevlisinin hadsizliğine, erdemli sabırın gördüğü muameleye dayanmayı sağlayan güç. İnsan bir hançer darbesiyle bütün bunlara son verebilecekken, insan neden kahır dolu bir hayatı kan ter içinde sürdürür? Ölümden sonrakine duyulan korku, kimselerin geri dönmediği keşfedilmemiş ülkenin varlığı iradeyi şaşırtıyor ve bilmediğimize koşmaktansa, bildiğimiz belalara katlanmayı tercih ediyoruz. Bilinç korkak yapıyor hepimizi. Kararlılığın asıl rengi düşüncenin

Peri sultan, dualarında bütün günahlarımı hatırla. (Shakespeare, 1995, p. 82)	Kim katlanırdı, bu yorgun yaşamın yükü altında Homurdanıp terlemeye, Ölümden sonraki bir şeyin korkusu olmasaydı? Sınırlarını bir geçenin bir daha dönmediği O bilinmeyen ülkenin korkusu kafamızı karıştırıp Bizleri, tanımadığımız dertlere koşup gitmektense, Karşınızdakilere katlanmak zorunda bırakmasaydı? İşte bunları düşündükçe Ödlek olup çıkıyoruz hepimiz, Ve işte böyle kararlılığın doğal rengi, Endişenin soluk gölgesiyle bozuluyor; Bulutları hedef alan büyük ve iddialı atılımlar Bu yüzden yörüngesinden sapıyor Ve bir girişim olmaktan çıkıyor adları Hey, o da kim? Güzel Ophelia!.. Peri kızı dualarında benim günahlarımı da unutma. (Shakespeare, 2013, pp. 115-116)	Soluk ışığıyla bulanıklaşıyor. Ana dair büyük girişimler Bu yüzden yollarını şaşırıp Eylem niteliklerini yitiriyorlar. Peri kızı dualarında beni unutma.

In the famous soliloquy in Table 21 by Prince Hamlet, the signs and phrases that stand out start with the famous "to be or not to be" quotation. Prince Hamlet's speech in Table 21 is on life and death that could be interpreted as signs that he is in a deep mourning period. However, the rest of the speech reveals that the soliloquy is purely metaphysical. He is yearning for a life that would let him "perchance to dream," although he is unsure what dreams might come in that sleep of death. This is an implicit reference to the questioning of purgatory. These signs are open to interpretation. The graveyard scene that comes after this speech is worth considering because Prince

Hamlet talks to Yorrick the jester's skull as if he were still alive and could hear him.[68] The third sign that will reveal where Hamlet sees hope for himself is "the undiscovered country". The effect of suspense is intensified to a great degree in this soliloquy because the mind-body dichotomy is evident in both the source text and translations.

Referring to Prince Hamlet's graveyard scene again,[69] the way that Hamlet touches the dead's skulls and bones would parallel exhumation. Moving the body parts of the dead to revive them was strictly banned by Christian authorities.[70] The significance of the concept would cover the broad research of metaphysics. The supernatural exists in the text because surpassing the borders of life and death is the matter for Shakespearean Hamlet. Since magic would not be performed on the stage, his quest in the metaphysical sense is evident only in the soliloquy. The enigmas' effect takes another turn with Hamlet's clumsy attitude to metaphysics, which can be surprisingly interpreted as implicit references to magic and necromancy, possibly reminiscent of older versions[71] because his mind is on the "undiscovered land" after death.

Therefore, it is worth looking at the translations of the famous phrase "to be or not to be" because all interpretations say different things about the phrase's meaning. In TT1, the phrase was translated as "Var olmak, yahut yok olmak" (existing or being destroyed) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it is not clear in the original text whether it means "destruction" of a human being or "dying" in the ordinary course of life. The meaning “not to be" is unclear because in the rest of the soliloquy, Hamlet talks of a coma-like sleep that may resemble the sleep of death of lovers in *Romeo and Juliet*, not precisely destruction. It may also refer to a possibility that the sign *sleep* was used metaphorically.

In other words, the whole speech would be a description of *purgatory*. Therefore, "yok olmak" (being destroyed) adds another meaning to the context of purgatory. In TT2, the phrase was translated as "Var olmak mı, yok olmak mı", which

[68] See Arden Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 2003, p. 386
[69] See Arden Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 2003, p. 382
[70] See Week 1 video Magic and Superstition in Christian Europe/ Magic in the Middle Ages / Coursera
[71] See Gesta Denorum by Saxo Grammaticus and Amleth by Belleforest

is on common ground with the translation in TT1. In TT3, on the other hand, it was translated as "Yaşamak mı, yoksa ölmek mi" (Living or dying), which is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) with a difference. Unlike TT1 and TT2, this time, death is openly introduced. It is also an example of adding extra meaning to the context because it is unclear whether "not to be" exactly means death or destruction of the soul. In TT4 and the proposed translation, it was translated as "Var olmak ya da olmamak".

The second sign to consider is conscience. The noun form of the sign "conscience" has many different connotations such as "real knowledge, inner conviction, true understanding, internal reflection, inner voice, inmost thought,"[72] which refers to the idea of "knowing". However, the secondary meaning of the sign "sense of indebtedness or feeling of obligation"[73] may be meaningful in the iconographic context. "Indebtedness" and "obligation" could refer to Hamlet's reference to *purgatory* in the quote "what dreams may come".

In translations, it is possible to see that the first meaning of the sign was considered. In TT1, the sign "conscience" was translated as "şuurumuzdur" (our conscience), in TT2 as "bilinç" (conscience) in TT3 as "düşünmek" (thinking), and in TT4 "düşündükçe" (as I think) as examples of sliding of the meaning(Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). All these translations are explicit references to Hamlet's metaphysics. Shakespeare's link of conscience with the notion of purgatory is worth considering in this sense.

In the proposed translation, the sign "bilinç" was chosen as conscience. In Turkish, vebal (burden) would be an alternative because the sign covers both the sense of guilt and the iconographic link of the sign concerning purgatory. The background, which implicitly refers to the relationships between Prince Hamlet's actions, thoughts, and religious views, is ambiguous. In the famous "to be or not to be" soliloquy, he *sounds* like a Protestant, but he chases the Ghost by asking God to "make his nerves as hard as Nemean Lion's" to echo paganism. This dichotomy of

[72] https://www.shakespeareswords.com/Public/Glossary.aspx [04.04.201]
[73] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/meaculpa [05.04.2021]

the body and the mind visible in his actions may result in translating different contexts offered by the sign.

Table 22: Example 19 for Translation Analysis and Comparison

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Ghost: Ay, that incestuous, that adulterate beast, With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts— O wicked wit, and gifts that have the power So to seduce!—won to his shameful lust The will of my most seemingly-virtuous queen. O Hamlet, what a falling off was there, From me, whose love was of that dignity That it went hand in hand even with the vow I made to her in marriage, and to decline Upon a wretch whose natural gifts were poor To those of mine. But virtue, as it never will be mov'd, Though lewdness court it in a shape of heaven, So lust, though to a radiant angel link'd, Will sate itself in a celestial bed And prey on garbage. 1.5. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 218)	-----	Hayalet: Evet, o haram arzulara susamış hayvan, Sihirbaz oyunlarıyla, şeytanca hediyelerle (Ah ne korkunç bir aldatma gücü varmış O hediyelerin, o şeytan tuzaklarının!) İğrenç emellerine çeldi yüreğini O melek görünüşlü kraliçemin! Ah Hamlet, nasıl böylesine düşer insan? Sevgim ne yükseklerde tutuyordu onu, Sevgim hep elele yürüyordu, Evlenirken ona ettiğim yeminle. Nasıl alçalır o yaratığın çamuruna? Doğuştan yapısı bile daha cılızdı benimkinden. Ama, sağlam insan nasıl, cenneti de verseler, Dinlemezse aşağılık cümbüşlerin çağırışını, Çürük insan, meleklerle sarmaş dolaş da olsa. Bıkar göklerdeki yatağından. Can atar iğrenç pisliklere… (Shakespeare,1974, p. 36)
TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Hayalet: Evet, akrabasına göz diken, zina düşkünü o canavar benim o kadar faziletli gözüken Kıraliçemi zekâsının büyüsüyle büyüledi; Hıyanet dolu hediyelerle elde etti – ah, insanı bu türlü baştan	Hayalet: Evet, akrabasıyla sevişen o ahlaksız canavar; Zekâsını karımı büyülemek için kullanan, Onu hediyelerle baştan çıkaran hain.	Hayalet: Evet, o akrabasıyla evlenen, zinaya meyilli yaratık. Büyücü zekasıyla, ihanete davet eden hediyeleriyle baştan çıkardı o sözde en

çıkarabilen zekâ ne melûn zekâdır, o hediyeler ne melûn hediyeler! -sonunda onu iğrenç arzularına ram etti.-Ah Hamlet, bu düşüş ne müthiş bir düşüştü! Evlenirken verdiği sözden bir gün bile ayrılmıyacak kadar sevgisi asli olan beni bırakmak, tabiattan nasibi bana nispetle hiç sayılan bir zavallıya tenezzül etmek! Ama, nasıl, safahat hattâ ilâhî bir mevcudun kılığına 'girerek ona öyle yanaşmak istediği vakit bile, fazilet aldırış etmezse; Öylece şehvet de, nur içinde bir meleğe eş. olup cennet yataklarında yattığı vakit bile, bıkkınlık duyar çöplükte eşelenmek ister. (Shakespeare,1995, p. 36-37)	Ah o iğrenç zekâ ve iğrenç hediyeler! Onu kandırmaya yetti güçleri. Şehvetten gözleri dönmüş bu utanmaz, sonunda, Görünüşte iffetli Kraliçe'min iradesini yendi. Ah Hamlet, o ne düşüştü bilsen, Benden sonra. Öyle yüce bir aşktı ki benimki, Düğün yeminiyle el ele geldi bugüne dek; Oysa şimdi, doğal meziyetleri benimkiler yanında hiç olan o sefile kaldı Kraliçem. Ama, edepsizlik cennetlik kılığına girse de, Erdemi nasıl şaşırtamazsa yolundan; Göksel yataktan bıkar şehvet, Yanında yatan ışıl ışıl bir melek olsa da. Bıkar ve leş aramaya çıkar sonunda. (Shakespeare, 2013, pp. 69-70)	namus timsali kraliçemi, utanç verici emellerine alet etmek için. Ah Hamlet, bir bilsen nasıl bir gözden düşüştü bu. Kraliçemi evlenirken ettiğim yemin kadar el üstünde tutardım. O doğadan nasiplenememiş hilkat garibesine mi kaldı? Ancak erdem nasıl kılını kıpırdatmazsa, cennetten çıkma gibi gözükse şirret, Şehvet ışık saçan meleğin yanında dursa bile, Sonunda atar kendini gök yatağından, Çeri çöpü yutmak için.

In Table 22, the ghost describes King Claudius as a "beast" rather than a human. The ghost also refers to him as a witch who would seduce a pious Christian woman like queen Gertrude to commit incest. In pre-Shakespearean Hamlet texts, we may quickly notice that Hamlet's role as the magician had been swapped with King Claudius. In this respect, the king is openly accused of witchcraft. The Ghost explicitly means that the Queen did not marry out of love but because of the love spell that King Claudius was able to make. The effect of enigma is intensified because we may assume that whole of Denmark is under the spell of an anti-Christian witch.

In this context, three signs stand out. They are "incestuous", "witchcraft", and "wicked wit"**,** which are also the essential elements of suspense. It is interesting to see in the translations that in TT1, that the whole context was excluded. Since we do not have a foreword to the translation, it is impossible to claim the reason behind the exclusion of the entire context. It may be supposed that the enigma's keywords are excluded for a reason. Consequently, the keywords concerning the enigma above were

also eliminated. It can be proposed that this is an example of wiping out of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172)

In TT2, on the other hand, the sign incestuous was translated as "haram arzulara susamış" as an example of darkening of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), while in TT3, it was translated as "akrabasına göz diken" (having an eye on his relative) through under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), and "akrabasıyla sevişen" (incestuous) as the translation of the sign.

Table 23: Example 20 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hamlet: O that this too too sullied flesh would melt, Thaw and resolve itself into a dew, Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd His canon 'gainst Self-slaughter. Oh God! Oh God! How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable Seem to me all the uses of this world ! Fie on't, ah 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- So excellent a king, that was to this Hyperion to a satyr, so loving to my mother That he might not beteem the winds of heaven Visit her face too roughly. Heaven and earth, Must I remember? Why? She would hang on him	Hamlet: Ah şu kaskatı vücut erise, dağılsa, çiğ tanesine dönse! Yahut Ezeli Halik, nefse kıymayı nehy etmemiş olsa! Ey Allahım! Ey Allahım! Bu dünyanın her hali bana ne kadar yorucu, bayat, sıkıntılı ve faydasız geliyor. Yazıklar olsun! Yazıklar olsun! Yanmamış; her şeyi tohuma kaçmış bir bahçe gibi içini tabiatın kaynağı ve kaba şeyleri sarmış! Böyle mi olacaktı! Öleli yalnız 2 ay oldu. Hayır o kadar da değil, iki ay değil. Hem öyle mükemmel bir hükümdardı ki onun yanında bu, Hyperion'a nispeten bir "satyr" gibidir. Annemi öyle severdi ki, sert esen bir rüzgârın bile yüzünü incitmesine gönlü razı olmazdı! Ey semâ, ey toprak! Niçin hatırlıyorum? Annem bir türlü dayamıyormuş gibi onun etrafında dolaşırdı. Halbuki bir ay içinde — hayır, düşünmemeli – Zaaf senin adın kadındır!- Bir kısacık ay; zavallı babamın tabutunu, Niobe gibi göz yaşları ile o bile – Allahım! Aklı ve dili olmayan bir hayvan bile daha uzun matem tutardı — amcama, babamın kardeşine vardı; fakat ben ne kadar Herkül'e benzemezsem, babama o kadar benzemiyen o	Hamlet: Ah bu katı, kaskatı beden bir dağılsa, Eriyip gitse bir çiy tanesinde sabahın! Yada 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. O yüce kralı bir düşün, bir de buna bak! Biri güneş tanrısı, öteki bir orman şeytanı! Nasıl da severdi annemi? Esen yellerden sakınırdı yüzünü. Yerler, gökler; unutsam olmaz mı bunları?

As if increase of appetite had grown By what it fed on; and yet within a month- Let me not think on't—Frailty, thy name is woman- A little month or ere those shoes were old With which she follow'd my poor father's body, Like Niobe, all tears — why she- Oh God, a beast that wants discourse of reason Would have mourn'd longer—married with my uncle, Father's brother—but no more like my father Than I to Hercules. Within a month, Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous tears Had left the flushing in her galled eyes, She married- O most wicked speed! To post With such dexterity to incestuous sheets! It is not, nor it cannot come to good. But break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue. 1.2. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 187-190)	adama, bir ay içinde, henüz bu en riyakâr yaşlarla yanan gözlerindeki kırmızılık zail olmadan vardı. Ey haram döşeğine bu kadar süratle atılan günahkâr istical! Bu hayra alamet değil, Kırıl ey kalb, çünkü dilimi tutmam lazım. (Shakespeare, 1943, pp. 10-11)	O da nasıl düşerdi babamın üstüne? Sevgiyle beslendikçe artar gibiydi sevgisi. Öyleyken bir ay içinde… Düşünmesem daha iyi. Kadın zaaf demekmiş meğer! Kısacık bir ay… Daha eskimedi o gün giydiği pabuçlar Babamın tabutu ardında yürürken, Niobe gibi, iki gözü iki çeşme… Nasıl olur, o kadın, evet aynı kadın (Tanrım, beyinsiz bir hayvan bile Daha fazla acı çekerdi) amcamla evleniyor; Babamın kardeşiyle; Öyle de bir kardeş ki Ben Herakles'e ne kadar benzemezsem O da o kadar benzemiyor babama. Bir ay içinde… Yalancı göz yaşlarının tuzu Daha yakarken kızarmış gözlerini Evleniyor bu adamla. Ne kıyasıya bir acele bu! Ne azgın bir atılış haram döşeğine! İyi değil, iyilik de çıkamaz bundan. Ama boğ kendini, yüreğim; dilimi tutmak gerek! (Shakespeare, 1974, pp. 19-20)
TT3 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	**TT4** Hamlet: Ah, şu kaskatı beden eriyip çözülseydi, Bir çiğ damlasına dönseydi keşke! Ya da, o Ebedi Varlık,	**Proposed Translation** Hamlet: Ah, bu kaskatı beden eriyip dağılsa, Bir çiğ tanesine dönüşse, Keşke Tanrı yasak etmemiş olsaydı canına kıymayı kendinin.

geliyor. Yazık ona, yazık! Yolunmayan otlan tohuma kaçmış bir bahçeyi andırıyor. Tabiatta ne kadar yabani, zararlı şey varsa içini sade onlar bürümüş. Böyle olacaktı ha! Öleli daha iki ay geçti. Yok, o kadar bile değil, iki ay bile değil. Hem öyle mükemmel bir hükümdardı ki, bunun yanında, Satyrin yanma Hyperion gelmiş de durmuş sanılırdı. Hem annemi öyle severdi kî rüzgârların yüzüne hızla değmesine bile razı olmazdı. Ey gökler, ey yer! Hatırlamasam olmaz mı? Doydukça iştihası artıyormuş gibi kollama babamın boynundan nasıl ayırmazdı. Sonra bir ay içinde… Düşünmiyeyim daha iyi, Ey ruh düşkünlüğü, senin adın kadın olmalı! Bir aycağız… zavallı babamın ölüsünün ardından, Niobe gibi gözyaşı içinde giderken giydiği ayakkabıları bile eskimeden…O kadın, evet aynı kadın... Tanrım! Muhakemeden nasibi olmıyan bir hayvan bile daha uzun zaman acınırdı… amcamla evlendi, babamın kardeşiyle. Ama ben Herakles'e ne kadar benzemiyorsam o da babama o kadar benzemez. Bir ay içinde. Sahte gözyaşlarının tuzundan yanan gözlerinin daha kızıllığı geçmeden evlendi. Ah! bu kadar ateşle haram döşeğine koşmak ne suçlu bir seğirtiş! Bu işin ne başında hayır var ne sonu hayır çıkar. Ama benim içim parçalanacak, çünkü dilimi tutmaya mecburum. (Shakespeare, 1995, pp. 19-20)	Kendini öldürmeyi yasaklamamış olsaydı insana. Ah Tanrım! Öyle sıkıcı, yavan, boş ve yararsız Geliyor ki her şey bana şu dünyada. Yazık, ah, çok yazık! Her yanını ot bürümüş bir bahçe, Tohuma kaçmış baştan başa. Doğada çürümüş, kokuşmuş ne varsa Onlara kalmış her yer. Böyle mi olacaktı… Öleli daha iki ay oldu; yok yok iki ay bile değil! Ne mükemmel bir kraldı! Bununla kıyaslandığında, O bir Hyperion'du, buysa bir Satir. Nasıl da severdi annemi! Göksel rüzgârlar biraz hırçınlaşsa, Annemin yüzüne uğramalarına izin vermezdi. Ah, yer ve gök; niye gitmiyor aklımdan? Tabii ya, öyle düşkündü ki babama, Yedikçe iştahı kabaran insanlara benziyordu. Oysa, daha bir ay geçmeden – Atmalıyım bunu kafamdan, "Zayıf" yerine "kadın" desek daha iyi – Bir aycık geçmeden, ya da Niobe» gibi, gözyaşları içinde, Zavallı babamın tabutunun peşinden giderken giydiği O ayakkabılar daha eskimeden. – Evet o, aynı kadın – Ah Tanrım!	Tanrım! Tanrım! Dünya nasıl bezgin, yavan ve tatsız geliyor bana, Ne korkunç! Ne korkunç! Bu ot bürümüş bahçe, tohuma kaçmış Yalnızca kaba ve değersiz şeylerle dolu Bunları mı görecektim? Ölümünün üzerinden iki ay bile geçmemişken Şimdikiyle kıyas kabul etmeyecek eşsiz bir kral Kutsal ışık tanrısı Hyperion kalırdı bu satirin yanında. Öyle düşkündü ki anneme, meltemlerin bile yüzüne çarpmasına tahammül edemezdi. Ey yerleri gökleri yaratan Tanrım! Tüm bunları nasıl unutayım? Neden? Babama bir türlü doyamazdı o da, ama bir ay içinde-Kadının adı zaaftır- Daha zavallı babacığımın tabutunu izlerken giydiği pabuçları eskimeye fırsat bulamadı. Niobe gibi iki gözü iki çeşme ağlarken-Tanrım! Muhakemeden yoksun bir yaratık daha uzun yas tutardı- Evlendi babamın zerrece benzemeyen amcamla. Ben Herküle ne kadar benzersem o da o kadar benzer babama. Bir ay içinde, sahte gözyaşlarının tuzu hala kızartırken gözlerini Evlendi alel acele, şeytani bir hızla. Yıldırım hızıyla atladı haram döşeğine! Bu işten iyilik çıkmaz!

	Düşünce yetisi olmayan bir hayvan bile Ondan daha uzun süre yas tutardı – amcamla evlendi, Babamın kardeşiyle; amcam ama, Ben Herkül'e ne kadar benziyorsam. O da o kadar benziyor babama. Bir ay içinde, O sahte gözyaşlarının tuzuyla yanan gözlerinin Kırmızılığı bile gitmeden, Evlendi. Ah, bu ne haince telaş, Böyle hemen günah çarşaflarına koşuvermek! Ne başında hayır var bu işin ne sonunda. Ama, parçalan, ey yüreğim, Dilimi tutmak zorundayım çünkü. (Shakespeare, 2013, pp. 49-50)	Ama sus yüreğim, parçalansan da çünkü tutmalıyım dilimi.

In the Table 23, Prince Hamlet talks about taking his own life for the first time. Interestingly, the soliloquy refers to faith and disbelief, life and death, and the sufferings of human life. In the discourse analysis of the soliloquy, it is not easy to say whether Prince Hamlet, as a character, was an atheist, a skeptic, or an anti-Catholic. There is an implicit reference that he sees Queen Gertrude as the accomplice to the new king. His famous quote, "Frailty, thy name is woman," is the embodiment of marriage's negative feelings. He idealizes his father both as a king and a husband for whom no comparison to King Claudius would be possible.

In this respect, there are three keywords to look at concerning the world's description in his view. The first sign is "sullied," which means both rigid and dirty.[74] It is also an implicit reference to the mortal body made up of soil. The transformation of the soul into a dew, and the idea of natural cleanliness, as a result, would be interpreted as "immortality".

[74] See Merriam-webster.com/ sully

Prince Hamlet is on the brink of questioning every notion in his life concerning his power to possess a kingdom, familial relationships, religion, philosophy, a crime against oneself and others. In his view, his mother's "frailty" causes the old kingdom to be brought down for a new one. "Frailty, thy name is a woman" is an anti-feminist view of the old kingdom that was condemned. The third keyword to consider is "the beast", that wants discourse that refers to the mind and body dichotomy in the Shakespearean sense.

In TT1 and TT4, the sign "sullied" was translated as "kaskatı," and in TT2, "katı, kaskatı." In this respect, these are examples of sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the reference to dirt is erased and a possible meaning that is potential but not actualized in the context of the original text is used in the translation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, it was translated as "et yığını" (lumps of flesh) as an example of perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the phrase is entirely irrelevant in the original text. The second sign, "frailty", is translated in various contexts. In translations TT1, TT2 and TT4, the sign was translated as "zaaf". However, in TT3, it was translated as "ruh düşkünlüğü" (poverty in the soul), which is an example of alteration of the meaning because a false meaning that is not entirely irrelevant to the original text was evoked. (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172)

Translation of the third sign, "beast that wants discourse of reason", is worth considering the manifestations of enigma and suspense. In TT1, it was translated as "aklı ve dili olmayan bir hayvan" (an animal without reason and language) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because there is an excessive commentary on the meaning of the original text.

In TT2, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "beyinsiz bir hayvan" (an animal without a brain) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the implicit meaning in the text was made explicit. (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) In TT3, the phrase was translated as "muhakemeden nasibi olmıyan bir hayvan" (a beast that wants discourse of reason) free of designificative tendencies. In TT4, the phrase was translated as "düşünce yetisi olmayan bir hayvan bile" (a beast that wants discourse of reason) in the similar way.

The soliloquy of Prince Hamlet is often read through the psychological lens but it may also be read as an embodiment of Prince Hamlet's fear for afterlife and death. The unknown and the elusiveness of the supernatural overweighs all through the speech. It may also be deduced that Prince Hamlet asks for his own death but he is scared to go beyond the limits set by his religion. The themes in this speech are implicitly tied to enigmas because the suspense mostly relies on death and afterlife in Shakespeare's Hamlet. The concept of discrimination in source and target texts requires further investigation in the comment. As discussed above, there is discriminative language use in Shakespearean tragedies that should be noted. Discriminative language use against women is so dominant in the text that the character Prince Hamlet was criticized severely for the language that he uses to describe his mother and Ophelia. The answer probably lies in the fact that the pathetic division in Shakespearean tragedies already includes the damnation of the supernatural, Dionysian cult, and certain female stereotypes who were presented as the followers.

3.3. Mythological and Iconographic References in *Hamlet* and its Translations

The study of iconography and mythology in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* will be the focus in this chapter. Therefore, in concordance with this thesis's argument, evil descriptions of main characters through mythology were selected for the study. There are numerous references to Greek mythology in Hamlet's comments on the theatrical performance in the palace. His descriptions of King Hamlet, Queen Gertrude, and his uncle King Claudius are critical to the argument of this thesis in connection with evil, witchcraft, and magic.

Mythological references in the text serve as elements of pathetic structure because Prince Hamlet can express his feelings through mythological references. Mythological figures like Dionysian women and satyrs have contributed to descriptions of witchcraft. It is evident when Prince Hamlet uses the image of a satyr to describe King Claudius. On the other hand, Hyperion, the god of heavenly light, is equalled to dead father Hamlet. The connection of evil and mythological character**s** are already existent in *Hamlet*. The presentation of Queen Gertrude as the opposite of

Niobe may be read as an indication that she is not a queen to respect genealogy, unlike Niobe. Prince Hamlet also describes his mother through Hecuba as Troy's fallen queen, often associated with magic and prophecy.[75]

The only iconographic allusion is related to both King Claudius and Queen Gertrude. The pearl put into the drinking cup, therefore, needs to be studied on the symbolic level. First, the pearl symbolizes purity, piety, and union. However, in the final duel scene, we have the poisoning of Queen Gertrude from the pearl that King Claudius puts in the cup. It may reveal that poisoning imagery was at work, as a pathetic element, concerning how manifestations of evil existed. Poisoning also refers to the original sin[76] to echo the poisoning of Eve in the ear. To put it another way, reverberations from the crucible are evident in *Hamlet* as the final scene is marked by poisoning and witchcraft.

Hyperion to a satyr (mythology)

> But two months dead-nay, not so much, not two-
> So excellent a king, that was to this
> Hyperion to a satyr, so loving to my mother
> That he might not beteem the winds of heaven
> Visit her face too roughly 1.2. (Shakespare, 2003, p. 187).

Prince Hamlet's description of his father as Hyperion, as opposed to a satyr, reflects his idealization of King Hamlet's physical beauty. Satyrs, half-human, half-goat creatures, are often associated with the wine God of Dionysus, who is regarded as the archetype for man by Gerard F. Else:

> The god of this deep substratum, where all individuation and rationality are swallowed up, is Dionysus, and its exemplar in the world of art is the satyr. Half man, half beast though the satyr is, he is nevertheless not really a lower kind of being than man. He represents in sentient form the profound truth, the primordial essence that has been glossed over by civilization. The satyr is in fact "the

[75] See Metamorphoses of Ovid, Book XIII
[76] See King James Bible, Genesis , (3.2)

> archetype of man, the embodiment of his highest and intensest emotions . . . wisdom's harbinger speaking from the very heart of nature." Thus it is no accident that tragedy, born from the spirit of music, should have been originally incorporated in, consubstantial with, the chorus of satyrs. That chorus is "a self-mirroring of the Dionysian man," and everything that comes later—actors, action, 'drama'—is but a vision seen by it, in which the spectator (*hypocrite spectateur*, *son semblable*, *son frère)* finds his own inmost nature revealed. (Else, 1965, p. 9)

King Claudius was explicitly likened to the followers of the Dionysian cult, who would lose themselves in wine drinking and earthly pleasures as suggested in the text. This evidence supports this thesis's argument because the Early Modern view on witchcraft and portrayal of the devil takes its roots from the presentations of the Dionysian cult.[77]

The depiction of King Claudius as a witch who cast a spell on Christian Denmark by killing its real king, seducing its queen, and bringing "rottenness" also reveals how Prince Hamlet gazes at the supernatural. Spells, witchcraft, and ecstasy would be the opposite of Hyperion because he was depicted as the Titan of heavenly light. He fathered the sun, moon, and dawn in mythology.[78] The contrast between divine light and evil magic is closely connected to pathos and reverberations from the crucible because satyrs are associated with Dionysiac practices. King Claudius's positioning as a follower of the wine god Dionysus turns Prince Hamlet, a defender of Christianity. In this respect, King Claudius is no more the personal enemy of Hamlet, who usurped the Danish throne but detrimental to both the state and the church.

The contrast in the mythological references pertains to a battle between two distinct world views. The difference shapes most Early Modern thinking, including the body and mind dichotomy, mentioned and exemplified in the metaphoric depiction of satyrs and Hyperion. It pertains to the distinction between a beast and

[77] See Greek Mythography, Alan Cameron, p.62- 140- 148
[78] Ibid

a human being. It is Hyperion, not the satyr, that was symbolized by heavenly light. In this metaphor, Prince Hamlet's quest for light, justice for his father's death was embodied in the contrast of two bodies. The satyr is seeking earthly pleasures and the God of celestial light. A satyr's body is depicted as a man with horns in Roman art that resembles the devil. In this respect, Prince Hamlet and King Hamlet were depicted as opposites.

The idealization of the dead father exists for a purpose. In Prince Hamlet's gaze, King Hamlet was the ideal Christian king who was murdered by a Cain and satyr-like bestial being that resembled Dionysus's followers. There is also an implicit use of light and dark imagery in the text, as themes studied by Andrew Cecil Bradley in Shakespeare's tragedies. Most of the supernatural and the evil depictions were taken from mythological tales as the source for the "reverberations" from the crucible of the witches in the Renaissance gaze.

Niobe (mythology)

> Let me not think on't-Frailty, thy name is woman-
> A little month, or ere those shoes were old
> With which she followe'd my poor father's body,
> Like Niobe, all tears- why she-
> O God, a beast that wants discourse of reason
> Would have mourn'd longer-married with my uncle,
> My father's brother-but no more like my father
> Than I to Hercules..1.2. (Shakespare, 2003, p.188).

Prince Hamlet describes his mother through the mythological story in the book *Metamorphoses* by Publius Ovidius. In the mythological tale, ten children of Niobe were killed because she boasted of having many children and refused to worship Leto.[79] The way that Prince Hamlet uses the metaphor for her mother mirrors the Elizabethan interpretation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. As stated by Lyn Enterline, "in Elizabethan England, the habit of allegorizing Ovid's poem gave way to another, transpersonal mode of reading: Ovidian metamorphosis was understood to be, as

[79] See Metamorphoses of Ovid, Book VI

Jonathan Bate puts it, ``psychological and metaphorical instead of physical and literal." (2000, p. 23).

In this sense, Queen Gertrude is mocked for her so-called respect for the dead king. It is therefore, essential to analyse cynicism in the description rather than the tale of Niobe, which functions as a background to Prince Hamlet's negativity. Shakespearean Hamlet shows great respect and dedication for his genealogy which echoes Early Modern politics, as mentioned before. Still, it would be wrong to claim that *all* his actions can be described in complete concordance with Early Modern political thought. Hamlet's stress on his father's genealogy and remembrance is mixed with his inconsistent approach to life, religion, and Danish society.

Niobe's mythological depiction serves as the ideal that Queen Gertrude is the opposite. In this respect, Prince Hamlet attributes a new meaning to Niobe's tale because he uses it as a material mockery. The reference depicts Queen Gertrude as the exact opposite of Niobe, who would turn to stone crying too much for losing her genealogy. The metaphor reflects anger towards the mother because she put him in great danger by marrying King Claudius. In Prince Hamlet's view, Queen Gertrude is the accomplice to the king. When we take the famous quote, "Frailty, thy name is a woman!" into consideration, Queen Gertrude is not fragile but *frail*. Shakespeare's gaze on women was reflected in this famous quote. Prince Hamlet's cynicism towards himself is evident in the way that he contrasts himself with Hercules, who was able to kill and wear the fur of Neman Lion (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 214)

Hecuba (mythology)

> Hamlet: For Hecuba!
> What's Hecuba to him, or he to her,
> That he should weep for her? What would he do
> Had he the motive and the cue for passion
> that I have? He would drown the stage with tears,
> And cleave the general ear with horrid speech,
> Make mad the guilty and appal the free,
> Confound the ignorant, and amazed indeed
> The very faculties of eyes and ears.
> 2.2.(Shakespeare, 2003, p. 270)

In this excerpt, it is possible to see that Prince Hamlet uses another motherly figure in Greek mythology, Hecuba, the queen of Troy's fallen city and wife to Priam.[80] She is known to have given birth to Paris, Hector, and Cassandra.[81] She is an impressive figure because two of her children were directly associated with magic and the supernatural, Paris and Cassandra.[82] Paris is left to die because of a prophetic dream that she has in pregnancy because he was feared to destroy Troy. Cassandra is doomed to predict the future but not convince others in her prophetic power. [83]

This speech provides the link of magic and the supernatural with Queen Gertrude, the king's accomplice in Prince Hamlet's view. The reference to Hecuba, the fallen queen of Troy, is brought to the text with the players who were used to stage Greek tragedies. Since the Fall of Troy results in the death of some of Hecuba's children, including Hector, the pain is brought to the stage. In his view, the exaggeration of the pain for Hecuba is a fake one because he is suffering in silence. He wonders what the player would do with the pain and passion of him on the stage. The player and Hecuba are not related to each other, but he and his mother do. He implicitly refers to the possibility that his mother would not cry as much as Hecuba. The mother of Paris and Cassandra, unmistakably associated with prophecy or witchcraft, cries after her children. In this respect, we have a horrible depiction of Queen Gertrude, a heartless mother who would not cry as much as the witch Hecuba when her children were killed. As Hamlet claims, "drown the stage with tears" and "make mad guilty and appal the free" if his life had been staged instead of the fall of Troy. Queen Gertrude is implicitly referred to as Hecuba, a magician, the opposite of an ideal Christian queen.

Union (Pearl) dropped in wine cup (iconography)

King: Set me the stoups of wine upon that table.
If Hamlet give the first or the second hit,
Or quit in answer of the third exchange
Let all the battlements their ordnance fire:
The King shall drink to Hamlet's better breath,

[80] Mythology.net/heroes 04.05.2021
[81] Ibid
[82] Ibid
[83] Ibid

And in the cup an union shall he throw,
Richer than that which four successive kings
In Denmark's crown have worn-give me the cups-
And let the kettle to the trumpet speak,
The trumpet to the cannoneer without,
The cannons to the heavens, the heaven to earth,
"Now the King drinks to Hamlet." Come, begin.
And you, the judges, bear a wary eye.
5.2. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 410-411)

In this speech of King Claudius, one may assume that "a union richer than that which four successive kings have worn" was put into the cup to celebrate Prince Hamlet's probable success. However, this is a trick that King Claudius uses to destroy his enemy. Even if Hamlet wins the duel with Laertes, he will eventually be poisoned with the cup's contents. The pearl, called a union, is of the finest quality that would appear in kings' crowns (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 410). Pearl will dissolve in an acidic atmosphere like in a wine cup. The answer may be the fact that the pearl is itself a poison (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 411). In a cup of wine, however, a big, single pearl may have important symbolical meanings. The cup itself may signify the Holy Grail's opposite and contains poison King Claudius himself prepared. Here, the connection of King Claudius with evil magic and witchcraft is evident. He ultimately poisons the symbolical Holy Grail to destroy the Protestant Danish Prince, who would otherwise be on the throne. At the end of the play, during the duel between Laertes and Prince Hamlet, Queen Gertrude drinks from the cup herself and gets poisoned.

In the Christian sense, the purity that the union would suggest may have deep symbolical meanings. In this sense, King Claudius is a Cain-like creature who can potentially destroy pious Denmark. King Claudius and his associations with evil magic and the supernatural pertain to iconographic symbolism in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Studying the contrast between King Claudius and dead king Hamlet may give further information on Early Modern understanding of magic, supernatural as opposed to religion, and politics. However, this investigation is beyond the limits and scope of this thesis.

Mythological and iconographic signs that can be found in footnotes in Shakespearean texts set the background for the plot. Reconsidering them using the semiotics of translation may better reveal the connections between the Greek, Roman, and Western worlds. However, the aim of this thesis is not to form a theoretical basis for the existence of mythology and iconography in Shakespearean texts. Serious research was carried out until this time, some of which the references to this thesis cover. A semiotic analysis of mythology and iconography may be helpful to reveal the *potential meanings* in a text rather than only listing the sources and references of *Hamlet.*

When the background to Shakespearean texts is overlooked, the references to certain mythological characters like Niobe or Hercules may be lost. One may remember the story of Hercules in detail but seeing how it contributes to the self-image of Prince Hamlet requires further research. Hamlet sees himself, in contrast to Hercules. The semi-god who is most often depicted as carrying the weight of the universe [84] is a prominent part of characterization. Semiotic analysis would similarly be helpful of how footnotes are at work in this text. The methods of study for translation are there for shedding light on the information that is mostly taken for granted, as in the case of iconography and mythology. The information is not new, but the semiotics of translation proposes ways to look at both the source and the target texts.

Semiotics of translation may reveal why Queen Gertrude is connected to Niobe, the mythological figure. Prince Hamlet aims at mocking the Kingdom of Denmark through his mother's so-called "frailty", in contrast to Niobe. The contrast in the mythological is there to be studied rather than Niobe's mythological story itself. In this respect, translations of "Niobe" are mythological signs that can be erased, changed, or the information may again be given in footnotes.

It is also a possibility that a similar name for the translation of Niobe can be used. The geographical region where Niobe's story takes place is in Anatolia, Manisa (Magnesia), near Mount Sphylos.[85] Niobe is a much less common name for the

[84] See Greek Mythography, Alan Cameron , pp.246-293
[85] See Greek Mythography, Alan Cameron, p.157

princess of Phyrigia in Turkish. The story is known to be belonging to "Ağlayan Kaya" (Weeping Rock) in the Turkish context. In all the translations chosen for this study, the name Niobe exists without footnotes that would link "Ağlayan Kaya" (Weeping Rock) to Queen Niobe. It is also a possibility that "Ağlayan Kaya" could be the alternative to Niobe. In the proposed translation, the name Niobe was retained, but a footnote was preferred to shed light on the version of the mythological story in Turkish.

The other mythological reference in Table 24 is how Prince Hamlet contrasts Hyperion, the God of eternal light, to a satyr like his uncle. The connection of satyrs with witchcraft is because they are examples of metamorphoses, as their bodies are half-goat, half-human.[86] The way that Hyperion is presented in the speech is as opposed to satyrs, who are base creatures associated with witchcraft in the Christian sense. They form another aspect of the Dionysian cult about the birth of tragedy. The idea of baseness in Hamlet is exemplified through the satyrs and King Claudius. In this respect, translations of the names Hyperion and satyr stand out.

In translations except for TT2, Hyperion was translated as "Hyperion," and satyr was translated as "satir" as transferences of the names. In TT2, however, Hyperion was translated as "güneş tanrısı" (god of the sun) and satyr as "orman şeytanı" (demon of the forest). "Güneş tanrısı" is a perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because Hyperion is the father to Helios (The sun) in mythology and produces other meaning. The translation "orman şeytanı" (demon of the forest) is a sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "şeytan" (demon) does not exist in the source text and a meaning that is possible in the text was produced.

The last mythological reference to be studied is the way that Prince Hamlet contrasts himself with Hercules. Hercules, in Greek, Heracles in Roman, is a semi-god with incredible physical power. However, Hamlet's description of himself through Hercules is an oxymoron because there is also a similarity between the two characters: antic disposition. Like Prince Hamlet, Hercules is famous for losing himself to psychic powers, possibly as the work of Hera, the angry wife of Zeus. Translations bear no

[86] See Metamorphoses of Ovid, Book IV

designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), while a few comments can be made on the translations of the name Hercules.

As stated above, Hercules is the Greek version of the name, while Heracles is the Roman. What can be inferred about the preferences of the translators, then? In TT1 and TT4, the name Hercules was translated as Herkül (Hercules). It could indicate that the translators preferred to use the Greek version of the name because it already existed in the source text. On the other hand, in TT2 and TT3, Herakles (Heracles) was preferred as an alternative. The reason for differences in the translation of the name of the mythological character also reveals that both Greek and Roman perspectives exist in Shakespearean theatre. Hercules is the Greek version of the name Heracles in Roman, but there are differences concerning the associative meaning because different power challenges are exposed. The translation of the name Heracles as Hercules is a sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the context changes, but the name is the same.

Table 24: Example 21 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hamlet: O that this too too sullied flesh would melt, Thaw and resolve itself into a dew, Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd His canon 'gainst Self-slaughter. Oh God! Oh God! How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable Seem to me all the uses of this world ! Fie on't, ah 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-	**Hamlet:** O kaskatı vücut erise, dağılsa, çiğ tanesine dönse! Yahut Ezeli Halik, nefse kıymayı nehy etmemiş olsa! Ey Allahım! Ey Allahım! Bu dünyanın her hali bana ne kadar yorucu, bayat, sıkıntılı ve faydasız geliyor. Yazıklar olsun! Yazıklar olsun! Yanmamış; her şeyi tohuma kaçmış bir bahçe gibi içini tabiatın kaynağı ve kaba şeyleri sarmış! Böyle mi olacaktı! Öleli yalnız 2 ay oldu. Hayır o kadar da değil, iki ay değil. Hem öyle mükemmel bir hükümdardı ki onun yanında bu, Hyperion'a nispeten bir "satyr" gibidir. Annemi öyle severdi ki, sert esen bir rüzgârın bile yüzünü incitmesine gönlü razı olmazdı! Ey semâ, ey toprak! Niçin hatırlıyorum? Annem bir türlü dayamıyormuş gibi onun etrafında dolaşırdı. Halbuki bir ay içinde — hayır,	**Hamlet:** Ah bu katı, kaskatı beden bir dağılsa, 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?

So excellent a king, that was to this Hyperion to a satyr, so loving to my mother That he might not beteem the winds of heaven Visit her face too roughly. Heaven and earth, Must I remember? Why? She would hang on him As if increase of appetite had grown By what it fed on; and yet within a month- Let me not think on't—Frailty, thy name is woman- A little month or ere those shoes were old With which she follow'd my poor father's body, Like Niobe, all tears — why she- Oh God, a beast that wants discourse of reason Would have mourn'd longer—married with my uncle, Father's brother—but no more like my father Than I to Hercules. Within a month, Ere yet the salt of most unrighteous tears Had left the flushing in her galled eyes, She married- O most wicked speed! To post With such dexterity to incestuous sheets! It is not, nor it cannot come to good. But break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue. 1.2. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 187-190)	düşünmemeli – Zaaf senin adın kadındır!- Bir kısacık ay; zavallı babamın tabutunu, Niobe gibi göz yaşları ile o bile – Allahım! Aklı ve dili olmayan bir hayvan bile daha uzun matem tutardı — amcama, babamın kardeşine vardı; fakat ben ne kadar Herkül'e benzemezsem, babama o kadar benzemiyen o adama, bir ay içinde, henüz bu en riyakâr yaşlarla yanan gözlerindeki kırmızılık zail olmadan vardı. Ey haram döşeğine bu kadar süratle atılan günahkâr istical! Bu hayra alamet değil, Kırıl ey kalb, çünkü dilimi tutmam lazım. (Shakespeare, 1943, pp. 10-11)	O kadar bile değil, iki ay bile olmadı. O yüce kralı bir düşün, bir de buna bak! Biri güneş tanrısı, öteki bir orman şeytanı! Nasıl da severdi annemi? Esen yellerden sakınırdı yüzünü. Yerler, gökler; unutsam olmaz mı bunları? O da nasıl düşerdi babamın üstüne? Sevgiyle beslendikçe artar gibiydi sevgisi. Öyleyken bir ay içinde… Düşünmesem daha iyi. Kadın zaaf demekmiş meğer! Kısacık bir ay… Daha eskimedi o gün giydiği pabuçlar Babamın tabutu ardında yürürken, Niobe gibi, iki gözü iki çeşme… Nasıl olur, o kadın, evet aynı kadın (Tanrım, beyinsiz bir hayvan bile Daha fazla acı çekerdi) amcamla evleniyor; Babamın kardeşiyle; Öyle de bir kardeş ki Ben Herakles'e ne kadar benzemezsem O da o kadar benzemiyor babama. Bir ay içinde… Yalancı göz yaşlarının tuzu Daha yakarken kızarmış gözlerini Evleniyor bu adamla. Ne kıyasıya bir acele bu! Ne azgın bir atılış haram döşeğine! İyi değil, iyilik de çıkamaz bundan.

		Ama boğ kendini, yüreğim; dilimi tutmak gerek! (Shakespeare, 1974, pp. 19-20)
TT3 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! Yolunmayan otlan tohuma kaçmış bir bahçeyi andırıyor. Tabiatta ne kadar yabani, zararlı şey varsa içini sade onlar bürümüş. Böyle olacaktı ha! Öleli daha iki ay geçti. Yok, o kadar bile değil, iki ay bile değil. Hem öyle mükemmel bir hükümdardı ki, bunun yanında, Satyrin yanma Hyperion gelmiş de durmuş sanılırdı. Hem annemi öyle severdi kî rüzgârların yüzüne hızla değmesine bile razı olmazdı. Ey gökler, ey yer! Hatırlamasam olmaz mı? Doydukça iştihası artıyormuş gibi kollama babamın boynundan nasıl ayırmazdı. Sonra bir ay içinde… Düşünmiyeyim daha iyi, Ey ruh düşkünlüğü, senin adın kadın olmalı! Bir aycağız… zavallı babamın ölüsünün ardından, Niobe gibi gözyaşı içinde giderken giydiği ayakkabıları bile eskimeden…O kadın, evet aynı kadın... Tanrım! Muhakemeden nasibi olmıyan bir hayvan bile daha uzun zaman acınırdı… amcamla evlendi, babamın kardeşiyle. Ama ben Herakles'e ne kadar benzemiyorsam o da babama o kadar benzemez. Bir ay içinde. Sahte gözyaşlarının tuzundan yanan gözlerinin daha kızıllığı geçmeden evlendi. Ah! bu	**TT4** Hamlet: Ah, şu kaskatı beden eriyip çözülseydi, Bir çiğ damlasına dönseydi keşke! Ya da, o Ebedi Varlık, Kendini öldürmeyi yasaklamamış olsaydı insana. Ah Tanrım! Öyle sıkıcı, yavan, boş ve yararsız Geliyor ki her şey bana şu dünyada. Yazık, ah, çok yazık! Her yanını ot bürümüş bir bahçe, Tohuma kaçmış baştan başa. Doğada çürümüş, kokuşmuş ne varsa Onlara kalmış her yer. Böyle mi olacaktı… Öleli daha iki ay oldu; yok yok iki ay bile değil! Ne mükemmel bir kraldı! Bununla kıyaslandığında, O bir Hyperion'du, buysa bir Satir. Nasıl da severdi annemi! Göksel rüzgârlar biraz hırçınlaşsa, Annemin yüzüne uğramalarına izin vermezdi. Ah, yer ve gök; niye gitmiyor aklımdan? Tabii ya, öyle düşkündü ki babama, Yedikçe iştahı kabaran insanlara benziyordu.	**Proposed Translation** Hamlet: Ah, bu kaskatı beden eriyip dağılsa, Bir çiğ tanesine dönüşse, Keşke Tanrı yasak etmemiş olsaydı canına kıymayı kendinin. Tanrım! Tanrım! Dünya nasıl bezgin, yavan ve tatsız geliyor bana, Ne korkunç! Ne korkunç! Bu ot bürümüş bahçe, tohuma kaçmış Yalnızca kaba ve değersiz şeylerle dolu Bunları mı görecektim? Ölümünün üzerinden iki ay bile geçmemişken Şimdikiyle kıyas kabul etmeyecek eşsiz bir kral Kutsal ışık tanrısı Hyperion kalırdı bu satirin yanında. Öyle düşkündü ki anneme, meltemlerin bile yüzüne çarpmasına tahammül edemezdi. Ey yerleri gökleri yaratan Tanrım! Tüm bunları nasıl unutayım? Neden? Babama bir türlü doyamazdı o da, ama bir ay içinde-Kadının adı zaaftır- Daha zavallı babacığımın tabutunu izlerken giydiği pabuçları eskimeye fırsat bulamadı. Niobe[87] gibi iki gözü iki çeşme ağlarken-Tanrım! Muhakemeden yoksun bir yaratık daha uzun yas tutardı-

[87] Niobe is also known as "Ağlayan Kaya" (Weeping Rock) in Turkey, Manisa.

kadar ateşle haram döşeğine koşmak ne suçlu bir seğirtiş! Bu işin ne başında hayır var ne sonu hayır çıkar. Ama benim içim parçalanacak, çünkü dilimi tutmaya mecburum. (Shakespeare, 1995, pp. 19-20)	Oysa, daha bir ay geçmeden – Atmalıyım bunu kafamdan, "Zayıf" yerine "kadın" desek daha iyi – Bir aycık geçmeden, ya da Niobe» gibi, gözyaşları içinde, Zavallı babamın tabutunun peşinden giderken giydiği O ayakkabılar daha eskimeden. – Evet o, aynı kadın – Ah Tanrım! Düşünce yetisi olmayan bir hayvan bile Ondan daha uzun süre yas tutardı – amcamla evlendi, Babamın kardeşiyle; amcam ama, Ben Herkül'e ne kadar benziyorsam. O da o kadar benziyor babama. Bir ay içinde, O sahte gözyaşlarının tuzuyla yanan gözlerinin Kırmızılığı bile gitmeden, Evlendi. Ah, bu ne haince telaş, Böyle hemen günah çarşaflarına koşuvermek! Ne başında hayır var bu işin ne sonunda. Ama, parçalan, ey yüreğim, Dilimi tutmak zorundayım çünkü. (Shakespeare, 2013, pp. 49-50)	Evlendi babamın zerrece benzemeyen amcamla. Ben Herküle ne kadar benzersem o da o kadar benzer babama. Bir ay içinde, sahte gözyaşlarının tuzu hala kızartırken gözlerini Evlendi alel acele, şeytani bir hızla. Yıldırım hızıyla atladı haram döşeğine! Bu işten iyilik çıkmaz! Ama sus yüreğim, parçalansan da çünkü tutmalıyım dilimi.

The next mythological reference to consider is about the fallen queen of Troy, Hecuba. In the scene that the players in Elsinore play, the pain of the fallen queen of Troy is presented on the stage because of losing the genealogy at the Trojan War. Hamlet tries to suggest that his pain is more profound than the pain of losing a generation of princes in Troy. In this respect, the loss of Denmark to King Claudius is more significant than the fall of Troy because Rome was founded after the fall of it. In

Prince Hamlet's case, the country looks so futile and desperate that the foundation of another Denmark by Hamlet seems almost impossible. In this respect, the player would cry harder for Hamlet if he knew about his destiny. Hamlet describes his situation with dramatic techniques in such a way that we have a picture of a stage flooded with tears, would deafen the audience with words, drive the guilty mad and horrify the innocent, scare the ignorant and almost paralyze the whole faculties concerning the comprehension of reality.

Through mythological references, it is possible to understand the mental state of Prince Hamlet because he both mourns the death of King Hamlet and his fallen country. In the hands of King Claudius, Denmark is futile because the throne was taken over by deceit and lies. However, Queen Gertrude could be an opposite depiction of Hecuba like Niobe because she does not respect genealogy in Prince Hamlet's view. He possibly proposes that Denmark is worse than the fallen Troy because the foundation of another Christian Denmark may not be possible as it is "poisoned" by a demon. Prince Hamlet fears failing his mission in saving the kingdom from the hands of the "wicked wit"(Shakespeare, 2003, p. 2018).

There are two keywords to consider in translations: "Passion" and "the very faculties of eyes and ear." The extensive usage of the sign shows that it may be used in a religious, love context, or war context. It is unclear what Prince Hamlet refers to here because whether he wants to get the crown back, Ophelia or the mother is so blurry.

In TT1, the sign passion was translated as "ihtiras" (passion), which is free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, it was translated as "acı" (pain) as an alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it produces a false meaning that is not completely irrelevant to the meaning in the original text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). It can be claimed that the word preference of the translation is both a reference to Prince Hamlet's pain of losing his father and the pains of Jesus Christ (also called passion in a Christian context). In TT3, it was translated as "coşmak" (to be euphoric), and in TT4, it was translated as "coşku" (euphoria), which are both examples of perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The translations of the sign passion, as written above, vary because the sign's contexts are all broad. Since Systematics of Designificative Tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) offers alternative ways of looking at translations, the analyses of translations also reveal how Shakespearean texts may have been crafted. The universe of meanings connected to one speech may be studied in different manifestations of the sign to form a *spectrum* of meaning. Using Systematics of Designificative Tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) also gives us a chance to look at the reasons behind the sign choice and the categories that sign choice falls into.

Translations for the sign passion are also examples of how different contexts may coexist in one speech of a Shakesperean tragedy. Explaining the sign choice using Systematics of Designificative Tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) also reveals *how* translators may have looked at the sign.

In this respect, the sign passion is iconographic because Prince Hamlet is a scholar of Wittenberg, but Shakespeare's use of the sign makes it look personal. Translation of the sign is the translation of the sign pain (acı in Turkish). It may alternatively be read as a reference to the pains of Jesus Christ during crucifixion[88] and this would be an alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) as stated above. Passion (ihtiras) can be interpreted as his personal aim to get the crown back. However, the existence of designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) enables the translator to analyse texts before and after translating. Using the Systematics of Designificative Tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), it is also possible to study the various contexts in a Shakespearean text.

The next signs to consider are "amazed indeed the very faculties of eye and ear" in the Table 25. There are different sign choices in translation, so the phrase needs clarifying. First, the sign amazement may refer to a temporary situation that may affect a person in today's context. One may be amazed by one action or a group of signs but "amazed indeed the very faculties of eye and ear" refers to a permanent situation rather than temporary. The *amazement* of one's eyes and ear is an indication that the faculties

[88] See merriam-webster.com/ crucifixion 04.03.2021

may not function properly. Prince Hamlet's description of the situation also refers to being bewitched.

Prince Hamlet describes both being physically poisoned in the ear like King Hamlet and metaphorically like Queen Gertrude. Since Prince Hamlet cannot talk about the issue openly, he chooses to present through a play inside a play that sheds light on the murder of the old king. The same poison also works on King Claudius, and he reacts when he is poisoned in the ear like Queen Gertrude. Therefore, "amazed indeed the very faculties of eye and ear" is a reference to witchcraft, which can be read as one of the manifestations of pathos in Hamlet. The story of King Claudius and King Hamlet, in Prince Hamlet's view, has the potential to stop the eyes and the ear from working properly as if a spell had been cast on the listener.

When we look at the translations of "amaze indeed the very faculties of eye and ear," in TT1, it was translated as "gören gözü, işiten kulağı birbirine katardı" (would jumble up the strong eye and hearing ear) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because there is imagery referring to a chaos of the functions of the faculties. In TT2, it was translated as "Dondururdu gören gözleri, duyan kulakları" (it would freeze the strong eyes and hearing ears) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning; (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because excessive information on the faculties was given. It was translated in TT3 as "görüp işitenleri gerçekten hayretlere salardı" (it would amaze the ones who see and hear). However, it is an example of an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it provides incomplete information by not referring to the faculties of eyes and ear. In TT4, it was translated as "Gözlerle kulakların işlevini şaşırtırdı" (it would stop the eyes and ears from functioning) as an example of sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the meaning in the translation is possible but not actualized in the context of the original text.

In the proposed translation, the sentence "amazed indeed the very faculties of eye and ear" was translated as "seyirciye gözünü kulağını şaşırtırdı" (audience in amazement would not tell the ear form the eye).

Table 25: Example 22 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hamlet: For Hecuba! What's Hecuba to him, or he to her, That he should weep for her? What would he do Had he the motive and the cue for passion that I have? He would drown the stage with tears, And cleave the general ear with horrid speech, Make mad the guilty and appal the free, Confound the ignorant, and amazed indeed The very faculties of eyes and ears.2.2 (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 270)	Hamlet: Hecuba için! Hecuba'dan ona ne, yahut o Hecuba'nın nesi oluyor ki Hecuba için ağlıyor? Acaba onun benim ihtirasım gibi bir saiki olsa ne yapardı? Sahneyi göz yaşına boğar, sözünün dehşetiyle seyircilerin kulağını patlatır, mücrimi çıldırtır, masuma dehşet salar, cahili ürkütür, gören gözü, işiten kulağı birbirine katardı. (Shakespaere, 1943, p. 47)	Hamlet: Hekuba uğruna! Ona ne Hekuba'dan, ondan Hekuba'ya ne? Yine de ağlıyor… Ne yapmazdı öyleyse Onun içinde olsa benim acımın kaynağı, nedeni? Göz yaşına boğardı sahneyi, Korkunç çığlıklarla paralardı yürekleri Suçluyu delirtir, suçsuzu afallatırdı: Korku salardı bilmeyenin içine, Dondururdu gören gözleri, duyan kulakları! (Shakespeare, 1974, p. 69)
TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Hamlet: Hekabe onun nesi, Hekabe'den ona ne ki öyle göz yaşı döksün? Coşmak için onda benim sebeplerim olsaydı ne yapardı kim bilir? Sahneyi göz yaşına boğar; herkesin kulağım korkunç bir hitabeyle yırtardı, suçluyu çıldırtır, suçsuzu dehşete düşürür, cahili şaşkın ederdi; görüp işitenleri gerçekten hayretlere salardı. (Shakespeare, 1995, p. 77)	**Hamlet:** Hekuba için! Hekuba'dan ona ne, ya da ondan Hekuba'ya, Ki Hekuba için gözyaşı döksün! Ne yapardı acaba, Coşkuya kapılmak için bendeki gerekçe Onda olsaydı? Sahneyi gözyaşlarına boğardı, Konuşmasının dehşetinden herkesin kulakları çatlardı, Suçluları çıldırtır, suçsuzların rengini sarartır, Gözlerle kulakların işlevini şaşırtırdı. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 110)	**Hamlet:** Hekuba içinmiş! Hekuba onun nesi oluyor ki ona o kadar gözyaşı döküyor? Eğer benim yerimde olsaydı tutkusunu hangi söz ve hareketlerle anlatırdı acaba? Sahneyi göz yaşlarına boğar, korkunç bir tiradla kulakları yırtar, suçluyu delirtir, suçsuzu afallatır, cahili serseme çevirir, dinleyenlere gözünü kulağını şaşırtırdı.

In the speech by King Claudius in Table 26 the real "stoups of wine" are brought to the scene. The readers may focus on the actual cups rather than their metaphorical meaning. The action could well be read imagery as the Holy Grail in the hands of a witch. The King declares that he will drink from the cup first as soon as Hamlet gives the first and the second hit or quit in answer to the exchange. It may be

read as an indication that the cup is free of poison, and the king has good intentions towards Prince Hamlet. The people in the palace would probably not suspect the king of the murder because it is uncommon to suspect the poison on a union from the hands of a king. King Claudius and his deceit for Denmark are presented through iconographic references.

Table 26: Example 23 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT 2**
King: Set me the stoups of wine upon that Table. If Hamlet give the first or the second hit, Or quit in answer of the third exchange Let all the battlements their ordnance fire: The King shall drink to Hamlet's better breath, And in the cup an union shall he throw, Richer than that which four successive kings In Denmark's crown have worn-give me the cups- And let the kettle to the trumpet speak, The trumpet to the cannoneer without, The cannons to the heavens, the heaven to earth, "Now the King drinks to Hamlet." Come, begin. And you, the judges, bear a wary eye. 5.2. Shakespeare, 2003, p. 410)	Masanın üstüne şarap kadehlerini koyun. Birinci veya ikimi dürtüşü Hamlet yapabilirse ve yahut üçüncüsüne mukabele edebilirse, söyleyin, bütün kalelerden toplar atılsın. Kral Hamlet'in muvaffakiyetine içecek ve kadehe bir inci koyacak – birbiri ardınca dört Danimarka Kralının taçlarında taşıdıkları inciden daha kıymetli bir inci! — Kadehleri bana verin; davul boruya, boru topçuya, toplar göklere, gökler yere, «Şimdi Kral Hamlet 'in şerefine içiyor» diye ilân etsin. Gelin, başlayın. Siz de, hakemler, gözlerinizi dört açın. (Shakespeare, 1943, p. 115)	Şarap kupaları koyun şu masanın üstüne. Hamlet birinci ya da ikinci elde kazanırsa. Yahut ücüncüde berabere kalırlarsa. Bütün kulelerden toplar atılsın! Kral Hamlet'in sağlığına içecek Ve bir inci atacak şarap kupasına, Arka arkaya dört Danimarka kralının Tacından kalmış incilerden daha kıymetlisini. Getirin bana kupaları! Haydi, davullar borulara seslensin. Borular toplara, toplar göklere, gökler yere, Kral Hamlet'in sağlığına içiyor! Haydi, başlayın. Hakemler dört açın gözünüzü. (Shakespeare, 1974, p. 159)

TT3	TT4	Proposed Translation
Kıral: Şarap kupalarını masanın üstüne hazır edin. Eğer Hamlet birinci yahut ikinci vuruşu başarır yahut üçüncü vuruşun hemen karşılığını verir de Laertes ile ödeşirse bütün kulelerden toplar atılsın: Kıral, Hamlet 'in soluğu kesilmemesi şerefine içecek. Kupaya da, birbiri ardından Danimarka tahtına geçen dört hükümdarın tacındakinden daha kıymetli bir inci atacak. Kupaları verin bana. Kös davula, davul dışardaki topçuya, toplar göklere, gök de yere bildirsin ki "Şimdi Kıral, Hamlet şerefine içiyor!" Hadi başlayın. (Shakespeare, 1995, p.183)	**Kral:** Şarap taslarını şu masanın üstüne koyun. Eğer birinci ya da ikinci vuruşu Hamlet yaparsa, Ya da üçüncü vuruşmayı kazanırsa, Bütün toplar atılsın. Kral Hamlet 'in sağlığına içecek Ve kupaya bir inci atacak; Danimarka tacını art arda giyen Dört kralın taşıdığından daha değerli bir inci. Verin kupaları ve davullar borazanlara seslensin Borazanlar dışardaki topçuya, Toplar göklere, gökyüzü yeryüzüne: Hamlet 'in şerefine içiyor Kral," desin. Haydi başlayın**…** ve siz hakemler gözünüzü açın (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 216)	**Kral:** Şu masanın üzerinde şarap kupaları hazırlanacak, Eğer Hamlet ilk ya da ikinci vuruşu yapar Ya da üçüncüde berabere kalırlarsa Bütün borazanlar çalacak Kral Hamlet'in sağlığına içecek, Ve içine dört Danimarka tacınınkinden bile değerli Büyük bir inci atacak. Kadehleri uzatın bana-davullarla borazanlar çalınsın Topların sesi göklere çıksın, Gök te yere desin ki: "Şimdi kral Hamlet'in şerefine içecek." Gelin,başlayın. Ve siz,hakemler, gözlerinizi dört açın!

The interpretation of iconographic signs in the text mostly relies on how Prince Hamlet as a Wittenberg scholar may see the world around him, though he may not have considered the evil intentions of King Claudius. The cup and the union, as an iconographic sign, may be read through how the king presents the issue. This iconographic sign is an explicit sign that shows the poisoning of holiness in Denmark, as it is constantly claimed by Prince Hamlet. In the final scene in the text, both intentions of Prince Hamlet and King Claudius are made clear. Hamlet wishes to receive Holy Grail back from the hands of King Claudius. On the other hand, King Claudius wishes to poison Holy Grail with a poisonous union. In Prince Hamlet's view, King Claudius is both guilty and sinful.

The way that King Claudius describes the union as richer than "four successive kings of Denmark" have worn may have metaphorical implications. It can be alternatively read as an indication that King Claudius respects the genealogy of Prince Hamlet, but it is actually the opposite. The union also echoes Othello's final scene as

he refers to Indian "threw the pearl richer than his tribe." Unlike the Indian, King Claudius throws the union into the cup, with an evil purpose.

In translations, how the sign "stoup" was translated is important because it is a contrast to the Holy Grail myth. The word choice of King Claudius reflects it, too. He does not use the synonyms vessel, cup, or basin, but the stoup also refers to the basin filled with holy water at the entrance of a church.[89] In this respect, the whole speech can be read as the poisoning of the holy water with witchcraft. The existence of the union, in this respect, is not an indication of purification but the poisoning of the symbolism of the Holy Grail.

In all translations, except TT1, "stoup" was translated as "Kupa" (cup) in Turkish. In TT1, however, it was translated as "kadeh" (goblet) as an example of an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it does not directly refer to a stoup. The imagery used in TT1 is possible, but iconographic allusions may require more detailed references.

The translation of the sign union, in contrast to the references that can be made about the container of wine, is critical. In TT1, it was translated as "– birbiri ardınca dört Danimarka Kralının taçlarında taşıdıkları inciden daha kıymetli bir inci" (Richer than that which four successive kings /In Denmark's crown have worn). In TT3 it was translated as "birbiri ardından Danimarka tahtına geçen dört hükümdarın tacındakinden daha kıymetli bir inci" (Richer than that which four successive kings/In Denmark's crown have worn). In TT4 it was translated as "Danimarka tacını art arda giyen/Dört kralın taşıdığından daha değerli bir inci." (Richer than that which four successive kings/In Denmark's crown have worn). The signs with iconograhic and mythological allusions were preserved in TT1, TT2, TT3 and TT4. However, in TT2, it was translated as "arka arkaya dört Danimarka kralının /Tacından kalmış incilerden daha kıymetlisini." (Richer than that which four successive kings /Have left in Denmark's crown) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because there is no indication that leftover pearls from other crowns of Denmark existed. Through discourse analysis of this translation, it may not

[89] See merriam- webster.com/stoup 04.04.2021

be possible to say whether the previous kings wore the same crown or had new crowns designed for themselves.

3.4. Veridictory Modalities in *Hamlet* and its Translations

It is critical to study the veridictory square in *Hamlet* because keeping secrets, lies, and deceit is directly related to the meaning universe. Explaining the causes behind such actions may provide a better grasp of the text's pathetic structure. It is interesting to note that Prince Hamlet uses drama to search for the truth in the palace. His heroic efforts to discover the difference between seeming and being constitute the pathetic structure of the plot.

The veridictory square–takes the following into account:(1) the evaluating subject, (2) the object being evaluated, (3) the specific characteristic evaluated in the object, (4) the veridictory categories: true (being+seeming), false (not-being+not seeming), illusory (not being+seeming) and secret (being+not-seeming). Considering this description, it is possible to clarify the veridictory states of the characters (Greimas & Courtés, 1982, p. 369). In this study, the veridictory state to focus on will be "truth" (being+seeming), as exemplified in Hamlet's mental state.

Hamlet's positioning as a character in the text relies so much on the discovery of the truth behind his father's murder that the search almost turns into a quest for "salvation". The veridictory modalities are seeming and being (Greimas & Courtés, 1982, p. 369). In *Hamlet*, these notions are swapped to cover the truth in the palace about the murder of King Hamlet. In Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary by A.J. Greimas and J. Courtes, the definitions of seeming is given below:

> Outside of its ordinary use, the lexeme being is used, in semiotics, with at least three different meanings: (a) It serves as copula in utterances of state*; thus, by predication,* it joins to the object properties considered "essential." On the level of semantic representation* such properties are interpreted as subjective values* in junction* with the subject of state; (b) It is used as well to name the modal category of veridiction*: being/seeming; c) Finally, it designates the positive term of the immanence* schema*: it is then in a relation of contrariety* with

seeming*-VALUE; VERIDICTORY MODALITIES; HAVING/TO HAVE. (Greimas and Courtés, 1982, p. 22)

Being is related to having power or freedom, which are concepts both related to the pathos in Hamlet because the protagonist is in the state of "not being able to". Seeming, on the other hand, refers to double operation as contrary to being, and it pertains to the veridictory term truth:

> By seeming is meant the positive term* of the schema* of manifestation* on the semiotic square* onto which the modal category of veridiction is projected. The term seeming is in a relation of contrariety with that of being (understood, in this sense, as the positive term of the schema of immanence*). The double operation which has the effect of asserting the terms of *seeming* and the complex veridictory term named *truth* (characterizing a state of which one says that it seems" and that it "is" at the same time). —VERIDICTORY MODALITIES (Greimas and Courtés, 1982, p. 270)

The king may seem to have died of a natural cause, but the truth is just the opposite. The people in the palace ignore the reactions of the Prince and call him mad. According to the veridictory modalities of seeming and being, Prince Hamlet is in the state of "not being able to". Pathos in the meaning universe, then, is directly related to how seeming and being are at work in the text. Prince Hamlet's perspective relies on his hesitation to believe in the version in the palace because he notices the play with the relationship between seeming and being. In this respect, Prince Hamlet looks for the causes of the seemingly natural death of his father.

Table 27: Example 24 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hamlet: Seems, madam? Nay, it is. I know not 'seems'. 'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother, Nor customary suits of solemn black,	Hamlet: Görünüyor mu dediniz, Madam? Hayır, bu bir hakikattir; «Görünüyor» un bence mânası yok. Aziz anne,	Hamlet: Görünen mi dediniz? Olan deyiniz, sayın bayan, Görünen yok benim için, olan var. Giydiğim karalar değil yalnız, sevgili annemiz,

Nor windy suspiration of forc'd breath, No, nor the fruitful river in the eye, Nor the dejected haviour of the visage, Together with all forms, moods, shapes of grief, That can denote me truly. These indeed seem, For they are actions that a man might play; But I have that within which passes show, These but the trappings and the suits of woe. 1.2. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 183-184)	ne bu simsiyah manto, ne bu âdet olan karalar, ne ahu vahlar, ne gözden boşanan yaşlar, ne suratsızlık, ne çatıklık, ne de bütün bunlarla giden acının her hangi zahirî şekli, tarzı ve gösterişi içimdekini ifade edebilir. Bunlara hakikaten, «görünüyor» denebilir; çünkü her insanın taklit edebileceği hareketlerden ibarettir; halbuki benim içimdeki şey bütün gösterişin üstündedir. Bunlar ise sadece matemin gösteriş ve kıyafetidir. (Shakespeare, 1943, p. 9)	Âdetlere uyarak tuttuğum matem değil, İniltiler, sel gibi göz yaşları değil, Dertli, kederli bir görünüş değil, Takma, uydurma bir yüz değil, Benim gerçek halimi anlatacak. Bütün bunlar görünüş gerçekten. Gösteriş olabilir bütün bunlar. Ama hiçbiri anlatmaz bunların Benim içimdekini. (Shakespeare, 1974, p. 17)
TT3 Hamlet: Böyle gözüküyor" mu, Kıraliçem? Hayır, böyle. Ben "gözükmek" nedir bilmem. Ne sade kuzguni pelerinim, anneciğim, ne yaşlıların giymesi âdet olmuş karalar, ne tıkanan göğüsten kopan hıçkırıklar, ne gözden durmadan akan yaşlar, ne yüzdeki bezgin ifade, ne de ıstırabın bütün şekilleri, hal ve görünüşleri beni gerçekten anlatabilir. Sahiden bunlar "gözükür, bunlar taklide elverişli hareketlerdir. Ama benim içimde gösterişi aşan bir şey var; bunlarsa ıstırabın sadece süsü, takıntıları. (Shakespeare, 1995, p. 17)	**TT4** Hamlet: "Görünüyor" ne demek? "Görünmüyor" efendim. Gerçekten öyle. Yalnızca şu kara palto değil, sevgili anne, Benim içyüzümü gösteren; Ne de yaslı günlerin sıradan siyah giysileri, Ne de elde olmayan sesli iç çekişler, Yok yok; ne de gözlerde dinmeyen ırmaklar, Ne de yüzdeki perişan ifadeler, ya da Acı belirten tavırlar, haller, pozlar, İşte bunlar "görünür." Çünkü bu rolleri oynayabilir insan. Benim içimde görünüşten öte bir şey var… Bu saydıklarımsa acının süsleri, takıları yalnız. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 47)	Proposed Translation Hamlet: "Öyle görünüyor mu dediniz?", efendim? Hayır, tam tersi. Ben "öyle görünmek" nedir, bilmem. Kara cübbem, adet olduğu üzere giyilen ciddi yas kıyafetleri, göğsü titreten zorlama hıçkırıklar, iki gözü iki çeşme ağlamalar, canından bezmiş bir yüz ile, derdin, kederin bin türlü hali kifayetsiz kalır beni yeteri kadar anlatmaya. Bunlar "öyle görünendir" çünkü rol yapabilir insan. Benim içimde ise görünenden öte bir şey var. Bahsi geçen acılar ise gösteriş malzemesi sadece.

The excerpt in Table 27 from the source text is an example of studying "seeming" and "being" in the text. The way that Prince Hamlet describes "being" is by staying away from imitation. He has a state of mind free from the "act of playing". The way seeming is described concerning dramatic presentation is realized when Prince Hamlet goes to see the visiting actors in the palace. Prince Hamlet warns the actors not to imitate more than necessary because he is looking for an undercover of the truth. Prince Hamlet's presentation in Shakespeare's tragedy implicitly refers to the roots of dramatic presentation dating back to Dionysian practices. Shakespeare's Hamlet would not openly embrace the idea of Dionysus as "the archetype for man" (Nietzsche, 2000, p.7) because the division in the pathos of Hamlet is founded upon the damnation of demonic possession. As Stephen Greenblatt suggests, demonic possession includes the notion of transformation inside theatrical performance:

> Demonic possession is a particularly attractive cornerstone for such an analysis, not only because of its histrionic intensity but because the theater itself is by its nature bound up with possession. Harsnett did not have to believe that the cult of Dionysus out of which the Greek drama evolved was a cult of possession; even the ordinary and familiar theater of his own time depended upon the apparent transformation of the actor into the voice, the actions, and the face of another. (Greenblatt, 1988, p. 211)

As discussed before, the division stems from binary models concerning the birth of tragedy. Harsnett is one of the leading figures in the English Renaissance that modelled the negative perspective on the supernatural. Demonic possession, as Stephen Greenblatt suggests, is not only an idea concerning the history of drama but also a lens to how Renaissance politics were grounded. The idea extends to the characterization of Edgar as Poor Tom, which mostly relies on Harsnett's description of a soul haunted by famous spirits listed in the book *Declaration of Popish Impostures.* Poor Tom can be described in terms of a tragicomic character because he "pretends" to be possessed by evil spirits, as underlined by Foakes (2001, p.102):

> Another book that seized Shakespeare's imagination when he worked on King Lear was Samuel Harsnett's A Declaration of Popish Impostures. This polemical attack on a group of Catholic priests who conducted exorcism in private houses was written by the chaplain to the Bishop of London as part of an official campaign against exorcism as practised both by some Protestants and by Catholics. (Walker, 44-5; Brownlow,49-66). Harsnett often writes with great verve, and his quirky vocabulary and lively imagery were raided by Shakespeare for his characterization of Edgar as Poor Tom in Act 3, as well as occasionally for words or phrases elsewhere in the play. Harsnett depicted Catholic priests as players, "cunning comedians" (Brownlow, p. 217), and the series of exorcisms they carried out in 1585-6 as the performance of a tragicomedy. Edgar too, pretending in 3.4 to be possessed or pursued by spirits whose names, Flibbertigibet, Smulkin, etc., are taken from Harsnett, also plays his part on the stage with a verie good grace! (Brownlow, p. 218)

In Shakespearean tragedies, as in the example of Poor Tom, the relationship between seeming and being is visible even through characterization. There are three keywords to study concerning pathos. They are "seems", "nay, it is", and "denote me truly". TT1, TT2, TT3, and TT4 do not bear any meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). However, in TT4 "böyle gözüküyor" (seems so) and in the proposed translation, "öyle görünüyor" (seems so) were preferred for emphasis. "Nay, it is" is the phrase that was translated as an answer. In TT1, the phrase was translated as "Hayır, bu bir hakikattir" as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "Olan deyiniz, sayın bayan", and the signs were preserved. In TT3, the phrase was translated as "Hayır, böyle" which does not bear any meaning transformation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), in TT4 the phrase was translated as "Gerçekten öyle" as

an example of sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). because negation was not reflected although the meaning produced might be a potential one

The phrase "denote me truly" was translated as "içimdeki şey" (the thing inside me) in TT1 as an example of-under-interpretation of the meaning because it produces insufficient meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). It was translated as "gerçek halimi anlatacak" (denote my true feelings) in TT2 and as "beni gerçekten anlatabilir" (denote me truly) in TT3 which preserves signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, the phrase is omitted from the context, which is an example of wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation, sign was preserved through the pharse "beni yeteri kadar anlatmaya" (to denote me enough).

3.5. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *Hamlet* and its Translations

The focus of the transformations of the subject is the "madness" of Prince Hamlet, often stated in the text. The concept will be studied using Jean Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 186-189), Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-subjects (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-195) which was first written in 2007 and finalized in 2019. Drama studies use concepts of a subject, quasi-subject, and non-subject to analyze the mental states of characters, mainly including non-subjects, the representations of madness in the text. The typology of non-subjects helps reveal subject transformations (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.189-190) of tragic characters who sway from one mental state to another. In the example of Prince Hamlet, analysing the mental state of the character as a non-subject is critical in understanding the pathos of the play. The deep pain and mourning of the Wittenberg scholar and how they were manifested in the play may reveal the strains of the pathetic structure by studying Prince Hamlet's presentation as a non-subject. In the palace, his madness is a "real" one, although "there is method in his madness", as claimed by Polonius. It is unclear at the beginning of the text whether Prince Hamlet is mad, but when he openly talks about it to his friend Horatio, it becomes clear:

> Textual evidence of *Hamlet* provides confirmation to this argument. Hamlet first explains his behavior as "an antic disposition" when he talks to Horatio; he

states, "How strange or off soe're I bear myself, As I perchance hereafter shall think meet To put an antic disposition on…" (II. 5. 170-175). Hamlet is fully aware that his behavior at times could be classified as insane, which is why he is not considered to be mentally ill. This "antic disposition" could only be devised by a sane man. Hamlet also informs the queen of his actions by declaring he is "essentially not in madness, but mad in craft" (III. 4. 180-195). His instability is skillfully designed to execute a specific plan. Hamlet even admits that he is not "mad". This two quotations that came straight from the text of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, provides confirmation to the fact that Hamlet is not insane.[90]

Fredrich Nietzsche links madness to the origins of theatre. In this sense, the madness of Hamlet has its roots in Dionysiac madness. In this sense, Hamlet, as a tragic character, contributes to the pathetic structure through two opposing views on the birth of tragedy: The Dionysian madness and the hero cult. As the primitive motives of a Wittenberg scholar are grounded on the birth of tragedy according to Nietzsche, Prince Hamlet's madness has traces of the characteristics of the Dionysiac rituals:

> What then must have been the source of the opposing demand, which emerged at an earlier point in time, the *demand for ugliness,* the older Hellenes' good, the severe will to pessimism, to the tragic myth, to affirm the image of all that is fearsome, wicked, mysterious, annihilating and fateful at the very foundations of existence - where must the origins of tragedy have lain at that time? Perhaps in *desire and delight (Lust),* in strength, in overbrimming health, in an excess of plenitude? In this case, what is the meaning (in physiological terms) of that

[90] https://sites.google.com/site/hamletsinsanity/ [03.12.2020]

> madness - Dionysiac madness - from which both the tragic and the comic arts emerged? What? Is madness perhaps not necessarily a symptom of degeneration, of decline, of a culture that has gone on too long? Are there perhaps - and this is a question for psychiatrists neuroses of health, of national youth and youthfulness? What does the synthesis of goat and god in the satyr point to? (Nietzsche, 2000, p.7)

It has been a point of dispute whether Prince Hamlet is mad or not. There are incidents in which he speaks and talks as if he is on the brink of self-destruction. His words before he meets the Ghost reflect the inner conflicts that he has about life, death, and the afterlife. Therefore, in the play, Prince Hamlet's philosophical questioning of life parallels his madness. The long speeches of Hamlet may look intellectual to us. However, for the Renaissance readers, it should have intensified the impression for Hamlet, who was a Protestant prince educated in Wittenberg, all began with the *desire* to go beyond human comprehension and "speak with the dead" as Stephen Greenblatt claims in his book *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Greenblatt, 1988, p.1).

Hamlet seems to be stretching the boundaries of human "vision" that includes an encounter with the supernatural. Implicitly, Hamlet's wish to meet the supernatural with "nerves as hard Nemean Lion's" is an indication that his madness is real rather than "feigned." Madness or antic disposition in this sense is directly related to the Wittenberg scholar's encounter with the supernatural. It is not clearly stated whether Hamlet goes mad after he meets his Ghost Father or not. We may not be able to say whether Hamlet's antic disposition is the result of his wish for another life (and kingdom), his encounter with the Ghost father, or his love for Ophelia. He may look like a madman who lost integrity, talked nonsense, and attacked suddenly, but still, there is "a method in his madness". Therefore, studying antic disposition in the text requires further study of the technical details in the text.

First, since it includes the theme of the encounter with the supernatural, antic disposition is directly related to pathos in the tragedy. The explicit reference to Hercules and his sufferings due to madness caused by Hera[i] supports it. One can claim

Prince Hamlet is like Hercules, who kills his wife and children in a trance because he kills Polonius in a bout of madness. However, he is unlike the semi-god who killed Nemean Lion because he seems to lack the physical power that Hercules has. The theme of the supernatural and madness are counterparts to each other. In this sense, they both serve how pathos is structured throughout the text.

In the disorganized speech that he makes to Ophelia in Table 28, the sentences look as if they were scattered here and there. It is the first sign that the people in the palace call him to have lost his mind to Ophelia's love. Hamlet, on the other hand, is aware that Ophelia was manipulated by her father, who works at the king's command. In the speech, Prince Hamlet's tone is angry either towards Ophelia or the people in the palace. According to Jean Claude Coquet's Theory of Enunciation, Prince Hamlet is both under the effect of the forces acting inside the instance of origin and the transcendent instance of cosmic and symbolic nature (Öztürk, Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-195).

In the translations, there is one keyword and a phrase to consider: Plague and monster. In TT1 and the proposed translation, the phrase was translated as "lanetim" (my curse), in which signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "acı söz" (bitter word) as an example of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because of bitter words and produced insufficient meaning. In TT3, the phrase was translated as "musibet" (omen), in which signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, the phrase was translated as "beddua", in which signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "monster" on the other hand, was translated as "ucube" in TT1, "canavar" in TT2, which are free of the designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because both of these signs are different words for "monster" in Turkish. In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "onlara ne isim taktırdığınızı" (by which names you cause them to be called), as an example of perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) and in TT4, as "maskara" (clown) which is an example of alteration of the meaning because it

produces a possible meaning that is not completely irrelevant to the meaning in the original text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

In translations, too, these two signs constitute the insults concerning pathos and reveal how pathetic structure is organized. Even the insults in the text by Prince Hamlet are structured around the monster/human depiction and plague that would be related to witchcraft. In this respect, the translations of the sign "monster" were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) to cover the contrast between the depiction of a monster and a human.

Another important sign in the context of the damnation of the supernatural is marriage. It would look useless to consider the sign in the source text and translations because it looks like a simple sign to use and translate. The sign "marriage" is "evlilik" in all translations except TT1. The translation for marriage in TT2 is "kocaya varmak", which is a very sexist expression to describe marriage. There is no talk of equality in the marriage connotation in this translation, contrary to the case in the source text. Reusing this translation would be a recreation of discourse.

Table 28: Example 25 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hamlet: If thou dost marry, I'll give thee this plague for thy dowry: be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow, thou shalt not escape calumny. Get thee to a nunnery, farewell. Or if thou wilt needs marry, marry a fool; for wise men know well enough what monsters you make of them. To a nunnery, go – and quickly too. Farewell. 3.1. (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 282)	Hamlet: Eğer mutlak kocaya varacaksan, şu lanetim sana düğün hediyesi olsun: Buz kadar temiz, kar kadar saf dahi olsan, iftiradan kurtulmayasın. Haydi bir manastıra çekil. Allaha ısmarladık. Yahut mutlak koca istiyorsan, bir aptala var, çünkü akıllı adamlar kendilerini nasıl bir ucubeye çevireceğinizi bilirler. Bir manastıra çekil, haydi; hem de çabuk. Allaha ısmarladık. (Shakespeare, 1943, p.52)	Hamlet: Evlenirsen şu acı sözü çeyiz diye götürürsün benden: Buzlar kadar el değmedik, karlar gibi temiz de olsan çamur atılmaktan kurtulamayacaksın. Manastıra git. Haydi, elveda! Ama ille de evleneceksen, sersemin biriyle evlen; çünkü akıllılar sizin kendilerini ne canavara çevireceğinizi bilirler. Manastıra, manastıra git; çarçabuk hem de elveda! (Shakespeare, 1974, p. 76)
TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Hamlet: Evlenirsen sana cihaz diye şu musibeti veriyorum: ismetinden donsan, kar gibi lekesiz olsan gene de iftiradan kurtulamayacaksın. Bir manastıra git, haydi; hoşçakal. Yok, ille evleneceksen, sersemin biriyle evlen; çünkü aklı başında olanlar onlara ne isim taktırdığınızı pekâlâ	Hamlet: Eğer bir gün evlenirsen şu beddua benden sana çeyiz olsun: Buz kadar el değmemiş, kar gibi temiz olsan da, iftiranın elinden kaçamayacaksın. Manastıra at kendini. Haydi elveda. İlle de evleneceksen, bir budalayla evlen. Çünkü aklı başında erkekler sizin onları nasıl maskaraya	Hamlet: Eğer bir gün evlenirsen, lanetim sana çeyiz olsun. Buzdan daha el değmemiş, kardan daha saf bile olsan, iftiradan kaçamayasın.Git, bir manastıra kapan. Elveda. İlla ki evleneceksen, delinin birine var. Çünkü akıllılar sizin onları nasıl yaratıklara

bilirler. Manastıra, hadi; hem hiç durmadan. Hoşça kal. (Shakespeare.1995, p.86)	çevirdiğinizi çok iyi bilir. Manastıra, haydi çabuk ol. Elveda. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 118)	dönüştüreceğinizi iyi bilirler. Koş, git manastıra. Hem de hemen.

The speech above is the sign that Ophelia was involved in bringing the proof to the King for Prince Hamlet's madness. Polonius sends Ophelia to Hamlet, who talks to her "as if" he is mad. Prince Hamlet's angry tone and insults may or may not be read as proof of his antic disposition. The imagery that he uses about married men turning into monsters after marrying may be read as a reference to Hercules, the semi-god, because he kills his own children and wife under the spell of Hera. In the speech, Prince Hamlet displays behaviour that he may be regarded as a non-subject because he speaks in an angry tone that puzzles Ophelia.

3.6. Songs in *Hamlet* and its Translations

Ophelia's song(s)[91] in Table 29 are a series of obscene folk songs for Valentine's Day that she sings in the court, a very inappropriate place to sing in. Therefore, they are called songs of madness because the silent Ophelia starts singing after the murder of Polonius, her father. The song is about a young girl who mourns for a lost love like Ophelia. She presumably mourns for a lost future with Prince Hamlet. In the text, Ophelia has almost no voice to talk except the limits set by Polonius, the father. Consequently, she almost "erupts" while singing and chooses a song that is not to be sung before the King and the Queen. The song is analysed in its relationship with the argument of this thesis.

In the first excerpt to the song, Ophelia gives us the description of a pilgrim who wears a large-brimmed hat with cockleshells on it, a rod, and sandals. The description may refer to Prince Hamlet, who is to save Christian Denmark. The religious connotation here may be read as the departure of Hamlet from Denmark to England to die. King Cladius sends Hamlet to England with a letter from Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to execute him on his arrival to England. The death could be an implicit reference to the murder of Polonius, and in the middle of the song, there could be a shift to the scene in the graveyard. The song could be a foreshadowing of Prince Hamlet's possible death in England. There are three lines to consider in this respect.

[91] See Iphigenia's story in Greek Mythography by Alan Cameron, p. 132, pp. 232-235

They are "How should I your true love know?", "sandal shoon" and "Which bewept to the grave did not go/ With true-love showers."

Table 29: Example 26 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Ophelia: How should I your true love know From another one? By his cockle hat and staff And his sandal shoon… He is dead and gone, lady He is dead and gone, At his head a grass-green turf, At his heels a stone… White his shroud as the mountain snow—… Larded with sweet flowers Which bewept to the grave did not go. With true love showers. 4.5.(Shakespeare, 2003, pp. 348-349)	Ophelia: Sahici sevdanı başkasından Nasıl ayırt edeyim? Çıngıraklı külâhından Elindeki asadan Ayağındaki sandaldan… Üstü yeşil yaprak, Altı katı toprak, O öldü gitti, Lady, O öldü gitti, ah!... Beyazdır kefeni, dağdaki karlar gibi… Kokulu çiçeklere sardılar Sevenler, mezara götürüp Arkasından ağladılar. (Shakespeare, 1943, pp.84-85)	Ophelia: Nasıl ayırt ederim bir bakışta Seveni sevmeyenden? Külâhından tozlu çarıklarından Elindeki değnekten... Öldü, güzel sultanım, çoktan öldü Öldü gömüldü bile. Başında yemyeşil otlar büyüdü Taşı dikildi bile… Ak kefenler giydirdi kardan beyaz… Sarıldı çiçeklere Arar arar sevdiğini bulamaz Ağlayanlar içinde. (Shakespeare, 1974, pp. 118-119)
TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Ophelia: Bir öğretsen bana sen, o "vefalı" yarini Nasıl ayırtdetmeli? Başındaki serpuştan, ayağındaki çarıktan, Elindeki asadan… O çoktan ölüp gitti, sultanım efendim, O çoktan ölüp gitti, Baş ucunda yemyeşil çimenler bile bitti; Ayak ucunda taşı… Kefeni dağlardaki karlar gibi bembeyaz… Ne çiçekler örtülü! Sonra da mezarına sevenlerin göz yaşı, Dökülmeden gömüldü.	Ophelia: Sevdiğimi tanırım ben Karıştırmam hiç kimseyle: Şapkasından değneğinden, Ayağındaki sandalından, bir de… Ama o şimdi öldü gitti, Dayanamadı artık sonunda; Başucunda yeşil ot bitti, Tek bir taş var ayak ucunda… Dağlardaki kar gibi bembeyazmış kefeni, Güzelim çiçeklerle bezenmiş; Gerçek aşkın yağmur gibi gözyaşları, Birini bile yere düşürememiş. (Shakespeare, 2013, pp. 168-169)	Ophelia: Sahici aşkı nasıl tanıdım? Başındaki şapkadan, ayağındaki sandaldan, elindeki değnekten. O öldü gitti,efendim Öldü gitti. Çoktan başucunda bitmiş Yemyeşil çimenler, Ayakucuna taş konmuş. Güzel çiçeklerle bezenmiş, Dağlardaki kar misali bembeyaz kefeni, Konurken mezara, Gerçek aşk yağmuruyla ıslanmamış.

(Shakespeare, 1995, pp. 135-136)		

In TT1, the phrase was translated as "Sahici sevdanı başkasından/ Nasıl ayırt edeyim?" (How should I your true love know) which preserves the signs. It was translated in TT2 as "Nasıl ayırt ederim bir bakışta/Seveni sevmeyenden?" (How can I true love know at first sight?) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning because it gives excessive commentary on the meaning in the original text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, "Bir öğretsen bana sen, o 'vefalı' yarini Nasıl ayırtdetmeli?" (Teach me, how to know true love.) as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it produces a false meaning that is not completely relevant while in TT4 "Sevdiğimi tanırım ben/Karıştırmam hiç kimseyle" (I know my true love from others) is an example of the opposition of the meaning because it produces a meaning that is contrary to the meaning in the original text. (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The phrase "Sandal shoon" was translated in TT1, TT3 and in the proposed translation as "Ayağındaki sandaldan", in which signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2 "tozlu çarıklarından" (dusty sandals) and in TT3, "ayağındaki çarıktan", (sandals on his feet) are examples of alteration of the meaning because a false meaning that is not completely irrelevant to the meaning in the original text was produced (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

"Which bewept to the grave did not go/ With true-love showers" was translated in TT1 as "Sevenler, mezara götürüp /Arkasından ağladılar" (Lovers took him to the grave and cried for his death) as an example of perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because both the imagery and the word choice are irrelevant to the meaning in the original text. In TT2, it was translated as "arar sevdiğini bulamaz/Ağlayanlar içinde" (Searches his lover among the ones who cry) as a perversion of the meaning, too because there is no such imagery in the ST (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, it was translated as "Sonra da mezarına sevenlerin göz yaşı, /Dökülmeden gömüldü" (He was buried, then, without the tears of lovers shed in his grave) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because, in the ST, there is a reference to flowers

being dropped into the grave, not tears. Therefore, there is excessive commentary in this translation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4 "Gerçek aşkın yağmur gibi gözyaşları, /Birini bile yere düşürememiş" (Rain-like tears of truth, could not make any one of them fall) is an example of sliding of the meaning because the meaning in this translation is not actualized (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) but an alternative meaning was produced because the sign "love showers" was changed.

Table 30: Example 27 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Ophelia: And. will not come again? And will not come again? No, no he is dead, Go to thy death-bed, He never will come again. His beard, was as white as snow, All flaxen was his poll. He is gone, he is gone, And we cast away moan. God a mercy on his soul… 4.5.(Shakespeare, 2003, p. 360)	Ophelia: Bir daha gelmez mi acab? Bir daha gelmez mi acab? Hayır, hayır, o öldü. Sen ölüm döşeğine git, O bir daha gelmeyecek "Kar gibi beyazdı sakalı" İpek gibiydi başı, O gitti, O gitti. Matemimiz boşa gitti Allah rahmet eylesin (Shakespeare, 1943, p. 89)	Ophelia: Bir daha gelmeyecek mi bir daha? Bir daha gelmeyecek mi bir daha? Gitti gelmez bekleme, Gir ölüm döşeğine, Öldü gitti, gitti gelmez bir daha Sakalı vardı bembeyaz kar Keten rengi saçları Gitti, yok oldu gitti, Ağlamışsın ne fayda Rahmet dile canına! (Shakespeare, 1974, p.125)
TT3	**TT4**	**Proposed Translation**
Ophelia: Demek ki gelmiyecek! Demek ki gelmiyecek? Öldü o, gelmek nerde! Gidip uzan, öl sen de. Bir daha gelmeyecek. Sakalı süt beyazı, İpek gibi saçları. Gitti bir kere gitti, Boş gözyaşı bizimki, Tanrım Ruhuna acı! (Shakespeare, 1995, p. 144)	Ophelia: Geri dönmeyecek mi bana! Geri dönmeyecek mi bana? Yok yok, o öldü gitti. Senin de günün bitti. O asla dönmeyecek sana. Kar gibi beyazdı sakalı, Keten gibiydi başı, Gitti o artık, gitti, Bizim de yasımız bitti. Tanrı onu bağışlasın. (Shakespeare, 2013, p. 177)	Ophelia: Geri dönmez mi bana? Hiç mi dönmez acaba? Yok, hayır. Öldü o. Sen de git ölüm döşeğine, O artık gelmez bir daha. Kar gibi beyaz sakalı, Lepiska saçları. Öldü, o artık buradan gider, Yas tutsan ne çıkar! Tanrı ruhuna, merhamet eder.

In the Table 30 "All flaxen was his poll", "And we cast away moan" and "God a mercy on his soul" are the lines to consider. The phrase "All flaxen was his poll" was

translated as "İpek gibiydi başı" (his head looked like silk) in TT1 in which signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, it was translated as "Keten rengi saçları" (linen-colored hair) is an example of darkening of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because "flaxen" as keten (linen) produces ambiguous meaning. In TT3, the phrase was translated as "İpek gibi saçları" (silk-like hair) and proposed translation "Lepiska saçları" (Leipzig silk-like hair) in which signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4, it was translated as "Keten gibiydi başı," (his head was like linen) as an example of darkening of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The phrase "And we cast away moan" was translated as "Matemimiz boşa gitti" (Our mourning is vain) in TT1 and "Ağlamışsın ne fayda" (What is the use of crying?) in TT2, and "Boş gözyaşı bizimki" (Our tears are useless) in TT3, "Bizim de yasımız bitti" (Our mourning is over) in TT4, which are all free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The phrase "God a mercy on his soul" was translated as "Allah rahmet eylesin" (May he rest in peace) in TT1 as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the translator evoked a connotation in the Turkish context although the meaning produced is relevant. In TT2, "Rahmet dile canına" (Pray for his soul to rest in peace) was translated as an example of alteration of meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the meaning evoked is not irrelevant, but the phrase is translated in the Turkish context. In TT3, the phrase was translated as "Tanrım ruhuna acı!" (My God, have mercy on his soul!) without meaning transformations(Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT4 the phrase was translated as "Tanrı onu bağışlasın" (May God forgive him!) and in proposed translation "Tanrı onun ruhuna, merhamet eder" (May God have mercy on his soul) which are free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The song of Ophelia in Table 30 can be read as reverberations of madness because of the disorganized content and expressions which are full of woe. The singing Ophelia is not the daughter of the advisor to King Claudius, but an alternative Ophelia comes to the stage to shock the people in the palace. The songs are parts of the

portrayal of a disorganized mind that shakes the palace to its ground. Therefore, the songs of Ophelia have a language of their own.

3.7. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *Hamlet* and its Translations

The major themes of discrimination are initially about women. As mentioned beforehand, the way that Prince Hamlet describes his mother is the opposite of an ideal Christian Queen who would mourn for a long period and not even think of getting married right after. Moreover, he uses certain mythological references *to contrast* Niobe and Hecuba, who are the unhappiest mothers because their sons are killed. Queen Gertrude is presented as a queen who would destroy genealogy because pathos in Shakespearean tragedies requires demonization and idealization of certain characters.

Interestingly, discrimination in *Hamlet* initially exists to serve the division existent in the pathetic structure. However, a thorough study of discrimination is required because it is one of the steps of semiotic analysis of a text. Queen Gertrude and Lady Macbeth are the ones to tear their babies (genealogy) for a possible rebirth because their presentation is directly linked to the Dionysian cult (E. Tuna, 2000, p.118). Therefore, witchcraft and crucible are presented in the text within the discriminatory discourse that shows itself in the famous phrase "Frailty, thy name is woman!"

As mentioned above, Prince Hamlet refers to the female stereotype as "frail" who would live on bodily drives. This is an implicit reference to the crucible of the witches because Queen Gertrude is depicted as the opposite of an ideal queen for Christian Denmark. The discriminatory discourse in *Hamlet* has long been analysed from a feminist perspective. It has been interpreted as an over-generalization for all women to refer to their weaknesses. However, Shakespearean pathos is rooted in contrast between certain mythological and iconographic references. It is possible to claim that it refers to women who are like "witches" who make magic using their crucibles.

Frail could refer to the body-mind dichotomy that is existent in Early Modern thought. Therefore, in Prince Hamlet's view, women who do not respect the idea of

genealogy are like "beasts" that dwell on bodily drives like the followers of the Dionysian cult. The frailty that he is referring to are, interestingly, the drives in a female body, which is almost self-explanatory. Prince Hamlet labels Queen Gertrude's body as "frail" because he considers the female drives in Queen Gertrude's body as the source of witchcraft and evil magic. It is not only because Queen Gertrude married his uncle Claudius shortly after the death of his father but also, she has frailty, bodily drives that help with the evil magic that King Claudius casts on Christian Denmark. It is not stated in the text where exactly the king got the poison, or he learned the sinister way to use it. The presentation of King Claudius, not as a necromancer but as a potential user of the crucible, is striking. The necromancer would be a scholar who learnt to read and write in Latin, but a user of crucible could be anyone with evil intentions. This makes the portrayal of King Claudius even worse because he echoes satyrs, the followers of the Dionysian cult.

The mind-body division in Shakespearean pathos, then, also reflects the respect for genealogy and using witchcraft to destroy it, a very central theme of the plot in *Hamlet.* In this respect, the traces of Queen Gertrude's frailty can be searched in the way that the "woman and frailty" exists in the text.

As mentioned above, the stereotype takes its roots from the structure of Shakespearean pathos, which consists of two opposing features: The characters who demand respect for genealogy like in the example of Prince Hamlet and King Lear and the characters who are associated with the destruction of it like King Claudius, Queen Gertrude or King Lear's daughters Albany and Regan. There are traces of discriminatory discourse in the very construction of Shakespearean pathos. The frailty that Prince Hamlet refers to is the frailty shown by women who were associated with evil magic (remembering how she married King Claudius).

Witchcraft (in the form of Claudius, not pre-Shakespearean Hamlets) is the opposite of the character Hamlet. The King is presented as a prince who would respect genealogy and identify demons in a Christian country. The mind-body dichotomy existent in Early modern thought, through the pathetic structure of the play, reveals the contrast between King Claudius, who would destroy genealogy like Cain, and Prince Hamlet, who is ready to defend Denmark against witches.

4. A TRANSLATION-ORIENTED SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF *KING LEAR*

4.1. Summary of *King Lear*

The story takes place in pre-Christian Britain. King Lear has decided to divide his kingdom amongst his three daughters, Cordelia, Regan, and Goneril. Lear plans to give the largest part to the daughter who will express her love most and flatter him. He is almost sure that his favourite daughter, Cordelia, will finally get the largest kingdom. Goneril and Regan are both cunning and deceitful. They pretend to love their father and try to use exaggerated expressions and vocabulary to win the challenge. Cordelia says that she "cannot heave her heart into her mouth" (Shakespeare, 2001, 164) and refuses to play the game. The answer "nothing" vexes King Lear so much that he gives up Cordelia completely. The King of France praises Cordelia's honesty and decides to marry her without her dowry. Cordelia accepts his proposal and leaves the country to go to France.

Although he was banished by Lear, Kent understands that the king is not well enough to decide on his own, disguises himself, and becomes Lear's servant. Regan and Goneril act together, and Lear and his few companions go to live with Goneril. She shows her real face and plans to treat him like the older man. After the quarrel, Lear decides to leave, and he sends Kent to Regan. When Lear arrives at Regan's castle, he faces the fact that Kent has been placed in stocks set free by Lear. The old king soon realizes that Regan is trying to stab him in the back with her sister.

Gloucester hears that the two sisters plan to murder Lear. He warns Kent to send Lear to Dover to find shelter. Regan and Goneril discover Gloucester's plan to save Lear. Cornwall, Regan's husband, plucks Gloucester's eyes out. A servant who helps Gloucester kills Cornwall with a sword.

Cordelia's army of French troops at Dover starts a war with Regan and Goneril. After Cordelia's return, Kent tries to unite father and daughter while Gloucester tries to find his lost son, Edgar. Lear awakes to find out that Cordelia has been defeated. Punishment of death is given to Cordelia by Edmund. In love with Edmund, Goneril poisons Regan. Edgar finally reveals his true identity and kills Edmund. Goneril commits suicide.

Dying, Edmund tries to reverse the order to execute Cordelia too late. Lear is seen carrying the body of Cordelia in his arms before he falls dead on his daughter. Kent says that he will be with his master in the afterlife to leave Edgar to wear the crown of Britain.

The summary will prove useful especially in the enigma section, because the main strains of the plot are studied in relation to pathos. It is important to get clear about the plots and subplots in *King Lear* because they are all interconnected. Writing a detailed summary of a great tragedy may also be helpful in studying the characters because some characters may be doubled like Edgar as Tom O'Bedlam, which requires an in-depth analysis.

4.2. Enigmas in *King Lear* and its Translations

Enigmas in *King Lear* can be read as representations of disorder of the world, while pathetic structure presents the order that Shakespeare designed as the background. The Roman idea of honouring ancestors, possibly borrowed from Ovid, represents King Lear's mindset while Regan and Goneril are defined through evil magic and witchcraft. The supernatural is non-existent in the text because there are no gods, no ghosts, or no link with evil like *Hamlet* or *Othello*. As stated by Northrop Frye, there is no explicit reference to the supernatural in the text, but the fear of it survives:

> And just as the divine world is hazy and mysterious, so is the demonic world. *King Lear* is in many respects the spookiest of all the great tragedies, and yet "nothing" explicitly supernatural or superhuman occurs in it: there is "nothing" to correspond to the Ghost in *Hamlet* or the witches in *Macbeth*. Five fiends inhabit Poor Tom, but we don't believe in his devils, and wouldn't even if we didn't know that Poor Tom is Edgar. (Bloom, 2010, p. 18)

The fall of King Lear and the categorization of Regan and Goneril as stereotypical followers of the wine god Dionysus could be worth studying. However, King Lear's kingdom is prone to be associated with evil in the Renaissance gaze because the setting is pagan. The *destruction* of the kingdom arrives just because he

fails to recognize his saviour, Cordelia. As a result, King Lear loses all gods without finding new ones:

> *Lear* that it was "a pagan play for a Christian audience." "Christian poetry" is an oxymoron; poetry in a deep sense is always pagan. Shakespeare was not interested either in solving problems or in finding God. "nothing" is solved in or by *King Lear*, and Lear loses his old gods without finding new ones. (ed. Bloom, 2010, p. 3)

The protagonist falls at the beginning of the text, and "nothing" turns into a major enigma throughout the plot. As stated by Harold Bloom, "beyond the scale of everyone else in his drama, Lear is as much a fallen, mortal god as he is a king" (Bloom, 2010, p. 3), and "*King Lear* is cosmos falling into chaos" (Bloom, 2010, p. 1).

The arrival of chaos may mark the Creation because the world is created out of "nothing" in the Christian context. Rather than referring to the Apocalypse explicitly in the Christian sense, Lear's decadence can be read through the idealization of honouring ancestors and women who oppose the patriarchal order. The dichotomy forms the main strains of the pathetic structure of the text. Moreover, the standpoints for his madness are pre-set concerning the decadence of pagan gods.

The text is set in pre-Christian England. First, King Lear's so-called favourite daughter, Cordelia, is banished because she opposes flattering his father. She fails to nominate herself as the most suitable successor in the context of honouring ancestors. The moment she fails the test, she is banished from the country because Lear detests her, but he expects Regan and Goneril to found kingdoms in complete concordance with the practices of honouring ancestors. Cordelia is now the *abject* (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18) to be driven out of the patriarchal pagan kingdom, symbolized by the Sun. A further study of Roman and Greek in four great tragedies may reveal the contrast between the cult of worshipping the ancestors and Dionysiac practices.

In return, however, Cordelia refuses to abandon her father as a fallen king and comes from France to save him. She turns into a Mother Mary figure that contrasts

with the pagan background of the text. The fallen mortal, Lear, is planned to be saved by the arrival of Cordelia into England. King Lear's suffering is intensified because Cordelia is brutally killed by the Centaurs Regan and Goneril as "a Mother Mary figure". The death of the saviour in pre-Christian England constitutes the major enigma at the end of the text.

King Lear's division of his kingdom into three is the rejection of the Early Modern idea of unification of England by King James I. (He is considered to have united kingdoms of Ireland, Scotland, and England-including Wales). Regarding Renaissance politics, malice is unleashed through the division of Lear's kingdom according to the degree of compliments that he gets from his heirs. Therefore, the enigmas are centered around the subversion of a former English king, as reverberations of "nothing" are heard all through the text. There seems to be no room for the supernatural in the text at first sight because the gods do not answer Lear when he is in great suffering. It is an unusual dislocation in a pagan context because there is usually room for the supernatural in such a society. As the fallen god himself, King Lear's constant attempt to find a cause for human suffering is useless. He later understands that certain humans are capable of acting like demons on earth.

In the Shakespearean *King Lear*, The Early Modern prejudice on magic and the supernatural may *still* have been influential in forming pathetic structure. King Lear's devotion to the idea of honouring the ancestors may look disconnected from the supernatural because the theme is the decadence of pagan gods. As Harold Bloom claims, the supernatural ultimately vanishes in Lear's kingdom, and pagan gods stop answering him:

> *Lear* that it was "a pagan play for a Christian audience." "Christian poetry"
>
> is an oxymoron; poetry, in a deep sense, is always pagan. Shakespeare was not
>
> interested either in solving problems or in finding God. "nothing" is solved in
>
> or by *King Lear*, and Lear loses his old gods without finding new ones. (Bloom,
>
> 2010, p. 3)

However, his damnation of Regan and Goneril as "centaurs" may reveal that the traces of magic because it is a direct connection to Dionysus. The whole plot is a portrayal of the fall of the king of divine providence at the beginning, unlike other tragedies by Shakespeare. The Lear near Gloucester is not equal to a god anymore but a fallen king in a land where there are no gods or real demons. Malice comes from the people around him. As stated by Gloucester, King Lear's call to pagan gods is unanswered because he claims, "As flies to wanton boys we are to gods, they kill us for sport"! (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 306). Therefore, "the subversion" is a major enigma that is not resolved at the end. Neither Gloucester nor Lear can find the real cause of Regan and Goneril's evil doings and Edmund.

King Lear's dedication to Roman God Janus fails to repel the "centaur-like" daughters Regan and Goneril because they "poison King Lear" in the ear with their balmy speeches. Regan and Goneril are likely to bring evil magic also in the Renaissance gaze because King Lear echoes the representations of evil magic that certain women were associated with. Cordelia is banished because she describes her father as "nothing", immediately falling into the opposite category of honouring ancestors. In the earlier texts of King Lear, Cordelia's reply is "like salt" rather than "nothing". The idea can be traced back to "the holy salt". The salt used to drive evil spirits away erased in the Shakespearean text may indicate that Cordelia venerates her father like the holy salt. Lear misses the symbolism of "nothing" and takes the flattery of Regan and Goneril as proof that they will respect and honour their genealogy. The idea of holy salt belongs to the Greek world because the notion first takes place in Iliad. The salt symbolism was later used and adapted by Christianity which is almost non-existent in the Shakespearean King Lear. There is one reference to the salt of tears after the fall, King Lear, as the only one connection to the earlier versions of the text:

> No seconds? All myself?
> Why this would make a man a man of salt,
> To use his eyes for garden water pots. 4.6. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 341)

The salt symbolism may also shed light on the problem of justice in the text. The contrast between Cordelia's sisters' balmy words and the salt mark King Lear's end. In Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the characters add "blessed salt" to the meals of their guests. Cordelia's allusion to salt, in non-Shakespearean texts, can be read as a

prologue to the famous speech ending with "nothing". The salt may be read as a symbolism of truth as opposed to the lies and flattery of Goneril and Regan. The contrast between the idea of "holy salt" to dismiss evil spirits and Goneril and Regan is striking.

Lear later realizes that "the demons to drive away" were Regan and Goneril, who manage their share of the land through horrible acts of violence that echo Dionysiac rituals in trance or intoxication (although some sources claim that followers of the Dionysian cult abused stronger substances). The negative portrayal of King Lear's daughters also means that he has no favourite among them because they all rebel against his mindset, including Cordelia.

Shakespearean Cordelia explains the love of her father through "nothing", the word that King Lear would despise to hear. Cordelia's banishment is not the result of her failure to express but her open announcement of the "nothing". King Lear is vexed upon hearing the word because he expects to hear flattery as the beginning of the practices of honouring ancestors. The miscommunication occurs because Lear speaks in contrasting jargon. King Lear's response, "How, nothing will come out of nothing! Speak again!" (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 164) echoes the Renaissance idea *of ex nihilo nihil fit*, while Shakespearean pathos relies on Renaissance *ex traduce* meaning direct origin from the souls of the parents.

Shakespearean Lear explicitly refers to Aristotle and Lucretius because he is pagan. The argument in De Rerum Natura (On the Nature of Things) by Lucretius, as marked by "Nothing will come of nothing! Speak!" (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 164) is quite the opposite to the way that Lear approaches his pagan religion. Lear's worship of Janus and his dedication to worshipping ancestors contradict with clinamen, the free will of the matter. Moreover, he seems to oppose the idea that Lucretius claims "death is 'nothing' to us," which can be interpreted that death is only a beginning. [1] The subversion is the embodiment of the decadence of the king-god-father figure in *King Lear* because the protagonist does not believe in beginnings:

> The gods, in this play, are "nothing" admirable, and yet they are the only gods in existence. What Edmund helps us see in Lear's character is that the king's

> elements of greatness are subdued neither by their antitheses in the bastard's analytical nihilism or by the monarch's own developing skepticiscm as to divine justice. What the Fool helps us see is that wisdom, however bitter, also does not diminish Lear's greatness, even when that is manifested only as a great unwisdom. (Foakes, 2001, p. 12)

The structure of Shakespearean pathos is not fit for the explicit connection with *initiation*, an idea that dates back to the origins of theatre. In other words, the spiritual journey of a shaman, as well as Dionysian practices forming the birth of theatre, contradicts honouring ancestors as a part of Renaissance politics in Early Modern England. Technically speaking, it is because rebirth has been expelled from drama. Lear cannot be saved although he *sleeps*, in a way explained by Frye (1986, p. 118), to become a new king. Cordelia's failure to save the kingdom marks the impossibility of the rebirth because it would contradict Cordelia's role of being the saviour of King Lear's new kingdom.

As pathos in four great tragedies was structured as honouring ancestors and negative portrayal of Dionysian practices, we may assume that "rebirth" would be classified as a negative component because it is a direct reference to the name Dionysus which means born twice. It may explain why Lear's kingdom is not founded again, although he supports the idea of honouring ancestors, and a saviour arrives to save his kingdom.

However, the term in Shakespearean pathos is negatively presented as opposed to honouring the ancestors to serve as the background to how negation or "nothing" is presented. It may be questioned whether there will be a rebirth of King Lear at the end of the text. As stated above, we do not have evidence in the text that King Lear will be reborn through being a Fool, in the sense that Frye (1986, p. 118) explains. The madness of Lear is so pathetically crafted that he even confuses the Fool with the saviour of the land, Cordelia.

King Lear immediately accepts the sign "nothing" as proof of Cordelia's rejection of him, and the banishment can be read as an act of driving the demon away.

As stated by Northrop Frye, King Lear's obsession with a formula of something in place of something also bids him from focusing on the real intentions of his heirs:

> There is another context, easier to understand, in which the conception of "nothing" is of great significance. What is the cause of love, friendship, good faith, loyalty or any of the essential human virtues? "nothing". There's no "why" about them: they just are. In putting on his love-test act, Lear is obsessed by the formula of something for something. I'll love you if you love me, and if you love me you'll get a great big slice of England. When Cordelia says that she loves him according to her "bond," she of course doesn't mean anything (Frye, 1986, p. 109).

On the other hand, Cordelia's use of "nothing" is very different from how Lear uses it because it refers to Creation in the iconographic context. Harold Bloom agrees with the way that W. R. Elton explains pre-Christian elements implemented as references to both as the origin and the end:

> William R. Elton persuasively sees the tragedy as non-Christian, in harmony with its pre-Christian paganism, set as it is in a Britain contemporaneous with the Book of Job. Lear dies in despair of the pagan gods, and his survivors echo his despair, but in that echo Shakespeare blends overtones of biblical apocalypse. "nothing" becomes the Creation, in the Bible, and never can be reduced to "nothing" again, even in apocalypse. But in Lear's tragedy, "nothing" does come of "nothing", and so "nothing" is at last both origin and end. (Bloom, 2010, p. 11)

In John Milton's Paradise Lost (Book I), the sign "nothing" refers to the chaos before the creation of the world because deep and dark waters rise before the Sun rises in the Christian context. The sign *"nothing"* then refers to the chasm before the Creation. Cordelia cannot say that she loves her father as much as the world (Lear's

kingdom is also a part of "nothing") because Christian England is non-existent in the text. The world through iconography refers to the darkness of King Lear's world. Lear's association of himself with the Sun is explicitly rejected by Cordelia.

King Lear does not even notice that Cordelia's perspective refers to different interpretations of the sign. His choleric attitude, which is an allusion to ecstasy and King of Lapith, costs a very high price. Interpreting the flattery of Goneril and Regan as the proof that they will respect their genealogy when they are crowned prepares for his end. King Lear happily divides his kingdom between the two daughters assuming that he will be able to maintain his role as a father and the former king. He feels relieved to have driven the demon Cordelia, who dared to challenge her father to negate the idea of honouring the ancestors.

Therefore, the major enigma that forms the basis for the pathetic structure is rooted in the contrasts between the father and daughter. The sign "nothing" can be read in the Christian context as Creation but in a pagan context. The reverberations of the sign "nothing" take an unexpected turn when Cordelia comes from France to restore the mad king and his kingdom through the medicine (possibly used as a metaphor for faith) on her lips:

O my dear father, restoration hang
Thy medicine on my lips, and let this kiss
Repair those violent harms that my two sisters
Have in thy reverence made. 4.7.(Shakespeare, 2001, p. 352)

King Lear's speech is the depiction of the price that he pays, likened to Ixion, the King of Lapith. It can be read as an answer to Cordelia's announcement of herself as the saviour of England:

You do me wrong to take me out o' the grave,
Thou art a soul in bliss, but I am bound
Upon a wheel of fire that mine own tears
Do scald like molten lead. 4.7.(Shakespeare, 2001, p.353)

Cordelia is described as a spirit (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 353) by Lear, who also uses the explicit sign "bliss" out of pagan context while asking for forgiveness. Cordelia, in return, uses the sign "benediction" instead of "clemency". The former is

totally iconographic, while the latter can both be used in pagan and Christian contexts. Cordelia, in addition, associates Lear with the word "benediction" to describe their reunion in the iconographic context:

Cordelia: O look upon me, sir,
And hold your hands in benediction o'er me! 4.7. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 354)

The subversion in *King Lear* also calls for a feminist reading because the sign "nothing" is the major enigma as representations of "evil women" that operates in all the levels of the text. The negative portrayal of Dionysian women is existent in the text even before the love test of King and his daughters because Shakespeare's *King Lear* classifies women according to their concordance with honouring genealogy. In this respect, King Lear's prejudice against his daughters and his "foolish" way of testing love to divide the country also marks the Renaissance concept of the *abject* (Kristeva, 1982, p. 18) in Kristevan terms. Shakespeare's handling of the material from the old texts is based on the idea of abject (Kristeva, 1982, p.18) because it is a part of Renaissance self-fashioning. The abject in the text is modelled upon the negative portrayal of women because it is already existent in the dynamics of Renaissance society. A direct allusion to the Dionysian cult and their activities centered around destroying genealogy marks the destruction of pagan gods. Lear thinks the gods do not answer him because he yields to followers of the Dionysian cult. It also shows that the Christian context is not a must for the idea of honouring the ancestors to exist, like in *Hamlet* and *Othello*. King Lear's largely pagan background is also bound up to the contrast of honouring genealogy or opposing the king as the negative portrayal of Regan and Goneril calls for. It is evident that these characters perform horrible acts of violence, but there is a similarity between Lady Macbeth's verbal attempt to crush her baby's head (a weird but direct allusion to the myth of Dionysian women who tear their babies' bodies for rebirth) and Goneril and Cornwall's attempt to gauge the eyes of Gloucester. They share the common ground as the practice of evil magic.

Alternatively, the sign "nothing" can be read through a gender-specific lens because it also meant "vagina" in Renaissance slang. Many critics have looked at the meaning of the sign in King Lear's relationship with Cordelia and have come to different conclusions.

King Lear's sharing the kingdom with his daughters is not an attempt to start matriarchy, especially when the pathetic structure is studied in detail. First, the mother of Cordelia, Regan, and Goneril is invisible. Speculating on why the daughters have the non-existent mother can be a challenge because of the Quarto and Folio differences in Shakespearean Lear. Moreover, in previous versions of the text, there is no queen who would explain King Lear's situation. Alternatively, the invisible mother can be read as a metaphor to contrast King Lear's association with the "wheel of fire" (the sun). The moon, which traditionally symbolizes women and rebirth, is invisible when the Sun is in the full course. The non-existent queen in King Lear may also reveal that the king wishes to avoid matriarchal religious practices, symbolized mainly by the moon. The love test between Lear and his daughters takes place because Lear fails to trust his lineage. It is a possibility that their mother(s) were tied to certain matriarchal religious practices in pagan England to be condemned as witches in the Renaissance gaze.

The translations of *King Lear* into Turkish can also be read as sources that would reveal the pathetic structure connected with major and minor enigmas. The concept of subversion is reflected in the source text and its translations because, in *King Lear*, the plot is implicitly connected to *negation*. As King Lear speaks to divide his kingdom, he moves towards paying an irreparable cost because he almost denies himself as a king. Similarly, Gloucester thinks that he found the villain Edgar in his household and ultimately falls into Edmund's trap. In a tragedy where old gods disappear without the arrival of the new ones, the representations of subversion are inevitable. *King Lear* requires an extensive analysis of the major enigma, *"nothing,"* reverberating through the text in different characters. In the dialogue below, the miscommunication between Lear and Cordelia is exemplified. The exchange of "nothing" a couple of times results in the disinheritance of Cordelia as a suitable heir.

Table 31: Example 28 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Cordelia: "nothing", my lord. Lear: "nothing"? Cordelia: "nothing".	Cordelia. — Hiçbir şey efendimiz. Lear — Hiçbir Şey mi?	Cordelia: Hiçbir şey, efendimiz. Lear: Hiçbir şey mi? Cordelia Hiçbir şey.

Lear: How "nothing" will come of "nothing". Speak again. Cordelia: Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave my heart into my mouth. I love your majesty According to my bond, no more nor less. 1.1.Shakespeare, 2001, p.164)	Cordelia — Hiçbir şey efendimiz. Lear – Hiçten hiç çıkar bir şey söyle. Cordelia – Ne bahtsızım! Kalbimi dile getiremiyorum. Efendimizi evlâtlık bağının gerektirdiği kadar seviyorum. Ne daha, fazla, ne daha az. (Shakespeare, 1959, p.15)	Lear: Bak, hiçlikten hiçbir şey doğmaz. Sen bir şey söyle gene. Cordelia: Öyle bedbahtım ki. Söze dökemiyorum kalbimdekini. Ne eksik ne fazla; evlatlık bağının' Gerektirdiği gibi seviyorum siz majestelerini. (Shakespeare, 2019, p. 107)
TT3 Cordelia: Hiçbir şey, lordum. Lear: Hiç mi? Cordelia: Hiçten hiç çıkar. Ona göre konuş. Cordelia: Üzgünüm ama Yüreğimdekini dile dökemiyorum, Bir evlat babasını ne kadar severse O kadar seviyorum majestelerini, Ne fazla, ne az. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.25)	**Proposed Translation** Cordelia: Hiç, efendimiz. Lear: Hiç mi dedin? Cordelia: Hiç. Lear: Hiç hiçlikten doğar. Tekrar konuş Cordelia: Kalbim dile gelemediği için özür dilerim. Siz majestelerini bağımın izin verdiği kadar seviyorum: Ne eksik, ne de fazla.	

In the translations of the sign heart in Table 31, different choices for translation were adopted. In TT1, the sign was translated as "Kalbimi dile getiremiyorum" (I cannot let my heart speak) and in the proposed translation "Kalbim dile gelemediği için" (because my heart cannot speak) which bear no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2 it was translated as "Söze dökemiyorum kalbimdekini" (I cannot utter the contents of my heart) and in TT3 "Yüreğimdekini dile dökemiyorum" (I cannot utter the contents of my heart), which may both be interpreted as examples of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the connection between Cordelia's mother and the heart is lost. The phrase may alternatively be read as Cordelia's wish to express her feelings about her mother.

In the translation of the sign bond, different choices were made. In TT1 and TT2, the sign was translated as "evlatlık bağı," which bears no meaning

transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "Bir evlat babasını ne kadar severse" (as much as a child loves her father), which is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it provides excessive commentary on the sign (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation, the sign bond was translated as "bağlılığımın" (my pledge). In the proposed translation, the connotation of the sign bond was not dismissed because it also could refer to the covenant, an agreement on holy matrimony[1] to be read in iconographic terms.

The context in Table 31 reveals the pathetic structure of the text. The translation of the signs *"nothing", bond,* and *heart* may look obvious at first because these look like simple words to translate. However, when the enigmatic structure of the text is taken into consideration, the symbolical meaning of the signs outweighs it. The reasons for Cordelia's silence tell more about herself. However, the symbolical reading of these signs requires the study of an implicit network of meaning. The reasons behind the lack of communication between the father and the youngest daughter are there, but they are not explicit.

First, the sign "nothing" refers to two different worlds, as explained before. King Lear describes his belief as "the sacred radiance of the sun" (Shakespeare, 2001, p.165) and "the mysteries of Hecate and the night" (Shakespeare, 2001, p.165) and "by all the operation of the orbs" (Shakespeare, 2001, p.165) " which may look contradictory at first. In King Lear's world, light and dark reverberate because he openly refers to the sun and the moon as symbols of masculine and feminine properties.

The exchange of *"nothing"* between the father and the daughter, in this respect, may be read as the clash between *ex nihilo nihil fit* (all things were formed out of pre-existing things) and ex nihilo (the world was created out of a chasm). The former pertains to Greek philosopher Parmenides and later Lucretius. However, King Lear's belief in the supernatural contradicts the *ex nihilo nihil fit* perspective of the creation of the world. King Lear's self-conflicting view on the creation of the universe is evident in his constant references to Janus and Jupiter. In this respect, King Lear's description

of *"nothing"* is within the materialistic sphere, meaning destruction or chaos in the Epicurean sense.

Cordelia's description of "nothing" is implicit in the Christian sense, as she speaks from the theological sphere. Her silence says a lot about how she perceives the world. Her view on the creation of the universe, in this respect, is the opposite of King Lear. She talks about the possibility of existence through "nothing". In this respect, Cordelia refers to a world other than the pagan one. She describes her love for her father in terms of a world that has not been created yet. Christianity is almost non-existent (except for implicit references of Cordelia and Kent) in Lear's pagan kingdom. She cannot openly say that she loves her father as much as the world because she can only refer to the possibility of it.

The second sign to consider is the heart which may also be read at the symbolical level. Cordelia's use of heart is an explicit reference to her feelings about her father, while her silence can be read as a heavy heart. Cordelia's name is also a reference to heart because Corde means heart in Latin. It still does not provide adequate references to the heaviness in Cordelia's heart.

She is non-existent in the text for no reason. Cordelia's silence may give us a chance to consider the mother she cannot talk about openly. Therefore, Cordelia's heart or the mother may reveal the reason she speaks on iconographic terms. Her father sticks to a pagan understanding of "nothing," which contradicts within itself. Moreover, Cordelia's character may indicate that her mother was not the same as the mother of Regan and Goneril because, in earlier versions of *King Lear* text, the youngest daughter was the stepsister to older ones.

Therefore, differences in the story may explain why King Lear is reluctant to listen to what Cordelia's heart may say. She was also banished because she had to keep silent about her heart or the mother. Regarding the description of King Lear of Regan and Goneril as "centaurs," it could be presumed that their mother was pagan. On the other hand, Cordelia's silence may indicate that her mother could be a secret Christian. Cordelia arrives in England as a saviour at the end of the text, which may resemble Mother Mary.

When we consider the sign "bond", we may come up with different conclusions. The bond may be read as a reference to the physical bond between the father and the child. In this respect, it is not clear whether Cordelia means the bond between her and her father. The invisible mother may be the reason behind her expression, "I cannot heave my heart into my mouth." The sign "nothing" was translated as "hiç birşey" (nothing) in TT1 and TT2. The translation of "nothing" "comes out of nothing" as "hiçlikten hiç çıkar" (nothing comes out of nothing) in TT1 and "Hiçten hiç çıkar" (nothing comes out of nothing) in TT3 preserved the signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). "Hiçlikten hiçbir şey doğmaz" (nothing is born out of nothing) in TT2 and "hiç hiçlikten doğar" (nothing is born out of nothing) in the proposed translation are examples of over-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna , 2017, p. 172).

Table 32: Example 29 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Cordelia: I yet beseech your majesty, If for I want that glib and oily art To speak and purpose not – since what I well intend, I'll do't before I speak – that you make known It is no vicious blot, murder, or foulness, No unchaste action or dishonoured step, That hath deprived me of your grace and favour, But even for want of that for which I am richer, A still soliciting eye and such a tongue That l am glad I have not— though not to have it, Hath lost me in your liking. 1.1 .(Shakespeare, 2001, pp.173-174)	Cordelia – Yalvarırım sizden efendimiz — kastetmediğim şeyleri tatlı tatlı, akıcı söylerle söylemek sanatını beceremiyorum diye kızmış olsanız bile bana — yalvarırım sizden söyleyin, lütuf ve teveccühünüzden mahrum kalmama sebep, namusuma sürülen bir leke, işlediğim bir cinayet, şerefsizlik yolunda attığım bir adım, iffetsizlik, alçaklık değil; dilenen aç bakışlar gibi, beni sevginizden mahrum bıraktığı halde bende olmadığı için kendimi bahtiyar saydığım bir dil gibi yokluğu ile zenginleştiğim şeylerdir, söyleyin. (Shakespeare, 1959, p.21)	Cordelia: Yine de yalvarırım size, söyleyin, majesteleri, İçimden gelen şeyleri konuşmadan evvel yapan ben, İçimden gelmeyen şeyleri yapmacık ve süslü sözlerle Dile getirmeyi beceremiyorum diye kahırlanıyorsunuz bana böyle; Yoksa bir namus lekesi, bir cinayet yahut kalleşlik, İffetsizlik yahut alçaklık değildir sebep, Seni lütuf ve teveccühünüzden mahrum edişinize; Ama bilin ki, sizin sevginizi kaybetmeme yol açtıysa bile, Biteviye dilenen aç gözlere yahut işlek bir dile Sahip olmamak memnun ediyor beni, Zira bunlardan yoksun olduğum için

		Daha zengin sayıyorum kendimi. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.117-119)
TT3 Cordelia: Majesteleri, izninizle, Ben öyle yağlı ballı konuşma sanatını bilmem, İçimden gelmeyeni dışa vurmam; duygularımı sözle değil davranışımla gösteririm. Onun için, beni gözünüzden düşürenin, Kasıtlı, kötü niyetli, alçakça bir şey, Ahlaksızlık veya canilik olmadığını Lütfen herkes bilsin. Sahip olmadığım şeyler beni daha varlıklı kılıyor: Hep karşısındakinden bir şey bekleyen bakışlar Ve her türlü övgüye hazır bir dil. Yazık ki, olmayan bu özelliklerim yüzünden, Sizin sevginizi kaybettim. (Shakespeare,2020, p.32)	**Proposed Translation** Cordelia: Efendim sevgi ve ihsanınızdan yoksun bırakılmama sebep eğer yapmacıklı söz sanatıyla içimden gelmeyenleri söylemekse, iyi niyetim konuşmadan önce de belliydi. Ne kara leke, ne cinayet ne de alçaklık bunun nedeni. Açgözlü bakışlarım ve öyle bir dilim olmadığı için sevginizi kaybetmeme rağmen daha zenginim.	

In the context, the translators' choices refer to Cordelia and the misogynistic gaze. There are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of crucial signs like "vicious blot" and "dishonoured step". Cordelia's description of actions inappropriate for her as a princess may have been over-interpreted through the misogynistic gaze. In TT1 vicious blot was translated as "namusuma sürülen bir leke" (a blot on my chastity). Similarly, in TT2, the phrase was translated as "namus lekesi" (blot on chastity) as examples of the over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The way that Cordelia speaks is implicit. Therefore, a vicious blot could have different connotations other than sexual allusions. The alternative translation of the phrase could be "kara leke" (black blot) or "karalama" (defamation). In TT3, the phrase was translated as "kasıtlı" (on purpose) with a possible allusion to defamation which

is an example of under-interpretation of the meaning because it provides insufficient information (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Another critical issue concerning the translation of this phrase is that the vicious blot could be defamation of a person. In the source text, it is not clear what precisely he phrase refers to. Therefore, interpreting the phrase through misogynistic gaze would be a repetition of the discriminative discourse in translations.

The translations of "dishonoured steps" contain tendencies of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), possibly because the context for the phrase is implicit. In TT1, the phrase was translated as "şerefsizlik yolunda attığım bir adım" (a step is taken to dishonour) because dishonoured means "lack or loss of honour and reputation" or "shame." In TT2, the phrase was translated as "kalleşlik" (treachery) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation, the phrase was translated as "alçakça" (in a recreant way). In TT3, it was translated as "alçaklık" (recreancy) which bears no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Table 33: Example 30 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Gloucester: "These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us: though the wisdom of nature can reason it thus and thus, yet nature finds itself scourged by the sequent effects: love cools, friendship falls off, brothers divide: in cities, mutinies; in countries, discord; in palaces, treason; and the bond cracked 'twixt son and father. This villain of mine comes under the prediction; there's son against father: the king falls from bias of nature; there's father against child. We have seen the best of our time: machinations, hollowness, treachery, and all ruinous disorders, follow us disquietly to our graves. Find out this villain, Edmund; it shall lose thee "nothing"; do it carefully. And the noble and true-hearted Kent banished! his offence, honesty! 'Tis strange, Strange!	Gloucester — Şu son günlerdeki ay ve güneş tutulmaları hiç de hayra alâmet değil. Gerçi insan, aklı bunları şu veya bu sebebe bağlayarak izah ediyor ama gene -de bu tutulmaların ardısıra gelen belâ ve musibetler insanın yakasını bırakmıyor. Sevgi soğuyor; dostluklar yok oluyor; kardeşler bozuşuyor; şehirlerde isyanlar, memlekette ihtilâflar baş gösteriyor; saraylarda ihanet… Baba ile evlât arasındaki bağlar kopuyor. Oğlum, olacak o alçak da bu musibetlerin gerçek olduğunu ispat etmiyor mu? İşte babasına ayak 'direyen oğul! Kral, tabiat yolundan sapıyor ve işte evlâdına karşı cephe alan bir baba. Hayatımızın o güzel günleri geçti artık… Hile, yalan, hıyanet, türlü yıkıcı	Gloucester: Ay ve güneş tutulmaları hayra alamet değil bizim için. Tabiat ilimleri bu tür olayları şu veya bu sebebe bağlayarak izah etse bile, bunların ardı sıra gelen musibetlerden yakasını kurtaramıyor insan tabiatı? Sevgi buz gibi soğuyor; dostluklar bozuluyor; kardeş kardeşe düşman oluyor; şehirlerde isyan, ülkelerde kargaşa, saraylarda ihanet baş gösterirken, baba ile oğul arasındaki bağ kopuyor. Oğlum olacak o hain de bu kehaneti doğruluyor; al sana, babasına karşı gelen oğul işte. Kral tabiat yolundan sapıyor; al sana, evladına düşman olan baba. Ömrümüzün baharı geride kaldı artık: Yalan dolan, sahtekârlık, kalleşlik ve bin bir türlü fesat peşimizde, gözü açık

1.2.(Shakespeare, 2001, pp.185-186)	düzensizlikler rahat bırakmayacak, peşimizden ayrılmayacak artık… ta mezara kadar. Edmund, o sefilin içyüzünü ortaya koy; bir şey kaybedecek değilsin. Yalnız dikkatli davran... O asil, o sadık Kent de sürüldü gitti? Suçu? Dürüstlük? Garip, çok garip!... (Shakespeare, 1959, pp.29-30)	gideceğiz kabrimize. O hainin maskesini düşür, Edmund; bir şey kaybedecek değilsin ama dikkatli yap bu işi. Bak, o soylu, o sadık Kent bile sürüldü! Suçu da dürüstlüktü! Olacak iş değil! (Shakespeare, 2019, p.131)
TT3 Gloucester: O güneş ve ay tutulmaları iyiye işaret değildi. Her ne kadar bunun şu ya da bu şekilde bilimsel açıklamaları varsa da doğa bu işin sonuçlarında etkileniyor. Sevgi azalıyor, dostluklar bozuluyor kardeşler birbirine düşüyor, şehirlerde ayaklanmalar oluyor, ülkelerde iç savaş çıkıyor, saraylarda ihanet görülüyor, babayla oğul arasında bağ kopuyor. Hain oğlum da buna örnek: Oğul babaya karşı. Kral doğal yoldan sapıyor:Baba evlada karşı. En iyi günler geride kaldı. Komplolar,riyakarlık,ihanet, feci kargaşa mezara kadar peşimizi bırakmayacak artık. Öğren o alçağın niyetini Edmund. Bir şey kaybetmezsin. Dikkatli ol. Soylu, açık yürekli Kent de sürülsün ha. Suçu dürüstlük! Çok tuhaf!' (Shakespeare, 2020, pp. 40-41)	**Proposed Translation** Gloucester: Zamanlı zamansız ay tutulmaları doğanın bilgeliği öyle gerektirmiş olsa da hakikaten hayra alamet değil. Doğa bunun tekrarlanmasından kötü etkileniyor: Sevgi azalıyor, arkadaşlıklar bozuluyor, kardeşlerin arası açılıyor, şehirlerde isyan, ülkelerde iç savaş, saraylarda vatana ihanet ayyuka çıkarken baba oğul arasındaki bağlar çatırdıyor. Hain oğlum tam da buna örnek işte: Oğul babaya karşı geliyor, kral mutlaki yetkileri devredince, çocuk babaya karşı geliyor. En iyi zamanları yaşadık biz, entrika, ihanet, ikiyüzlülük ve kargaşa mezara kadar bizimle. Edmund, o haini bul; hiçbir şeyinden olmayacaksın, ama dikkatli ol. Asil ve dürüst Kent sürgün edildi! Suçu, dürüstlüktü! Tuhaf! Çok tuhaf!	

In the soliloquy by Gloucester in Table 33, we have a depiction of King Lear's kingdom right before the subversion and the decadence of old pagan gods altogether. The sign "nothing" as a major enigma manifests itself in King Lear's life and Gloucester's, who blames the eclipse of the sun and the moon for the discordance of the paternal order. There are mutinies in palaces, and the harmony in the family is broken. Both Gloucester and King Lear fail to recognize that the sign "nothing" has two meanings: negation and being because characterization calls for it. Both

Gloucester and Lear interpret "nothing" as destruction, and it is what they live through, while Cordelia and Kent constitute the opposite to restore King Lear's fallen kingdom

Gloucester's warning to Edmund saying “[f]ind out this villain, Edmund; it shall lose thee 'nothing,' do it carefully" may be interpreted in two ways. Gloucester may be giving Edmund his full consent to get Edgar back to the household for punishment. Alternatively, the warning may reveal the alternative meaning of the sign "nothing" that both Gloucester and Lear fail to recognize. The sentence could be rewritten to reflect the double-sided meaning of "nothing" like a major enigma: Find out this villain, Edmund. It shall lose thee (Gloucester himself) "nothing" (the world). Unfortunately, the moment of epiphany arrives after Gloucester is blinded by the help of his illegitimate son, Edmund.

In the translation analysis, the signs of *treason, late eclipse,* and *nature's bias* may be read as indications that Gloucester prophesizes the subversion and the decadence of old gods. When Gloucester refers to the late eclipses of the sun and the moon, it is quite probable that he articulates the fear that the old order would be destroyed. In Gloucester's reading, the late eclipses would signal the broken order of nature because they are unusual events. It is when the timing of the eclipses and phases of the moon and the sun are out of joint that the disasters may happen. It could be suspected that the natural law and order of things were also susceptible to destruction. Reference to the late eclipses of the sun and the moon may be read as an implicit way of expressing the possibility of the decadence of gods.

Nature's bias, in this respect, may be read as the natural law that governs the birth and death of human beings. Gloucester refers to nature as strictly tied to the behaviour of pagan gods such as Janus and Jupiter. The respect for genealogy is interpreted as the result of the natural law. Gloucester echoes King Lear's ancestor worship through the fear for the broken order as the decadence of worshipping the ancestors.

The sign of treason that Gloucester uses is related to pathos and the major enigma of "nothing" because treason in King Lear's kingdom would not be free of disrespect to genealogy. Edmund, Regan, and Goneril behave as the embodiment of treason because they aim to destroy the "natural" order that the kingdom was founded

upon. "Nothing" as an enigma, then, is the result of the broken natural order for honouring ancestors because it brings chaos to the kingdom. However, as a prominent component of the pathetic structure, the link between honouring ancestors and "nothing," is loosely presented. Moreover, Cordelia and Kent, as tragic characters, constitute the other component of "nothing," which has positive connotations in theology because life sprang out of chaos according to Christianity. [1]

The translations of the signs "in palaces: treason" as "saraylarda ihanet" (treason in palaces) in all target texts seem to be free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). However, "ihanet" in Turkish can be an translation to "treachery" used by Gloucester. In an emphatic speech like this, it may be appropriate to distinguish between treason and treachery. Treason is coming against the law in King Lear's kingdom, which could be exemplified through the actions of Edmund, Regan, and Goneril. In this respect, treachery in palaces can be read as an example of an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) in TT1 because insufficient information is provided. Moreover, the sign treason is equal to the actions against honouring the ancestors in Gloucester's speech, as explained above. In the proposed translation of treason as "vatana ihanet" (treason against the country) is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Nature's bias, on the other hand, may be read as a natural law, as stated above. However, what "the fall from the bias of nature" denotes is unclear. The bias of nature that Gloucester mentions could be read as pro-monarchical bias, the king's natural right to rule. In translations TT1 and TT2, the phrase was translated as "kral tabiat yolundan sapıyor" (the king puts the natural way aside) and in TT3 "kral doğal yoldan sapıyor" (the king puts the natural way aside), which do not openly refer to the king's natural right to rule. In the propsed translation that may cover both the natural way and the right to rule would be "mutlaki yetkileri devrediyor" (the king puts the royal duties aside) with a possible allusion to a change in the regime in King Lear's kingdom, from monarchy to oligarchy; this would result in over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because of the extra information.

Table 34: Example 31 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Edmund: Thou, Nature, art my goddess; to thy law My services are bound. Wherefore should I Stand in the plague of custom, and permit The curiosity of nations to deprive me? For that I am some twelve or fourteen moonshines Lag of a brother? Why bastard? Wherefore base? When my dimensions are as well compact, My mind as generous and my shape as true As honest madam's issue? Why brand they us With base? With baseness, bastardy? Base, base? 1.1. (Shakespeare, 2001, pp. 179-181)	Edmund:- Ey Tabiat! Benim tanrım sensin! ben senin kanunlarına kul köleyim. Kardeşimden on, on beş ay sonra dünyaya geldim diye niçin o baş belâsı göreneklerin gadrine uğrayayım? Toplumların o titiz hassasiyeti beni niçin haklarımdan mahrum bıraksın? Piçmişim alçağın, sefilin biriymişim, neden? Benim de namuslu, şerefli bir kadının evlâdı kadar hatlarım düzgün, ruhum asil değil mi? Bedenim babamın kalıbını taşımıyor mu? Öyleyse niçin piçlik, alçaklık damgası vuruluyor bize? (Shakespeare, 1959, pp.24-25)	Edmund: Ey Tabiat, tanrıçam sensin benim; Bense senin yasanın hizmetindeki bir köleyim. Öyleyse sırf bir kardeşten on on beş ay geç doğdum diye Niye göz yumacakmışım örfün başıma bela kesilmesine? Niye izin vereyim milletin lüzumsuz hassasiyetlerinin Beni hakkım olandan mahrum etmesine? Piçmişim, Alçağın, rezilin tekiymişim diye öyle mi, bak sen! Hem de namuslu bir hanımın evladı kadar endamım Yerinde, ruhum bir o kadar soyluyken? Neden piç yaftası vuruyorlar bize? Bu piçlik, soysuzluk, alçaklık, rezillik damgası niye? (Shakespeare, 2019, p.125)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Edmund: Ey doğa, benim tanrıçam sensin; Senin yasalarına göre davranırım ben. Sırf on iki ya da on dört ay Küçüğüm diye ağabeyimden Toplumun töreleri beni niye bağlasın. Niye mağdur etsin ulusların yasaları? Niye piç desinler, niye gayri meşru desinler bana? Enim boyum onunkinden farklı mı? En az iffetli kadın dölü kadar Aklım yerinde, bedenim zinde değil mi?	Edmund: Ey Doğa, tanrıçamsın, senin buyruğuna tabi bütün hareketlerim. Niye gelenek illetine uyup, toplumsal yasalarının beni hakkımdan mahrum etmesine izin vereyim? Sırf ağabeyimden on iki on dört ay geç doğdum diye neden gayrimeşru ve aşağı sınıf oluyorum? Eciş bücüş değilim, aklım fikrim yerinde, en az bir hanım evladı kadar yakışıklıyım. Niye gayrimeşru damgası yiyeyim? Hem aşağı sınıf hem de gayrimeşru! Aşağı sınıf ha!	

Niye piç damgası vururlar ki bize? Piç, piç! Neymiş bu piçlik? (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.36-37)		

Edmund's talk in Table 34 starts with praise to Goddess Nature and her laws. The relationship between nature and the laws signals the possible decadence of gods. It is Edmund who openly dismisses the law in King Lear's kingdom and embraces mother Nature *only*. It is, therefore, essential to see the difference between the natural law that Edmund mentions and the natural law to rule that governed King Lear's kingdom to honour his ancestors. Therefore, Edmund's worship of the natural law echoes that of Dionysian practices that would be condemned as evil on the Elizabethan stage.

The signs to look at are the "plague of custom", "curiosity of nations", and "an honest madam's issue", which may reveal the character's perspective. In his speech, for Edmund, the Natural Law is hierarchically higher than the law of nations. Therefore, he calls the custom not as trouble but as a plague. The sign plague in the sense that Edmund uses may also mean omen. In Edmund's gaze, customs are serious illnesses that may deprive a person of his birth right. We may sympathize with Edmund in this respect because he is right in his claim of the land of inheritance. However, the dichotomy of honouring ancestors and Dionysiac practices that pertain to uncontrollable instincts constitutes the background of the text. Edmund is presented as an evil character because he does not respect Gloucester, King Lear, and the foundations of pagan English society. Therefore, "nothing" is also a major enigma that signals chaos in the kingdom because the children disobey the customs.

In this respect, a curiosity of nations can be read as support to King Lear's way of management based on an elevated sense of belonging to the ancestors. "An honest madam's issue" is an expression in which Edmund admits himself to be born out of wedlock. The lack of a marriage bond between his mother and Gloucester turns the character Edmund into one of the negative components of pathos. He is at work for the arrival of "nothing" into the kingdom founded by King Lear. However, Edmund's enigmatic function is retained to the end of the text because he decides to help Cordelia and Lear to found a new kingdom. He cancels the order of death on them, which is too

late. Cordelia's death arrives as a trap for the reader because her death is so unreadily unexpected.

In the translations of these signs, the plague of custom stands out because the phrase is the embodiment of Edmund's hatred for the society that he lives in. In TT1, the phrase was translated as "o baş belâsı göreneklerin gadrine uğrayayım," (fallen by the wrath of damned customs) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), in TT2, "örfün başıma bela kesilmesine" (troubled by customs) as an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), in TT3 "toplumun töreleri beni niye bağlasın" (why should I be affected by the customs of nations) as an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) and in the proposed translation "gelenek illetine boyun eğmek" (stand in the plague of customs) free of meaning transformations.

The curiosity of nations in TT1 was translated as "toplumların o titiz hassasiyeti" (particular sensitivity of the nations) as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, "toplumların lüzumsuz hassasiyetlerinin" (unnecessary sensitivity of the nations) is an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3 "ulusların yasaları" (laws of nations) and in the proposed translation "toplumların yasaları" (laws of nations) bear no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

"An honest madam's issue" may be gazed whether the translation of the phrase is a reproduction of the misogynistic discourse. The phrase was translated in TT1 as "namuslu, şerefli bir kadının evlâdı" (the son of a chaste and honourable woman) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "namuslu bir hanımın evladı" (son of a chaste woman) as an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Because chastity was used instead of honesty in the source text "iffetli kadın dölü" (the offspring of a chaste woman) in TT3 it is is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The proposed translation provides an alternative as "hanım evladı" (son of a lady), which is more or less free of misogynistic discourse but is an example of under-interpretation.

4.3. Mythological and Iconographic Allusions in *King Lear* and its Translations

While questioning the significance of the study of iconography and mythology in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, reverberations of "nothing" takes place in a time before Christianity in England. In the conversation between King Lear and Cordelia, marked by the sign *"nothing"* reverberates as *a leitmotif* in the text as stated by Maurice Blanchot:

> 'Nothing' sets into motion the protagonist's and the play's departure from the closed realm of ritual into the uncertain world of theater. Unhinging Lear's ritualistic theater of sovereignty, '"nothing" throws the kingdom out of joint. The theater that is King Lear emerges precisely from this dislocation of the framework of sovereignty. Time itself is thrown out of joint insofar as time is understood in terms of the framework of a history of predictable sovereign succession. As agent of this dislocation, the signifier "nothing" will reverberate as leitmotif throughout the language of the play in the mouths of various characters. (Sun, 2010, p.23)

The sign "nothing" means existence for Cordelia because of the Creation myth in Christianity, while King Lear primarily relies on his interpretation of ancient Greek philosophy. Cordelia derives from Cordeilla, the daughter of the sea god Lir in Celtic Mythology. Her name could also be an indication that she was formerly connected to the supernatural. Moreover, Corde in Latin means heart, which ties her to the missing mother figure in the text. The *hysterica passio* of Lear and how pathetic elements are implemented in the text may explain *the double definition* of the character Cordelia.

These two sets of allusions serve to separate the worlds of the father, the king, and Cordelia. The use of iconographic data in Hamlet, for example, and Roman and Greek mythology, cannot be read through the same gaze as King Lear. In pathetic and enigmatic structure and characterization, *King Lear* is vastly different because the

mythological and iconographic data was crafted on the *double entendre* of the expression "nothing."

Evil and witchcraft are also defined as reverberations (signs) of "nothing" because King Lear openly addresses Hecate, the queen of the witches, as well as the sun, moon, and the planets. Hecate's mysteries complement this ancient pagan belief that was reformulated according to the division of identification of evil and honouring the ancestors in Shakespearean pathos. The evil women that King Lear condemns are Dionysian women, apart from Hecate and her followers. King Lear's belief system is on two opposite poles, like daytime and night, as well as foul and fair. The "the sacred radiance of the sun" and "all the operation of the orbs" that King Lear constantly refers to are contrary to the Renaissance gaze. King Lear's ambivalence may be read in the intolerance of King Lear to Cordelia, who openly refuses to flatter and honour her ancestor. Cordelia, as a pagan princess, cannot be solely studied on mythological terms. She was banished from the kingdom as if she were condemned to be a follower of dark magical practices. Shakespearean Lear categorizes women contrary to his pagan belief as damned. He is so ecstatic that he rips the natural bonds in a second with his daughter, Cordelia. The princess was banished simply because she fell into the wrong category.

Cordelia's name is critical to study in this respect because, in the earlier versions of the text, she was presented as Cordeilla, the daughter of the Celtic sea god Lir. However, a Latinized version of her name can be read as Corde: heart, illa: that through which King Lear's hysterica passio can be read. The name also has connections with the mother, who is non-existent in the text.

Cordelia's name itself bears conflicts between the mythological and iconographic data presentation, which could reflect the pathetic structure of the text. However, Cordelia's link with iconography is implicit. In other words, like Kent, the allusions to Cordelia's characterization are below the surface. It may not be explicitly claimed that Cordelia is the embodiment of Mother Mary, but traces of the idea of a saviour can be read through iconography. Noting that Cordelia's name bears associations with the concept of mother, it is understandable why she is depicted as the saviour.

King Lear's ideal kingdom is planned to be founded on the principle of honouring ancestors, which requires a kind of activity to drive the "demons" away. It is Cordelia who is the first to be driven away because she opposed the foundations of the new kingdom. As the plot unfolds, it is possible to analyse the reasons behind King Lear's fall from Kent's perspective. Old king seems to have confused the demons (Regan and Goneril) with the saviour (Cordelia). Through Kent's speech, it is possible to read the mythological and iconographic worlds as opposites. Unlike King Lear, the birth of hope is visible instead of destruction. Therefore, it can be said that Kent is the one to bring news of redemption to King Lear's fallen kingdom who can express himself both in mythological and iconographic terms.

It may be worth focusing on her silence before the banishment of Cordelia because she almost refuses to defend herself even after King Lear claims "her truth be her dower" (Shakespeare, 2001, p.165). There is a *double entendre* because the sign "truth" may also have iconographic meaning that King Lear cannot refer to. As a pagan king, he uses mythological references like the planets that decide about life and death.

Kent comes between "the dragon and his wrath" (Shakespeare, 2000, p.166) and questions the royal power of Lear as the greatest sin after Cordelia is banished. Lear, in turn, he swears by Jupiter not to accept Kent back also because he is out of the belief system of the kingdom. He is damned as "recreant" to mean disbeliever. In King Lear's gaze, Kent is now a threat to honouring his ancestors' ideal kingdom(s) principle. The banishment of Kent can be read as a proof of King Lear's intolerance towards the critical gaze of the foundations of his shrine.

Kent's speech after the banishment and his transition from the pagan context to iconographic is striking. It is an interesting talk because it is unclear whether Kent talks to himself, Cordelia, or King Lear. Lexicology is explicitly iconographic, and the context of the speech contains the signs like "heaven's benediction," "beacon," "beams" can be read as reverberations of light in the iconographic context. They may have numerous connotations in the Christian context. Kent gives an unexpected definition of "nothing," which is implicit as the harbinger of hope into King Lear's fallen kingdom. He pronounces it just before reading the letter, and Kent's interpretation of the sign "nothing" is close to Cordelia's interpretation of the sign. The

world pertains to "miracles" rather than misery. There will be "remedies" for the losses with the arrival of Cordelia as the saviour. Interestingly, Kent also calls out to the Roman goddess Fortuna, who turns the wheel to decide humankind's future. It may be read as evidence of his dedication to the goddess, along with iconographic allusions.

Kent sees hope in Cordelia's arrival in the fallen land and the goddess Fortuna's turning of the wheel. The wheel can also be associated with the dangers of ecstasy because King of Lapith was doomed to turn in a wheel of fire. In this respect, Kent's choice of pagan deities also presents the contrasts mentioned in *King Lear*. The negative presentation of deities and their representations on the Renaissance stage also marks Shakespearean pathos. Cordelia, as an example, is represented *only* through iconography because she is the female figure of a saviour. Therefore, in the Shakespearean version of the Lir story, the connection between Cordelia and Celtic mythology is lost. Cordeilla, the daughter of the Celtic Sea god Lir in the background, contradicts with iconography and the saviour image.

King Lear's fall may be read as the result of the destruction of hope (Cordelia) by a demon (Edmund) who was born under Ursa Major, the star of negatively portrayed deities:

> This is the excellent foppery of the world that when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behaviour, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars, as if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion, knaves, thieves, and treachers by spherical predominance, drunkards, liars, and adulterers by an enforced obedience of planetary influence, and all that we are evil in by a divine thrusting-on. An admirable evasion of whoremaster man, to lay his goatish disposition to the charge of a star. My father compounded with my mother under the dragon's tail and my nativity was under Ursa Major, so that it follows I am rough and lecherous. Fut! I should have been that I am, had the maidenliest star in the firmament twinkled on my bastardizing. (Shakespeare, 2001, p.186)

Edmund is never categorized like the queens Goneril and Regan, although he is greatly responsible for much of the violence in the text. Moreover, he is given a chance to explain the reasons behind his foulness: To have been born under a wrong star (Ursa Major) would be just enough to explain his drive to destroy his legitimate brother, Edgar.

On the other hand, in Regan and Goneril's case, we have two stereotypical women who aim at destroying their father's genealogy. According to the pathetic structure, they do not need much explanation for their malice because they are "bad on their own" for the attempts. Especially when King Lear claims "down, they have hell" to refer to their sexuality because the relationship with stereotypical Dionysian women and bestiality is readily available in the text:

> The fitchew, nor the soiled horse, goes to 't with a more riotous appetite. Down from the waist they are Centaurs, though women all above. But to the girdle do the gods inherit, beneath is all the fiend's: there's hell, there's darkness, there is the sulphurous pit, burning, scalding, stench, consumption! Fie, fie, fie! Pah, Pah! Give me an ounce of civet, good apothecary, to sweeten my imagination: there's money for thee. (Shakespeare, 2001, p.336)

All daughters, including Cordelia, are categorized according to the stereotypical image of wild Dionysiac women by King Lear because he attempts to *test* their loyalty. The image is associated with the crucible even before the conversation concerning the division of the crown is made. The mythological representation of the stereotypes (Regan and Goneril) serves as the background to pathos.

The mythological and iconographic information in the source and target texts reveals meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) that vary from one target text to another. In the context below, the connection to mythology is evident. King Lear's speech is full of shocking imagery that describes savageness. Interestingly, at the beginning of the speech, he combines religious rituals concerning the sun and

the night with light and dark imagery that may pertain to the reverberations of foul and fair in Shakespearean pathos.

The rituals of Hecate concerning the night may also be read as an allusion to the supernatural. As a theatrical text, King Lear is free of ghosts (Hamlet) or witches (Macbeth). Certain elements through which characters reveal their connection with magic (handkerchief in Othello) are important for pathos. Instead, it uses strong reverberations of contrasts like the sun and the night, paganism and Christianity, the legitimate or the illegitimate, and finally, Dionysian women (centaurs) and loyal Cordelia. To put it in other words, in *King Lear,* the idea of the supernatural is lacking, but the pathetic structure remains identical to other great tragedies. The four great tragedies were crafted similarly in terms of pathetic structure for the very purpose of painting a negative representation of Dionysian practices versus "the ideal" mindset of honouring the ancestors. The plot of *King Lear* is full of presentations and representations that form the core of dramatic tension. They come one after another for a substantial build work of suspense. Many critics claim *King Lear* to be weak in terms of the interwoven dramatic network because of many subplots, but the reverberations of foul and fair connect them. Mythological and iconographic references above are in direct relation to pathos and required an in-depth analysis. They are allusions to surface meaning in relation to pathos because it is impossible to see the relationship between them without putting them into a framework.

In this respect, it may help study the dramatic effect of the text because they contain most of the reverberations of foul and fair. The light and dark in Shakespearean tragedies can be used as the positive and negative categories to study allusions and references altogether. It may sound like references and allusions are confused but studying allusions separately outside the pathetic structure may only serve the purpose of a footnote study. The duality in the presentations and representations of *"nothing"* is also rooted in how mythological and iconographic data is implemented in the text.

The duality in the presentations and representations of "nothing" is also rooted in how mythological and iconographic data is implemented in the text. *King Lear*'s pathetic effect relies on decadence and hope simultaneously. The tragedy is on the cliffhanging of the arrival of hope, which is ultimately destroyed when Cordelia arrives

in King Lear's arms dead. The worlds that King Lear and Cordelia represent as tragic characters are distinct at the beginning because the former is mythological while the latter is iconographic. The dichotomy between the Dionysian cult and honouring ancestors is present in *King Lear*, although the context is pagan which reflects the deep-rooted prejudice of religious practices out of institutionalized ones. In King Lear's kingdom, the mysteries and practices of Hecate are acceptable because it is the complement of the sun, while he condemns his daughters as Centaurs and embodiment of hell. King Lear's politics interestingly parallels the English Renaissance because the idea of self-fashioning is undeniably dominant. Banishment of Kent and Cordelia relies upon how Lear categorizes them into traitors because Cordelia utters "nothing" while Kent "comes between the dragon and his wrath" (Shakespeare, 2010, 166) to support her.

Tendencies vary between translating the mythological and iconographic data or completely erasing them. It may be deduced that mythological data and allusions may at first be seen as an obstacle since mythological and iconographic allusions in Shakespearean tragedies are directly connected to pathetic structure, enigmas, and characterization. They constantly pertain to ″nothing", as the source of negation and coming into being. As far as negation is concerned, the text also parallels the structure of the Divine Comedy of Dante as Hell, Earth and Heaven in one:

> Although the play certainly permits this interpretation, such a reading detracts from the examination of King Lear as a study in the redemption of a man, a play which perhaps can be regarded as tragedy only if it is judged according to standards which it refutes, and a drama which is strikingly comparable to the Divine Comedy of Dante. Concluding his study of King Lear as Shakespeare's further development of the conflict between the authority of the past and that of the present, Harold Goddard has noted that King Lear is Hell, Earth, and Heaven in one. (Darwin, 1959, p. 28)

Therefore, it may cause an wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) to erase all mythological and iconographic allusions in the text. In

King Lear's speech, the tone is angry because we have an announcement of rejection of an offspring who refused to honor (almost worshipping) her genealogy. Cordelia's announcement of taking "half-my duty, half my care" with her to her husband's home is iconographic because, in King Lear's ideal kingdom, Cordelia's husband would also have to obey Lear's demands. In this respect, Cordelia's refusal is also a denial of the mythological background in King Lear's speech because the source of ancestor worship is the monument built for Janus. Cordelia refuses the pagan deities, and we can read her comeback through iconographic allusions in Kent's speech.

The signs to consider in Table 35 are truth, the mysteries of Hecate and the night, barbarous Scythian, and "he that makes his generation messes, to gorge his appetite. All these signs and phrases can be read either through the mythological or iconographic gaze. The phrase "mysteries of Hecate and the night" was translated as "Hekate'nin o gizli âyinleri üzerine" (on the secret rituals of Hecate) in TT1 as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because there is not a direct allusion to the rituals of magic in the source text. The phrase was translated as "Hekate'nin esrarlı gece ayinleri üstüne" (on that secret night rituals of Hecate) in TT2. This can be considered an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the rituals were explicitly stated to belong to the night which does not appear in the source text. In TT3, the phrase was translated as "Hecate'nin ve gecenin gizemli gücü" (the mysterious power of Hecate and the night) and "Hecate'nin ve gecenin gizemi" (the mystery of Hecate and the night) in the proposed translation which bears no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The name Hecate, the queen of the witches was present in all translations, although it was translated as Hekate, a Turkish form of the name. Over-interpretation as a meaning transformation is evident (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because what King Lear means as "the mysteries of Hecate and the night" is implicit in the source text. In other words, translating the sign "mystery" with the tendency of over-interpretation may cause a misunderstanding of the concept of magic and the supernatural in the text. King Lear is a text that exemplifies the decadence of all pagan gods which is critically important to consider.

Hecate and her mysteries can be read as symbols for light and dark for King Lear rather than worshipping Hecate herself. In other words, the sun, and the mysteries of Hecate, as complements to each other symbolize Lear's pagan beliefs. In the examples of over-interpretation, the reference to rituals of Hecate is explicit reference to the pagan belief and rituals of King Lear. Honouring ancestors flows through the pathetic structure of the text marked by the subtle categorization of royal daughters.

A creative choice had been made in the translation of the phrases "barbarous Scythian" and "he that makes his generation messes, to gorge his appetite." In TT1, the phrase "barbarous Scythian" (barbar İskitli) was completely erased, and the rest of the phrase was translated as "açlığını gidermek için çocuklarını yutan bir vahşi bile" (a savage who gobbles his children to gorge his appetite). It seems that the two phrases were combined to make one.

However, we have an alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) in TT1 because a false meaning that is not completely irrelevant to the meaning in the original text was produced. The existence of the sign vahşi (a savage) in TT3 is an over-interpretation of "barbarous Scythian."

The phrase itself is not a direct reference to mythology but the description of Scythians by Herodotus in Histories. The two phrases were conjoined possibly because King Lear refers to human sacrifice in religious rituals in that ancient culture. The sentence "he that makes his generation messes to gorge his appetite" may be read as a reference to Cronos, who has the habit of devouring his children.

In TT2, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "barbar İskitler/Yahut aç midesini doldurmak için/Kendi evladını yiyen yamyamlar bile" (barbarous Scythians or cannibals who fill their hungry stomachs with their offspring) which is also an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) . The sign "cannibals" does not explicitly exist in the text. As stated above, King Lear's speech may not be read as a proof that Scythians practiced cannibalism. Moreover, in this case, the possibility of reference to Cronos is erased.

In TT3, similarly, there is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the phrase was translated as "barbar İskitler ya da/ Acıkınca kendi ırkını yiyen yamyamlar" (barbarous Scythians or cannibals who fill his

hungry stomachs with their race). The imagery of filling in the stomach does not exist in the source text. The use of the sign "race" (ırk) looks awkward and it can be read as a sign that the metaphorical and mythological dimension of the text was somewhat disregarded.

In the proposed translation, the phrase was translated as, "Barbar İskitliyle, iştahını bastırmak için soyunu tüketen" and the sign race was erased and offspringwas used. In this translation, it is possible to link the imagery to Cronos, who devoured all his children except Zeus.

The study of mythological references should bring to mind the metaphorical dimension of the sign choice because they can be critical in translation evaluation. In this example, "barbarous Scythians" may not be read as a mythological reference. However, Renaissance readers (or readers today) may interpret the allusion as real acts of cannibalism. It is also fairly possible that Scythian, a culture outside Europe, may have been labelled as cannibals in the Early Modern context.The metaphor also supports the argument of this thesis because King Lear detests both he who devours his generation and she who devours her generation like Dionysian women1, an explicit reference to Regan and Goneril.

Table 35: Example 32 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lear: Well- let it be so. Thy truth then be thy dower, For by the sacred radiance of the sun, The mysteries of Hecate and the night, By all the operation of the orbs From whom we do exist and cease to be, Here I disclaim all my paternal care, Propinquity and property of blood? And as a stranger to my heart and me, Hold thee from this for ever, The barbarous Scythian,	Lear — Peki öyleyse! Dürüstlük mirasın olsun senin. Güneş'in o mukaddes nuru üzerine Hekate'nin o gizli âyinleri üzerine; hayata, ölüme hükmeden o yıldızlar üzerine yemin ediyorum ki, bugün, burada, bütün babalık vazifelerimden, akrabalık ve kan bağlarından sıyrılıyorum; ve seni şu andan itibaren bana ve kalbime yabancı sayıyorum. Şunu da bil ki, açlığını gidermek için çocuklarını yutan bir vahşi bile benim göğsümde senin kadar, bir zamanlar kızım olan senin kadar, yakınlık, merhamet ve teselli bulacaktır. (Shakespeare,1959, p.16)	Lear: Tamam, öyle diyelim. O zaman senin de çeyizin açık sözlülük olsun, Gökteki güneşin mukaddes şavkı üstüne Hekate'nin esrarlı gece ayinleri üstüne, Varoluşumuza ve ölümümüze hükmeden Gökcisimlerinin devinimi üstüne yemin ederim ki, An itibariyle tüm babalık hakkımdan feragat ediyor, Aramızdaki akrabalık ve kan bağını reddediyor, Seni yüreğime ve nefsime ebediyen yad sayıyorum

Or he that makes his generation messes, To gorge his appetite, shall to my bosom, Be as well neighboured, pitied and relieved, As thou my sometime daughter. 1.1. (Shakespeare, 2001, pp.165-166)		Bundan böyle. Bilesin ki, barbar İskitler Yahut aç midesini doldurmak için Kendi evladını yiyen yamyamlar bile Ancak senin, evvelce kızım olan senin kadar Muhabbet, merhamet ve avunç bulabilir benim sinemde. (Shakespeare, 2019, p. 109)
TT3 Lear: Öyle mi? Doğruluğun drahoman olsun o zaman! Güneşin kutsal ışınları adına, Hecate'nin ve gecenin gizemli gücü Ve varlıkla yokluğu belirleyen yıldızlar adına, Her türlü babalık yükümlülüğümü, Yakınlığımı ve kan bağımı geçersiz sayıyorum Ve şu andan itibaren sonsuza dek Seni kendime ve gönlüme yabancı biliyorum. Barbar İskitler ya da Acıkınca kendi ırkını yiyen yamyamlar Benim sabık kızımdan daha büyük yakınlık, Merhamet ve yardım görecekler benden. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.26)	**Proposed Translation** Lear: Öyle mi? Doğruluğunu drahoma diye götür o zaman, Güneş'in kutsal ışıklarıyla Hecate'nin ve gecenin gizemi, Yaşamamıza ve ölümümüze hükmeden yıldızların dönüşü üzerine yemin ederim ki, Kan bağımıza dair haklardan vazgeçerek seni evlatlıktan reddediyorum. Şahsıma ve ruhuma sonsuza dek yabancı olacaksın. Barbar İskitliyle, iştahını bastırmak için soyunu tüketeninki kadar merhamet ve ihsan ederim sana!	

In the context in Table 36, the signs to note are *hated* and *by Jupiter*. The phrase *hated* in TT1 was translated as iğrenç (disgusting) as an example of the over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). It was also translated as nefretlik (abhorred) in TT2, as kahrolası (damned) in TT3, which could be considered among the examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation the phrase was translated as

hasmane (hostile) because there is now a lot of tension between King Lear and the character Kent. The purpose of the talk is to point out the hostility towards Kent because of his intolerance towards the ones who think outside the borders of honouring the ancestors. Kent's back is hated because he is regarded as hostile towards the kingdom.

The phrase *by* Jupiter was retained in all translations except TT1. The connection between Kent's speech of hope and Lear's banishment which follows one another is lost and it is an example of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Table 36: Example 33 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lear: Hear me, Recreant, on thine allegiance, hear me: That thou hast sought to make us break our vows, Which we durst never yet, and with strained pride, To come betwixt our sentences and our power, Which, nor our nature, nor our place can bear, Our potency made good, take thy reward. Five days we do allot thee for provision, To shield thee from disasters of the world, And on the sixth to turn thy hated back Upon our kingdom. If on the next day following Thy banished trunk be found in our dominions, The moment is thy death. Away! By Jupiter, This shall not be revoked. 1.1.(Shakespeare,2001, pp.170-171)	Lear — Dinle beni hain; vaktiyle ettiğin sadakat yemini hakkı için dinle. Madem ki bizi şimdiye kadar göze almadığımız bir şeye, sözümüzden dönmeye, sürüklemek istedin; mademki o aşırı gururun sana kararımız ile iktidarımız arasına girmek, ne tabiatımızın, ne de mevkiimizin tahammül edemiyeceği böyle bir küstahIıkta bulunmak cüretini verdi, kudretimizin hışmıma uğra da hakettiğin mükâfatı gör: beş içinde hayatın zahmet ve meşakkatlerine gerebilmek için gereken hazırlıkları yapacaksın altıncı gün iğrenç sırtını krallığımıza çevirmiş olman gerek. Eğer onuncu gün, sürgün ettiğimiz o bedenin ülkelerimizde görülecek olursa kendini ölmüş bil. Defol hadi! Kararım kat'idir. (Shakespeare, 1959, p.18-19)	Lear: Beni dinle, hain! Ettiğin sadakat yemininin hakkı için dinle! Madem bizi Bugüne dek haşa meyletmediğimiz bir şeye sevkedip, Sözümüzden döndürmeye yeltendin ve Ne fıtratımızın ne de makamımızın hazmedemeyeceği Taşkın bir küstahlıkla kararımız ile sultamız arasına girmek cüretini gösterdin, Kudretimizin hışmından da nasibini alacaksın. Dünyanın türlü musibetinden korunman için gereken hazırlıkları yapasın diye beş gün mühlet veriyoruz sana, Lakin altıncı gün, dönmüş olacaksın o nefretlik sırtını krallığımıza. Onuncu gün gelip çattığında, sürgün yemiş gövden Topraklarımızda görülecek olursa, Kendini ölmüş bilesin o dakka. Hadi defol şimdi! Jüpiter şahidim olsun ki, Dönmeyeceğim bu kararımdan

		geri. (Shakespeare, 2019, p.113)
TT3 Lear: Beni dinle hain! Kendini bil ve beni dinle! Madem ettiğimiz yeminden döndürmeye çalıştın bizi— Ki bunu asla yapmayız – ve haddini aşan kibrinle Verdiğimiz cezayı kınama küstahlığında bulundun- Ki buna dayanmak ne bize yakışır Ne de kraliyet makamına-Gücümüzü küçümsemenin ödülünü dinle o zaman: Sana beş gün veriyoruz. Bu süre içinde pılını pırtını topla. Altıncı gün o kahrolası sırtını dön Ve krallığımızı terk et. Eğer onuncu gün Hâlâ topraklarımızdaysan kendini ölmüş bil. Git! Jüpiter hakkı için kararımız kesindir. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.29)	**Proposed Translation** Lear: Dinle beni hain, sadakat yeminini hatırla da dinle: Bizi ettiğimiz yeminden döndürmeye çalışsan da nafile. Hadsizlikle sözümüz ve gücümüz arasına girersen buna ne tabiatımız ne de mevkimiz müsaade eder: Kudretimiz nisbetince karşılığını vereceğiz. Sana karşılaşacağın melanetlere karşı hazırlanmak için beş gün süre. Altıncı gün lanetli sırtını krallığımıza dönmüş olacaksın. Eğer onuncu gün kovulmuş cismin topraklarımızda bulunursa, kendini ölmüş bil. Yıkıl karşımdan! Jüpiter adına için sözümden dönmeyeceğim!	

The speech in Table 37 involves both mythological and iconographic allusions. The phrases to consider are "Thou out of heaven's benediction com'st/To the warm sun", "give losses their remedies" and "Fortune, good night. Smile once more. Turn thy wheel" the contrast between the iconographic and mythological signs because they refer to two ways of reading of "nothing" by King Lear and Cordelia. The pathetic structure in Shakespearean Lear also lies in the contrast between the mythological and iconographic signs. The suffering of King Lear is obvious in many representations of his fall and mythological and iconographic allusions were crafted to reflect it. These allusions mirror the reasoning behind them to reflect the duality in the representations of *"nothing"* that reverberates both in source texts and their translations.

Kent's speech can be analysed in two ways since he refers to Fortuna (Goddess Fortuna in Roman Mythology) and implicitly speaks in a Christian context that has not arrived at the land yet. Kent is the only character who speaks in both jargons. His

phrases like "out of heaven's benediction" and "give losses their remedies" may be read in iconographic context rather than references to mythology. Kent almost announces the arrival of Cordelia into the land as the arrival of a female saviour who would put an end to corruption in the state. On the other hand, he refers to Fortuna at the end of his speech and interestingly to the wheel that all human beings were bound to. The resemblances between King Lear's references to Jupiter and Kent's reference to Fortuna are meaningful because she is often considered to be Jupiter's daughter. The concept of the wheel of Fortune was later Christianized. In King Lear, Kent is a character who is in-between the two worlds because of the duality of the pathetic structure of the text.

In TT1, the phrase "Thou out of heaven's benediction com'st/To the warm sun." was translated as "yağmurdan kaçayım derken doluya tutuldun" (you jumped out of a frying pan into the fire) as an example of the over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "varlıktan yokluğa düştü" (fell from riches to rags) as an example of the under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, the phrase was translated as "-bugün Tanrı'nın sevgili kuluyken insanoğlu, /yarın kızgın güneşin altında bulur kendini" and in the proposed translation "kutsandığı cennetten kovulan kızgın güneşte yanarmış." (he who is banished from heaven's benediction, burns under scorching sun) which do not bear any meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The phrase "gives losses their remedies" was translated as "bütün illetlerin ilâcı onda" (remedies of all malice is in her) in TT1. Similarly, in the proposed translation the phrase was translated as "dertlilere çare olacağını söylüyor" (she says she will bring remedies to the ones in distress) which bears no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "yaşanan zayiata bir çare düşünüp/ bulacağını söylüyor" (she says she will think and take care of the losses)" and in TT3 "işleri yoluna koyma fırsatı buluyorum" (I find the opportunity to take care of issues) which are examples of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the iconographic allusion is not retained.

The phrase "fortune, good night. Smile once more. Turn thy wheel" can be read mostly as a reference to mythology. Translators did not openly refer to goddess

Fortuna but made use of personification as fate in Turkish. The synonym for *talih* (fortune) has positive connotations while *kader* (fate) has negative. Moreover, it was not preferred possibly because it is mostly used in connection with a religious understanding. None of the translations bear designificative tendencies in translation of the context with those signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "hayırlı geceler, ey talih! bir kere daha gülsen yüzüme… döndürsene çarkını" in TT1 and "ey talih iyi geceler sana. çarkını döndür de, bir kere daha gül yüzümüze" in TT2 and in TT3 "iyi geceler, Talih, bir kere daha gül yüzüme, döndür şu çarkını yeniden" which are almost translation to each other. In the proposed translation, the phrase was translated as "Talih Tanrıçası, çarkını çevirirken bari bu defa gül yüzüme!" which bears no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The translation of Fortune as "Talih Tanrıçası" (Goddess Fortuna) is not an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because Fortuna is known to be a goddess in the Roman world.

Table 37: Example 34 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Kent: Good King, that must approve the common saw, Thou out of heaven's benediction com'st To the warm sun. Approach, thou beacon to this under-globe, That by thy comfortable beams I may Peruse this letter. "nothing" almost sees miracles But misery. I know 'tis from Cordelia, Who hath most fortunately been informed Of my obscurèd course (reading the letter) and "shall find time From this enormous state, seeking to give Losses their remedies." All weary and o'erwatched,	Kent — İyi yürekli 'kralım: yağmurdan kaçayım derken doluya tutuldun; ata sözünü ispat sana da nasipmiş demek… Ey dünyamızın feneri, biraz yaklaş da, ışığının yardımıyla şu mektubu okuyayım. Mucize beklemek sefalete vergidir: Cordelia'nın yazısı bu… tanıdım... Kılık değiştirdiğimi iyi bir tesadüfle öğrenmiş olacak. Sürüp giden bu kanunsuzluk ve düzensizliklerden bir yolunu bulup o kurtaracak bizi… bütün illetlerin ilâcı onda. Yorgunluktan, uykusuzluktan ağırlaşan gözlerim; fırsat bu fırsat: kapanın da bu utanç verici halimi görmeyin. Hayırlı geceler, ey talih! Bir kere daha gülsen yüzüme… döndürsene çarkını… (Uyur) (Shakespeare,1959, pp.67-68)	Kent: Ah, soylu kralım, hani derler ya, Varlıktan yokluğa düştü diye, öyle oldu seninki de. Göklerin altındaki kürenin feneri, yaklaş da, Şu mektubu okuyayım senin müşfik ışığında. Ancak çaresizlere nasiptir mucizeler. Cordelia'dan geliyor mektup, anladım; Şükür ki, öğrenmiş kılık değiştirerek işe giriştiğimi. Bu keşmekeşten uzakta, Yaşanan zayiata bir çare düşünüp bulacağını söylüyor mektubunda. Yorgunluktan, uykusuzluktan Ağırlaşan gözlerim, hazır fırsat varken kapanın da, Bu Utanç verici meskenimi görmeyin. Ey talih iyi geceler sana.

Take vantage, heavy eyes, not to behold This shameful lodging. Fortune, good night. Smile once more. Turn thy wheel. 2.2. (Shakespeare, 2001, pp. 235-236)		Çarkını döndür de, bir kere daha gül yüzümüze. (Uyur) (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.191-193)
TT3 Kent: Aziz Kral, ne demişler. Bugün Tann'nın sevgili kuluyken insanoğlu, Yarın kızgın güneşin altında bulur kendini. Yaklaş yeryüzünün kılavuz ışığı yaklaş ki Huzur veren aydınlığında şu mektuba bir bakayım. Mucizeler acı çekene görünür yalnız. Biliyorum, Cordelia'dan bu mektup. Neyse ki benim gizli görevimi öğrendi. (Okur.) "Oradaki korkunç şartlardan uzak, Burada işleri yoluna koyma fırsatı buluyorum. Yorgun ve uykusuzum, gözlerim kapanıyor. Hem dinlenmiş olurum uyurken Hem de bu utanç verici barınağı Görmek zorunda kalmam hiç değilse. İyi geceler, Talih, bir kere daha gül yüzüme, Döndür şu çarkını yeniden. (Uyur.) (Shakespeare,2020, pp.81-82)	**Proposed Translation** Kent: Merhametli kralım, hani derler ya, kutsandığı cennetten Kovulan kızgın güneşte yanarmış. Yaklaş ve kılavuzluk et bu dünyaya ki, şefkat saçan ışığınla şu mektuba bir göz atayım. Dünyada mucizeden çok acı var. Bunun Cordelia'dan olduğunu sanıyorum. Tebdil gezdiğimi iyi bir tesadüf eseri öğrenmiş olmalı. (Mektubu okur) " hırgürden uzakta, dertlilere çare olacağını söylüyor" söylüyor. Bitkin ve uykusuzum. Gözlerim kapansın da artık bu sefil barınağı görmeyeyim. İyi geceler, Talih Tanrıçası, çarkını çevirirken bari bu defa gül yüzüme!	

In Turkish, explaining the idea of fortune through Roman mythology is not common. On the other hand, the mythological allusion to the Goddess Fortuna, as the daughter of Jupiter and controller of human destiny as Fortuna Primigenia is evident in the source text. To repeat, Shakespearean pathos in *King Lear* is marked by

reverberations of the duality of "nothing". In Kent's speech, therefore, both mythology and iconography exist to refer to both decadence of King Lear and the arrival of a saviour into the fallen land.

4.4. Veridictory Modalities in *King Lear* and its Translations

In *King Lear*, veridictory modalities (seeming/being) are modelled around physical and psychological blindness, reminding us of Oedipus Rex by Sophocles. Similarly, King Lear's hubris in the Aristotelean sense results in his downfall and the blindness of Gloucester. Father to both a legitimate and an illegitimate son, Gloucester is in the limbo world because a wrong choice could cost him his life. There is a paradoxical relationship between seeming and being in the text because the children who seem to disobey their fathers (Cordelia and Edgar) prove themselves to be honouring their ancestors and protectors of pagan English kingdom.

The seeming/being relationship is also related to how Lear and Gloucester categorize their children according to the principles of the shrine of honouring ancestors. Cordelia's lack of expressing herself in the presence of King Lear is interpreted as a sign to disobey the pagan gods as well as the king. Cordelia's banishment on a seeming act of disobedience and Edgar's condemnation are on common grounds. Both Gloucester and Lear are tricked by what seems to be contrary to their presence because of being blinded by the devotion to the principles of the shrine and patriarchal gaze. King Lear and Gloucester misjudge their well-intentioned kids and condemn them.

Interestingly, at the end of the text, Edgar condemns his father back in his expression after the final duel. He pays the price of coming against the legal ties of marriage out of the principles and borders set by the king and the state. As stated by Northrop Frye, legal ties of marriage are also questioned in terms of moral justice by the future king of England, Edgar:

> After he strikes down Edmund in the final duel, he remarks that the gods are just, and that Gloucester's blindness was the inevitable result of going into a whorehouse to beget Edmund. (I feel very sorry for Edmund's mother, who seems to me to get a quite undeservedly bad press.) Even though Edmund agrees

> with the statement, it doesn't make much of a point, as we're explicitly told that Goneril and Regan were "got 'tween lawful sheets." In fact, the whole relation between Gloucester and the Lear tragedies seems to have something of a contrast between an explicable and an inexplicable disaster. The Gloucester tragedy perhaps can—just—be explained in moral terms; the Lear tragedy cannot. (Frye,1986, p. 23)

Above we have the explanation of Gloucester's blurry perception of the relationship between seeming and being. As Gloucester fails to see who the loyal heir to him is, he confuses seeming with being. King Lear's case, who banishes Cordelia, her most suitable heir, is also an example of it. It *seems* that she went against the principles set by her father with her silence as the proof that she will not honour her ancestors. Cordelia seems to be a rebel because of her lack of explaining herself. She is banished from the country that she would inherit. Regan and Goneril, on the other hand, hide behind flatter and seem to be suitable heirs to Lear's principles of honouring ancestors. Lear finds his most suitable heir and *sees* the truth when he can grasp (although he is almost a non-subject) the relationship between seeming and being after Cordelia comes back. The context exemplifies Lear's moment of epiphany, to confess that Cordelia was misunderstood after sisters prove themselves to be unsuitable heirs to King Lear.

There are two signs to consider in Table 38 in terms of translation, which are "your tears wet" and "Yes, faith". The expression "yes faith" was not translated in TT1, which is an example of wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "evet hakikaten öyle" (Yes, it is really so), which is free of designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "evet öyle" (yes, that's it) and in the proposed translation "gerçekten öyle" (it is really so), which are free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "your tears wet" was translated in TT1 as "yaş mı var gözümde" (do I have tears in my eyes), which is an example of the opposition of the meaning (Öztürk

Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because there is no allusion to King Lear's tears in the source text, which is an example of the opposition of the meaning also in microcontextual level because there is no allusion to King Lear's tears in the source text. However, it uses a misunderstanding of the meaning in the source text. In TT2, the phrase was translated as "senin gözyaşın mı yoksa" (are these your tears) free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "gözyaşları gerçek mi" (are these tears real) and in proposed translation "gözyaşların gerçek mi" (are your tears real) are also free of designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Table 38: Example 35 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lear: Be your tears wet? Yes, faith; I pray weep not. If you have poison for me, I will drink it. I know you do not love me, for your sisters Have, as I do remember, done me wrong. You have some cause, they have not. 4.7.(Shakespeare, 2001, p.355)	Lear: Ne o, yaş mı var gözümde? Yoo ağlama!...Zehrin varsa ver içeyim. Biliyorum beni sevmezsin; çünkü hatırlayabildiğim kadarı, kardeşlerin bana kötülük etti; sen olsaydın hadi, ortada bir sebep var derdim, ama onlar… (Shakespeare, 1959, p.146)	Lear: Bunlar senin gözyaşın mı yoksa? Evet hakikaten öyle; Yalvarırım ağlama. Zehrin varsa getir içeyim. Biliyorum beni sevmediğini. Hatırladığım kadarıyla, Ablaların da haksızlık ettiler bana. Senin nefret etmek için bir nedenin var, Onların o da yoktu oysa. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.323-325)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Lear: Bu gözyaşları gerçek mi? Evet öyle. Ne olur ağlama. Yanında zehir varsa ver içeyim. Biliyorum beni sevmiyorsun. Yanlış hatırlamıyorsam ablaların bana haksızlık etti. Senin gerekçen var ama onların yok. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.170)	Lear: Gözyaşların gerçek mi? Gerçekten de öyle, yalvarırım ağlama. Zehirin varsa, ver içeyim. Biliyorum sevmiyorsun beni Hatırladığım kadarıyla bana ihanet eden ablaların yüzünden. Onların nedenleri yoktu, oysa senin var.	

4.5. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *King Lear* and its Translations

Studying signs of insanity may look obvious to most critics for the study of four great tragedies, but the definition of insanity in the text may be challenging. There are two types of insanity in the text, one Lear's and the other is Edgar's. The latter is a feigned one, like Hamlet, which can be described as an antic disposition. The focus of the transformations of the subject is not the "madness" of Edgar, as the future king of England. Disguised as Tom O'Bedlam, Edgar is the *negation* of the shamanic attempt for rebirth rather than referring to the practice of initiation. King Lear's madness, which can at times be described as close to the concept of non-subject(Öztürk Kasar, 2017, 186-189) marks the failure of rebirth in the sense that Northrop Frye uses. Madness will be studied using Jean Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.186-189), Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-subjects (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.189-195). The typology of non-subjects provides a framework to study subject transformations (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-190). The transformation of Lear will be explained in terms of a non-subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 186-189). It can be deduced that Edgar's madness is feigned because it is a disguise for him. In this case, he is not a non-subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 186-189). Lear moves to being and acting as a non-subject under dysphoria (Greimas and Courtés 1982, p.96) when he is rejected by Regan and Goneril. Under the effect of dysphoria, (Greimas and Courtés 1982, p.96) it is possible to move to being a non-subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.186-189). Lear's anger is also caused by the decadence of the pagan gods after he is dethroned.

Lear's madness can firstly be read in connection with the jester. Paradoxically, it is the jester who tries to speak sensibly and the truth in reversed sentences and verse. It may be read as the indication that he is aiming "to madden the bewildered old monarch" and "labor to destroy Lear's sanity" (Shakespeare, 2001, p.5). The comments of the jester have a profound effect on Lear, as stated by Coleridge and quoted by Harold Bloom:

> As Coleridge noted, the Fool joins himself to the pathos or suffering of the drama; he does not stand apart in a jester's role. Yet Shakespeare excludes the Fool from the tragedy of Lear and Cordelia; the Fool simply drops out of the play, notoriously without explanation. (Bloom, 2010, p.4)

The numerous allusions and the jester's comments to King Lear's madness may be read as efforts to bring some sense to his actions at first. However, the jester's aim of terrorizing Lear reveals itself in the play of words:

> The Fool's dramatic function, like Horatio's, is partly to be a surrogate for the audience, mediating Lear's sublimity for us even as Horatio mediates the sublime aspects of Hamlet. The Fool and Horatio are floating presences, rather than proper characters in themselves. Horatio's only affect, besides his love for Hamlet, is his capacity for wonder, while the Fool's love for Lear is accompanied by a capacity for terror, on Lear's behalf as on his own. (Bloom, 2010, p.4)

Similarly, the jester is fuelling his anger through ambivalent words because he aims at making the king vulnerable, as put by Harold Bloom:

> Those who hate the king are monsters of the deep: Goneril, Regan, Cornwall. That leaves Lear's Fool, who loves the king, yet also manifests an uncanny ambivalence toward his master. The Fool, at once Lear's fourth child and his tormentor, is one of the two great ref lectors of the king in the play (Bloom, 2010, p.7).

The feigned madness of Edgar, on the other hand, is connected to the the subplot, his half-brother Edmund openly claims himself to be in connection with evil spirits. The contrast between the idea of holiness and the evil magic is so evident in the text that Edmund, who speaks mostly in pagan terms, describes himself as having been born "under the dragon's tail" as "overtones of evil, as Satan was called. Edgar's feigned madness is quite different from Hamlet's because Tom O'Bedlam is close to Lear in madness (he describes himself on a wheel of fire, like King of Lapith, Ixion, for seducing Juno). Alternatively, the wheel of fire can be read as a metaphor for the sun, worshipped in pagan times. Moreover, Edgar claims the blinding of Gloucester was the result of his consummation with Edmund's mother under the wrong star. Edgar, who becomes the next English king, totally complies with the norms set by

King Lear. As stated by Harold Bloom, the pathetic structure of the text is inevitably centred around the theme of honouring the ancestors even in feigned madness:

> His enemy half-brother, Edmund, designs the entire drama. How is Edmund to be defeated? With a genius for negativity, the outcast Edgar goes downward and outward to become Tom O'Bedlam, and then a discarded serving man, and finally a black knight without a name, to avenge himself and his father on Edmund and his cohorts. Edgar's quest, like Hamlet's, is to sustain the honor of the father and of the god-father, Lear. It can be said that Edgar does a better job than Hamlet does, but at a very high price, for himself and for his father, Gloucester. (Bloom, 2010, p.2)

On the other hand, his relationship with Edmund puts Gloucester into the position of the father for the possessed. To drive the demon away and legitimize himself, Edmund helps Cornwall to gauge his father's eyes, which can also be read as an act of exorcism. Therefore, Edgar is aware of his connection with the supernatural. He imitates to be one and does not turn into a total non-subject. Therefore, his madness is not a reflection of his wish for "rebirth". Interesting, he takes place of the jester, (The Fool) to guide Lear in his mock shamanic journey for the "rebirth" as the new the king of England. The actual connection to the supernatural, be non-existent but driving demons away is explicitly exemplified in the exorcism on Gloucester. Moreover, the madness of Tom O'Bedlam is connected to the supernatural because the imagery is reminiscent of a psychic journey as Frye claims:

> This kind of imagery reminds us of certain primitive poets and magicians, like the "shamans" of central Asia, who go through long initiations that involve journeys to upper and lower worlds. We are now in a world where all knowledge of anything "spiritual" or otherworldly has been degraded to Po or Tom's fiends, his nightmare with her ninefold, his dark tower of Childe Roland, and other phantasms linked to the night and the storm. (Frye, 1986, p. 118)

However, Tom O'Bedlam (Edgar) in *King Lear* is not so often visited by fiends to imitate initiations of magicians, who go through the ceremony because of the rebirth of Edgar, as a mad figure, collects all the metaphorical and physical qualities of madness to *negate* them. If we read Edgar's madness as a journey of initiation, Edgar's madness is feigned because he imitates Tom O'Bedlam to *disappear* inside the stereotype. His perfect imitation of the speeches of Tom O'Bedlams may be read as a strong marker that he is almost dissolved into "nothingness". On the contrary, Edgar goes through no journey of initiation because he would immediately fall out of the category of honouring ancestors. Instead, Edgar disguises himself as a beast that lacks reason in the very Early modern sense:

> It should be clear from all this that the question "What is a natural man?" has two answers. On his own proper human level it is natural to man to be clothed, sociable and reasonable. When Goneril and Regan keep asking Lear why he needs all those knights, the first part of his answer, in the speech beginning "Oh, reason not the need," is a quite coherent statement of the fact that civilized life is not based simply on needs. But in this storm world that Lear is descending into, what is natural man like? Lear has hardly begun to formulate the question when Poor Tom appears as the answer to it. "Didst thou give all to thy two daughters?" Lear asks, still preoccupied with his own concerns. But we're getting down now to the underside of the Goneril–Regan world:
>
> Poor Tom, that eats the swimming frog, the toad, the tadpole, the wall-newt and the water; that in the fury of his heart, when the foul fi end rages, eats cow-dung for sallets, swallows the old rat and the ditch-dog; drinks the green mantle of the standing pool (Frye, 1986, p. 19)

Tom O'Bedlam figure is an anti-Christ (Greenblatt) in the Renaissance sense and a stereotype of evil from the crucible of witches that reverberates all through the text. As Lear asks, "What is a man?" the answer is partly Tom O'Bedlam and partly

Edgar because, in King Lear's pagan understanding of the supernatural as the sun God Jupiter and Hecate has turned him away from man. A bestial-like creature like Tom O'Bedlam gives him the care, support, and protection he has been longing for. It is King Lear who loses grasp of reality to confuse the future king Edgar with Tom O' Bedlam. As Lear claims that Tom O'Bedlam is "the thing itself" he undresses his regal clothes because he has also been reduced to a poor Tom who is a parody of free human beings as claimed by Frye:

> The imagery creates a world more nauseating than Hamlet ever dreamed of. "Is man no more than this?", Lear asks. In a way Poor Tom is a kind of ghastly parody of a free man, because he owes "nothing" to the amenities of civilization. Lear is reminded that he still has at least clothes and starts tearing them off to be level with Poor Tom, but he is distracted from this. He says in a miracle of condensed verbal power: "Thou art the thing itself." He has started at one end of nature and ended at the other, and now his downward journey has reached a terminus. Perhaps one of Edgar's motives in assuming his Poor Tom disguise was to provide a solid bottom for Lear's descent. Below or behind him is the chaos-world portended by the storm: the world of the furies and fiends that Edgar is keeping Lear protected from, just as he protects Gloucester later from the self-destructive "fiend" that wants to hurl him over a cliff. (Frye. 1986, p.181)

In contrast, as the future king of England Edgar disguises himself as a beggar called Tom'o Bedlam. The reference to "Bedlam hospital for the insane" and the fear of the evil of the Renaissance society seems to have been embodied in Tom O Bedlams because they looked like beasts and were not as fully accommodated as men. As described by Edgar, the "patients" who go through the processes in the hospital escape to urban areas where they would become beggars. Therefore, the scene that Lear undresses as a pagan king is the peak of Shakespearean pathos. Lear as a pagan king was recreated in the image of Tom O'Bedlam, an *abject* in Kristevan sense (Kristeva, 1982, p.18) and an Antichrist (Greenblatt, 2012, p.9). Edgar's speech gives a very

detailed description of Tom O'Bedlams' physical and mental states who were driven away from the Renaissance society.

However, a semiotic analysis of Edgar's speech reveals his mimicking the physical and psychological torture that they had in the institution. Their songs can be read as the reverberations from the crucible of witches, and their voices are heard as they escape from the institution. These people may also mimic Turlipins, whose leader was burnt at stake as a witch. They lived in rags half-naked to respect the poor because Edgar calls himself "Poor Turlygod" although he does not go through the sleep as King Lear does.

Table 39: Example 36 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Edgar: I heard myself proclaimed, And by the happy hollow of a tree Escaped the hunt. No port is free, no place That guard and most unusual vigilance Does not attend my taking. Whiles I may 'scape, I will preserve myself, and am bethought To take the basest and most poorest shape That ever penury in contempt of man Brought near to beast. My face I'll grime with filth, Blanket my loins, elf all my hair in knots, And with presented nakedness outface The winds and persecutions of the sky. The country gives me proof and precedent Of Bedlam beggars, who with roaring voices,	Edgar – Hakkımda verilen kararı ilân ettiler, işittim; ve ancak bahtın önüme çıkardığı bir ağaç kovuğu sayesinde peşimdekilerden kurtulabildim. Bütün yollar kapalı bana artık; her yerde, 'gördükleri anda yakama yapışacak uyanık, acar nöbetçiler var. Kaçabildiğim müddetçe canımı kurtarabilirim. Zaruret, insanın ne aşağılık bir mahlûk olduğunu yüzüne çarpmak ister gibi, onu, hayvana en çok yaklaştıran sefil bir kılığa sokar; ben de bu kılığa girmeği düşündüm. Yüzümü çamura bularım; belime bez sarar; saçlarımı düğüm düğüm, karmakarışık eder; göklerin saldığı bütün afet ve belâlara çırılçıplak, uluorta göğüs gererim, Memleketimizde tımarhane kaçkını dilenciler önce de vardı, şimdi de var, Acı acı bağırırlar; uyuşmuş, acı duymaz olmuş çıplak kollarına iğneler, kıymıklar, çivi, dikenli dallar saplarlar, ve bu korkunç görünüşleriyle, fakir çiftlikleri. Sefil köyleri, ağıl ve değirmenleri dolaşır; kâh delice lanetlerle, kâh dualar ederek merhameti zorlarlar. Ben de böyle bir dilenci olurum. Zavalı Tom derler bana. Zavallı Tom! Ancak bu yolda bir kurtuluş	Edgar: Hakkımda yakalama karan çıkardıklarını duydum, Şans eseri bir ağacın kovuğuna sığındım da av olmaktan öyle kurtuldum. Bütün çıkış yollan tutulmuş, Kaçacak yer yok ve beni yakalamak için Kaçabildiğim kadar kaçıp kurtaracağım canımı Ve sefaletin insan denen şu kibirli mahluku Hayvana yaklaştırdığı en aşağı en yoksul kılığa Sokacağım kendimi. Yüzümü kire bulayacak, Belime paçavralar saracak, Saçlarını düğüm düğüm yapacak Ve çıkan fırtınaya, gökten gelen her belaya, Meydan okuyacağım çıplaklığımla. Nasılsa Bedlam kaçkını dilenciler Oldu bitti vardı memlekette; Hani artık bir şey hissetmez olmuş, Çürük kaplı cavlak kollarına iğneler,

Strike in their numbed and mortified bare arms Pins, wooden pricks, nails, sprigs of rosemary, And with this horrible object from low farms, Poor pelting villages, sheepcotes, and mills, Sometime with lunatic bans, sometime with prayers, Enforce their charity. "Poor Turlygod!" "Poor Tom!"— That's something yet. Edgar I "nothing" am. 2.2. (Shakespeare, 2001, pp. 237-238)	ümidi var; Edgar olarak kalmak yok olmak demektir. (Shakespeare,1959, pp.68-69)	Sivri tahtalar, çiviler, biberiye dikenleri saplarken İnim inim inler de, o yüzüne bakılmaz halleriyle Kıraç çiftlikleri fakirlikten perişan olmuş köyleri, Ağılları ve değirmenleri dolaşıp, Kah deli deli beddualar savurarak, Kah dualarla yakarak sadaka koparırlar, Tanrı aşkına yok mu sadaka veren şu zavallı çulsuza! Çulsuz Tom'dur adım! Hiç olmazsa bir adım var böyle; Edgar olarak bir hiçten ibaret olduğuma göre. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.193-195)
TT3 Edgar: Kanun kaçağı ilan edildim. Neyse ki bir ağaç kovuğuna saklanıp Peşindekileri atlattım. Hiçbir liman, hiçbir yer güvenli Köşe bucak aranıyorum. Bir yolunu bulup kaçana kadar saklanmalıyım Bu uğurda insanoğlunun gördüğü en sefil, Hatta hayvandan farksız kılıklara girmeye razıyım Suratımı çamurla sıvayacağım, Kasıklarıma bir çaput bağlayıp Saçlarımı keçe gibi düğüm düğüm yapacağım, Ve olan çıplaklığımla rüzgâra, yağmura, Gökten inecek ne varsa hepsine meydan Ne tımarhane kaçkını berduşlar gördüm, Etrafta sarsak adımlarla böğüre böğüre dolaşırken,	**Proposed Translation** Edgar: Adıma çıkarılan arama emrini duydum, karşıma şans eseri çıkan bu ağaç kovuğuna saklandım. Hiçbir mekan ve liman beni koruyacak kadar güvenli değil ve en ihtiyatlı davranış bile yetersiz kalacak. Kendimi korumak için görülebilecek en aşağı ve sefil görünüme bürüneceğim, öyle ki daha önce hiçbir insan bir hayvana cismen bu kadar benzememiştir. Yüzümü pislikle kapatıp, belime çaput bağlarım. Saçlarımı arapsaçı gibi düğüm düğüm yapar, ve yarı-çıplak bedenimle gökten inecek lanetlerle rüzgara karşı dururum. Bu memlekette şu böğürüp duran Bedlam dilencileri yok mu,mosmor, hissiz kollarına iğne, kıymık, çivi ve biberiye sürgünleri saplarlar, Korkunç durumda küçük çifliklerden, yoksul, sefil köylülerden, koyun ağıllarından Kah deliler gibi haykırarak, kah dua ederek sadaka isterler. Zavallı çıplak, kaçık dilenci!	

Uyuşmuş, çürük içinde kollarına İğne, diken, çivi, biberiye çöpü saplıyor Ve o halde çiftliklerden, zavallı yoksul köylerden, Koyun ağıllarından, değirmenlerden, Arada bir çılgınca bağırıp çağırarak, Bazen dua ederek insanları ürkütüp Sadaka istiyorlardı. Zavallı Tom! Kaçık Tom! Ben buyum artık, Edgar yok bundan böyle. (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.82-83)	Zavallı Tom! -o bile bir şeyken ben Edgar, artık hiçbirşeyim!

When we look at translations of certain signs in Edgar's speech in Table 39, translations of "lunatic bans", and "elf my hair in knots" vary. The phrase "lunatic bans" was translated in TT1 as "delice lanetlerle" (with maddened curses) in TT2, the phrase was translated as "deli deli beddualar savurarak" (cursing like madmen) in the proposed translation "deliler gibi beddua ederek" (cursing like madmen), which bear no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, pp.170-18). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "çılgınca bağırıp çağırarak" (screaming like madmen), as an example of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign ban, which is a sign of madness, is erased.

The sign "elf my hair in knots" was translated in TT1 as "saçlarımı düğüm düğüm, karmakarışık eder" (make my hair tangled in knots), in TT2 as "saçlarını düğüm düğüm yapacak" (put his hair in knots) which bear no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "saçlarımı keçe gibi düğüm düğüm yapacağım" (I will make my hair like felt in knots), which is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In proposed translation "arapsaçı gibi düğüm düğüm yapar," (pur my hair in knots like an Arab) is an example of over-interpretation.

All these phrases are descriptive of Tom O'Bedlams as stereotypes. However, it is critical to consider each phrase from the perspective of semiotics of translation.

Lunatic bans can be explained in association of madness with the movements of the moon. "Elf my hair in knots" may be read as an allusion to the supernatural because of the sign elf. (It is possible to see the relationship with Queen Mab, who tangles people's hair).

The speech in Table 40 exemplifies his moving towards being a non-subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.186-189) because he is unable to recognize himself in the mirror. Therefore, madness can be traced in King Lear's *phusis* (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, 186-189) as the result of dysphoria.

Table 40: Example 37 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lear: Does any here know me? Why, this is not Lear. Does Lear walk thus? Speak thus? Where are his eyes? Either his notion weakens, or his discernings are lethargied. -Ha!, sleeping or waking? Sure, 'tis not so. Who is it that can tell me who I am? Fool: Lear's shadow. 1.4. (Shakespeare, 2001, p. 204)	Lear -Beni tanıyan kimse var mı burada? Ben Lear değilim her halde. Lear böyle mi yürür? Böyle mi konuşur? Gözleri nerede? Lear ya bunadı, ya beyni uyuştu da idraki kalmadı. Uyanık mıyım ben? imkânı yok... biriniz söylemez mi bana, ben kimim? Soytarı – Lear'ın gölgesi. (Shakespeare, 1959, p.45)	Lear: Alla'sen tanıyan var mı beni burada? Bu konuşan Lear değil zira. Böyle mi yürür Lear? Böyle mi konuşur? Gözleri nerede? Ya aklı kıtlaştı bu Lear'ın ya da beyni uyuştu, muhakemesini yitirdi. Şu an uyanık mıyım ben, ha? Yo, mümkünatı yok. Kimim ben, biriniz bana söylese ya? Soytarı: Lear'ın gölgesi? (Shakespeare,2019, p.155)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Lear: Beni tanıyan yok mu burada? Bu Lear değil. Lear böyle mi yürür? Böyle mi konuşur? Gözleri nerede? Ya aklı gidiyor ya da beyni uyuştu. Uyanık mıyım ben, ha? Hiç sanmam. Ben kimim? Kim söyleyecek bana? Soytarı: Lear'ın gölgesi. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.57)	Lear: Beni tanıyan çıkmaz mı? Çünkü bu Lear olamaz. Lear böyle mi yürür? Böyle mi konuşur? Gözlerine ne oldu? Tamamen aklını mı yitirdi yoksa sadece muhakemesi mi bozuldu? Rüyada mıyım, yoksa uyanık mı? Olamaz, mümkün değil. Kimim ben, bilen yok mu? Soytarı: Lear'ın hayaleti.	

The disillusionment that he goes through under the effect of dysphoria (Greimas and Courtés 1982, p.96) resembles the detachment from a social being to a non-subject. The question "Where are his eyes?" (Shakespeare, 2020, p.57) is an

indication that he cannot fully perceive his image, which can be read both physically and metaphorically. The questions "Does Lear walk thus?" (Shakespeare, 2020, p.57) and "Does Lear speak thus?" (Shakespeare, 2020, p.57) also reveal that he has almost left the manners of a king aside. However, the phrase "sleeping or waking" may be read as a proof of Lear's moving towards the state of being a non-subject (Shakespeare, 2020, p.57). He is so disoriented that he cannot recognize himself as a king. The moment that he is rejected by his daughters, his kingdom turns into a country invaded by centaurs, followers of Dionysian practices. Similarly, the shrine which was founded by him on the principles of honouring ancestors is lost.

King Lear turns into a non-subject many times after the fall of the kingdom not only because he has lost his daughters, but also, he loses his kingdom at the transcendental level. It is the Fool who provides the answer to him. He is "Lear shadow" to indicate that he is in a non-subject state now because he lost all the connections with the old one. This Lear is no longer the self-aware king Lear, but a shadow to live between life and death. In this case, Lear as a non-subject constitutes the core of pathos in *King Lear*.

In connection with madness, "the sleep" mentioned in this speech may be read metaphorically. As stated by Frye, sleep may be read as an indicator of the initiation of a magician or a shaman whose powers are renewed in that sleep (Frye, 1986, p.181). As in the scene that Lear is in deep sleep and Cordelia is told by the doctor that it is the only cure for him, we may wonder whether he will be cured through *madness* in the sense of initiation because the notion contradicts with honouring ancestors. As claimed by Carolyn French, King Lear's madness maybe both lunacy and spiritual regeneration:

> Erasmus describes two kinds of madness which seem Lear. The first is brought by the furies, lashing one into followed by the self torment of guilt. The second is first-a healing madness which fills the mind with comforting reality becomes too unbearable. Lear experiences both kinds of his spiritual regeneration. His agony is over by the scene, and in the Dover scene he is a real lunatic, not far from Tom in the quality of his madness. The interval between is marked by sleep,

which the doctor later tells Cordelia is the only cure for the troubled mind. (French, 1959, p.527)

However, the rebirth of a shaman, a pagan magician, or king is not acceptable on the stage because it is a direct reference to Dionysian practices. As Dionysus means born twice, the practice does not comply with honouring ancestors and Renaissance politics. Dionysian aspects in Greek theatre, which date back to ancient rituals in Caucasia and Anatolia are all at odds with the Renaissance stage. Therefore, King Lear dies without being born again, along with Cordelia's death. As the last hope to Lear's kingdom, Cordelia dies so suddenly and abruptly. As claimed by Northrop Frye, the final pathos of Lear is unique in its aspect of symbolising decadence of Lear:

> No other tragedy by Shakespeare risks a final pathos as terrible as Lear's. His entrance with the dead Cordelia in his arms is a spectacle scarcely to be borne; Dr. Samuel Johnson could not tolerate it. We are not given any finality in regard to the Fool; he vanishes from the play, almost as though Shakespeare has forgotten him. Edmund's enormous transformation has no pragmatic consequences; his change of orders comes too late, and his death affects no one. Lear's death is something like an apocalypse for Edgar, Albany, and Kent and scarcely less than that for us. Hamlet's death has elements in it of a transcendental release, while Lear's offers us no solace, aesthetic or metaphysical. The three survivors—Albany, Kent, and Edgar—are left standing onstage like so many waifs, lamenting a father-god lost forever to them. Albany, astonishingly but persuasively, attempts to yield rule to Kent and Edgar, but Kent indicates that he expects to follow Lear into death soon enough, while Edgar concludes with a plangent couplet that intimates a universal decline:
>
> Th e oldest hath borne most: we that are young

Shall never see so much, nor live so long.

It is as if the death of the father-king-god has removed the only figuration that participated neither in origin nor in end. (Bloom, 2010, 10-11)

The decadence of gods and the failure of rebirth of King Lear on stage is the final reverberation of "nothing", a leitmotif for life and death. The old world is dead without the appearance of the new one because rebirth is not possible on the Renaissance stage. As claimed by Northrop Frye, shamanic rebirth is only possible in ancient Greek theatre. In the Nietzschean sense, followers of Dionysus is a metaphor for human beings rather than kings. Through sleep, in the sense that Frye claims, (Frye, 1986, pp. 27-28) Lear is associated with Dionysiac practices opposed to honouring ancestors. Therefore, Cordelia cannot form a new kingdom. The harbinger of hope to Lear's kingdom turns into the new anti-Christ because the father sleeps to resemble Dionysus. The Renaissance stage is not fit for a father-god king who goes through initiation like a shaman. That would be too much to expect.

In the translations of the speech that exemplifies how Lear has turned into a non-subject in Table 41, we can see the phrases "Lear's shadow", and "where are his eyes"? overweigh. The phrase Lear's shadow may be read in two ways: Lear's Shadow could be read as an allusion to his madness and his association with the supernatural. The phrase may also be read to Lear's ghost.

The sign "shadow" was translated in TT1 as "gölge," in TT2, TT3, and the proposed translation "hayalet" (spectre) because it provides us with a link to the element of supernatural in tragedy. In the proposed translation, the translation is not an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because spectre is one of the secondary meanings of the sign shadow.

The sign "where are his eyes" was translated in TT1, TT2, and TT3 as "gözleri nerede?" without any meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In the proposed translation, on the other hand, "gözlerine ne oldu" (what happened to his eyes) was preferred because the "where are" structure also covers a kind of curiosity of what might have happened to Lear's eyes. In this case, the proposed translation is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.

172). This translation choice also refers to the blinding of Gloucester and the metaphorical blindness of King Lear.

4.6. Songs in *King Lear* and its Translations

The songs in the text were mostly sung by the Fool. Before analysing the function of songs, it would be more appropriate to look at the function of the Fool as a character. It is often stated that fools function as mirrors revealing the weaknesses of kings. Lear's Fool, on the other hand, goes beyond the intended function of his role. It turns into a bitter inner voice that mostly destroys Lear's sanity in his hardest times. Lear's Fool interestingly mirrors Regan and Goneril, too who similarly refrain from honouring their ancestors. The Fool is as bitter as they are, as merciless as Edmund the illegitimate because he has no tolerance for Lear's situation. The fool thinks, speaks, and swaps roles at an impossible speed to madden Lear. According to Bloom, the Fool's place in the text can be described in dramatic terms, both linked to enigmatic and pathetic structures:

> The Fool's dramatic function, like Horatio's, is partly to be a surrogate for the audience, mediating Lear's sublimity for us even as Horatio mediates the sublime aspects of Hamlet. The Fool and Horatio are floating presences, rather than proper characters in themselves. Horatio's only affect, besides his love for Hamlet, is his capacity for wonder, while the Fool's love for Lear is accompanied by a capacity for terror, on Lear's behalf as on his own. Perhaps it is fitting that the Fool's last sentence (act 2, scene 6, line 84) is the hugely enigmatic "And I'll go to bed at noon" in response to Lear's pathetic: "So, so. We'll go to supper i' th' morning." (Bloom, 2010, p.4)

The Fool is directly related to the pathetic structure of the text because he intensifies the suffering of Lear as claimed by Coleridge except for the scene that Cordelia dies:

> As Coleridge noted, the Fool joins himself to the pathos or suffering of the drama; he does not stand apart in a jester's role. Yet Shakespeare excludes the

> Fool from the tragedy of Lear and Cordelia; the Fool simply drops out of the play, notoriously without explanation. (Bloom, 2010, p.4)

The climax is inappropriate for the Fool to appear when King Lear and his heiress die without the possibility of rebirth. In this respect, the function of the Fool and Poor Tom are intermingled because in the heath scene (outside the palace), Tom O'Bedlam appears. Unlike the Fool, Tom O'Bedlam is unaccommodated. In this respect, the Fool and Tom O'Bedlam are opposites because the latter lacks the hidden agenda of maddening Lear. Tom also shows Lear the mirror because he makes it possible for Lear to see "the thing itself" in his visage. There is a resemblance between Lear's so-called journey and the original song of Tom O'Bedlam, which describes his journey as nothing:

> On the heath, the Fool's role is largely taken over by Poor Tom, although the idiot doggerel that he recites (in the Folio text only) at the end of Act III, Scene ii is still called a "prophecy." As for Poor Tom, a ballad on "Tom o' Bedlam" was collected in the eighteenth century and may well go back to something very similar extant in Shakespeare's time. The last stanza of the ballad goes:
>
> With an host of furious fancies
>
> Whereof I am commander,
>
> With a burning spear, and a horse of air,
>
> To the wilderness I wander.
>
> By a knight of ghosts and shadows
>
> I summoned am to tourney
>
> Ten leagues beyond the wide world's end,
>
> Methinks it is no journey. (Frye, 1986, pp. 27-28)

The original song above, which describes the journey that Tom O'Bedlam goes through as a stereotype, interestingly points out the spiritual journey, a possible reminiscent of the Greek idea in the English culture. The stereotype of Tom O'Bedlam and his madness may have been interpreted as the spiritual journey, a kind of journey that changes a person. There is a clear resemblance between the association of Tom O'Bedlam with the supernatural, madness, and the spiritual journey and reality. In this respect, the real Tom O'Bedlams, not Edgar would show more to Lear than the pinning Fool.

In the song below, the Fool is making fun of Lear and implicitly calling him mad. The Fool describes Lear as "the fool", in a derogative way. The description is far from the notion of folly in the Erasmine sense, which may be read as a symbol of spiritual development. First, the Fool merely insults Lear for not being able to notice the true motives of Regan and Goneril, who have no intention of respecting their father king. Second, the Fool goes on to liken Lear to "an ape" who would imitate humans in behaviour when he says "their manners are so apish" (Shakespeare, 2001, p.201). Third, he likens Lear to a child who would play "boo-beep" with adults, constantly showing and hiding his face.

The last metaphor may be read as a reference to his old age and an allusion to his possible lack of understanding. The Fool's song does not respect the journey that he would go through like Tom O'Bedlam (Edgar) does but rather undermines him with mockery. The speech of Tom O'Bedlam is at times incomprehensible, but it helps Lear to get insight. The Fool's speech is completely understandable, although it aims at destroying Lear's sanity in a very cunning and immoral way. The language that the Fool uses is belittling and insulting to fit its purpose. In this respect, the Fool is destructive because they are in the palaces of Regan and Goneril together. Outside in the storm, with Tom O'Bedlam disguised as Edgar, Lear is safer because he is not only away from Regan and Goneril but also the Fool.

The dramatic function of the Fool and Tom O'Bedlam, therefore, is achieved through their being opposites. These two characters are counterparts to each for the pathetic structure of King Lear, but the worlds that they represent are opposites. Shakespeare's characterization of the Fool and Poor Tom turns them into almost

parodies of each other. When the Fool speaks, he makes perfect sense but is far from being a fool who supports his king. When Tom O'Bedlam speaks, he may amuse the king with the unintelligibility of his disorganized speech. It is Tom O'Bedlam who cares for Lear although he mimics the shaman in madness.

Outside in the storm, we may not look for the Fool who should have been with Lear because we know that the Fool has a different function than the traditional one. The Fool is now Tom O'Bedlam, very different from the traditional "mirror" role of the Fool. Therefore, the relationship between Lear and the Fool is futile because it produces destruction. The "journey" guided by Tom O'Bedlam is feeding hope as an illusion though, as marked by the arrival of Cordelia.

All songs of the character Fool teach Lear the wisdom that he has to see through, but the song below is critically important to exemplify how the Fool sees the madness of King Lear. In fact, in this song, the Fool gives us an account of how King Lear falls from a godlike king to a kind of madness. However, the link with Dionysiac madness is implicit in the song because references of supernatural are deliberately made. The song is a perfect mixture of madness and being a Fool in both senses. Although the Fool stresses King Lear's "stupidity", pinning him so many times in the text, he describes how he exactly fell. The diction and tone of the song are mocking but descriptive.

Table 41: Example 38 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Fool: … [Sings.] Fools had ne'er less grace in a year, For wise men are grown foppish, And know not how their wits to wear, Their manners are so apish... [Sings.] Then they for sudden joy did weep And I for sorrow sung, That such a king should play bo-peep, And go the fools among. 1.4.(Shakespeare, 2001, p.201)	Soytarı: …-Delilere iş kalmadı, Akıllılar şimdi deli, Sapıttılar yollarını. Taklid, ile hep bizleri. …Göz yaşı döktü onlar sevinçten Ben de türküler ördüm kederden Böyle bir kral çocuk olup Deliliğe saptı diye. (Shakespeare, 1959, p.42)	(Şarkı söyler)… Budalalar hiç böyle gözden düşmediydi, Çünkü akıllılar toptan aptal kesildi, Bildikleri yok akıllarını nasıl kullanacaklarını, Ancak taklit ediyorlar biz budalaları... [Şarkı söyler} Sevinçten ağlamaya başladılar durduk yere, Üzüntümden şarkı söyledim ben de,

		Böyle bir kral körebe oynayan çocuklar misali Gözü bağlı karıştı gitti diye aptalların içine. (Shakespeare, 2019, p.151)
TT3 Soytarı: "(Şarkı söyler.) Soytarılar bu yıl gözden düştü, Bilgeler hep soytarıya dönüştü; Kendi aklını kullanamaman Taklitçi maymun doldu her yan. … (şarkı söyler) Kral çocuklaşınca, ılara karışınca, Onlar ağlarken sevinçten, Ben şarkıya sarıldım kederden" (Shakespeare, 2020, p.54)	**Proposed Translation** Soytarı: Soytarılara rağbet yok bu yıl, Bilgeler gösterişe kapılıp, Şaşırdılar akıllarını Tam da oldular budala taklitçisi. (şarkı söyler) Bir gülüp bir ağlayınca onlar, Üzüntümden söyler oldum, Böyle bir krala körebe oynamak yakıştı mı, Tuttu abdallara karıştı.	

Certain signs in the translation *of "Fool," "boo-beep" and "apish"* (Shakespeare, 2001, p.201) in Table 41 constitute the background to Lear's madness. Therefore, one of the translations of the sign fool may be "aptal" (fool) or "budala" (fool) in the sense of little or no wit. Alternatively, the fool can be translated as "soytarı" (clown). A third and implicit meaning could be "abdal" (fool) in the sense that Frye (Frye, 1986, p. 27-28) sees the madness of King Lear as the attempt of the rebirth of a shaman, which is the same meaning as abdal (fool) in Turkish.

The translation of "Bo-beep" as "körebe" can be guessed easily in the first reading of the text, but it should be remembered that the "bo-beep" can also be a metaphor to the psychological "blindness" of King Lear, paralleled by Gloucester's actual blindness. TT3 has chosen to eliminate the phrase as an example of wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), and the other translated the phrase "bo-beep" as "çocuk olup" in TT1 as an example of under-interpretation of the meaning because connotations to blindness are lost (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The translation of "apish" and its connotations requires careful evaluation. The phrase is a derivative of "ape" (maymun) and was possibly chosen to support the

childishness of King Lear, who expected flatter from his heirs as proof that they will be ruling the country in the best way. Translating the phrase as "ape" (maymun) may be read as the reproduction of derogatory discourse.

4.7. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in King Lear and its Translations

The discriminatory discourse and insults in the text share the Renaissance prejudice against bestiality and witchcraft. The moment Gloucester finds out the so-called betrayal of Edgar, he utters insults that describe him as a beast rather than a human being. Gloucester can be considered as the opposite to Kent, who openly tells King Lear to lose faith in gods that he swears. As the second great follower of the cult of honouring ancestors Gloucester's description of his son's damnation through the image of bestiality is striking. It has vast connotations about pathos, enigmatic structure, and characterization. In this respect, bestiality can be read as a metonymy for all the unacceptable practices of the supernatural, including the Dionysian cult.

Concerning discriminatory discourse and insults, the depiction of bestiality of Edgar (who in turn disguises as Tom O'Bedlam, the stereotype for the insane) by Gloucester is also the open announcement of Edgar's fall from the state of an ideal heir who would honour his ancestors. Gloucester's lack of insight parallels that of King Lear. Both characters categorize their children according to the honouring of ancestors and are destroyed by the ones whom they misjudge as the ideal. King Lear describes Cordelia as a beast who deserves less than one who gobbles her/his generation to gorge his appetite.

Gloucester describes Edgar as "unnatural," which echoes King Lear's signs. Edgar is more than "brutish" in Gloucester's gaze because he goes against the principles of idealization and honouring the ancestors. The signs "detested, abhorred, detested, brutish and abominable" that Gloucester uses to describe his disgust denote imagery of a beast as if it were before him. The imaginary beast that Gloucester *sees* may be read as the reference to dark bodily drives of Regan and Goneril as centaurs. His illegitimate son, Edmund, however, turns out to be a male monster to help and seduce both Regan and Goneril. As claimed by Harold Bloom," Edmund, so dangerously attractive to Goneril and Regan, and to something in ourselves as well, is

loved by the fatal sisters precisely because he incarnates every quality alien to their father, whom they at once loathe and dread. (2010, p.3).

In this respect, the existence of Edmund can also be read through "nothing", because he is in total denial of the principles of honouring ancestors. Denying his father, his king, and the values that Lear's kingdom was founded upon, Edmund himself turns into a negation. Therefore, he trusts Mother Nature, to establish his position as a ruler. Regan and Goneril become playthings for him because, *through* them, he wishes to be reborn as a legitimate king. Edmund's association of himself with the dark powers of nature is evident in the text, but the bestiality of his nature remains implicit. He does not openly show a violent action, but he witnesses the blinding of Gloucester without a single emotional reaction. It is, however, Edmund's indecisiveness that adds to the enigmatic function of Gloucester's story, as claimed by Harold Bloom:

> Edmund is superbly sincere when he asks the absolutely open questions: "Which of them shall I take? / Both? One? Or neither?" His insouciance is sublime, the questions being tossed off in the spirit of a light event, as though a modern young nobleman might ask whether he should take two princesses, one, or none out to dinner? A double date with Goneril and Regan should daunt any libertine, but the negation named Edmund is something very enigmatic (Bloom, 2010, p.8).

Edmund's indecisiveness reveals itself in the last attempt to save Cordelia and Lear, as a very unexpected turn. Gloucester describes Edgar, referring to the bestiality in his nature because he confuses Edgar with Edmund. Analysing the reasons behind the damnation of bestiality may give us a rough understanding of how pathos is structured in King Lear. According to Gloucester, any child who opposes a father turns into "a detested, brutish villain." The following signs in translation which are "abhorred" and "unnatural" in translations may be read as indicators of bestiality.

In Table 42, the sign "abhorred" was translated in TT1 as "ah, hain" (ay, villain), which is an example of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "mendebur hain", (abhorred

villain) in TT3, as "alçak hain" (abhorred villain), and in the proposed translation "rezil hain" (infamous villain) which bear no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "unnatural" was translated In TT1 as "lanet" (cursed) which is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning because it gives excessive commentary (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "alçak" (debased) as an example of an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "yoz" (degenerate) and in the proposed translation "soysuz" (debased), which are free of designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Table 42: Example 39 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Gloucester: O villain, villain! His very opinion in the letter. Abhorred villain! Unnatural, detested, brutish! villain – worse than brutish! Go, sirrah, seek him. Apprehend him. Abominable villain, where is he? 1.2.(Shakespeare, 2001, p.184)	Gloucester – Ah alçak, alçak! Mektupta söylediği bu değil mi zaten? Ah hain! Canavar yürekli herif, habis! hayvan! hayvandan da hayvan! Git bul onu! Yakala da getir. İğrenç canavar! Nerede şimdi biliyor musun? (Shakespeare, 1959, p.28)	Gloucester: Ah hain, ah alçak! Tam bövle söylüyor ya mektupta da! Mendebur hain! Mayası bozuk, iğrenç, aşağılık hayvan! Hayvandan da aşağı hain! Hadi, bul getir onu bana! Tutuklatayım da görsün onu, menfur köpek! Nerde şimdi? (Shakespeare, 2019, p.129)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Gloucester: O, alçak, alçak! Tam da mektupta yazdığı gibi. Alçak hain! Aşağılık sefil, ruhsuz canavar! Canavardan da beter! Git evlat, bul onu. Gösteririm ben ona. İğrenç yaratık! Git evlat, bul onu. Gösteririm ben ona. İğrenç yaratık! Nerede o? (Shakespeare, 2020, p.39)	Gloucester: Seni alçak seni! Tam da bunu diyor mektupta! Rezil hain! Sapkın, sefil, canavar ruhlu alçak-canavardan da beter! Çabuk git bul onu! Tutukla hemen! İğrenç yaratık, nerede o?	

Shakespeare uses the sign "degenerate" to complement the sign *bastard*. However, degenerate has different connotations when it is studied in its relationship with pathos. Shakespeare's pathetic framework may reveal that a degenerate person would equal a beast in King Lear's gaze. Having no base or origin brings about the idea of being animal-like, whose breed may well be unknown. Lear's description of her daughter as the degenerate pushes her into a position of illegitimate because she

would be disinherited the moment King Lear announces. Therefore, there is so much stress on bastardy in the text as well as degeneration that they point out pathetic structure and characterization, which is undeniably bound to the double-sided pathetic structure.

Table 43: Example 40 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lear: Darkness and devils! Saddle my horses; call my train together. Degenerate bastard, I'll not trouble thee: Yet have I left my daughter. 1.4.(Shakespeare, 2001, p.206)	Lear -Lanet olsun, lanet! Hazırlayın atlarımı! Adamlarımı toplayın! Soysuz piç! seni rahatsız etmeyeceğim artık. Benim bir kızım daha var. (Shakespeare, 1959, p. 46)	Lear: Lanet olsun böyle işe, lanet! Hazırlayın atlarımı; toplayın adamlarımı. Soysuz piç seni! Korkma, rahatsızlık vermem artık sana. Bir kızım daha var, neyse ki. (Shakespeare,2019, pp.155-157)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Lear: Lanet olsun! Atlarımı eyerleyin! Adamlarımı toplayın! Soysuz piç! Sana kalmadık. Bir kızım daha var benim. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.58)	Lear: Lanet olsun, atlarımı eyerleyin, arabamı çağırın. Soysuz piç, sana kalmadık! Bir evladım daha var benim!	

In Gloucester's story in Table 43, being illegitimate is almost a sin in King Lear's kingdom because legitimacy is seen as proof that ancestors will be worshipped by this genealogy. When a person is illegitimate, the chances that she/he will conform to the shrine of honouring ancestors is lower. The definition could likely be closer to what Lear means by "degenerate". To be precise, the phrase "degenerate bastard" may be a double definition, almost the proof that an offspring does not comply with honouring ancestors as the basis of Lear's pagan religion.

King Lear addressing "darkness and devils" to curse his daughters looks contradictory to his pagan belief. Lear's contradiction pertains to the division of dark and light forces in ancient pagan religion based on honouring ancestors. In Lear's understanding of religion, light and dark forces are not dismissed but *categorized*. He openly addresses Hecate, the queen of witches but condemns centaurs and followers

of Dionysian practices. In this respect, "degenerate bastard" is a way of adding up to the category that King Lear wishes to drive away. Although Goneril is not illegitimate, the use of the sign "degenerate bastard" may also be read as proof that his father disinherited her.

It is a possibility that King Lear addresses the dark components of pagan religion as he referred to Hecate in the banishment speech of Cordelia. However, it is also possible that he sees his daughter as belonging to darkness and devils. All translators chose to translate the phrase as "lanet olsun" (I curse you) which may sound similar to the phrase "darkness and devils" in function. However, "darkness and devils" may be read as the dark component of pagan belief in King Lear's kingdom. None of the translations bear meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The full form of the phrase would be "in the name of darkness and devils." In this respect, an allusion to the pagan beliefs may be possible, like Hecate, retaining the mythological links to the pagan world because what King Lear means by "darkness and devils" is implicit. The phrase "degenerate" is a derivative translation of the signs as "dejenere" (degenerate), which would not explain much in the context of King Lear. The sign degenerate means having a base or an origin. All the translators chose to translate the phrase as "soysuz piç" (degenerate bastard). The translation may sound awkward in English, but it underlines the hidden meaning behind Shakespeare's choice of the sign. The moment Goneril proves herself to be contrary to their ancestors (which can also be read as a strong indicator of patriarchy), she *turns into* a bastard, a kind of heir undesirable in King Lear's gaze. Therefore, the adjectives that King Lear uses to curse may reveal reverberations from the crucible of witches, the hushed voices of the undesirable people in history.

After seeking the link between Gloucester's description of a beast and King Lear's description of female monsters, looking at the discriminative discourse through womanhood is necessary. Goneril asks him to dismiss his train, he leaves the house with insults *echoing* Gloucester. However, when he has a cold shoulder from Regan, he uses the imagery of reproduction to curse and insult her. He calls out to the goddess Nature this time, "to convey her sterility" to stop her from reproducing and getting honoured by the birth of a baby. The discriminative discourse through womanhood is obvious. The curse may sound familiar, and it may have been a common *patriarchal*

punishment to women who tend to disobey. He addresses the goddess Nature as the head of pagan religion to "dry her organs of increase" and infertility will become her punishment. He may sound *too* patriarchal to us today, but the image of infertile women in *King Lear* equal to followers of Dionysian cult just for the very purpose of failing to provide genealogy. In other words, the way that King Lear describes his daughter, Goneril is equal to witches in the Renaissance gaze. The damnation of infertile women on their contrast with honouring ancestors may reveal the pathetic structure of the text, to remind us that there will always be women to damn in patriarchal contexts.

Table 44: Example 41 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lear: It may be so, my lord. Hear, Nature, hear, dear goddess, hear! Suspend thy purpose if thou didst intend To make this creature fruitful. Into her womb convey sterility. Dry up in her the organs of increase, And from her derogate body never spring A babe to honor her. If she must teem, Create her child of spleen, that it may live And be a thwart disnatured torment to her. Let it stamp wrinkles in her brow of youth, With cadent tears fret channels in her cheeks, Turn all her mother's pains and benefits To laughter and contempt, that she may feel— How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is	Lear — Olabilir, efendim, olabilir… Dinle beni ey tabiat; sevgili tanrı, dinle beni! Bu mahlûku verimli kılmak niyetinde isen eğer, tasarından vazgeç. Rahmine kısırlığın damgasını vur; döl alacak uzuvlarını kurut da, lanet vücudundan ona şeref getirecek bir evlâd çıkmasın! Kaderinde doğurmak varsa bile, çocuğunun hamurunu öyle bir kin ve garaz mayasıyla yoğur ki, evlâdı, ömrü boyunca onu kahrıyla, kan tanımazlığı ile inim inim inletsin! Genç alnını kırış kırış buruştursun; döktüreceği göz yaşlarıyla yanaklarında derin izler açsın! Anasının bütün emek, zahmet ve iyiliklerini alayla, hakaretle karşılasın da, bu kadın evlâd nankörlüğünün bir yılanın dişinden de keskin olduğunu anlasın. Durmam burada artık, durmam. (Shakespeare, 1959, p.47)	Lear: Mümkündür, efendim, mümkündür. Duy beni, ey tabiat; ey aziz tanrıça, duy sesimi! Bu mahlûku doğurgan kılmaksa niyetin, Vazgeç ve kısırlık aşıla rahmine! Üreme organlarım kupkuru et de, o alçak bedeninden Billah doğmasın onu şereflendirecek bir bebe. Alnında doğurmak yazılıysa bile öyle bir garez ekesin ki Doğacak çocuğunun meşrebine, ömrü hayatı boyunca İsyan edip buna, bin kahır çektirsin huysuzluğuyla! Kırış kırış etsin bunun genç alnını, Gözyaşından oluk oluk yapsın yanaklarını, Annesinin bütün emeklerine, İyiliklerine alay ve hakaretle Mukabele etsin ki, evlat nankörlüğünün Yılanın dişinden daha keskin olduğunu bellesin bu da.

To have a thankless child.— Away, away! 1.4. (Shakespeare, 2001, p.208)		Hadi gidelim, artık duramam burada! (Shakespeare, 2019, p.159)
TT3 Lear: Olabilir lordum. Dinle Doğa, dinle! Dinle tanrıça, dinle! Bu kadını anne yapmaya niyetliysen, Vazgeç bu niyetinden. Kısırlık aşıla rahmine. Tüm üreme organlarını kurut ki Yoz bedeninden bir yavru çıkıp Onurlandıramasın onu. İlle doğuracaksa, Kötülük timsali olsun evladı ve ömür boyu Sapık bir canavar gibi azap çektirsin ona. Kırış kırış oyulsun alnı dertten. Gözyaşları sel gibi akıp yanaklarında oyuklar açsın. Evladı için yaptığı fedakârlığın, çektiği eziyetin karşılığı Kahkaha ve horlanma olsun, Ki tatsın, yılan zehrinden beter Nankör evlat acısını. Gidelim, gidelim! (Shakespeare, 2020, p.59)	**Proposed Translation** Lear: Olabilir efendim. Duy sesimi ey tabiat ana, kutsal tanrıça, duy! Bu yaratığı doğurgan yapmaya niyetlendiysen bir dinle. Rahmini kısırlaştır. Tüm üreme organlarını öyle bir kurut ki, Soysuz bedeninden onu onurlandıracak bir evlat doğmasın. Eğer doğurursa, öyle kindar bir çocuk olsun ki, Yaşadığı her an ona duygusuzca işkence etsin. Genç alnına kırışıkların izini bıraksın. Gözyaşları yüzünde derin izler bıraksın, Anasının tüm acı ve fedakarlıklarının karşılığı alay ve acı çekme olsun. Yılan ısırmasından beter hayırsız evlat acısını tatsın. Hadi artık gidelim!	

It is open to discussion whether Regan deserves the curse or not, but King Lear sees infertility, a medical condition that affected many women also in ancient times, as a punishment for women who refuse to honour their ancestors. Through discourse analysis in Table 44, it is possible to say that infertile women also fall into the same category as followers of Dionysian practices because Lear's shrine is explicitly patriarchal. As an *alternative* punishment, he calls out to Goddess Nature to give Regan a "thankless child" which will be automatically categorized as a disbeliever. Lear describes Regan's body as "derogate" because she is disinherited the moment

Lear starts making the speech. Her body is debased now because it lacks a base, the ancestors, in King Lear's gaze.

In translations, the signs to consider are "derogate", "disnatured" and "child of spleen." King Lear describes Regan's body as derogate using the same terms that King Lear describes Goneril. Her degeneration was linked to having no origin. Derogate has the same meaning as degeneration or deviates in standard or quality. It is possible to say that King Lear uses a similar jargon to describe his heir when they oppose him. King Lear as a character is undeniably patriarchal, and he classifies his daughters according to the mindset. The discriminative gaze of Lear is not only patriarchal but also brings about a negative portrayal of Dionysiac practices. The way that he describes his daughters after his fall is almost closer to the description of beasts like the degenerate, the derogate, and finally centaurs.

Both Goneril and Regan were depicted as bad on their own, in the text, without any supernatural effect. However, King Lear chooses to call them beasts, which may give us a chance to research the relationship between the jargon he uses and the pathetic structure of the text. Therefore, looking at how derogate and degenerate were translated may also count for a study of pathos.

The sign "derogate" was translated in TT1 as "lanet" (cursed) which is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna , 2017, p.172) because it is not one of the connotations of the sign. In TT2, the phrase was translated as "alçak" (villain) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning as well and it produces excessive meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, on the other hand, the phrase was translated as "yoz" (degenerate) and in the proposed translation "soysuz" (debased) free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "disnatured" was translated in TT1 as "kan tanımazlık" (not respecting the bloodline) as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the phrase means "deprived or destitude of natural feelings" in modern English.The phrase was not translated in TT2 and it is as an example of wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT3, the phrase was translated as "sapık bir canavar gibi" (like a perverted monster), which

is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because there is excessive commentary on the sign. In the proposed translation, the phrase was translated as "duygusuzca" (without feelings).

5. SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF MACBETH AND ITS TRANSLATIONS

5.1. Summary of *Macbeth*

On the dark suburbs of Scotland, generals Macbeth and Banquo come across three strange women who resemble men, named Weird Sisters. The prophecy that Macbeth will become Thane of Cawdor and King of Scotland is made to his surprise. However, the witches are playful because they claim that Banquo's descendants will be kings, not him. King Duncan names Macbeth Thane of Cawdor a little later to commend his success in the latest battle. The King pays a visit to Macbeth's castle at Inverness that night.

Meanwhile, Lady Macbeth swears to help her husband kill Duncan for him to wear the crown. At night, the guards are intoxicated by drugged wine given to them by Lady Macbeth. Macbeth enters the room and kills the King, although he regrets it immediately. Macduff discovers the murder, after which Macbeth kills the guards for a seeming revenge. Duncan's sons, Malcolm and Donalbain, escape because they are held responsible for the crime. Macbeth becomes King of Scotland, but his feeling of insecurity does not go away. Remembering the prophecy about Banquo's descendants, he plans to kill Banquo and his son Fleance, and Banquo dies in the attack plotted by Macbeth while his son escapes.

Macbeth sees the ghost of Banquo at the state banquet given to honour his coronation and puzzles the courtiers with his reactions to it. Macbeth immediately goes to the witches to learn the future of his kingdom. He is revealed that his safety will be maintained until Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane against him. They also claim that he will not be challenged by anyone born of a woman. Macbeth is deluded to consider himself invincible after the prophecy, but Banquo's son, Fleance, is also predicted to follow Scottish succession. King Macbeth considers the realization of the two prophecies to be impossible. Macbeth also slaughters Macduff's family for more control over the crown.

Meanwhile, Macduff and Malcolm agree on leading an army against the castle Dunsinane. Macbeth is completely sure that no one born out of a woman will challenge his security until Birnam Wood moves towards him. The guards bring him the news

that trees are moving, and he is desperate to discover that Malcolm's army carries tree branches as camouflage to end his reign. Lady Macbeth, on the other hand, goes mad and commits suicide.

When Macduff arrives at the castle, he challenges Macbeth by telling him that he was taken from his mother's womb before his birth, an unnatural way of coming to this world. The king does not defend himself because he eventually yields to the supernatural. Macduff conquers Macbeth and cuts his head off. Malcolm declares peace before being crowned as the king in Scone.

The details in this summary were chosen according to the pathetic structure of the text. After King Duncan is murdered, Scotland turns into a rollercoaster in which foul and fair are intermingled. Macbeth's reign is marked by his dedication to the supernatural, an undesirable trait in Shakespearean pathos. His inability to notice the playfulness of the Weird Sisters is a basic pathetic element because King Macbeth loses his balance while trying to get control over both the supernatural and the Scottish kingdom. He fails to understand the elusive nature of magical practices. The end of King Macbeth in the Shakespearean text marks the end of supernatural practices in Scotland. The answers to why *Macbeth* as a Shakespearean text excludes magic from Scotland may lie in the pathetic structure of the text through semiotic analysis.

5.2. Enigmas in the Source and Target Texts

In the opening scene, Banquo's comment on the Weird Sisters' outward appearances is almost proof that these are unsafe creatures in the Early Modern gaze. They look like women when Banquo looks at their "choppy fingers" (Shakespeare, 2003, p.15), but their "beards" prevent him from calling them women. Neither Macbeth nor the readers are sure whether they will bring good to the kingdom or not. Shakespeare's *Macbeth* takes place in a time of turmoil which may be read as the source of intimidation embodied in the appearance of the Weird Sisters. It is not certain whether they arrive for war or peace. The future of Scotland is similarly hard to foresee.

Moreover, the thanes are unsure whether King Macbeth will unite the Scottish clans to constitute the new kingdom or divide them. Consequently, the theme of darkness overweighs all through the plot, and metaphorically speaking, the Weird

Sisters arrive with their crucibles to foresee the future of Scotland. Their existence is a major enigma for the readers because the Weird Sisters are there to play with the fates of mortals.

In *Macbeth*, the supernatural is consequently the opposite of the idealized sphere of honouring ancestors. The pathetic structure reflects the Early Modern version of the patriarchal gaze, and the crucible image in *Macbeth* successfully constitutes the major enigma for the reader as the leitmotifs, dark (foul) or light (fair), reverberate to serve the purpose. However, the implications of enigmas for the reader are apt to change according to how the reader sees the supernatural. If the readers see the Weird Sisters as the ultimate work of the supernatural, they may tend to believe in the predictions as the text progresses. In the opposite case, the reader may see the metaphorical implications of magic, such as viewing them as reflections of Macbeth's inner conflicts as a king. In either case, the contrast between the notions of the supernatural and honouring genealogy act counterparts of enigmatic networks has a tremendous effect on suspense.

Most readers may describe Macbeth as a "dark" play for these reasons. The future of Scotland is hard to foresee, and from the beginning of the text, political strains arise. Shakespearean *Macbeth* can be read as a war between the supernatural and the legitimacy of the Scottish crown through the line of succession, which later unites with the English crown. The enigmatic network in *Macbeth* symbolically elaborates the political situation and the future of Scotland. Günseli İşçi suggests the leitmotifs foul and fair as "a summary of conflicting values in Macbeth with its dialectical dimension" (İşçi, 2001, p.25).[92] The songs of the Weird Sisters bring forward these conflicting values to the text as they praise Hecate, the Queen of the witches.

Moreover, Hecate is herself a riddle hard to be solved because the name Hecate (Iphigenia) is listed in the Catalogue of Women by Hesiod as the daughter of Agamemnon. Iphigenia was sacrificed in the myth Oresteia. Her emergence as Hecate may be the work of magic because rebirth of Hecate, Iphigenia, and Artemis are at times intermingled in mythology. In the version of Hesiod, Iphigenia's metamorphosis into the Queen of the Witches is nothing more than rebirth, a prominent reason for

[92] See Yeni Eleştiriden Yeni Tarihselci Eleştiriye Macbeth, p.25

damnation in the Early modern gaze. Moreover, Hecate herself could take the triple form of a horse, dog, and lion, and she may have appeared at such her crossroad shrines, with the human form facing the fourth direction" (Matyszak, 2015, p. 119). Contrary to the notion of honouring genealogy in the Early Modern gaze, the name Iphigenia explicitly represents matriarchy because her mother, Clytemnestra, murders her father to defy the patriarchal structure in Greek society. Consequently, it may be proposed that pathos in the text was modelled upon conflicts in the Scottish society as embodied in the characters Macbeth and Banquo. The former represents magic (old matriarchal beliefs of Scotland) and the latter patriarchy in Scotland. Since Hecate represents the dark in the Early Modern sense as stated by Phillip Matyszak, Hecate and her rituals meant anything but the practices outside societal norms:

> Throughout her long history, Hecate received public as well as private cult, the latter often taking forms that were anything but normal. She was worshipped in liminal places, and sacrifices to her were as anomalous as the goddess herself. The earliest archaeological evidence is a dedication to Hecate shrine "outside the gates"- as opposed to the Coan cult of Hecate in the city- where she received libations of unmixed wine. (Matyszak, 2015, pp. 242-243)

The Weird Sisters voice the feeling of insecurity and intimidation in the Scottish kingdom as they ask each other, "When shall we three meet? When the hurley-burley is done/ When the battle is lost and won" (Shakespeare, 2003, 3). The answers to questions should be equivocal because nothing is stable in the kingdom. As stated by İşçi, "questions intensify the tension in the text in the peak moments" (İşçi, 2001, p.23)[93]. The opening questions set the background to the text so successfully that they almost provide the context and the enigmas in just two lines. As proposed by L.C. Knights, in *Macbeth*, we also have a presentation of the decadence of societal values and order through "two main themes, which can only be separated for analysis" (Knights, 1933, p.131). The foul and fair "are blended in the play-the themes of the reversal of values of natural disorder" (Knights, 1933, p.131).

[93] See Yeni Eleştiriden Yeni Tarihselci Eleştiriye Macbeth, p.23

As the supernatural themes overweigh in the context, Macbeth will not be able to free himself from obsessing over the predictions of the Weird Sisters because uncertainty is crafted to be the essence in the Scottish land:

> Nothing is certain in this play, not even the most accepted of divisions. All is in turmoil - in chaos - in savage conflict. The play begins with an enormous blast on a desolate space - space - an arena of thunder and lightning. And in this void, emptiness, anything can happen. Any words can be spoken. manifestation - diabolical, divine - can take shape. All is translated into the medium of theatre itself. For this reason the witches are women of pure imagination just as they are men of entire contradiction. These masculine females, these woman-shaped men lay claim to be controllers of this destiny. Theirs is the sole power to determine fate. They dictate the laws of the land that is this play. They decide the history of its population. They create the geography of its perilous terrain. And one great irony, one terrifying truth defines the anarchy, the absolute essence of their and this world's existence. 'Fair is foul, and foul is fair.' That is a maxim that will reverberate through every incident of Macbeth (McGuinness, 2015, p.70).

The characterisation of the protagonist is also dependent on the predictions of the Weird Sisters because they control King Macbeth to death. They are "so wither'd and so wild in their attire" (Shakespeare, 2003, p.15) that signifies damnation in the Renaissance gaze. The witches are characterized as such evil masters of the art of foretelling that they aspire beyond the image of the crucible and touch upon the foundations of magic. Their practices bring Hecate and rebirth and initiation in Scotland, which ties *Macbeth* to the foundations of Greek drama. Having been born twice with male and female properties, the wine god Dionysus from the crucible of the witches goes beyond the Renaissance conventions and reaches out to the enigmatic network in *Macbeth*.

On the other hand, the link between shamanic rebirth and the witches is loosely presented in the text. We may not immediately claim that the Weird Sisters practice the art of magic through Dionysiac rebirth. However, it would be an underestimation to evaluate King Macbeth as a character outside the sphere of initiation because magic is a major enigma. Banquo's characterisation is the exact opposite of Macbeth, who immediately decides that The Weird Sisters are not to be trusted, as they are "unlovely Scottish versions of the three Fates" (what Holinshed called in his account, "the goddesses of destinie") (Craig, 2001, p.56). Their androgynous look may recall Dionysus to the modern gaze as they carry the physical characteristics of both sexes. The implicit link to Dionysus, who was born twice through a process (initiation), repels against the notion of honouring genealogy in the Early Modern gaze.

The playfulness of Fate represented by the Weird Sisters and Hecate is a test of King Macbeth's dedication to the supernatural, who longs for security at all costs. The witches play with inconsistencies of Macbeth with mysterious powers so successfully that his encounter almost resembles the seduction and the possession of the soul:

> They have mysterious, chiefly for evil; but we are sometimes made to feel that their evil-doing is more petty and silly than frightful. One sister is nursing a spiteful grudge against a sailor whose wife has refused her a few chestnuts (I.iii.4 ff.); this has the flavour of village gossip, old wives' tales. Taken together they may be said to incarnate all egotistic, anti-social, blighting instincts, seductions rife in any environment but taking on different shapes (Kiernan, 2016, p.135).

In addition, as stated by Michael P. Zuckert, the Weird Sisters symbolise the cosmological context and superhuman control on mortals like Fates, although they implicitly project Macbeth's conflicts:

> The opening scene, though brief, highlights the witches by giving them this signal opening appearance. The witches, ever mysterious, supply what we might call the "cosmological context" of the play. They are and stand for the

> superhuman forces at work in this lower world in which we puny mortals conduct our affairs. Their intervention is somehow responsible for the events to follow. Although there is a constant temptation to "psychologise" them, as there is the Homeric gods or Hamlet's father's ghost, nonetheless they do not seem to be mere projections of Macbeth's psyche: to say nothing of anything else, Banquo sees and hears hence see them even when Macbeth is not on stage (Zuckert, 2016, pp.589-590).

Unlike Banquo, who stands firm in supernatural issues and magic, Macbeth is like a swinging ship in the storm. He is blighted by magic on his way to the Scottish throne and after. As stated by Lionel Charles Knights, King Macbeth "is a statement of evil" (Knights, 1933, p.132) because the ambiguity concerning the protagonist and his kingdom is lethal.

The "hurley-burley" starts as the Weird Sisters predict the future of Macbeth using battle and fighting imagery. It is implicit whether they refer to a real battle or a metaphysical one, as stated by Knights:

> It is worth remarking that "Hurley-burley" implies more than "the tumult of sedition or insurrection" Both it and "when the Battaile's lost and, wonne" suggest the kind of metaphysical pitch-and-toss that is about to be played with good and evil (Knights, 1933, p.132).

Macbeth is almost enslaved by them because they "prophesy intriguing things - all invitations to, all indications of, power, increasing power coming to Macbeth" (McGuinness, 2015, p. 70). Macbeth's firm belief of himself as the invincible King of Scotland is a deceptive game of the Weird Sisters because their "oracles to his rival are more ambiguous, but ambiguity, equivocation, irony- these are linguistic games Macbeth cannot play" (McGuinness, 2015, p.71).

Analysing witchcraft in the Early Modern context requires a comparison of the androgynous Weird Sisters and the healers in ancient England. Their practices,

including preparing medicine, elixirs and anaesthesia for primitive operations compared to today, recall reverberations from the crucible. However, *the* ability to foresee the future was damned in the Early Modern context. Foretelling was pure blasphemy, a central theme in Shakespeare's *Macbeth.* As Stephen Greenblatt investigates, *Macbeth* and its relationship with the cultural traditions of Early Modern England are so striking that it is possible to find evidence on the persecution of women along with the staging of the Weird Sisters:

> Why should we not say than that *Macbeth*, with its staging of witches and its final solution, probably contributed, in an indirect but powerful way, to the popular fear of demonic agency and the official persecution and killing of women? Why should we not say that this play is about evil is evil? (Greenblatt, 1991, p.20)

Evil embodied in the female-like men or men-like females may strongly point out Dionysus, the god of wine and ecstasy. Since the Renaissance understanding of magic was formed by categorising old-time deities into new ones, it is critical to analyse why Dionysian practices were not embraced in English theatre for tragic pathos in Shakespeare. Weird Sisters' speeches, motives, or intentions and the practice of magic serve as the major enigma in the text because they are so hard to define.

The fluidity of gender and magic in *Macbeth* also contrasts with the idea of honouring the ancestors. Genealogy and the magic of the Weird Sisters are at opposite poles in the pathetic structure because the latter does not comply with the norms of Renaissance society. The banning of supernatural by religious authorities was a common practice in Shakespeare's time. The roots of Early modern prejudice on "the odd ones" may then be traced back to the image of the crucible. It may serve as the background to an academic study concerning the crucible, possibly queer history, which is not within the scope of this thesis.

Consequently, Banquo's comments on the appearances of the Weird Sisters may sound too patriarchal to the modern ear. Banquo, as the forefather to English lineage through James I, questions their existence. His reaction to the emergence of

the Weird Sisters points out a discriminative strain to be studied because he speaks as if he is obliged to decide on the gender of Weird Sisters to trust their predictions. We may view him as a terribly patriarchal character today. There would be no prizes for guessing that Banquo would not trust the Weird Sisters even if they looked properly like women of that era. Their sudden arrival and questions defy patriarchy. Therefore, the character Banquo represents the Scottish and English crown's future as a pillar to support honouring the ancestors in the text.

As opposed to Banquo, Macbeth's witches might be a starting point to trace the roots of the damnation of magical practices. Since magic contradicts the very foundations of Early Modern political thought in England, Banquo's suspicion may be read as an echo for the damnation of witches by the future king of England, King James, the writer of Demonology.[94] The religious authorities were openly condemning supernatural practices as evil, even before his reign. For example, Burchard, Bishop of Worms, was "particularly contemptuous of dreams of night flying with Diana, Hecate or the German Holde" because he was suspicious of "horrific acts" (Greenblatt, 1991, p.18).

Therefore, Macbeth's daydreams of the Weird Sisters may be read as the reflection of the ecstasy that the religious authorities had warned about. It serves as the background to the enigmatic network in *Macbeth* because elusive representations of magic and condemnation of witchcraft similarly serve the pathos of the tragedy. Shakespearean Macbeth is a historical character, but it owes its powerful suspense effect to the supernatural as a major enigma for the readers. Moreover, the idea of rebirth dating back to the foundations of Greek tragedy was also the odd one out. The limitations set by religious authorities strongly indicate the overweighing fear that the witches would bring a dead man to life one day. There was also constant stress on the protection of baptism against the witches. The possibility of their stealing the dead from the cemetery would equal the damnation of Christian souls because of the deep fear of exhumation. The image of the Weird Sisters putting the body parts from cemeteries into the cauldron (like Macbeth's witches) to cook and bring the dead man back to life was strongly feared. As Greenblatt proposes, the following excerpt can be

[94] Daemonologie. by King of England James I See: https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/25929

read as the revealing of secrets of the witches who exhume bodies in the Christian cemeteries and a serious warning to the baptised by the religious authorities:

> And do you believe that you can kill, though without visible arms, people baptised and redeemed by the blood of Christ, and you can cook and eat their flesh, after putting some straw on a piece of wood or something in the place of the heart? And then that you can resuscitate them after you have eaten them and make them live again? (Greenblatt, 1991, p.18)

Therefore, the negative views on the witches in the Early Modern gaze and the supernatural in the tragedy are visible when Banquo fails to trust the witches. Macbeth, on the contrary, loses the kingdom to the tricks of fate because pathos was crafted to reflect the contrasts between the two characters. It is eventually Banquo who wins because his lineage exceeds Macbeth's reign in real life. Therefore, the Weird Sisters constitute the major enigma because intimidation is revealed through their questions. As claimed by Cox, representations of witches and their damnations were the major issues as opposed to today because religion was at the heart of Renaissance theatre:

> Religion in Macbeth includes witches, prophecy and arcane details of demonology-many of them explicated by old historicist and fascinating to the reigning monarch, as new historicists have compellingly recognised. But religion includes much more than those things, in that it goes to the heart of tragedy itself. (Cox, 2013, p.236)

Moreover, in Banquo's speech, there are several references to man and manhood that should be read as the support to honouring of the ancestors. Since Macbeth does not have a male child to succeed him, his manhood is questionable. Therefore, he is out of the sphere of honouring the ancestors and closer to the ambiguity of the witches. Macbeth turns into an enigmatic character because he is not identifiable in terms of manhood even through magic and the supernatural. Had he been characterized like Banquo, as in "Historie Regum Britannie", *only* to represent

the line of succession Scottish monarchy, Shakespearean Macbeth would just be the repetition of previous Macbeth stories. The character would be easily identified, and Macbeth himself would not be a major enigma for the reader because such a history would also lack the king's associations with magic. Even to the last scene in the text, *why* King Macbeth is attracted to magic cannot be clearly defined. The Renaissance conventions support the honouring of the ancestors as a notion to voicing patriarchy. As stated by Terry Eagleton, the male gender was described as the embodiment of patriarchal stereotype of courage and emotional control, and Macbeth is out of that sphere:

> Macbeth, for example, is much preoccupies with the various meanings of "man": the term can be zoologically descriptive as when Macbeth tells his hired killers that they are men as far as "the catalogue" goes; or it can make an appeal to inherent value. Macduff, whose family is slaughtered by Macbeth, is advised by Malcolm to "Dispute it like a man", to which the swift riposte is: "I shall do so; But I must also feel it like a man." Malcolm's 'man' is the patriarchal stereotype of courage and emotional control; Macduff himself appeals beyond to this ideology of gender to the common humanity which cuts below it, the level of shared compassion where differences of gender are not finally very important (Eagleton, 2000, p.100).

The supernatural and the magic defy the boundaries of "manhood" in Renaissance politics because "witchcraft was itself a sin, a heretical relapse into paganism" (Greenblatt, 1991, p.18). The resemblance between the definition of sin and magic is an implicit but striking example of how societal norms work through stereotypes.

For the Early Modern gaze, the damnation of magical practices must have acted like guidebooks to stay away from "ambiguity" in the sense that Macbeth's witches are presented. Moreover, the practices of the witches represented "the old beliefs" which were "concentrated in the figure of Satan" (Greenblatt, 1991, p. 17). It would be an

underestimation to think that stereotypes existed in Early Modern text without a political reason. Jonathan Dollimore, who refers to Heywood's Apology for Actors, similarly claimed that "plays were written and performed to teach 'subjects' 'obedience to their king ‘by showing them 'the untimely end of such as have moved tumults, commotions and insurrections' opposed to the power of demystification" (Dollimore, 1985, pp.7-8).

It is, therefore, evident that Banquo, the forefather to James I, is suspicious of supernatural beings in total conformity with politics at that time. Shakespearean pathos leans towards honouring ancestors because a prominent character like Banquo justifies the idea. In *Macbeth*, as Victor Kiernan puts it, the new era has arrived with its conflicts and degradation of the foundations of Scottish society:

> Macbeth oversteps all bounds; the old virtues are degraded, or run wild: courage becomes readiness for murder, monarchy degenerates into despotism, religion into magic. An era is breaking up; new energies, still unharnessed and chaotic, are arising out of it. (Kiernan, 1996, p.138)

Supernatural in *Macbeth,* as an enigma, is at work to demystify because the Weird Sisters and their Queen Hecate are heard behind the crucible to reveal the muted voices of history. As Dollimore refers to Greenblatt's view on the rise of drama as challenging power in the Early Modern period, he claims that "radical subversiveness is defined as not merely the attempt to seize existing authority, but as a challenge to the principles upon which authority is based" (Dollimore, 1985, p.13). The dialectical view on the conflicting powers defined as magic versus honouring the ancestors in *Macbeth* is consequently elaborated.

The duality in Macbeth as a character is visible after he contacts the supernatural. The Weird Sisters and the intimidation they bring to the text are so dominating that readers may cease to remember that Macbeth is known to be a commander who would not be shaken very easily. The prophecy "Macbeth shall continue to rule until Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane" (Shakespeare, 2003, p.112) arrives as the minor enigma to link his existence as a king with magic. Confident with

the predictions of the Weird Sisters, Macbeth assumes that they will bring good to his new kingdom. He loses all because he fails to recognise the playfulness of fate.

A semiotic reading of the crucible image in *Macbeth*, intertextuality is critical to note as one of the steps in semiotic reading. According to Kristeva's theory of intertextuality, every artistic text is "a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another" (Kristeva, 1966, p.85). The individual text and the cultural text are bounded by "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality, in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts" (Kristeva, 1969, p.36). In this respect, Kristeva's view on history is on the common ground with Greenblatt, who evaluates cultural traditions because "the concept of text as ideologeme determines the very procedure of a semiotics that, by studying the text as intertextuality, considers it as such within (the text of) society" (Kristeva, 1969, p.37). According to Kristeva's theory, signifiers are plural, full of historical meaning that may reveal the traces of persecution of certain women labelled as witches, to signify the Weird Sisters' existence and the damnations in *Macbeth.*

Referring to Julia Kristeva's intertextuality (Kristeva, 1969, p.36), the Weird Sisters may also be read as signs to guide us in reading Renaissance politics backwards. In this case, Banquo and the thanes who support the British rule on the Scottish crown are the characters representing the sphere of the ideal, "honouring the ancestors". On the other hand, Macbeth disregards the warning of Banquo, who is a total disbeliever of the damned supernatural. Although the witches predict that Banquo's genealogy will rule, he does not fall into the traps of the Weird sisters for more power as an ideal king would do. Shakespearean pathos and enigmas reveal the reasons for Macbeth's obsession with the Weird Sisters who arrive in Scotland to drive him away from the ideal of honouring ancestors.

The intertextuality in *Macbeth* is rooted in the historical chronicles, but it may look redundant to study them today. It may be crucial to see that Macbeth's representations as a good king in Holinshed's chronicles have been changed to support pathetic structure in the Shakespearean text. For similar reasons, Banquo's son Fleance escapes from the murderers and the plot is ultimately linked to King James I. Banquo's lineage, King James I, combined the Scottish and the English crowns first time in

history. Banquo is pathetically presented as the ideal heir instead of the historical MacBethad Mac Finlaid, namely Macbeth. It may be read as the greatest support to the claim that Shakespearean pathos is inescapably political. As Kiernan puts it, Shakespeare could not think outside the boundaries of the monarchical system:

> Shakespeare could not think, or at least could not talk, of any other government in Britain than monarchy. But Macbeth is the only major tragedy where monarchy is shown, first in Scotland, then in England, functioning both practically and legitimately, or de facto and de jure. (Kiernan, 1996, p.127)

Macbeth fails as a king in the Shakespearean version because enigmas are at work. For this reason, his obsession with witchcraft and predictions marks the characterisation of *Macbeth.* The Ghost of Banquo that arrives during the banquet intensifies the suspense so strongly that King Macbeth almost personifies it during the state banquet in front of noblemen.

Therefore, the speech of Banquo can be read as the introduction of enigmas into the text. The use of supernatural elements is so heavily dependent on the ambiguity of the Weird Sisters that Shakespeare brings Hecate, the Queen of the Witches, to the stage to triple the suspense effect. The elusiveness of the supernatural grasps Macbeth's mind as the Weird Sisters give one prophecy after another. Macbeth so devoutly believes Hecate and her minions that he falls into their verbal traps at the end.

As the plot unfolds, both the readers and Macbeth experience the playfulness of Fate through the practices of Weird Sisters. Therefore, the whole text can be read as a depiction of how the supernatural may mislead a great soldier and a Scottish king. *Macbeth* may nearly serve as the guidebook of avoiding the dangers of encountering the supernatural for Renaissance readers and protecting oneself from the witches points strongly to the crucible image because the Weird Sisters are known to decide what to do with mortals while boiling elixirs in the cauldron.

5.3. Enigmas in *Macbeth* and its Translations

Banquo's characterisation depends on the *rejection* of the Weird Sisters' prophecies because they echo the reverberations from the crucible. In his speech in the first example, Banquo explicitly suspects that the Weird Sisters would bring evil to the kingdom. His role in the text may look secondary at first, but "pathetically" speaking, it overweighs Macbeth's. As a result, the Weird Sisters fail to trick him with the play of words.

In Table 45, there are examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like "wild", "inhabitants o' th' earth and choppy fingers". These phrases were chosen because they describe the Weird Sisters through the gaze of Banquo, forefather to King James I, to represent the prejudice on women outside patriarchal genealogy. Since the appearances of the Weird Sisters is a crucial part of the enigmatic network in *Macbeth,* how they were revealed to the reader is striking. The word wild was preferred for the outward appearances of the Weird Sisters. However, the use of choppy (shaky) fingers may denote that they are experienced women, and wisdom may come to mind. However, when we look at the *sign "inhabitants o' th' earth",* we may see that they are not regarded as the dweller on the earth.

Table 45: Example 42 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Ban. How far is't call'd to Forres? What are these, So wither'd and so wild in their attire, That look not like the inhabitants o' th'earth, And yet are on't? Live you? or are you aught That man may question? You seem to understand me, By each at once her choppy finger laying Upon her skinny lips: you should be women,	Banquo – Fores'e ne kadar yol var! Bunlar da ne? Böyle kupkuru, üstleri başları acayip, yeryüzünün insanlarına hiç benzemiyorlar, ama yine yer yüzündeler! Canlı mısınız? İnsan sual sorsa cevap verir misiniz? Her birinizin şahrem şahrem parmağını derileşmiş dudağına götürdüğüne bakılırsa söylediklerimi anlamışa benziyorsunuz. Kadın olsanız gerek. Ama sakallarınız sizi öyle zannetmeme imkân bırakmıyor. (Shakespeare, 1946, p.10)	Banquo Forres'e daha ne kadar var acaba? Hey, bunlar da ne? Şu kırışık suratlara, şu paspal giysilere bakın; Bu dünyadan değiller sanki, Ama karşımızdalar!... Canlı mısınız, cansız mı? Konuşabilir misiniz bizimle? Her biriniz buruşuk parmağını,

And yet your beards forbid me to interpret That you are so. 1.3.(Shakespeare, 2003, p.15)		O kuru dudağına götürdüğüne göre, Beni anlıyor gibisiniz. Kadınsınız diyeceğim ama, Sakallarınıza bakınca aklım karışıyor. (Shakespeare, 2019,p.26)
TT3 Banquo Forres'e ne kadar var daha? Bunlar da kim? Şunlara bak: Kupkuru! Kılıkları da bir acayip… Bu dünyadan değiller sanki? Hey, in misiniz, cin misiniz? İnsan dilinden anlar mısınız? Yarık çizik parmaklarınızı Kupkuru dudaklarınıza götürdüğünüze göre Anlamış görünüyorsunuz söylediklerimi. Size kadın diyeceğim diyemiyorum, Bu kadar sakallı kadın da olmaz ki. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.9)	**Proposed Translation** Banquo Forres'e ne kadar daha var? Bunlar da kim oluyor? Kırışık içinde yüzleri, kılık kıyafet delilik timsali! Sanki yeryüzü sakinlerine benzemiyorlar ama yine de dünyadalar. Yaşıyor musunuz yoksa ecinni misiniz? Beni anladığınızı sanıyorum, yarık parmağınızı incecik dudağınıza götürdüğünüze göre. Size kadın desem olmaz ki, sakallarınız var.	

The key in Table 45 signs almost give a full description of the Weird Sisters in the Early Modern gaze as embodied in the character Banquo. The sign wild meaning "çılgın" (crazy) or "deli" (mad) in Turkish was translated as "acayip" (odd) as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) in TT1 and TT3 because the meaning produced is not totally irrelevant. (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The sign of madness was translated as "paspal" (shabby) in TT2 as an example of perversion of the meaning because the sign wild, which may be read as a reference to women of magic, was transformed to an irrelevant sign. The word shabby (paspal) only describes the outward appearances of the Weird Sisters consequently, meaning irrelevant to the original text was produced (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

It is open to discussion whether "delilik timsali" (as an embodiment of madness) in the proposed translation is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk

Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) or not because it also contains one of the possible meanings of the word "wild" in Turkish. The phrase "delilik timsali" (as an embodiment of madness) is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the emphasis itself counts as excessive commentary.

In TT1, "choppy fingers" was translated as "şahrem şahrem" (torn and slit) and "yarık çizik" (torn and slit) in TT3 and signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). In TT2, the phrase was translated as "buruşuk" (shrunk) as an example of alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the word "shrunk" refers to old age. The meaning is different from "torn and slit", which may be caused by overwork rather than old age. The alteration is a meaning transformation that is not totally irrelevant to the meaning in the text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The translation of the phrase as "yarık" (slit) in the proposed translation is an example of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign torn, which is covered by the word choppy, is erased.

The sign "look not like the inhabitants o' the 'earth" was translated as "yeryüzünün insanlarına hiç benzemiyorlar" (they do not look like the inhabitants of this world). In TT1 signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "bu dünyadan değiller sanki" (they look as if they are not from this world) in TT2 and TT3 as an example of sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the phrase of the signs in the target text almost describes the Weird Sisters as supernatural beings. However, this is a secondary implicit meaning. "İnsana benzemiyorlar" (they do not look like humans) in the proposed translation is an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign earth was completely erased.

Table 46: Example 43 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
App. Be lion-mettled, proud, and take no care Who chafes, who frets, or where conspirers are:	Üçüncü Hayalet. – Aslan yürekli. Gururlu ol; kızdıranlara, can sıkanlara aldırma; hainlik edecekleri	Hayalet Aslan gibi cesur ve pervasız ol; Kuruntuya, endişeye kapılanlara boş ver; Komploculara umursama. Macbeth'i kimse alt edemez;

Macbeth shall never vanquish'd be, until Great Birnam Wood to high Dunsinane Hill Shall come against him. 4.1. (Shakespeare,2003, pp.112-113)	aramaya kalkma. Macbeth, koca Birnam ormanı, ona karşı ayaklanıp Dunsinane tepesine gelmedikçe yenilmiyecektir. (Shakespeare, 1946, p.67)	Meğer ki, Koca Birnam ormanı kalksın, Dunsinane tepesine gelip, karşısına dikilsin. (Shakespeare,, 2019, p.100)
TT3 Üçüncü Hayalet Aslan yürekli ol! Gururlu ol! Düşme ardına Dil uzatan, başkaldıran, tuzak kuranların. Kimse Macbeth'in hakkından gelemez Koca Birnam ormanı kalkıp üstüne gelmedikçe, Dunsinane tepelerine kadar yürümedikçe. (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.71-72)	**Proposed Translation** Üçüncü hayalet Aslan yürekli ve gururlu ol! Sana dil uzatan, başkaldıran ve kumpas kuranların peşine düşme! Macbeth, koca Birnam ormanı üzerine yürümedikçe yenilmez!	

The Weird Sisters' prophecy depicts Macbeth as the most invincible king as a trick of fate. The Weird Sisters claim Macbeth will not be beaten until the trees in Great Birnam Wood march towards Dunsinane. Still, Macbeth's failure in noticing the play of words ultimately causes his destruction. The witches mockingly refer to the "impossibility" of transforming into trees because it would be the work of the supernatural. However, Shakespearean pathos has room for "changing shapes" as it borrows a lot from the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. Macbeth is so delusional that he thinks trees have started walking towards him in the final soliloquy. He finally yields to the supernatural after the death of Lady Macbeth.

The speech in Table 46 is the final prophesy for Macbeth to rule. However, Macbeth falls because he is unable to understand a smart tactic of a siege. His fall as a king is within the sphere of Shakespearean pathos but outside the honouring of the ancestors. He is fallen because he *yields* to the supernatural totally, marked in how he surrenders Macduff, the one who was not born out of a woman. Macbeth ultimately pays the high price of worshipping the Weird Sisters for the future of Scotland because

they delude him as the most invincible king on earth. Shakespearean Macbeth is an enigmatic character because why he was attracted to magic cannot be clearly identified. Shakespearean Macbeth is more than a name in the Scottish line of succession because of his hard-to-define the association with a magician the Shakespearean text. The Weird Sisters serve as the basis for Macbeth's *hamartia*, on classical terms of tragedy. Still, there is a lot more to say about his actions as inseparable elements of suspense.

In the excerpt in second example, the translators' choices are studied in pathetic structure and enigmas. There are references to Macbeth's manhood and bravery in the last talk of the Weird Sisters because he is deluded into thinking of himself as the invincible King of Scotland.

There are no meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like "vanquished" and "lion mettled". The sign vanquished was translated as "yenilmeyecektir" (is not going to be beaten) in TT1, "alt edemeyecektir" (shall not overthrow) in TT2, "hakkından gelemez" (cannot get over him) in TT3, and as "yenilmez" (will not be beaten) in the proposed translation and signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The most emphatic of all is "alt edemeyecektir" (shall not overthrow). It may be helpful to remember that the word *vanquish* in English is also used for feelings like fear. Since King Macbeth is equated with "fear", it may be an alternative to use the most emphatic word "alt edemeyecektir" (shall not overthrow).

The sign "lion-mettled" was translated ted as "aslan yürekli" (lion-hearted) in TT1, "aslan gibi" (like a lion) in TT2 and TT3, and "aslan yürekli" (lion-hearted) in the proposed translation, which are all free of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). However, there is another dimension to using the phrase *lion mettled* as providing the link to the concept of metamorphoses. The witches want Macbeth to turn into a lion as a supernatural being. In this respect, an alternative to the translations above would be "aslana dönüşmek" (turn into a lion), preserving the signs likewise.

Mythological information may not be reflected in the translation, but a footnote may remind the reader about it. There is a very strong mythological strain in how the

witches describe King Macbeth because they cannot talk in iconographic terms. Implicit connections to mythology like in the example may be overlooked if the pathetic structure of Shakespeare is disregarded. Instead, whether implicit or explicit, mythological links in metaphors provide both the source (Ovid's *Metamorphoses* like in the example) and the pathetic function concerning four great tragedies.

Table 47: Example 44 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Macb. She should have died hereafter. There would have been a time for such a word. -- Tomorrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow, Creeps in this petty pace from day to day, To the last syllable of recorded time; And all our yesterdays have lighted fools The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle! Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player That struts and frets his hour upon the stage, And then is heard no more: It is a tale Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, Signifying nothing. 5.5. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp.153-154)	Macbeth. — Daha sonra ölecekti, böyle sözün bir zamanı vardı. Yarın ardından yarın, böyle küçücük adımlarla gün gün üstüne gelir sokulur - nasipteki zamanın son noktasına kadar. Bütün dünlerimiz de sersemlere ışık tutmuş, ölümü toprak yoluna götürmüştür. Sön, kısacık mum, sön! Ömür bir yürür gölge; zavallı bir oyuncu ki sahnede salınıp çırpınarak saatini dolduruyor, sonra bir daha adı işitilmiyor: bir aptalın söylediği masal ki sırf gürültü, taşkınlık; bir mânaya geldiği de yok. (Macbeth, 1946, p. 95)	Macbeth: Bir gün ölecekti nasıl olsa; Bu haber bir gün gelecekti. Yarın… Yine yarın… Yine yarın… Sürüklenip gidiyor böyle bu boş yaşam, Kayıtlı zamanın son hecesine kadar. Dünlerimiz ise, onca budalaya ışık tutup, Toprak altına giden yolu gösterdi, Sön artık, hadi sön, ömrü kısa kandil! Yaşam dediğin yürüyen bir gölge, Bir garip oyuncu; Bir hışım sahnede dolanıp boy gösteriyor; Sonra haber çıkmıyor zavallıdan. Yaşam bir masal; kaçığın birinin anlattığı. Şamata ve öfke dolu baştan başa; Hiçbir anlamı yok. (Shakespeare, 2019, p.134)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Macbeth: Er geç ölecekti kraliçe: Er geç bir gün söylenecekti bu söz. Yarın, Yarından sonra bir yarın, bir yarın daha Sürüp gidiyor günden güne küçük adımlarla;	Macbeth: Zaten ölecekti ve gelecekti ölüm haberi bir gün! Bu sözün bir zamanı var. Yarın, yarın, bir daha yarın! Biteviye adımlarla ilerler günden güne!	

Geçmiş günlerimiz ise nice sersemlere ışık tutmuş Ölüm yolunda, toz toprak olmazdan önce. Sön, cılız kandil, sön! Hayat dediğin ne ki: Yürüyen bir gölge, bir zavallı kukla bu sahnede: Bir saat boy gösterip, boyun kırıp gidecek! Bir daha da duyulmayacak artık sesi. Bir aptalın anlattığı bir masal bu: Kuru gürültüler, deli saçmalarıyla dolu. (Shakespeare,, 2020, p.101)	Bize biçilen ömrün son dakikasına kadar. Dünlerimiz sersemlere ölüm yolundaki toz toprağa ışık tutmaktan öteye gitmez. Sön artık bitmiş mum, sön! Yaşam yürüyen bir gölgeden farksız, Sahnede zamanını doldurmak için oradan oraya gidip gelen bir oyuncu gibi sesi bir daha duyulmayan. Hayat bir aptalın anlattığı gürültü patırtılı anlamsız bir hikayedir,	

The final soliloquy shows Macbeth's distrust in tomorrow, an enigma for the readers. Macbeth's indecisive attitude can be traced back to his association with the supernatural because he almost confuses the future with magic. His last words, "signifying nothing" is a major enigma because of the *double entendre* of the word nothing. The word may alternatively point out both life and death in the Christian context. *Signifying nothing* is an extensive phrase, apt for semiotic analysis. Remembering Cordelia's use of nothing in *King Lear*, references to life and death can be traced. Macbeth's description of his life as a ghost marks his longing for the start of another life. Macbeth's dissatisfaction may also be read as his desire for *rebirth* in a sense used in Greek tragedies to comply with Shakespearean pathos.

The speech is made right after Macbeth hears about the suicide of Lady Macbeth. In the metaphorical sense that Northrop Frye uses (Frye, 1986, pp.27-28), the queen consort's inability to sleep may be seen as a failure in *the initiation process* and an attempt for rebirth in the text. On the other hand, Macbeth's comment "Out, out brief candle" (Macbeth, 2020, p.101) may be read as a description of his death because he seems to be longing for rebirth. His death wish seems to be more tied to initiation because stereotypes dating back to the birth of drama, the Greek elements rather than Roman (except Ovid) overweigh for Macbeths. The existence of Lady Macbeth is explicitly tied to psychological death as the result of the failure of rebirth, in close association with magic.

Although King Macbeth starts his speech by commenting on the death of Lady Macbeth, he calls life "a walking shadow". The ghost of Lady Macbeth does not arrive, possibly because Macbeth does not murder her. Had he murdered Lady Macbeth like Banquo, there would be another ghost rather than a soliloquy in this scene. Macbeth's final comments are full of both negation and existence because he is in the limbo world between life and death.

Starting from Macbeth's phrase "She should have died hereafter" to the last, the speech consists of conflicting phrases that would puzzle the readers. As an example, the last phrase is semantically correct, but the callousness does not fit the context. Through the gaze of feminism, Macbeth's indifference to the death of his wife, who did everything for Macbeth to sit on the throne, can be read as almost a denial of her existence.

There are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like "signifying nothing" and "idiot". The sign "signifying nothing" was translated as "bir manaya geldiği de yok" (it means nothing) in TT1. The same phrase was translated as "Hiçbir anlamı yok" (it means nothing) in TT2 preserving the signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "deli saçmalarıyla dolu" (full of utter nonsense) in TT3 as an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because "utter nonsense" (deli saçması) is a sign that does not exist in the source text. The same phrase was translated as "anlamsız bir hikayedir," (a meaningless tale) in the proposed translation as an example of over-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "meaningless tale" (anlamsız hikaye) gives excessive commentary on the sign.

On the other hand, a footnote can be helpful for the readers in connection with the iconographic meaning of the word nothing. It may mean destruction in the metaphorical sense because Christianity explains the Creation through nothing[95]. The word nothing refers to chasm before the Creation of the world[96], and it may be read as the precursor of the idea of Creation instead of destruction.

[95] See Paradise Lost, John Milton
[96] Ibid

The sign "idiot" was translated as "aptal" (idiot) in TT1 and TT3, which do not bear any meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "kaçığın" (cracked) in TT2 as an example of over-interpretation because it gives excessive commentary on the sign (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). However, "abdalın", the proposed translation, points out an interesting possibility of the meaning because the word "abdal" (fool or folly) is rhyming with "aptal" and near- homonym of the word. The meaning could also be interpreted as "abdal" (fool or folly) in the sense that Frye (Frye, 1986, p.118) uses as the attempt of the rebirth of a shaman. There is a sound play between the words. In the proposed translation, there is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) which may be read as a reference to the idea of folly rather than stupidity.

The combination can be found in the word "abdal" (dervish) in Turkish rather than "aptal" (stupid) as an aspirated or non-aspirated sound confusion. It is open to interpretation whether King Macbeth refers to stupidity or wisdom, while in the proposed translation, "abdal" is an over-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) of the word. A footnote giving brief information on the idea of folly and wisdom would clarify the huge difference between the Turkish words "aptal" (fool) and "abdal" (folly). Concerning Renaissance context, a footnote may also be given to remind The Praise of the Folly by Erasmus because it is within the context of Shakespearean tragedies.

Table 48: Example 45 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Macb. Thou losest labor: As easy mayst thou the intrenchant air With thy keen sword impress as make me bleed: Let fall thy blade on vulnerable crests; I bear a charmed life; which must not yield To one of woman born. Macd. Despair thy charm,	Macbeth – Boşuna emek harcama. Keskin kılıcınla ha kesilmez havayı kesmişsin, ha benim kanımı akıtmışsın. Varsın kılıç namlun yaralanır başlara insin. Benim hayatım sihirlidir: kadından doğmuş kimseye boyun eğmez. Macduff. — Sihrinden ümit kes; hizmetinden çıkmadığın ruh da sana bildirsin ki Macduff vaktinden önce anasının karnından alınmıştı. (Shakespeare, 1946, p.99)	Macbeth Boşuna yorma kendini. O keskin kılıcınla, Benden kan çıkarmaya çalışacağına, Havayı kes biç daha iyi. Korunmasız insanların tepesine indir o kılıcı sen. Sendeki can afsunlu; kadından doğma hiçbir erkek Alamaz o canı. Macduff

And let the angel whom thou still hast served Tell thee, Macduff was from his mother's womb Untimely ripp'd. 5.8. (Shakespeare, 2003, p.159)		O afsuna bel bağlama artık. Uşaklık ettiğin iblise sorsan söylerdi sana: Macduff, günü gelmeden alınmıştı Anasının rahminden. (Shakespeare, 2019, p.140)
TT3 Macbeth Uğraşma boşuna. Kesilmez havayı kesmeye kalkma. Senin keskin kılıcın işlemez bana. Git yarılır başlara vur, benim başım büyülü: Kadından doğmuşlar yenemez beni. Macduff Kes o büyüden umudunu sen. Kölesi olduğun şeytana sor söylesin sana; Macduff'ı doğum vaktinden önce Anasının karnını yarıp çıkardılar. (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.105-106)	**Proposed Translation** Macbeth Nafile çabalama! Ha o bilenmiş kılıcınla havayı kesmişsin, ha benim kanımı dökmüşsün. O kılıç ölümlülerin başlarına insin. Benim hayatım sihirlidir. Bir kadından doğmuşlara yenilmem. Macduff O büyüden kes umudunu artık. Hizmetindeki ruh sana Macduff'ın anasından karnı yarılıp vaktinden önce alındığını söylemedi mi?	

Macduff reveals the last enigma in Table 48 in the prediction of The Weird Sisters that Macbeth is to be destroyed only with the power of the supernatural when Birnam Wood comes to Dunsinane. Macduff's relationship with the supernatural is explicit only at the end because "from his mother's womb untimely ripped" (Shakespeare, 2003, p.159) is a minor enigma hidden at the end of the text.

However, doctors in ancient Scotland would not perform such an operation. The dangers of it would fall onto the shoulders of healers who boil mysterious compounds in the cauldron. It was an invasive medical practice also because the practitioners would be labelled as witches even if both the mother and the child survived. The witches practice magic because Macduff's mother should also have been put into a deep sleep before the baby was taken out. The process must have looked like black magic in the Early Modern gaze because baby Macduff was born out of a coma-

like sleep. Moreover, he was "from his mother's womb, untimely ripped", (Shakespeare, 2003, p.159), which means he was also a premature baby. Most early births today are not free of serious complications, but baby Macduff survives both during the operation and after, which must have resembled the *rebirth* of a dead baby.

Therefore, Macduff was brought into this world in the Early Modern context in the work of magic and witchcraft. Macduff, who is brought into this world with the magic of the healers, using elixirs (primitive forms of anaesthesia) boiled in the cauldron, defeats Macbeth to help the English rule on the Scottish crown. The traces of Dionysus, meaning born twice, and the concept of initiation point to the birth of drama, as Northrop Frye claims (Frye, 1986, p.118). Consequently, the concept of rebirth also revolves around Macduff's mysterious birth.

However, the revelation of Macduff's birth alone may not be very effective as an enigma for modern readers today because of the routine practice of caesarean operations. Ties of ancient medicine and magic may be overlooked. Moreover, the revelation may sound comical to the modern ears if Macduff's association with witchcraft, magic, and evil is not considered. Shakespearean pathos may explain why the birth of Macduff comes as a shock to Macbeth because he *feels* obliged to yield to the supernatural. Ultimately, reverberations from the crucible are heard when Macduff kills Macbeth because Scotland's ties with the supernatural are also ripped. The speech takes place at the end of the text. It can also be read as revealing Macduff's connection with the supernatural.

After that, the future of Scotland is given to the hands of Malcolm, who is known to support England. Scotland is finally out of the burning and boiling of the cauldron of the witches, and the "hurley-burley" is said to be done now because of the new order. As stated by Bryan Adams Hampton, the Scottish household was marked by irrationality and magic while the English represented logic, reason, and sanctified kings during the reign of Malcolm:

> These binaries of "clean" and "dirty" and "holy" and "unholy," are especially germane in Macbeth, where Shakespeare antithetically renders the royal households and householders of Scotland and England. The former falls under

> the irrational, sinister, disorderly, and barbaric headship of Macbeth, the latter under the rational, illumined, ordered, and civilised headship of one of the last Anglo-Saxon kings and the early patron saint of England, Edward III (1003-66), whose miraculous healing powers are mentioned in IV.iii. 142-60, and in whose Court Malcolm and Macduff take refuge. (Hampton, 2011, p.333)

In translations of the speech, there are meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like "charmed life" and "untimely ripped". The sign "charmed life" was translated as "hayatım sihirlidir" (my life is charmed) in TT1 and in the proposed translation, which does not bear any meaning transformations."Sendeki can afsunlu" (your soul is magical) in TT2 on the other hand, is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it gives excessive commentary on the sign. It should be noted that Macbeth says "I bear" which means that he is talking about his life. The word "afsunlu" in Turkish, derived from Farsi means magic, but etymologically speaking, it has the same root as "efsane" (myth). The sign "afsun" in Turkish, not magic in English, also gives excessive commentary because it is used in all contexts, whether religious or pagan. "Başım büyülü" (my head is charmed) in TT3 is a destruction of the meaning because the sign "baş" (head) was used instead of the sign "life" because the word "baş" (head), which does not appear in the source text and the phrase lacks clear meaning in Turkish.

The sign "from his mother's womb untimely ripped" was translated as "vaktinden önce anasının karnından alınmıştı" (from his mother's womb untimely ripped) in TT1, "günü gelmeden alınmıştı anasının rahminden" (from his mother's womb untimely ripped) in TT2, "doğum vaktinden önce anasının karnını yarıp çıkardılar" (from his mother's womb untimely ripped) in TT3 and "anasının karnı yarılıp vaktinden önce alındığını söylemedi mi" (from his mother's womb untimely ripped) in the proposed translation, which do not bear any meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). However, in the source text, the sentence begins as reverse for emphasis of a poetic language and a similar emphasis is not visible in translations. It is a challenge for the translators to copy iambic pentameter in

Shakespearean tragedies because the same rhyming pattern does not exist in Turkish. Therefore, a change in the emphasis of the text may be critical to consider.

It may be helpful to reconsider why such an emphasis is needed here. In connection to Shakespearean pathos, Macduff's birth is related to magic and witchcraft, which may sound very meaningful in the Early Modern context. For modern readers, though, it may have a similar effect.

5.4. Mythological and Iconographic Allusions in *Macbeth* and its Translations

Mythological and iconographic allusions are mixed with open references from Scottish history, and certain mythological characters are also embedded in the text. However, not every reference (like different versions of historical Macbeths) is an allusion. For example, the Anglicised Beaton name and its associations with magic could be read as a reference. King and Lady Macbeth (Gruoch)[97] are the characters with different versions of the same story that sources give, which points to the intertextuality as proposed by Julia Kristeva (Kristeva, 1969, p.36). Intertextual reading may help show the link of historical Macbeth stories taken from some versions of historical knowledge.

Gruoch (Lady Macbeth) and Duncan were married in an older version than Shakespeare's. Lady Macbeth and Macbeth (Mac Bethad Mc Findlaich) kill Duncan together and then marry. They both go against the rule of xenia (to respect the guest who is an elder member of the society) which may be read as the vein to the crafting of Shakespearean pathos based on honouring the ancestors. Lady Grouch wanted his son named Lulach the Fool or the Simple to sit on the throne because they do not have a child with Macbeth. It may be the starting point of Shakespeare's depiction of Lady Macbeth as a power-thirsty female who would leave aside her womanhood for a throne for her husband or son. In terms of intertextuality (Kristeva, 1969, p.36), we may also look at history to see the conflict "the Duncan whom he read of in Holinshed was a quite unsatisfactory ruler, Macbeth for many years a much better one" (Kiernan, 1996, p. 128).

[97] For more information of the relationship between Shakesperean Lady Macbeth and the Scottish Queen Grouch, see https://www.historyofroyalwomen.com/gruoch/gruoch-real-lady-macbeth/

On the other hand, there are mythological allusions concerning the fierceness of Lady Macbeth, but it is hard to say that she was openly presented to be a witch in the text. As stated by Greenblatt, Lady Macbeth, "is not revealed to be a witch, yet the witches subsist a tenebrous filament to which Lady Macbeth is obscurely but palpably linked"(Greenblatt, 1991, p.34). Lady Macbeth's association with Dionysian practices is more visible since she openly confesses that she would tear her baby's body into pieces in a moment of ecstasy to pursue power. However, her description as a Bacchae is manipulated because she openly states that she would sacrifice the poor baby for power. The purpose behind her characterization results in her condemnation as a "fiend" by Macduff. In other words, King Macbeth is more implicitly described in terms of the negative side of Shakespearean pathos, which requires a rejection of the idea of honouring ancestors. Lady Macbeth's description as a "fiendish queen" is an explicit reference to bestiality and witchcraft. However, she is strictly tied to the limitations the Scottish clan organization would bring. Therefore, it is often overlooked that she is submissive to her husband and the king from whom she gets no affection:

> We never see her free enough from weightier thoughts to return his affection. She is devoted to her image of him, and what he may come to be, rather than to him as a human being, and recoils from him as soon as he recoils from their grim plan. (Kiernan, 1996, p.131)

On the other hand, the mythological character Medea may alternatively be read as the prototype of Lady Macbeth because she is vengeful and wild. She uses all her magical power for her husband, Jason, to rule as an act of submissiveness. However, the connection between Lady Macbeth and the supernatural is somewhat loose in the Shakespearean text. Medea can do magic and change shapes (the link to *Metamorphoses*) while Lady Macbeth hides the bloody business to make her husband the king without the *apparent* help of magic. It looks like the family name Macbeth (Beaton in English)[98] , possibly because of the name's associations with medical

[98] The original names of the family were Macbeth or Bethune or Beaton as the Anglicised form

practices[99] in pagan Scotland, was chosen by the Weird Sisters to teach their supernatural art instead of Gruoch.

The intertextual link may be found in the very name of the Macbeth family, whose ancient medical practices may have looked like witchcraft to the Renaissance gaze. In the Shakespearean tragedies, on the other hand, the explicit reference to Macbeth's association with the ancient time healers does not exist. Instead, Macbeth is obsessed with the supernatural and the riddles of the witches to foresee the future of the Scottish crown.

Alternatively, the image of Medusa, a snake woman (Gorgon), and her poisoned breasts point out to the serpent sign as a symbol of rebirth in ancient cultures. Lady Macbeth's confessions to take the boneless gums from her nipples to dash the baby's brains out may alternatively be read as a link to Medusa's poisoned breast. She also asks her milk "to be taken for gall" which would be severely poisonous for the new-born. Lady Macbeth would be doubly damned because of her poisonous breasts and Medusa's association with rebirth as a snake woman. Therefore, from the beginning of the text, Lady Macbeth has her share of the negative portrayal of strong women as a negative pathetic component. In other words, even before the talk of murdering King Duncan, the character Lady Macbeth was mythologically tied to the image of a female beast as a threat to the idea of forming a patriarchal genealogy.

The wayward (Weird) sisters, on the other hand, may refer to three Muses-threefold muses, and they can also reach out to the emergence of Hecate. It may be helpful to remember that in the catalogue of women by Hesiod[100], Agamemnon's sacrificed daughter Iphigenia is turned into Hecate by Artemis.[101] Witnessing that Hecate comes to the stage as a character in *Macbeth*, one can also link Clytemnestra with Lady Macbeth as a female tyrant.

As stated by Bigliazzi, "Clytemnestra's subterranean fear in Agamemnon, her dialectical confrontation with her husband and his symbolic transformation into a tyrant" (Bigliazzi, 2017, p. 444) can also be read as the upside-down version of

[99] For more information on the history of the Beaton family see https://www.houseofnames.com/beaton-family-crest
[100] http://www.thethinkersgarden.com/2017/06/the-heroine-cults-of-ancient-greece/

Macbeth. Both Oresteia and Macbeth represent "tyrannical female fear, stressing the fundamental exchange of gender roles in keeping with the Dionysian subversive logic of tragedy" (Bigliazzi, 2017, p. 444). Clytemnestra, Lady Macbeth, and Dionysus as the god of ecstasy, in this respect, meet in *Macbeth* to challenge the patriarchal order in Scotland.

Moreover, they may also be read as reflections of Erinyes/Fortuna in Oresteia, who drive Orestes mad after matricide. Her mother, Clytaemnestra, the wife of Agamemnon, was so angry with her husband for sacrificing their daughter that she decided to murder him with her lover. [102] Orestes kills her mother for this and does not get any punishment in the old Greek family and belief system, and he is purified by Apollo in a Delphic oracle instead.

Therefore, the ultimate source of witchcraft as the character Hecate was tied, according to Hesiod's Catalogue of Women, to inequality in the Greek clan system that would punish patricide but not *matricide*. As stated by Silvia Bigliazzi, the roots of William Shakespeare's Macbeth can be traced in Greek texts, mostly in Oresteia, because "the fear of the female tyrant" is exemplified in the text:

> This is the starting point for the present issue too. Although recent criticism has increasingly argued in favor of a more widespread circulation of Greek texts in the English Renaissance than has been recognised, no uncontroversial evidence of Aeschylus's direct influence upon Shakespeare has been put forward to date. And yet, Macbeth does resemble the Oresteia in many respects. The two plays' common preoccupation with the tyrant's fear and their peculiar engagement with it are not erased by their historical and dramatic differences. (Bigliazzi, 2017, p. 437)

The chasing of Orestes by the Furies after he killed his mother to madden him is the major mythological reference in *Macbeth*. The Weird Sisters play with Macbeth's fears. However, as stated by Heiner Zimmermann, they are not as powerful

[102] For more information on the plot of the play see https://www.britannica.com/topic/Oresteia

as goddesses because the maddening of Macbeth is also dependent on his deep desires for power:

> In contrast to Juno, the witches have limited power over Macbeth. Whilst Hercules is irresistibly seized by passions, which dim his reason, the witches tempt Macbeth appealing to his "deep desires". Their appearance as haggard old women with beards could be reminiscent of the woodcut illustrations depicting the Furies in Golding's translation of Ovid's version of the myth in Metamorphoses Book IX- as Elizabeth Truax remarked (Zimmermann, 2006, p. 362).

The role of Hecate in *Macbeth* can be read as the embodiment of the dark component of Shakespearean pathos as opposed to the Renaissance ideal of honouring ancestors. Macbeth's famous quote, "I'm weary of the sun", (Shakespeare, 2003, p.155), can be read as proof of his inclination towards Hecate, symbolised by the moon. Traditionally speaking, the moon symbolises women because of their monthly cycles, and attraction to the moon has been traditionally associated with magic and the supernatural.

Mythologically speaking, Macbeth's facing towards the moon before his kingdom falls may be read as proof of his dedication to magic and the supernatural. In addition, as stated by Heiner Zimmermann, there are striking resemblances between famous tragedies of Seneca and famous tragedies of his time:

> Studies of the sources of Macbeth by K. Muir, G. Bullough, I. Ewbanks, and E. B. Lyle pointed out verbal echoes from several Senecan tragedies in J. Heywood's and J. Studley's versions, such as Hercules Furens, Hercules Oetaeus, Medea, and Agamemnon, which suggest that there is a memory of Seneca's Hercules tragedies in Shakespeare's text" (Zimmerman, 2006, p.361).

The talk of Hecate in the speech below indicates her remorse because the Weird Sisters do not call her when they tell riddles to Macbeth to play with his mind. Hecate

wishes to have her part in the tricks because she is the mistress of the mind game that the witches play with Macbeth. The Queen of the witches feels disappointed because they turned Macbeth into a "spiteful and wrathful" son who focused on his ambitions rather than serving witchcraft.

In deciding his destiny, Hecate tells the witches that she will catch "the vap'rous drop profound" (Shakespeare, 2003, pp.99-100) on the corner of the moon. The drop will bring illusions to Macbeth's mind, and he will forget about "death and fate" and the riddles of the witches. Hecate wishes Macbeth to focus on "wisdom, grace and fear", through which she describes the practices of herself and her minions. Through Hecate's long talk, it is possible to see that Weird Sisters wish Macbeth to be involved in their art. It may be read as a seduction scene because they know the weakest side of Macbeth, as with the other mortals: security. The Weird Sisters choose to play the last riddle with Macbeth according to the orders of Hecate. As the final strike, Macbeth eventually believes that he will remain invincible until the trees in Birnam Wood walk through Dunsinane.

Table 49: Example 46 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Hec. Have I not reason, beldams as you are, Saucy and overbold, how did you dare To trade and traffic with Macbeth, In riddles and affairs of death; And I, the mistress of your charms, The close contriver of all harms, Was never called to bear my part, Or show the glory of our art? And, which is worse, all you have done Hath been but for a wayward son, Spiteful and wrathful, who, as others do,	Hecate, — Hakkım yok mu, cadı karılar, başından büyük işe kalkışan küstahlar, sizi! Nasıl cesaret edip Macbeth'le ölüm dirim işleri muamma alış verişlerine giriştiniz de beni, büyülerinizin sultanını, bütün kötülüklerin tertipçisini işe davet etmediniz, sanatımızın şanını göstermeye çağırmadınız? Hem daha fenası, bütün emeklerinizi zaten sapık, kinci, öfkeli, olan bir insan oğluna tükettiniz: öbürleri gibi, sizinkini değil kendi çıkarlarını düşünen birine. Ama şimdi kabahatinizi tamir edin bakalım: gidin, sabahleyin Acheron kuyusu başında benimle buluşun. Bahtını öğrenmeye oraya gelecek. Kaplarınızı, büyülerinizi, sihirlerinizi, daha başka neyiniz varsa hepsini hazırlayın. Ben havalanıyorum; bu geceyi berbat ve hayırsız bir iş uğruna harcayacağım. Öğleden önce	Hecate: Şunlara bak, utanmadan da soruyorlar, Sizi gidi kendini bilmez cadalozlar! Siz ne cüretle çene çalıyorsunuz Macbeth'le, Falcılık taslıyorsunuz ölüm kalım işlerinde? Oysa ben, Cadılar Kraliçesi, hepinizi yöneten, Her türlü belayı gizlice kotaran ben, Hiç çağrılmış değilim rolümü oynamaya, İşin şerefinden payıma düşeni almaya. Üstelik, daha beteri, bütün yaptığınız da, Serkeş bir oğula yaramış sonunda;

Loves for his own ends, not for you. But make amends now. Get you gone, And at the pit of Acheron Meet me i' th' morning: thither he Will come to know his destiny. Your vessels and your spells provide, Your charms and everything beside. I am for th'air. This night I'll spend Unto a dismal and a fatal end. Great business must be wrought ere noon. Upon the corner of the moon There hangs a vap'rous drop profound; I'll catch it ere it come to ground: And that distilled by magic sleights, Shall raise such artificial sprites As by the strength of their illusion Shall draw him on to his confusion. He shall spurn fate, scorn death, and bear His hopes 'bove wisdom, grace, and fear; And you all know, security Is mortals' chiefest enemy. 3.5. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp.99-100)	büyük bir mesele başarılmış olmalı. Ayın ucunda bir buhar damlası hazır bekliyor; yere düşmeden onu yakalavacağım: bu damla, sihirli yollarla süzülürse, öyle olmadık ruhlar meydana çıkaracak ki bunların hayal kuvveti onun başını belâya sürükliyecek. Nasibe aldırmayacak, Ölümü hor görecek; aklı rahmeti, ölümü aşan ümitlere kapılacak; halbuki siz hepiniz bilirsiniz: emniyet ölümlü olanların baş düşmanıdır. (Macbeth, 1946, p.60-61)	Kindar, hınçlı, çıkarcı; çoğu insan gibi; Sizi değil, hep kendini düşünen birine yani. Temizleyin şimdi yapağınızı. Hadi gidin; Yarın sabah Acheron kıyısına gelin. Macbeth de gelecek, kaderini sormaya. Kazanlarınızı, büyülerinizi hazır edin ona, Afsun, tılsım, hiçbir şey unutmayın sakın. Benim vaktim geldi, havaya karışmam yakın. Feci bir kadere tanık oluyorum bu gece. Ayrıca, yapılacak büyük iş var ondan önce. Bir damla iksir asılı yarımayın ucunda; Yere düşmeden gidip almalıyım onu mutlaka. Havadan cinler, hayaller yaratacak bu iksir, Afsunludur çünkü, okunup üflenmiştir. O zaman Macbeth serseme dönecek. Bunları gördüğü anda; aklı başından gidecek; Kaderini hor görecek, ölümü hiçe sayacak; Umudu aklın, erdemin, korkunun üstünde tutacak; Oysa pek iyi bildiği gibi sizlerin, Kendine fazla güven baş düşmanıdır ölümlülerin. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.87- 88)

TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Hecate Nasıl kızmam? Sizi cadı karılar, sizi! Sizi yüzsüzler, Sizi başından büyük işlere kalkışanlar! Siz nasıl Macbeth'le anlaşır, Ölüm alışverişine girersiniz de bana anlatmazsınız bu şeytanlıkları? Ben ki başıyım bu işlerin, Sanatımızın sırlarını, büyü yapmasını, Benim öğreten size. İşin kötüsü, bütün yaptığınız da ne? Bir azgın, bir dik kafalı insanoğluna, Sizi değil kendi çıkarını düşünen, İçi kin dolu bir insanoğluna hizmet etmek. Temizleyin şimdi yediğiniz haltı: Gidin şimdi ve gün doğarken, Akheron' kıyısında bulun beni. Macbeth oraya gelecek, Falına baktırmaya. Kap, kazan, büyü, müyü, Hazırlayın neniz varsa. Bir işim var pişirilecek bu gece, Yarın öğleye, bir karışık, Bir belalı büyük iş. Bir damla var büyülü, duman duman. Onu kapacağım yere düşmeden: O damla girdi mi bizim tezgâha Öyle cinler çıkacak ki içinden Girip beynine, düşlerine Belaya salacaklar başını.	Hecate: Sizi gidi şirretler sizi, Nasıl sormam yaptığınızın hesabını küstah ve yüzsüzler? Nasıl olur da Macbeth'le ölüm kalım bilmeceleri hakkında konuşup anlaşırsınız? Benim, büyülerinizin efendisinin, tüm kötülüklerin en büyük mucidinin sanatımızı yüceltmeye gelmesine nasıl engel olursunuz? Daha da beteri, bütün yaptığınız size değil, diğerlerinin yaptığı gibi sadece kendine hizmet eden, kindar ve başına buyruk bir kişi yaratmak oldu. Temizleyin bakalım yediğiniz herzeyi: Şimdi gidin ve sabah Acheron kıyısında benimle buluşun. Macbeth oraya kaderini öğrenmeye gelecek. Kazanlarınızı, büyülerinizi ne lazımsa hazırlayın. Havaya karışmak üzereyim. Bu gece kapkara ve ölümcül bir isle meşgul olacağım. Yarın öğleden önce büyük bir iş kotarılacak. Ayın en ucunda büyüden dumanı tüten bir damla alınacak. Yere düşmeden tutulacak. Büyü ilmiyle işlenecek. Öyle tuhaf ruhlar çıkacak ki içinden Yanılsamaların gücü, Olacak zihninde öcü. Kadere karşı duracak, Ölüme meydan okuyacak Umutlarını bilgelik, zerafet ve korkunun üstünde tutacak. Hepinizin de bildiği gibi, Güven duymak ölümlülerin en baş derdi.	

Kaderi saymaz, ölüme aldırmaz olacak: Aklın, korkunun sınırlarını aşıp Tanrıdan ötelere gidecek umutları. Oysa hep bilirsiniz nedir, Ölümlülerin başını yiyen: Kendine fazla güven. (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.62-63)		

In Table 49, the translators' choices contain examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) of key signs like "vaporous drop profound" and "wayward son". These signs were chosen because the first is about the practice of magic, and the second is the name given to Macbeth by Hecate, the queen of the witches.

The sign "vaporous drop profound" was translated as "buhar damlası" in TT1 as an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "profound" was not translated. "Bir damla iksir" in TT2 is similarly an under-interpretation of the meaning because the sign "vaporous", which could have connotations with magic, was not translated (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). "Bir damla var büyülü, duman duman" (there is a smoky vaporous drop) in TT3 and "büyüden dumanı tüten bir damla" (a drop smouldering magic) in the proposed translation preserve the signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "wayward son" was translated as "bir insan oğluna" (to a man) in TT1 is an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "wayward" was not translated. The phrase was translated as "serkeş bir oğula" (to a wayward son) in TT2, "bir dik kafalı insanoğluna" (to a wayward human being) in TT3 and as "başına buyruk bir kişi" (a wayward son), which preserve the signs in the source text (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

Table 50: Example 47 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Macb. What man dare, I dare: Approach thou like the rugged Russian bear,	Macbeth, - Bir adam neyi göze alırsa alırım: kıllı Rus ayısı gibi, dişli gergedan gibi, yahut Curcan illerinin kaplanı gel; o şekle girme de hangi şekle girersen gir, sağlam sinirlerim	Macbeth Erkek olmaya ben de erkeğim! Azgın Rus ayısı gelsin isterse üstüme Ya da zırhlı gergedan veya Hyrcania kaplanı;

The armed rhinoceros, or th' Hyrcan tiger; Take any shape but that, and my firm nerves Shall never tremble. Or be alive again, And dare me to the desert with thy sword; If trembling I inhabit then, protest me The baby of a girl. Hence, horrible shadow! Unreal mockery, hence! 3. 4. (Shakespeare, 2003, p.95)	bir kere bile titremez; yahut tekrar diril, kılıcını çekerek meydan oku, beni çöle çağır; o zamanda titrer kalırsam beni kız bebek ilân et. Haydi git, korkunç gölge! Asılsız alay, git. (Shakespeare, 1946, p. 58)	Seninki dışında, hangi kılıkta gelirse gelsin, Hiç tınmam bile. Ya da, yine canlan da gel; Al kılıcını istediğin kuytuda kapışalım. O zaman da titret; çıkamazsam karşına, Ufacık, kız bebekten daha korkak de bana. Yok ol karşımdan, korkunç gölge! Gerçek dışı maskara, defol! (Shakespeare, 2019, p. 85)
TT3 Macbeth Bir insan neyi göze alabilirse almışım göze. Gel, yaklaş, kudurmuş Rus ayısı! Azılı gergedan, cana susamış Kaplan! Böyle görünme de ne olursan ol: Kılım kıpırdamayacak karşında. Diril istersen, kılıcını çek, çağır beni Issız bir yere. Korkar da evime kapanırsam, Bir kızın bebeği de bana, bebeği de! Çekil git, pis hortlak. Uydurma surat, çekil git! (Shakespeare, 2020, p.60)	**Proposed Translation** Macbeth Göze alınabilecek her şeyi göze aldım ben: Yaklaş vahşi Rus ayısı, Azgın gergedan ya da Hazar kaplanı, Bu şekle girme de ne olursan ol, çelik gibi sinirlerim asla gevşemez. Ya da diril tekrar, kılıcınla teke tek dövüşelim. Eğer kılım kıpırdarsa, hanım evladı de bana! Defol, korkunç hayalet! Hayali yaratık, defol!	

Concerning Shakespearean pathos, seeing how King Macbeth approaches the ghosts as visitors from the underworld is critical. The scene takes place during the banquet given to celebrate the coronation of King Macbeth. Like in the dagger scene, Macbeth's fear of the ghost is visible. Before Macbeth ends the banquet with this speech, there is an argument between Lady Macbeth and him concerning manliness.

Macbeth is on the brink of yielding the playful ghost that arrives to fill in the empty seat of Banquo in the banquet hall.

The argument between Lady and King Macbeth in Table 50 reveals that the fearless soldier Macbeth panics as Banquo's ghost re-enters the banquet hall. This time King Macbeth challenges the ghost with his "manliness". The references to the ghost as the "Russian bear", "the armed rhinoceros" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 95), and "the Hycran tiger" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 95) are indications that Macbeth prefers the appearance of the ghost to the beasts well-known for their fierceness. His phrase "take any shape but that" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 95) may also be read as a reference to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The appearance of the ghost of Banquo, with his bloody face, triggers panic and fear in King Macbeth. Macbeth's fear of Banquo's bloody body is so vivid that he shouts at it, "thy bones are marrowless, thy blood is cold" (Shakespeare, 2003, p. 95) to dismiss any possibility of revival from the underworld.

There are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs. The sign "Hycarian Tiger" was translated as "Curcan illerinin kaplanı" (The tiger of the Hycarian lands) in TT1 as an example of under-interpretation of the of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it provides insufficient information . The phrase was translated as "cana susamış kaplan" (blood-thirsty tiger) in TT3 as an over-interpretation of the meaning because the connotations between a tiger and bloodthirstiness are made explicit to provide excessive commentary on the text. (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The phrase was translated as "Hyrcania kaplanı" (Hyrcan tiger) in TT2 and as "Hazar Kaplanı" (Hyrcan Tiger) in the proposed translation, which preserve the signs in the source text. In the proposed translation, the word "Hazar" was preferred as the translation of Hyrcan in English, which pertain to the geographical region in Caucasia from which the so-called tiger lived. The word Hyrcan may be unfamiliar to Turkish readers, while "Hazar" instantly recalls Caucasia as the familiar geographical region.

The sign "unreal mockery" which was translated as "asılsız alay" (baseless mockery) in TT1 is an alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because a false meaning with the sign "asılsız" (baseless) was produced in the target

text. Similarly, "gerçek dışı maskara" (unreal clown) in TT2 is an alteration of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "maskara" (clown) in Turkish does not exist in the source text. The sign translated as "uydurma surat" (made-up face) in TT3 is a perversion of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign made-up (uydurma) does not exist in the source text and "hayali yaratık" (imaginary beast) in proposed translation is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because "imaginary" (hayali) is a sign that does not exist in the source text.

Table 51: Example 48 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Macd. Confusion now hath made his masterpiece. Most sacrilegious murder hath broke ope The Lord's anointed temple, and stole thence The life o' th' building! Macb. What is 't you say? "The life"? Len. Mean you his majesty? Macd. Approach the chamber, and destroy your sight With a new Gorgon. Do not bid me speak: See, and then speak yourselves. – 2.3. (Shakespeare,2003, p. 63)	Macduff, - Ah, felâket felâket! Seni hatırlamıya da anmıya da ne dil razı olur, ne gönül! Macbeth Lenox Ne oldu ki ? Macduff, — Düzeni altüst olan işlerin şaheseri bu! Çok kâfirce bir cinayet. Tanrının mukaddes mabedine zorla girerek oradan yapının canını almış! Macbeth. — Ne dediniz? Canını mı? Lenox. — Hükümdarımızın mı demek istiyorsunuz? Macduff. – Odaya gidin de gözlerinizi yeni bir Gorgon kör etsin. Benden söz beklemeyin. Görün de söyleneceği kendiniz söylersiniz… (Shakespeare, 1946, pp. 36-37)	Macduff Felaket! En kötü şey oldu! İmansız caniler, Tanrı'nın kutsal mabedine zorbaca girip, İçindeki canı çalmışlar Macbeth Ne demek istiyorsun? Hangi canı! Lennox Majeste mi yoksa? Macbeth Odaya gelin de, Gorgon'u görmüş gibi Kör olup taş kesilin sizde. Kendi gözlerinizle görün ve ona göre konuşun… (Shakespeare, 2019, p.58)
TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Macduff Böylesine canavarlık görülmemiş. Cinayetlerin en cehennemliği Tanrının evini talan etmiş de sanki Tapılan canı almış içinden… Macbeth Neler söylüyorsun? Ne canı? Lennox	Macduff: Felaketin en büyüğü geldi. Caninin en cehennemliği, Tanrının kutsal evine girip, İçindeki canı çalmış. Macbeth: Ne diyorsun sen? "Kimin canı"?	

Krala mı bir şey oldu? Macduff Gidin odaya da taş kesilsin gözleriniz, Yılan saçlı Gorgon'u görmüş gibi. Beni konuşturmayın; gidin görün, Sonra kendiniz konuşun konuşabilirseniz. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.37-38)	Lennox: Kral mı yoksa? Macduff: Odaya bir girin de gözleriniz yılan saçlı yeni bir Gorgon görmüş gibi taş kesilsin. Beni konuşturmayın, gidin kendiniz görün.

Macduff's description of King Duncan's death in both mythological and iconographic terms may also be helpful in studying meaning transformations. The phrases like "most sacrilegious murder" and "The Lord's anointed temple" are iconographic because the words "sacrilegious" and "anointed" belong to Christian terminology. At the same time, "a new Gorgon" is a reference to Medusa and her sisters.[103] It is an interesting speech because iconographic elements contrast with the myth of Medusa, the most undesirable woman in the Early Modern context. On the practical level, such contrasting elements exist in the text for emphasis. The reference to Medusa may mean that the sight of the murder of the king is so frightful that one may turn into stone-like Medusa's onlookers. However, at a deeper level, "the snake woman" image may be serving Shakespearean pathos.

Moreover, the snake woman image may be read as an implicit reference to Oresteia or the equalling of three Gorgons with three Furies. Macduff's speech can also be read as an example of intertextuality also because of the iconographic data in Genesis. The mythological tales like Medusa, Clytaemnestra, or Hecate have a great impact on the modelling and remodelling of the "femme Fatale" image. Macduff describes Duncan's death as if a Gorgon stole the king's soul. In this respect, "the snake woman" (Gorgon) can be read as a stereotype to cover Clytaemnestra, Medusa, Eve, The Furies (Erinyes), and Lady Macbeth. Like the sounds of hell-broth coming from in the cauldron in the songs of the Weird Sisters, "the snake woman" stereotype reverberates all through the text, beginning with the murder of King Duncan.

It may be critical to remember King Duncan's murder is also the murder of the holy household, which ends history in Christian Scotland and "amens". The snake contrasts the anointed temple that Duncan represents the honouring of the ancestors as

[103] For more information see https://www.britannica.com/topic/Gorgon

a character. With the arrival of the Gorgon-like queen, there starts Macbeth's rule based on the predictions of the supernatural beings:

> In keeping with Macbeths status as enemy to the successive - one who, following the murder of Duncan, wishes history to come to an end- the play often seems a stuttering series of "amens," attempts to bring something to a close, which to Macbeth s horror turn out to be "omens," or projections about the future and therefore about succession. Recounting to Lady Macbeth his effort to echo one of the groomsmen's "Amens" the night of Duncan's murder, Macbeth confides, One cried, 'God bless us!' and 'Amen,' the other, As they had seen me with these hangman's hands. List'ning their fear, I could not say, Amen,' When they did say, 'God bless us.' Lady M. Consider it not so deeply Mac. But wherefore could not I pronounce 'Amen'? I had most need of blessing, and 'Amen' Stuck in my throat. (Baldo, 1996, p. 557)

The murder of sacredness in Scotland is technically there to provide background to the damnation of the Macbeth household. King Macbeth knows he also murdered his salvation marked by his phrase "mine eternal jewel":

> Even more than Othello, Macbeth thinks intensely about his salvation-"mine eternal jewel", as he calls it, "given to the common enemy of man" in his assassination of Duncan (3.1 69-70). Gratuitously murdering a king who had just honoured him, Macbeth destroys not only his lord but also his guest and kinsman (1.7.12-14), thus committing, as several critics have pointed out, the three sins of Dante's Caina. For just one of those sins (betraying one's lord), Dante imagines Brutus, Cassius, and Judas being gnawed forever in the tripartite mouth of Satan. Macbeth's hell is this-wordly, as always for Shakespeare's tragic heroes, but his despair derives from a specifically Christian sense of what he

does to himself, as Jorgensen has shown, and the background of grace is what makes the suffering of his "deep damnation" so powerful. (Cox, 2007, p.81)

In other words, Macbeth loses everything in terms of Christian faith but tries to win his fortune through Fortuna (the Weird Sisters) by doing a "secret geometry of chance".

In the Table 51, the translators' choices are also worth considering in terms of meaning transformations. There are examples of the meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like *Gorgon,* sacrilegious and anointed.

The sign *Gorgon* was translated as "Gorgon" in all the target texts as well as in the proposed translation, thus preserving signs.

However, we may not claim that the sign "Gorgon" will recall the picture of the snake-headed Medusa for the Turkish readers who have prior knowledge of mythology. It may be helpful to put a footnote to the sign that will attract the readers' attention. For the readers who do not realize that Gorgon is related to Medusa, the translation will bear an under-interpretation of the meaning. In this way, the connection between the pathetic structure of Shakespearean tragedies and the sign Gorgon may be well understood. The Early Modern perspective on magic and witchcraft and the iconographic dimension in Macduff's description of the murder of King Duncan will be better visible.

The sign "sacrilegious" was translated as "kafirce" (in blasphemy) in TT1 and "imansız" (faithless) in TT2, which could be considered over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the connotations of the words chosen provide excessive commentary. The phrase was translated as "en cehennemliği" (most hellish murder) in TT3 and in the proposed translation as an over-interpretation of the meaning because the sign "sacrilegious" has an implicit connection with the sign "hell" that was made explicit in the translation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

However, the word "anointed" refers to the anointment of the Scottish King to sanctify and secure Scotland as a Christian kingdom which may be unfamiliar to

Turkish readers. The sign *anointed* was translated as "mukaddes" (sanctified) in TT1 but as "kutsal" (holy) in TT2, TT3 and in the proposed translation, which does not bear any meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The alternative to the translations above could be "kutsanmış" (holy), bearing the same meaning as "mukaddes" (sanctified) as well as a footnote that may help clarify the anointment process as a Scottish King.

Table 52: Example 49 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lady M. What beast was 't, then, That made you break this enterprise to me? When you durst do it, then you were a man; And, to be more than what you were, you would, Be so much more the man. Nor time nor place, Did then adhere, and yet you would make both: They have made themselves, and that their fitness now Does unmake you. I have given suck, and know How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me. I would, while it was smiling in my face, Have pluck'd my nipple from his boneless gums And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn As you have done to this. 1.7. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp.41-42)	Lady Macbeth. – Öyleyse bu teşebbüsü bana haber verniye sizi zorlayan hangi canavardı? O işi yapmayı göze aldığınız zaman, işte asıl o zaman erkektiniz; erdiğinizden daha fazlasına etmek için daha çok erkeklik göstermeye hazırdınız. O sırada ne zaman uygundu, ne de yer; ama siz ikisini de yaratmaya bakıyordunuz. Onlar kendiliklerinden yaratıldılar, fakat uygunlukları sizi siz olmaktan çıkarıyor. Çocuk büyüttüm; insanın, meme verdiği yavruya sevgisi ne kadar şefkat doludur biliyorum; ama sizin bu iş için ettiğiniz yemin gibi bir yemin etmiş olsaydım daha dişleri çıkmamış ağzından memenin başını çeker de onun beynini dağıtırdım. (Macbeth, 1946, pp.24-25)	Lady Macbeth O zaman hangi yaratığın zoruyla açtın planını bana? Bu işi yapmaya cüretin varken insandın; O anda olduğundan fazlasını olabilmek için, Daha da bir insan olmaya hazırdın. O sıra, ne zaman ne yer uygundu bu iş için; Ama sen bir yolunu bulmaya hazırdın. Şimdi ikisi de kendiliğinden uygun düştü, Mükemmel bir fırsat çıktı, Ama bu defa sen ödlekleştin. Ben çocuk emzirdim; bebek meme emerken İnsan onu ne kadar sever, Nasıl içi titrer, bilirim. Yine de, yüzüme gülücükler yaparken, Daha o dişleri çıkmamış ağzından Mememi çekip alır ve beynini dağıtırdım, Eğer bunu yapmaya yemin etmiş olsaydım; Tıpkı senin yemin ettiğin gibi. (Shakespeare,2019, pp.43-44)
TT3 Lady Macbeth	**Proposed Translation** Lady Macbeth	

Öyleyse hangi hayvan yazdırdı sana Bana yazdıklarını? O zaman insandın asıl, Yapmaya yüreğin olduğu zaman. Daha ileri git şimdi, Daha fazla insan olmak istiyorsan. O zaman ne sıraydı bu işin, ne de yeri, Öyleyken yerini de sırasını da yaratmaya hazırdın. Şimdi kendiliğinden ikisi de elinde: Ama sen yoksun, sen kendi elinde değilsin. Ben çocuk büyüttüm, bilirim nedir tadı Sütümü emen bir yavrunun. Öyleyken, Mememi çeker alırdım dişsiz damaklarından, Beynini ezerdim kendi yavrumun, Senin ettiğin yemini etmiş olsaydım. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.24)	Öyleyse hangi yaratığın ağzından çıktı bana yazdıkların? Asıl yapmaya niyetlendiğiniz zaman adam sıfatına girdiniz. Kendinizi aşıp adamdan fazlası bile olabilirdiniz. Zaman ve mekan uymasa da, ikisini birden ayarlamak istediniz. Tam işler yoluna girdi, ödlekleştiniz. Ben bebek emzirdim, memeyi emene nasıl şevkatle yaklaşılır bilirim. Eğer senin gibi yeminli olsaydım, o dişsiz ağzını mememden çeker, o dakika beynini dağıtırdım.	

Lady Macbeth's famous speech in Table 52 is a striking example of how negatively crafted female characters and Shakespearean pathos are related. In one speech, it is possible to see allusions to Bacchae and the Dionysian cult, Medusa and her poisoned breasts, the snake imagery, and Medea, the conjurer. They murdered her male children to destroy patriarchal genealogy. She tries to convince Macbeth into committing murders for power. It has been the subject of many disputes, most of them coming from feminist scholars. As it is also one of the steps in semiotic reading, feminism gives room to analyse the speech sprung from the mouth of a female under patriarchal suppression, regardless of noble lineage. She was described as almost a female beast who would strangle her baby for the power play.

The speech in Table 52 is traditionally regarded as first-hand proof of the "fiendishness" of Lady Macbeth as a shallow interpretation. A closer look at the roots of drama, it may be deduced that she was only depicted in mythological contexts to add negative qualities to her as "the bestial Lady Macbeth" for Shakespearean pathos.

Alternatively, a feminist reading from the point of view of the semiotics of translation may give us a chance to stretch out to the mythological and iconographic description of women who live outside the boundaries set by the patriarchal society. Lady Macbeth is not *free*, even in terms of characterization. The ambitious woman who would choose to tear her baby apart for power can be read as a metaphor of a Bacchae to mimic the rebirth of the wine God Dionysus after he was torn apart by Titans.[104] Therefore, it is open to discussion whether Lady Macbeth's bestiality refers to a real-life practice or not.

As stated before, Bacchae's attempts for rebirth refer to one of the theories concerning the birth of drama. The relationship between Shakespearean pathos, mythology, and iconography may reveal the basis of her characterization. As claimed by many feminist scholars, Lady Macbeth is a character who turns into an accomplice of murder for her husband to rule, not *herself*. There is a contradiction in the characterization because the Bacchae were free women, often regarded as possessing healing powers to make the rebirth of Dionysus possible every spring. [105] Lady Macbeth explicitly lacks such power because she is stuck by the limitations set by the patriarchal Scottish society. Lady Macbeth had a royal background living according to the restrictions set by her lineage. Interpreting the "dashing the baby's brain out" as *proof* of her fiendishness would be overly simplistic because the imagery dates to the foundations of drama. She was almost depicted as a monster because she asked for rebirth as having male properties, an aspect of drama condemned on the Renaissance stage. The relationship between rebirth, witchcraft and the portrayal of supernatural elements requires further study for deeper analysis of characters.

[104] For more information on Greek mythography and the birth of the wine god Dionysus, see p.131 Aeschylus and Athens: by George Thomson
[105] Ibid

In the excerpt above, the translators' choices are worth considering in terms of womanhood. There are examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like *beast* and *unmake*.

The sign beast translated as "canavar" (monster) in TT1 is free of designificative tendencies (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "hayvan" (animal) in TT3 as an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the meaning bestiality "yaratık" (beast) was not translated. The sign beast may be read as a reference to the "unnatural" (supernatural) existence. In TT2 and the proposed translation signs were preserved (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "unmake you" translated as "sizi siz olmaktan çıkarıyor" (it makes you unlike yourself) in TT1 preserves the sign (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p.172). However, "sen kendi elinde değilsin" (you cannot control yourself) in TT3 is an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the meaning of control does not exist in the source text. The phrase was translated as "ödlekleştin" (grown coward) in TT2 and "ödlekleştiniz" (you have grown coward) in the proposed translation as examples of sliding of the meaning because a possible meaning that is potential but not actualized in the context of the original text was produced (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

5.5. Veridictory modalities in *Macbeth* and its translations

It is critical to study the veridictory square in the text *Macbeth* in terms of the difference between seeming and being because pathos in the text is directly related to magic in the form of the Weird Sisters. Throughout the plot, King Macbeth continually confuses *seeming* with *being* as he is deluded by the predictions on the future of the crown of Scotland. Perhaps more than any other great tragedy, an academic study on the pathos of *Macbeth* relies on the relationship between veridictory modalities and enigmas as suspense elements. The more King Macbeth is deluded with seeming and being, the stronger suspense gets. Therefore, explaining the framework below may provide a better grasp of the text's pathetic structure.

The speech in Table 53 is an example of how Macbeth confuses seeming (the trees walking towards Castle Dunsinane) and being (Macduff's soldiers use tree

branches as camouflage). There are enough soldiers to protect Macbeth in the castle, but he is so delusional that he cannot understand that real soldiers are coming for a siege of the castle. He *yields* to the supernatural because he confuses seeming with being. The unclear commands distract his own soldiers, and Macbeth is ultimately defeated by Macduff, who was not born out of a woman.

Table 53: Example 50 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Macb. If thou speak'st false, Upon the next tree shall thou hang alive Till famine cling thee. If thy speech be sooth, I care not if thou dost for me as much.-- I pull in resolution; and begin To doubt th' equivocation of the fiend, That lies like truth: "Fear not, till Birnam wood Do come to Dunsinane"; — and now a wood Comes toward Dunsinane.— Arm, arm, and out!— If this which he avouches does appear, There is nor flying hence nor tarrying here. I 'gin to be aweary of the sun, And wish th' estate o' th' world were now undone.— Ring the alarum-bell!—Blow, wind! Come, wrack! At least we'll die with harness on our back. 5.5. (Shakespeare, 2003, p.155)	Macbeth. — Yalan söylüyorsan ilk ağaca diri diri asılacak, orada açlıktan gebereceksin Sözün doğruysa ayni şeyi sen bana yap istersen, aldırmam... Azmim gevşiyor. Doğru benzeri yalanlar söyleyen iblisin iki yüzlü lâf ettiğinden şüphelenmeye başlıyorum…"Birnam ormanı Dunsinan'e gelinceye dek korkma!" Oysa şimdi bir orman Dunsinane'e doğru geliyor… Silâh başına, silâh! Sonra dışarı! Dediğin bu şey doğru akarsa ne buradan kaçmak olur, ne burada kalmak. Güneşten bıkmaya başlıyorum artık, dünyanın sonu gelmesini istiyorum, Tehlike çanım çalın! Es, rüzgâr! Gelsin yakıp yıkmak! Hiç değilse sırtımızda zırhla ölürüz! (Shakespeare, 1946, pp.95-96)	Macbeth Eğer yalan konuşuyorsan, En yakın ağaca, açlıktan ölene kadar, Canlı canlı asılacaksın. Söylediğin doğruya, en iyisi, Aynı şeyi sen bana yap. Kendime güvenimi kaybediyorum Ve doğru söyler gibi yapıp yalan uyduran O düzenbaz iblisin konuşmasından Şüphe etmeye başlıyorum. Ne demişti: 'Birnam Ormanı Dunsinane'e gelene kadar korkma.' İşte şimdi bir orman Dunsinane'e geliyor. Hadi, silahlara, silahlara! Cenk meydanına! Ger kehaneti doğruysa, kaçmanın da anlamı yok, Beklemenin de. Güneşten bıkmaya başladım; Keşke şu anda evren dağılıp param parça olsa. Savaş çanlarını çalın! Esin rüzgârlar! Gel bakalım bela! Hiç değilse, Sırtımızda zırhımızla ölürüz. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.135-136)

TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Macbeth Yalan söylüyorsan, ilk ağaca diri diri asılır, Açlıktan geberinceye kadar kalırsın. Doğruysa söylediğin, sen beni as, aldırmam. İşte bu yıkar bütün gücümü. İster misin bir şey saklı olsun Cadının gerçeğimsi yalanlarında: "Birnam ormanı Dusinane'e yürümedikçe korkma!" Oysa kalkmış geliyor işte orman. Haydi, kuşanıp gelsin herkes, çıkalım. Haber doğruysa kaçsak da boş, kalsak da. Ben güneşi görmekten bezdim artık. Varsın bütün dünya yok oluversin! Çalsın bela çanları! Essin ölüm rüzgârları! Zırhımız sırtımızda ölürüz hiç olmazsa! (Shakespeare, 2020, p.102)	Macbeth Söylediğin yalansa, seni ilk bulduğum ağaca diri diri asarım açlıktan geberirsin. Söylediğin doğruysa, istersen sen aynı şeyi bana yap. Kararlılığım söndükçe. " Birnam ormanı Dunsinane üzerine yürümedikçe korkma!" diyen ikiyüzlülük cadının gerçekle yalanı karıştırdığından şüphelenmeye başlıyorum. İşte orman kalkmış bana geliyor. Çıkmaya davranın. Eğer gelen şey yüzünü gösterirse kaçsak da kalsak da bir. Zaten bezmişim güneşi görmekten, dünya yok olsa ne çıkar! Çalsın tehlike çanları! Kaçmak yok bela rüzgarından! Sırtımızda zırhla ölürüz en azından!	

In the last scene, Macbeth assumes that the trees in the Birnam Wood have started marching towards the castle instead of the camouflaged soldiers who walked through them. The speech above reveals the ambiguity in the predictions of the witches, and he calls them "lies like truth" because he finally realizes that the Weird Sisters were playing tricks on him. This scene exemplifies how Macbeth confuses seeming with being because Macbeth formerly had total faith that the witches had told him the truth. He was convinced that his faith would not be shaken because trees would never walk to come towards him. The seeming reality is the invincible Macbeth because he is dedicated to the prophesy that trees will not change into humans to destroy his kingship.

Macbeth's faith in the predictions of the witches is an illusion about seeming. The reality, on the other hand, is revealed through the playfulness of Fate, the Weird Sisters mimicking Erinyes in Oresteia. Mythologically speaking, the tricks of fate date back to ancient Greek where mortals did not fully trust supernatural beings. King Macbeth is the total opposite of Banquo, who is ultimately suspicious of the Weird Sisters firstly because of their strange appearance, as stated before. Macbeth almost worships the predictions of the Weird Sisters at all costs for the throne.

There are examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like *undone* and *weary of the sun*. The sign undone is related to the foundation of a new kingdom by Macbeth as well as its destruction. The sign "sun", on the other hand, may be read in relation to the rise and fall of the kingdom.

King Macbeth yearns for the destruction of the world that he lives in. It would be too simplistic to claim that King Macbeth wishes for death because the idea "to be weary of the sun" can be read as a mythological allusion to the sun god Apollo that contrasts with Hecate, symbolized by the moon.

The phrase undone was translated as "dünyanın sonunun gelmesi" (the arrival of the end of the world) in TT1 by preserving signs but, "dağılıp paramparça olmak" (to be ripped in pieces) in TT2 is an example of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "paramparça" (ripped in pieces) does not appear in the source text. The phrase was translated as "dünya yok oluversin" (let the world be destroyed) in TT3 and as "dünya yok olsa ne çıkar" (what change would come even if the world is destroyed) in the proposed translation as examples of sliding of the meaning because in both a possible meaning that is potential was produced (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign " weary of the sun" was translated as "güneşten bıkmaya başlıyorum artık" (I am starting to get fed up with the sun) in TT1, "güneşten bıkmaya başladım" (I have started to get fed up with the sun) in TT2, "güneşi görmekten bezdim artık" (I am now weary of the sun) in TT3 and "bezmişim güneşi görmekten" (I am already weary of the sun) in the proposed translation, each preserving the signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

5.6. Subject Transformations, Signs of Insanity or Antic Disposition in *Macbeth* and its Translations

In Shakespearean great tragedies, madness is a common theme. However, it may be a challenge to find a common ground to study types of madness in the texts because it is hard to define the concept in relation to pathos and characterization. Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation provides us with a framework to study "subject transformations"of characters through the division of subjects into three as subjects, non-subjects, and quasi-subjects (Coquet, 2007, p. 37, Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p. 189). Moreover, it enables the reader to analyse the mental states of the speakers and to evaluate individual and mutual speeches of characters, diction, register, broken sentences, and positionality of speakers.

In studying the transformation of the subjects, (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189), it should be remembered that the states are not permanent. In other words, the passing of the subject to the non-subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189) stage is at times challenging to study also because of Macbeth's indecisiveness. Jumping from one mental state to another, especially before the murder of King Duncan, is critical. Lady Macbeth displays herself as a non-subject at the end of the text after the murders of the successive kings of Scotland. The queen consort exemplifies the madness in *Macbeth* rather than the Scottish king himself because the pathetic structure in the tragedy is based on a negative gaze on women.

In the way described by Northrop Frye (1986, p.118), madness is also associated with the initiation of a shaman for rebirth, working implicitly as a theme. Although King Macbeth displays mood shifts, he does not have a total breakdown like his queen. He constantly lives on the brink of moving from being a subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189) to a non-subject (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189) as instances, as exemplified in the banquet scene. He is unlike Othello, who has an epileptic fit, after which he "sleeps" to echo initiation. On the other hand, he "hath murdered sleep" in Scotland as if he murdered the possibility of rebirth instead of King Duncan. The sign "sleep" in Scotland may also be read as resurrection in iconographic terms. He is confused, angry, and delusional at times but never turns into a non-subject like Lady

Macbeth. Macbeth is not explicitly called "mad", although other characters see and hear his mood shifts and strange talks.

He even does not move to a state of a total "non-subject" (Coquet, 2007, p.37) even when his dedicated belief is that Birnam Wood will never march towards Dunsinane is destroyed. There could be a simple explanation like avoiding the mental instability of a former Scottish king on the stage. Alternatively, a former Scottish King who goes through a sleep of initiation in the Renaissance stage like King Lear was merely unnecessary, possibly because Lady Macbeth *served* the purpose.

Macbeth's quest to foresee through madness and mystic initiation is implicit for Macbeth but still attached to the pathetic structure. In this respect, Lady Macbeth's madness can be regarded as a pathetic element and an aspect of characterization. She becomes a total non-subject (Coquet, 2007, p.37) because of her associations with discriminative gaze in Renaissance society. In concordance with her submissive role as a woman, Lady Macbeth goes mad instead of King Macbeth.

Reading Lady Macbeth's association with Bacchae is critical because madness, witchcraft, and mythology are intermingled in her characterization. As mentioned above, rebirth exists in four great Shakespearean tragedies as a negative element because of its association with witchcraft. Therefore, the framework that provides room for King Macbeth's madness will remain vague if the concept of initiation is left aside.

Madness also forms the background to King and Lady Macbeth's relationship, as exemplified in their dialogues before the murder of King Duncan. However, the representations of madness are made explicitly through Lady Macbeth, not King Macbeth. Sexist codes in Shakespeare's four great tragedies are at work because Lady Macbeth mirrors all madwomen, beasts, and witches, along with the Weird Sisters. As characterization is largely dependent upon the division between sexist codes and honouring the ancestors, Lady Macbeth may be read as a stereotype that would symbolize all madwomen, borrowing from Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *Madwomen in the Attic*, throughout the crucible of history.

The speech in Table 54 exemplifies Macbeth's swaying from being a subject to a non-subject. The illusion of the dagger has many metaphorical implications. All

through the speech, Macbeth tries to decide whether the dagger is a real one or the work of his imagination. He is aware of his "high and low tides" in perception. Halfway through the speech, Macbeth hints at his relationship with the supernatural, as exemplified by his reference to Hecate. His reference to the dark practices of the world is striking because explicit references to witchcraft also mark the negative components of pathos. He openly comments on Hecate and the darkness, which may be read as the source of his madness.

However, there are challenges to exemplify King Macbeth's mental states only through magic and the supernatural. A reading from the point of view of the semiotics of translation may reveal how Macbeth's mind was affected by the Weird Sisters because it is arguable that he sways from being a subject (as a king) to a non-subject through the work of magic of the Weird Sisters and Hecate.

Table 54: Example 51 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Macb. Is this a dagger which I see before me, The handle toward my hand? Come, let me clutch thee:-- I have thee not, and yet I see thee still. Art thou not, fatal vision, sensible To feeling as to sight? or art thou but A dagger of the mind, a false creation, Proceeding from the heat-oppressed brain? I see thee yet, in form as palpable As this which now I draw. Thou marshall'st me the way that I was going; And such an instrument I was to use-- Mine eyes are made the fools o' th'other senses,	Macbeth - Şu önümde gördüğüm bir hançer mi? Kabzası da elime doğru çevrilmiş. Gel, yakalıyayım seni. Ele geçmiyorsun, ama seni hâlâ görüyorum. Meşum hayal, göze görülür de elle tutulmaz mısın? Yoksa, sadece zihnin yarattığı bir hançer misin, ateş içinde yanan kafanın uydurduğu bir hayal misin? Seni hâlâ görüyorum, tutulacak gibisin tıpkı şu kınından sıyırdığım hançer gibi. Bana tuttuğum yolu gösteriyorsun, kullanacağım aletin de eşini. Gözlerim ya bütün öbür hislerimin eğlencesi oldu, yahut değerce hepsine bedel. Seni hâlâ görüyorum. Hem yüzünde, hem sapında kan damlaları var; demin yoktu. Öyle hançer filân yok. Gözlerime böyle tesir eden o kanlı, iştir, Şimdi dünyanın yarı yüzünde tabiat ölmüş gibi; perdelenen uykuyu kötü rüyalar bozuyor; sihirbazlar âyindeler; solgun Hecate'ye sunacaklarını sunuyorlar; bekçisi kurdun sesiyle ayaklanan ve zamanı onun ulumasından öğrenen	Macbeth: Bu ne? Bir hançer mi bu önümde beliren, Kabzası elime yakın? Gel hadi, gir elime! Tutamıyorum seni, ama hâlâ görüyorum. Ey ölümcül hayal, göze görünüyorsun, Ama ele gelmiyorsun, öyle mi? Yoksa kafamın içinde misin yalnızca? Sahte bir hançer! Hummalı beynimin ürünü! İşte hâlâ ordasın; çektiğim şu hançer kadar gerçek. Demek bana yol gösteriyorsun; Böyle bir alet vardı benim aklımda da! Ya gözlerim öteki duyularımın maskarası oldu; Ya da o ikisi, ötekilerin hepsine bedel.

Or else worth all the rest; I see thee still, And on thy blade and dudgeon gouts of blood, Which was not so before.-- There's no such thing: It is the bloody business which informs Thus to mine eyes.-- Now o'er the one halfworld Nature seems dead, and wicked dreams abuse The curtain'd sleep; witchcraft celebrates Pale Hecate's offerings, and wither'd murder, Alarum'd by his sentinel, the wolf, Whose howl's his watch, thus with his stealthy pace. With Tarquin's ravishing strides, towards his design Moves like a ghost. Thou sure and firm-set earth, Hear not my steps, which way they walk, for fear Thy very stones prate of my whereabout, And take the present horror from the time, Which now suits with it. Whiles I threat, he lives: Words to the heat of deeds too cold breath gives. 2.1. (Shakespeare, 2003, pp.47-50)	iskeletleşmiş cinayet, işte böyle Tarquinius'un sinsi ve tez adımlarıyla, hırsızlama, hedefine doğru bir hayalet gibi ilerliyor. Sende sağlam ve emin toprak, adımlarımın sesini duyma, ne tarafa gittiklerini bilme; yoksa, korkarım, taşların nerede olduğumu haber verir de, zamanın yakışığı olan bu korkunçluğu giderir. Kötülüğüm dilde kaldıkça yaşayacak o. Söz, insanda iş yapmak ateşini söndürüyor. (Shakespeare, 1946, pp. 28-29)	Hep gözümün önündesin; üstelik şimdi, Hem ağzında hem kabzanda kan pıhtısı var. Daha önce bunlar yoktu üstünde. Hayır, olamaz böyle şey. Hayal görüyorum; Kafamdaki şu kanlı iş yüzünden. Şu anda dünyanın yarısında Doğa ölüden farksız; Uğursuz rüyalar uykunun perdeleri arasından Yanıltıyor insanları. Büyücüler ayinde şimdi, Tanrıça Hecate'ye kurbanlar sunuyorlar. Şimdi o iskelet gibi cani, muhafızı olan kurdun Uluyarak verdiği işaretle doğruluyor, Ve gözünü şehvet bürümüş Tarquin misali, Sinsi sinsi, hortlak gibi yaklaşıyor avına. Ey koca dünya, sağlam dur şimdi, Ayak seslerimi duyma sakın, Anlamaya çalışma ne yöne gittiğimi; Yoksa bakarsın, taşların dillerini tutamaz, Tam işin zamanı gelmişken, O korkunç sessizliği bozar, Yerimi belli ederler sonra. Ama heyhat! Ben tehdit savurur dururken, O hâlâ yaşıyor; işin tavı kaçıyor, Eylemin yerini boş laf alıyor. (Shakespeare, 2019, p.48-49)

TT3	**Proposed Translation**
Macbeth …Bir hançer mi önümde gördüğüm? Sapı elimden yana çevrik… Gel, sarsın elim seni. Yoksun elimde; ama görüyorum seni. Uğursuz görüntü, göze var ele yok musun sen? Kafamdaki bir hançer misin yoksa? Ateşli beynim mi yarattı seni? Görüyorum işte yine; tutulacak gibisin, Şu kınından çıkardığım hançer gibi. Gideceğim yeri gösteriyorsun bana Ve kullanacağım silahın ta kendisini. Ya gözlerim öbür duyularınla oynuyor, Ya öbür duyularım gözlerimle. Yine görüyorum işte seni: Ağzında ve sapında kan var; demin yoktu. Yok, hançer falan yok Benim kanlı tasarım bu gözlerimin gördüğü Şimdi, dünyanın yarısında tabiat ölü gibi; Perdelere bürülü uykuyu kötü rüyalar sarmış. Cadılar başlamıştır şimdi büyülerine, Soluk yüzlü tanrıçaları Hecate'yi Ve cinayet, iskelet suratlı cinayet, Bekçisi ve habercisi kurdun ulumaları, Hırsız Tarquinius'un sinsi ve uzun adımlarıyla İlerliyor hedefine doğru, bir hortlak gibi. Sen ey sağlam, katı toprak,	**Macbeth:** Bu önümde gördüğüm bir hançer mi yoksa? Sapı bana doğru çevrilmiş mi? Gel, kavrayayım seni şöyle bir elimle, seni hala görürken. Yoksa ölümcül bir hayal misin, hem gözü hem kalbi kandıracak? Yoksa ateşler içinde yanan bir zihnin ürettiği bir kandırmaca mı? Hala görüyorum seni, çektiğim hançer kadar gerçeksin. Kullanacağım aletle yolumu aydınlatıyorsun. Gözlerimin diğer hislerime üstünlüğü son bulsa da ağzında ve bıçağında kan damlaları görüyorum. Demin böyle bir şey yoktu. Seni gözlerime getiren işte o kanlı iştir. Şimdi dünyanın diğer yüzünde doğa ölmüş gibi Lanetli rüyalar derin uykuları bozuyor Cadılar ayinde rengi solmuş Hekate'ye kurbanlar sunarken, cani iskelet kurt muhafızının uluyarak verdiği işaretle gizlice doğruluyor, Tarquin misali sinsice hayalet gibi ilerliyor. Ey kendinden emin koca dünya, Duyma ayak seslerimi, bastığım taşlar ayak seslerimi haber vermesin kimseye. Tam da zamanıyken işin, korkunç sessizliği bozmasın. Be tehditler savururken o hala yaşıyor, Ateşli eylemler kelimelerin soğuk nefesiyle son buluyor.

Duyma ayak seslerimi, bilme gittiğim yeri; Yoksa korkarım, taşlar bile keser yolumu; Bozarlar bu işime gelen korkunç sessizliği. Duncan daha sağ, sen lafla asıp kesmedesin, Kelimeler ateşine su serper eylemin. (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.29-30)	

There are examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) in Table 54 concerning the translations of key signs like "Pale Hecate" and "curtained sleep and present horror". The sign Pale Hecate was translated as "Hekate" (Hecate) in TT1 as a wiping out of the meaning because the signs "pale" and "goddess" were not translated, and the translation provides incomplete information and provides insufficient meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). Similarly, "Tanrıça Hekate" (Goddess Hecate) in TT2 is also a wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign pale was not translated. "Soluk yüzlü tanrıçaları Hecate" (Their pale goddess Hecate) in TT3 and "rengi solmuş tanrıça Hekate" in the proposed translations preserved the signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "curtained sleep" was translated as "perdelenen uykuyu" (curtained sleep) in TT1 preserving signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "uykunun perdeleri arasından" (through the curtains of sleep) in TT2 as an example of the over-interpretation of the meaning because imagery "curtains of the sleep" (uykunun perdeleri) does not appear in the source text. "Perdelere bürülü uykuyu" (sleep wrapped in curtains) in TT3 is also an example of over-interpretation because excessive commentary on the sign was given. (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "derin" (deep) in the proposed translation as an alteration of the meaning because the "deep sleep" imagery is different from the original one. In this context, a false meaning that is not completely irrelevant to the meaning in the original text was produced (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "present horror" was translated as "bu korkunçluğu" (this horridness) in TT1 by preserving signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was

translated as "korkunç sessizliği" (horrid silence) in TT2, TT3 and the proposed translation as examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "sessizlik" (silence) does not exist in the source text. The alternative to the sign present could be "mevcut" (already existent) in the context and combination with the sign horror.

The well-known context in Table 55 exemplifies Lady Macbeth's turning into a non-subject, which is often regarded by the critics as the reflection of "guilty conscience". The speech may be read as an example of regression because it also resembles the talk of three or four-year-old infants who have the habit of talking to themselves, which will later turn into the inner voice.

From the beginning of the speech to the end, Lady Macbeth sways from talking to herself to addressing King Macbeth. She asks almost rhetorical questions and is scornful both to herself and him. She tells off both herself and King Macbeth for being "afeard". It is horrifying to notice that she cannot free herself even after she turns into a total non-subject) (Coquet, 2007, p.37) as the result of regression. The patriarchal gaze is so dominating on Lady Macbeth that her inner voice is controlled by the political ambitions of King Macbeth. Her phrase "Hell is murky" may be read as an indication of the fear of hell, and she fears divine punishment instead of the king.

Table 55: Example 52 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
Lady M. Out, damned spot!; out, I say. One; two; why, then 'tis time to do't. —Hell is murky. — Fie, my lord, fie! a soldier and afeard? — What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to accompt? — Yet who would have thought the old man to have had so much blood in him? 5.1. (Shakespeare, 2003, p.139)	Lady Macbeth -Çık, melun leke! Çık, diyorum! Bir… İki… Eh öyleyse yapmak vakti geldi. Cehennem karanlıkmış. Ayıp size, efendimiz ayıp! Hem asker olun, hem korkun! Kimin bildiğinden ne çekinelim, nasıl olsa kudretimiz sorgu suale gelmez. Yine de, kim ihtiyarda bu kadar kan bulunacağını zannederdi? (Shakespeare 1946, pp. 86-87)	Lady Macbeth Hadi çık, uğursuz leke, çıksana! Bir, iki. Tamam, işi bitirme vakti geldi. Cehennem çok kasvetli. Ayıp, Lordum, ayıp! Asker korkar mı? Anlarlarsa anlasınlar; kimin haddine yetkimizi sorgulamak? Ama hayret, ihtiyarda da amma bitmez kan varmış; kimin aklına gelirdi. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.123-124)

TT3	**Proposed Translation**	
Lady Macbeth Çık elimden, korkunç leke çık diyorum sana! Bu bir…Bu iki… Tamam: Haydi şimdi. Cehennem ne karanlıkmış! Yazık, koca kralım benim. Yazıklar olsun! Bir asker korkar mı hiç? Ne diye korkuyorsun bilinmesinden? Kimin haddine bizden hesap sormak? Bir ihtiyardan bu kadar kan akacağı kimin aklına gelirdi? (Shakespeare, 2020, pp.92-93)	Lady Macbeth Çık elimden lanet leke, çık diyorum sana! Bir, iki derken…Çünkü yapmanın zamanı geldi. Cehennem zifiri karanlıkmış! Yazıklar olsun size, efendim. Askerler hiç korkar mı? Kimseden korkacak değiliz, Kimi haddine düşmüş kudretimizi sorgulamak? Yine de yaşlı adamdan bu denli kan akacağı kimin aklına gelirdi?	

The phrase "out, damned spot out" (Shakespeare, 2003, p.139) is clear evidence that she sees spots in her hands that the doctor and her maids fail to see. Lady Macbeth's hallucinations are about her hands that "have not committed" the murder. As mentioned above, King Macbeth does not lose the grip of reality like Lady Macbeth does, although he is guilty of regicide. Instead, Lady Macbeth takes the blame and fears damnation. Lady Macbeth speaks as if she witnessed the blood released from King Duncan's body minutes after the dagger was pierced through him. It could be read as proof of Lady Macbeth's *subjection* because she confuses herself with King Macbeth. She ultimately loses herself while keeping King Macbeth alive. Regarding feminist criticism, therefore, Lady Macbeth's taking the guilt of the murder may be read as an indication of her turning into a "non-subject" (Coquet, 2007, p.37).

However, it would also be misleading to interpret the whole speech as a regression that resembles the self-talk of a four-year-old. Lady Macbeth's words are mixed with her phrases that tell off King Macbeth. Even in a regression, a psychiatric disturbance that may symbolize the initiation of Lady Macbeth in the metaphorical sense is striking to notice. Lady Macbeth cannot be free of King Macbeth even in her dreams. Even if she had attained the knowledge of foreseeing the future through rebirth, it would be the rebirth of King Macbeth, not herself. Lady Macbeth is the

king's property, and she is a prisoner even in terms of psychic initiation and rebirth. Had she been a follower of Medea instead of Dionysus, her powers of magic would be exploited like Medea, and she would be betrayed whenever the politics of the country required. The references in the speech are so intermingled that it is impossible to say which sentences belong to King Macbeth and which ones belong to herself.

In Table 55, there are examples of over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like "murky", "fie" and "accompt". The sign "murky" was translated as "karanlıkmış" (it is so dark) in TT1 by preserving sign (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "çok kasvetli" (very gloomy) in TT2 as a sliding of the meaning because the sign "gloomy" that may refer to the negative psychological effect of darkness does not exist in the source text. In this translation, a meaning that is potential but not actualized in the context of the ST was produced. Similarly, the phrase was translated as "ne karanlıkmış" (how dark it is) in TT3 as an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because an extra emphasis was added to the sentence. The phrase was translated as "zifiri karanlıkmış" (pitch-dark) in the proposed translation as an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the extra emphasis on darkness was added. Excessive commentary on the sign was given as well as emphasis.

"Fie, my lord, fie!" is an exclamation in English, and the Turkish translation "ayıp" or "ayıp size!" lacks emphasis, and such an exclamation in Turkish is very old-fashioned. The sign "fie" was translated as "ayıp" (shame on you) in TT1 and TT2, which could be considered an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because it provides insufficient meaning. "Yazık" (alas) in TT3 is also an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because "alas" is weaker in emphasis than "fie". "Yazıklar olsun" (Shame on you!) in the proposed translation may be read as an alternative to "ayıp" in Modern Turkish without compromising the emphasis in Lady Macbeth's exclamation.

The sign "accompt" was translated as "sorgu sual" (investigation) in TT1 and "hesap sormak" (to accompt) in TT3, which preserve the sign (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "sorgulamak" (to question) in TT2 and in

proposed translation as examples of under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the emphasis in the sign "accompt" is not translated and insufficient meaning was produced.

5.7. Songs in *Macbeth* and its Translations

The song of the witches in Table 56 echoes their mysterious practices. The Weird Sisters shout "double-double, toil, and trouble/ Fire burn and cauldron bubble" (Shakespeare, 2003, 106) as the reverberations from the crucible because their song takes its roots from the foundations of the very word tragedy. This description shows a link to Dionysus and the Bacchae because Dionysus was put into a cauldron to be boiled for rebirth by Titans. The references and allusions to death and rebirth reverberate through the foundations of Greek drama.

However, the actual rebirth of a character, an element of English folk drama, cannot be presented on the Renaissance stage backed up by the state. The concept is labelled as witchcraft because of the conventions and politics of the age. Therefore, in the song of the Weird Sisters, the contents of the cauldron or the crucible are described as "hell-broth". To make it, they use bits and pieces of nasty wild animals and human beings (alive or dead?) to boost the powers of dark magic, which can also be read as the condemnation of ancient medical practices. Their use of parts of animals may point out change shapes from a human being to an animal and get their power for rebirth.

In *Macbeth*, however, the rebirth of a character and the practices of ancient Greek culture were made implicit in the pathetic structure as an attempt to *edit* them. As a result, the famous song of the witches of Macbeth sounds almost *comical* because the significance of using parts of animals and dead bodies for magic would not sound very convincing to the modern ear. The link between the rituals of early drama and Dionysian practices and the "hell-broth" made up of the lizards, newts, or other dead animal parts are not there for petrification for the readers today. Instead, they are in the broth for the signification of the process of rebirth.

Table 56: Example 53 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
1 Witch. Round about the cauldron go;	Birinci Cadı. – Kazanın etrafında dönelim, içine zehirli	Birinci Cadı

In the poison'd entrails throw.-- Toad, that under cold stone Days and nights hast thirty one Swelter'd venom sleeping got, Boil thou first i' th' charmed pot. All. Double, double toil and trouble; Fire burn and cauldron bubble. 2 Witch. Fillet of a fenny snake, In the cauldron boil and bake; Eye of newt, and toe of frog, Wool of bat, and tongue of dog, Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting, Lizard's leg, and howlet's wing, For a charm of powerful trouble, Like a hell-broth boil and bubble. 4.1 (Shakespeare, 2003, p.106)	bağırsak atalım da atalım. Taş altında otuz bir gündüz gece uyuya uyuya ağu sızdıran kurbağa: kazanda ilk sen kayna! Hepsi. Katmer ol dert üzüntü, katmer; ateş yan, kazan fıkırda! İkinci Cadı. – Bataklık yılanın kaburga eti, kazanda kayna da piş; semender gözü, kurbağa ayağı, yarasa tüyü, köpek dili, engereğin çatal dili, kör yılanın dişi, kertenkele bacağı, baykuş kanadı, derdi yaman bir büyü için cehennem aşı gibi kaynayıp fokurdayın. (Shakespeare, 1946, p. 61)	O zaman dönelim kazanın çevresinde; Atalım içine ağulu işkembeyi de. Soğuk taş alanda otuz bir gün yatmış, Uykuda terlemiş, bol zehir yapmış Kurbağayı da afsunlu kazana katalım, Hepsini karıştırıp, güzelce kaynatalım. Hepsi Dert üstüne dert, bela üstüne bela, Yan ateşim yan, kayna kazanım kayna. İkinci Cadı Kaygan tarafından bir dilim çamur yılanı Atıp içine, karıştıralım kaynayan kazanı; Üste kurbağa ayağı, semender gözü; Bir parça köpek dili, az da yarasa tüyü, Kör keler iğnesi, engereğin çatal dili; Yavru baykuş kanadı, kertenkele bacağı. Buna derler cehennem çorbası; Bunu içenin kısmeti, belanın belalısı. (Shakespeare, 2019, pp.94-95)
TT3 Birinci Cadı Kayna kazan, biz dönelim çevrende: Kokmuş işkembeyi attım içine. Soğuk soğuk taş altında kurbağa, Otuz bir gün, otuz bir gece Zehim zehim zehirini toplaya, Kazanımda ilk önce o kaynaya.	**Proposed Translation** Birinci Cadı Dönelim kazanı çepeçevre, atarken zehirli bağırsakları, Soğuk taş altında otuz bir gün ve gecenin uykusundan zehri katmerlenmiş kurbağa, Efsunlu kazanda ilk o kaynaya! Üçü Birden Fokurdayan kazanı ateşleyelim	

Üçü Birden Acı üstüne acı, kan üstüne kan, Kayna kazanım kayna, yan ateşim yan. İkinci Cadı Kara yılan kıtır kıtır kesilsin, At kazana fıkır fıkır kaynasın. Semender gözü, kurbağanın başparmağı, Köpek dili, yarasanın kıkırdağı, Yılan dişi, çiyan kuyruğu, Puhu kanadı, kertenkele budu, Fokurdayıp pişsin kazanda, Bir cehennem yemeği acılığında. (Shakespeare, 2020, pp. 67-68)	Derdi belayı çiftleyelim İkinci Cadı Kem yılan parça parça edilsin, Kazanda pişsin taşsın, Yarasa kıkırdağı, köpek dili, Semender gözü, kurbağanın başparmağı, Çatallı engerek dili, Kör kelerin iğnesi, Kertenkele kuyruğu, Baykuş kanadı Taşım taşım kaynasın Cehennem çorbası misali fokurdasın.	

There are examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) concerning the translations of key signs like "toil and trouble" and "charmed". The sign "toil and trouble" was translated as "kazan fıkırda" (cauldron boil) in TT1 and " fokurdayan kazanı ateşleyelim" (put fire under the bubbling cauldron) in the proposed translation preserved signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase "bela üstüne bela" (trouble after trouble) in TT2 is an example of preserving signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The translation "kan üstüne kan" (blood after blood) in TT3 is an alteration of the meaning because a false meaning that is not completely irrelevant was produced (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

The sign "charmed pot" was translated as "kazanda" (in the cauldron) in TT1 and "kazanımda" (in my cauldron) in TT3 as under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The phrase was translated as "afsunlu kazana" (to the charmed cauldron) in TT2 and "efsunlu kazanda" (in the charmed cauldron) in the proposed translation preserving signs (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172).

5.8. Discriminatory Discourse and Insults in *Macbeth* ad its Translations

The second part of the songs of the Weird Sisters is also a source of discriminative strains in the Early Modern Society because there are explicit examples

that may be read as reverberations from the crucible. Initially, "gall of a goat" is a striking connection that may stretch back to the Dionysian cult and the birth of tragedy because Dionysus is at times described as a goat. The phrase "slips of yew" also intensifies the magic and the supernatural because the yew tree "symbolises death and resurrection in the Celtic culture"[106] for its ability to live hundreds of years. The "slips of yew" that were "sliver'ed in the moon's eclipse" may be interpreted as precursors of psychic disturbance during King Macbeth's reign. In one phrase, we have a perfect combination of two cultures, one is Greek, and the other is Celtic to mark rebirth, which symbolizes the practices of the Weird Sisters in the Shakespearean tragic context.

Discriminative and misogynistic gaze in *Macbeth* can be traced back to the damnation of rebirth to exemplify driving the devil away. The idea of rebirth comes out of the cauldron from "hell-broth" made up of "gall of goat", "slips of yew", "the liver of a blaspheming Jew", "nose of a Turk" and "Tartar's lips", which recalls the damnation of Greek, Celtic, Jewish, Turkish and the Mongolian cultures outside the "idealized" sphere of honouring ancestors.

It would be too much to expect for Early Modern dramatic texts to be free of the prejudice against Eastern cultures because Early Modern politics practice it. Moreover, the ingredients of the soup are added to the crucible of magic in concordance with negative images of certain cultures for Renaissance politics. The witches mimic the tearing apart of the baby Dionysus by Titans and cook in a cauldron for rebirth. The body parts in the cauldron were taken from non-Christian cemeteries because the exhumation of dead Christian bodies was a sensitive issue in that era.

The semiotic reading of the crucible of witches may overturn the definition of rebirth in the English Renaissance through the rebirth of the Greek and Roman cultures that form the foundation of the culture. Although rebirth dates back to the practices of the Dionysian cult, the contents of the cauldron seem to have been swept under the carpet for the now obvious political reasons.

The witches then form a contrast with the idealization of honouring the ancestors when they say the finger of "a birth-strangled babe". However, Dionysus is

[106] See https://treesforlife.org.uk/into-the-forest/trees-plants-animals/trees/yew [03.06.2021]

not birth-strangled but the imagery is a connection with illegitimacy, an undesirable kind of offspring brought into this world by the "drab". In the excerpt below, there is horrible imagery of using the finger of a birth-strangled baby in the magical potion. The relationship between a birth-strangled baby and honouring the ancestors is striking because the damnation of a new-born is the issue in the Early Modern context for those who were begotten out of wedlock. As a result, they would be strangled as soon as they were born.

The use of the word "drab" is striking here because it directly references healers and the witches who would help with abortion or illegitimate birth issues outside the boundaries set by society. It alternatively means "filthy woman", which may also have many connotations in the patriarchal context. Derogative use for women is so embedded into language that one may even pick the words without noticing. It is critical to remember that some derogative words are directly used as insults to women.

Through the imagery that the witches use, the readers may assume that the strangling of the baby was also performed by themselves, a reference to horrid practices of the cauldron-boilers. Illegitimacy is one of the reverberations from the crucible because the babies outside the boundaries set by the patriarchal society were damned as soon as they were born.

As it is possible to hear the discriminative strains of the hell-broth in the cauldron, we may claim that reverberations signify the damnation of witchcraft in Early Modern thought. Greek mythological elements or figures are the undesired ones compared to Roman thought that can be mostly described in the context of honouring the ancestors. However, the cauldron or the crucible of the witches also reveals Hecate herself to describe her activities. The Weird Sisters and their master are both strong pathetic elements, although being ambiguous. Without their practices and connotations, William Shakespeare's *Macbeth* would be no different than another version of the historical records of England.

Table 57: Example 54 for Translation Comparison and Analysis

ST	**TT1**	**TT2**
3 Witch. Scale of dragon, tooth of wolf,	Üçüncü Cadı. – Ejder pulu, kurt dişi, büyücü mumyaları; tuzlu denizlerin aç kurtlarının ağzıyla	Üçüncü Cadı

Witches' mummy, maw and gulf, Of the ravin'd salt-sea shark: Root of hemlock digg'd i' th' dark; Liver of blaspheming Jew; Gall of goat, and slips of yew Sliver'd in the moon's eclipse, Nose of Turk, and Tartar's lips; Finger of birth-strangled babe, Ditch-deliver'd by a drab, Make the gruel thick and slab: Add thereto a tiger's chaudron, For th' ingredients of our cauldron. 4.1. (Shakespeare,2003, pp.107-108)	kursağı; karanlıkta kazılıp çıkmış baldıran kökü; küfürbaz çıfıt ciğeri; keçi safrası, ay tutulduğu sırada kesilen porsuk yaprağı; Türk burnu, Tatar dudağı; doğar doğmaz boğulup çukura atılmış orospu çocuğunun parmağı; çorbaya peklik verin, koyuluk verin. Üstelik bir kaplama bağırsağı kazanımızdakilere katılsın. (Shakespeare, 1946, p. 61)	İki tek kurt dişi, bir tutam ejderha pulu, Cadı mumyası, bağırsak, dalak tozu, Tuzlu denizden çıkma köpek balığı özü, Karanlıkta sökülmüş baldıran kökü, Bol tarafından porsuk ağacı yongası, Ay tutulduğu sıra kesilmişinden. Türk Burnu, Tatar dudağı, irisinden; Yosma bebeği, hendekte doğmuş, Doğar doğmaz boğdurulmuş. Okkalısından bir de kaplan midesi, İyi karışsın şimdi bunların hepsi. (Shakespeare, 2019, p. 95)
TT3 Üçüncü Cadı Pul pul ejderha derisi, kurt dişi, Bir cadı kemiğinin çürümüşü, Köpekbalığının kursağı, tuzlu tuzlu, Baldıran kökü, gece koparılmış, gizli gizli. Bir parça Yahudi ciğeri, kara kara, Biraz keçi safrası, sari, sarı, Porsuk yaprağının kurumuşu, Ay tutulduğu zaman toplanmışı. Türk burnu, Tatar dudağı, Bir orospudan doğmuş, Doğar doğmaz boğulmuş Bir çocuğun parmağı. At hepsini kazana, kaynasın: Biraz kaplan işkembesi de katmalı ki	**Proposed Translation** Üçüncü Cadı Ejderha pulu, kurt dişi, Cadı mumyası, tuzlanmış köpekbalığının delinmiş boğazıyla kursağı, zifiri karanlıkta sökülmüş baldıran kökü, Başeğmez Yahudi mersini tohumu,[107] Keçi safrası, ay tutulmasında kırılmış porsuk ağacı dalları, Türk burnu, Tatar dudağı, Hendekte umacının doğurup boğduğu bebeğinin parmağı, Hepsi birden helmelensin, Kaplan işkembesini de at kazana fıkır fıkır kaynasın.	

[107] The reference may be read in relation to the Renaissance idea of seeing liver as the source of negative feelings and bearing discriminative gaze… The imagery may also be linked to Jew's myrtle, a kind of plant known to be sacred to Jewish religious practices.

Koyulaşsın çorba, kıvamına gelsin. (Shakespeare, 2020, p.68)		

There are examples of meaning transformations (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) in Table 57 concerning the translations of key signs like the "liver of a blaspheming Jew". The sign "liver of blaspheming Jew" was translated as "küfürbaz çıfıt ciğeri" (the liver of a blaspheming Jew) in TT1 as an example of an over-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the word "çıfıt" in Turkish also refers to dirt and grime. The sign was not translated in TT2, which could be considered the wiping out of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), "Yahudi ciğeri" (the liver of a Jew) in TT3 is an example of an under-interpretation of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign "blaspheming" was not translated. The phrase was translated as "başeğmez Yahudi mersini tohumu" in the proposed translation as an example of sliding of the meaning (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172) because the sign may be traced back to the use of Jew's myrtle in religious practices.[108] The plant is always evergreen and never bends because of drying. It may also be read as a symbol of immortality. The phrase "başeğmez" (unbending) in the proposed translation is also a reference to the evergreen plant. The phrase "the liver of the blaspheming Jew" may then be read as fusing the signs choleric (liver) and Jew's myrtle as the plant. The sign turns into a personification rather than referring to a real person. The sign "blaspheming" was translated as "başeğmez" (evergreen/unbending). It is a challenging sign to translate because translating the sign as "blaspheming" (inançsız) would reproduce the discriminative gaze in the text.

It may then be questioned whether discriminative jargon is reproduced in translations. Discriminative language use in Shakespearean tragedies is not uncommon, or at least it is a fact that it cannot be disregarded today. Rebirth and reproduction refer to womanhood whether consciously or unconsciously. Macbeth's use of the snake imagery and rebirth provides an interesting point because he also has a negative gaze on the rebirth of a snake by changing her skin. The snake imagery used for women is an insult directly related to how snake is perceived in the Early Modern

[108] For more information on the contents of the cauldron see https://www.themarysue.com/witchess-brew-macbeth-plants-and-herbs/

context. In old cultures, like Greek snake would be associated with rebirth. However, the theme of rebirth itself became a part of discriminative jargon in the Renaissance context because of the very idea of driving the demons away. Therefore, translating Shakespeare by avoiding discriminative jargon may not be possible. However, talking about the *source* of discriminative jargon in footnotes may be very helpful. The association of the snake with womanhood is evident in King Macbeth's soliloquy and rebirth and reproduction is consciously or unconsciously associated with womanhood.

> We have scotch'd the snake, not kill'd it:
>
> She'll close and be herself, whilst our poor malice
>
> Remains in danger of her former tooth. (Shakespeare, 2003, p.81) (Act III, Scene II)

CONCLUSION

Within the scope of this thesis, a semiotic reading of Shakespearean pathos was carried out to reveal the dichotomy between the honouring of the ancestors and the Greek Dionysus rituals. The representations of pathos in Shakespeare's four great tragedies, namely *Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello,* and *King Lear* was studied based on Jean-Claude Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 189-195), Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-Subjects (2007, pp. 3-6), the concept of enigma and verdictory modalities (Greimas and Courtés, 1982, p. 369) that she adopted from the studies of Paris School of Semiotics (Öztürk Kasar, 2009, p.170) and her Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p. 154; Öztürk Kasar &Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The steps to semiotic reading in this study were; reading enigmas, elaborating mythological and iconographic references and allusions, reading the signs of magic and madness through subject transformations, signs of insanity or antic disposition, carrying out a semiotic analysis of songs and finally evaluating the crucible image as a sign in relation to discriminatory discourse. In addition, for each part that is studied from the tragedies, a translation was proposed because the proposed translations may serve as a reconsideration of pathetic elements, as well as a tribute to the valuable translations made and printed. To make it more precise, the proposed translations do not cover the whole texts like in other translations but may be read as little notes to consider when a thorough study of pathos is the issue. They cover a set of coherent but incomplete segments of the text. Within this framework, the results of the analysis of the plays and their comparative evaluations with the target texts are discussed below as concluding remarks for each separately.

Concluding remarks for *Othello*

Shakespeare did not favour "transformations" in the Ovidian sense. In Shakespeare's *Othello,* the signs concerning magic would be the focus to study the Renaissance gaze. Shakespeare's prejudice against Greek elements in tragedies parallels the way Renaissance society discriminates Dionysiac practices as magic. Therefore, Shakespearean tragedies may have served the purpose of a warning for its audience about the dangers of not being able to identify the devil. For the English Renaissance society, the world was full of ancient demons, mostly rooted in

mythological allusions, while iconography served the purpose of keeping faith. Prejudice in Shakespeare's gaze was studied based on the concept of Julia Kristeva's *abject* (Kristeva, 1982, p.18) embodied as the evil in the crucible image.

For this reason, the relationship between mythological and iconographic allusions, and the pathetic structure in Shakespearean texts were studied. Mythical and biblical allusions in great tragedies were comparatively studied as pathetic elements through semiotics of translation. The study of pathos in Shakespeare is related to transformation (metamorphoses) and madness. The elusiveness of evil was structurally studied, both in the original texts and their translations and the focus was on the pathetic value of characters, Desdemona, and Othello. The possibilities of enunciation in translated literature, as well as the very essence of the sources as the background to it, was also the focus.

The association of Othello with Poseidon and Desdemona with Theophane constitutes the mythological base of the tragedy. Iago's description of their future child with Crius Crysomalus, the magic of Medea that gets the fleece and Desdemona's association with the dying swan, Cynus and Iago's calling out ancient deities for the help are secondary mythological strains. Othello's association with the Persian king Xerxes pouring his anger through the seas Pontic, Propontic and Hellespont robotized Othello's discriminative gaze on "turning Turk," Othello's association of his suicide with the murder of a "malignant and a turban'ed Turk" in Aleppo form the historical background, reveals that *abject* (Kristeva, 1982, p.18) existed in the Renaissance society. The purpose of identification and assimilation of old and new "demons" speaking from the crucible was the everyday practice reflected in Renaissance drama. In this respect, Shakespearean tragedies have intertextual relationships with biblical sources. Shakespeare seems to have eliminated the theme of rebirth deriving from Dionysian practices and mythological stories were categorized to serve the purpose.

In the study, The Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.189-190) was used in analyses of mental states of characters as part of pathos itself. This also refers to the mental states of Shakespearean characters marked by Othello's association with the devil. In *Othello*, there is such a potent strain to point out to magic that the handkerchief is an enigmatic element itself. Studying the concept of the devil

reveals that, in *Othello*, the characters Desdemona and Othello are demonic from the very beginning of the text. This pertains to the dominance of the discriminative gaze in Renaissance society.

The mythological and iconographic allusions directly related to pathos as reflected in the target texts were compared to the source text based on Öztürk Kasar's Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p.154; Öztürk Kasar &Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The meaning transformations observed in the target texts are shown as designificative tendencies in the Table below:

Table 58: Meaning transformations in *Othello*

DESIGNIFICATIVE TENDENCIES	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
Over-interpretation of the meaning	11	2	6	5
Darkening of the meaning	--	1	--	--
Under-interpretation of the meaning	4	5	4	3
Sliding of the meaning	1	1	--	3
Alteration of the meaning	2	3	2	3
Opposition of the meaning	--	--	--	--
Perversion of the meaning	--	--	1	--
Destruction of the meaning	--	--	--	--
Wiping out of the meaning	2	1	4	4

The most common designificative tendency was over-interpretation of the meaning, with twenty-four examples. There is one example of darkening of the

meaning, sixteen examples of under-interpretation of the meaning, five examples of sliding of the meaning, ten examples of alteration of the meaning, one example of perversion of the meaning and eleven examples of wiping out of the meaning. It was interesting to see that except in TT1, translation decisions were sometimes out of the contexts of mythological and iconographic references. In TT1, footnotes were used for such references, to enable the reader to have a better understanding of the context, as a contribution to the reading of Shakespeare.

As stated above, studying the pathetic structures of the tragedies is mostly dependent on how mythological and iconographic data is interpreted. Therefore, specific methods and theories were needed to study state(s) of the minds of characters, transformations of meaning, and the connection between the plot and the actions of characters. Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.189-195) enables both the translator and the reader to focus on the "enunciating instance" as producer and receiver of discourse. The autonomy domain of enunciating instance is our five senses: in other words, our bodies. The speaker's perception passes through a filtering process and is transformed into judgement in the mind of the speaker, depending upon forces acting from inside and those coming from outside at the moment of production or reception of discourse. Therefore, it is critical to study the drives or passions as well as cosmic or symbolic forces at work (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, p.189). The framework for drama studies was useful in the analyses of mental states of characters, mainly non-subjects, which constitutes a challenging part in the analysis of a tragic character. The typology of non-subjects (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 3-6) was used to analyse the tragic characters in detail, who visibly sway from one mental state to another.

The details of the pathetic structure of tragedies were analysed because tragic characters' "subject transformations" (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp. 190-194) and Othello and Desdemona's identification with the devils were exemplified through the theoretical framework. To be more precise, the framework was helpful in the study of mental states of characters to trace the dual structure of pathos in Shakespeare's four great tragedies. The descriptions of Othello's anger in terms of ethnicity and Desdemona's lack of understanding of his conflicting nature underline the differences between them. The discriminative gaze modelled in Renaissance society finally

condemns them as counterparts to the devil. Desdemona's portrayal of an ideal Christian woman at the beginning of the text is destroyed to the end of the tragedy because Othello seduces her. Desdemona's disrespect to her Venetian genealogy makes her a servant of the devil because, in the first place, she contradicts with the theme of "honouring ancestors," portrayed as the ideal "fashioning" in Shakespearean tragedies. Othello's "devilish nature" eventually hunts Desdemona, the pious woman, to curse her.

Concluding Remarks for *Hamlet*

In Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* the Ghost of Hamlet's deceased father and the manifestation of evil are inescapably linked terms to study. The mystery surrounding the death of Hamlet, the king, constitutes the universe of meaning of the text. The pathetic structure of the text can be studied based on this mystery. "Bouts of madness" of Prince Hamlet may be read as the result of Hamlet's encounter with the supernatural or Hamlet's existential problems, including his fear of loss of faith. These intensify the effect of enigmas as traps for readers.

For Renaissance readers, perversion of faith was the dominant fear, and Prince Hamlet's approach to the Ghost contrasts the way that readers would approach an apparition. Prince Hamlet embraces the supernatural rather than dreading it. He also embraces the truth provided by it. Even in this respect, clouds of suspicions would still be hanging because Prince Hamlet jumps from one mental state to another.

Suspense in *Hamlet* is dependent upon how the elusive nature of the supernatural, as the dark component of pathos, is crafted. Since, from the Protestant perspective, the Ghost would be no more than the devil, the fear of the supernatural serves as the background of the text. Therefore, from the very beginning of the text, the fear of the devil and the danger of losing one's faith are major elements. Consequently, the reader cannot be sure whether Hamlet will be deceived by the devil, or it is the ghost father speaking the truth to him. Witchcraft, necromancy, and conjuring magic were crimes. The revelation of the truth could not have been based on any encounter with the supernatural, whether it is witchcraft, superstition, or necromancy. These would be viewed as negative. The demonization and the

condemnation of old and mythological figures constitute the negative components of pathos.

Prince Hamlet's suspicions on the "identity" of the Ghost are deep-rooted in how the English society in Shakespeare's time looked at the old beliefs, paganism, psychic world, and Christianity as a religion. The pathetic and enigmatic structure is, therefore, directly related to how suspense functions throughout the text.

Had Shakespeare written an end that revealed the possession of Prince Hamlet by the devil and loss of his faith, the book would probably not attract so much attention. The intimidation in the text is fuelled by the possibility of Prince Hamlet's Christian soul being stolen by the devil as opposed to feigned madness. Therefore, the Ghost, the supernatural, and the uncanny as negative components of Shakespearean pathos, are still at work because of Prince Hamlet's associations with necromancy and his "desire to speak with the dead," as Stephen Greenblatt suggests,[1] are at work in the background of the text with a considerable effect on suspense. Prince Hamlet's presentation as a character is full of conflicts and ambiguities that also serve the purpose.

The arrival of the Ghost is ironically the embodiment of Hamlet's fears and conflicts in his mind because they refer to the impossibility of having a clear description of the evil, no matter how hard one tries. *Hamlet* is a play that is paradoxically constructed to reflect the mind and body dichotomy in Prince Hamlet's character because he is obliged to become an ideal Renaissance man. As mentioned above, referring to the first murder, the Kingdom of Denmark, in the rule of King Claudius, is no different than a Christian dystopia because it turns into a kingdom of a Cain-like uncle of Prince Hamlet.

Translation evaluations were made based on Öztürk Kasar's Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p.154; Öztürk Kasar &Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The meaning transformations observed in the target texts are shown as designificative tendencies in the Table below: There are sixteen examples of over-interpretation, three examples of darkening of the meaning, eight examples under-interpretation, thirteen examples of sliding of the meaning, ten examples of alteration of the meaning, one example of opposition of the meaning, seven examples of perversion of the meaning,

one example of destruction of the meaning and three examples of wiping out of the meaning and as exemplified.

Table 59: Meaning Transformations in *Hamlet*

DESIGNIFICATIVE TENDENCIES	TT1	TT2	TT3	TT4
Over-interpretation of the meaning	6	6	3	1
Darkening of the meaning	--	2	--	1
Under-interpretation of the meaning	3	2	3	--
Sliding of the meaning	2	4	2	5
Alteration of the meaning	1	4	4	1
Opposition of the meaning	--	--	--	1
Perversion of the meaning	1	2	3	1
Destruction of the meaning	--	--	1	--
Wiping out of the meaning	1	--	--	2

Enigmas, discriminative gaze, mental states of characters, and songs are manifestations of Shakespearean pathos and representations of demonization in Early Modern Society. The most common designificative tendency was over-interpretation of the meaning. The possible cause of it could be the lack of framework in the interpretations of signs and expressions in Shakespeare's tragedies. This may be the result of a need to make the pathetic meaning explicit. The second common tendency was alteration of the meaning, which again must be stemming from a clear framework for duality in meaning in Shakespeare. There were also examples of perversion of the meaning and wiping out of the meaning. To conclude, the lack of a clear framework for the literary expression in Shakespearean pathos may have caused some of the

various designificative tendencies in the translations of Hamlet, among other reasons related to the challenges concerning the form.

In *Hamlet*, antic disposition or feigned madness was evaluated based on Coquet's Theory of Instances of Enunciation (Öztürk Kasar, 2017, pp.189-195), as it concentrates on forces acting from inside the producer and receiver of discourse and those interfering from outside, as factors influencing the perception and judgment. Hamlet's madness is a major theme in the tragedy because he is both under the influence of drives and passions concerning his *phusis* and transcendental components. The latter and the former refer to the mind-body dichotomy in Early Modern thought, marked by driving off the magic and the supernatural.

Concluding Remarks for King Lear

The pathos and characterization, as exemplified in *King Lear* is the core study of this thesis. The pathetic structure is divided according to the negative categorization of followers of Dionysian cult like in other great tragedies. Although supernatural elements like ghosts, charmed objects (Othello's handkerchief), or witches are not visible in King Lear, explicit allusions to the Dionysian cult, a common strain in four great tragedies, have a great impact on characterization. Therefore, King Lear resembles the other tragedies in dramatic technique, even in the pathetic structure.

A thorough study of pathos in *King Lear* may also reveal the discriminative strain in the tragedy because of the negative portrayal of Dionysian women, as exemplified in characters Regan and Goneril. In other words, the lack of witches does not mean that misogyny does not exist in King Lear. On the contrary, there is more room for discriminative discourse in *King Lear* simply because he chooses to *categorize* his daughters according to the principles of honouring ancestors. King Lear's pagan world embraces both the Sun god Jupiter and Hecate as the light and dark representations of supernatural elements. However, there is also a total damnation of Dionysian practices, as the basis of Greek drama. The answers to reverberations of "nothing" seem to lie in the negative representations of certain women in four great tragedies because they seem to be fulfilling the function of negation. Moreover, it can be read as proof of the patriarchal discrimination in concordance with the patriarchal principles that Lear's pagan kingdom.

To make it more precise, there are mainly three women in the text who could be defined on negative terms in the text. They are daughters to Lear: Goneril, Regan, and Cordelia. Regan and Goneril were presented as princesses who would be ideal heirs to King Lear's dedicated notion of honouring ancestors after Cordelia's banishment.

It is Cordelia, who is banished, after she refused to flatter her father, not the elder sisters. It is interpreted by Lear as a sign that she is not an heiress who would honour her ancestors. The main reason for Cordelia's banishment looks like her failure "in honouring his elder", but below the surface, she cannot express herself fully through "nothing" which could be exchanged a few times between her and the king.

The significance of King Lear's response, "nothing will come out of nothing! I charge thee, speak!" (Shakespeare, 2006, p. 226) sets the background for pathetic structure. It also reveals his dedication to the pagan understanding of "nothing", which may be read as destruction. The whole play may be read as reverberations of *"nothing"* as a sign which can be read both through mythology and iconography.

Although King Lear's pagan religion embraces the opposites like Jupiter and Hecate, *Cordelia's* use of *"nothing"* is significant because her words implicitly point out Creation on iconographic terms. Therefore, Cordelia is a character who can be read both on iconographic and mythological terms. In other words, King Lear's use of *"nothing"* points out destruction, while Cordelia's use of the notion points out birth. In this respect, *"nothing"* reverberates all through the text to signify both life and death. This sign is so dominant in the text that *King Lear*'s pathos has been founded upon the reverberations of "nothing". In addition to the contrast of honouring ancestors and the damnation of Dionysian women, dramatic representation is also tied to how *"nothing"* changes meaning in the mouths of certain characters. *King Lear* is a text that has plots and subplots to be studied. In other words, two stories, that of Lear's and Gloucester's, parallel each other in such a way that both characters have resemblances in perspective, hubris, and decadence. Gloucester's stress on legitimacy parallels Lear's dedicated view on honouring ancestors. In Lear's perspective, illegitimacy, refusing to honour ancestors, and being followers of Dionysian practices are all odd-one-outs because they do not comply with the principles of the shrine.

The madness of King Lear was studied based on Öztürk Kasar's Typology of Non-subjects (2017, pp.186-189), especially after he is dismissed by Regan and Goneril. In the speech when he has difficulty in recognizing his voice, face, and manners, he can be regarded as a non-subject because of dysphoria (Greimas and Courtés 1982, p. 96), excessive sorrow, as the source of his madness.

King Lear's madness can also be read through reverberations of *"nothing"*, as counterparts to each other. The *double entendre* of the sign *"nothing"* is also a foreshadowing of the disasters to come. The sign, "nothing", meaning destruction in the sense that Lear uses, will follow him and Gloucester to the end of the text. *"Nothing"* also pertains to both the physical blindness of Gloucester and psychological blindness of King Lear. They both fail to see the hope that Cordelia would bring to the kingdom. The more they fail to see the other meaning of "nothing", the more they come up with disasters.

Translation evaluations were carried out based on Öztürk Kasar's Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p.154; Öztürk Kasar &Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The meaning transformations observed in the target texts are shown as designificative tendencies in the Table below: There are twenty-five examples of over-interpretation of the meaning, thirteen examples of under-interpretation of the meaning, three examples of alteration of the meaning, one example of opposition of the meaning, three examples of wiping out of the meaning.

Table 60: Meaning Transformations in *King Lear*

DESIGNIFICATIVE TENDENCIES	**TT1**	**TT2**	**TT3**
Over-interpretation of the meaning	9	9	7
Darkening of the meaning	--	--	--
Under-interpretation of the meaning	4	4	5
Sliding of the meaning	--	--	--
Alteration of the meaning	2	1	--

Opposition of the meaning	1	--	--
Perversion of the meaning	--	--	--
Destruction of the meaning	--	--	--
Wiping out of the meaning	1	1	1

When we look at source text and its translations, mythological allusions seem to overweigh iconographic ones. Two characters are associated with iconography: Kent and Cordelia. It is possible to see that actual names for mythological characters such as Jupiter were used in translations. In the target texts, the leading designificative tendency was over-interpretation (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017, p. 172), possibly because the double entendré of the sign crucible overweighs. However, translating strong pathetic expression may be tricky, especially when King Lear's mindset is disregarded. For example, King Lear's description of his daughters as "pelican" is also tied to the description of Dionysian women, already existent in the text. Disregarding feminist readings of King Lear may result in a portrayal of King Lear as an ideal king who was destroyed by his children. There are implicit signs in the text that we may not disregard in a thorough study of pathos, mythology, iconography, enigmas and translation.

The leading designificative tendency detected is over-interpretation. Focusing on the framework for the pathetic structure of the text, along with King Lear's mindset, in this respect, may lessen tendencies of over-interpretation.

Concluding Remarks for *Macbeth*

As exemplified in *Macbeth*, the pathos and characterisation are similarly divided according to the negative categorization of followers of the Dionysian cult. Contrary to *King Lear*, explicit allusions to the Dionysian-like practices of the witches, and even Hecate, the queen of the witches are existent.

The negative portrayal of Dionysian women contradicts the very principles of honouring ancestors. The dichotomy of supernatural elements' light and dark representations is also exemplified through the Sun god Jupiter and Hecate. As the basis of Greek drama, Dionysian practices are strongly tied to reverberations of the crucible (or cauldron), possibly because Macbeth was the real-life king of Scotland. It

is important to analyse why honouring the ancestors and the witches was crafted as the negative representations of certain women. The dichotomy lies at the heart of four great tragedies.

The predictions of the witches also bring forth rebirth and initiation to introduce foreseeing in Greek mythology. However, The Weird Sisters and shamanic rebirth are loose in connection. Still, the characterization of Macbeth is not totally outside the sphere of initiation because of his "murdering sleep" in Scotland, which may have both mythological and iconographic connotations. Weird Sisters and Hecate test Macbeth's dedication to the supernatural to reveal the conflicts in him. King Macbeth is attracted to them to echo seduction and possession of the soul. Macbeth is predicted to rule as an invincible king until the trees of Great Wood Birnam marches towards Dunsinane, but it proves to be one of the tricks of fate.

King Macbeth's failure to notice the Weird Sisters' mockery is marked by his fear of "changed shapes", as it borrows a lot from the *Metamorphoses* symbolically. Macbeth's delusions make him think that trees have started walking towards him. However, Macbeth's fall as a king is within the sphere of Shakespearean pathos because he *yields* to the supernatural. His failure is marked– by how he surrenders to Macduff, the one who was not born out of a woman.

Banquo stands firm to magic while Macbeth is destroyed on his way to the Scottish throne. Macbeth has no genealogy, and his "manhood" is questionable in terms of honouring the ancestors. Therefore, he is closer to the ambiguity of the Weird Sisters.

For this reason, the resemblance between the androgynous Weird Sisters and the healers in the Early Modern context refers to the ability to foresee the future. The female-like men or men-like females may strongly point out Dionysus, the god of wine and ecstasy. Since the Renaissance understanding of magic was a restatement and a negation of old-time deities, it is critical to know why Dionysian practices were not embraced in English theatre. Magic contradicts the very foundations of Early Modern thought in England, and the religious authorities were openly condemning supernatural practices.

The possibility of stealing the dead from the cemeteries (like Macbeth's witches) to cook and bringing them back to life as an example of rebirth were practices that were strongly feared. The witches and the supernatural were condemned through Banquo, who failed to trust the witches because they were "wild in attire". Shakespearean pathos is crafted to reflect the contrasts in the two characters while the Weird Sisters themselves constitute the major enigma behind the plot. However, the Weird Sisters, who are in the transition line between male and female, resemble Dionysus in shocking truth to the Early Modern gaze, as having been born twice with male and female properties.

The supernatural, which was outside the boundaries of "manhood", is inescapably bound by Renaissance politics. Therefore, it is challenging to decide whether Macbeth turns into a non-subject after Lady Macbeth dies at the end of the text. The famous "tomorrow" speech does not support the view that he speaks in a contradictory way because of dysphoria excessive sorrow, as the source of his madness. On the contrary, all through the speech, it is possible to see that he is in-between because of excessive boredom concerning life, as marked by his phrase. On the contrary, to the end of the speech, he is under the effect of euphoria (Greimas and Courtés 1982, p.109) because he decides to fight for a new life, rebirth as far as Shakespearean pathos is concerned.

Translation evaluations were carried out based on Öztürk Kasar's Systematics of Designification (Öztürk Kasar 2020, p.154; Öztürk Kasar &Tuna, 2017, p. 172). The meaning transformations observed in the target texts are shown as designificative tendencies in the Table below:

Table 61: Meaning transformations in *Macbeth*

DESIGNIFICATIVE TENDENCIES	TT1	TT2	TT3
Over-interpretation of the meaning	2	5	6
Darkening of the meaning	--	--	--
Under-interpretation of the meaning	5	3	4
Sliding of the meaning	--	3	2
Alteration of the meaning	2	2	2
Opposition of the meaning	--	--	--
Perversion of the meaning	--	1	1
Destruction of the meaning	--	--	1
Wiping out of the meaning	1	2	--

When we look at source texts and their translations, mythological allusions are almost equal to iconographic ones. In other words, we have a mixture of mythological allusions and iconographic ones. Mythological characters such as Jupiter and Hecate were used in translations. There are thirteen examples of over-interpretation, twelve examples of under-interpretation of the meaning, five examples of sliding of the meaning, six examples of alteration of the meaning, two examples of perversion of the meaning, one example of destruction of the meaning and finally, three example of wiping out of the meaning. The tendency of over-interpretation overweighs possibly because of the strong pathetic structure but balancing emphasis, stress, and the important traits of pathetic expression may be a challenge.

There are implicit signs in the text that we may not disregard in a thorough study of pathos, mythology, iconography, enigmas, and translation. However, translating mythological allusions and expressions, especially Lady Macbeth and the Weird Sisters, may be a challenge because of the associations of Dionysian women in the text. Disregarding feminist readings of Macbeth concerning the pathetic structure of the text may result in a portrayal of Lady Macbeth as a fiendish queen who destroyed her children. Lady Macbeth's depiction as a suffocating mother would be missing out on the Dionysian link. Focusing on the framework for the pathetic structure of the text, along with imbalances of King Macbeth himself, in this respect, may lessen tendencies of over-interpretation.

Overall Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to research whether the painful events concerning Shakespearean pathos had a common ground. In connection to classical theories of birth concerning the genre, pathos is the expression of mourning songs of the ancestors, or the painful songs sung after the death of the wine god Dionysus. In the evolvement of the genre tragedy, pathos could be explained as the collective expression of all painful events through characterization. However, the plots of four great tragedies differed from each other and protagonists were clearly not stereotypes. This may have been the cause the reception of pathos foregrounded and studied as separate pillars. However, such studies might have eventually underestimated pathos as a solid foundation to the expression of painful events in tragedy. In the preliminary analysis of the thesis, it was possible to trace both the theories concerning the birth of tragedy as honouring of the ancestors and songs of Dionysus in terms of plot and characterization. To put it in another way, pathos in four great tragedies was diversely foregrounded on the two theories concerning the birth of drama, classified as conflicting signs in this thesis. The honouring of the ancestors as a sign was read as the search of an ideal king in the Renaissance world as a positively received tenet. The mythological signs starting with Dionysus, on the other hand, were read as the signs of discrimination. These signs turned out to be labelling of certain mythological figures as a practice of witchcraft in four great tragedies.

The preliminary research of the thesis revealed that both signs concerning the birth of tragedy existed to conflict with each other. The aim of the thesis was to carry out the semiotic analysis of these conflicting signs, to elaborate why Shakesperean pathos has such an outstanding effect. In the semiotic reading of the texts, it was noticed that these two common grounds operated almost as the diverse plates on earth to create huge suspense in texts. The semiotic analysis of these texts revealed the labelling of Dionysus rituals as witchcraft, reflected in plot, characterization and the background also served as an account of signs of discrimination. In relation to this, bestiality and madness were classified under the sign crucible, covering both witchcraft and history. By referring to Julia Kristeva's intertextuality, it was stated that history of witchcraft is the outcome of discrimination as a recently coined term. It was concluded that the traces of Renaissance politics in these texts semiotically verified the condemnation of witches. Witchcraft signs semiotically revealed that witches were almost received as the sole convicts for the pain and the pathetic network in these texts reflected between the lines was an extensive research area.

The contribution of this thesis to the research area was to draw attention to pathos as a less frequently studied element of Renaissance drama. The pain in Renaissance tragedies was an underestimated concept to be generally taken for granted. In the classical reading of drama, the suffering of the character was related to the character flaw (hamartia). On the other hand, the existence of pain in four great tragedies stem from themselves and it was decided that the relationship between the emergence of pathos from mourning songs would not be enough to carry out a detailed semiotic analysis of these texts as signs of witchcraft and honouring of the ancestors. More extensive research resulted in the operation of diversity in the mythological allusions and references mainly as Apollo (the god of reason and light) and Dionysus (God of wine and ecstasy) taken from *Metamorphoses* by Publius Ovidius. It was claimed that this pathetic network operating in the background was in total conformity of the Renaissance norms' idealization of reason and damnation of ecstasy.

It was also detected that the pathetic elements positioned as opposite poles became mostly visible in characterization. In other words, the polarity was visible in both protagonists and other characters. In this case, it would not be suitable to study the likeness in characters in pathetic representation. As an example, Banquo, as the

forefather to James I, stuck to reason and dismissed the witches. Therefore, Banquo, who was characterized as a great enemy to witches could only be on the opposite pathetic level to Macbeth. On the contrary, Macbeth was considered to be magic lover. It was claimed that Macbeth's attraction to magic also invited the theme of madness into the text. The madness signs were reflected through Lady Macbeth, who has to desire to commit infanticide like Bacchae on the same negative pathetic level with Lady Macbeth. It was between the lines that Macbeth turns to a mad monster through magic and goes against the ideal of honouring his ancestor and king, Duncan. Macbeth is doomed because he falls into the traps of Hecate and her minions.

Hamlet as a character, on the other hand, was to be read through the ideal of honouring the ancestor because he failed to take revenge of his father. It was stated that Hamlet's relationship with magic, like in the old version Amleth as a pagan necromancer was erased because pathetic structure was polarized. It was possible to learn about magic and Hamlet through intertextuality only. Had Hamlet and Amleth coexisted in the Shakesperean version, we would have a Protestant prince who constantly made magic revive the dead and risk his life for revenge to honour his ancestors. It was stated that the polarity in pathos, as mentioned above, would not let a protagonist to have all of these at the same time. On the contrary, Hamlet's feigned madness is a shelter for him because real madness was a theme that was associated with magic.

The pathetic level in King Lear was striking to study because the negative and positive elements in this text worked differently. King Leir, as in the old version of the text, was known to raise a temple to honour his father. In the Shakesperean version, King Lear, the protagonist is against Dionysus because he openly calls his daughters Goneril and Regan as centaurs as an insult. King Lear condemns Dionysus but worships Hecate and Apollo. There is proof that the protagonist was associated with magic. To make it more precise, King Lear honoured his ancestors, and is dedicated to *reason* instead of ecstasy. However, he is too far away from being an ideal character like Banquo because he is still to be read through the crucible sign by worshipping Hecate. King Lear loses all pagan gods that he worships and is pathetically punished with more suffering and madness.

In *Othello*, on the other hand, refusing to honour one's ancestor is implemented into the text through Desdemona, the daughter to the Venetian senator Brabantio. The cold-blooded and sensible Othello as a servant of Venice goes mad because of the magic in the handkerchief. Pathetic polarity in this tragedy was at peak when Othello is taken over by magic. The positive interpretation of the handkerchief was not pathetically possible because of love charm.

The semiotic analysis of dichotomy or polarity of pathos in four great tragedies revealed the clues to representations of pain in four great tragedies which had a structure unique to the time of Shakespeare. In this analysis, the positive and negative representations were studied in each sign in each tragedy, not only plot, characters, background or soliloquys. Therefore, the semiotic analysis was extended to a translation-oriented semiotic analysis of pathos which also covered the study through translator tendencies of designification (Öztürk Kasar & Tuna, 2017) of pathetic signs. The integral semiotic reading of pathetic signs in original texts and their translations had revealed the fine connections of them.

In conclusion, in the four great tragedies of Shakespeare titled *Othello, Hamlet, King Lear* and *Macbeth*, a semiotic reading of pathos or signs of pathos revealed two conflicting or polarized network of signs. It was revealed that the negative signs were related to witchcraft from an intertextual perspective based on the mythological signs, mainly the lamentations for the death of wine god Dionysus, taken from *Metamorphoses* by Publius Ovidius. This network of signs intertextually referred to the crucible of the witches as well as their history. The positive network of signs covering honouring of the ancestors was based on the ancestor worship dating back to the foundations of drama. It was claimed that the unique pathetic impact and tension in four great tragedies were based on two conflicting networks of signs. The painful songs, pathos or pathetic signs were interpreted as *reverberations* from the crucible because both signs date back to the beginning of Renaissance history. The semiotic reading was effective in amplifying all the painful songs of the genre tragedy. However, the Early Modern era was the time during which *only* the "honouring of the ancestors", genealogy or succession were heard as the former. An intertextual reading of the history of witchcraft, as one of the steps to semiotic reading, revealed the constant muffling of the latter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, M. D. (2003). Historical Dictionary of Witchcraft. Scarecrow Press.

Baldo, J. (1996). The Politics of Aloofness in "Macbeth", English Literary Renaissance, Vol.26, No. 3, Monarchs, University of Chicago Press, (Autumn 1996), pp. 531-560.

Batson, B. (2006). Shakespeare's Christianity: The Protestant and Catholic Poetics of Julius Caesar, Macbeth, and Hamlet. Baylor University Press.

Bloom, H. (2010). Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: William Shakespeare's King Lear-Blooms Literary Criticism. Infobase Publishing.

Bigliazzi, S. (2017). The Tyrant's Fear. Comparative Drama, Vol. 51, No. 4, The Tyrant's Fear: Part I (Winter 2017), pp.434-454.

Bradley, A.C. (2007). Shakespearean Tragedy Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and Macbeth, Palgrave Macmillan.

Cameron, A. (2004). Greek Mythography in the Roman World (Society for Classical Studies American Classical Studies (No. 48)). Oxford University Press.

Carlevale, J. (2005). "Dionysus Now: Dionysian Myth-History in the Sixties," Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics Third Series, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 77-116.

Crawford, C. (2004). Daughters of the Inquisition: Medieval Madness: Origins and Aftermath, Seven Springs Press.

Coquet, J.-C. (2020). Yükümsüz özne sorunsalı. (S. Öztürk Kasar, Trans.). Dünya Dilleri, Edebiyatları ve Çeviri Çalışmaları Dergisi (DEDÇED), 1(2), 187-199.

Coquet, J-C. (2007). Phusis et Logos [Phusis and Logos]. PUV.

Coquet, J-C. (1984). Le Discours et Son Sujet-I. [The Discourse and its Subject-I] Klincksieck.

Cox, J. D. (2007). Seeming Knowledge: Shakespeare and Skeptical Faith. Baylor University Press.

Cox, J. D. (2013). Religion and Suffering in "Macbeth", Christianity and Literature,Vol. 62, No. 2, John Hopkins University Press, (Winter 2013), pp. 225- 240.

Craig, L. H. (2001). Of Philosophers and Kings: Political Philosophy in Shakespeare's Macbeth and King Lear. University of Toronto Press.

Derks, T. (1998). Gods, Temples and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideas in Roman Gaul. Amsterdam Archeological Studies.

Dollimore, J. (1984). Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries. Brighton: Harvester.

Dollimore, J. (1985). Shakespeare Cultural Materialism and New Historicism, Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism, Manchester University Press (pp. 2-18).

Eagleton, T. (2000). William Shakespeare (Rereading Literature), Blackwell Publishing.

Eagleton, T. (2010). On Evil. Yale University Press.

Edbury, P.W. (1999). Kingdoms of the Crusaders: From Jerusalem to Cyprus. Ashgate Press.

Edwards, P. (Ed.) (2003). Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. The New Cambridge Shakespeare.

Else, F. G. (1965). The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy. The Norton Library.

Enterline, L. (2000). The Rhetoric of the Body From Ovid to Shakespeare. Cambridge University Press.

Foakes, R.A. (2001). Introduction. King Lear (Arden Shakespeare). Thomson Learning.

Frankforter, D. A. Davis, M. (1995). The Shakespeare Name Dictionary. Routledge.

French, C. S. (1959). Shakespeare's "Folly": King Lear, Shakespeare Quarterly, Autumn, 1959, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Autumn, 1959), pp. 523-529, Oxford University Press Cambridge University Press.

Frye, N. (1986). On Shakespeare, Yale University Press.

Grant, M. (1954). Roman Literature, Penguin Books.

Genette, G. (1983). Narrative discourse: An essay in method, (J. W. Lewin, Trans.). New York: Cornell University Press.

Gibson, M. &. Esra, J. A. (2016). Shakespeare's Demonology: A Dictionary. Bloomsbury Publishing. Marion Gibson and Jo Ann Esra.

Greenblatt, S. (1980). Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. University of Chicago Press.

Greenblatt, S. (1988). Shakespeare and the Exorcists. Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England (pp. 94-122). University of California Press.

Greenblatt, S. (1991). Shakespeare Betwitched. Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions (pp.17-42) University of Delaware Press.

Greenblatt, S. (2013). Hamlet in Purgatory, Princeton University Press.

Greenblatt, S. (2017). Shakespeare's Cure for Xenophobia. The New Yorker -3 July 2017.

Courtés, J., Greimas A.J., (1982). Semiotics and Language: An Analytical Dictionary. Indiana University Press.

Hamlin, H. (2013). The Bible in Shakespeare. Oxford University Press.

Hampton, B. A. (2011). Purgation, Exorcism, and the Civilizing Process in Macbeth, Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, Vol. 51, No. 2, Tudor and Stuart Drama, Rice University (Spring 2011) (pp. 327-347).

Howell, W. (2018). The Elements of History. From the Creation of the World, to the Reign of Constantin the Great. Creative Media Partners.

Honnigman, E. A. J. (1997). Introduction. Othello (Arden Shakespeare). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Jenkins, H. (2003). Introduction. Hamlet (Arden Shakespeare). Thomson Learning.

Kiernan, V. (2016). Eight Tragedies of Shakespeare. Zed Books.

Knights, L.C. (1933). How Many Children Had Lady Macbeth? Minority Press, Cambridge.

Kristeva, J. (1969). Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art, Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. & Roudiez, L. S. (1982). Powers Of Horror: An Essay On Abjection, New York: Columbia University Press.

Kuleli, M. (2018). "Öznelik yetisi: Bir göstergebilimsel Çözümleme Adımı ve Çeviri Göstergebilimi Bakış Açısıyla Bir Tiyatro Metninde Çeviri Değerlendirmesi", RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi (pp.33- 72).

Lake, P. (2016). How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage: Power and Succession in the History Plays, Yale University Press.

Mabillard, A. (2000). "Shakespeare's Sources for Macbeth", Shakespeare Online http://www.shakespeareonline.com/sources/macbethsources.html .

March, J. R. (2014). Dictionary of Classical Mythology, Oxbow Books.

McGuinness, F. (2015). Madness and Magic: Shakespeare's "Macbeth", Irish University Review, Vol. 45, No. 1, Special Issue: Mirror up to Theatre: Essays in Honour of Christopher Murray (Spring/Summer 2015), Edinburg University Press (pp. 69-80).

Nicolle, D. (1997). The Janissaries, Osprey Publishing.

Nietzche, F. (2000). The Birth of Tragedy, Oxford University Press.

Oldridge, D. (2016). Fairies and the Devil in Early Modern England", The Seventeenth Century Journal, Vol: 31, No.1 (pp. 1- 15).

Öztürk Kasar, S. (2020). De la désignification en traduction littéraire: Les gens d'en face de Georges Simenon dans le contexte turc du point de vue de la sémiotique de la traduction. [On designification in literary translation: Les gens d'en face by Georges Simenon in the Turkish context from the point of view of semiotics of translation]. Parallèles, 32 (1) (pp154-175).

Öztürk Kasar, S. (2017). Jean-Claude Coquet ve Söyleyenler Kuramı. Prof. Dr. Ayşe Eziler Kıran'a Armağan, Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları (pp.183-199).

Öztürk Kasar, S. (2012.) Jean Claude Coquet ile Bir Dil Görüngübilimine Doğru. XII. Uluslararası Dil, Yazın, Deyişbilim Sempozyumu (pp. 427-433). Trakya University.

Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009) Pour une Sémiotique de la Traduction [Towards Semiotics of Translation]. In C. Laplace, M. Lederer & D. Gile (Eds.). La Traduction et ses Métiers (pp. 163-175). Lettres Modernes Minard.

Öztürk Kasar, S. (2007). Pour une Typologie des Non-Sujets [Towards a Typology of Non-Subjects]. Congres Internationale l'Association Française de Sémiotique intitulé Sémio: Rencontres Sémiotiques : Les Interfaces Disciplinaires des Théories aux Pratiques Professionnelles. Paris Sorbonne University. http://afssemio.com/semio2007/ spip.php?article19

Öztürk Kasar, S. & Tuna, D. (2017). Shakespeare in Three Languages: Reading and Analyzing Sonnet 130 and Its Translations in Light of Semiotics. International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching, Vol: 5, No: 1.

Pickard, C. A. (1966). Dithyramb, tragedy and comed. Clarendon Press.

Putt, S. G. (1981). Golden Age of English Drama. The English Association.

Rifattere, M. (1983). Text Production. Columbia University Press

Russell, J. B. (1986). A History of Witchcraft; Sorcerers, Heretics and Pagans, Thames & Hudson.

Scott, K. (1930). "Emperor Worship in Ovid", Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Vol. 61 (pp. 43- 69).

Shakespeare, W. (1943). Hamlet (H. Edip Adıvar, & V. Turhan, Trans.). İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları

Shakespeare, W. (1946). Macbeth (O. Burian, Trans.). Milli Eğitim Basımevi

Shakespeare, W. (1959). Kral Lear (İ. Şahinbaş, Trans.). Maarif Basımevi.

Shakespeare, W. (1964). Othello (Ü. Tamer, Trans.). Varlık Yayınevi.

Shakespeare, W. (1974). Hamlet (S. Eyüpoğlu, Trans.). Remzi Kitabevi.

Shakespeare, W. (1995). Hamlet (O. Burian, Trans.). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Shakespeare, W. (1996). Othello (O. Burian, Trans.). Meb Yayınevi.

Shakespeare, W. (1997). Othello. (E. A. J. Honigmann, Ed). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Shakespeare, W. (2001). Othello, (A. V. Turhan & T. Oflazoğlu,Trans.).İz Yayınları.

Shakespeare, W. (2003). Hamlet (H. Jenkins, Ed.).Thomson Learning.

Shakespeare, W. (2003). Macbeth. The Arden Shakespeare.

Shakespeare, W. (2001). King Lear. Thomson Learning.

Shakespeare, W. (2013) Kral Lear (B. Bozkurt, Trans.).Remzi Kitabevi

Shakespeare, W. (2013). Hamlet (B. Bozkurt, Trans.). Remzi Kitabevi

Shakespeare, W. (2018). Othello (B. Bozkurt, Trans.). Remzi Kitabevi

Shakespeare, W. (2019). Macbeth (B. Bozkurt, Trans.) Remzi Kitabevi

Shakespeare, W. (2019) Kral Lear (E. Ayhan, Trans.). Alfa Edebiyat

Shakespeare, W. (2020). Macbeth (S. Eyüboğlu, Trans.).Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Sönmez İşçi, G. (2001). Yeni Eleştiriden Yeni Tarihselci Eleştiriye Macbeth. Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.

Sun, E. (2010). Succeeding King Lear: Literature, Exposure, and the Possibility of Politics. Fordham University Press.

Taplin, O. (2005). Greek Tragedy in Action. Routledge Press.

Thomson, G. (1980). Aeschylus and Athens: A Study of Athenian Drama and Democracy, Beekman Publication.

Tuna, D. & Çelik, C. (2020). "Princesses Dethroning Patriarchy: De/re-constructions and redefinitions in children's literature" Yazınsal Feminizmler: Yöndeşimler ve Kesişimler / Literary Feminisms: Convergences and Intersections. In D.Tuna, M. Kuleli & J. Aliyev (Eds). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Tuna, D. & Kuleli, M. (2017). Çeviri Göstergebilimi Çerçevesinde Yazınsal Çeviri İçin Bir Metin Çözümleme ve Karşılaştırma Modeli. Eğitim Yayınevi.

Tuna, E. (2000). Şamanlık ve Oyunculuk. Okyanus Yayınları

Zimmermann, H. (2006). Macbeth and Hercules, Renaissance Studies, Vol. 20, No. 3 (June 2006), pp. 356-378.

Zuckert, M. P. (2016). Something Wicked This Way Comes": Machiavelli, Macbeth, and the Conquest of Fortuna, The Review of Politics, Vol. 78, No. 4, Special Issue on Shakespeare's Politics in Honor of the 400th Anniversary of His Birth, Fall 2016 (pp. 589-60).