



Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi

The Journal of International Social Research

Cilt: 9 Sayı: 46 Volume: 9 Issue: 46

Ekim 2016 October 2016

www.sosyalarastirmalar.com Issn: 1307-9581

## SHAKESPEARE REVISITED: A COMPARATIVE AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF NECİP FAZIL KISAKÜREK'S *BİR ADAM YARATMAK* AND WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *HAMLET*

Mustafa KARA\*

### Abstract

After the Reorganization Period (Tanzimat Dönemi), roughly between 1860 and 1895 during the reign of the Ottoman Empire, the effects of West over Turkish Literature increased more and more. In the route of modernization, people attached much more importance to the West, thus gave it way to permeate into the lives and correspondingly, to the literature of a nation. There are various effective Western representatives in Turkish Literature; however, Shakespeare's impact has been so powerful that Turkish writers, one of which is Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, considered him as a model and followed some specific issues about his writings. To specify Shakespeare's effect over Kısakürek, this article aims to analyse the similarities and differences between the two plays, *Bir Adam Yaratmak* by Necip Fazıl Kısakürek and *Hamlet* by William Shakespeare, in terms of characterization, plot, and themes such as madness, alienation to the community, existence vs. death, action vs. inaction, fatalism and identity crisis. By doing so, it is aimed to evince and embody Shakespeare's effect over Kısakürek and his work, *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, which is both an original play in Turkish Literature and an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in terms of its success in the internalization process of the universal values and problems, presented by Shakespeare.

**Keywords:** Necip Fazıl Kısakürek, *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, Similarities and Differences.

### 1. Introduction

Necip Fazıl Kısakürek was born in İstanbul in 1904. He was a novelist, poet, dramatist, philosopher, and an activist. He began his writing career

at *Kemalist* monthly youth magazine in the late 1920s. He [also] wrote for other magazines like Sedat Simavi's *Yedigün* (Seven days), and in 1936 started his own arts and ideas journal, *Ağaç*, which he published for one year. Kısakürek also published three volumes of poetry in those years and began writing plays about materialism and despair in modern life (Thompson, 2004: 1326).

He was also an Islamist publisher and writer. There are many symbols, references and concepts of Islam in his writings. He was not a supporter of any literary movement in Turkish Literature as his contemporaries were; because, he had his own ideas and canons.

In 1945, he became editor of *Büyük Doğu* (Great east), an Islamist magazine whose anti-Westernization message carried influence particularly in rural areas. From 1950, the ruling Democrat party provided financial support to the magazine, but in a twist of politics, Kısakürek was jailed in 1952 in a crackdown on politically oriented Islamist publications (Thompson, 2004: 1326).

Beginning his literary career at a very young age, Kısakürek procrastinated writing a play until Muhsin Ertuğrul, a very professional director, actor and producer in Turkish drama, asked him why he did not pen a work of drama yet. This is how Kısakürek steps into the world of drama: writing his first play *Tohum* in 1935, he was appreciated by the scholars and the critiques of the time, though his play was not adopted by a vast majority of spectators (Gül, 2010: 56). This, for sure, is one of the reasons why Kısakürek asserts that *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, his second play, will be his masterpiece since he evaluates it as follows: "I am writing a piece of art which is to be renowned globally. I might succeed it or not. That is not the case, if my work of art is bad, it must be globally bad, if it is good, it must be good worldwide. [...] Either good for the whole world, or bad" (Milâr, 1938: 4). Considering this, it is not inappropriate to list Kısakürek among those famous fathers and mothers of literature, for his understanding of drama is a universal one, too. He sketches his notion of drama and the value of dramatists as follows:

Grasping life within a cube which has a foldable front-face... Like ensnaring... This is drama... [...] If you ask me, the wheel is the greatest of all human inventions. [However,] the biggest invention in arts is drama (qtd. in Sorgun, 2015: 145).

\* Lecturer, Çukurova University, School of Foreign Languages.

Beginning his career as a poet, Kısakürek elevates drama among all other art forms since he believes that it enforces spectators to see their own lives and selves, animated by actors and actresses; furthermore, there is definitely no escape from the confrontation, provided by the actions on stage.

His play, *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, which was translated into English by the Pakistani writer and translator Masud Akhtar Shaikh as *Creating a Man*, was first performed in the winter of 1937 - 1938. The subject matter is about Husrev, a writer, authoring a play by giving references to his personal life and creating a man. By doing so, as a son of a dead father, Husrev is forced to live the life of the character he creates in his play *Ölüm Korkusu*, which is a play within the play. Kısakürek summarizes Husrev's tragedy in a nutshell as follows:

Once he endeavours to create something, the craftsman in the play [...] intrudes into the forbidden zone with a big surprise, startles the secrets that are forbidden to touch, and suddenly confronts with Allah's sovereignty and his command: «Let him live the play he has created, and let him be the man he wants to create!» (2016: 6).

Considering Shakespeare, on the other hand, it will not be unfair to state that he deserves to be named as "the father of English Literature" due to the fact that he succeeded affecting many other writers in different parts of the world and that even his less attractive plays are still performed on stage worldwide. "The main reason why he is immortal is his rebirth in every generation, in every country as well as his liveliness during all these processes of rebirth" (Urgan, 2014: 10). Though unknown specifically, he was born in April, 1564 and died on April 23 in 1616. It is not easy to write about Shakespeare, for he has been influential for many others since his period. He composed around thirty-four plays, "the majority of which are crucial to an understanding of literary history and resist reduction even to the conventional categories of comedies, tragedies, and histories" (Burt, 2009: 3). He was highly effective in finding a linkage between the classical drama and what is now called the Elizabethan or Renaissance drama. "[He] created an expressive dramatic form that would serve as a romantic alternative to the classical norm of order and balance, and helped establish the tension between classicism and romanticism that defines modernism" (Burt, 2009: 3).

*Hamlet*, a revenge tragedy, is about Hamlet, the prince of Denmark, trying to figure out the mist behind his father's death. By talking to his father's ghost, Hamlet realizes that his father, King Hamlet, was killed by his own uncle, Claudius. Furthermore, Gertrude, Hamlet's mother, marries to his previously uncle but now his father Claudius. From now on, Hamlet will vacillate between action and inaction about taking his father's revenge.

Kısakürek gets interested in metaphysics in one part of his life and questions the secrecy behind the "thing". Because of this philosophising activity, he experiences a sort of stressful period of time. During that depressive period, he reads *Hamlet* and admires the "thinker" Hamlet very much. On reading *Hamlet*, he confesses in his novel, *Kafakâğıdı*, that he is impressed by the dialogues, themes and characters of the play. Besides, he watches Muhsin Ertuğrul acting Hamlet on stage and he decides to write a play that includes a character like Hamlet for Muhsin Ertuğrul to play. When all these circumstances come together, it is easy to grasp William Shakespeare's effects on Necip Fazıl Kısakürek: the effects which approach Kısakürek gradually and give him the opportunity to create his masterpiece, *Bir Adam Yaratmak*.

## **2. A Comprehensive Study of *Bir Adam Yaratmak* and *Hamlet***

### **2.1. Characterization**

The similarities between the plays in terms of characterization hit the eyes of the audience at once. Although there are some different aspects of the characters, they should be categorized as more alike than different. To be more specific, the resembling characters, which are given as follows, are analysed in terms of their similarities and differences: Hamlet & Husrev, Horatio & Mansur, Ophelia & Selma, Gertrude & Ulviye, Rosencrantz - Guildenstern & Nevzat - Şeref, Leartes & Turgut, and Grave-digger & Osman.

#### **2.1.1. Hamlet & Husrev**

It is universally known that *Hamlet* is a tragedy (or a revenge tragedy) though *Bir Adam Yaratmak* is not; however, both of the characters share one common point that they both are tragic. One of the most particular qualities of a tragic hero is that the character should belong to a noble and rich family; that is why Hamlet is a prince in the play. Despite the fact that naming Husrev as a tragic hero is not compulsory, it is still obvious that he is noble, too. When his name is analysed more deeply, it is seen that it has a specific meaning. "The name, attributed to the character, calls for the meaning, 'racially superior'. Apart from being a Persian sultan in history, Husrev also means 'sultan' as a noun" (Şenol, 2003: 45). Moreover, in Hegelian terms, a tragic hero is a thinker on the stage of history. Therefore, it is possible to entitle both of these characters as tragic heroes, for they think and think throughout the plays, because of which they gradually grasp new consciousness. After each consciousness both of the characters are alienated to their communities.

Both Hamlet and Husrev are different from the community they live in due to their distinctive way of contemplation and logical inferences. Their difference from the group they belong to makes them more and more pessimistic about the present and the future.

What a piece of work is a man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals; and yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me; no, nor women neither. (Shakespeare, 2001: 69)

Hamlet's interlocutors are Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, who come to Denmark to cheer up the prince and find out the reason why he loses all his merriness. He appreciates the perfect creature of all the others in the world; however, despite being the best of all species, he does not believe that he is one of them. He does not belong to the same group, for he has his own characteristics, distinguishing him from the others. Nobody but Horatio sympathizes with him; therefore, the other people around seem like a quintessence of dust to Hamlet. Urgan argues Hamlet's alienation to his own society as below:

The tragedy of this man of thought does not only stem from the private conditions he is in but also from the fact that he lives in a society, hostile to any sort of thought: His uncle Claudius is scared of thinking; his mother Gertrude and his beloved Ophelia lack the mental faculty of thinking; Ophelia's father Polonius is both suspicious of thought and he is not smart enough to think; Ophelia's brother Leartes despises thought, etc. Therefore, Hamlet cannot project his thoughts on anyone other than his friend Horatio (2014: 321).

This is one of the main reasons why Hamlet does not intend to talk in a "sane" way to any of the characters other than Horatio: Claudius is so scared of Hamlet's obsessive thinking of his father that he assigns Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to find out the misery Hamlet hides behind; Gertrude, on the other hand, is so incapable of analysing the events that she cannot find out that she is married to her ex-husband's murderer; Ophelia, moreover, cannot become a real individual since she and her actions are bound to what her father and brother command her; Polonius, furthermore, is the most loyal member of ignorance, for he is blind-minded and unable to understand Hamlet's satiric speeches; Leartes, too, is an ignorant man owing to his monomania, mostly provided by Claudius. None of these characters struggle to understand the events around them; therefore, Hamlet is doomed to his intellectual loneliness, which is only broken by his friend Horatio.

Husrev, on the other hand, is not more different from Hamlet in this aspect. He, too, has a stronger ability of comprehension once compared to the people around him. As well as Hamlet, he complains about shallowness of the people, too.

Zeynep! I am not one of those serial production men, pervading cities, streets, and coffeehouses. I wish I were one of them. They are healthy, natural, and perfect creatures. I guess, I am only a tool Allah created just to suffer and agonize. Everything that constitutes the world, every event, or every action is a way of torture for me. Somehow, I cannot find my role or my comfort. Considering the animals, living with their natural pleasures, I understand what a beautiful and secure medium I am deprived of. I am a patient, having frightened and hurt the animal in me (Kısakürek, 2016: 74).

When Husrev grizzles about these people, he actually emphasizes the condition that he is not one of those people, who resemble each other and are actually and unconsciously useless; on the contrary, everything that happens forces him to think over and over, which makes him feel as an outcast. "Neither the woman, approaching Husrev with affection, nor his mother excuses Husrev. The 'difference' among them is a sort of 'leaven difference'" (Miyasoğlu, 2009: 92). The question, nonetheless, is if Husrev is really in need of being excused by the other people around. He is the real embodiment of the tormented self, alienated to his own society due to his philosophizing activities. Thus, "Husrev, in many respects, is reflective of the sorrows of [his] epic ordeal in the ivory tower. This is the place where he is exposed to tribulation traumatically" (Miyasoğlu, 2009: 93).

### **2.1.2. Horatio & Mansur**

Neither Horatio nor Mansur leaves their friends when they seem weird to the community due to their speeches and actions. They seem in both plays from the beginning till the end and they understand and support their friends by heart. Both Hamlet and Husrev feel better when they are with Horatio and Mansur. They can easily talk to them and talk about their grief. Şenol also suggests this by asserting as follows:

Both friends [...] conciliate them [Hamlet and Husrev], they are well-behaved and think and behave in a virtuous and rational way. They both agree with their friends about the people of the time, existence and non-existence. Only they understand their friends. [...] None of them tends to leave their friends alone – even on their death (2003: 79).

After all, at the end of *Hamlet*, it is Horatio who is going to tell the whole story frankly and objectively to the rest of the world. In Husrev's case, moreover, except for his familial bonds, Mansur is the only one who is really sorry for his friend's fluctuating psychology and his undesired end.

### **2.1.3. Ophelia & Selma**

Both of these characters feel a deep and sacred love towards the heroes. They are both innocent and behave properly to them; however, they are accidentally murdered by their lovers through the middle of each play. While Husrev is trying to enact an event to the guests in his house, he shoots Selma inadvertently. Hamlet, on the other hand, kills Polonius, Ophelia's father, by accident, too. Because Ophelia is great in sorrow for her father's death, she goes really mad and eventually drowns in a river.

### **2.1.4. Gertrude & Ulviye**

Both mothers show affection to their sons. When Hamlet seems abnormal when compared to the time his father was alive, Gertrude wants Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to find out the reason about his different attitudes. Following that, when Hamlet kills Polonius, Gertrude sees that Hamlet is not mad actually, therefore avoids telling the truth to Claudius. Ulviye, on the other hand, shares the same compassion and instinct of preservation to his son. Being scared of the possibility that Husrev may hang himself to the same fig tree, where his father was found dead, she orders Osman to cut the tree through the end of the play. As Şenol asserts "both mothers are in search of ways to protect their sons" (2003: 75).

### **2.1.5. Rosencrantz - Guildenstern & Nevzat - Şeref**

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, Hamlet's childhood friends, work for the service of Claudius for the sake of their own profits. They do not hesitate taking their friends to England for death. Similarly, Nevzat and Şeref try to make profit from Husrev's unstable state of mind. Şeref publishes every single detail about Husrev's private life in his newspaper while Nevzat struggles to persuade Ulviye to admit Husrev in Nevzat's clinique for mentally unstable people.

### **2.1.6. Leartes & Turgut**

Neither Leartes nor Turgut shows a full development in the plays. They are functional characters that keep the plays continue in that Leartes leaves Denmark in the beginning of the play and Turgut never seems except for the beginning while he interviews with Husrev, as the author of *Ölüm Korkusu*. Both of the characters come up through the end of the play. Finally, both of them reveal the truth about the things that the heroes do not know; while Leartes confesses that Claudius is a traitor at the end of the duel, Turgut informs Husrev that his boss, Şeref, has bad plans for him; in other words, Şeref aims to hype his newspaper company up with Husrev's private life and madness.

### **2.1.7. Grave-digger & Osman**

Like Leartes and Turgut, Grave-digger and Osman are also functional characters since they both contribute to the heroes' aims of highlighting the vanity of life. Both the grave-digger and Osman answer the characters' questions about death.

## **2.2. Plot**

As aforementioned, both plays have some similar characteristics in terms of their plots. The problem of both plays, for instance, is the deaths of Hamlet's and Husrev's fathers, for the reasons of deaths are unknown to the heroes. By questioning the secrecy of these deaths, both characters prepare their tragic ends at the end of the plays. The events occur around the characters after the deaths of the fathers in each play. Another similarity between the plots is that there is a play within each play. Hamlet prepares the play *Mouse Trap* to be sure about the murderer of his father and Husrev authors *Ölüm Korkusu* to demonstrate the suspicions of his father's death and his fear of death. "Both of the heroes choose their fathers' deaths as their plays' subject matters. The reason why the plays come up is the heroes' suspicions and uneasiness, stemming from the way their fathers died" (Şenol, 2003: 42). These reasons force both of the heroes to do something to find out the truth behind their fathers' death.

Madness is yet another similarity between the plays. Although Husrev's and Hamlet's madness differ in their intentions, there is no doubt that Kısakürek benefits from Hamlet's madness to give an alternative productiveness into his play. Shakespeare chooses to leave Hamlet's madness obscure since the first impressions till the end; naturally, his insanity adds a lot to the development of the plot. Just like Shakespeare, Kısakürek creates a character with an unstable state of mind to give depth to the plot. Nevertheless, it is true that Husrev is made obliged to go mad by the community he is in. The only difference of these characters about madness is that for Hamlet, the audience is aware of the condition that his madness is an unidentifiable one whereas Husrev's is as real as flesh and blood.

There are also similar love affairs in each play. Hamlet loves Ophelia, a pure girl committing suicide after her father's death, caused by Hamlet, and Husrev loves Selma, another innocent girl, being murdered by Husrev accidentally. These parallelisms also call our attention to the similarities within the plots.

For the parts that Hamlet speaks to the grave-digger and Husrev to Osman, it is rather difficult to distinguish the interrogations of the characters. Even their statements and questions remind the audience (or the readers) of the other play. On seeing his father's portrait, Husrev feels a deep grief and asks Osman a few questions to imply that no matter what people do, they will not be able to get rid of intermingling with earth and transforming into dust in the end. Nothing more will come out of our lives and a human, existing with all his glory, flesh and blood before, will be (or perhaps will not be) remembered one day with his portrait, which survives much more than its possessor.

**Husrev:** Have you ever held my father's hands, Osman?

**Osman:** Of course, sir. I have held and kissed them heaps of times.

**Husrev:** (*Crazily*) Were they warm?

[...]

**Osman:** Of course, they were, sir.

**Husrev:** Where are those hands now? Perhaps they are now five pencils as cold as ice, made of bones, torn apart from their wrist (Kısakürek, 2016: 111)!

Especially Husrev's final reasoning about his father's bones, "perhaps they are now five pencils as cold as ice, made of bones, torn apart from their wrist", reminds the audience of Hamlet's ideas about Yorick's skull:

[A] fellow of infinite jest; or most excellent fancy, he hath borne me on his back a thousand times; and now how abhorred in my imagination it is, my gorge rises at it. Here hung those lips, that I have kiss'd I know not how oft. Where be your gibes now? your gambols? your songs? your flesh of merriment that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now to mock your own jeering? quite chop-fallen? Now get you to my Lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come (Shakespeare, 2001:138 - 9).

As touchy as Husrev's words, Hamlet also states that there is no way out of death and all humanity is sentenced to it, accordingly, to corruption underneath the earth. No matter how handsome, beautiful, ugly, physically strong or weak man is, his/her hands will be manacled and his feet will be shackled in the grave to a vulnerable piece of bone. The only difference between these speeches is that one of the abovementioned bones belongs to the fingers while the other is about the skull of a human being.

Obviously, considering the parallel natures of the plots, the blurred picture of Shakespeare's effects over Kısakürek gets more and more clear. Both of the authors share some other specific common points such as the themes of the plays due to the similarities mentioned above.

### 2.3. Themes

#### 2.3.1. Madness

Before getting into the theme, it will be better to state the function of being a mad man in each play. In *Hamlet*, the hero's being mad provides him the circumstances to observe his environment very well; whatever he does, he is not held responsible for anything. In *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, on the other hand, Husrev's insanity prevents him from expressing himself to the people clearly. From the middle of the play till the end, this madness troubles him. In short, while Hamlet's madness contributes him a lot to find out the truths about what goes on, Husrev's makes him more and more introvert and imprisoned within his thoughts.

Though being questioned for centuries, there is still no consensus over Hamlet's madness due to the fact that he states he acts like a mad man in some parts of the play while he refuses that he is insane in other parts.

Here, as before, never, so help you mercy,  
How strange or odd so'er I bear myself,  
As I perchance hereafter shall think meet  
To put an antic disposition on,  
That you, at such times seeing me, never shall,  
With arms encumber'd thus, or this head-shake,  
Or by pronouncing of some doubtful phrase,  
As, 'Well, well, we know,' or, 'We could, an if we would;'  
Or, 'If we list to speak,' or, 'There be, an if they might;'  
Or such ambiguous giving out, to note

That you know ought of me: this not to do (Shakespeare, 2001: 53).

Hamlet clearly exposes that he will act like a mad man to plot on Claudius in order to catch his guilty conscience. He explicitly states that he will take on an "antic disposition" to seem ridiculous, thereby getting rid of any responsibility one must have if he is sane. Though these words belong to Hamlet, he also states that he is not mad while speaking to his mother. When Gertrude claims that Hamlet's words are nothing more than the reflections of being mad, Hamlet refuses her idea rapidly. "My pulse, as yours, doth temperately keep time, / And makes as healthful music. It is not madness / That I have utter'd"

(Shakespeare, 2001:107). With the clash of the two observations, stemming from Hamlet's alternative attitudes, it gets more and more difficult to make sure about his insanity. Nevertheless, it is possible to claim that Hamlet has two kinds of madness; one of them is a pretentious one whereas the other is a mere reflection of his nervousness since "attitudes of Hamlet, pretending to be mad, are different from the attitudes of Hamlet, who, at times, is rather close to be insane" (Urgan, 2014: 469).

This theme is inserted in *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, too. Although the themes have some common grounds, some of their reflections in the plays are pretty different. Husrev, for instance, never refuses the fact that he is mad. Most of the time, he even apologizes from the people around, especially from his mother:

**Husrev:** Mother, forgive me! It's not me who should forgive you, you should forgive me! I am mad!

**Ulviye:** You are not, my son, you are not.

**Husrev:** I am, mother! Unfortunately, I am (Kısakürek, 2016: 127).

Sometimes Husrev's insanity makes him affectionate whereas sometimes he is aggressive; however, it cannot be underestimated that he has a pure nature and the community forces him to be mad.

As Hamlet goes back and forth between madness and sanity, which is rather convenient to his ultimate goal, so does Husrev. Contrary to what he says above, he sometimes admits that he is healthy and he does not demonstrate any signs of madness. Şeref asserts that he tries to be gentle when Husrev speaks harshly about him. On hearing that, Husrev refuses the idea that he should not be taken into consideration due to his lunacy. "Alright, maybe I am sick. But do not believe that I am sick now. If you think you find intolerable things with these words, assume that you hear these from a healthy man at a healthy moment" (Kısakürek, 2016: 82). As obvious, the methods of the theme are different but still there are similarities between the words of the heroes, which prove Şenol's ideas over Hamlet's and Husrev's insanity that "both of the heroes put madness aside once they intend to say important things to their interlocutors" (2003: 64).

### 2.3.2. Alienation to the community

Related to madness, the alienation of the characters due to their difference from the communities, is depicted in the plays, as well. As Şenol puts forward, the people around the heroes are unsympathetic and most of them are opportunists (2003: 92). Except for Horatio in *Hamlet* and Mansur in *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, nobody understands them correctly. When Husrev and Şeref have a debate over the fact that Şeref published Selma's diary in his newspaper, Husrev cannot help unburdening himself to Mansur.

**Husrev:** I can't take it anymore, Mansur! I will give these people what they want. They want it in such a way that I can't endure it anymore. What do they want? That I will be imprisoned in a madhouse? I will. That I will act like a March cat? I will. That I will wander around the streets with a tambourine, a shrill pipe and a group of children behind me? I will. My father hanged himself on a fig tree. Should I hang myself on the same tree and on the same branch? I will. I will do whatever they want. Do you understand me Mansur? Defending myself against these people seems extremely ugly to me.

**Mansur:** Husrev! I want to curl up and die.

**Husrev:** I get it now. They will not leave me alone with my torture and insanity. I will do everything necessary to be alone, on my own (Kısakürek, 2016: 88 - 9).

Husrev feels the grief of being an outcast among the people of his own environment deeply. The fact that he bursts out to Mansur about his inner thoughts, conflicts and revolt against the other people reminds the readers of the same idea of confidence in Hamlet to Horatio. Horatio's loyalty to Hamlet is observable from the beginning of the play until the end. He, not anyone else, knows every single detail about Hamlet's actions and thoughts, therefore, when he wants to follow his fellow Hamlet's death, Hamlet stops him: "If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart, / Absent thee from felicity awhile, / And in this harsh world draw thy breath pain, / To tell my story" (Shakespeare, 2001: 154). The proof that Hamlet trusts no one but Horatio lies beneath the surface of these words since only Horatio sympathizes with Hamlet and it is only him who can tell Hamlet's story objectively. Apparently, both of the heroes find confidence in only one of the characters in each play and they both are isolated from the other people in the society.

### 2.3.3. Existence vs. Death

Both of the characters contemplate on death and existence so much that they experience unbearable grief, for they try to oppose death and corruption in a way. The world gives them pleasure no more. They cannot recognize the world they lived before. It seems different to the characters with every single aspect.

**Husrev:** I'm losing my equilibrium, huh? What is it that you call equilibrium? I am losing my world! This world is not the world I knew. The universe, on which I have lived for forty years, is not that universe now. The realities I have believed in for forty years, the securities that I have put my head on as pillows, the relations, on which I have constructed buildings, slip down from my hands. Nothing reminds me of the old. A new face comes out of everything.

[...] This armchair does not resemble an armchair, nor does this mirror to a mirror. ... I wish they had ripped my flesh to shreds with nippers so that I had not seen this world (Kısakürek, 2016: 67).

On the death of his father, his friends' intrigues on him, killing Selma accidentally, Husrev cannot view the world from the same perspective as before. He considers that there is no point in living and when he keeps contemplating on death on seeing the portrait of his father, he emphasizes the vanity of life by talking to Osman, as Hamlet to the grave-digger and to Horatio. "'Always preoccupied with death', Husrev experiences a crisis of ideas by vacillating between the dilemma of killing himself and killing death" (Sorgun, 2015: 149). Husrev's final words instantly remind us of Hamlet's mourning after his father's murder and his mother's marriage to his uncle.

O! that this too too solid flesh would melt,  
Thaw and resolve itself into a dew;  
Or that the Everlasting had not fix'd  
His canon 'gainst self-slaughter (Shakespeare, 2001: 35)!

After those unbearable events, Hamlet is tired of living and he wishes for death. His existence does not make any sense to him. Providing that God did not forbid people committing suicide, he would not hesitate for a moment to give an end to his life. As Husrev wishes for death in order not to see the present world, so does Hamlet to stop experiencing the tormenting globe: "How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable / Seem to me all the uses of this world" (Shakespeare, 2001: 35). Like Husrev, Hamlet, too, suggests that nothing comes out of this new world. Living is just a waste of time, which becomes more concrete when he talks about Yorick's skull to Horatio and to the grave-digger.

As Şenol suggests, the heroes, accordingly people, are helpless and weak when the subject matter is death (2003: 55). Both of the characters believe in the everlastingness of existence; however, it is obvious that they both are men of thinking rather than acting. Therefore, when they consider the torture after death, they themselves feel pain within their souls and bodies. As such, when Claudius asks for the corpse of Polonius, Hamlet answers in an unexpected way, which reflects his sub-conscience:

Not where he eats, but where he is eaten: a certain convocation of politic worms are e'en at him. Your worm is your only emperor for diet: we fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for maggots: your fat king and your lean beggar is but variable service; two dishes, but to one table: that's the end (Shakespeare, 2001: 113).

Beneath his conscience, Hamlet has the idea of torture of nature to the dead bodies, which have already experienced the worst of all, but apparently, not sufficient for them to prove nature that they suffered enough. Just like Hamlet, Husrev also has the same idea about the decay of the corpses:

I hear! Hark, you can hear, too! I hear that billions of worms beneath the earth are eating billions of corpses as billions of silk worms eat mulberry leaves crunchily. (*Madly*) Corpses! Drops of champagne, drunk by the eyeless and earless worms! Appetizers of dust and dirt! The terrifying players of a terrorizing hide and seek game (Kısakürek, 2016:112)!

Husrev's ideas about death and decay of the bodies make him more and more scared of dying. By saying that he hears the sound of the worms eating the dead, he seems as if he were experiencing the same occasion at that time.

Both Hamlet and Husrev reflect their fear of death and of the unknown; the former, with his famous "to be or not to be" soliloquy while the latter, with his play *Ölüm Korkusu*:

**Hamlet:** The undiscover'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 (Shakespeare, 2001: 81).

The scary unknown has placed within Hamlet's conscience so much that he himself admits his cowardice. He may give an end to the torments of his life by killing himself; however, with the excuse of God's prohibition and his confession about the unknown, he cannot choose non-existence, but existence. Husrev's case, on the other hand, is not that different from Hamlet's. He has been interested in his father's reasons of death so much that the fear of death has interpenetrated into his conscience, as well. This is why he writes the play; to reflect his inner world to the outer one.

#### 2.3.4. Action vs. Inaction

Both of the heroes prefer to remain inactive at most parts of the plays. Because they are men of thinking, they criticize the people, who do not question anything but accept everything as they are. Hamlet starts philosophizing the use of man, who does everything but thinking.

What is a man,  
If his chief good and market of his time

Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more.  
Sure he that made us with such large discourse,  
Looking before and after, gave us not  
That capability and god-like reason  
To fust in us unus'd (Shakespeare, 2001: 116).

Believing in the Almighty, which creates another theme, Hamlet asserts that if something is presented to the humanity, it is not for a dull reason; on the contrary, nothing is causeless. Now that people have brains, they "have to" use it to distinguish themselves from the animals, whose existence is only for eating and sleeping.

Hamlet and Husrev meet on the same grounds once again. Husrev also thinks that people are very simple-minded just because they do not question anything and accept everything without thinking critically. When Zeynep insists on her notion that the accidental murder in the play, *Ölüm Korkusu*, is far from being realistic, Husrev gets angry and revolts against her, accordingly against the other people in the room; "You put the events into such narrow frames. The world is not as quadrilateral as you think it is" (Kısakürek, 2016: 40). Husrev implies the people in the room that they all see life from only one perspective. Every little detail about an idea should be developed more and more, they should not be crammed in a bottle, which is the homo-fabricant idea that people who produce something deserve being considered as important and valuable rather than those who are accustomed to consume, which, for sure, make Husrev and Hamlet more valuable once compared to the other people around, for they are real homo-fabricants, producing ideas all the time although the ideas they put forth make them more and more alienated to their communities.

Both Hamlet's and Husrev's thoughts about philosophizing are obvious from their speeches. However, they are not aware of the condition that they experience a sort of irony in that by over-thinking, they are prevented from acting, which is another trait that distinguishes people from the animals.

In *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, there is not an obligatory action as there is in *Hamlet*. As known, Hamlet should avenge his father's death. However, Husrev does not have that kind of a compulsory action. Nevertheless, his creation, *Ölüm Korkusu*, requires forcing the author to share the same destiny with the man he creates. This is why Husrev is as inactive as Hamlet. According to the play, he should put an end to his life by hanging himself to the same fig tree that his father committed suicide. But he does not; he attempts to do so through the end of the play just to see that the fig tree is destroyed by Osman on Ulviye's commandment.

Hamlet's words prove both his and Husrev's reason of inactivity. Their conscience is so lively that they cannot act. Again in the famous "to be or not to be" soliloquy, Hamlet explicitly puts the blame on his conscience, which proves Husrev's condition, too:

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 (Shakespeare, 2001: 82).

According to Hamlet, they are so much interested in the unknown and they are so frightened of the abstract that they lose their nerves and even if they decide to do something, their action is either directed to a wrong turn, or it loses momentum. Therefore, until Hamlet hears about the villain from a living human being, not from a ghost, he does not kill Claudius. Just like him, Husrev does not try to commit suicide before he finds out the truth behind his father's death, which is the fright of death. To do this, both of the writers benefit from Bacon's ideas of *Novum Organum*. They make their characters use the inductive reasoning technique through experimentation of the data they have. Finally, by commenting on the premises, both Hamlet and Husrev acquire the information they need.

### 2.3.5. Fatalism

Hamlet's fatalistic views are presented in the play just at the beginning. He believes that sometimes it is not up to anyone's choice to do something. There is another inexplicable power over people that determines everything and make people live the life He has prepared.

**Hamlet:** That for some vicious mole of nature in [people],  
As, in their birth, – wherein they are not guilty,  
Since nature cannot choose his origin, –  
By the o'ergrowth of some complexion,  
Oft breaking down the pales and forts of reason,  
Or by some habit that too much o'er-leavens  
The form of plausible manners (Shakespeare, 2001: 45).



According to Hamlet, people may have some disqualified traits within their characters by birth, which is not their fault, for they have no chance to choose what they are going to be. On the other hand, when he kills Polonius accidentally, he admits that “[f]or this same Lord, / I do repent: but Heaven hath pleas’d it so, / To punish me with this, and this with me” (Shakespeare, 2001: 108). He believes that he must be punished in a way and that Polonius must be punished, too. Therefore, it is the trick of God, who has control over His subjects.

The same fatalistic view can also be experienced with that of Husrev’s. When he tries to explain the accidental murder of the fictional mother by his son, he gives a vivid portrait of a series of coincidental events that occur out of the control of people:

I remember an example that has always preoccupied my mind. Listen! For instance, one day a man is crushed by a car in Eminönü Square. [...] Let’s go back to ten minutes before the event. The man, for instance, is around Gülhane Park. Suppose that the car comes from Taksim Square. Can you see the scenery? Coming? A car within a thousand cars and a man among a hundred thousand men. Neither the man knows that he will be crushed, nor does the driver that he will crush. They both approach each other as a result of many coincidences. For example, the man stops by a shop. He buys a box of matches. He takes a few steps and talks to a friend of his. He glances at the show cases. Even these innocent movements have shares in the storm that will come up eventually. All these movements are intermingled in a very mysterious way and bring about the inauspicious end. That moment stems from a very simple reason. An absence of mind, an ignorance, this or that. God knows how and where the coincidences are managed and that they have a rather complicated and inextricable mathematics (Kısakürek, 2016: 45).

Although trying to defend his character’s accidental crime in a logical frame, Husrev gives an irrelevant series of events, which emphasizes the fact that there is an inexplicable phenomenon that gives people directions and obligations to follow the route, specified before. Regarding both Hamlet’s and Husrev’s own words, thence, the picture of the fatalist views in both plays become clearer.

#### **2.3.6. Identity Crisis**

To start with, a definition of identity will be more useful in understanding the characters’ difficulty in identifying themselves. In accordance with Erikson’s definition, identity

is a sense of personal continuity and sameness, but it is also a quality of unself conscious living, as can be so gloriously obvious in a young person who has found himself as he has found his communality. In him we see emerge a unification of what is irreversibly given (that is, body type and temperament, giftedness and vulnerability, infantile models and ingrained prejudices) with the open choices provided (available roles, occupational possibilities, values offered, friendships made, sexual encounters), and all this within traditional or emerging cultural and historical patterns (1970: 732).

Identity crisis, thus, can be defined as the clash between the self and all the attributions Erikson makes above. In both plays, sometimes the characters are stuck when they encounter the complexities of events, which lead them to feel complicated about their identities. Hamlet, for instance, goes through a cycle of events, among which are clashing intrinsic and extrinsic examples such as the ghost of Old Hamlet, who commands his son avenge from Claudius, thereby conflicting with all the morals he has formulated. Gertrude’s marriage to Hamlet’s uncle, seeing Claudius as the new king after his father’s death, his mother’s and uncle’s hope of seeing Hamlet as durable and strong enough to tolerate his father’s death as well as Hamlet’s burden as a son who should be in search for his father’s revenge via another murder are the various obstacles that shackle and crack Hamlet’s identity. Considering all these external forces, it is clear that Hamlet is overwhelmed and he goes through an identity crisis.

Husrev shares the same crisis with Hamlet and finally solves the equation by philosophizing as follows:

What did I do? I pushed the limits. While I was trying to get out of myself, I encountered myself. [...] It seems that I had to be Allah in order to understand that I am a subject to him! I see that I had to create a man to understand how I was created! [...] What did I do? I slipped away from the most durable step. I hurt the blindness. How can I look at what is visible now? A man finds his fate as a dream while he is asleep. How can I watch this dream when I am awake? I am stuck between Allah and the crowd. How can I hang up in the air (Kısakürek, 2016: 70 – 1)?

Husrev’s external experiences are his obligations to tolerate Selma’s accidental murder, to find out the truth behind his father’s death, to resist his false friends like Nevzat and Şeref, to prove Turgut that the play is not an autobiographical one, and to preserve his honour by not being published in the newspapers as Selma’s

secret love and as a mad author. His internal experience, on the other hand, lies beneath his fault in creating a man and identifying a destiny for him. While facing with the truth, he is supposed to tolerate the consequences.

### 3. Conclusion

Regarding all the similarities and differences above, it is pretty obvious that Necip Fazıl Kısakürek both benefited from Shakespeare and created a different literary work once compared to *Hamlet*. Both plays are original in their own nature and although they share some common points in characterizations, plots and themes, they put forward different ideas and truths about human nature. On the other hand, Kısakürek respects and harps on Shakespeare, Goethe, and Rimbaud among many others (Özdenören, 2015: 96). Therefore, it is possible to draw a parallelism between Kısakürek and Shakespeare, whom he appreciates a lot. As Şenol also suggests “*Bir Adam Yaratmak* melts the similarities within itself and takes a brand new style without making concessions from Necip Fazıl’s understanding and tone” (2003: 94). Although Miyasoğlu believes that remembering the subject matters and problems of each play, the similarity between *Bir Adam Yaratmak* and *Hamlet* is limited to their value, which is a very common point among all classic works (2009: 95), Shakespearean effects over Kısakürek’s play are highly observable in terms of characterizations, themes, and plots. Still the most striking point is that as a Renaissance playwright and actor, Shakespeare goes on influencing many others in literary terms even approximately four hundred years later.

### REFERENCES

- BURT, D. S. (2009). *The Literary 100, Revised Edition: A Ranking of the Most Influential Novelists, Playwrights, and Poets of All Time*, USA: Facts on File, Inc..
- ERIKSON, E. H. (1970). “Autobiographic Notes on the Identity Crisis”, *Daedalus*, Vol. 99, No. 4, p. 730 – 759.
- GÜL, M. F. (2010). *Necip Fazıl ve Tiyatro*. Konya: Kömen Yayınları.
- KISAKÜREK, N. F. (2010). *Bir Adam Yaratmak*, İstanbul: Büyük Doğu Yayınları.
- MILÂR, S. (1938). “Bir Adam Yaratmak Piyesini Tahlil”, *Türk Tiyatrosu Dergisi*, I. İkinci Kânun, S. 85, s. 7 – 14.
- MIYASOĞLU, M. (2009). *Necip Fazıl Kısakürek*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- ÖZDENÖREN, R. (2015). “Necip Fazıl Kısakürek”. In Öz, A., Kara, İ. & Ertuğrul, A. (Eds.). *Necip Fazıl Kitabı*. (pp. 93 – 120). İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. (2001). *Hamlet*, England; London, Penguin Books.
- SORGUN, H. (2015). “Tiyatro “Sahne”sinden Anadolu’nun “Sine”sine: Necip Fazıl Kısakürek”. In Öz, A., Kara, İ. & Ertuğrul, A. (Eds.). *Necip Fazıl Kitabı*. (pp. 143 – 161). İstanbul: Zeytinburnu Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.
- ŞENOL, D. (2003). *Sahnenin İki Yüzü: Bir Adam Yaratmak ile Hamlet Karşılaştırması*, İstanbul: Kara Kutu Yayınları.
- THOMPSON, E. (2004). “Kısakürek, Necip Fazıl”. In Mattar, P. (Ed.). *Encyclopaedia of the Modern Middle East and North Africa Vol. 2*. (p. 1326). USA: The Gale Group, Inc..
- URGAN, M. (2014). *Shakespeare ve Hamlet*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.