Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 21, Issue No. 3, April-2024, ISSN 2230-7540

Exercising Intercultural Performance in Adaptations: Regional Kerala Myths and Rituals used as tool in Shakespeare film adaptation in Kannaki and Karmayogi

Mr. Shefin. S*

Research Scholar, Department of English and OELs, Dr. Harisingh Gour Central University,Sagar (M.P.) India.

Email: shefinkalathil@gmail.com

Abstract - Integral to the concept of "interculturalism" is an appreciation and knowledge of many cultural backgrounds. The major emphasis of intercultural performances is the equitable and meaningful interchange of performance standards and conventions. The timeless universal truths about mankind found in William Shakespeare's plays ensure that they remain relevant and influential even in our own day. Shakespearean plays are more amenable to adaptation into any genre because of their adaptability and flexibility as well as their inherent humanism. There is a lengthy history of retelling great stories in Malayalam film. The literary shifts, thematic echoes, and cultural subtleties that set apart the two film versions of Shakespeare's tragedies, "Hamlet" and "Antony and Cleopatra," from one another are the subject of this research. The exotic customs of Kelipathram and Poorakkali from Kerala have been included into the film to emphasize the cultural superiority of the Orient over the Occident. Shakespeare's Cleopatra continues to evoke mixed feelings in modern audiences; some see her as a manipulative force, while others find her aesthetically pleasing. Whatever your opinion, it's clear that Cleopatra defies categorization within patriarchal society's narrow definitions of women. The film's director gave Kannaki a mysterious air. Kannaki successfully achieves the characteristic of cinematic appropriation by meticulously blending mythological, cultural, geographical, and semiotic aspects within the narrative realm of Antony and Cleopatra. As a result, the director alludes to Antony and Cleopatra's politics inside Kannaki's oriental poetics.

Keywords: Kelipathram, Kannaki, Karmayogi, William Shakespeare, Kerala

----------X----------

INTRODUCTION

"Interculturalism" is predicated on a profound familiarity with and appreciation for many cultural backgrounds. Mutually beneficial sharing of performance standards and conventions is at the heart of intercultural performances. Due to the mutually beneficial nature of intercultural performances, they have far-reaching effects on society. When compared to performances that include elements of other cultures, these performances seem more natural. Two distinct forms of multiculturalism may be identified: acculturation and transculturation (Marsden J, 1991). The goal of transculturation is to improve upon and elevate both the indigenous and non-indigenous ways of life. It builds performance codes and then transplants them to a new time and place with significant significance. Through the process of acculturation, people are able to absorb and adapt to elements of other cultures. It integrates performance codes from other languages into our own performance frameworks. Intercultural theatre often employs Shakespeare's plays. But this area is still mostly uncharted and ignored.

Shakespeare in Intercultural Settings

An English playwright from the sixteenth century, William Shakespeare utterly transformed the English language with his dramatic and poetic works. His plays in particular ruled a whole literary period known as the Elizabethan Age, often referred to as the Shakespearean Age. Relationships were the driving force behind the deep and captivating nature of Shakespeare's plays connections between people and the communities in which they live. Shakespeare was the best at capturing the harsh reality of life in fifteenth-century Britain (Charnes Linda, 2000). This was the main reason his plays always garnered a lot of attention. A lot of people could identify with the protagonists and antagonists. They understood the problems that the protagonists had to deal with. The characters' anguish was something they could identify with. This is what made Shakespeare such a master storyteller; his

plays have this characteristic. However, keep in mind that Shakespeare was a writer in the sixteenth century. But his writings are still being altered, 400 years later.

In order to interact with a text from a different culture, intercultural performances often adopt a certain theatrical style. Regarding Shakespeare, there are a number of examples: *Zulu Macbeth, Noh Hamlet Kathakali King Lear (1989), the Kunqu Macbeth (1987), kyogen adaptations such as Hora Zamurai—a Kyogen Falstaff (1991) and Kyogen of Errors (2001), and the Beijing Opera adaptations by Wu Hsing Kuo (The Kingdom of Desire [Macbeth] (1986), Li Er Zai Ci [King Lear] (2002)*, by way of example). This mashup of cultures is more on display in Yohangza *Theatre Company's (2006)* Korean staging of A Midsummer Night's Dream. Still, by reserving the opposite end for western Shakespeare, they continue to favour the western theatre. One way to combat this is to stage performances that include a variety of genres rather than focusing just on Shakespeare. For instance, Search: *Hamlet* (2002), *Desdemona* [Othello] (2000), and *Lear (1997)*, all directed by Ong Keng Sen of Singapore, used Asian interculturality with Asian actors hailing from a variety of customs, languages, and origins. While he did not give any preference to either Shakespeare or the artists from India, Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, or Singapore, he did use their performances and the theatre to showcase kudiyattam, Kathakali, Korean percussion, puppetry from Myanmar, Yogyanese court dance, video, installation art, dance, music, visual art, film, ritual, etc. For instance, he eschewed the Moor element in his Desdemona by casting Claire Wong, a Singaporean artist of Chinese heritage, as Desdemona and Madhu Margi, an Indian Koodiyattam performer, and Maya Rao, a Kathakali artist, as Othello. The discussion is elevated to a new level by Maya Rao's portrayal of an older Othello in dreams who is ambisexual and by Madhu's portrayal of a married Othello (Lan, 2004). *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by Tim Supple was an effort along these lines; the play included international performers and their styles. Supple instructed the artists to utilise their "thinking language" and mother-tongue translations of the play, according to Indian theatre artist PR Jijoy, who played Theseus. This led to a performance with several languages and acting styles, sometimes even within the same role. This exemplifies the wide variety of theatres, languages, and cultural practices. In order to showcase the rich performing traditions of many civilizations, some of these shows include performers from diverse ethnic origins. These plays challenge the conventional wisdom about Shakespeare (Bloom, Harold, 1999).

FILMIC MODES OF THREE SHAKESPEARE TRAGEDIES "*HAMLET*" AND "*ANTONY* AND *CLEOPATRA*"

"Poorakkali" and "Kelipathram" entangled with *Hamlet*

Shakespeare in the modern postcolonial period has been indigenized, relocated, and transculturalized on an ongoing basis in response to the social and cultural context of the language it is being adapted for. Filmic adaptations and appropriations of Shakespearean tragedies have also impacted Indian cinema, reflecting the plays' importance in the world of theatre and performance. The indigenized fusion of regional arts like Yakshagana, Kathakali, Sangeet-nataka, and South-West and North-Eastern Martial Arts has inspired film adaptations and appropriations of Shakespearean plays set in different regions (Ashcroft et al, 2013). Plays adapted for regional cinema have resulted in "fused regional hybrid versions" as a result of this. This study article takes a look at one regional hybrid version of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The Indian film *Karmayogi*, set in the regional tongue of Malayalam, is an adaptation and appropriation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Before India's independence, foreign merchants who landed and settled along the country's eastern coastlines brought William Shakespeare's plays to amuse themselves. The establishment of theatres that presented plays written by British authors had a higher purpose than just providing amusement. Performing the plays in India also had the secondary but no less important goal of promoting Western culture and habits over Eastern ones. The plays that took place in the Calcutta Theatre were all written by William Shakespeare. Not only that, but several of his plays were staged there more than once (Greenblat Stephen, 2001). Plays of Shakespeare have become an integral part of Indian culture in modern, post-colonial India via translation, performance, adaptation, and absorption. Even though Shakespeare's plays are deeply ingrained in Indian culture, the East has its own subtle ways of reimagining and adapting them, while also subtly communicating with the West about the social, ethical, and cultural distinctions between the meta-narrative of Shakespeare's plays and these reimagined Indian tales. In light of this transcultural adaptation of Shakespeare's works, Harish Trivedi contends that, similar to colonial India, a non-literary component now determines Shakespeare's prestige, popularity, and distribution. From the Empire to ELT, or the dominance of English as the leading international language, we have seen it all (Trivedi & Bartholomeusz, 2005, p. 21).

The drama "*Hamlet*" has been moved by V.K. Prakash to the southwest area of Tamil Nadu, Kerala. He aimed to establish a foothold in the modern Orient by incorporating the traditional art forms of 'Kelipathram' and 'Poorakkali' into it. In the introduction to the "Post-Colonial Shakespeare" article that Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin co-authored in 1998, Loomba states that regional post-colonial discussions allow for the exploration of "Other" Shakespeare, which in turn helps to establish a solid foundation for Eastern narratives on top of Western metanarratives (Buckley, T. 2013). V.K. Prakash has infused Kelipathram and Poorakkali to highlight the unique aspect of the East in conventional and standardised arts in contrast to the West. Yogi Gurukkals was known for their ceremonial art form known as Kelipathram, which was widely practiced in the northern regions of the

Malabar Coast. Similarly, North Malabar males engage in a traditional dancing practice called Poorakkali. As part of the Pooram festival, Bhagavathy temples celebrate it for nine days to pay homage to Kamadeva (Burnett, M. T. 2013).

William Shakespeare's Tragedy in *Antony* and *Cleopatra*

William Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* is primarily a dramatic love story with some political overtones. A tragic end comes to the great Roman Emperor Antony as he juggles his responsibilities as head of state with his passions for "licentious sexuality and lust"—an affair with *Cleopatra*. The three plays written by Shakespeare that deal with Roman history are Julius Caesar, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and Coriolanus. Shakespeare drew on Sir Thomas North's translation of "Lives of Plutarch" for theme material in all three plays. Though *Antony and Cleopatra* are seen as a continuation of his earlier play Julius Caesar, the thematic atmosphere of the two plays couldn't be more different (Luludova, E., 2017). As the licentious closeness and passion between the Roman commander Antony and the Egyptian queen *Cleopatra* take front stage, the mostly political themes in these two plays take a back seat. A lot of people have strong opinions about *Antony and Cleopatra*, a play by William Shakespeare. The play's critics couldn't agree on whether it depicted the tragic fall of a great Roman general betrayed on multiple occasions by his passionate and crafty lover, the Egyptian queen *Cleopatra*, or a "transcendental love" between Rome and Egypt or the East and West (Trivedi, P. & Bartholomeusz, D. 2005). Using hyperbolic language to convey the uniqueness and historical importance of the experience described, as well as to reawaken the emotions and "a sense of ideal and the unusual vitality of the protagonists," the play contains the most ornate and magnificent speeches and words in all of Shakespeare's plays, according to Michael Magoulias. Excessive vocabulary is prevalent in the work, depicting expansive views of nature, describing political grandeur and power, and making passionate assertions (Magoulias 1995). The tragic demise of Antony, according to many critics, is caused by the play's hyperbolic vocabulary and the hyperbolic personalities of its characters. According to Magoulias (1995), some people think that *Cleopatra*'s morally repugnant features lead to Antony's downfall, while others think that her egotistical, confusing, and indeterminable qualities are defects or a tragic flaw in her character. According to Maynard Mack, a famous Shakespeare scholar, *Antony and Cleopatra*'s protagonist Antony is subordinated in some way due to *Cleopatra*'s fatalistic and supernatural qualities.

> PHILO
>
> Nay, but this dotage of our general's
>
> O'erflows the measure. Those his goodly eyes,
>
> That o'er the files and musters of the war
>
> Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, and now turn
>
> The office and devotion of their view
>
> Upon a tawny front. His captain's heart,
>
> Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst?
>
> The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper
>
> And is become the bellows and the fan
>
> To cool a gypsy's lust. (1.1.1-10)

Despite Antony's choice of her and our exposure to her recognisable feminine abilities, the play maintains a further certainty that a force acts through her, which is also, in a way, destiny. For everyone, she is a magical being; for the Romans, she has an air of suggestion that expands the meaning of words like "enchantress," "fairy," "witch," "charm," and "spell" beyond their usual boundaries of virtuousness and sensual adulation (Mack 1973:57). Although some critics have hailed *Antony and Cleopatra* as one of Shakespeare's greatest tragedies, others have said that the play is problematic because of the ambiguity it maintains in terms of substance, structure, and character roles. However, feminist critics see the play as significant because Shakespeare, via the characters in the play, challenges patriarchal worldviews and male-dominated literary criticism by calling into question traditional gender roles (Decker, Marsha A. 2012).

Shakespeare treats his female protagonists differently in tragedies and comedies; say A. H. Nason and L. Bamber. According to this view, Shakespeare takes a feminist stance in his comedies but exclusively gives masculine characters the spotlight in his tragedies. Shakespeare seems to be a male who plays the role of a woman in his comedies, if not a feminist (Muir, Kenneth, 1987). Comedic female leads are often portrayed as smarter, more self-aware, sexier, livelier, and gayer than their male counterparts. Goneril, Regan, Lady Macbeth, and Volumnia are some of Shakespeare's most terrifying female characters in his plays. These horrific depictions are laden with sexual animosity; how can we explain this? Because the villainy of these people stems from their inherent weaknesses as women; they are not just wicked women. Shakespeare subtly makes their brutality worse by placing it just where our expectations of a woman's compassion are (Bamber 1982: 2).

In light of the various interpretations and critiques of Antony's demise, this article seeks to demonstrate how *Cleopatra*, a remarkable ancient female role model, contributed to Antony's demise by appealing to patriarchal assumptions about women, using her alluring words and speeches, and bringing attention

to herself as a femme fatale (Randazzo, Gelsey, 2012). *Cleopatra* is a manipulative and impulsive woman who takes use of her position of power, her knowledge of men, and her femininity to further her personal interests and that of the Egyptian kingdom. This view holds that *Cleopatra*'s participation in Antony's demise, whether submissive or rebellious, merits analysis (Shakespeare, W., 2005). For example, Antony told *Cleopatra* that he wanted to return to Rome to do his role as one of the triumvirs of Rome when he heard that Rome was about to go to war with Pompey. In a very subservient manner, *Cleopatra* says:

> My becomings are my downfall if they don't look well on you.
>
> Listen not to my pitiful foolishness; your honour commands you to do so.
>
> You are accompanied by all the gods.
>
> Atop your sabre
>
> Rest in your triumph, and your success will be easy
>
> Spread out before you. (1.4.177-122)

However, in the first scene of Act I, *Cleopatra* makes fun of Antony, telling him, "Do this, or this" (1.1.25), and teasing him for being a puppet for Fulvia and Caesar. "Let Rome in Tiber melt...Here is my space" (1.1.38–39) is his response to *Cleopatra*'s subversive remark, and he goes on to emphasise that he loves *Cleopatra* alone. By repeating his statements and making fun of him, she tells her friends:

> Impressive deception!
>
> Even though he didn't love Fulvia, he nevertheless married her.
>
> I will discover that I am not (1.1.46-48)

Depending on the context, *Cleopatra*'s volatility in character and her ever-present cunning play submissive or subversive roles towards Antony. Antony, the famous Roman commander, is "so enchanted" by *Cleopatra*'s beauty; his fixation on sexuality and physical attractiveness, however, are the key elements in comprehending his demise. As the play opens, we see Antony as the great leader and a responsible general who is aware of his own shortcomings; for example, in Act 1, Scene 1, he says, "These strong Egyptian fetters I must break/or lose myself in dotage" (1.1.128). This honourable commander becomes engrossed in his romance with *Cleopatra* as the play progresses. He loves her so much that he becomes oblivious to his duties as a great Roman commander; even though he was afraid she would make him old. Roman moral rules of loyalty and obedience are violated by *Cleopatra*'s immoral activities, which are driven by her contradictory personality. "She is cunning past man's thought / would I have never seen her!" he says later, in his twilight years, as an admission of guilt for his own error. Thus, he is conflicted (1.2.161-168) between his responsibilities to Rome and Egypt, or, put another way, between his desires for pleasure and his obligations to his duty.

KAAVU THEENDAL'S NAGARADHANA (SNAKE WORSHIPPING-KANNAKI) AND KELIPATRAM'S (KARMAYOGI MOVIE) RITUALIZED PRESENTATIONS

In the northern regions of the Malabar Coast, the Yogi Gurukkals practise a ritual art called Kelipathram. Similarly, males traditionally do Poorakkali, a kind of dance. During the Pooram festival, which was held at the Bhagavathy temple to celebrate Kamadeva, it was observed for nine days.

- To investigate how Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was reimagined and repositioned within the postcolonial oriental environment.
- By showcasing the south-western regional culture of Kerala, to place a focus on the Orient's cultural supremacy over the Occident.
- To see how the original Western *Hamlet* and the Eastern *Karmayogi* are diametrically opposed.

Jayaraj adapts the Bard's work for the mythological and cultural context of Tamil Nadu and Kerala. A *hamlet* called Chemmanampathy on the border between Kerala and Tamil Nadu serves as the film's precise setting. The rustic beauty of Chemmanampathy-*Kannaki* becomes Shakespeare's queen of Egypt. The title of the adapted work, *Kannaki*, guarantees that the heroine will take centre stage in the final product (Attukal Devi, 2018). A plethora of male characters are loitering about her area, perhaps trying to get her attention. But she is firmly convinced that she inherited some evil or magical power from her father, thus she is prohibited to do them. This makes them wary of approaching her. In actuality, this legend serves to ward off the lustful local males. Jayaraj portrays her as a wise woman who can treat victims of poisons such snake bites. The cultural trans-creation is greatly aided by this distinction. Jayaraj reduces the number of characters in the screen adaptation of the narrative so that the cinematic craft can maintain the atmosphere. Shakespearean characters in his films with a Tamil flavour include names like Gounder and Choman, among others. Antony, Octavius Caesar, Lepidus, Sextus Pompey, and Octavia are the main characters of *Antony and Cleopatra (*Vignier, Isabelle, 2004*)*. The *Kannaki*te characters that are similar to them include Manikyam, Choman, Gounder, Kaliyappan, and Kumudam. Ravunni, who is *Kannaki*'s attendant and the polar opposite of Madrian, the attendant of Queen *Cleopatra*, plays a more significant role in *Kannaki*'s life despite being a small character.

A new character, Kanakamma, the local fate teller who is never without her caged parrot, is introduced to Jayaraj's storyline. In the Indian states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu, many believe that trained parrots can predict their destiny. As a result, the director creatively incorporates avian astrology (pakshishastram), in which a parrot serves as an astrologer, into the film to strengthen the cultural translation. In his plays, Shakespeare deftly employs characters such as fortune tellers, witches, and others. "Beware the Ides of March," the soothsayer warns Julius Caesar in Shakespeare's Roman comedy Julius Caesar. To creatively highlight the obstacles in Manikyam and *Kannaki*'s existence, Jayaraj uses the fate teller Kannakamma. Along with *Kannaki* and Kumudam, she approaches Manikyam and his assistant Muthu (Canidius's inverse) in the film (Decker, Marsha A., 2012). The locals mindlessly follow her advice, which ends up causing them disaster as well. The cultural bricolage usually revolves on the adaptations. When the cultures of the source and target texts are mixed, a new cultural milieu is formed. The use of the "cockfight" game by Jayaraj to manage the tran-culturation process in his modified text is quite remarkable. He transforms the battlegrounds into cockpits where the angry cocks fight. In this contest, every cock stands in for its owner. From this vantage point, he brings to life the characters Manikyam, Choman, Kaliyappan, and Gounder. Even *Kannaki* has aggressive cocks stashed away. She asks Manikyam to train her cocks after hearing that Manikyam's cock recently beat Gounder's cock. Manikyam plays the role of *Kannaki*'s bodyguard throughout the film, much like in the play, and she is tormented by Gounder and Choman. At the same time, Choman separates himself from *Kannaki* and, on the recommendation of Kaliyappan and others, arranges for his sister Kumudam to be married to Manikyan in order to cement their link. In the play, this scene is reminiscent of the one in which Octavius, inspired by Lepidus to refocus his attention away from *Cleopatra* and onto his royal responsibilities, chooses to grant Antony his sister's hand in marriage (Hatchuel, S., 2015).

Manikyan and *Kannaki* are taken aback by the marriage announcement. Manikyan feels the same way about Kumudam as Antony does about his sister. Manikyan is consumed by despair by the constant presence of *Kannaki* in his thoughts. Choman and the other elders of the community gave him the renowned ritual-kavu theendal to help him get his mental vigour back. When people from different cultures get together, their local customs and beliefs play a big role (Luludova, E., 2017). Presented as a follower of Naga Daivangal (the Snake God) and Goddess Kali, *Kannaki* is a fascinating figure. The religious practice of Nagaradhana, which literally means "snake worshipping," is deeply ingrained in the Keralit Hindu tradition. To improve the visual storytelling, Jayaraj uses pictures of Naga idols. In an act of reverence, she dusts the idols with turmeric powder in the film. The image of *Kannaki* is that of a devout woman who visits Goddess Kali to ask for her favours. Kali, Kettukala, and Thulasithara sculptures, as well as homakundam, kolam, and other regional indications, are captured by the camera (Vipanchika., 2016). Veedu thendi Kavutheendal is a native ceremony that plays in the background of *Kannaki*'s hut throughout the film. "Kodungalluramme varamarulu pallival thumbukalil thudiunaru" is the first line of a song that plays during the ceremony. Listeners may be swept away by the lyrics, who have the power to evoke profound emotions in them. The song is deeply related to the *Kannaki* story. Kodungaluramma, literally "Goddess of Kodungallur," is said to be an incarnation of *Kannaki*, the goddess of wealth and prosperity (Sanders, Julie., 2006).

> At Attukal in Thiruvananthapuram, Kannagi bestowed the "darsan" blessing on the local as she made her journey to Kodungallur in Kerala. At Attukal, Theey built a temple. Additionally, it is said that Devi ultimately arrived in Kodungalloor and made her home at the Kodungalloor Devi Temple, which is situated south of Guruvayur. Traditional practices and beliefs in Tamil Nadu and Kerala are profoundly impacted by Kannagi-related occurrences. (Web)

Onscreen, Manikyam and *Kannaki* don the robes of the oracle Velichappadu and bring pallival. They do the ceremony with great reverence in the hopes of regaining the emotional stability they had before their separation. After that, Manikyam and *Kannaki* reunite in the scene that follows. Choman is so enraged by their reunion that he plots vengeance on Manikyam with his enemy, Gounder. In an effort to drive a wedge between Manikyam and *Kannaki*, Kanakkama engages in intrigue. When Kumudam and Manikyam meet privately, he expresses his sisterly adoration once more (Magoulias, Michael, 1995). Kumudam tells *Kannaki*, in her rage, that she would soon be a mother to Manikyam's kid. *Kannaki* is completely devastated by her remarks. Instead of finding a solution, she decides to end her own life. He begs Ravunni for help, telling him that Manickyam is leaving for Manikyam and that her last request is that Kumudam marry her.

The poison of the snakes is the cause of *Cleopatra*'s demise in the drama. For his modified text as well, Jayaraj steps into the spotlight. In a twist of fate, *Kannaki* a healer who helps those afflicted by snake bites chooses to meet her demise at the hands of a snake despite her fervent devotion to Nagaraja. Following his spectacular triumph in the cockfight over Choman and Goundar, Manikyam makes his way to *Kannaki*. After learning she's leaving, he sets up a duel with his game cock, Keerichekavan (Montrose, Louis Adrian, 1983). In the next close-up, his enraged member slices through the cardinal vein in the neck. At the moment of the climax, the lifeless corpses of *Kannaki* and Manikyam lay close together, with the snake that bit *Kannaki* visible nearby. Seeing the lovers' terrible conclusion breaks Ravunni's heart. Even in the play's devastating

ending scene, Jayaraj manages to make a strong impression on viewers. In all its mythological, cultural, and thematic glory, Jayaraj's *Kannaki* stands as an appropriation, not a modification, of Julie Sander's concept. In his revised version of the play, he plays with the plot of *Antony and Cleopatra* in a roundabout way (Muir, Kenneth, 1987). There is a colossal difference between the stage production and the film's mise-en-scene. He transfers it to a different nation, time period, and ethnic group. *Cleopatra*'s portrayal by Jayaraj as *Kannaki* is remarkable. By contrasting *Cleopatra*'s serpentine beauty with Kannakki Amman's purity and sanctity, he shapes the depiction. The inherent cultural bricolage of an adapted piece is enhanced in this iteration. This is also an inter-semiotic transaction, as adaptations are phenomena that occur across cultures. It is described by Roman Jakobson as the "transmutation of signs— and interpretation of verbal signs of non-verbal sign system." (Jakobson 114)

The well-known film Adviser on semiconductors the four main categories of sign codes used in cinema analysis, according to Umberto Eco, are indexical, symbolic, iconic, and enigma. Indirect indexical indications indicate a concept. A universal code is a symbolic code. Iconic signs highlight the abstract significance. Use the Engima code, which is often used in trailers and posters, to pique viewers' interest. It is important to note that selecting suitable semiotic codes is a part of text transcreation (Onyett, Nicola, 2010). Powerful signals in *Kannaki* include cultural and regional codes like cockfight (Kozhikettu), Nagaradhana, etc. Kali, Nagadaivangal, and Kettukala are the film's indexical codes. The colour red is used most often as a symbolic code; examples include Manikyam's red silk sari that she gives to *Kannaki*, the "blood" that they both spill, and Velichappadu's crimson clothing. It really enhances the visual storytelling. Palmyra palms and cocks are the most recognisable symbols (Randazzo, Gelsey, 2012). There is animosity between the characters, and the cock fight displays that. The triumph of a single cock on cockpit represents the magnificence of its owner. Palmyra palms abound in the area around *Kannaki*'s dwelling. The film's director attributes *Kannaki*'s uncanny demeanour to this. *Kannaki* achieves the characteristic of cinematic appropriation by appropriately blending mythological, cultural, geographical, and semiotic components within the narrative realm of *Antony and Cleopatra*. So, using *Kannaki*'s eastern poetry, the director alludes to the politics of *Antony and Cleopatra (*Vignier, Isabelle, 2004*)*.

EXAMINING THE DISSIMILARITIES AND SIMILARITIES IN THE CHARACTER IDENTITIES OF CLEOPATRA, KANNAKI, HAMLET, AND RUDRAN

Kannaki is Jayaraj's second work; it's like *Antony and Cleopatra* with an oriental twist. He reimagines *Antony and Cleopatra*'s tale in a different setting, with a different society, customs, etc. He finds great inspiration in the Shakespearean flicks of Japanese filmmaker Akira Kurosawa. He uses the *Kannaki* tale, which is common in Tamil literature, to create a setting that is suitable for *Kannaki*'s culture. Into his masterwork Silappathikaram, Ilango Adigal deftly constructed the story of the *Kannaki*. The protagonists of Ilango Adigal's stories are *Kannaki* and Kovalan, her husband. An ancient heroine named *Kannaki* battled for the right to prove her husband's innocence. Despite the accusations from the demonic powers, she is worshipped by many residents as the goddess of virginity. Prior to Jayaraj, several literary and cinematic works appropriated the *Kannaki* story. In *Kannaki*, Jayaraj discovers a copy of *Cleopatra* from Shakespeare (Orfall, B., 2009). A lot of people think of *Cleopatra* as a "femme fatale," and they say that her beauty is serpentine. Jayaraj draws parallels between *Cleopatra* and *Kannaki*, two fictional characters, and then uses *Kannaki* to channel *Cleopatra*'s spirit. Shakespeare weaves the narrative of *Antony and Cleopatra* around *Cleopatra*, one of the strong female characters in his canon. Jayaraj deftly seizes the opportunity to blend *Kannaki* tale with Shakespearean themes. *Kannaki*, played by Jayaraj, is a beautiful woman who, like *Cleopatra*, captivates viewers with her charisma and screen presence.

The film adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* has changed the play significantly. A number of notable directors have adapted the works of Laurence Oliver, Michael Almereydas, Kenneth Branagh, Franco Zefirelli, and many more. Many international film festivals have shown *Karmayogi*, a Malayalam regional adaptation of the play. Both Laurence Oliver and Franco Zefirelli's *Hamlet* and V.K. Prakash's *Karmayogi* are unique adaptations of Shakespearean plays, yet they share the same history of reusing and recycling old material (Jakobson, Roman, 2000). Shakespeare, in his plays, reimagined old tales by plagiarising them from sources like Holinshed's chronicles or Plurtarch's Lives. Just as Shakespeare owes Saxo Grammaticus (Historia Denica, "Danish History," the play's source) to Shakespeare, so too do contemporary *Hamlet* adaptations owe him.

There are several similarities between plays and films. Both are more grounded in reality while yet including aspects of performance and the aesthetic enjoyment of witnessing it. The movie uses the same set design, costumes, lighting, music, and sound effects of a play. Concurrently, there are also obvious distinctions between the two.

> The audience at a movie or play sits in a fixed position relative to, and at about the same distance from, the screen or stage, and reacts both individually and collectively to what they see. The stage's focus area defines the audience's point of view, which does not change throughout the performance. Film, on the other hand, may transcend the limitations of the proscenium. The distance between the performance and the spectator may seem to be changing, but

> in reality, it is just changing the audience's viewpoint. This is mostly achieved by strategically placing the camera in a film. Instead, in theatre, the actor—sometimes supported by lighting and sound effects—is responsible for drawing the audience's attention to certain parts of the stage. For "a long time the medium of the motion was regarded as a new proscenium," the design of the cinema screen in a theatre is reminiscent of a proscenium stage, and the running duration of a feature film almost matches that of a regular play (Cahir 145)

Instead of focusing on the hero's mental health, Oliver's film emphasises that "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark." This is immediately apparent in the macabre atmosphere it generates, with its ominous score set against scenes of a stormy sky and a raging ocean. Therefore, Oliver's *Hamlet* seeks a cinematic reconstruction by paying close attention to the play's universal sense of governmental responsibilities and corruption. Instead of delving into the tragedy of *Hamlet*'s life the main focus of Shakespearean scholars the film becomes a record of the rot and corruption of the political system (Narayanan, 2016). Examples of this reason include the sequences when the army protects the nation, the long, wide shot of Elsinore castle, the coronation ceremony, and so on. As Horatio, Bernado, and Mercellus witness the joy of marriage triumph over the sorrow of death in the palace, *Hamlet* describes his first encounter with the ghost.

> *HAMLET*. Marriage isn't Even though I was born and raised here; I still think it's a tradition that's more respected when broken than when followed. Our name is tarnished, and our accomplishments, even when achieved at our best, are undermined, by this conceited celebration of the east and west, which makes us the object of ridicule and taxation from other countries. This means that it often happens to males, even when they are innocent, because to a wicked mole of nature that is there from birth. In the general condemnation, their virtues even if they are as pure as gracewill be tainted by that one fault either because of the overgrowth of a certain complexion that often undermines the pales and forts of reason or because of a habit that has become too strong.

Lines 13–37 of the original text are included in this scene's reproduction, with a little modification that removes lines 36–38 (1. 2). Not long after that, the spectre materialises. The spectre transcends the play's supernatural aspect. It's symbolic function, according to Kozintsev (quoted in Bobik 12), is to foretell a better Denmark and a warning of its decline. The king's death symbolises Denmark's dire situation. By contrasting the ghost with *Hamlet*'s words, the curse that has befallen the nation is driven home. "Remember me," the ghost whispers. Its sound echoes throughout the room. This memory of decaying Denmark is what motivates *Hamlet* to take action in Oliver's adaptation. The deceased monarch has appointed junior *Hamlet* to restore the kingdom, and old *Hamlet* wants his son to recall the period when he was alive. Despite the king's usurpation, he brings up the Elizabethan guilt of regicide to *Hamlet* (Bobik 12).

V.K. Prakash's 2012 regional version of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in Malyalam, Karmayog, is an effort to recreate *Hamlet* against the background of Keralan mythology and culture. Following the definition of the word "adaptation" to the letter, Prakash successfully transplanted the Elibethan play into a new cultural context, but the extent to which it replicated the play's sublime qualities remains debatable. Rudran Gurukkal, portrayed by Indrajith of the Chathothu family, is meant to represent the regional *Hamlet* in the film (Fleck, 2014). It is said that Lord Shiva was born into the yogi group, to which this family belongs. Along with the ghost element, Laertes, Gertrude, Polonius, Kidathan, Moonumani, Ophelia, and the majority of the characters from *Hamlet* (*Hamlet*, Rudran, Bhairavan, Claudius, Gertrude, Mankamma, Kanthan, and Laertes), the vengeance theme is also present. However, there are also distinctions, such as Kidathan's effort to unseat Bhairavan and Bhairavan's murder of Kidathan. Instead of taking Shakespeare's *Hamlet* at face value, *Karmayogi* uses the story's thread to create a series of dichotomies: tradition vs. modernity, spirituality vs. consumerism, and money vs. poverty. It is a celluloid dialogic text that requires an in-depth understanding of Shiva tradition, Indian philosophy, the cultural importance of Theyyam, etc., in order to understand. Ironically, the film depicts Bhairavan the heir apparent to the older brother's throne as worldly, contemporary, and rich the very opposite of the spiritual, traditional, and yogic character he was meant to be. He is the modernist who puts an end to the legacy of his late brother's heritage (K, 2017). By stating, "it was the customs and practices that took his life," he makes his animosity against the fabled yogic tradition his brother adhered to plainly apparent by the fact that he murdered the sibling. Love for tradition is shown by Rudran's devotion to his father's traditions. To rephrase, Rudran despises modernism, and he despises Bhairavan for the same reason.

Like *Hamlet*, the film is polysemic in terms of the cultures it draws from. The term "Karmayogi" may refer to more than one thing. A yogi and karma work together in this way. A person's deeds are their karma. Those who engage in the practice of yoga are referred to as yogis. In Indian philosophy, yoga refers to methods for achieving inner calm and harmony. One possible extension of the Sanskrit word's meaning of "Union" is union with God. Rudran Gurukal (*Hamlet*), played by Claudia Julius, is the polar opposite of Bhairavan (Claudius) in the film. The Yogi follows in his father's footsteps by embracing spiritual poverty via begging, a practice performed by Shivite monks, despite his father's

riches (Jess-Cooke, C., 2006). Rudran, whose name means "Siva," also takes this path to enlightenment. Here, set in an Indian environment, the film recreates the spiritual conversation of good vs. evil that is unveiled in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. In this case, the conflict that emerges is not between good and evil, but between spirituality and materialism. Instead of the vengeful karma seen in *Hamlet*, this karma is the yogic karma that leads to spirituality. Spirituality surpasses even Rudran's concerns for vengeance.

TRAGIC PROTAGONISTS IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS, PARTICULARLY THOSE INVOLVING *CLEOPATRA* AND *HAMLET*, SUFFER FROM IDENTITY CRISES

The picture of *Cleopatra* is contradictory, and Shakespeare uses ambiguity as a dramatic tactic to bring these opposing aspects into harmony. The idea that Shakespeare purposefully used this tactic in the play was first put up by David Cecil. The narrative's inherent duality and ambiguity strikes a chord with scholars such as Danby and Mack. According to Logan and other academics, Shakespeare took influence from Christopher Marlowe's Dido, Queen of Carthage for *Antony and Cleopatra*, using the character approach of ambiguity (Slethaug, G. E., 2014). We set out to study the two characters' psyches in depth because of the ambivalence and ambiguity that permeate their motives and actions. Logan stresses that the ambiguity that envelops *Cleopatra*'s appearance not only enthrals the audience but also "instills a kind of credibility that people are familiar with from their everyday living," rendering *Cleopatra* the most fully humanised of the play's major characters (Thornton Burnett, M., 2013).

Questions like why *Cleopatra* fled the naval battle at Actium (3.10), flirted with Caesar's emissary Thidias (3.13), decided to pretend to die through Mardian (4.13), and offered treasure to Caesar (5.2) are heightened by the ambiguity of her motives and actions, which contributes to her mystique. The most important thing is that *Cleopatra*'s choice to end her life is still a complete mystery. Did they die as a martyr for Antony's death, or did they refuse to suffer the shame of imprisonment after a political loss? When *Cleopatra* is seen as nothing more than Antony's smitten lover, her behaviour becomes murky. Shakespeare mostly emphasises *Cleopatra*'s love affair with Antony, but her character goes beyond that. Caesar has Thidias cut *Cleopatra*'s links with Antony, highlighting *Cleopatra*'s political savvy (Mack, 1973). *Cleopatra* skillfully navigates the political terrain, although seeming compelled. Her later offer of cash to Caesar in Act V demonstrates her crisis-driven pursuit of a new sponsor after Antony's loss. Being Antony's lover doesn't diminish *Cleopatra*'s determination to maintain her royal rank. She begs Antony's emissary to ask Caesar to grant her descendants the crown of Egypt after the naval disaster at Actium. After Antony dies, she requests that Proculeius, Caesar's ambassador, petition the Egyptian king on her son's behalf.

Why *Cleopatra* chooses to end her own life is the most divisive mystery. One may argue that *Cleopatra* was an enamoured lover if she committed suicide to be a martyr for Antony. On the other hand, if one believes that *Cleopatra* was a noble queen who committed herself because she was desperate and did not want to face the shame of imprisonment, then she might be seen as a politician who failed (Bamber 1982). It is hard to understand *Cleopatra*'s behaviour since it goes against what one would anticipate from someone who is determined to destroy herself. This is especially true when considering her visit to Caesar and her donation of her riches. Some critics, like John Wilders, argue that *Cleopatra* tells Caesar the truth when she says she doesn't want to die, suggesting that Seleucus is following orders. On the other hand, there are those who think she uses her wits to try to negotiate with Caesar and allure him. Several things contributed to *Cleopatra*'s decision to end her own life. After her beloved Antony died, the Queen of Egypt was grieving, but her assassination was a calculated move to restore her honour after her discussions with Caesar failed (Randazzo, 2012). Act V establishes *Cleopatra* as the clear heroine as she faces an inner struggle and decides to die with imperial dignity. She talks to her slaves a lot about how much she wants to see Antony again, but she also talks about how scared she is of becoming a hostage. Shakespeare uses ambiguity and dualism as character development tools to make *Cleopatra* more complex and interesting by highlighting her seeming inconsistencies. Peter Hall, who is directing Judi Dench in the role of *Cleopatra*, stresses the complexity of the character and tells Dench not to give the audience a clear message. By carrying out this order to perfection, Dench gives the spectator a glimpse into *Cleopatra*'s complex character.

The drama unfolded in this play nearly 400 years ago, however the struggles experienced by the characters remain pertinent even in our times. Without a doubt, *Hamlet* has more English-language audience members than any other play. Written by Shakespeare somewhere between 1601 and 1602, *Hamlet*'s tragedy is considered a masterpiece of his work. The outstanding portrayal of the protagonist's struggle between his moral principles and the need for vengeance for his father's death demonstrates the playwright's creative maturity. Shakespeare's emphasis on the hero's predicament rather than depicting the gory crimes was a departure from modern vengeance dramas, which sometimes dramatically dramatised violent acts onstage.

> The protagonist should have excellent qualities while also having flaws; the audience should be able to relate to and sympathise with this character. No tragic hero in Shakespeare's plays is without the capacity for virtue and evil (*Hamlet* as a Tragedy, 2011)

Shakespeare drew on a variety of elements to build *Hamlet*, resulting in a complex and multi-layered

literary masterpiece that continues to captivate spectators and readers alike with its many interpretations. Ernest Johnson argued that *Hamlet*'s central conflict is with his own morality, specifically with his temptation to act out of evil passion rather than out of a desire to do what is right. Ultimately, *Hamlet* overcomes this internal conflict by achieving a more balanced perspective (Marsha A. Decker, 2012). Since *Hamlet*'s fundamental moral issue remains relevant even after all these years, he remains a man for all generations and the object of universal identification. All humans, even in this modern day, face the same destiny as *Hamlet* as he struggles to behave morally while living in a corrupt environment. Indeed, among Shakespeare's greatest tragedies is *Hamlet*:

> Shakespeare reached a point of creative maturity with this tragedy, which marks a turning point in his dramatic growth. The playwright brilliantly portrays the hero's conflicting impulses to uphold moral purity and exact revenge for his father's death. (*Hamlet* as a Tragedy, 2011)

There are few tragedies on par with *Hamlet* in the realm of literature. Published somewhere between 1601 and 1603, it is the earliest tragedy in Shakespeare's canon. One of the most famous and acclaimed plays of all time, as well as one of Shakespeare's finest works. The play delves into the themes of betrayal, love, and death, but it fails to provide a clear and hopeful resolution to these issues. This is because *Hamlet* is himself ambiguous, and the solutions to these problems are intricate tragedies that add to the hero's suffering (Fitz, 1977). The focus of Shakespeare's plays is the primary action, not the supernatural aspects. It makes the main character behave in a certain way. Shakespeare connects the natural world with the supernatural. In Shakespearean plays, Hamartia is the one who brings about the protagonists' ruin.

In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, there are three plots: the vengeance plot, the love story between *Hamlet* and Ophelia, and the impending war with Norway. There is a synopsis of some of the major story points in this play that follow *Hamlet* on his quest for revenge. In his immensely successful Spanish Tragedy (1587), Thomas Kyd popularised the genre of vengeance tragedy; Shakespeare refined it in *Hamlet*, which was probably inspired by another of Kyd's revenge plays, the Ur-*Hamlet*. Our modern world is bereft of Kyd's Ur-*Hamlet*, alas (Kidnie, Margaret Jane, 2009). There are some commonalities among revenge tragedies, such as a play inside a play, insane sequences, a vengeful ghost, a graphic scene or scenes of violence, and, most crucially, a protagonist with a deep grudge against a powerful adversary. This protagonist decides to take things into his own hands and secretly seeks vengeance. It is worth mentioning that out of all the protagonists in Elizabethan vengeance plays, *Hamlet* is the only one who can be deemed heroic since he understands the moral weight of his actions.

Among the most formative periods in European history, the Elizabethan Age stands out. The period beginning with Elizabeth I's reign (1558–1603) is often considered a watershed moment in English history. It is often portrayed by historians as the most glorious period of English history. "The symbol of Britannia was first used in 1572, and often thereafter, to mark the Elizabethan age as a renaissance that inspired national pride through classical ideals, international expansion, and naval triumph over the Spanish — at the time, a rival kingdom much hated by the people of the land." According to Dakhal (2018) "England was economically healthier, more expansive, and more optimistic under the Tudors" than at any point in a thousand years, according to historian John Guy (1988), who described the circumstances at this period in England as a whole-life-field shift (Dakhil, 2018).

In his magnum opus "*Hamlet*," Shakespeare brilliantly portrayed the phenomenon of Elizabethan-era superstitions. He used the ghost to set the stage for the drama and reveal its central reason. Furthermore, Shakespeare was able to provide a vivid image of the prevailing ideologies of Elizabeth I's reign via the spectre. He transforms the play into a timeless historical tale with a compelling narrative. The contemporary reader may readily immerse themselves and engage with the plot (Ahmed, Nafees, 2019). Additionally, he brought attention to the prevalent belief system of the period about omens and how people placed great stock in these omens, attributing their future events to specific occurrences like the appearance of ghosts, the movement of the dead along highways, the descent of comets, eclipses, and so on. People were making predictions about the future based on what they had read about superstitions. Shakespeare used the presence of the ghost in the first scene to produce a scary impression on the readers."Critics are almost unanimous in praising the subtle means by which Shakespeare has produced an atmosphere of supernatural mystery and fear" (Dakhil, 2018).

WHAT ROLE DO REGIONAL AND RITUALISTIC MYTHICAL CONCERNS PLAY IN ENHANCING AN APPROPRIATE OR ADAPTED SHAKESPEAREAN TEXT?

A text is adapted when it is revised to fit the local context and language. But appropriation is heavily laden with adaptation. If you want to perceive the world via Shakespearean lenses, you have to practise appropriating his work. 'Adaptation' is more often used in cinema studies, even though both terms refer to reworkings (Boose, Burt, 2005). It has nothing to do with "appropriation," a term more often used in the field of cultural studies. Linda Hutcheon defines adaptation as a subgenre of "intertextuality" and notes that the word originally came from cinema criticism; nonetheless, she widens its use, questions its derivative character, and views it as having a broader scope. Instead of evolving vertically, she believes that adaptation might happen before the

original is known, and it can even split into several variants (xii). "A derivation that is not derivative a work that is second without being secondary" is what she means when she says adaptation (9). Shakespeare adaptations, which highlight the relevance of the Bard via his modernizations, were brought to light by Jan Kott's Shakespeare Our Contemporary (1964). References to appropriations include works by Novy, Women's Re-Visions, Cross-Cultural Performances, Transforming Shakespeare, Erickson, Aebischer, Esche, and Wheale, and Henderson, as well as works by Marxism, feminism, postcolonialism, multiculturalism, and posthumanism. In these ways, his stakeholders generate modern-day Shakespeare. Contrary to the idea that adaptation is an "offshoot," Maderson includes appropriation in the creative production/consumption dichotomy as an obstacle to an objective and uncaring stance:

> The fundamental principle of appropriation is the desire to own something, which is linked to abduction, adoption, and robbery. The act of acquiring the object of desire and transforming it into one's own via physical possession are both included by this concept. Rather to being objective and unbiased, appropriation suggests taking something for one's own benefit (Marsden 1).

Life would be so much easier (albeit duller) if every line in poetry actually would "tell" the author's name, indicating its birthplace and provenance, as Sonnet 76 indicates. On the other hand, modern literary studies avoid this kind of transparent writing. D. C. Greetham likens the "inversion" that occurred in textual theory in the latter decades of the twentieth century to Marx's "inversion" of Hegel (Greetham 1999, 370). Similar to Marx's assertion that matter, not spirit, constitutes the essence of the universe, contemporary bibliographers have regarded the "materialtext" as the "real foundation" of textuality, disregarding the original authorial utterance or "idea" in favour of the text's post-lapsarian contingencies, its negotiations with its own history, as the basis of textual operations. As a result, authoriality, particularly authorial intention, is reduced to a mere "function" or "superstructure" of this history instead of its raison-d'être, as opposed to its raison-d'être, as previously stated (370–71). Modern bibliography recognises textuality as a history of change rather than attempting to imitate a text-that-never-was, the authorial text envisioned as unique, comprehensive, and flawless in and of itself:

> Only the law of change remains unchangeable in the textual situation. It is a law, however, and all laws have their boundaries. Although these sociohistorical variables may and can be defined and conceived in diverse ways, they do set the stage for the life histories of individual texts as they enter the world. These histories, according to the law of change, will display an endless process of textual evolution and mutation—a process that can only be stopped if the textual alterations of a specific work become extinct. Therefore, in order to understand texts and textualities, we must delve into these intricate (and potentially endless) histories of textual change and variation (McGann 1991, 9)

Needless to say, the author is the first to go through this process, since their metaphorical "death" is also involved in the birth of writing. According to Foucault's seminal work "What is an Author?", "discourses are objects of appropriation" (Foucault 1984, 108), which means that "appropriation", begins with the author's death because of this, writing can no longer assert its primacy as a static, universal form that is "all one, ever the same." A key to its survival is its malleability, or "variationor quick change." How infinitely malleable and continuous are this "textual development and mutation?"How do we know it's the same "work" if it can be edited in an almost endless number of ways? When does textual variation result in a new text rather than a mutation? Are we still dealing with Shakespeare when we discuss "appropriations" of his work, given they are also written by other people? Would it be possible to continue "dressing old words new" but still considering them to be the same old words? Focusing on "appropriations" leads to "aview of Shakespeare embedded not only in his own culture but in ours, forcing us to consider both the impact we have on the plays and the impact they have on us," according to Jean I. Marsden, in a seminal work (1991, 8). By their very nature, appropriation studies are less interested in how the plays affect us and more in how we affect the plays. Like the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of "to appropriate: to take possession of for one's own; to take to one's self." Marsden sees appropriation as a unilateral grab. Taking also means removing: The act of appropriation involves both expropriation and the loss of inherent worth and meaning:

> The fundamental principle of appropriation is the desire to own something, which is linked to kidnapping, adoption, and robbery. Both capturing the object of desire and claiming it as one's own via possession are included in this. Appropriation implies taking something for one's personal benefit, which is neither kind nor impartial. (Marsden 1991, 1)

By using such strong rhetoric, the critic demonstrates that they see appropriation as violent and are responding with liberal indignation against a kind of cultural colonisation. However, we are becoming more and more persuaded that this is the only method to approach the classic works of literature from the past. As Terence Hawkes famously put it, "Human actions, activities, the 'things of this world,' don't themselves 'mean.' It is we who mean by them" (Hawkes 1996, 8) Shakespeare returns our own values, or at least what we bring to him or what others have left behind, as Gary Taylor says (Taylor 1989, 411). As a result, appropriation is the only option. The poststructuralist truism verum factum—that we create our reality—

forms the basis of Marsden's perspective. In other words, "[T]here is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so" (*Hamlet* 2.2.239), since "[E]very act of interpretation can be seen as an act of appropriation — making sense of a literary artefact by fitting it into our own parameters" (the sometimes-Cartesian *Hamlet*). By reimagining it, the literary work becomes ours just as certainly as if we had physically secured its existence (Marsden 1991, 1).

That is why the study of Shakespeare's appropriation starts with a paradox. The only way to really understand the work is to reimagine it, to appropriate it. However, the idea of such reimagining is seen as an aggressive attack on the work's initial character, akin to appropriation. The work lacks a unique character, nevertheless (Lee, Adele. 2005). On the contrary, this "identity" is flipped back and forth between being assumed and rejected, deleted and recovered. A piece of writing is only as meaningful as its reader. Still, we think our appropriations provide unique meanings to the work that others miss. We are no longer confident in our ability to detect that elusive and incomprehensible stranger, despite the fact that "different from" predicates a comparator; there can be no difference without another.

CONCLUSION

By highlighting Shakespeare's universality and elevating the local via his international edge, the cross-cultural theatre uses Shakespeare to transcend cultural boundaries and enter the realm of global theatre. When regional theatre forms use Shakespeare as a crutch to stand on an international stage, the unique Elizabethan flavour of Shakespeare is lost. The globalisation of capitalism logic dictates this. His aura of great art is transferred to these many regional forms by his canonical standing. As a cultural imperialist, the idea that they rely on him more than he does on them makes the locals give up more so that they can fit in with Shakespeare. Global capitalism uses this method to reach the most inaccessible parts of the planet. Global capitalism and multicultural products have a deep and intricate link. In the former colonies, capitalism has long taken advantage of the elevated status of Shakespeare and the English language, which were brought to these regions at least two centuries ago. It is intriguing to wonder whether the intercultural Shakespeare is built on diversity and cultural pluralism or if it is a cover for cultural imperialism to sneak in. This amalgam, which masquerades as multiculturalism, serves to amplify the pretence of cultural diversity while really concealing its imperialist goals. This underhanded goal is eliminated in multicultural works via the use of mutually beneficial cooperation. Shakespeare benefits just as much from local adaptations as the other way around.

Filmmakers have little trouble adapting and appropriating Shakespeare's plays into other cultural and regional genres and disciplines because of his endearing trait of appealing to and pleasing all sorts of audiences. Therefore, the purpose of this research study is to illustrate and highlight the ways in which the post-colonial Orient is influenced by the Western culture of the Shakespearean play *Hamlet*. It also draws attention to the metanarrative *Hamlet*'s transculturalization as it is reimagined and revitalised via the mythology and culture of southwestern Kerala. Films based on Shakespearean plays have been produced in many different cultural contexts. A number of filmmakers have shown interest in adapting his *Hamlet*.

Shakespeare skillfully used ambiguity to showcase *Cleopatra*'s complex character. Deliberate ambiguity does not contradict anything; on the contrary, it heightens the mystery surrounding *Cleopatra*, making her persona more intriguing, vibrant, and enigmatic. This theatrical method gives *Cleopatra*'s image permanent allure, drawing in generations of researchers who study it and filmmakers who copy it. Considering the cultural power dynamic between the source and the adaptation, such intertextual resonances will assume new dimensions in intercultural adaptations, particularly those that use Shakespeare to retell tales that are already deeply ingrained in the target culture. Shakespeare has been the subject of heated controversy over the last generation as more and more adaptations of his works have sprung up all over the world, particularly in Asia. Many have questioned whether Shakespeare facilitates cross-cultural understanding or perpetuates Western cultural dominance. Does Shakespeare serve as nothing more than a worldwide symbol of Western cultural and economic supremacy, similar to Big Macs and iPhones? In Sonia Massai's words, "the omnipresent image of the dominant other as its ultimate point of origin" is reinforced by even the most extreme interpretations of Shakespeare's plays, which perpetuates his cultural standing. (5). On the other hand, has the process of appropriation and intercultural engagement promoted resistance and, in some cases, even reversed the usual circulation of cultural capital by using Shakespeare as a source to be transformed and brought to the West? With varying degrees of implicit or direct approval, words like "reproduce" (Cartelli 17), "appropriate" (Huang and Rivlin 8), and "collaborate" (Henderson 1) have been employed to describe the adaptations, despite the full recognition of their complex and diversely hybrid features.

Despite the intimate relationship between interculturalism and globalisation, and the fact that international Shakespeare gets more mileage when he uses a major person from the Western canon, the intercultural codes that Shakespeare employs also give him more significance. Shakespearean branding ensures increased exposure in English-speaking nations, where multicultural performances are being marketed as Shakespearean events. Local tags, however, are what really bring in the crowds and give Shakespeare a new dimension. Not only do Eastern theatrical traditions physically enhance the show, but their exotic otherness also gives them

more significance. The main force behind the promotion of intercultural Shakespeare is global capitalism according to Brian Singleton in *The Sounds the Logic of Global Capitalism*, 629, intercultural Shakespeare is immediately recognisable for its use of mythologized cultural symbols for transcultural communication and large-scale marketing. However, cultural authenticity and equality are the determinants of the interculturality of production. The majority of multicultural Shakespeare presentations minimise the non-Western cultural aspects to stage props and exotic otherness for the sake of spectacle. The cultural significance, equality, and authenticity of these features are not given the same level of attention as the Shakespearean aspects, which represent western cultural characteristics. True Shakespeare incorporates Elizabethan diction and theatrical conventions. Shakespearean aspects increasingly predominate in international performances as modern theatres place an emphasis on performance, and his language triumphs over the non-Western performance norms of indigenous cultures. Indigenous Shakespearean performances that prioritise equitable participation sometimes fail to uphold the claims of true Shakespeare. This is a tricky balancing act, but several shows have pulled it off keeping the meaning of his statements while using his language has helped many people get above this authenticity issue. Shakespearean plays financed by multinational corporations sometimes skimp on vocabulary while retaining concepts in an effort to highlight the universality of his works.

REFERENCES

1. Attukal Devi: The Mother of Love: Story of Goddess Kannagi, 15. February, 2018, www.attukaldevi.com>sstory-kannagi
2. Bamber, Linda (1982) Comic Women, Tragic Men: A Study of Gender and Genre in Shakespeare. Stanford Univ. Press.
3. Bobik, Melaine. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in the Movies. Norderstedt Germany: GRIN Verlag, 2002. Print.
4. Cahir, Linda, Costanzo. Literature into Film: Theory and Practical Approaches. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2006. Print.
5. Cartelli, Thomas. Repositioning Shakespeare: National Formations, Postcolonial Appropriations. Routledge, 1999.
6. Cecil, David. (1949). *Antony and Cleopatra*. Poets and Story-Tellers: A Book of Critical Essays. Macmillan Press, 1-24.
7. Corrigon,T, editor. Film and Literature: An Introduction and Reader. Prince Hall, 1998.
8. Dakhil. A. (2018). Hesitation in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Iraq. Darasat Tarbawiyah. Retrieved from: https://www.iasj.net › iasj
9. Danby, John F. (1949). The Shakespearean Dialectic: An Aspect of *Antony and Cleopatra*. Scrutiny 16.3, 196-213.
10. Fuller, David. (2004). "Passion and Politics: *Antony and Cleopatra* in Performance." *Antony and Cleopatra*: New Critical Essays,edited by Sara Munson Deats, Routledge Press, 112-126.
11. Henderson, Diana. Collaborations with the Past: Reshaping Shakespeare across Time and Media. Cornell UP, 2006.
12. Huang, Alexa, and Elizabeth Rivlin. Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
13. Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation". The Translation Studies Reader, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 2000.
14. Kenneth. M. (1973). Shakespeare and the Tragic Pattern. London: Folcroft Library Editions.
15. Logan, R. A. (2004). "'High events as these': Sources, Influences, and the Artistry of *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Antony and Cleopatra*: New Critical Essays,edited by Sara Munson Deats, Routledge Press, 153-167.
16. Mack, Maynard (1973) Killing the king: Three studies in Shakespeares tragic structure. New Haven: Yale University Press.
17. Mack, Maynard. (1960). Introduction. *Antony and Cleopatra*, edited by Maynard Mack, Penguin Press, 14-21.
18. Magoulias, Michael (1995) "*Antony and Cleopatra* (Vol. 27) – Introduction". In: Shakespearean Criticism. Vol. 27. Gale Cengage.
19. Marsden, Jean I., ed. 1991. The Appropriation of Shakespeare: The Works and the Myth. HemelHempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
20. McGann, Jerome. 1991. The Textual Condition. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
21. Oliver, Laurence. Dir. *Hamlet*. Perf. Laurence Oliver. Two Cities Film,1948. Film.
22. Prakash, V, K, Dir. *Karmayogi*. Perf. Indrajith, Thalaivasal Vijay. Creative Land Pictures. 2012. Film.
23. Sanders, Julie. Adaptation and Appropriation. Routledge, 2006.
24. Shakespeare, W. (2015). The Philip Weller Annotated Shakespeare, *Hamlet*. Orient Blackswan Publication.

25. Shakespeare, William. (2009). *Antony and Cleopatra*: The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare. Edited by John Dover Wilson, Cambridge University Press.

26. Trivedi, P. & Bartholomeusz, D. (Eds.). (2005). India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation, and Performance. University of Delaware Press.

27. Hawkes, Terence. 1996. "Introduction" to Alternative Shakespeares, Vol. 2. London: Routledge.1-16.

28. Greetham, D. C. 1999. Theories of the Text. Oxford: Clarendon Press

29. Vignier, Isabelle (2004). The Tragic in Antony and Cleopatra. Retrieved March 09, 2017, from http://www.literature- study-online.com/essays/antony-cleopatra.html

30. Shakespeare, W., Jones, E., & Weis, R. (2005). Antony and Cleopatra. London: Penguin.

31. Magoulias, Michael (1995) "Antony And Cleopatra (Vol. 27) – Introduction". In: Shakespearean Criticism. Vol. 27. Gale Cengage.

32. Decker, Marsha A. (2012) Language, Gender, and Power: Cleopatra VII of Egypt, Christine De Pizan, and Queen Elizabeth I of England.

33. Orfall, B. (2009). Bollywood Retakes: Literary Adaptation and Appropriation in Contemporary Hindi Cinema. University of Oregon

34. Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2013). Post-colonial Studies: The Key Concepts. Routledge.

35. Buckley, T. (2013). Hero as Avatar: Karmayogi, Kerala's Kalarippayattu Hamlet: A Review of V. K. Prakash's Malayalam Film Adaptation of William Shakespeare's Hamlet. The Shakespeare Institute Review, Shakespeare & The Superhuman. Association with the University of Birmingham. 2. 41-46.

36. Burnett, M. T. (2013). Shakespeare and World Cinema. Cambridge University Press.

37. Vipanchika. (2016, April 26). Chapter II, Kelipatram – A Ritual Tradition of North Malabar. Retrieved from http://narthaki73.blogspot.com/2016/04/chapter-iikelipatram-ritual-tradition.html

38. Venning, D. (2011). Cultural Imperialism and Intercultural Encounter in Merchant Ivory's Shakespeare Wallah. Asian Theatre Journal, 28(1), 149-167.

39. Greenblatt, Stephen. 1997. "General Introduction" to The Norton Shakespeare (based on the Oxford Edition). Edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: Norton. 1-76.

40. Lee, Adele. "The Player King and Kingly Players: Inverting Hamlet in Lee Joon-ik's King and the Clown (2005)." Borrowers and Lenders, vol. XII, no. 1, Fall 2018, www.borrowers.uga.edu/784121/show.

Corresponding Author

Mr. Shefin. S*

Research Scholar, Department of English and OELs, Dr. Harisingh Gour Central University,Sagar (M.P.) India.

Email: shefinkalathil@gmail.com