

A Comparative Study of *Hamlet* and *Haider* as its Indian Adaptation

by Vishal Bhardwaj: An Intertextual Approach

Zohreh Taebi^{1,*} - Azra Ghandeharion² - Leili Badrlou³

^{1, 2, 3} Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of

Mashhad

ABSTRACT

Countless directors have used Shakespearean plays as the basis of their adaptations. Vishal Bhardwaj is an Indian director whose *Haider* (2014) is considered a modern adaptation of *Hamlet* to talk about his contemporary society's engagements. Bhardwaj chose *Hamlet* because of its potential to reflect his society's current anxieties; however, he made some changes to fit it into the Indian context. This article seeks to analyze the relationship between *Hamlet* and its Indian adaptation with special focus on similarities and differences in characterization, setting and the plot's most pivotal elements in the light of the intertextual theory to answer the following questions: Why is *Hamlet* an appropriate choice for adaptation? What features of *Hamlet* have been reinforced or differed in *Haider*? What features underline the significance of intertextuality in *Haider*? How has Bhardwaj produced a contemporary *Hamlet* and expanded its themes? Intertextuality as this study's main framework will result in discovering new meanings and aspects in *Hamlet* and *Haider* because as Hutcheon (2006, p. 21) declares adaptation is inexorably a subcategory of intertextuality if the receiver knows the adapted text.

Keywords: Adaptation; Comparative Analysis; *Haider*; *Hamlet*; Intertextuality

1. INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality as a postmodern theory has its roots in the twentieth century and was first introduced by Julia Kristeva (Allen, 2000, p. 3). Based on this theory, there is a continuous relationship among the literary texts and thus, they cannot be considered as having any unique meaning or being the product of a particular author's mind. According to what Allen (2000) has quoted from Barthes in his book, a text is where a series of writings are mixed with each other and hence, the writer's only power is to blend them and produce a new one which lacks originality (p. 13).

What is important in intertextuality is the interconnection among diverse types of literature like film adaptations. Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins (2010) state that movie adaptations are all intertextual since they are considered as dialogues with other texts such as the texts upon which they are based (p. 19). As Stam and Raengo (2005) note, all films and not only adaptations are intertextual (p. 27). In other words, when we call a work an adaptation, we approve of its relationship with other works and this is the reason why adaptations are considered as a subcategory of intertextuality (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 6).

Sanders (2006) in her book, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, refers to the connection between the source text and the adapted text as an intertextual link and declares that analyzing the similarities and differences between the texts involved is the central focus of adaptation studies. What she refers to can be called, then, intertextual comparison (p. 25).

Movie adaptations as the most prevalent kind of adaptations are becoming highly widespread all over the today's world. One of the main reasons is related to what Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins (2010) state as 'globalization' in different aspects (p. 11). Another reason may be, as Costanzo (1992, p. 13) states, the 'advantages' that films have got over books like the use of special effects which are somehow impossible while reading a book. Actually, the screenwriters may make some certain elements simpler and more acceptable or sometimes they may omit some other features which are hard to explain (Parrill, 2002, p. 12).

The ubiquity of movie adaptations may contrast the prejudice against them as being all considered 'subordinate' in comparison with the original literary works (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 2). A persevering insistence on fidelity has also kept adaptation theory from development (Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins, 2010, p. 12). However, there are many critics who

think that directors who adapt a work of literature such as a novel or play are new authors and should act independently because they have to bring their own vision into the new production (Costanzo, 1992, p. 20).

The adaptations unveil new aspects and are not exactly the same as the original work since this is most often considered as a kind of unfaithfulness to the original work (Costanzo, 1992, p. 20). Hence, there can be a comparison between both the original literary work and its adaptation. In other words, what is required in understanding adaptation is the belief that books and movies are distinct and so adapters cannot simply transfer a novel, or even another film, to the screen. They must interpret the original text and choose which meaning they find most operative, then imagine scenes, characters, plot elements, etc., that fit their deduction (Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins, 2010, p. 16).

This paper is an attempt to take a comparative approach toward *Hamlet* and *Haider* (2014) as its modern adaptation by the Indian director, Vishal Bhardwaj (1965). The main framework of this paper will be intertextuality which is about the continuous relationship among all literary works. The choice of this framework is mainly due to the close relationship among intertextuality and the comparative literature studies as its subcategory. In fact, intertextuality will help the readers find some new meanings and aspects in *Hamlet* and *Haider* by answering these questions: Why is *Hamlet* an appropriate choice for adaptation? What features of *Hamlet* have been reinforced or differed in *Haider*? What features underline the significance of intertextuality in *Haider*? How has Bhardwaj produced a contemporary *Hamlet* and expanded its themes?

Furthermore, this paper will certainly act like a bridge between these two artistic works and will also open new ways of analyzing Indian adaptations of Shakespeare because although the relevance of intertextual analysis to Shakespearean plays has been discussed extensively, there is a dearth of studies on the place of these theories in the criticism of contemporary Indian movies and thus, this article tries to fill in this gap. In fact, although there have been some articles in which several critics have discussed their viewpoints toward *Haider*, none has offered any satisfactory articulate, detailed account of the film especially in terms of intertextuality.

To do so, this article will analyze the relationship between *Hamlet* and *Haider* with special focus on similarities and differences in characterization, setting and the plot's most important elements. Finally, it will be found that sometimes the adaptation would be the same as the source text and other times it would be different; it would alter the original text whenever it meets the director's need and is regarded an appropriate way to talk about the social, religious and political problems which the director confronts in his contemporary society.

1.1 Shakespeare in India

Shakespeare has been the subject of study and analysis in different fields. There have been many scholars and writers in many arenas whose attention has been attracted toward him. Not only writers but also directors and screenwriters have been interested in Shakespeare's multidimensional plays because their adaptation suggests a good way to earn cultural authority (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 93). One of the many other remarkable points about the adaptations of William Shakespeare's plays is their modern quality (Grady, 2000, p. 1) and how they can easily move from their Elizabethan context to the modern age to talk about what is going on in the contemporary era.

According to Naikar (2002), Dryden thinks of Shakespeare as the man with the most comprehensive soul of all poets. Naikar also points that when Carlyle was asked whether he would give up the Indian Empire or Shakespeare, he said, 'Indian Empire or no Empire will go, at any rate, some day; but this Shakespeare does not go, he lasts forever with us' (p. 1). Shakespeare's popularity in India started just since his introduction to this British colony. Shakespeare was introduced in India during the age of Johnson and Garrick in 1775 as the year of the American Independence War (Naikar, 2002, p. 2).

The establishment of the Hindu College in 1816, and the teaching of Shakespeare by distinguished teachers like Richardson had such a great effect on the students' minds that they became interested in Shakespeare criticism and would also act his plays. Actually, scholarship in Shakespearean works has been supposed as the yardstick of proficiency among the Indian professors and intellectuals. Some of the ways in which Shakespeare's influence has been felt in India include translations, adaptations and plays in Indian languages based on the model of Shakespeare's plays (Naikar, 2002, pp. 3-4) especially since the year 2000 and in 'Bollywood' as the term which refers to the prolific Hindi film industry in Bombay (Ganti, 2004, p. 2).

1.2 *Hamlet* vs. *Haider*

The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark is a tragedy by William Shakespeare written at an uncertain date between 1599 and 1602 and set in the Kingdom of Denmark. This tragedy is considered by many as the greatest drama which has been ever written (Foakes, 1993, p. 1) and there have been lots of directors who have noticed its potential for adaptation especially those like Vishal Bhardwaj who sought an apt way to talk about political issues. As Foakes (1993) declares, there are many reasons which brought *Hamlet* back from the private to the public world. One was completely political (p. 37).

Foakes also announces that the political adaptation started early, as in Freiligrath's identification of Hamlet with young German intellectuals who dreamt about the revolution which they could not bring about. In England *Hamlet* came to symbolize those modern men who rejected the imperialist ideology. From another perspective, *Hamlet* seemed to represent the failure of a 'great nature confronted with a low environment' (p. 37). Actually, *Hamlet* also stood for the

problems of the age and those who endlessly hesitated from their weak will (p. 19); thus, Hamlet was an important symbolic political figure like a liberal intellectual who seemed to be incapable of action in the nineteenth century (p. 6). As already mentioned, this is exactly what can be seen in *Haider* through which the director has tried to talk about the political subjects.

Haider is a 2014 Indian crime film directed by Vishal Bhardwaj, and co-authored by Basharat Peer and Bhardwaj. It is the third episode of Bhardwaj's Shakespearean trilogy after *Maqbool* (2003) and *Omkara* (2006) in which he has tried to reflect the 'violence of modern India' (see http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/28/arts/international/in-haider-vishal-bhardwaj-draws-from-hamlet.html?_r=0). The film is a modern adaptation of *Hamlet*, set during the Kashmir conflicts of 1995. Set in the year 1995 in the valley of Kashmir, *Haider* is the story of a young man with the same name who returns home in Kashmir (from Aligarh) after getting aware of his father's disappearance. His father as a peace-loving doctor saves the life of a militant for which the army and the police department arrest and keep him in their control with no traces left of his identity. What Haider faces after coming back home is an old, broken house. He also realizes that his mother is in a close relationship with his uncle. Soon Haider learns that his uncle is responsible for his father's murder and what follows then is his journey to revenge his father's death.

In *Haider*, Bhardwaj has tried to Indianize *Hamlet* and make it fit his society's context. In other words, he has tried to remove all traces of foreignness by changing the title of the play, names of people and places, and replacing all references to western customs or behavior with appropriate cultural counterparts (Trivedi & Bartholomeusz, 2005, p. 54). Thus, *Haider* is a kind of domestication which makes its source text apt in its new context. According to Bhardwaj, the major motive which made him talk about his country's conflicts through an English drama is that what happens in Kashmir is a tragedy, but no one is talking about it and once one talks of it, it sounds that s/he is freed from it. This director believes that he is telling the truth and talking about it is like a salve on a wound (see www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jul/25/bollywood-hamlet-kashmir-controversy-india). This may refer to what Albrecht-Crane and Cutchins (2010, p. 19) say about the intertextual quality of adaptations which is to help us see some adaptations as a means of criticism.

2. DISCUSSION

2.1 Intertextual Elements of Plot

What is a 'Shakespearean film'? According to Hatchuel (2004), the expression 'Shakespearean film' can cover adaptations with more or less similarity to the plot and the original text, films that respect the plot but use a translated, adapted text, films whose framework is inspired by the plot of a play but may not involve one single word of the text, and films that use Shakespeare extracts but whose framework does not follow the plot of any play (pp. 18-19). Actually, there are different ways to adapt a Shakespearean play and *Haider* may belong to the first category. In such cases Shakespeare's text is either completely absent or only present in a few scenes and there may be lots of similar and diverse points in the plot of both the literary work and its adaptation.

Bhardwaj has tried to keep the major elements of *Hamlet* but this hasn't restricted him to change it in a way that is more fathomable to the Indian audience. The most important reason to render the plot is to talk about the same problems and themes. As Hutcheon (2006, p. 10) declares themes are possibly of most importance to plays and, at the same time, the easiest adaptable elements across media. Shakespeare wrote *Hamlet* to talk about the Renaissance, the period in which he lived and the same happens about *Haider* which is actually a way for Bhardwaj to talk about a contemporary problem.

There are some similarities and differences between *Hamlet* and *Haider*. The first similarity is related to the heroic structure of both the play and movie's plot. According to Hogan (2008), the heroic plot is actually two plots which are linked by connecting the invasion with the usurpation. Specifically, the usurper is often in close contact with the invader. As a result, the most archetypal way of overcoming the invader is for the hero to return from exile and lead the defense himself or herself (pp. 40-41).

One of the most essential features of heroic plots is the necessity of taking action by the hero which results in war and violence as highly attractive features for the Indian audiences. In addition to the same heroic plot structure, both *Hamlet* and *Haider* can also be said to share the same romantic plot in which the beloved is from the enemy side

and the clash between the two sides separates the lovers (Hogan, 2008, p. 42). Moreover, *Hamlet* and *Haider* share the same storyline that is the story of a man who is trying to know the truth about his father's death and avenge it. However, the incidents which he encounters in this route lead to his doubt. Among the other shared points is the use of two letters 'H' and 'A' which are common between *Hamlet* and *Haider*; even, the famous lines '*Something is rotten in the state of Denmark*' is very much applicable to Kashmir where Haider deals with the political problems (see <http://indiaopines.com/oedipus-complex-binds-haider-hamlet/>).

The other major element of the plot is the significance of Skull. In both *Hamlet* and *Haider*, the image of skull is thematically important. As the protagonists speak to the skull, they probe into the philosophy of death. However, the plot has undergone certain changes, too; for example, new soliloquys have been created. Actually, the filmmakers may reconstruct the soliloquys in many ways to make them fit the movie medium. They may transform them into a verbal or visual dialogue, and even sometimes into a verbal as well as visual dialogue (Hatchuel, 2004, p. 78).

This is the case of *Haider* in which the new soliloquys are made to deliver Hamlet's madness and the political criticism in it (see <http://www.warscapes.com/blog/hamlet-gets-way-haider>) like when he reads the bare act of the Armed Forces Special Powers Act on a traffic roundabout with his mad-like appearance. There is also a change in the order of the main events like the director's attempt to transfer the third act to the beginning of the movie, making its plot more linear in comparison with *Hamlet* because as Hutcheon declares linear realist plots are more easily adaptable for the screen (2006, p. 15). In case of *Haider*, not only linearity but also the Kashmiri dialect spoken by the characters has caused the movie to be more believable.

The other point of difference is the change that is observed at the end of the movie. Here Haider prefers peace to any kind of revenge and so, he decides not to kill his uncle. Some of the other differences may be due to the amount of emphasis which is given to some parts, for instance the parts which are about Fortinbras are not emphasized very much; on the other hand, the Oedipus complex aspect of the movie has been focused so much that may shock the Indian audiences.

Actually, it is said to be one of the central themes of the film that binds together the play and the film. An example of this can be perceived in Haider's first reaction when he returns home and watches his uncle dancing and singing to please his sister-in-law. Haider does not say any words and reacts instantly accusing his mother of betraying his late father. In addition, the various flashbacks show how he was obsessed with his mother's beauty even in childhood. The other example is the honest conversation between Haider and his mother about their childhood days when she asks him, '*Do you remember you did not like even your father to touch me and slept between the two of us at night*' to which he replies, '*Yes and just imagine how I will tolerate his brother touching you? Why did you remarry so soon after his death?*' Even if there is some ambiguity, it is the stand of Gertrude in *Hamlet* (see <http://indiaopines.com/oedipus-complex-binds-haider-hamlet/>).

The last point which is going to be discussed here is related to the way *Haider* reconstructs the play-within-play scene. In this scene, we see a group of travelling actors who are performing a play which is exactly what happened to King Hamlet. Hamlet wants to see his uncle's reaction so that he can act with more certainty. It seems that everything is just as what Hamlet had thought because Claudius gets shocked and leaves the room after watching the play's murder part. Thus, Hamlet makes sure about his uncle's guilt and decides to murder him. Nevertheless, he finds Claudius praying and decides to kill him at some other time. In *Haider*, however, we notice some differences such as the way Haider organizes the play to be acted.

As mentioned earlier, Bhardwaj has tried to adapt *Hamlet* in a way which would fit the Indian principles. Bhardwaj has rendered this part to a dance show as one of the most typical features of any Indian movie and actually, this is one of the film's very skillfully-produced parts which has increased its attraction for any audience. Moreover, most people may know the Indian cinematic industry as being so emotional like in displaying the relationship between different characters just as what is happening among Haider and his mistress or his mother which is more passionate than the relationship between Hamlet and Ophelia or Gertrude.

Songs' addition to Indian adaptations is actually one of the tactics to indianize them. According to Ganti (2004, p. 77), there are three major ways of 'Indianization' which involve: adding emotions, extending the story, and including songs. It seems that songs as the features which make the Indian movies different can serve those other objectives as well. In addition, songs are among the most important elements in an Indian movie because they are frequently used to

help the passage of time and remind memories, to assist characterization when they are used to introduce the leading actors and to indirectly address where characters can have thoughts and desires which they cannot reveal directly just as what is noticed in *Haider* (Ganti, 2004, p. 81).

2.2 Intertextuality in Characterization

Characterization is one of the most important features for a director whose production is an adaptation. It is because the characters should be based on the main text's characters and thus, comparable with each other. In this part, there will be a two by two comparison between both *Hamlet* and *Haider*'s main characters to see how similar or different they are.

As one of the most known characters ever created by Shakespeare, Hamlet seems to be a good choice for adaptation in Bollywood's hero-based films. He represents a moody, theatrical and intelligent young man who is surrounded by an unjust system. The worst problem is that he does not have any knowledge of the truth and so he cannot be sure about his relatives' real intentions or feelings because he is living in a world of hypocrisy. Therefore, he is unendingly captured by doubts. All these features make Hamlet an appropriate character for an Indian filmmaker in shaping his own protagonist's characteristics.

Actually, Hamlet and Haider as the main characters share lots of similarities. Both are the title characters, about thirty years old, melancholy, bitter and suspicious about the insincerity they are surrounded by. Although Hamlet and Haider signify men with academic studies, it may sometimes happen that their doubts make them prone to silly and thoughtless actions. Even when they have the adequate evidence that the uncle murdered his brother, they don't take any action but wait for them to be proved. It is also important to note that both Hamlet and Haider are extremely depressed and malcontent with affairs in their regions and in their own family.

Claudius and Khurram Meer are the second characters to be compared. They are both the protagonists' uncles and antagonists. Both of them are ambitious politicians with sexual desires and lust for power; however, it may happen in some scenes in which they seem caring and affectionate like in the case of their deep love for their beloveds. Unlike their brothers, Claudius and Khurram Meer are both corrupt politicians. The love that Claudius has for Gertrude may be sincere, but it also seems likely that he married her to win the throne away from Hamlet but in *Haider* it seems that Khurram loves Ghazala more sincerely and has no especial motive. As the play or the movie progresses, both these characters' fear of the protagonists' craziness grows and leads them to even worse actions; they encourage the Laertes role to avenge his father's death as they attempt to calm him down. And finally, we see how their lust for power leads to a great disaster, including the loss of their own beloveds.

As the next important characters, Gertrude and Ghazala Meer are both the protagonists' mothers who are attracted to their late husbands' brothers and unaware of what has really happened to their gone husbands. They both share a kind of deep love for their sons but are at the same time weak and instead of wanting to know the truth, they are after affection. It seems that their beauty and dependence on men are their sole characteristics to achieve their goals. In *Haider*, the wives of the disappeared are called 'half-widows' (see <http://roadsandkingdoms.com/2014/hamlet-in-kashmir/>). They do not know if their husbands are alive or dead and are deprived of their natural status as a wife.

It seems that Ghazala is not that sad with her husband's loss especially in the scene that she is sitting next to her brother-in-law while happily chanting a song which seems too unusual and shocks Haider too much; however, she looks stronger than Gertrude in her willpower to decide about her own life (see <http://roadsandkingdoms.com/2014/hamlet-in-kashmir/>). One of the common points which Ghazala and Gertrude have in common is that their love for their sons is so much that sometimes it acts like an obstacle, preventing them from achieving their goals. The same is true about Hamlet and Haider; Ghazala and Gertrude know that some of their actions annoy their sons to a great extent but this won't make them ignore their mothers. The gentle sexual connotations in the mother-son relationship that Ghazala and Gertrude have with their sons is really acceptable in the case of loveless South Asian marriages, 'They don't love their husbands,' and 'they love their sons instead' (see <http://roadsandkingdoms.com/2014/hamlet-in-kashmir/>).

The other female characters of *Hamlet* and its adaptation include Ophelia and Arshia who are both beautiful young girls with whom the main characters have fallen in love. They are sweet and innocent girls, dependent on men to tell them what to do and finally give in to their fathers' schemes to discover the protagonists' decisions which leads to their madness and death. According to Foakes (1993, pp. 159-160) it seems that madness is the final solution through which they can proclaim their independence and suppressed desires in a male-controlled society.

Next, the similarities and differences among the ghost and Roohdar as its Indian counterpart will be discussed. This character reveals everything about the truth. In *Hamlet*, it is the specter of Hamlet's recently deceased father but in *Haider*, it is a man who is dressed all in white and has been the companion of Haider's father in everywhere like ghosts

as his name suggests this; however, this makes no difference in what he intends to say which is calling upon the protagonist to avenge his father. In *Hamlet*, the protagonist speculates that the ghost might be a devil sent to deceive and tempt him into murder but in *Haider* there is not such a belief because instead of the ghost, Roohdar appears to disclose the reality. However, the reason why Bhardwaj decided not to imitate Shakespeare in using a ghost in his movie may go back to his intention to highlight the uncertainty theme and make the movie more believable.

The two Salman Khans as Haider's friends and Bhardwaj's interpretation of Shakespeare's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are also of great significance. According to what has been mentioned in one of the movie's related websites, they are 'minor characters' and are often treated as comic relief (see <http://www.antiserious.com/2014/10/20/of-helmet-and-hamlet-in-haider/>). In the play they are Hamlet's good friends who are ordered by Claudius to spy on Hamlet. The same is true about what is seen in the movie in which they act according to their benefits which make them forget their friendship with the protagonist and do whatever that may please their superior in order to survive. Actually, it seems as if Kashmir is rotten because of such rotten characters whose sole goal is to quench their thirst for power just as in *Hamlet*.

It seems that Bhardwaj has taken a lot of care not to imitate Shakespeare but remake each scene and part in a new way. One of these unique features is the changes that the Indian audience may notice in the movie's characterization such as the addition or deletion of some characters. Horatio is among these characters who seems to be absent in *Haider*. As Hamlet's close friend and classmate at Wittenberg University, Horatio is presented as a studious, skeptical young man who is very much trusted by Hamlet. We notice this character in the play because at the end of the play, Hamlet makes Horatio responsible to tell his story; however, there is no need to someone for narration of Haider's story since it has got a different ending and the protagonist himself will survive in *Haider*.

The last characters who will be compared with each other are Laertes and Liyaqat Lone. Polonius' death is the crucial event here because it is right after this incident that Laertes' role becomes important and Hamlet gets into a serious dispute with Claudius, leading to chaos in the court, Ophelia's madness, and Laertes' return after his sister commits suicide. Laertes is used as the last and best means through which Claudius can kill Hamlet because Claudius is not capable of murdering him by himself. In fact, he cannot kill Hamlet in a direct manner because he knows how much Gertrude loves her son.

Thus, he comes up with the idea of poison from Laertes to make sure that Hamlet will die (Foakes, 1993, pp. 166-167) since Laertes has got enough motivations to hate Hamlet. In both *Hamlet* and *Haider*, Laertes has the same fate and is finally killed by Hamlet; however, there are some slight differences. In both the play and the movie, it is the Claudius role who tempts Laertes to get revenge but it happens in a less direct manner in the movie and there is not any arrangement for a fight among Haider and Liyaqat. In fact, it is in the graveyard while burying Arshia's corpse when Haider understands what has happened to his mistress and so goes ahead to take the last look at her but right at this time, Liyaqat loses his control and attacks Haider who behaves madly and eventually kills him but unwantedly.

2.3 Intertextuality in Setting

Setting has always been really helpful in displaying a literary work's main themes. In *Hamlet*, it plays a crucial role in revealing the themes of eavesdropping, lying, and hesitation. It has also got an important role in *Haider* as the first Indian film in which Kashmir is seen from the inside (see <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/28/arts/international/in-haider-vishal-bhardwaj-draws-from-hamlet.html>). The film's producer has been skilled enough in re-presenting the Kashmir of 1995 all along with its darkness to the audience. According to Monti and Rozzonelli (2016, p. 43), Jammu and Kashmir have got both political and emotional importance for India. For many ones Kashmir equals a heaven-like valley connected with an insolvable conflict, resulting in India and Pakistan to dispute ownership over the Kashmir region for many years; however, no movie has dared to talk this directly about this issue as *Haider* in which Bhardwaj has shown successfully how the human beings' rotten nature may result in a disastrous state in a heaven-like place like Kashmir.

The other notable point here is related to the religious tensions because both *Hamlet* and *Haider* happen in a time when the religious chaos is in its peak. In *Hamlet*, these tensions are mostly among the Protestants and Catholics while *Haider* displays a conflict between Muslims and Hindus. In *Hamlet*, these tensions have an imperative role to highlight Hamlet's hesitation as the play's major theme; for example when King Hamlet's ghost appears, no one can be sure about it because according to Catholicism, it is in purgatory till his crimes are burnt. On the other hand, the Protestants did not believe in the purgatory or ghosts. Thus, Hamlet is unable to decide confidently and has to wait until he gets enough evidence. The other instance which provokes more hesitation and inaction in Hamlet goes back to the Catholic belief that a man should be dedicated to God and his family; hence, Hamlet is again doubtful whether to take revenge by himself or to leave everything to God.

The same tension is similarly right about Kashmir. One of the reasons behind the Kashmir's conflict is based on the religious issues which arose from the Partition of British India in 1947 into modern India and Pakistan. India's most

people are Hindus while more than ninety percent of Kashmiries believe in Islam just the same as Pakistanis. Actually, the division of India and Pakistan was based on religion; all Muslim areas went to Pakistan, and other areas remained in India ruled by a Hindu king. Since Pakistan is a Muslim nation, leaving the Muslim Kashmir with India for them could not be acceptable and hence, they are trying to take this part. Therefore, what can be concluded in this part is that both Shakespeare and Bhardwaj were to some extent obsessed with the importance of religious issues in their time's conflicts which originated from the place where they happened and hence, the choice of an appropriate setting can very well reflect them.

3. CONCLUSION

This paper took an intertextual approach toward a comparative study of *Hamlet* and *Haider* as its Indian adaptation by Bhardwaj. It argued that the notion of intertextuality as a communication between at least two texts has been increasingly applied both theoretically and practically to Shakespeare's works. Such an approach would have different objectives such as the addition of new meanings or enrichment of the main themes as what was noticed in *Haider* as *Hamlet's* Indian adaptation. The main concern of this study was to show that Bhardwaj's *Haider* modernized and domesticated *Hamlet* to talk about the social and political concerns of the Indian contemporary society; the reason may go back to *Hamlet's* abstruseness, leading to its being a highly multidimensional work. As noticed, sometimes the adaptation would be the same as the source text and other times it would be different. It would transform the original text whenever it met the director's need but proved to be an appropriate way to talk about the social, religious and political problems which Bhardwaj confronted in his contemporary society.

REFERENCES

- 1) Albrecht-Crane, C. , & Cutchins, D. R. (2010). *Adaptation Studies: New Approaches*. Medison [N.J.]: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- 2) Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 3) Burke, J. (2014). *Bollywood Hamlet set in Kashmir likely to cause controversy in India*. Retrieved from The Guardian: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jul/25/bollywood-hamlet-kashmir-controversy-india>
- 4) Costanzo, W. V. (1992). *Reading the Movies: Twelve Great Films on Video and How to Teach Them* . Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- 5) Foakes, R. (1993). *Hamlet versus Lear: Cultural Politics and Shakespeare's Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 6) Ganti, T. (2004). *Bollywood: A Guidebook to Popular Hindi Cinema*. New York; London: Routledge.
- 7) Grady, H. (2002). *Shakespeare and Modernity: Early Modern to Millennium*. New York: Rotledge.
- 8) Hatchuel, S. (2004). *Shakespeare: From Stage to Screen*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 9) Hogan, P. C. (2008). *Understanding Indian movies: culture, cognition, and cinematic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 10) Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge.
- 11) Jump, J. D. (1968). *Shakespeare "Hamlet": Selection of Critical Essays*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 12) Leitch, T. (2003). Twelve Fallacies in Contemporary Adaptation Theory. *Criticism*, 45 (2), 149-171.
- 13) Monti, A., & Rozzonelli, C. (2016). *Experiments in Film Appreciation*. Torino; Lyon: New Post.
- 14) Naikar, B. S. (2002). *Indian Response to Shakespeare*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.
- 15) Parrill, S. (2002). *Jane Austen on Film and Television: A Critical Study of the Adaptations*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co.
- 16) Roy, S. (2015). *Of Helmet and Hamlet in Haider*. Retrieved from Anti Serious: <http://www.antiserious.com/2014/10/20/of-helmet-and-hamlet-in-haider>
- 17) Sanders, J. (2006). *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London; New York: Routledge.
- 18) Shringarpure, B. (2014). *Hamlet Gets In The Way of Haider*. Retrieved from Warscapes: <http://www.warscapes.com/blog/hamlet-gets-way-haider>
- 19) Srivastava, A. (2016). *Thread of 'Oedipus complex' binds Haider and Hamlet*. Retrieved from In India Opines: <http://indiaopines.com/oedipus-complex-binds-haider-hamlet>
- 20) Stam, R., & Raengo, A. . (2005). *Literature and Film: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- 21) Trivedi, P., & Bartholomeusz, D. (2005). *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation, and Performance*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- 22) Vats, V. (2014). *Bollywood Takes on the Agony of Kashmir, Through ShakespeareIn 'Haider,' Vishal Bhardwaj Draws From 'Hamlet'*. Retrieved from The New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/28/arts/international/in-haider-visha>

- 23) Waraich, O. (2014). *Hamlet in Kashmir*. Retrieved from Roads & Kingdoms:
<http://roadsandkingdoms.com/2014/hamlet-in-kashmir/>