Regarding Mortality: Confrontation of the Absurd in *Hamlet* and *Demons*

In what ways, and to what purposes, do Shakespeare's Hamlet *and Dostoevsky's* Demons *portray the reaction of characters to the Absurd?*

Subject: English A

Category: II

Word count: 4000

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	2
II.	Disillusionment and Freedom	3
III.	Mortality and Fear	6
IV.	Agency and Liberation	9
V.	Conclusion	13
Appendix		15
Works Cited		16

I Introduction

On December 22, 1849, writer Fyodor Dostoevsky was reprieved from his death sentence at the last minute in front of the firing squad (Morson). Having eluded death just as Hamlet did in England, the experience changed him as much as it did Hamlet and gave him "a new grasp of existence from his confrontation with death" (Frank in Roazen). Regarding death, then, we find Shakespeare's Hamlet wondering "to be or not to be," while Dostoevsky's Kirillov is ready to revolt against human finitude without compromise.

Substantial readings in the history of critical approaches to *Hamlet* are existentialism-oriented, and Dostoevsky is credited with writing the first existentialist novel, *Notes From Underground*. The two artists have a profound understanding of the rational mind's failure to explain the absurd human condition, which presents itself as a central theme in both *Hamlet* and *Demons*. First developed by nineteenth-century philosopher Søren Kierkegaard, the Absurd involves the understanding of an irrational, meaningless world where no metaphysical reasons explain human existence (Popkin and Stroll). Such a state of mind is what disillusionment refers to in the essay, which illuminates for the characters in *Hamlet* and *Demons* the concepts of autonomy and agency.

Before the development of existentialism, both writers engaged in existentialist discourse in forms of literature during major periods of shifting values and social order—the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. The way in which great literature treats its characters reveals the authors' attitudes about what the realisation we now call the Absurd entails for humanity. Though scholars tend to reject the parallel in characters between *Hamlet* and *Demons*, I argue that it is worthwhile to discuss in what ways and to what purposes these two works portray the reaction of characters to the Absurd, specifically Hamlet and Kirillov (Belknap). Analysing the works in parallel allows the interpretation of one through the other. The comparison draws attention to the possible emancipatory nature of the Absurd and

accentuates the subtle differences in the position after the characters' similar starting points of disillusionment. Kirillov's exclusive attention to the metaphysical concept of God sheds light on the different focus levels: Hamlet's world is the world of mortals in which he accepts his place; Kirillov's faith in transcending mortality with suicide turns out to be a lie.

The Absurd is deeply relevant in today's world, where more people than ever recognise that no predetermined ethics dictate or restrain one's action. Even though such disillusionment has always existed, it appears to be more pervasive and intense in a time well-equipped with terminologies to articulate its predicament. But great literature is timeless, and we are always able to gain insights and solace in their revelation of the human condition.

II Disillusionment and Freedom

The first and most crucial step in confronting the Absurd is being acutely aware of mortality. The disillusionment that human existence is inherently meaningless and terminates with death is the gateway to understanding autonomy. In this respect, Kirillov the atheist goes one step further than Hamlet. When the prince still appears paralysed by the realisation and has not yet the liberation revealed to him, Kirillov pinpoints the human predicament: "Life is, and death is not at all" (Dostoevsky 236). The parallel structure reinforces the nullity of death, precisely what preoccupies and steers Hamlet away from the Christian worldview that promises future eternal life. As a result, nausea and paralysis pervade his world (Tekiney). In Act I, Hamlet laments "that this too too solid flesh would melt, thaw, and resolve itself into a dew" (Shakespeare I.ii.129-130). His sorrowful exclamation illustrates the imagery of the perishing life and acknowledges its finality, repeating "too too" in intense anguish. The word "solid", contrasting with the elemental imagery of dew water, shows life ends up being a part

of the inanimate, indifferent world of nature as it dissipates, however concrete and physical it used to be.

After realising the fundamental irreducible corporeality of human existence (Hossain), Hamlet fails to find anything meaningful in what is essentially "of nothing" even when he praises its infinite faculty: "What a piece of work is a man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculty, in form and moving how express and admirable, in action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a god—the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust?" (Shakespeare IV.ii.28; II.ii.301-305). The similes demonstrate human's advanced intellectual faculty by likening humans to divine beings such as gods and angels. Ironically, the Absurd stems from the unfulfilled need of our reason to make sense of the irrational world (Camus). Hamlet has deep misgivings about rationality as his intellect leads him to initial disillusionment and subsequent anguish. The metaphor for humans alludes to the fifth essence, which is the purest and highest form of an element, according to mediaeval philosophy ("Distilling the Essence of 'Quintessence'"). To Hamlet, humans are the purest essence of dust; therefore, they are trivial, insignificant, and meaningless to the utmost degree. Human existence is merely the material that consists of the flesh and does not have an essence to which we ought to adhere.

Through the contrasting similes and the rhetorical question without an answer, Hamlet's resigned, frustrated tone makes it evident that Shakespeare does not intend to make Hamlet resist corporeality. Kirillov, however, conjectures a possibility of change in such physicality. His logic states that one must kill himself to achieve absolute freedom as this act signals the destruction of God, after which man will "be God and will change physically." Kirillov speaks in the future tense and repeatedly emphasises "everybody", "no one", and "all of them" with a remarkable resoluteness in his reasoning. He talks with a special consciousness of the collective human lot, whereas Hamlet, though he speaks of humans in

general, only focuses on their present predicament. The different foci of their reaction will eventually lead to distinct final stances taken regarding the Absurd and their fate (Dostoevsky 115; 114).

Shakespeare employs the dust symbol later again to emphasise the indiscriminate nature of death. In the graveyard, Hamlet asks in melancholy if Alexander the Great also "looked o' this fashion i'th'earth" after death. He then continues: "Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth to dust. The dust is earth, of earth we make loam." The historical reference to Alexander the Great shows even the most powerful and influential man cannot escape death, regardless of his achievements and earthly status. The greatness of his accomplishments contrasts the plain, lucidly articulated statements of his life: "died, buried, returneth into dust," same as just everyone. Moreover, the earth is made into the loam for trivial, base utility purposes such as "stop a beer-barrel." Eventually, any glorious existence will be rendered meaningless and returned to the indifferent world. The contrast effectively accentuates the insignificance of life and the ultimate futility of worldly things (Shakespeare V.i.188-189; 199-201; 202).

However, from such a lack of essence, Hamlet later acknowledges that the freedom to assign meaning arises. He states: "there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so. To me [Denmark] is a prison." To the prince, beings no longer have an essence that is "good" or "bad"; rather, it depends on one's will. This realisation affirms the power of human autonomy, which Hamlet can only mask behind words of madness in the Danish court intrigue. When Polonius asks what he is reading, he replies with "words, words, words." The answer is literal, composed of the fundamental component of books in their surface form, and its significance slowly dissolves in consecutive repetition. But the answer itself, precisely only words, can mislead, confound, and conceal his true intentions in wordplay. Simultaneously meaningless and intentionally polysemous, words are an indispensable

medium of thought for Hamlet to achieve more freedom of expression (Shakespeare II.ii: 247-249; 192).

Yet words are not sufficient for Kirillov to demonstrate his freedom. When arguing with Verkhovensky, Kirillov exclaims: "all my life I did not want it to be only words. This is why I lived, because I kept not wanting it. And now, too, every day I want it not to be words." The "it" has a vague referent, but considering Kirillov has indicated that he thinks only one thing all his life and God has tormented him all his life, it is safe to interpret "it" as his idea of overcoming God (which, to Kirillov, is synonymous to mortality or fear of death). He wants the idea to be an actualised rebellion, more than abstraction or words he keeps articulating to explain it. The repetition of negation and "I want" reflects the rejection of the emptiness of words and his hyper-present will. Unlike Hamlet's subtle, implicit play on words, Kirillov demands a decisive action that fully asserts his autonomy (Dostoevsky 615; 116).

In comparison, Hamlet's view on death appears more passive and uncertain with a trace of Renaissance scepticism. While both works indicate a heightened sense of autonomy is the result of being conscious of nothingness at the heart of being, Shakespeare portrays the ambivalence and the existential anxiety when confronting the Absurd, and Dostoevsky examines how human attempt to overcome mortality is doomed to failure.

III Mortality and Fear

In the wake of the disillusionment, suicide appears to be an inescapable thought that occurs to both Hamlet and Kirillov. Dostoevsky designs Kirillov's logical suicide as a gesture to liberate humanity from the fear of death. For Hamlet, who experiences exactly such a fear, suicide remains mostly a solution to escape life's suffering and meaninglessness. Hamlet recognises the finitude and uncertainty but hesitates to directly confront them. Unlike that of Kirillov, Hamlet's world is very much still the mortal world, and to him, God seems

decidedly other and not something he can fathom becoming. Hamlet belongs to those who are kept from committing suicide by the two prejudices identified by Kirillov: "the pain of the fear of death" and "the other world" (Dostoevsky 115).

Earlier, Hamlet cites God's "canon 'gainst self-slaughter" as the reason for not killing himself. According to his "to be, or not to be" soliloquy (see appendix), the fear of death and uncertainty of the afterlife "[puzzle] the will" and prevent him from committing suicide. Fortune, or fate, seems "outrageous"—"excessive" in old English—to him, the word choice illustrating the extreme randomness of life and the powerlessness of humanity. The line may seem to refuse the possibility of freedom but can be alternatively read as the character unyielding to fate, and the freedom lies in the choice of suffering or taking arms. Hamlet ponders, "to die, to sleep." "Sleep" is the common euphemism for death, a realm uncontrolled by the conscious mind. The two phrases add ambiguity to the idea of the afterlife, where Hamlet wishes for no more "slings and arrows" and "sea of troubles." The expressions create imagery of life as a constant battle with overwhelming forces, serving as a metaphor for Hamlet's immense suffering. It is worth noting that he contemplates not to live, but "to be or not to be". Bakhtin distinguishes between two senses of the verb "to be": either to simply exist passively or to engage in the process of existing. It is clear that for Hamlet that following the ghost's instruction would be passively assuming his role, and he desires the latter more authentic action (Shakespeare I.ii.132; III.i.57-81).

Hamlet's agency mainly shows through his relationship with the life he lives, unlike Kirillov, who actively tries to establish human autonomy through his own death. He demonstrates the reaction to the Absurd at its extreme—suicide, which he thinks no one else dares to do. To him, suicide is the logical consequence that follows the discovery of the meaninglessness of life. Hamlet saying "thinking makes it so" is to take the first steps of realising the power of one's own will; Kirillov is willing to kill himself to validate his

philosophy that humans are free and God's equal. Kirillov agrees that "it was not [him] who ate the idea, but the idea that ate [him]" (Dostoevsky 558). The "idea" is personified and takes an active role in consuming Kirillov's existence, suggesting that Kirillov commits to his logic to an extreme degree that undermines his agency, and his approach is flawed.

Kirillov refers to God in a more general sense as "the pain of the fear of death"—essentially, an irrational fear. Since fear is irrational, God does not exist according to the rational mind. Yet God "is necessary and must exist" because humans are limited and don't have enough courage to assert their freedom. Kirillov's words imply God's existence because to "show [his] insubordination," there must be a God for him to rebel against. To resolve this paradox, suicide must be a process of destruction of God to show his "new fearsome freedom," as long as it is not out of fear and despair but freely chosen (Dostoevsky 115; 615; 619).

As mentioned above, fear of death is one of the factors that contribute to Hamlet's indecision. According to Heidegger, humans avoid confrontation with death, viewing death as an infinitely postponed event in the future instead of a constantly undergoing process (Siddiqi). So far, Hamlet does recognise finitude, but only as an ultimate end point of life, fearing the uncertainty of what comes after the event. In contrast, Kirillov seeks to prove the possibility of liberating humanity from the fear of death. God gives Kirillov the necessary backdrop for his rational mind—much celebrated by the Enlightenment—to establish itself and assert human autonomy. In "to be or not to be", Hamlet asks if he, as a mortal, should continue to exist. In a sense, Kirillov ponders the same question, but the subject changes to God. He must first kill himself so that "God will not be" (Dostoevsky 115). He focuses on transcending mortality, while Hamlet lingers on the mortal ground and accepts what reason cannot explain.

In the final conversation with Verkhovensky, Kirillov exclaimed: "Don't you understand that a man with these two thoughts cannot go on living? […] Don't you understand that a man can shoot himself for that alone?" The rhetorical questions show how decidedly evident it is that he should kill himself, and the repetition conveys his strong conviction about his logic. Kirillov stresses his singularity using contrasting sides of "me" and "you" and is convinced of being the "one man of the thousands of your millions" who has the courage to assert his autonomy and "save" humanity from fear (Dostoevsky 619). This salvation is the duty Kirillov constructs for himself; he willingly accepts and commits himself to it as a response to his freedom—to demonstrate this freedom to others so they can have a "new life, a new man, everything new" (Dostoevsky 115). On the other hand, Hamlet finds it difficult to assume the role given by society. His duty as a son is to avenge his father, something he cannot bring himself to do. In a soliloquy in Act II, the repetition of insults effectively emphasises the frustration of Hamlet's inaction and lack of decision power. Hamlet compares himself to a "peasant slave," "a scullion," a person of very little worth and a servant, suggesting he is forced to do what he does not want (Shakespeare II.ii.537-594). The repetition of a "slave" meaning emphasises his state of being restrained by his status and intellect. His hesitance suggests following his duty is not an authentic choice he should make. From Shakespeare to Dostoevsky, the fear and ambivalence towards death become a radical rebellion. *Hamlet* accentuates the celebration of liberty and agency on a more individual level; Dostoevsky explores the philosophical implications of a logical response to the Absurd.

IV Agency and Liberation

Under the worldview of the Absurd, the lack of essence grants people the freedom to define themselves. This agency makes having an authentic human life in an absurd world possible. In the denouement, Hamlet accepts death as an immediate possibility and does not

seek anything further as Kirillov does. Dostoevsky suggests that the rebellion—Kirillov's suicide, what critics call "the most harrowing scene in all fiction"—is a noble attempt in logic but futile in practice (Pevear).

Hamlet values authenticity and finds life unbearable when he is unable to do so. His dislike for inauthentic people is increasingly unconcealed when he calls the unnecessarily flattering messenger Osric a "water-fly"—a petty annoyance. Before departing for England, his despair and sense of meaninglessness "flooded his consciousness and paralysed his will" (Fly). In his previous hesitation, he feels that he does not own his life; now, he steps into the liberation offered by disillusionment. As Hossain notes, under the imminence of death, "Hamlet understands the existential immensity of his freedom to commit himself authentically to his situation." This understanding of freedom comes with the mounting pressure of the situation. The Absurd and the looming death no longer impede but even encourages Hamlet to finally engage in making the reality. Hamlet now more readily accepts the finality of life (or "providence"), which allows him to take a more authentic and active approach to asserting himself. He explains the death of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern saying, "there's a divinity that shapes our ends." The "divinity" is the inevitable finality that he thinks we cannot control and calmly accepts. Thus, he views death not as infinitely postponed but more as an immediate possibility. When Hamlet accepts the duel, he says: "The readiness is all." Since death is inevitable, whether now or yet to come, he is no longer rendered immobile by the doubt of what comes after death. The sense of readiness has replaced fear, in which we find courage and nobleness (Shakespeare V.ii.84; 10; 169).

Act V is where Shakespeare demonstrates how Hamlet affirms his agency in life. Upon seeing Claudius and others entering the graveyard, Hamlet advances and asserts his identity, proudly announcing: "This is I/Hamlet the Dane" (Shakespeare V.i.247). The recognition of identity stresses his individuality. Later he states: "the interim is mine"

(Shakespeare V.ii.74). By taking possession of the interim, he takes charge of and structures his life and actions (Fly). He is prepared —"have been in continual practise" (Shakespeare V.ii.157), chooses to fight and is almost triumphant over his enemy. After reflecting on revenge and death throughout the play, Hamlet eventually steps into action in the fencing match, somehow fulfilling both at once. The interim is short, but Act V is densely composed of Hamlet's specific life and authentic actions, and the significance of these events finally gives his life meaning. Just as Horatio sighs at last: "Now cracks a noble heart" (Shakespeare V.ii.312), Shakespeare praises the nobleness of establishing an individual existence through action and not an empty, formal social identity.

Such nobleness also exists in Kirillov's courage to commit suicide. Stavrogin describes Kirillov as "magnanimous" because Kirillov commits suicide under the conviction that it fulfils his duty of saving humankind. But to Dostoevsky, the attempt to replace God after discovering life's meaninglessness, noble as it is, has a problematic side. For Kirillov to prove his absolute freedom, he has to remain indifferent in front of death, yet his humanity still exists in him. When Verkhovensky, who has murdered Kirillov's former friend Shatov, instructs Kirillov to take the blame for the murder (to this Kirillov has consented earlier in the novel), he wavers and firmly declares that he "won't write that [he] killed Shatov." His impulsive behaviours, e.g., "cried out", "jumping up from the sofa", "snatched his revolver", show that the news about the murder makes him lose his collectedness. This reaction is reflective of the side of Kirillov that despises heinous people. Dostoevsky sympathetically depicts his humane side to reinforce the tragedy of his suicide and demonstrate the destructive influence of the idea (Dostoevsky 676; 613; 612).

Verkhovensky tries to threaten Kirillov with his revolver and force him to kill himself, but Kirillov must will his death without any reason to demonstrate absolute freedom. The will must be completely his own so that his proof is not philosophically tainted (Hunt). After

reiterating his idea, Kirillov agrees to write the confession in a moment of maniacal delirium. As Hamlet moves away from feigning madness, Kirillov seems to descend into complete madness. Dostoevsky skilfully portrays Kirillov's feverish speech flooded with exclamations and frantic utterances: he is "shaking as if in fever", repeatedly demanding "more abuse" for the suicide note, "bellowed with rapture" and "exclaimed with astonishment" (Dostoevsky 620). The abounding excitement in the scene emphasises his madness and accentuates the terrible emptiness and silence of the impending death.

These intense moments culminate in Kirillov's theoretical manifestation of free will—his plan to overcome the Absurd. He goes into a "dark, horrible room", hiding in "the corner formed by the wardrobe and the wall" (Dostoevsky 623). The darkness and sense of confinement effectively set up a sinister and solemn mood and foreshadow he will experience quite the opposite of his desired fulfilment and freedom. When Verkhovensky enters and seizes Kirillov, Kirillov bites Verkhovensky's finger and knocks the candle off his hand. Kirillov has his revolver, and Verkhovensky flees the room. From this moment on, Verkhovensky no longer poses a threat. As he rushes along the hall in the darkness, he hears "terrible shouts [come] flying after him from the room: 'Now, now, now, now...' Ten times or so" (Dostoevsky 625). The call is a repeated imperative, indicating Kirillov takes power over his own will and commands himself to commit suicide alone in the dark, with no pressure (Siddiqi). The readers do not witness the death of Kirillov directly but rather by hearing an abrupt gunshot: "there suddenly came a loud shot" (Dostoevsky 625). The moment of expression of free will remains not with the reader but with Kirillov, who is alone in that room. His death ends in chaos and then terrible emptiness—the unfathomable nullity of death itself, and nothing change like he had hypothesised.

From the different paths taken by the two characters, we see that the understanding of the Absurd brings the potential for emancipation. Acceptance of the Absurd can coexist with an authentic and meaningful life; the rejection, however, contains a dangerous emptiness.

V Conclusion

Hamlet and *Demons* anticipate our existential concerns in their exploration of how humans face the Absurd and illustrate how disillusionment can lead to awareness of autonomy and agency after the initial anguish and reflection on death. Aptly put by Kauffman, after realising the sheer absurdity of life, what remains is "the liberating feeling of pervasive disillusionment," though Hamlet and Kirillov seek and experience it on different levels (18). Shakespeare reveals the universal through the struggle of one individual—Hamlet—that the nobility of the soul is achieved through accepting mortality and asserting his freedom and individuality. While Shakespeare conveys an affirmation of life and the emancipatory side of the Absurd in his tragedy, Dostoevsky exposes the tragic futility of transcending mortality in an emptier death. Kirillov responds to an absurd life by committing logical suicide, trying to demonstrate his freedom but dies a death no different from others. Despite fulfilling the suicide does arguably brings a sense of liberation for him, becoming the new human is neither possible nor gives the desired plenitude but ultimately reinforces the nullity of death. Thus, it can be seen that human nature achieves its liberation and nobility not in transcending mortality but rather in its immanence and finitude.

Evidently, neither *Hamlet* nor *Demons* offer a definite answer to the question of the best response to the Absurd but instead insightfully capture the complexity of life and its problems. The treatment of the Absurd is intertwined with sociopolitical, ethical, theological and other factors beyond the scope of this essay. The complexity does not weaken the

purifying and enlightening effect of art, and the experience of works that show humans in their confrontation with this world is, in itself, a sufficient resolution (Berdyaev).

Appendix

From Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, III.i.57-81:

> To be, or not to be—that is the question:
>
> Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
>
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune
>
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles
>
> [...]
>
> But that the dread of something after death,
>
> The undiscovered country, from whose bourn
>
> No traveller returns, puzzles the will.

Works Cited

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovič. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Vadim Liapunov, Austin (Tex.), U of Texas P, 1993, hscif.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/bakhtin_mikhail_toward_a_philosophy_of_the_act.pdf . Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.

Belknap, Robert. "Shakespeare and the Possessed." *Dostoevsky Studies*, vol. 5, 1984, sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/DS/05/063.shtml. Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.

Berdyaev, Nicolas. *Dostoievsky: an Interpretation.* Translated by Haiying Geng. Guangxi Normal University Press, 2020.

Camus, Albert. *Myth of Sisyphus*. France, 1942.

Distilling the Essence of 'Quintessence'. Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/quintessence-origin-meaning-history-elements. Accessed 10 Oct. 2022.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Demons.* Translated by R. Pevear and L. Volokhonsky. New York, Vintage Books, Random House, 1994.

Fly, Richard. "Accommodating Death: The Ending of Hamlet." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1984, pp. 257–74. *JSTOR*, https://doi.org/10.2307/450527. Accessed 23 Oct. 2022.

Hossain, Amir. *Existentialist Readings of Shakespeare's Hamlet: An Overview.* Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.

Hunt, Aiden, and Thomas. "Dostoyevsky, Demons, Week 10: Part III, Chapters 5 and 6." Classics and the Western Canon, Goodreads, 3 Mar. 2021, www.goodreads.com/topic/show/21890455-week-10-part-iii-chapters-5-and-6. Accessed 22 Nov. 2022.

https://www.goodreads.com/topic/show/21890455-week-10-part-iii-chapters-5-and-6 Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.

Kaufmann, Walter. *From Shakespeare to Existentialism: An original study of Goethe, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Rilke, Freud, Jaspers, Heidegger, Toynbee.* New York, Anchor Books, 1960.

Morson, Gary Saul. "Fyodor Dostoyevsky". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 7 Nov. 2022, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Fyodor-Dostoyevsky. Accessed 15 December 2022.

Popkin, Richard H., and Avrum Stroll. *Philosophy Made Simple*. London, W.H. Allen, 1969. Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.

Roazen, Paul. "Dostoevsky in Exile." *VQR*, vol. 61/3, nos. Summer 1985, 12 Dec. 2003, www.vqronline.org/dostoevsky-exile. Accessed 23 Oct. 2022.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. Edited by G.R Hibbard, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.

Siddiqi, Bilal. "Existentialism, Epiphany, and Polyphony in Dostoevsky's Post-Siberian Novels". *Religions*, 17 January 2019. Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.

Tekiney, Ash, *From Shakespeare to Kierkegaard: An Existential Reading of Hamlet*, Dogufl University Dergisi, 2001 / 4, http://files.meetup.com/351497/An%20Existential%20Reading%20of%20Hamlet_%20Ash%20Tekinay.pdf. Accessed 15 Oct. 2022.