

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**



**SPACE AND POWER IN
SAMUEL BECKETT AND FERHAN ŐENSOY**

Ph.D. DISSERTATION

**İsmail Murat Glgeli
(Y1112.620004)**

**Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program**

Thesis Advisor: Prof. Dr. C. Gnseli Snmez İŐçi

APRIL, 2017





19/04/2017

T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ
DOKTORA TEZ ONAY BELGESİ

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Doktora Programı Y1112.620004 numaralı öğrencisi İsmail Murat GÖLGE'LİNİN "SPACE AND POWER IN SAMUEL BECKETT AND FERHAN ŞENSOY" adlı doktora tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 13/03/2017 tarih ve 2017/05 sayılı kararı ile oluşturulan jüri tarafından *oybirliği* ile Doktora tezi olarak *kabul* edilmiştir.

	Unvan- Ad-Soyad	İmza
Danışman	Prof. Dr. Cemile Günseli SÖNMEZ İŞÇİ	
Üye (TİK)	Doç. Dr. Ferma LEKESİZALIN	
Üye (TİK)	Prof. Dr. Erol İPEKLİ	
Üye	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gamze SABANCI UZUN	
Üye	Prof. Dr. Abdullatif ACARLIOĞLU	

Tezin Savunulduğu Tarih :19/04/2017

Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun tarih ve sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Özer KANBUROĞLU

Enstitü Müdürü Vekili



DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation “**Space and Power in Samuel Beckett and Ferhan Şensoy**” was written by me in accordance with academic rules and ethical values. I also confirm that I benefitted from a lot of works and showed them in reference part.03.03.2017

İsmail Murat Glgeli





FOREWORD

I would like express my deep gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. C. Günseli Sönmez İşçi. I am so thankful that she has accepted me as an advisee and during the writing period she has always given me her precious time for reading my drafts and provided me with valuable feedback and worthful suggestions. Her invaluable guidance and her considerable encouragement she has provided was inestimable and with her invaluable academic guidance, I found strength and grittiness to finish writing this dissertation.

I wish also to express my deep gratitude to Prof. Dr. Zülal Balpınar for giving me support and for listening to me and giving me helpful advice for the improvement of this study. I can never remunerate that she has spent many hours to read my preliminary drafts and has given fruitful comments on the study. Without Prof. Dr. Zülal Balpınar it would not have been possible for me to complete this dissertation.

I truly thank to Prof. Dr. Azize Özgüven for her gracious guidance and invaluable comments.

I am especially indebted to support from Prof. Erol İpekli. He has never hesitated about providing me relevant sources for this study.

I owe many thanks to my colleague Lecturer Ela Akgün Özbek for heartening me in every process of the study. I am immensely grateful to her for giving me her thoughtful and helpful advice. I can never remunerate for the technical support that she has given me.

I am deeply grateful to my office-mate Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya İpek for her endurance and high tolerance towards being exposed to pile of books everywhere in the office for over two years.

I am also thankful to Emrah Şatıroğlu for sharing his precious time for the layout support.

Finally, I would like to thank to my family for their emotional support during the process of writing this dissertation.

March 2017

İ. Murat Gölge



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
ÖZET	xi
ABSTRACT	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	11
2.1. Michel Foucault and the Concept of Space	11
2.1.1. Space according to Michel Foucault.....	12
2.1.2. Space in Theatre Plays.....	18
2.2. Theory of Power	21
2.2.1. Power According to Michel Foucault.....	23
2.2.2. Panopticism and Power.....	28
3. THE THEATRE OF THE ABSURD AND TURKISH TRADITIONAL THEATRE	37
3.1. The Theatre of the Absurd.....	37
3.1.1. Meaninglessness of Human Condition.....	45
3.1.2. Lack of Communication, Alienation, Dehumanization.....	46
3.1.3. Anti-Theatre (Drama), Anti-Play, Anti-Character.....	47
3.1.4. Anti-Language.....	50
3.2. Samuel Beckett.....	53
3.2.1. Samuel Beckett's Literary Style.....	59
3.3. <i>Waiting for Godot</i>	71
3.3.1. Who is Godot?.....	73
3.3.2. Plot Summary of <i>Waiting for Godot</i>	75
3.4. <i>End Game</i>	80
3.4.1. Plot Summary of <i>End Game</i>	88
3.5. <i>Godot has Arrived</i>	93
3.5.1. Miodrac Bulatovic.....	95
3.5.2. Plot Summary of <i>Godot Has Arrived</i>	95
3.6. Ferhan Şensoy.....	99
3.6.1. Ferhan Şensoy's Writing Style.....	103
3.6.2. Turkish Traditional Theatre – Ortaoyunu.....	116
3.6.2.1.Origins of Ortaoyunu.....	116
3.6.2.2.Setting and Staging.....	119
3.6.2.3.Characters of Ortaoyunu.....	120
3.6.2.4.Structure of Plays.....	123
3.7. <i>Good Riddance Godot (Güle Güle Godot)</i>	125
3.7.1. Plot Summary of <i>Good Riddance Godot</i>	132
4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYS	139
4.1. Concept of Space in Beckett.....	139
4.2. Concept of Space in Şensoy.....	141

4.3. Space in Waiting for Godot, Endgame and Güle Güle Godot.....	143
4.4. Power in Waiting for Godot, Endgame and Güle Güle Godot	195
4.5. Panopticism in Waiting for Godot, Endgame and Güle Güle Godot	221
5. CONCLUSION.....	235
REFERENCES.....	245
RESUME.....	253



SAMUEL BECKETT VE FERHAN ŞENSOY'DA UZAM VE GÜÇ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Samuel Beckett'in *Godot'u Beklerken*, *Oyunsonu* ve Ferhan Şensoy'un *Güle Güle Godot* oyunlarında uzam, güç ve panoptisizm kavramlarını incelemek ve bu kavramların karakterler üzerindeki etkilerini analiz etmektir. Michel Foucault'nun uzam, güç ve panoptisizm kuramları çalışmanın felsefi temelini oluşturmaktadır. Bu çalışmada beş bölüm bulunmaktadır.

Birinci bölümde araştırma sorularına, ikinci bölümde Michel Foucault ve kuramlarına yer verilmiştir. Üçüncü bölümde Absürd Tiyatro, Samuel Beckett, Geleneksel Türk Tiyatrosu ve Ferhan Şensoy detaylandırılmış ve bu araştırma için incelenecek oyunların konuları ele alınmıştır. Dördüncü bölümde araştırma soruları ışığında uzam kavramı ve Foucault'nun heterotopya kuramının altı ilkesi oyunlarda ayrıntılı olarak incelenmiştir. Güç kuramı oyunlarda aranmış, karakterlerin güç olgusundan nasıl etkilendikleri analiz edilmiş ve tartışılmıştır. Panoptisizmin etkileri araştırılmış ve karakterlerin panoptisizm karşısında ki davranış, tutum ve düşünceleri incelenmiştir.

Son bölümde araştırma soruları sentezlenmiş ve cevaplar bulunmaya çalışılmıştır. Bulunan bu cevaplar oyunların geçtiği ülkelerin toplumlarına ışık tutmaktadır. Bulgular Şensoy'un karakterlerinin Beckett'in karakterlerine göre geleceğe daha umutla baktığını ortaya koymaktadır. Beckett'in karakterleri ya sınırlandırılmış eylemler içerisinde ya da tamamen hapis olmuş durumdadırlar. Şensoy'un karakterleri psikolojik ve fiziksel zararlardan kolayca kurtulabilmekte ve kendi otoritelerini kurmaya başlamaktadırlar. *Güle Güle Godot*'da karakterler arasındaki ilişkiler Beckett'in karakterlerine göre daha yakın ve samimidir. Beckett'in oyunlarında karakterler arasında dönüşümlü güç ilişkisi bulunmaktadır ve bu ilişki karşılıklı ihtiyaçlardan doğmaktadır. Öte yandan *Güle Güle Godot*'daki karakterlerin birbirleriyle olan ilişkileri daha saf ve gerçek arkadaşlık içermektedir.

Her üç oyunda bütün karakterler bekleme eylemi içerisindeyler, fakat bu beklemeler farklı biçimlerde ve farklı sebeplerden dolayı gerçekleşmektedir. Hepsi içinde buldukları koşulları değiştirmek istemektedirler. Bu karakterler kendileri ve özellikle içinde buldukları dünya hakkındaki sorulara yanıt bulmak arzusu taşımaktadırlar. Beckett'in karakterleri için bu sorular yanıt bulmaktan; Şensoy'un karakterleri için birincil önemdeki soru yanıt bulmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler : *Michel Foucault, uzam, güç, panoptisizm, Samuel Beckett, Ferhan Şensoy*



SPACE AND POWER IN SAMUEL BECKETT AND FERHAN ŞENSOY

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyze the concept of space and investigate the theory of power, the effects of power and panopticism over the characters in the plays of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, and Ferhan Şensoy's *Güle Güle Godot* (*Good Riddance Godot*). Theories on space, power and panopticism of Michel Foucault form philosophical background of the study. The study is comprised of five chapters.

The first chapter introduces the research questions and the second discusses Michel Foucault and his philosophy. The third elaborates the Theatre of the Absurd, Samuel Beckett, Turkish Traditional Theatre and Ferhan Şensoy and outlines the plots and the background of the plays in question. The fourth chapter addresses the research questions and carries the discussion forward into analysis of the plays. Detailed analysis and the discussion of the concept of space is presented for all three plays. The six principles of heterotopias of Foucault are examined in the plays in detail. Power in the plays is scrutinized and how the characters are affected by power is analyzed and discussed. The effect of panopticism is studied and the manners of the characters against panopticism is investigated.

The final chapter of the study synthesizes the answers to the research questions. The answers that are found in the plays shed light to the societies that the plays belong to. The findings demonstrate that Şensoy's characters are more hopeful for their future than Beckett's. Beckett's characters are either in restrained action or in total confinement. Şensoy's characters even after psychological and physical destruction recover quickly and try to establish their own authority. Personal ties among the characters are stronger in *Good Riddance Godot* than they are in Beckett's plays. In Beckett's plays, there is an interchangeable power relationship between the characters, and this power relation is based on mutual need. On the other hand, there is a pure and sincere friendship among people in *Good Riddance Godot*.

All the characters in the three plays studied are waiting but in different manners and with different expectations. They all want to change their circumstances and try to find answers to the questions mostly about themselves and the world around them. In Beckett, the questions remain unanswered, but in Şensoy, the main problem is at least answered.

Keywords : *Michel Foucault, space, power, panopticism, Samuel Beckett, Ferhan Şensoy*

1. INTRODUCTION

At the end of the World War II Albert Camus in the *Myth of Sisyphus* defines the conditions of humanity as,

A world that can be explained even with bad reasons is a familiar world. But, on the other hand, in a universe suddenly divested of illusions and lights, man feels an alien, a stranger. His exile is without remedy since he is deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land. This divorce between man and this life, the actor and his setting, is properly the feeling of absurdity” (Camus, 1991:6).

The words above clearly reveals the anxiety of humanity towards the absurdity of existence of their lives. This anxiety has become the origin of the basics of Absurd theatre (Nutku, 1985: 236). Camus believes that human condition in this entire world is basically meaningless and humanity should see the fact that a fulfilling commonsensical interpretation of the universe is beyond its reach. From this point of view, the world is to be seen absolutely as absurd (Crabb, 2006: 1), and the term absurd identifies the meaningless, senseless and irrational aspects of life. Absurdism, as a movement, endeavors to form a method of rationalizing the irrational features in this uncertain world and an absurdist drama questions the importance of an individual's role as a being in this life and their significance in the actions that they take in this nonsensical world. According to Absurdist death and the idea of afterlife is as irrational as existence. They consider that both existing and non-existing direct humanity to the same end; moreover, they believe that since the idea of existence is imperceptible and nonphysical, it is impossible for the act of existing to be authentic (Bolick, 2009: 1).

It is seen that the world suffers from ruinous internal changes that it undergoes and existence seems to be absurd. In such an atmosphere, the condition of the individual is useless and fruitless. The ruinous internal change is the World War II and through its pain and catastrophic atmosphere that the individuals breathed sprung the Theatre of the Absurd. During and after the war there were political and social changes as well as economic ones. Apart from the mentioned changes fascism, ferocity of the war and the

Holocaust inspired the idea that the actions of individual are insignificant and these terrible events kindled existentialism as a philosophical idea. The individual was considered a pawn in the matter of political schemes and power games. Seeing that more than fifty million people had died during the war, individuals stopped believing in their existence, and the existentialists considered morality was profane. This profanation led them to question the significance of the individuals in this catastrophic world (Bolick, 2009:1). In this catastrophic atmosphere, as Esslin points out, the argument of the playwrights of the Theatre of the Absurd was not about whether the world is absurd or not, rather their argument is about to present it as such. Some of the playwrights who presented this absurdity and carried the human condition in this absurd world into their themes of the plays were Beckett, Adamov, Ionesco and Genet (Esslin, 1983: 24).

Samuel Beckett is one of the most remarkable representative of the Theatre of the Absurd and it would be beneficial for one to start examining the Theatre of the Absurd through Beckett (Nutku, 1993: 237, Bennet, 2011:7). The following quotation below summarizes what Beckett does in his works,

The plotless play, the use of discontinuous dialogue, the set empty but filled with mysterious suggestion, the denouement that never comes, the effects of silence and the tension that builds in a pause, the sheer theatricality held by the actor's voice in extended monologue, or the dramatic opportunity that lies in standing stock-still, have become so characteristic of our theater that we hardly notice them all." (Brater in Bennett, 2011:7)

Years after of German occupation of France Beckett came to limelight with his three novels and two plays. When Roger Blin staged Beckett's first play *Waiting for Godot* for the first time in 1953, it became the talk of the town. In the play, there are two tramps who wait for Godot to come. These two tramps argue, fight, make peace and sometimes think to commit suicide. They try to sleep or gnaw a carrot. In the meantime, two other men appear on the stage, one is the master and the other is the slave. The tramps think that the master is Godot but the master convinces them that he is not. A boy comes on the stage and tells them that Godot will not come that day but he will definitely do so the next day. Nevertheless, Godot never comes, or he does but the tramps may not have paid attention. The main theme of the play is waiting. The tramps, Estragon and Vladimir do not know what they are waiting for. The waiting is not the beginning but the end. The play has a pessimistic tone and has improvisation like dialogues. The situation of the tramps reflects two issues, they act as buffoons as

if they are wearing masks and hiding the suffering inside. The interior suffering they have is the suffering of humanity (Nutku, 1993: 237).

Roger Blin put Beckett's second play *Endgame* on stage in 1957. *Endgame* was another success of the playwright and in the play nothing progresses. The name of the play imagines the end of many things and end of the life is among them. Audiences see that everything is over and done with, there is nothing left and life is destroyed. While *Waiting for Godot* emphasizes 'waiting', *Endgame* presents out of life, 'abandonment' (Nutku, 1993: 237).

Beckett is the 20th Century writer but his works go beyond the space and time limits of humanity and become the representative of freedom which embraces the space and times of all time (Yüksel, 2006:16). Beckett has influenced many writers, his works has been an inspiration to them and Ferhan Şensoy is one of them. What Samuel Beckett is to the Theatre of the Absurd as one of its best representatives, so is Ferhan Şensoy who has inherited and followed the footsteps of Traditional Turkish Theatre.

Traditional Turkish theatre came in contact with the western theater during the reform era of Tanzimat and with the declaration of republic. Playwrights struggled to form western style like dramas and traditional Turkish theatre was put aside. For many years, Turkish theatre welcomed the adopted plays on stage. It is possible to say that there were more western plays than original Turkish plays on stage until 1960's. Absurd theatre became very popular in Turkey during the years of 1960 because of convenience of the political conditions of the era. Theater of the Absurd and Epic Theater influenced Turkish playwrights and they became distant to classical theater. This tendency lasted until 1990's. Some of the playwrights who started to question the classical theatre were, Melih Cevdet Anday, Aziz Nesin, Haldun Taner, Güngör Dilmen and Ferhan Şensoy. It would be a mistake to state that the playwrights produced their works strictly following the Theater of the Absurd, but it would be true to say they were influenced by the movement. Because of the political conditions in Turkey during the years of 1980's and 1990's, Turkish theatre was in decline. Nevertheless, there were also some playwrights who were aware of the rich source of Traditional Turkish Theater and produced many modern plays using its landmarks. Ferhan Şensoy who used many effects of the traditional Turkish Theatre was also very much influenced by Beckett. His *Güle Güle Godot (Good Riddance Godot)* is a tribute to *Waiting for Godot* (Ergün, 2015: 165-166).

Ferhan Şensoy wrote the first version of *Good Riddance Godot* when he was only seventeen. After he had drama education in France, Şensoy established a theatre group called 'Ortaoyuncular' in Turkey and since then he has been writing, directing and acting within the body of this group. What makes Şensoy unique among other playwrights in Turkey is that, he has his own style of the use of the language both in his works and on the stage and he is the most remarkable representative of encomiasts. As Yüksel points out, he is a language acrobat and that he has a strong ability to use language in his own style (Yüksel, 1995 in Pekman 2002: 151).

Ferhan Şensoy has written, directed and acted in many plays which criticize the current events in a humorous manner. Şensoy's *Good Riddance Godot* embraces both western theatre style and Traditional Turkish Theatre. Şensoy considers the Traditional Turkish Theatre as a rich source for his plays and creates his own absurd characters taking after the characters of Traditional Turkish Theatre.

In *Good Riddance Godot*, the name of the country is never mentioned, and the audience meet the main characters Kavuklu and Kavuksuz who are on duty for Godot. The country has a water problem and people question the reason. They are waiting for Godot to leave the country since they believe that he is the main reason of their problems. One day Godot leaves but the problems do not end. This time who would govern the country becomes another issue in this unnamed country.

Good Riddance Godot carries traces of the absurd, epic and traditional theatre. When structurally analyzed, it can be seen that Theater of the Absurd and Ortaoyunu, Traditional Turkish Theatre, superimpose one another. Şensoy took the advantage of traditional form and introduced the Ortaoyunu with contemporary elements. The main characters Kavuklu and Kavuksuz resemble Vladimir and Estragon in Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. Kavuksuz is the modern version of Pişekar in Ortaoyunu and Kavuklu and Kavuksuz behave as they would in Ortaoyunu. The characteristics of Ortaoyunu is to criticize and mock the political system and say whatever comes to mind. From this perspective *Good Riddance Godot* is a good example of Ortaoyunu but in a contemporary manner (Ergün, 2015: 174-175).

In this thesis, the plays *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot* will be examined in the light of Michel Foucault's ideas on space, power and panopticon. According to Foucault, there are utopias and heterotopias. Utopias are the sites

introduced to the society in a perfected form and they are not real. Opposed to utopias, heterotopias point real places, in other words places that do exist in the society (Foucault, 1986: 3). Heterotopia is not imaginary and is not a perfect place. It indicates the physical places in real society. For example, a home has rooms, walls, a roof and many other physical characteristics. It is possible to say that home and office do not have the same meaning for an individual. These two spaces are different from each other even though an office and a home may have the same physical objects and materials. As a matter of fact, their differences are not related to their physical reality but their roles. The opposition between two spaces include private and public space, leisure and work space. Giving contingent meanings to spaces empower individuals to identify the space as a specific one. The spaces are discriminated from one another according to their roles such as, the café, the cinema, the school, the hospital and the university. They are all different from each other that people can distinguish them easily. These sites have all different roles and imbue individuals with certain expectations to remind who they are in a certain site (Radford, Radford & Lingel 2015: 735-736).

Foucault introduces six characteristics of heterotopias as social sites. The first one is spaces that are found in every society and in every culture. He divides the first one into two; heterotopias of crisis and heterotopias of deviation. When he talks about crisis of heterotopia, he means the sacred or privileged places reserved for individuals in a state of crises. He believes that crises of heterotopia are disappearing in today's world and is replaced by crises of deviation in which the individuals whose manners are deviant from the expected social norms. The second heterotopia that Foucault talks about is the sites whose functions change over time. The third one is that heterotopias are multiple spaces and they juxtapose with several spaces and order one even if they are incompatible in themselves. The fourth one as Foucault explains that heterotopias are in connection with time. Time can be accumulated and interrupted or can be transitory in other spaces. The fifth heterotopia differ from the other sites but it does not mean that they are disconnected or separated by other social sites. And the last heterotopia Foucault introduces is heterotopias are relational and they do not occur on their own (Foucault, 1986: 4-8).

The concept of power is the second objective of this thesis. Power will be discussed in the light of Foucault's point of view. Foucault thinks that power is a kind of dominating

factor and does not only belong to a group, class or an individual. Power does not embody macro power like political or economic power, but also includes micro power relations. Foucault believes that power relations involves relationship of two individuals. This relationship is the power that one can direct or determine the behavior of another. There are different kinds of power relations in the society such as between women and men, teachers and students or between family members. These power relations are micro power relations and these micro power relations embody individuals to accept or reject the control of the others. Furthermore, the individuals who are exposed to the power in the relationship may attempt to avoid or resist control. Moreover, this individual who is under control may try to control the action in turn, and by doing so, a complex network of intrapersonal power relationship is formed (Yu, 2014: 244). Foucault states that “power is exercised from innumerable points, in the relations as a one way operation (Foucault, 1978: 94). Since power is exercised from innumerable points, Foucault does not consider power as a one-way operation. Power is not a force that is exercised from ruling to the ruled only but can be imposed by other forces in all directions like from ruled to ruling. From Foucault’s point of view, it is true to say that power is a changing network relation. According to Foucault, power is omnipresent since it is impossible to escape from it in relations and it is inseparable from the individual. In other words, when there is a relationship there exists power (Yu, 2014: 244). As it is stated, power is omniscient since “it comes from everywhere” (Foucault, 1978: 93). In short, power circulates and functions in the form of a chain; it is never in anybody’s hand and never localized in a certain place.

Power relations are implanted in the society and in the social lives of individuals. Foucault sees that governmentality is the fact of social life and it is almost impossible to escape from it. Individuals are exposed to such a power exercised from cradle to graves. Any institution in a society such as family, hospital, school or the like is subject to the government. The action of power exists and is incarnated on the relationship of the individuals like teacher and student, doctor and patient (Smart, 2002: XV). Apart from exercising examples of power above there is another form to impose power on others; that is Panopticon.

Panopticon is a prison design, which is first described by Jeremy Bentham in the 18th Century. The architectural design of Panopticon is perfect for exercising power on prisoners. As well as being an instrument to exercise power on individuals, it is also a

heterotopia. For long years, the architectural idea of Panopticon is adapted by many institutions to serve as an inevitable element of power. Prisons are ambivalent and incongruous places, which have enclosures for punishing and generating criminals and they serve to both liberate and morally imprison them (Johnson, 2006: 85). The architectural form of the buildings belongs to institutions like schools, factories and military barracks is also inspired from the Panopticon since it is accepted as an architectural machine which generates homogeneous effects of power. What makes Panopticon so effective on exercising power on individuals is the visibility. In the architectural form of Panopticon, it is ensured that every moment the individuals are exposed to invisible observation. In other words, Panopticon is like an apparatus of power that provides visibility for institutions to observe individuals everywhere by a centralized and unseen observer. Individuals who are being exposed to such observation are individualized in their own spaces. These individuals are unable to see their observers and in the meantime, they have consciousness and feeling of being watched all the time. This feeling which the individual sense is the automatic function of power. The individual would find difficult to act freely as if there were an observer all the time (Smart, 2002: 83-84).

The aim of this study is to analyze the concept of space and investigate the theory of power and the effects of power over the characters and the cultures in which they live in through the plays of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, *End Game*, and Ferhan Şensoy's *Good Riddance Godot*. The study will also investigate how the characters in the plays are affected from the dominant figure of panopticism. In the first and the second chapters, Michael Foucault's aforementioned theories and Samuel Beckett and Ferhan Şensoy are studied in detail. In order to investigate the aforementioned topics, the following research questions are addressed:

1. Is the concept of space reflected in the plays of Samuel Beckett and Ferhan Şensoy?
2. Are the characters in the plays of Beckett and Şensoy affected by the theory of power?
3. Are the characters in the plays affected by the dominant figure of panopticism?

Chapter II introduces Michel Foucault, and his philosophy briefly. In order to investigate Foucault's ideas on space, power and panopticism, there is a need to

analyze the writer himself. Space according to Foucault is discussed and one of his articles, which is related to theme of this thesis, is scrutinized. The terms, which Foucault uses, utopia and heterotopia connected to space are introduced, and how these terms take part in social lives are discussed. After examining his thoughts about space and mainly heterotopias in social life, the idea of space in plays is studied. Foucault's theory of power is explained and how he approaches power is discussed. Related to theory of power from Foucault's point of view, Bentham's prison model, 'Panopticon' is presented and the terminology 'panopticism' that occur in social life is viewed.

Chapter III carries the information about the Theatre of the Absurd since the plays that are examined in this thesis are absurd plays. Industrial revolution influenced the way individuals viewed the world. This more mechanized world was destroying their common decency, common sense and common values. The spiritual chaos induced by the loss of these values created a void which was then filled with material goods. These new materialistic self centered individuals lived mostly in urban areas. In the cities, people lost their consciousness and self awareness and started to live in a mass becoming passive and insignificant in their societies (İpşiroğlu, 1996: 15). The results of both World Wars played a significant roles on people's losing their hopes and beliefs. In this chaotic atmosphere, the Theatre of the Absurd became the voice of the society and the collective consciousness of the individuals. It demonstrated the psychological conditions of the people, who found themselves observing the terror of the World War II witnessing the atomic bomb, Hitler, mass deaths and the destruction of the cities. What was destroyed was not only the cities but also the hope and future dreams of the people. People were no longer feeling fear but they were in a state of anxiety and depression. Under such terrible and chaotic circumstances, the Theatre of the Absurd became the protesting scream of art (Şener, 1991:354).

The Theatre of the Absurd reflects the reality of the conditions of the modern human being. The bare picture of the individual and their confusion in the face of this chaotic atmosphere is portrayed on the stage of the absurd theatre. Samuel Beckett was aware of the fact that people were in a dilemma and questioning their existence, and he made his works become the voice of human kind. Beckett was the writer of rebellious humanity who both were the precious and irreplaceable members of the social structure and were doomed to an inevitable end. Samuel Beckett was the voice of people of rebellious dilemma (Yüksel, 2006: 18-19). Chapter III introduces Samuel Beckett and

his literary style. Beckett's use of language and how he adopted the absurd style of dialogues into his works is also taken into consideration. His first play *Waiting for Godot* and his second play *Endgame* are introduced and the background information about the plays is shared. When and under what conditions the plays first staged were viewed and one of the important question about the first play who Godot is studied. In this chapter plot summary of the plays *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot* are given to the readers to remind them the essential details of the plays in order to illuminate the analysis made.

Miodrag Bulatovic and his play *Godot has Arrived* is viewed in this chapter. A rough overview of the play *Godot has Arrived* is important and essential since *Godot has Arrived* fits like a passage between Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and Şensoy's *Good Riddance Godot*. In the first play, the characters Vladimir and Estragon are waiting for Godot endlessly and at the end of the play he never comes. In Bulatovic's play *Godot has Arrived* Godot is intruded as a human being. In this three act play it is witnessed that Godot has a bad personality and he is actually a person who is not worth to wait for. Ferhan Şensoy after reading the play *Godot has Arrived* writes *Good Riddance Godot* where Godot is quite like Bulatovic's Godot not worth waiting nor likeable. In short Bulatovic's *Godot has Arrived* is a kind of bridge between *Waiting for Godot* and *Good Riddance Godot*.

The playwright of the third play that is studied in the thesis, Ferhan Şensoy, is presented. His brief biography, his writing style and the innovations he brought to Turkish theatre are enumerated. Traditional Turkish Theatre, in other words Ortaoyunu, is also introduced in this chapter. The reason to talk about Ortaoyunu and its historical background in detail is to realize and perceive the cultural information about Turkish theatre, the characteristics of it and establish familiarity with the characters that take place in Ortaoyunu. The information about Ortaoyunu provides a better understanding about Ferhan Şensoy. Şensoy is the representative of Ortaoyunu in Turkey as a playwright and as an actor. He reflects the society in his plays using dramatic tools of Ortaoyunu. *Good Riddance Godot* exemplifies this fact thoroughly.

Chapter IV addresses the research questions and carries the discussion forward into analysis of the aforementioned plays. Space, power and panopticism through Foucault's point of view are studied comparatively in all of the plays. This chapter begins with the concept of space for both playwrights; how they view and reflect the

concept of space in their works are examined. Detailed analysis with discussion of the concept of space is examined in all three plays. The six principles of heterotopias of Foucault are studied in the plays in detail. Power in the plays is examined in the light of Foucault's point of view. The question "is there a power relationship among the characters in the plays" is examined and how the characters are affected by power is analyzed and discussed. The characters in all the plays are compared through the effect of power they experience. Finally, the effect of panopticism is studied and the manners of the characters against panopticism is examined.

The final chapter traces the answers to the research questions. The questions are answered and explained in this chapter and the answers that are found in the plays shed light to the societies that the plays belong to. One of the purpose of the art of theatre is to reflect individuals in the society as they are. The characters in the plays in the scope of space power and panopticon and what happens to them within these parameters reveals not only the individuals' manners in which they react and adjust their actions but reflects how the societies they live in –and where the plays belong – are shaped through these characters as a whole.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In one of his interviews, Foucault points out that he believes that space is significant element to form any communal life; moreover, it is also essential for power to be exercised. When the issue is the space, heterotopias are the fundamental topic to be taken into consideration. Heterotopias are the singular spaces that can be found in any social space. Their functions are different from each other, even sometimes opposite of others (Rabinow, 1984: 252). Space is a crucial fact for exercising power and power is everywhere. Power embraces everything but it is not an institution nor a structure. Foucault considers that power is just a 'complex strategic situation' as a 'multiplicity of force relations' and it is intentional and nonsubjective (Foucault, 1978:93). Panopticon is an architectural figure and it is an apparatus of power. It is regarded as a laboratory of power, which generates homogenous impacts of power (Smart, 2002:82). The mentioned concepts, space, power and panopticism are scrutinized below.

2.1. Michel Foucault and the Concept of Space

Michel Foucault was born in France and lived between the years of 1926 and 1984. After having his early education in local schools and after at a Catholic school where he received his bachelor's degree, he continued his education at Sorbonne. He studied philosophy and received his degree in philosophy. Due to some academic and political considerations Foucault changed his field of study and received another degree in psychology. Short after having psychology license he acquired a diploma in psychopathology in order to conduct research on the field and mental illnesses. His research on psychopathology and mental illnesses helped him to write his book, "Mental Illness and Psychology". The following years see Foucault as a successful academic and a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Clermont-Ferrand.

In later years, Foucault was regarded as provocative thinker and theorist, renowned and criticized and sometimes misrepresented. However, Taylor, (2011:1) claims that

Foucault was not a systematic thinker; rather he was an experimenter. Foucault also considers himself an experimenter not a theorist and he states that;

“Each new work profoundly changes the terms of thinking which I had reached with the previous work. In this sense I consider myself more an experimenter than a theorist; I don’t develop deductive systems to apply uniformly in different fields of research. When I write, I do it above all to change myself and not to think the same as before” (Foucault, 1991:27).

As an experimenter Foucault continued his research and had various essays on “madness and reason”, power and knowledge” relations and more work on human sciences. Some important figures and their works such as George Dumezil’s analyses of discourse, George Canguilhem’s distinctive approach to the history of science and the study of Jean Hyppolite on Hegel played great role on Foucault’s intellectual formation along with whole generation of thinkers like Althusser, Deleuze and Derrida (Foucault, 1981: 73-74). They were like mentors and teachers to Foucault and he reflected this influence on French intellectual life. Moreover, some other important key figures and structures had great influences on Foucault’s works such as Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche. To Foucault they were the leaders who have introduced new social interpretations and consequently introduced the idea of new hermeneutics, in other words a new order of interpretation.

Foucault considers that Marx, Freud, and Nietzsche respectively, recognized the existence of relationship between power and knowledge. Marx recognized this relationship as a form of relation between forms of thought, ideas and economic power; as for Freud, it was conceived as relation of desire and knowledge; and lastly for Nietzsche will of power is the other way of expressing all forms of thoughts and knowledge. (Smart, 1985: 2-3)

2.1.1 Space according to Michel Foucault

The concept of power and knowledge slightly mentioned above will be discussed in detail in the following sections. Michel Foucault concerns about space. In one of his lectures and in his article *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias* Foucault describes the importance of space by giving various examples. In his article based on his lecture in Paris in March 1967, Foucault argues that the image and the concept of time have been perceived in various ways and he describes the importance of time and space. He points out that it is impossible to ignore the intersection of time with space. The space that people live in today is heterogeneous and in this space time and history

coexist at the same time. Foucault discusses that people do not live in a void where individuals and things can be placed, instead they live in set of relations. Foucault explains in his article that these relations establish places or sites.

“The space in which we live, which draws us out of ourselves, in which the erosion of our lives, our time and our history occurs, the space that claws and gnaws at us, is also, in itself, a heterogeneous space. In other words, we do not live in a kind of void, inside of which we could place individuals and things. We do not live inside a void that could be colored with diverse shades of light, we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another” (Foucault, 1986 :23).

From his point of view, it is possible to say that places in which people live are not like empty boxes; the space people live in has already been divided as set of relations. Yet, Foucault in his article is interested in the sites or the places that have the connection and their relations to all other sites. In other words, he is interested in spaces which are linked with all others; nevertheless, these spaces should be in contradiction with all other sites. In his article *Of Other Spaces* Michel Foucault focuses on those places and establishes two unique sites that are linked to other spaces as well as being in contradiction with them. He names these spaces as “utopias and heterotopias” (Foucault, 1986: 23; Leach, 1997: 321-322).

Utopias are the sites with no real places or in other words they are fundamentally unreal places. Utopias have general affiliation with the real space of society and this general relation can have both direct and inverted analogy with the sites of the society. Utopias introduce the people and the civilization either in a perfect norm or the society pictured upside down (Foucault, 1986 :24; Leach, 1997: 321-322).

As mentioned above a utopia is a perfect world and it is not possible for a society to achieve such condition and a place. Foucault concedes his thoughts about utopias as there are some other real places opposed to utopias which do not exist and these real places actually can be found in the thoughts and in founding of every society. He explains that;

“... real places which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted” (Foucault,1986 :24).

From these lines it is clear that Foucault is in agreement with the idea of utopias which have the concept of perfection surrounding the society in every aspect. Nevertheless, it is all known that realizing such perfect notion is impossible. People in the society

being aware of the impossibility of having such a perfect notion or place in their real lives might have the tendency to find such a perfect place in theatres, cinemas or even in the internet. It can be an escape from the physical reality for the people who seek utopias. This may be because people can be dissatisfied with their present circumstances or their ideals of seeking better places to have better lives, in short utopias. Foucault thinks that since it is impossible for one to find her/his utopia there may be an attempt to escape to other places which he names heterotopias.

Foucault expresses that heterotopias are part of every culture; however, they occur differently in different places and times. These heterotopias take varied forms and they do not have exact universal prevalent norm or models. He gives the definition and explanation of heterotopias as, “those singular spaces to be found in some given social spaces whose functions are different or even the opposite of others” (Rabinow, 1984:252). Foucault provides six principles to explain heterotopias that are applicable to real societies. These principles of heterotopias as Foucault lists them are as follows.

The first principle is that all cultures establish their own heterotopias and no universal heterotopia could be found in the world since they take varied forms. Nevertheless Foucault divides these heterotopias into two main categories and these categories are identified as heterotopia of crisis and deviation. Heterotopia of crisis refers to forbidden and sacred places which are kept and reserved for individuals in a position of crisis. Foucault exemplifies heterotopia of crises as adolescence, menstruating, pregnant women and he thinks that as the time flows and with the change of social norms the exemplified crisis of heterotopias will firmly and continuously disappear and few of the remnants would be found. Foucault here includes the site of a bride’s honeymoon trip and deflowering on a train or a honeymoon hotel and not in her own house. Nevertheless, Foucault indicates that many of the heterotopias of crises continuously disappear and are replaced by new ones. The replaced heterotopias are identified as heterotopias of deviation. These heterotopias refer to individuals whose behavior is deviant from the expected norms. Rest homes, psychiatric hospitals and prisons are some of the examples which Foucault identifies.

The second principle, put forth by Foucault, is that heterotopias may change and function differently within the society in different situations. Cemeteries are the given example by Foucault in his article *Of Other Spaces*. He states that cemeteries have always had an important role and have always existed by the churches located in the

center of the town within a location between the living and the death in the Western cultures. Cemeteries are spaces that have connections with all the sites of the town, city or the society. Until the 18th century cemeteries were in the heart of the towns yet there have been important changes in their status due to the growing of disbelief in immortality and growing concerns about hygiene. As a result they were removed from the centers from the beginning of the 19th century. In a time of changing beliefs in the society in the resurrection and immortality of the soul, people began to think that these were not relevant to the body's remains. Nevertheless, they started to pay attention to the dead bodies more since these were the only traces of their existence in this entire world. The idea about the dead has changed from the beginning of the nineteenth century. People began to consider the dead as risks to the well-being of the living. As the ideas about dead changed, the location of the cemeteries also changed from the heart of the town. The idea of a cemetery also changed from a sacred place to be visited to a family's dark resting place.

“The city of the death is the observe of the society of the living or rather than the observe, it is its image, its in temporal image. For the death have gone through the moment of change, and their monuments are the visible signs of the permanence of their city.” (Aries, 1974:74)

Foucault's ideas about the change of the heterotopias coincide with the thoughts of Aries who suggests that when a space creates a break in time, it becomes permanent.

The third principle introduced by Foucault is that heterotopias may take the form of inconsistent and paradoxical sites, in other words, heterotopias are able to combine several spaces that otherwise may not be able to exist together. Foucault states that, “The heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible” (Foucault, 1986: 25). Theatres, cinemas, and botanical gardens are identified as examples.

“Thus it is that the theatre brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another; thus it is that the cinema is a very odd rectangular room, at the end of which, on a two dimensional screen, one sees the projection of a three dimensional space” (Foucault, 1997:25).

The fourth principles of heterotopias are the ones linked together in a traditional time identifying spaces that represent both quasi-eternal places like museums or libraries and temporal places like fairgrounds. In other words, heterotopias are a kind of link between heterotopia and time. A heterotopia can disconnect an individual from her/his usual time. Foucault names this concept heterochronic. In this concept cemeteries are

highly heterotopic places since cemetery means a loss for a person and also means a kind of reminder of quasi-eternity, which can be identified as heterochronic. Museums and libraries are perfect examples of heterotopias within the concept of quasi-eternity. People have the desire of collecting the history in one single place where time stops opposing the actual world time that forever continues. Museums and libraries are the cultures of seventeenth century. In those times these places were the expression of individual choice. The idea of collecting things like the books in the libraries or objects belong to the history and to people's modernity. On the other side opposing to quasi-eternal heterotopias there are rather temporal like fairgrounds or vacation villages. Foucault states that two forms of the heterotopias meet in these concepts, and heterotopia of the festivals or eternity of accumulating time in a sense are the relatives of museums and libraries where one is able to abolish time. However, this is the time which is rediscovered as if reaching the entire history of humankind. In other words, vacation villages are an attempt to replicate life of the primitive cultures that have existed long ago in one short and limited intense period. (Johnson, 2006 : 79)

The fifth principle is that a heterotopia is in relation with other places. A heterotopia creates an imagery order and reason yet these are not freely accessible. One way to enter these heterotopias are either by compulsory means such as imprisonment or rituals and purification ceremonies like Scandinavian saunas and Moslem baths. On the contrary to such heterotopias there seems to be other heterotopias that have accessible openings; nonetheless, they remain an illusion. Individuals may allude themselves to be in these heterotopic sites yet they are excluded from them. Foucault gives an example of Brazil farms;

“I am thinking, for example, of the famous bedrooms that existed on the great farms of Brazil and elsewhere in South America. The entry door did not lead into the central room where the family lived, and every individual or traveler who came by had the right to open this door, to enter into the bedroom and to sleep there for a night. Now these bedrooms were such that the individual who went into them never had access to the family's quarter the visitor was absolutely the guest in transit, was not really the invited guest” (Foucault, 1986:28).

The sixth principle of the heterotopias is that they have a complete function of having a relation with the space that remains outside of them. This external function is characterized as unfolding between two extreme poles. They function in two different ways; they either create a space of illusion that present every single space of reality or they form and create a kind of space that is almost perfect and well-arranged as

opposed to the space where societies live. This is not a heterotopia of illusion but heterotopia of compensation. The American puritans and Jesuits of Paraguay and their aims of forming perfect societies are exemplified in the article *Of Other Spaces* (Foucault, 1986 :27).

The functions of utopia and heterotopia differ from one another except one. In the same article Foucault also describes a mixture of these two concepts in the example of a mirror. According to Foucault, a mirror is both utopia and heterotopia, since the mirror has evitable functions to be considered in the form of two.

“The mirror is, after all, a utopia, since it is a placeless place. In the mirror, I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent: such is the utopia of the mirror. But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy. From the standpoint of the mirror I discover my absence from the place where I am since I see myself over there. Starting from this gaze that is, as it were, directed toward me, from the ground of this virtual space that is on the other side of the glass, I came back toward myself and to reconstitute myself there where I am. The mirror functions as a heterotopia in this respect” (Foucault, 1986: 24).

In other words, the mirror is considered as utopia because it indicates a place that does not exist. Moreover, it is also a heterotopia since heterotopias are the places that exist and the mirror itself does exist. When looking in a mirror, one might observe her or his being there, in the mirror, yet one is not here. Nevertheless, one might also realize the absence of self being in the mirror, and the presence of one being in reality. The example of the mirror as utopia and heterotopia may be transferred into the stage of theatre. According to Foucault utopias are the places of perfection or the opposite. Heterotopias are the real places and can be found in every culture, they function differently, and they are able to combine several spaces which may be impossible to coexist otherwise. They function as separating one from her/his usual time and link between heterotopia and time, they create an imagery order and reason yet they are not freely accessible. Moreover, the heterotopias have a complete function of having a relation with the space that remains outside of them.

As Perenic, (2012 :265) points out the terminology of space in general does not only refer to spaces of geography in a narrow concept, but refers to one of the chief factors in literary culture’s distribution and dynamics. In the present study the concept of space will refer to the concept of space as used in the theatre and plays on stage.

From the point of this reference of space and theatre, the principles aforesaid in some sense describe some of the functions of the art of theatre. The plays on the stage pictures either a perfect world or a world upside down similar to Foucault's concept of utopia. Moreover, theatre compensates almost all the principles of heterotopia discussed above. The art of theatre can be found in every culture and it can function differently. On stage it is possible to combine several spaces which may be impossible to bond in the world. Plays on stage may separate and take the audiences from their real time and may create a link between heterotopia and time. Moreover, the audiences may find the relation between the created times on stage with the real time outside. What is more, the plays of theatre may have a perfect function of having a relation with the space that remains outside.

2.1.2 Space in theatre plays

The terminology "space" has been welcomed into the world of theatre from the beginning of 1970's. The wording "space" is started to be used instead of the terminology "site" with the modern theatre and with new changes in the concept of scenery and the setting of plays on stage (Karayel, 2010 :1). Site in general is used to define the place itself on stage; space however is considerably different from this physical and concrete place. The concept of space in theatre was born with modern theatre. The terminology of space is the result of a kind of new comprehension of the reconstruction of the theatre that deviated from the traditional borders of stage and found itself in search of new ways of communicating with the audiences (Çamurdan, 1994: 1). Artaud points out that theatre is born out of a kind of organized anarchy, and space in theatre is a systematically arranged forms in a certain space concept of disordered indicators in the universe and in the world (Artaud, 1958: 51).

In order to make the terminology "space" in theatre clearer it is quite essential to explain some of the different understandings about this concept. First of all, the location of the theatre building in the city, the architecture of it, the form and the style of its stage and the relationship of the theatre hall and the stage reflect the types of plays that are generally being staged. The versions of the stages differ from each other such as the Elizabethan and the Italian. Each version has its own characteristics like the size, the opportunities it provides to the players, and the number of entrance and exit halls. The important point here is that the version of the stage has a dominant effect

on the types of plays that can be staged just like the relationship between the theatre building and the plays since some theatre buildings may give clues about the type of the play. Another important indicator of the space is the setting on the stage. Setting is the whole equipment that enframes the action, architectural or pictorial. Beside those physical and concrete enframed stage forms there is the concept of stage space. To understand the terminology better it would be beneficial to determine the differences between stage place and stage space in meaning. Stage place is the site where the actors act on. The stage place is enframed with the setting, lighting and other accessories and it is concrete. Nevertheless, stage space is the indicator of the concrete place and covers all the equipment on it. Stage space and the audience space together form the theatre space. Brooks states that “I can take any empty space and call it a bare stage. A man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged” (Brooks, 1996:7).

This is the principle of the theatre; the audience and the players. Theatre space can be provided anywhere as long as there are audiences and the actors. In other words, theatre space is the activity place of the people in relationship. This is the role of the modern theatre and this theatre breaks up the borders of the stage and embrace the audiences as if they are a part of the play on stage. In this concept the theatre hall and the stage faces each other and this makes the audiences part of the action.

Ionesco places the concept of space in the characters and declares that space is endless within itself and awaits for an explorer to reveal the unknown spaces and worlds inside of the character since the space inside of one being displays parallelism with the psychological world of the character (Ertekin, 2009:353-354). In Ionesco’s plays, when the enclosed room setting in which the characters feel themselves imprisoned disappears the open space also starts to reflect the inner world of the character. Thus, the characters explore and reach the desired spaces which perfectly match their requests. The space forms itself through the inner selves of the characters in the play (Ertekin, 2009: 356-357 - Karayel, 2010 :1).

The main reason for characters exploring themselves inside and disappearing to the open spaces, and reflecting their inner worlds, is that in 1950’s the playwrights started to consider the space as a single element as an inevitable part of ones being. Space has found its dimension and started to reflect the personalities and the inner worlds of the

characters on stage (Ertekin, 2009 :356-362). It may be right to say that the space in theatre functions in two ways; space on the stage and space in characters.

Beckett started the use of other places as well as the stage as an option. He involves the theatre hall into the action and sometimes even places the hall in the middle of the action providing theatre space. A play on the stage reflects the concept of “now and here” and the place other than the stage in the theatre envelops the performance within time and reflects the theatre space. In other words, past and present affect the concept of “now and here”. Moreover, if the stage and the time of acting reflect “now and here” than it is possible to say that outside of the stage envelops the time of acting with the concept of time. This is the space that reflects stage and life combined (Karayel, 2010:1). This explanation may present an example for Foucault’s concept of heterotopias aforementioned in the previous section.

Foucault presents that heterotopias as combination of several spaces that might be impossible to coexist otherwise and says; “the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible” (Foucault, 1986: 25). According to Foucault’s principles and ideas the theatre is one of the heterotopias which links and combines the past and the present in a juxtaposing real place. As he puts it;

“Thus it is that the theatre brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another; thus it is that the cinema is a very odd rectangular room, at the end of which, on a two dimensional screen, one sees the projection of a three dimensional space” (Foucault, 1986 :25).

Moreover, using other places just as a stage Beckett creates and provides a bigger theatre space. By using outside of the stage, like the hall or the audience section, Beckett employs the present time in which the audiences breathe to envelop the time on the stage that the actors and actresses picture. This can be presented as an example of Foucault’s heterotopias of time. He thinks that heterotopias are a kind of link in time. Heterotopia functions as separating and disconnecting one from her/his usual time. Foucault named this concept heterochronic. By creating a bigger space through involving the places in a theatre building, Beckett links and combines the present time and the time in the play, in other words it is a kind of heterochronic matter for the audiences.

According to Foucault “space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power” (Rabinow, 1984:252). Foucault believes that space is an essential matter for the people who live altogether and space is also a cornerstone for any use of power. Rabinow in his interview with Foucault points out that when it comes to analyze a building in terms of its disciplinary function architects would tend to focus on the walls of the building. However, Foucault’s attitude would be to analyze it in terms of its space rather than its physical walls since he thinks that the walls are only one feature of the institution. Furthermore, Foucault believes that the space is an essential matter to conduct social relations within the community (Rabinow, 1984:253-255). As mentioned before, space in theatre functions as breaking the walls between the audiences and the stage in order to create new relationships with the theatre spectators. It is possible to say that space is the result of a new perception style of the theatre in search of new narrating techniques, in other words, space in theatre is an activity place where people are in relation with each other. This concept of space breaks the barriers between the audiences and the stage so that space provides a space for audiences to be involved in the play. (Çamurdan, 1994 :1). It can be said that the idea of Foucault’s space can be accepted as an essential matter to conduct social relations in between human beings in the society.

2.2. Theory of Power

In its general meaning power is usually perceived as the potential of a force or an agent to enforce and impose his/her orders over the will of the powerless. Moreover, it is also understood that power is a kind of act where the agent to imposes his/her ability to force the powerless to do the things that they do not wish to do. In other words, power is a kind of possession which is owned and controlled by those agents in power (Balan, 2013: 38).

Therefore, power is usually conceived as something that the powerful agents can easily realize their will over the will of powerless people, or forcing the powerless people to do things that they do not desire to do so. Power is also conceptualized as a possession which the powerful can use for their own domain and will over the powerless to control them while powerless try to avoid themselves from the undesired control of the powerful (Mills, 2003: 34-35).

One of the examples of strength of power over the powerless people to control them or to force them to act in an undesired manner would be the monarchy systems of the past. During the reign of kings and queens there was power which was held by the monarch. These monarchs were able to exercise power as they wished. They were able to control the power since it belongs to them. They believed and made people believe that their power was given by God. In later periods the idea of power has changed and the beliefs about power in people's mind shaped differently. The new belief pronounced that power belong to no one. The monarchs continued to reign; nevertheless, they no longer maintained the power in their monarchy and no longer exercised the control of power over the powerless. The execution of the kings like Charles I in 1649 by English Parliamentarians and Louis XVI in 1793 by the French revolutionaries demonstrated that people stopped believing the divine rights of the kings and that they were the representatives of God (Danaher, 2000: 70-71).

The belief that the monarchs were gifted by God and may reign and use their power with impunity may originally relate to the power of church during the Renaissance period. In the Renaissance episteme the world was considered as God's book and the power of church provoked the idea of this world view since the church itself held the power of dominating and controlling of writing, culture and the most importantly knowledge. This power of governing knowledge and culture lost its significance when the church lost its monopolizing power. Since many institutions and disciplines began to compete with each other to authorize and produce knowledge and truth. Nevertheless, none of the groups were able to talk in the name of God and their declarations were always open to the arguments. This caused institutions to negotiate with each other to gain support in order to have the control over people. In the modern age it is believed that power comes from the people since in democracies people elect their leaders. This electoral right seems to provide individuals with power (Danaher, 2000: 72). It may not be the case when the elected people become powerful in the mask of standing in for people or in the form of representing them. Danaher, (2000: 70) claims that power never stays in one's hands yet it moves around as the history reflects.

However, today many theorists think that power has changed its shape and its source. They believe that power today springs from the state institutions and flows down to the individuals. Althusser, the Marxist theorist, for example, mostly focuses on the oppression of people in front of the state institutions and shield themselves as

individuals against the inscrutable behavior and actions of an ideology. Althusser states that people are faced with one way traffic of power which runs from top to downwards and individuals are the puppets against the ideological and repressive authority. Althusser is also interested in how the State oppresses people and how ideology forms people as individuals. In his model individuals are deceived fools of ideological pressures. (Althusser, 1993: 4-14).

Other theorists like James Scott have questioned this power relationship from the point of view of powerful and the powerless constrained behavior. He thinks that when the powerful and the powerless are in relationship they are constrained in their behavior within the power relationship. He demonstrates that in their behavior to each other they may produce a master and slave relationship by the change of their linguistic manner within the presence of each other and when out of each other's presence they may act differently. In his work *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* James Scott exemplifies the situation and states that when the less powerful people are in the presence of their peers they start to mock the powerful person and invent funny nicknames and try to use every single opportunity to humiliate the powerful. On the other hand, in a similar social situation the powerful will complain to his peers about the difficulty to maintain a control on the less powerful. Scott suggests that there is a need to analyze the behavior of the powerful and powerless when they are with their equals. He thinks that when this is the case the powerless develop a 'hidden transcript' and he explains the action as "a critique of power spoken behind the back of the dominant" (Scott, 1990: xii). When analyzing the powerful and powerless the total relation of power and the hidden transcripts as well as the public performances should be taken in to consideration (Mills, 2003: 41).

2.2.1 Power according to Michel Foucault

Following a general explanation of power and the relation of powerful to the powerless, it is now necessary to introduce Foucault's idea and concept of power. In order to understand what Foucault tries to express when he talks about power, it would be beneficial to clarify the meaning of power in French language. The noun "pouvoir" is translated as "power" in English, yet this word has also the infinitive form of the verb meaning "to be able to", or commonly "can" in most Romance languages. The word "pouvoir" can also be explained as puissance or force. When reading Foucault

the word “pouvoir” must be realized in this dual sense; both “power” as English speakers use and in the meaning of potentiality or capability. According to Foucault “power” has a more complex meaning than the term “puissance” conveys. Foucault asserts that the “power” should not be taken in with its old monarchical form, as something one possesses over others. Foucault believes that “power” lives on culture and customs, institutions and individuals. Its effects can be seen in multiple ways; in other words, not simply negative or positive but also productive (Feder, 2011: 55-56).

Some theorists believe that the power relations emerge from the powerful people or mostly from state institutions. According to Foucault power is not an element that is controlled and used by people, either by individuals or groups, yet it is rather a complex process and is a set of relations between different groups and areas of society which continuously change due to circumstances and time (Danaher, 2000: 87). Mills (2003: 34-38) argues that the notion of the individual is problematic for Foucault, yet she states that the operation of power can be most clearly seen in the relationship between the individual and the institution. Foucault in his many works aimed to analyze the effects of different institutions on individuals and on society and the behaviors of those people and affirming and resisting ways to those effects. Foucault’s central concern to these effects related to the institutions is power. Foucault believes that power is something that people and the institutions embrace and that power is mostly related to oppression and constraint (Mills, 2003: 50).

As stated in the previous section power is considered as something that the powerful develop a kind of force over the powerless to persuade to do things and act according to their own will without questioning the desires of powerless. In other words, powerful agents or powerful people use their power to control the powerless people. At the same time powerless people try to avoid this undesired power. Contrary to this idea, Foucault thinks that power is not a possession but rather it is a kind of strategy and something that can be performed (Foucault, 1978: 9-16).

As the given example in the previous section clarifies the force and potential of power in the past was exercised during the reign of the kings and queens. The monarchs were able to exercise the power according to their wishes. On the contrary, Foucault believes that power is not an element that can either be held by, or belongs to, anybody. Danaher, (2000: 70) proves the idea with his statement that in the present day the place of power is evacuated and now it belongs to no one.

Foucault considers power as not something to be owned but rather something that demonstrates itself in a more strategic way than a possession as stated below:

“Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application” (Foucault in Fontana & Pasquino, 1980: 98).

Foucault in this quotation stresses that power is conceived as something that functions like a chain or acts like a net. What he means is that power is an organization of relations that has penetrated the whole society but not the kind of relationship between the oppressed and the oppressor. Moreover, the individuals should not be considered as the recipients of power, yet they should be idealized as a place where power is performed and a place in which it is resisted. In his model Foucault means that both power and the individual play an equal role in the power relations. In other words, not only power itself but also the individual takes part in the power relations. Individuals can either be subjected to oppression or can actively take place in the relations with others and the institutions. (Mills, 2003: 35)

Foucault also stresses that power is employed and practiced in a net like organization, in other words, power is never set and settled in certain places. Power can surge and proceed very quickly from one area to another. This flow of power from one point to another depends on the circumstances of the atmosphere. In other words, relations of power are not set in stone and cannot be tied up in some certain place (Danaher, 2000: 71). The power of politicians and their use of power has been briefly explained in the previous section. Even though the groups or the institutions act like they are the representatives of the people, their opportunity to hold power in their hands may be quite impossible. Foucault points out that people can keep power no longer than the politicians or rich business people. This may spring from the fact that, as Foucault claims, power cannot be held in one certain domination for long (Danaher, 2000: 73).

Moreover, Foucault considers that power is not something that the institutions own and possess and also use oppressively against individuals and the groups, namely against society. He makes his analysis of power from different perspectives, and views

power from a different standpoint. Foucault regards power as obvious and straightforward oppression of the powerless by the powerful, focusing to analyze how this oppression is being operated in daily interactions between people and institutions (Foucault, 1978: 17-28). As it is stressed before power does not belong to anyone and it is spread throughout social institutions. Power is operated in daily disciplines and the individuals are subjected to it in the daily routines. Teachers and the students can be given as an example to power practice in an institution. The teacher exercises power over the students and moreover, the school administration has many countless ways of governing the behaviors of the students. The teacher holds the power in the classroom and is also a subject who is forced to follow certain rules and daily disciplines. Both teachers and students are the members of the same institution. They both follow the same path while being observed to become docile individuals. If it is considered how much time is allowed and spent making the school children to sit still and force to have good handwriting, it would then be understood how power on individuals can be effective. Foucault perceives this power as decentralized and depersonalized (Leitch 2001:1618).

Foucault claims that individuals in society should stop considering power as a kind of oppression only, since he believes that oppressive methods and assessments do not only mean repression and censorship but they also mean being productive. He believes that under oppression one may find new solutions and new behaviors (Foucault, 1978: 7-18). Foucault believes that power is something co-extensive with society; it regulates and is thoroughly pervasive (Seisun, 2004: 3). He claims that “power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives” (Brochier, 1980: 39).

As it can be seen Foucault does not view power as negative, he examines it rather from a different perspective and argues that oppressive measures are in fact productive and they happen to give rise to new forms of behavior instead of stopping or censoring certain forms of behavior (Foucault, 1978: 86-90).

Earlier Marxist theorists mostly were concerned with focusing on oppression; nevertheless, unlike those theorists Foucault rather was interested in foregrounding resistance to power. In other words, he is less concerned with oppressive features of power but more with the resistance of individuals to power (Mills, 2003: 33-34; Balan,

2013: 2). Foucault in his work *The History of Sexuality* in 'Volume I' states that "where there is power there is resistance" (Foucault, 1978:95). This statement can be interpreted as the relationship between those struggling against power and not only the master and slave relationship. Power itself may create a resistance towards it and this resistance reveals a power and resistance relationship. In other words, when there is power to be exercised there has to be someone to resist it. Moreover, Foucault believes that when there is no one to resist or no resistance then there is no power at all (Mills, 2003: 40).

As aforementioned in the previous section many other theorists believe that power finds its source and its power from state institutions. Marxist theorist Althusser especially worked over the concept of power that state institutions and the buildings utilize over the powerless people who see themselves only individuals against the inscrutable behavior and actions of the ideology. Althusser believes that individuals are faced with one way traffic of power that flows from top downwards. As it is the case, individuals begin to feel themselves like puppets against this ideological and repressive system. This one way traffic of power oppresses people and the ideology of the traffic forms them as individuals (Althusser, 1993:4-14). On the other hand, Foucault proposes an alternative ideal named "bottom-up model" and in his model power relations permeate and dissipate in all relations in the society. His bottom-up model of power enables him to create a model of everyday manners in which power is enacted and exerted, and allows an analysis centered on individuals as an active subjects. This liberates individuals from being deceived as fools or being an ordinary object of power (Mills, 2003: 73). Through Foucault's model of power one can conclude that power is a system and a kind of network relations embracing the whole society yet not an only model of relations between the oppressed and the oppressor. Moreover, in his model individuals are not just the objects of power but they are venues, or places where the power and the resistance to it are exerted (Balan, 2013: 2). In other words, Foucault idealizes power as something of a strategy and something which one does or perform in specific context instead of possessing it. Power should be acknowledged as something that has to be performed regularly rather than an achievement. Foucault states that power is spread over every single area of the society rather than being located in one certain institution. He argues that power relations are

everywhere, in many forms, in multiple ways even in institutions and administrations as quoted in,

“When I speak of power relations, of the forms of rationality which can rule and regulate them, I am not referring to Power - with a capital P - dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body. In fact, there are power relations. They are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or within an institution, or an administration...”
(Foucault, 1990; 38).

Foucault argues that it is not simple and easy to observe these power relations in the society and his concern is that these power relations are hidden. These power relations may be the most hidden ones in the social structure and the essential thing is to find out what is most hidden in the power relations and to discover and direct them in a social act (Foucault, 1990: 119). It can be understood from his ideas that he is appertaining to find the local forms of power and how they are in negotiation with individuals and other agencies. Before Foucault, Marxist theorists located power in the center of impersonal institutions like the army and the police force, on the other hand, Foucault in his model of power relations became interested in local forms of power (Mills, 2003: 36). The idea of local power relations have influenced many feminist theorists, for instance Judith Butler was inspired by the model and she has tried to develop relationships forms between gender and power. In developing her model she was concerned and hoped that the gender identity was something that one should perform in particular situations, not something that one possessed (Butler, 1999: 84-90).

Foucault’s viewing power is certainly different and contrary to the ideas of Marxist and early feminist theorists. They idealized power as a form of oppression and repression and Foucault names this term as ‘repressive hypothesis’; therefore, he analyzes power as something productive (Foucault, 1978:84-88; Mills, 2003: 33-40). Power may have power to shape the individual to have forms of behavior in different situations instead of constraining the individuals.

2.2.2. Panopticism and power

Power cannot be perceived as something which can divide the society into two as dominators and dominated. It is accepted by many theorists that power can be an intolerable and repressive agent in the society; nevertheless, it is said to be creative as well. Power can be an effectuation agent that helps one’s cultural and social

circumstances. Foucault pictures how power is established in society and how it is embodied in cultural and social institutions (Seisun, 2004:3-8). Foucault in his work *Discipline and Punishment* makes deep analysis of this mentioned embodiment of power in institutions while illustrating architectural presentations of Bentham's model of panopticon. Foucault in his works states that architectural apparatus can be used as a kind of machine to create and maintain a power relation in the society making individuals to perceive that the mechanism of this power relationship works independent of a person who operates it (Foucault, 1995: 199-210). Similarly, Leach suggests that the mechanism Foucault illustrates is the architectural form of panopticon and this constitute helps to form a social control in society (Leach, 1999: 120).

In order to make the Bentham's model of panopticon clear it would be beneficial to give description of this architectural work. The panopticon architectural system is designed by British philosopher Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century. It is an idealized architectural form mainly designed for a range of institutions involving factories, schools, military barracks and prisons. In prison architecture panopticon became the most beneficial and influential of all forms to provide its management (Davies, 2004: 1-3).

Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* pictures Panopticon architectural design in detail and explains that there is an annular building at the periphery and there is a tower with wide windows at the center. These windows open onto the inner side of the annular building. The peripheral building has cells which extends the whole width of the building. The cells have two windows; one facing the tower window and the other one facing outside to allow the light into the cell from one end to the other to be observed all the time. By the effect of backlighting one can observe all the cells from the tower by standing out against the light (Foucault, 1995: 200-201). The light pervading into the cell makes the panopticon different from old time prisons like dungeons. The prisoners would be kept in the light instead of the dark. Foucault states that "... the back lights enables one to pick out from the central tower the little captive silhouettes in the ring of cells. In short the principle of the dungeon is reversed; daylight and the overseer's gaze captures the inmate more effectively than darkness, which afforded after all a sort of protection" (Barou & Perrot, 1980: 147). In dungeons the prisoners were mostly removed from sight of the authorities, on the other hand, the Panopticon provided complete vision and the prisoners became the potential targets of the

authority's gaze every moment of the day (Danaher, 2000:54). Relatively, what makes panopticon unique is that the prisoners would never be sure whether they are being watched or not since the architectural design would not provide them with the ability to see the inside of the tower. Moreover, Panopticon provides prisoners to stay in light different from old time dark dungeons. As a matter of fact, the prisoners staying in light would never know whether they are being watched or not. They would be in dark in another sense. (Davies, 2004: 2).

Mills, (2003: 43-45) points out Foucault's idea that a new form of internalized disciplinary exercising models or disciplinary ways develop through particular way of organizing the spatial arrangements of factories, prisons or schools to enable to make maximum level of observation. She quotes that "one is forced to act as if one is constantly being surveyed even when one is not. Thus, this form of spatial arrangement entails a particular form of power relation and restriction of behaviors" (Mills, 2003:45). Similarly, Barry Smart states that "the power exercised through hierarchical surveillance is not a possession or a property, rather it has the character of a machine or apparatus through which power is produced and individuals are distributed in a permanent and continuous field" (Smart, 1985:81). A person who is in a place like Panopticon and having the disciplinary constraints all the time would be expected to internalize the disciplinary gaze as Foucault points out, "He who is subjected to a field of visibility and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection" (Foucault, 1991:202-203). This form of power exercised by powerful authorities over the powerless without physical torture on the bodies would seem more effective. The powerless individual would start to play different roles. The oppressor or the security guard in the tower might be absent; yet the prisoner would continue to act and behave as the way he was expected to since he would have already internalized the behavioral code of the system or the oppressor. In other words, the prisoner would behave as if he is still being watched by the oppressor (Mills, 2003: 46).

Feder, (2011: 60) states that the architecture of panoptic model Bentham posited "Panopticism" functions in two ways. The first one is to circulate power just as in the example of the prison and the second one is to produce knowledge. Foucault considers the panopticon as a laboratory and a privileged place to carry on experiments on men

and to analyze the outcomes of this mechanism over them. Foucault's formulation of the term "power/knowledge" is derived from this idea. Foucault states that "...the panopticon was also a laboratory; it could be used as a machine to carry out experiments to alter behavior, to train or correct individuals" (Foucault, 1995: 203). As stated above he also considers the panopticon as a place in which one can make analysis on men and he says, "The Panopticon is a privileged place for experiments on men, and for analyzing with complete certainty the transformations that may be obtained from them" (ibid.:204). Moreover, Foucault stresses that,

"The Panopticon functions as a kind of laboratory of power. Thanks to its mechanisms of observation, it gains in efficiency and in the ability to penetrate into men's behavior; knowledge follows the advances of power, discovering new objects of knowledge over all the surfaces on which power is exercised" (ibid.:204).

Wood points out that the Panopticon is a permanent structure because of its powerful function over individuals and the opportunities it offers to the authorities. Therefore it can be generalized. In other words, the Panopticon actually can be built everywhere to accomplish generalized discipline in the society (Wood, 2007:248).

In order to comprehend how Foucault uses the term knowledge in his works, it is necessary to examine the French language. The English knowledge translates into French either as *connaissance* or *savoir*. Therefore, Foucault uses the term knowledge in two different meanings and connotations. Foucault is concerned about how a specific kind of implicit knowledge "*savoir*" can shape the explicit knowledge "*connaissance*". (Feder, 2011:55). In French the word "*savoir*" means the kind of knowledge which can be derived from the books. In other words it is a kind of encyclopedic knowledge and it can be acquired through books. "*Savoir*" consists of concepts, methods, and theories. When "*savoir*" is experienced and interiorized then it becomes "*connaissance*". This kind of knowledge can be acquired through experiences, and through life it is enhanced (L'edifice, 2009:1). Similarly, in Foucault's work *The Archaeology of Knowledge* French meaning of knowledge is also explained and is stated as "*connaissance*" referring to a particular corpus of knowledge, in a particular discipline- biology or economics, for example. *Savoir*, on the other hand, is usually defined as knowledge in general, the totality of *connaissance*'s. Foucault states that, "by *connaissance* I mean the relation of the subject to the object and the formal rules that govern it. *Savoir* refers to the conditions that are necessary in a particular period for this or that type of object to be given to

connaissance and for this or that enunciation to be formulated” (Foucault, 1972:15) Foucault suggests that these two words, “savoir” and “connaissance” must be distinguished from one another. In his works, he prefers to focus on the word “savoir” to talk about knowledge. Therefore, through this work the word knowledge will be used in Foucault’s sense.

Foucault makes a strong connection between power and knowledge. Berry Smart points out that knowledge is extremely and inextricably entangled with the concept of power. Moreover, the progress in knowledge and the progress in the exercise of power are associated with each other. Foucault believes that “there is no disinterested knowledge; knowledge and power are mutually and inextricably interdependent. A site where power is exercised is also a place at which knowledge is produced” (Smart, 2003: 58). It is clearly seen that knowledge and power are inextricably linked to each other. To quote Foucault, “ ...there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (Foucault, 1995: 27).

Foucault thinks and describes knowledge as being a conjunction of power relations (Fontana & Pasquino, 1980: 122-123), relatively he argues that “it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power” (Brochier: 1980: 52). Foucault in this quotation emphasizes that the knowledge itself is not separate and detached from power but rather it is an integral part of struggles over it. He also affirms that in producing knowledge one would need to gain power. In short, power and knowledge are the elements that depend on one another (Mills, 2003: 69).

Horrocks (2006: 120) quotes that “prisons are major industries of power/knowledge”, and continuous as “Carceral society and its sciences, such as psychiatry, psychology and even sociology ensure that the judges of normality are everywhere”. A suitable mechanism for the judges the Panopticon becomes the mechanism to control knowledge and power; in his works *Madness and Civilization*, *The Birth of the Clinic* and *History of Madness* Foucault presents particular historical connections between knowledge and power bearing on the body. In *Birth of the Clinic* he states that when the power is obtained by enlightened classes or intellectual circles, they wish to restore knowledge to protect the social order and individual lives (Foucault, 2003:81). Similarly, the destructive force of power is exemplified in *Madness and Civilization*.

The authorities, or as he puts, the directors control the power not only in the hospitals but throughout the city of Paris. It is stated that they have all the power of direction, of administration, of police, of correction and punishment, of knowledge over individuals (Foucault, 1988:40). The Panopticon power is also emphasized in *History of Madness* as the prisons and asylums are contradictory places used for punishing and generating criminals, as well as liberating and morally imprisoning the mad. Generating docile individuals in these institutions would be the main intention (Foucault, 2006: 53-55, 271, and 317). Power and knowledge can be the control mechanisms of the Panopticon, since these two are strongly interwoven to each other. Foucault talks about power and knowledge relation as follows

“... that knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended and that knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands and its interests...we should admit rather that power produces knowledge.... That power and knowledge directly imply one another” (Foucault, 1995:27).

Foucault was also interested in the scale and continuity of the exercise of power. He believed that this continuity of exercising power needs deep knowledge of detail. Foucault wanted to find out the differences between infrequent exercises of destructive forces like the military occupations or public executions and the imposing and continuing practices of discipline and training (Rouse, 2005: 2). The first type of destructive forces are the massive ones, on the other hand, the second one can be categorized into the Panopticon way of training. As it is said, both forces involve knowledge about objects. Foucault asserts that

“... there was the scale of the control: it was a question not of treating the body, en masse, ‘wholesale’, as if it were an indissociable unity, but of forgetting it ‘retail’ individually; of exercising upon it a subtle coercion, of obtaining holds upon it at the level of the mechanism itself – movements, gestures, attitudes, rapidity: an infinitesimal power over the active body” (Foucault, 1995: 136-137).

It is clear that through discipline and training the authority can produce new gestures, habits, actions and skills, in other words new type of people for society. In order to produce such samples knowledge is needed. Foucault (1995: 190) states that in a good medical discipline the authority should integrate individual data into a cumulative systems and should keep them in safe to have the detail and necessary knowledge about them. The more knowledge about individuals can mean the more power for authorities to practice on them. These types of documentation and surveillance make people knowable and known. Moreover, these forms of knowledge can provide opportunities

for authorities to presuppose individuals' actions. A wider and more extensive knowledge enable more continuous and permeating control over people. Foucault was aware of these staged continuous techniques of power and knowledge relationship. These two initially instituted in order to neutralize and control the forthcoming dangerous social elements. At the very beginning they were advanced into the isolated intuitions including prisons, hospitals or factories, yet were adopted into many other institutions step by step (Rouse, 2005: 4). Foucault names this act as 'swarming' of disciplinary mechanisms and associates this kind of discipline with Panopticism.

“While on the one hand, the disciplinary establishments increase their mechanisms have a certain tendency to become "de-institutionalized," to emerge from the closed fortresses in which they once functioned and to circulate in a "free" state; the massive, compact disciplines are broken down into flexible methods of control, which may be transferred and adapted... therefore one can speak of the formation of a disciplinary society in this movement that stretches from the enclosed disciplines, a sort of social "quarantine," to an indefinitely generalizable mechanism of 'panopticism'" (Foucault, 1995: 211-216)

The Panopticon presents fundamental notions for the society like power, power/knowledge and discipline. The machine or the system Panopticon illustrates clear and obvious discipline surveillance in controlling effort over individuals. In other words, the aim of the Panopticon is to individualize the body to become docile through continuous isolation and observation, so that the body can reach the norms of the allowed behavior of the authority. This surveillance is one of the most important concepts of the Panopticon, yet the surveillance does not only belong to the prisons but also to institutions in our modern era. Within the mechanism of Panopticon knowledge is the standardization and ideological motivation for the institutions and power is the main cause of their existence. Power produces and generates knowledge and knowledge in same way produces and generates power. The power of surveillance makes the power/knowledge work as a disciplinary force, since the surveillance supports the control; otherwise, there would be no control mechanism. This observing control mechanism creates standard and obedient individuals. In other words, the institutions became the factories that produce individuals who become integrated in the knowledge system of the mechanism. (Seisun, 2004: 5)

If the gaze and surveillance is ignored, the order, the individualization, and rationalization of the space of the prison would be ineffective. Similarly, if the knowledge system and the social norms of the institution is ignored or not respected,

the public space order and rationalizing would be ineffective. Institutions are important places since they are the shelters of power/knowledge. Nevertheless, apart from institutions there is one more shelter for power/knowledge today, and it is called the “public space” (Seisun, 2004: 5-9). Power and knowledge relations can be spread out to the public spaces from the institutions. It can be stated that public space and the physical networks can function like the institutions today. Public space is the other way of institutionalizing the social body and individuals. Today Panopticon functions identical to public space (Foucault, 1986: 23).

In public space surveillance and isolation exercise in different forms but have the same effect as the Panopticon system. Knowledge is still the ultimate modifier of the social body in public space. Public space forms its power from knowledge. Within the public space surveillance is the most essential part of Foucault’s concept of power. Knowledge is the main element that generates discipline in the social structure and on individuals. In other words, in today’s modern city structure the properties of Panopticon including standardization, regulation and the surveillance are transcended into the society. The public space generates individuals to become functional and docile within power/knowledge dynamics. In the cities the surveillance of the crowds to normalize the individuals cannot be as effective as the surveillance of the individual. The individual can never stay away from the surveillance of other individuals in public space in the cities. The behavior of the individual is always under surveillance just like in the Panopticon. In public space the generators and the authorities prefer to stay invisible whereas the individuals who work under the authorities become the most visible objects. In other words, Foucault thinks that the working classes are the objects of power because they are visible (Seisun, 2004: 12). Foucault viewed and interpreted the universities within the concept of the Panopticon (Timur, 2005:71).

Horrocks, (1997: 120) points out that surveillance and observation are the main issues in social life and now everywhere. Classified into the institutions a doctor, teacher or a foreman can observe and spy on others and penetrate their behavior. It is a panopticon in public space. Individuals are located in space and they are in relation with each other. The subjects in space would never know when they are being watched. This uncertainty would cause them to police themselves.

Foucault considers that there is a great similarity between the birth of modernism and birth of prisons. According to him modernism was a kind of period which turned the

individuals into the disciplined society. During this period the punishments became moderate, generalized and the rules of authorities controlled every space in the society. Foucault associates the Panopticon with public space discipline in the society (Timur, 2005: 68)



3. THE THEATRE OF THE ABSURD AND TURKISH TRADITIONAL THEATRE

The aim of this study is to analyze the concept of space and investigate the theory of power and the effects of power and panopticism over the characters in the plays of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, *End Game*, and Ferhan Şensoy's *Good Riddance Godot*. Therefore, it is beneficial to explore The Theatre of Absurd and Traditional Turkish Theatre as well as mentioned playwrights. The exploration of the Theatre of the Absurd and Traditional Turkish Theatre may clearly reflect the circumstances of the characters in the plays within their cultural environment.

3.1. The Theatre of the Absurd

The art of theatre is defined as one of the oldest and one of the most social arts in the world. Because it is the oldest, the traditional form of this art still continues as it was, and because it is the most social one, it changes as the society it reflects changes throughout the years. Hamlet defines the universal aim of the theatre in his famous words;

“... whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure.” (Hamlet, III.ii.67-68).

As Shakespeare pointed out in the words of Prince Hamlet the theatre is in continuous change to reflect and to follow the change of the society. In time being the theatre has changed in language, in setting, in types and in genres (Çapan, 1992; 9-10). One of the genres of the theatre is the Theatre of the Absurd.

Esslin, (1983: 23) states that the word “absurd” originally means ‘out of harmony’ in a musical setting. He also gives the dictionary definition of the absurd as “out of harmony with reason or propriety, incongruous, unreasonable, and illogical.” (Esslin, 1983; 23). In Cambridge Dictionary the word absurd is defined as ‘stupid, unreasonable, silly in humorous way’ (Cambridge, 2008). The common semantic

usage of absurd in the society is ‘unreasonable, silly or ridiculous’ as the dictionaries define; nevertheless, it is not the meaning that should come to mind when the topic is the theatre of absurd. Ionesco defines his way of understanding of the concept absurd as; “Absurd is that which is devoid of purpose. . . . Cut off from his religious, metaphysical, and transcendental roots, man is lost; all his actions become senseless, absurd, useless” (Quoted in Esslin, 1983; 23). Therefore, the Theatre of the Absurd is more than the theatre of ridiculous and something silly as the dictionaries interpret it to be.

The roots of the Theatre of the Absurd dates back to Alfred Jerry’s play ‘*Ubu the King*’ considered to be the pioneer of the French surrealism. The purpose of the Theatre of the Absurd is to astonish, annoy and give pain to the audiences. The purpose and characteristics of the Theatre of the Absurd is quite similar to Antonin Artaud’s way of thinking stated in the previous chapter as “theatre is born out of a kind of organized anarchy...” (Artaud, 1958: 51). In other words, the Theatre of the Absurd in some sense is under the influence of Antonin Artaud. The Theatre of the Absurd was born in France and became popular in United States and in other European countries. Samuel Beckett, Eugene Ionesco, Jean Genet, Herold Pinter and Edward Albee are some and the most important playwrights who wrote many plays and became the pioneers of the Theatre of the Absurd (Şener, 1991: 351).

It is essential to remember that the word ‘absurd’ is a gift from Albert Camus. By this word, he reflected the meaninglessness of life and his own alienation in the world (Ersevîm, 1968: 36-40). Moreover, Camus used the word to identify men who is aware of the fact that everything around is meaningless and everything in the world is contrarian to logic and intelligence (Şener, 1991:354). On the other hand, the term ‘the Theatre of Absurd’ is invented by Martin Esslin to refer to the literary works of American and European playwrights and dramatists in the years of 1950s and early 1960s (Esslin, 1983:19-28). Esslin defined the term the ‘Theatre of the Absurd’ in the lights of Camus’ ideas and came up with explanation such as ‘ the drama of metaphysical pain of nonsensical condition of human being’. Esslin introduced how this metaphysical pain of nonsensical condition of men is reflected in the plays of Ionesco, Beckett, Genet, Pinter and Albee (Şener, 1991:354). These playwrights and dramatists in their work generally dwelled on pessimistic view of humanity where men is anxious and hopelessly trying to control his fate. In the plays the Theatre of the

Absurd is typically characterized by illogical actions, meaningless dialogues and unrealistic plots. However, it is beneficial to keep in mind that the Theatre of the Absurd does not refer to absurd plays with absurd characters who behave absurdly on the stage. As mentioned above it is the designation given by Martin Esslin. This dramatic genre emerged after the Second World War partly in reaction to the philosophical systems which dominates the political systems of the world (Hornby, 2015: 1).

In 1942, Albert Camus had questioned the behavior of humankind in the sense of their pessimism in life. It was just after the Second World War and people of the age had started to lose their hope and future expectations. Similarly, in the thoughts of Existentialism human being think that life is aimless in this absurd and chaotic world. In this very situation Camus questioned why humankind should not seek an escape from this meaningless world and commit suicide since life had lost all its meaning. In *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Camus exemplified this chaotic life and tried to draw attention to human condition which is considered to be absurd and aimless (Esslin, 1983:19-28). For a crime against Gods, Sisyphus was condemned in Tartarus to an eternity of rolling a rock uphill then watching it roll back down again. Sisyphus continuously repeats the act of carrying the rock even though knowing that it will roll down the hill. Similarly, human beings continue to live in this chaotic world even though they are aware of the fact that there is no aim in life and no order in the universe; moreover, there is an inevitable death at the end (Şener, 1991: 352-353).

Camus detailed the circumstance of the period and the human condition as;

“A world that can be explained even with bad reasons is a familiar world. But, on the other hand, in a universe suddenly divested of illusions and lights, man feels an alien, a stranger. His exile is without remedy since he is deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land. This divorce between man and this life, the actor and his setting, is properly the feeling of absurdity. All healthy men having thought of their own suicide, it can be seen, without further explanation, that there is a direct connection between this feeling and the longing for death” (Camus, 1991:6).

Camus was an Existentialist philosopher and it would be beneficial to discuss Existentialism to discover and understand the term Absurd intensively. As it can be clearly seen from the quotation, according to Existentialism, mankind does not really understand the meaning of well-ordered universe. Everything in this universe is coincidental and aimless. Human being finds herself/himself in an ultimate chaos. It is impossible to explain and define the world with reason. What men all know is that

she/he is a being in this world. Human beings define their own meaning in life, and try to make rational decisions even though living in an irrational universe. There is no God or no transcendent force, hence the only way to counter this nothingness and to find the meaning in life is to embrace existence. The characteristics of this being was not formed beforehand. It is wrong to believe that men were born with certain characteristics and these characteristics guide men in life. Individuals are entirely free and everyone must consider their own responsibility. In other words, freedom and making decisions are fundamental in a world of absurd condition of humanity where suffering and inevitable death is everywhere. Camus believed that there comes an absurdity when individual's desire of order collides with the real world's lack of order (Şener, 1991: 352 & Mastin, 2008: 1).

Many famous playwrights like Samuel Beckett, Eugene Ionesco, Arthur Adamov, Jean Genet and Herold Pinter focused on this metaphysical suffering and produced many works. Many other philosophers and playwrights like Sartre and Camus had focused on similar topics such as, senselessness of life, the inevitable devaluation of ideals, purity and purpose. Nevertheless, these philosophers and playwrights differ from the dramatists of the Absurd in an important respect. While the dramatists of Theatre of the Absurd endeavor to express the sense of senselessness of the human condition and the insufficiency of the rational approach by the abandonment of rational devices and discursive thought, the other writers and philosophers present their ideas of the irrationality of the human condition in the form of perspicuous and logically constructed reasoning. Camus and Sartre indicate and demonstrate the new content in the old traditional custom, on the other hand, the Theatre of the Absurd aims to find a unity between its basic assumptions and the form in which these are expressed (Esslin, 1983: 23-24).

In other words, Theatre of the Absurd realizes the world and the reality not in logical, in invariable order and harmony but in a kind of chaos which cannot be defined and/or explained. The Theatre of the Absurd recognizes that this absurdity could be staged only if all the traditional order and harmony is broken. The Theatre of the Absurd regulates and makes illogical arrangements on the structure and the language texture of the play. The principles and the rules of the Theatre of the Absurd are not clearly defined. Each playwright and each director has his/her own style. That is why the Theatre of the Absurd is still considered to be 'avant-garde'. Even though the Theatre

of the Absurd has no certain rules and the principles, it is the voice of society and its collective consciousness on stage. It reflects the psychological mood of the ones who witnessed the terrors of the World War II. People of the time had found themselves in a hopeless world. They were paralyzed in front of the horrible terror and terrifying powers. The atomic bomb, Hitler, mass deaths and destruction of the cities created terrifying feelings in societies. The feeling of fear left its place to anxiety and depression. The hope for a better future and a better world to live in had disappeared, and acceptance of irrecoverable destruction was welcomed. Now humankind started to feel themselves as an eternal exile in this entire world (Şener, 1991: 351-355).

The true picture of man in his forever confusion has been pictured and staged in the Theatre of the Absurd. Life is portrayed in its eventual, bare and absolute reality. Humankind is stripped of their uncalculated and unaccepted qualities of their social position and then confronted with her/his basic choices and basic structures of the existence. Humankind has started to wait and wait in between the unavoidable facts of birth and death. The Theatre of the Absurd has a precious purpose to make the audience be fully aware of their mysterious and risky place in the world (Lacey, 1968:1-4).

The Theatre of the Absurd is the reflection of discrepancies and contradictions on the stage. The characters in the Theatre of the Absurd do not belong to anywhere, they are like thrown into world. In other words, they do not belong to the environment that they were thrown into. The dialogues are free from cause and effect relation and mostly meaningless. To talk about the frame of the plot is quite impossible since there is no dramatic progress in the plays (Güçbilmez, 2003:96). Hence the play is usually short and the theme is simple to convey. Declaring that the humankind is nothing in a nothing world is the main goal of the Theatre of the Absurd and it does not need more than two acts on the stage. One or two acts can be sufficient for the audience who might prefer not to stay and listen. The audience of the twentieth century does not favor to hear others' persistent cries of ambiguity. The Theatre of the Absurd forces the audience to think and question since the conclusions it draws are not the happy ones. According to the absurd playwright, the world has completely collapsed. Communication becomes impossible day by day. Identity exists on driving license and on passports. What if the driving license or the passport is lost? The answer is given in the Theatre of the Absurd and the situation clear; 'only nothingness exists' (Lacey, 1968:4-7).

The individual is the center concept of the Theatre of the Absurd. The plays intend to examine and to characterize the individual intensely. The playwright reflects his own imagery and his vision onto the stage. As mentioned before Absurdist plays mirror the tragicomic lives of the individuals who live alone in a crowd of people. Usually, the weakness of the characters towards life and their sufferings as well as their struggles in taking part in the society as individuals are the main issues reflected by the playwrights on stage. Individuals become alienated from themselves first and thus start to lose their personalities. This causes and creates introverted and lonely individuals who cut all their ties from the outside world because living in an environment where suffering from lack of communication becomes unbearable. When there is no communication among people in the society, there would be more absurd people who suffer from loneliness. Absurdist dramatists think that the solid indicator of non-communicative society is the loss of the language as means of communication among people (Yıldız, 2009:9-13).

The Theatre of the Absurd is not interested in expressing information or destinies of the characters or presenting their problems. It is also not concerned with the presentation of events, the adventures of the characters or description of the fate. Instead the Theatre of the Absurd embraces the presentation of one individual's basic situation. Therefore, it is the theatre of situation and it is against to the theatre of events. Under this circumstances The Theatre of the Absurd prefers not to use argumentative and discursive speech but a language based on patterns of concrete images. It aims to present a sense of being not to solve any problems. The Theatre of the Absurd reflects the inner world of the playwright; therefore, it lacks objectively lifelike characters. It cannot demonstrate the conflicts of dispositions of the characters or cannot present human passions stucked in conflicts. The action in the play of The Theatre of the Absurd aims to communicate a pattern of poetic images not to tell a story in order to communicate some social lessons. For example, in '*Waiting for Godot*' things happen; yet what happens there do not generate a story or a plot. What happens in the play is the image of Beckett's perception of 'nothing really ever happens in man's existence'. '*Waiting for Godot*' is a play which is a complex poetic image constituted of a complicated form of subordinate images and themes. The reason for that is to make audience to awaken the complex impression of a static and basic situation (Esslin, 1983: 403-404).

In the period of meaningless and Godless Second World War world people had started to lose their hope and absurd plays started to reflect the reality. The Theatre of the Absurd openly rebelled against the Conventional Theatre. Unlike the Conventional Theatre, the Theatre of the Absurd aimed to startle the audience and shook them out of their comfortable life routines. Audiences faced with something surreal, illogical, conflictless and plotless form. Because of this war and distracting life conditions the language as a means of communication is gained new form. It is possible to say that one of the most important features of the Theatre of the Absurd is the distrust of language as a means of communication. In the meantime, language has become an instrument of conventionalized, stereotyped, meaningless exchanges. Words people utter has failed to express the essence of human experience. People mostly use the cliché patterns of greeting words and tend to talk about the most usual and common conversational topics and pretend that they are having real communication among themselves. Language has lost its identity as communicative device. To make people aware of this very fact, ridicules, conventionalized and stereotyped speech patterns appear in the Theatre of the Absurd. By expressing such language patterns the playwrights try to make people be aware of the possibility of going beyond everyday speech conventions and have them talk more authentically. They realize that conventionalized speech acts and patterns are barriers among people. In order to reach the essence of the communication, it is essential to discredit and abandon the false supporters of the language. In order to reveal the fact of aforementioned non-communicative society, the playwrights of the Theatre of the Absurd deconstruct the language and new communication devices have been created. Using body in acting and the objects become the newly created communication devices. Plays without words or with minimum use of words have become the favor of the playwrights of the Theatre of the Absurd. On the other hand, use of objects become more important than language in Absurd Theatre. What happens on stage transcends and becomes more significant and it often contradicts with the words of the characters on stage. The hidden and implied meaning of words have primary importance in absurd theatre. This became more effective and important than what is actually being said. The Theatre of the Absurd endeavors to communicate in an unresolved totality of perception. As it is the case, it had to go beyond language (Ahmed, 2015:2). It is quite necessary to stress on an issue that because the Theatre of the Absurd distrusts language, it should not be assumed that language has lost its allure. The element of language still plays an

important role in communication and in the Absurd plays; however, the act itself on the stage surpasses language. As mentioned before, often enough the acting contradicts with the spoken words which the characters utter. One of Ionesco's play '*the Chairs*' can be an example to the issue. The play is a poetic one; nevertheless; the beauty and the effectiveness of the play does not lie in the words but in the moment of ever-growing number of empty chairs (Esslin, 1983: 26).

Eugene Ionesco was misunderstood by a play critic after his plays '*The Chairs*' and '*The Lesson*' staged at the Royal Court. In the play he was thought to be said that speech in communication was useless and communication among people is impossible. The critic, Kenneth Tynan, printed his ideas as "... Here was a writer ready to declare that words were meaningless and that all communication between human beings was impossible" (Esslin, 1983:128). The critic also speculated that Eugene Ionesco was moving away from realism with his characters and events in his plays. Eugene Ionesco, in other words, was accused of being anti-realist. Nevertheless, Eugene Ionesco protested against this accusation and strongly rejected that he was anti-realist. He tried to express himself and stated that he was not an anti-realist writer and he did not mean that the communication in words is impossible. He said that "it is difficult to make oneself understood, not absolutely impossible" (Quoted in Esslin, 1983:128-129).

The general aim of the Theatre of the Absurd is to demonstrate that the world itself is an absurd place to live in and unfortunately there is no humanistic structure for the individuals in this world. It also aims to show that what controls the individual is not the logic but the id of the subconscious. The Theatre of the Absurd desires individuals stop deceiving themselves and achieve the awareness of the absurdity. The audience sharing the time with the characters on the stage will face with their own reality and would start to think on the real meaning of life they live in (Şener, 1991: 351-353).

A well-known real life example might help to understand how individuals' question themselves after watching an absurd play. In 1957 November, a group of actors were waiting to meet the audience on the stage yet they were worried since the audience were not the usual one. The actors were about to play Samuel Beckett's well known play *Waiting for Godot*. They were not sure how the audience would react since the play was staged in the San Quentin Prison. The audience were the prisoners. There has been no live performance of a play in this prison since 1913. After 34 years both parties

were excited and the actors were rather worried. They were worried since wherever they had played this intellectual play, it has produced riots among the sophisticated audience. Now they were about to come onto the stage in front of the toughest audience. After the curtain parted the play began. What happened was that the prisoners were highly effected by the play just like the highly sophisticated audiences in other countries. The next day there was a striking column in San Quentin newspaper about the play;

“The trio of muscle-men, biceps overflowing... parked all 642 lbs on the aisle and waited for the girls and funny stuff. When this didn't appear they audibly fumed and audibly decided to wait until the house lights dimmed before escaping. They made one error. They listened and looked two minutes too long- and stayed. Left at the end. All shook...” (Esslin, 1983:20-21).

The Theatre of the Absurd accepts and presents man as a being (Şener, 1991: 354-363). Life of human being is full of suffering, cruelty and it is dangerous. Living in such an environment, people lose themselves in it. People in such conditions start to feel lonely, scared and insecure. Feeling no one to trust in the society, man begins to feel that life is empty and useless. Gradually, they get used to living in such an environment and the feelings this environment induce in them. At the end, this emptiness become the true essence of their daily routines. Living in such a state of absurdity and isolation occupies their mind and lives. The Theatre of the Absurd then becomes the voice of the reality of life in a depressing society. In this cheerless society people are tired, obscure and aimless. The Theatre of the Absurd is the product of modern society. People in this society are not aware of the real meaning of their lives or the destination of their lives (Zhu, 2013:1464-1466). The playwrights have followed different tones and unique ways to express the feelings of the society, yet they produce and share some common features in their plays that need further discussion.

3.1.1. Meaninglessness of human condition

It is a fact that man is mortal. Being aware of the end and trying hard in this limited life is meaningless. There is great irony between the passions of men and their fatal destiny. Realizing this irony makes one to understand that the behavior of men is meaningless. Moreover, the universe is chaotic. Reason cannot find its place in the order of this Universe. It is meaningless to try to establish order for man to live in this world. It is a deception to think that life has meaning. An example to this meaninglessness of life can be seen in *Waiting for Godot*. There are two characters in the play and the

meaning of their lives is endless waiting. They cannot figure out why and what they are waiting for. Their life is meaningless in this endless waiting atmosphere (Şener,1991: 355).

- ESTRAGON** : I'm not a historian.
- VLADIMIR** : Wait . . . we embraced . . . we were happy . . . happy . . . what do we do now that we're happy . . . go on waiting . . . waiting . . . let me think . . . it's coming . . . go on waiting . . . now that we're happy . . . let me see . . . ah!
The tree!
- ESTRAGON** : The tree?
- VLADIMIR** : Do you not remember?
- ESTRAGON** : I'm tired.
- VLADIMIR** : Look at it. They look at the tree.
- ESTRAGON** : I see nothing. (Beckett, 2006: 57, Act II)

They question; nevertheless, they cannot find the essence of the human existence. They live in a real world but it is meaningless. In this meaningless world their lives are absurd. The playwrights of the Theatre of the Absurd express their ideas and feelings about this world by means of the protagonists of their plays. It is widely accepted that a theatre play is a kind of a mirror that reflects the real phenomena in the society, the chaos and the meaninglessness (Zhu, 2013:1464-1466; Şener, 1991: 355)

3.1.2. Lack of communication, alienation, dehumanization

Individuals communicate with each other mostly when necessary, and this communication occurs rather in a cold and harsh manner. Because of this, people prefer not to communicate with each other. So there is no real communication among people. Speech is not a communication device anymore; it is only way of chattering. In conversations, there is often contradiction between the words and the meaning. That is why speaking aloud do not give the true meaning. This is the reason why people would prefer to stop communicate and start to live in their isolated worlds. This state becomes a chain reaction among people and it grows like a snowball. On the other hand, the most dangerous snowball is the one which grows in people's heart. This snowball in the heart causes loneliness and isolation. The Theatre of the Absurd

reflects this very loneliness of the individual on stage through avoidance of the written language and canalizing on visual narration (Zhu, 2013:1464-1466; Şener, 1991: 355). Men become alienated in the society. Social relationship is perished because of oppression of totalitarian regime and its mass exterminations. Men, in the society, do not trust others and do not feel safe anymore. It is an age of mistrust and insecurity. Because of selfishness and fright in their hearts, people are afraid that the ones in higher social status would laugh and look down on them. So they chose to hide themselves from rest of the society. The desires and pursuits they have are left aside in their hearts even though they have rights to voice them out loud. Moreover; tyranny and despotism rule the social relationships. Despotism in the society also causes men to become isolated individuals. The playwrights of Absurd feel that people suffer in this chaotic world. This suffering lasts as long as they live. So they have to endure this meaningless and chaotic world from cradle to grave. In ‘Waiting for Godot’ Vladimir and Estragon seem to be good friends; however, the way they behave on stage indicates that they are in fact isolated and unconcerned. They cannot give any warmth and provide comfort to each other. They communicate with each other only with few words without much feeling and concern.

ESTRAGON : Nothing.

VLADIMIR : Show me.

ESTRAGON : There's nothing to show.

VLADIMIR : Try and put it on again.

ESTRAGON : (*examining his foot*). I'll air it for a bit. (Beckett, 2006: 3, Act I)

This insensitivity and the condition of apathy causes people to feel lonely and helpless. The Theatre of the Absurd reflects the condition of the people on the stage (Zhu, 2013:1464-1466; Şener, 1991: 355).

3.1.3. Anti-theatre (drama), anti-play, anti-character

The writers of the Theatre of the Absurd prefer to ignore the most features of the traditional forms of European theatre (Şener, 1991: 356-357). One of the features of the traditional theatre is that the plot, the setting and the characters are clearly introduced. The play is arranged in a logical order. The audience can easily find themselves in the regular patterns and the logical order of the play. Sometimes, in

traditional plays, it is easy to guess the next move of the protagonists on stage according to their moods and the words they utter. Sometimes, the audience or the readers may find hints about what would happen next to deduce the plot. Such hints or the way the protagonist act on stage may give clues to the audience to guess the end of the play. These features can make traditional dramas easy and enjoyable to watch and/or read (Zhu, 2013: 1464). Eugene Ionesco also rejects the features of the traditional forms of European theatre and names his theatre as ‘anti-theatre’ and names his plays as ‘anti-plays’. He describes the process of writing his first play as follows;

“While writing the play (for it had become a kind of play or anti-play; that is, a parody of a play, a comedy of comedy) I felt sick, dizzy, nauseated. I had to interrupt my work from time to time and; wondering all the while what demon was prodding me on, lie down on my couch for fear of seeing my work sink into nothingness, and me with it.” (Quoted in Esslin, 1983: 138).

In anti-theatre, time and place do not take place in their logical form of daily lives. The features of the characters are not depicted and sometimes their names are not mentioned at all. The characters are created with curious and grotesque personalities which continue on stage from the beginning to the end. The characters on stage are created specially by the playwright to point out the hopelessness of life and to express the absurdity in society. In the Theatre of the Absurd, the absurdity in the society are shown by cartoonized characters. The playwright make them act in an unnatural and theatrical way. In traditional drama characters are shaped as they are to be and they behave suitable to their own personalities in common sense. Their language and their behaviors should be easy to understand and should be compatible with their personalities. The audience is able to follow and understand both the play and the characters easily. Nevertheless, the characters in an anti-play, the Theatre of the Absurd, are completely shaped and described by the playwright. In other words, the characters of an anti-play are not the logical ones that can be seen in a daily routine. Especially, the protagonists behave different and talk different. They talk to themselves repeatedly and their continuous meaningless monologues are interrupted by other characters. Most of the time, the sentences the protagonists utter are disordered. The monologues or the dialogues are different from the daily ones since there are no regular rules in their conversations. This may cause difficulty for audiences to understand the conversation on stage and catch the underlying meaning of the utterances (Zhu, 2013:1462-1463; Şener, 1991: 357-358; Esslin, 1983: 138-192).

There are no heroes or villains and no undifferentiated crowds in the Theatre of the Absurd. Instead there is a pair of individuals living together or otherwise coexisting. They have problems about their relationship with each other but they cannot even imagine living apart. The atmosphere they create is not hysterical but boring and frustrating. They are uneasy and anxious of something yet they do not rise an open revolt. They deal with their own business. The Absurdist world is full of strange happenings like two old couple live in garbage cans. This is strange and odd to the audience. It is not the reaction of the characters, they accept their bizarre state of existence because it is all they know. They are simple and ordinary people and they behave like one; however, the act actually is the reaction to this world. (Hornby, 2015: 4).

While creating a plot and the characters of a play, the playwright of the Theatre of the Absurd does not feel limited with formal structures, he is free in his thinking while writing an anti-play. Ionesco states that;

“Everything is permitted in the theatre: to bring characters to life, but also to materialize states of anxiety, inner presences. It is thus not only permitted, but advisable, to make the properties join in the action, to make objects live, to animate the décor, to make symbols concrete. Just as words are continued by gesture, action, mime, which, at the moment when words become inadequate, take their place, the material elements of the stage can in turn further intensify these” (Esslin, 1983: 191).

Actually, Ionesco is suggesting a different type of theatre and a different type of characterization than the common ones. His aim is to break the common theatre habits and routines of the theatre audience. In order to save the audience from common reactions, he suggests a different acting technique. For example, a comic text must be played solemnly and in a ceremonies manner, or in a dramatic text to prevent redundant sentimentality jokes are introduced. Ionesco asserts that cartoonizing on stage hurts more and comedy reflects the hopelessness more effectively. Ionesco unites the ordinary and the surprising, tragic and funny, verse and prose together. These contrasts create tension and a method of reflecting the life struggles and fear of death and meaningless anxiety of the individuals (Şener, 1991: 358).

Samuel Beckett created anti-hero image in his plays. These anti-heroes are staged as disabled, miserable, helpless, ignorant and non-believers. These heroes are completely different from the traditional image of heroes. These anti-heroes live in doubt and have nightmares all the time. They are hopeless and they do not even struggle to be free of

all these adverse feelings. They even do not have words to utter (Şener, 1991: 358). The characteristics of 'anti-character' and 'anti-play' can be seen in the play '*Waiting for Godot*'. The tramps, Vladimir and Estragon, are the protagonists of the play. From the beginning to the end of the play they talk continuously. The talking sometimes turn into monologues and sometimes into dialogues. They sometimes talk to themselves and sometime to each other. Their dialogues do not have any regularity and it is quite difficult for the audience or the reader to follow their conversation. They sometimes utter some words or some sentences that have no implications at all. There is no clue that reveals their personalities and their backgrounds. The audience do not have any information about their backgrounds, homes and families. All that is known is that there are two men on stage. The time period of their lives is not expressed. Compared to the traditional dramas, the protagonists in '*Waiting for Godot*' are extraordinary in personalities. It is a kind of illusion created by the playwright that they do not actually have any personalities; however, they are shaped with special personalities. The audience cannot guess what would happen at the end of the play. They even cannot be sure what these two tramps would say or do next. Throughout the play the actions and the dialogues of the two protagonists are not clear. There is one thing clear about the play, that is these two men are endlessly waiting and while waiting they are in endlessly talking. The essence of the play comes from the emptiness of the characters' hearts. The meaningless conversations they have and their senseless behavior reflect the meaning of human existence (Zhu, 2013: 1462).

3.1.4. Anti-language

Language and its use is an essential part of a literary work. Writers' styles and their power of using language in literary works differ and the use of language in literary work may indicate the type of the work. In traditional dramas the use of language is formed in a logical order. Audience or the reader of dramas can effortlessly follow the dialogues. One character asks a question and the other character gives the appropriate answer to this question. The given answer should or should not have to be true or false; nevertheless, it should be logical. The dialogues in traditional dramas follow each other in a coherent and consistent order. This makes the play easy to follow for the audience or the readers. On the other hand, there is no such logical order in the Theatre of the Absurd. There is no identical regularities in the use of language. The dialogues or monologues occur in a disorderly manner. The characters on stage speaks to

her/himself or to the other characters. This is what usually happens on stage, yet what the character says sometimes will not be the answer to the question that the other character has asked. Similarly, the dialogues do not follow each other in a logical order. The dialogues may occur and line up irrelevantly from one another. The audience may have difficulty to follow and understand the conversation on stage. In 'Waiting for Godot' for example, the characters talk about their waiting process and few minutes later they completely change the subject and start talking about something completely different (Zhu, 2013: 1463).

ESTRAGON : He should be here.
VLADIMIR : He didn't say for sure he'd come.
ESTRAGON : And if he doesn't come?
VLADIMIR : We'll come back tomorrow.
ESTRAGON : And then the day after tomorrow.
VLADIMIR : Possibly.
ESTRAGON : And so on.
VLADIMIR : The point is—
ESTRAGON : Until he comes.
VLADIMIR : You're merciless.
ESTRAGON : We came here yesterday.
VLADIMIR : Ah no, there you're mistaken.
ESTRAGON : What did we do yesterday?
VLADIMIR : What did we do yesterday?
ESTRAGON : Yes. (Beckett, 2006: 6-7, Act I)

In other words, in the Theatre of the Absurd, there is no logical regularity to obey the regular use of language. The words or the irrelevant dialogues or monologues may have deeper meaning inside; still, the pattern of language may not be logical. The audience would be lost in such dialogues and they find it difficult to follow the thoughts of the characters. When reading a play of the Theatre of the Absurd, understanding the thinking patterns of the characters is no more easier than watching the play. The dialogues in the text are not easy to follow. Just as the audience, the reader cannot guess what the next statement will be. The reason for that can be stated as, the language they use is irregular and unpredictable. The playwright of the Theatre of the Absurd does not follow ordinary sense and thinking patterns. Only the use of

common sense may help the audience or the reader discover and understand the characters (Zhu, 2013: 1463).

In the 'literary' theatre language is considered to be the predominant component. By contrast, in the 'anti-literary' theatre, in circus or in music halls, language is regarded as a subordinate constituent. The Theatre of the Absurd has power to use the language as only one constituent of its multidimensional poetic imagery. This power of using the language as only one constituent can sometimes be dominant and sometimes be submerged. The Theatre of the Absurd introduced a new dimension to the stage by making contrast between language of a scene and an action and reducing the language to meaningless pattern. Man in the street is now skeptical because of being exposed to attacks of mass media and advertisements. They are skeptical that what they are told in mass media and in advertisements can be actually not true. They become professionals to read between the lines to guess the reality of the language that conceals rather than it reveals. Using the superlatives all the time, advertising has succeeded to devalue language to a point where the words are beginning to be considered as meaningless components of language. There then becomes a great gap between language and reality. In other words, language appears to be more and more in contradiction to reality (Esslin, 1983: 406-409). Ionesco summarizes the views of Antonin Artaud and states that;

“As our knowledge becomes separated from life, our culture no longer contains ourselves (for only insignificant part of ourselves), for it forms a 'social' context into which we are not integrated, so the problem becomes that of bringing our life back into contact with our culture, making it a living culture once again. To achieve this, we shall first have to kill 'the respect for what is written down in black and white'... to break up our language so that it can be put together again in order to re-establish contact with 'the absolute', or as I should prefer to say, 'with multiple reality'; it is imperative to 'push human beings again towards seeing themselves as they really are.'” (Esslin, 1983: 409)

This is the actual reason why communication between men is demonstrated as in a state of breakdown in the Theatre of the Absurd. It is only a satirical exaggeration of the substantial state of affairs. Language, in this mass communication age, has lost its true meaning. It is to be reduced to its actual function. This function can be stated as the expression of authentic content, rather than concealment. It can only be provided if the reverence to the spoken and written language is restored and if living language can take place of the ossified clichés that dominate thinking (Esslin, 1983: 409).

3.2. Samuel Beckett

He has been known as Samuel Beckett yet his full name is Samuel Barclay Beckett. He lived between the years of 1906 and 1989. He was born in Dublin and just like Yeats, Wilde and Shaw he came from a prosperous Protestant Irish family. His early childhood years fell into the time of World War I. He had an almost had a “Quaker” education because of the family and the society pressure. However, in the later years he lost his faith. The religious education he had must have affected him deeply since Samuel Beckett alludes religion, faith, Jesus and his crucifixion in his works (Esslin, 1983: 29; Özgüven, 1998: 1).

At the age of fourteen Beckett started Portora Royal School at Enniskillen which was founded by James I. The school was one of the Anglo-Irishman traditional boarding school and was famous for many of its remarkable students like Oscar Wilde. During his school years, Samuel Beckett stood out among other students with his bright writing style which clearly revealed that he was a sensitive and tormented young man. He was not only successful in lessons but also was good at sports like cricket and rugger. After Portora Royal School he went on to Dublin University, Trinity College where he learnt French and Italian and received his Bachelor of Arts degree. He regularly went to Abbey Theatre during his University years, and the theatre became pivotal in his life as he remembers those theatre days in his novel *Murphy* as;

“In his last will and testament, Murphy... enjoins his heirs and executors to place his ashes in a paper bag and take them to the Abbey Theatre, Lr Abbey Street, Dublin... into what the great and good Lord Chesterfield calls the necessary house, where their happiest hours have been spent, on the right as one goes down in to the pit... and that the chain be there pulled upon them, if possible during the performance of a piece” (Esslin, 1983: 29).

He was such a remarkable student in academia that he was nominated to represent his school in Ecole Normale Superieure in Paris in a program of traditional exchange of lecturers. After a short period of teaching experience in Belfast, he went to Paris for two years as an English Lecturer. In Paris, he met James Joyce and found himself in his group and taking part in a book *Our Exagmination round his Factification for Incamination of work in Progress* as a writer when he was 23. He helped James Joyce to translate Joyce’s book *Anna Livia Plurabelle* into French under Joyce’s supervision. He won a literary prize for the best poem on the subject of time. His poem *Whoroscope* is about philosopher Descartes and his meditations on time, hens’ eggs and evanescence. In other words, the protagonist Rene Descartes waits for his morning

omelet of well-aged-eggs, while meditating on the obscurity of technological mysteries, the passage of time and approaching death. During his stay in Paris Beckett was under the influence of Joyce, Descartes, Schopenhauer and Berkeley. When Beckett was back to Dublin, he started to work at Trinity College as an assistant to a Professor of Romance Languages. There he received his Master of Arts degree; however, feeling that routine life is the cancer of time, he decided to leave the University and his routine life. He started writing poems, short stories and doing odd jobs. His collection of essays, *Proust*, and a poetry book Echo's *Bones and Other Precipitates* were published consecutively. He travelled to London, Paris and Germany. His first novel *Murphy* carries out deep traces of his life in London. It is no coincidence that Beckett's characters in his works are lonely tramps and wanderers. He later chose to live in Paris for several reasons. Paris was the city for arts. In Paris there were theatres and most importantly there were theatre audiences. It was possible to maintain an individual life in the crowd of people. (Esslin, 1983; 30-33; Özgüven, 1998: 2-4; Özbalak, 2012: 21-22).

Whenever Samuel Beckett was in Paris, he met Joyce. They both liked the pleasure of loneliness and they both were pessimistic; Beckett was pessimistic about the world and Joyce was pessimistic about himself. The conversations they had were short and mostly in questions and answers format. Richard Ellmann states in Ellis;

Beckett was addicted to silence, and so was Joyce; they engaged in conversations which consisted often in silences directed towards each other, both suffused with sadness, Beckett mostly for the world, Joyce mostly for himself...(Ellis, 1983: 34)

Beckett wrote his first play *Eleutheria* which was written in French and remained unpublished and unperformed. The play is about a young man and his efforts to stay away from his social obligations and his family. The play is in three acts. The stage is divided into two. On the right the young man lies in his bed, apathetic and passive, and on the left his family and his friends talk about the situation and about him without addressing the young man. In later acts, the action shifts from left to right. The young man gathers his energy to free himself from the chains and cut himself loose from the society. His novel *Murphy* and the play *Eleutheria* in some sense reflect the ideas of Samuel Beckett and his search for a life of his own in pursuit of freedom (Esslin, 1983: 34-35; Özgüven, 1998: 4).

Paris was a safe haven for Beckett to live in; nevertheless, in 1938, he was hospitalized from a stab onto his lung by an underworld character on the streets to whom he had refused to give money. After his wound had healed, Beckett went to the prison to see the man who had stabbed him. Beckett asked the reason why he had chosen and stabbed him. The man in prison answered “I don’t know, sir.” The words of the assailant were spoken by the messenger boy in *Waiting for Godot* and the man’s voice in *Molloy* (Esslin, 1983: 36; Özgüven, 1998: 4).

General consensus agrees that Samuel Beckett’s career as a novelist began with *Murphy* (Esslin, 1983: 34). The story depicts the protagonist’s inner struggle between his desires for his prostitute-mistress and for complete escape into the darkness of mind. The inner conflict dispersed when the protagonist is atomized by a gas explosion.

When World War II broke out, Beckett was in Ireland and he immediately travelled to Paris and stayed there since he was a citizen of Ireland and considered a neutral person. He soon joined the Resistance group and worked for them in dangerous environments. After some of the group members had been arrested, Beckett made his way to the unoccupied zone. Finding a place to live in, Beckett worked as a country laborer in a peasant’s house in Vaucluse where he wrote his second book *Watt* which portrays the futile search of Watt for understanding in the household Mr. Knott, who continually changes shapes. The place name, Vaucluse, takes place in the French version of *Waiting for Godot*. In the English version, the Vaucluse changes to ‘the Macon country’, the Cackon country. (Esslin, 1983: 36; Özgüven, 1998: 4; Özbalak: 2012: 22).

- ESTRAGON** : You and your landscapes! Tell me about the worms!
- VLADIMIR** : All the same, you can't tell me that this (*gesture*) bears any resemblance to . . . (*he hesitates*) . . . to the Macon country for example. You can't deny there's a big difference.
- ESTRAGON** : The Macon country! Who's talking to you about the Macon country?
- VLADIMIR** :But you were there yourself, in the Macon country.

ESTRAGON :No I was never in the Macon country! I've puked my puke of a life away here, I tell you! Here! In the Cackon country!

VLADIMIR :But we were there together, I could swear to it! Picking grapes for a man called . . . (*he snaps his fingers*) . . . can't think of the name of the man, at a place called . . . (*snaps his fingers*) . . . can't think of the name of the place, do you not remember? (Beckett, 2006; 52 Act II).

After the war, Beckett volunteered to work for the Irish Red Cross in St. Lo in Normandy and before returning to Paris, he spent some time as a storekeeper and an interpreter in a field hospital at Saint-Lo. Paris years after the war was the most productive for Samuel Beckett. In five years, he wrote the plays *Eleutheria*, *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame*, as well as an unpublished novel *Mercier at Camier*. He also wrote some stories under the cover of *Nouvelles et Textes pour Rien*, and he produced a major prose narrative trilogy, *Molloy*, *Melone Dies* and *the Unnamable*. He wrote these novels in French and subsequently translated them into English (Esslin, 1983: 37; Özgüven, 1998: 5; Özbalak: 2012: 22).

Samuel Beckett wrote all these masterpieces that proclaimed him fame in the literary scene in French. He declared that when he wrote in French it was easier to write without style (Özgüven, 1998: 5). He also announced that "...there were some things about himself that he did not like, that French had the right 'weakening' effect. It was the weakness he had chosen, as Melville's Bartleby 'preferred not to' live..."(Esslin, 1983: 38). It might be true that Beckett preferred not to use his mother tongue in order not to fall into the allusions and evocation of English. In other words, with the change of language Beckett escaped from everything with which he was familiar. When he was asked the reason of switching the languages, the answer he gave was,

"... an Irishman, French represented a form of weakness by comparison with the mother tongue. Besides, English because of its very richness holds out the temptation to rhetoric and virtuosity, which are merely words mirroring themselves complacently, narcissus-like. The relative asceticism of French seemed more appropriate to the expression of being, undeveloped and unsupported somewhere in the depths of the microcosm". (Carrière, 2005: 37)

Moreover, for Samuel Beckett writing in French was enjoyable since it was a different experience and process from writing in English. Writing in French provided him more control over his style. Thanks to French, Beckett could write in a radically different

style than that which he employed in English. French had a weakening effect on him. Moreover, in French, the hero in the story discovers his true accent and assumes universal significance. This achievement was doubly unique because it involves not only the use of French but also the painful process or retranslation into the author's native tongue. In writing French, Beckett makes his writings certain that they will remain in an eternal struggle and a painful wrestling with the spirit of language itself. That is why he considers his radio plays which were written in English as relaxation. (Carrière, 2005:37; Liukkonen, 2008: 15; Esslin, 1983:39; Yüksel, 2006: 41).

After writing *Murphy* and success of *Molloy*, *Waiting for Godot* was Beckett's real triumph (Özgüven, 1998: 5). The endless wait and the hope of two tramps, Vladimir and Estragon, is shown on stage, to fill the boredom while waiting the promised arrival of Godot they try to recall their past, tell jokes and talk about Godot. A bourgeois tyrant, Pozzo and his servant Lucky appear on the scene. Godot sends a message that he will come the next day not that day. During the waiting time, two men try to hang themselves and then announce their intention of leaving the place; nevertheless, they find no energy to go anywhere. Beckett might be trying to express that there is no meaning without being. Even the existence of Vladimir and Estragon is a question mark if there is no Godot. Without Godot, their purpose is lost and they try to commit suicide; nevertheless, it is made clear that the suicide is not a solution to their dilemma.

Beckett's second play was *Endgame* and this play develops one of Beckett's central themes men in mutual dependence. Two of the characters Hamm and Clov occupy a room with Negg and Nell who are in dustbins. *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* will be studied in detail in the following chapter.

The *Endgame* was in two acts originally but was reduced to one act and shared the stage with another shorter play of Beckett's *Act Without Words I*. In the second performance *Endgame* was coupled with his play *Krapp's Last Tape* written in English. The play is about an old man sitting in his room alone and at night he listens to the tape recordings. The recordings are from various periods of his past (Esslin, 1983: 41-42; Özgüven; 1998: 6).

In the last full length novel *How It Is* Beckett preferred to use plain and simple language. It is considered that with *How It Is* Beckett reached a new level of austerity" (Esslin, 1983: 41; Özgüven, 1998; 6). The novel is about lonely people in a mythical

universe crawling through the mud on their bellies. The protagonist crawls across the mud pulling a sack of canned food behind him. He passes another crawler and he tortures him with his speech. He is left alone and waits for another crawler to pass by him and torture him with speech in turn.

Beckett wrote for radio, theatre and television. His other staged plays *Happy Days* and *Play* mirror a gloomy and a darksome world. His miniature play *Come and Go* is few pages in length and staged in German in Berlin for the first time. It would be true to say that, the play *Come and Go* is a further step to conciseness. Beckett's interest in radio plays continued because he was always fascinated by the problems of technical world and the mass media. He also wrote *Words and Music*.

Samuel Beckett met the medium of cinema with a project for a film with Ionesco and Pinter contributing. The television play *Eh Joe* was performed in Germany and on the B.B.C. The medium of television became an essential source for Beckett and provided him every opportunity to show off his work. As he took an active role in actual production process, sometimes as a director, he had a chance to control the visual side of his work more directly. As a result, he was considered as the creator of movement and three-dimensional images rather than a dramatic poet (Esslin, 1983: 41-42; Özgüven, 1998: 6).

In 1969, Samuel Beckett was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. All through his life, Beckett preferred to live a secluded life and stayed elusive since keeping his privacy as ever. He preferred not to appear on radio or television programs nor did he accept interviews for newspapers about his work. He met his friends at the neighborhood café. He had the habit of drinking espresso accompanied with thin cigarettes. Beckett continued his silence even on his eightieth birthday celebration in New York and Paris (Liukkonen, 2008:4). When he was seventy-four years old, he pronounced that,

“I always thought old age would be a writer's best chance. Whenever I read the late work of Goethe or W. B. Yeats I had the impertinence to identify with it. Now my memory's gone, all the old fluency's disappeared. I don't write a single sentence without saying to myself, 'It's a lie!' So I know I was right. It's the best chance I've ever had.” (Shainberg, 1987:2).

Two years later, at the age of seventy-six, Beckett in Paris expressed the very same thoughts,

“It's a paradox, but with old age, the more the possibilities diminish, the better chance you have. With diminished concentration, loss of memory, obscured intelligence — what you, for example, might call 'brain damage' — the more chance there is for saying something closest to what one really is. Even though everything seems inexpressible, there remains the need to express. A child needs to make a sand castle even though it makes no sense. In old age, with only a few grains of sand one has the greatest possibility.” (Shainberg, 1987:2; Liukkonen, 2008:4)

Beckett spent his last years in home for the aged and passed away when he was eighty-three in December, 1989. Samuel Beckett had chosen a secluded life and had preferred not to talk about his work neither on television nor on radio (Yüksel, 2006: 15). He has lived and died just like the characters in his works.

3.2.1 Samuel Beckett's literary style

Samuel Beckett had his own writing style and he was unique in his plot structure, characters, tone, language and technique both in his novels and his plays. His method of approaching the problems of the society and life itself and interpreting the atmosphere of the age has made him unique. He is considered to be the “last modernist” and the first “postmodernist”. Beckett was a very productive writer since he produced many works and wrote poetry, novels, stories, theatre plays, radio and television plays, novellas and many essays. His literary life can be examined in three periods; from beginning to 1945 is the first, between 1945 to 1960 is the second and 1960 to the death is the third period (Özbalak, 2012: 23-25; Carriere, 2005: 15).

In the first period it is seen that the style is under the influence of James Joyce. Beckett had not created his own style yet. The language he preferred was English. He collected his poems in a book named *Echo's Bonos and Other Precipitates*. He wrote many short stories and collected them in his book *More Picks Than Kicks*. He wrote his first novel *Murphy* and during the Second World War II he wrote *Watt* and his essay *Proust*. The most important characteristics of his work in this period is that they carry traditional features of short stories and novels. In other words, the plot structure is traditional, the characters are many in number and their dialogues are meaningful. Moreover, there are descriptions, a certain chronological order and time line in his work and the writer is the narrator and he is omniscient. His paragraphs and dialogues follow the same pattern as in traditional novel style and syntactic rules. In his later years, many of those features had been minimized in his work and some of these features are eradicated.

His work became modest and plain in style (Özbalak, 2012: 24-25; Carriere, 2005: 15-16).

The second period was his productive years. He developed his unique style and created most famous work in the years between 1945 and 1960. He chose to write his works in French. He explains his opinion;

“It is indeed getting more and more difficult, even pointless, for me to write in formal English. And more and more my language appears to me like a veil which one has to tear apart in order to get to those things (or the nothingness) lying behind it.” (Josipovici, 2009:1).

He wrote a play *Eleutheria* which was never staged, and also wrote his well-known theatre plays *Waiting for Godot*, *End Game*, *Krapps Last Tape* and *Happy Days*. In these years he wrote radio plays and some novels such as; *Molloy*, *Malone Dies*, *The Unnamable*, and *Mercier et Camier*. In this period, readers met a different style in his work; language use and writing techniques were not traditional anymore as they were in the first period. The works are now placeless, timeless and there was no certain plot structure and no action. The narrator is now unknown; moreover, there are long and aporetic sentences and many interior monologues in his works (Özbalak, 2012: 26).

In the last period, he wrote many radio and television plays and stories. Examining his late years, he can be defined as a minimalist and simple. For example, one of his plays *Breath* lasts only 35 seconds and with no character at all. Another theatre play titled *Play* consist of three characters and in his play *Not I* there is only a mouth on stage (Özbalak, 2012: 31-32; Carriere, 2005: 16-19).

The characters he created were mostly old people trying to stay conscious and walk on the small path to death. The reason for this could be his mother and her unrecoverable and painful illness. Beckett was watching her mother die in Dublin. He reflected the human condition in life and their struggles through his characters. Beckett was highly affected from the World War II and he lived under the shadow of death and violence for some time. He spent part of his life fighting for the freedom of humanity. Beckett believed there was no significant evidence that the God was watching humanity. People in this wild word struggle to live under the harsh conditions of life and this life is the short period between birth and death. Beckett when writing about Proust quoted the famous Spanish dramatist and poet Pedro Calderon de la Barca “the greatest sin of man is to have been born”. Beckett adopted the meaning of this quotation into his life

and accepted it as his moral. These words have left their imprint in his entire life and his work (Yüksel, 2006: 28 - 30).

Beckett was born and lived in the 20th century which is considered to be the third 'golden age'. A time for mankind to run for space travel, start to have desires to be dominant over nature and making efforts for peace and welfare of humanity with the help of technology. He observed and distinguished the core facts behind the glitters of the 'golden age'. Beckett's works are the ironic products of the 'golden age'. In this 'golden age', technology and economic powers were used for oppressing mankind. Almost all the opportunities were employed to extinguish the human populace in the Second World War. Moreover, religion and philosophy remained incapable of interpreting the meaning of life and the value of human kind was brought down to minimum. Beckett was the writer of the rebellious humanity living in uneasy conditions and he was aware of the fact that human kind was in complete dilemma. On one hand, human kind is considered precious and an irreplaceable member of the social phenomenon and on the other, they are scudded towards the inevitable fact of death just like every creature in the world. Samuel Beckett was the voice of this rebellious dilemma of the human kind. In this rebellious dilemmatic atmosphere people start to generate meaning for life (Yüksel, 2006: 18-19). In the play, *End Game* Hamm and Clov start to feel that they generate meaning in the course of the play;

HAMM: We're not beginning to... to... mean something?

CLOV: Mean something! You and I, mean something! (*Brief laugh.*)
Ah that's a good one!

HAMM: I wonder. (*Pause.*) Imagine if a rational being came back to earth, wouldn't he be liable to get ideas into his head if he observed us long enough. (*Voice of rational being.*) Ah, good, now I see what it is, yes, now I understand what they're at!
(Beckett, 2009: 21)

In Hamm's words by saying "us" especially, Beckett stresses that not only the characters of the play but also the audience sitting in their seats in the theatre live in this creasy world (Yüksel, 2006:19). It would be possible to say that Beckett's works exemplifies the outside world clearly. In his work, the characters are felt trapped in some condition and they cannot leave the place and go away just like many people in

the society. The unseen pressure of the atmosphere bind them to the place where they are stuck

ESTRAGON : I'm going. (*He does not move*). (Beckett, 2006: 4, Act I)

...

ESTRAGON : I'm going.

VLADIMIR : Help me up first, then we'll go together.

ESTRAGON : You promise?

VLADIMIR : I swear it!

ESTRAGON : And we'll never come back?

VLADIMIR : Never!

ESTRAGON : We'll go to the Pyrenees.

VLADIMIR : Wherever you like.

ESTRAGON : I've always wanted to wander in the Pyrenees.

VLADIMIR : You'll wander in them.

ESTRAGON : (*recoiling*). Who farted?

VLADIMIR : Pozzo.

POZZO : Here! Here! Pity!

ESTRAGON : It's revolting!

VLADIMIR : Quick! Give me your hand!

ESTRAGON : I'm going. (*Pause. Louder.*) I'm going.

VLADIMIR : Well I suppose in the end I'll get up by myself. (*He tries, fails.*) In the fullness of time.

ESTRAGON : What's the matter with you?

VLADIMIR : Go to hell.

ESTRAGON : Are you staying there?

VLADIMIR : For the time being (Beckett, 2006: 74, Act II)

.....

ESTRAGON : I'm going.

VLADIMIR : So am I.

ESTRAGON : Was I long asleep?

VLADIMIR : I don't know. *Silence.*

ESTRAGON : Where shall we go?
VLADIMIR : Not far.
ESTRAGON : Oh yes, let's go far away from here.
VLADIMIR : We can't.
ESTRAGON : Why not?
VLADIMIR : We have to come back tomorrow (Beckett, 2006: 85, Act II)

Beckett read Dante's *Divine Comedy* during his school years and was deeply affected from the story of Belacqua who postponed his confession and regretting his sins so he was not allowed into limbo and was punished to live. His characters in Beckett's works reflect the struggle of Belacqua at limbo, between life and death, between meaninglessness and nothingness. The characters in their meaningless conversations and the meaningless act of waiting reflect the meaninglessness of the life. Beckett, in his works, tried to reason the existence of human kind as 'meaningful and purposeful'. In *Waiting for Godot* Vladimir's only concern is to have a meaningful and purposeful place in this barren world. Similarly, in *End Game* Hamm reflects the longing for 'meaningfulness and purposefulness' in their lives since Hamm is all aware of futility and absurdity of his life.

HAMM : I wonder. (*Pause.*) Imagine if a rational being came back to earth, wouldn't he be liable to get ideas into his head if he observed us long enough. (*Voice of rational being*) Ah, good, now I see what it is, yes, now I understand what they're at! (*Clov starts, drops the telescope and begins to scratch his belly with both hands. Normal voice*) And without going so far as that, we ourselves... (*with emotion*)
...we ourselves... at certain moments... (*Vehemently*) To think perhaps it won't all have been for nothing! (Beckett, 2009: 22)

In Paris, Beckett designated his writing style and indigenized the elitist writing style of Proust into his works. Beckett adopted Proust's ideas into his works and he supported that the purpose of writing should be to avoid what was already written so

as to prevent language to come to the point of exhaustion. In his letter to Axel Kaun Beckett was expressing his ideas on writing style;

“...Grammar and style! To me they seem to have become as irrelevant as a Biedermeier bathing suit or the imperturbability of a gentleman. A mask. It is to be hoped the time will come, thank God, in some circles it already has, when language is best used when most efficiently abused, Since we cannot dismiss it all at once, at least we do not want to leave anything undone that may contribute to its disrepute. To drill one hole after another into it until that which lurks behind, be it something or nothing, starts seeping through—I cannot imagine a higher goal for today’s writer. Or is literature alone to be left behind on that old, foul road long ago abandoned by music and painting? Is there something paralytically sacred contained within the unnature of the word that does not belong to the elements of the other arts? Is there any reason why that terrifyingly arbitrary materiality of the word surface should not be dissolved, as, for example, the sound surface of Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony is devoured by huge black pauses, so that for pages on end we cannot perceive it as other than a dizzying path of sounds connecting unfathomable chasms of silence? An answer is requested. “(Josipovici, 2009:1).

As it can be seen from the quotation that Beckett struggled to save the dignity of the language throughout his life. Writing in English and in French and translating his works from one language to another is the proof of his renovation in language. He believed that habitual and familiar patterns in literature are the most dangerous ones for the beauty of the art. He preferred not to produce familiar patterns in his works and he was creating a resistance towards audiences and readers and their expectancies in literature works. Beckett believed that words are the tools that forms impenetrable obstacles in language and these tools keep people knowing who they are and what they are. Words are rational so they are time bound and con. Therefore, they cannot account for the self that exists outside time and place. The quotation below expresses Beckett’s technique;

“ if one can destroy the rationality of words, pour them out in a massive and torrential jumble defying time and structure, detach them from their contents, there is a chance that he may get close to his true self” (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 821).

This was what Beckett did in his way of using language. He desired to produce a new language of timelessness and spacelessness. This is a kind of language which as “a system of sounds devoid of content which moves only within itself” (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 821). In his plays, Beckett used such simple language to express the breakdowns and the disintegration of language. In *Waiting for Godot*, the characters use everyday language and they talk in everyday words, nevertheless the words they choose serve for different purpose.

“The two tramps are on the stage. They have to explain themselves but it seems that they don’t have a text prepared beforehand and scrupulously learnt by heart to support them they have to invent. But just as they have nothing to recite, they have nothing to invent as well as their conversation reduces to fragments” (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 821).

VLADIMIR : Ah yes, the two thieves. Do you remember the story?

ESTRAGON : No.

VLADIMIR : Shall I tell it to you?

ESTRAGON : No.

VLADIMIR : It'll pass the time. (*Pause.*) Two thieves, crucified at the same time as our Saviour. One—

ESTRAGON : Our what?

VLADIMIR : Our Saviour. Two thieves. One is supposed to have been saved and the other . . . (*he searches for the contrary of saved*) . . . damned (Beckett, 2006: 4, Act I).

The dialogue above can be a good example of the simplicity of Beckett’s language. The conversation is in short declarative sentences and halting. In some dialogues the sentences have no verbs. Lack of verbs proposes the breakdown of language and struggle of the characters’ in expressing themselves (Carrière, 2005: 52).

Decomposition on the stage captures the language and the dialogue of the characters turns into absolute minimalism. The characters realize and experience the silent and wordless reality of self through pauses and silences throughout the play. In the first act in *Waiting for Godot* two tramps are concerned with time in their waiting. That is why the language in this act is in rather long and routine dialogues (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 821).

VLADIMIR : When I think of it . . . all these years . . . but for me . . . where would you be . . . (*Decisively.*) You'd be nothing more than a little heap of bones at the present minute, no doubt about it.

ESTRAGON : And what of it?

VLADIMIR : (*gloomily*) It's too much for one man. (*Pause. Cheerfully.*) On the other hand what's the good of losing

heart now, that's what I say. We should have thought of it a million years ago, in the nineties.

ESTRAGON : Ah stop blathering and help me off with this bloody thing.

VLADIMIR : Hand in hand from the top of the Eiffel Tower, among the first. We were respectable in those days. Now it's too late. They wouldn't even let us up. (*Estragon tears at his boot.*) What are you doing?

ESTRAGON : Taking off my boot. Did that never happen to you?

VLADIMIR : Boots must be taken off every day, I'm tired telling you that. Why don't you listen to me? (Beckett, 2006: 2, Act I).

On the other hand, it can be seen in the second act that the tramps are tired of waiting and they are exhausted, hence it is quite impossible to see an action on stage and the characters are mostly speechless. In other words, language is left aside and silence becomes dominant. This silence is a new form of language that Beckett produced for tramps to get on with.

ESTRAGON : It is not sufficient. (*Silence*)

VLADIMIR : They make a noise like feathers.

ESTRAGON : Like leaves.

VLADIMIR : Likes ashes.

ESTRAGON : Like leaves. (*Long silence*)

VLADIMIR : Say something!

ESTRAGON : I'm trying. (*Long silence.*) (Beckett, 2006: 54, Act II)

In the course of the play, language fades away continuously and the dialogues between the characters turns into monologues. The monologue that Vladimir utters below reflects Godot's central dilemma; "everything changes, and nothing does: all days blur into one day, but life itself is short, and passes quickly" (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 822). Vladimir express this central dilemma clearly;

VLADIMIR : Let us not waste our time in idle discourse! (*Pause. Vehemently.*) Let us do something, while we have the chance! It is not every day that we are needed. Not

indeed that we personally are needed. Others would meet the case equally well, if not better. To all mankind they were addressed, those cries for help still ringing in our ears! But at this place, at this moment of time, all mankind is us, whether we like it or not. Let us make the most of it, before it is too late! Let us represent worthily for once the foul brood to which a cruel fate consigned us! What do you say? (*Estragon says nothing.*) It is true that when with folded arms we weigh the pros and cons we are no less a credit to our species. The tiger bounds to the help of his congeners without the least reflection, or else he slinks away into the depths of the thickets. But that is not the question. What are we doing here, *that* is the question. And we are blessed in this, that we happen to know the answer. Yes, in this immense confusion one thing alone is clear. We are waiting for Godot to come (Beckett, 2006: 71-72, Act II).

It becomes more and more difficult for them to talk to each other. Talking means inventing and no matter how clever the characters are, they run out of words and start to repeat themselves. This repetition is Beckett's technique to disintegrate the language and to provide a language of self. Moreover, these repetitions and readymade phrases offer great opportunity to the tramps as a way of passing time. During these repetitions and readymade phrases, they find the chance to tell each other stories, to insult each other, to hang themselves and to make the waiting act short in any manner possible. The dialogues then become quite similar to those of cross-talk comedian's pattern (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 822).

ESTRAGON : (*step forward*) You're angry? (*Silence. Step forward*). Forgive me. (*Silence. Step forward. Estragon lays his hand on Vladimir's shoulder*) Come, Didi. (*Silence.*) Give me your hand. (*Vladimir half turns.*) Embrace me! (*Vladimir stiffens*) Don't be stubborn!

(Vladimir softens. They embrace. Estragon recoils) You stink of garlic!

VLADIMIR : It's for the kidneys. *(Silence. Estragon looks attentively at the tree)* What do we do now?

ESTRAGON : Wait.

VLADIMIR : Yes, but while waiting.

ESTRAGON : What about hanging ourselves?

VLADIMIR : Hmm. It'd give us an erection.

ESTRAGON : *(highly excited)* An erection!

VLADIMIR : With all that follows. Where it falls mandrakes grow. That's why they shriek when you pull them up. Did you not know that?

ESTRAGON : Let's hang ourselves immediately!

VLADIMIR : From a bough? *(They go towards the tree)* I wouldn't trust it.

ESTRAGON : We can always try.

VLADIMIR : Go ahead.

ESTRAGON : After you. (Beckett, 2006: 9, Act I).

Beckett's language use in his works and his discourse of humanity are different from stereotyped traditional literature. His writing adventure starts with a definite detachment from traditional stereotyped literary forms. His writing adventure develops into a process of decontamination period. Through the process of decontamination period, the characters of Beckett leave the effects of their physical presences and penetrate into the acting part of their consciousness. The conditions and incidents become simpler in his works thanks to his writing style. Language is used only when necessary. Sentences turn into the phrases then to the words and finally into exclamations (Yüksel, 2006: 35). Through transformation of dialogues, Beckett disintegrates language in his use of action and mime. This is a means of communication beyond language by the use of dramatic medium which Beckett contributed a new dimension of language by using action and mime in theatre. Words and language become less significant. In his plays, there are times when the words and actions are contradictory. The characters say something but their actions are contrary to their verbal expressions (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 823).

ESTRAGON : Well, shall we go?
VLADIMIR : Yes, let's go. (*They do not move*) (Beckett, 2006: 47, Act I).

As it is seen in Beckett's works, the actions are contrary to verbal expressions. The contradictions in verbal expressions breakdown the communication among the characters. By doing this Beckett tells the readers and the audiences that everything about existentialism is nonsense and meaningless. This contradiction can easily be seen in "Waiting for Godot". Vladimir and Estragon always invite each other to leave the place but they never do that (Özbalak, 2012: 34)

ESTRAGON : What do we do now?
VLADIMIR : I don't know.
ESTRAGON : Let's go.
VLADIMIR : We can't.
ESTRAGON : Why not?
VLADIMIR : We're waiting for Godot.
ESTRAGON : (*despairingly*). Ah! (*Pause*).
VLADIMIR : How they've changed! (Beckett, 2006: 41, Act I).

The characters in Beckett's plays sometimes keep long silences and they stand still for some time and they repeat the same words continuously. This is another way of expressing breakdown of communication and illustrating that life is monotonous and depressive. On the other hand, this silence reflects nothingness. In Beckett's world, the silence is nothingness and the voice is the existence. The characters in the plays long for silence; even though they long for it they cannot keep the silence long. They seem to be in need of proving their existences by talking. The words which the characters utter are not for expressing a meaning but proof of their existence (Türkyılmaz, 2009: 203-204)

ESTRAGON : Like leaves. (*Long silence*)
VLADIMIR : Say something!
ESTRAGON : I'm trying. (*Long silence*)
VLADIMIR : (*in anguish*). Say anything at all!
ESTRAGON : What do we do now?
VLADIMIR : Wait for Godot.

ESTRAGON : Ah! (*Silence*) (Beckett, 2006: 54, Act II).

As a matter of fact, language changes its appearance in his works. In *Waiting for Godot* the cycle of gestures and words cover both the actions and the structures of the dialogues. Tramps have the habit of trying to find synonyms for the words in order to talk as well as repeating words and sentences. For Beckett the technique of finding synonyms to the words sounds like echoes between the dialogues is “devoid language of context and make it a system of sounds”. The characters find synonyms of the words to make sounds as “their mind turns from things to words and from words to sounds.” (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 823).

VLADIMIR : We have our reasons.

ESTRAGON : All the dead voices.

VLADIMIR : They make a noise like wings.

ESTRAGON : Like leaves.

VLADIMIR : Like sand.

ESTRAGON : Like leaves. (*Silence*) (Beckett, 2006: 54, Act II).

In the course of the play Estragon is the one who runs out of the words first, on the other hand Vladimir continuous to invent words. Vladimir’s continuous invention of words creates the idea that Estragon will be the first to sense his real self (Rahimipoor, Edoyan & Hashemi, 2011: 823).

Most of the characters of Beckett in his plays act like storytellers, writers and actors. Even though they are all fictional, they struggle to reflect and express the writer through their monologues and dialogues on the stage. When Lucky finally begins to talk, he becomes the representative of the pain expressed in his talk. Hamm is an actor, a storyteller and an encomiast. When telling a story, he stops telling it and start another story about the story he was telling. Winnie is aware of herself as an actress and an encomiast. Krapp is a writer who has sold only seventeen copies of his work. In the plays *Act Without Words I* and *Act Without Words II* Beckett tries to talk and express himself without words (Güçbilmez, 2003: 119).

Apart from all, one of the most important issues that Beckett is concerned about in his works is existentialism. This issue is expressed through the matters of senseless, meaninglessness, emptiness and lastly nothingness of life for the human being that were thrown into this world. The greatest chaos that men would face in their entire life

is the chaos of being born and the destiny of death. Meeting death is inevitable and the exact time is never known so it negates the meaning of life and makes it senseless. This fills human kind with fear and emptiness. Especially, humanity already struggles with many problems in this life like illnesses, wars, earthquakes and poverty. These actually would be enough to drag men into the depths of pessimism. Beckett expresses existentialism blended with pessimism, dark humour and irony. In other words, Beckett was the voice and the writer of revolt (Özbalak, 2012: 32; Berke, ____).

3.3. *Waiting For Godot*

The play *Waiting for Godot* has taken its place among the classics. It became so popular that every word and every single line of the play has been tediously examined and many different interpretations have been made. Most of the interpretations are the product of intensive and elaborate reading analysis. However, these examinations and interpretations suffocates the play since Beckett wrote the play in a very simple language and he reflected the well-known factors from the show business in creating the situation, atmosphere and the relationships of it. It would be beneficial to stress that Beckett describes the play as a tragic farce and this play is a story of tragic and farce reflection of show business (Yüksel, 2006: 49-50).

Waiting for Godot was originally written in French and published in 1952. The play premiered in Babylone Theatre on 5th of January 1953 for the first time and it was directed by Roger Blin and made history. The audiences were already astonished after the first curtain and they reacted in two poles; one did not like the play at all since they did not understand it at all, and the others who were really astonished and happy from this new stage event even though they did not understand the play completely Yüksel, 2006: 49). When the play ended, *Waiting for Godot* put its stamp on history. Martin Esslin describes the feelings of the audiences as below:

“Of course, an intelligent spectator can pick up at least some of the ground rules of an unfamiliar convention as he goes along. The persistent innovative drive and desire to break new and original ground which is so characteristic of modern Western culture also leads to a constant change in the conventions of dramatic performance. The history of theatrical scandals accompanying the introduction of such innovations from the ‘Battle of *Harnani*’ in 1881 to the scandals caused by Ibsen, Wagner or Beckett illustrates the process by which such new conventions are established. A section of the audience nurtured in the old convention may completely fail to understand such a performance, while others ‘decode’ the new convention as it unfolds.” (Esslin, 1988: 147)

Samuel Beckett in Shaw Centenary programme in Gaiety Theatre in Dublin has specifically verbalized his admiration for John Millington Synge's *The Well of the Saints* written in 1905. This play is an Irish 'tramp comedy' just like *Waiting for Godot*. The central characters of the play were Martin and Mary Doul and they were blind beggars. They were encouraged by the sighted villagers whom they lived with. They had fallen in love with the poetic and beautiful images that they have constructed of each other in which they maintain a sustained belief. The scene of the first act is that there is a country road with big stones alongside it with the ruined doorway of a church on the left. The central characters Martin and Mary Doul enter and sit on the stones and they pass idle time together and wish for even a momentary sight. They were hearing "wonders" at a nearby fair. There was a saint passing through the town heading to a holy shrine. He applies holly water to the Douls' eyes and this holy water temporarily give them sight. This moment fulfills their longing yet destroys the romantic illusions that each had lovingly constructed of the other. On the way back saint applies the holly water for the second time and this application of the holly water will make the change permanent. Therefore, this time the Douls would have to make decision whether to accept the miracle and continue to live in the sighted world illusionless or whether to repudiate the benevolent supernatural treatment and return back to the life being literally blind. They can recapture their figurative blindness, which means they can unsee what they have seen of each other and reconstruct their lost illusions. Their choice is a separate moral and epistemological issue (Hutchings, 2005: 77-78).

There are some similarities between two plays *The Well of the Saints* and *Waiting for Godot*. The road, the paired tramps, the blindness, the anticipated arrival of the supernatural being who transforms lives of the tramps like the saint and Godot can be counted. Moreover, there are more parallelism in epistemological, existential and theological issues between the plays. The Douls define each other, their happiness and their life's aims through language; they do not know the world directly. They are completely solipsistic and their existence are perforce. They do not know each other more than an illusion and artificial constructs and they are shattered when the itinerant miracle man arrives. This man should have supposed to be a benevolent agent who gives favours to the tramps. He is like a bestowing God who makes miracles. In *Waiting for Godot* the blindness comes for Pozzo and the central characters Estragon

and Vladimir are in hope of transformation if Godot ever does come. The tragicomic experience of these Irish tramps in both plays transcends their particular time and place (Hutchings, 2005:78).

3.3.1. Who is Godot?

In an interview, Beckett has shared his views on literature with research physician Jay A. Levy. Levy remarks that in Beckett's words he has never denied Godot was God. However, he did not intend it to have any specific meaning. As Beckett puts into words Godot could be representative of one's goal or objective. Levy mentions some of her analogies, such as the removal of shoes in the first act befitting biblical accounts of the respect given to holy places. It is said that Beckett has agreed to these analogies yet he added that he in no way had the Bible in mind when he wrote the play (Andonian, 1998: 197). Similarly, the director Alan Schneider who was to direct the first American production of *Waiting for Godot* asked Beckett who Godot was and what it meant. The answer he received from Beckett was rather annoying and sounded angry. Beckett said, "If I knew, I would have said so in the play" (Esslin, 1983: 44). These words can be taken as a good warning to anyone who intends to discover and find the exact meanings of the characters and the plays of Beckett.

Ferhan Şensoy, the playwright and an actor, has lived through a similar situation with Beckett. It was at the time when Şensoy has written a play *Good Riddance Godot* inspired by Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and Miodrag Bulatovic's *Godot has Arrived*. When he was in France for his education, he had the opportunity to meet Samuel Beckett and talk about his play *Waiting for Godot* in particular. Şensoy told the story to Yavuz Pekman who was one of the actors and the stage director of *Good Riddance Godot*. Pekman was told that Şensoy asked a friend to arrange a meeting with Samuel Beckett. The arrangement had been made and an appointment was made. Şensoy was so excited to meet Samuel Beckett. On the day of meeting he went to Beckett's house just on time. An attendant has answered the door and invited Şensoy to a big room with a glass ceiling. Şensoy has noticed that there were many pigeons on the glass roof and has listened the sounds of them while waiting for Samuel Beckett. Soon Beckett entered the room and sat across Ferhan Şensoy. Şensoy tells Pekman that "I was filled with tremendous and breathless excitement and was confused. I asked the most foolish question to Beckett". He asked Beckett the annoying question "Who

was Godot". Samuel Beckett stared at Şensoy for a moment and raised his long index finger up and said "pigeons" while pointing the glass roof, and left the room even not saying goodbye (Y. Pekman 2013, personal communication, 20 October).

To find the answer to the question who "Godot" was and the identity of Godot is left to the readers and the audiences. A common explanation was that Godot was God. In French adding the suffix "-ot" to the end of the word is used to make this word diminutive, In French Charlie Chaplin's nickname is the affectionate 'Charlot' and instead of pronouncing his full name it is common to say 'Charlot'. Therefore, to create the name 'Got-ot' is to originate a figure that could be considered as 'an endearing little god' in other words 'a minor god'. Of course the mentioned 'minor god or the endearing little god' is not the Supreme Being, the creator and the ruler of the universe (Graver, 2004: 42). However, since the play was written in French originally, the name seems to bear no resemblance to the French word for God 'Dieu'. It is possible to say that Godot is derived from Goddot, a corrupted version of God wot, which means God knows (O'Nan, 1979: 2; Kenner, 1973: 120). Moreover, 'Godo' refers to God in spoken Irish (Graver, 2004:42). The French name of the play is *En Attendant Godot* and this title may reflect the work of Simone Weil's *Attende de Dieu* means "Waiting for God". However, Beckett is known to give interesting names to his characters. Therefore, the name "Godot" may be given after well-known French racing cyclist, Godeau since 'bicycle' is often used in Beckett's works (Yüksel, 2006:55; Kenner, 1973: 120). Another explanation is that Godot may be named after the character Godeaux in Balsac's play *Le Fiseur* or with well-known name *Mercadet*. Godeau runs away taking capital money and his partner Mercadet is left financially strapped. Godeau is expected for a long time and he never appears. Close to the final curtain, a miracle happens and Godeau is reported to have come back very rich and his so-called arrival saves Marcedet and assures a happy ending; nevertheless, Godeau never appears on stage (Yüksel, 2006: 55; Graver, 2004: 42-43). There are many other meanings of Godot and Graver (2004) in his book expresses some of them as follows;

Of a dozen common French words and phrases that begin with g-o-d, nearly every one has some teasing connection to the story and theme of Beckett's play. Godillotis French for 'hobnailed boot' or 'shapeless old shoe'; and godasses are 'military boots'. Godailleris 'to go pub-crawling', and goddam is French slang for 'an Englishman' (who according to Estragon had drunk a little more than usual on the way to the brothel). ... Closest in sound is godet, the name of a popular cognac, but also the French word for 'a wooden bowl' or 'mug', which in different usages refers to the bowl of a pipe (smoked by

Pozzo who carelessly refers to Godot as Godet) and a small glass of wine (which washes down Pozzo's chicken). In the French original, Vladimir identifies Lucky's dance as 'la mort du lampiste', 'the death of the lamplighter'; and as Frederick Busi has helpfully noted, a lamplighter is the person charged with keeping town lights illuminated, a job which used to require small receptacles called godets filled with combustible materials and wicks. Inevitably, as Colin Duckworth has concluded, the receptacle called a godet might in the broad sense hold any meaning put into it. (Graver, 2004: 41-42)

To sum up, it is obvious that the name "Godot", whatever it refers to, is used ingeniously in the play and even though there seems to have many verbal correspondences the name has no fixed meaning – all this to create an image of extraordinary suggestiveness and contemporary applicability (Graver, 2004: 42). Moreover, the whole play is essentially not about Godot - who he is, or whether he will ever arrive - but about waiting. As the title indicates, the play is about the act of waiting itself. French title *En Attendant Godot*, while waiting for Godot, is more precise depiction of the meaning in comparison to its English translation. Asking what happens in the meantime makes more sense and is more relevant to the adventures of Vladimir and Estragon. Approaching the play in this way makes the play far richer and more suggestive than interpreting Godot as one: as God (Hutchings 2005: 25; Graver, 2004: 40-41).

Waiting for Godot does not tell a story instead it explores a static situation of Vladimir and Estragon's waiting act on a country road. In this act of waiting, nobody comes, nobody goes and nothing happens. Vladimir and Estragon believe that Godot will come but Godot never arrives. Therefore, Godot becomes an absent person or object that human beings desire or for whom they feel obliged to wait (Esslin, 1983: 46; Hutchings 2005: 25).

3.3.2. Plot summary of "Waiting for Godot"

The play begins with Estragon struggling with his boot. He is sitting on a low mound and trying to take off his boot. The effort is physically exhausting that is why between his attempts he sits panting and says:

ESTRAGON : (*giving up again*) Nothing to be done (Beckett, 2006: 1, Act I).

Estragon tells Vladimir that he has spent the night in a ditch and been beaten by some attackers as usual. Spending a night apart from each other, they are happy to be

reunited. With Vladimir's help, Estragon takes his boot off with pain. Vladimir is also in pain and cannot laugh properly, he smiles instead. Vladimir contemplates one Gospel account that says Christ saved one of the thieves. Estragon wants to leave; nevertheless, they cannot leave the place since they are waiting for Godot. They question whether they are waiting in the right place, at the right time and on the right day. They quarrel for some time and they reconcile as usual. While waiting Estragon suggests they hang themselves on the tree, but they cannot do that since they disagree over who should hang himself first. Vladimir at the end states that they should wait for Godot. They say that they have forgone their rights. Estragon is hungry and Vladimir offers him a carrot. Estragon eats the carrot hungrily. They conclude that they are bound to Godot and they are unable to act.

Pozzo and Lucky enter. Pozzo drives Lucky forward with a whip. Lucky looks like an animal with a rope tied around his neck. Pozzo forces lucky to carry his belongings. Estragon and Vladimir think that Pozzo is Godot. Pozzo orders lucky to bring his stool, his coat and food, and Lucky obeys. Estragon and Vladimir protest Pozzo for his inhumane treatment of Lucky. Nevertheless, Pozzo deflects their reaction and the subject is dropped. Pozzo stands up to leave the place after smoking his pipe, but decides not to go. Nevertheless, his pride prevents him to resit. Estragon and Vladimir question why Lucky never puts the luggage down.

POZZO : Ah! Why couldn't you say so before? Why he doesn't make himself comfortable? Let's try and get this clear. Has he not the right to? Certainly he has. It follows that he doesn't want to. There's reasoning for you. And why doesn't he want to? (*Pause.*) Gentlemen, the reason is this.

VLADIMIR : (*to Estragon*). Make a note of this.

POZZO : He wants to impress me, so that I'll keep him (Beckett, 2006: 24, Act I).

When Pozzo declares that he would sell Lucky, Lucky cries. Seeing that Estragon and Vladimir are sorry for Lucky, Pozzo tells them to dry Lucky's tears. Estragon tries but Lucky kicks him on his leg. Estragon feels the pain and cries. Pozzo announces that Lucky has taught him all the beautiful things he knows but he has now become

unbearable and driving Pozzo mad. Hearing that Estragon and Vladimir start to abuse Lucky for mistreating Pozzo, his master.

POZZO : (*groaning, clutching his head*). I can't bear it . . . any longer . . . the way he goes on . . . you've no idea . . . it's terrible . . . he must go . . . (*he waves his arms*) . . . I'm going mad . . . (*he collapses, his head in his hands*) . . . I can't bear it . . . any longer (Beckett, 2006: 26-27, Act I).

After calming down, Pozzo looks for his pipe, which he has misplaced. Vladimir plays with his hat and Estragon with his boot. Pozzo breaks into a monologue about night and twilight. He alternates between the lyrical and commonplace. He ends his speech pessimistic saying that everything can happen in this world when one is least prepared. Because Estragon and Vladimir have been nice to Pozzo, he asks if there is anything, he can do for them. He decides to reward Estragon and Vladimir for that and he makes Lucky dance, recite, sing and think. Lucky starts to dance and he drops his hat. Pozzo says that;

POZZO : He can't think without his hat (Beckett, 2006: 35, Act I).

Hearing Pozzo, Vladimir places the hat on Lucky's head and Lucky starts a long and incoherent monologue. He talks about possible goodness of God, the tortures of hellfire, the commonness of sport and the vacuity of suburbs. The long and incoherent monologue of Lucky upsets the others and to stop him Vladimir captures Lucky's hat. Lucky stops talking. Eventually, Pozzo and Lucky leave. Estragon also wants to leave but Vladimir reminds him that they need to stay and wait for Godot. A boy comes.

VLADIMIR : You have a message from Mr. Godot?

BOY : Yes Sir. (Beckett, 2006: 42, Act I).

The boy says Godot will not come today, but he will come the next day. He tells Vladimir that he works for Godot and verbalizes that he is kind to him but adds that Godot beats the Boy's shepherd brother. Vladimir request the boy to tell Godot that he has seen them. By the time the Boy leaves, night has fallen. Estragon decides to leave his boots there but Vladimir protests.

VLADIMIR : But you can't go barefoot!

ESTRAGON : Christ did. (Beckett, 2006: 46, Act I).

They decide to leave the place for the night but they stay still. The first act ends.

The second act begins next day, in the same location and at the same time. The boots are still on the stage and the tree has grown some leaves. Vladimir and Estragon have spent the night separately. Vladimir appears first and he sings. Estragon enters and tells Vladimir that he was beaten during the night with no reason. They are happy to see each other again and give each other a hug. Feeling happy Estragon asks what they should do.

ESTRAGON : We are happy. (*Silence.*) What do we do now, now that we are happy?

VLADIMIR : Wait for Godot. (*Estragon groans. Silence.*) Things have changed here since yesterday. (Beckett, 2006: 51, Act II).

Vladimir talks about previous day and mentions Pozzo and Lucy but Estragon remembers nothing about these people except Lucky's kick. He also does not recognize the place they are standing the day before. In their thoughts, they are overwhelmed by the whispering voices of the dead around them. They struggle to break their silence, but succeed only for a little while. Estragon remembers that they spent the day and the past fifty years chattering inanities.

Estragon discovers that the boots he left yesterday has been exchanged for another old pair. Estragon tries to wear one but gives up saying that he is tired.

ESTRAGON : (*having tried in vain to work it out*). I'm tired! (*Pause.*) Let's go.

VLADIMIR : We can't.

ESTRAGON : Why not?

VLADIMIR : We're waiting for Godot. (Beckett, 2006: 59, Act II).

Estragon falls asleep and wakes up frightened. He wants to tell Vladimir his dream but Vladimir prefers Estragon not to describe the dream. Vladimir again reminds Estragon that they are waiting for Godot when Estragon wants to leave the place. Vladimir finds Lucky's hat on the ground and he tries it on. Vladimir is now sure that they have returned to the right place. Estragon and Vladimir start to exchange their hats and

Lucky's back and forth. Finally, Vladimir keeps Lucky's hat and Estragon keeps his own. Vladimir suggests that they play Pozzo and Lucy.

VLADIMIR : Will you not play?

ESTRAGON : Play at what?

VLADIMIR : We could play at Pozzo and Lucky.

ESTRAGON : Never heard of it. (Beckett, 2006: 64, Act II).

Estragon leaves the stage but returns almost immediately because some people are coming. He and Vladimir run both side of the stage and have a look. Vladimir is joyful and convinced that Godot is coming for sure. They try to hide but there is nowhere to go or hide. Lucky enters with Pozzo. Pozzo follows Lucky closely behind because he is now blind. Lucky suddenly stops when he sees Vladimir and Estragon. Since Pozzo cannot see what happens in front of him, he bumps into Lucky. They both fall down and Pozzo cannot get up. Vladimir thinks it is an excellent opportunity to do a good thing as a member of the human race. Vladimir and Estragon try to get Pozzo up but they too fall on the ground. They call Pozzo 'Cain' and 'Abel' and Pozzo responds to both names. They decide that he is all of humanity. They get up without difficulty. They help Pozzo stand up, and he asks who they are. Pozzo does not remember them from the day before. Pozzo asks the time and Estragon thinks that it is morning on the other hand Vladimir is sure that it is evening. Vladimir asks Pozzo when he went blind.

POZZO : (*violently*). Don't question me! The blind have no notion of time. The things of time are hidden from them too. (Beckett, 2006: 79, Act II).

Estragon goes next to Lucy and starts to kick him repeatedly. Pozzo is getting ready to leave but Vladimir wants Lucy to sing before they go. Pozzo tells them that he cannot because he is dumb. When he is asked he gets angry.

VLADIMIR : Dumb! Since when?

POZZO : (*suddenly furious.*) Have you not done tormenting me with your accursed time! It's abominable! When! When! One day, is that not enough for you, one day he went dumb, one day I went blind, one day we'll go deaf, one day we were born, one day we shall die, the same day,

the same second, is that not enough for you?
(*Calmer.*) They give birth astride of a grave, the light
gleams an instant, then it's night once more. (*He jerks the
rope.*) On! (Beckett, 2006: 82, Act II).

Pozzo leaves with Lucky, Estragon fall asleep. As on the previous day a boy enters with a message from Godot, saying that he will not come today but definitely tomorrow. This boy is not the one that came the day before. The boy tells that Godot does nothing when Vladimir asks what Godot does. After Vladimir tells the boy to inform Godot that he saw Vladimir, the boy leaves. Estragon wakes up and wants to leave immediately, but Vladimir stops him by saying they have to come back here the next day to wait for Godot. They point out that except the tree; everything is dead on the landscape. They try to hang themselves again as in the beginning of the play, but they cannot succeed. Estragon and Vladimir decide to leave but they stay on stage.

3.4 *Endgame*

Beckett originated the play *Endgame* in his mind in 1953 to 1954 and wrote it in French between 1955 and 1956. It was Beckett's third play and has premiered in London Royal Court Theatre directed by Roger Blin on 3th April in 1957. Nevertheless, *Endgame* did not gain the success which *Waiting for Godot* had achieved. The audience expected to watch a play like *Waiting for Godot* which has the tragicomic story of two characters Vladimir and Estragon. In the tragicomic situation of *Waiting for Godot*, there is an act of waiting and there is hope with amity. The feeling of hope is successfully transferred to the audiences by the characters on stage, Vladimir and Estragon, and the audience shares the love which amity evokes. These sympathetic feelings are not seen in *Endgame*. It is like Vladimir and Estragon had met a better offer and left the theatre for good, so the stage is left to Pozzo and Lucky. Pozzo is now Hamm and Lucky has become Clov (Yüksel, 2006:71; Tan, 2007: 24). Pozzo and Lucky's relationship is so similar to Hamm and Clov's; "Flamboyant, blind master who abuses, yet is effectively bound to, his servant." (Kundert - Gibbs, 1999: 84). Even though Hamm and Clov become Vladimir and Estragon or Pozzo and Lucky, the master and slave relationship and lovelessness are the dominant figures in the play.

Worton, (2008) quotes Beckett's remarks; "You must realize that Hamm and Clov are Didi and Gogo at a later date, at the end of their lives. Actually they are Suzanne

and me”. Beckett here talks about Suzanne Deschevaux-Dumesnil and their relationship. In 1950’s they realized that life with and without one another was quite impossible. In other words, they found it difficult to spend life together and unimaginable to leave each other so in this paradox they got married in 1961. (Worton, 2008:71).

Endgame can be taken as a new play as well as the third act of the previous play *Waiting for Godot*. It seems as if Samuel Beckett was dissatisfied with *Waiting for Godot* with its humanist and semi-naturalistic life-affirming manner and wrote *Endgame* (Kennedy, 2004: 47). It is generally agreed that *Endgame* carries certain aspects of the previous play *Waiting for Godot*. *Endgame* addresses further points of condensation and ferocity of life. When it is to compare the similarities between the characters and the act of waiting in *Waiting for Godot* and the ending in *Endgame*, it can be concluded that *Endgame* seems to be endorsing life less and diminishing human abilities more. Samuel Beckett succeeds in that by means of decaying language and the setting (Tan, 2007: 24). Beckett picturized a darker vision with a more disturbing setting and with characters more inhuman than in *Waiting for Godot* in this one act structure play. Compared to *Waiting for Godot*, the final scene of *Endgame* is too much like a scene of a traditional tragedy (Kennedy, 2004: 47).

Mercier, (1998: 117) claims that Samuel Beckett with *Endgame* introduces a new dramatic genre. According to him, *Waiting for Godot* is a willfully aborted comedy as well as a tragedy since the audience at the Cherry Lane Theatre in New York laughed many times during the play, but the laughs were all the same and were all one kind mirthless. On the other hand, with *Endgame*,

“.... tragicomedy dips to the tragic end of the scale, not the comic. True tragedy, of course, is impossible for a writer who cannot believe in a tragic hero – powerful, proud, yet essentially good save for the tragic flaw. “*Endgame*” is modern substitute for tragedy. Hamm and Clov are not heroes but monsters. Yet they suffer themselves even as they torture others. Hamm may well be right in denying that there can be misery loftier than his. Only Nagg has a fair share of goodness, and he lacks the power and the pride necessary to the tragic hero. “*Endgame*” is a purposefully aborted tragedy. It does not purge our passions because we do not identify ourselves fully with either Hamm or Clov.” (Mercier, 1998: 117).

Endgame, with little changes, carries some aspects of the previous play *Waiting for Godot*. The road in *Waiting for Godot* has disappeared and is replaced by a room like a prison cell. The room has two very small windows with a view to almost nowhere,

in other words to a dead universe. Estragon and Vladimir are rather mobile in their waiting process whereas the couple who replaces them, Ham and Clov, are limited in their mobility in the extreme. Hamm is prisoned to his wheelchair and can only touch the walls of the prison like room, Clov cannot sit and can only run to and fro from wall to wall, from center to circumference. The other two characters of the play, Nell and Nagg, are totally immobile since they are legless and spend their whole time bound to dustbins (Kennedy, 2004:47).

The play begins with the word “finished” and this is not quite common in world drama. The idea of “ending” is embodied at every level of the action in the play. Such a start and embodiment of the word in the process of the play contradicts all the known elements of traditional drama. With the opening words of Clov, the audience and the reader immediately find themselves in some kind of crisis like a final stage of an illness, a hopeless situation or the last scene of a play (Kennedy, 2004:48). The play pictures the last stages of human struggle in the world. It seems that the universe has been completely destroyed. There seems to have been a holocaust which Hamm would have liked since he thinks his misery is loftier than anyone else in the world (Robinson, 1969: 262).

HAMM : Me— *(he yawns)* —to play. *(He takes off his glasses, wipes his eyes, his face, the glasses, puts them on again, folds the handkerchief and puts it back neatly in the breast pocket of his dressing gown. He clears his throat, joins the tips of his fingers.)* Can there be misery— *(he yawns)* —loftier than mine? No doubt. Formerly. But now? *(Pause.)* My father? *(Pause.)* My mother? *(Pause.)* My... dog? *(Pause.)* Oh I am willing to believe they suffer as much as such creatures can suffer. But does that mean their sufferings equal mine? No doubt. *(Pause.)* No, all is a— *(he yawns)* —bsolute, *(proudly)* the bigger a man is the fuller he is. *(Pause. Gloomily.)* And the emptier. *(He sniffs.)* Clov! *(Pause.)* No, alone. *(Pause.)* What dreams! Those forests! *(Pause.)* Enough, it's time it ended, in the shelter, too. *(Pause.)* And yet I hesitate, I hesitate to... to end. Yes, there it is, it's time it ended

and yet I hesitate to— (*He yawns.*) —to end. (*Yawns.*)
God, I'm tired, I'd be better off in bed. (*He whistles.*
Enter Clov immediately. He halts beside the chair.) You
pollute the air! (*Pause.*) Get me ready, I'm going to bed.
(Beckett, 2009: 6)

The world outside is left to its nothingness and death in this extinct world is the only witness. Death has eluded the characters in the room and they are waiting for the end, in other words, they are longing for the heap to be completed (Robinson, 1969: 262). The concept of “waiting” in the previous play *Waiting for Godot* has let the way to “ending” in the one act play *Endgame*. In the opening words of the play Clov expresses his thoughts picturizing how they are so close to the end;

CLOV : (fixed gaze, tonelessly): Finished, it's finished, nearly finished, it must be nearly finished. (*Pause.*) Grain upon grain, one by one, and one day, suddenly, there's a heap, a little heap, the impossible heap. (*Pause.*) I can't be punished any more. (*Pause.*) I'll go now to my kitchen, ten feet by ten feet by ten feet, and wait for him to whistle me. (*Pause.*) Nice dimensions, nice proportions, I'll lean on the table, and look at the wall, and wait for him to whistle me. (*He remains a moment motionless, then goes out. He comes back immediately, goes to window right, takes up the ladder and carries it out. Pause. Hamm stirs. He yawns under the handkerchief. He removes the handkerchief from his face. Very red face. Glasses with black lenses.*) (Beckett, 2009: 6)

In this play there are overlapping connotations of the idea of ‘ending’ for humanity such as; ending of a life, ending a relationship, end of the world, preparing to die, completing a game of chess, a story or a performance. In short it is possible to state that the central metaphor of the play about ending is; “the ending is an endless process”. (Kennedy, 2004: 48).

The title *Endgame* refers to a chess game and the term 'end game' is used to express the final moves of the game 'chess'. So the play is named after the game of 'chess' in Beckett's English translation. Being a champion of chess during his school years, Beckett believed that the meaning of 'play' best reflects the environment and atmosphere in which nothing is real, so he set his play in accordance with the chess moves. In short, stage has become a chessboard and the characters of the play have become chess pieces (Yüksel, 2006: 72; Cohn, 1962: 44; Bloom, 1984: 75).

The characters in *Endgame* are not only characters in a play but they are also the ones to be played with. Hamm is a player as a character as well as a chess piece on a chessboard. It is possible to say that he is a threatening king since he is positioned in the center of the room as if he is sitting on his throne. He dominates the action from his throne and directing the activities of his subordinates. However, he is stuck to his throne and cannot move. In other words, he is helpless on his throne and needs Clov to push him around in his confined kingdom. Like the king on a chessboard Hamm's movement is limited to one step in anyone direction.

HAMM : Take me for a little turn.
(*Clov goes behind the chair and pushes it forward.*)
Not too fast!
(*Clov pushes chair.*)
Right round the world!
(*Clov pushes chair.*)
Hug the walls, then back to the center again.
(*Clov pushes chair.*)
I was right in the center, wasn't I? (Beckett, 2009: 18)

Moreover, Hamm is reliant upon Clov to protect him from the existing dangers coming from outside the room. Hamm lives in anxiety and he is concerned with his own security.

HAMM : Gone from me you'd be dead.
CLOV : And vice versa.
HAMM : Outside of here it's death! (Beckett, 2009: 42)

When Hamm calls, Clov appears at the kitchen door and with increasing resentment goes to windows to inspect outside for signs of threatening movement with his

telescope. Though everything seems safe and sound Hamm's fears persists which seem to be ridiculous and baseless (Robinson, 1969; 264). As a king, Hamm becomes a rational being in this play. In his divine like character, he is not only an actor but also he is like a director. He is not interested in creation as it is expected from a creator but interested in destruction of the world (Cohn, 1962: 45). What is around him is desolated and there is no threatening factor around to overtake Hamm's forces. Hamm is like a piece in a chess game and is stuck on the chess board with Clov. There are no other pieces left and it is a game of reduction. At the end of the game the board is almost empty (Robinson, 1969; 264).

HAMM : It's because there are no more navigators. (Beckett, 2009: 39)

...

CLOV : There are no more bicycle-wheels. (Beckett, 2009: 9)

...

CLOV : There are no more coffins. (Beckett, 2009: 46)

HAMM : Then let it end!

...

HAMM : There are no more sugar plums! (Beckett, 2009: 34)

...

CLOV : There's no more pap. (Beckett, 2009: 10)

...

CLOV : There are no more rugs. (Beckett, 2009: 40)

Hamm seems to be resigned. "This is as Hamm wants it. His opponent is not human but time and against the latter one seeks to lose, to be eliminated into Nothing, not to win and continue a perverse encounter without hope" (Robinson, 1969: 264).

HAMM : ... Old endgame lost of old, play and lose and have done with losing.... Since that's the way we're playing it ... let's play it that way ... and speak no more about it ... speak no more (Beckett, 2009: 48).

There is nothing for Clov to do much about the circumstances on this chess game since like Hamm, Clov's movement is also restricted (Robinson, 1969: 264).

HAMM : Sit on him!

CLOV : I can't sit.

HAMM : True. And I can't stand. (Beckett, 2009: 10)

Clov is doomed to stand all the time and cannot sit at all. With his restricted movement and from the words he utters, Clov resembles the knight on a chess board. When he is asked whether he is always on foot or not, he answers as "sometimes on horse". (Robinson, 1969: 264)

HAMM : And your rounds? When you inspected my paupers.
Always on foot?

CLOV : Sometimes on horse.

(The lid of one of the bins lifts and the hands of Nagg appear,

gripping the rim. Then his head emerges. Nightcap. Very white face. Nagg yawns, then listens.)

I'll leave you, I have things to do. (Beckett, 2009: 9)

Regarding the room as a chessboard, Hamm, the king, is guarded by his attendant pieces; Nagg and Nell. Nagg and Nell are prisoned in their dustbins and they represent imprisoned pawns (Robinson, 1969: 264). Hamm as the king starts the game in the middle of the chess board as his throne is positioned there. In the course of the play, even if he wants his location to be changed by Clov, he wants to be placed in the middle again.

HAMM : Back to my place!

(Clov pushes chair back to center.)

Is that my place?

CLOV : Yes, that's your place.

HAMM : Am I right in the center?

CLOV : I'll measure it.

HAMM : More or less! More or less!

CLOV : *(moving chair slightly)*There!

HAMM : I'm more or less in the center?

CLOV : I'd say so.

HAMM : You'd say so! Put me right in the center!

CLOV : I'll go and get the tape.

HAMM : Roughly! Roughly!
(*Clov moves chair slightly.*)
Bang in the center!

In the beginning of the play, Clov (knight) stands at the kitchen door. Even though he makes constant moves, he stands in his beginning position at the end of the play. This means that there was no progress in the “chess game” and the last expected moves, like Hamm’s dying or Clov’s leaving home, was not accomplished. The reason for that is both players played the game and made their moves so that they can be in their original positions as in the beginning. Nell and Nagg as pawns stand still from beginning to the end of the play. Wellwarth comments on this as follows:

“...the final moves of a fantastically perverted chess game – is a static ballet of two immovable pawns, a helpless king, and aimlessly roving knight playing themselves into a hopeless stalemate.” (Wellwarth, 1965: 43)

The title of the play *Endgame* with its allusion to a chess game creates an atmosphere which carries both powerful sense of waiting as reality and as a metaphor for infinity. Beckett comments about the reality and infinity as;

“Hamm is a king in this chess game lost from the start. From the start he knows he is making loud senseless moves. That he will make no progress at all with the gaff. Now at the last he makes a few senseless moves as only a bad player would. A good one would have given up long ago. He is only trying to delay the inevitable end. Each of his gestures is one of the last useless moves which put off the end. He is a bad player.” (Cohn, 1974: 152)

It is important to remember that Hamm is conceived as the king in a chess game. In the play Hamm is trying to delay the inevitable end. Worton claims that Clov is a pawn. However, taking Beckett’s metaphor logically indicates that Clov is a king as well as a pawn related to the moves Clov makes. If the chess players are not good at the game, like Hamm and Clov, they may end up with two kings on the board and never end the game. With two kings left on the board the players can never end the game but delay it by taking infinite series of movements around the chess board. The inference of taking infinite series of movements accord with the reality of the master and servant relationship of the characters in the play. It is accepted that the master has social superiority and the servant has the power. The reason that the servant is considered more powerful is that the servant is more essential to the master than it is vice versa. Thus, Clov is stronger and powerful than Hamm because Clov makes Hamm’s existence possible. It is the same with Lucky and Pozzo in *Waiting for Godot*. Lucky is stronger than Pozzo because Lucky’s clear submissiveness and his

inadequacy provide support to Pozzo. This support helps Pozzo to create a sense of authority (Worton, 2008; 75).

To add to the interpretation of Hamm and Clov and chess pieces, it is possible to consider Clov as the rook. In chess rook moves on a straight line either horizontally or vertically which fits the movements of Clov in the play. Furthermore, if Hamm is the king, the rook, Clov shaped like a fortress as a chess piece, is his castle, habitat. These similarities with the chess game and the characters of the play metaphorically suit an explanation which likens Clov to a rook. There is also a rule in the chess game called castling where two pieces, king and the rook, can be moved simultaneously placing the rook to protect the king which augments the argument that Clov is really the rook in the chess game. As the end nears, two pieces are left on the board, the real king Hamm, and the rook which can act like a king, Clov.

3.4.1. Plot summary of *Endgame*

The play begins with gray light shedding on the stage. It is a room in Hamm's house. Two small windows and the curtains are drawn. There are two ashbins touching each other and covered with an old sheet. In the center, there is an armchair on castors and it is also covered with an old sheet. Hamm is blind and seated in the armchair. Clov, Hamm's servant appears and stares at Hamm motionless. Clov goes out and immediately returns with a stepladder. He goes through his routine and draws open the curtains on the windows. He removes the sheet from the ashbins, opens the lid of the bins and looks into them. Then, he pulls Hamm's sheet off. Hamm is in his dressing gown and there is a whistle hanging on his neck and a handkerchief over his face. He seems to be asleep. Clov looks over him and after a brief laugh;

CLOV : (*fixed gaze, tonelessly*) Finished, it's finished, nearly finished, it must be nearly finished. (*Pause.*) Grain upon grain, one by one, and one day, suddenly, there's a heap, a little heap, the impossible heap. (*Pause.*) I can't be punished any more. (*Pause.*) I'll go now to my kitchen, ten feet by ten feet by ten feet, and wait for him to whistle me. (*Pause.*) Nice dimensions, nice proportions, I'll lean on the table, and look at the wall, and wait for him to whistle me. (Beckett, 2009: 6)

He goes out, comes back immediately and takes the ladder and goes out again. Hamm awakens and removes the handkerchief from his face. Only then it is seen that he is wearing dark glasses. He questions his life;

HAMM : Me — *(he yawns)*— to play. *(He takes off his glasses, wipes his eyes, his face, the glasses, puts them on again, folds the handkerchief and puts it back neatly in the breast pocket of his dressing gown. He clears his throat, joins the tips of his fingers.)* Can there be misery— *(he yawns)* —loftier than mine? No doubt. Formerly. But now? *(Pause.)* My father? *(Pause.)* My mother? *(Pause.)* My... dog? *(Pause.)* Oh I am willing to believe they suffer as much as such creatures can suffer. But does that mean their sufferings equal mine? No doubt. *(Pause.)* No, all is a— *(he yawns)* —bsolute, *(proudly)* the bigger a man is the fuller he is. *(Pause. Gloomily.)* And the emptier. *(He sniffs.)* Clov! *(Pause.)* No, alone. *(Pause.)* What dreams! Those forests! *(Pause.)* Enough, it's time it ended, in the shelter, too. *(Pause.)* And yet I hesitate, I hesitate to... to end. Yes, there it is, it's time it ended and yet I hesitate to— *(He yawns.)* —to end. *(Yawns.)* ...
(Beckett, 2009: 6)

He whistles and Clov enters. Hamm insults Clov and orders him to make his bed. Hamm asks questions to Clov and commands him to get going; nevertheless, Clov does not move. Seeing that Clov does not respond to the commands Hamm threatens him by not providing food for him. Clov goes for Hamm's sheet. Hamm asks why Clov does not leave him and Clov says there is nowhere else. Clov, then, asks why Hamm keeps him, and for Hamm there is no one else. Hamm asks why Clov does not kill him and Clov replies that he does not know the combination of the larder.

Nagg, from one of the ashbins, emerges in a nightcap. Only his head is seen. He cries for his pap, Hamm whistles for Clov and orders him to get a biscuit since there is no pap left. Nagg complains and refuses the biscuit since it is hard for him to eat. Getting angry Hamm wants Clov to close the lid on him. Clov argues that there is no more

nature outside but Hamm does not accept it and says their bodies and mind have changed. They continue to debate for some time until Clov wants to leave him and go to the kitchen. Hamm asks Clov what he does in the kitchen and Clov replies that he looks at the wall and sees his light dying. Nagg again emerges from his bin with a biscuit in his mouth and he listens. Hamm and Clov talk about sprouts. Hamm tells Clov to leave and Clov says;

CLOV : I'm trying. (*He goes to the door, halts.*) Ever since I was whelped. (Beckett, 2009: 12)

Nagg knocks on the lid of the other bin and Nell emerges. Nagg asks her to kiss him and they try but it is impossible for them to kiss each other since they cannot reach from their bins. Nell questions why they live this 'farce' every day. They cannot see each other clearly since their sight has failed; moreover, Nell has a hearing problem. While they are talking, Hamm tells them to be quiet and expresses his desire to sleep. Nagg laughs at Hamm and Nell criticizes him for laughing at Hamm's unhappiness. Nagg wants Nell to scratch his back but Nell is not enthusiastic. Nagg tells a story about a tailor to cheer Nell up because this story often makes her laugh. It is a story which he had told her for the first time the day after they had gotten engaged. After finishing the story Nell does not laugh. Hearing Hamm's angry tone, Nagg disappears into his bin but Nell remains. Hamm whistles for Clov and orders him to throw the bins into the sea. Clov goes to Nell's bin and checks her pulse and says that there is none. Clov tucks Nell in her bin and closes the lid. They start a conversation on Hamm's painkiller pills and his decedent doctor. Hamm asks Clov to move him around the room on his armchair and he wants to get closer to the walls. Hamm directs Clov to return him back to his original place in the room.

Hamm orders Clov to check outside with the telescope and report what he sees. Clov grumbles about why they go through this farce every day. Hamm questions that if they are beginning to 'mean' something. When Hamm is making a speech Clov interrupts and finds out that he has a flea on his body. They both start to worry that the flea might be the reason for humanity to start from there all over again. Clov gets a can of insecticide and pours it into his pants. Hamm offers Clov to leave for the south and tells him to build a raft for both of them but Clov refuses the idea. Upon hearing that Hamm says that he would go alone and Clov accepts and tells him that he is starting

to build a raft right away. Hamm stops him and asks whether it is time for his painkiller. Hamm makes dramatic long speech;

HAMM : In my house. (*Pause. With prophetic relish.*) One day you'll be blind like me. You'll be sitting here, a speck in the void, in the dark, forever, like me. (*Pause.*) One day you'll say to yourself, I'm tired, I'll sit down, and you'll go and sit down. Then you'll say, I'm hungry, I'll get up and get something to eat. But you won't get up. You'll say, I shouldn't have sat down, but since I have I'll sit on a little longer, then I'll get up and get something to eat. But you won't get up and you won't get anything to eat. (*Pause.*) You'll look at the wall a while, then you'll say, I'll close my eyes, perhaps have a little sleep, after that I'll feel better, and you'll close them. And when you open them again there'll be no wall any more. (*Pause.*) Infinite emptiness will be all around you, all the resurrected dead of all the ages wouldn't fill it, and there you'll be like a little bit of grit in the middle of the steppe. (*Pause.*) Yes, one day you'll know what it is, you'll be like me, except that you won't have anyone with you, because you won't have had pity on anyone and because there won't be anyone left to have pity on you. (*Pause.*) (Beckett, 2009: 23-24)

They continue to fuss about Hamm's asking Clov to leave the house and wanting Clov to destroy him and the ones in the ashbins. Clov says that he cannot destroy them. Hamm asks Clov if he remembers the first time he came home and his own father. The answer is negative and Hamm says he was a father to Clov. When Clov is about to leave Hamm, Hamm asks about his dog. Hamm orders Clov to get the dog. Clov comes back on the stage with a stuffed three-legged toy dog which has been made for him. Hamm wants the dog to be placed next to his armchair as if the dog is gazing up at him. Hamm accuses Clov of not helping an old woman called Mother Pegg. Mother Pegg needed an oil for her lamp. Hamm complains that her light is extinguished.

Clov wonders why he cannot refuse Hamm's orders. Hamm talks about a madman who was a painter once. He remembers a madman saying the end of the world has come since he thought the entire world was in ashes. Clov threatens to leave Hamm again and Hamm wonders how he would know whether Clov left or died in the kitchen. Clov tells him that he would set an alarm clock so that Hamm would know that he is dead. Hamm tells Clov that it is time for his story but Clov does not want to hear a story. Hamm orders Clov to ask his father in the bin. Nagg accepts to listen to Hamm's story provided that he gives him a sugar-plum.

After Clov leaves the stage Hamm asks Nagg the reason why he engendered him. Eventually, Hamm tells a long story with many stops. When the story ends Clov appears and says there is a rat in the kitchen. Nagg asks for his sugar-plum and Hamm refuses to give him one. With great disappointment Nagg curses him and returns to his bin.

Hamm asks for his dog again. Clov hands it to Hamm but he throws it away. Clov starts tidying things up around the room because he likes order.

CLOV : Putting things in order. (*He straightens up. Fervently.*)
I'm going to clear everything away! (*He starts picking up again.*)

HAMM : Order!

CLOV :(*straightening up*) I love order. It's my dream. A world where all would be silent and still, and each thing in its last place, under the last dust. (*He starts picking up again.*) (Beckett, 2009: 35)

Hamm wants Clov to listen to his story before he leaves but soon changes his mind and tells he is too tired to finish it or to make up another one. Hamm orders Clov the check on his parents in the bins. His mother Nell is dead and Nagg is crying. Hamm asks Clov to push his chair to the window, because he wants to feel the sunshine on his face. Nevertheless, there is no sun then Hamm wants to hear the sound of the sea and orders him to open the window; However, there is no sea. Hamm wants to be pushed to the center again and he asks Clov to kiss him on his forehead or hold his hand but Clov refuses to do both. Hamm asks for his dog and changes his mind again. Clov leaves promising to kill the rat.

Hamm makes a long speech again which is about how the end happened in the beginning and how they survived. Hearing the whistle Clov enters holding an alarm clock in his hand and looks for a place to hang it. Clov tells Hamm that it is time for the painkillers. Hamm again orders Clov the check outside. Clov mentions Mother Pegg and blames Hamm for her death in dark because of his refusing her request of oil for her lamp. Clov questions himself why he still obeys Hamm. Hamm asks for his dog again and this time Clov comes down from the ladder and hit Hamm with the dog. Clov checks outside and thinks that he sees a small boy. He decides to go outside and find the small boy if he is there. Hamm repeats again that he does not need Clov anymore and asks him to say some parting words from his heart. Clov remembers the past and the people who made promises about giving him happiness when he was growing up. Clov leaves the stage and Hamm calls Clov twice but he does not respond. Hamm calls for his father but he does not respond either. Hamm makes a speech about nature of ending and covers his face with his handkerchief.

3.5. *Godot Has Arrived*

Miodrag Bulatovic's play *Godot has Arrived* is the play written after *Waiting for Godot* and before *Good Riddance Godot*. That makes the play important since Ferhan Şensoy had the inspiration of naming his own play *Good Riddance Godot* after reading it. In his unpublished work *Gecedeste*, Şensoy states that,

...

galatasaray lisesin'de öğrenciyken düşünölmüş

düşünölmekle kalmamış oturulup yazılmış

artık çok soluk teksir kaatlarına

oyun yazmak nedir hiç bilmiyorken

bindokuzyüzaltmışsekiz ilkbaharı

ilk tiyatro oyunumu yazmış bulunuyorum

...

iki soytarısı var oyunun

...

estragon'la vladimir'i anımsatan beckettengiz kişiler

...

bulatoviç'in

godot geldi
oyununu okuyunca
yeniden açıyorum dosyamı
bindokuzyüzyetmişbirde
türkiye çok karışıkken
godot go home
oluyor yeniden yazılan oyunun ismi ... (Şensoy, 2014: 64)

Şensoy above explains the background of the play *Good Riddance Godot* in rhyme in his unpublished work *Gecedeste*. He announces that he has written his play *Good Riddance Godot* after reading Bulatovic's *Godot Has Arrived*.

It has been thought during galatasaray high school years
Not only been thought but been written
On faded cheap sheets of paper
Not even had a clue how to write a play
Nineteensixtyeight spring
I have written my first play
...
There are two harlequins in the play
...
Redolent of beckett like characters estragon and vladimir
Bulatovic's
Godot has arrived
When reading it
I reopen my file in
Nineteenseventyone
When turkey was disordered
Godot go home
Is the re-written play ... (Şensoy, 2014: 64)

As it is seen, Şensoy named his play *Good Riddance Godot* because in Bulotocic's play *Godot has arrived*. That is why Şensoy says good-bye to Godot (Pekman 2013). To realize why Şensoy says good-bye to Godot, it is essential to discuss about Miodrag

Bulatovic and his play *Godot Has Arrived*. That is the reason why the play *Godot has Arrived* takes place in this theses.

3.5.1. Miodrag Bulatovic

He was a Serbian writer and lived between 1930 and 1991. He was a novelist and a playwright and the best representative of the 1950's generation. His books were mostly known for their graphic portrayals of sex, decay, black humor and violence. Bulatovic was an active political figure as well as a writer. He started his writing career with a book of short stories *Djavoli dolaze* (the Devils Are Coming) and with this book he received the Serbian Writers Union Award. The novel *The Red Rooster Flies Heavenwards* was translated into more than twenty languages. The story takes place in writer's homeland of northeastern Montenegro and the novel achieved considerable success. Nevertheless, Bulatovic decided to stop the publication of the book since there were interferences from the authority and he was uncomfortable with it. By stopping the publication, he, in a way, protested the interferences. He wrote his next novel *Hero on Donkey* and it also achieved a considerable success. The reality is blurred beyond recognition with strong symbols, metaphors and hyperboles. With its plot structure and the subtitle "the time of shame" it became a symbolic antiwar novel (Mihailovic, 1975).

3.5.2. Plot summary of *Godot Has Arrived*

The audience meet a big closed curtain. This big curtain opens and the audience see second one on the stage on which *Godot Has Arrived* is written in comic fonts. A train stopping is clearly and loudly heard behind the curtain. The curtain on which *Godot has Arrived* written has three sections. First, the left section slowly rises and a big man, Vladimir, with his trousers dropped down to his ankles wearing long underwear sitting under a tree is seen. There is a rope hanging on the tree. He is questioning through mime whether it is best to hang himself or to struggle in the marsh. The middle section of the curtain rises and a road which has holes full of mud, stones, a telegraph pole with its wires hanging down appears. There is a black crow positioned on the telegraph pole. Finally, the last section of the curtain rises and skinny, feeble man, Estragon appears on stage. He is wearing an undervest and a black coat holding a big size hat. Just like Vladimir his pants are dropped down to his ankles and he is in long underwear.

They say that they have waited for nothing but they are feeling well now. Then all of a sudden their pants dropped down and they felt very lucky. Estragon wishes to write this lucky day down but Vladimir objects the idea and says writing may cause trouble. Vladimir says that there is no need to think because there are people who are thinking for them and they earn money for doing that.

A sound of train stopping is heard and an unpleasant smell fills the stage. Vladimir tells that this smell comes from the animals travelling in the first class and the train will come back again. They agree that they are brothers and they love each other. They think that they are the representatives of the humanity. Estragon says that he will hang the first pig getting off the train and Vladimir opposes that and says he will hang all the passengers on the train. Vladimir is proud of his Slavic race and rejects Estragon's clown imputation.

A boy enters and sees Vladimir and Estragon jumping up and down and singing. He introduces himself as a boy and says he is the one to be awaited, to be proud of and to be thought all the time. Vladimir thinks that he might be Godot but Estragon rejects the idea and says it is impossible for Godot to be that young. They become fearful and tell the boy that they are not asking his name and his job and neither what he has been doing for a thousand years in and before the war. They tell him that they have not seen him around before. The boy says he is the one who is inseparable part of them. He says he was in the post office and announces that Godot is coming. Estragon and Vladimir become extremely happy. The boy says that Godot is in the post office with a girl there.

They all hear whipping and groaning. A big man Pozzo enters driving Lucky by means of a rope wound round his neck. Lucky is an old man carrying the bags. Pozzo forces Lucky to act like a cat but Lucky sounds like a dog. Pozzo introduces himself and talks about his family tree saying that he is a noble man. Vladimir and Estragon say that they are waiting for Godot but Pozzo says it is pointless to wait for Godot because he is sure that he is not coming. Moreover, he says that Godot is an invented mythical character of the powerless individuals. He adds that Godot might come out of a church. The boy says it is quite unimaginable since Godot has never stepped through a church door and that he is in the post office. Pozzo believes that Estragon and Vladimir are hopeless and there will be nothing left in the world, not even bones nor plants. The boy stands just in the middle of the stage and advises them not to lose any hope since he is sure that Godot is coming. Vladimir and Estragon in a fearful pose say that Godot

is their rescuer and they curse the post offices, receivers, transmitters, wires, wireless and all the tulips of Holland. Suddenly, they hear thunder, train stopping and rifle shooting. Pozzo tells that Godot is certainly the driver of the train because he owns everything. The first act ends.

The second act of the play starts with the rise of the left section of the curtain. A band, cymbal, drumbeat, laughter and heehaw are heard. Vladimir and Estragon appear. They want to stay alone and wish to prevent other curtains from rising. Nevertheless, with the middle section rising Pozzo and Lucky are seen. Pozzo makes a long speech about how he has fallen and states that he also decided to wait for the savior.

Godot enters and asks if there are dogs, lions, tigers or hyenas around. Hearing that there is no danger he says he is not a tiny and weak hope. He is in his forties wearing Charlie Chaplin shoes and a feeble man covered with flour. Godot tells them that he is a baker. Godot asks them whether they are clowns and Vladimir says they are not; they are dressed funny to entertain people. Estragon says they are ashamed of the clothing which they deemed appropriate. Godot laughs at them and builds a bakery on stage. Godot says that it is the fifth village he stopped by and the people in the villages do not want to believe that he is a baker. They think that he is the savior. He says he is sorry to disappoint them. Estragon and Vladimir talk about their past and how happy they were in those years. But later, they were told that they are the enemies. Then they start to live in fearful world. They talk about what they ate and how they survived.

Godot tells Pozzo that he himself is a baker and corn flour is for pigs and for people who like corn. Train stops again and Godot says what kind a train this is. It is full of blood and full of pigs. The drivers are the monkeys. Pozzo and Godot talk about pigs, Godot describes the pigs. Estragon says that they have waited for so long but no one has arrived. While waiting he said they forgot how others looked. Vladimir adds that many others walked through and the earth beneath collapsed. They have seen many disasters, fires, robbers and murders. They first ride down on them and then they said they were free as birds. Godot asks about Lucky and Pozzo says they are at the same age but he is in his mature years of his manhood yet he himself is not and he is weak. Lucky makes a speech about wars, blood and guilt. Godot tells Pozzo that after lunch he will free Lucky. Godot asks Pozzo why he is astonished since they figured out that he is the savior and he is saving Lucky. Godot offers flour to them but they refuse the offer since the flour has an unpleasant smell. Pozzo does not believe that this man is

Godot. Hearing what Pozzo says Vladimir tells Godot that he is not the real one and he should leave. Estragon agrees. They mime as if they have guns and they shoot. The struggle is about Lucky. Godot wants to free him but others do not want him to free Lucy. The scene become like a military coup. The second act ends.

The third act starts with curtain rise, there is a bakery, and flour sacks but Godot is not on the scene. Estragon and Vladimir enter, both of them covered in flour. They talk about how happy to be alone again. They try to describe happiness. Suddenly they change the subject and;

VLADIMIR : Everything has slackened, time... even thoughts are tired... thoughts Gogo... (Bulatovic, 1970: 72).

They again start to tell each other how happy they are now and want to be left alone forever. They say they do not want any volunteered fireman around since they have built houses to burn down. They say that there will be nothing left to be saved. They even do not want the boy, who has introduced them to Godot, around. They think that Godot was the not real one. They do not want to bear Pozzo and Lucky either. Estragon says that Pozzo played poker and lose the lands. The lands most probably belong to a deputy. Estragon thinks that he has seen a mouse but Vladimir refuses that and says it is not a mouse it is a moss, their moss. All of a sudden, they hear a rumble and train stopping, the boy appears wet and tells that the post office has collapsed. Vladimir sees Godot with a girl. They want to destroy Godot to save the girl and they start dreaming about it. In their dream they pretend as if there was no flour sacks and Godot.

Pozzo and Lucky enter but this time Lucky is holding the rope and driving Pozzo. Vladimir says the bakery stinks and asks how to burn it down. Lucky says with deep hatred or drown in your tears. Lucky and Vladimir talk about changing the roles. Vladimir tells Lucky to do something since he is the state and the authority now. Godot enters and declares that he is full of pity for all of them, Vladimir, Estragon, Lucky and Pozzo. Lucky makes a speech and they realize that Lucky is sophisticated and educated. He says he knows many languages. Lucky blames Godot for hurting the girl in the post office and Godot says they loved each other. Godot requests Lucky to free Pozzo and Lucky says there is no real freedom in life. Freedom is only in the books. Godot says he has never read one because he does not know how to read and write. He says he is not a worrier either. He is only a baker. Lucky, Estragon and Vladimir decide

to kill Godot with Lucky's sword. Godot bequeaths that they should try his flour at least once and free Pozzo. They set a mock trial and Vladimir announces Godot as public enemy. They humiliate Godot and dismiss him. Godot begs to stay and makes a long speech. The train stops and Godot is about to leave but the boy yells asking for help. He cannot walk because the frogs has bitten his legs. Godot runs for help and he gives the boy what he has as if he is his own son. Godot says he will take care of him until he recovers. The third act ends.

3.6. Ferhan Şensoy

Ferhan Şensoy was born in Çarşamba, borough of Samsun in 1951. He started his high school education in Galatasaray high school in İstanbul but graduated from Çarşamba high school. During his Galatasaray high school years one of his short stories, *Kusura Kalmayın Dalgındır Hüsam* was published in Yeni Ufuklar periodical in its November 1968 issue. His stories continued to be published in a periodical, Soyut and his poems were published in Yeni Ufuklar. In 1970, his first sketches were staged by Devekuşu Cabaret Theatre. He has written one of his early plays *Je M'en Fous Bilader* in Turkish and French, two languages at the same. The rehearsals were practiced in Devekuşu Cabaret Theatre with Galatasaray Oyuncuları. This group was an amateur theatre group which Ferhan Şensoy formed during his high school years. Being a bright and remarkable student Haldun Taner gave a full support to Şensoy for his play *Je M'en Fous Bilader* and the play was staged by Devekuşu Cabaret just once under the locked doors because of 12 March memorandum and declaration of martial law (Şensoy, 2014: 799).

He joined Grup Oyuncuları as a professional theatre actor. Playing in Ayfer Feray Theatre, he had the opportunity to direct his first play *Güm Güm Güm* with İsmet Küntay in Paravana Cabaret in 1971. Şensoy went to France and started his drama education at Ecole Supérieure d'Art Dramatique in Theatre national de Strasbourg in 1972. During his theatre education, he worked as an assistant to French theatre director Jérôme Savary and also played in *De Moise A Mao* in Magic circus. In late 1973, he has written his first play *Good Riddance Godot* in French under the name of *Godot Go Home*. In the same year he has also written a collage play, *Proche-Orient Lointain* (Near East is Far) using the French translated scripts of famous Turkish writers Nazım Hikmet, Fazıl Hüsni Dağlarca and Yunus Emre (Şensoy, 2014: 799-800).

He played at Theatre National De Strasbourg in Les Res-Sources Naturelles Pierre Laville and was assistant to the director Andre-Lois Perinetti. In the same year, he put two of his plays which were written in French *Ce Fou De Gogol* and *Harem Qui Rit* on stage at Theatre De Quatre-Sous in Montreal. Şensoy directed and also played in his musical *Harem Qui Rit*. He was awarded a Best Foreign Writer prize in Montreal in 1975. After his theatre education and experiences he had in France, he returned to Turkey and started to work at Ali Poyrazođlu Theatre as a writer and an actor. He directed and also played in one of his plays *Dur Konuşma Sus Söyleme* at Ali Poyrazođlu Theatre in 1976. In the same year, he also worked at Türk Yazarları Theatre as a director and an actor. He has written his first television sketch, *Ali Uyanık*. It was the first time he was seen on television as a waiter acting with Ali Poyrazođlu. Şensoy joined Nisa Serezli – Tolga Aşkiner Theatre group and continued to write sketches for Devekuşu Caberet and TRT television channel (Şensoy, 2014; 800).

Ferhan Şensoy has published his first book *Kazancı Yokuşu* in 1977 and in the same year, his first movie *Kızını Dövmeyen Dizini Döver* was shot under the direction of Temel Gürsu. In the meantime, Şensoy formed a theatre group with Mete İnselel named Anyamanya Kumpanya Theatre. He has written *İdi Amin Avantadan Lavanta* theatre play and both directed and acted in the play in his theatre group. His television series *Bizim Sınıf* was banned in the second week for humiliating teachers. He left Anyamanya Kumpanya and staged *Bizim Sınıf* at Ali Poyrazođlu theatre and also worked at Ayfer Feray Theatre as an actor (Şensoy, 2014; 800-801).

Ferhan Şensoy wrote a serial *Sizin Sınıf* for TRT television channel and he also acted in it. Şensoy has also written, directed and acted in a musical *Hayrola Kayrola* at Ayfer Feray Theatre. In the same year, he staged his cabaret *Dedikodu Şov* at Stardust Night club. Many famous names such as, Adile Naşit, Perran Kutman, Pakize Suda, Sevda Karaca and İstanbul Gelişim band gave significant contribution to the cabaret. Şensoy has written *Şahları da Vururlar* and formed his new theatre group Ortaoyuncular. He directed and acted in *Şahları da Vururlar* at Ortaoyuncular. In 1980 Şensoy was awarded Avni Dilligil Jury's Special Award and Dergi 13 the Best Play Award. He staged *Aşkın Gözüne Gözlük* at Tuncat Özinel theatre and in 1980 Ortaoyuncular has moved to Beyođlu Küçük Sahne and *Şahları da Vururlar* continued to be staged there (Şensoy, 2014; 801-802).

Şensoy has written many plays and directed them all and acted in most of them. His humorous style, critical point of view and his exceptional and outstanding ability of using the words has made him remarkable in the art of theatre in Turkey. In 1981, he wrote *Parasız Yaşamak Pahalı* and *Kahraman Bakkal Süpermarkete Karşı*. Fuat Güner, Özkan Uğur and Zeliha Berksoy took place on stage in *Kahraman Bakkal Süpermarkete Karşı*. *Şahları da Vururlar* was published under the name of Ortaoyuncular in the same year. Şensoy formed an amateur theatre group called “Nöbetçi Tiyatro” and gave training to the students whom he has chosen after an interview and examination. Şensoy wrote *Binbir Gece Cinayetleri* which was the continuation of *Şahları da Vururlar*; nevertheless, the play was banned during the rehearsals because of Iran Consulate General’s application to the State Department. The play was about Khomeini period and Iran Consulate General wrote threatening letter to Ortaoyuncular asking this play not to be played at all. In the same year Şensoy’s new book *Afitap’ın Kocası İstanbul* was published and staged a play *En Büyük Romülüs Başka Büyük Yok* at Nöbetçi Tiyatro. He has written *Kiralık Oyun* and made its music, he directed and acted in it (Şensoy, 2014; 802).

During the military service years, Şensoy directed his play which was inspired from the seven poems of Bertold Brecht, *Anna’nın Yedi Ana Günahı*. He has also written, made the music and directed *Fırıncı Şükri, Deli Vahap, Nuri ve Ötekiler*. He staged *Afitap’ın Kocası İstanbul* at Nöbetçi Tiyatro while he was writing *İstanbul’u Satıyorum*. In 1985, Şensoy has updated Aristophanes’ *The Wasps* and directed and acted in the play. His other books *Gündeste* and *Ayna Merdiven* were published in 1986 and in the same year, Şensoy has written and staged *İçinden Tramvay Geçen Şarkı* cooperating with Hümeysra and Grup Gündoğarken. He has written *Muzır Müzikal* and staged at Şan Theatre. Grup Lokomatif, Derya Baykal, Bülent Kayabaş, Sevil Üstekin, Tarık Papuçcuoğlu made valuable contribution to Ortaoyuncular. The Musical produced extreme reactions. Reactionists became terribly uncomfortable with the musical and Ferhan Şensoy was charged because of the play. After the 77th play on 7 February 1987, Şan Theatre was suspiciously burned down. Ferhan Şensoy was sentenced to prison for 21 days because of the musical mentioned above. In the same year, he has written *Ferhangi Şeyler* and the play has staged more than 2000 times up to now. Şensoy has written another television serial *Varsayalım İsmail* directed and acted in it. He was awarded Nokta Doruktakiler Prize. (Şensoy, 2014; 803).

Şensoy has rewritten *İstanbul'u Satıyorum* and staged it at Ortaoyuncular with great contribution of Münir Özkul and Erol Günaydın. In 1988, he was awarded Ulvi Uraz the best Director Prize and Sanat Kurumu Prize. He put *Keşanlı Ali Destanı* written by Haldun Taner on stage at İstanbul Şehir Theatre. In the same year, he has translated *Don Juan and Madonna* written by Anca Visdei and shared the stage with Derya Baykal. He has written *Soyut Padişah* and has published another book *Düşbükü*. Şensoy was awarded Avni Dilligil Prize, Nasrettin Hodja Humour Prize, Ministry of Culture Jury's Special Award and Hey Girl Best Oscars of the Year Prize in 1989. Ferhan Şensoy has taken Kel Hasan Efendi's "Kavuk" from Münir Özkul. This is a historical event and an honorable prize for theatre actors. Ortaoyuncular moved to Ses-1885 from Küçük Sahne in 1989. He was awarded Nokta Doruktakiler Prize for the second time and Altan Erbulak Prize. He performed in a movie *Büyük Yanlızlık* with Sezen Aksu. Tomris Uyar translated *İstanbul'u Satıyorum* into English and Şensoy has rewritten *Good Riddance Godot* and *Ce Fou De Gogol (Şu Gogol Delisi)* in Turkish and has put the play on the stage. The book of the play *Good Riddance Godot* was published in 1993 in the same year with *Denememeler*. With *Şu Gogol Delisi* the players have received Avni Dilligil Prize and Ferhan Şensoy was awarded Altın Objektif Prize (Şensoy, 2014; 804-806).

Ferhan Şensoy rented a boat and transformed it into a theatre hall and named İçinden Dalga Geçen Tiyatro. He has performed two different plays on this sailing stage every night on the Bosphorus in Istanbul; *Seyircili Seyir Defteri* and *Kırkambar Gece Tiyatrosu* after midnight (Meyer-Dinkgrafe, 2002: 275). Şensoy was awarded İsmail Dümbüllü Prize in 1994. Şensoy has written many serials for television and his many plays were put on the stage by different theatre groups abroad; *Good Riddance Godot* in France translated as *Adieu Godot*, and in Russia translated by Huroman Nevruzova, *Hayrola Kayrola* in Yugoslavia, *Kahraman Bakkal Süpermarkete Karşı* and *Parasız Yaşamak Pahalı* in Amsterdam. Şensoy has also organized talk shows and game shows for different television channels and radios. In 1995 Şensoy has written and staged *Üç Kuruşluk Opera* and *Felek Bir Gün Salakken*. A year later, he has published *Oteller Kitabı* and has written a movie scenario *Kapsama Alanı Dışında*. Ortaoyuncular was awarded Ministry of Culture the Best Company Prize. Şensoy, while producing movie scenarios and theatre plays, has written for humor magazines. He has fictionalized a play *Haldun Taner Caberet* related to Haldun Taner's proses, stories and sketches. He

has written a script *Çok Tuhaf Soruşturma* and rewritten Anton Chekov's *the Cherry Orchard* under the name of *Fişne Pahçesu* which is now a contemporary black sea region story. After putting the plays on stage, he has written *Sahibinden Satılık Birinci El Ortaoyunu* and published autobiographical book *Kalemimin Sapını Gülle Donattım*. A translated part of the play *Good Riddance Godot* was published in a play anthology *De L'Adriatique a la Mer Noire* in France under the name *Adieu Godot*. (Şensoy, 2014; 806-809).

Şensoy has written and directed the plays *Kökü Bitti Zıkkım Zulada*, *Kahraman Osman* and *Biri Bizi Dikizliyor*. He has published *Rum Memed*, *İngilizce Bilmeden Hepinizi I Love You* and *FerhAntoloji*, and was awarded Sanat Kurumu The Best Playwright Prize and Afife Jale / Muhsin Ertuğrul Prize in the years of 2001 and 2002. He performed in *Şans Kapıyı Kırınca*, *Pardon* and *Aktör Eskisi*. In 2005, he has published three books; *Eşeğin Fikri*, *Hacı Kominist* and *Elvada SSK*. In the same year, he was awarded Deneme Sahnesi 35 year the Best Actor and Nasrettin Hodja Golden Ass Humour Prize. Şensoy performed in a movie *Son Ders* as a starring character. He has rewritten a television serial *Boşgezen ve Kalfası* as a play. He has written and directed 2019/ *Bilimsiz Kurgusal Güldürü* and staged it at Ortaoyuncular. He has written the scenario of *Şeref ile Jülyet* and has written and directed the play *Ruhundan Tramvay Geçen Adam* which was about Karl Valentin's life story and his sketches. Şensoy has published *Seçme Sapan Şeyler* and has written and directed *Fername*, *İşsizler Cennete Gider*, *Nasri Hoca* and *Muhelif Eşeği* and *Masal Müfettişi*. Ferhan Şensoy has received many prizes apart from the aforementioned ones (Şensoy, 2014; 806-809).

3.6.1 Ferhan Şensoy's writing style

Ferhan Şensoy has started his writing career with the first draft of *Good Riddance Godot* during his high school years in 1968 when he was 17. He has been writing, directing and acting in his own plays with "Ortaoyuncular", a company he himself has established in 1980. After studying at Ecole Superieure d Arts Dramatiques in France, he has worked with Jerome Savary at Magic Circus as his assistant. In the years he spent in France and with Jerome Savary he has accumulated know how and knowledge which enabled him to amalgamate his western training with Turkish traditional theatre when he came back to Turkey. Şensoy was an immediate success with his play *Sahlarında Vururlar* in 1980. Since then he has updated many of his plays as well as

some other plays, wrote and acted in different plays ranging from *theatrum mundi*, cabaret to authentic epic plays. As a contemporary encomiast, Ferhan Şensoy presents an authentic and unique identity with his use of language on stage, his relationship with the audience and his unique writing style. He has been struggling to establish integrative theatre notion in Turkey just like Brecht and Fo. He has created a perception in theatre world where a playwright can also act on stage to constitute an integrative theatre notion. Şensoy criticizes the ideas and the people who believe that it is true to represent the national theatre with a traditional identity (Pekman, 2002: 149). Şensoy believes that the artists should renew themselves and he states his ideas as:

“For artists, renewal occur in self and style. Actors appear on stage and the canavaccio has already been determined for centuries for them. One sets the context and the other appears on stage and cracks a joke. People laugh a lot and many fill the theatre every day. Changing a joke of Muammer Karaca in *Cibali Karakolu* for example is considered neither modernity nor contemporaneity. Artists confuse the topicality with modernity. They think that they are renewing themselves; nevertheless, they are parroting the old canavaccio. Under this circumstances we are entitled to question contemporary world view and forms of innovation” (Kurtulan, 1982: 59)

Şensoy may have reason to complain about Turkish theatre. To become contemporary and innovative Turkish playwrights have chosen to adapt Western plays onto Turkish stages, or have preferred to transfer the traditional Turkish plays to Italian stage (Pekman, 2002: 150). Şensoy expresses his opinion about playwrights in an interview as;

Question: When talking about innovation in style do you mean Western styles?

Şensoy: Both yes and no. The conventional style in Turkey is the Western style anyway. In other words, it is the Italian stage. It was not possible to stage the traditional Turkish theatre, *Ortaoyunu*, on Italian stage. Even Western actors have tried to change the traditional Italian stage style and they have preferred to act next to the audiences, in the middle or everywhere in the theatre hall. Brecht introduced the innovation to Western theatre with the Middle East theatre style. Through *Ortaoyunu* Turkish theatre can easily renovate its style, for example, the shadow theatre, *Karagöz* technique can be adapted and used with different perspectives (Kurtulan, 1982: 59).

Ferhan Şensoy has been in search of the aforementioned perspectives in his plays. Şensoy does not claim that he knows how and what the innovation should be in style. He says he has been searching for it and trying not to fall behind universal and contemporary developments... (Kurtulan, 1982: 60). What makes Ferhan Şensoy different from other playwrights is his ability of the use of language. As in folk theatre

tradition, Ferhan Şensoy forms a play technique based on the richness of language. Şensoy's use of language in his plays is totally different from others since he does not prefer to continue the tradition of writing with all known wordplays. He added new and unique dimensions to the use of language. (Pekman, 2002: 150) Ayşegül Yüksel considers Şensoy's ability of language use as;

Şensoy has the ability of viewing his mother tongue objectively and critically in comparison to most of his contemporaries. Through using a unique use of language, Şensoy creates a wide space of producing humor for himself from daily politic humor to ordinary comedy (Yüksel, 1988: 4).

Ferhan Şensoy's unique style of using language does not only underlie the humor on the stage but also underlie the alienation technique in his plays. The words, the sentences and the dialogues Şensoy uses are not the conventional ones that the audiences are used to hear. When those sentences and the dialogues are decoded, it is understood that they are the system created to give joy to the audiences. Through questioning and decoding, the audiences may start to consider their native tongue more objective as much as they question the play on the stage.

Since there are no published English translations of Ferhan Şensoy's plays and articles, the following dialogues and paragraphs will be translated by the researcher to avail them to English speakers. Some dialogues or paragraphs below are not suitable for word for word translation because of cultural factors and word formation, so they are only summarized in English. The example below is an example of Ferhan Şensoy's ability of employing different meanings to commonly well-known words.

KAVUKSUZ : Otel ne?

KAVUKLU : Bildiğiniz o ince uzun tel! O tel! (GGG, 1996: 7)

Here is an example of a play on words. “*Otel*” means “*Hotel*” in English. When you separate letter “*O*” and the syllable “*tel*” a completely different meaning is obtained in Turkish language. “*O*” stands for the demonstrative pronoun “*that*” and “*tel*” means wire in English. Thus “*O tel*” means “*that wire*”. Şensoy attains a completely different meaning by playing with words in his works and that makes him unique. In the following dialogue Şensoy plays with words referring to commonly known objects and creates questions in audiences' minds.

KAVUKLU : ... Bavul zengin dursun diye koyulmuş şeyler...
Taşınmasa da olur, salaklıklar... Gittiğimiz yerde, ne lan

bu, deyip atacağımız nesnelere... Yoksa bizim bir yerden bir yere götürülecek şeylerimizin hepsi yüreğimizin içinde... Başka neyimiz var ki? Benim diş fırçam yok örneğin, senin var mı?

KAVUKSUZ : Benim yıllardır yok. Hangi suyla, hangi diş fırçalıyorsun? Kürdanla kuru temizleme... Kişisel kürdan taşımaya da gerek yok. (GGG, 1996: 66)

Most probably everyone sitting in the theatre hall knows what a toothpick is but how many of them has ever thought of making a sentence like “dry cleaning with toothpick” referring to dental hygiene. Kavuklu identifies a luggage and talks about the purpose of carrying it. He says a lot of unnecessary stuff is put in and carried in the suitcase all the way to the destination. However, upon arrival when it is opened the owner feels the futility of carrying so much for no reason and starts questioning the reason why. He says,

KAVUKLU :...What we need to carry is all in our heart... What else do we own? I don't have a toothbrush for example, do you have one?"

KAVUKSUZ : I haven't had one for years. Where is the running water to brush the teeth anyway. Dry cleaning with a toothpick... It is not even necessary to carry a personal toothpick. (GGG, 1996: 66)

...

H. EDWARD :Oh! Anna! Bu ne BİTİFİL rastlantı... Sizi İN DI SKAY arıyorken İN DI burda buldum. Dalgalandım da duruldum. Bu bana MAY GAD IN BİTİFİL bir lütfü.

MAHMUT : Eyvallah, ... Mahmut Abiniz müthiş bir değer olduğu için sayın büyüklerimiz beni bir mapushanede röpo yapmayı uygun görmüşler. (Şensoy, 1983 in Pekman, 2002: 151)

In the dialogue above Şensoy mingles Turkish and English together and creates a euphony as well; “Sizi İN DI SKAY arıyorken İN DI burda buldum. Dalgalanım da duruldum.” Sizi İN DI SKAY arıyorken İN DI burda buldum means finding someone unexpectedly. Şensoy uses English not in correct spelling form but in speaking format which also creates a humorous effect in the dialogues.

Ayşegül Yüksel defines Ferhan Şensoy as a language acrobat since he battles Turkish against Turkish and breaks the chains of command in the prescribed structures and he carefully observes his mother tongue as if he is hearing it for the first time. He becomes the voice of unspoken by using vocalic and lexical associations of the language (Yüksel, 1995 in Pekman 2002: 151). What Şensoy does can be considered as contemporary perspective in written form of spoken competence of traditional theatre. Nevertheless, this contemporary perspective must be perceived as a production of different worldview and art politics since his theatre ancestors had only aimed to create laughter from the moral (Pekman, 2002: 150-151).

Şensoy benefits from language characteristics of ethnic groups in traditional theatre and he expresses these language properties through imitation on stage. In doing so Şensoy carries his imitated narration into different dimensions. This dimension is a unique one, which can be easily perceived by everyone; moreover, it is a structure of newly created language where use of alienation is the ultimate peak. Şensoy creates such alienation in *Şahları da Vururlar*, reminding Iranian imitation of traditional theatre mingling Turkish and Farsi languages (Pekman, 2002: 152).

MEŞHEDİ

: (reads) Dahi oyun başlar başlamaz, kaleyi kefereye tevcih-I hücum eylendi. Şeşinci dakikada keferenin sol muhaccimi Yanaki Dalyanakis in müstasna şutu, kefereyi yeke mukabil sıfır ile öne geçirdi. Golden sonra takımımız toparlanır gibi oldu ise de mir türlü toparlanamadı. Mir ara Fuji Şirzat, yorgunluktan düştükte hakeme gidip faul vermesini talep eyledi. Hakem-ül merkeziye, federasyon-ül Fransevi den Jean-Paul Futbollö...

DİBA

: Ah oui?

MEŞHEDİ

: Ah oui (continuous to read) Ol ah oui faul vermedi. Muna minirlenen Fuji Şirzat hakame bi-edep el, kol ve bilek işaretlerinde bulundukta, hakem Fuji Şirzat a alkart gösterdi. Anın üzerine takımımız oyuna cıhar muhaccim ilen devam etmekte muztar kaldı. (Şahları da Vururlar, 1988: 66-67)

Şensoy has conceived similar structure in mingling Turkish and Latin through Greek performing imitation in traditional theatre in *Köhne Bizans Operası*.

YORGO

: Ena aksam deniz kıyısında yürüyakıs, önümde dio kadın yan yana gidakıs... Enası orta yaşlı, enası daha gentsdse... yüzlerinde tüller var, gentsdse kadının gözlerini görakıs. Kadın egoya bakakıs, ego kadına bakakıs, kadının gözlerinin itsi gülakıs... Birden tsarpilmento, peslerinden yürümento, kemerlere kadar izlemento. Kemerlerin orda birden Kadın dönakıs, egoya kosarak boynumda sarilakıs, sapsallamento! Ego da onu kollarimin arasında sikakıs... Kadının kokusu basımı dönürümdöndürüs... (Köhne Bizans Operası, 1992 in Pekman, 2002: 152)

When creating this newly structured language Ferhan Şensoy uses “*ts*” instead of “*ç*”, “*ds*” instead of “*c*” and “*i*” instead of “*ı*” sounding like imitations of Greeks in Turkish traditional plays of Ortaoyunu. While constructing a new language Şensoy follows the rules of traditional theatre; however, he avoids the use of imitations as they are but presents a unique and contemporary conclusion. He changes some well-known and frequently used words with foreign equivalents, like using “*ego*” instead of “*ben*”. Moreover, he creates suffixes like, “*-mento*”, “*-ium*”, “*-ius*” and uses them appropriately. In the final analysis, the generated language is unique to Şensoy and is found quite odd by the audiences. The language he uses creates a successful tool for alienation on stage and this language is the most effective instrument of his humor (Pekman, 2002: 153).

Şensoy’s ability of using the words also distinguishes the fantasy and the abstraction in the language. Instead of cracking a joke which makes the audiences laugh only,

Şensoy prefers to force the imagination and the opinions of the audiences and compel them to question every single concept of the language and make them aware of the facts of language that they use every day. Şensoy in his works abstracts the words from their figurative meanings and reduces them to their most common meanings. He makes up and improvises new words and propositional phrases that have never been thought of before. The newly invented words and the phrases easily perceived by the readers and the audiences become the basics of his comedy (Yüksel, 1996: 14).

KAVUKLU : Çok güzel bir aptallık var ortada.

KAVUKSUZ : Sensin aptal!

KAVUKLU : Ben kimseye aptal demiyorum, aptallık öyle lök gibi duruyor ortada, kime ait olduğu belli değil, kimse sahip çıkmıyor, öylesine sokağa bırakılmış piç bir aptallık... Öyle salak salak bakmayın bana, somut olarak var bu aptallık, kokusu burnuma, pıtırdsı kulağıma geliyor...

KAVUKSUZ : Kokulu ve pıtırılı bir şey yani... (GGG, 1996: 18)

Şensoy criticizes the stupidity of humanity in this dialogue but he never directs this stupidity to anyone. He gives shape to the word “*stupid*” and uses it differently as it has never been used before. In the first place, Kavuksuz takes the word personal and gets angry; however, Kavuklu clarifies his ideas and the word together and criticizes the society without addressing them.

KAVUKLU : There is a beautiful stupidity in the middle

KAVUKSUZ : You are stupid!

KAVUKLU : I don't address anyone and say stupid. Stupidity sits there awkwardly. It is uncertain who it belongs to. No one wants to own it. It looks like an illegitimate stupidity thrown into the streets... Don't look at me foolishly. This stupidity is concrete, I can smell it, I can hear its tapping...

KAVUKSUZ : It is a smelly and noisy thing then... (GGG, 1996: 18)

Tongue twisters are the most significant segments of being a master of words in folk drama tradition. Ferhan Şensoy can successfully use tongue twisters The fantasy and

abstraction of tongue twisters become a different language device for Ferhan Şensoy. He uses tongue twisters not as they are but successfully applies them into his plays and dialogues. To give an example;

Laleli minaresi kabakulak sepetini mezara verip atlı karınca huzurunda tevellüd eden zerzevatçı küfeleri aklına hiffet getirip darüş-şifaya bend-i zincir olmuşlardır dahi hatta geçen ayın çarşambasından bu ayın perşembesine yedi buçuk metre kısa gelmiş, bilmem ki bunlar ne kadar kayısı pestili idare eder, bunu herhalde Yemiş iskelesinde ki manavlardan sormak gerek. Biz gelelim hikayemize... (And, 1985: 225)

The tongue twister above is the opening prologue of the encomiast. Encomiast does not give any clue about the story; moreover, the tongue twister itself is meaningless. This short meaningless prologue is vocalized both to show the mastery of words of the encomiast so as to effect the audiences and to announce that the story that will be told is only a fiction but the fiction is also a reality since there is a reality behind every single fiction. Ferhan Şensoy applies this technique into his dialogues and he preferred not to use it only as a prologue. (Pekman, 2002: 154).

TAHİR

:O zaman size bir fıkra anlattığım... Balıklar ikişer ikişer çiftleşirler... Üçer üçer de çiftleşebilir... Ama ona çiftleşme denmez... Üçleşme denir...Zaten balıklar bu kadar akıllı değildir, bunları düşünemezler. Eskiden televizyonda balıklar vardı. Şimdi yoktur. Televizyonda balıkların yerini Cenk Koray almıştır. Cenk Koray'ın fıkrayla ilgisi yoktur. Ben sadece ona sinirlenirim. Nasrettin Hoca bir ün balık almaya gider. Balıkçı balıkçı bu balıklar çiftleşir mi, der. Hoca balıkçıya söyler, bunu. Balıkçı hocayı tanımaktadır, onun için söze Hoca diye başlar. Cenk Koray, Nasrettin Hoca yı tanımaz. Çünkü o zamanlarda televizyon icat edilmemişti. O gün Akşehir'de hava yer yer mevzi sağnak yağışlıdır. Hoca bir gün önce göle maya çalmıştır. Yağmur yağar, maya bozular. Zaten Hoca sık sık balık almaktadır. Balıkçılık önemlidir. Karasularımızda mebzulen balık bulunur. Karasularımız pis değildir ama kara-sular denir.

Fıkramız bu kadar sulu değildir zaten. Balıkçı kaşlarını kaldırarak Hoca ya: Ha, sen bağa ne soraysun? diye sorar. Balıkçı lazdır. Balıkçılar laz olur. Akşehir Karadeniz kıyısında değildir, göldür. Göl denizin küçüğüdür...(Dur Konuşma Sus Söyleme in Pekman, 2002:154)

This contemporary example of a tongue twister above looks nonsensical at first sight. However, when it is examined carefully it is seen that the tongue twister actually is a criticism of television, which had in filtered people's lives and the society with colorful and cultural allusions in 1970's. Ferhan Şensoy, as seen from the tongue twister, chains the illogical words, and creates new logic out of them and uses their effects in humor (Pekman, 2002: 154-155).

Şensoy writes his most plays in the exhibitionist style. When the plays are structurally examined there are independent parts which actually bound to each other with songs or by a narrator. Each part constitutes a story in itself even though they all follow one another. In other words, stories in each part form different and another big story in the play. The narrator for Ferhan Şensoy is not only a figure that links the episodes to each other in the play, nor acts on the stage to give clues to the audiences nor to be the voice of the writer; it is a hero who keeps the performance of the play high all the time. That is why the narrators in Şensoy's plays are the organic parts of the stories unlike other narrators who seem like they are attached to the plays of other playwrights.

SÖZCÜMENT : Yıl bindokuzyüz ellibeş, İsviçre nin Zermatt kenti... Sebayi düyü penç geçe... Dördüncü Murat kılığına girmiş Prenses Eşref ile...(Soldan tebdil-I kıyafet Prenses Eşref girer) Amerikan Gizli İstikbarat, yani, CIA Başkanı Allen Dulles, bi-zatihi kör ayaklarda...(Kara gözlüklü beyaz bastonlu Dulles girer) Buluştular ıssız bir yerde sebayi düyü penç geçe... Madem o yer ıssız, ben ne arıyorum burda... (çıkır) (Şahları da Vururlar, 1988:50).

Ferhan Şensoy, in the above example makes the audience believe that the narrator is an essential part of the play. Since the narrator gives a clear definition of the scene and

questions himself. Moreover, Şensoy plays with the words and names the narrator as “sözcüment” since “söz” in Turkish means “word” and “sözcüment” means “the one who speaks”.

SÖZCÜMENT : It is nineteen fifty-five, Zermatt in Switzerland. At five past three... Prens Eşref dressed like IV. Murat and (*Prens Eşref enters disguised from left*) Central Intelligence Agency, CIA, head Allen Dulles pretending he is blind... (*enters wearing black glasses and white walking-stick*). They meet in a deserted place at five past three. Seeing that it is a deserted place, what the hell am I doing here... (*exits*) (Şahları da Vururlar, 1988:50).

When constructing his exhibitionist style, Şensoy is careful to avoid using common techniques since he is most probably aware that using common techniques could reduce the sincerity of the play. He has created a unique style of expressing the events in his plays and works. For example, Şensoy has brought the parenthesis into focus, which are always hidden from the audiences and has given them a narrating identity. In other words, by explaining what is in parenthesis to the audiences he disturbs the privacy of the stage. By doing so, he both increases the effect of alienation and brings the third dimension to the stage (Pekman, 2002:155).

BAY PARANTEZ : Aç köşeli parantez, aç parantez... bay parantez bu oyunda parantez içlerini oynamaktadır... kapa parantez... bay parantez sadan girer, kapa köşeli parantez... Aç parantez, efendim, iyi akşamlar mı desem? ... Özür mü dilesem?... En önemlisi, parantez mi desem, ayraç mı desem?... Parantez frenkçe, ayraç yeni çıktı... Bakalım herkes benimsedi mi ayraç'ı?... antr parantez, tam anlaşılamayan şeyleri daha anlaşılır kılmak için açılan parantez e ayraç deyip, bir şeyi açıklayalım darken aşırı anlaşılmazlaştırmayalım... diye düşünüyorum ... Parantezler de düşünür. ... Ayraç ayırmayı, hatta cart diye ayırmayı çarıştırtıyor ... kulağa ... koklanış bakımından ... Parantez açıklamak için.

...

Bir parantez bir paranteze demiş ki ... Bre parantez, aramız da dalar var...

Bre parantez bir paranteze demiş ki ... A be salak parantez, aramızda hiçbir şey olmasa bize ne gerek ... Aslında bu oyunda parantez ne gerek? ... aç parantez bu yazarlar çok manyak kapa parantez ... Epiğin de epiği var, adı tursil epiği ... Bendeniz ... aç parantez ... BAY PARANTEZ ... kapa parantez ... Işık söner ... kapa parantez ... (Anna'nın 7 Ana Günahı, 1983 in Pekman, 2002: 156)

In the dialogue above, Bay Parantez, Mr. Parenthesis, resembles a narrator at first sight but Şensoy turns the parenthesis into a kind of harlequin. The parenthesis has a function of expressing the thoughts of the writer in Brecht; nevertheless, it serves an independent naughty childlike function, who actively opposes the playwright in Şensoy.

Moreover, Şensoy always reminds the audiences that what they are watching is just a play. He is achieving this in his unique style and he is quite successful in arousing a feeling in audiences that the feeling of alienation he creates is a part of a play.

KAVUKLU : Burası orası mı? Doğru yerde miyiz yani?

KAVUKSUZ : Elbette

KAVUKLU : Ne biliyorsun?

KAVUKSUZ : Tiyatronun girişinde, gişede, gazete ilanlarında yazıyor gayet açık bir biçimde: GOOD RİDDANCE GODOT, saat 21.00'de Ses-1885 te! Doğru adresteyiz, endişelenme.

KAVUKLU : Kaça kadar bekleyeceğiz.

KAVUKSUZ : saat 23.23' e dek!

KAVUKLU : Yapma yahu! Niye?

KAVUKSUZ : E, iki perde bekliyoruz.

KAVUKLU : İkinci perdenin birinciden ne farkı var?

KAVUKSUZ : Hıyar işte

KAVUKLU : Kim?

KAVUKSUZ : Yazar!

- KAVUKLU** : Cumartesi Pazar ikişerden dört perde!
KAVUKSUZ : Pazartesiye de turne koyarlar!
KAVUKLU : Bana bak Godot modot yok, işlettiler bizi... (GGG, 1996: 9-10)

In the above dialogue, Şensoy's reminding the audience that what they are watching is just a play fits perfectly and arouses a feeling in audiences and the readers that this reminding is like a part of the play.

- KAVUKLU** : Is this the place? Are we in the right place?
KAVUKSUZ : Of course.
KAVUKLU : How do you know?
KAVUKSUZ : It is written at the entrance of the theatre, on the ticket box, and in the newspapers: GOOD RIDDANCE GODOT, time: 21.00 Ses-1885! We are at the right address, don't worry.
KAVUKLU : Until what time are we going to wait?
KAVUKSUZ : Until 23.23 !
KAVUKLU : Oh really! Why?
KAVUKSUZ : The play is two acts.
KAVUKLU : What is different between the acts?
KAVUKSUZ : He is a jerk.
KAVUKLU : Who?
KAVUKSUZ : The playwright!
KAVUKLU : For acts altogether in Saturday and Sunday!
KAVUKSUZ : Most probably a tour on Monday!
KAVUKLU : There is no Godot or alike. It is a hoax. (GGG, 1996: 9-10)

Another element of folk theatre is the rudeness. Şensoy uses bawdy and rude words and sexual innuendos in dialogues in his plays and in his works. He thinks that these words are parts of the humor; moreover, they are the reality in life. Here is an example from one of his plays *Haneler* written in 1973.

- OROSPU** : Bak son defa soruyorum, yapıcekmissin, yapmicek misin?
KALFA : (rakısından bir yudum alır) N'apılecek?
OROSPU : Ne istersen hayatım! Yatma kalkma yüz dolar. Bütün gece kalırsam ikiyüzelli dolar.
KALFA : Hiç kalmazsan kaç dolar?

- OROSPU** : İstersen kalmayız, öyle bir soralım dedik, kapı açık, gece gece belki canın sıkılıyordur felan dedik.
- KALFA** : Ben karı konusunu tamamen kapattım hamfendi!
- OROSPU** : Manyak n’olcek! (Haneler, 1973 in Şensoy, 2014: 82)

The dialogue is between a prostitute, Orospu as a character and a foreman, Kalfa. The prostitute is seeking business; however, the foreman refuses her in a humorous manner.

- OROSPU** : It is the last time I am asking you, are you going to do it or not?
- KALFA** : (takes a zip from his raki) What to do?
- OROSPU** : Whatever love! Quick one costs hundred dollars. Staying whole night is two hundred and fifty dollars.
- KALFA** : How much what if you don’t stay?
- OROSPU** : If you don’t want no problem, I just wanted to ask, the door is open, it is night and I thought you got bored.
- KALFA** : I closed to chicks, mam!
- OROSPU** : You maniac! (Haneler, 1973 in Şensoy, 2014: 82)

Şensoy uses sexuality and the words that refer to it in his plays and his stories. There are many examples in his stories and articles showing that sexuality is used as a humorous factor. Nevertheless, Şensoy does not employ bawdy and rude words in their real rude and harsh connotation. He mingles them with other words and sentences in his stories and articles that they become as if they are part of the story and a humorous factor. The following paragraph is taken from “Oteller Kitabı” written in 1996. In this book Ferhan Şensoy talks about the hotels both in Turkey and abroad where he stayed during his theatre tours and holidays. He describes the hotels and the memories he has had in simple words sometimes with sexual associations in a natural and humorous way.

“... para atınca gazoz veren makineler var.... aptal makina para bozamuyor, yalnızca deliğine uygun madensel parayı tanıyor. ... deliğine uygun yuvarlaklıkta bozuk para sokunca tatmin olan ve içecek sıvı ifraz eden canavarın karşısına yazıldım. Yalamadan yuttu beş markı ve fakat bir ifrazat yok frijit makinada. Ver lan paramı geri düğmesine bastım sinirle. Utandı, diling diye düşük yaptı beş markı. Yeniden denedim, gene aynı lezbiyen tavrı sergiliyor hayvan. Arka arkaya bir marklar sokmayı denedim. Bu kez tensel bir uyum oluştu aramızda ve gazozu verdi canavar. ... epey aradıktan sonra, kapak açıcı deliğin canavarın tam arkasında, kış deliği yerinde gizlenmiş olduğunu keşfettim. Sektüm şişeyi kışına, kanırttırdım. ...”(Oteller Kitabı, 1996:192-193).

In this paragraph, Şensoy tells the readers one of his memories he has had in Germany during one of his tours. He had an experience with a vending machine and expressed

that moment in a comic manner. He uses personification technique to make the humor more affective. In his narrating technique the vending machine sounds like a human and the experience that Ferhan Şensoy becomes richly comic.

“... there are machines which throws drinks when you insert money. ... Stupid machine does not give any change. ... It only recognizes the appropriate coin which fits into its hole. I stood in front of the machine, which ejaculates drinks when it feels the satisfaction of feeling the coin in. It gobbled five marks down but there is no excretion in this frigid machine. I pressed the “give my money back” button angrily. It became ashamed and aborted five marks into his little money hole. I tried again, and this animal exhibits the same frigid manner. I tried to insert marks one after another. This time we catch the sensuous harmony and it threw the drink. ... After a long search for the hole, which is used for opening the bottles, I found it just behind the monster, in the place where its asshole is. I pushed the bottle into its asshole and twisted...” (Oteller Kitabı, 1996:192-193).

As it is seen, Şensoy narrates such an ordinary incident in such a humorous way by choosing sexual innuendos and words that not many of his contemporaries have chosen. Moreover, the narrating technique and the allusions he applies into his works make him unique in style.

3.6.2. Turkish traditional theatre – Ortaoyunu

Ferhan Şensoy is one of the major representatives of Turkish Traditional Theatre, Ortaoyunu. To make both Ferhan Şensoy and the analysis that will be discussed in the next chapter clear, it is necessary to examine Turkish Traditional Theatre in this part. Ferhan Şensoy in his plays refers to Ortaoyunu quite often and mostly uses the names of the characters and reflects characteristic features of them in his plays. To ensure clarity, some basic information about Ortaoyunu is provided in the following sections.

3.6.2.1 Origin of Ortaoyunu

Before giving a brief historical background about Ortaoyunu, its origin will be discussed. The word “Orta” in Ortaoyunu usually means “middle” and “oyun” means “play”. Ortaoyunu refers to a play performed in the middle of the spectators. There are some different interpretations about the origin of the name Ortaoyunu.

The first one is that Ortaoyunu was an offspring of the Janissaries “Orta”. “Orta” is one of the companies’ name that Janissaries belonged to and there was a section of the Ottoman army composed of man of all trades, such as the acting professionals. From this fact, it is assumed that “Orta” company entertained soldiers. Kavuklu, the main character of Ortaoyunu, tells in one play that his costume and his large wadged

headgear are exact copy of the Janissary costume. (And, 1963: 40 & Er, 2015: 117). This could support the Janissary and Ortaoyunu connection.

The second interpretation is that Western researchers claim both Greek and Latin “mimus”, and Italian “Commedias dell’arte” had great influence on the emergence of Ortaoyunu. “Commedia dell’arte” was originally translated into Turkish as “arte oyunu”. Moreover, the word “arte” could be connected with Ortaoyunu since there are some similarities between the characters, dialogues and the play designs. It is possible that over the course of the years, the word “arte” because of the possible changes in pronunciation may eventually turned into the word “Orta”. There are Italian plays which were performed in Turkey in the past and there are many nautical words and other expressions in Turkish borrowed from Italian. Some of words which were borrowed are, “tiyatro” from “teatro”, “prova” (rehearsal), “kumpanya” from compagnia, “palyaço” from pagliaccio. “palanka” is the name given to the round area for Ortaoyunu and this word comes from an Italian word “palanca” (And, 1963: 40 & Er, 2015: 117).

Ortaoyunu contains many terms that were borrowed from Gypsy language. For instance, the word “maskere” means in the middle just like “orta” in Ortaoyunu. The word “maskere” is used in different languages using almost the same sounds; the Arabic word “Maskhara”, the Spanish word “mascara” and the Turkish word “maskara” (the buffoon). The play in Ortaoyunu is based on buffoonery and it is acted in the middle, and the Turkish word could be a direct borrowing from Gypsy language. What is important in these backgrounds of origin is that Ortaoyunu means a play performed in the middle (And, 1963, 40 & Er, 2015: 117).

There are different interpretations about the origin of the word Ortaoyunu. The earliest historical mention of Ortaoyunu is in the 12th century. The plays were performed in the city of Konya in Asia Minor in the courts of Sultans of the Seldjuk dynasty. The plays in the classic world of theatre were based on mimes. The resemblance of classic mime and late Ortaoyunu is remarkable. Both of them have similar arrangements and actions and have common dialogue constructions. Moreover, the costumes of Ortaoyunu carries certain traces of the classic mime. It is possible to say that relying on the evidence mentioned above Ortaoyunu was inspired by the classic world (Martinovitch, 1933: 13).

While some claim that the roots of Ortaoyunu date back to 14th century some others say that the dates are more recent. It is said that during the reign of Beyazid I, an Ottoman Sultan (1389 – 1402) there were mime players along with companies of dancers and singers at court. Evliya Çelebi mentions that there were popular companies and these companies performed variety of plays which gained popularity and success and it is possible to surmise that the earliest roots of Ortaoyunu are to be found in these plays (Kudret, 1994: 2).

Another assumption maintains that Ortaoyunu was performed at mental institutions as part of the treatment of mentally ill patients during the reign of Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent (1520 – 1566). Actually, this assumption strongly relies on the facts from the texts, which were written by Kavuklu Hamdi and Küçük İsmail. As it is written in the texts this treatment was suggested by a European doctor and the use of plays with mental patients instead of chaining and locking them away. The interest of the mentally ill to these performances was so high that they attended the shows regularly. Because of the popularity of the performances, the players had to perform at other events as well, moreover; their fame has even reached the court. They started to perform Ortaoyunu at the homes of wealthy citizens and in court. Some say that this might be the beginning of Ortaoyunu (And, 1985: 344).

Some scholars claim that the circumcision feasts organized for the sons of the sultans during the reigns of Sultan Murat IV (1623 – 1640) and of Sultan İbrahim (1640 – 1648) were similar with Ortaoyunu. Therefore, they say that Ortaoyunu came into being during the reign of these Sultans in the 17th century. Another assumption maintains that Ortaoyunu dates back to the period of Mustafa III, (1757 – 1774). It is asserted that Ortaoyunu arose from shadow puppet shows of the Ottoman Empire, Karagöz which was popular at the time. There were miniatures representing the old festivals and the similarities between Karagöz and Ortaoyunu (Kudret, 1994: 45-46 & And, 1985: 39). Kudret posits the theory that Ortaoyunu came out of the Karagöz plays in 1790's (Kudret, (1994: 46). There is a striking question that is not possible to answer satisfactorily. The shadow play has similarity with Ortaoyunu in characters, comic elements and the atmosphere. The only difference between them is shadow theatre uses puppets and Ortaoyunu uses live actors. The question is how much is Ortaoyunu under the influence of Karagöz, the shadow theatre, or vice a versa. In Turkey, Ortaoyunu could have developed from the class of puppeteers, conjurers, storytellers,

strolling actor-mimes, musicians, and dancers or amalgamation of all. Moreover, the festivity book written in 1675 depicts that the actors in Ortaoyunu were dressed like the puppets in a shadow play during their performances (And, 1963: 39).

The word “Ortaoyunu” first appears in written sources during the reign of Mahmut II (1808 – 1839). Poet Esat (1833) wrote a poem named *Sürname-i Saliha* (1834) which is about the marriage festivities of Saliha Sultan, the daughter of Mahmut II and Rifat Halil Paşa (And, 1985: 361 & Er, 2015: 117 & Ümit, 2014: . The related lines are as follows;

Çengiler eyledi raksa ikram
Doldu cünbüş ile meydan-ı hıyam
Leb-i etraf-nişn-ı meydan
Oldu Ortaoyunu’ndan handan. (And, 1985: 361)

The lines above describe how enjoyable the festivities were. “Çengi” is the woman who dances with the rhythm of the music and these women invite others to dance. The following lines describe the happiness mentioning that the tents in the square were filled with joy because of Ortaoyunu.

To conclude, some scholars believe that Ortaoyunu is a fairly new type of entertainment and some others say that Ortaoyunu performances originated after 1790 as an offspring of Karagöz. Even though, there are many conflicting assumptions about the emergence of Ortaoyunu, And, (1963: 39) states that “What might have misled all these authors in their conclusion that Ortaoyunu originated at the beginning of 19th century could be the fairly recent adoption of the name Orta Oyunu. ...other names were used for this particular spectacle such as Kol Oyunu, Meydan Oyunu, etc.”

3.6.2.2 Setting and staging

There are three major areas in Ortaoyunu: the dressing area, the acting area and the audience area. The dressing area is called “Sandık” or “Pusat room” and it is a fairly small room. The actors change their costumes in this room and there is a door connecting this room to the acting area for actors to use (Er, 2015: 119 & And, 1985: 402-403).

The acting area is the stage of Ortaoyunu and it consists of mostly an open space in the center around which the audience sit. There are indoor performances well. Both the performers and the audience stand or sit during the performance. There are low

fences marking the space and to divide the audience and the acting area. The stage is oval occasionally quadrangular. The acting area is called “meydan” and is divided into two sections: the musicians’ space and the acting space. The stage of Ortaoyunu is in the center around which the audience sit. There were no curtains and the actors wait their parts sitting among the members of the orchestra remaining visible to the audience during the play. The instruments played in Ortaoyunu is “zurna” (shrill pipe) or “çifte nara”(double drum). Orchestra is placed near the entrance of the stage and consists of only two people. Sometimes there are more musical instruments to be seen including a lute, a violin, a dulcimer, a tambourine, a flute (nei) a mandolin and others. The acting area has two folding screens to be used as props and they occupy the same fixed places on stage. One of them is fixed near the entrance and the other one is at the opposite side of the stage. These props take place of the stage decorations of the European theatre. One of them represents the house and the other one, rather the smaller one, represents a shop (And, 1963: 40 & Er, 2015: 119 & Martinovitch, 1933: 16).

The last one to be mentioned is the space devoted to the audience. The audience area is divided into two sections. The one for male audience is called “the place (mevki) and the other for female audience is called “the cage” (kafes). The male and female audience areas were kept separate. (Kudret, 1997 :105)

3.6.2.3 Characters of Ortaoyunu

In Ortaoyunu the costumes, the personalities and the language typify the characters. Costume is the obvious sign of the characters so each character wears his or her distinctive costume from one play to another. Every single outfit indicates the profession and the habits of the persona. Even hand props define the characters. For instance, the drunkard carries a bottle in his hand, Tiryaki (the addict) a bar of hashish, Kabadayı (the bandit) a pistol, Kastamonulu (woodcutter) an axe and Laz (man from the black sea) a kemençe (a musical instrument particular to the area) (Er, 2015: 124).

The cast in the plays of Ortaoyunu is not overlarge and the characters are more or less stereotyped. Three important characters Pişekar, Kavuklu and Zenne will be examined in detail to give an overall idea about the characteristics of Ortaoyunu the rest will be named only. Moreover, Ferhan Şensoy in his play *Good Riddance Godot* gives place to Kavuklu and Pişekar in another persona name Kavuksuz.

The main character is named Pişekar, which means a clever man and a conjurer. He is also the stage manager and the manager of the company. He comes on the stage first, bows to the audience on all four sides, and opens the performance and closes the play at the end. He introduces the name of the play and he seldom leaves the stage. When he has nothing to do on the stage he sits cross-legged on the ground or among the audience and awaits for his turn. In the play, he often uses the name Tosun Efendi for himself. He is dressed in a yellow gown, red shalvar (trousers) and a nightcap of many colored bits covers his head. He usually holds a cudgel to strike the heads of his associates. He speaks an emphatic and incomprehensible Turkish. Pişekar always deceives people and he is careful, little bit conceited and well read. Because he is able to speak smoothly and is kind, he gains the confidence and the respect of the others. He interferes in the discussions and likes to quarrel with Kavuklu. Pişekar is a moderate and wise person so he is there to reconcile Kavuklu with other characters (Martinovitch, 1933: 17 & And, 1933: 40 & Er, 2015: 126).

Another main actor is called Kavuklu and he is a comic personage of Ortaoyunu. His official name is usually "Hamdi". He is a trader, an artisan and a servant in the plays. He appears on the stage in a silk or woolen tunic, a red gown and red shalvars (trousers). He covers his head with an enormous hat of tag ends bound with the turban. Kavuklu speaks a pure and clear Turkish. He is quite ignorant; however, he has a strong common sense so it is very difficult to overcome him. Kavuklu as a persona symbolizing the moral conception and common sense of the common people. He does not think twice nor hesitate to say whatever he thinks. Actually, he is not well educated and it is possible to say that he is illiterate. Moreover, he is fearless, generous, sincere and sometimes seems indifferent. Apart from these he is a cunning and he has no occupation so he suffers from poverty. He has to work and do the things that he hates sometimes. He does not like lies and hypocrisy, he has difficulty in realizing the intrigues that happens around him. He prefers to remain realistic and he believes that the dream and the illusion have no use.

Kavuklu owns all the comic elements and aspects in the performance. To act as Kavuklu, one need to have the ability of creativity and has to present all his abilities with words, mimics, gestures and movements. It is true to say that the success of the play mainly depends on Kavuklu. He is always on stage and never leaves until the end of the performance. In the course of the play other comic characters enter and Kavuklu

is the one to converse and quarrel with them. He is there to make pun and make the audience laugh. His dialogues with Pişekar comprise an important part of the play. It can be assimilable that their dialogue is like a battle. During their quarrels Kavuklu causes many accidents and deformations of the language since he does not listen nor he does not hear the others. In the example below there is a pretention not to understand the conversation and Kavuklu returns it in the same way to Pişekar (Martinovitch, 1933: 18 & And, 1933: 40 & Er, 2015: 127).

“Pişekar hints that Kavuklu is like a dog, saying: He becomes loyal like a dog upon seeing the money. Kavuklu, in his repatee, says to return the word “dog” to Pişekar: My brother considers me to be what he is.”(Er, 2015: 127)

Another deformation of the conversation method is that Kavuklu pretends to have understood a statement that he indeed does not understand.

PİŞEKAR : It is a duty of humankind to help someone, a friend, anyone you meet anywhere and everybody you know or do not know. Charity can be given as an example to this duty.

KAVUKLU :Now, should I say ‘amen’? (Er, 2015: 127)

This battle of wit between these two characters sometimes includes tongue twisters. In these tongue twisters Kavuklu tells an impossible story without any logic in it and makes the audience to believe what he says. Audience eventually realize that Kavuklu is merely relating a dream (Martinovitch, 1933: 18 & And, 1933: 40 & Er, 2015: 127).

Here is an example of one of his tongue twisters;

“Kavuklu buys a pumpkin seed and plants it and the pumpkin grows to such a size that it covers half the garden and the neighbourhood children hang swings on its branches. It takes four people three days to saw it in half and then the whole neighborhood eats its insides and eventually make a boat from its skin. The boat is so large that it takes sixteen people to row it, but when it gets a little way out to sea the boat melts and all the occupants fall into the water. Only Kavuklu manages to keep afloat and suddenly someone slaps his face. This however, turns out to be his cousin who is sharing Kavuklu’s bed with him and who has stretched out his arm and accidentally hit Kavuklu.” (And, 1933: 41)

Main plot of the performance follows the dialogue above. The main plot in Ortaoyunu is called “fasıl”. In the course of the main plot Kavuklu usually asks Pişekar for a job and some women ask him to help them to find a house. There is no real plot in Ortaoyunu, instead merely a series of loosely connected scenes fill the performance.

There are no female actors in Ortaoyunu, Zenne is the woman character played by male actor in Ortaoyunu (And, 1933: 41).

Female roles in Ortaoyunu represent every age and every social class and in the jargon of Ortaoyunu Zenne is called “Gaco” and the black women called “Kayarto”. Kavuklu teases them because of their appearance. Zenne appears in different characters; as a wife, as a mistress, or as a prostitute. When she is the wife she is usually the wife of Kavuklu or Pişekar. Women in the plays are wise, beautiful and romantic. Zenne appears in different costumes. She wears “yaşmak” (head cover worn by women to cover their heads) and large coat with sleeves (levy ferace). Ferace is a kind of dress that covers the whole body.

Çelebi, Cüce (dwarf) or Kambur (Hunchbacked), Külhanbeyi (Rowdy), Denyo (Naïve) Kayserili (the man of Kayseri) Hirbo (Anatolian), Laz (the man of Blacksea), Balama (Greek), Yahudi (Jew), Arap (Arabic) Acem (The Persian), Arnavut (The Albanian) and Rumelili (The man of Roumelia) are the other characters of Ortaoyunu, and each of them have certain characteristics of their own reflected by their costumes or their behaviors.

3.6.2.4. Structure of plays

Ortaoyunu consists of four parts: the prologue, a dialogue, the play or main plot and the epilogue. The aim of the prologue and dialogue are to warm the audience up and show the comic expertise of the two main characters. Main plot is the heart of the dramatic presentation and the epilogue publicizes the future performances (And, 1985: 386 - 401).

Prologue begins with the sound of shrill pipe (zurna) of Pişekar. Pişekar enters and bows to the audience on all four sides and speaks to the musicians and introduces the play, such as the following:

PİŞEKAR : Efendim cümleten sefalar getirdiniz. (Zurnacıya)
Amma benim pehlivanım!

ZURNACI : Buyur benim pehlivanım!

PİŞEKAR : Bu da hesap değil.

ZURNACI : Nedir hesabın?

PİŞEKAR : Borcu sıkıyor kasabın. Filanca oyunun (oyunun adını takdim eder) taklidini aldım. Çal da oyunumuz başlasın., tenezzülen teşrif buyuran zevat-ı kiram zevkiyab olsunlar. (And, 1985: 387)

Pişekar and Zurnacı's dialogue above is the inauguration of the play. They are warming the audiences up by saying:

PİŞEKAR : Welcome all...(to shrill pipe player) Oh my brave hero

ZURNACI : Yes my gallant hero!

PİŞEKAR : It is not a debt

ZURNACI : What is your debt?

PİŞEKAR : Fed up with the debt to the butcher. Here is the play entitled (mentones the name of the play) play the shrill pipe so that we can start the play. We shall entertain the audience so that they may enjoy themselves. (And, 1985: 387)

After the inaugurating dialogue above the shrill pipe plays music of Kavuklu and Kavuklu enters. It rarely happens that Zenne, Çelebi or some other characters enter and talk to Pişekar.

After prologue comes dialogue. Dialogue is the second part of Ortaoyunu and it is called "muhavere". The success of this part depends on the virtuosity of the characters. The dialogue is divided into two parts, exposition (arzbar) and virtuosity monologue (tekerleme).

Exposition is the opening dialogue and the characters on stage, Kavuklu and Pişekar, meet by accident and they misunderstood each other. The conversation based on misunderstanding is a strong element for humor and this is called "arzbar". Virtuosity monologue is where Kavuklu shows his virtuosity. Imagined events are described by Kavuklu and these are usually the description of Kavuklu's dreams that he tells Pişekar. Pişekar listens to him patiently until the end as if the story Kavuklu is telling him a true one. At the end everybody realizes that this is actually a dream and actually this virtuosity monologue of Kavuklu has no relation to the theme of the play. (And, 1985: 393). Here is an example,

“Kavuklu raises silkworms in Bursa and when the worms emerge from the cocoons they grow to such a size that half the house is filled with them. Karagöz then finds himself in one of the cocoons and begins to perspire and suffocate, but in reality, he has only become entangled in the bedclothes.”
(And, 1933: 40)

Fasil is the main plot or the play section of Ortaoyunu and it starts after the virtuosity monologue of Kavuklu. In this part Kavuklu usually seeks for a job and Pişekar finds one for him. In one performance he becomes a smith, in another becomes a barkeeper. The objective of this part is to create justification for Kavuklu to stay on stage. In this part of the performance most of the characters appear, the action is quite simple and the simpleness of the action foregrounds the spoken ability of the performance. As mentioned before the scenery consist of two props only: two folding screens represents the house (new world) and the shop.

Epilogue is the last part of Ortaoyunu and it is rather a short section. Pişakar, as he has introduced the play in the beginning, announces to the audience that the performance is about to come to an end. He apologizes to them for any failings on the part of the players and announces the name of the next performance (And, 1985: 401).

3.7. *Good Riddance Godot*

Ferhan Şensoy states that his adventure of writing his first theatre play *Good Riddance Godot* dates back to his school years of Galatasaray high school. In 1968 he has written the play; however, in different name: *Develi Pireli Oyun (Play with Camels and Fleas)*. The play has two harlequins just like in *Waiting for Godot* and the characters' names of the play *Develi Pireli Oyun* sound like the names of the characters in *Waiting for Godot*: Ergenekon and İldemir. One of his friends at Galatasaray High school has read the play and found it both beautiful and very communist. Upon hearing the comment of his friend, Ferhan Şensoy decided to shelf the play. After reading Bulatovic's play *Godot has Arrived* which was dedicated to Samulel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, Ferhan Şensoy opened the file and started to work on his play again. Bulatovic's play *Godot has Arrived* became a creative inspiration for Ferhan Şensoy to revise his play in 1971. He changed the name of the play to *Godot Go Home* and the name of the characters to İri (huge) and Yarım (half). In 1973 in Strasburg Ferhan Şensoy re-wrote the play in Frankish with new names of the characters: İri becomes Ponçık and Yarım becomes Kokoreç. Ferhan Şensoy remarks that *Godot Go Home* is “a play written many times but never staged”. In 1989, he again starts to re-write the

play using both the Frankish and Turkish versions, and names the play *Good Riddance Godot* considering the political developments of the country and completes it in 1991. After many rehearsals starting in January 1992, the play meets its audiences in April 11th 1992 (Şensoy, 1996: 88-91).

Good Riddance Godot differs in fiction and characters from Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. Ferhan Şensoy classifies the characters of the play, 12 of them, as absurd characters in the beginning of the play. These absurd characters can be divided into four categories considering their compatible relationships with each other: the first one is Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, the second one is Godot, Godotgiller and İtoluit, the third one is Ferhat, Çiçek, Toprak and Dolunay and the last one is Bokko and Leke. Godot, Godotgiller and İtoluit represent the governors; Kavuklu, Kavuksuz, Ferhat, Çiçek, Toprak, Dolunay, Bokko and Leke represent the society of the country. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are parallel characters to Vladimir and Estragon of *Waiting for Godot*. Vladimir and Estragon are the forefront characters of *Waiting for Godot*; nevertheless, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are not. They are the leading characters of the play but not as much as Vladimir and Estragon. Both Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are discontent with the situation they are in and want a change. Kavuksuz dreams for a magnificent Godot to arrive and Kavuklu wants present Godot to go. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are as motionless as Estragon and Vladimir. Nevertheless, Estragon and Vladimir wait for Godot to come but Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are waiting for Godot to go. During this wait Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, communicate with the people around them but mostly they have illogical conversations with each other, they sing songs, tell each other jokes, play and sometimes they try to hang themselves. Each time they try to hang themselves they fall down and all the struggle they have gone through becomes fruitless. The way they act and talk during the wait create the humor in the play. These two, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, mostly have illogical conversations with each other and with the others but sometimes the audience realize that what they say are actually very logical ones (Ergün, 2015: 169).

İTOLUİT : N'oluyoruz kardeşlerim? Bir hiç yüzünden kim basıyor frene yeşil ışıkta?

KAVUKLU : Hep frene basıyorum. Gaz frene çok yakın.

KAVUKSUZ : Siz böyle, temiz ve mutlu ve yağlı olasınız diye kirlenen ellerimiz, büyüyüp adam oldular. Bak parmağıma, bu deri bu kemiğe dar geliyor. Anlıyor musun? (GGG, 1996: 38)

İTOLUIT : What's up brothers? Who steps on the breaks for no reason. The lights are green.

KAVUKLU : I always step on the breaks. Breaks are so close to gas pedal.

KAVUKSUZ : Our dirty hands have grown up for you to be clean, happy and greasy. Look at my finger, this skin is tight to the bone. Do you understand me? (GGG, 1996: 38)

In the conversation above, the response of Kavuksuz is an example of logical words. In the dialogue above, İtoluit finds people to go on strike nonsense and the words of Kavuksuz is the response to İtoluit.

The most humorous character is Kavuklu in *Good Riddance Godot* and Ferhan Şensoy creates Kavuksuz to make a couple like Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot*. The question may be asked why Şensoy did not place Pişekar next to Kavuklu as in *Ortaoyunu*? There could be two answers to this question. The first one would be Ferhan Şensoy avoided to place Pişekar not to create a perception of writing a new type of *Ortaoyunu*. The second one would be not to exclude the characteristics of Vladimir and Estragon. Kavuklu is the leading comic in *Ortaoyunu* and Pişekar is the one who represents the logic and wisdom. The humor of Kavuklu and the wisdom of Pişekar meet Kavuklu and Kavuksuz in Ferhan Şensoy. The wisdom of Pişekar of *Ortaoyunu* would not be suitable in *Good Riddance Godot* so that Şensoy creates another character, Kavuksuz. In other words, Ferhan Şensoy combines Kavuklu and Pişekar, Estragon and Vladimir in the features of Kavuklu and Kavuksuz (Ergun, 2015: 169).

Techniques like misunderstanding, pretending not to understand, seeming to understand and coining a new phrase enrich the dialogues and the stage in traditional Turkish theatre. These techniques also reveal the absurdism of multicultural structure of the plays and the era they were written in. Thus, the linguistic performance of traditional Turkish theatre parallels the meaninglessness of verbalism and lack of

communication in absurd theatre. Just like Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot* Kavuklu and Kavuksuz struggle with lack of communication most of the times; moreover, they are aware that through these meaningless speeches they are passing time. Nevertheless, in traditional Turkish theatre, the verbalism is not absurd and nonsensical because of the idea of meaninglessness of life itself as in absurd theatre. It is just meaningless to fill in time in traditional Turkish theatre (Ergun, 2015: 169). For instance:

- KAVUKLU** : Ne diyoruz?
- KAVUKSUZ** : Hiç! Aramızda top çevirip zaman kazanıyoruz, beraberlik neyimize yetmiyor? Bizde şampiyon olacak bir faça var mı?
(*Hızla yer değiştiriler*)
- KAVUKSUZ** : (*izleyiciye*) Ancak bu çocuk bahçesi çocukların çok mütahitlerin ilgisini çekmiş olup...
- KAVUKLU** : (*izleyiciye*) Çok iyi zırvalıyoruz. Bravo biz! (GGG, 1996: 13)

In the dialogue above, Kavuksuz does not hide that they are passing the time. The conversation might seem nonsensical at first sight yet Kavuksuz touches the very important problem of losing the green. So, the nonsensical words are not uttered because of absurdism of life like in absurd theatre but to attract the attention of the responsible. Here is the English translation:

- KAVUKLU** : What are we saying?
- KAVUKSUZ** : Nothing! We are just passing the ball around and gaining time. Equalization is enough for us. Do we have the championship face?
(*Switches the positions quickly*)
- KAVUKSUZ** : (*to the audience*) This kinder garden draws constrictors' attention much more than it draws children's...

KAVUKLU : *(to the audience)* we are the best talking nonsense. Well done us! (GGG, 1996: 13)

Godot in Ferhan Şensoy's play is the governor of the waterless country. Godot is represented by an overhanging door, which has a golden knob. Godot is picturized as a cruel general whose residence is not known. Godot never appears on stage and his voice is heard only twice. In the first one, Godot talks to his public, he listens to their problems and proposes rather imposes solutions to them.

FERHAT : Godot hazretleri biz halkınız!Z!

GODOT : Aferin! Ne istiyorsunuz?

TOPRAK : Su istiyoruz!

DOLUNAY : Ben hortum da istiyorum!

GODOT : İyi!

KAVUKLU : Ne iyi?

GODOT : Siz talihli bir milletsiniz. Doğuda, Bindikden dağında su var. Seçin içinizden bir yiğit gitsin delsin Bindikden dağını, kavuştursun bizi suya.

KAVUKSUZ : Niye bir tek yiğit? Beş on yiğit olmaz mı?

...

GODOT : Olmaz tek bir yiğit gidecek! To be or not to be! Thas is the quotation!

FERHAT : Ben giderim tek başıma. Olmazları oldurmanın zamanı!

GODOT : Aferin esas çocuk! Açık olsun yolun hatta, good vibrations!

(Hızla yükselir sofitaya altın tokmaklı kapı.) (GGG, 1996: 47 – 48)

FERHAT : Godot, his highness! We are your people!

GODOT : Well done! What do you want?

TOPRAK : We want water!

DOLUNAY : I want hose as well!

GODOT : Good!

- KAVUKLU** : What is good?
- GODOT** : You are lucky. In the East there is water on the Bindiken mountain. Choose someone brave, let him go and pierce the Bindiken mountain and get the water.
- KAVUKSUZ** : Why only a single brave one? Can't it be five or ten?
- ...
- GODOT** : Out of the question! Only one brave can go! To be or not to be! That is the quotation!
- FERHAT** : I will go by myself. It is time to make impossible possible.
- GODOT** : Well done made boy! Best all the, even, good vibrations!
- (The door with golden knob raises)* (GGG, 1996: 47 – 48)

Unlike Samuel Beckett's Godot, Ferhan Şensoy's Godot is clearly identified in the play. In Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, Godot is pictured as a savior and an evangel, on the other hand, Godot in Ferhan Şensoy's play is someone who is cruel and is not liked by the society. The characters who represent the society want Godot to leave the country as soon as possible since Godot is picturized as a cruel coup general. Considering Godot as coup general then it is possible to remark that Godotgiller can be the soldiers that support Godot and İtoluit can be a politician. The characters represent the society in the play are Toprak (soil), Çiçek (flower), Dolunay (fullmoon) and Ferhat (a legendary character who pierced mountains for his beloved Shirin). When the names are analyzed it is seen that they are well-selected. Toprak (soil) and Çiçek (flower) are the members of a waterless country. They both need water desperately since water is their life source. Ferhat is the classical allusion to the legend Ferhad and Shirin. These characters question the system and rebel. They are never scared to say what they think is true. The other character Bokko (shitty) rarely appear on stage and his political ideas and thoughts are unclear. To whom he politically supports is left uncertain (Ergun, 2015: 172 - 173).

- BOKKO** : Duydunuz mu? Haberi duydunuz mu?
- KAVUKSUZ** : N'olmuş
- BOKKO** : Partimizi kuruyormuşuz!
- TOPRAK** : Duyduk.

BOKKO : Kimi başkan yapıyoruz peki? (GGG, 1996: 45)

From the dialogue above, it is seen that Bokko has no idea for himself and he needs others' ideas to follow. He hears that they are establishing a political party and he does even not know who the political leader is. Here is English translation:

BOKKO : Have you heard? Have you heard the news?

KAVUKSUZ : What's up?

BOKKO : Establishing our political party!

TOPRAK : Heard it.

BOKKO : Who are we giving chair to then? (GGG, 1996: 45)

He claps Leke (stain) even he does not understand a word what Leke utters. When it is asked he says:

LEKE : Sallangıç! Islangeç yengeç ve örümgeç! Fortlangoç ve yüzgeç bingec, sen dur, sen geç, düzengeç, serdengeç! Dalgıç, dalmakıç, sarkaç saat kaç patlangoç, solungaç, zangoç zangırdeç ya da kandırğaç, ayrıca garç ve gurç ve kokoreç!

(Bokko elinde olmadan alkışlar. Herkes döner şaşkın Bokko'ya bakar. Leke de şaşırmıştır bu işe. En şaşkın Bokko'dur.)

KAVUKLU : Ne anladın ki ne alkışlıyorsun? Ne diyor?

BOKKO : Ne bileyim ben... İyi konuşuyor işte... Şey diyor ... Garç diyor, gurç diyor... kokoreç diyor... daha ne desin? Açık açık konuşuyor işte! (GGG, 1996: 45-46)

Leke in the dialogue above utters meaningless words among some meaningful ones. What Leke says here is completely meaningless and nonsense. However, Bokko claps him where everyone is astonished including Leke. Kavuklu asks what he understood from the speech and Bokko replies that he does not know. Bokko says Leke talks well. It is quite possible that Şensoy makes criticism of people who have no ability of critical thinking and believes in everything that they hear.

Leke is the last character to be examined here. All through the play he talks sometimes in words sometimes in sentences. Mostly the words or the sentences he uses are completely meaningless but what he says sometimes fits into the situation and summarize the circumstances that they are in. In *Good Riddance Godot* the society struggles against the governor of the country and Ferhan Şensoy uses the absurd technique to make it clear. Kavuklu, Kavuksuz and Leke are the characters whom Şensoy criticizes the system through their eyes. By means of these mentioned characters, Şensoy integrates one of the features of Ortaoyunu into his play: Criticizing the political system and making fun of the political leaders (Ergun, 2015: 173 & And, 1985: 371).

Ferhan Şensoy keeps the props in a minimum number similar to Ortaoyunu tradition. There are two wheelless bicycles on stage on which Kavuklu and Kavuksuz ride. They ride the bicycles but they cannot go even a meter forward. In other words, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz cannot leave the place, just like Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot*. The action of not leaving the place because of Godot is the same in both plays. Thus, it can be said that the wheelless bicycles on stage symbolizes waiting and the motionlessness just like in *Waiting for Godot*. Estragon and Vladimir are waiting Godot to come; nevertheless, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are waiting for Godot to go. The luggage on stage supports the idea of Godot leaving since luggage is a thing, which people carry when they go on a journey. The people of this unnamed country are looking forward to Godot to go and never come back again (Ergun, 2015: 175).

Time and place in *Good Riddance Godot* is left uncertain and never identified. The audience may make inferences about the time and the country according to their background yet what is more important to realize from the play is that Ferhan Şensoy focuses on the social problems instead of absurdism of human beings in this absurd universe.

3.7.1 Plot summary of *Good Riddance Godot*

There are eleven sections in the play and six of them consist of songs giving clues about the circumstances of the environment and the characters. The names of the sections are as follows; “Sabun Gibilik” (As if a Soap), “Makinalar Hızlandılar Şarkısı” (Song of Machines Work Faster), “Mavi Engin Gökyüzü”, (Deep Blue Sky), Oksijenle Hidrojenin Şarkısı” (Song of Oxygen and Hydrogen), “Bindiken Dağı

Şarkısı” (Song of Bindiken Mountain), “Gidiyoruz” (We are Leaving), Ağlayan Çağlayan Şarkısı”, (Song of Crying Waterfall), “Özün Boşa Geçişinin Şarkısı” (Song of Wasted Self), “Godotsuzluk” (Without Godot), “Yok Böyle Bir Alışkanlık Şarkısı” (Song of Such a Routine). The names of the sections there are sections with songs only; however, there are also songs which summarize the situation of the characters in the section.

The play begins with a military march and Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are on the stage. İtoluit comes to the stage and announces that:

İTOLUIT : Sayın Godot, bu akşam da gelecekmiş, sakın bir yere kımıldanmayın! (GGG, 1996: 5)

İTOLUIT : Honorable Godot will also be coming tonight, don't you dare to leave! (GGG, 1996: 5)

The name of the country is not explicitly clarified and in this unknown country Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are in hope of waiting a desired Godot to come and expecting existing Godot to leave. They both sing a song named “Bekliyoruz Godot Gitsin Şarkısı” (Song of Expecting Godot to Go). This song is quite important since it summarizes the plot and the background of the play:

Uyduk Beckett'e	Believed in Beckett
Bekledik Onu	We have waited for him
Gelmedi Godot	Godot has never arrived
Sorduk Beckett'e	We asked Beckett
Kim lan bu Godot?	Who the hell is Godot?
Samuel Beckett	Samuel Beckett
Susunluğunu korudu	Kept his silence
Susunca haklı	It is silence
çıkıyor insan	makes one right
Bir bok denizindeydik	We were in deep shit
Umuttu Godot	Godot was hope
Godot'ydu moda!	Godot was fashion!
Birden maçıymışçasına	They clap their hand as if they are
el çırparlar	in a football match

Godot buraya!	Godot over here!
Godot buraya!	Godot over here!
Tuttuk getirdik Bulatoviç'le	Brought him here by means of Bulatovic
Hoşgeldi Godot!	Welcome Godot!
Godot hoşgeldi!	Godot welcome!
Denize düşmüştük	Drowning man we were
Gelene sarıldık	Clutched at straw
Geldi geçti	Came over
başımıza yerleşti	started to govern
Ağrıdı başımız ve	Problems occurred
Kuruldu bu susuzluk düzeni	Waterless system is established
Gitmedi Godot!	Godot didn't leave!
Godot gitmedi!	Godot didn't go!
Diyorlar ki kaçacakmış	It is said that he will run away
Bekliyoruz ki kaçsın!	We are waiting for him to flee
Bekliyoruz, Godot gitsin!	We are waiting for Godot to go!
El sallamak istiyoruz	We want to wave
Güle Güle Godot!	Goodbye Godot!
Godot güle güle!	Godot goodbye!
... (GGG, 1996:7-8)	... (GGG, 1996:7-8)

Kavuklu and Kavuksuz cannot leave the place where they are now since they are on the guard of Godot, in other words, they are waiting for new desired Godot to arrive. Godotgiller and İtoluit are the characters who stand by Godot and are the governors. Godotgiller are not happy with others' waiting for a new Godot:

GODOTGİLLER : Godot geldi işte

Godot geldi aşka

Godot'nun aşkı pembe

Godot geldi işte!

3. GODOTGİL : (*Sert*) Bir tane Godot var, başka Godot yok! (GGG, 1996: 12)

Godotgiller announces that Godot is already here and the 3. Godotgil angrily repeats that:

3. GODOTGİL :(*Angrily*) There is only one Godot and there is no other Godot! (GGG, 1996: 12)

In this unnamed country other characters apart from Godotgiller and İtoluit are the governed citizens and they are unhappy with the system and they loudly complain about the water problem in the country. They even cannot make tea for themselves:

KAVUKSUZ :Bokko! Aloooo, Bokko!

BOKKO : (*girer*) Ne var?

KAVUKSUZ : İki çay yap bize!

BOKKO : Su yok!

KAVUKSUZ : Biliyorum. Espiri yapıyorum

BOKKO : Bir daha yapma! (*çıkır*) (GGG, 1996: 14)

KAVUKSUZ : Bokko! Helooo, Bokko!

BOKKO : (*Enters*) What?

KAVUKSUZ : Make us two cups of tea!

BOKKO : There is no water

KAVUKSUZ : I know. I am making a joke.

BOKKO : Don't again (*leaves*) (GGG, 1996: 14)

It is clear that the water problem has lasted quite a long time and Kavuksuz even can make jokes about it. Ferhat, Çiçek and Dolunay, who are the aware ones, enter with the song "Makinalar Hızlandılar". The song is the criticism of the system and Ferhat, Çiçek and Dolunay can stand against it. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz do nothing except waiting on stage. Bokko represent the ordinary people on streets who have no conscious and believe everything they are told. Leke utters meaningless words but actually the words Leke utters fit into the situation perfectly. They all appear on stage and discuss about water sources of the country and try to reason the situation they are in. Ferhat, Dolunay and Çiçek leave the stage and Kavuklu and Kavuksuz start to ride

wheelless bicycles and talk about trust and some other nonsense topics. When all the characters are on stage again, İtoluit comes and makes a speech about how ridiculous it is to complain and not doing work by giving examples of the bees.

People of the unnamed country are fed up with working for nothing and go on a strike:

KAVUKSUZ : N'oluyor?

TOPRAK : Grev!

KAVUKLU : Grev ne?

FERHAT : Direniş!

KAVUKSUZ : Neye yarayacak?

TOPRAK : Çalışmamız neye yarıyor? (GGG, 1996: 37)

Kavuksuz hears some voices and sees that Ferhat, Dolunay, Çiçek and Toprak enter and sit with banners which has nothing written on. Kavuksuz asks:

KAVUKSUZ : What is going on?

TOPRAK : Strike!

KAVUKLU : What is strike?

FERHAT : Disobedience

KAVUKSUZ : What good is it going to do?

TOPRAK : What good is our working do? (Şensoy, 1996:37)

Nevertheless, İtoluit enters and tries to convince them that soon there will be water since they are working on it hard. He cannot succeed and tells people that they are given rights that Godot approved. He announces a good news that they can establish a political party to rule the country. They get excited with the news but cannot decide how to elect a chairperson. In this chaotic setting Godot's voice is heard. Godot tells them that they are very lucky people and there is water on Bindiken Mountain and orders them to nominate one person to bring water for them. Bindiken Mountain is in fact a dangerous place since there lives a pink monster with a red head; however, Ferhat volunteers for the mission.

Kavuklu looks through binoculars and checks Ferhat's fire, but cannot see one. Seeing no fire makes them believe that Ferhat could be dead. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz want to hang themselves but cannot succeed so they leave the stage. From Godotgiller 1.

Godotgil, 2. Godotgil enters quietly and 3. Godotgil out of breath. They talk to İtoluit. 3. Godotgil tells that people are going on strike again the next day. İtoluit is quite calm and sure that the people cannot do anything and a strike will be useless. İtoluit imposes prohibitions and restrictions to make themselves safe. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz enter carrying their luggage. It is evident that they are leaving the country.

In this chaotic atmosphere İtoluit enters and announces that Godot has run away. People of this unnamed country become very happy with the news and Kavuklu and Kavuksuz think that there is no need to leave the country. Kavuksuz raises a question and asks who will be the one to deal with the affairs of the country. Toprak, Dolunay and even Bokko say that they can do the job which Godot has been doing. While they are trying to find a compromise, Godotgiller enter and tell them that they have seized the control of the country. People start asking questions to Godotgiller and try to understand their governing methods. İtoluit enters and announces that he has written a new constitution. Nevertheless, the people are not satisfied with what they heard, thus Godotgiller and İtoluit have to leave the country. They all start to sing “Yok Böyle Bir Alışkanlık Şarkısı” (Song of Such a Routine) which is about freedom. After the song, all the characters leave the stage but Kavuklu and Kavuksuz. Ferhat enters when Kavuklu is announcing the end of the play.



4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PLAYS

Following detailed information about Michel Foucault and his theories on space, power and panopticism and the historical backgrounds of the Theatre of the Absurd and Traditional Turkish Theatre as well as Samuel Beckett and Ferhan Şensoy, the answers to the questions that are addressed in introduction will be searched in this chapter. The research questions are:

1. Is the concept of space reflected in the plays of Samuel Beckett and Ferhan Şensoy?
2. Are the characters in the plays of Beckett and Şensoy affected from the theory of power?
3. Are the characters in the plays affected from the dominant figure of panopticism?

4.1. Concept of Space in Beckett

As explained in chapter III, Samuel Beckett's literary life can be examined in three periods; from beginning to 1945 is the first period, between 1945 to 1960 is the second and 1960 to his death is the third (Özbalak, 2012: 23-25; Carriere, 2005: 15). Beckett introduced his readers to a new writing style which was different in language use and writing techniques than the traditional ones in the years between 1945 and 1960. In these years he produced *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* among many others. Including the theatre plays *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, the works he created during this period are placeless and timeless (Özbalak, 2012: 26); nevertheless, when the works are analyzed it can be seen that there is time and place to be found in timelessness and placelessness.

The audience who watch his plays may meet either a perfect picture of the world or the one, which is characterized upside down, just like concepts of utopias and heterotopias of Michel Foucault. Foucault states that "They (utopias) present society

itself in a perfected form, or else society turned upside down...” (Foucault, 1986:3) Plays on stage can take the audiences to different worlds and different times from the existing ones, thus it is possible to say that, these plays can create a link between heterotopias and time. Foucault believes that theatre is an example of heterotopia and it is heterotopic since “it is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible. Thus it is that the theatre brings onto the rectangle of the stage, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another” (Foucault, 1986: 6 & Tompkins, 2014: 4). A staged heterotopia can allow audiences to distinguish some hint or inkling of another world, even one that is otherwise invisible. It is the heterotopia that allows and provides the potential for spatializing in performance both visible and invisible locations. Audience then is able to imagine the invisible locations (Tompkins, 2014: 6).

It is possible to say that, Samuel Beckett successfully creates such relationship in his plays while picturizing the world conditions upside down and help his audience to travel in between times and places in his timeless and placeless plays. The term space is quite a wide concept. There can be many definitions and applications of it into many fields including literature and theatre; however, the concept of space in this study will be limited to theories of space proposed by Michel Foucault. The concept space and time in the following pages will refer to space and time relationship in utopias and heterotopias of Michel Foucault.

Foucault states that “space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power” (Rabinow, 1984:252). As studied in detail in chapter II, Foucault believes that space is an essential matter to conduct social relations within the community; moreover, he states “...it is not possible to disregard the fatal intersection of time with space” (Foucault, 1984:1). Theatre buildings serve to the idea quite well since space and time in theatre has a function of breaking the walls between the audiences and plays on stage and that creates a kind of relationship between the play and the audience. Moreover, according to Foucault space is an essential mater for the people who live altogether and space breaks the barriers between the audience and the stage. (Rabinow, 1984:253-255 & Çamurdan, 1994 :1). The timelessness and placelessness in Beckett’s plays may serve the idea of breaking the walls between the audience and the stage just like the concept of space. Thus, Beckett has successfully created such relationship with his audience through the concept of space in his plays.

4.2. Concept of Space in Şensoy

Ferhan Şensoy, throughout his career, has produced many works including numerous plays, articles and books. He has brought innovations to the Turkish theatre, or at least, as he puts it, he has been searching for it and trying not to fall behind the universal and contemporary developments in theatre. (Kurtulan, 1982:60). His writing style makes him unique among his contemporaries. Şensoy prefers not to continue with the tradition of writing with all traditional wordplays, instead he adds new dimensions to the use of language (Pekman, 2002: 150). His career and his writing style can be examined in the light of Foucault's concept of space.

One of the innovations that Şensoy established in his early career was to rent a boat and transform it into a theatre hall. He named this new form of theatre "İçinden Dalga Geçen Tiyatro". He has performed two plays on both decks of the boat every night while sailing along the Bosphorus. After playing *Seyircili Seyir Defteri* on the first deck, he played *Kırkambar Gece Tiyatrosu* on the second deck after midnight (Meyer-Dinkgrafe, 2002: 275). Transforming a boat into a theatre hall is a perfect example of concept of space from Foucault's viewpoint. Foucault considers that space is an essential matter to conduct social relations within the community (Foucault, 1984: 1). It is possible to say that while transforming a boat into a theatre hall Şensoy perfectly serves Foucault's idea. Şensoy by transforming a boat into a theatre hall removed every single wall on stage and established a kind of communication which created a relationship between the audience and the players that has never been done before. Without walls on stage, the theatre hall turns into a place where there are no barriers between the players and the audience. Moreover, this particular of theatre hall is an innovation that can be named heterotopia of deviation. Foucault explains heterotopias of deviation as, "those in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required means or norms are placed" (Foucault, 1984: 5). The classical concept of theatre requires audiences to sit and watch the play and bans any kind of beverage or drinks during performance. On the other hand, what Ferhan Şensoy had established changed the rules of the classical theatre forms and brought some innovations for the good of the audiences. They were able to watch the play while having their drinks and even their dinner. The boat was designed like a restaurant with a stage in it. The performance was mostly interactive with the audiences. The audience were able to express their thoughts freely in the course of the play. That can be a sufficient evidence

of heterotopias of deviation considering the behaviors of the audience on the boat theatre.

The “Kavuk” of Kel Hasan which Ferhan Şensoy took over from Münir Özkul can also be regarded as something heterochronic. It is the tradition that the “Kavuk” is handed down to the best representative of Ortaoyunu in Turkey. The “Kavuk” belonged to Kel Hasan and from Kel Hasan the “Kavuk” was handed down to following; İsmail Hakkı Dümbüllü, Münir Özkul and Ferhan Şensoy (Hurriyet, 2016). As evident, The “Kavuk” comes from the past and brings the past memories to present day. Foucault states that,

“Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time. This situation shows us that the cemetery is indeed a highly heterotopic place since, for the individual, the cemetery begins with this strange heterochrony, the loss of life, and with this quasi-eternity in which her permanent lot is dissolution and disappearance” (Foucault, 1984: 6).

It is possible to consider the “Kavuk” as heterochronic since it symbolizes eternity on stage. The first owner of the “Kavuk” was Kel Hasan, lived between the years of 1874 and 1925, and The Kavuk carries the traces of the past and the Ortaoyunu of those years. It is like a museum itself to demonstrate the importance of Ortaoyunu today. Foucault believes that,

“From a general standpoint, in a society like ours heterotopias and heterochronies are structured and distributed in a relatively complex fashion. First of all, there are heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time, for example museums and libraries. Museums and libraries have become heterotopias in which time never stops building up and topping its own summit ...” (Foucault, 1984: 7).

What Foucault states above can fit into the Kel Hasan’s “Kavuk”. The “Kavuk” figuratively has been accumulating the past years on it and from person to person it transfers traces of years of Ortaoyunu to the audience.

As it was studied in the previous chapter, Ferhan Şensoy has a unique writing style which is full of word plays, tongue twisters and metaphors. The ability of performing tongue twisters made him to be considered to be the master of the words. Ayşegül Yüksel expresses that Ferhan Şensoy is a language acrobat who battles Turkish against Turkish and breaks the chains of command in the prescribed structures. He carefully observes his mother tongue as if he is hearing it for the first time. He becomes the

voice of unspoken by using vocalic and lexical associations of the language (Yüksel, 1995 in Pekman 2002: 151) The ability of using words can be parallel to the ideas of Foucault's on language of space. Foucault states that, “

“... reveals that language is (or, perhaps, became) a thing of a space. That it might describe or pass through space is no longer what is essential here. And if space is, in today's language, the most obsessive of metaphors, it is not that it henceforth offers the only recourse; but it is in space that, from the outset, language unfurls, slips on itself, determines its choices, draws its figures and translations. It is in space that it transports itself, that its very being 'metaphorizes' itself” (Foucault, 2007: 163).

The manner in which Ferhan Şensoy uses language can be regarded as space in Foucault's view. Şensoy creates his own space in plays through his unique style of language.

4.3. Space in *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot*

It would be beneficial to start to outline and analyze the constructed and abstracted spaces of the plays since heterotopias would have little meaning without this framing structure. The constructed space of *Waiting for Godot* is a lonely isolated road as Beckett emphasizes in the introduction of the play.

(A country road. A tree. Evening. Estragon, sitting on a low mound, is trying to take off his boot. He pulls at it with both hands, panting. He gives up, exhausted, rests, tries again. As before. Enter Vladimir).
(WfG, 2006: 1, Act I)

The scene is described as one single tree along with a rock in a no man's land. In the first act, the single tree on stage has no leaves as it is dead already.

VLADIMIR : He said by the tree. (*They look at the tree.*) Do you see any others?
ESTRAGON : What is it?
VLADIMIR : I don't know. A willow.
ESTRAGON : Where are the leaves?
VLADIMIR : It must be dead.
ESTRAGON : No more weeping.
VLADIMIR : Or perhaps it's not the season.
ESTRAGON : Looks to me more like a bush.
VLADIMIR : A shrub.

ESTRAGON : A bush. (WfG, 2006: 6, Act I)

Nevertheless, in the second act the dead tree of act one now has some leaves,

VLADIMIR : Look at it.

They look at the tree.

ESTRAGON : I see nothing.

VLADIMIR : But yesterday evening it was all black and bare. And now it's covered with leaves.

ESTRAGON : Leaves?

VLADIMIR : In a single night.

ESTRAGON : It must be the Spring.

VLADIMIR : But in a single night! (WfG, 2006: 57, Act II)

It is understood from the conversation between Vladimir and Estragon that in this no man's land people strangely harm fellow countrymen and any semblance of a normal existence is out of question. There are some assailants who never appear on stage and have never been described are ready to harm the ones who do not belong to their society or allow any semblance of a normal existence. The audience or the readers may get the implication that these never-to-be-seen people are dangerous. What Vladimir asks Estragon and the answer Estragon gives support to this idea;

VLADIMIR : And they didn't beat you?

ESTRAGON : Beat me? Certainly they beat me.

VLADIMIR : The same lot as usual?

ESTRAGON : The same? I don't know. (WfG, 2006: 1, Act I)

The constructed space in *Endgame* is quite the same as it is in *Waiting for Godot* with one difference. The action takes place in a bare interior, in other words in a room. Samuel Beckett picturizes the interior as,

Bare interior.

Grey Light.

Left and right back, high up, two small windows, curtains drawn.

Front right, a door. Hanging near door, its face to wall, a picture.

Front left, touching each other, covered with an old sheet, two ashbins.

Center, in an armchair on castors, covered with an old sheet. (Endgame, 2009: 5)

From the way the constructed space picturized, the audiences or the readers may get the feeling that there is a very limited form of vital sign in the interior. It seems like the characters of the play are stuck in a prison or a sanctuary (Çeber, 2010: 38). Hamm, Clov, Nagg and Nell are in a prison like place where one is in need of the other to survive. Outside the room is described as 'hell',

HAMM : Stop!

(Clov stops chair close to back wall. Hamm lays his hand against wall.)

Old wall!

(Pause.)

Beyond is the... other hell.

(Pause. Violently.)

Closer! Closer! Up against! (Endgame, 2009; 18)

The constructed space in *Good Riddance Godot* is an unnamed town in an unnamed country. It is understood from the instructions that there is an elevation on stage where İtoluit makes a speech on,

(... İtoluit enters holding an orchestra pit. Bokko, Dohunay and Çiçek follows İtoluit to the stage. İtoluit climb on elevation and the others line up in front of him. İtoluit conducts the song as if he is a maestro and he also sings.) (GGG, 1996: 30)

and where Kavuklu looks at the Bindiken mountain through binoculars as Şensoy describes,

(Kavuksuz sits on the same place as he was in the beginning of the play. Kavuklu, on an elevation holding a binoculars looking away.) (GGG, 1996: 51)

The abstracted space of *Waiting for Godot* starts with a ditch that never appears on stage. It is the place where the assailants have beaten Estragon the night before. The ditch is not on stage but as seen in the following dialogue it is implied.

VLADIMIR : *Hurt, coldly.* May one enquire where His Highness spent the night?

ESTRAGON : In a ditch.

VLADIMIR : *Admiringly.* A ditch! Where?

ESTRAGON : *Without gesture.* Over there. (WfG, 2006: 1, Act I)

The audience or the readers can easily sense that the abstracted space in *Endgame* is the kitchen. Outside the stage there is a kitchen and it is unclear how Clov goes in or comes out. Positioned outside the stage, kitchen indicates the dimensionless of the play. It is not clear where the play takes place but the unseen kitchen is the place where the boundaries are removed (Çeber, 2010: 38). Beckett does not design a fictional space in his plays. Beckett positions his characters in the space of a stage not in a fictional space; in other words, it is no place or the whole world (Sağlam, 2007: 61). Clov looks out through right window and he confirms what Hamm says about the sea, then he carries the ladder to the left window and announces that there is gray emptiness from pole to pole. Outside is always the same and never changes throughout the play. Outside the space is frozen, quiet and almost dead like a picture in a photograph with no sun shining as it is described in the conversation between Hamm and Clov below,

HAMM : Look at the sea.

CLOV : It's the same.

HAMM : Look at the ocean!

(Clov gets down, takes a few steps towards window left, goes back for ladder, carries it over and sets it down under window left, gets up on it, turns the telescope on the without, looks at length. He starts, lowers the telescope, examines it, turns it again on the without.)

...

HAMM : And the horizon? Nothing on the horizon?

CLOV : *(lowering the telescope, turning towards Hamm, exasperated*

What in God's name could there be on the horizon?
(Pause.)

HAMM : The waves, how are the waves?

CLOV : The waves?
(He turns the telescope on the waves.)
Lead.

HAMM : And the sun?

CLOV : *(looking)* Zero.

...

HAMM : Then what is it?

CLOV : *(looking)* Gray.
(Lowering the telescope, turning towards Hamm, louder.)
Gray!
(Pause. Still louder.)

GRRAY!

(Pause. He gets down, approaches Hamm from behind, whispers in his ear.)

HAMM : *(starting)* Gray! Did I hear you say gray?

CLOV : Light black. From pole to pole. (Endgame, 2006: 20-21)

There is not much information about constructed space of the plays as if the plays take place on a bare stage. On the other hand, there are some clues and evidence about abstracted place given in the instructions in *Good Riddance Godot*. The stage sometimes turns into a parliament like place and sometimes a lonely country road. Şensoy uses props to make the audience believe that the play is taking place in mentioned sites. He uses a wooden door with golden knob to make the stage turn into a parliament of an unnamed country. It is quite clear that the stage becomes a parliament like site since whenever the wooden door with the golden knob comes

down on a fly bar Godot's voice is heard. Godot is the cruel general and also the leader of the unnamed country.

"Everyone stares at each other. While they all are about to leave the stage, a wooden door with a golden knob comes down on the fly bar accompanied by music. Everyone stares at the wooden door with the golden knob open mouthed. Leke walks with a limp and knocks with anger. Godot's voice is heard."

GODOT : Evde Yokum!

HEPSİ : (*ürkerek*) Godot!

(*Ferhat gider ısrarla kapıyı çalar.*)

GODOT : Ne var?

FERHAT : Godot hazretleri biz halkınız! (GGG, 1996: 47)

...

GODOT : I am not home

ALL : (*timidly*) Godot!

(*Ferhat knocks the door insisently*)

GODOT : What?

FERHAT : Godot, your highness! We are your people! (GGG, 1996: 47)

Moreover, the golden knob itself also presents evidence that the stage turns into a parliament like site since it could be the symbol of wealth and richness. Şensoy may imply that the people in the parliament, or in other words, the ones who hold the power live in wealth whereas the common people suffer because of lack of water. Whenever someone from the government is on stage, discriminatory props are seen. The big silvered frame can be the other example. In the beginning of the play a big silvered frame comes down on a fly bar and stays hanging on stage. Godotgiller are the ones who represent Godot and they are positioned on spate place on stage as if they are in a building which belongs to the government. The building is never mentioned in the play but it can be sensed that there is one with windows. Godotgiller are behind the windows and in any threatening situation they disperse and protect themselves from the society. The image of this building can be counted as abstracted space of the play.

(... a big silvered frame comes down from fly bar. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are on the stage. Godotgiller enter and take their position behind the frame. They are like a military picture...) (GGG, 1996:5)

(Kavuklu takes his shoe off and throws it to Godotgiller. Godotgiller pull down the shutters of the windows and open the small windows on the shutters. Their eyes are seen only...) (GGG, 1996: 12).

From the instructions and conversations, it is understood that there is a mountain far away from this unnamed country. The name of the mountain is “Bindiken”. Bindiken can be translated into English as a dangerous place to go since the first syllable of the name “bin” means a thousand, and the second syllable “diken” means thorn. The word Bindiken mountain, in other words is a mound with “thousand thorns”. A mountain with thousand thorns is a dangerous place for people to go. In the translations below the name of the mountain will be given as it is mentioned in the play.

GODOT : Siz talihli bir milletsiniz. Doğuda, Bindikden dağında su var. Seçin içinizden bir yiğit gitsin delsin Bindikden dağını, kavuştursun bizi suya. (GGG, 1996: 47)

GODOT : You are such a lucky people. In the East there is water on the Bindiken mountain. Choose someone brave, let him go and pierce the Bindiken mountain and have the water. (GGG, 1996: 47).

The mountain is also mentioned in the instructions of the scene, in the song and in the conversation of Kavuklu and Kavuksuz.

(Music starts. They start to sing Bindiken song altogether...) (GGG, 1996: 48)

Bindikendağı Şarkısı	Bindiken Mountain Song
Bindiken	Bindiken
Bindiken	Bindiken
Bindiken dağı	Bindiken mountain
Aman vermez diken	Remorseless thorns
Kırmızı başlı	Red head
Pembe canavar	Pink monster
Geri vermez gidene	Never frees anyone
Bindiken	Bindiken
Bindiken	Bindiken
Bindiken dağı	Bindiken dağı

Geri vermez gideni

Never let go (GGG, 1996: 49)

Bindiken mountain is also mentioned in the conversation of Kavuklu and Kavuksuz,

- KAVUKSUZ** : Ne görüyorsun?
KAVUKLU : Dürbünün camlarını!
KAVUKSUZ : Nereye bakıyorsun?
KAVUKLU : Dürbünün camlarına!
KAVUKSUZ : Bindiken Dağı'na bakmıyor musun?
KAVUKLU : Bakıyorum. (GGG, 1996: 51)

- KAVUKSUZ** : What do you see?
KAVUKLU : Glasses of binoculars!
KAVUKSUZ : What are you looking at?
KAVUKLU : To the glasses of binoculars!
KAVUKSUZ : Don't you look at Bindiken Mountain?
KAVUKLU : I do. (GGG, 1996: 51)

Audience see that there is a car cover that is hiding something underneath in the corner of the stage. After playing backgammon Kavuklu and Kavuksuz lift the car cover and two bicycles without tires appear. These bicycles only with pedals are fixed to the stage. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz get on the bicycles and start pedaling them. Leke mimes as if she was walking next to them while Godotgiller follow them holding a portable fig tree with its branch and leaves. Şensoy describes the scene as;

(Kavuklu and Kavuksuz sahnenin bir köşesinde üstü araba örtüsüyle örtülü, iki bisikletin örtüsünü kaldırır, bisikletleri ortaya çıkarırlar, binerler. Bisikletler sahneye sabitlenmiştir, tekerlekleri yoktur, yalnız pedalları çevirir ilerlemezler. Leke onların yanında pantomim yürüyüşü yürür. Godotgiller portative bir incir ağacı ve kendilerini kamufler eden incir dalı ve yapraklarıyla peşlerine düşerler. (GGG, 1996: 23)

(Kavuklu and Kavuksuz lift the car cover hiding the bicycles underneath in the corner of the stage. The bicycles appear and they get on them. The bicycles are fixed on the stage, they do not have tires, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz start pedaling them, they do not move along. Leke mimes as if she is walking next to them. Godotgiller follow Kavuklu and Kavuksuz holding a portable fig tree and with a branch as well with its foliage camouflaging themselves.) (GGG, 1996: 23)

The scene above evokes the feeling that Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are riding the bicycles on a country road which is unnamed and unmentioned. This can be considered as an abstracted space of the play. Moreover, Şensoy hints that there is a rural area in the play as an abstracted space.

(...*Bokko Dolunay kolkoladırlar. Bokko takım elbise, boyunbağı, yakasında kırmızı karanfil. Mutlu bir kır gezisinde gibi sahneye çıkarlar*) (GGG, 1996: 28).

(... *Bokko and Dolunay are arm in arm. Bokko is in suit with a tie and a red clove on his lapel. They enter happy as if they are walking on a country road*) (GGG, 1996: 28).

Both the constructed and abstracted spaces of the plays *Waiting for Godot* and *Good Riddance Godot* may imply hope, waiting and exile. Vladimir and Estragon tirelessly wait for Godot and they are hopeful that Godot will come the next day even he has not shown up that day. Both characters are in a place of no man's land where danger is so close, just like as if they are in exile but they are waiting for someone who is very important for them. There are also similar feelings of hope and waiting in Şensoy's play *Good Riddance Godot* but in different terms. The characters in the play do not like Godot. They are waiting for him to leave their country one day. Godot is so cruel that he does not hesitate to endanger his people and he easily orders one to go to a very dangerous mountain to bring some water to the town. On the other hand, the feelings of hope and waiting that occur in both plays change and even disappear in the play *Endgame*. The characters in *Endgame* are in a sanctuary or a prison like room away from the society. They are presented as if they are the last humans on earth (Duckworth, 2007: 30). The unremembered yesterdays that take place in *Waiting for Godot* help to serve to contextualize those that happen in *Endgame*. It is possible to say that *Endgame* can be read as a form of a third act for *Waiting for Godot* (Gatewood, 2007: 55)

It is ironic that Vladimir and Estragon have an idea that they are meeting Godot in an isolated place. Foucault explains his third principle in his article "Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias" as follows, "the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible" (Foucault, 1984:6).

ESTRAGON : We came here yesterday.

VLADIMIR : Ah no, there you're mistaken.

ESTRAGON : What did we do yesterday?

VLADIMIR : What did we do yesterday?

ESTRAGON : Yes.

VLADIMIR : Why . . . (*Angrily.*) Nothing is certain when you're about.

ESTRAGON : In my opinion we were here.

VLADIMIR : (*looking round*). You recognize the place?

...

ESTRAGON : If he came yesterday and we weren't here you may be sure he won't come again today.

VLADIMIR : But you say we were here yesterday. (WfG, 2006: 7)

The place where Vladimir and Estragon are in actually is not suitable for a meeting place for someone as important as Godot. The “here” that Vladimir uses as an address for the meeting place with Godot has even no geographical name (Frank, 2002: 2). It is as if Becket makes the unknown, isolated, unnamed and incompatible place somewhere function very important by announcing Godot will come to that place.

In the play, *Endgame* the same heterotopia can be seen since the characters of the play are stuck in a prison like room in the middle of nowhere and with no one around. Hamm is blind and cannot walk, Clov on the other hand cannot sit so he has to walk around. Nagg and Nell are the old ones who cannot leave the bins that they are in. Such people in such terrible conditions are left alone in prison like room as if they are the last humans on earth. In other words, they are in a space, that itself is incompatible. There seems to be no life forms around.

HAMM : And the horizon? Nothing on the horizon?

CLOV : (*lowering the telescope, turning towards Hamm, exasperated*) What in God's name could there be on the horizon?
(*Pause.*)

HAMM : The waves, how are the waves?

CLOV : The waves?

(He turns the telescope on the waves.)

Lead.

HAMM : And the sun?

CLOV :*(looking)* Zero.

HAMM : But it should be sinking. Look again.

CLOV :*(looking)* Damn the sun.

HAMM : Is it night already then?

CLOV :*(looking)* No.

HAMM : Then what is it?

CLOV :*(looking)* Gray.

(Lowering the telescope, turning towards Hamm, louder.)

Gray!

(Pause. Still louder.)

GRRAY!

(Pause. He gets down, approaches Hamm from behind, whispers in his ear.)

HAMM :*(starting)* Gray! Did I hear you say gray?

CLOV : Light black. From pole to pole. (Endgame, 2009: 21)

In *Good Riddance Godot* Şensoy creates similar heterotopia as in Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. Godot in *Good Riddance Godot* is picturized as a very cruel but an important general who likes to live in peace and luxury. Moreover, Şensoy demonstrates Godot as a supernatural being. He is never seen on stage but his voice is heard. He is in a place where no one can reach him (Kocaman, 2007: 436). He lives somewhere up in the sky. His wooden door with golden knob comes down on a fly bar. He is never seen on stage;

(Herkes birbirine bakar. Leke'nin söylevini önemseyerek dağılırlarken, müzik eşliğinde altın tokmaklı bir tahta kapı iner sofitadan. Hepsi şaşkın bakınırlar. Leke topallayarak gelir, kapının tokmağını sinirle çalar. Godot'un sesi duyulur)

GODOT : Evde Yokum!

HEPSİ : (*ürkerek*) Godot!
Ferhat gider ısrarla kapıyı çalar.

GODOT : Ne var?

FERHAT : Godot hazretleri biz halkınız! (Şensoy, 1996: 47)

(Everyone stares at each other. While they all are about to leave the stage, a wooden door with the golden knob comes down on fly bar accompanied by music.

Everyone stares at the wooden door with the golden knob open mouthed. Leke walks with a limp and knocks with anger. Godot's voice is heard.)

GODOT : I am not home

ALL : (*timidly*) Godot!

Ferhat knocks the door insistently

GODOT : What?

FERHAT : Godot, your highness! We are your people! (GGG, 1996: 47)

Such a general living above his people should have a country in better condition with no danger and no problems. The same heterotopia mentioned above can correspond with the play.

It is possible to point out that the constructed and abstracted spaces of the play can be good examples of a heterotopia according to the third principle. Foucault states that,

“The heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible. Thus it is that the theatre brings onto the rectangle of the state, one after the other, a whole series of places that are foreign to one another...” (Foucault, 1984: 6).

The idea above can be studied from two points of view. The first one is that the theatre brings people and the events on the stage together and the second point is that the incompatible events occur on the stage. As Foucault states the theatre is a place of whole, which brings other places that are foreign to each other. The audience who come to watch the play live in their own time and place; nevertheless; they are introduced to different time and places on stage. The theatre brings the audiences space and the space of the plays on the stage together for a period of time. As Foucault puts it:

... perhaps the oldest example of the heterotopias that take the form of contradictory sites is the garden. We must not forget that in the Orient the garden, an astonishing creation that is now a thousand years old, had very deep and seemingly superimposed meanings. The traditional garden of the Persians was a secret space that was supposed to bring together inside its rectangle four parts representing the four parts of the world, with a space still more sacred than the others that were like an umbilicus, the navel of the world at its center..., and all the vegetation of the garden was supposed to come together in this space, in this sort of microcosm. As for the carpets, they were originally reproduction of gardens (the garden is a rug onto which the whole world comes to enact its symbolic perfection, and the rug is a sort of garden that can move across space). The garden is the smallest parcel of the world and then it is the totality of the world....” (Foucault, 1984: 6)

To summarize the carpets are the reproduction of the gardens and they can become the microcosm of the gardens as well. It is possible to fit theatre into this category since the theatres can be the microcosm of the world. Just like gardens, theatres can be the smallest example of the world and life itself. What occurs on stage may be the criticism of the world so life itself and the events on stage may not be compatible sometimes. As Foucault suggests time and places on stage can be several that are in themselves incompatible. Moreover, Foucault states that “heterotopias are most often linked to slice in time” (Foucault, 1984: 6). A heterotopia can disconnect an individual from her/his usual time. According to Foucault this is heterochronic. It is possible to say that the plays can generate the heterotopic zone of the audience and the characters.

Beckett in *Waiting for Godot* creates an illusion about community through trivial type of tramps. Considering this illusion there is a depth in time in the play. In each scene, the audience meet a moment of a community presented in history. When the curtain raises, the audience have the feeling that the place seen on the stage has been there before it has been seen. Moreover, it will be assumed that the place on the stage will continue to exist even as an imagery society after the curtain goes down. In fact, the kind of community in the play does not exist in today’s world (Frank, 2002:1). This is a heterotopia of the third and fourth principles of Foucault that the play makes the audience witness a different community in various times and makes them travel in time. Foucault states that “the heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.” (Foucault, 1984: 6) From this point of view, it is possible to say that the actual world in which the audience live and the world that are presented in the play are completely incompatible. Moreover, as the fourth principle points out, “heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time...” (Foucault, 1984: 6), the space in the play is linked in

time, thus Beckett creates an illusion of travelling from time to time and from community to community which are not real in his play.

As for the second point in the plays there happens incompatible events on the stage. In the second act of *Waiting for Godot*, everything is the same in the setting as it was in the first act except some leaves on the tree. The leaves support the desire for hope of lost humanity and the irony of hoping for Godot's arrival. This is a kind of irony and foreshadowing of Godot's not meeting Vladimir and Estragon that evening. The heterotopic zone of hope of the characters ends in catastrophic consequences: loss of hope.

The tree on stage is the only object that exists in the middle of no man's land and it seems that the tree has the similar fate as Vladimir and Estragon. It is as if the tree is struggling to survive with these two characters. On the other hand, it also seems that the tree has no meaning for them since Vladimir and Estragon take nothing from it to affect their present circumstances (Withanage, 2011: 15-16). In the beginning of the play, they seem indifferent to the tree sometimes or act as if they do not care;

- ESTRAGON** : What is it?
- VLADIMIR** : I don't know. A willow.
- ESTRAGON** : Where are the leaves?
- VLADIMIR** : It must be dead.
- ESTRAGON** : No more weeping.
- VLADIMIR** : Or perhaps it's not the season.
- ESTRAGON** : Looks to me more like a bush.
- VLADIMIR** : A shrub.
- ESTRAGON** : A bush. (WfG, 2006: 6, Act I)

Nevertheless, at the end of the second act they again mention the tree for the last time, but this time they mean that it is a tree and the conversation they have on tree has a positive connotation.

- VLADIMIR** : He'd punish us. (*Silence. He looks at the tree.*)
Everything's dead but the tree.
- ESTRAGON** : (*looking at the tree*). What is it?

VLADIMIR : It's the tree.
ESTRAGON : Yes, but what kind?
VLADIMIR : I don't know. A willow.

(Estragon draws Vladimir towards the tree. They stand motionless before it. Silence.) (WfG, 2006: 86, Act II)

Apart from their real world, the audiences may find themselves stuck in a world where there is only one room to hide in a depressing atmosphere. *Endgame* may make the audience feel that way. The heterochronic feeling that the audiences may feel in the play is the destruction of humanity and the world. Some critics say that the destruction is not only for the characters in the room but for everybody who lives in the 20th century. The play can be considered as a time period after a great disaster. The nature and the habitat is dead and food was perished. Hamm suffers and pays the price both for himself and for the humanity (Tezcan, 2010: 34). The characters in *Endgame* are seem to be left alone in the world where death is all around. It is like the carpet example of Foucault since the situation that the characters are in is the example of loss of hope of the mankind. Thus, the play can be the microcosm of hopelessness of the humanity. As a microcosm of humanity Hamm is pessimistic and fearful about outside world.

HAMM : Outside of here it's death.
(Pause.) (Endgame, 2009: 9)

Clov, on the other hand is unhappy and pessimistic as well;

HAMM : Then he's living.
(Pause.)
Did you ever have an instant of happiness?

CLOV : Not to my knowledge.
(Pause.) (Endgame, 2009: 9)

A parallel situation in Şensoy's play is the Godot's indifference towards his people. As a governor he is expected to be careful and concerned for his people. Instead of trying to find solutions to waterlessness and listening to his people, he becomes cruel

especially when seeing people going on a strike. The only solution Godot finds reflects his point of view;

GODOT : Bırakınız grev yapsınlar

İTOLUİT :Ölüm orucu gibi sapıklıkları denemek isteyenler var.

GODOT : Bırakınız ölsünler! (GGG, 1996: 59)

GODOT : Let them go on a strike

İTOLUİT : Some of them want to try fasting to death

GODOT : Let them die! (GGG, 1996: 59)

The bicycles without tires are considered as incompatible props on the stage. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz ride the bicycles as if there are moving and Leke mimes as if she is walking next to them. The bicycles without tires symbolize being stuck in a place. It is impossible to leave since without tires no one can move forward on a bicycle. Şensoy confirms the ideas of the characters in the play that they cannot leave their hometown but they are wishing Godot to leave the country.

Gitmedi Godot!

Godot didn't go

Godot gitmedi!

Godot didn't go

Diyorlar ki kaçacakmış

It is said that he will run away

Bekliyoruz ki kaçsın!

We are waiting so!

Bekliyoruz, Godot gitsin!

We are waiting for Godot to go!

El sallamak istiyoruz

We want to wave him

Güle Güle Godot!

Goodbye Godot!

Godot güle güle!

Godot goodbye! (GGG, 1996:8)

The following dialogue is another example to an incompatible situation. What should be normal is to move when the lights are green. Green light is a symbol of progression but İtoluit makes a metaphor on the issue;

İTOLUİT : N'oluyoruz kardeşlerim? Bir hiç yüzünden kim basıyor frene yeşil ışıktta?

KAVUKLU : Hep frene basıyorum. Gaz frene çok yakın. (GGG, 1996: 38)

İTOLUİT : What's up brothers? Who the hell step on the brakes on the green light?

KAVUKLU : I always step on the break. Brake and the gas is close to each other. (GGG, 1996:38)

In Beckett's plays, some of the objects used and some of the events occur on the stage seem to have no connection to the characters and to the world that they are in. For example, the objects Beckett prefers for the play *Waiting for Godot* are independent. The first act seems temporal since it is quite different from the second act like the heterotopias that are linked to the accumulation of time. Foucault states that "Opposite the heterotopias that are linked to the accumulation of time, there are those linked, on the contrary, to time in its most flowing, transitory, precarious aspect, to time in the mode of the festival. These heterotopias are not oriented toward the eternal, they are rather absolutely temporal. Such, for example, are the fairgrounds..." (Foucault, 1984: 7)

Buffoon like acting is seen in Beckett's plays and this enriches the plays. The characters in Beckett's plays reflect the struggles of humanity in this nonsense world. In this struggle the characters become like a buffoon and the only difference from a real circus buffoon is that, the characters on the stage are there to entertain themselves not the audience. (Özgüven, 1998: 72). The buffoon like acting is like the temporal heterotopias Foucault states. With the help of buffoonery, the play may become like a link to flowing and transitory time, since buffoonery is not the real aim in the play. The circus like acting is mostly seen in *Waiting for Godot* among his plays. Estragon's pulling his boot or losing the cord that holds up his trousers and his trousers' falling down to his ankles can be given as examples (Özgüven, 1998: 73),

VLADIMIR : Show me all the same. (*Estragon loosens the cord that holds up his trousers which, much too big for him, fall about his ankles. They look at the cord.*) It might do in a pinch. But is it strong enough?

ESTRAGON : We'll soon see. Here.
(They each take an end of the cord and pull. It breaks. They almost fall.) (WfG, 2006: 86, Act II)

Moreover, not realizing that his trousers are fallen to his ankles and continuing to act like that is kind of a circus like acting. Estragon pulls up his trousers after Vladimir tells him to do so (Özgüven, 1998: 73),

VLADIMIR : Pull on your trousers.

ESTRAGON : What?

VLADIMIR : Pull on your trousers.

ESTRAGON : You want me to pull off my trousers?

VLADIMIR : Pull ON your trousers.

ESTRAGON : (*realizing his trousers are down*). True.

(*He pulls up his trousers.*) (WfG, 2006: 87, Act II)

As buffoonery may reflect the temporal heterotopia in the play, the props used on stage can also be given as an examples of temporal heterotopia. The objects used in the first act are different from the ones in the second act. In the second act of *Waiting for Godot*, Vladimir and Estragon confused since Estragon does not remember what has happened the day before. Vladimir is sure that they are in the same place as they were yesterday but Estragon cannot remember clearly. Vladimir shows the tree;

VLADIMIR : The tree, look at the tree.

(*Estragon looks at the tree.*)

ESTRAGON : Was it not there yesterday?

VLADIMIR : Yes of course it was there. Do you not remember? We nearly hanged ourselves from it. But you wouldn't. Do you not remember?

ESTRAGON : You dreamt it.

VLADIMIR : Is it possible you've forgotten already?

ESTRAGON : That's the way I am. Either I forget immediately or I never forget. (WfG, 2006: 52)

Pozzo and Lucky return to see the tramps, Estragon has a wound on his leg from Lucky's kick. These are the signs which Estragon and Vladimir remember from the

day before. However, there are actually some changes in the place. The tree was bare in the beginning and in the second act, it has sprouted a few leaves.

VLADIMIR : Look at it.

(They look at the tree.)

ESTRAGON : I see nothing.

VLADIMIR : But yesterday evening it was all black and bare. And now it's covered with leaves.

ESTRAGON : Leaves?

VLADIMIR : In a single night.

ESTRAGON : It must be the Spring.

VLADIMIR : But in a single night! (WfG, 2006: 57)

Pozzo and Lucky are in different condition from the first act. Pozzo is blind, needs guidance and help, and he does neither remember 'yesterday' nor Estragon and Vladimir.

(Enter Pozzo and Lucky. Pozzo is blind. Lucky burdened as before. Rope as before, but much shorter, so that Pozzo may follow more easily. Lucky wearing a different hat. At the sight of Vladimir and Estragon he stops short. Pozzo, continuing on his way, bumps into him.) (WfG, 2006: 77)

...

POZZO : Who are you?

VLADIMIR : Do you not recognize us?

POZZO : I am blind.

(Silence.)

ESTRAGON : Perhaps he can see into the future.

VLADIMIR : Since when?

POZZO : I used to have wonderful sight— but are you friends?

ESTRAGON : *(laughing noisily)*. He wants to know if we are friends!

VLADIMIR : No, he means friends of his.

ESTRAGON : Well?

VLADIMIR : We've proved we are, by helping him.

ESTRAGON :Exactly. Would we have helped him if we weren't his friends?

VLADIMIR : Possibly.

ESTRAGON : True.

VLADIMIR : Don't let's quibble about that now.

POZZO : You are not highwaymen?

ESTRAGON : Highwaymen! Do we look like highwaymen?

VLADIMIR : Damn it, can't you see the man is blind! (WfG, 2006:

77)

Vladimir and Estragon find the boots and the hat in the place where they have left the day before. However, the boots are in different color and they do not fit.

VLADIMIR : (*triumphantly, pointing to the boots*). There they are! (*Estragon looks at the boots.*) At the very spot where you left them yesterday!

Estragon goes towards the boots, inspects them closely.

ESTRAGON : They're not mine.

VLADIMIR : (*stupefied*). Not yours!

ESTRAGON : Mine were black. These are brown.

VLADIMIR : You're sure yours were black?

ESTRAGON : Well they were a kind of gray.

VLADIMIR : And these are brown. Show me.

ESTRAGON : (*picking up a boot*). Well they're a kind of green.

VLADIMIR : Show me. (*Estragon hands him the boot. Vladimir inspects it, throws it down angrily.*) Well of all the—

ESTRAGON : You see, all that's a lot of bloody—

VLADIMIR : Ah! I see what it is. Yes, I see what's happened.

ESTRAGON : All that's a lot of bloody—

VLADIMIR : It's elementary. Someone came and took yours and left you his.

ESTRAGON : Why?

VLADIMIR : His were too tight for him, so he took yours.

ESTRAGON : But mine were too tight. (WfG, 2006: 59)

The same kind of buffoonery as it is in *Waiting for Godot* can be seen in *Endgame* and this is an example of temporal heterotopia. Fleas makes Clov uncomfortable and pours the powder into his trousers (Özgüven, 1998: 73).

CLOV : *(angushed, scratching himself)* I have a flea!

HAMM : A flea! Are there still fleas?

CLOV : On me there's one.

(Scratching.)

Unless it's a crab louse.

HAMM : *(very perturbed)* But humanity might start from there all over again! Catch him, for the love of God!

CLOV : I'll go and get the powder.

(Exit Clov.)

HAMM : A flea! This is awful! What a day!

(Enter Clov with a sprinkling-tin.)

CLOV : I'm back again, with the insecticide.

HAMM : Let him have it!

(Clov loosens the top of his trousers, pulls it forward and shakes powder into the aperture. He stoops, looks, waits, starts, frenziedly shakes more powder, stoops, looks, waits.) (Endgame, 2006: 22)

Nevertheless, when the relationships of the characters are considered, temporal heterotopia do not correspond. The characters in *Endgame* are somehow dependent to one another and cannot leave each other. When the dialogues and the manners of the characters are considered, the relationships seem like rather temporal. As mentioned before, the play picturizes the last stages of human struggle in the world. It seems that the universe has been completely destroyed and there is nothing left. Under such terrible condition the characters are in need of each other and that may arise a feeling that they are having a relationship based on self-interests. This self-interest may make their relationship seem temporal. It is possible to say that the play focuses on benefits and self-seeking relationships of the characters stuck in a prison like room without any life evidence around. The circumstances they are in make them dependent to each other.

HAMM : Why don't you finish us?

(Pause.)

I'll tell you the combination of the cupboard if you promise to finish me.

CLOV : I couldn't finish you.

HAMM : Then you shan't finish me.

(Pause.)

CLOV : I'll leave you, I have things to do. (Endgame, 2006: 24)

Even though Clov utters such words in this dialogue the characters somehow are tied to each other and cannot leave. Clov repeatedly tells Hamm that “I will leave you”; nevertheless, he does not leave Hamm. Even when Clov sees a child outside which symbolizes hope, he prefers not to leave Hamm alone (Özgüven, 1998: 89). However, it seems that with any chance that they could find, they would be ready to end this temporal relationship.

The characters are dependent to each other. One cannot do without the other. Hamm is stuck on his chair and cannot move himself. Moreover, he is blind and cannot see what is outside the room. He needs Clov to push him around and he needs his eyes to see what is outside the room.

HAMM : Look at the sea.

CLOV : It's the same.

HAMM : Look at the ocean!

(Clov gets down, takes a few steps towards window left, goes back for ladder, carries it over and sets it down under window left, gets up on it, turns the telescope on the without, looks at length. He starts, lowers the telescope, examines it, turns it again on the without.)

CLOV : Never seen anything like that!

HAMM : *(anxious)* What? A sail? A fin? Smoke?

CLOV : *(looking)* The light is sunk.

HAMM : *(relieved)* Pah! We all knew that. (Endgame, 2009: 21)

Moreover, since Hamm is blind he is reliant upon Clov to protect him from the possible existing dangers that might come outside the room. The feeling that Hamm carries makes him anxious because he thinks that death outside is ready to take them.

HAMM : Gone from me you'd be dead.
CLOV : And vice versa.
HAMM : Outside of here it's death! (Endgame, 2009: 42)

Clov, on the other hand, needs Hamm, since he does not know the combination of the cupboard. Without Hamm Clov would be starving to death.

CLOV :I don't know the combination of the cupboard.
(Endgame, 2009: 9)

On the other hand, Şensoy's characters in *Good Riddance Godot* except Godot himself, do not correspond to what Foucault suggests on temporal heterotopias. The relationship of the characters who represent ordinary people in this unnamed country, namely Kavuklu, Kavuksuz, Leke, Ferhat, Dolunay, Çiçek and Toprak, are unified to one another. When Godot tells them that they could find water in Bindiken mountain but only one man can go to get water, the others grumble and ask why ten or fifteen of them cannot go. The relationship of those people are not temporal since they seem to reject the idea of only one person to go to that dangerous mountain. If they were not interdependent to each other they would not care who goes and gets the water.

FERHAT : Godot hazretleri biz halkımızız!
GODOT : Aferin! Ne istiyorsunuz?
TOPRAK : Su istiyoruz!
DOLUNAY : Ben hortum da istiyorum!
GODOT : İyi!
KAVUKLU : Ne iyi?
GODOT : Siz talihli bir milletsiniz. Doğuda, Bindikden dağında su var. Seçin içinizden bir yiğit gitsin delsin Bindikden dağını, kavuştursun bizi suya.
KAVUKSUZ : Niye bir tek yiğit? Beş on yiğit olmaz mı?
...
GODOT : Olmaz tek bir yiğit gidecek! To be or not to be! That is the quotation!
FERHAT : Ben giderim tek başıma. Olmazları oldurmanın zamanı!
GODOT : Aferin esas çocuk! Açık olsun yolun hatta, good vibrations!

Hızla yükselir sofıtaya altın tokmaklı kapı. (GGG, 1996: 47 – 48)

- FERHAT** : Godot, your highness! We are your people!
- GODOT** : Well done! What do you want?
- TOPRAK** : We want water!
- DOLUNAY** : I want hose as well!
- GODOT** : Good!
- KAVUKLU** : What is good?
- GODOT** : You are lucky. In the East there is water on the Bindiken mountain. Choose someone brave, let him go and pierce the Bindiken mountain and have the water.
- KAVUKSUZ** : Why only a single brave one? Can't it be five or ten?
...
- GODOT** : Out of the question! Only one brave can go! To be or not to be! That is the quotation!
- FERHAT** : I will go by myself. It is time to make impossible possible.
- GODOT** : Well done my boy! Best all the way, even, good vibes!
The door with golden knob raises (GGG, 1996: 47 – 48)

One of the characters in the Fasil part of Ortaoyunu was Ferhad. The story of Ferhad and Shirin was covered by Ortaoyunu. In the story Shirin's mother asks Ferhad to bring water from the mountain and if he succeeds Ferhad could marry Shirin. (And, 1985; 439). Similar to Ortaoyunu, in Şensoy's play, Ferhad volunteers to go to the Bindiken Mountain and Kavuklu and Kavuksuz worry about Ferhad. As Kavuklu and Pişekar in Ortaoyunu, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are bound to each other from their hearts and they care about the people around them (And, 1985; 468-469). The following dialogues are the proof of their faithfulness. Kavuklu does not see the fire that Ferhad lit on Bindiken Mountain and Kavuksuz does not want to think of that something bad happens to Ferhad. Kavuksuz makes up excuses,

KAVUKSUZ : Yaktığı ateş yanıyor mu?

KAVUKLU : Hayır

Kavuksuz telaşla yerinden kalkar, Kavuklu'nun yanına gelir.

KAVUKSUZ : Sönmüş mü Ferhat'ın ateşi?

Dürbünü alır, bakar.

...

KAVUKSUZ : Belki de rüzgar söndürdü ateşi...

KAVUKLU : Yeniden yakardı.

KAVUKSUZ : Belki kibriti bitti!

...

KAVUKSUZ : İlk zamanlar görüyorduk ateşi!

KAVUKLU : Sonra söndü işte.

KAVUKSUZ : Belki çalı çırpı bulamadı.

KAVUKLU : Saçmalıyorsun.

KAVUKSUZ : Belki de rüzgar söndürdü ateşi.

...

KAVUKSUZ : Belki kibriti bitti de demişmiydim? (GGG, 1996: 51 - 53)

KAVUKSUZ : Is the fire still on?

KAVUKLU : No

Kavuksuz stands up in haste and comes next to Kavuklu

KAVUKSUZ : Is Ferhat's fire extinguished?

Takes the binoculars, looks at the mountain

...

KAVUKSUZ : May be the wind extinguished the fire...

KAVUKLU : He would start the fire again.

KAVUKSUZ : May be he is out of matches!

...

KAVUKSUZ : We saw the fire earlier!

KAVUKSUZ : It is extinguished somehow.

KAVUKSUZ : May be he couldn't find any brushwood

KAVUKLU : Don't be silly

KAVUKSUZ : May be the wind extinguished the fire

...

KAVUKSUZ : Did I tell you that may be he is out of matches? (GGG, 1996: 51 - 53)

They obviously do not want to think that something bad happened to their friend on the mountain. They worry about Ferhat and this is evidence that their relationship is not temporal and that they care for each other.

Foucault states that “The site is defined by relations of proximity between points or elements; formally, we can describe these relations as series, trees, or grids” (Foucault, 1984: 2). Moreover, Foucault also talks about heterotopias of deviation and describes it as “... those in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed. Cases of these are, and of course prisons....” (Foucault, 1984: 5) The situation of the characters of *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot* on the stage seem to prove Foucault’s ideas since all the characters of the plays are stuck on the stage. Vladimir and Estragon seem to be prisoned in a site of relations of a tree and grids in *Waiting for Godot* but the grids are invisible. The stage is like a bars free prison, but the characters never leave the place. Hamm, Clov, Nagg and Nell seem to be prisoned in a room where surrounded by nothingness and death. Moreover, Nagg and Nell are stuck in ashbins. The people in *Good Riddance Godot* are caged under the reign of a tyrant general who never appears.

The stage of the play *Waiting for Godot* is a closed space. There are entrances and there are no exits. At the beginning of the play, Beckett describes the stage short; “A country road. A tree. Evening.” (WfG, 2006: 1, Act I). Through these three short stage directions, the audience are invited to an open and loose space which is not defined or delimited. Thus, the stage seems like an entirely free world. Nevertheless, the fact is completely different. Beckett invisibly restricts the freedom of the characters in the play. Vladimir and Estragon can move around freely even they know that they can leave the stage if they want to. However, they are restricted on the stage that they have to return to their original place as if they have strong ties with it. Similarly, Pozzo and Lucky are cursed to repeat the same entrances and exits endlessly. The journey the characters take on the stage does proceed neither forward nor backward. There is no other place for characters to go and they are not allowed to rest on the stage. They are like prisoners since there are no visible bars to limit their immediate activities and that makes them feel free (Frank, 2002: 2-3). Nevertheless, their private space and social

space are restricted and they are in dilemma all the time as in the last dialogue presents at the end of the first act,

ESTRAGON :Well, shall we go?

VLADIMIR :Yes, let's go.

They do not move. (WfG, 2006: 47, Act I)

It is assumed from the story of the play that Estragon and Vladimir have simply been thrown into a strange and prison like isolated land without any preliminary explanation about their situation. What they only know is that they are there to meet Godot. In this isolated place, even though they have known each other for a long time, they hardly recognize each other as members of the same community, nor know what to do with each or with time given to them. They spent the night in different places apart from each other. They get confused when they see each other in the beginning of each act, and pretend as if the other has done something wrong that Estragon refuses the embrace offered in both acts.

VLADIMIR : *(advancing with short, stiff strides, legs wide apart)*. I'm beginning to come round to that opinion. All my life I've tried to put it from me, saying Vladimir, be reasonable, you haven't yet tried everything. And I resumed the struggle. *(He broods, musing on the struggle. Turning to Estragon.)* So there you are again.

ESTRAGON : Am I?

VLADIMIR : I'm glad to see you back. I thought you were gone forever.

ESTRAGON : Me too.

VLADIMIR : Together again at last! We'll have to celebrate this. But how? *(He reflects.)* Get up till I embrace you.

ESTRAGON :*(irritably)*. Not now, not now. (Beckett, 2006: 1, Act I)
...

VLADIMIR : You again! *(Estragon halts but does not raise his head. Vladimir goes towards him.)* Come here till I embrace you.

ESTRAGON : Don't touch me!

(Vladimir holds back, pained.)

VLADIMIR : Do you want me to go away? *(Pause.)* Gogo! *(Pause. Vladimir observes him attentively.)* Did they beat you? *(Pause.)* Gogo! *(Estragon remains silent, head bowed.)*
Where did you spend the night?

ESTRAGON : Don't touch me! Don't question me! Don't speak to me!
Stay with me! (WfG, 2006: 49, Act II)

Estragon and Vladimir's behavior towards each other changes in the course of the play just like the change of heterotopia of crisis to heterotopia of deviation. As it can be seen from the dialogues above, the anger they feel towards each other settles in later dialogues. Foucault defines heterotopia of deviation as "those in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed" (Foucault, 1984: 5). The relationship and the thoughts of these two tramps are deviant through the play since they sometimes decide to go but do not move or decide to commit suicide but they give up and they sometimes argue even though they seem to complete one another.

Similarly, the stage of *Endgame* is also a closed one. There is no visible entrance to the stage from neither side and it is made the audience sense that there is a kitchen behind the curtain which Clov continuously goes. The stage is described as,

Bare interior.

Grey Light.

Left and right back, high up, two small windows, curtains drawn.

Front right, a door. Hanging near door, its face to wall, a picture.

Front left, touching each other, covered with an old sheet, two ashbins.

Center, in an armchair on castors, covered with an old sheet, Hamm.

Motionless by the door, his eyes fixed on Hamm, Clov. Very red face.

Brief tableau. (Endgame, 2009: 5)

In *Endgame*, the audience are invited to a quite empty room with an invisible kitchen behind the curtain or the stage. While Beckett invisibly restricts the freedom of the characters in *Waiting for Godot*, he visibly abolishes the freedom of the characters in *Endgame*. Hamm cannot walk and is confined to his chair, moreover he cannot see and is imprisoned in his imagination and fears.

HAMM : What, I'd like to know.
CLOV : I look at the wall.
HAMM : The wall! And what do you see on your wall? Mene, mene? Naked bodies? (Endgame, 2009: 11)

Clov, on the other hand, cannot sit and is doomed to walk and stand up all the time. Nell and Nagg are imprisoned to the ashbins.

CLOV : Sometimes on horse.
(The lid of one of the bins lifts and the hands of Nagg appear, gripping the rim. Then his head emerges. Nightcap. Very white face. Nagg yawns, then listens.)
I'll leave you, I have things to do. (Endgame, 2009: 9)

...
HAMM : We're getting on.
(He leans back in his chair, remains motionless. Nagg knocks on the lid of the other bin. Pause. He knocks harder. The lid lifts and the hands of Nell appear, gripping the rim. Then her head emerges. Lace cap. Very white face.) (Endgame, 2009: 9)

Among all the characters in the play only Clov can move and walk in the room and though he is able to walk, he prefers not to leave Hamm and the room. He tells Hamm that he will leave them many times but he does not. It seems that Hamm changes the subject and make Clov forget what he said for some time or consider this leaving to the kitchen.

CLOV : ... I'll leave you, I have things to do.

HAMM : In your kitchen?

CLOV : Yes. (Endgame, 2009: 9)

...
CLOV : No.

(Pause.)

I'll leave you, I have things to do.

HAMM : In your kitchen?

CLOV : Yes. (Endgame, 2009: 11)

...
CLOV : Then I'll leave you.
HAMM : You can't leave us.
CLOV : Then I won't leave you.
(Pause.) (Endgame, 2009: 24)

...
CLOV : I'll leave you, I have things to do.
HAMM : Do you remember when you came here? (Endgame, 2009: 24)

Like in *Waiting for Godot* there is no other place for the characters to go. They are like prisoners locked in a room where death is outside.

HAMM : Outside of here it's death! (Endgame, 2009: 24)

There are no visible bars to limit their activities and they are free only in the room but is possible to say that the room that they are stuck in has become their whole world. Hamm orders Clov to give him a little turn and say;

HAMM : Take me for a little turn.
(Clov goes behind the chair and pushes it forward.)
Not too fast!
(Clov pushes chair.)
Right round the world!
(Clov pushes chair.)
Hug the walls, then back to the center again.
(Clov pushes chair.)
I was right in the center, wasn't I? (Endgame, 2009: 19)

As it can be seen from the dialogue that the characters have accommodated themselves to the environment that they are in. Their freedom is taken away from them and they are left to live in four walls but they consider this normal. The normal should be living in freedom but as Foucault states the characters accommodated themselves to the deviant environment.

Similar prison like environment can be seen in *Good Riddance Godot*. Şensoy by using characters from Ortaoyunu, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz instead of Kavuklu and Pişekar, is augmenting the limited space he allows to his characters. In Ortaoyunu the characters

move around a central circle and their movements are limited to this circle which is surrounded by low fences. This implies a dual limitation on *Good Riddance Godot*'s characters; one that is on actual stage and one which is covertly suggested by Ortaoyunu. Furthermore, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are guarding, trying not to miss Godot. They both know that they will not see Godot but still they cannot leave the place. They are hopeful that Godot will go. Kavuklu offers to go but,

KAVUKLU : Haydi gidelim!
KAVUKSUZ : Gidemeyiz!
KAVUKLU : Niçin?
KAVUKSUZ : Godot nöbetindeyiz! (kısa susku) Hem nereye gidebiliriz? Ve nasıl? Doğuda mıyız? Batıda mı? ...
(GGG, 1996, 8)

KAVUKLU : Let's go!
KAVUKSUZ : We can't
KAVUKLU : Why?
KAVUKSUZ : We are on Godot watch. (short silence) Where can we go? And how? Are we in the East? In the West? (GGG, 1996, 8)

Other characters try to convince Kavuklu and Kavuksuz to go with them,

FERHAT : Hadi, gelin bizimle!
KAVUKSUZ : Gelemeyiz!
DOLUNAY : Niçün?
KAVUKLU : Godot nöbetindeyiz!
ÇİÇEK : Gel-me-ye-cek!
KAVUKLU : Tamam tamam, biliyoruz.... (GGG, 1996: 22)

FERHAT : Come on. Come with us!
KAVUKSUZ : We can't
DOLUNAY : Why?
KAVUKLU : We are on Godot watch
ÇİÇEK : He-will-not-come!
KAVUKLU : Okay Okay, we know.... (GGG, 1996: 22)

Unlike the characters in *Waiting for Godot* and in *Endgame*, the people in *Güle Good Riddance Godot* refuse to live in deviant environment. In other words, they refuse to accept the heterotopia of deviation. They are uncomfortable with the conditions and they grumble,

DOLUNAY : Ben yan gelip yatarken, suyu ağzıma akıtsınlar, istiyorsun. İstersen senin için huni de bulduralım.

ÇİÇEK : Elde kova, tencere, günboyu yitik suyun peşinde, niye deli gibi dolanıyoruz biz? Asıl buna yanıt verin siz!
(GGG, 1996: 21)

DOLUNAY : You are laying around and you want water to be found and poured into your mouth. Do you want us to find a funnel for you?

ÇİÇEK : Why do you think I am running after lost water with buckets and pots all day like crazy. You answer this first!
(GGG, 1996: 21)

Nevertheless, some of the characters in the play are deviant themselves. They act according to the situation that they are in. They are not trustworthy people. For example, when Godot is ruling the country Kavuklu and Kavuksuz want Godot to leave the country.

KAVUKSUZ : O kolay kolay gitmez.

DOLUNAY : Gidecek!

KAVUKLU : İyi tamam, biz ondan önce gidiyoruz. (GGG, 1996: 62)

KAVUKSUZ : He won't go soon.

DOLUNAY : He will!

KAVUKLU : Okay, We are going then. (GGG, 1996: 62)

They even sing a song on their hope of Godot's run away,

...

Gitmedi Godot!

Godot didn't go

Godot gitmedi!

Godot didn't go

Diyorlar ki kaçacakmış

It is said that he will run away

Bekliyoruz ki kaçsın! We are waiting so!
Bekliyoruz, Godot gitsin! We are waiting for Godot to go!
El sallamak istiyoruz We want to wave him
Güle Güle Godot! Goodbye Godot!
Godot güle güle! Godot goodbye! (GGG, 1996:8)

Nevertheless, after Godot's run away, those characters seem so upset,

BOKKO : Lan neredeyse keşke gitmeseydi Godot diyeceksiniz!

KAVUKLU : Nerdeyse!

KAVUKSUZ : Godot'nun bir ağırlığı vardı...

...

KAVUKSUZ : Godot varken, dostumuzu düşmanımızı biliyorduk.
Kimin kim olduğu belliydi... Şimdi daha da karıştı iş!
Keşke gitmeseydi Godot! (Şensoy, 1996: 73 -74)

BOKKO : You seem to say that we wished Godot has never left !

KAVUKLU : Almost!

KAVUKSUZ : Godot had an authority...

...

KAVUKSUZ : When Godot was here we knew who our enemies and
friends were. Now we are confused. I wish Godot would
have never left (GGG, 1996: 73 -74)

Similar deviation can be seen in the other characters. The ones who were the ardent supporters of Godot changed their speeches after Godot is gone. When Godot was ruling the country, Itoluit was defending and flattering Godot since he was working for Godot,

DOLUNAY : Su istiyoruz su!

İTOLUİT :Anlıyorum.. Fakat böyle bıldırcın gibi boşa patırdanmanız size bir şey getirmez, götürür. Sıkıntılar gelip geçicidir. Her felaket bir mutluluk müjdesidir.
(GGG, 1996:39)

DOLUNAY : We want water!
İTOLUİT : I see. Pattering like quail won't bring you anything.
Problems are temporary. Each disaster is an evangel of happiness. (GGG, 1996:39)

In other dialogue İtoluit clearly announces his side,

İTOLUİT : Endişelenecek bir şey yok. Gerekirse dağda uyduruk bir ateş yaktırırız. Çok grev gördük, çok grev çözdük biz. Olmazsa, üç beş damacana su dağıtırız, ortalık yatıştır. (GGG, 1996: 57)

İTOLUİT : There is nothing to worry about. If necessary, we can build a sloppy fire on the mountain. We have gone through a lot of strikes, and we ended a lot. In the worst case we can give few bottles of water to them, things will calm down. (GGG, 1996: 57)

After Godot has left the country,

İTOLUİT : Kardeşlerims, siz beni tamamen yanlış anlamışsınız. Çok ayıp! Ben her zaman sizin yanınızda olmuş, sizin çıkarlarınız için Godot'yla çatışmış, iş bu yüzden ne ona ne size yaranabilmiş bir kardeşinizim ve inanın Godot'nun gidişine hepinizden çok ben sevindim. (GGG, 1996: 76).

İTOLUİT : Brothers, you have completely misunderstood me. Scandalous! I have always been on your side and I quarreled with Godot just to protect your welfare. That is the reason why I could not serve neither you nor Godot properly. Believe me I am the happiest of all now that Godot has gone. (GGG, 1996: 76)

What Foucault states "... those in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed..." (Foucault, 1984: 5) can match with the behaviors of the characters in *Good Riddance Godot*. As these dialogues

point out, they act and behave according to the circumstances. But this does not loosen their ties to each other.

Foucault talks about crisis of heterotopia in his article *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias* and states that there are privileged, sacred and forbidden places reserved for people who live in a society. He states as;

“...But the heterotopias obviously take quite varied forms, and perhaps no one absolutely universal form of heterotopia would be found. ... In the so-called primitive societies, there is a certain form of heterotopia that I would call crisis heterotopia, i.e. there are privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis...” (Foucault, 1984: 4)

In *Waiting for Godot* the tree on stage may symbolize many possibilities both positive and negative. The tree without leaves may symbolize death and lifelessness and with leaves hope. With or without leaves, the tree seems to have an important role for the characters since it is like a privileged and sacred place for Vladimir and Estragon. What makes the tree seem privileged and sacred for the tramps is that it is the exact place where Godot would meet them. This idea can be related to Foucault’s first principle, crisis heterotopia,

As Foucault states in the quotation the tree may have the role for Estragon and Vladimir to have relation to the society and the human environment. It is the only prop on the stage that the audience may have the feeling that Estragon and Vladimir have the connection to life itself. The tree without leaves seems dead in the first act but awakens at the second day in the second act. The leaves may be the symbol of hope for tomorrow, which in tramps’ case is Godot. To sum up, it is the tree that they try to use and hang themselves to end their lives, or to have hope that Godot will come the next day.

VLADIMIR : Look at the tree.

ESTRAGON : It's never the same pus from one second to the next.

VLADIMIR : The tree, look at the tree.

(Estragon looks at the tree.)

ESTRAGON : Was it not there yesterday?

VLADIMIR : Yes of course it was there. Do you not remember? We nearly hanged ourselves from it. But you wouldn't. Do you not remember? (Beckett, 2006: 51-52, Act II)

Considering the geographical place, the tramps seem to be in a state of crisis as Foucault states in his article *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias*.

“...the boarding school, in its nineteenth-century form, or military service for young men, having certainly played such a role, as the first manifestations of sexual virility were in fact supposed to take place “elsewhere” than at home.... this heterotopia without geographical markers.” (Foucault, 1984: 5).

The place where Godot would come and meet them is quite an unusual place since it is a no man’s land. In this lonely place, Estragon and Vladimir are also lonely and sometimes hopeless. This place is like an “elsewhere” place that Foucault mentions in his article *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias*.

The geographical place that *Endgame* takes place is also no man’s land. The characters are positioned into a room in which there is nothing around except death. In this lonely environment the characters are stuck in that room hopeless. The room here may become an “elsewhere” place. Moreover, the room is described like inside of a skull. It is inside Hamm’s skull. The walls are gray like the color of the gray matter in the brain and two windows situated high are the eyes of Hamm. Clov tries to find out what Hamm has in mind while climbing up and looking out of the windows. (Yüksel in Beckett, 2007; 14).

The crisis of heterotopia in *Endgame* can be the room that is presented on the stage. The room is mostly empty like a primitive place and it is a sacred place for the characters. It is sacred since the room is the only place that one can stay alive. Hamm and Clov are aware of that fact and say;

HAMM : Gone from me you'd be dead.

CLOV : And vice versa.

HAMM : Outside of here it's death! (Endgame, 2009, 42)

Moreover, Hamm thinks that the room is the only sacred place for the humanity and the ones left outside of the room are doomed.

CLOV : No? A potential procreator?

HAMM : If he exists he'll die there or he'll come here. And if he doesn't...

(Pause.) (Beckett, 2009: 46)

In Şensoy’s play there is no geographical markers unlike Beckett’s plays. The place the play takes place in is an unnamed country. The characters in this unnamed country do not think to leave their homes even though they have problems. The characters are

struggling with two big problems in this country. The first one is Godot himself as a governor and the other one is the waterlessness of the country. People want and hope Godot to leave the country and to have running water in their homes. The problems of the country do not seem to be close to the solution in near future. Even under such terrible conditions people do not think and try to leave their country but they stay and hope. Normally, there should be water in a place where people are located. In this country houses should have water running from the taps and the governors should supply basic and necessary needs to ease people's lives but it seems it is not the case;

DOLUNAY : Su istiyoruz su!
İTOLUİT : Anlıyorum....
FERHAT : Musluk istiyoruz, sundurma istiyoruz.
DOLUNAY : Hortum istiyoruz, hortum! (Şensoy, 1996: 40)

DOLUNAY : We want water!
İTOLUİT : I see....
FERHAT : We want a tap; we want a porch.
DOLUNAY : We want a hose! (GGG, 1996: 40)

Instead of providing water for the people, Godot suggests his people to go and find water on a mountain.

GODOT : Siz talihli bir milletsiniz. Doğuda, Bindikden dağında su var. Seçin içinizden bir yiğit gitsin delsin Bindikden dağını, kavuştursun bizi suya. (Şensoy, 1996: 47 – 48)

GODOT : You are such a lucky people. In the East there is water on the Bindiken mountain. Choose someone brave, let him go and pierce the Bindiken mountain and get the water. (Şensoy, 1996: 47 – 48)

Finding water on the mountain can be considered as a kind of crises of heterotopia since the water is not in the place where it should be. The water should be brought to the city and be provided to the people. In this condition the water can be the “elsewhere” as Foucault points out.

Moreover, there is another example of crisis of heterotopia in the play *Good Riddance Godot*. There is a covert fact in the play that Godotgiller and Godot have water

themselves. In the play Şensoy gives instructions about the stage and says “ ... Godotgiller follow Kavuklu and Kavuksuz holding a portable fig tree and with a branch as well with its foliage camouflaging themselves...” (GGG, 1996: 23). The fig tree in the play has at least symbolic meanings. Fig trees crave water and are grown in places close to water. Their roots try to reach water even in greater depths. Just like the common people crave for water in the play. Seeing a fig tree with a branch as well with its foliage gives an idea that Godotgiller do not suffer from lack of water. The foliage of the tree signals the powers of the government have water. On the other hand, a single fig tree also symbolizes bareness. Fig trees are pollinated by either other fig trees or a fig wasp. Therefore, a single fig tree is incapable of bearing any fruit. This is strongly emphasized in Şensoy’s play by having single fig tree which Godotgiller carry. It is like the Fig tree craves for water for the common people. The fig tree simulates and parallels the human suffering in its symbolic meaning.

Şensoy’s fig tree is like the willow tree in Beckett’s play. The willows like the fig trees crave for water and grow around water sources. Both Şensoy and Beckett point out bareness by their use of tree symbols. While Şensoy uses a fig tree Beckett’s tree is a weeping willow. Beckett in his first act in *Waiting for Godot* has Vladimir and Estragon talking about the barren tree. The type of tree is implied to be a weeping willow.

ESTRAGON : What is it?
VLADIMIR : I don't know. A willow.
ESTRAGON : Where are the leaves?
VLADIMIR : It must be dead.
ESTRAGON : No more weeping. (WfG, 2006: 6, Act I)

A similar conversation about the same tree takes place in act two;

ESTRAGON : (*looking at the tree*). What is it?
VLADIMIR : It's the tree.
ESTRAGON : Yes, but what kind?
VLADIMIR : I don't know. A willow (WfG, 2006: 86, Act II)

Beckett with use of a willow tree, especially a weeping willow tree is sending a covert message to his audience and making his characters in the play realize how hopeless and barren everything is. By using parallel conversations between his characters,

Beckett augments the message he has given in the first act. It is hopeless to hope even the tree with or without leaves is crying for all.

In *Waiting for Godot*, the audience are informed that Estragon and Vladimir have known each other for a long time. These two talk about their long friendship and Vladimir mentions the suicide plans that they had in the past.

VLADIMIR : (*gloomily*). It's too much for one man. (*Pause. Cheerfully.*) On the other hand what's the good of losing heart now, that's what I say. We should have thought of it a million years ago, in the nineties.

ESTRAGON : Ah stop blathering and help me off with this bloody thing.

VLADIMIR : Hand in hand from the top of the Eiffel Tower, among the first. We were respectable in those days. Now it's too late. They wouldn't even let us up. (*Estragon tears at his boot.*) What are you doing? (WfG, 2006: 2, Act I)

Through Vladimir's words, "We should have thought of it a million years ago, in nineties" it is understood that they have a long friendship, in other words, they have known each other for a long time and the utterance proves that the tramps have no sense of time (Withanage, 2011:11). Vladimir makes some references on suicide and says they should have been among the one who first jump off the Eiffel Tower. Eiffel Tower is also a clue about their long relationship. By saying "hand in hand from the top of the Eiffel Tower, among the first" implies that they have known each other since the time Eiffel Tower was built. The Eiffel Tower is heterochronic since it is a link between history and today. Foucault states that,

"Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time... in a society like ours heterotopias and heterochronies are structured and distributed in a relatively complex fashion. First of all, there are heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time, for example museums and libraries. Museums and libraries have become heterotopias in which time never stops building up and topping its own summit..." (Foucault, 1984: 6 – 7)

The Eiffel Tower fits into this category and it is possible to call it heterochronic. Like a museum, the Eiffel Tower serves the same purpose. Considering the long friendship of Vladimir and Estragon, the Eiffel Tower is a heterochronic figure. In the play, it

seems like time has no destructive effect on the characters that they are still alive and they are in an isolated place to wait for Godot “We should have thought of it a million years ago, in the nineties.” (Beckett, 2006: 2, Act I). The Eiffel Tower stands since it is built many years ago and Beckett uses the Eiffel Tower to emphasize the concept of time and from Foucault’s point of view, it turns into a heterochronic figure. Moreover, as Foucault points out, heterotopias of indefinite are accumulating time just like the Eiffel Tower.

There is no entrapment to clock time and physical space in *Waiting for Godot*. Beckett avoids this entrapment by blurring details in the background action. The appointment date with Godot wobbles and the certainty of the characters recedes because of skepticism and anxiety. Thus, the meaning of appointment with Godot is dissolved, and turned into a concept of ‘meeting’ in universal meaning. Beckett has no doubts about dealing with separate pieces of times and places at the same time. He perfectly blends them into a heterogeneous scene. The thoughts and viewpoints of the characters jump from the present to biblical past and then jump back to the present. The action continually moves from one place to another (Frank, 2002: 1). The heterochronic situation is seen from the actions of the characters in the play. The Eiffel Tower is the heterochronic figure in the play since the Eiffel Tower has the past and the future as well as present. It is like a museum carrying the past memories to the present.

Another heterochronic element of *Waiting for Godot* is the play itself and the stage setting. *Waiting for Godot* connects the ordinary and modest life of Vladimir and Estragon with the idea of Christian vigil. Beckett elevates Estragon and Vladimir’s the lowest form of life to the biblical dimension;

VLADIMIR : Did you ever read the Bible?

ESTRAGON : The Bible . . . (*He reflects.*) I must have taken a look at it.

VLADIMIR : Do you remember the Gospels?

ESTRAGON : I remember the maps of the Holy Land. Coloured they were. Very pretty. The Dead Sea was pale blue. The very look of it made me thirsty. That's where we'll go, I used to say, that's where we'll go for our honeymoon. We'll swim. We'll be happy. (WfG, 2006: 4, Act I)

The conversation below is evidence that Hamm and Clov have known each other for a long time. Clov is brought to Hamm's house when he was young that even he does not remember when and how;

HAMM : Do you remember when you came here?

CLOV : No. Too small, you told me.

HAMM : Do you remember your father?

CLOV : *(wearily)* Same answer.

(Pause.)

You've asked me these questions millions of times.

HAMM : I love the old questions.

(With fervour.)

Ah the old questions, the old answers, there's nothing like them!

(Pause.)

It was I was a father to you.

CLOV : Yes.

(He looks at Hamm fixedly.)

You were that to me.

HAMM : My house a home for you.

CLOV : Yes.

(He looks about him.)

This was that for me. (Endgame, 2009; 24-25)

Unlike Eiffel Tower in *Waiting for Godot*, the heterochronic figure is destroyed in *Endgame*. The light can be considered a heterochronic figure since Hamm remembers it from his past. It is clear that the light was there before the world was not destroyed. Hamm says that he is aware of the process. Hamm says that he knows that the light is sunk. The heterochronic element in this play is sinking of the light like the hopes of the characters. In other words, it is possible to say that the past memories of Hamm and Clov are destroyed. The light is not a link to the future.

HAMM : Look at the ocean!

(Clov gets down, takes a few steps towards window left, goes back for ladder, carries it over and sets it down under window left, gets up on it, turns the telescope on

the without, looks at length. He starts, lowers the telescope, examines it, turns it again on the without.)

- CLOV** : Never seen anything like that!
- HAMM** : *(anxious)* What? A sail? A fin? Smoke?
- CLOV** : *(looking)* The light is sunk.
- HAMM** : *(relieved)* Pah! We all knew that.
- CLOV** : *(looking)* There was a bit left.
- HAMM** : The base.
- CLOV** : *(looking)* Yes.
- HAMM** : And now?
- CLOV** : *(looking)* All gone. (Endgame, 2009; 20-21)

The hat which Vladimir wears in *Waiting for Godot* is associated with the head and the head is associated with intellect. Since Vladimir wears the hat, he has the intellectual abilities. On the other hand, the shoe is associated with the foot, the farthest part of the body from the head. Estragon plays with his boots; thus the boots indicate the corporeal role of Estragon. Vladimir remembers the past events which Estragon does not and Estragon has a constant complaint of physical pain. Estragon and Vladimir seem to represent a division of a single man between mind and body (Carriere, 2005: 51).

Pozzo and Lucky, similar to Estragon and Vladimir, seem to complete each other. Nevertheless, their relationship compared to Estragon and Vladimir is more primitive. Pozzo is a sadist master and Lucky is an obedient slave (Esslin, 1983: 43). In the second act, Pozzo goes blind and Lucky becomes speechless. Even under this reversed conditions, they are still interdependent. The rope that ties them together is in Pozzo's hand. Pozzo takes Lucky to an unknown journey whereas Vladimir and Estragon stay and are waiting for Godot (Tezcan, 2010: 23). These four characters sharing the same space can be an example to Foucault ideas. Foucault states that "We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of near and far, of the side by side,..." (Foucault, 1984:1). The couples in the play do not leave each other even though they have intended to do so. As Foucault states they are together in their space. Moreover, Foucault states that, "... we do not live in a kind of void, inside of which we could place individual and things. We do not live inside a void that could be colored with diverse shades of light, we live inside a set of relations that delineates

sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another” (Foucault, 1984: 3). Foucault’s ideas seem to prove that the relations of these characters in the play are interdependent. Estragon wants Vladimir next to him;

ESTRAGON : Don't touch me! Don't question me! Don't speak to me!
Stay with me! (WfG, 2006: 49, Act II)

Pozzo cannot do without Lucky even though he sometimes gets angry with Lucky. For a long time Pozzo denies to give response to Vladimir’s question “you want to get rid of him?” Pozzo at the end admits that what he has said about Lucky’s fate is not true. As Foucault states “we do not live in a kind of void”.

VLADIMIR : You want to get rid of him?

POZZO : He wants to cod me, but he won't.

VLADIMIR : You want to get rid of him?

POZZO : He imagines that when I see how well he carries I'll be tempted to keep him on in that capacity.

ESTRAGON : You've had enough of him?

POZZO : In reality he carries like a pig. It's not his job.

VLADIMIR : You want to get rid of him?

POZZO : He imagines that when I see him indefatigable I'll regret my decision. Such is his miserable scheme. As though I were short of slaves! (*All three look at Lucky.*) Atlas, son of Jupiter! (*Silence.*) Well, that's that, I think. Anything else?

(*Vaporizer*)

VLADIMIR : You want to get rid of him?

POZZO : Remark that I might just as well have been in his shoes and he in mine. If chance had not willed otherwise. To each one his due.

VLADIMIR : You waagerrim?

POZZO : I beg your pardon?

VLADIMIR : You want to get rid of him?

POZZO : I do. But instead of driving him away as I might have done, I mean instead of simply kicking him out on his arse, in the goodness of my heart I am bringing him to

the fair, where I hope to get a good price for him. The truth is you can't drive such creatures away. The best thing would be to kill them.

(Lucky weeps) (WfG, 2006: 24, Act I)

....

POZZO : *(sobbing)*. He used to be so kind . . . so helpful . . . and entertaining . . . my good angel . . . and now . . . he's killing me.

ESTRAGON : *(to Vladimir)*. Does he want to replace him? (Beckett, 2006: 27, Act I)

...

POZZO : *(calmer)*. Gentlemen, I don't know what came over me. Forgive me. Forget all I said. *(More and more his old self.)* I don't remember exactly what it was, but you may be sure there wasn't a word of truth in it. *(Drawing himself up, striking his chest.)* Do I look like a man that can be made to suffer? Frankly? *(He rummages in his pockets.)* What have I done with my pipe? (WfG, 2006: 27, Act I)

Estragon and Vladimir as Pozzo and Lucky seem to care for their long term relationships. They cannot leave each other and they are interdependent after the years they have spent with each other. That makes them aged as well. The characters of the play can be considered old. That may make another heterotopia come true; heterotopia of crises and heterotopia of deviation. Foucault states, "... old age is a crisis, but is also a deviation since in our society where leisure is the rule, idleness is a sort of deviation" (Foucault, 1984: 5). Vladimir and Estragon can fit into the category of idleness. In both acts, they just spend time, play and talk and do nothing else under the cover of 'waiting'.

Clov and Hamm, like Lucky and Pozzo, are tied to each other somehow. Like Pozzo and Lucky, Hamm and Clov in *Endgame* are not free. Clov waits for an excuse to leave his master on the other hand, Hamm waits for the end of life. In this active waiting process Hamm plays the role of the master. Hamm is described as if he is in charge of his world, but the reality is different. Actually, Hamm is helpless and miserable. He is

unable to see or move and he needs Clov to provide food, toys and painkiller for him. He is like a small child to be looked after.

HAMM : Is my dog ready?

CLOV : He lacks a leg.

HAMM : Is he silky?

CLOV : He's kind of a Pomeranian.

HAMM : Go and get him.

CLOV : He lacks a leg.

HAMM : Go and get him!

(Exit Clov.)

We're getting on.

(Enter Clov holding by one of its three legs a black toy dog.) (Endgame; 2009; 25-26)

...

HAMM : Time enough.

(Clov halts.)

Give me my pain killer.

CLOV : It's too soon.

(Pause.)

It's too soon on top of your tonic, it wouldn't act.
(Endgame; 2009; 17)

He also needs Clov's eyes to know what is happening outside (Kumbert-Gibbs, 1999; 84 - 85). These two, Hamm and Clov, like Pozzo and Lucky in *Waiting for Godot* live in a relationship that "delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another" as Foucault theorized (Foucault, 1984: 3). Moreover, it is clear that the characters in *Endgame* have spent long years together or at least they grew up altogether.

HAMM : Do you remember when you came here?

CLOV : No. Too small, you told me.

HAMM : Do you remember your father?

CLOV : *(wearily)* Same answer.

(Pause.)

You've asked me these questions millions of times.

HAMM : I love the old questions.
(*With fervour.*)
Ah the old questions, the old answers, there's nothing
like them!
(*Pause.*) (Endgame, 2009; 25)

Nagg and Nell seem to have grown old together as well. They are now in ashbins and they need Hamm and Clov to survive. The following conversation of these two indicates the years they have spent together.

NAGG : I've lost me tooth.
NELL : When?
NAGG : I had it yesterday.
NELL : (*elegiac*) Ah yesterday.
(*They turn painfully towards each other.*)
NAGG : Can you see me?
NELL : Hardly. And you?
...
NAGG : Do you remember—
NELL : No.
NAGG : When we crashed on our tandem and lost our shanks.
(*They laugh heartily.*)
NELL : It was in the Ardennes.
(*They laugh less heartily.*)
NAGG : On the road to Sedan. (Endgame, 2009; 12-13)

As conversation suggests they have spent long years together and grown old together. Nagg remembers a memory that they had shared in the past years. The only thing they do today is to take their heads up from the ashbins and spent some time together without doing anything. They are old and they can fit into the theory of the heterotopia of crises and heterotopia of deviation. It would be beneficial to remember what Foucault states; "... old age is a crisis, but is also a deviation since in our society where leisure is the rule, idleness is a sort of deviation" (Foucault, 1984: 5).

In *Good Riddance Godot Şensoy* introduces two characters from the traditional Turkish theatre; Kavuklu and Kavuksuz. Kavuk is the head gear that the intellectuals

or the ones in power wear. The dichotomy created by Şensoy in these characters is that one is with head gear and one is without. These two men like Vladimir and Estragon complete each other. Furthermore, Şensoy has his two characters Kavuklu and Kavuksuz tied to one another in their hearts. Şensoy superimposes two characters by giving them a shared heart.

The reference to time in *Good Riddance Godot* in Şensoy's play does not come from a physical reference like the Eiffel Tower in *Waiting for Godot* but rather from a cultural one. Ortaoyunu which existed in the Turkish culture since 14th Century is a time reference to old times. Remembering Kavuklu and Pişekar from Ortaoyunu, the audience will know that characters like Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are timeless characters. Şensoy, thus creates an implied heterochronic concept. In Ortaoyunu all the characters existed together for centuries, implying that they have known each other for a long time. Even though, the play *Good Riddance Godot* does not give any overt reference to this fact, the audience will not question their long term partnership since they have been there for centuries.

Unlike the characters in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, the characters in *Good Riddance Godot* seem brave to perform some legal and collective actions like going on a strike and volunteer to take part in governing the country. Instead of passivized waiting as in Beckett's plays, Şensoy's characters volunteer to do something about the country and to rewrite the constitution. Here are the dialogues;

KAVUKSUZ : İyi tamam da, gene de birinin devlet işleriyle ilgilenmesi gerekmiyor mu?

DOLUNAY : Ben ilgilenirim devlet işleriyle!
(*Kısa susku. Herkes Dolunay'a bakar.*)

TOPRAK : Ben de ilgilenebilirim!
(*Kısa susku. Herkes herkese bakar.*)

BOKKO : Siz o işleri bana bırakın... Devlet yönetmek çay ocağı yönetmekten zor değil herhalde. (GGG, 1996; 72)

....

TOPRAK : Bir anayasa gerekiyorsa biz kendimiz yaparız. Bizim de kurşun ve dolma ve tükenmez kalemlerimiz var. (GGG, 1996;76)

- KAVUKSUZ** : I see, but shouldn't someone take care of state affairs?
- DOLUNAY** : I can take care of state affairs!
Short silence. Everyone looks at Dolunay.
- TOPRAK** : I can also!
Short silence. Everyone looks at everyone.
- BOKKO** : Leave it to me... governing does not supposed to be more difficult than running a tea house. (GGG, 1996; 72)

- TOPRAK** : If it is necessary to make a constitution, we can do it ourselves. We have lead pencils, fountain and ballpoint pens. (GGG, 1996;76)

Dolunay, Toprak and Bokko are ready to take part and govern the country even though they do not have any prior experience in politics. Nevertheless, their irreducible ties of relationships provide power in themselves to govern the country. They all go on a strike for better conditions and they can come altogether to make a constitution. In other words, they may suit Foucault's thought since they live in a set of relations that has strong ties to each other to overcome any difficulties.

Foucault states that "the last trait of heterotopias is that they have function in relation to all the space that remains. This function unfolds between two extreme poles. Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory.... Their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled." (Foucault, 1984: 8) The space in *Waiting for Godot* can fit into the idea that Foucault states. Withanage makes an assumption that the space in *Waiting for Godot* can also be seen as eternity (Withanage, 2001: 18). It is obvious that the characters on stage are not happy with their present conditions. They even cannot do anything to change their current circumstances for better ones and they waste their time for Godot. They are in hope of happiness and prosperity that Godot would bring into their lives. It is believed that Godot will bring purpose and meaning to Estragon and Vladimir's lives. Estragon says:

ESTRAGON : I've tried everything. (WfG, 2006:60, Act II)

From what Estragon utters arise a feeling that they are tired of trying on earth and they gave up fighting for life. It is possible to conclude that they are waiting to end their sufferings on the earth and start a new life in a heavenly place to succeed in their lives with the guidance of Godot. In other words, they would accomplish everything they failed on the earth, and they hope to create a new space where happiness would welcome them. The words of Estragon below seem to prove the idea;

ESTRAGON : I remember the maps of the Holy Land. Colored they were. Very pretty. The Dead Sea was pale blue. The very look of it made me thirsty. That's where we'll go, I used to say, that's where we'll go for our honeymoon. We'll swim. We'll be happy. (WfG, 2006: 4, Act I)

Similar circumstances can be true for Hamm and Clov in *Endgame*. The present situation for the characters in the room seems hopeless. There are no life traces around the room and Hamm and Clov are stuck in that room as if they are being cursed. Hamm cannot walk and see and Clov cannot sit and rest. Moreover, Nagg and Nell are double prisoned. They are stuck in both the room and the ashbins. Hamm threw his mother and father into the ashbins (Özgüven, 1998; 70). The life in the room is messy, ill constructed and jumbled. From the beginning Clov expresses his desire to end this messy, ill constructed and jumbled world that they are living in.

CLOV : (*fixed gaze, tonelessly*) Finished, it's finished, nearly finished, it must be nearly finished.

(*Pause.*)

Grain upon grain, one by one, and one day, suddenly, there's a heap, a little heap, the impossible heap.

(*Pause.*)

I can't be punished any more.

(*Pause.*)

I'll go now to my kitchen, ten feet by ten feet by ten feet, and wait for him to whistle me.

(*Pause.*)

Nice dimensions, nice proportions, I'll lean on the table, and look at the wall, and wait for him to whistle me.

(He remains a moment motionless, then goes out. He comes back immediately, goes to window right, takes up the ladder and carries it out. Pause. Hamm stirs. He yawns under the handkerchief. He removes the handkerchief from his face. Very red face. Glasses with black lenses.) (Endgame, 2009; 6)

Clov feels uncomfortable in the position that he is in. As mentioned in chapter III, it is like a never ending chess play. The game never ends and they suffer more each day. With the starting words of Clov, readers and the audiences are immediately located at some point of crisis and this crisis continuous throughout the play. With Hamm's words the feeling of crisis develops and continues. Hamm begins talking in between yawning as if his burst of energy is pushing against his yawning from boredom (Kennedy, 2004; 48).

HAMM : Me—*(he yawns)*—to play.
He takes off his glasses, wipes his eyes, his face, the glasses, puts them on again, folds the handkerchief and puts it back neatly in the breast pocket of his dressing gown. He clears his throat, joins the tips of his fingers.
Can there be misery— *he yawns*—loftier than mine? No doubt. Formerly. But now? *Pause.* My father? *Pause.* My mother? *Pause.* My... dog? *Pause.*
Oh I am willing to believe they suffer as much as such creatures can suffer. But does that mean their sufferings equal mine? No doubt. *Pause.* No, all is a— *he yawns* —bsolute, *(proudly)* the bigger a man is the fuller he is. *(Pause. Gloomily.)* And the emptier. *(He sniffs.)* Clov! *(Pause.)* No, alone. *(Pause.)* What dreams! Those forests! *(Pause.)* Enough, it's time it ended, in the shelter, too. *(Pause.)* And yet I hesitate, I hesitate to... to end. Yes, there it is, it's time it ended and yet I hesitate to— *(He yawns.)* —to end. *(Yawns.)* God, I'm tired, I'd be better off in bed. *(He whistles. Enter Clov immediately. He halts beside the chair.)* You pollute the air! *(Pause.)* Get me ready, I'm going to bed.

CLOV : I've just got you up. (Endgame, 2009; 6)

Hamm's giving orders to Clov is Hamm's source of energy to go through the day. He orders but Clov seems to refuse the orders as if he is refusing the new day:

HAMM : Get me ready.
(*Clov does not move.*)
Go and get the sheet.
(*Clov does not move.*)
Clov!

CLOV : Yes. (Endgame, 2009; 8)

Hamm and Clov refuse the new day altogether. Hamm refuses to spend the day Clov refuses Hamm's orders. It becomes clearer with the conversation about the pain killers. Even with few minutes of action weariness and pain are re-asserted. Hamm asks for his pain-killers (Kennedy, 2004: 48).

HAMM : This is slow work.
(*Pause.*)
Is it not time for my pain-killer? (Endgame, 2009; 11)

This conversation takes part at the beginning of the play and it is clear that the day has just begun. Nevertheless, there are words that refers to the end of the day even it is the beginning of the day (Kennedy, 2004: 49). This may show that both characters refuse the coming day since there is no hope in it and the day would be messy, ill constructed, and jumbled as before and as the world that they are in. By refusing the coming day, it may be possible to say that they are creating an illusionary time for themselves to feel better. In other words, in their illusionary world they may be creating a space perfect and meticulous and well arranged.

HAMM : This is not much fun.
(*Pause.*)
But that's always the way at the end of the day, isn't it,
Clov?

CLOV : Always.

HAMM : It's the end of the day like any other day, isn't it, Clov?

CLOV : Looks like it.
(*Pause.*) (Endgame, 2009; 12)

The past memories that Nagg remembers creates an atmosphere that there was a better life once and it seems he misses those better days. It is ironic that he remembers such terrible accident as if it was something good to remember. They laugh heartily.

NAGG : When we crashed on our tandem and lost our shanks.
(*They laugh heartily.*)

NELL : It was in the Ardennes.
(*They laugh less heartily.*)

NAGG : On the road to Sedan.
(*They laugh still less heartily.*)
Are you cold? (Endgame, 2009;13)

The dialogues above would be counted as evidence to prove what Foucault states, "... their role (heterotopias) is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed and jumbled" (Foucault, 1984: 8). Nagg lives in the past and remembering better days and Hamm creates himself an illusionary world in the prison like room. In other words, they all create themselves another real like perfect, meticulous and well-arranged space in their minds even in their hopeless situations.

Foucault's theory on the heterotopia mentioned above can be found in *Good Riddance Godot* as well. The people live in miserable conditions that there is no water in the country. They are all hopeful that Godot would go one day and all their problems would end. Nevertheless, the unnamed country that they live in governed by a cruel general and there seems there are no rights for the people. The cruel general gives orders and people have to obey. İtoluit, one of general's man, temporize them and give them hope;

İTOLUIT : Anlıyorum. Suya kavuşacaksınız arkadaşlar. Elimizden geleni yapıyoruz. Olanaklar çerçevesinde olanaksızı olanaksız kılma çabamız sürüyor. Niye şemsiyeyle dolaşıyorum ben, niye böyle açık bir şemsiyeyle dolaşıyorum? Yağmur bekliyoruz! Yurdumuzun kuzey batısında bulutlar görüldü. Kahraman pilotlarımız bulutlara yağmur bombası zerketmek üzere uçuşa geçtiler bile... Bir basıyorlar bulutun gözüne bombayı, bulutun iki gözü iki çeşme... Pek yakında buraları sel alacak, hazırlıklı

olun. Demişti dersiniz. Herkesin musluğu olacak. ... (GGG, 1996; 40)

İTOLUİT : I understand. You will have water dear friends. We are doing our best. We are trying to make impossible impossible with our means. Why do you think I am carrying an umbrella, why am I walking holding an open umbrella? We are expecting rain! The clouds are seen from the North West of our country. Our valiant pilots are on their way to launch rain bombs to these clouds... When they launch bombs to the clouds the clouds will burst in tears... Soon there will be flood here. I am telling you. Everyone will have taps. ... (GGG, 1996; 40)

The problematic, messy, ill constructed and jumbled reality of the country is turned into a hopeful one. İtoluit creates an illusionary better dream like atmosphere and temporize the people by lying about the water. The characters in *Good Riddance Godot* are not happy with their present situation like the ones in *Waiting for Godot*. They do not have power to change the current circumstances for good and they are struggling to have some water. Unlike *Waiting for Godot* they are hopeful that all the problems would end when Godot leaves them. They are creating a dreamy perfect space as an illusionary and dream like country in their thought and they believe that they would live in a country like one when Godot leaves them.

4.4. Power in *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot*

Foucault believes that power's condition of possibility must not be understood as a primary focus, rather it must be perceived as local, unstable, unbalanced and heterogeneous (Johnson, 2006; 19). Time in the plays exists as a force for the characters in *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot*, and it is heterogeneous. It is clear that the characters, Vladimir, Estragon, Clov and Hamm become progressively weakened because of the invisible time forcing on them. They have lost the sense of time and they are confused whether it continues or not. This loss of sense creates a kind of power on the characters. The days in the plays, *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, are similar to each other so they cannot know whether the time is really passing and the end is close or not. There is a darkness and this darkness

produces power. In *Waiting for Godot* the end is based on the promise of an arrival of Godot which never happens in the play. In *Endgame* there is a promise of departure which never happens. It is possible to say that Estragon, Vladimir, Hamm and Clov look forward to the future, but if there is no past, there cannot be any present and future for them. They need to invent past for themselves in order to project onto a non-existent future. They do it by creating stories. In both plays the past is remembered with nostalgia (Worton, 2008; 77).

VLADIMIR : (*seeing Lucky's hat*). Well!

ESTRAGON : Farewell.

VLADIMIR : Lucky's hat. (*He goes towards it.*) I've been here an hour and never saw it. (*Very pleased.*) Fine!

ESTRAGON : You'll never see me again.

VLADIMIR : I knew it was the right place. Now our troubles are over. (*He picks up the hat, contemplates it, straightens it.*) Must have been a very fine hat. (*He puts it on in place of his own which he hands to Estragon.*) Here. (WfG, 2006; 63, Act II)

Nell, Hamm and Clov have dialogues referring the past regarded with nostalgia;

NELL : Why this farce, day after day?
(*Pause.*)

NAGG : I've lost me tooth.

NELL : When?

NAGG : I had it yesterday.

NELL (*elegiac*): Ah yesterday.
(*They turn painfully towards each other.*) (Endgame, 2009; 12, 13)

When Nagg announces that he has lost his tooth Nell asks when this has happened. Actually Nell should know when Nagg has lost his tooth since they have grown old together. Nell's question and Nagg's elegiac response reveals that they have no sense of time. Yesterday, literary, is a close past and if Nagg has lost his tooth yesterday then Nell should have remembered the incident and there would be no need for Nagg to

express the response “yesterday” in elegiac tone. Saying yesterday in an elegiac manner makes the audience feel that Nagg has missed the past years.

HAMM : No, I mean Mother Pegg.

CLOV : But naturally she's extinguished!

(Pause.)

What's the matter with you today?

HAMM : I'm taking my course.

(Pause.)

Is she buried?

CLOV : Buried! Who would have buried her?

HAMM : You.

CLOV : Me! Haven't I enough to do without burying people?

HAMM : But you'll bury me.

CLOV : No I won't bury you.

(Pause.)

HAMM : She was bonny once, like a flower of the field.

(With reminiscent leer.)

And a great one for the men!

CLOV : We too were bonny—once. It's a rare thing not to have been bonny—once.

(Pause.) (Endgame, 2009; 27)

There is a heterogeneous power in the dialogue above that the word “once” refer to past and this word is used twice, one by Hamm and one by Clov. It is possible that they are also missing the past. Becket’s words “*with reminiscent leer*” reveals that they are missing the past or they are lost in time. Hamm says that Clov buried Mother Pegg but he does not remember such an incident. Right after their dialogue referring to the past they start talking about the future and then jump back to the dialogues referring to the past again indicates that they are lost in time.

A similar indication of power of time can also be seen in *Good Riddance Godot*. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz seem that they are lost in time. There is no present for them; nevertheless, they have hope for the future.

KAVUKLU : Saat kaç?

- KAVUKSUZ** : Bilmiyorum bilmiyorum!
- KAVUKLU** : Yani ne zamandır bekliyoruz?
- KAVUKSUZ** : Hemen umutsuzluğa kapılma. Aslolan acele etmemek ve geç kalmamaktır. (GGG, 1996; 11)
- KAVUKLU** : What is the time?
- KAVUKSUZ** : I don't know I don't know
- KAVUKLU** : Well, how long have we been waiting for?
- KAVUKSUZ** : Don't get desperate. What is essential is not to hurry and not to be late. (GGG, 1996; 11)

Mills, (2003) states one of Foucault's ideas about power and explains that according to Foucault power is something that people and institutions embrace and that power is mostly related to oppression and constraint. (Mills, 2003;50). As it was stated in the first chapter, powerful develop a kind of force over the powerless to persuade them to do what is desired and force them to act according to their own will without questioning. In short, powerful agents or people use their power to control the powerless. Powerful agents or powerful people sometimes use their power on powerless strategically. The idea matches with Foucault's ideas since he believes that power is not a possession but rather it is a kind of strategy and something that can be performed (Foucault, 1978: 9-16).

In the light of Foucault's ideas, the concept of power can be found in the plays of Beckett and Şensoy. In "Waiting for Godot" it is clear that Godot has the power to control the actions of the characters on the stage even though he never appears. In this sense Godot' power is covert and it can be said that his power is not an abusing one. Vladimir and Estragon are waiting for him to come and during their wait, the audience feel the power of Godot through the excitement and behavior of Vladimir and Estragon. The sign of Godot's power is the act of waiting itself. Here are the related dialogues,

- ESTRAGON** : Charming spot. (*He turns, advances to front, halts facing auditorium.*) Inspiring prospects. (*He turns to Vladimir.*) Let's go.
- VLADIMIR** : We can't.
- ESTRAGON** : Why not?

VLADIMIR : We're waiting for Godot.

ESTRAGON : (*despairingly*). Ah! (*Pause.*) You're sure it was here?

VLADIMIR : What?

ESTRAGON : That we were to wait.

VLADIMIR : He said by the tree. (*They look at the tree.*) Do you see any others? (WfG, 2006: 6, Act I)

...

ESTRAGON : He should be here.

VLADIMIR : He didn't say for sure he'd come.

ESTRAGON : And if he doesn't come?

VLADIMIR : We'll come back tomorrow.

ESTRAGON : And then the day after tomorrow.

VLADIMIR : Possibly.

ESTRAGON : And so on.

VLADIMIR : The point is—

ESTRAGON : Until he comes. (WfG, 2006: 6, Act I)

...

ESTRAGON : If he came yesterday and we weren't here you may be sure he won't come again today.

VLADIMIR : But you say we were here yesterday. (WfG, 2006: 7, Act I)

Vladimir and Estragon spread out the feeling of excitement and fear that they have in them. They do not want to miss Godot and they are ready to do whatever necessary to meet Godot in the appointed place. They are ready to come and wait there day after day until he comes. As it is seen Estragon is fearful of missing Godot. The covert power of Godot controls Estragon and Vladimir. It is such a power that even when they meet Pozzo Estragon and Vladimir insistently think that he is Godot and they are in deep disappointment when they learn that he is not Godot.

ESTRAGON : (*undertone*). Is that him?

VLADIMIR : Who?

ESTRAGON : (*trying to remember the name*). Er . . .

VLADIMIR : Godot?

ESTRAGON : Yes.

POZZO : I present myself: Pozzo.
VLADIMIR : (*to Estragon*). Not at all!
ESTRAGON : He said Godot.
VLADIMIR : Not at all!
ESTRAGON : (*timidly, to Pozzo*). You're not Mr. Godot, Sir? (WfG, 2006: 15)

Estragon has the feeling that Godot is so powerful that he can control everything.

ESTRAGON : I hear nothing.
VLADIMIR : Hsst! (*They listen. Estragon loses his balance, almost falls. He clutches the arm of Vladimir, who totters. They listen, huddled together.*) Nor I. (*Sighs of relief. They relax and separate.*)
ESTRAGON : You gave me a fright.
VLADIMIR : I thought it was he.
ESTRAGON : Who?
VLADIMIR : Godot.
ESTRAGON : Pah! The wind in the reeds.
VLADIMIR : I could have sworn I heard shouts.
ESTRAGON : And why would he shout?
VLADIMIR : At his horse. (WfG, 2006: 12)

Similar power and fear can be seen in Şensoy's play *Good Riddance Godot* with only one difference. The power that the cruel General uses is highly and openly abusive towards his people. The power that is given to the general by the playwright is abusive and this makes this power overt. He does not care about the lives of his people but himself only. Similar to Godot in *Waiting for Godot*, the General is not seen on the stage but his voice is heard twice during the play. The words he utters are full of power and carelessness. Both his position and the way he treats his people makes him powerful. Before his voice is heard a door with a golden knob comes down on a fly bar. Even this door scene is a manifestation of power.

“Herkes birbirine bakar. Leke'nin söylevini önemseyerek dağılırlarken, müzik eşliğinde altın tokmaklı bir tahta kapı iner sofıtan. Hepsi şaşkın

bakınırlar. Leke topallayarak gelir, kapının tokmağını sinirle çalar. Godot'un sesi duyulur.”

GODOT : Evde Yokum!

HEPSİ : (ürkerek) Godot!

Ferhat gider ısrarla kapıyı çalar.

GODOT : Ne var?

FERHAT : Godot hazretleri biz halkınız! (Şensoy, 1996: 47)

“Everyone stares at each other. While they all are about to leave the stage caring what Leke has just said, a wooden door with a golden knob comes down on the fly bar accompanied by music. Everyone stares at the wooden door with the golden knob open mouthed. Leke walks with a limp and knocks with anger. Godot's voice is heard.”

GODOT : I am not home

ALL : (timidly) Godot!

(Ferhat knocks the door insistently)

GODOT : What?

FERHAT : Godot, your highness! We are your people! (GGG, 1996: 47)

When Ferhat knocks the door Godot gives a harsh response. The response reveals his power as well. On the other hand, Ferhat's words “his highness” shows that they all accept Godot's power.

Godot in Şensoy's play can easily put one of his own people into jeopardy without giving any consideration to any danger this person may face. The danger to be faced is life threatening. As stated before, there is an evidence that Godot has water. There are signs hanging down from the fly bar augmenting the fact that Godot has water.

“Godot'ya 100 Metre”

“Godot Çeşmesi”

“Godot/5 Metre”

“Godot Şelalesi”

“Godot/20 Metre”

“Godot”

“Girilmez” (GGG, 1996: 58)

“100 Meters to Godot”

“Godot Fountain”

“Godot/50 Meters”

“Godot Waterfall”

“Godot/20 Meters”

“Godot No Trespassing” (GGG, 1996: 58)

Godot lives in comfort since he has the power and his own people are doomed to face danger since they are the powerless ones.

FERHAT : Godot hazretleri biz halkınız!

GODOT : Aferin! Ne istiyorsunuz?

TOPRAK : Su istiyoruz!

DOLUNAY : Ben hortum da istiyorum!

GODOT : İyi!

KAVUKLU : Ne iyi?

GODOT : Siz talihli bir milletsiniz. Doğuda, Bindikden dağında su var. Seçin içinizden bir yiğit gitsin delsin Bindikden dağını, kavuştursun bizi suya.

KAVUKSUZ : Niye bir tek yiğit? Beş on yiğit olmaz mı?

...

GODOT : Olmaz tek bir yiğit gidecek! To be or not to be! Thas is the quotation!

FERHAT : Ben giderim tek başıma. Olmazları öldürmanın zamanı!

GODOT : Aferin esas çocuk! Açık olsun yolun hatta, good vibrations!

Hızla yükselir sofıtaya altın tokmaklı kapı. (GGG, 1996: 47 – 48)

FERHAT : Godot, your highness! We are your people!

GODOT : Well done! What do you want?

TOPRAK : We want water!
DOLUNAY : I want hose as well!
GODOT : Good!
KAVUKLU : What is good?
GODOT : You are lucky. In the East there is water on the Bindiken mountain. Choose someone brave, let him go and pierce the Bindiken mountain and get the water.
KAVUKSUZ : Why only a single brave one? Can't it be five or ten?
...
GODOT : Out of the question! Only one brave can go! To be or not to be! That is the quotation!
FERHAT : I will go by myself. It is time to make impossible possible.
GODOT : Well done my boy! Best all the way, even, good vibes!
(*The door with golden knob raises*) (GGG, 1996: 47 – 48)

The second time Godot's voice is heard is after the signs. İtoluit wakes him up and informs Godot about people's attempt at indefinite hunger strike. The conversation makes Godot's cruelty clear. He believes that he can control everything and without him the country would collapse. He is absolutely sure about his own power. Moreover, he does not feel any respect for his people.

DÖRDÜ : İyi akşamlar Sayın Godot!
GODOT : (sesi duyulur) Neden uyarıyorsunuz beni şu şırıltılı uykumdan? Gene ne var? Gene mi dalgalandı ruhlar? Kanı mı bitlendi milletin?
İTOLUİT : Hayır hayır hayır, Sayın Godot! Herşey tıkırında, Emirleriniz ışığında hareket ettiğimiz sürece herhangi bir olay oluşmasına olanak yok zaten. ...
GODOT : Bırakın grev yapsınlar. Sonunda sıkılırlar.
İTOLUİT : Ölüm orucu gibi sapıklıkları denemek isteyenler var.
GODOT : Bırakınız ölsünler!
İTOLUİT : Bu durumda olayların daha da büyümesinden ürküyo...
GODOT : Bana bakın... Bırakır giderim vallahi!

İtoluit ve Godotgiller yerlere kapanırlar.

DÖRDÜ : Aman efendim, sakın bizi bırakmayın... Biz sizsiz ne yaparız?

GODOT : Beni böyle boktan şeyler için bir daha rahatsız etmeyin!
...(GGG, 1996: 59-60)

ALL FOUR : Good evening honorable Godot!

GODOT : (his voice is heard) Why the hell are you waking me up from my plashy sleep. What's wrong again. Are my people getting deep pockets?

İTOLUİT : No no no, Honorable Godot! Everything is okay. It is impossible to have any incident as long as we follow your orders...

GODOT : Let them go on a strike if they want to. They will get tired of it.

İTOLUIT : Some of them want to try indefinite hunger strike.

GODOT : Let them die! (GGG, 1996: 59)

İTOLUİT : In this case we are afraid of ...

GODOT : Listen to me... I will walk out right now, I swear.

İtoluit and Godotgiller are on their knees

ALL FOUR : Oh dear sir, please don't leave us... What can we do without you?

GODOT : Then don't disturb me on such shitty matters! ... (GGG, 1996: 59 - 60)

The power in *Endgame* is rather more strategic just like Foucault points out when explaining it; power is not a possession but rather it is a kind of strategy and something that can be performed (Foucault, 1978: 9-16) Hamm and Clov have power on each other and they share the power and use it towards each other. At first sight it is possible to say that Hamm is the one who holds to power in his hands, since he is the one who controls the others but it is not the real case. Hamm needs Clov to survive and that gives Clov power as well.

CLOV : Why do you keep me?

HAMM : There's no one else.

CLOV : There's nowhere else.
(*Pause.*) (Endgame, 2009: 8)

They use that power strategically on each other thus; they end up having a power relationship.

HAMM : Why don't you kill me?
CLOV : I don't know the combination of the cupboard.
(*Pause.*) (Endgame, 2009: 9)

As inferred from the dialogue above Clov can easily kill Hamm if he wants to. In other words, he has the power to do so, but he does not choose to take this option. It is understood that he really needs the combination of the cupboard and that is the real reason for not killing Hamm. Nevertheless, in another dialogue it is seen that actually what stops Clov killing Hamm is not really the combination of the cupboard. There is something else that stops Clov to kill Hamm. It is the power that they share. Without one the other would be left powerless.

CLOV : So you all want me to leave you.

HAMM : Naturally.

CLOV : Then I'll leave you.

HAMM : You can't leave us.

CLOV : Then I won't leave you.

(*Pause.*)

HAMM : Why don't you finish us?

(*Pause.*)

I'll tell you the combination of the cupboard if you promise to finish me.

CLOV : I couldn't finish you.

HAMM : Then you won't finish me.

(*Pause.*) (Endgame, 2009: 24)

The power that they interchange gives strength to them. Clov has the choice to leave Hamm but he prefers not to. Instead of leaving him, Clov obeys orders of Hamm.

CLOV :... I'll lean on the table, and look at the wall, and wait for him to whistle me.

(He remains a moment motionless, then goes out. ...)

(Endgame, 2009:6)

Danaher, states that according to Foucault power cannot be held by or belong to anybody (Danaher, 2000: 70). Foucault considers that power cannot be owned;

“Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application” (Foucault in Fontana & Pasquino, 1980: 98).

He means that power functions like a chain and it is a kind of organization which penetrates into the society. Foucault thinks that power and the individual play an equal role in the power relationship. In other words, when there is power there is an individual. They both take part in this power relationship (Mills, 2003: 35). As it is the case, Foucault says that power can proceed very quickly from one area to another and power cannot be held in one certain authority for long (Danaher, 2000: 71 – 73). Foucault's beliefs about power as explained above and in the second chapter in detail can be found in the plays of Beckett and Şensoy. The circumstances in which Pozzo and Lucky are found in *Waiting for Godot* match Foucault's theory. In the first act Pozzo's situation and his power is unquestionable. He knows what he is doing and controls people, especially Lucky. He easily gives orders to the others and holds the control mechanism in his hands. The way he treats Lucky is an example;

Enter Pozzo and Lucky. Pozzo drives Lucky by means of a rope passed round his neck, so that Lucky is the first to enter, followed by the rope which is long enough to let him reach the middle of the stage before Pozzo appears. Lucky carries a heavy bag, a folding stool, a picnic basket and a greatcoat, Pozzo a whip.

POZZO : *(off)*. On! *(Crack of whip. Pozzo appears. They cross the stage. Lucky passes before Vladimir and Estragon and exit. Pozzo at the sight of Vladimir and Estragon*

stops short. The rope tautens. Pozzo jerks at it violently.)

Back!

Noise of Lucky falling with all his baggage. Vladimir and Estragon turn towards him, half wishing half fearing to go to his assistance. Vladimir takes a step towards Lucky, Estragon holds him back by the sleeve. (WfG, 2006: 14)

...

POZZO

: (with magnanimous gesture). Let's say no more about it. (He jerks the rope.) Up pig! (Pause.) Every time he drops he falls asleep. (Jerks the rope.) Up hog! (Noise of Lucky getting up and picking up his baggage. Pozzo jerks the rope.) Back! (Enter Lucky backwards.) Stop! (Lucky stops.) Turn! (Lucky turns. To Vladimir and Estragon, affably.) Gentlemen, I am happy to have met you. (Before their incredulous expression.) Yes yes, sincerely happy. (He jerks the rope.) Closer! (Lucky advances.) Stop! (Lucky stops.) Yes, the road seems long when one journeys all alone for . . . (he consults his watch) . . . yes . . . (he calculates) . . . yes, six hours, that's right, six hours on end, and never a soul in sight. (To Lucky.) Coat! (Lucky puts down the bag, advances, gives the coat, goes back to his place, takes up the bag.) Hold that! (Pozzo holds out the whip. Lucky advances and, both his hands being occupied, takes the whip in his mouth, then goes back to his place. Pozzo begins to put on his coat, stops.) Coat! (Lucky puts down the bag, basket and stool, helps Pozzo on with his coat, goes back to his place and takes up bag, basket and stool.) Touch of autumn in the air this evening. (Pozzo finishes buttoning up his coat, stoops, inspects himself, straightens up.) Whip! (Lucky advances, stoops, Pozzo snatches the whip from his mouth, Lucky goes back to his

place.) Yes, gentlemen, I cannot go for long without the society of my likes (he puts on his glasses and looks at the two likes) even when the likeness is an imperfect one. (He takes off his glasses.) Stool! (Lucky puts down bag and basket, advances, opens stool, puts it down, goes back to his place, takes up bag and basket.) Closer! (Lucky puts down bag and basket, advances, moves stool, goes back to his place, takes up bag and basket. Pozzo sits down, places the butt of his whip against Lucky's chest and pushes.) Back! (Lucky takes a step back.) Further! (Lucky takes another step back.) Stop! (Lucky stops. To Vladimir and Estragon.) That is why, with your permission, I propose to dally with you a moment, before I venture any further. Basket! (Lucky advances, gives the basket, goes back to his place.) The fresh air stimulates the jaded appetite. (He opens the basket, takes out a piece of chicken and a bottle of wine.) Basket! (Lucky advances, picks up the basket and goes back to his place.) Further! (Lucky takes a step back.) He stinks. Happy days! (He drinks from the bottle, puts it down and begins to eat.) (Silence.) (WfG, 2006: 16-18)

When Estragon and Vladimir come close to Lucky they see that Lucky's neck has a running sore. They examine him closely and they start to feel sorry for him. Seeing him in such condition they try to talk to him, but Pozzo with the same powerful attitude that he uses for Lucky orders Vladimir and Estragon to leave Lucky alone.

POZZO

: Leave him in peace! (They turn toward Pozzo who, having finished eating, wipes his mouth with the back of his hand.) Can't you see he wants to rest? Basket! (He strikes a match and begins to light his pipe. Estragon sees the chicken bones on the ground and stares at them greedily. As Lucky does not move Pozzo throws the match angrily away and jerks the rope.) Basket! (Lucky

starts, almost falls, recovers his senses, advances, puts the bottle in the basket and goes back to his place. Estragon stares at the bones. Pozzo strikes another match and lights his pipe.) What can you expect, it's not his job. *(He pulls at his pipe, stretches out his legs.)* Ah! That's better. (WfG, 2006: 19)

The behavior and the body language of Pozzo signals his power. Vladimir's discomfort while talking to Pozzo is clearly felt. Vladimir is uncomfortable and he suffers in the power of Pozzo like Lucky. This is inferred from the way he talks to Pozzo. He stutters as if he is scared.

POZZO : *(To Vladimir).* Are you alluding to anything in particular?
VLADIMIR : *(stutteringly resolute).* To treat a man . . . *(gesture towards Lucky)* . . . like that . . . I think that . . . no . . . a human being . . . no . . . it's a scandal! (WfG, 2006: 20)

However, in the second act Pozzo comes on the stage as a needy man. He is blind and he needs Lucky's eyes to survive. Lucky is mute and Pozzo is blind. Lucky's eyesight gives him the power so Pozzo is not as strong and powerful as he was in the first act. What Foucault outlined in terms of power is illustrated in the play. Power cannot be hold in one's hand for long.

(Enter Pozzo and Lucky. Pozzo is blind. Lucky burdened as before. Rope as before, but much shorter, so that Pozzo may follow more easily. Lucky wearing a different hat. At the sight of Vladimir and Estragon he stops short. Pozzo, continuing on his way, bumps into him.) (WfG, 2006: 69)

Pozzo falls down and cannot stand up by himself. He groans for help but Estragon and Vladimir do not rush to help Pozzo. Estragon does not even remember him. Estragon and Vladimir talk and try to decide whether to help him or not. In the meantime, Pozzo continues to groan on the floor.

VLADIMIR : But it's not Godot.
ESTRAGON : It's not Godot?

VLADIMIR : It's not Godot.
ESTRAGON : Then who is it?
VLADIMIR : It's Pozzo. (WfG, 2006: 70)
...
ESTRAGON : Then let him get up.
VLADIMIR : He can't.
ESTRAGON : Why not?
VLADIMIR : I don't know.
Pozzo writhes, groans, beats the ground with his fists.
ESTRAGON : We should ask him for the bone first. Then if he refuses
we'll leave him there.
VLADIMIR : You mean we have him at our mercy? (WfG, 2006: 70)

Their drawback and fear towards Pozzo is completely gone and now in the second act Vladimir and Estragon have the power. They treat Pozzo cruelly.

POZZO : What happened?
VLADIMIR : (*violently*). Will you stop it, you! Pest! He can think of
nothing but himself!
ESTRAGON : What about a little snooze?
VLADIMIR : Did you hear him? He wants to know what happened!
ESTRAGON : Don't mind him. Sleep.
(*Silence.*)
POZZO : Pity! Pity!
ESTRAGON : (*with a start*). What is it?
VLADIMIR : Were you asleep?
ESTRAGON : I must have been.
VLADIMIR : It's this bastard Pozzo at it again.
ESTRAGON : Make him stop it. Kick him in the crotch.
VLADIMIR : (*striking Pozzo*). Will you stop it! Crablouse! (*Pozzo
extricates himself with cries of pain and crawls away. He
stops, sees the air blindly, calling for help. Vladimir,
propped on his elbow, observes his retreat.*) He's off!
(*Pozzo collapses.*) He's down! (WfG, 2006: 75)

As it is seen from the dialogues above power changes hands and whoever holds the power also changes. Foucault states that “power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives” (Brochier, 1980: 39). Power relationship and how the power can change people is also be seen in *Good Riddance Godot*.

The master slave relationship between Pozzo and Lucky in *Waiting for Godot* is seen between Godot, governors and the people in *Good Riddance Godot*. Godotgiller and İtoluit convince and deceive people on behalf of Godot. They are as cruel as Godot himself. İtoluit is the messenger since Godot never appears but his voice is heard twice. İtoluit wants people to obey the governors without reserve, and he does not want them to question the water problem in the country and ask for their rights. He is a self-interested man who lies to people and he watches for an opportunity to give harm them. İtoluit is very insensitive about the people in the country. He is totally careless about their feeling and thinks that he can control them with his power.

İTOLUİT : Endişelenecek bir şey yok. Gerekirse dağda uyduruk bir ateş yaktırırız. Çok grev gördük, çok grev çözdük biz. Olmazsa üç beş damacana su dağıtırız, ortalık yatıştır.

3. G.GİL : Hiç sanmıyorum, yarın sokaklar ana baba günü olacak!

İTOLUİT :Bu gecedен yasaklarız sokağa çıkmayı. Takmayın böyle şeylere kafayı. Abartmayalım. Ne ayaklanmalar gördük biz. Ne çabuk unuttunuz!

1.G.GİL :Ülkeyi terketmek için bir hazırlığa gerek yok yani şimdilik!

İTOLUİT : Ne münasebet hocam, ülke bizim ülkemiz!

1. G.GİL : Hayır devrim mevrım olursa, bizi oyarlar da, onun için şey yaptım...

İTOLUİT : Ne devrimi hocam? Bu ülkede devrim yalnız biz isteyince olur! (GGG, 1996: 57-58)

İTOLUİT : No need to worry. We can lit a fake fire on the mountain if needed. We lived through many strikes and stopped

many. If necessary we can distribute few gallons of water that will calm down things.

3. G.GİL : I don't think so. Tomorrow the streets will be bursting at the seams.

İTOLUİT : We can order a curfew. Stop the ants in your pants. No need to exaggerate. We lived through many riots. How quickly you have forgotten!

1.G.GİL : You mean, no need to be prepared to leave the country for now!

İTOLUİT : Of course not Mr. This country is ours!

1. G.GİL : I mean if there is any upheaval, these people will kill us...

İTOLUİT : What upheaval Mr.? Any upheaval would occur only if we want it to happen in this country! (GGG, 1996: 57-58)

It would be essential to remind that these people in the dialogue gain their power from Godot. Godot is the power in this country but İtoluit and Godotgiller are more royalist than the king is. Godot does not care what happens in the country and what people do. He lives in his place and thinks for only himself. As a messenger, İtoluit takes the power from Godot and uses it over the people. However, when Godot leaves the country, İtoluit changes immediately and tries to fit into the new set up. He makes a speech and acts as if he was one of them all the time. He claims that what he did in the past was absolutely misunderstood. He continues to lie to the people and he wants to deceive them with a constitution which he has written. This time he tries to gain his own power.

İTOLUİT : Arkadaşlar, sayın halkım, sayın herkes! Gözümüz aydın! Artık bir anayasamız var!

KAVUKLU : Ha, evet bir de bu tip vardı... ben bunu tamamen unutmuştum!

İTOLUİT : Kardeşlerims, siz beni tamamen yanlış anlamışsınız. Çok ayıp! Ben her zaman sizin yanınızda olmuş, sizin çıkarlarınız için Godot'yla çatışmış; iş bu yüzden ne ona ne size yaranabilmiş bir kardeşinizim ve inanın

Godot'nun gidişine hepinizden çok ben sevindim. Neyse artık bu kötü günler geride kaldı. Yeni bir yönetim, yeni bir anayasa düşündüm. Hepsinize haklarınızı veren ve size yönetime karşı savunan bir anayasa... Haksızlık, eşitsizlik, adaletsizlik son buluyor. Sezar'ın hakkı Sezar'a verilecek!

KAVUKSUZ

: Sezar sen mi oluyorsun?

İTOLUİT

: Hayır efendim, herkes Sezar! (GGG, 1996: 75-76)

İTOLUİT

:Friends, My people, dear countrymen! Congratulations!
We have a new constitution!

KAVUKLU

: Ah, him... I have completely forgotten about him

İTOLUİT

: Brothers, you have completely misunderstood me. Scandalous! I have always been on your side and I quarreled with Godot just to protect your welfare. That is the reason why I could not serve neither you nor Godot properly. Believe me I am the happiest of all now that Godot has gone. Whatever, bad times are over now. I have thought about a new type of regime and a new constitution. A constitution which supports all your rights and protects you from the government. Invidiousness, inequality, injustice end right now. Give the devil his due period starts.

KAVUKSUZ

: Are you the devil here?

İTOLUİT

: No sir, everybody is! (GGG, 1996: 75-76)

İtoluit expresses his pleasure from Godot's leaving the country, yet few scenes earlier he was begging Godot not to leave them. He was also buttering up Godot when he was in power,

İTOLUİT

: Hayır hayır hayır, Sayın Godot! Herşey tıklarında, Emirleriniz ışığında hareket ettiğimiz sürece herhangi bir olay oluşmasına olanak yok zaten. ...

...

İtoluit ve Godotgiller yerlere kapanırlar.

DÖRDÜ : Aman efendim, sakın bizi bırakmayın... Biz sizsiz ne yaparız? (GGG, 1996: 59-60)

İTOLUİT : No no no, Honorable Godot! Everything is okay. It is impossible to have any incident as long as we follow your orders...

...

İtoluit and Godotgiller are on their knees

ALL FOUR : Oh dear sir, please don't leave us... What can we do without you? (GGG, 1996: 59-60)

Not only İtoluit, but also some of the others among people become volunteers to govern the country. In other words, they are volunteering to have power. Even Bokko compares running a tea house with governing a country. What Foucault states is right, "power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (Brochier, 1980: 39).

DOLUNAY : Ben ilgilenirim devlet işleriyle!
(*Kısa susuku. Herkes Dolunay'a bakar.*)

TOPRAK : Ben de ilgilenebilirim!
(*Kısa susku. Herkes herkese bakar.*)

BOKKO : Siz o işleri bana bırakın... Devlet yönetmek çay ocağı yönetmekten zor değil herhalde. (GGG, 1996: 72)

DOLUNAY : I can take care of state affairs!
(*Short silence. Everyone looks at Dolunay.*)

TOPRAK : I can also!
(*Short silence. Everyone looks at everyone.*)

BOKKO : Leave it to me... governing does not supposed to be more difficult than running a tea house. (GGG, 1996; 72)

Moreover, as stated in the second chapter, Foucault believes that power is not something negative. He views power from a different perspective. He states that oppressive measures are in fact productive and they happen to give rise to new forms of behavior instead of stopping or censoring certain forms of behavior (Foucault, 1978:

86 – 90). Foucault is more interested in the resistance of individuals to power than oppressive features of power (Mills, 2003: 33-34; Balan, 2013: 2). Foucault states that, “where there is power there is resistance” (Foucault, 1978: 95). There are power and resistance relationship in the plays and the resistance keep the characters alert all the time and make them productive in their thinking. For example, in *Waiting for Godot* Estragon and Vladimir are alert all the time against the covert power of Godot. This alert situation makes them hopeful for Godot’s arrival, in other words, they are hopeful in hopelessness. They want to believe that Godot will come, if not today most probably the following day. They are told to wait for him and they are in the act of waiting. Godot’s not coming creates power on Estragon and Vladimir. They insistently and resistantly keep waiting for Godot. This act of waiting is a kind of resistance against the covert power of Godot.

ESTRAGON : And if he doesn't come?
VLADIMIR : We'll come back tomorrow.
ESTRAGON : And then the day after tomorrow.
VLADIMIR : Possibly.
ESTRAGON : And so on.
VLADIMIR : The point is—
ESTRAGON : Until he comes. (WfG, 2006: 6, Act I)

It seems their insistance will continue until Godot comes. The situation of Lucky is a good example to power and resistance relationship as well. Pozzo expresses his power over Lucky mercilessly.

POZZO : Is it enough? No doubt. But I am liberal. It's my nature. This evening. So much the worse for me. (*He jerks the rope. Lucky looks at him.*) For I shall suffer, no doubt about that. (*He picks up the whip.*) What do you prefer? Shall we have him dance, or sing, or recite, or think, or— (WfG, 2006: 32, Act I)

When Vladimir puts the hat on Lucky’s head, Lucky starts to think and makes a long speech, in other words “think speech” (Burkman, 2008: 36). Until he had the hat on Lucky had remained silent. Since the hat symbolizes the head and thinking, this speech

that Lucky makes is considered a kind of resistance against the power Pozzo has on him. He finds the opportunity to talk and expresses his ideas.

LUCKY : Given the existence as uttered forth in the public works of Puncher and Wattmann of a personal God quaquaquaqua with white beard quaquaquaqua outside time without extension who from the heights of divine apathia divine athambia divine aphasia loves us dearly with some exceptions for reasons unknown but time will tell and suffers like the divine Miranda with those who for reasons unknown but time will tell are plunged in torment plunged in fire whose fire flames if that continues and who can doubt it will fire the firmament that is to say blast hell to heaven so blue still and calm so calm with a calm which even though intermittent is better than

...

I resume alas alas abandoned unfinished the skull the skull in Connemara in spite of the tennis the skull alas the stones Cunard (*mêlée, final vociferations*) . . . tennis . . . the stones . . . so calm . . . Cunard . . . unfinished . . . (WfG, 2006: 36-38, Act I)

This talk is resistance and kind of an insurrection. Pozzo suffers during the speech and his suffering grows more with each word. This continuous until Vladimir grabs the hat (Burkman, 36: 2008). Then Pozzo with relief seeing that the resistance is over says that,

POZZO : Give me that! (*He snatches the hat from Vladimir, throws it on the ground, tramples on it.*) There's an end to his thinking! (WfG, 2006: 38, Act I)

In the second act, the roles of Pozzo and Lucky changes, Pozzo becomes blind and Lucky is dumb; nevertheless, the cruel master slave relationship seen in the first act still continuous even when Pozzo becomes helpless, but the resistance of Lucky ends

in the second act. By giving the whip to Pozzo, Lucky gives his own power to him again.

POZZO : On. (*Lucky, laden down, takes his place before Pozzo.*)
Whip! (*Lucky puts everything down, looks for whip, finds it, puts it into Pozzo's hand, takes up everything again.*) Rope!
Lucky puts everything down, puts end of rope into Pozzo's hand, takes up everything again. (WfG, 2006: 81, Act II)

Power and resistance relationship is also seen in Şensoy's play *Good Riddance Godot*. People do not like the way the cruel general, Godot, governing the country since there are problems such as being without water. The way Godot treats them is another source of distress for these people. He behaves as if he listens to them but he never cares about his people's needs. His being indifferent and the power that he holds over them make the people uncomfortable and discontent. Their resistance begins with anger;

DOLUNAY : (*alaylı*) Sık sık dingildedığı oluyor mu sinirciğinizin?
KAVUKLU : Hayır. Genelde sinirliyiz.
DOLUNAY : Hımmm... Daha çok nelere sinirleniyorsunuz?
KAVUKSUZ : Sinirlenmediğimiz bir şey yok

...

(Kısa susku. Birbirlerine bakar, birbirlerine yönelir, neredeyse bir çember oluştururlar. Bokko, Leke ve Godotgiller müthiş bir kavganın başlayacağını sezinleyerek, işi gücü bırakıp, pür dikkat izlemeye koyulurlar. Birden beşi birden aynı anda hızla ve bağırarak konuşmaya başlarlar.)(GGG, 1996: 19-20)

DOLUNAY : (*sardonic*) does your pain in the rear end gets angry that often?
KAVUKLU : No. We are angry in general.
DOLUNAY : Well... What do you get angry at most of the time?
KAVUKSUZ : There is nothing we don't get angry about.

...

(Short silence. They stare at each other, they move towards each other, they nearly form a circle. Sensing that there will be a big fight soon, Bokko, Leke and Godotgiller stop what they are right doing and start watching. Suddenly five of them start talking altogether fast and shouting.) (GGG, 1996: 19-20)

Actually, the anger that explode has nothing to do with themselves. Their anger actually is directed at Godotgiller, İtoluit and mostly Godot. People begin to show their reactions while arguing with each other. Godot's not appearing on the stage and not being seen by the people creates a powerful atmosphere. In other words, just like Godot in *Waiting for Godot*, the absence of Godot in *Good Riddance Godot* exercise power over people.

FERHAT : Hadi gelin bizimle!
KAVUKSUZ : Gelemeyiz!
DOLUNAY : Niçün?
KAVUKLU : Godot nöbetindeyiz!
ÇİÇEK : Gel-me-ye-cek!
KAVUKLU : Tamam tamam, biliyoruz. ... (GGG, 1996: 22)

FERHAT : Came on, come with us!
KAVUKSUZ : We cannot!
DOLUNAY : Why?
KAVUKLU :We are on Godot duty!
ÇİÇEK : He-won't-come!
KAVUKLU : Okay, okay, we know it. ... (GGG, 1996: 22)

People start giving reactions against that power, first by anger next by going on a strike,

Ferhat, Dolunay, Çiçek, Toprak, halktan kişiler, ellerinde hiç yazısız boş bir pankartla gelip sahnenin ortasına otururlar.

KAVUKSUZ : N'oluyor?
TOPRAK : Grev!
KAVUKLU : Grev ne?

FERHAT : Direniş!
KAVUKSUZ : Neye yarayacak?
TOPRAK : Çalışmamız neye yarıyor? (Şensoy, 1996: 37)

Ferhat, Dolunay, Çiçek, Toprak, some people enter and sit in the middle of the stage with banners which has nothing written on.

KAVUKSUZ : What is going on?
TOPRAK : Strike!
KAVUKLU : What is strike?
FERHAT : Disobedience
KAVUKSUZ : What good is it going to do?
TOPRAK : What good is our working do? (Şensoy, 1996:37)

Another resistance against power that is seen in the play is the section where Godotgiller try to be the new governors of the country. After Godot's leaving the country, Godotgiller aim to keep the power with themselves and govern the country, but people react negatively to their desire.

G.GİLLER : Merhaba arkadaşlar!
1. G.GİL : Godot gitti ve ülkemiz yasaksız, demokratik bir düzene kavuştu...
DOLUNAY : Nasıl yani?
2. G.GİL : Devlete el koyduk. Her işe biz bakacağız.
DOLUNAY : Her işe kimin bakacağına halk karar verecek?
1.G.GİL : Nasıl yani?
DOLUNAY : İsteyen aday olsun. Yöneticiyi halk seçsin!
3.G.GİL : Halk anlamaz bu işlerden!
LEKE : Debokrası!
Herkes döner Leke'ye bakar, Leke sözünü heceleyerek yineler.
LEKE : De-bok-ra-si!
3.G.GİL : Biz üçümüz, konsey olarak yönetimi götürebiliriz!

- 2.G.GİL** : Evet arkadaşlar, bunca yıl sizinle kader birliği etmiş, birlikte Godot'yu sırtında taşımış idarecileriniz olarak, yönetimi bizim devralmamız sizin çıkarınızdır.
- KAVUKLU** : Nasıl bir yönetim düşünüyorsunuz? Programınız nedir?
- 1.G.GİL** : Programımız, halkın mutluluğudur.
- ÇİÇEK** : Hiç yöneten olmasa, halk daha mutlu olur...
- 2.G.GİL** : Olur mu? Büyük kargaşa doğar!
- ÇİÇEK** : Doğsun! Kargaşadan varacağız bir huzura.
- KAVUKSUZ** : Doğru! (GGG, 1996: 73-74)
-
- G.GİLLER** : Hello friends!
- 1. G.GİL** : Godot is gone and our country obtained a democratic system...
- DOLUNAY** : How?
- 2. G.GİL** : We take the action. We take care of the things.
- DOLUNAY** : Community take care of things?
- 1.G.GİL** : How?
- DOLUNAY** : Anyone can be a candidate. People elect the governer!
- 3.G.GİL** : It is not people's cup of tea!
- LEKE** : Decrapracy!
Everybody turns and looks at Leke, Leke spells again
- LEKE** : De-crap-ra-cy!
- 3.G.GİL** : we can continue the government as a triple council!
- 2.G.GİL** : Yes friends, we have been sharing a common fate with you and we have carried Godot on our backs for years. It would be your benefit if we take over the government as an experienced governors.
- KAVUKLU** : What kind of a government type are you planning?
What is your program?
- 1.G.GİL** : Our program is people's happiness.
- ÇİÇEK** : If there is no governors, people would be happier...
- 2.G.GİL** : How can it be? There would be chaos!
- ÇİÇEK** : Possible! We will reach peace through chaos.
- KAVUKSUZ** : Abslutately! (GGG, 1996: 73-74)

Godotgiller insist on ruling the country, in other words keeping the power themselves but people on the street do not want them to do so. They are against the power that Godotgiller try to have and people show reactions. What Godotgiller are trying to do is to expose a new type of power on the society and what people do is to resist against the power.

4.5. Panopticism in *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot*

According to Foucault, the architectural apparatus of panopticon can be used as a machine to create and maintain a power relation making individuals to perceive that the mechanism of this power relationship works independent of a person who operates it (Foucault, 1995: 199-210). This architectural form of panopticon provides aid to form social control in the society. As explained in the second chapter in detail, there is an annular building at the periphery and there is a tower with wide windows at the center. The architectural form reminds the structure of Ortaoyunu. In Ortaoyunu, the stage is framed with low fences to mark the space in which the play is to be performed (And, 1963: 40). The low fences prevent actors to cross over to the audience section and audiences to the stage. The structure is in circular form just like Bentham's model of panopticon. *Good Riddance Godot* is not a complete Ortaoyunu example but there are examples of Ortaoyunu in it, such as the names of the characters; Kavuklu and Kavuksuz. It would be essential to remember that Kavuksuz in *Good Riddance Godot* is the equivalence of Pişekar in Ortaoyunu.

Apart from the structural design of panopticon, power of panopticism can be found in the plays of Şensoy and Beckett. The tower with wide windows in the center arouse a feeling of being watched all the time. This makes panopticon unique that the prisoners are never sure whether they are being watched or not since the architectural design does not provide any prisoner to see inside of the tower. They feel that they are being watched all the time. That feeling stops them to act freely, in other words they are instinctively forced to act as they are told to do so. The cruel general, Godot, do not permit people to leave the place they are in. He authorizes only one person to go and find the water.

GODOT

: Siz talihli bir milletsiniz. Doğuda, Bindikden dağında su var. Seçin içinizden bir yiğit gitsin delsin Bindikden dağını, kavuştursun bizi suya.

KAVUKSUZ : Niye bir tek yiğit? Beş on yiğit olmaz mı?
 ...

GODOT : Olmaz tek bir yiğit gidecek! To be or not to be! That is the quotation! (GGG, 1996: 47- 48)

GODOT : You are lucky. In the East there is water on the Bindiken mountain. Choose someone brave, let him go and pierce the Bindiken mountain and have the water.

KAVUKSUZ : Why only a single brave one? Can't it be five or ten?
 ...

GODOT : Out of the question! Only one brave can go! To be or not to be! That is the quotation! (GGG, 1996: 47- 48)

Similar actions can be found in *Waiting for Godot* in Beckett's. The main characters, Estragon and Vladimir, are always in the same place and never leave. And more Vladimir thinks that he has heard Godot's shout as if he is there. This creates panopticism for the characters.

VLADIMIR : I thought it was he.
ESTRAGON : Who?
VLADIMIR : Godot.
ESTRAGON : Pah! The wind in the reeds.
VLADIMIR : I could have sworn I heard shouts.
ESTRAGON : And why would he shout?
VLADIMIR : At his horse. (WfG, 2006: 12, Act I)

Estragon and Vladimir think Godot is so close to them that he can come anytime. That is why they had hard times to believe that Pozzo is not Godot.

ESTRAGON : (*undertone*). Is that him?
VLADIMIR : Who?
ESTRAGON : (*trying to remember the name*). Er . . .
VLADIMIR : Godot?
ESTRAGON : Yes.
POZZO : I present myself: Pozzo.
VLADIMIR : (*to Estragon*). Not at all!

ESTRAGON : He said Godot.
VLADIMIR : Not at all!
ESTRAGON : (*timidly, to Pozzo*). You're not Mr. Godot, Sir? (WfG, 2006: 15, Act I)

The structural design of panopticon also reminds the setting in *Endgame* with few differences. In panopticon the prisoners would be kept in the light and Foucault comments that the back lights coming from the windows provides men at the central tower to see the silhouettes of the prisoners (Barou & Perrot, 1980: 147). The characters in *Endgame* are stuck in a prison like room with two windows close to the ceiling. Clov looks at the windows by the help of a ladder each time. Clov thinks that he sees a boy outside just like prisoners are seen from the tower of panopticon.

CLOV : (*dismayed*) Looks like a small boy!
HAMM : (*sarcastic*) A small... boy! (Endgame, 2009: 46)

This time the situation is reversed. It is like Clov and Hamm are in a tower but imprisoned and cannot leave the room at all. There is danger and death outside. There is an external power and this power keeps them in the room. It is clear that the characters in the play are not under surveillance but nature becomes kind of panopticon for them. They behave accordingly,

CLOV : (*after reflection*) Nor I.
(He gets up on ladder, turns the telescope on the without.)
 Let's see.
(He looks, moving the telescope.)
 Zero...
(he looks)
 ...zero...
(he looks)
 ...and zero.
HAMM : Nothing stirs. All is—
CLOV : Zer—
HAMM : (*violently*) Wait till you're spoken to!
(Normal voice.)

All is... all is... all is what?

(Violently.)

All is what?

CLOV

: What all is? In a word? Is that what you want to know?

Just a moment.

(He turns the telescope on the without, looks, lowers the telescope, turns towards Hamm.)

Corpsed. (Endgame, 2009: 20)

There is a similar extensive power that can be seen in *Good Riddance Godot*. The nature is dry and it does not give the people water. It is clearly seen from the signs that water is provided just for Godot.

“Godot’ya 100 Metre”

“Godot Çeşmesi”

“Godot/5 Metre”

“Godot Şelalesi”

“Godot/20 Metre”

“Godot”

“Girilmez” (GGG, 1996: 58)

“100 Meters to Godot”

“Godot Fountain”

“Godot/50 Meters”

“Godot Waterfall”

“Godot/20 Meters”

“Godot No Trespassing” (GGG, 1996: 58)

There is no water for the people and they are forced to behave according to the circumstances. It is a kind of panopticon for the people who have no power. Nature becomes a panopticon for them since it does not give any water.

İTOLUİT

: Anlıyorum. Suya kavuşacaksınız arkadaşlar. Elimizden geleni yapıyoruz. Olanaklar çerçevesinde olanaksızı olanaksız kılma çabamız sürüyor. Niye şemsiyeyle dolaşıyorum ben, niye böyle açık bir şemsiyeyle

dolaşıyorum? Yağmur bekliyoruz! Yurdumuzun kuzey batısında bulutlar görüldü. Kahraman pilotlarımız bulutlara yağmur bombası zerketmek üzere uçuşa geçtiler bile... Bir basıyorlar bulutun gözüne bombayı, bulutun iki gözü iki çeşme... Pek yakında buraları sel alacak, hazırlıklı olun. Demişti dersiniz. Herkesin musluğu olacak. ... (GGG, 1996; 40)

İTOLUİT

: I understand. You will have water dear friends. We are doing our best. We are trying to make impossible impossible with our means. Why do you think I am carrying an umbrella, why am I walking holding an open umbrella? We are expecting rain! The clouds are seen from the North West of our country. Our valiant pilots are on their way to launch rain bombs to these clouds... When they launch bombs to the clouds the clouds will burst in tears... Soon there will be flood here. I am telling you. Everyone will have taps. ... (GGG, 1996; 40)

Foucault states that “He who is subjected to a field of visibility and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection” (Foucault, 1991:202-203). Moreover, if the person or the agent has the adequate knowledge about the others, this person would have the sufficient visibility about them, and that would make the person or the agent more powerful in front of others. Foucault states that “it is not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power” (Brochier, 1980: 52). It is possible to say that the more knowledge makes the agent more powerful. It is clear that Hamm knows Clov since he was of a very young age. That means Hamm has adequate knowledge about Clov and he is older than him since Hamm is a father to Clov.

HAMM

: Do you remember when you came here?

CLOV

: No. Too small, you told me.

HAMM : Do you remember your father?

CLOV : *(wearily)* Same answer.

(Pause.)

You've asked me these questions millions of times.

HAMM : I love the old questions.

(With fervour.)

Ah the old questions, the old answers, there's nothing like them!

(Pause.)

It was I was a father to you.

CLOV : Yes.

(He looks at Hamm fixedly.)

You were that to me.

HAMM : My house a home for you. (Endgame, 2009: 24-25)

The age difference may create a powerful situation as well in the room. However, the eyesight advantage of Clov gives him the visual power. Nevertheless, Clov obeys the orders of Hamm and Hamm needs Clov to survive. They have a mutual power situation. However, Clov is under panopticon of Hamm. Hamm calls him continuously and gives orders. These perpetual callings make Clov imprisoned in the room and he cannot leave Hamm for long. Hamm is always there as if he is watching him all the time even when he has no eyesight. Hamm is older than Clov and that means Hamm knows a lot about Clov. The knowledge on Clov and the age difference between them give power to Hamm and Hamm controls Clov even with only one whistle.

HAMM : ... God, I'm tired, I'd be better off in bed.

(He whistles. Enter Clov immediately. He halts beside the chair.)

You pollute the air!

(Pause.)

Get me ready, I'm going to bed. (Endgame, 2009: 6-7)

Knowledge and power relationship also occur in *Good Riddance Godot*. The governors know how the people react in certain situations. This knowledge gives them the power and panopticon. They can watch and control the people and control them easily. Itoluit is not fearful when he hears about strikes and possible upheaval. Itoluit has a powerful

panopticon over the society. He watches and controls everything on behalf of Godot. The situation supports Foucault. Foucault believes in suitable atmosphere. Panopticon is a proper mechanism to control knowledge and power. Moreover, he states that when power is obtained by enlightened classes or intellectual circles, they want to restore knowledge to protect the social order for good (Foucault, 2003:81). Nevertheless, if this power is held by destructive authorities, the situation is reversed. The knowledge this time is used for correction and punishment (Foucault, 1988: 40). In other words, power and knowledge can be the control mechanism of the panopticon. In *Good Riddance Godot* knowledge is used for benefits of power. When there is enough knowledge about individuals, there is adequate power for authorities to practice;

İTOLUİT : Endişelenecek bir şey yok. Gerekirse dağda uyduruk bir ateş yaktırırız. Çok grev gördük, çok grev çözdük biz. Olmazsa üç beş damacana su dağıtırız, ortalık yatıştır.

3. G.GİL : Hiç sanmıyorum, yarın sokaklar ana baba günü olacak!
İTOLUİT :Bu gecedен yasaklarız sokağa çıkmayı. Takmayın böyle şeylere kafayı. Abartmayalım. Ne ayaklanmalar gördük biz. Ne çabuk unuttunuz!

1.G.GİL :Ülkeyi terketmek için bir hazırlığa gerek yok yani şimdilik!

İTOLUİT : Ne münasebet hocam, ülke bizim ülkemiz!

1. G.GİL : Hayır devrim mevrım olursa, bizi oyarlar da, onun için şey yaptım...

İTOLUİT : Ne devrimi hocam? Bu ülkede devrim yalnız biz isteyince olur! (GGG, 1996: 57-58)

İTOLUİT : No need to worry. We can lit a fake fire on the mountain if needed. We lived through many strikes and stopped many. If necessary we can distribute few gallons of water that will calm down things.

3. G.GİL : I don't think so. Tomorrow the streets will be bursting at the seams.

- ÍTOLUÏT** : We can order a curfew. Stop the ants in your pants. No need to exaggerate. We lived through many riots. How quickly you have forgotten!
- 1.G.GÌL** : You mean, no need to be prepared to leave the country for now!
- ÍTOLUÏT** : Of course not Mr. This country is ours!
- 1. G.GÌL** : I mean if there is any upheaval, these people will kill us...
- ÍTOLUÏT** : What upheaval Mr.? Any upheaval would occur only if we want it to happen in this country! (GGG, 1996: 57-58)

Public space is another form of panopticon today. In any public space, there is also surveillance and isolation as in panopticon. Knowledge is the most important modifier of the social body. In other words, public space gains its power from knowledge. Knowledge is the main element that generates discipline in the society. The public space evoke individuals to become functional and docile within power and knowledge dynamics. Individuals in the societies are always under surveillance and it is impossible for them to run away from it. The surveillance creates the similar effect as Panopticon. In public space the authorities prefer to stay invisible; nevertheless, the public who work under the authorities remain visible all the time. Foucault thinks that the working classes are the objects of power because they are visible (Seisun, 2004:12). As powerful authorities, Godots both in *Waiting for Godot* and in *Good Riddance Godot* remain invisible. Their invisibility creates a Panopticon effect on the characters. What they do is according to Godots' wishes. Vladimir and Estragon do not want to leave the place because they are told that Godot will come there.

- VLADIMIR** : You have a message from Mr. Godot.
- BOY** : Yes Sir.
- VLADIMIR** : He won't come this evening.
- BOY** : No Sir.
- VLADIMIR** : But he'll come tomorrow.
- BOY** : Yes Sir. (WfG, 2006: 84, Act II)

They keep waiting in the same place standing firm.

VLADIMIR : We're waiting for Godot.
ESTRAGON : (*despairingly*). Ah! (*Pause.*) You're sure it was here?
VLADIMIR : What?
ESTRAGON : That we were to wait.
VLADIMIR : He said by the tree. (*They look at the tree.*) Do you see any others? (WfG, 2006: 6, Act, I).

They prefer not to leave the place. Even though they have never seen Godot before, they keep on waiting as they are being told to do so. The effect of power is sensed in their waiting activity. When Estragon offers to go away from there Vladimir says they cannot. Saying “cannot” means they have no ability or no right to do it.

ESTRAGON : Oh yes, let's go far away from here.
VLADIMIR : We can't.
ESTRAGON : Why not?
VLADIMIR : We have to come back tomorrow.
ESTRAGON : What for?
VLADIMIR : To wait for Godot. (WfG, 2006: 85, Act II)

Since they have never met Godot before they want to have information from the messenger boy about him. Their ignorance on Godot creates power on them and the power turns into a Panopticon. They do not know how Godot would react in certain situation. They want to know about Godot,

VLADIMIR : You work for Mr. Godot?
BOY : Yes Sir.
VLADIMIR : What do you do?
BOY : I mind the goats, Sir.
VLADIMIR : Is he good to you?
BOY : Yes Sir.
VLADIMIR : He doesn't beat you?
BOY : No Sir, not me.
VLADIMIR : Whom does he beat?
BOY : He beats my brother, Sir.
VLADIMIR : Ah, you have a brother?
BOY : Yes Sir.

VLADIMIR : What does he do?
BOY : He minds the sheep, Sir.
VLADIMIR : And why doesn't he beat you?
BOY : I don't know, Sir.
VLADIMIR : He must be fond of you.
BOY : I don't know, Sir.
(Silence.)
VLADIMIR : Does he give you enough to eat? *(The Boy hesitates.)*
Does he feed you well?
BOY : Fairly well, Sir. (WfG, 2006: 44-45, Act I).
...
VLADIMIR : *(softly)*. Has he a beard, Mr. Godot?
BOY : Yes Sir.
VLADIMIR : Fair or . . . *(he hesitates)* . . . or black?
BOY : I think it's white, Sir.
Silence.
VLADIMIR : Christ have mercy on us!
(Silence.) (WfG, 2006: 84-85, Act II)

Estragon and Vladimir accept Godot's power without any question and they place Godot on a pedestal as if he is a king or an equivalent in their minds. Godot is such a powerful authority for them that when they are accepted to see Godot they will meet him on their hands and knees.

ESTRAGON : Where do we come in?
VLADIMIR : Come in?
ESTRAGON : Take your time.
VLADIMIR : Come in? On our hands and knees.
ESTRAGON : As bad as that?
VLADIMIR : Your Worship wishes to assert his prerogatives?
ESTRAGON : We've no rights any more?
(Laugh of Vladimir, stifled as before, less the smile.)
(WfG, 2006:11, Act I)

Godot's panopticism is clearly seen in Vladimir's words below that even though Godot is not there or in the same atmosphere with them they are careful to act as they are ordered. Vladimir does not laugh since laughing is prohibited.

VLADIMIR : You'd make me laugh if it wasn't prohibited.

ESTRAGON : We've lost our rights?

VLADIMIR : (*distinctly*). We got rid of them.

Silence. They remain motionless, arms dangling, heads sunk, sagging at the knees.

ESTRAGON : (*feebly*). We're not tied? (*Pause.*) We're not—

VLADIMIR : Listen!

They listen, grotesquely rigid. (WfG, 2006:11, Act I)

Similar Panopticon effect is seen in *Good Riddance Godot*. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are also in duty of waiting for Godot and they prefer not to leave the place.

FERHAT : Hadi gelin bizimle!

KAVUKSUZ : Gelemeyiz!

DOLUNAY : Niçün?

KAVUKLU : Godot nöbetindeyiz!

ÇİÇEK : Gel-me-ye-cek!

KAVUKLU : Tamam tamam, biliyoruz. ... (GGG, 1996: 22)

FERHAT : Came on, come with us!

KAVUKSUZ : We cannot!

DOLUNAY : Why?

KAVUKLU : We are on Godot duty!

ÇİÇEK : He-won't-come!

KAVUKLU : Okay, okay, we know it. ... (GGG, 1996: 22)

Similar to Godot in *Waiting for Godot*, cruel general Godot in *Good Riddance Godot* never appears on the stage. Godot's voice is heard twice and a door with golden knob symbolizes Godot. This door gives the feeling that Godot is someone very powerful. In both plays, the characters are not under physical surveillance of their respective Godots. Vladimir and Estragon act obediently as Godot would prefer them to do so. In fact, their act of waiting form their behavior because they are told to wait. Kavuklu,

Kavuksuz and the others live according to Godot's rules. Kavuklu, Kavuksuz and the others in *Good Riddance Godot* are under surveillances all the time but there is another powerful agent, İtoluit. İtoluit is the eyes of Godot since he reports every single detail about people to him. If it had not been for him Godot would not have been aware of what people have done in the country. The dialogue below supports the idea,

- DÖRDÜ** : İyi akşamlar Sayın Godot!
- GODOT** : (*sesi duyulur*) Neden uyarıyorsunuz beni şu şırıltılı uykumdan? Gene ne var? Gene mi dalgalandı ruhlar? Kanı mı bitlendi milletin?
- İTOLUİT** : Hayır hayır hayır, Sayın Godot! Herşey tıkırında, Emirleriniz ışığında hareket ettiğimiz sürece herhangi bir olay oluşmasına olanak yok zaten. ...
- GODOT** : Bırakın grev yapsınlar. Sonunda sıkılırlar.
- İTOLUİT** : Ölüm orucu gibi sapıklıkları denemek isteyenler var.
- GODOT** : Bırakınız ölsünler!
- İTOLUİT** : Bu durumda olayların daha da büyümesinden ürküyo...
- GODOT** : Bana bakın... Bırakır giderim vallahi!
(*İtoluit ve Godotgiller yerlere kapanırlar.*)
- DÖRDÜ** : Aman efendim, sakın bizi bırakmayın... Biz sizensiz ne yaparız?
- GODOT** : Beni böyle boktan şeyler için bir daha rahatsız etmeyin!
...(GGG, 1996: 59-60)
- ALL FOUR** : Good evening honorable Godot!
- GODOT** : (his voice is heard) Why the hell are you waking me up from my plashy sleep. What's wrong again. Are my people getting deep pockets?
- İTOLUİT** : No no no, Honorable Godot! Everything is okay. It is impossible to have any incident as long as we follow your orders...
- GODOT** : Let them go on a strike if they want to. They will get tired of it.
- İTOLUIT** : Some of them want to try indefinite hunger strike.

GODOT : Let them die! (GGG, 1996: 59)
ÍTOLUÏT : In this case we are afraid of ...
GODOT : Listen to me... I will walk out right now, I swear.
Ítoluit and Godotgiller are on their knees
ALL FOUR : Oh dear sir, please don't leave us... What can we do
without you?
GODOT : Then don't disturb me on such shitty matters! ... (GGG,
1996: 59 - 60)

As it can be seen from the dialogues above, Godots are invisible and their invisibility creates power over the society. It is accepted that they are the authorities in the plays and their authority forms panoptic atmosphere in the public space. As Foucault, states they remain invisible and individuals who accept their power are visible all the time.



5. CONCLUSION

It is often said that Beckett reflects the human condition in his works. Beckett enriches his theatrical landscapes with whittled-down characters who might be the amputees dwelling in ashbins or the ones with disembodied mouths. The characters, who are inseparably linked to the catastrophic historical moments, reflect the conditions of the world as if they are the mirrors of the meaningless world. In a world infested with injustice and amorality the characters remain not only as a handful physical odds but also as reflections of a dysfunctional world. Beckett illustrates and reveals the disenchantment of humanity in the World War Two in its philosophical and historical sense. He is one of the writers who produced his works under the terrifying shadow of the Holocaust and is aware of the fact that unchecked power is the real horror. Beckett identifies the war as a socio-cultural fracture and mirrors its violence and destruction in his works (Swanson, 2011: 1). The relationship and the conditions of the characters in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* express the unfortunate fact as they are crippled, blinded and trapped in no man's land and ashbins.

The characters in Beckett's plays, *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* and Şensoy's *Good Riddance Godot* are somehow metaphorically spellbound by a power and the gaze of a powerful authority as explained in Chapter IV. From Foucault's point of view power is internalized, it is possible to conclude that the characters struggle to disentangle themselves from this powerful and inescapable gaze. They feel the power and are uncomfortable with it. Nevertheless, their struggles are hopeless because the powerful gaze is internalized already. Their attempts are pointless. The hope that Godot will come the next day stop Vladimir and Estragon to leave the place for they have been ordered to wait in a certain location. Lucky embraces this power in the second act, he gives the whip to Pozzo. This means that Lucky has already accepted and internalized the power of Pozzo and his gaze. Hamm and Clov in *Endgame* interchange their powers during the play, Clov suffers from Hamm's powerful gaze eventhough he is blind. All the characters who represent society in *Good Riddance Godot* suffer from

the gaze, İtoluit and Godotgiller, and the power of unwanted Godot. These structures that Beckett and Şensoy utilize in their dramatic works go beyond simple characterization; the characters all mirror the larger social and historical circumstances.

According to Foucault power is a structure of observation in a carceral machinery and it is internalized. Power is in the system and the individuals are the peripheral effects of the system (Barou & Perrot, 1980: 98). The confinement conditions of Beckett's and Şensoy's characters in the plays *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot* are the theoretical counterparts of Foucault's theory of carcerality. There are surveillances, futilities and containments in *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot* and they match with what Foucault states in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Foucault picturizes the carcerality through Bentham's Panopticon as an example of power.

An inspector arriving unexpectedly at the center of the Panopticon will be able to judge at a glance, without anything being concealed from him, how the entire establishment is functioning (Foucault, 1995: 204).

Of course, what Foucault illustrates above goes beyond Bentham's model of Panopticon prisoning and becomes an institutional mechanism that points its gaze to the society. Foucault states that;

Panopticon, on the other hand, must be understood a generalized model of functioning; a way of defining power relations in terms of the everyday life of men (Foucault, 1995:205).

The relationship of power and Panopticon are clearly displayed in Beckett and Şensoy. Both correspond with Foucault in the idea that the ultimate redemption is only possible with the destruction of the individual (Swanson, 2011:4). The examples of physical and psychological destruction of the individual is demonstrated in the plays of Beckett and there are images of physical confinement and their internalization of authority as Foucault explains. The characters in the plays *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* are illustrated either in restrained movement or total confinement. The confinement and the paralysis of the characters is used as a governing and a central mechanism. Hamm cannot walk and he is vulnerable to observation, Clov cannot sit and has to walk around all the time and this is his confinement. Nagg and Nell are imprisoned to the ashbins in *Endgame*. The situation is not different in *Waiting for Godot*. Vladimir and Estragon are confined in a no man's land and cannot leave the place. Lucky is under Pozzo's

domination even Pozzo loses the power in the second act. They all are bound to the authority one way or another. They are all limited individuals and this limited physicality portrays them as beings rather than individuals who know what exactly to do. On the other hand, in Şensoy's play, there is even psychological destruction of the characters and there is physical destruction of the authority; authority falls apart. Godot leaves the country after given great psychological damages to the society. The characters who represent society recover and try to establish their own authority. Contrary to the characters in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, the characters in *Good Riddance Godot* are presented in full form of individuals, not limited ones who are patient to some degree in a terrible condition. When the people in *Good Riddance Godot* think that they are not heard by Godot because they do not have water in the country, they are brave enough to go on a hunger strike.

The settings of the plays are designed to be confusing at first glance since it is difficult to decide whether characters are free or encircled by uncontrollable factors. The stage in the plays are almost empty with few props. There is a country road in the middle of nowhere with a bare tree standing empty of leaves in the first act, and a few in the second act in *Waiting for Godot*. If the tree is to be excluded, the stage would be all empty. The barren surrounding signals the helpless situation that the characters are both in terms of time and place. In *Endgame*, there is a room, which is considered safe at first sight since the outer place invites death. As it is in *Waiting for Godot*, the stage is almost empty with a wheelchair, two windows and two ashbins. All the characters are restricted in their movements. Clov can leave the room as he mentions all the time, but he does not. Hamm is confined to his wheelchair and sees the world through the eyes of Clov. Nagg and Nell, on the other hand, are imprisoned in their ashbins which restrict their physical movements. In both plays, the settings seem to be safe in the beginning; nevertheless, audiences see that the characters are entrapped in the settings and this entrapment confuses them and makes the situation almost impossible for them to decide which choice is feasible; to go or to stay (Shalgin, 2014:102). The setting is a neighborhood in a city in *Good Riddance Godot* and it is an empty one with two bicycles. The people in *Good Riddance Godot* do not even think about leaving. When Ferhat is assigned to find water on Bindiken mountain, other people do not want him to go alone and worry after he has gone. Personal ties among the characters are stronger in *Good Riddance Godot* than they are in Beckett's plays. In Beckett's plays, there is

an interchangeable power relationship between them and in this power relation they need one another; however, there is a pure and sincere friendship among people in *Good Riddance Godot*.

The constructed space is almost bare in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, and this bare stage setting means entrapment for the characters. This entrapment provides a sense of isolation and loneliness. It is this loneliness and isolation that furnishes special relationship between Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot* and Hamm and Clov in *Endgame*. This constructed space for both of the plays is heterotopic since they all continue their relationships in a prisonlike atmosphere and they endure it during their endless waiting state in *Waiting for Godot* and their hopeless state in *Endgame*. The characters both have constrained relationships in their isolated and hopeless states and dependent relationships since they need one another. This heterotopic relationship envelops the plays. In *Good Riddance Godot* the people are hopeful that one day Godot will leave the country. The hopelessness that is witnessed in Beckett is dispersed in Şensoy. The songs that they sing announce the hopeful state of the people by saying “goodbye Godot”. The characters in *Good Riddance Godot* are unified to one another and they prefer to act as a community. They even feel uncomfortable when Godot orders one of them to go and get water from Bindiken Mountain. The relationship in Beckett’s characters are based on isolation and loneliness whereas it is based on friendship and neighborliness in Şensoy’s.

What is all-common in the plays of Beckett and Şensoy is ‘waiting’ which becomes the condition humanity endlessly experience. Nevertheless, the viewpoint of playwrights differs. The characters in Beckett experience the state of waiting in dilemma. Vladimir and Estragon are hopeful that Godot will come the next day with questions in their minds. They are on a country road and they do not know where this road would lead them to. They persuade themselves that Godot will come the next day. During their waiting, they find excuses, blame themselves, and try to figure out uncertainty of the time and the exact place Godot’s arrival. The universe is destroyed and there is nothing left in *Endgame*. Hamm and Clov need each other to survive in their condition. The nature and everything is already dead outside. Both outside and inside is considered to be hell and they suffer in these conditions. Hamm asks Clov to kill him but Clov refuses for he does not want to be left alone in this sufferable world and wait for death all alone. (Özgüven, 1998: 89). Clov is frightened from the unknown

outer world and he is entrapped to wait with Hamm inside. In this sense it is clear that outer world means death. Concept of ‘waiting’ prevails in *Endgame* too; nevertheless, ‘waiting in this play is not for arrival, but for promised ‘departure’. Nagg and Nell, the old parents, imprisoned in their ashbins unable to move outside are waiting for death because of time and age factors. They are waiting for their end to come but they cannot reach that end, they cannot move at all and what they only can do is to ‘wait’ (Shalgin, 2014: 104). In Şensoy, on the other hand, the state of waiting in the play is not as depressing and hopeless as in Beckett’s. There is a water problem in the country and people suffer a lot from this waterlessness. They are planning to go on a hunger strike and revolt. What they do is not aimless, hopeless and absurd as the characters do in Beckett. People in Şensoy’s play are hopeful that one day Godot will go and then their problems will end.

The use of some heterotopias discussed in Chapter IV are different for both playwrights. Beckett’s use of heterotopia, which is related to time, is explicit. Foucault states that “heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time” (Foucault, 1984: 6). The relationship of Vladimir and Estragon dates back to long years. Vladimir says that “We should have thought of it a million years ago, in the nineties” (WfG, 2006: 2, Act I). From these words it is perceived that Vladimir and Estragon know each other for a long time. Another sign to mark their long relationship is the Eiffel Tower. Beckett explicitly makes connection between Eiffel Tower and their long friendship. Eiffel Tower is a heterotopia in *Waiting for Godot* since it links the slices of time. The heterochronic figure in *Endgame* is presented with a destroyed light outside. Clov and Hamm remember about the light and they know that it is sunk. From the dialogues of Nagg and Nell, it is realized that they have grown old together. In *Good Riddance Godot*, there is no explicit description about the heterotopia but the idea is implicitly given. The names of the characters present us with heterotopia. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are the main characters of the play and their names refer to Kavuklu and Pişekar from Ortaoyunu in Traditional Turkish Theatre. Considering Ortaoyunu dates back to 14th Century, it is implicitly understood that Kavuklu and Kavuksuz has had a long friendship. Another name of the character, Ferhat, also serves a similar purpose. Ferhad and Shirin are the names from Ortaoyunu and their story dates back to history (And, 1985; 439). The historical story of Ferhad and Shirin is the heterochronic

component in the play *Good Riddance Godot*. The name Ferhat refers to Ferhad from Ortaoyunu.

Beckett's plays *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* begin with chaotic situation and with a problem and ends in the same chaotic situation and with the same problem or with a problem of a same nature. Their main problem is 'waiting' and 'waiting' is the greatest source of power exercised over the characters. Under the dominant figure of waiting their lives become puzzled and mysterious since they cannot decide what to do themselves nor can they act freely. They are bound to power of 'waiting'. In Şensoy's play, *Good Riddance Godot* begins with a chaotic atmosphere and with a problem vital to the people in the unnamed country. Nevertheless, the play does not end in similar chaotic situation as it has begun. However, the end of the play is the start of other problems, the future is not seen and clear. There are things for people to oversee for their country and they do not know how to settle these governmental issues. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are leaving but they do not know which way and where to go. All the characters in three plays mentioned above are waiting but in different manners and with conceptions. They all want to change the situation and try to find answers to the questions mostly about themselves and the world around them. In Beckett, the questions remain unanswered but in Şensoy, the main problem is solved. Power is internalized and within the system, the individual becomes the peripheral effect of the system (Swanson, 2011: 3) and as Foucault points out "where there is power there is resistance" (Foucault, 1978:95). The people encounter resistance to the system and achieve their desired freedom in *Good Riddance Godot*, on the other hand, the characters remain passivized and left to their hopeless destiny in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*.

Samuel Beckett is one of the main representatives of Irish Theatre and Ferhan Şensoy is one of the dominant figures of Turkish Traditional Theatre. The theatres that they represent is also a kind of heterotopia as it is explained in Chapter IV. There are differences between Absurd Theatre and Turkish Traditional Theatre as well as similarities. These differences and the similarities affect the makeup of the plays and the characters. In the history of Irish theatre, there was a society who did not have a national theatre tradition. During the war of independence, the national ties linked them to one another and this unity conduced them establishing a national theatre. In the plays, the playwrights mirrored the lives they led as a society and staged them.

Traditional music, dance, folk songs and the poems performed on the stage were awakening the nationalist feelings of the people (Korkut, 1943: 11 & Çapan, 2014: 5). The age in which the Absurd plays were produced was an age transition since the effects and the traces of medieval beliefs were held in eighteenth century rationalism and in nineteenth century Marxism. However, Theatre of the Absurd is a reflection of the attitude which is considered to be the best representative of the age (Esslin, 1983:24).

After the World War II people started to lose their hope and future expectations. Theatre of the Absurd became the voice of terrified societies. People saw themselves as people who witness the terrors of the war and the psychological mood they are in. People began to feel that there is no hope for the future because the better world to live in had disappeared (Şener, 1991: 351-355). Theatre of the Absurd reflects the chaotic atmosphere of the world and it centers on the individual. The plays examine and characterize the individual and become the mirror of the tragicomic lives that have been passivized (Yıldız, 2009:9-13).

Ortaoyunu is exclusively based on laughter, in other words it is basically a theatre of laughter. Ortaoyunu is not based on nationalist feelings as it is in Irish Theatre. It aims to entertain the audiences. There are some ways of producing laughter in Ortaoyunu such as disguise, exaggeration, mocking and incongruity. In Ortaoyunu, portrayal of social customs is the major theme and while exemplifying an issue from the social life. The play itself is rebellious to injustice. The characters of Ortaoyunu are not passive when challenged and they react immediately. It is not like Irish theatre nor Absurd Theater. There are no passive reactions or passive waiting (And, 1964: 42-43, 48-49). This reaction to injustice is seen in *Good Riddance Godot*. The characters in the play are brave to perform some legal and collective actions like going on a strike. Moreover, they are ready to take part in governing the country, even when they do not have any knowledge of how to do so. At least they are ready to take part in the action instead of being passive. As Foucault points out, power is exercised in multiple layers. Once the authority was holding power in that unnamed country and now the people. In *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* the characters are passive in their limited heterotopias and wait for an arrival or a departure.

The main characters, Estragon - Vladimir, Clov - Hamm and Kavuklu – Kavuksuz are socially equal. Their power relation especially in *Endgame* does not stem from a

socially dictated intra relationship but rather from necessities, in *Good Riddance Godot* out of purpose. As mentioned before, Vladimir - Estragon and Kavuklu – Kavuksuz are all waiting for Godot for different reasons. The former ones are waiting for Godot's arrival, the latter for Godot's departure.

The social equality in their timeless and placeless society is only disturbed by the existence of higher power. In *Waiting for Godot* and *Good Riddance Godot* it is Godot who has the upper hand. The Godots are omnipotent and omnipresent even though they are never seen and only heard in *Good Riddance Godot*. In *Endgame* it seems as if this higher power does not exist. However, there is an unseen power which keeps the characters in the prison like room. In *Waiting for Godot* and *Good Riddance Godot* the audience is given a name, Godot. In *Endgame* there is no name mentioned. Still the presence of an unspoken and unnamed power is felt. It is this pressure that has presented the characters in *Endgame* with their predicament.

The characters in *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Good Riddance Godot* are coerced some way or another and their behaviors towards this tensity differ from each other. As mentioned before, the characters in Beckett's plays are more passivized then the characters in Şensoy's. The people in *Good Riddance Godot* suffer from the waterlessness on the surface but in between lines, they suffer from cruel General, Godot. Godot limits the freedom of the people in the country. Feeling entrapped, people try to break free and rebel against the system, such as going on a hunger strike. As the songs and the dialogues of the characters indicate, they never lose their hope that one day Godot will depart and they will be happy and free; free to have water. On the other hand, Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot* are in an act of endless waiting and they try not to lose their hope that Godot will come the next day. The situation is not any different for Hamm and Clov in *Endgame*. The surrounding smells death, and in such an environment, they are waiting for the end. In Beckett's plays the characters coerce themselves, in other words, they choose to be coerced; however, they would be free if they would choose to. Sartre states that "you are free therefore choose" (Sartre, 1966: 38). What Sartre means here that people always have choices since he repeatedly remarks that human beings are "absolutely free", "totally free" and "condemned to be free" (Sartre, 1972: 509, 555, 40, 129, 439). Sartre notes that "man cannot be sometimes slave and sometimes free; he is wholly and forever free or he is not free at all" (Sartre, 1972:441). Moreover, he asserts that,

“When we declare that the slave in chains is as free as his master, we do not mean to speak of a freedom which would remain undetermined. The slave in chains is free to break *them*; this means that the very meaning of his chains will appear to him in the light of the end which he will have chosen: to remain a slave or to risk the worst in order to get rid of his slavery” (Sartre, 1972: 550).

To have the freedom, one should be conscious to choose. Similarly, one should choose to be conscious. Sartre points out that,

“...as our being is precisely our original choice, the consciousness (of) the choice is identical with the self-consciousness which we have. One must be conscious in order to choose, and one must choose in order to be conscious. Choice and consciousness are one and the same thing” (Sartre, 1972: 462).

The freedom of the individual relies on the act of choosing (Jones, 2015: 91). In Beckett’s plays, it is clearly displayed that the characters are incapable of making their own choices and taking actions (Aldegheishem, 2015: 299). Instead, they remain powerless and passive. The characters in *Good Riddance Godot*, try to make their own choices even though they are under the dominance of a cruel General. Making their own choices set them all free at the end of the play. Nevertheless, this new freedom is not a comfortable one because they have to make new choices like who is going to be the new leader. *Good Riddance Godot* points the picture of the modern society who even at the happiest moment must make new choices. The endless need to make choices in order to be free in the tragedy of modern men is reflected in the play.

When the characters are studied from the point of view of their goals, the *Endgame* characters do not have a goal nor do they have an intent to find one. In *Waiting for Godot* the characters have only one aspiration, to wait for Godot. On the other hand, in *Good Riddance Godot* the characters sure enough share Vladimir and Estragon’s aspirations about Godot. However, they have an additional mission. Finding water is the force that unites the society in *Good Riddance Godot* much more so than the characters in *Endgame* and *Waiting for Godot*.

The three plays discussed in this work are representatives of any society old or new dealing with problems; may it be the ancient Greece trying to find democracy by killing its most prominent thinker, or may it be the modern day consumer society trying to deal with economic crises. Beckett in his immanent wisdom has managed to strip down all the frills of a social world to its bare essential. The plays *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* try to show what it is to be human and what it takes to remain human. They show us the most primitive and the most sophisticated as well as the most

spiritual. They tell us in a metaphoric manner what to do when faced with omnipotent and omnipresent power: Endure.

Endurance is characteristic to human beings. The plays tell us to keep going whether we are waiting for Godot or coming out of a prison like room. The same theme of endurance is also seen in *Good Riddance Godot*. Yes, there is oppression, yes, there is no water, yes there are middleman who use power over citizens on behalf of Godot. Still, the end signifies the triumph of endurance.

The three plays discussed are without a specific reference to time or location. It is precisely because of this that these plays can be anywhere or anytime. Godot can be anybody, whoever it is, Godot can be interpreted in terms of politics, philosophy, religion, belief or anything one can think of. This will be one of the reasons why all three will be performed many years from this day on and still convey a meaning to the audiences.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A.** (2015). *Basic Concept of the Theatre of the Absurd*, academia. edu. viewed 30.03.2015, http://www.academia.edu/4752768/Basic_Concept_of_the_Theatre_of_the_Absurd
- Aldegheishem, H.** (2015). Existentialism Staged: A Comparative Study between Beckett's 'Waiting for Godot' and Kanafani's 'The Hat and the Prophet', *Arab World English Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 295 – 301.
- Althusser, L.** (1993). *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, London: Verso.
- And, M.** (1963). *The History of Theatre and Popular Entertainment in Turkey*, Ankara: Forum Yayınları.
- And, M.** (1985). *Geleneksel Türk Tiyatrosu; Köylü ve Halk Tiyatrosu Gelenekleri*, İstanbul: İnkilap Kitabevi.
- Andonian, C.C.** (ed.) (1998). *The Critical Response to Samuel Beckett*, Greenwood Press, Westport CT.
- Aries, P.** (1974). *Western Attitudes Towards Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Artaud, A.** (1958). *The Theatre and its Double*, New York: Grove Press.
- Balan, S.** (2013). *M. Foucault's View on Power Relations*, Institute of Philosophy and Psychology, Viewed 20.07.2014, http://cogito.ucdc.ro/nr_2v2/M.%20FOUCAULT'S%20VIEW%20ON%20POWER%20RELATIONS.pdf.
- Barou, J.P. & Perrot, M.** (1980). 'The Eye of Power', in Colin Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*, Pantheon Books, New York pp. 146 – 165.
- Beckett, S.** (2006). *Waiting For Godot*, London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Beckett, S.** (2007). *Oyun Sonu*, İstanbul: Tem Yayın ve Yapımcılık.
- Beckett, S.** (2009). *End Game*, London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Berke, F.A.** (n.d.). *Beckett Söyleni-Söylemi-Söylem Biçimi*, viewed 27.12.2015, www.isikder.org.tr/docs/yazarlar/fusunatatman.pdf.
- Bloom, H.** (ed.) (1987). *Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot*, Chelsea House, New York.
- Bolick, E.L.** (2009). 'Absurdism in Post-Modern Art: Examining the Interplay Between Waiting for Godot and Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close', *Inquires Journal*, Vol.1, No. 11, pp.1-6. Viewed 20.01.2017,

[http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/36/absurdism-in-post-modern-art-examining-the-interplay-between-waiting-for-godot-and-extremely-loud-and-incredibly-close.](http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/36/absurdism-in-post-modern-art-examining-the-interplay-between-waiting-for-godot-and-extremely-loud-and-incredibly-close)

- Brochier, J.J.** (1980). 'Prison Talk' in Colin Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* by Michel Foucault, Pantheon Books, New York. pp. 37 - 54
- Brooks, P.** (1996). *The Empty Space* New York: Touch stone Books.
- Bulatovic, M.** (1970). *Godot Geldi*, Sevgi Sabuncu, Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Burkman, K. H.** (2008). 'The Nonarrival of Godot: Initiation into the Sacred Void' in Harold B (ed.) *Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot* Infobase Publishing, New York pp. 33-53.
- Butler, J.** (1999). *Gender Trouble; Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.
- Cambridge Dictionary** (2008). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Çamurdan, E.** (1994). *Tiyatroda Mekan, Uzam ve Öteki Terimler*, Tiyatro Dergisi, viewed 25.12.2013,
- Camus, A.** (1991). *The Myth of Sisyphus*, USA: Vintage Publishing.
- Çapan, C.** (1992) *Değişen Tiyatro*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Çapan, C.** (2014). *İrlanda Tiyatrosunda Gerçekçilik*, İstanbul: Yazın Basım Yayın.
- Carriere, J.F.** (2005). 'Samuel Beckett and Bilingualism: How the Return to English Influences the Later Writing Style and Gender Roles of All That Fall and Happy Days', Phd Thesis, Louisiana State University, United States of America.
- Çeber, D.** (2010). 'Analysis of the End of Game by Samuel Beckett through Semiotic Method' *Atatürk Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi Dergisi*. Issue 18, pp. 37.
- Cohn, R.** (1962). 'Plays and Player in the Plays of Samuel Beckett', *Yale French Studies*, no. 29, The New Dramatists, pp. 43-48.
- Cohn, R.** (1974). *Back to Beckett*, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Crabb, J.P.** (2006). *Theatre of the Absurd*, *Theatre Database*, viewed 20.01.2017, http://www.theatredatabase.com/20th_century/theatre_of_the_absurd.html.
- Danaher, G., Schirato, T. & Webb, J.** (2000). *Understanding Foucault*, St. Leonards N.S.W: Allen & Unwin.
- Davies, K.** (2004) 'Panopticon' *Encyclopedia of Prisons & Correctional Facilities*. Ed. Thousand O (ed.), pp. 664-67. SAGE Reference Online. viewed 17.01.2014, <http://www.sagepub.com/hanserintro/study/materials/reference/ref8.1.pdf>.
- Duckworth, C.** (2007). 'Re-Evaluating Endgame', in Mark SB (ed.) *Samuel Beckett's Endgame*, Rodopi, Newyork, pp. 23-49.
- Er, A.** (2015). 'An Iprovised Example in Traditional Turkish Theatre: Ortaoyunu', *Humanitas International Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 6 Special Issue, Autumn, pp. 115-134.

- Ergün, N.** (2015). ‘Çağdaş Türk Tiyatrosunda Samuel Beckett Etkisi: Güle Güle Godot ve Godot’ yu Beklemezken’, *Türkbilig Türkoloji Araştırmaları*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Vol. 29 Spring, pp. 161 – 190.
- Ersevım, İ.** (1968). *Uyumsuz (Absurd) Tiyatro*, Salve Regina College, Newport, viewed 12.03.2015, <http://www.ismailersevim.com.tr/?p=1830>.
- Ertekin, A.** (2009). ‘Ionesco Tiyatrosunda Uzamın Fantastik Yönü’, *Frankofoni*, Vol. 21, pp. 353 – 364.
- Esslin, M.** (1983). *The Theatre of the Absurd*, New York: Doubleday Company Inc.
- Esslin, M.** (1988). *The Field of Drama*, London: A&C Black Publishers Limited.
- Feder, E.K.** (2011). ‘Power / Knowledge’ in Taylor D (ed.), *Michel Foucault Key Concepts*, Acumen, Durham UK, pp. 55-68.
- Fontana, A. & Pasquino, P.** (1980). ‘Truth and Power’ in Colin Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*, Pantheon Books, New York pp. 109 – 133.
- Foucault, M.** (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on the Language*, Smith AMS, (translator), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M.** (1978). *History of Sexuality Volume I an Intruduction*, Hurley R (translator), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M.** (1981). ‘The Order of Discourse’, in Young R (ed.), *Untying the Text; A Post-Structuralist Reader*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, Boston, pp 51-78.
- Foucault, M.** (1986). ‘Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias’, Miskowiec J. (translator) in *Diacritics* Vol. 16, no 1, Spring, pp. 22–27, viewed 18.06.2014, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/464648>.
- Foucault, M.** (1988). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M.** (1990). ‘Chritical Theory/Intellectual Theory, interview with Gerard Raulet’ in Kritzman L. (ed.), *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, Routledge, New York, pp. 17-46.
- Foucault, M.** (1990). ‘Power and Sex, Interview with Bernard Henry Levy’ in Kritzman L (ed.), *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, Routledge, New York, pp. 110-125.
- Foucault, M.** (1991). *Remarks on Marx: Conversations with Duccio Trombadori*, Goldstain J & Cascaito J (translator), New York: Semiotext(e) Columbia University.
- Foucault, M.** (1995). *Discipline & Punish: Birth of Prison*, Sheridan, A (translator) New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M.** (2003). *The Birth of the Clinic*, London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M.** (2006). *History of Madness*, Murphy J & Khalfa J (translator), London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M.** (2007). ‘The Language of Space’, in Crampton J (ed.), [*Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*](#), Ashgate Publishing, USA, pp. 163-167.

- Frank, R.** (2002). 'The Concept of Time and Space in Beckett's Dramas Happy Days and Waiting for Godot', *Blesok*, Issue 25, Volume 5, March-April, viewed 24.12.2013 <http://www.blesok.com.mk/tekst.asp?lang=eng&tekst=402&str>.
- Gatewood, J.E.** (2007). 'Memory and Its Devices in Endgame', in Byron MS (ed.) *Samuel Beckett's Endgame*, Rodopi, Newyork pp 49-69.
- Graver, L.** (2004). *Beckett: Waiting for Godot*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Güçbilmez, B.** (2003). 'Absürd Tiyatroda İroni; The Irony of Absurd Theatre', *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, Tiyatro Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol.15.
- Hornby, R.** (2015). 'Theatre of the Absurd', *The Hudson Review*, Vol 67, Issue 4, Winter, pp 1-11, Viewed 28.05.2015, Online Research Reader: Questia Reader.
- Horrocks, C. & Jevtic, Z.** (2006). *Introducing Foucault*, USA: Totem Books.
<http://www.esencamurdan.com/makale-detay/tiyatroda-mekan,-uzam-ve-öteki-terimler/7>
- Hurriyet Newspaper**, (2006). *Kavuşun Yeni Sahibi Belli Oldu*, viewed 21.05.2016, <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/kavugun-yeni-sahibi-belli-oldu-40103194>.
- Hutchings, W.** (2005). *Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot: A Reference Guide*, Westport CT: Praeger.
- İpşiroğlu, Z.** (1996). *Uyumsuz Tiyatroda Gerçekçilik*, İstanbul: Mitos Boyut Yayıncılık.
- Johnson, P.** (2006). 'Unravelling Foucault's Different Spaces', *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 19, Issue 4, pp. 75-90, viewed 12.05.2014, <http://hhs.sagepub.com/content/19/4/75.full.pdf>.
- Jones, P.** (2015). Sartre's Concept of Freedom(s), *Sartre Studies International*, Vol. 21, Issue 2, pp. 85-133.
- Josipovici, G.** (2009). 'Letters from Beckett', *The Letters of Samuel Beckett, Volume One: 1929–1940*, viewed 30.09.2015, <http://www.samuelbeckett.net/TLSRevu.html>.
- Karayel, I.** (2010). 'Uzamı, Salt Mekan Anlamının Ötesine Taşıyan Bir Yazar: Beckett', *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Hakemli Dergisi*, Vol 3, No 5, viewed 12. 04. 2014, <http://edergi.sdu.edu.tr/index.php/gsfed/article/viewFile/1974/1827>.
- Kennedy, A.K.** (2004). *Samuel Beckett*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kocaman, Ş** (2007). 'Beklenen ve Uğurlanan Godot'lar üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Çalışması: Samuel Beckett / Godot'yu Beklerken, Ferhan Şensoy / Güle Güle Godot', *Çukurova University Sosyal Bilimle Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 429-444.
- Korkut, S.** (1943). *İrlanda Milli Tiyatrosunu Kuranlar ve Dramlarından Nümuneler*, Ankara: Çankaya Matbaası.
- Kudret, C.** (1994). *Ortaoyunu I*, İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi.

- Kundert-Gibbs J.L.** (1999). *No-Thing Is Left to Tell: Zen/Chaos Theory in the Dramatic Art of Samuel Beckett*, Madison NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Kurtulan, İ.** (1982). 'Ferhan Şensoy İle Söyleşi', *Edebiyat 81*, Vol.2, No. 14, pp. 59-60, Matbaa 81, İstanbul.
- L'edifice**, (2009). *Savoir et Connaissance; Sapere et Cognoscere*, viewed 21.01.2014 <http://www.ledifice.net/7007-2.html>.
- Lacey, C.** (1968). *Samuel Beckett's: Theatre of the Absurd*, Salve Regina College, Newport, viewed 12.03.2015, <http://www.ismailersevim.com.tr/?p=1830>.
- Leach, N.** (1999). *Architecture and Revolution*, London: Routledge.
- Leach, N.** (ed.) (1997). *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, NYC: Routledge, viewed 20.09.2014, <https://designpracticesandparadigms.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/leach-ed-rethinking-architecture.pdf>.
- Leitch V.B.** (ed.) (2001). *The Norton Anthology The Theory and Criticism*, USA: Norton & Company.
- Liukkonen, P.** (2008). *Samuel Beckett*, viewed 01.09.2015, <http://authorscalendar.info/beckett.htm>,
- Martinovitch, N.N.** (1933). *The Turkish Theatre Contributors*, New York: New York Theatre Arts.
- Mastin, L.** (2008). *The Basics of Philosophy, "Existentialism"*, viewed 05.05.2015, http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_existentialism.html.
- Mercier, V.** (1998). 'How to Read Endgame', in Andonian CC (ed.), *The Critical Response to Samuel Beckett*, Greenwood Press, Westport CT, pp. 114-117.
- Meyer-Dinkgrafe, D.** (ed.) (2002). *Who is Who in Contemporary World Theatre*, Routledge, London.
- Mihailovich D.V.** (1975). 'On the Contemporary Serbian Novel', *The International Fictional Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 18-26 viewed 24.05.2016, <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/IFR/search/search?simpleQuery=on+the+contemporary+serbian+novel&searchField=title>.
- Mills, S.** (2003). *Michel Foucault*, London: Routledge.
- Nutku, Ö.** (1985). *Dünya Tiyatrosu Tarihi 2: 19. Yüzyıldan- Günümüze Kadar*, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- O'nan, M.** (1979). 'Names in Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot' *Literary Onomastics Studies*, Vol. 6, Article 17, viewed 21.12.2016 <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/los/vol6/iss1/17>.
- Özbalak, T.** (2012). 'Leyla Erbil'de Samuel Beckett Etkisi', M.A. Thesis, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, Afyon.
- Özguven, A.** (1998). *Çağdaş Tiyatro'da Samuel Beckett'in Yeri*, İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1.

- Pekman, Y.** (2002). *Çağdaş Tiyatromuzda Geleneksellik*, İstanbul: Mitos & Boyut Yayınları.
- Perenic, U.** (2012). 'Space in Literature and Literature in Space', *Slavisticna Revija*, Vol. 3, Issue 60, July – September, pp. 265 - 270, viewed 24.12.2012 http://www.srl.si/sql_pdf/SRL_2012_3_02.pdf.
- Rabinow, P.** (1984). *The Foucault Reader*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Radford, G., Radford, M.L. & Lingel, J.** (2015). 'The Library as Heterotopia: Michel Foucault and the Experience of Library Space', *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 71, Issue: 4, pp. 733-751 viewed 21.01.2017, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1690994674/fulltextPDF/774074AC72A34C40PQ/4?accountid=7181>.
- Rahimipoor, S., Edoyan, H. & Hashemi, M.** (2011). 'Self Revelation in Samuel Beckett's Language', *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 28, pp 820-824, viewed 29.10.2015, <http://ac.els-cdn.com>.
- Robinson, M.** (1969). *The Long Sonata of the Dead: A Study of Samuel Beckett* New York: Grove Press Inc.
- Rouse, J** (2005). *Power/Knowledge*, Wesleyan University, viewed 25.04.2014, <https://wesfiles.wesleyan.edu/home/jrouse/PowerKnowledge.pdf>
- Sağlam, T.** (2007). 'Transformation of Space from Ibsen to Beckett', *Tiyatro Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Issue 23, pp. 53 - 62
- Sartre, J.P.** (1966). *Existentialism and Humanism*, Mairet P (translator), London: Methuen & Co.
- Sartre, J.P.** (1972). *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*, London: Methuen & Co.
- Scott, J.** (1990). *Domination and the Arts of Resistance; Hidden Transcripts*, USA: Yale University Press.
- Seisun, C.** (2004). 'Space Power Foucault', *Architecture Insights*, viewed 24.12.2013, http://architectureinsights.com.au/media/uploads/resources/space_power_architecture_a4.pdf.
- Şener, S.** (1991). *Dünden Bugüne Tiyatro Düşüncesi*, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No: 468, Devlet Konservatuvarı Yayınları No:3.
- Şensoy, F.** (1988). *Şahları da Vururlar*, İstanbul: Ortaoyuncular Sanat Gösterileri ve Yayıncılık A.Ş.
- Şensoy, F.** (1996) *Oteller Kitabı*, İstanbul: Ortaoyuncular Sanat Gösterileri ve Yayıncılık A.Ş.
- Şensoy, F.** (1996). *Güle Güle Godot*, İstanbul: Ortaoyuncular Sanat Gösterileri ve Yayıncılık A.Ş.
- Şensoy, F.** (2014). *FerhAntoloji*, İstanbul: Bilgi Yayıncılık.
- Shainberg, L.** (1987). 'Exorcising Beckett', *The Paris Review*, No. 104, Fall, viewed 08.09.2015, <http://www.samuel-beckett.net/ShainExor1.html>.

- Shakespeare, W.** (2003). *Hamlet*, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Shalgin, A.** (2014). 'Time, Waiting and Entrapment in Samuel Beckett', *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 4, No 9(1), July, pp. 101 – 117.
- Smart, B.** (2002). *Michel Foucault*, London: Routledge.
- Swanson, V.** (2011). 'Confining, Incapacitating, and Partitioning the Body: Carcerality and Surveillance in Samuel Beckett's Endgame, Happy Days and Play', *Miranda (Online)*, 4/201, viewed 25.01.2017, <http://miranda.revues.org/1872>
- Tan, T.** (2007). 'Existentialism and Samuel Beckett's Two Plays: End Game and Happy Days', M.A. Dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Taylor, D.** (ed.). (2011). *Michel Foucault Key Concepts*, Acumen, Durham UK.
- Tezcan, S.Z.** (2010). 'Samuel Beckett'in Godot'u Beklerken, Oyun Sonu, Mutlu Günler ve Krapp'in Son Bandı Adlı Oyunlarında Zaman Kavramının İşleyişi', M.A. Dissertation, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Timur, T.** (2005). *Felsefi İzlenimler-Sartre, Althusser, Foucault, Derrida*, İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.
- Tompkins, J.** (2014). *Theatre's Heterotopias: Performance and the Cultural Politics of Space*, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Türkyılmaz, Ü.** (2009). 'Beckett'in Mutlu Günler Oyunu Üzerine Bir İnceleme' *Gazi Üniversitesi Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, Vol. 3, No. 5, Winter, pp. 195-206. Viewed 20. 12. 2015, <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/gav/article/viewFile/5000142032/5000129838>
- Wellwarth E.G.** (1965). *The Theatre of Protest and Paradox: Developments in the Avant-garde Drama*, London: Macc Gibbon and Kee.
- Withanage, I.H.** (2011). 'Waiting for Nothing; an Analysis of "Waiting for Godot" by Samuel Beckett', B.A. Thesis, University of Island.
- Wood, D.M.** (2007). 'Beyond the Panopticon? Foucault and Surveillance Studies', in Crampton J (ed.), *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, Ashgate Publishing, USA, pp. 245-265.
- Worton, M.** (2008). 'Waiting for Godot and End Game: Theatre as Text', in Bloom H (ed.) *Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot*, Infobase Publishing, New York, pp. 71-93.
- Yıldız, T.** (2009). 'Varoluşçu ve Absürd Tiyatro', M.A Thesis, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İleri Oyunculuk Programı, İstanbul.
- Yu, Y.** (2014). 'A study of Power Relation in Pinter's plays from Foucault's power View', *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 4, No. 9.
- Yüksel, A.** (1988). *Ferhangi Şeyler'deki Ferhan Şensoy*, Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 10.10.1988.
- Yüksel, A.** (1996). *Ferhangi Şeylerin Eniştesi Felek Bir Gün Salakken*, Cumhuriyet Newspaper, 24.07.1996.
- Yüksel, A.** (2006). *Samuel Beckett Tiyatrosu*, İstanbul: Dünya Yayıncılık.

Zhu, J. (2013). 'Analysis on the Artistic Features and Themes of the Theater of the Absurd' *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 8, August, pp. 1462-1466.



RESUME

Instructor İ. Murat GÖLGELİ



E-Mail: imgolgel@anadolu.edu.tr

Contact Details

Office Address : Anadolu University Yunus Emre Campus Education
Faculty English Language Teaching Department
Office Telephone : +90 (222) 335 0580 / 3493

Education

1998 – 2006 : Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences,
English Language Teaching Program, MA, Eskişehir.
1996 – 1997 : Gazi University, Faculty of Education, Pedagogical
Formation Certificate Classes, Ankara.
1993 – 1996 : Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department
of American Culture and Literature, BA, Ankara

Master Dissertation

The Views of EFL Students towards Literature in English Language Teaching
Department

Administrative Duties

2015 - : Research Centre for Applied Studies on Turks Abroad
Board Membership.
2014 - : Education Faculty, Social and Cultural Activities
Coordinator

2014 -	: Anadolu University, Education Faculty, Mevlana Student Exchange Program Coordinator Assistant
2013 -	: Anadolu University, English/ American Literature, E-Book Coordinator Assistant
2013 – 2015	: Eco-C European Community Communication Program Board Membership
2006 – 2015	: Education Faculty, Library Coordinator.

National and International Projects

2014	: Eco-C European Community Communication Project Seminar, European Community Communication Specialist Certificate, Vienna, Austria, 05 - 08 February.
2013	: Community Services and Social Responsibility Projects Workshop, Hacettepe University, Presentation, 30 November-01 December.

Erasmus Staff Exchange

2014	: Greek Mythology and Intercultural Communication, English Culture, Visiting Lecturer, Vechta University, Vechta, Germany.
2013	: Legends in Greek Mythology and Today, English Culture, Visiting Lecturer, Kielce University, Kielce, Poland.
2012	: Greek Mythology and Advertisement, Visiting Lecturer, Tampere University, Tampere, Finland.
2010	: English and Turkish Culture Differences, Visiting Lecturer, Granada University, Granada, Spain.
2007	: Short Story Analysis, The Cask of Amontillado, Edgar Allan Poe and English Culture, Pardubice University, Pardubice, Czech Republic.

Seminars

- 1) Eco-C European Community Body Language and Communication Seminar, Speaker, Çukurova University, Education Faculty, Adana, 17 September 2014
- 2) Eco-C European Community Body Language and Communication Seminar, Speaker, Gaziantep University, School of Foreign Languages, Gaziantep, 15 September 2014
- 3) Eco-C European Community Body Language and Communication Seminar, Atayurt Schools, Speaker, Eskişehir.

- 4) Interpersonal Communication and Aikido Seminar, Speaker, Haselstauden Mittelschule, Dornbirn, Austria, 12-13 June 2014.

Papers Submitted to International Meetings

- 1) Golgeli, M. (2016). "English and Demotivating Factors", International Teacher Education Conference (ITEC), February 4-6, Dubai, UAE., 05/02/2016
- 2) Golgeli, M. (2015). Panoptic Gaze in "Waiting for Godot" International Institute of Social and Economic Sciences, April 14-17, Rome, Italy., 14/04/2015
- 3) Golgeli, M.(2012) Shakespeare, Culture, Universality", The world of Shakespeare, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, October 10-12, Tbilisi, Georgia., 2012
- 4) Golgeli, M (2009).Factors Affecting the Views of EFL Teacher Candidates towards Novel Analysis Courses in an English Language Teacher Education Department. The Asian Conference on Education (ACE 2009), October 23-24.Osaka, Japan, 23/10/2009
- 5) Golgeli, M. (2006).The Feelings Of EFL Students Towards Literature in English Language Teaching Department. The CLaSIC 2006: Processes and Process-Oriented in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning, December 7-9, Singapore., 08/12/2006
- 6) Golgeli, M. (2007) Possible Factors That Affect EFL Students' Feelings Towards Literature Classes. International Society for Language Studies. 02-04 April 2007. Honolulu-Hawaii
- 7) Golgeli, M. (2007). Have We Ever Asked Students? 2nd International Conference on Language, Education and Diversity (LED 2007), November 21-24, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Published National Books and Book Parts

- 1) Golgeli, M. (2013) "Analysis of An Inspector Calls III" Unit 7. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı II, 101-115. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:3020, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1972
- 2) Golgeli, M. (2013) "Analysis of An Inspector Calls II" Unit 6. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı II, 87-101. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:3020, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1972
- 3) Golgeli, M. (2013) "Analysis of An Inspector Calls I" Unit 5. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı II, 71-87. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:3020, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1972
- 4) Golgeli, M. (2013) "Analysis of Heart of Darkness III" Unit 3. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı II, 33-47. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:3020, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1972
- 5) Golgeli, M. (2013) "Analysis of Heart of Darkness II" Unit 2. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı II, 17-33. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:3020, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1972

- 6) Golgeli, M. (2013) "Analysis of Heart of Darkness I" Unit 1. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı II, 1-17. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:3020, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1972
- 7) Golgeli, M. (2012) "Analysis of Like a Winding Sheet" Unit 6. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı I, 89-103. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2710, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1673
- 8) Golgeli, M. (2012) "Analysis of The Legacy" Unit 3. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı I, 35-51. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2710, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1673
- 9) Golgeli, M. (2012) "Short Story as a Genre" Unit I. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı I, 1-17. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2710, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1673
- 10) Golgeli, M.(2010) "Analysis of Lord of the Flies" Unit 10. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 97-115. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132
- 11) Golgeli, M.(2010) "Analysis of Lord of the Flies II" Unit 9. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 83-97. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132
- 12) Golgeli, M.(2010) "Analysis of Lord of the Flies I" Unit 8. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 75-83. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132
- 13) Golgeli, M.(2010) "Analysis of Shock Tactics & The Humorous Story" Unit 5. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 43-51. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132
- 14) Golgeli, M.(2010) "Analysis of The Rivals & The Ghost Story" Unit 3. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 25-33. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132
- 15) Golgeli, M.(2010) "Analysis of The Marble Hands & The Horror Story" Unit 2. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 17-25. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132
- 16) Golgeli, M. (2010) "Short Story" Unit I. İngiliz/Amerikan Edebiyatı, 1-17. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No:2102, Açık Öğretim Fakültesi Yayınları No: 1132

Artistic Activities

- 1) Anadolu University Faculty of Education, Chamber Theatre, Komik Para, Director, Actor, 2016
- 2) Anadolu University Faculty of Education, Chamber Theatre, Karmakarışık, 2015
- 3) Anadolu University Faculty of Education, Chamber Theatre, Kaç Baba Kaç, Director, 2009
- 4) Anadolu University Faculty of Education Chamber Theatre , Kaç Baba Kaç, Director, 2008

- 5) Anadolu University Faculty of Education Chamber Theatre, Canavar Sofrası, Art Consultant, 2007
- 6) Anadolu University Faculty of Education Chamber Theater, Ay Işığında Şamata, Actor and Director, 2005
- 7) Atılım University, Theatre Group, Founder, Lysistrata, Updated, Actor and Director, 1996
- 8) Ankara Halk Oyuncuları, AHOT, Haymatlos Nasıl Yapılır, Actor, 1994
- 9) Cumhuriyet University Theatre Group, Bir Şeyler Yap Met, Actor, Sivas, 1992

Achievement and Awards

- 1) Aikikai Aikido Federation Dan Diploma, Japan, 2013
- 2) Pilot Binbaşı Ali Tekin İlk Öğretim Okulu, Community Services, Presented a Plaque, 2011
- 3) Kaç Baba Kaç, Director, Akdeniz University Certificate of Appreciation and Participation, 2009
- 4) Ay Işığında Şamata, Actor, Director, Bar Association, Presented a Plaque, 2005