

**AS WE STILL WAIT FOR GODOT,
FERHAN SENSOY HAS ALREADY BID HIM FAREWELL**

For all men live by truth and stand in need of expression. In love, in art, in avarice, in politics, in labor, in games, we study to utter our painful secret. The man is only half himself, the other half is his expression.

Ralph Waldo Emerson (qtd. in Adler i)

This hope in humans, to complete their missing half and to achieve a satisfactory means of mutual exchange of ‘expression’ with other fellow beings, pushes them towards creation. However, as Borges indicates, there is nothing new under the sun. How then, is the need for creation and expression fulfilled? The Theatre of the Absurd expresses this despair and disillusionment and suggests that there is no meaning, purpose or progress in contemporary life. This is the dilemma of the absurdists to believe in a meaningless, illogical world, and to still futilely struggle to express themselves through writing in order to be a part of this nothingness, purposelessness. If they had lost all hope they would not have risked their art to dissolve in the so-called ‘disillusionment’ of contemporary life. Samuel Beckett questions this meaninglessness, he wanted not to preach hopelessness but to awake and shake his audience so that they would not raise their expectations and hopes and encounter the unavoidable disillusionment. *Waiting for Godot* is still an enigma for many world audiences. For some audiences, Godot represents God, or the hope that never came. However, Beckett indicated that he did not know himself who Godot was; “If [he] knew, [he] would have said so in the play” (Mordden 293).

In contrast to this existentialist interpretation of Beckett, Ferhan Sensoy chooses to resolve this unavoidable disillusionment of waiting for Godot by provoking the people to revolt against the unjust governing of Godot. Sensoy's Godot is not God or hope, but rather the political rulers who limit democracy and govern poorly. I believe that Sensoy has not only re-invented Beckett's *Waiting For Godot*, but he has also re-interpreted the usage of absurd techniques to emphasize his aims. Beckett's 'absurdity' of waiting, had become quite 'normal' when it was adapted by Ferhan Sensoy to the waiting process in the Turkish political context and applied to the situation of the contemporary Turkish society.

This paper will analyze the aspects of absurdism in Ferhan Sensoy's *Gule Gule Godot* in the light of the play it was inspired from, Samuel Beckett's *Waiting For Godot*. After defining the absurd, as it will be used in this research, the experimental forms used in *Waiting For Godot* will be analyzed to underline the definition of the "absurd" and later this definition will be comparatively applied to *Gule Gule Godot* in order to partially reveal the perception and the adaptation of the 'absurd' on the Turkish stage. The main aim of this study is to inspect whether or not the experimentation with the 'absurd' is re-interpreted and re-enacted as to suggest a similar meaning as on the European stage or has been re-invented in order for it to infer another level of meaning for the Turkish stage.

Albert Camus defined the feeling of absurdity in his essay, "The Myth of Sisyphus" (1943). He wrote:

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 his life . . . is properly the feeling of absurdity. (qtd. in Brockett 547)

However, Martin Esslin coined the term of the Theatre of the Absurd in 1961 to describe the specific approaches repeated in the plays of Samuel Beckett, Arthur Adamov, Eugene Ionesco and Jean Genet. Esslin explained that the convention of the Absurd sprang from a “feeling of deep illusionment, the draining away of the sense of meaning and purpose in life” (311) which was the characteristic of countries like France and Britain in the years after the Second World War. The evolvement of the absurd thought was a result of the Nazi genocide, the brutality of the atomic bomb and the nuclear threat of the Cold War. These events led to the questioning of the validity of the human reason and logic. This anxiety and doubt led to the emergence of the Theatre of the Absurd where “man’s plight in this world of uncertainty” (Brockett 547) was dramatized.

Esslin pointed out that the absurdists were not the first to comprehend this illogicality of life however, they were the “first to depict it in a bizarrely illogical style” (Mordden 17). This illogic found in the absurd plays parallels its dictionary meaning. In Webster’s Dictionary the definition of ‘absurd’ is given as “so clearly untrue or unreasonable as to be laughable or ridiculous” (6). However, there is a deeper understanding that creates the absurd. Martin Esslin describes this understanding of the absurd writers as:

Theatre of the absurd strives to express its sense of the senselessness of the human condition and the inadequacy of the rational approach by the open abandonment of rational devices and discursive thought . . . The Theatre of the Absurd goes a step further in trying to achieve a unity between its basic assumptions and the form in which these are expressed. (Esslin 24)

However, absurdism was not a genre or a movement as critic and translator Maurice Valency indicated, it was rather “a collection of experimental forms” (Mordden 17). Therefore, the unity Martin Esslin assumes to exist between the absurd playwrights is the result of their

experimentation with theatrical forms, rather than a unified belief of the absurd. Eugene Ionesco defines the term 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” (qtd in Esslin, 23). Therefore, the practitioners of the Theatre of the Absurd have redefined the common usage of the word ‘absurd’ in English, which is to be ‘ridiculous’. The representation of man in the ‘senseless and illogical’ world creates the emphasis required to comprehend the meaning of the absurd as used by these writers.

The common elements of absurdism in the plays of Genet, Ionesco, Adamov and Beckett can be seen in the dialogues, setting, action and over all in the means of thematic representation. This meaninglessness of life is very frequently reflected in the dialogues of the plays that can be inferred as absurd. As Jak Deleon states, “It is not the words themselves that are important, but the context in which they are used” (2). The context creates the meanings implied through the meaningless dialogues.

The stage design is another important factor that reveals the aims of the absurd playwright. Beckett usually works in “an almost-bare stage, a barren landscape with, perhaps, a tree or a rock” (Deleon 2). The minimal and meaningless usage of language as well as the barren stage is used to depict the purposeless existence led by humans who are trapped in the fixed norms of their society. The possibility of a coherent, comprehensible and meaningful communication is impossible, since language is dead according to the absurdists. Furthermore, the repetition of real life experience has pushed the absurdist playwright to abandon “traditional patterns of cause-to-effect arrangement of incidents; rather than developing an action linearly, they show its circularity; they explore the texture of a condition rather than tell a connected story” (Brockett 547). The action and situation in the absurd plays are not resolved. Time and

place are usually cut off from the general world to suggest the universal aspects of the play. The dramatic forms of comedy and tragedy often combine in these plays where the “serious often becomes the grotesque and the comic ominous and near-tragic” (Brockett 548). The uniting theme of all the absurd plays can be found in the unknowable truth and irrational life as well as in their perception of the human “entrapment in an illogical, impersonal, and indifferent existence” (Brockett 548). As Martin Esslin indicates, the “Theatre of the Absurd is intent on making its audience aware of man’s precarious and mysterious position in the universe” (Esslin 402). To summarize all these points, Carol Altieri in her essay “The American Dream and Experience in Literature” lists the conventions of the Absurdists as:

- 1) Meaningless or empty conversation and manners.
- 2) An expression of absurdity, uncertainty and futility.
- 3) Strong sense of irony and satire.
- 4) Disparate or inconsistent action and many symbolic objects.
- 5) Caricatured or stereotyped characters that personify certain ideas.

It would be useful to analyze these points in both *Waiting for Godot* and later in *Gule Gule Godot* to evaluate the understanding of the absurd in both writers’ contexts. Samuel Beckett’s play has a very simple dramatic sequence. In front of a country road and a dead, dry tree, in the time of evening, the audience meets Estragon trying to take off one of his boots without success and indicates that there is “Nothing to be done” (Beckett 7). Vladimir comes on the stage and agrees with Estragon’s statement by stating that he too was “beginning to come round to that opinion [that there is nothing to be done]” (Beckett 7). However, it is not clear what Vladimir is talking about, and right in the beginning an expression of meaninglessness and emptiness is emphasized. A meaningful contact in this meaningless universe is impossible to

achieve according to the absurdists, and Carol Altieri's first convention of an absurd play - its expression of the meaninglessness and emptiness in conversation - is fulfilled right at the beginning of the play.

In the progress of the play, as if Vladimir and Estragon have been separate from each other for a very long time, they are very glad to see each other and Vladimir tells him that they should celebrate their reunion. However, then the reader understands that they have been only separate for one night and Estragon has been beaten up by what seems to be the same people, once again. The uncertainty of their dialogue and actions persist until the reader finally learns from Vladimir that they are waiting for Godot. Their action of waiting still does not create a certainty since they neither know who Godot is, what he looks like, nor whether they have come to the right place or at the right time. Vladimir emphasizes the uncertainty of their situation as he indicates that nothing is certain when he is with Estragon. They are not even sure what day it is, nor whether they were there the day before or not. Vladimir wakes Estragon up from his sleep stating that he felt lonely; however, he does not want to know about Estragon's dream. As they talk about going on their separate ways, they embrace and later decide to hang themselves, but achieve no success. This part and the ending of the play where Godot never arrives, gives a deep sense of the absurdity, uncertainty and the futility that Altieri has listed as a convention of the absurd plays.

Later on the reader meets with Pozzo and Lucky. However unsure the reader is of the identity of Pozzo, it is clear that he is a caricature or a stereotype of a landowner or an employer whom treats his employees like animals as he treats Lucky as his servant and his horse. The introduction of Pozzo and Lucky into the play is a means to criticize the capitalistic system where the tyrants overrule the servants unjustly. Pozzo's representation as the ruling force and

Lucky's presentation as the working force coincides with Altieri's fifth characteristic of the absurd which is to present caricatures or stereotypes that personify certain ideas.

Towards the end of the first scene, a boy comes to the stage to inform Vladimir and Estragon that Mr. Godot will not be able to make it. At this point, Vladimir asks the boy whether or not he was the boy who came yesterday; but the boy indicates that it is his first time Mr. Godot has employed him with such work, and that it is the first time he meets Vladimir. This dialogue, as with many others, is repeated in the second act. When the first act is over, Vladimir and Estragon decide to leave but, as it is written in the stage descriptions, "they do not move" (Beckett 36).

The second act is pretty much similar to the first act with some differences. The first difference is that the dead tree now has a few leaves on it, which suggest the passing of time. However, from Vladimir's dialogue, it can be inferred that this scene should actually be taking place the next day of the first act. Estragon seems to have forgotten everything that has taken place in the first act, and Vladimir tries to remind Estragon of the previous day, or the first act in this sense. Estragon just cannot remember, and the audience, who still has a memory of the first act, assumes that, similar to a linear dramatic play, the second act should follow after the first. Beckett satirizes this expectation of the audience by placing the blossomed tree, which gives the impression that a longer period of time has passed, opposed to Vladimir, who insists that it is the next day. A willing suspension of disbelief is not Beckett's expectation from his audience.

The second difference in this scene is that Pozzo is blind and Lucky is dumb. Pozzo is not as strong as he seemed to be in the first act. Just like in the first act, the boy comes to tell them that Mr. Godot will not be able to come today, but he will come tomorrow. Vladimir takes

the words from the boy's mouth since they had had the exact same conversation the day before according to Vladimir, but the boy has no memory of the event and is unable to recognize him. As the boy leaves, Vladimir and Estragon once again decide to commit suicide but the rope breaks and they decide to hang themselves on the following day unless Godot comes. They indicate that if Godot comes, they will be saved. In the very similar way the first act had ended, they decide to go, but "they do not move" (Beckett 61). As mentioned before, the list of conventions of the absurds can be seen in *Waiting for Godot*. The uncertainty and the meaningless, which is repeatedly emphasized in the play leaves the reader not with a certain understanding, but with a general conviction of futility. Martin Esslin indicated that:

In *Waiting for Godot*, the feeling of uncertainty it produces, the ebb and flow of this uncertainty - from the hope of discovering the identity of Godot to its repeated disappointment - are themselves the essence of the play. Any endeavor to arrive at a clear and certain interpretation by establishing the identity of Godot through critical analysis would be as foolish as trying to discover the clear outlines hidden behind chiaroscuro of a painting by Rembrandt by scraping away the paint. (Esslin 45)

Due to the 'futility' of reaching a certain interpretation of the play, it will be much wiser to analyze Ferhan Sensoy's *Gule Gule Godot* in the same way so as to discuss the differences in the approaches of the two writers towards the absurd.

Ferhan Sensoy's *Gule Gule Godot* opens with a military march where Godot's men inform Kavuklu and Kavuksuz that Godot would be coming tonight as usual. This first action in the play discloses the political aspects of *Gule Gule Godot* where Godot is the military power that is controlling the country. Carol Altieri's caricatured or stereotyped characters that personify certain ideas or even institutions in this case is much more evident in Sensoy's play. The character of Itoluit presents those government officials who would flatter and butter up

every powerful figure for their own benefits. Itoluit stands for those utilitarian and pragmatic people; this is also signified in his name, which is a slang in Turkish and which could be translated as a 'vile man'. The three Godotgiller (-giller is a suffix to suggest those who belong to Godot's ancestry) stand for those who work and conduct illegal actions if necessary for the power, ruling a country. Kavuklu¹ and Kavuksuz present two figures who are unable to conform to the system and therefore, stand as outsiders. After a meaningless dialogue between Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, they start singing a song called 'We are waiting for Godot to go'.

Uyduk Beckett'e
Bekledik onu
Gelmedi Godot
Godot gelmedi
Sorduk Beckett'e
Kim lan bu Godot
Samuel Beckett suskunlugunu korudu
Susunca hakli cikiyor insan
Bir bok denizindeydik
Umuttu Godot
Godot'ydu moda!¹
(Sensoy 7)

Sensoy's intertextuality of Beckett and *Waiting for Godot* reveals the postmodern aspect of *Gule Gule Godot*. The songs in the play give information about the past events, the present situation or clearly give a moral to the audience. After this song, the audience is informed that they are waiting in guard for Godot, for this reason, they cannot leave. In Beckett, the identity of Godot was not revealed. Vladimir and Estragon were waiting futilely for Godot to arrive. In Sensoy, Godot is portrayed as an unjust governing power that never comes physically but can be heard through the wooden door with the golden handle. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz wait on guard for Godot, but the audience never comprehends why they are waiting for Godot because,

¹ Kavuklu is a type in traditional Turkish theatre called Ortaoyunu close to a figure like Laurel in Laurel and Hardy. His name suggests a man with a hat while Kavuksuz means a man without a hat.

actually they are hoping that Godot would leave. This disparate or inconsistent action emphasizes the usage of the conventions Altieri has listed for the absurdists.

The beginning of the play reveals another aspect that the play criticizes; the east and west dichotomy. Kavuksuz asks, "Doguda miyiz? Batıda mı? Neyin doğusu? Bu doğunun yosunlu dibini batı değil mi? Yakın mıyiz? Irak mıyiz bilemiyoruz ki!"ⁱⁱ (Sensoy 8-9). In addition to this dichotomy about the position of Turkey within the world context, when Kavuklu states that "Yani artık bir bütünü birbirini tamamlayan parçaları değiliz"ⁱⁱⁱ (Sensoy 14), the dichotomy between the east and west, which is experienced within Turkey, is also emphasized. It is clear that Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, who represent the citizens of Turkey are unable to form a whole. Their fights among each other also highlight this dissolution among the Turkish citizens. However, even though Kavuklu and Kavuksuz constantly fight, they cannot separate from each other. This aspect of their relationship gives a hope to the endurance of the existence of their togetherness and unity, therefore emphasizing hope for unity. This could also be true for Vladimir and Estragon, whose togetherness unfortunately does not bring Godot but, delays their termination since, neither Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, nor Vladimir and Estragon can function or endure without the other. Although both plays end abruptly, the spectator is left with the perception that the couples in both plays would stay together and persist waiting futilely for someone or something. For this reason, both plays contain the uncertainty as well as the absurdity of living.

To continue with *Gule Gule Godot*, as Ferhat, Dolunay and Cicek enter the stage singing the song of 'The Machines became Faster', the audience is informed that there is a water shortage in the country. Furthermore, the song stands as a warning to the industrial workers; the machine is a guillotine and you might get your arm or your fingers cut off, accidentally. The

next part starts with a discussion that parodies the situation of the general Turkish public who do not revolt although they are frustrated with everything. This leads to the discussion between Kavuklu, Ferhat, Kavuksuz, Dolunay and Çiçek where, all at the same time, they comment on the daily problems, but are unable to reach a solution for they do not even listen to each other. Ferhat, Dolunay and Çiçek ask Kavuklu and Kavuksuz to join them in their search for water, but Kavuklu and Kavuksuz reject them, rudely mentioning that they are waiting for Godot. In the meantime, the three Godotgiller spy on this conversation, as if they are the secret agents of Godot.

Here we also meet Toprak, who is pregnant and very thirsty. Ferhat carries her on a hand carriage, but he is unable to find water for her². The Godotgiller do not let Ferhat have any of the figs that are hanging freely on a tree to give to Toprak. This ironically reflects the way that government-related people have divided among themselves the riches that this country offers freely to its inhabitants. Then Itoluit enters to give a long propaganda speech about the way that the bees work to death, in order to serve their queens. In this satire of a government official's public speech, Itoluit tries to persuade the citizens to work like these bees and not complain about the shortage of water or the usual lack of necessary things that one needs to continue working and living. Dolunay asks Itoluit when the bees sting, this question is actually an allusion to the revolt of citizens, and Itoluit tries to threaten them by saying that if the bees sting another, they also die themselves. Then Kavuksuz asks about wasps, and Itoluit replies by saying that the wasps are a disgrace to the bee kind and they are a small bunch, which will be terminated soon. This dialogue satirizes the way the government silences the groups or individuals who try to revolt, and how they threaten the others to conform to their ideas and

² Coincidentally during the writing of this play, Turkey had a water shortage.

ways of governing. Itoluit finishes his speech and the Godotgiller applaud him wildly, again symbolizing their hypocrisy.

After this Toprak and Ferhat announce that they are on strike, and they demand to have water. Itoluit indicates that they are doing everything they can and that they are expecting rain soon, so that they should be patient. However, Toprak states that the past four generations have been patient, and the baby she is carrying is the fifth generation whom is asked to be patient. As Itoluit understands that the strike is really something serious, in order to change the subject he announces that Godot has allowed them to form parties to become a part of the democratic system. This step is actually the government's way to silence the strikes by giving them something else instead of the thing they really need. In Sensoy, the strong sense of irony and satire Carol Altieri has coined for the absurd plays can be sensed in almost every sentence.

As they try to establish a new party, the citizens think about whom to pick as the president of this party. At this point a wooden door with a golden handle come down from the ceiling. This door stands for Godot's house and Godot speaks behind the door saying that he is not home, when they knock on his door. When they knock again with more determination, and demand water from him, Godot, once again behind the door, tells them to pick a courageous young man to go to Bindiken Mountain to drill the water from the mountain. Kavuksuz asks why there must be only one person going to the mountain, and Godot states that more than one person traveling together would be regarded as an illegal public demonstration. Ferhat volunteers to go to Bindiken mountain, where he will have to first fight the Red Headed Pink Monster, which is an allusion to Turkish epics, and then Ferhat will have to drill the mountain for water. When Kavuklu and Kavuksuz do not see Ferhat's fire in the mountaintop, which would suggest that he had achieved to survive the monster, they lose hope and think about

leaving, but they do not move. Then they decide to hang themselves. Very similar to *Waiting for Godot*, Kavuksuz takes the rope, which holds his pants up, so as soon as he unties the rope, his pants fall down. In addition to this, they do not have the tree that Vladimir and Estragon had, so when the rope is too short for them, Kavuksuz says that they could hang Kavuklu to his feet and in return, Kavuklu asks whose feet they would hang Kavuksuz on. As they leave the stage disappointed, Itoluit and the three Godotgiller enter the stage to meet Godot. They discuss that there will be a big demonstration the next day and Godot's voice tells them not to bother him with such nonsense. Itoluit and the Godotgiller escape the country, as the public demonstration starts. The demonstration is another satire of the demonstrations in Turkey where people play music and dance as they hold posters that protest whatever they are revolting against.

Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are about to leave as the citizens tell them that they should stay and fight, and the person who should be leaving is, in fact, Godot himself. Still determined to leave, Kavuklu, Kavuksuz and Leke meet Itoluit on their way and are informed that Godot has run away, leaving the country without a government. Kavuklu and Kavuksuz no longer need to escape the country, so they stay. In the next scene everyone is gathered together, celebrating Godot's departure. However, as soon as they try to determine a new person to take Godot's place, they almost wish that Godot had not left, since it is hard to choose a new leader. Leke speaks meaningless sentences, and Bokko applauds. Bokko is a satire of those citizens who chose governments without having any idea what they propose for the benefit of the country. At this point, Godotgiller enter the stage stating that they would be taking charge since they are the only remaining government officials who know how to manage the country. Right after this, Itoluit enters stating that he was always on the citizen's side, and now he had written down a

very just constitution. However, the citizens bid them farewell rudely, and they are banished. At the end of the play, Kavuklu and Kavuksuz are still discussing whether to leave in separate directions or not, and Ferhat enters all wet, stating that mountains can also be drilled. However, Kavuklu indicates that he is too late and that the play has ended.

Ferhan Sensoy's *Gule Gule Godot* has re-written Samuel Beckett's play in order to emphasize not the process of hoping and waiting for Godot's arrival but, the process of hoping and waiting for Godot to leave. The play is a political satire concerning the military intervention in Turkey during the eighties. Sensoy has satirized the government officials, the public understanding of democracy, and the dichotomy of the east versus the west, especially in Turkey. At the end of the play, when Ferhat, who seems to symbolize legendary Turkish heroes, comes to announce that he was able to accomplish the impossible and drill the mountain to bring in water, Kavuklu's reply seems to abandon the hope brought in by Ferhat. It is too late for the arrival of any hope; the futility of living, especially in Turkey, is re-emphasized at the end. However, Godot has left and the country has achieved democracy at the end, but the last act, brings back the meaningless dialogues between Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, who, still determined to leave, instead carry on a meaningless conversation as they look into the contents of their handbags.

Kavuklu: Bana hic yalan soyledin mi?
Kavuksuz: Niye?
Kavuklu: Ne niye?
Kavuksuz: Nasil?
Kavuklu: Gayet tabii!
Kavuksuz: Sen bana hic yalan soyledin mi?
Kavuklu: Neyi?
Kavuksuz: Ne neyi?
Kavuklu: Nasil?
Both together: Gayet tabii! Aptal herif!^{iv}
(Sensoy 82)

After this Kavuksuz asks about the bra he has found in Kavuklus' handbag and Kavuklu reveals that he went and bought it from the store. In reality Kavuklu does not know a woman who wore this bra. As they discuss leaving on separate directions, Ferhat comes in with the hopeful news, and Kavuklu and Kavuksuz once again cannot leave neither the city nor each other. The play finishes with this uncertainty: what the new democracy would bring to the country, what happened to the water problem, whether or not Kavuklu and Kavuksuz leave each other is not explained at the end of the play. However, in contrast to *Waiting for Godot* where Godot never comes, in *Gule Gule Godot*, Godot, who has arrived, has been insensible and unjust to those who have been waiting for him. Godot in *Gule Gule Godot* leaves as hoped for and democracy is brought to the country. The result of this democracy is not explained, but the first step towards hope is taken, although its future is still ambiguous.

In *Waiting for Godot*, there is no action taken to obtain this hope, Ferhan Sensoy reshapes the absurd technique where action is taken but the end results are vague. Martin Esslin states that:

It is true that basically the Theatre of the Absurd attacks the comfortable certainties of religious or political orthodoxy. It aims to shock its audience out of complacency, to bring it face to face with the harsh facts of the human situation as these writers see it. But the challenge behind this message is anything but one of despair. It is a challenge to accept the human condition as it is, in all its mystery and absurdity, and to bear it with dignity, nobly, responsibly; precisely because there are no easy solutions to the mysteries of existence, because ultimately man is alone in a meaningless world. The shedding of easy solutions, of comforting illusions, may be painful, but it leaves behind it a sense of freedom and relief. And that is why, in the last resort, the Theatre of the Absurd does not provoke tears of despair but the laughter of liberation. (Penguin 23)

Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* makes use of universal characters who emphasize the meaninglessness of the world, and their waiting for Godot to arrive is the illusion that there will

be a solution, a hope that would liberate them. However, Ferhan Sensoy decreases the limits of his play by specifically making use of a Turkish context since, the play contains many satirical Turkish situations that might be meaningless to a foreign audience. For example, Sensoy, by naming the main characters as Kavuklu and Kavuksuz, refers to traditional Turkish theatre form of Ortaoyunu where social and political satire and causing laughter is the main purpose of the stereotypical figures who present the general characteristics of the contemporary times. However, Sensoy combines the traditional aspects of Turkish theatre with the aspects of the Theatre of the Absurd, therefore creating a unique composition of theatre techniques. Sensoy's experimentation with the 'absurd' is re-interpreted and re-enacted as to serve as a means for a sharp satire of society and politics, rather than a means to merely signify the meaninglessness of life. Therefore, Sensoy has expanded the term 'absurd,' in order for it to infer another level of meaning for the Turkish stage.

As a conclusion, both Beckett and Sensoy depict their own worldviews through these plays. Sensoy's intertextualization of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, further reveal his unwillingness to make use of one type of theatrical technique within his play. Sensoy combines the traditional Turkish theatre with postmodern, expressionistic, Brechtian, as well as, absurd techniques in *Gule Gule Godot*. Ferhan Sensoy weaves the futility, the meaninglessness and the uncertainty emphasized in the techniques of the Theatre of the Absurd, together with the satire of actual events and situations in Turkish history. Similar to *Waiting for Godot*, the open ending of *Gule Gule Godot* emphasizes the uncertainty of life, even though the main problematic of Godot's presence is resolved.

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

Beckett, Samuel. *Waiting for Godot*. Trans. Grove Weidenfeld. NY: Grove Press, 1982.

Sensoy, Ferhan. *Gule Gule Godot*. stanbul: Ortaoyuncular Yaynlar, 1996.

Secondary Sources:

Adler, Thomas P. *Mirror On The Stage: The Pulitzer Plays as an Approach to American Drama*. Indiana: Purdue UP, 1987.

Brockett, Oscar and Mark Pape, eds. *World Drama*. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1984.

Deleon, Jak. *The Harold Pinter Tradition in Contemporary Drama*. Istanbul: Bogazici Universitesi Yayinlari, 1986.

Esslin, Martin. *The Theatre of the Absurd*. London: Penguin Books, 1983.

Mordden, Ethan. *The Fireside Companion to the Theatre*. NY: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1988.

Penguin Books. *Absurd Drama*. London: 1965.

Webster's New World Dictionary. Third edition. Eds: Victoria Neufeldt and David Guralnik. NY: Webster's New World, 1988.

ⁱ**NOTES:**

We conformed to Beckett
We waited for him
He did not come
Godot did not come
We asked Beckett
Who the heck is Godot
Samuel Beckett kept his silence
Silence proves you right
We were in a sea of shit
Godot was hope
Godot was the fashion!

ii “Are we in the east? Or the west? Isn’t the mossy bottom of the east, the west? Are we near? or far, can we know?”

iii Then we are not the parts of a whole.

iv

Kavuklu: Did you ever lie to me?
Kavuksuz: Why?
Kavuklu: What why?
Kavuksuz: How?
Kavuklu: Of course!
Kavuksuz: Did you ever lie to me?
Kavuklu: What?
Kavuksuz: What what?
Kavuklu: How?
Both together: Of course! Idiot!