

THE TURKISH TRANSLATION AND STAGING OF *ARTURO UI*
FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF *VERFREMDUNGSEFFEKT*:
AN ANALYSIS



MERT MORALI

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2021

THE TURKISH TRANSLATION AND STAGING OF *ARTURO UI*
FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF *VERFREMDUNGSEFFEKT*:
AN ANALYSIS

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Translation

by
Mert Moralı

Boğaziçi University

2021

The Turkish Translation and Staging of *Arturo Ui*
from the perspective of *Verfremdungseffekt*: An Analysis

The thesis of Mert Morali
has been approved by:

Assist. Prof. Jonathan Maurice Ross
(Thesis Advisor)

Prof. Özlem Berk Albachten

Assist. Prof. Ayşenaz Cengiz

Prof. David Barnett
(External Member)

Prof. Suat Karantay
(External Member)

August 2021

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, MERT MORALI, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date

ABSTRACT

The Turkish Translation and Staging of *Arturo Ui* from the Perspective of *Verfremdungseffekt*: An Analysis

This thesis investigates whether, and if so, how *Verfremdungseffekt* has been conveyed in the Turkish translation and staging of Bertolt Brecht's *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*, the fruit of the efforts of the translator Yücel Erten and the director Ümit Aydoğdu. To that aim, within the framework of *Verfremdungseffekt* and Pavis' notion of *mise en scène*, a comparative analysis is carried out of the original text, the translation, and the Tiyatroadam theatre company's performance of the play in 2013. By making the familiar strange, Brecht's *Verfremdung* aims to encourage the audience to reflect on the socio-economic and political aspects of the events on the stage. Patrice Pavis' *mise en scène* offers potentially fruitful insight into the symbiotic relationship between the text and performance, a key feature of Brechtian theatre. As part of the comparative analysis, the role of the director Ümit Aydoğdu and the methods he applied in his production are examined. Aydoğdu's *Arturo Ui* suggests that an effective *mise en scène* can be created if the director remains alert to the needs and resources of multiple semiotic systems. By fostering a symbiotic relationship between these systems, a director may succeed in realizing *Verfremdungseffekt* in the staging of a translated play, especially if they (like the translator) make effective use of the methods of compensation and amplification. In this sense, by illuminating the roles of the translator and the director, this thesis demonstrates how Erten's translation serves as a crucial foundation for the achievement of *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage in a symbiotic manner.

ÖZET

Arturo Ui'nin Türkçe Çevirisi ve Sahnelemesinin

Verfremdungseffekt Açısından İncelemesi

Bu çalışma Yücel Erten'in çevirdiği ve Ümit Aydoğdu'nun yönettiği, Bertolt Brecht'in *Arturo Ui'nin Önlenebilir Tırmanışı* adlı eserini, *Verfremdungseffekt*'in (yabancılaştırma etkisi) aktarılması açısından incelemektedir. Yabancılaştırma kavramı ve Pavis'in mizansen anlayışı çerçevesinde kaynak metin, metnin çevirisi ve Tiyatroadam tarafından 2013'te sergilenen oyunun kaydı karşılaştırmalı analize tabi tutulmaktadır. Yabancılaştırma, bilindik olanı tuhaflaştırarak seyircilerin sahnedeki olayları sosyoekonomik ve sosyopolitik açıdan eleştirel bir şekilde değerlendirmesini amaçlar. Kuramsal çerçevesini Pavis'in mizansen anlayışının oluşturduğu bu incelemede de metin ve performans arasındaki simbiyotik ilişkiye odaklanılmaktadır, zira söz konusu ilişki yabancılaştırma kavramının yapısında da mevcuttur. Bu doğrultuda Pavis'in mizansen anlayışı bir model olarak kullanılarak Ümit Aydoğdu'nun prodüksiyonda uyguladığı yöntemler kapsamlı bir şekilde ele alınmakta ve yönetmen farklı gösterge sistemlerini göz önünde bulundurduğu takdirde etkili bir mizansene ulaşılabilceği ileri sürülmektedir. Bir başka deyişle, metin ve performans arasında kurulacak simbiyotik bir ilişkiyle çeviri oyundaki yabancılaştırma etkisinin sahneye aktarılmasının mümkün olduğu iddia edilmektedir. Bu doğrultuda çevirmenin ve yönetmenin rolleri aydınlatılarak yabancılaştırma etkisinin sahnede simbiyotik bir biçimde yaratılmasında Erten'in çevirisinin son derece önemli olduğu belirtilmektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to convey my sincere thanks to my advisor, Dr. Jonathan Maurice Ross for his priceless suggestions that helped me to stay on the path during the preparation of this thesis. He made invaluable contributions to my research and writing, always encouraging me to reflect in detail on what I was doing.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Suat Karantay for directing me to remarkable sources on theatre translation and changing my perspective towards stylistics altogether. I also would like to deeply thank Prof. Özlem Berk Albachten, who always encouraged me to think and write critically and supported me in my journey of academic writing with her valuable contributions as well. Additionally, I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Ayşenaz Cengiz and Dr. İsmail Kaplan, who kindly guided me during my study at the program whenever I consulted them.

Furthermore, I wish to express my thanks to TÜBİTAK for providing me with the financial support that I required to cover my expenses for commuting between Izmir and Istanbul and being accommodated at the campus.

I convey my sincere thanks to Dr. Müge Işıklar Koçak who accepted to be among the members of my thesis committee and also always showed her sincere support for my academic career, even during my BA study at the Department of Translation and Interpreting at Dokuz Eylül University.

I would like to extend my thanks to Prof. David Barnett who encouraged me to reflect on the fundamental concepts of Brechtian theatre. I also would like to thank Dr. Şule Demirkol Ertürk for kindly accepting to be among the members of my thesis committee. I want to thank Dr. Selçuk Eryatmaz, Dr. Aslı Selcen, Dr. Güldane

Duygu Tümer and Dr. Tutku Yılmaz, who always supported me mentally and made my work life easier each day.

Additionally, I wish to convey my sincere thanks to the director Dr. Ümit Aydođdu and the actor Deniz Özmen for kindly providing me a recording of Tiyatroadam theatre company's performance of *Arturo Ui*. I also would like to express my deep gratitude to ONK Copyright Agency for sending me the translation of the play when I kindly asked them.

I would like to thank all the research assistants at the Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies at Bođaziçi University who always helped me to overcome technical difficulties, even when I was in my town, Izmir.

I owe special thanks to my dear friend Res. Asst. Selim Ozan Çekçi, who has always stood by me and cheered me up whenever I felt frustrated. And I also wish to convey my thanks to my dear friend Pelin Kaça who never got tired of my questions and reassured me with her comments.

Special thanks go to my stubborn cat Bihter, who literally lived on me and my computer during my writing journey. Lastly, and most importantly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my dear mother Funda Moralı and my dear father İlhan Moralı. Since my childhood, they have supported me in my attempts to achieve my dreams, and during the preparation of this thesis, they listened to me patiently every day as I informed them about my progress.



To my mom and dad

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 BERTOLT BRECHT AND HIS THEORY OF EPIC THEATRE.....	6
2.1 Brecht's early years	6
2.2 The influences of prominent artists on Bertolt Brecht.....	7
2.3 Epic theatre	12
CHAPTER 3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW	26
3.1 Theoretical framework.....	26
3.2 Literature review.....	35
3.3 Methodology.....	54
CHAPTER 4 BERTOLT BRECHT AND <i>ARTURO UI</i> IN TURKEY.....	56
4.1 Brecht in Turkey	56
4.2 <i>Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui</i> within the Turkish theatrical system	58
CHAPTER 5 ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH TRANSLATION AND STAGING OF <i>ARTURO UI</i>	62
5.1 The synopsis of the play	64
5.2 The analysis of the play	65
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION	145
REFERENCES	150

APPENDIX A BRECHT'S COMPARISON	158
APPENDIX B THE LIST OF BRECHT PLAYS STAGED IN TURKEY	159
APPENDIX C ENGLISH BACK-TRANSLATIONS	161



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. A Comparison between Dramatic and Epic Theatre.....	13
Table 2. The Opening Lines of the Prologue	67
Table 3. The Mix of Formal and Informal Language in the Prologue	69
Table 4. The Closing Lines of the Prologue	70
Table 5. A Comparison between the Source, the Translation, and the Script.....	71
Table 6. Contradictory Effect of the Closing Lines	72
Table 7. Comparison of the Opening Song in the Performance with the Prologue ..	79
Table 8. The Omission of “Taub” (pigeon)	86
Table 9. Translation of “Pontius zum Pilatus”: A Comparison	90
Table 10. Ui Complains about the Police.....	112
Table 11. Dogsborough’s Fluctuating Mood	119
Table 12. Ui’s Contradictory Remarks	124
Table 13. A Brecht Poem: The Interrogation of the Good	130

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Prior to the beginning of the play	74
Figure 2. The entrance of the actors to the stage.....	74
Figure 3. The actors looking at the audience	74
Figure 4. The male actor during the opening speech	75
Figure 5. The female actor during the opening speech	76
Figure 6. Gesture of putting on a hat.....	76
Figure 7. The actors changing their clothes	79
Figure 8. The actors as the members of the Cauliflower Trust.....	80
Figure 9. The actors fiddling in their pockets	83
Figure 10. The search for gold coins.....	83
Figure 11. The actors fiddling in each other's pockets in a self-satisfied manner....	84
Figure 12. The male actor drawing a piece of paper from Sheet's pocket.....	84
Figure 13. The members of the Cauliflower Trust trying to get the paper	84
Figure 14. Sheet with his paper	85
Figure 15. Caruther complaining about poverty	88
Figure 16. The Trust members shouting, "No buyer!"	88
Figure 17. The Cauliflower Trust turning their backs.....	91
Figure 18. Sneaky looks.....	91
Figure 19. The Cauliflower Trust approaching Sheet.....	92
Figure 20. The Cauliflower Trust forcing Sheet	93
Figure 21. Crushing Sheet.....	94
Figure 22. The Trust putting their feet on Sheet's back.....	94

Figure 23. Feet on Sheet’s back again	95
Figure 24. The historical background of the scene	100
Figure 25. Gesture of putting on a hat and beating a cane on the floor	101
Figure 26. Hands in the aprons	101
Figure 27. Dogsborough raising his finger	103
Figure 28. Dogsborough raising his finger again.....	104
Figure 29. A member of the Trust stepping forward	105
Figure 30. Tears in a Trust member’s eyes	105
Figure 31. The Trust members trying to persuade Dogsborough	106
Figure 32. Dogsborough on his honesty	107
Figure 33. Female actor as the narrator with a smile on her face	109
Figure 34. Female actor switching to her “Ui” persona.....	109
Figure 35. Ui’s aggressive gestures	113
Figure 36. Ui raising his voice in an aggressive manner	113
Figure 37. Actors standing behind Dogsborough, ready to switch to their roles....	115
Figure 38. Dogsborough’s son on the stage	116
Figure 39. Young Dogsborough singing an Italian song	116
Figure 40. Dogsborough proud of his son.....	117
Figure 41. Dogsborough mumbling sadly.....	117
Figure 42. Dogsborough scolding his son.....	118
Figure 43. Peaceful Dogsborough.....	118
Figure 44. Sudden transition to sadness.....	119
Figure 45. Dogsborough praising the scenery calmly.....	120
Figure 46. Dogsborough suddenly getting angry.....	121
Figure 47. Dogsborough looking out of the window	121

Figure 48. Thöst!	122
Figure 49. Ui with an elegant suit and a red carnation.....	125
Figure 50. Ui’s angry gestures	126
Figure 51. Ui touching his hair furiously	126
Figure 52. Gang members shouting “Arturo! Ui!”	127
Figure 53. Ui pointing to his gang	128
Figure 54. Ui and his Gang	128
Figure 55. Ui strangling Dogsborough.....	129
Figure 56. Ui: “Me! Arturo Ui!”	129
Figure 57. Ui reciting the poem, with his gang behind him.....	131
Figure 58. Dogsborough, Ui and the gang dancing and singing.....	131
Figure 59. A female Ui on the stage again.....	135
Figure 60. O’Casey pointing at Ui	136
Figure 61. The actor reciting the monologue	138
Figure 62. Ui mirroring the actor’s gestures 1	138
Figure 63. Ui mirroring the actor’s gestures 2	139
Figure 64. Ui standing up and approaching the actor	139
Figure 65. Ui’s gestures interrupting his own speech	140
Figure 66. Ui jumping suddenly.....	141
Figure 67. Ui mirroring the actor’s gestures 3	141
Figure 68. Ui mirroring the actor’s gestures 4	142
Figure 69. Ui reciting the monologue furiously.....	143
Figure 70. Two Ui’s exhibiting exactly the same <i>Gestus</i>	143

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

Appendix C, Table C1. English translation of the prologue’s opening lines.....	161
Appendix C, Table C2. English translation of formal and informal language	161
Appendix C, Table C3. English translation of the prologue’s closing lines	162
Appendix C, Table C4. English translation of Erten’s translation and script.....	162
Appendix C, Table C5. English translation of the dialectical effect in the prologue	163
Appendix C, Table C6. English translation of the prologue and opening song.....	164
Appendix C, Table C7. English translation of the omission of “Taub”	164
Appendix C, Table C8. English translation of “Pontius zum Pilatus”.....	165
Appendix C, Table C9. English translation of Ui complaining about the police....	165
Appendix C, Table C10. English translation of Dogsborough’s fluctuating mood	166
Appendix C, Table C11. English translation of Ui’s contradictory remarks	166
Appendix C, Table C12. English translation of “İyi Adama Bir İki Soru”	167

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

With his multifarious personality and disputatious nature, Bertolt Brecht was one of the most influential and preeminent figures of the 20th century. He was celebrated as a marvellous poet, a subversive and audacious playwright and, last but not least, as a pathbreaking theoretician. He spent his entire life on his theory of epic theatre and applying it to his plays. With epic theatre, Brecht rebelled against the classic Aristotelian function of theatre, which was mainly based on the self-identification of the audience with the actors on the stage. However, non-Aristotelian epic theatre aims to hamper self-identification, which may allow the audience to embrace a critical approach towards the events presented on the stage.

In Brechtian epic theatre, *Verfremdung* aims to make the familiar strange and to stimulate the audience to approach the play critically.¹ Brecht mobilizes every tool in his arsenal in an attempt to engender the so-called *Verfremdungseffekt* (or *V-Effekt*) on the stage, this effect being far more than just an aesthetic gimmick. In fact, the *Verfremdungseffekt* can be regarded as a means to an end. Brecht's objective in inducing the *Verfremdungseffekt* is to encourage the audience to appreciate the socio-

¹In his blog on Brecht (www.brechtinpractice.org), David Barnett (2021) stresses that “alienation” was the most common translation of *Verfremdung* (“Verfremdung”, para. 2). Indeed, in the early works of Brecht expert and translator John Willett, we frequently encounter the terms “alienation” and “alienation effect” (see. *The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht*, 1967 and *Brecht On Theatre*, 1964). However, Prof. Barnett (2021) states that due to its negative meaning in English, there is a tendency to use the original German term (“Verfremdung”, para. 2). Indeed, in the contemporary works by David Barnett (2015), Laura Bradley (2006), and Meg Mumford (2009), one can see that the original German word is used instead of “alienation”. For this reason, throughout the thesis, I will use *Verfremdung* to denote a process and *Verfremdungseffekt* as the outcome of the process of *Verfremdung*. Also, I am grateful to Prof. David Barnett and his blog for alerting me to this distinction.

economic and political circumstances of the story presented on the stage within its historical context. And this, according to Bertolt Brecht, can be only achieved through critical reflection on the play.

Verfremdung is complex and multi-semiotic in nature. Brecht did not regard the text as the only element for creating this effect. He also utilized many other stage elements such as *Gestus*, the placement of the actors on the stage, *Fabel*, episodic narration, songs, decors, lights and so forth. In the creation of *Verfremdungseffekt*, none of these elements are deemed superior to each other. On the contrary, the text and stage elements are intended to contribute together to its realization.

Since he first started writing his plays in the late 1910s, Brecht's works have been translated into more than fifty languages and staged thousands of times. However, particularly given the centrality to Brecht's theatrical work of the quite complex concepts of *Verfremdung* and *Verfremdungseffekt*, translating Brecht plays and staging translations of Brecht are certainly not straightforward ventures and inevitably call for meticulous attention to detail. In view of this, in this thesis I aim to unearth whether and, if so, how *Verfremdungseffekt* was achieved through the Turkish translation and staging of Bertolt Brecht's *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* (1965) [The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui] by translator Yücel Erten and director Ümit Aydoğdu. To that end, I will compare the original text, the translation of the play by Yücel Erten, and a recording of the production staged by Tiyatroadam under the direction of the director Ümit Aydoğdu.

In Chapter Two, I will introduce the fundamental aspects of epic theatre, to outline the context within which Brecht's concept of *Verfremdung* is situated. I will attempt to enrich this introduction to epic theatre by first offering a concise portrait

of Bertolt Brecht; to understand how Brecht developed his theories, we need to be aware of his early life and career and of the prominent names who had an influence on his understanding of theatre in general.

Following this brief portrait, Chapter Two will concentrate on the theoretical aspects of Brechtian theatre, drawing on the works of the playwright himself, as well as on other renowned scholars and critics. Within the scope of this theoretical survey, I will touch on the relationship between *Verfremdung* and dialectics. Additionally, a detailed review will be offered of Brecht's approach to stage design, the use of music, acting style, *Gestus* and *Fabel*, as well as of his use of language. Chapter Two will lay the groundwork for Chapter Five, where my analysis of the Turkish translation and staging of *Arturo Ui* (2013) will draw heavily on the concepts and the methods of Brechtian theatre.

Chapter Three will present the theoretical framework and methodology applied in this thesis and offer a review of the scholarly literature most salient to this study. In the theoretical framework, I will introduce Patrice Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* (1982). Based on the notion of a symbiotic relationship between two semiotic systems, i.e. text and performance, Pavis' *mise en scène* resembles Brecht's concept of *Verfremdung* inasmuch as it emphasises the symbiotic relationship between the various components of a stage play. As such, it serves as a useful model for analysing the translation and staging of Brecht's *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*. Besides, to discover the role of the translator and the expectations from him/her, I will refer to translation scholars such as Ortrun Zuber (1980) and Susan Bassnett-McGuire (1985/2014). Their remarks will also help us to understand the perception of the text and performance from the perspective of translation studies.

In the literature review, I will first survey the studies on Bertolt Brecht abroad. To this end, I will introduce the works approaching Brecht from a translational perspective. Afterwards, I will move on to look at studies that concentrate on Brecht plays in terms of performance. Despite the scarcity of works analysing Brecht translations in conjunction with their performances, works with a textual focus still contribute to my thesis in that they assist in the analysis of Brecht's language from the perspective of *Verfremdungseffekt*. Before concluding the part on Brecht abroad, I will share the discussions surrounding *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*. Following these works, I will place the emphasis on the works on Bertolt Brecht in Turkey. After introducing the studies within the Turkish theatrical systems, I will offer a detailed examination of Ümit Aydoğdu's (2011) doctoral thesis on his production of *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*.

Finally, in the methodology part of Chapter Three, I will elaborate on the approach I have used in the analysis of the play and explain how the performance itself became my main point of reference when pinpointing the examples of *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. To this end, I will explain the terms “compensation” and “amplification” by referring to different translation scholars.

Chapter Four will offer a concise contextualization of Brecht's works in Turkey, with particular attention being paid to the previous productions of *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*. This chapter will allow us to position Aydoğdu's production within the Turkish theatrical system. Additionally, it will serve as an introduction to Tiyatroadam, Ümit Aydoğdu, and Yücel Erten. This contextualization aims to present a general view of the play's journey in Turkey prior to the detailed analysis of the production in Chapter Five.

Chapter Five concentrates on selected examples of *Verfremdungseffekt* in Aydođdu's production of *Arturo Ui*, the main focus of my thesis. First of all, I will share a summary of the play. Afterwards, I will compare the original text, Yücel Erten's translation and Aydođdu's production. With the help of images from the performance, I will show how Aydođdu sometimes compensates for his omissions of Erten's meticulous translation that preserves the parts where Brecht may have aimed to realize linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt*. This compensation can take the form of a textual addition to the script or through the deployment of other stage elements. In some cases, however, we will see that Aydođdu uses stage elements such as gestures, lights or the placement of actors on the stage to create a contradiction to the verbal text, which may eventually pave the way for the achievement of *Verfremdungseffekt* among the audience. With all these examples, I aim to explore how *Verfremdungseffekt* can be conveyed in the translation and staging of Brecht plays, and my deployment of Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* will demonstrate how this theoretical construct can potentially be used as a model for analysing performances of the translated plays within the Turkish theatrical system.

Finally, Chapter Six will summarize the content of the chapters in this thesis and its overall findings, before ending by discussing the limitations of this study as well as the implications it carries for both translation and theatre studies.

CHAPTER 2

BERTOLT BRECHT AND HIS THEORY OF EPIC THEATRE

In this chapter, I would like to introduce Bertolt Brecht and his theory of epic theatre, leading on to a focus on *Verfremdung*. First, I will depict both the socio-economic and political atmosphere of Germany during the First World War and the playwright's rebellious nature. This context-setting can serve to present the zeitgeist of the early decades of the 20th century and its effect on Brecht.

Subsequently, to trace the roots of Brecht's theories and works, I will refer to the prominent figures that had a strong influence on Brecht. Afterwards, I will dwell on epic theatre by explaining Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre, dialectics, and *Verfremdung*. In doing so, I aim to present a holistic and revealing image of Bertolt Brecht and his theatre. Without such a theoretical summary, it is not possible to appreciate the importance and complexity of *Verfremdung*.

2.1 Brecht's early years

Bertolt Brecht was born in Augsburg, Bavaria in 1898, to a Catholic father, working as a manager at a paper mill, and a pious Protestant mother. Even though he belonged to a wealthy bourgeois family and was brought up in line with the manners of his class in a devout Christian home, Brecht's rebellious soul was discernible in his youth. The traces of his early indignation against the bourgeoisie with an unmistakable rejection of his class can be seen in his poem "Verjagt mit gutem Grund" [Hunted for Good Reason]: "I grew up as the son of well-to-do people...

When I was grown up and looked about me, I did not like the people of my own class... And I left my own class and allied myself with insignificant people” (Brecht, 1976, p. 316).² In addition to this openly anti-bourgeois attitude, realizing the harsh realities and devastating outcomes of the war, Brecht developed a determined anti-war stance. When he was asked in high school to write an essay on the nobility of dying for the fatherland, he criticized this very idea by stating that “the claim that dying for the fatherland is honourable and sweet, but it can only be regarded as poor propaganda” (as cited in Schoeps, 2001, p. 52). Indeed, the First World War cost the lives of millions, including 700,000 civilians, and shattered the entire continent, with Germany being one of the most heavily affected countries both economically and socio-politically (Rosenhaft, 2006, p. 6). In 1918, when it was clear that Germany had to come to terms with the Allies, the German political stage witnessed radical changes alongside urgent calls for reform and revolution. Rightfully blamed for the consequences of the war, the Monarchy collapsed and subsequently the proclamation of the republic heralded a blooming democratic atmosphere with the social democrats and communists as main actors (Rosenhaft, 2006, p. 9). It was this political climate that gave a fresh impetus to the young Brecht to seek and find the theatre form he was looking for.

2.2 The influences of prominent artists on Bertolt Brecht

In this part, to trace the early roots of Brecht’s works, I would like to mention a few prominent names who had a colossal influence on Brecht and thus paved the way for the inception of his career as a playwright and theatre theoretician.

² This poem is taken from the compilation *Bertolt Brecht poems* edited and translated by John Willett and Ralph Manheim (1976).

Originally emerging in France, a form of political satire and parody, cabaret features song, dance, recitation, improvisation, exaggerated decors, costumes, and make-up. The first German cabaret performances were at the Bunes Theater in Berlin in 1901, and then in Munich, where the famous cabaret ensemble Die elf Scharfrichter performed in Zum goldenen Hirschen, a small pub with only 100 seats. Lareau (2006) reveals that such performances “incorporated literary songs, recitations, dance, sketches, folk songs and puppet performance with an overt criticism against censorship and injustice” (“Die elf Scharfrichter”, para. 2).³ The young and enthusiastic poet Brecht, who was wandering through the beerhalls in Munich, was so enchanted by this artform that he embraced and adapted certain features of it for his own works. Now, I would like to recount a few cabaret connoisseurs of the time, highlighting what part of their performances affected Brecht and in what way.

Frank Wedekind, whom Bertolt Brecht met during his stay in Munich, was a legendary cabaret performer, singer, and playwright. A remarkably idiosyncratic artist, he apparently impressed Brecht with his singing performances and ability to grasp control over the audience as a performer. In one of his early writings published in 1918, Brecht (1963a) expressed his awe for Wedekind's performance in a play written by Wedekind himself, and congratulated him for acting much better than professional actors and filling the room just by himself (p. 7). Wedekind was well-known for the ballads that he composed and sang with his guitar on the stage. A huge fan of Wedekind, Brecht acknowledged that he composed his own songs inspired by Wedekind's ballads (Forcht, 2012, p. 40).

³ Unless stated otherwise, all subsequent translations from German or Turkish are by the author of this thesis.

Another cabaret star who had a momentous impact on Brecht was Karl Valentin, one of the most influential and successful performers in Munich, particularly during the first decades of the 20th century. Valentin's influence on Brecht's plays in terms of theatricality is evident.⁴ In his performances, Valentin frequently used flamboyant make-up and masks purposefully designed to look artificial and exaggerated, all serving to perplex the audience. Walter Benjamin (1998) notes that, when working on a play with Valentin and trying to find the appropriate effect for soldiers on the stage, Brecht consulted Valentin, who suggested that soldiers should look pale and scared (p. 115). Upon this suggestion, the two decided to paint the soldiers' faces with white chalk, which would eventually look extremely artificial and strange (Benjamin, 1998, p. 115).

Additionally, Joel Schechter (2006) proposes that the cartoon-like and gestic representations of characters by Chaplin and Valentin inspired Brecht to “invent stage characters who could be described as political clowns” (p. 90). Similarly, Brecht (1963a) stresses that Karl Valentin does not make jokes; in fact, he is “the joke” (p. 161). Valentin portrayed his characters as if they were stilted versions of what they represented. Here, the portrayal of the characters in a way that exposes what they represent bears a striking resemblance to the term *Gestus*, which refers to the social attitudes and gestures of a person representing his/her own social class and the space-time he/she lives in. Mumford (2009) reveals that, although Brecht initially used the term “to mean ‘gesture’ in the sense of a purely physical expression”, starting with the late 1920s he referred to it as “moulded and sometimes subconscious body language of a person from a particular social class...” (p. 53).

⁴ Although there are various definitions of theatricality, here I refer to Roland Barthes (1964, as cited in Pavis, 1998): “What is theatricality? It is theatre-minus-text, it is a density of signs and sensations built up on stage starting from the written argument; it is that ecumenical perception of sensuous artifice – gesture, tone, distance, substance, light...”(p. 395).

Similarly, Double and Wilson (2006) define *Gestus* as “the physical gesture which reveals a deeper social truth” (p. 56). Mumford (2009) demonstrates that Brecht's interest in Karl Valentin and Charlie Chaplin fuelled his use of the comic and of de-familiarizing devices that provided a critical distance for both the audience and the actors; in that sense, Valentin “gave Brecht advice about how to help actors become gestural demonstrators” (p. 14).

Regarded as the master of stirring and contentious silent movies that criticize deeply embedded social inequality, rampant militarism, and oppressive authorities, Charlie Chaplin had a poignant gestic way of acting, due both to the nature of silent films and to the actor's own *Weltanschauung*. As Mumford suggests (2009), long before Brecht came up with his notion of *Gestus*, Chaplin was already using his body as a way of expressing the social attitudes of his characters (p. 14). Thus, it is by no means a coincidence that Charlie Chaplin had a dynamic role in Brecht's works. Grimm (1961) remarks that Brecht was evidently influenced by Chaplin's millionaire figure in *City Lights* when he created his memorable character Puntila (p. 35).

After the actors and performers who continued to be a source of inspiration for Brecht throughout his life, I would like to mention one more name, a noteworthy director and theatre theoretician, who is regarded as the inventor of “epic theatre”: Erwin Piscator. Brecht had the opportunity to work closely with Piscator and observe the fundamental aspects of epic theatre at first hand. Therefore, the similarity between Brecht's and Piscator's views on theatre is no coincidence. Richard Schechner (2012) explains that Piscator saw naturalism in theatre as bourgeois sentimentality, which motivated him to attempt to reveal on the stage the facts of life, instead of “lies”, through the sumptuous use of cutting edge and thus expensive technology, such as moving machines, cinematic projections, flashlights, banners,

and loud noises (p. xvi). Brecht (1939/2014) himself stresses that “Piscator undertook the most radical attempt to endow the theatre with an instructive character” and notes that there was nothing in Piscator’s theatre that did not have instructional value (“On Experimental Theatre”, para. 7).⁵ The playwright also reveals that, through stage design, Piscator wanted the audience “to reach political decisions” (1939/2014, “On Experimental Theatre”, para. 9).

Even though both Piscator and Brecht introduced novelties to the theatre of their period, Brecht differed from Piscator in some ways. Theatre scholar Laura Bradley (2006) highlights that while Piscator used the merits of technology on the stage as a means of offering political commentary, Brecht introduced novel theatrical forms (p. 4). With the help of new dramatic forms, Brecht developed a dialectical theatre that would reveal the contradictions of a society that is not fixed but constantly changing (Bradley, 2006, p. 4).

In this section, I have showed how deeply these artists affected Brecht and his works. In one of his essays “10 Cheers for Bertolt Brecht”, theatre scholar and dramatist Dan Rebellato (2016) states that “Brecht’s theatre is theatre at its most theatrical” and that all the elements of Brechtian theatre such as songs, actor, lights, text, and design have their own roles and influence on the audience (p. 3). Indeed, all these artists, Wedekind, Valentin, Chaplin, and Piscator shaped Brecht’s views on theatre and influenced his plays in terms of theatricality. Now, in the next part, I will dwell on the key terms and concepts of epic theatre.

⁵ All the subsequent quotations from Brecht dated 2014 are taken from the third edition of *Brecht on Theatre* edited by Marc Silberman, Steve Giles and Tom Kuhn (2014). Their translations do not belong to the author of this thesis. Additionally, I have kept the original dates of Brecht’s essays where possible.

2.3 Epic theatre

In this part, I will introduce epic theatre by presenting the concepts of Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre, dialectics, and *Verfremdung*. Even though these terms require particular attention independently, they are very much intertwined.

Therefore, it can be claimed that understanding *Verfremdung* necessitates a solid comprehension of these concepts.

In Aristotelian sense, the “epic” denotes a dramaturgy based on “episodes”. Aristotle, in his *Poetics*, defines the term “episodic” as “episodes or acts succeeding one another without probable or necessary sequence” (Butcher, 1902, pp. 37-38). Pavis (1998) stresses that Piscator and Brecht gave their theatre the name “epic” to denote an “approach to theatre that goes beyond classical, ‘Aristotelian’ dramaturgy based on dramatic tension, conflict, and a regular progression of action” (p. 128). However, Pavis (1998) also notes that the form of theatre that involve “epic elements” dated back to the Middle Ages (p. 128). In this sense, interruptive elements, epilogues, prologues, and other forms of narratives “are remnants of the epic in the dramatic form...” (Pavis, 1998, p. 128). Similarly, theatre scholar Laura Bradley (2006) notes that in Brecht’s theatre there are “epic elements” such as songs creating an interruptive effect on the dramatic action, images projected on a screen, and captions on the political arguments of the play (p. 5). In this sense, the “epic” aims to stimulate the audience to embrace a critical approach based on the comparison and evaluation (Bradley, 2006, p. 5).

In the following part, I will analyse Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre and explain the differences between them in close detail.

2.3.1 Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre

Coined by Erwin Piscator in the first quarter of the 20th century, “epic theatre” is loaded with theoretical armoury and trenchant criticism of classic Aristotelian theatre. Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre, to which epic theatre also belongs, are considered to be diametrically opposed from various aspects. In her seminal work *Das epische Theater* [The Epic Theatre], Marianne Kesting (1978) points out that the term “Aristotelian” refers to a particular form of dramaturgy seeking integrity and causality between events, which will eventually end in a cathartic effect (p. 10). On the other hand, “non-Aristotelian” theatre designates a dramaturgy that rejects all these strictures and stresses that the course of events on the stage should flow freely in space and time, not adhering to a strict causality, and that each scene can act independently without connecting to the other scenes (Kesting, 1978, p. 10). In an essay on his play *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* [Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny], Brecht (1930/2011) presents a comparison between the main features of dramatic and epic theatre, as shown below in Table 1.⁶ However, one should not take this table as reflecting absolute contrasts. In fact, Brecht himself (1930/2011) notes that “this table does not present absolute contrasts, but rather keeps the focus on changes that can be applied in the emphasis/stress” (p. 41).

Table 1. A Comparison between Dramatic and Epic Theatre

Dramatic Theatre (Aristotelian)	Epic Theatre (non-Aristotelian)
Attention of the audience is on the play's end	Attention of the audience is on the course
Each scene exists for the next one	Each scene exists for itself
An organic/natural development	Montage is used
Events follow a linear path	Events are curvilinear

(Brecht, 1930/2011, p. 42).

⁶ For original text, please see Appendix A.

Still, one may wonder what this table means in reality; how does the uninterrupted display of events following a linear path or, just the opposite, non-linear and detached scenes, change the way the audience perceive the play itself and why does it matter at all? In classic Aristotelian theatre, the linear and sequential presentation of the events on the stage serve a catastrophic end and a “cathartic” experience among the audience, which is ensured through identification; to put it more clearly, the audience lose themselves in the play and develop an empathetic bond with actors and events on the stage (identification) and as a result they reach a kind of emotional purification (catharsis) on the stage.

Thus, organic development and integrity have utmost importance in Aristotelian theatre. In non-Aristotelian theatre, on the other hand, the reason why scenes are organized in a non-linear or “curvilinear” fashion is that such a format ensures detachment between scenes, and the play is interrupted incessantly. This interruption prevents the “self-identification” of the audience with the actors.

When discussing Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre, one must consider the notion of “illusion”. In one of his theoretical essays in *A Short Organum for the Theatre*, Brecht (1964) criticizes Aristotelian theatre for creating illusion and putting the audience into a passive and sedentary mode: “True, their eyes are open, but, they stare rather than see, just as they listen rather than hear. They look at the stage as if in a trance...”(p. 187).⁷ This “illusionary” arrangement on the stage and the audience being “passive” is also tightly connected to the concept of the fourth wall. In *Dialoge aus dem Messingkauf* (1963b) [The Buying Brass], which is regarded as one of the most important theoretical works of Bertolt Brecht, written in the form of a four-sided conversation, the Dramaturg asks the Philosopher what he thinks about “the

⁷ This quotation is taken from the first edition of *Brecht on Theatre* edited and translated by John Willett (1964).

Fourth Wall". In reply to the Philosopher asking what it is, the Dramaturg reveals that plays are usually performed as if the stage is made up of four walls instead of three in reality, and the fourth wall is considered to be the part where the audience sits (Brecht, 1963b, p. 66). The purpose behind this is to create an impression that the events acted out on the stage are from real life and the audience is not there to watch it. The Actor contributes to the Dramaturg's remarks as well by stating that "in reality, we arrange everything to look great on the stage and do not demonstrate that this is actually an arrangement" (Brecht, 1963b, p. 66). However, in *Dialoge aus dem Messingkauf* Brecht (1963b) stresses that he wants to demolish the fourth wall altogether and asks the actor to act in a way that shows everything on the stage is arranged for the audience (p. 67). Still, one may ask what Brecht's purpose was in striving to eliminate this sense of illusion and breaking down the fourth wall. The answer is that, according to Brecht, the state of being under the spell inhibits critical thinking on the audience's part and thus results in the conditions underlying particular events being ignored.

This said, recent studies have objected to the notion of illusion in theatre since our age is already surrounded with all forms of illusion. In his article "When We Talk of Horses: Or, what do we see when we see a play?", Dan Rebellato (2009) questions the so-called illusionistic nature of theatre. He notes that in theatre studies there is a common agreement that "dramatic theatre is an illusionistic theatre" (2009, p. 17). Rebellato (2009) furthers his argument by highlighting that Brecht's epic theatre is believed to be breaking the illusion, or the "spell" of the play (p. 18). Still, according to Rebellato (2009), no one can claim that the audience really believe that what they are watching is not fictitious but reality itself (p. 18).

In fact, the audience never forget that they are in a theatre hall and watching a play (Rebellato, 2009, p. 18). Similarly, David Barnett (2021) sees the notion of “anti-illusion” in Brechtian theatre as a cliché and stresses that “one needs only move one’s head away from the stage or playing area to reveal the artifice of theatrical performance” (“Brechtian Clichés #1: He wants you to know you’re in a theatre”, para. 1). Barnett (2021) points out that the reason why Brecht places such emphasis on anti-illusionistic features of epic theatre could be the fact that, during his lifetime, TV and other technologies were not common or still developing and it was theatre that offered the best form of illusion (“Brechtian Clichés #1: He wants you to know you’re in a theatre”, para. 2). For this reason, Barnett (2021) argues that, in today’s Brechtian productions, one should keep the focus on “dialectical interrogation of the dramatic material” rather than anti-illusionist clichés (“Brechtian Clichés #1: He wants you to know you’re in a theatre”, para. 4). Indeed, in the age of IMAX theatres, 3D movies, interactive computer games, and VR glasses, it does not make much sense to claim that theatre creates an illusion that needs to be broken.

In the analysis of *Arturo Ui* from the perspective of *Verfremdungseffekt*, I follow the same principle and concentrate on the treatment of contradictions and dialectics inherent in the concept and process of *Verfremdung*. For the same reason, throughout the thesis, I avoid evaluating the concept of *Verfremdung* only in terms of its traditional anti-illusionistic aspects.

2.3.2 *Verfremdung*

Verfremdung serves as the backbone of Brechtian theatre. Brecht (1939/2014) defines the concept as follows: “*Verfremdung* estranges an incident or character simply by taking from the incident or character what is self-evident, familiar, obvious in order to produce wonder and curiosity” (“On Experimental Theatre”, para. 34). The aim here is to encourage the audience to reflect on the play from a critical standpoint and question what they see on the stage. In this sense, the notion of “dialectics” and *Verfremdung* are strictly interrelated. Barnett (2021) explains their relationship as follows:

‘Making the familiar strange’ [referring to *Verfremdung*] is an example of a dialectical process: the audience encounters something it recognizes; that thing is then presented as strange (that is, the ‘thing’ is now in contradiction with itself); and the audience then has to reach a new understanding in order to move beyond the contradiction. (para. 3)

Contradictions stimulate the audience to think about why people behave in a certain manner and help viewers to comprehend the connections between these behaviours and people’s social positions. In other words, the audience question the events from a social and historical perspective and reflect on their political nature. So, one can say that dialectics has a political purpose. As a Marxist playwright, Brecht saw contradictions as a means to challenge the established conception of theatre, or rather of the theatre of the bourgeoisie. The remarks of theatre scholar Marc Silberman (2014), in this sense, are quite informative:

In order to achieve these aims [Marxist projections] Brecht’s theatre will reject the Naturalistic representational conventions of bourgeois theatre together with its ideological functions, whereby its spectators exchange a contradictory world for a harmonious one and so passively accept the socio-economic and political status quo. (“Return to Germany”, para. 7)

Now, I will emphasize why Brecht believes that contradictions should be deployed as means to criticise the harmonious world presented on the stage as well as acceptance of the socio-economic and political status quo. A political perspective on dialectics teaches that people do not have to conform to the status quo since, like nature itself, society and its economic and political institutions can be altered, provided that oppositional forces resist and undertake interventions. Besides, if something is not fixed right from the start but occurs and changes as a result of the struggle between contrasting forces, the prevailing conditions are always prone to evolve. With respect to the dialectical nature of *Verfremdung* as a process, Brecht (1939/2014) states that “spectators no longer see the persons on stage as unchangeable, closed off to influence, helplessly resigned to their fate. They see: this person is like this because the conditions are like that” and that the audience are invited “into the theatre as those who change the world rather than accept it, who intervene in natural and social processes” (“On Experimental Theatre”, para. 35).

Within the context of dialectics in Brechtian theatre, the term *Fabel* should be discussed as well. David Barnett (2015a) points out that *Fabel* does not simply mean the story of the play (p. 86). Instead, *Fabel* refers to “an interpreted version of the events” in a dialectical way since it highlights the contradictions present within the play (Barnett, 2015a, p. 86). But one may ask how the *Fabel* of the play allows these contradictions to be presented on the stage. Here, the term *Arrangement* comes to the forefront. Barnett (2015a) defines an *Arrangement* as a kind of tableau that displays the relations between the figures and their contradictions in such a way that the audience can analyse the events (p. 90). Brecht is known to have been extremely meticulous in organizing an *Arrangement*. During the rehearsal of a play, first of all,

he arranged the positions of the actors on the stage to be able to demonstrate the *Fabel* of the play to the audience in the clearest way (Barnett, 2015a, p. 93).

So far so good, but how is this effect realized in Brechtian theatre?

Verfremdungseffekt is created through various methods. Almost the entire play is built on the collaboration of various sign systems and each component serves its realization on the stage. Among this one can list: the episodic and non-linear structure of the narration; interruptions through songs/music; the gestic acting style; the use of decors, props, clothes; lighting and projections; the very placement of the actors on the stage; *Fabel*; the dialectical nature of the play; and last but not least, the language of the play. This said, Barnett (2021) reminds us that “*Verfremdung* is a process and not a device” and thus it “can be engineered in very different ways and are not formulaic” (para. 4). In the following part, I will place a particular emphasis on the methods or techniques of *Verfremdung*.

2.3.3 The Methods of *Verfremdung*

2.3.3.1 Interruption

The importance of episodic structure in Brecht's plays has already been highlighted. Nevertheless, this kind of fragmented narration as a method of “interruption” deserves a more detailed discussion. Episodic structure based on non-linear narration may produce *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage through interruption in two ways. First, it breaks the unity of the plot in general and thus blocks the way to a cathartic end in Aristotelian terms. Another method to interrupt the play and create *Verfremdungseffekt* is the abundant use of songs placed between the scenes and mostly in the middle of the scenes, and sub-titles, documents, and films projected

onto the screen. John Willett (1967) describes this as “taking the wind out of the actors' sails and showing the actual mechanics of the work” (p. 172).

Furthermore, in his book *Bertolt Brecht: Dialectics, Poetry, Politics* (2009), theatre scholar Peter Brooker underlines Brecht's focus on the interruption in terms of showing change. The playwright stresses that the epic actor should “show his character's coherence despite, or rather by means of, interruptions” because the development of the character through the play and “the various phases must be able to be clearly seen, and therefore separated” (Brecht, 2009, as cited in Brooker, p. 46). In this way, the actor can tie these “separated” elements together to produce a character that is changeable, rather than fixed (Brecht, 2009, as cited in Brooker, p. 6); this, according to Brooker (2009), is how Brecht's view on interruptions is in line with the principles of dialectics (p. 49). David Barnett (2015a) also accentuates that Brecht aims to produce “differences between the different signs in the theatre, between figures, between context, between drama and narrative” and that this difference is all about “discontinuity and interruption” (p. 81). Through these differences, Brecht attempts to encourage the audience to reflect on the contradictions instead of easily consuming the play on the stage (Barnett, 2015a, p. 81). So, we can say that the function of interruptions in a Brecht play is to reflect the workings of the dialectic, in that they highlight the contradictions and change of the figures throughout the play.

2.3.3.2 Music

Music occupies great importance in Brecht's theatre in various ways. Through its interruptive use, it breaks the unity of the story and creates a discontinuity. Brecht (1935/2014) praises a production of the *Die Dreigroschenoper* [The Threepenny Opera] in 1928 and stresses that the use of music in the production offered a new understanding of music because it required the separation of the music from other elements of the play (“On the Use of Music in an Epic Theatre”, para. 3). The playwright reveals that the placement of an orchestra visibly on the stage, the changes in the lighting as the actors sing the songs, and the projection of the song titles on a screen greatly contributed to the audience’s experience in general (“On the Use of Music in an Epic Theatre”, para. 3).

The focus on the “separation of elements” is evidenced by another musical play by Brecht. Barnett (2015a) refers to Brecht’s suggestion for a production of *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* in 1930 where the playwright calls for “a radical separation of elements” in terms of the music, the script and the performance of the play (p. 69). The separation of elements invites the audience to think about what they see on the stage critically instead of accepting it instantly (Barnett, 2015a, p. 74) because the “difference between the sign-systems helps complicate the reception process and disrupts the processes of empathy” (Barnett, 2015a, p. 73).

Another function of music in Brechtian theatre is that it also serves as a commentary on the events narrated on the stage. Brecht (1935/2014) showed his deep appreciation of the use of music in a production of his play *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* in which the music composed by Hans Eisler on the one hand helped convey the socio-political problems that affected working class people and on the other hand gave a necessary response to those who claimed that communism

would bring chaos (“On the Use of Music in an Epic Theatre”, para. 9). In particular, according to Brecht (1935/2014), by means of music, the actors can display the *Gestus* of the figures (“On the Use of Music in an Epic Theatre”, para. 7), which allows the audience to reflect on behaviours displayed by the actors in line with their social positions. Furthermore, if one takes Brecht’s focus on the alterable nature of human behaviours depending on the conditions into consideration, the role of music in Brechtian play can be truly appreciated.

In short, music has a vital function in Brecht’s plays. It contributes to the separation of elements and thus creates discontinuity, reveals the *Gestus* of figures, and highlights their potential to change.

2.3.3.3 Acting style

Brecht was known to collaborate with actors during the rehearsals and always to pay attention to their suggestions. Thanks to these democratic rehearsals, he came up with the brightest ideas for staging a performance (Thomson, 2006, p. 31). The reason behind this practice was that Brecht saw the acting method as a crucial element of his theatre. In Brechtian theatre, actors should not play their characters by losing themselves in the role; instead, they are expected to ‘tell’ their characters from a critical stance, based on self-observation. In this sense, they act in “quotation marks” (Unwin, 2005, p. 58). How this can be done is exemplified by Brecht’s description (1933/2014) of Helene Weigel's acting in *Die Mutter* [The Mother]

[Weigel] spoke her lines as though they had been written in the third person, so not only did she not pretend that she really was Vlassova or believed she was, or that she was actually speaking these words in real life, but she also

prevented the spectators from imagining themselves (out of laxity and force of habit) into a specific living room. (“Notes on the Mother”, para. 5)

Brecht was quite insistent on this type of acting. In a Brecht play, the actor should not simply sing a song but rather show the character singing a song, which is also emphasized by Brecht when he states that “it is the actor's business not to express feeling but to 'show attitudes or *Gesten*” (Willett, 1967, p. 172). In other words, the actors imitate characters visibly in a way to suggest that this character would act and feel this way in the face of such event. Theatre scholar and critic John Rouse (1982) praises Helene Weigel's performance in portraying Mother Courage's agony when she hears of the death of her son, Swiss Cheese's (p. 36). He states that, even though the audience were utterly shocked by the scene, Weigel's gestures prevented them from feeling empathy toward Courage (1982, p. 36). Peter Brooker (2009) also reflects on this type of situation when he remarks: “What is entailed in *Gestus* then is the analysis of an underlying and internally contradictory social content, the third-person quotation, ... knotting together of a series of social gestic in an episodic but progressive and educative narrative” (p. 51). Additionally, “the separation of character and actor” gives the audience opportunity to develop a critical approach towards the “familiar social types and stories, and thus for the inference of alternative deeds...” because it creates a discrepant situation (Brooker, 2009, p. 52).

A gestic acting style, then, encourages the audience to reflect on the figures on the stage and why they behave in a certain manner. When the audience discover the social positions and the relations between the figures, they come to realize the underlying conditions that can be changed.

2.3.3.4 Language

In addition to the methods mentioned above, a number of textual elements could be said to have the potential to induce the *Verfremdungseffekt*. To be able to comprehend these, one should first become familiar with Brecht's style. Brecht is known to have been inspired by various sources that range from old folk tales and songs, Anglo-Saxon poets, to the theatrical traditions of East Asia. In his seminal book *The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht*, John Willett (1967) demonstrates that Brecht commonly used parody with frequent references to Goethe and Schiller alongside "pseudo-Shakespearean blank verse, pantomimic rhymed couplets, formal prologues and epilogues, popular songs old and new" (p. 102). According to Willett (1967), in the composition of his songs, Brecht was heavily influenced by the old ballads performed at the public fairs in Bavaria (p. 88). At the same time, he also showed his deep admiration for the poetic style of Rudyard Kipling, whose poems he translated to use in his plays (Willett, 1967, p. 90), as well as being inspired by the use of unrhymed verse in Japanese Noh plays (Willett, 1967, p. 97). However, what makes Brecht's language distinct is the fact that he also abundantly uses slang, proverbs, and dialects in the same text in a simple and clear manner. Through this unusual composition, the use of slang and a high register at the same, Brecht aims to create a language that catches the audience's attention. Eddershaw (2002) emphasizes the difficulty in translating Brecht because of the multifarious nature of Brecht's language, the aim of which is to engender the *Verfremdungseffekt* (p. 53).

Furthermore, the interruption of the rhymed prose with unrhymed verse and abrupt stage directions inserted between these may create an interruptive language. Brecht himself (1940/2014) states that in order to achieve the *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage, actors should announce the stage directions and other forms of

commentaries out loud (“Short Description of a New Technique of Acting That Produces a *Verfremdung* Effect”, para. 12) and they should not hide the fact that they have rehearsed that part before (“Short Description a New Technique of Acting That Produces a *Verfremdung* Effect”, para. 16).

In this chapter, I have introduced the concept of epic theatre along with the key concepts associated with it. Comprehending the concepts of Aristotelian and non-Aristotelian theatre, dialectics and, last but not least, *Verfremdung* is crucial for the focus of my thesis because my analysis will be heavily based on these terms. In the next chapter, I would like to concentrate on the theoretical framework of my thesis, alongside my methodology and literature review.

CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, METHODOLOGY
AND LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Theoretical framework

In my theoretical framework, I will focus on the key concepts involved in my analysis of Tiyatroadam production of *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*. To this end, I will introduce Patrice Pavis' views regarding the relationship between the text and performance and continue with his notion of *mise en scène*. This will be followed by an exposition of the relationship between this notion and *Verfremdung*. Finally, I will concentrate more specifically on the roles of the director and the translator. To reveal the expectations regarding theatre translation and the role of the translator from the perspective of translation studies, I will dwell on the remarks of translation scholars Ortrun Zuber (1980) and Susan Bassnett-McGuire (1985/2014). By doing that, I will illuminate their perception of the relationship between the text and performance and how it affects the responsibilities attributed to the translator.

3.1.1 Patrice Pavis: Text, performance, and *mise en scène*

World-renowned theatre scholar Patrice Pavis is known for his essays on theatre semiotics and considered one of the most influential authors working on the topic. Differing from traditional views, Pavis's understanding of the relationship between text and performance liberates both notions from each other's unrealistic demands and paves the way for an independent approach towards both.

Pavis (1992/2005) rejects the perception of “performance (stage signs) as the logical and chronological consequence of textual signs” and declares “that the one precedes the other” (p. 29). According to this view, text and performance should preserve their “autonomy” since they can be considered as part of two “different semiotic systems” (Pavis, 1992/2005, p. 26).

Furthermore, with the purpose of putting an end to “fruitless” discussions of text and stage dichotomy, Pavis (1982) offers an understanding of the text freed from being “an invariable element or deep structure of the performance” (p. 29). As a result, the focus shifts to the relationship between the two semiotics and the “construction they can impose on each other”, rather than the text or stage being reduced into one another (Pavis, 1982, p. 29). Now, I would like to refer to Pavis’ interpretation of *mise en scène*, which is essentially based on his perspective on the interaction between text and performance.

In an essay on *mise en scène* and theatre semiology in his book *Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of Theatre*, Pavis (1982) states that he “overall” accepts A. Veinstein's definition of the notion:

The term *mise en scène* has two distinct meanings: it designates, on the one hand, the ensemble of means of stage expression (acting, costume, décor or set, music, lighting, furnishings) and, on the other hand, the function involving the elaboration and the spatial and temporal arrangement of these means of expression in order to interpret a dramatic work or a theme. (p. 136)

Here, Pavis carefully highlights the problematic views of the notion and adds his own interpretation by putting the emphasis on interaction and confrontation. Pavis (1992/2005) states that what the audience sees on the stage is a performance “in which the text is only one of several components, others being the actors, the space, the tempo” and they cannot infer “from the performance the work that led up to it”

because *mise en scène* “is the synchronic confrontation of signifying systems, and it is their interaction, not their history, that is offered to the spectator and that produces meaning” (p. 24). Pavis furthers his argument by offering two more definitions of the notion, each with the same emphasis: “...*mise en scène*, defined as the bringing together or confrontation, in a given space and time, of different signifying systems, for an audience...” (1992/2005, p. 24) and that “it is an object of knowledge, a network of associations or relationships uniting the different stage materials into signifying systems, created both by production (the actors, the director, the stage in general) and reception (the spectators)” (1992/2005, p. 25).

As stressed above, these definitions are closely related to Pavis's view of the relationship between the text and performance. They reject a linear transference from the text to the performance and instead require a simultaneous co-existence of different semiotic systems. Now, I will focus on Pavis's explanation of what *mise en scène* is not since it completes his definition and highlights its critical aspects.

Pavis (1982) accentuates that most of the time *mise en scène* is considered as the “stage rendering of a pre-existing textual message”, where a “faithful” equivalence of the text is created by the “stage expression” or occasionally stage directions are seen as a way to “transcode information about the dramatic universe into a decor or a stage figuration” (p. 144). All these impressions result in viewing the notion as a mere “refraction of a text onto the stage” which only serves to “confirm what the text has already suggested” (Pavis, 1982, p. 145). In *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, opposing such a reductionist view, Pavis (1992/2005) stresses that *mise en scène* “is not the staging of a supposed textual 'potential'” (p. 26), “does not annihilate or dissolve the dramatic text” (p. 27), and “is not the fusion of two

referents (textual and stage)” (p. 28). In other words, the relationship between text and performance should not be regarded as “conversion, translation or reduction of the one to the other” (Pavis, 1982, p. 29).

While explaining the rationale of my focus on Pavis, I stated that there are aligning points between his interpretation of *mise en scène* and Brechtian theatre, particularly in the structure of *Verfremdung*. Now, in the next part, I will elucidate these aligning points and reveal why Pavis' interpretation could be useful in my analysis.

3.1.2 *Verfremdung* and *mise en scène*

As discussed in detail in Chapter Two, in Brecht plays, the text and other stage elements, each with their own semiotics, collaborate to realize the *Verfremdungseffekt* in a symbiotic relationship and non-hierarchical structure. To avoid repetition, I will refrain from going through the methods of *Verfremdung* again. However, the following quotation perfectly summarizes the collaborative nature of *Verfremdung*. In *A Short Organum for the Theatre*, Brecht (1964) himself emphasizes *Verfremdung* in terms of its elements and the people responsible for producing it on the stage:

The exposition of the story and its communication by suitable means of alienation constitute the main business of the theatre. Not everything depends on the actor, even though nothing may be done without taking him into account. The ‘story’ is set out, brought forward, and shown by the theatre as a whole, by actors, stage designers, mask-makers, costumiers, composers, and choreographers. They unite their various arts for the joint operation, without of course sacrificing their independence in the process. (p. 202)⁸

⁸ This quotation is taken from the first edition of *Brecht on Theatre* edited and translated by John Willett (1964). Throughout the thesis, I have avoided translating *Verfremdung* as “alienation” as

Here, the playwright emphasizes that *Verfremdung* is used to reveal the story and that this is the essence of the theatre. His emphasis on the way “the story is set out through the collective effect of various elements or as “the theatre as a whole” bears a striking resemblance to Pavis’ definition. As noted above, Pavis (1992/2005) states that *mise en scène* is “the synchronic confrontation of signifying systems” (p. 29). He also adds that “the two semiotics must keep their autonomy because text and performance adhere to different semiotic systems” (1992/2005, p. 26). Brecht’s emphasis on “the joint operation” where the components do not “sacrifice their independence in the process” looks almost identical to Pavis’ emphasis on the need for textual and stage signs to preserve their autonomy. In fact, Pavis himself (1982) acknowledges this parallelism and describes Brechtian theatre as “an ensemble of systems alienated from one another, never losing their autonomy” (p. 32).

As we have seen, Pavis criticizes (2005) the view of performance as a “logical and chronological” outcome of the text, which consequently places the text as the preceding element (p. 29) and reduces *mise en scène* to the staging of an invariable text (p. 26). The proximity of Pavis’ position to the Brechtian take on elements such as *Gestus* and story can be seen below:

It seems rather difficult to tell which elements, *Gestus* or story, is logically and temporally anterior to the other; it appears at any rate that story and *Gestus* are closely linked, and constitute the play and *its mise en scène*. (Pavis, 1982, p. 40)

In this quote, Pavis refers to the lack of linearity or hierarchical order between the text and performance (in this context, *Gestus*) in Brechtian theatre. Similarly, Pavis (1982) explains that *Gestus* holds a primary role in the creation of

explained before. However, I find it appropriate to leave it as “alienation” since this is the term chosen by the translator himself.

Verfremdungseffekt, “where the thing is simultaneously recognized and made strange”, which encourages us to think about the contradictions between the text and gestures further (p. 45).

In this way, the confrontation of different semiotics in *mise en scène* and the interaction of various components within the framework of *Verfremdung* point to a symbiotic relationship between the text and stage elements. In both cases, these semiotics are non-reductive, non-hierarchical, and autonomous. Besides, there is no “logical and chronological” order between them. All these features are the pillars of both notions, Pavis’ *mise en scène* and Brecht’s *Verfremdung*. They are the “points of alignment” that I stressed in the first place.

3.1.3 *Mise en scène* and the roles of the translator and the director

In this part, I would like to briefly highlight the roles of the translator and the director, reflecting on what is expected of them and what their responsibilities are. First of all, I will dwell on the translator’s role. The remarks of various translation scholars reflect their expectations of theatre translation. In her article “Problems of Propriety and Authenticity in Translating Modern Drama”, translation scholar Ortrun Zuber (1980) keeps her focus on a close relationship between the visual-acoustic and linguistic aspects of a play and underlines the necessity of paying attention to both aspects in the translation process:

Even though a play might be perfectly translated linguistically, and even though it might be artistically refined, this piece of literature still requires action and movement in order to achieve that complete integration of text and performance, that coalescence of literature and theatre which constitutes drama. (Zuber, 1980, p. 95)

Zuber (1980) then expounds on the notions of “action and movement” and “non-verbal signs” and signals the aspects that a translator should pay attention to:

The translation of a play requires more consideration of non-verbal and non-literary aspects than does the translation of novels or poetry. A play depends on additional elements, such as movements, gestures, postures, mimicry, speech rhythms, intonations, music and other sound effects, lights, stage scenery. In particular, a play is dependent on the immediacy of the impact on the audience. (p. 92)

We can infer from these remarks that Zuber views the translator as someone who should be expert in excavating the performative aspect of the text (if there is such a thing), and successfully convey these in her/his translation. One can see the similar emphasis in another article written on theatre translation. In her article “Ways Through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts”, Bassnett-McGuire (1985/2014) notes that the theatre of a given society will inevitably comprise a set of culturally determined codes that are performance conventions but are also present in the written text” (p. 92) and that “the translator carries the responsibility of transferring not only the linguistic but a series of other codes as well” (p. 89). Likewise, theatre scholar Robert W. Corrigan (1961) accentuates his view of translation by suggesting that the translator should not only translate the play but also direct and act it, by becoming a “writer, director, actor, audience” and, last but not least, a critic (p. 101).

There are two common points between these views. First, theatre translation should not be seen as a mere interlingual translation since there are many constraints that should be taken into consideration. These are the linguistic aspects of the text and the multiplicity of signs or codes. The second is the translator, who should be dealing with all these constraints. This is mainly due to the perception of the

relationship between the text and performance. These scholars consider performance as something embedded in the text or they conceive the text and performance as “inseparable”. Based on this assumption, they assign the translator the task of detecting various codes embedded in the text and translating the text by paying absolute attention to these codes.

However, as discussed above in detail, Pavis sees text and performance as parts of two different semiotic systems. They cannot be reduced into one other since performance is not a chronological outcome of the text and neither comes before the other (Pavis, 1992/2005, p. 29). Separating these systems and refusing to create a hierarchical or chronological order between them has the potential of alleviating the translator of many of his/her responsibilities. It can be said that the translator does not have to consider the so-called performance signs buried in the text.

Still, according to this proposition, someone needs to supervise the symbiotic relationship between the text and performance and other sign systems. At this point, the director comes to forefront, as the person who has various semiotics at his/her disposal. In her article “The Delicate Balance: Dynamic Interactions in Translating Drama into Theatre”, Patsy McCarthy (1984) stresses that it is the director’s responsibility to understand and acknowledge the intention of the playwright and, when working on a play by Harold Pinter, he/she should realize that “much of the richness lies in the unseen and the unsaid – the pauses are as eloquent as the language” (p. 56). She then furthers her argument and highlights that the performance with all its aspects should be “orchestrated” by the director:

The good director must have the eye of a sculptor or painter, the ear of a musician, the rhythm of an expert conductor, the understanding of an incisive intellect, and be a person of great humour or intense passions to underline the inner feelings of the text. (1984, p. 63)

However, it should be noted that, according to Pavis, the director is not someone with absolute authority. Instead, Pavis (1992/2005) warns that we should not “speak of the director as a private individual instructed by a theatrical institution to put his or her name to an artistic product” (p. 24). According to him, *mise en scène* is not the “...haphazard assembling of materials, the ill-defined activity of the director...”, but it is “created both by production (the actors, the director, the stage in general) and reception (the spectators)” (Pavis, 1992/2005, p. 25). Also, with regards to the role of the director, in her article “On Being a Playwright/Director”, Wendy Blaxland (1984) states that when a director “wants to cut scenes, or rewrite or restructure them, or even wishes to add other elements” he/she should act with “a sense of responsibility” to the playwright (1984, p. 42). Likewise, McCarthy (1984) defends the view that a director should not “ignore the discipline established by the playwright” and asks whether the director should stage “a simple parable like *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* with expensive costumes and elaborate lighting effects on a revolving stage?” (p. 56). Even though one cannot deny that with its perception of the text and performance, Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* indirectly takes the responsibility from the translator and allocates it to the director, it does not suggest an authoritative director who can force one semiotics into other and weaken its role.

In my thesis, I focus on *Verfremdungseffekt* from a translational perspective and address this question: “How can one analyse the Turkish translation and staging of *Arturo Ui* from the perspective of *Verfremdungseffekt*?” In the analysis of the play, I will use Pavis' concept of *mise en scène* as a model for two reasons. Firstly, from a translational perspective, this non-hierarchical and symbiotic approach liberates us from deciding whether we should pay attention to the textual aspects of the translated play or to the stage elements. Instead of creating a useless dichotomy,

it offers us a holistic perspective for the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt*. And secondly, it will help us to evaluate the role of the director Ümit Aydoğdu in creating a symbiotic relationship between different semiotics in the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt*, especially in staging a translated play where the translation by Yücel Erten acted as the textual foundation.

3.2 Literature review

In this part, I aim to present a concise literature review. First, I will refer to the works on Bertolt Brecht abroad and the discussions on *Arturo Ui* as a play. Then, I will briefly share the works on Bertolt Brecht in Turkey and conclude with a detailed examination of Ümit Aydoğdu's doctoral thesis. Such a review will allow me to position my work in relation to previous studies.

3.2.1 Works on Bertolt Brecht abroad

3.2.1.1 The analysis of Brecht translations at the textual level

In this part, I would like to focus on the works approaching the translation of Brecht plays from a text-oriented perspective. Among the works that perform a textual analysis, André Lefevere's "Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature" preserves a well-deserved place in the literature. In this article, Lefevere (1982/2004) stresses that every translation is a form of refraction and it is thus not reasonable to judge translations simply from the perspective of what is lost, preserved, or properly transferred. He suggests that instead of complaining about a Brecht image based on misinterpretation, we should

come to accept that such refractions are understandable in literature and life in general (1982/2004, p. 234). According to Lefevere (1982/2004), these refractions are in fact the act of adapting a text to a target audience with the aim of shaping their perception of the work, which eventually contributes to the creation of a certain image of an author and his/her oeuvre (p. 235). For instance, in his translation of *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* [Mother Courage and Her Children] Eric Bentley translates “Käs aufs Weißbrot” as “Cheese on pumpernickel”, which can be seen as a way to approximate the American audience to the text, since for Americans, it is only natural for Germans to eat cheese on pumpernickel, a type of commonly consumed bread in Germany (Lefevere, 1982/2004, p. 237).

Additionally, in his article André Lefevere (1982/2004) stresses that how much a translation compromises is closely related with the status of the author in a target literary system (p. 237). Therefore, Hays’ Brecht translations that were published in 1941 (when Brecht was not known in the US) differ significantly from Manheim and Willett’s translations since, as an author becomes part of the “canon” in a given target literary system, the translation of his/her works tends to free itself from the conceptions of the target system (Lefevere, 1982/2004, p. 237).

Another article showing the relationship between the notion of translation, rewriting and Brecht is Liu Xiaoqing’s “A Metonymic Translation: Bertolt Brecht’s *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*”. In her article, Xiaoqing (2013) states that Brecht’s *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* is in fact an adaptation of an old Chinese play *The Story of the Circle of Chalk* by Li Xingdao, as acknowledged by Brecht himself (p. 133). Through the article, similarities, and differences in terms of language, the story, and characters are highlighted in a comparative manner. Xiaoqing (2013) boldly suggests that Brecht became a translator while he was writing *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*

and his way of writing was actually the act of translation itself (p. 133). In the creation of his play, Brecht “turned re-creation into creation” by incorporating some aspects of the original Chinese play into his, whereas he also excluded certain elements of the original play (Xiaoqing, 2013, p. 134).

Furthermore, in her book *Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre*, translator and scholar Gunilla Anderman (2005) offers a remarkably comprehensive review of the works of the canonized playwrights translated into English. Among these playwrights, Anderman (2005) dwells on Brecht's translational journey within the British literary system. She states that the first Brecht plays found their ways into Britain thanks to the efforts of amateur theatre groups with socialist leanings in the mid-1930s (2005, p. 216). For instance, a socialist theatre group “Theatre of Action” staged their own translation of Brecht’s *Die Rundköpfe und die Spitzköpfe* [Round Heads and Pointed Heads] (Anderman, 2005, p. 217). This was followed by the staging of an English production of *Die Gewehre der Frau Carrar* [Senora Carrar’s Rifles] which was similarly brought to the stage by a socialist theatre group, the London Unity (Anderman, 2005, p. 217). Anderman (2005) reveals that in the political atmosphere of the 60s and 70s, Brecht plays were adapted into the target theatrical systems in such a way that they matched or reflected the predicaments of the local audience such as an adaptation of *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* to the setting of Liverpool, whose inhabitants belonged to the working class (p. 221). Towards the end of the 1970s and early ‘80s, English-language Brecht plays increasingly gained popularity among middle-class and subsidized theatres as well, but their Brechtian style and social political activism were lost (Anderman, 2005, p. 224).

In addition to her emphasis on the socio-political effect of Brecht translations in the UK, Anderman (2005) also reviews Brecht translations with a closer textual

analysis, particularly from the perspective of *Verfremdung*. The role of language in creating *Verfremdungseffekt* has been already emphasized in Chapter Two with references to John Willett and Margaret Eddershaw. Still, due to her focus on the translational aspects of *Verfremdungseffekt* at a language level, I would like to briefly share a few of Anderman's findings. Anderman (2005) reiterates that, through “the use of slang, expletives and linguistic structures that are designed to catch the spectator's ear”, one can achieve *Verfremdungseffekt* at a textual level (p. 230). She furthers her argument by categorizing the distancing uses of the language in Brecht's plays. For instance, she states that in his translation of *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*, John Willett attempted to recreate the Bavarian dialect of Mother Courage by replacing it with a northern English accent (2005, p. 230). However, he also diluted Mother Courage's character by translating a line in which Mother Courage uses the word *Krankheit* to refer to her daughter's predicament, as “complaint” instead of “illness” (Anderman, 2005, p. 230). Anderman (2005) notes that such examples (e.g. translating *Gestank* as “pong”) cushions the intended effect, which is to create a distance between the audience and Mother Courage (p. 230). Another method, according to Anderman (2005), is “the linguistic manipulations” of Brecht to give a “humorous effect” such as replacing a well-known expression in such way that it immediately draws audience's attention (p. 231). By referring to John Willett's translation, she shows how these linguistic manipulations can be recreated in translation. In Scene 8, Mother Courage says, “Don't tell me *peace has broken out* just after I laid in new stock” whereas the usual collocation for “breaking out” is “war” (2005, p. 231). Furthermore, one last example would be the use of evidently strange phrases that attract the audience's attention such as using the adjective

“innocent” instead of “guilty” in this line: “Corruption's our only hope... even an *innocent* man will have a chance of being let off. “ (Anderman, 2005, p. 231).

Furthermore, in her doctoral thesis *Translating Brecht: Versions of Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder for the British Stage*, Katherine J. Williams (2009) performs a translational analysis on the five English translations of Brecht's *Mutter Courage* in a similar way to Gunilla Anderman's study. Williams (2009) analyses these translations from the perspective of linguistic *Verfremdung*. She states that the linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt* occurs when “the accepted rules of language” are “violated” and “the audience's attention is consciously drawn to language use” (2009, p. 92). The reason behind this is the fact that Brecht believed that one could alter reality through the medium of language, “altering reality” being “the heart of the political aim” of Brecht’s works (Williams, 2009, p. 92). After briefly highlighting the linguistic aspects of *Verfremdung* such as use of dialects, slang, unusual expressions, comical elements that sound strange for the audience, use of prose and verse interchangeably, Biblical references so on and so forth, Williams acknowledges the challenges of translating such a style (2009, p. 102).

The common point of the abovementioned works is that they analyse merely the “linguistic” aspects of Brecht plays rather than embracing a more interdisciplinary approach and putting a spotlight on epic theatre, which can help us comprehend the symbiotic nature of Brecht plays, as I have discussed in detail before. As noted above, Gunilla Anderman (2005) proposes that, in his translation, John Willett weakens Mother Courage’s stiff character by translating *Krankheit* as complaint and thus tones down the intended *Verfremdungseffekt*. However, it does not seem reasonable to claim that the *Verfremdungseffekt* can be broken with the translation of a single word. Linguistic *Verfremdung* is only one component and such

losses can be compensated on the stage through the medium of other stage elements. Additionally, her claim is probably based on the fact that she can see the difference only because she compares the source and target text in a close examination. In a real-time performance, it may not be possible for the audience to catch that small difference, since their attention would most probably be on the performance, not just on the individual words enunciated by the actors.

3.2.1.2 The attempts to analyse Brecht plays from a performative perspective

In this part, I will reflect on those works that take the performative aspects of Brecht plays into consideration. In these works, we see an article by Anthony Meech, the translator of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, staged on the National Theatre under the direction of Tim Baker in 2002. In his article “Brecht’s The Three Penny Opera for the National Theatre: a 3p Opera?”, Meech (2011) shares his experiences of his translational journey, illuminating the role of the translator and the challenges awaiting them in the translation of Brecht plays. According to Meech (2011), when translating a Brecht play, one should always keep in mind that the text is not a finite version and productions become more like journeys on the stage (p. 127). The main reason is Brecht’s emphasis on the value of experimentation and the collaboration innate to each staging process, as can be seen in his essays *Versuche* [Essays] (Meech, 2011, p. 127). However, even though Meech emphasizes Brecht’s words regarding the collaborative and experimental nature of his plays, we do not see the changes that the text went through in its journey from page to stage, despite the fact that Meech himself describes it as a journey.

A similar emphasis on Brecht's collaborative approach towards the staging and translation of his plays can also be found in theatre scholar Margaret Eddershaw's comprehensive book *Performing Brecht*. Eddershaw (2002) does not concentrate on Brecht and his works from a strictly translational perspective but still provides interesting examples on the translation of Brecht plays. For instance, she points to the collaboration between Charles Laughton (lead actor acting Galileo) and Brecht on the translation of *The Life of Galileo*: "Laughton spoke no German and Brecht's English was uncertain, but they established an immediate and effective rapport. With the aid of dictionaries, they acted out and demonstrated the text for each other until the meaning satisfied both" (2002, p. 29).

According to Patrick Primavesi (1999) this collaboration was particularly critical for reaching an agreement on the gestures of the actors, which was essentially based on a trial-and-error method (p. 57). Another benefit of such an experimental approach is the opportunity to create a novel and rich production with the aid of the actor in the process (Primavesi, 1999, p. 56). However, just like Meech, neither Eddershaw nor Primavesi give an example proving their points. They only mention how important the collaboration is in terms of producing a performable Brecht play in Brechtian manner, but they do not share specific incidents where a line is adapted in keeping with the *Gestus* of the actor or how it contributes to the dialectical development of the scene in question.

Another scholar who takes performance into consideration when reviewing Brecht in her work is Laura Bradley. With a focus on the cultural appropriation of the play in the USA, Bradley (2006) points out that in the *Die Mutter* [The Mother]

production by the Theatre Union in 1932, not only the text but also the aesthetics⁹ of Brechtian theatre were also adapted to the target audience (p. 142). Assigned to produce an “ideologically and aesthetically safe version” of *Mutter Courage*, Paul Peters turned the play into a three acts “cathartic melodrama” by breaking the epic structure and rewriting the end in a way that would lead to a more appealing finale (Bradley, 2006, pp. 144-145). Additionally, Peters omitted some figures by keeping more intimate ones such as Iwan, Pawel and Sostakowitsch (Bradley, 2006, p. 146). Bradley's work differs from textual oriented ones by putting the emphasis on not just the text but also the aesthetic aspects of the play on the stage.

3.2.1.3 Discussions on *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*

In this part of the literature review, I would like to dwell on the discussions surrounding *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*. The following remarks may widen our perspective regarding the play’s challenges and possibilities.

In the first volume of *Arbeitsjournal (1938-1942)* [Working Journal], Brecht (1973a) stresses that, when he was reflecting on the American theatre during his visit in New York, he decided to write a gangster play that everybody knew (p. 249). As for the target audience, Meg Mumford (2009) provides the information that the playwright wrote the play for those who knew the history of American gangsters well (p. 32). Indeed, in an essay on the play in *Schriften zum Theater 4* [The Writings on Theatre 4], Brecht (1963c) notes that he wrote the play in 1941 in Finland with the aim of narrating Hitler’s rise to power by placing him in a familiar setting for the

⁹ In *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis*, Patrice Pavis (1998) notes that the term theatre aesthetics “sets out the laws of dramatic composition, indicating how text and stage function” (p. 15).

capitalist world (p. 162). Also, in a letter to stage designer and director Mordecai Gorelik, who was in charge of the stage design in a production of *Die Mutter* in Broadway in 1935, the playwright expressed his conviction that *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* would be a success in New York (Nutku, 2014, p. 111).

Furthermore, in the same essay in *Schriften zum Theater 4*, Brecht (1963c) explains his motive behind writing this play. He states that he wrote the play in a parable form “to demolish the dangerous respect that people show for the great murderers” (1963c, p. 166). Brecht (1963c) further elaborates his intention by pointing out that these great political murderers should be particularly exposed through reference to their comical aspects (p. 163). In this sense, the following remarks by the playwright are quite illuminative:

In order that the play may retain all its (regrettable) significance, it must be produced on the Grand Scale, and preferably with obvious hark backs to the Elizabethan theatre... pure parody however must be avoided, and the comic element must be to some extent revolting. The actual presentation has got to go at top speed... (as cited in Willett, 1967, p. 53)¹⁰

In this quote, the terms “the grand scale” and “parody” deserve a closer look since they are connected to wider issues of the play such as its allegorical nature and the dialectical representation of Ui. In his book *Brecht in Practice: Theatre, Theory and Performance*, David Barnett (2015a) highlights that, in *Arturo Ui*, “Brecht wanted the scenes to function on their own merits and to reveal more than just historical details” (p. 183). Brecht’s request to perform the play in the grand style, according to Barnett (2015a), was an attempt to keep the focus on the play, not on its historical connections, and thus prevent the audience from reducing it to a mere allegory (p.

¹⁰ Here Willett (1967) translates “großen Stil” as “Grand Scale”. However, the correct translation should be “grand style” since it refers to the very style of the play. The word “scale” can create confusion in terms of denoting a meaning such as “scope, extend” of the play.

183).¹¹, Due to the allegorical nature of *Arturo Ui*, the audience may believe that they have understood the parallelism between the play and its historical reality, which may eventually result in the conviction that no further analysis is required (Barnett, 2015a, pp. 182-183). Such a reductionist interpretation of the play is not something that can be desired in a Brecht play. As emphasized before, Brecht always invites the audience to reflect on the play critically and to reach an understanding of the relationships between the events and figures on the stage. Barnett (2015a) names this undesired reductionism “allegory trap” (p. 187) and defines it as a major issue that can “threaten to undermine the principles of Brechtian theatre” (p. 183).

Now I would like to share a few cases where the analogies in the play posed challenges for the directors. In her book *Performing Brecht*, Margaret Eddershaw (2002) analyses an *Ui* production directed by Di Trevis and staged by the Royal National Theatre in 1991 (p. 140). In the production, Di Trevis filled the stage with the images of the Nazi period, which made clear the allegory of the play and drew the audience’s attention to the historical connections (Eddershaw, 2002, p. 146). Trevis explained her preference by claiming that her target audience was young people who might not know the historical aspects of the play (as cited in Eddershaw, 2002, p. 146). In the light of the notion of the “allegory trap” defined above by David Barnett, Trevis’ decision to place a particular emphasis on the historical details can be interpreted as a wrong path to follow in staging *Arturo Ui*. Some theatre critics such as Michael Coveney criticized the highlighting of the historical connections through images, music and slogans (Eddershaw, 2002, p. 148). Margaret Eddershaw (2002) also criticizes the stage design of the production for being too crowded with slides (p. 149) and stresses that even Trevis herself grew dissatisfied with the play in

¹¹ The term (*großen Stil*) refers to a certain form of rhetoric that features the use of a highly figurative language with a potential to arouse emotion.

time and found the gangster setting as an allegory “too thin to sustain such a very important subject” (as cited in Eddershaw, 2002, p. 148).

In contrast to Trevis’ production, we see that the issue of *Ui* as allegory was taken more seriously by another director. In his book *A History of the Berliner Ensemble*, Barnett (2015b) gives a striking example from a *Ui* production staged by the Berliner Ensemble in 1959 under the direction of Manfred Wekwerth and Peter Palitzsch. Barnett (2015b) reveals that Wekwerth was not satisfied with the initial sketches for the *Arrangements* on the stage, since they tended to look like a caricature of the Nazi era (p. 161). To avoid this, Wekwerth decided to work with drafts that incorporated the Nazi attributes into the gangsters’ *Haltungen* (Barnett, 2015b, p. 161).¹² Barnett (2015b) interprets Wekwerth’s decision as an attempt to overcome the challenges of staging an allegorical play and “offer the audience a complex interpenetration of Nazism and the gangster genre” in a way that emphasizes the possibility of stopping *Ui*’s rise to the power (p. 161).

Now I would like to concentrate briefly on the dialectical and parodical nature of Arturo *Ui*, the lead figure of the play. Renowned theatre critic Michael Billington (1973) describes the performance of the actor Leonard Rossiter in a 1969 production of the play by likening Rossiter to “a clown at the start of a circus” while pointing out that he was at the same time “physically grotesque” (p. 72). Billington (1973) further depicts the physicality of Rossiter’s *Ui* on the stage, noting that “his corkscrew body constantly seemed to be in the grip of some barely restrainable animal force but, at the same time, the absurdity balanced the menace... To make evil funny is a singular achievement...” (p. 72). Similarly, Margaret Eddershaw

¹² Barnett (2015a) notes that the word *Haltung* “combines what is usually a mental state in English (attitude) with physical expression (bearing)” (p. 98). It refers to the attitudes of a figures towards another figure.

(2002) highlights the amalgam of comical and hideous aspects of the play and praises the portraying of Ui by Anthony Sher in Trevis' production in 1991 as "a skilful blend of satire and menace" (p. 149). Furthermore, theatre scholar Stephen Unwin (2005) notes that Brecht was immensely inspired by Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* and he intended to portray Ui in a way that could reveal Hitler's absurdity (p. 174). According to Unwin (2005), the combination of opposing styles in the play presents an excellent cartoon "which shocks even as it teaches, entertains even as it appals" (p. 176). The focus on the contradictory and parodical features of Ui by these theatre critics are no coincidence since it can be said that this was what the playwright Bertolt Brecht exactly wanted in his play.

With regards to the abovementioned 1959 Berliner Ensemble production of the play by Wekwerth and Palitzsch, Barnett (2015b) claims that the directors were in favour of inserting "dialectical contradictions to open up the events on stage" and that this contrast was almost palpable in the production (p. 162). By doing this, they were following Brecht's instruction to reveal relationships (Barnett, 2015b, p. 163).

Last but not least, these contradictions show how Ui, as a figure, changes through the play. In other words, Ui is not a fixed personality, but rather he is quite dynamic. The actor Anthony Sher (2002) explains that when he was portraying Ui he "was very interested in his whole journey" and that he "thought the Actor's scene could change Ui, quite completely. He does not just learn a few Hitler gestures, he transforms" (as cited in Eddershaw, p. 145). The notion of "change", the essence of dialectics, has an utmost importance in Brechtian theatre because it emphasizes that it is the conditions that shape events in the history. For this reason, *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* requires the director to pay attention to Ui's journey through the play and the underlying conditions of his rise to the power and its potential to be

stopped (Barnett, 2015a, p. 183). In this sense, Barnett (2015a) points out that the word “resistible” in the title of the play signals Brecht’s understanding of history as something that is not inevitable (p. 183).

In this part, I have presented the issues surrounding *Arturo Ui* as a play. These mainly include the allegorical nature of the play itself and a few cases where directors of different productions tried to avoid this issue. Besides, I have reflected on the parodical and dialectical nature of Ui as a figure and theatrical attempts to portray Arturo Ui on the stage as a contradictory figure.

3.2.2 Works on Bertolt Brecht in Turkey

In this part, I will put an emphasis on the works written on Brecht and his works within the Turkish context. One of the most recent and valuable sources on the topic is Ela Gezen’s “Brecht on the Turkish stage: Adaptation, Experimentation, and Theatre Aesthetics in Genco Erkal's Dostlar Tiyatrosu”. In her article, Gezen (2016) places the spotlight on renowned Turkish theatre connoisseur Genco Erkal and his Dostlar Tiyatrosu. She states that Erkal played a major role in introducing Brechtian theatre to the Turkish theatrical system through his “interpretation, transformation, and adaptations” and paved the way for a dialogue between Brechtian theatre and the traditional Turkish theatre (2016, p. 269). According to Gezen (2016), Brecht's works encouraged the Turkish playwrights to adapt Brechtian methods in a way that can tackle the socio-economic and political problems of the Turkish society, which led to a synthesis between Brechtian theatre and the traditional theatre (p. 273). Gezen (2016) also notes that the number of academic studies on Brecht has been quite limited in the Turkish context (p. 270) and she points to a few publications by

theatre critics such as *Türkiye'de Brecht* [Brecht in Turkey] by Özdemir Nutku (1976) and *Tiyatroda Devrim* [Revolution in Theatre] by Zehra İpşiroğlu (2000). I will now briefly review them because both works deserve a closer look.

In *Türkiye'de Brecht*, Özdemir Nutku (1976) compiles his reviews of Brecht plays staged between 1964 and 1976. Nutku, as a renowned theatre critic and translator, analyses the productions in detail by explaining how well or badly the directors apply the concepts of Brechtian theatre to their productions. In terms of documenting these performances in detail and a plain language, Nutku manages to produce a guide for the early Brecht productions in Turkey. However, despite being a translator, he only occasionally (two or three times) refers to the translational aspects of the plays. Still, in these rare references to translation, Nutku always emphasizes the importance of a particular line for Brechtian theatre and takes it as a part of performance. For instance, he points out that, although the translation of *Leben des Galilei* [The Life of Galileo] by Ülkü Tamer and Mütekin Ökmen was quite good and correct, it was the director Metin Deniz who should have paid attention to the application of *Gestus* on the stage (1976, p. 127). This example reveals Nutku's approach toward theatre translation. He takes the responsibility from the translator's shoulders and specifically assigns the director to produce a performable version of the translated play on the stage itself.

Furthermore, in Chapter Four of her book *Tiyatroda Devrim*, Zehra İpşiroğlu (2000) focuses on the theatre of *Verfremdung* in Turkey and provides a brief summary of Brecht performances in Turkey, dedicating a separate (albeit short) part for Brecht translations. In the part on translation, İpşiroğlu (2000) illuminates the defamiliarizing role of Brecht's language by adding that the language becomes “parodical” through the juxtaposition of references to the Bible and other canonical

writings of Western culture with the use of slang, idioms etc. (p. 114). İpşirođlu (2000) continues her argument by criticizing Can Yücel's translation of Brecht's *Schweyk im Zweiten Weltkrieg* [Schweik in the Second World War] She states that, unlike Adalet Cimcoz's free, performative, and truly Brechtian translations, Yücel “turned Brecht's refined sense of humour into a vulgar public comedy with overuse of slang, sexual references” and thus destroyed Brecht's main aim, which is, according to İpşirođlu, to encourage the audience to think through the use of comic elements (2000, pp. 114-115). Can Yücel's reply to this criticism is worth mentioning too. In his interview with translation scholar Suat Karantay, Yücel (1989) defends that one cannot expect from the Turkish audience to understand Brecht's parodies and references at language level, whereas the use of slang is common in Brecht and even necessary (p. 15). Still, İpşirođlu's notion of “performative” and “Brechtian translation” is not well-defined. She criticizes Yücel's translation for the over-use of profanity, but she does not share any concrete examples of what she understands from a performable Brechtian translation. Besides, İpşirođlu does not explain why the audience cannot develop a critical perspective towards the play due to Yücel's slang and sexual references in his translation.

As discussed in the theoretical framework and shown in the analysis of *Arturo Ui* in Chapter Five in detail, *Verfremdung* is not a concept based on mono-semiotics. For this reason, İpşirođlu's claim that Yücel's translation damages the play's potential of stimulating critical observation among the audience is not well grounded. It ignores all other elements, various sign systems collaborating on the stage, and over-simplifies Brechtian theatre and *Verfremdung*.

Although the number of publications written specifically on Bertolt Brecht has increased considerably in the last ten years in Turkey, the ones analysing Brecht

plays from a translational perspective can be unfortunately counted on the fingers of one hand. In her book *Pierre Bourdieu Sosyolojisi Işığında Türk Tiyatro Alanında Çevirinin Rolü ve Dostlar Tiyatrosunun Konumu* [The Role of Translation within the Turkish Theatrical System and the Position of Dostlar Tiyatrosu from the Perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology], Hilal Erkazancı Durmuş (2020) reviews the role of Dostlar Tiyatrosu led by Genco Erkal and Erkal's personal habitus in the selection and staging of Brecht plays. Erkazancı Durmuş's work can be considered as the first book reflecting on Brecht translations from the perspective of translation studies in Turkey. In addition to Erkazancı Durmuş's book, there are two master theses written on Brecht from a translational perspective. In his MA thesis titled *Applicability of the Equivalence and the Skopos Theory to the Practice of Translation: A Critical Approach to the Translations of Bertolt Brecht*, Fırat Soysal (2012) analyses selected Brecht plays from the perspective of Werner Koller's Equivalence and Hans J. Vermeer's Skopos theory. Additionally, in his MA thesis, Apdullah Aktay (2009) reviews the Turkish translations of idioms in *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Besides, in their article "Bertolt Brecht'in 'Üç Kuruşluk Opera' adlı eserinin Türkçeye aktarımındaki dilsel öğelerin kültürel boyutlarıyla incelenmesi" [The Analysis of Cultural Dimensions of the Grammatical Items in Translation of Bertolt Brecht's The Threepenny Opera], Ümmügülsüm Albiz Telci and Fadime Çoban (2017) analyse the translation of cultural items in *Die Dreigroschenoper*.

However, the common problem of these equivalence-oriented works is the fact that they do not pay attention to the theatrical aspects of Brecht's plays, instead they evaluate them only on the basis of the translations of the cultural items and idioms. However, isolating the expressions and idioms within the text would prove itself inefficient to offer a translational perspective on Brecht's works and even may

result in disconnecting Brecht from its theatrical context. However, in my thesis, I approach *Verfremdung* by taking both its linguistic and theatrical aspects into consideration. As I have discussed above, *Verfremdung* is a complicated notion, which cannot be reduced to a “single” component. Thus, my thesis differs from the abovementioned works through its particular focus on *mise en scène*, a notion from theatre semiotics.

Now, last but not the least, I would like to concentrate on the PhD thesis of the director Ümit Aydoğdu. Aydoğdu (2011) completed the proficiency in art program (Sanatta Yeterlilik Programı) with his thesis entitled *Brecht'in Arturo Ui'si: Bertolt Brecht'in Epik Tiyatro Araçlarının Günümüzde Kullanımına Yönelik bir Sahneleme Denemesi* [Arturo Ui by Brecht: A Staging Attempt to Utilize Brecht's Epic Theatre from Today's Perspective]. His study is based on an *Arturo Ui* production staged by the students of the Faculty of Performing Arts at Anadolu University under his direction in 2011. Two years later, Aydoğdu used exactly the same script for the Tiyatroadam production in 2013. A comparison of the script in his thesis with the recording of Tiyatroadam production confirms this (Aydoğdu, personal communication via e-mail, July 10, 2020).

In his study, Aydoğdu (2011) articulates his understanding of Brechtian theatre and presents the script of *Arturo Ui*, explaining almost each scene of the production directed by himself. In the following part, I will only comment on his remarks that are directly related to his view of theatre. The analysis chapter, on the other hand, incorporates both his views and his explanations of the scenes.

Aydoğdu's remarks on epic theatre in general reveal striking similarities between his and Brecht's understanding of theatre. This resemblance can also be observed in his production, which is reviewed in close detail in the analysis.

Aydoğdu (2011) stresses that if theatre practitioners want the audience to develop a new understanding of theatre and watch the play with a fresh look, they should first and foremost be innovatory in their own works (p. ii). Therefore, the biggest threat for theatre is to forget its progressive role and turn it into “a museum for masterpieces that avoid any risk and repeat themselves” (Aydoğdu, 2011, p. 2).

According to Aydoğdu (2011), Brecht always believed in progression, innovation and change (p. 4). For this reason, staging his plays in an easily acceptable and conservative manner would mean betraying the playwright (Aydoğdu, 2011, p. 4). Such an approach would also defy the idea that everything can change when conditions change (Aydoğdu, 2011, p. 5). After explaining his views on the role of theatre, Aydoğdu (2011) accentuates that the main aim of his study is to break the familiar ways of watching a play through the medium of *Verfremdung* and *Gestus* (p. 6). In the following lines, we get a glimpse of his understanding of *Verfremdung* as a concept as well. Aydoğdu (2011) notes that *Verfremdung* is an essential concept which requires the collaboration of various stage elements such as acting, costume, stage design, and music (p. 22). He maintains that these elements should be orchestrated in a way that can lead to the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage (2011, p. 22). Besides, according to Aydoğdu (2011), *Verfremdungseffekt* should be created in a manner that can change the perspective of the audience by showing them that conditions of life in general are not constant but instead alterable (p. 22). For this reason, “actors should be able to discover and show behaviours and attitudes by allowing the audience to interpret the text from different points” (Aydoğdu, 2011, p. 25). Aydoğdu (2011) also states that the theory of epic theatre should be taken as a kind of map and adapted to the needs of the country where the play will be staged in line with the aim of the production

itself (2011, p. 31). Aydoğdu (2011) elaborates his statement by highlighting that “Each component of the play such as text, acting, stage design, light, and music, should be centred around the production individually and as a whole” (p. 32).

As can be seen from these remarks, Aydoğdu has a good command of Brecht’s ideas on theatre, which also align with his own understanding of epic theatre and *Verfremdung*. Even though Aydoğdu’s thesis offers us a clear insight into his understanding of Brechtian theatre and *mise en scène* in general, it lacks a thorough theoretical discussion of concepts such as *Gestus*, *Fabel*, historicization, and dialectics. Besides, references to the translator Yücel Erten are nowhere to be found. Aydoğdu (2011) attempts to justify the lack of acknowledgment regarding the translator’s role and insufficient theoretical discussion (p. 8). He accentuates that in his study he deliberately avoided putting too much emphasis on the theory because he saw his thesis as a practical reference for staging attempts in the future (2011, p. 8). He also adds that he did not want his study to cross the boundaries of other academic disciplines (2011, p. 8). What he means with “the boundaries of other academic disciplines” unfortunately remains fuzzy since he does not specifically point to “translation studies” or “semiotics”.

However, insufficient theoretical discussion of Brechtian concepts reduces the thesis to a superficial description of the staging scene by scene without revealing the global rationale or intention behind the director’s decisions. The incorporation of theory and practice would allow us to see the black box of the director, particularly in such a complex and well-structured production. Besides, the lack of any references to the translator Yücel Erten’s effort gives the impression that the director was responsible himself for creating and staging the original text. This may serve as an

example of how translation might be ignored and seen as “secondary” within theatre studies despite the fact that a whole production is based on a translation.

3.3 Methodology

With regard to my methodology, I will first analyse the original text in close detail, with a focus on the lines/parts that may achieve *Verfremdungseffekt* linguistically.

John Willett's *The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht* (1967) and Gunilla Anderman's *Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre* (2005) are particularly useful in terms of analysing the playwright's style in detail.

Afterwards, I will compare Yücel Erten's translation (1999) with the original text in order to ascertain Erten's translational decisions. However, to be able to use Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* as a model, a review of the recording of the performance is of utmost importance. For this reason, I will analyse a recording of the play staged by Tiyatroadam under the direction of Ümit Aydoğdu, comparing the scenes to the original text and Erten's translation. To present my findings, I will be comparing the original text, Erten's translation and images from the performance, in order to reveal whether and how Aydoğdu approached the relationship between the text and performance in line with Pavis' notion of *mise en scène*.

When explaining Aydoğdu's methods, I will frequently refer to the terms “compensation” and “amplification”. In their article “Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach”, translation scholars Lucia Molina and Amparo Hurtado Albir (2002) define compensation as a translation technique used when “an item of information, or a stylistic effect from the ST that cannot be reproduced in the same place in the TT” and thus “is introduced elsewhere

in the TT” (p. 500). In their definition of compensation, renowned translation scholars Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1995) keep the focus on the preservation of the ST’s “overall tone” in the TT. The emphasis on “overall tone” and “effect” can be also seen in Keith Harvey’s (1995) definition of the term. Harvey (1995) stresses that he views compensation as “a technique for making up the loss of a source text by recreating a similar effect in the target text...” (p. 66).

As for the definition of “amplification”, Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) stress that amplification is a technique of translation that “requires more words than the source language to express the same idea” (p. 339). Similarly, Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002) demonstrate that amplification takes place when multiple signifiers are used for “syntactic or lexical gaps” (p. 500).

However, I would like to stress that I will be using “compensation” in a rather different, quite distinct sense. With compensation, I refer to the compensation of specific lines or parts present in Erten's translation but lost/omitted in the script. This can take place in the form of placing an alternative textual element or a stage element that may give the same effect in the performance.

With amplification, on the other hand, I mean the amplification of the intended effect of a specific line/part in Erten's translation on the stage through the medium of textual or stage elements. In other words, whereas these two methods are originally pertinent to translation of prose texts, my interpretation is centred on theatre translation which involved multiple semiotics.

CHAPTER 4

BERTOLT BRECHT AND *ARTURO UI* IN TURKEY

4.1 Brecht in Turkey

The social and political conditions in Turkey during the 1960s —the post-coup environment, a coalition government, and a new liberal constitution— merged with the zeitgeist of the 60s in general and laid the perfect ground for the birth of a political theatre. The first socialist and politically involved theatre groups such as Dostlar Tiyatrosu, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, Halk Oyuncuları Birliği, Halk Oyuncuları, Ankara Birliği Sahnesi and Devrim İçin Hareket Tiyatrosu were founded in this atmosphere (Buttanrı, 2010, p. 65). Thus, it is not surprising to see that the first Brecht performances in Turkish took place during this period as well.

As far as we have been able to ascertain, the first Brecht play translated into Turkish was *Der gute Mensch von Sezuan*. In her essay “Adalet Cimcoz: Sanatta Yeni Bir Soluğu Müjdeleyen Çevirmen” [Adalet Cimcoz: A Translator Heralding a New Breath in Art], translation scholar Ş. Seda Yücekurt Ünlü (2019) explains that this play was actually translated by Adalet Cimcoz in 1956 at the request of renowned playwright Haldun Taner, but the book, a compilation of a few stories by Brecht and the play, was banned on the charge of being communist propaganda (p. 162). Dikmen Gürün (2019) notes that when *Der gute Mensch von Sezuan* [The Good People of Sezuan] was finally staged by Istanbul City Theatres in 1964 at Tepebaşı Dram Sahnesi, it was raided by fanatical religious groups (p. 121).¹³

¹³ A comprehensive list of Brecht translations in Turkey can be found in Appendix B. When compiling this list, my main sources were the website of Devlet Tiyatroları Genel Müdürlüğü (the State Theatre) (2021), which offered a detailed archive of the plays staged so far, Tiyatrolar.com.tr (2021), and the website of Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu (2021).

After this incident, the Istanbul City Theatres did not include any Brecht plays until the season of 1975-76, in which *Leben des Galilei* (trans. Ülkü Tamer, Müntekim Ökmen) was staged. In the next seasons, the following plays were added to the repertoire: *Schweyk im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (1976-77, trans. Can Yücel), *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* (1977-78, trans. İsmet Sait Damgacı, Muammer Sencer), and *Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reichs* [The Fear and Misery of the Third Reich] translated by Can Yücel (Gürmen et al., 1985, pp. 36-49).

During the 70s, private theatre companies staged Brecht plays as well, albeit in the middle of severe restrictions. Özdemir Nutku (1976) reveals that *Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches* by Bertolt Brecht was staged by Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu in 1972 only six times until it was banned by the State under the martial law (p. 91). Furthermore, In the 1974-1975 season, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu staged *Die Mutter* by Brecht, but after a lawsuit filed against the play for doing “communism propaganda”, the theatre company was shut down (Gürün, 2000, p. 89).

Following the 1980 coup, theatre activities came to a halt. Still, towards the end of the post-coup atmosphere, Dostlar Tiyatrosu staged *Herr Puntila und sein Knecht Matti* [Mr. Puntila and his Man Matti] in 1988 under the direction of Genco Erkal. It was indeed a positive initiative. However, in her review, theatre scholar and critic Ayşegül Yüksel (2000) complains that even though Brecht's 90th birthday was enthusiastically celebrated around the world with the theatre activities and the staging of his plays, it was a shame to see that only one Brecht play was staged in Turkey in the season of 1988 (p. 129).

Starting with the 1990-1991 season, Brecht returned to the repertoire of the City and State Theatres again. Bursa State Theatre staged *Der kaukasische Kreidekreis* [The Caucasian Chalk Circle] (trans. Can Yücel) in the 1990-1991

season under the direction of Nurhan Karadağ. In the same season, *Leben des Galilei* (trans. Adalet Cimcoz) was staged at Ankara State Theatre by German director Heinz Uwe Haus. These plays were followed by *Der gute Mensch von Sezuan* (1998-1999, Van State Theatre, dir. Lise Scheer, trans. Adalet Cimcoz) and *Die Kleinbürgerhochzeit* [A Respectable Wedding] (1999-2000, İzmir State Theatre, dir. Rolf Doerr, trans. Yılmaz Onay). In the beginning of the 2000s, the rise of an alternative theatre and the increase in the number of new theatre companies contributed to the popularity of Brecht plays in Turkey, as did the affinity of these companies with the innovative, critical and provocative. *Die Kleinbürgerhochzeit* was staged by Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu and Sarı Sandalye in 2002 and 2017 respectively. Particularly after 2010, the City and State Theatres also incorporated Brecht plays in their repertoires: *Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reichs* (Nilüfer Belediyesi Kent Tiyatrosu), *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder* (Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu, 2012-2013), *Leben des Galilei* (Diyarbakır Devlet Tiyatrosu, 2017), *Herr Puntilla und sein Knecht Matti* (Bursa Devlet Tiyatrosu, 2017-2018).

4.2 *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* within the Turkish theatrical system
Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui was staged by Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu for the first time in Turkey in the 1965-1966 season. The director was theatre practitioner and poet Asaf Çiyiltepe and the translators were Sevgi Soysal and Başar Sabuncu. Even though we do not have a full list of actors, we see that Asaf Çiyiltepe himself and Genco Erkal were also in the cast (Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, 2021).

After this production, no other theatre companies staged the play again until 1979. However, in 1979, the State Theatres incorporated *Arturo Ui* as the first Brecht

play in its repertoire and it was staged by the Ankara State Theatre (Kaysı, 1987, p. 323). Introduced as a musical play of two acts, the play was directed by Yücel Erten and translated by Sevgi Soysal and Başar Sabuncu, while the lead figure, Arturo Ui, was portrayed by a male actor, Işık Toprak. In a review published in *Cumhuriyet*, theatre critic Ayşegül Yüksel (1979/2000) praises Erten's production and states that it was successful in terms of presenting a meticulous example of epic acting and highlighting the historical context by drawing a parallelism between Ui and Hitler through the use of photographs and explanations (p. 70). However, she does not offer any other comments, which makes it difficult to evaluate the production in detail.

Furthermore, theatre scholar Müzeyyen Buttanrı (2010) stresses that the production was instantly banned and those behind the production were dismissed (p. 69). As briefly explained above, this period was incredibly turbulent in terms of political conflicts, and it was one year before the bloody 1980 coup. Taking these conditions into consideration, it can be claimed that even incorporating *Arturo Ui* into the repertoire as the first Brecht play to be staged by the State Theatres required quite an amount of courage.

In the 1999-2000 season, *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* returned to the stage of Istanbul State Theatre, with Yücel Erten being both the translator and the director. Thus, twenty years on, Erten preferred his own translation instead of Sevgi Soysal's and Başar Sabuncu's. After this production, the State Theatres did not stage the play again. However, between 2013 and 2017, *Arturo Ui* gained a striking popularity and was staged by three different theatre companies: Bornova Belediyesi Şehir Tiyatrosu (2011), Tiyatroadam (2013), and Tiyatrohane (2017).

In 2011, Bornova Belediyesi Şehir Tiyatrosu, financed by the municipality of Bornova, staged the play under the direction of Hakan Taner Yıldırım. This time, the

translation was that by Özdemir Nutku. Similarly, Nutku's translation was used in the Tiyatrohane production of 2017, directed by Erk Bilgiç. Based on the information on its website, we learn that Tiyatrohane theatre company was founded by Erk Bilgiç himself under the supervision of Özdemir Nutku. Even though we do not have such information, one may assume that Nutku as the translator might have contributed to Bilgiç's production of *Arturo Ui*. Now I would like to concentrate on the Tiyatrodam (2013) production, the director Ümit Aydoğdu and the translator Yücel Erten, since they will be at the centre of my analysis.

Founded in 2007 by a group of actors in Istanbul, Tiyatrodam declares that, as a private theatre company, its aim is to stage plays that tackle the problems Turkey encounters as a country (Tiyatrodam, 2021). Their repertoire has included plays by Ben Elton (*Gasping*), Boris Vian (*The General's Tea Party*), Friedrich Dürrenmatt (*Frank der Fünfte*) [Frank the Fifth], Nazım Hikmet (*İvan İvanoviç Var mıydı, Yok muydu?*) [Did İvan İvanoviç exist, or not?], and Bertolt Brecht (*Der kaukasische Kreidekreis* and *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*) (Tiyatrodam, 2021). Despite being a small and independent theatre company, Tiyatrodam enjoyed wide press coverage with Dürrenmatt's *Frank der Fünfte* directed by Fatih Koyunuğlu in the 2016-2017 season and Brecht's *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* directed by Ümit Aydoğdu and staged between 2013 and 2016 (Tiyatrodam, 2021).

The fact that *Arturo Ui* was staged for three seasons successively is not a coincidence. First staged in 2013, the play was praised by various theatre critics and in 2014 was nominated for one of the most prestigious theatre awards in Turkey, the Afife Theatre Awards, in seven categories. In a review published in *Evrensel* newspaper, well-known theatre critic Üstün Akmen (2014) accentuates that Aydoğdu's contemporary interpretation of the play was in line with the principles of

epic theatre, with the audience becoming active observers (para. 4). Akmen (2014) also states that both Aydođdu and Tiyatroadam fully deserved their awards (para. 18). In another review in Tiyatro Online, theatre critic Aycan Akçamete (2014) praises Aydođdu for staging the play by building a team spirit among the actors in a lively manner (para. 1). It can be said that the huge success of *Arturo Ui* in 2014 encouraged Aydođdu to work on other Brecht plays as well. That is to say, currently an associate professor at the department of Performing Arts at Anadolu University, Ümit Aydođdu has also directed *Beş Para Etmez Varyete* [Worthless Vaudeville], an adaptation of *Die Dreigroschenoper* (Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu), *Herr Puntila und sein Knecht Matti* (Bursa State Theatre) and *Der kaukasische Kreidekreis* (Tiyatroadam).

Rather surprisingly, in the introductions and reviews on the play, we see that only Üstün Akmen, as an experienced theatre critic, comments on Yücel Erten's translation. Akmen (2014) acclaimed Erten for producing a perfect translation for the stage which contributed greatly to the production (para. 3). However, the very fact that the Afife Theatre Awards do not have an award category for the best translation or any kind of acknowledgment regarding the role of the translator is quite disappointing. Even as a renowned theatre director, actor, and translator, who served as the director of the State Theatres for a while and translated several other Brecht plays, Yücel Erten remained almost invisible, although he worked on two other *Arturo Ui* productions both as a director and translator. This may be an indication of how little attention is paid to translation in Turkish theatre circles.

CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH TRANSLATION
AND STAGING OF *ARTURO UI*

In my theoretical framework, I presented an approach that may be of use in the analysis of Brecht plays in terms of translation and staging, particularly from the perspective of *Verfremdungseffekt*. As I discussed in detail in Chapter Three, Patrice Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* and Brecht's conception of *Verfremdung* seem to be quite parallel in terms of what they say about the symbiotic, sometimes dialectical relationship between the multiple sign systems, the text and the stage elements, in a theatrical production. In principle, in Brecht's plays and Pavis' notion of *mise en scène*, these multiple sign systems do not discount one another but rather serve a common aim, the creation of *mise en scène* and *Verfremdungseffekt*. In theory, this does not seem problematic. However, on the stage there may be a set of challenges.

First of all, in staging *Arturo Ui*, one may claim that the director Ümit Aydoğdu was presumably dependent on the translation and thus on Erten's expertise as the translator.¹⁴ For Aydoğdu to detect and work on devices that may produce linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt*, it can be assumed that the precondition was Yücel Erten's ability to transfer these in his translation.¹⁵ Second, even if Erten had

¹⁴ Unfortunately, I was not able to reach Yücel Erten. On the other hand, Dr. Aydoğdu contributed to this thesis by kindly directing me to Tiyatroadam theatre company and helping me to acquire a copy of the play's recording. He also told me that Tiyatroadam production used exactly the same script as his *Ui* production in 2011. I wanted to ask Dr. Aydoğdu further about a possible collaboration with Erten and the role of the translation/the translator in the staging process. I requested an interview, but I was not able to receive a reply. Therefore, when addressing questions regarding the role of translation and a collaborative process, we can only make assumptions based on his doctoral thesis (2011).

¹⁵ However, it should be noted that Aydoğdu may have been also familiar with the German original or with other English/Turkish translations. Since he does not make any comment on the translation except listing Erten's name as the translator in his thesis (2011), we cannot be a hundred percent sure.

preserved such instances successfully, it would have been Aydoğdu who made the final decision and utilized them in the creation of *Verfremdungseffekt*. He could simply have omitted and ignored them and sought shelter in the stage elements where his expertise probably resides. Such a preference would have resulted in a downplaying of the textual aspects of *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage and made it impossible to talk about a symbiotic relationship between the two semiotics. Still, in his doctoral thesis, Aydoğdu (2011) stresses that *Verfremdung* is a fundamental concept that depends on the collaboration of various elements (p. 22) and these elements need to be orchestrated in a manner that may produce *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage (p. 22). To this end, “each component of the play such as text, acting, stage design, light, and music, should be centred around the aim of the production both individually and as a whole” (Aydoğdu, 2011, p. 32). Taking his own statement into consideration, one can claim that he pays attention to multiple sign systems and aims to create a relationship between them. Acknowledging all these challenges, I do not claim that Pavis' approach will produce the best results and help us to analyse the translation and staging of the play perfectly. I only see this alignment between Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* and Brecht's *Verfremdung*, which is highlighted by Pavis himself as well. He points to the parallelism and categorises Brechtian theatre as “an ensemble of systems alienated from one another, never losing their autonomy” (1982, p. 32). Thus, I see this affinity as an opportunity to reflect on a possible symbiotic relationship between the text and performance and its analysis from the perspective of translation studies and theatre semiotics.

In the following analysis, I will demonstrate cases where Aydoğdu managed or failed to create a symbiotic relationship in line with Pavis' notion; that is, he

achieved *Verfremdungseffekt* by means of textual and stage aspects, as well as through the relationship between these aspects.

5.1 The synopsis of the play

Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui is an allegory of Hitler's rise to power, set in Chicago. In the play, The Cauliflower Trust, a group of merchants mainly selling cauliflowers, attempts to increase their profits in the city of Chicago devastated by a harsh economic crisis. To this purpose, they try to deceive Dogsborough, the mayor, through bribery. After a series of attempts, Dogsborough accepts their offer and gives a loan to the Cauliflower Trust from the City's budget despite the fact that he knows the Trust will not be spending the money to repair the docks. In return for his favour, The Cauliflower Trust sells a shipping company to Dogsborough for half the price. After Arturo Ui, the gangster, learns about this secret deal, he tries to blackmail Dogsborough to gain power within the city. Eventually, Dogsborough gives up and surrenders to Ui's blackmail. Afterwards, Ui forces the greengrocers to pay them money in exchange for protection. When one of the greengrocers resists, Ui and his gang burn down his warehouse. Meanwhile, Ui and his gang gradually takes control of the neighbouring city, Cicero. Finally, at the end of the play, Ui becomes someone that no one can possibly stop or resist.

5.2 The analysis of the play

In analysing how *Verfremdungseffekt* is realised on the stage, compensation and amplification can be considered as key methods for translators, directors, and scholars studying their work. These should not be seen as deviations from the text or over-imposing of the stage elements on the text. On the contrary, as will be seen in the following examples, they are based on a negotiation between the text and stage elements. In the Turkish translation and staging of *Arturo Ui*, the director Ümit Aydoğdu utilized different methods of compensation and amplification in an attempt to achieve *Verfremdungseffekt*. These could be at the textual level, such as by altering the translation or replacing it with a new text, as well as through incorporating a stage element. In other words, my analysis of the realisation of *Verfremdungseffekt* involves examining the text and performance together. For this reason, I will be analysing the translation not in isolation, but by taking its relationship to the performance into consideration.

"Alteration" at textual level is a very familiar concept when it comes to Brechtian theatre. Renowned Brecht translator Anthony Meech (2011) states that the actors in Berliner Ensemble got anxious whenever they heard the clicks of Brecht's typewriter since Brecht was known to alter the text during the rehearsals when he saw the play on the stage (p. 127). Besides, the very fact that Brecht named his voluminous compilations of theoretical essays "Versuche" could be seen as proof of the organic and collaborative nature of Brecht plays, where the text should be regarded not as something finite but as everchanging (Meech, 2011, p. 127). Known for his theoretical works on Brecht plays, Stephen Unwin (2005) similarly emphasizes that rehearsals under Brecht's direction lasted months with the aim of reaching the "gestic" effect, which requires constant change and re-development of

the play (p. 73). In this sense, his repeated revisions of *Leben des Galilei* could be seen as the prime example of Brecht's habit of changing the text, since between 1938 and 1955 he published three different versions of the same play. In other words, we can say that Brecht always encouraged a critical reflection on his works and developed new ways of interpreting and staging them. Aydoğdu's production can be regarded as a good example of that. Aydoğdu (2011) himself accentuates that Brecht's plays should be staged in an innovative and progressive way rather than like a piece of work exhibited in a museum (p. 2) because an easily consumable production would mean betraying the playwright (p. 4). He also defends the view that theatre practitioners must take care to be innovatory if they want the audience to watch the play with a fresh look (2011, p. ii). However, when we approach Aydoğdu's treatment of the translation, we should not forget the possibility that the director drew primarily or mostly on Yücel Erten's translation, carrying out additions or omissions on the basis of Erten's text. For this reason, unless he looked to another translation or the original itself for reference, it might be suggested that Aydoğdu's decisions were not based on his judgment of the original text, but the translation. In other words, in cases where Aydoğdu supported the text with stage elements with the aim of creating *Verfremdungseffekt*, the director could have been possibly bound by Erten's interpretation of Brecht's text. Now, in the following analysis, I will share some examples from the Turkish staging of *Arturo Ui* staged in 2013 by Tiyatroadam under the direction of Ümit Aydoğdu. Due to the limited scope of my thesis, I will not concentrate on each scene in order. Instead, following the analysis of the prologue, the main emphasis will be on Dogsborough, the Cauliflower Trust, and Arturo Ui. The motive behind such a focus is to highlight how these figures change through the play, which is a central theme in Brechtian theatre. Since

contradictions play a central role in the creation of *Verfremdungseffekt* and also revealing the transformation of the figures on the stage, I will primarily choose the examples that bring out contradictory behaviours and *Gestus* of the figures.

These examples will show Aydođdu's understanding of *mise en scène* and its role in realizing *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. To this end, my method will be first introducing the devices in Brecht's text that may contribute to the creation of *Verfremdungseffekt* and then examining whether, and if so how, they were preserved in Erten's translation. Afterwards, I will scrutinise the way in which the same points in the text were dealt with during the performance to see how they were compensated and/or amplified in the script and/or through other aspects of the staging under the direction of Ümit Aydođdu.

5.2.1 The prologue

First of all, in Table 2 below, I would like to share the first four lines of the prologue and Yücel Erten's translation:

Table 2. The Opening Lines of the Prologue¹⁶

Verehrtes Publikum, wir bringen heute - Ruhe dort hinten, Leute! Und nehmen Sie den Hut ab, junge Frau! (Brecht ,1965, p. 7)	Sayın Baylar Bayanlar Bugün, burada, yüksek huzurlarınızda Hoop, arka taraf sessiz olalım kardeşim! Hanımefendi, siz de şapkanızı çıkarın lütfen! (Erten, 1999, p. 39). ¹⁷
--	---

¹⁶ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C1.

¹⁷ Since I could not find a printed edition of Yücel Erten's translation, throughout the thesis I referred to Erten's Turkish translation kindly provided by ONK Copyright Agency upon my request.

When reviewed closely in terms of register, it can be seen that there is a mix of a formal and informal register in the German: "Verehrtes Publikum!" (Dear audience!) is followed by "Ruhe dort hinten, Leute!" (Keep your voice down, folks!). Then we have a rhyming couplet: "Enthaltend zum allererstenmal, Die Wahrheit über den großen Dockshilfeskandal" (For the first time, we bring you the truth of the big dockyard scandal!). This mixed register is successfully preserved in the translation as well. After these opening lines comes the rest of the speech. A passage is shown in Table 3 below with its translation.

As stated in Chapter Two, John Willett (1967) emphasizes that Brecht commonly uses parody to create *Verfremdungseffekt* through "pseudo-Shakespearean language, pantomimic rhymed couplets, formal prologues and epilogues, popular songs old and new" (p. 102). Indeed, in the second half of the above given passage, which can be seen in Table 3 below, we see sudden transitions from Shakespeare references and rhyming couplets to the lines addressing the audience: "Wem fällt da nicht Richard der Dritte ein? Seit den Zeiten der roten und weißen Rose..." and "Verehrtes Publikum, angesichts davon, War es die Absicht der Direktion". These can be interpreted as the use a mixed register. In the translation, Yücel Erten retained this style exactly as it is in the German by paying attention to the rhymes ("...dramı", "...itirafları..."), Shakespeare references ("Kral Üçüncü Richard faciası..." and "Shakespeare tragedyaları halt etmiş") and the transition to direct address to the audience ("İşte bu yüzden sayın bayanlar ve baylar...").

Considering the nature of the play itself, namely an allegory for Hitler's rise to power set in the gangster world of Chicago, these rhyming lines in Table 4 become contradictory themselves. They point to the historical nature of these events, ("Jedoch ist alles streng wirklichkeitsgetreu ..." and "Was wir hier zeigen, weiß der

ganze Kontinent”) and at the same time they claim that this is a gangster play (“Er ist das Gangsterstück, das jeder kennt!”).

Table 3. The Mix of Formal and Informal Language in the Prologue¹⁸

<p>(...ab junge Frau!) Die große historische Gangsterschau! Enthaltend zum allererstenmal Die Wahrheit über den großen Dockshilfeskandal. Ferner bringen wir Ihnen zur Kenntnis Dogsboroughs Testament und Geständnis. Den Aufstieg des Arturo Ui während der Baisse! Sensationen im berühmigten Speicherbrandprozeß! ... Wem fällt da nicht Richard der Dritte ein? Seit den Zeiten der roten und weißen Rose Sah man nicht mehr große Fulminante und blutige Schlächterein! Verehrtes Publikum, angesichts davon War es die Absicht der Direktion Weder Kosten zu scheuen noch Sondergebühren Und alles im großen Stile aufzuführen. (Brecht, 1965, pp. 7-8).</p>	<p>Evet sayın seyirciler Bugün, burada, yüksek huzurlarınızda ünlü yangın davası, Gangsterlerin büyük tarihi dramı... Kredi yolsuzluğu üzerine daha önce hiç duyulmadık büyük ifşaat! Daha: Dogsborough'nun vasiyetnamesi ve itirafları! Arturo Ui'nin borsa çöküşü sırasındaki hızlı tırmanışı! ... Kral Üçüncü Richard faciası! Kırmızı güller - Beyaz Güller Savaşı! Shakespeare tragedyaları halt etmiş! O günden bu yana böyle kan dökülmemiş, Böylesine boğazlamamış insan insanı. İşte bu yüzden, sayın bayanlar ve baylar, Müdüriyetimiz hiçbir masraftan kaçınmamış bulunuyor. Ve büyük trajik stilde oynanıyor olup biten. (Erten, 1999, pp. 3-4).</p>
--	---

Particularly the line, "das Gangsterstück, das jeder kennt!" (A gangster story that everybody knows!) refers to the fact that this allegorical story is familiar to everyone since it retells the rise of fascism under the right conditions. In his translation, we see that Erten preserved these lines by also paying attention to the rhymes.

The brief textual review below of the prologue reveals Brecht's attempts to use a mixed register. Aware of this, Yücel Erten preserved these parts in his translation. However, the main question here is how Ümit Aydoğdu approached this textual style during the staging of the play.

¹⁸ An English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C2.

Table 4. The Closing Lines of the Prologue¹⁹

<p>Jedoch ist alles streng wirklichkeitsgetreu Denn was Sie heut abend sehen, ist nicht neu Nicht erfunden und ausgedacht Zensuriert und für Sie zurechtgemacht: Was wir hier zeigen, weiß der ganze Kontinent: Er ist das Gangsterstück, das jeder kennt! (Brecht, 1965, pp. 8-9).</p>	<p>Bu akşamki oyunda Ne var ne yok yaşanmış Ne düzmece ne yalan Yalnız biraz budanmış Tarihtir gördüğünüz Ve pek bildik bir konu Tüm dünyanın tattığı Gangsterler oyunu (Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>
---	--

Did he keep it exactly as it was or simply ignore it and continue with his own style of staging? I suggest that, on first appearances, one may think that he completely ignored this meticulously written prologue. That is to say, in the performance, Aydoğdu replaced the prologue with another opening speech. The references to Shakespeare, rhyming couplets, the mode of the prologue (a monologue by an announcer) and practically all the content seem to be lost. However, a closer review may show us that this was not the case. Now I would like to show that in Act 1, the Prologue, Aydoğdu compensated for the dissonant register in the German source text though a mixture of semantically resembling lines and other stage elements which will be analysed below.

Table 5 below presents a comparison of the original, Erten's translation and the script. First of all, as can be seen below, the script does not follow the original/translation. It is a replacement text added by Aydoğdu himself. As a result of this replacement, aspects of Brecht's style, namely the sudden transition from informal to formal language and rhyming couplets, all preserved and even deliberately highlighted by Erten in his translation meticulously, is lost. As I mentioned before, Gunilla Anderman (2005) reiterates that this kind of stylistic distinctions may "catch the spectator's ear" (p. 230) and create a *Verfremdungseffekt*.

¹⁹ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C3.

Table 5. A Comparison between the Source, the Translation, and the Script²⁰

Source	Translation	Script
<p>Verehrtes Publikum, wir bringen heute - Ruhe dort hinten, Leute! Und nehmen Sie den Hut ab, junge Frau! - Die große historische Gangsterschau! Enthaltend zum allererstenmal Die Wahrheit über den großen Dockshilfeskandal. Ferner bringen wir Ihnen zur Kenntnis Dogsboroughs Testament und Geständnis. Den Aufstieg des Arturo Ui während der Baisse! Sensationen im berüchtigten Speicherbrandprozeß! (Brecht, 1965, p. 7). ... War es die Absicht der Direktion Weder Kosten zu scheuen noch Sondergebühren Und alles im großen Stile aufzuführen. (Brecht, 1965, p. 8).</p>	<p>Sayın Baylar Bayanlar Bugün, burada, yüksek huzurlarınızda Hoop, arka taraf sessiz olalım kardeşim! Hanımefendi, siz de şapkanızı çıkarın lütfen! Bugün burada yüksek huzurlarınızda ünlü yangın davası, Gangsterlerin büyük tarihi dramı. Kredi yolsuzluğu üzerine daha önce hiç duyulmadık büyük ifşaat! Daha: Dogsborough'nun vasiyetnamesi ve itirafları! Arturo Ui'nin borsa çöküşü sırasındaki hızlı tırmanışı! (Erten, 1999, p. 3). ... İşte bu yüzden sayın bayanlar ve baylar, Müdüriyetimiz hiçbir masraftan kaçınmamış bulunuyor. Ve büyük trajik stilde oynanıyor. (Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>Bayanlar Baylar Bugün sizlere Bertolt Brecht'in sözleriyle bir öykü anlatacağız, Tiyatro sanatının yaratıcı sahnesinden. Öykümüz Arturo Ui'nin dillere destan yükselişini anlatır. Peki kimdir bu Arturo Ui? Bir gangster mi, bir kahraman mı? (Act 1, Prologue)</p>

Still, apart from these rhymes and sudden transitions, there are other linguistic elements in the original and translation that Aydoğdu recreated through semantically resembling lines to compensate for his omissions. For instance, he kept lines such as: “Bayanlar baylar...” (Ladies and Gentlemen), “Bugün sizlere Bertolt Brecht’in sözleriyle bir öykü anlatacağız” (Today, we will tell you a story in Bertolt Brecht’s words), and “Öykümüz Arturo Ui’nin dillere destan yükselişini anlatır” (Our story is about the epic rise of Arturo Ui).

In the closing lines of the original and translation as shown in Table 6, we see a particular emphasis that this is a story known by everybody in the world and everything represented on the stage is reality, not something new or invented (“nicht

²⁰ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C4.

erfunden und ausgedacht”). In other words, on the one hand, Brecht highlights that this is not a fictitious story but something historical that everybody knows (“Was wir hier zeigen, weiß der ganze Kontinent”). On the other hand, he states that this is a gangster story (“Es ist das Gangsterstück, das jeder Kennt!”), which can be taken as a contradictory statement. In his translation, Erten preserved this discordance in terms of both its content and form (rhyming endings). However, in the script, we see significant omissions and additions.

Table 6. Contradictory Effect of the Closing Lines²¹

Original	Translation	Script
<p>Jedoch ist alles streng wirklichkeitstreu Denn was Sie heut abend sehen, ist nicht neu Nicht erfunden und ausgedacht</p> <p>Zensuriert und für Sie zurechtgemacht: Was wir hier zeigen, weiß der ganze Kontinent: Es ist das Gangsterstück, das jeder Kennt!</p> <p>(Brecht, 1965, pp. 8-9).</p>	<p>Bu akşamki oyunda Ne var ne yok yaşanmış Ne düzmece ne yalan Yalnız biraz budanmış</p> <p>Tarihtir gördüğünüz Ve pek bildik bir konu Tüm dünyanın tattığı Gangsterler oyunu</p> <p>(Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>Çünkü Arturo Ui bir kişi değil. O yalnızca bir çerçeve. Çerçevenin içindeki resimler değişebilir, değişti de. Dün değişti, bugün değişiyor, yarın da değişecek. Tıpkı insanlık tarihi boyunca dünyanın başına bela olmuş pek çok resim gibi Hitler mesela; Kim diyebilir ki ya da hanginiz diyebilirsiniz ki Hitler olmasaydı onca yıkım, kıym olmazdı Emin olun, o olmasaydı da o çerçeve boş kalmazdı. ... Alın işte yan yana koyduk iki hikayeyi Ama siz de görün resmi değil Onu içine alan çerçeveyi (Act 1, the Prologue)</p>

Still, through semantically resembling lines (which also happen to rhyme), Brecht’s conflicting message is compensated: “...Arturo Ui bir kişi değil, o yalnızca bir çerçeve. Çerçevenin içindeki resimler değişebilir. Dün değişti, bugün değişiyor, yarın da değişecek...” (Arturo Ui is not a person, he is just a frame. Pictures in the frames can change. It changed yesterday, is changing now, and will change tomorrow) and

²¹ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C5.

“Tıpkı insanlık tarihi boyunca dünyanın başına bela olmuş pek çok resim gibi, Hitler mesela...” (Just like all those pictures that plagued the earth throughout the history, take Adolf Hitler for instance...).

The first three lines of the script as shown in Table 6 remind the audience that Arturo Ui (frame) is just a figure telling a story (picture). So, it does not directly say “this is a gangster play”, but it points to the allegorical nature of the play. Right after that comes the line mentioning Hitler, and the announcer presents explicit parallels between the play and Hitler’s rise to power, which is supported by the closing line, “Alın işte yan yana koyduk iki hikayeyi...” (Here we bring two stories together). Through these additions, the effect of the conflicting statements in the closing lines in the original and translation, is recreated at textual level in the script even though it deviates from the original and Erten’s translation significantly.

So far, I have revealed Aydoğdu’s compensation at the textual level to show that he also paid attention to the linguistically contradictory aspects of the text that may produce a linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt*. Now I will approach these lines by taking account of the performance itself. As a director who had multiple semiotics at his disposal, Aydoğdu did not compensate for his textual deviations only through the script; he also resorted to stage elements that may both compensate for these omissions and amplify *Verfremdungseffekt*.

In the original text and translation, the prologue is enunciated by a single announcer introducing the figures of the play to the audience one by one in front of a closed curtain. However, in the prologue in Act 1 under Aydoğdu’s production, we first see a dark stage as shown in Figure 1.²²

²² Throughout Chapter Five, all the subsequent figures including this one are taken from a recording of the play (staged by Ümit Aydoğdu in 2013) kindly provided by Tiyatroadam theatre company upon my request.

Afterwards, the lights suddenly turn on as all the actors come from the backstage briskly (see Figure 2) and line up on the stage facing the audience, with hats in their hands (see Figure 3).



Figure 1. Prior to the beginning of the play



Figure 2. The entrance of the actors to the stage



Figure 3. The actors looking at the audience

Right after that, the actors line up on the stage. Subsequently, they start enunciating the opening speech in order and each actor shifts his/her head right and left as she/he

speaks. The following lines added by Aydođdu to the script point to the potential of historical conditions to change: “...Arturo Ui bir kiři deđil, o yalnızca bir çerçeve. Çerçevenin içindeki resimler deđiřebilir. Dün deđiřti, bugün deđiřiyor, yarın da deđiřecek...” (Arturo Ui is not a person, he is just a frame. The pictures in the frames can change. They changed yesterday, they are changing now, and they will change tomorrow), “Tıpkı insanlık tarihi boyunca dünyanın başına bela olmuş pek çok resim gibi, Hitler mesela...” (Just like all those pictures that plagued the earth throughout history, take Hitler for instance...), and “İřte bu yüzden kiřilerin yoktur bir önemi, çerçevelerdir var eden o dönemi...” (Therefore, individuals are not important, it is the frames that make up a period). The very fact that these lines are enunciated by different actors on the stage changing every two and three lines amplifies the changeability emphasised in these closing lines. Aydođdu (2011) also confirms that having the actors change their roles throughout the play was an attempt both to enrich these opening lines and to keep the audience constantly alert (p. 33).²³ In other words, the semantic content of the script is also reflected in the form of the delivery as illustrated in Figure 4 and Figure 5.



Figure 4. The male actor during the opening speech

²³ As I noted in the Literature Review, Aydođdu’s thesis is based on a detailed explanation of another *Ui* production. However, he confirmed in personal correspondence that he used exactly the same script for the Tiyatroadam production, which can also be seen when compared with the recording of the play. Still, I would like to suggest that I approach his thesis with caution and refer to his explanations/confirmations only if I am convinced that they hold true for the Tiyatroadam production as well. To avoid any kind of confusion, I would like to stress that the comments by Aydođdu which I may subsequently cite are based on his 2011 *Ui* production rather than the one being discussed here.



Figure 5. The female actor during the opening speech

During the enunciation of the closing lines “Alın işte yan yana koyduk iki hikayeyi...” (Here we bring two stories together) by a male actor, other actors start to sing the opening song in the form of a cappella, and at the end of the opening speech, all actors put on their hats and continue to sing, as the male actor joins the others.

The gesture of putting on their hats as they start singing demonstrates that one minute they appear in their persona of actors and then switch into their roles the next moment, as can be seen in Figure 6.



Figure 6. Gesture of putting on a hat

This gesture may generate *Verfremdungseffekt* in two ways. First, it inhibits the audience from identifying with the figures on the stage since they can see that the

actors are not fully in their roles, switching as they do suddenly between the role of narrator and their characters. Second, it can be regarded as an interruptive gesture because it marks the end of the prologue and signals an abrupt transition to the next scene through a song performed by the actors. It may also be said to compensate for the switch in the register of the prologue produced through sudden transitions from formal Shakespearean couplets to informal lines addressing the audience. In the prologue, as one will remember, the announcer talks about the content of the play with rhyming couplets one moment and turns to the actor or the audience to warn them or give a direction in the next moment. Brecht aims to create the *Verfremdungseffekt* through such interruptions and quick transitions. As noted above, in his translation Erten preserved this transitional effect stylistically by paying attention to the rhymes as well. What I mean with compensation for linguistic devices through staging procedures is that Aydoğdu might have attempted to recreate the effect of these stylistic devices through the actors' gesture of putting on their hats and switching personas, as well as the interruptive effect of the song before the next scene. Erten's successful translation in terms of reflecting this effect might have contributed to Aydoğdu's decision to compensate for the omission of parts of the prologue with such a stage addition. Aydoğdu's remarks on the meticulous arrangement of everything on the stage may confirm this subtle addition. He notes that the theatrical effect created on the stage can serve to draw the audience's attention to the play on the stage (2011, p. 35).

Furthermore, as highlighted in Chapter Two, songs are used as an effective tool of *Verfremdung* in Brecht plays. These songs both create interruption and contribute to the content with their lyrics. Aydoğdu (2011) emphasizes that music is one of the most important tools that can create *Verfremdungseffekt* since it interrupts

the play and thus open the events to discussion (p. 28). With regards to his Ui production in 2011, Aydođdu (2011) acknowledges that the songs conveyed the meaning in a clearer way (p. 35) and engaged the audience more in the play through both the performance and their semantic content (2011, p. 36). In the Tiyatroadam production, we see that the same songs were used, and they too interrupted the play and contributed to the meaning.²⁴ In Table 7, a comparison between the original, the translation and the opening song in the script reveals the thematic resemblance between them. As can be seen here, the emphasis on murder, slaughter, violence, and their historical recurrence is recreated in the opening song as well: "Katil olmak çok kolay... Bir tek leř yeter!" (Being a murderer is easy, it takes only one kill!), "İřte payımıza dūřenler, nefret, dehřet, řiddet ve kan!" (Here's what you get: hate, terror, violence and blood!), and "Tanıdık bir öykü bu, tekrarlanır ha bire..." (It's a well-known story which keeps repeating itself). These lines are also amplified by the interruptive effect of the song and the vivid a cappella performance of the actors, which together contribute to the *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage.

Additionally, we see that both songs have rhymes: "Tekrarlanır ha bire/Dün de aynı bugünde/Sayenizde" (It keeps repeating itself. Yesterday and today are the same, thanks to you!) and "Katil olmak çok kolay... Bir tek leř yeter!" (Being a murderer is easy, it takes only one kill!). The ending rhymes in the opening song could be interpreted as an attempt to recreate the style of Brecht's rhyming couplets.

²⁴ Aydođdu (2011) points out that that they rearranged the songs of 17 Hippies and Tiger Lilies for the production by writing new lyrics for their songs to contribute to the semantic content of the episodes and the play as a whole (p. 89). He explains that 17 Hippies frequently uses Balkan, German, and French melodies in their songs whereas Tiger Lilies is known as a "Brechtian Blues" band (Aydođdu, 2011, p. 89). It should be noted that even though these songs were written and composed for Aydođdu's 2011 production, the same songs were also used in 2013 production.

Table 7. Comparison of the Opening Song in the Performance with the Prologue²⁵

Source	Translation	Script
<p>Einer der größeren Killer aller Zeiten! Weg mit dir! (zu Emanuele Giri)</p> <p>...</p> <p>Seit den Zeiten der roten und weißen Rose</p> <p>Sah man nicht mehr so große Fulminante und blutige Schlächterein!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Jedoch ist alles streng wirklichkeitsgetreu</p> <p>Denn was Sie heut abend sehen, ist nicht neu</p> <p>Nicht erfunden und ausgedacht. Was wir hier zeigen, weiß der ganze Kontinent!</p> <p>(Brecht, 1965, pp. 8-9).</p>	<p>Bütün zamanların en büyük katillerinden biri! Yaylan!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Kırmızı Güller - Beyaz Güller savaşı!</p> <p>...</p> <p>O günden bu yana böyle kan dökülmemiş,</p> <p>Böylesine boğazlamamış insan insanı.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Bu akşamki oyunda</p> <p>Ne var ne yok yaşanmış</p> <p>Ne düzmece ne yalan</p> <p>Yalnız biraz budanmış</p> <p>...</p> <p>Tarihtir gördüğünüz</p> <p>Ve pek bildik bir konu</p> <p>(Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>Katil olmak çok kolay</p> <p>Bir tek leş yeter!</p> <p>Ama öldürürsen</p> <p>Binlerce</p> <p>Kahraman derler</p> <p>....</p> <p>İşte payınıza düşenler</p> <p>Nefret, dehşet, şiddet ve kan!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Tanıdık bir öykü bu</p> <p>Tekrarlanır ha bire</p> <p>Dün de aynı bugünde</p> <p>Sayenizde...</p> <p>(Act 1, the Prologue).</p>

As the opening song is about to end, the actors start changing their clothes visibly and do not stop singing meanwhile (see Figure 7). In the beginning of the next scene, after the song ends, we see the actors in their aprons as the members of the Cauliflower Trust, as demonstrated in Figure 8.



Figure 7. The actors changing their clothes

²⁵ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C6.



Figure 8. The actors as the members of the Cauliflower Trust

This quick change in a very short time —from actors as narrators to actors as the singers in a cappella band and finally to actors as the members of the Cauliflower Trust— can be taken as an important aspect of Brechtian theatre and a major *Verfremdung* method, since it has the potential to prevent the audience's identification with the actors on the stage. Commenting on his *Arturo Ui* production in 2011, Aydoğdu (2011) highlights that the actors have multiple responsibilities on the stage such as performing their roles, singing the songs, dancing, and ensuring transitions between scenes through various techniques (p. 59). Since the actors are assigned multiple roles, the audience are constantly alerted as to the artifice of the play and can observe the events from a distance without losing themselves in the play (Aydoğdu, 2011, p. 59). As illustrated in the images taken from the production, we can say that the deployment of a multiplicity of roles is also very much at the centre of Tiyatroadam production. In the following part, I will present another example demonstrating the use of *Gestus* as a mean of textual compensation and a significant device in the creation of *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage.

5.2.2 The Cauliflower Trust convenes²⁶

In Act 1, Scene 1, we see the members of the Cauliflower Trust who are complaining about the economic crisis in the city and trying to find a solution that will serve their interests. Even though Sheet is not present in this scene in the original text and translation, Aydođdu combines this scene with another episode in which the members of the Cauliflower Trust use the crisis as an opportunity and try to persuade Sheet to sell his dockyard. Defined as “interpreting fictional events through the lens of real social contradictions” (Barnett, 2015a, p. 89), the *Fabel* of this scene can be explained as follows: the Cauliflower Trust are complaining about how their economic interests are being harmed by the financial crisis the City is undergoing. As a solution, they are thinking about persuading almighty Dogsborough, the Mayor, to help them out. Despite being a supposedly honest man, Dogsborough also has things to lose. He is acting in line with his own interests. Similarly, the gangster Arturo Ui wants to gain influence in order to achieve his political aims. However, unlike the Trust and Dogsborough, as a gangster, Ui does not hesitate to eradicate all the obstacles in his way, including people. Now, in the following parts, I will explain all these relations in close detail.

Through the creation of a dynamic dialogue, this scene introduces the relationships between the members of the Cauliflower Trust and reveals their political and economic interests, which is a central theme in the play as a metaphor for the landowners and their close ties with politicians in Germany during the 1930s right before Hitler's ascension to power. In fact, at the beginning of the scene, we see

²⁶ In his production, Aydođdu merged Scenes 1 (1a and 1b), 2, and 3 in the original text and presented them as Scene 1. The following parts entitled “The Cauliflower Trust Convenes”, “Dogsborough: Rebuilt on the Stage”, and “Arturo Ui's First Appearance on the Stage” are included in Scene 1 and all the quotations in them are taken from the recording of the Tiyatroadam production (2013). Aydođdu (2011) stresses that this merger reveals the interests of Dogsborough, the Cauliflower Trust, and Arturo Ui more clearly (p. 37).

the members of the Cauliflower Trust and a narrator briefly explaining the meaning of the scene they will act: “1929-1932. Dünya ekonomik bunalımı. Bunalım en kötü etkilerini Almanya’da gösteriyor. Büyük sermaye sahipleri devletten kredi alma çabasındalar...” (The world is suffering from an economic crisis. Germany has to deal with its consequences. Major capital owners try to get a loan from the state...).

First of all, before analysing the scene, I would like to refer to the allegory trap again, as discussed in the literature review. Barnett (2015a) stresses that the allegorical nature of the play may cause the audience to assume that they have successfully understood what the play is about and thus require no further analysis (pp. 182-183), a risky situation which Barnett (2015a) terms the “allegory trap” (p. 187). Barnett contends that this trap can “threaten to undermine the principles of Brechtian theatre” (p. 183). At first glance, the abovementioned explanations in the original text may indeed simplify the play for the audience and create an illusion of comprehension. Still, they can also help to foster an episodic structuring of the play, which comes to be made up of detached scenes, each telling their own story in a non-linear way. However, throughout the play, we also see that Aydođdu avoided open references to Hitler such as projections and illustrations. Instead, he attempted to reflect Ui’s change in the course of the play by highlighting his *Gestus* as well as the disharmony embodied in Hitler’s gestures and temperament.

We can see the same principle at work in the representation on the stage of other interest groups, such as the Cauliflower Trust. Aydođdu supplemented the text with highly creative use of stage elements to demonstrate the relationship between the members of the Cauliflower Trust and their interests. To this end, we see that Aydođdu placed a special emphasis on the *Gestus* of the Trust. In this sense, Aydođdu’s thoughts on the importance of *Gestus* may explain his focus on this

concept. He states that actors should show their behaviour and attitudes on the stage in such a way as to stimulate the audience to reflect on the text from different perspectives (2011, p. 25). It can be suggested that through the meticulous use of *Gestus*, the director Ümit Aydođdu also managed to create discordance and thus *Verfremdungseffekt* among the audience.

After the end of the above explanation, we see a gestural transition prior to the beginning of the scene. In this transition, as the lights change, the narrator and other actors wearing aprons fiddle in their pockets, producing a metallic sound resembling the sound of coins, as illustrated in Figure 9.



Figure 9. The actors fiddling in their pockets

Then, they look at the floor and make a sound in unison in an exaggerated way to give the impression that they are thinking of ways to find money/gold (Figure 10).



Figure 10. The search for gold coins

Afterward, they continue fiddling in each other's pockets with curiosity and then inhale and exhale in a self-satisfied way (see Figure 11).



Figure 11. The actors fiddling in each other's pockets in a self-satisfied manner

Finally, one actor shouts "Sheet!", while extracting a piece of paper from the pocket of the narrator, who thereby becomes transformed into Sheet (see Figure 12).



Figure 12. The male actor drawing a piece of paper from Sheet's pocket

The members of the Cauliflower Trust assemble in the middle of the stage and struggle with one another to get hold of the paper, as shown in Figure 13.



Figure 13. The members of the Cauliflower Trust trying to get the paper

However, Figure 14 shows that Sheet keeps hold of the paper and comes to the front of the stage, while others line up behind him.



Figure 14. Sheet with his paper

In Brechtian theatre, the stage arrangement aims to illuminate the social relations between the characters in such a way that their tension is visible to the audience (Barnett, 2015a, p. 90). For instance, a comparison between Figures 3 and 9 shown up reveals the difference in the actors' placement on the stage. In the former, the actors line up in a loose formation, whereas in the latter they visibly stand much closer together and keep this close arrangement during the scene. In the first position, they are not in their roles yet and they are narrators introducing the play to the audience. However, in the latter, they become the members of the Cauliflower Trust, whose economic and political interests are closely aligned. So, this change in their placement on the stage between these two scenes and roles should not be taken as something coincidental. In the original text/translation, Brecht does not offer such a stage direction; rather, this was a well-thought-out invention by the director Aydoğdu. Furthermore, as will be seen below, Aydoğdu amplified this effect through the *Gestus* of figures throughout the scene.

After the introductory commentary ends, the members of the Trust play with the gold in their pockets (creating the same metallic sound), while looking right and left and producing thoughtful sounds, as well as continuing to pry into each other's

pockets. These actions signal that the members of the Trust are always thinking about their profits and search for every opportunity to fill their pockets. Besides, they are not independent capital owners; on the contrary, they are a closely related network sharing mutual interests and thus act as one. In addition, there is an evident irony in the fact that, even though the members of the Trust complain about the economic crisis and how bad their business is, their pockets are still filled with gold, as is indicated through a *Gestus* that is repeated a number of times during the scene. Furthermore, the greed of the rich is made very manifest when an actor shouting "Sheet!" grabs a piece of paper from another's pocket and brings it to the rest of the Trust, who scream and practically assault Sheet to get hold of it. For profit, they can exploit anyone, even one of their own, and they attack like a pack of wolves when they sense a moment of weakness.

Having presented a few examples of *Gestus* that show how it supports the overall political message of Brecht's play, I would now like to focus on the relationship between the text and stage elements in Act 1, Scene 1. Table 8 reveals a significant omission in the script.

Table 8. The Omission of "Taub" (pigeon) ²⁷

Source	Translation	Script
<p>Letzten Donnerstag Lud mich Ted Moon mit einigen achtzig andern Zum Taubessen auf den Montag. Kämen wir wirklich, fänden wir bei ihm vielleicht Nur noch den Auktionator. Dieser Wechsel Vom Überfluß zur Armut kommt heut schneller Als mancher zum Erbleichen braucht. (Brecht, 1965, p. 10).</p>	<p>Geçen hafta seksen kişi kadar Ted Moon'a güvercin yemeye davetliydik. Eğer gerçekten kalkıp gitseydik, herhalde haciz memurundan başka bir şey bulamayacaktık. Göz açıp kapayınca kadar bolluğumuz kıtlığa dönüşüverdi. (Erten, 1999, p. 5).</p>	<p>Göz açıp kapayınca kadar bolluğumuz kıtlığa dönüşüverdi. (Act 1, Scene 1).</p>

²⁷ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C7.

In Brechtian theatre, food is not only a matter of decor on the stage. As suggested by Stephen Unwin (2005), "Marxists believe that people's lives are shaped by the food they eat..." (p. 80). As a Marxist playwright, Brecht's famous line in *Die Dreigroschenoper*, "Erst kommt das Fressen, dann kommt die Moral" (Food comes first, and then morals) (Brecht, 1973b, p. 102) can be taken as betokening the importance Brecht attributed to food.

Taking into consideration the connotations that Brecht attached to food, it is clear that the reference in the original to a dinner invitation for 80 people to eat "Taub" (pigeon) ("Lud mich Ted Moon mit einigen achtzig andern zum Taubessen auf den Montag"), which was also preserved in Erten's translation, is intended to symbolize the social class of the participants, their richness. Whereas the common people eat cauliflower, the rich eat pigeon. In the English translation of the play, the translator Jennifer Wise (2013) translates "Taub" as "roast beef supper" (p. 6), which could be seen as an attempt to create an equivalence of Taub's rich connotation for the American audience. In addition, the wealthy connotation of eating pigeon is likely to jar with Caruther's complaint. In the original and Erten's translation, he says that last week, they were invited to eat pigeon while now they are supposedly suffering from poverty ("Vom Überfluß zur Armut"). However, in the script for Aydoğdu's performance, Caruther says nothing but "Göz açıp kapayıncaya kadar bolluğumuz kıtlığa dönüşüverdi ..." (We went from abundance to scarcity in a blink), omitting both the rich connotation of eating "Taub" and the paradoxical dimension of complaining about poverty and scarcity. On first appearances, this omission really seems like a major loss, at least for a Brecht play. Still, a closer look will show us that Aydoğdu compensated this through the use of a *Gestus*. The facial expression of the actor playing Caruther gives the impression that he could cry at any moment,

signalling his dissatisfaction with poverty, scarcity and the lack of buyers to buy his products. While he is in this state, the other members of the Cauliflower Trust move swiftly to listen to him (see Figure 15).



Figure 15. Caruther complaining about poverty

Then, the Trust make an audible metallic sound and then look at the audience (while producing the same sound) and shout "Yok!" (No buyer!) in unison with the same facial expression as shown in Figure 16.



Figure 16. The Trust members shouting, "No buyer!"

This *Gestus* could be said to convey the same effect of "Taub" in two ways. The connotations of richness and luxury are recreated on the stage through the metallic

sound of the coins, but this also results in a discord with their complaining about their so-called poverty. That is to say, the contrast between the words and actions of the Trust members may realize *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. At risk of over-interpretation, I would also like to suggest that the fact that we do not see any physical gold coins on the stage but only hear their metallic sound in the pockets of the aprons can amplify the hypocrisy and sneakiness of the Trust. They are doing business behind closed doors and hide their wealth so that they can complain about their supposedly terrible situation. While they are owners of capital, who control the whole business world, the fact that they wear the kind of regular apron that we would see on a poor greengrocer foregrounds the incompatibility even more.

Another striking example concerns the loss of a biblical reference in the translation. I am not suggesting, though, that Erten, as the translator, should or should not have kept these references. Now, in Table 9, I will compare the original text, the translation, and the script. In the original, Brecht uses an old German expression "vom Pontius zum Pilatus laufen" (go from door to door) with a satirical tone by adding "Pontius war weggereist" (Pontius was not at home/travelling) and "Pilatus war im Bad" (Pilate was taking a bath). As Gunilla Anderman states (2005), Brecht is known to manipulate expressions by adding humour in a way that alerts the audience with its strangeness (p. 231). So, by using a Biblical reference and then manipulating this archaic expression, it can be claimed that Bertolt Brecht aims to create a linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt*.

Besides, since the members of the Cauliflower Trust try to take advantage of Sheet and use him as a sacrifice as part of their sneaky plan (they will also soon kill him), a parallelism can be drawn between the fates of Sheet and Jesus.

Table 9. Translation of “Pontius zum Pilatus”: A Comparison²⁸

Source Text	Translation	Script
<p>SHEET: Ich lief vom Pontius zum Pilatus. Pontius War weggereist. Pilatus war im Bad. Man sieht nur noch die Rücken seiner Freunde! ... Die ganze Stadt näht sich die Taschen zu. (Brecht, 1965, p. 17).</p>	<p>SHEET: Kimin kapısını çaldıysam eli boş döndüm. Herkes ipine un sermiş. Bütün dostlarım dirsek çeviriyor! ... Paranın köküne kıran mı girdi ne? (Erten, 1999, p. 8).</p>	<p>SHEET: Kimin kapısını çaldıysam eli boş döndüm. Herkes ipine un sermiş. Bütün dostlarım dirsek çeviriyor! ... Paranın köküne kıran mı girdi ne? (Act 1, Scene 1).</p>

In this way, the reference to Pontius Pilate, the governor who gave the order to crucify Jesus, may also be an analogy to Sheet's fate. Furthermore, towards the end of his line, Sheet once again uses a slangy idiom: “Wie du mir, so ich dir!”: “Die ganze Stadt näht sich die Taschen zu!” (lit. The whole city sews up its wallet!) (p. 17). This could be an allusion to Goethe’s “Wie du mir, so ich dir!” (1827/1960): “Mann mit zugeknöpften Taschen, Dir tut niemand zulieb ...” (p. 483). The transition from a manipulated old German expression containing a Biblical reference to another idiom with a possible reference to Goethe in the closing line may contribute to the creation of linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt*. With John Willett's (1967) words: “The whole mixture suits Brecht's idea of conflict and incompatibility; it gives, to the later works especially, a great richness of texture...” (p. 103).

In Erten's translation, the linguistic manipulation, biblical references, and mixed use of language are lost. Erten only retained the idiomatic nature of the language. However, we still see that Sheet does not use standard language but incorporates slang and idioms frequently. Now, though, I will dwell on Aydoğdu's contributions and try to show how he used *Gestus* to compensate for the linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt* that seems to be lost here.

²⁸ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C8.

As Sheet enunciates "Kimin kapısını çaldıysam eli boş döndüm. Herkes ipine un sermiş. Bütün dostlarım dirsek çeviriyor!" (I went from door to door, and I have got nothing! Everybody has an excuse. All of my friends are turning their backs on me!), the members of the Cauliflower Trust turn their backs on him, and when Sheet turns to the audience again, they peek out from behind him with sneaky expressions on their faces (see Figure 17 and Figure 18).



Figure 17. The Cauliflower Trust turning their backs



Figure 18. Sneaky looks

The *Gestus* of turning their backs with a dissatisfied (almost loathing) expression on their faces and looking at Sheet sneakily while he addresses the audience aims to accentuate the behaviour of their social class. That is to say, the rich" landowners/capital owners only seek their own profit and are forever engaged in

conspiracy. Furthermore, in his closing lines, Sheet complains tearfully about the scarcity and poverty within the city: "Paranın köküne kıran mı girdi ne!" (I do not know whether pestilence got into the money!).

Right after this line, the members of the Cauliflower Trust turn their faces to the audience with a devilish but joyful expression, inhale and exhale with satisfaction, clinking the gold coins in their aprons, making a loud metallic sound and swiftly approach Sheet, as evidenced in Figure 19.



Figure 19. The Cauliflower Trust approaching Sheet

Then, one of the Trust members says: "Önerimize ne diyorsun?" ("Was ist mit meinem Vorschlag?"/What do you say to our proposition?). When Sheet replies "Satmak mı?" ("Zu verkaufen?"/Selling?), they scream in unison "Sat!" (Sell!). By adding a *Gestus* performed by the members of the Cauliflower Trust, who clink the gold coins after inhaling and exhaling with a devilish expression on their faces, Aydođdu created a discrepancy with the line "Paranın köküne kıran mı girdi ne!". While Sheet complains about scarcity, the members of the Cauliflower Trust relish playing with their gold coins. I suggest that this ironic contradiction (a stage element contradicting the text) may generate *Verfremdungseffekt*.

As for similar instances, I will attempt to reveal other conflicting situations that may achieve *Verfremdungseffekt*. When the members of the Trust attempt to

persuade Sheet to sell his dockyard, Flake enunciates: "Karnabahar tröstünün bu yolla sana yardım etmek istemiş olacağını hiç düşünemiyor musun?" ("Dass wir Im Trust dir helfen wollen könnten, daran Denkst du wohl gar nicht?"/ Don't you every think that the Trust actually wants to help you?) (Brecht, 1965, p. 18).²⁹ But right after that, they scream "Sat! Sat! Sat!" (Sell! Sell! Sell!) in unison and they walk up to Sheet as he kneels tearfully on the floor (see Figure 20).



Figure 20. The Cauliflower Trust forcing Sheet

The line "Sat! Sat! Sat!" enunciated by the Trust in unison is an addition by Aydoğdu, which once again jars with Flake's statement since he says they want to "help" him in a friendly way, but then all the members force Sheet to kneel by screaming "Sat!", while he cries.

Furthermore, we see that Butcher says "Çıkmadık candan umut kesilmez!" ("Wer noch nicht tot ist, lebt noch!"/The one who is not dead yet still lives!) (Brecht, 1965, p. 11).³⁰ While he says this line, he and other members of the Trust put their feet on the back of Sheet back, who is now lying on the floor (see Figure 21).

²⁹ The script uses Erten's translation, without changing anything.

³⁰ The script uses Erten's translation without changing anything.



Figure 21. Crushing Sheet

After this, they keep talking among themselves for a while, their feet still on Sheet's back. Finally, at the same time as they are shouting "Ahlak ölmüş!" ("s gibt keinen Anstand mehr!" /Morality is dead!) and Mulberry continues with "Yalnız para kıtlığı yok azizim, ahlak kıtlığı da var!" ("s ist nicht nur Geldknappheit! 's ist Anstandsknappheit!" /There is not only scarcity of money, but also of morality!) (Brecht, 1965, p. 13), they switch their feet and put them on Sheet's back again (Figure 22 and Figure 23).



Figure 22. The Trust putting their feet on Sheet's back



Figure 23. Feet on Sheet's back again

The *Gestus* of pressing Sheet's back accompanied by the lines "Çıkmadık candan umut kesilmez!", "Ahlak ölmüş!", and "Yalnız para kıtlığı yok azizim, ahlak kıtlığı da var!" are intended to create a parodical contradiction by showing the characteristics of the Trust's social class once again. On the face of it, the rich/capital owners/landowners talk about morality and honesty and complain about how bad their business is going, but in reality they continue to increase their wealth only by thinking about their profit.

As can be seen here, all this *Gestus* not only draws the attention of the audience through apparent contrasts but also conveys a politically loaded message, revealing the social class of the figures on the stage. Thus, *Gestus* is intended to induce critical thinking among the audience, encouraging spectators to reflect on the events depicted on the stage.

Furthermore, in Act 1, Scene 1, Aydoğdu kept Erten's translations exactly as they were and intended to induce the *Verfremdungseffekt* by means of the contrastive situations produced by the actors' gestures. The fact that Aydoğdu preserved Erten's translations but added a stage element to realize *Verfremdungseffekt* may testify to the director's conception of an ideal Brechtian production. In Aydoğdu's attempt, the two semiotic systems did not cancel one another out, but rather they collaborated for

a common purpose, *Verfremdungseffekt*, just as suggested in Pavis' notion of *mise en scène*, where two semiotics confront in a symbiotic manner (1992/2005, p. 24).

5.2.3 Dogsborough rebuilt on the stage

The representation of dialectics plays a fundamental role in showing the contradictions of the figures. In Aydoğdu's production, the fact that the actors portraying Ui, Dogsborough and other figures change in almost every scene can be seen as the application of dialectics to the stage. Aydoğdu (2011) notes that in this way the audience will not identify themselves with the actors on the stage (p. 60).

Now I would like to present the specific example of a main figure within the play and try to show how Aydoğdu constructed the dialectical image of that figure on the stage. In the play, Dogsborough, the Mayor of Chicago, is used to represent Paul von Hindenburg. Brecht initially presents him as an honest and trustworthy figure who has been ruling the city for a long time and is respected by almost everybody in the city. The playwright attributes religiosity to him to emphasize his apparently incorruptible temperament. He is portrayed as a wise old man, almost a godly father-figure. However, as the events unfold, he gradually turns into a corrupt politician who uses his authority and prestigious name for his own interests. The Cauliflower Trust bribes him to get a loan from the municipality and, when Arturo Ui learns this, he blackmails Dogsborough in order to ascend to power.

In other words, eventually we see that everybody, even god-like Dogsborough, the father of a nation (Hindenburg), can undergo a change under the right conditions. Nothing is fixed and everything changes in line with socio-economic and political conditions. In Aydoğdu's script, we see that the majority of

the lines attributing godly features to Dogsborough have been omitted, and even in some cases they are altered in a way that gives a totally opposite meaning. On first appearances, these omissions and alterations would seem to result in a toning down of Dogsborough's good qualities, the ones that grant him a well-respected name within the city. This would appear to undermine the dialectical nature of the figure, its gradual change from "good to bad" through the play. However, Aydoğdu tried to rebuild Dogsborough figure on the stage through contradictory stage elements. In the following, I will first show how Brecht attempts to portray a wise, almost divine, old man and how these attempts are omitted from the script even though they are preserved in Erten's translation. Subsequently, I will refer to Aydoğdu's production and reveal how he attempted to construct this image on the stage with the help of Erten's translation, even though he did undertake significant omissions in the script.

In the prologue, where the announcer introduces the figures one by one, he/she invites the actor who will play Dogsborough by enunciating the line: "Das Herz ist schwarz, das Haar ist weiß" (His heart is black, his hair is white) (Brecht, 1965, p. 7). Erten (1999) preserves this "black" and "white" dichotomy in his translation as "Ak saçlı, kara vicdanlı!" (He has white hair, but a black heart!) (p. 3). Through the play, this emphasis on Dogsborough's "white" hair is repeated in other scenes as well. Particularly in the scene where Dogsborough is terrified when he hears that he will undergo an investigation, he repeats: "Die Untersuchung wird es nicht geben. Niemand wird mir das Antun. Mein Haar ist weiß..." (There will not be an investigation. Nobody can do that to me! My hair is white...). Then, Ui replies with ferocity: "Doch außer Ihrem Haar ist nichts an Ihnen weiß" (Indeed, there is nothing white about you except your hair!) (Brecht, 1965, p. 40). In the translation, we see that these lines are translated in a way that preserves the image of white hair

and Ui's pun: "...Ak saçlarıma çamur atamazlar" (They cannot stain my white hair!) (Dogsborough) and "Ak kalmış tek yeriniz saçlarınız galiba" (I guess the only part of you that is still white is your hair!) (Erten, 1999, p. 20). Here, Dogsborough aims to defend his so far reputable name by highlighting his fatherly authority, his wise image. To do that, he refers to his white hair. Ui's reply implies that Dogsborough has already lost his prestigious reputation and his hands are now dirty, far from being clean. To him and others, his white hair does not mean anything other than the colour of his hair. In another case, after O'Casey (the investigator) accuses Dogsborough of giving a loan to the Cauliflower Trust for his own interests, Flake defends Dogsborough with "Sein weißes Haar müßt euch belehren, daß in ihm kein Arg sein kann" (His white hair must show you that he wouldn't do anything wrong!) (Brecht, 1965, p. 51). Erten's translation (1999) once again keeps the focus on the innocent and clean image of his white hair: "Ak saçları onun suçsuzluğunun kanıtıdır!" (His white hair is the proof of his innocence!) (p. 26).

In addition to this white hair image, there are other lines attributing religiosity to Dogsborough to strengthen his authoritative figure. For instance, during a discussion with the other members of Cauliflower Trust, Butcher states that they need a prestigious intermediary to get a loan from the municipality and Dogsborough, the trusted Mayor of the city, is their best shot: "Der alte Dogsborough ist unsre Anleih. Warum? Sie glauben an ihn. Wer an Gott längst nicht mehr glaubt, glaubt noch an Dogsborough" (The old Dogsborough is our loan. Why is that? It's because they believe in him. Even those who do not believe in God anymore still believe in Dogsborough) (Brecht, 1965, p. 15). Erten's translation (1999) closely follows the original: "Yaşlı Dogsborough bizim kredimizdir. Neden mi? Ona inanırlar da ondan. Tanrıya inanmayanlar bile inanır o ihtiyar kurda" (The Old

Dogsborough is our loan. Why? Because they believe him. Even those who do not believe in God still believe in that old wolf) (p. 7). Furthermore, Gaffles, the City Counsellor, states that the majority of the City Council stood by Dogsborough during the session investigating bribery allegations and objected to charges by screaming “Verträge Dogsboroughs fischig! wurd geschrien. Und was ist mit der Bibel? Die ist wohl auch fischig plötzlich!” (Dogsborough’s deals are fishy, eh? They screamed. And what about the Bible then? Has it become fishy suddenly as well?) (Brecht, 1965, p. 42). Erten (1999) once again keeps this reference in his translation: “Dogsborough’nun anlaşmaları mı karanlık? Bari İncil’e dil uzatın, belki o da karanlıktır” (Dogsborough’s deals are dark, eh? Defame the Bible then! Maybe the Bible is dark as well?) (p. 21). Lastly, while Dogsborough is resting in his country house on a Sunday, he listens to the Church bells: “Heut ist Sonntag. Hm. Die Glocken klängen friedlich, Wär in der Welt nicht so viel Menschenbosheit” (It’s Sunday. Hm. The Bells would ring peacefully if the people on this earth were not so evil) (Brecht, 1965, p. 35). Erten’s (1999) translation follows the source closely again: “Bugün Pazar. Yeryüzünde bu kadar kötülük olmasaydı, şu çan sesleri kulağa daha bir güzel gelirdi” (p. 18). This scene and line give the impression of a parody, with the image it conjures up of God resting peacefully on the 7th day after the creation and surveying the earth. Additionally, the line “Wär in der Welt nicht so viel Menschenbosheit...” sounds like God criticizing all the evil on earth.

All the examples given above create a divine and wise portrait of Dogsborough in a parodical way. Even though all these lines are successfully preserved in Erten’s translation, as shown above, they are omitted in Aydoğdu’s production. The omission of the white hair image, for instance, tones down the wise, fatherly, and trustworthy image of Dogsborough. What’s more, in one instance,

Aydođdu's attempt to compensate for the white hair image through a textual alteration results in an opposite meaning. On the stage, Dogsborough enunciates "Bunu bana yapamazlar, vicdanıma amur atamazlar!" (They cannot do this to me! They cannot hurt/defame my conscience!) and Ui replies, "Ak kalmıř tek yeriniz de vicdanınız galiba!" (The only white part is your conscience, I guess!). In the original, Ui's line accentuates that Dogsborough is far from innocent, whereas here Ui's line can be interpreted in just the opposite way. It suggests that he keeps his conscience white despite all these fishy dealings. Additionally, other divine references to Dogsborough in the above-given examples reinforce his reliable and authoritative image within the City. He has almost an untouchable and holy position. Despite all these merits, as the play continues, we witness his gradual corruption.

Now I would like to look at the production more closely and try to reveal whether, and if so, how Aydođdu managed to recreate Dogsborough's image and his eventual change on the stage. In Act 1, Scene 1, we see the members of the Trust and Dogsborough together for the first time. Since it reveals the corruption of Dogsborough, it has a particular significance in terms of the *Fabel* of the scene.

In the beginning of the scene, we see a male actor highlighting the historical background of the scene they are about to stage by explaining how German capital owners try to persuade President Hindenburg as illustrated in Figure 24.



Figure 24. The historical background of the scene

Right after that, he puts his hat on, sits on a wooden box resembling a throne and beats his cane on the floor (see Figure 25).



Figure 25. Gesture of putting on a hat and beating a cane on the floor

At the sound of his cane, the lights turn on and, at the opposite end of the stage, the Cauliflower Trust flinch and put their hands in their aprons (Figure 26).



Figure 26. Hands in the aprons

First of all, we see an abrupt and interruptive transition from the narrator to the figure of Dogsborough through the gesture of putting on the hat and slamming down his cane as a cue to start the scene. Furthermore, during the play, as the actor playing the role of Dogsborough changes, he does this by first putting on his hat, beating his cane on the floor and then sitting on a wooden box shaped like a throne, while

hunching his back. In addition, his son standing right next to him repeats his lines occasionally as he speaks. When considered closely, this combination of props and their use by the actor, that is, his *Gestus* whilst using them, resembles the mannerisms of an old king in a parodical way: he puts on his crown (hat) and holds his sceptre (wooden cane) as he sits on his throne (a wooden box with a spear-like headboard). Right beside him stands his right-hand-man (his son). He beats his cane when he is angry and speaks in a loud and authoritative voice. All these details show us how someone in such a position, in the position of a ruler, behaves. By creating a parodical portrayal of Dogsborough, Aydoğdu may have attempted to recreate Hindenburg's (or Dogsborough's) authority, power and old age visually on the stage. That is, the very nature of this mock situation here paves the way for the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt*; the manipulation of decor and *Gestus* contributes to the representation of the familiar concepts of power and authority, which are made to appear strange and almost comical on the stage.

Additionally, at the beginning of the scene, the positioning of Dogsborough, his son alongside him, and the members of the Cauliflower Trust, represents the relationship between them. The Trust members wearing identical clothes are lined up in the rear-right corner of the stage, with their backs almost touching the wooden decor, whereas Dogsborough sits on his throne placed in the opposite corner of the stage, in a diagonal position to the Cauliflower Trust. At that moment, we see that the Cauliflower Trust has not taken control of Dogsborough yet and they know that they still need to persuade him. So, they keep their distance by acting extremely carefully and politely, showing their reverence to him. They are almost in the presence of a king, standing respectfully at the far end of the audience chamber. Besides, their identical clothes and their proximity to one another, almost as if they

are stuck to each other, accentuates their interdependency in financial and political terms, their belonging to the same social class of owners of capital. In other words, the arrangement of actors on the stage by Aydođdu emphasizes the authority of Dogsborough once again and also illuminates his relationship with the Trust at the beginning, in addition to exposing the relations between the members of the Trust.

In addition to using these measures, Aydođdu combined the lines showing the trustworthiness and authority of Dogsborough with other stage elements and presented them in an unusual and strange manner, again with the aim of creating *Verfremdungseffekt* just as he did through the whole play. For instance, in the scene where the Cauliflower Trust tries to persuade him, Dogsborough looks at the audience, raises his voice and finger when he is saying "Dalavere! O rihtim inřaatlarını bilirim ben!" (Bullshit! I know these kinds of dockyard constructions!) and then lowers it as he furiously continues with "Girmem öyle iře!" (I'm not getting involved in that business!) (see Figure 27).



Figure 27. Dogsborough raising his finger

This finger gesture can be described as *Gestus* since it displays a behaviour closely related to the social status of Dogsborough and aims to illuminate the prescriptive, authoritative, and self-assured attitudes of rulers. During the scene, Dogsborough repeats exactly the same *Gestus* a number of times. For example, in another line emphasizing his reliability, Dogsborough asserts "Belediye bütçesi kimsenin yem

borusu değildir” (Nobody can feed on the City treasury!), he raises his finger and voice, and looks at the audience again (see Figure 28).



Figure 28. Dogsborough raising his finger again

This *Gestus* consists of the three moves of raising and lowering his finger, raising his voice and looking at the audience during the enunciation. Also, as can be seen in Figure 28, the Cauliflower Trust mock Dogsborough by laughing and imitating his finger gesture as he does so, which is another element adding a disruptive parodical aspect to Dogsborough's so-called authority. Whereas he tries to assert his authority through this *Gestus*, the members of the Trust mockingly imitate him. Their ironic theatrical reverence damages Dogsborough's authority. Once again, a contradictory situation is created on stage, which may make the familiar theme of authority strange and achieve the *Verfremdungseffekt* among the audience.

As the scene progresses, the Cauliflower Trust start praising Dogsborough for his trustworthiness, but when we look at their attitudes, their way of enunciating the lines, it becomes obvious that they continue to mock him and that they are not sincere in their words at all. For instance, a member disrupts the arrangement of the Cauliflower Trust on the stage by stepping forward and enunciating the following

line as he raises his finger: "Ama dün, o aptalca kredi önerimize vermiş olduğun cevabı duyunca, doğrusu bu ya, senin o şaşmaz, doğru, dürüst tavrın karşısında gözlerimiz yaşardı" (But yesterday, as we learned about your reply to our stupid loan offer, our eyes filled with tears because of your infallible, strong and honest attitude!) (see Figure 29). His finger gesture and voice level are exactly the same as Dogsborough's when he boasts about his own trustworthiness.



Figure 29. A member of the Trust stepping forward

Besides, as the Trust member concludes his words with "gözlerimiz yaşardı" (our eyes filled with tears...), he makes an exaggerated gesture to show how tears fell from their eyes (see Figure 30).



Figure 30. Tears in a Trust member's eyes

When the members of the Trust speak about Dogsborough's reliability and their respect for that, their gestures show just the opposite. They mock him by imitating his gestures and make exaggerated and original gestures such as miming how much they cried instead of actually crying, all showing their actual insincerity. In this way, the message conveyed by the lines spoken is contradicted by their gestures.

In the last part, we see that the Cauliflower Trust is about to persuade Dogsborough. A member utters the following line: "Bundan sonra sen de karnabaharcıların arasına katılmış olacaksın. Bundan sonra bizim dertlerimiz senin dertlerin olacak" (From now on, you will join the Cauliflower Trust. Our problems will be yours). This line is supported with a new arrangement of the members of the Cauliflower Trust on the stage. That is to say, the members surround Dogsborough and place one of their hands on him whereas they keep the other one in their pockets as usual, just before they manage to persuade him as illustrated in Figure 31.

Given that, at the beginning of the scene, they were positioned on the opposite corner of the stage, this final arrangement reveals how they now control Dogsborough and how Dogsborough is now corrupted and has become one of them.



Figure 31. The Trust members trying to persuade Dogsborough

Furthermore, Dogsborough is doing this for his own interests, he raises his finger once again with a happy face and says "Görüyorsun ya evlat, dürüstlük de bazen işe yarıyor!" (You see son, honesty can be useful sometimes!) in an assertive voice. This creates an absurd and even comical situation since what he is doing is diametrically opposed to the notion of "honesty". What is more, the members of the Cauliflower Trust then shout "Yaa!" (Well! Well!) in unison with an evidently mocking tone and sarcastic smiles on their faces (a line added by Aydoğdu) (see Figure 32).



Figure 32. Dogsborough on his honesty

In this part focusing on Dogsborough, I showed that, despite the omissions of lines attributing authority and religiosity to him (white hair and allusions to God and the Bible), Aydoğdu managed to create an authoritative Dogsborough image at the beginning of the scene through the use of mock props, *Gestus*, and the meticulous arrangement of the actors on the stage. In Act 1, Scene 1, we initially see a parodical portrait of a powerful, almost king-like Dogsborough (instead of a "godly" one) and then witness his corruption through the sneaky offers of the Cauliflower Trust. As I explained at the beginning of this part, this very change is essential in Brechtian theatre in terms of showing that there is no such thing as human nature but that

human behaviours are the result of socio-political and economic conditions surrounding them.

Besides, I would like to emphasize that Aydoğdu's fastidious *mise en scène* in the re-creation of Dogsborough's authoritative figure on the stage might owe its success to the translation of Yücel Erten. In the beginning of this part, I revealed why Brecht's religiosity allusions to Dogsborough were important in narrating the corruption of a trustworthy figure under the right conditions and how Erten preserved all of these meticulously in his translation. If Erten, as a translator, had missed or somehow deliberately omitted these references, it might have been challenging for the director Aydoğdu to notice Brecht's attention to Dogsborough and recreate him on the stage by compensating textual omissions mainly with stage elements in such a way as to potentially produce *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. Still, it can also be suggested that Aydoğdu might have conceivably used the original text, an annotated edition or other translations as a reference when he was working on the script.

5.2.4 Arturo Ui's first appearance on the stage

In this part, I would like to first concentrate on the presentation of Arturo Ui by different actors and then I will continue with a closer analysis of the scene.

In the prologue in the original text and Erten's translation, the actor depicting Arturo Ui is already introduced to the audience by the announcer who invites him onto the stage. However, in Aydoğdu's production, despite the fact that the audience keep hearing about Arturo Ui, the audience do not see him on the stage in the opening speech and he does not show up until the end of the scene featuring the Cauliflower Trust and Sheet. They are informed about the allegorical nature of the play at the

beginning (in the opening speech) and a clear comparison between Ui and Hitler has already been made. Additionally, right before Ui first appears on the stage, a female narrator steps into the downstage centre and explains the historical background of the scene, stating that Hitler is trying everything to come to power, but he fails to talk to Hindenburg. So, one may safely claim that the audience know that Arturo Ui is an allegorical depiction of Adolf Hitler. Therefore, one might expect a male actor to perform the role of Arturo Ui throughout the play. However, right after the female narrator finishes her brief explanation in a cheerful voice and with a smile on her face (see Figure 33), she quickly switches to the role of Arturo Ui and sits on the wooden box, with a masculine posture and a serious look on her face, as can be seen in Figure 34.



Figure 33. Female actor as the narrator with a smile on her face



Figure 34. Female actor switching to her “Ui” persona

The male actor downstage left turns his face and shouts "Arturo!". At that moment, it becomes a hundred percent clear that she will be portraying Arturo Ui in Act 1, Scene 1. Introducing Arturo Ui for the first time with a female actor who suddenly switches from her cheerful narrator role to a sulky masculine gang leader will probably be a huge surprise for the audience and even perplex them after their accumulating expectations to see someone resembling Hitler at least. By presenting the much-expected figure of Ui in a strange manner, Aydoğdu manages to draw the audience's attention and produce *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. Besides, thanks to this unfamiliar and perplexing presentation of Ui, Aydoğdu avoids the allegory trap since the explanation and the scene after that become conflicting. Now, I will explain it further in the following paragraphs.

Referring to his production in 2011, Aydoğdu (2011) points out that the Ui figure was portrayed by nine different female actors on the stage, which removed the focus from Ui as a person and revealed the socio-economic conditions that made Arturo Ui (p. 61). On the other hand, in the Tiyatroadam production, the majority of the cast consists of male actors, but the portrayal of Ui stays the same. The actors still change their roles and become Ui in turn as the play progresses. In fact, instead of having only female actors acting Ui, I find it more stimulating that the figure of Ui is being played by male and female actors interchangeably. In the first production, the audience might have been surprised at first when they saw a female Ui on the stage, but after Ui was portrayed by other female actors the audience might have come to accept this peculiarity which caused the surprise effect to diminish. However, in the Tiyatroadam production, when a female Ui suddenly becomes a male Ui, it adds a much more discrepant tone to the figure which may result in a

stronger *Verfremdungseffekt*. Besides, the focus on the socio-economic conditions and their potential to change are still preserved.

In *A Short Organum for the Theatre*, Brecht (1964) explains that, during rehearsals, it can be useful if the actor sees his character played by an actor of the opposite sex, because in this way, the sex of that character will be highlighted (p. 197). However, Aydoğdu (2011) underlines that through a female Ui he wanted to eliminate the role of gender, which would also remove the focus from Ui as an individual (p. 61). It looks like Brecht and Aydoğdu view the swapping of sexes on the stage in a different light. Still, as emphasized before, Brecht's works, including his theories, should not be regarded as fixed statements. On the contrary, they invite one to approach them critically and reach a new understanding.

In Act 1, Scene 1, we see Arturo Ui complaining about the fact that he is about to be forgotten after a short period of inactivity. He is afraid of doing anything illegal since he has barely escaped being jailed for involvement in a bank robbery. He is desperate and looking for a way to rise again. He still thinks about how he only just managed to stay out of jail, and he constantly bemoans his fate. As can be seen in Table 10, Brecht creates a comical and absurd situation. Even though he and his accomplices were outlaws trying to rob a bank, Ui cannot believe how the police intervened and opened fire. He complains about this. Right after that, Roma says they only shot in the air and it was unlawful. However, his words make this dialogue even stranger. Even though the only illegal act in this context is their bank robbery, Roma says it was the police who were acting against the law. Subsequently, Ui confesses that they brought false witnesses and blames the judge for not being sympathetic towards them. I would suggest that, in this brief dialogue, Brecht

attempts to create an unusual and even parodical situation through these obviously irrational lines, which can foster a linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt*.

When we look at Erten's translation and the script, we see that an important description by Roma is missing. "Ungezetlich" (unlawful) is omitted in both of them, which reduces the absurdity of the dialogue: blaming the law for acting unlawfully, even though it is their own actions that are unlawful. Still, as can be seen in the following analysis of the production, Aydođdu tried to create a surprise effect on the stage through his choice of actor to introduce Ui for the first time, and he also managed to reflect Ui's fear of the law.

Table 10. Ui Complains about the Police³¹

Source Text	Translation	Script
<p>ROMA: Und der kleine Zwischenfall in Harpers Bank mit diesen Polizisten liegt dir noch in den Knochen! UI: Aber sie schossen! ROMA: Nur in die Luft! 's war ungesetzlich. UI: Um ein Haar zwei Zeugen weniger, und ich säße im Kittchen jetzt. Und dieser Richter! Nicht für fünf Cent Sympathie. (Brecht, 1965, p. 26).</p>	<p>ROMA: Harper Bankasında aynasızlarla çatıştık diye de büsbütün heykel oldun. UI: Polisler ateş etti ama! ROMA: Yalnız havaya! UI: Ramak kalmıştı. İki tanık eksik getirsek şimdi kodeste olacaktım. Hele o yargıç! Beş kuruşluk sempati göstermedi! (Erten, 1999, p. 13).</p>	<p>ROMA: Son banka soygununda da aynasızlarla çatıştık diye de büsbütün heykel oldun. UI: Polisler bana ateş etti ama! ROMA: Yalnız havaya! UI: Ama ramak kalmıştı. İki tane eksik tanık götürsek ben şimdi kodeste olacaktım. Hele o yargıç! Hele o yargıç var ya! Beş kuruşluk sempati göstermedi şerefsiz! (Act 1, Scene 1).</p>

The omission of "ungezetlich" (unlawful) in Erten's translation and Aydođdu's production resulted in the loss of an important contradiction: the outlaws blaming the law enforcement for preventing them from robbing the bank and declaring this intervention as unlawful. However, Aydođdu creates an alternative parodical situation through the acting of the female actor portraying Ui on the stage. We see

³¹ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C9.

that the female actor puts on an artificial masculine voice with macho intonation and undertakes aggressive gestures very similar to those of Hitler (see Figure 35).



Figure 35. Ui's aggressive gestures

Particularly when enunciating the lines expressing his fear of the police and the law in general "Ama bana ateş ettiler!" (But they fired at me!) and "İki tanık eksik götürsek ben şimdi kodeste olacaktım!" (If we had brought two witnesses less, I would have ended up in jail!), the actor raises her artificial masculine and macho voice and makes aggressive gestures again, as is visible in Figure 36.



Figure 36. Ui raising his voice in an aggressive manner

As a gang leader, Arturo Ui tries to look strong and powerful with his armed men standing behind him, but at the same time he cannot believe the police fired at him. Ui's supposedly powerful and masculine portrait becomes parodical and strange especially when the figure is acted by a female actor enunciating the lines in an evidently artificial masculine voice. While I am not claiming that this detail of the performance is a direct equivalent to the parodical use of the term "unlawful", Aydoğdu still managed to compensate for the loss and draw a parodical and inconsistent Ui portrait by assigning the role to a perfectly talented female actor who successfully created a comical and powerless "powerful" Ui figure on the stage.

Now, in the following part, I will analyse the scene which brings Dogsborough and Arturo Ui together on the stage. This time, we see that Ui is acted by a male actor and the female actor now becomes a gang member.

5.2.5 Dogsborough meets Arturo Ui³²

It can be claimed that Act 1, Scene 2 is particularly important because Dogsborough meets Arturo Ui for the first time. While Dogsborough is resting in his country house, a gift from The Cauliflower Trust, Ui and his gang storm the place and Ui asks for Dogsborough's support. Meanwhile, Dogsborough is already remorseful and scared, and he tries to comfort himself by constantly repeating he did not do anything wrong. One moment he is indulging himself in the peaceful atmosphere of a Sunday morning spent in his country house, and the next minute he starts blaming himself for accepting the house and becoming involved in the loan scandal. Now I would like to

³² In the original text, this part belongs to Scene 3. However, due to the reordering of the scenes in Aydoğdu's production, it is labelled as a part of Scene 2. All the following quotations are taken from the recording of the Tiyatroadam production (2013).

show how Aydoğdu attempted to reflect his conflicting thoughts and Ui's contrasted statements and eccentric behaviours on the stage.

Before the scene, we see the actors singing a song (with no lyrics) a cappella as they prepare for the next scene. Then, at the opening of the scene, this time another male actor appears as a narrator. Before switching to his role, as can be seen in every scene of the play, he starts to explain the historical meaning of the scene from his role as narrator. He says that President Hindenburg refuses to make Hitler chancellor but also fears a possible investigation into the loan corruption. During his speech, we see that the other actors are standing behind him on the stage and are ready to switch to their roles when cued by the narrator (see Figure 37).



Figure 37. Actors standing behind Dogsborough, ready to switch to their roles

After his explanation, as in the previous scene, the narrator once again put on his hat, sits on his throne, bangs his cane on the floor and becomes Dogsborough. The lights go on, the actors behind him raise their machine guns, and Dogsborough's son appears on the stage, as demonstrated in Figure 38.



Figure 38. Dogsborough's son on the stage

Here, we see that Aydođdu added another song performance, which is also not present in the original play. Dogsborough's son sings "Santa Lucia", a famous traditional Italian song, off tone and creates a very disturbing but also funny performance on the stage. During his performance, Young Dogsborough sits on the edge of the stage and continues to sing as he looks at the audience and imitates paddling in the water (see Figure 39).



Figure 39. Young Dogsborough singing an Italian song

While he is singing this song, Dogsborough looks at him proudly with a big smile on his face and says “Aferin oğlum! Gurur duyuyorum!” (Well done, son! I am proud of you!) (see Figure 40).



Figure 40. Dogsborough proud of his son

However, right after these lines, he bows his head, hunches his back, and says “Hata ettim!” (It was a mistake!) in a sad manner, as illustrated in Figure 41.



Figure 41. Dogsborough mumbling sadly

He repeats this gesture a couple of times as his son continues his song: He looks at his son happily and then bows his head suddenly, mumbling silently to himself. Towards the end of the song, he makes a wry face and urges his son to finish the song and leave right away as Young Dogsborough raises his voice off-key once again: “Yeter! Çık dışarı!” (Enough! Get out!) (see Figure 42).



Figure 42. Dogsborough scolding his son

As explained in detail in Chapter Two, in Brechtian theatre, songs can generate *Verfremdungseffekt*. Here, this distorted form of Santa Lucia added by Aydođdu has the potential to create a comical effect on the audience due to its very disturbing and off-key sound. It is not a harmonious and musically aesthetical song; it is just the opposite. The actor performs it off-key purposefully by raising his voice in the wrong parts, in such a way that it grates on the audience's ears. In addition, the song creates a disjuncture with the scene since, whereas Dogsborough is extremely worried about a probable investigation in the City Council, his son continues to sing in a seemingly joyful manner. Furthermore, in the original play and Erten's translation, as mentioned above, we see that Dogsborough's state of mind fluctuates constantly. Aydođdu kept most of these lines, but this added song performance and short lines accompanied by Dogsborough's quick transitions between the gestures of happiness and sadness (see Figure 43 and Figure 44) successfully accentuate his fluctuating mood and anxiety, parallel with his contrasting statements on the stage.



Figure 43. Peaceful Dogsborough



Figure 44. Sudden transition to sadness

Besides, these gestures amplify this effect to such an extent that the quickness of transitions and discrepancy created by the song and Dogsborough's state of mind may lead to the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt* on the audience.

As shown in Table 11, Dogsborough's unstable state of mind is emphasized through sudden transitions within both the original text and Erten's translation:

Table 11. Dogsborough's Fluctuating Mood³³

Source Text	Translation
Was kann der Butcher wollen? Es waren die Pappeln, die bei diesem Landsitz mich reizten. Und der Blick zum See, wie Silber bevor's zu Talern wird. Und daß nicht saurer Geruch von Altem Bier hier hängt... Die Pappeln. Ja, die Pappeln waren's. Heut ist Sonntag. Die Glocken klängen friedlich... Was kann der Butcher heut, am Sonntag, wollen? Ich hätt dies Landhaus... (Brecht, 1965, pp. 34-35).	Ne ister ki benden? Beni buraya en çok çeken şu söğütler oldu. Bir de gümüşe benzeyen, akşamüstü altına kesen bu göl. Ekşi bira kokusundan uzak... İlevakin şu söğütler. Söğütlere dayanamadım işte. Bugün pazar. ... şu çan sesleri daha bir güzel gelirdi. Şu Butcher pazar günü ne isteyebilir benden? Ah şu evi keşke! (Erten, 1999, pp. 17-18).

Dogsborough sits and looks out of the window while he keeps talking to himself, hopping from one topic to the next. He loves the scenery he sees, but at the same time he regrets accepting the house and worries about Butcher (a member of the Cauliflower Trust). Now, when we look at Aydoğdu's production, the script does not follow Erten's translation closely but preserves the textual effect by keeping some lines with minor alterations: "Hiiii... Ah şu göl! Hiii... Şu manzara... Hiiii... Şu

³³ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C10.

söğütler... Hiii.... Hayatım boyunca hayallerimi süslemişlerdi. Almayacaktım bu evi! Hata ettim! Ama manzara çok güzel..." (Hiii... Look at this lake! Hiii... Look at this scenery!... Hiii... Look at these willows... Hiii... I have always dreamed about them! I should not have accepted this house! It was a mistake! But, such a beautiful view...). These sudden transitions, Dogsborough's conflicting thoughts and his fluctuating mood are amplified through the acting of the actor on the stage. They are presented in such sharp transitions and exaggerated manner that it makes the passage much stranger than it is in the text. For instance, by uttering "hiii!" in a high-pitched voice between the lines he softly enunciates, the actor interrupts the flow of his own speech and makes it unnatural and almost excruciatingly disturbing. He puts on a happy and naive face while uttering pastoral lines calmly and softly (see Figure 45).



Figure 45. Dogsborough praising the scenery calmly

Right after that, he swiftly gets angry, smashes his cane on the floor, raises his voice, and forms a crooked and furious face while expressing his regret for accepting the house, as evidenced in Figure 46.



Figure 46. Dogsborough suddenly getting angry

After that, his face changes suddenly again, he smiles and this time softly says "Ah! Such a beautiful view!" (see Figure 47)



Figure 47. Dogsborough looking out of the window

Furthermore, the fact that the stage decor does not change at all when Dogsborough appears to be looking out at an idyllic countryside scene, thus engendering a discrepancy between the stage and the lines spoken, may also pave the way for *Verfremdungseffekt* among the audience. Right after this passage, Dogsborough's son comes to the middle of the stage from where he has been standing and says that they are going to open an investigation at the City council. Dogsborough panics and says "Thöst!" (see Figure 48).



Figure 48. Thöst!

As a small addition to the script (not present in the original or Erten's translation), it creates a *double entendre*, since in Turkish "Höst!" (Whoa!) is really close to "Tröst!" (Trust). Although this might seem like a short utterance and a point of minor significance, I find it important in reflecting Dogsborough's anxiety and fear in one word, because the investigation into this fishy loan that Dogsborough is scared of is directly related to the Cauliflower Trust (*Karnabahar Tröstü*). Besides, as mentioned above, Brecht is known to have aimed to create linguistic *Verfremdungseffekt* by twisting familiar words in an unusual way that instantly draws the audience's attention. And Aydoğdu's insertion of "Thöst!" creates an equivalence of Brecht's manipulation of words in such way.

In his translation, Erten successfully reflected Dogsborough's sudden transitions. Aydoğdu worked on the translation and inserted "Hiiii..." sounds between Dogsborough's lines by combining it with the actor's intonation and gestures. In other words, Aydoğdu took these lines in Erten's translation showing Dogsborough's conflicting image and, through the insertion of stage elements, he created *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. He did not change the contrastive statements in the translation; instead he amplified them. This could show the symbiotic relationship between the different semiotics as emphasized in Pavis' notion of *mise en scène*.

In Act 1, Scene 2, as mentioned before, Dogsborough and Ui meet for the first time in person. Throughout the scene in the original play and Erten's translation

as well, we see that Arturo Ui has a furious and unstable temperament. He tries to persuade Dogsborough to vouch for him politely at first, but when he refuses to do so, Ui gets angry and starts to lose his politeness and almost uses vulgar language. This scene draws a portrait of Adolf Hitler allegorically by revealing his aggressive and hostile temperament and his sneaky utilization of lies to reach his purpose. Through patently conflicting lines and speedy switches from polite to impolite register, this scene presents Hitler in such a way that he appears close to being a psychiatric case. In Table 12, I would like to present a few of these fluctuations.

At the opening of his speech, Ui starts politely and introduces himself. Then he tries to emphasize his strength by proudly mentioning the number of his followers. Afterwards, the conflicting statements start. First, he says that he respects and loves the police, and he is visiting Dogsborough for this reason. A few lines later, he suddenly condemns the police for their laziness and taking bribes and sees this as the reason why greengroceries cannot sell their products. In the same sentence, he says that he can protect those people in exchange for a small fee.

So, Ui's critique of the police due to bribery and corruption ends with an offer of extortion. Afterwards, he highlights his power again, but at the same time, right in the next line, he pretentiously belittles his strength. He claims that he fully respects Dogsborough and would not hurt him under any circumstances. In the end, he threatens him openly. In his production, Aydoğdu followed Erten's translation closely, except for a few minor textual omissions and additions. However, towards the end of the scene, we start to see more significant additions: Aydoğdu inserts a poem by Brecht, a song, and a dance performance.

Table 12. Ui's Contradictory Remarks³⁴

Herr Dogsborough, Sie sehen vor sich einen verkannten Mann. Sein Bild geschwärzt von Neid sein Wollen entstellt von Niedertracht. (Brecht, 1965, p. 37).	Bay Dogsborough, şu anda karşınızda yanlış anlaşılmalı bir insan bulunuyor. Kıskançlık yüzünden adına kara çalınmış, aşağılık kimselerin ucuz iftiralara uğramış biri. (Erten, 1999, pp. 18-19)
Nun, jetzt sind's dreißig, und es werden mehr sein. (Brecht, 1965, p. 37).	Şimdi otuz kişiyiz. Daha da çoğalacağız. (Erten, 1999, p. 19)
Zumindest nicht von einer Polizei die ich stets schätzte. Drum steh ich vor Ihnen. (Brecht, 1965, p. 37).	Hiç değilse her zaman sevip saydığım polisimiz bana böyle bakmasın. İşte bu yüzden karşınıza gelmiş bulunuyorum. (Erten, 1999, p. 19)
Wie lang in solcher Stadt mit einer Polizei, faul und korrupt wird der Gemüsehändler sein Gemüse in ruh verkaufen können? Wird ihm nicht vielleicht schon morgen früh sein kleiner Laden von ruchloser Hand zerstört, die Kass geraubt sein? Wird er nicht lieber heut schon gegen kleines Entgelt kräftigen Schutz genießen wollen? (Brecht, 1965, p. 38)	Bu kentinden polisi bu kadar tembel ve böylesine rüşvetçiyken daha ne kadar zaman manav esnafı huzur içinde elindeki sebze meyveyi satabilir! Yarın sabah birtakım kirli eller, dükkânlarını yakıp yıkar, kasalarını soyarsa? Şimdiden küçük bir ücret karşılığı güçlü bir korucuya başvurmak istemezler mi? (Erten, 1999, p. 19)
Wissen Sie, was Sie brauchen? Sie brauchen Fäuste im Karfioltrust! Dreißig entschlossene Jungens unter meiner Führung! (Brecht, 1965, p. 39).	Sizin tröste ne gerek biliyor musunuz? Bilek gerek! Benim liderliğim altında davasından dönmeyecek otuz güçlü bilek! (Erten, 1999, p. 19).
Wie könnt ich jemals gegen Sie ankommen? Selbst wenn ich wollte und Sie nicht so schätzte? Was bin ich schon? Wie groß ist schon mein Anhang? (Brecht, 1965, p. 39).	Bizden size ne kötülük gelir? Hele benden, size bunca saygı duyan benden? Kimim ki ben? Değil mi? Arkamda kaç kişi var? (Erten, 1999, p. 20).
Haben Sie nich! Die hatten Sie gestern. Heut haben Sie keinen Freund mehr, aber morgen haben Sie nur Feinde. Wenn Sie einer rettet bin ich's! Arturo Ui! Ich! Ich! (Brecht, 1965, p. 40).	Dostunuz mostunuz yok artık! Düdü o. Bugün artık dostunuz kalmadı. Üstelik yarın da yalnızca düşmanlarınız olacak. Bu böyle. Bundan sizi kurtarabilecek tek bir kişi var, o da benim! Arturo Ui! Ben, ben! (Erten, 1999, p. 20).
Sie, ich warn Sie! Ich werde Sie zerschmettern! (Brecht, 1965, p. 41).	Fena yaparım namussuzum paralarım sizi! (Erten, 1999, p. 20).

In the places where he preserved the translation, Aydoğdu amplified the effect of the text with stage elements and minor but impactful additions. By doing that, he aimed to highlight the erratic and furious nature of Arturo Ui on the stage.

As mentioned before, while Dogsborough is speaking to himself, Arturo Ui and his gang visibly stand in the upstage centre waiting for their parts, almost as if they are in a trance. After Dogsborough's monologue ends, Young Dogsborough enters the stage and tells him that Arturo Ui and his gang are asking for him. First,

³⁴ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C11.

Roma (a gang member) and his men enter the stage, and shortly after we see Ui stumbling into the centre of the stage from the upstage centre. Ui clasps his hands in a respectful but exaggerated manner and bows his head as he addresses Dogsborough, who is sitting on his wooden throne. He wears an elegant suit and also a red carnation in his front pocket, a symbol of love and affection, as can be seen in Figure 49. That is to say, Ui's gestures strikingly resemble those of Adolf Hitler, including the movements of his hands.³⁵ Besides, the symbol of the red carnation contrasts with Ui's furious and unstable temperament.



Figure 49. Ui with an elegant suit and a red carnation

When Ui first comes centre stage, he turns his head and addresses Dogsborough softly with a smile on his face: "Sayın Başkan..." (Mr. Mayor...). Dogsborough does not reply, instead he grunts and turns his head the other way. Ui's smile quickly disappears, and he makes angry and impatient gestures (see Figure 50). Right after that, he enunciates the same line with exactly the same gestures and Dogsborough himself repeats the same as well.

³⁵ For further information, please see "The Rise to Power of Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump: A comparative study of speech delivery" by Sophie Wyckhuys (2019). Wyckhuys conducts a comprehensive speech analysis of Hitler and Trump with frequent references to their body languages.



Figure 50. Ui's angry gestures

This time, Ui angrily touches his head without saying anything as illustrated in Figure 51 and the gang behind him furiously shout in unison "Başkan!" (Mayor!).



Figure 51. Ui touching his hair furiously

Dogsborough suddenly turns to him and Ui starts to talk with respect again. With these swiftly changing gestures of the actor and his intonation backed up with the gang's shouting, Aydođdu intended to depict the unstable disposition and quick temper of Arturo Ui on the stage.

Shortly after, Ui comes downstage centre and, after a short discourse about his life, articulates the line, "Şimdi otuz kişiyiz. Ve daha da çođalacađız!" (We are

thirty men now, but we will soon be more!), he elevates his arms and places them diagonally over his chest. At the same time, his gang chants "Arturo! Ui!" (an addition to the text by Aydoğdu), leaving a gap of a second between the two names. Both Ui's *Gestus* and the way his gang shouts his name create an almost uncanny feeling. Ui is reminiscent of Hitler, with a frantic look in his eyes and the positioning of his arms. The way the gang chants his name with a second gap between "Arturo" and "Ui" and raising their arms above as they do so, is very similar to the "Sieg Heil!" slogan of Nazi mass-meetings (see Figure 52). At first one might think that it simplifies the play by drawing an overt parallelism to the play's allegorical nature. Even though I partially agree, I would like to also suggest that it might not be such a cheap allusion after all. We can assume that the majority of the Turkish audience do not speak German or, even if they did, it would not be so easy to detect it on the stage at that moment in such a dynamic, speedy, and complicated production. Considering the target audience, instead of an overt allusion, it may serve as a covert reference to Hitler's followers that only a few of the spectators can comprehend.



Figure 52. Gang members shouting "Arturo! Ui!"

Additionally, as can be seen in Table 12 above, Ui covertly threatens Dogsborough by saying that greengroceries need somebody to protect them in case some people try

to loot their stores. This covert threat turns to an overt one on the stage through the placement of the gang members with their machine guns behind Ui and the intonation and gestures of Ui. As he speaks the line "Yarın sabah birtakım kirli eller, dükkânlarını yakıp yıkar, kasalarını soyarsa? Şimdiden küçük bir ücret karşılığı gülü bir koruyucuya başvurmak istemezler mi?" (What if some cruel people burn down stores and empty tills tomorrow morning? Don't they want to find a powerful protector in exchange for a small fee?), Ui raises his voice and makes angry gestures (once again resembling Hitler's). He points to his gang behind him without turning his head (see Figure 53), makes a fist as he shouts, and the gang members laugh devilishly, with their machine guns up in the air (see Figure 54).



Figure 53. Ui pointing to his gang



Figure 54. Ui and his Gang

In addition to making the threat clearer, these gestures, intonation, and props (machine guns) also help to create a difference with Ui's words. He says all these things as if it is not his gang that will do these kinds of things, looting and stealing. Besides, he emphasizes that they may need a protector, whereas in fact what they need is a protector from Ui himself. A similar effect is recreated as Ui stresses that: "Dostunuz mostunuz yok artık Dogsborough! Düdü o! Bugünse sadece ve sadece düşmanlarınız var... Ve bundan sizi kurtarabilecek bir tek kişi var, o da benim! Ben! Arturo Ui!" (You do not have a friend anymore Dogsborough! It is in the past now. Today you only have enemies! And only one person can save you from this. Me! Arturo Ui!). However, as he says this, he tries to strangle him (see, Figure 55). Then he raises both his hands by making them fists and shouts "Me! Arturo Ui!" as demonstrated in Figure 56. Meanwhile, his gang point their guns at Dogsborough.



Figure 55. Ui strangling Dogsborough



Figure 56. Ui: "Me! Arturo Ui!"

At the end of this scene Aydoğdu placed the poem, “Verhör des Guten” [The Interrogation of the Good] by Bertolt Brecht, together with a song composed only for this production:³⁶ The poem shown in Table 13 fits perfectly with the content. Ui begs for Dogsborough's help to support him illegally, and when Dogsborough resists, he resorts to threats. Besides, Arturo Ui’s recitation of this poem on the stage adds a parodical effect to it.

As the parallel to Hitler, Arturo Ui, the gang leader, ironically questions Dogsborough's allegedly good conscience and declares him as his enemy since he does not help him with his evil purposes.

Table 13. A Brecht Poem: The Interrogation of the Good³⁷

<p>Verhör des Guten</p> <p>Tritt vor: wir hören dass du ein guter Mann bist. Du bist nicht käuflich Aber der Blitz Der ins Haus einschlägt ist auch Nicht käuflich. Was du einmal gesagt hast, dabei bleibst du. Was hast du gesagt? Du bist ehrlich, du sagst deine Meinung. Welche Meinung? So höre: Wir wissen Du bist unser Feind.</p> <p>(Brecht, 1995, p. 502).</p>	<p>İyi Adama Bir İki Soru</p> <p>Anladık iyisin Ama neye yarıyor iyiliğin? Seni kimse satın alamaz, Eve düşen yıldırım da Satın alınmaz Anladık dediğin dedik, Ama dediğin ne? Doğrusun, söylersin düşündüğünü, Ama düşündüğün ne? Şimdi bizi iyi dinle: Düşmanımızsın sen bizim</p> <p>(Act 1, Scene 2).</p>
---	---

As he reads the poem, Ui and his gang approach Dogsborough in a menacing manner, showing their guns. Between each line, the gang members constantly accompany the poem with the sounds "Oooo..." and "Ah...." sounds and thus create an interruptive effect (see Figure 57).

³⁶ The Turkish translator of the poem added to the production is not known.

³⁷ English translation can be found in Appendix C, Table C12.



Figure 57. Ui reciting the poem, with his gang behind him

After the poem, Ui suddenly starts to sing a song. He, his gang members and Dogsborough dance as he sings it, as shown in Figure 58. The gang members also support the song melodically through a cappella. The lyrics are as follow:

"Gebertirim, gebertirim, gebertirim seni! Parça, parça, paramparça ederim seni. Gebeeeeerrrr!" (I'll kill you, I'll kill you, I'll kill you! I will tear you apart!). The lyrics semantically reproduce the line in the original and Erten's translation (1999): "Sie, ich warn Sie! Ich werde Sie zerschmettern!" (Brecht, 1965, p. 41) (Fena yaparım! Namussuzum paralarım sizi!) (p. 20).



Figure 58. Dogsborough, Ui and the gang dancing and singing

The poem, song, and accompanying dance performance fit the scene thematically and create a parodical effect on the stage. They also serve as an interruption, placed

right in the middle of the narration. Thus, they can generate *Verfremdungseffekt* by detaching them from the play suddenly through a combination of ironic language, music, and dance.

5.2.6 A female Ui on the stage again³⁸

Dogsborough fears that Ui will expose his corruption. Thus, he assigns Ui as his substitute and supposedly assigns him to illuminate the shady case and save him. Ui ferociously kills all the witnesses one by one. The interrogator O'Casey questions Dogsborough, the Trust, and Arturo Ui at the City council. Meanwhile, they learn that Sheet was found dead. The *Fabel* of this scene reveals how Ui usurps power through blackmail and coercion and does not hesitate to kill anybody who stands in his way for the sake of his political aims. In this part, I would like to highlight the word choices in the original text and Erten's translation and will show how they affect the presentation of Ui on the stage. Then, I will continue with the director Ümit Aydođdu's interventions and directorial decisions.

While the Trust members, Dogsborough, and O'Casey are waiting for the man Dogsborough assigned to investigate his case, O'Casey expresses his suspicions and says that: "So, 's ist ein ehrlicher Mann?... Da Sheet heut nacht erst starb, könnst alles schon geklärt sein. Nun, ich hoff es ist ein guter Mann, den du gewählt hast" (Brecht, 1965, pp. 46-47). Erten's translation (1999) is as follows: "Namuslu biri olsa bari... Sheet henüz dün gece öldürüldüğüne göre, daha her şey açığa çıkabilir. Umarım, vekâlet verip görevlendirdiğin adam iyi biridir?" (I hope that he is an

³⁸ In the original text, this part belongs to Scene 4. However, due to the reordering of the scenes in Aydođdu's production, it is labelled as a part of Scene 3. All the following quotations are taken from the recording of the Tiyatroadam production (2013).

honourable man... Sheet was killed only yesterday, everything can be revealed. I hope that the man you assigned as your substitute is a good man, eh?) (p. 23).

So far, the audience has learned that Ui is far from being an honourable and good man and they can already guess that he is behind Sheet's death. For this reason, even though O' Casey does not know that Dogsborough's substitute is Ui himself, his words sound almost ironically naïve for the audience. In the same sentence, he mentions Sheet's murder and expects his murderer to be "ein ehrlicher Mann" and "ein guter Mann". It might be suggested that Brecht possibly uses these words in the same sentence to create an ironical and conflicting situation.

In his translation, Erten managed to preserve this effect. He translated "ehrlich" as "namuslu" (honourable) and "gut" as "good". On top of that, in the original "Da Sheet heut nacht erst starb", there is not an emphasis on the fact that he was killed, rather it says that he has been dead only for a limited time. However, we see that Erten translated the sentence in such a way that the murder is highlighted, thus strengthening the ironic and jarring effect of the sentence.

On the other hand, in Aydođdu's production, O'Casey enunciates this line as: "Namuslu biri olsa bari... Çünkü eđer öyleyse, Sheet daha yeni öldürüldüğüne göre her şey ortaya çıkıverir. Umarım vekâlet verip görevlendirdiđin adam namuslu biridir, Dogsborough?" (I hope that he is an honourable man... Sheet was killed only yesterday. So, everything can be revealed. I hope that the man you assigned as your substitute is an honourable man, Dogsborough?). We see that, instead of keeping Erten's translation of "ein guter Mann" as "iyi bir adam", Aydođdu preferred repeating "ein ehrlicher Mann" again and omitted the emphasis on Ui being "ein guter Mann". Brecht's emphasis on Ui as a so-called good man considerably strengthens the dissonant and ironical effect of this line, which is undermined by

Aydoğdu's alteration. Aydoğdu could have preserved or even intensified the emphasis on so-called goodness of Ui by means of the intonation and gestures of the actors. If Aydoğdu had used the opportunity in this way, it would have tied in with his introduction of Brecht's "Verhör des Guten" mentioned in the previous scene, a poem that is recited by a male Ui in such a way as to create a contradiction because it can be claimed that Ui is the opposite of a "good man".

I will now move on with another example of omission and alteration that has the potential to tone down the portrayal of Ui as being highly self-assured. In the previous part, we saw that Ui was incredibly polite in his first encounter with Dogsborough: "Herr Dogsborough, Sie sehen vor sich einen verkannten Mann. Sein Bild geschwärzt von Neid sein Wollen entstellt von Niedertracht" (Brecht, 1965, p. 37). Ui, however, was constantly fluctuating, being extremely polite one moment and incredibly furious and dangerous the next. He lacked self-assurance and desperately needed Dogsborough's support. However, in Act 1, Scene 3, we see a very self-assured Ui figure who has managed to intimidate Dogsborough and started to usurp the power. This self-assurance is evident in his speech as well. He does not need to convince anybody or resort to rhetoric for this purpose. He uses quite a casual language. In the original text, Arturo Ui enters the stage by briefly greeting the others on the stage: "Hallo, Clark! Hallo, Dogsborough! Hallo" (Brecht, 1965, p. 47). After Clark responds with the same greeting ("Hallo, Ui!"), Ui directly asks "Nun, was will man von mir wissen?" (Brecht, 1965, p. 47). Erten's translation (1999) is just as short and to the point, reflecting Ui's self-assurance: "Merhaba, Clark! Merhaba, Dogsborough! Merhaba...Evet, ne öğrenmek istiyorsunuz?" (Hello, Clark! Hello, Dogsborough! Hello... Yes, what do you want to know?) (pp. 23-24).

In Aydođdu’s production, Ui’s line is as follows: “Geciktiđim iin zgnm baylar. Evet, ne đrenmek istiyorsunuz?” (I am sorry for being late, gentlemen... Yes, what do you want to know?). With this alteration, the directness of Ui, his self-assurance, and his use of a casual language compared to his long rhetoric in the previous scene are lost. On top of that, he kindly apologizes for being late. In other words, it can be claimed that this minor alteration results in a toning down of Ui’s inconsistent attitudes towards the others. As Ui gradually usurps power and does not need the help of other people anymore, his attitude and mode of address change with him as well. We can see this change in comparison to his previous attitudes in the original and Erten’s translation. However, this effect is lost in the production in terms of register and it may also affect the dialectical development of Ui as a figure.

Furthermore, as shown in the previous parts, Aydođdu introduced Arturo Ui to the audience for the first time as a female figure and then, right in the next scene, Ui is portrayed by a male actor. In Act 1, Scene 3, after the presentation of a conflicting male Ui, Aydođdu swaps the sexes again and uses another female actor to play Ui (see Figure 59). Through the continuous change of Ui’s sex, the discrepant portrayal of Ui as a figure is reinforced and made “strange” in each scene. Thus, it can be claimed that the audience are perplexed and made alert in a dynamic manner, which could lead to *Verfremdungseffekt*.



Figure 59. A female Ui on the stage again

In the original text, right after Ui enters the stage and says “Nun, was will man von mir wissen?” (Brecht, 1965, p. 47), O’Casey turns to Dogsborough and enunciates “Das hier dein Mann?” (Brecht, 1965, p. 47). Erten (1999) translated this line as “Adamin bu mu?” (lit. translation: Your man is this?) (p. 24). In Erten’s translation, “Adamin” is positioned at the beginning of the sentence which can possibly remove the emphasis on “Mann” placed at the end of the sentence in German. This reminds us of Brecht’s attention to the use of language in a way that can convey *Gestus* (Brecht, 1963d, p. 281). In *Schriften zum Theater 3* [Writings on Theatre 3], Brecht (1963d) states that in terms of conveying *Gestus*, the sentence, “Reiße das Auge, das dich ärgert, aus!” (Pluck the eye, that troubles you, out!) is weaker than “Wenn dich dein Auge ärgert, reiße es aus!” (If your eye troubles you, pluck it out!) (p. 281).

Similar to this example, I suggest that Erten’s translation misses the effect in terms of *Gestus* as well. However, it is not Erten’s responsibility to imagine the gestures of the actors on the stage and translate accordingly. His translation is quite sufficient on paper. It was Aydoğdu himself who should have taken the gestic emphasis into consideration. However, in the production, Aydoğdu did not change Erten’s translation in line with the actor’s gesture on the stage. In the production, the actor portraying O’Casey points at Ui as he enunciates “Adamin bu mu?” (Your man is this?) almost in a quite a low voice (see Figure 60):



Figure 60. O’Casey pointing at Ui

This sentence structure and intonation might miss O'Casey's emphasis and surprise at Ui being Dogsborough's "man" ("Das hier dein Mann?") (Brecht, 1965, p. 47). Additionally, at least from the perspective of the Turkish production, Aydoğdu could have used this opportunity to highlight a difference through language. If O'Casey had raised his voice and addressed Ui as "adam" (Mann) with his finger pointed at him, it would have amplified the strangeness of Ui being a female. Furthermore, in Turkish, when the "adam" (man) is stressed in a different way, it can gain the meaning of honest, brave, or honourable.³⁹ This would add another layer of contrastive feature to Ui as a figure.

After focusing on the role of Erten's translation and showing how Aydoğdu's alterations changed the portrayal of Ui, in the next part, I will dwell on a very critical scene in the play, where Ui undergoes a complete transformation.

5.2.7 Ui takes lessons from an actor: A transformation on the stage⁴⁰

In Act 1, Scene 4, Ui takes lessons from an actor. The *Fabel* of this scene can show us a Ui who wants to improve his public speaking skills and learn how to use his body language to be able to influence people in line with his own interests, which is grasping absolute power. In Aydoğdu's production, Ui's improvement or, better said, transformation is shown through contradictions and the *Gestus* of the actor and Ui. First of all, we can see that Aydoğdu successfully managed to create a parodical representation of the scene with the abundant use of comical elements and

³⁹ I should clearly state that I find the use of "adam" in a way that denote such merits sexist because it attributes them to "manhood". However, in a gangster setting and with the aim of creating a contradiction, it might have made the very meaning parodical.

⁴⁰ In the original text, this part belongs to Scene 7. However, due to the reordering of the scenes in Aydoğdu's production, it is labelled as a part of Scene 4. All the following quotations are taken from the recording of the Tiyatroadam production (2013).

Shakespearean references also present in the original and Erten's translation. The scene starts with a parodical Shakespearean monologue added to the script by Aydođdu: "Sapı elinden yana çalmış, gel sarsın elim seni, göze var ele yok musun sen, şimdi kim bana namussuzluk ediyorsun diyebilir?..." (Its handle in my hand, let me hold it, shall I only look at you, is it forbidden to touch, who can blame me for acting dishonourably). Figure 61 shows the actor reciting the monologue using romantic gestures:



Figure 61. The actor reciting the monologue

We also see Ui sitting on a wooden bench and watching the actor's gestures closely. After a while, Ui starts to mirror his gestures in an extremely silly manner, as shown in Figure 62 and Figure 63 below:



Figure 62. Ui mirroring the actor's gestures 1



Figure 63. Ui mirroring the actor's gestures 2

With Ui's silly and exaggerated imitations, the actor's parodical monologue becomes parodical itself. Besides, the similarity between their movements is highlighted in a strange and almost comical manner. Following the monologue recited by the actor at a slow pace without hesitation, Ui stands up and approaches the actor briskly in a self-confident manner. He frowns and puts on a serious way (see Figure 64). This change brings out a discrepancy between his silly gestures just a moment ago.



Figure 64 Ui standing up and approaching the actor

Right after that, Ui's incomprehensible lines enunciated at extremely high speed and constantly interrupted by his own temperamental gestures creates contrast (see Figure 65 and Figure 66): "Güzel, güzel! Evet, evet. Dinleyin öyleyse. Konuşmam pek iyi değilmiş diyorlar... Yakında bazı yerlerde üç beş laf etmem gerekecek..." (Good, good! Yes, yes. Hear me out. They say that I cannot speak properly... Soon, I will have to talk in some places...).

Here, Aydoğdu's script follows Erten's translation word for word, except for the addition of "good, good" and "yes, yes" to the beginning of the sentence:

"Dinleyin öyleyse. Konuşmam pek iyi değişmiş diyorlar... Yakında bazı yerlerde üç beş laf etmem gerekecek" (Erten, 1999, p. 27).⁴¹



Figure 65 Ui's gestures interrupting his own speech

⁴¹ The German original is as follows: "So hören Sie: man hat mir zu verstehen gegeben, daß meine Aussprache zu wünschen übrig läßt. Und da es unvermeidlich sein wird, bei dem oder jenem Anlaß ein paar Worte zu äußern..." (Brecht, 1965, p. 54).



Figure 66 Ui jumping suddenly

As the scene continues, we see that Ui improves his gestures which look more determined and self-assured. Still, in comparison to the actor's smooth and fluent gestures, they are much more stiff, abrupt, and violent. As illustrated in Figure 67 and Figure 68, through this performance, Ümit Aydoğdu amplifies the discrepancies in Ui's behaviour through stage elements.



Figure 67 Ui mirroring the actor's gestures 3



Figure 68 Ui mirroring the actor's gestures 4

In addition to the contrasting gestures of the actor and Ui, the very intonation and enunciation of the lines by the actor and Ui produce difference and make Erten's translation sound strange in a way that may lead to *Verfremdungseffekt*. In the original, Brecht closes the scene with another parodical monologue that includes direct references to Shakespeare's drama. The monologue is recited by Ui himself:

"...Doch Brutus sagt uns, Cäsar war tyrannisch und Brutus ist ein ehrenwerter Mann. Ihre alle saht, wie bei den Luperkalien, Ich dreimal ihm die königliche Kron' brot" (Brecht, 1965, p. 60). Here, Erten (1999) produces a very faithful translation:

"...Fakat gene Brutus onun için, haristi diyor; ki Brutus şerefli bir adamdır. Siz hep gördünüz. Luperkalya yortusunda kendisine üç kez krallık tacını sundum" (...Still, Brutus says that he (referring to Caesar) was greedy and Brutus is an honourable man. You all saw this. I presented him the crown of the kingdom three times at Lupercalia festival) (p. 30). In his production, Aydoğdu uses Erten's translation as it is, but evidently instructed the actor to practically mumble the words. In the original and Erten's translation, there is nothing strange or inconsistent about this monologue.

However, the intonation and speed of the actor in Aydoğdu's production creates a discordance with the text itself, if one considers that such a text would normally be recited at a slow pace in an elegant manner. For this reason, Ui's recitation on the stage makes the familiar monologue sound brutal and quite different than its traditional style (see Figure 69).



Figure 69 Ui reciting the monologue furiously

Plus, the actors in the dark start to sing a melody while Ui's recitation continues, which creates an interruptive effect. At the same time, another Ui steps into the centre stage and two Ui's continue the monologue by exhibiting exactly the same *Gestus* (see Figure 70). The ending of this scene also illuminates how Ui continues to change throughout the play and undergo transformation.



Figure 70 Two Ui's exhibiting exactly the same *Gestus*

I suggest that the contrasting gestures, the strange enunciation of the lines, the interruptive effect of the song and the presence of two Ui figures could easily serve the *Verfremdungseffekt* on the stage. Erten's successful translation in terms of preserving the stylistic features of Brecht's Shakespearean monologue and Aydođdu's skilful use of stage elements contributed to the creation of contradiction and *Verfremdungseffekt* in Act 1, Scene 4. After this analysis part, in the next chapter I will synthesise my findings and show the possibilities and limitations of this thesis, with a particular focus on the analysis.



CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis was to find out whether, and if so, how *Verfremdungseffekt* could be conveyed in the Turkish translation and staging of *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui* by Bertolt Brecht. To this end, I presented and discussed various examples from the Tiyatroadam production of *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*, analysed within the framework of Patrice Pavis' notion of *mise en scène*. In the following, I will first and foremost reflect on the findings and possibilities of my thesis and then concisely discuss its limitations.

The analysis showed that, when resorting to textual omissions, Aydođdu tended to pay attention to the function of that particular line and compensated for it by utilizing various stage elements, particularly the *Gestus* of the figures and contradictory situations. Sometimes, though, without changing anything in Erten's translation, Aydođdu added a stage element that amplified the contradiction which eventually led to the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt*.

In other words, the examples revealed that the director Ümit Aydođdu orchestrated his own *mise en scène* to stage the play in a Brechtian way by utilizing Erten's translation. He deployed the multiple signs systems in such a way that they collaborated to create contradictory situations on the stage, which eventually paved the way for the realization of *Verfremdungseffekt*.

This comprehensive analysis revealed crucial findings for this thesis. First of all, we saw that *Verfremdungseffekt* can indeed be conveyed through translation and staging when the symbiotic relationship between the text and stage elements in

Brechtian theatre is taken into consideration. With his meticulous and skilful attention to various semiotics, the director Ümit Aydoğdu was able to realize *Verfremdungseffekt*. This success also revealed his understanding of *mise en scène* and its striking resemblance to Pavis' notion of *mise en scène* as both oversee a symbiotic relationship between multiple sign systems. This can be particularly seen in the relationship between text and performance.

From a broader perspective, the examples in the analysis have also demonstrated that Pavis' notion can be used as a model to analyse a Brecht play due to its affinity with the concept of *Verfremdung* in terms of requiring the collaboration of various sign systems and a symbiotic relationship. Still, I would like to stress that I do not consider this notion as a model that can be put into use in the analysis of every other play, just because it offered opportunities in the analysis of Aydoğdu's *Arturo Ui*. It is not a prescriptive model that can or should be followed precisely; it is far from it. It can be claimed that the notion of *mise en scène* does, however, push us to examine the director's distinct way of orchestrating the various sign systems in his/her direction of a performance.

Furthermore, as for the analytical method, these examples revealed that the terms "compensation" (Harvey, 1995; Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002) and "amplification" (Molina & Hurtado Albir, 2002; Vinay & Darbelnet, 1995) can be used outside their traditional definitions and incorporated into an analysis of multimodal texts. The former can possibly denote the compensation for a textual omission with an element from another sign system, whereas the latter can refer to the strengthening of a textual effect through the use of other semiotics. Still, multiple comprehensive interdisciplinary analyses are certainly required to be able to put these terms into use and reveal their actual potentials.

Additionally, each method of “compensation” and “amplification” demonstrated that, whenever Aydoğdu departed from the translated text, he still concentrated on its intended function. Ultimately, it might be assumed that he was mostly bound by Erten’s meticulous translation, not the original text. If Erten had failed to convey Brecht’s stylistic features, particularly the ones that might create contradiction and thus potentially *Verfremdungseffekt* at a linguistic level, Aydoğdu might have missed these nuances as well. This also showed the role of the translator in a production in general, at least for a production that does not involve the translator as an active agent in the process. In this case, one may suggest that Erten was probably only present with his linguistic choices and it was Aydoğdu himself who had the sole authority to work on his translation and shape it accordingly.

In Aydoğdu’s doctoral thesis frequently quoted in the literature review and the analysis, we do not see any acknowledgment of Erten’s role as the translator or his possible participation in any way. Based on this fact, one might claim that Erten was not involved in the production process. There could, of course, have been a non-documented consultation between Erten and Aydoğdu. Still, even if there was, it would appear that Aydoğdu did not find the collaboration worth commenting on. For me, this lack of acknowledgment of the translator came as a surprise, particularly coming from a director like Aydoğdu, who is evidently well-informed about the relationship between multiple sign systems.

This finding gives the impression that Aydoğdu viewed the translated text as something produced almost automatically, without the involvement of a translator, although one may assume that it was mostly through Erten’s translation that as a director, he possibly developed the script and took the first steps to shape his *mise en scène*. Still, even though Erten’s work remains unacknowledged and

underappreciated, it can also be claimed that he was relieved of his so-called duty to seek a performability supposedly embedded in the text or translate in a performable manner. Instead, he was conceivably tasked with working on the linguistic aspects of the original text that his translation was based on.

Now, I would like to reflect on the limitations of this thesis. The fact that I was not able to do interviews with the translator and the director to enquire about a possible collaboration between them resulted in making assumptions about their roles in this production. An interview would certainly enrich my thesis in terms of excavating their approaches toward the text and performance, and more importantly, the “ideal” roles of the translator and director from their perspectives. Particularly, as a translator, director, actor, and critic, Erten’s contributions would be priceless.

Additionally, discovering and studying a collaborative act of staging involving the translator and director of a Brecht play, if such a thing exists, would make it possible to reflect further on the relationship between text and performance within the context of *Verfremdung* as a concept. A valuable source that could certainly enrich further studies would be the comments of translators and directors concerning the attempt to achieve the *Verfremdungseffekt*, particularly by drawing on the symbiotic relationship between the translated text and stage elements.

Such sources and studies can be fruitful for both translation studies and theatre studies. For theatre studies, they may show how the collaboration between the director and translator can offer solutions in terms of orchestrating the *mise en scène* in a Brecht play. For translation studies, they can invite us to reflect on theatre translation further and change our perception regarding the translator’s role. They can encourage future researchers to dwell on multimodal translation in line with the roles of the various agents involved in the production of multimodal texts. Taking the

multiple semiotic systems into consideration can widen our perspective and inspire us to discover other forms of translation that involve various sign systems.

Furthermore, a focus on the roles of the individuals may promote research on the translation as a collaborative process, rather than an end-product, and stimulate us to cross the boundaries of other disciplines, which can enrich our understanding of translation as a phenomenon.



REFERENCES

- Akçamete, A. (2014). *Arturo Ui'nin önlenebilir tırmanışı—Tiyatroadam*. Tiyatronline. https://tiyatronline.com/arturo-ui-nin-onlenebilir-tirmanisi_-tiyat-ro-adam-2575
- Akmen, Ü. (2014). Ayrıcalık gene neşede: Arturo Ui'nin önlenebilir tırmanışı. *Evrensel Gazetesi*. <https://www.evrensel.net/yazi/71259/ayricalik-gene-nesede-arturo-uinin-onlenebilir-tirmanisi>
- Aktay, A. (2009). *Bertolt Brecht'in tiyatro metinlerinin Türkçeye aktarılışında deyim aktarmalarından kaynaklanan sorunlar ve bu sorunların dil öğretimindeki yansımaları* [MA]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Albiz Telci, Ü., & Çoban, F. (2017). Bertolt Brecht'in "Üç Kuruşluk Opera" adlı eserinin Türkçeye aktarımındaki dilsel öğelerin kültürel boyutlarıyla incelenmesi. *Tarih Okulu Dergisi*, XXX, 267-283.
- Anderman, G. (2005). *Europe on stage: Translation and theatre*. London: Oberon Books.
- Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu. (n.d.). Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu AST . Retrieved July 20, 2021, from <https://ast.com.tr>
- Aydoğdu, Ü. (2011). *Brecht'in Arturo Ui'si: Bertolt Brecht'in epik tiyatro araçlarının günümüzde kullanımına yönelik bir sahneleme denemesi* [Doctoral dissertation]. Anadolu Üniversitesi.
- Aydoğdu, Ü. (2013). *Arturo Ui'nin önlenebilir tırmanışı* [MP4]. Tiyatroadam.
- Barnett, D. (2015a). *Brecht in practice: Theatre, theory and performance*. London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Barnett, D. (2015b). *A history of the Berliner Ensemble*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnett, D. (2021). Brechtian clichés #1: He wants you to know you're in a theatre [Blog]. *Brecht in Practice*. <https://brechtinpractice.org/brechtian-cliches-1-wants-know-youre-theatre/>

Barnett, D. (2021). Verfremdung or Verfremdungseffekt. *Brecht in practice*. <http://brechtinpractice.org/theory/verfremdung-or-verfremdungseffekt/>

Bassnett-McGuire, S. (2014). Ways through the labyrinth: Strategies and methods for translating theatre texts. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (1st ed., pp. 87-102). Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge (Original work published 1985)

Benjamin, W. (1998). *Understanding Brecht*. London and New York, NY: Verso.

Billington, M. (1973). *The modern actor*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Blaxland, W. (1984). On being a playwright/director. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.), *Page to stage: Theatre as translation* (pp. 41-54). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Bradley, L. (2006). *Brecht and political theatre: The mother on stage*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brecht, B. (1963a). *Schriften zum Theater 1*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Brecht, B. (1963b). *Dialoge aus dem Messingkauf*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Brecht, B. (1963c). *Schriften zum Theater 4*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Brecht, B. (1963d). *Schriften zum Theater 3*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Brecht, B. (1964). A short organum for the theatre. In J. Willett (Ed. & Trans.), *Brecht on theatre: The development of an aesthetic* (1st ed., pp. 179-207). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.

Brecht, B. (1965). *Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Brecht, B. (1973a). *Arbeitsjournal (1938-1942)*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Brecht, B. (1973b). *Die Dreigroschenoper*.
https://is.muni.cz/el/1421/jaro2011/NJI_20/um/22843301/24039974/Brecht_Die_Dreigroschenoper_Akt_I_II.pdf
- Brecht, B. (1976). *Bertolt Brecht poems* (J. Willett & R. Manheim, Eds.). London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.
- Brecht, B. (1995). Verhör Des Guten. In *Werke* (Vol. 18, p. 502). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Brecht, B. (1999). *Arturo Ui'nin önlenebilir tırmanışı* (Y. Erten, Trans.) (n.p.).
- Brecht, B. (2011). *Epik tiyatro* (K. Şipal, trans.). İstanbul: Agora.
- Brecht, B. (2013). *The resistible rise of Arturo Ui* (J. Wise, Trans.). London: Methuen.
- Brecht, B. (2014). On experimental theatre. In M. Silberman, S. Giles, & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Brecht on theatre* (3rd ed.). London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury. (Original work published 1939)
- Brecht, B. (2014). On the use of music in an epic theatre. In M. Silberman, S. Giles, & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Brecht on theatre* (3rd ed.). London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury. (Original work published 1935)
- Brecht, B. (2014). Short description of a new technique of acting that produces a *Verfremdung* effect. In M. Silberman, S. Giles, & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Brecht on theatre* (3rd ed.). London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury. (Original work published 1940)
- Brecht, B. (2014). Notes on the mother. In M. Silberman, S. Giles, & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Brecht on theatre* (3rd ed.). London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury. (Original work published 1933)
- Brooker, P. (2017). *Bertolt Brecht: Dialectics, poetry, politics*. Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge.

Butcher, S. H. (Ed.). (1902). *The poetics of Aristotle*. London: Macmillan and Co. Limited

Buttanrı, M. (2010). Cumhuriyet devri Türk tiyatrosunda batı etkisi. *Turkish Studies*, 5(2), 50–91.

Corrigan, R. W. (1961). Translating for actors. In W. Arrowsmith & R. Shattuck (Eds., pp. 99-111), *The craft and context of translation*. Texas: The University of Texas Press.

Devlet Tiyatroları Genel Müdürlüğü. (n.d.). Retrieved July 18, 2021, from: <http://www.devtiyatro.gov.tr/>

Double, O., & Wilson, M. (2006). Brecht and cabaret. In P. Thomson & G. Sacks (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Brecht* (Cambridge Companions to Literature, pp. 40-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dünden Bugüne. (n.d.). AST. Retrieved May 19, 2021, from <https://ast.com.tr/DundenBugune.aspx>

Eddershaw, M. (2002). *Performing Brecht: Forty years of British performance*. Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge.

Erkazancı Durmuş, H. (2020). *Pierre Bourdieu sosyolojisi ışığında Türk tiyatro alanında çevirinin rolü ve Dostlar Tiyatrosu'nun konumu* (1st ed.). İstanbul: Hiper Yayın.

Forcht, G. W. (2012). *Frank Wedekind und die Volksstücktradition* (Vol. 41). Herbolzheim: Centaurus Verlag & Media.

Gezen, E. (2016). Brecht on the Turkish stage: Adaptation, experimentation, and theatre aesthetics in Genco Erkal's Dostlar Tiyatrosu. *German Life and Letters*, 69(2). 269–284.

Giles, S. (2014). A New Theatre. In M. Silberman, S. Giles, & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Brecht on theatre* (3rd ed.). London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Grimm, R. (1961). *Bertolt Brecht*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

- Gürmen, E., Denizhan , N., & Baltaoğlu , R. (Eds.). (1985). 1915-1985: 70 yılda oynadığımız oyunlar. In *Şehir Tiyatrosu: Tiyatromuz 70 yaşında*. İstanbul: Şehir Tiyatroları.
- Gürün, D. (2019). *Tiyatro benim hayatım: Yıldız Kenter'in hayat hikâyesi* (4th ed.). İstanbul: YKY.
- Gürün, D. (2000). *Tiyatro Yazıları*. İstanbul: Mitos Boyut Yayınları.
- Harvey, K. (1995). A descriptive framework for compensation. *The Translator*, 1(1), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1995.10798950>
- İpşiroğlu, Z. (2000). *Tiyatroda devrim*. İstanbul: Mitos Boyut Yayınları.
- Kaysı, Ö. (Ed.). (1987). *Devlet Tiyatroları'nda oynanmış oyunların bibliyografyası* (Vol. 4). Ankara: Devlet Tiyatroları İç Eğitim.
- Kesting, M. (1978). *Das epische Theater: Zur Struktur des modernen Dramas* (7th ed.). Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
- Lareau, A. (2006). *Kabarett (Weimarer Republik)*. [https://www.historisches-lexikonbayerns.de/Lexikon/Kabarett_\(Weimarer_Republik\)](https://www.historisches-lexikonbayerns.de/Lexikon/Kabarett_(Weimarer_Republik))
- Lefevre, A. (2004). Mother Courage's cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 233–250). Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1982)
- McCarthy, P. (1984). The Delicate balance: Dynamic interactions in translating drama into theatre. In O. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.), *Page to stage: Theatre as translation* (pp. 55-64). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Meech, A. (2011). Brecht's The Three Penny Opera for the National Theatre: A 3p Opera? In R. Baines, C. Marinetti, & M. Perteghella (Eds.), *Staging and performing translation: Text and theatre practice* (pp. 126-138). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2004). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta*, 47(4), 498–512.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar>

Mumford, M. (2009). *Bertolt Brecht*. Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge

Nutku, Ö. (1976). *Türkiye’de Brecht*. İstanbul: Tiyatro’76 Yayınları.

Nutku, Ö. (2014). Arturo Ui’nin yükselişi üzerine notlar. In B. Brecht, *Bütün Oyunları-7*. İstanbul: Agora.

Pavis, P. (1982). *Languages of the stage: Essays in the semiology of the theatre*. New York, NY: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Pavis, P. (1998). *Dictionary of the theatre: Terms, concepts, and analysis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Pavis, P. (2005). *Theatre at the crossroads of culture*. Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1992)

Primavesi, P. (1999). The performance of translation: Benjamin and Brecht on the loss of small details. *The Drama Review*, 43(4), 53–59.

Rebellato, D. (2009). When we talk of horses: Or, what do we see when we see a play? *Performance Research*, 14(1), 17–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13528160903113155>

Rebellato, D. (2016). *10 cheers for Bertolt Brecht*.
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/513c543ce4b0abff73bc0a82/t/58866bb43e00bef810f62018/1485204468584/3PO+programme.pdf>

Rosenhaft, E. (2006). Brecht’s Germany: 1898-1933. In P. Thomson & G. Sacks (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Brecht* (Cambridge Companions to Literature, pp. 3-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rouse, J. (1982). Brecht and the contradictory actor. In *Theatre Journal*, 36(1), no.1. 25–42.

- Schechner, R. (2012). Foreword. In Malina, J. *The Piscator notebook* (pp. xv-xix). Oxford and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schechter, J. (2006). Brecht's clowns: Man is Man and after. In P. Thomson & G. Sacks (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Brecht* (Cambridge Companions to Literature, pp. 90-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schoeps, K. (2001). Legende vom toten Soldaten. In Knopf, J. (Ed.). *Brecht Handbuch: Gedichte* (pp.50-57). Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.
- Silberman, M. (2014). Return to Germany. In M. Silberman, S. Giles, & T. Kuhn (Eds.), *Brecht on theatre* (3rd ed.). London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Soysal, F. (2012). *Applicability of the equivalence and The Skopos Theory to the practice of translation: A Critical approach to the translations of Bertolt Brecht* [MA]. Selçuk Üniversitesi.
- Thomson, P. (2006). Brecht's lives. In P. Thomson & G. Sacks (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Brecht* (Cambridge Companions to Literature, pp. 22-39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiyatroadam*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 21, 2021, from <http://www.tiyatroadam.com/>
- Tiyatrohane*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 20, 2021, from <https://www.tiyatrohane.net/>
- Tiyatrolar*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 19, 2021, from: <https://tiyatrolar.com.tr/>
- Unwin, S. (2005). *A guide to the plays of Bertolt Brecht*. London and New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Von Goethe, J. W. (1960). Wie du mir, so ich dir. In *Poetische Werke* (Vol. 1). Berlin: Berliner Ausgabe. (Original work published 1827)

- Willett, J. (1967). *The theatre of Bertolt Brecht*. London: Methuen & Co LTD.
- Williams, K. J. (2009). *Translating Brecht: Versions of Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder for the British stage* [PhD]. University of St. Andrews
- Wyckhuys, S. (2009). *The rise to power of Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump: A comparative study of speech delivery* [MA]. Université Catholique de Louvain.
- Xiaoqing, L. (2013). A Metonymic translation: Bertolt Brecht's The Caucasian Chalk Circle. *Translation: A Transdisciplinary Journal*, 133–158.
- Yücekurt Ünlü, Ş. S. (2019). Adalet Cimcoz: Sanatta yeni bir soluğu müjdeleyen çevirmen. In Ş. Tahir Gürçağlar (Ed.), *Kelimelerin kıyısında: Türkiye'de kadın çevirmenler* (pp. 155-173). İstanbul: İthaki.
- Yücel, C. (1989). *Can Yücel ile söyleyişi* (S. Karantay) [Metis Çeviri, 8].
- Yüksel, A. (2000). *Sahnedeki izdüşümler: 1975-2000*. İstanbul: Mitos Boyut Yayınları.
- Zuber, O. (1980). Problems of propriety and authenticity in translating modern drama. In O. Zuber (Ed.), *The language of theatre: Problems in the translation and transposition of drama*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

APPENDIX A
BRECHT'S COMPARISON

Original Text "Dramatik Tiyatro" and "Epik Tiyatro"

DRAMATİK TİYATRO'DA	EPİK TİYATRO'DA
Seyircinin ilgisi oyunun sonunda toplanır.	Seyircinin ilgisi oyunun yürüyüşü üzerine çekilir.
Her sahne bir ötekisi için vardır.	Her sahne kendisi için vardır.
Organik bir büyüme.	Montaj tekniği.
Olaylar düz bir çizgi üzerinde gelişir.	Her sahne kendisi için vardır.

APPENDIX B

THE LIST OF BRECHT PLAYS STAGED IN TURKEY

<p><i>Die Gewehre der Frau Carrar</i> [Senora Carrar's Rifles/Carrar Ana'nın Silahları]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1960 (staged by an unknown amateur group)2. Deneme Sahnesi3. 1970, Yenişehir Tiyatrosu, dir. Samet Çağan4. 1974, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Yaşar Akın and Erdal Gülver5. 2011-2012, Sarıyer Belediyesi Tiyatrosu, dir. Mahmut Gökhan Bulut6. 2011-2012, Konya Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Maral Üner Nutku, trans. Teoman Aktürel
<p><i>Die Ausnahme und die Regel</i> [The Exception and the Rule/Kural ve Kuraldışı]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1960 (staged by an unknown amateur group)
<p><i>Die Kleinbürgerhochzeit</i> [A Respectable Wedding/Küçük Burjuva Düğünü]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1960 (staged by an unknown amateur group)2. 1999-2000, İzmir Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Rolf Doerr, trans. Yılmaz Onay3. 2002-2003, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Yılmaz Onay.4. 2017, Sarı Sandalye, dir. Doğa Nalbantoğlu, trans. Yılmaz Onay.5. 2019-2020, Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Can Emüler, trans. Yılmaz Onay.
<p><i>Der gute Mensch von Sezuan</i> [The Good Person of Szechwan/Sezuan'ın İyi İnsanı]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1964, İstanbul Şehir Tiyatroları. Dir. Beklân Algan, trans. Adalet Cimcoz and Teoman Aktürel (poems)2. 1975-1976, Birlik Sahnesi, dir. Vasif Öngören.3. 1998-1999, Van Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Lise Scheer, trans. Adalet Cimcoz.4. 2011-2012, İstanbul Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Yücel Erten, trans. Adalet Cimcoz.
<p><i>Die Dreigroschenoper</i> [The Threepenny Opera/Üç Kuruşluk Opera]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1964, Dormen Tiyatrosu. Dir. And trans. Tuncay Çavdar.2. 1988-1989, İstanbul Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Yücel Erten, trans. Tuncay Çavdar.3. 2001-2002, Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Salih Erkan Gökücü, trans. Yücel Erten
<p><i>Herr Puntila und sein Knecht Matti</i> [Mr Puntila and his Man Matti/Puntila Ağa ve Uşağı Matti]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 1965-66, Dormen Tiyatrosu.2. 1987-1988, Dostlar Tiyatrosu, dir. Genco Erkal.3. 2002-2003, Antalya Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. İskender Altın, trans. Yılmaz Onay.4. 2017-2018, Bursa Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Ümit Aydoğdu, trans. Yılmaz Onay.

<p><i>Leben des Galilei</i> [Life of Galileo/Galile'nin Yaşamı]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1975-76, İstanbul Şehir Tiyatroları, dir. Metin Deniz, trans. Ülkü Tamer and Müntekim Ökmen. 1983-84, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Rutkay Aziz, trans. Adalet Cimcoz. 1983-1984, Dostlar Tiyatrosu, dir. Genco Erkal. 1990-1991, Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Heinz Uwe Haus, trans. Adalet Cimcoz. 2008-2009, Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Salih Erhan Göküçü, trans. Ahmet Cemal
<p><i>Der kaukasische Kreidekreis</i> [The Caucasian Chalk Circle/Kafkas Tebeşir Dairesi]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1979-1980, Dostlar Tiyatrosu, dir. Mehmet Ulusoy, trans. Can Yücel. 1990-1991, Bursa Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Nurhan Karadağ, trans. Can Yücel 2013, Çolpan İlhan & Sadri Alışık Tiyatrosu, dir. Barış Erdenk, trans. Yılmaz Onay. 2017, Tiyatroadam, dir. Ümit Aydoğdu, trans. Can Yücel. 2017, Diyarbakır Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Doğu Akal, trans. Yılmaz Onay.
<p><i>Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui</i> [The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui/Arturo Ui'nin Önlenebilir Tırmanışı]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1965-1966, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Asaf Çiyiltepe, trans. Sevgi and Başar Sabuncu. 1979, Devlet Tiyatroları, dir. Yücel Erten, trans. Sevgi Soysal and Başar Sabuncu 1999, İstanbul Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. And trans. Yücel Erten. 2013, Tiyatroadam, dir. Ümit Aydoğdu, trans. Yücel Erten. 2014, Bornova Belediyesi Tiyatrosu, dir. Hakan Taner Yıldırım, trans. Özdemir Nutku 2017, Tiyatrohane, dir. Erk Bilgiç, trans. Özdemir Nutku.
<p><i>Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reichs</i> [Fear and Misery of the Third Reich/III. Reich'in Korku ve Sefaleti]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1972, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Yılmaz Onay (banned) 1974, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Yılmaz Onay 1978-1979, İstanbul Şehir Tiyatroları, dir. Başar Sabuncu, trans. Can Yücel 2018, Nilüfer Belediyesi Kent Tiyatrosu, dir. Yunus Emre Bozdoğan, trans. Yılmaz Onay.
<p><i>Mann ist Mann</i> [Man is Man/Adam Adamdır]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1970, Ankara Birliği Sahnesi, dir. Vasıf Öngören 1996, Tiyatro Ti, dir. Mahir Günşıray
<p><i>Die Mutter</i> [The Mother/Ana]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1975, Ankara Sanat Tiyatrosu, dir. Rutkay Aziz
<p><i>Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder</i> [Mother Courage and Her Children/Cesaret Ana ve Çocukları]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2008, Semaver Kumpanya, dir. Işıl Kasapoğlu. 2012-2013, Ankara Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Ayşe Emel Mesci Berktaş, trans. Ayşe Selen.
<p><i>Schweyk im Zweiten Weltkrieg</i> [Schweyk in the Second World War/Şvayk Hitler'e Karşı]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1976-1977, İstanbul Şehir Tiyatroları, dir. Ergin Orbey, trans. Can Yücel.
<p><i>Antigone des Sophokles</i> [The Antigone of Sophocles/Sophokles'in Antigone'si]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2010-2011, Adana Devlet Tiyatrosu, dir. Barış Erdenk, trans. Ahmet Cemal.

APPENDIX C
ENGLISH BACK-TRANSLATIONS⁴²

Appendix C, Table C1. English translation of the prologue's opening lines

Sayın Baylar Bayanlar Bugün, burada, yüksek huzurlarınızda Hoop, arka taraf sessiz olalım kardeşim! Hanımefendi, siz de şapkanızı çıkarın lütfen! (Erten, 1999, p. 39).	Ladies and Gentlemen! Here, today, at your presence, Hey! Those in the back! Be quiet folks! Madam, take off your hat please!
---	--

Appendix C, Table C2. English translation of formal and informal language

Evet sayın seyirciler Bugün, burada, yüksek huzurlarınızda ünlü yangın davası, Gangsterlerin büyük tarihi dramı... Kredi yolsuzluğu üzerine daha önce hiç duyulmadık büyük ifşaat! Daha: Dogsborough'nun vasiyetnamesi ve itirafları! Arturo Ui'nin borsa çöküşü sırasındaki hızlı tırmanışı! (Erten, 1999, p. 3). ... Kral Üçüncü Richard faciası! Kırmızı güller - Beyaz Güller Savaşı! Shakespeare tragedyaları halt etmiş! O günden bu yana böyle kan dökülmemiş, Böylesine boğazlamamış insan insanı. İşte bu yüzden, sayın bayanlar ve baylar, Müdüriyetimiz hiçbir masraftan kaçınmamış bulunuyor. Ve büyük trajik stilde oynanıyor olup biten. (Erten, 1999, p. 4).	Yes, dear audience... Here, today, at your presence, The famous fire case, the big historical tragedy of Gangsters! The untold story of loan corruption! What's more: Dogsborough's will and confession! The rapid rise of Arturo Ui during the stock market crash! The catastrophe of Richard the Third! The battle between the red roses and white roses! Nothing like Shakespeare's tragedies! So much blood spilled since that day! So many people strangled each other! Thus, ladies and gentlemen, We spared no expense! And here, everything is staged in the style of a big tragedy!
--	--

⁴² Unless stated otherwise, all subsequent translations from Turkish into English are by the author of this thesis.

Appendix C, Table C3. English translation of the prologue's closing lines

<p>Bu akşamki oyunda Ne var ne yok yaşanmış Ne düzmece ne yalan Yalnız biraz budanmış Tarihtir gördüğünüz Ve pek bildik bir konu Tüm dünyanın tattığı Gangsterler oyunu (Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>In tonight's play Everything is real No bullshit, no lies Only altered a bit You will see history And a very familiar topic It's a gangster play The whole world knows</p>
--	---

Appendix C, Table C4. English translation of Erten's translation and script

Erten's Translation	English Back-translation	Script	English Back-translation
<p>Sayın Baylar Bayanlar Bugün, burada, yüksek huzurlarınızda Hoop, arka taraf sessiz olalım kardeşim! Hanımefendi, siz de şapkanızı çıkarın lütfen! Bugün burada yüksek huzurlarınızda ünlü yangın davası, Gangsterlerin büyük tarihi dramı. Kredi yolsuzluğu üzerine daha önce hiç duyulmadık büyük ifşaat! Daha: Dogsborough'nun vasiyetnamesi fe itirafları! Arturo Ui'nin borsa çöküşü sırasındaki hızlı tırmanışı! (Erten, 1999, p. 3). ... İşte bu yüzden sayın bayanlar ve baylar, Müdüriyetimiz hiçbir masraftan kaçınmamış bulunuyor. Ve büyük trajik stilde oynanıyor. (Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>Ladies and Gentlemen! Here, today, at your presence, Hey! Those in the back! Be quiet folks! Ma'am, take off your hat please! Here, today, at your presence, The famous fire case, the big historical tragedy of Gangsters! The untold story of loan corruption! What's more: Dogsborough's will and confession! The rapid rise of Arturo Ui during the stock market crash! ... Thus, ladies and gentlemen, We spared no expense! And here, everything is staged in the style of a big tragedy!</p>	<p>Bayanlar Baylar Bugün sizlere Bertolt Brecht'in sözleriyle bir öykü anlatacağız, Tiyatro sanatının yaratıcı sahnesinden. Öykümüz Arturo Ui'nin dillere destan yükselişini anlatır. Peki kimdir bu Arturo Ui? Bir gangster mi, bir kahraman mı? (Act 1, Prologue)</p>	<p>Ladies and gentlemen Today we will tell you a story with the words of Bertolt Brecht From the creative scene of the art of drama Our story narrates the legendary rise of Arturo Ui But who is Arturo Ui? A gangster, or a hero?</p>

Appendix C, Table C5. English translation of the dialectical effect in the prologue

Erten's Translation	English Back-translation	Script	English Back-translation
<p>Bu akşamki oyunda Ne var ne yok yaşanmış Ne düzmece ne yalan Yalnız biraz budanmış</p> <p>Tarihtir gördüğünüz Ve pek bildik bir konu Tüm dünyanın tattığı Gangsterler oyunu</p> <p>(Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>In tonight's play Everything is real No bullshit, no lies Only altered a bit</p> <p>You will see history And a very familiar topic It's a gangster play The whole world knows</p>	<p>Çünkü Arturo Ui bir kişi değil. O yalnızca bir çerçeve. Çerçevenin içindeki resimler değişebilir, değiştirdi de. Dün değişti, bugün değişiyor, yarın da değişecek. Tıpkı insanlık tarihi boyunca dünyanın başına bela olmuş pek çok resim gibi Hitler mesela; Kim diyebilir ki ya da hanginiz diyebilirsiniz ki Hitler olmasaydı onca yıkım, kıyım olmazdı Emin olun, o olmasaydı da o çerçeve boş kalmazdı. İşte bu yüzden kişilerin yoktur bir önemi Çerçevelerdir var eden o dönemi Alın işte yan yana koyduk iki hikayeyi Ama siz de görün resmi değil Onu içine alan çerçeveyi</p> <p>(Act 1, Prologue).</p>	<p>Because Arturo Ui is not a person He is only a frame And the pictures in the frames can change, and has already changed It changed yesterday, it is changing today, it will change tomorrow. Just like all other pictures that plagued the earth throughout the history of mankind Hitler, for instance. Who can say that if it was not for Hitler, we would not see such destruction and slaughter! Rest assured, that frame would not be empty, it would still fill with somebody else. Therefore, individuals do not matter It's frames that mark a period Here we put two stories together But you should see the frame, not the picture</p>

Appendix C, Table C6. English translation of the prologue and opening song

Erten's Translation	English Back-translation	Script	English Back-translation
<p>Bütün zamanların en büyük katillerinden biri! Yaylan!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Kırmızı Güller - Beyaz Güller savaşı!</p> <p>...</p> <p>O günden bu yana böyle kan dökülmemiş, Böylesine boğazlamamış insan insanı.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Bu akşamki oyunda Ne var ne yok yaşanmış Ne düzmece ne yalan Yalnız biraz budanmış</p> <p>...</p> <p>Tarihtir gördüğünüz Ve pek bildik bir konu (Erten, 1999, p. 4).</p>	<p>The biggest murderers of all times! Get out!</p> <p>...</p> <p>The battle between the red roses and white roses!</p> <p>...</p> <p>So much blood spilled since that day! So many people strangled each other!</p> <p>...</p> <p>In tonight's play Everything is real No bullshit, no lies Only altered a bit</p> <p>You will see history And a very familiar topic</p>	<p>Katil olmak çok kolay Bir tek leş yeter! Ama öldürürsen Binlerce Kahraman derler</p> <p>....</p> <p>İşte payınıza düşenler Nefret, dehşet, şiddet ve kan!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Tanıdık bir öykü bu Tekrarlanır ha bire Dün de aynı bugünde Sayenizde...</p> <p>(Act 1, Scene 1).</p>	<p>Being a murderer is very easy! One kill is all what it takes! But if you kill thousands, They will call you a hero!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Here's what you get Hate, terror, violence, blood!</p> <p>...</p> <p>It's a familiar story It keeps repeating itself Tomorrow and today are the same Thanks to you!</p>

Appendix C, Table C7. English translation of the omission of "Taub"

Erten's Translation	English Back-translation	Script	English Back-translation
<p>CARUTHER:</p> <p>Geçen hafta seksen kişi kadar Ted Moon'a güvercin yemeye davetliydik. Eğer gerçekten kalkıp gitseydik, herhalde haciz memurundan başka bir şey bulamayacaktık. Göz açıp kapayınca kadar bolluğumuz kıtlığa dönüşüverdi. (Erten, 1999, p. 5).</p>	<p>CARUTHER: Last week, Ted Moon invited 80 of us to eat pigeon. If we had accepted this invitation, we would have found only a repo man. Our wealth turned into scarcity, in a blink!</p>	<p>CARUTHER:</p> <p>Göz açıp kapayınca kadar bolluğumuz kıtlığa dönüşüverdi. (Act 1, Scene 1).</p>	<p>CARUTHER: Our wealth turned into scarcity, in a blink!</p>

Appendix C, Table C8. English translation of “Pontius zum Pilatus”

Erten’s Translation	English Back-translation	Script	English Back-translation
<p>SHEET: Kimin kapısını çaldıysam eli boş döndüm. Herkes ipine un sermiş. Bütün dostlarım dirsek çeviriyor! ... Paranın köküne kıran mı girdi ne? (Erten, 1999, p. 8).</p>	<p>SHEET: I returned back empty handed from every door I knocked on! Everybody added flavour on their ropes. All my friends turning their elbows to me! ... I do not know whether pestilence got into the money! (Erten, 1999, p. 8).</p>	<p>SHEET: Kimin kapısını çaldıysam eli boş döndüm. Herkes ipine un sermiş. Bütün dostlarım dirsek çeviriyor! ... Paranın köküne kıran mı girdi ne? (Act 1, Scene 1).</p>	<p>SHEET: I returned back empty handed from every door I knocked on! Everybody added flavour on their ropes. All my friends turning their elbows to me! ... I do not know whether pestilence got into the money!</p>

Appendix C, Table C9. English translation of Ui complaining about the police

Erten’s Translation	English Back-translation	Script	English Back-translation
<p>ROMA: Harper Bankasında aynasızlarla çatıştık diye de büsbütün heykel oldun. Uİ: Polisler ateş etti ama! ROMA: Yalnız havaya! Uİ: Ramak kalmıştı. İki tanık eksik getirsek şimdi kodeste olacaktım. Hele o yargıç! Beş kuruşluk sempati göstermedi! (Erten, 1999, p. 13).</p>	<p>ROMA: Since we clashed with the police at Harper Bank, you have almost become a statue! Uİ: But the police fired at me! ROMA: They fired their guns in the air! Uİ: It was so close! If we had not brought these two witnesses, I could have ended up in the jail. And that judge! He did not show me any sympathy for five cents!</p>	<p>ROMA: Son banka soygununda da aynasızlarla çatıştık diye de büsbütün heykel oldun. Uİ: Polisler bana ateş etti ama! ROMA: Yalnız havaya! Uİ: Ama ramak kalmıştı. İki tane eksik tanık götürsek ben şimdi kodeste olacaktım. Hele o yargıç! Hele o yargıç var ya! Beş kuruşluk sempati göstermedi şerefsiz! (Act 1, Scene 1)</p>	<p>Since we clashed with the police at the latest bank robbery, you have almost become a statue! Uİ: But the police fired at me! Roma: They fired their guns in the air! Uİ: But it was so close! If we had not brought these two witnesses, I could have ended up in the jail. And that judge! He did not show me any sympathy for five cents, piece of shit!</p>

Appendix C, Table C10. English translation of Dogsborough's fluctuating mood

<p>Ne ister ki benden? Beni buraya en çok çeken şu söğütler oldu. Bir de gümüşe benzeyen, akşamüstü altına kesen bu göl. Ekşi bira kokusundan uzak... İlle vakin şu söğütler. Söğütlere dayanamadım işte. Bugün pazar. ... şu çan sesleri daha bir güzel gelirdi. Şu Butcher pazar günü ne isteyebilir benden? Ah şu evi keşke! (Erten, 1999, pp. 17-18)</p>	<p>What does he want from me? What drew me to this scenery most were the willows. And that silvery lake that looks like it is made of golden in the evening. Far from sour stench of beer... Today is Sunday... The sound of the bells used to sound better. What can Butcher want from me on a Sunday? Ah, I wish I did not... That house...</p>
--	---

Appendix C, Table C11. English translation of Ui's contradictory remarks

<p>Bay Dogsborough, şu anda karşınızda yanlış anlaşılmiş bir insan bulunuyor. Kıskançlık yüzünden adına kara çalınmış, aşağılık kimselerin ucuz iftiralalarına uğramış biri. (Erten, 1999, pp. 18-19)</p>	<p>Mr. Dogsborough, you are looking at a misunderstood person now. They give me a bad name because they are jealous of me. I am slandered by those filthy people.</p>
<p>Şimdi otuz kişiyiz. Daha da çoğalacağız. (Erten, 1999, p. 19)</p>	<p>Now we are thirty. But we will be more!</p>
<p>Hiç değilse her zaman sevip saydığım polisimiz bana böyle bakmasın. İşte bu yüzden karşınıza gelmiş bulunuyorum. (Erten, 1999, p. 19)</p>	<p>I do not want the police whom I always loved and admired look at me this way. This is the reason why I am here.</p>
<p>Bu kentinden polisi bu kadar tembel ve böylesine rüşvetçiyken daha ne kadar zaman manav esnafı huzur içinde elindeki sebzeyi meyveyi satabilir! Yarın sabah birtakım kirli eller, dükkânlarını yakıp yıkar, kasalarını soyarsa? Şimdiden küçük bir ücret karşılığı güçlü bir korucuya başvurmak istemezler mi? (Erten, 1999, p. 19)</p>	<p>The police of this City are lazy and corrupt! How can the greengroceries sell their stuff peacefully in this atmosphere? What if some dirty hands destroyed their stores and took all their money tomorrow morning? Wouldn't they want to find a protector in exchange for a small fee before that happens?</p>
<p>Sizin tröste ne gerek biliyor musunuz? Bilek gerek! Benim liderliğim altında davasından dönmeyecek otuz güçlü bilek! (Erten, 1999, p. 19).</p>	<p>Do you know what you require for your Trust? Power! Thirty powerful men under my leadership!</p>
<p>Bizden size ne kötülük gelir? Hele benden, size bunca saygı duyan benden? Kimim ki ben? Değil mi? Arkamda kaç kişi var? (Erten, 1999, p. 20).</p>	<p>How can I do something bad to you? I, as someone admiring you so much! Who am I? How many people are there behind me?</p>
<p>Dostunuz mostunuz yok artık! Düdü o. Bugün artık dostunuz kalmadı. Üstelik yarın da yalnızca düşmanlarınız olacak. Bu böyle. Bundan sizi kurtarabilecek tek bir kişi var, o da benim! Arturo Ui! Ben, ben! (Erten, 1999, p. 20).</p>	<p>You do not have any friends now! You did have, but it was yesterday. Today, you do not have any! Besides, you will have more enemies tomorrow. This is what it is. There is only one person who can save you from this! It's me! Arturo Ui! Me! Me!</p>
<p>Fena yaparım namussuzum paralarım sizi! (Erten, 1999, p. 20).</p>	<p>I'll kill you! I swear, I'll destroy you!</p>

Appendix C, Table C12. English translation of “İyi Adama Bir İki Soru”

<p>İyi Adama Bir İki Soru</p> <p>Anladık iyisin Ama neye yarıyor iyiliğin? Seni kimse satın alamaz, Eve düşen yıldırım da Satın alınmaz Anladık dediğin dedik, Ama dediğin ne? Doğrusun, söylersin düşündüğünü, Ama düşündüğün ne? Şimdi bizi iyi dinle: Düşmanımızsın sen bizim</p> <p>(Act 1, Scene 2).</p>	<p>A few questions to a good man</p> <p>We see that you are good. But what good is that going to do? Nobody can buy you. You cannot buy the thunder that strike a house as well. We see that you hold to what you say. But what do you say? You are right. You say what you think. But what do you think? Now listen to us very closely. You are our enemy.</p>
---	---