

FROM PAGE TO STAGE: A CRITICAL SURVEY OF SAMUEL BECKETT'S *KRAPP'S LAST TAPE* WITHIN THE TURKISH THEATRICAL SYSTEM

Burç İdem Dinçel*

Introduction

One can hardly argue against the significance of the twentieth century in world history. The two world wars, the wrath of the Third Reich, the atrocities of the Stalin regime, colonial wars in Africa, not to mention the Cold War Era, have all left devastating effects on humanity. Apart from its calamitous vicissitudes, the twentieth century witnessed the advances in technology, human rights movements, the decolonization of countries in Asia and Africa, the discovery of space, all of which proved to have rather affirmative effects on almost every aspect of human life in the long run. With its pros and cons, the twentieth century was one of the most dynamic periods of history and it had so much to offer for the creative minds of its literary figures. It is no wonder that the presence of the traumatic facet of the century is either highly felt or depicted in great detail in most of the works of the twentieth century authors.

Within this general picture of the twentieth century Samuel Beckett acquires an important position: he was born on 13th of April in 1906, in Dublin, Ireland and died on 22nd December 1989 in Paris, France. In his eighty-three years of life, Beckett saw the Anglo-Irish War that was followed by the Irish Civil War, the two world wars, he had been in Germany during the “reign” of the Third Reich, lived in Paris, and partook in the struggle against the Nazi regime. Nevertheless, these events do not occur in the surface representations of Beckett’s writings, “*but the aftershocks they emitted through the values, beliefs and attitudes of the societies in which he lived and thought surely passed through and to some extent moulded his creative intelligence.*”^{1 2} The feelings of chaos, disappointment, death, isolation, let alone the bitter touch of alienation in Beckett’s characters, in fact, portray the tragic condition of the twentieth century individual.

* Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, Çevirmen

¹ Rónán McDonald, *The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2006, p. 23

² See also, Ayşegül Yüksel, *Samuel Beckett Tiyatrosu*, Dünya Kitapları, İstanbul, [1992] 2006, pp. 17-20.

Much has been written on Beckett's oeuvre. His novels, plays, *dramaticules*,³ and as well as his critical writings have all been an enticing field for scholars who aspire to dig out the aesthetics expressed in Beckett's work. One can hardly find a virgin territory within the realm of Beckett's work excluding the author's transformation from playwright to a theatrical artist, which, in the words of Gontarski is, "*one of the seminal developments of late Modernist theatre and yet one slighted in the critical and historical discourse.*"⁴ The fact that Beckett directed his own plays for a period of twenty years (1966-1986)⁵ makes him not merely a playwright, but also a director who can be positioned amongst the other influential directors of the twentieth century, such as Bertolt Brecht, Erwin Piscator, Edward Gordon Craig, and Vsevolod Meyerhold. However, Beckett's own productions did not arouse a great interest among the critics and scholars as one would expect from the prospective debates that the Beckett productions might have launched. And when Beckett's productions did arouse a curiosity within the theatrical circle, the attitude was rather hesitant towards the author's creative progression. The publication of Samuel Beckett's *Theatrical Notebooks* in the 1990s is a turning point in this case. Consequently, after the publication of Beckett's *Theatrical Notebooks*, which were composed of the author's revised texts for performance together with his dramaturgical notes, the interest towards the author's staging approach increased. Yet, Beckett's creative vision regarding the staging process was enough to baffle the critics and scholars who have prioritized the published versions –or in other words, the so-called original versions– of his works.

The relationship between Beckett's published works and their revised versions in his *Theatrical Notebooks* is reminiscent of a relationship that exists between a translated text and its source text. Nonetheless, as far as the notion of translation is concerned, this is not something new in Samuel Beckett. The fact that Beckett was a self-translator and his works, "*published in English and French, often bear only the most discreet of labels: 'translated by the author/traduit par l'auteur', when they are the second, not original,*

³ Beckett's coinage for his short plays. For a comprehensive analysis of Beckett's *dramaticules* see, Keir Elam "*Dead Heads: Damnation-Narration in the 'Dramaticules'*", in John Pilling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, pp. 145-166

⁴ S.E. Gontarski, "*Revising Himself: Performance as Text in Samuel Beckett's Theatre*", in *Journal of Modern Literature* v. 22 no.1, 1998, p. 131

⁵ For a chronological list of the Beckett plays directed by the author himself, see S.E. Gontarski, "*Beckett and Performance*", in Lois Oppenheim (ed.) *Palgrave Advances in Samuel Beckett Studies*, Macmillan, USA, 2004, pp. 205-207

version,”⁶ indicates the significance of translation for the author. Even though ample research concerned with Beckett as a self-translator has been done,⁷ one can hardly find a study that focuses on the author’s *Theatrical Notebooks* from the perspective of translation theories. However, Samuel Beckett’s *Theatrical Notebooks* suggest themselves as representative examples of intralingual translation in the Jacobsonian sense of the term,⁸ since in each of the revised text Beckett re-wrote his already existing texts in the language that they were originally written.

The same negligence towards Samuel Beckett’s *Theatrical Notebooks* holds true for the translated works of the author in foreign languages. In a manner evoking the puzzled critics and scholars who sanctify the published versions of Samuel Beckett’s work, the owner of the publishing houses set their priorities according to the published works of a given author. To some extent this publishing policy seems plausible: a publishing house can surely introduce the works of a foreign author through the translations of his/her work from their original versions which occupy vital location in the historical and critical discourse. Still, as far as the plays of Samuel Beckett are concerned, this publishing policy brings about a fundamental problem, that is, the possibility of abating the creative aspect of moving Beckett’s plays from page to stage according to the author’s revised texts. Thus, it can prove to be fruitful for the publishing houses to make a diligent research on the entire works, including the ones that are not established in the literary canon, of the foreign author whom they are going to select for translation. One can plausibly argue that the publication of Samuel Beckett’s *Theatrical Notebooks* is a rather recent phenomenon, thus might not coincide with the publication year of a given translation. In this case, the publishing houses are in the position of making the most of what they got as a source text, that is to say, prioritizing the theatrical aspect of Beckett’s texts.

Taking this argument as a starting point, this paper will focus on the Turkish translations of Samuel Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape* with the purpose of providing a critical approach to the study and practice of translated theatre texts. Instead of discussing whether

⁶ Ann Beer, “Beckett’s Bilingualism”, in John Pilling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, p. 209

⁷ See for instance, Ruby Cohn “Samuel Beckett Self-Translator”, in *PMLA* v. 76 no. 5, 1961, pp. 613-621; Lori Chamberlain, “The Same Old Stories’: Beckett’s Poetics of Translation”, in Alan Warren Friedman, Charles Rossmann and Dina Sherzer (eds.), *Beckett Translating / Translating Beckett*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987, pp. 17-24, and Steven Connor, *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory and Text*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1988, ch.5.

⁸ Cf. Roman Jakobson, “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London-New York, [1959] 2000, p. 114

a translated text is “correct”, “good”, or “bad”, the ultimate goal of this study will be, “to provide answers to such questions it should deal with the ‘hows’, the ‘whys and wherefores’”⁹ of the Turkish translations of Samuel Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape*. Whether the Turkish translators of *Krapp’s Last Tape* have prioritized the staging aspect of the play or not, will be the primary question that this paper will try to provide an answer for. In order to do so, the status of *Krapp’s Last Tape* together with Beckett’s revised text from his *Theatrical Notebooks* (1992) in the Beckett canon,¹⁰ will be discussed prior to the analysis of the three Turkish translations of the work in question; the translators being Hamdi Koç, Fatih Özgüven and Uğur Ün respectively. An interesting detail deserves mentioning here is the publication year of the Turkish translations of Samuel Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape*: all of the translations were published in 1993 by Yapı Kredi Publishing House (in July), İletişim Publishing House (in September) and Mitos Boyut Publishing House (in October) separately. Therefore, the analyses of the translations will be done in the order of their publication dates. Since theatre is a form of artwork which reaches the individual of a given society through the productions of the plays, this paper will dwell upon one of the recent performances of *Krapp’s Last Tape* by Tiyatro-Z which took place on 20th of March 2007 at Akatlar Cultural Centre in Istanbul with the intention to offer an analysis of the role of the translated text in performance. The performance text of the production was adapted for the stage by the actor Beyti Engin from Uğur Ün’s translation of the play and Samuel Beckett’s revised text from his *Theatrical Notebooks*. Borrowing from the Pavis Questionnaire¹¹ the questions related with the main features of translation, the role given to the text in performance and as well as the relationship between text and image,¹² this paper will aim at providing an assessment of the Tiyatro-Z production of Samuel Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape*.

⁹ Raymond van den Broeck, “Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function” in Theo Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature, Studies in Literary Translation*, Croom Helm, London/Sydney, 1985, p. 58

¹⁰ Since Beckett’s engagement with theatre is one of the main points to be tackled in this paper, in what follows, this study will limit itself to discuss the status of *Krapp’s Last Tape* within Beckett’s theatrical canon.

¹¹ The questionnaire itself was devised by the theatre semiotician Patrice Pavis in 1985 with the purpose of deconstructing any given performance into its component parts in order to form a basis for close analysis. The questionnaire provides a list of theatrical sign systems and as a matter of fact, offers a “what to look for” approach. Within the broad scope of the questionnaire, there is also a sub-category devoted to the role of the text in a performance.

¹² Cf. Patrice Pavis, “*Theatre Analysis: Some Questions and a Questionnaire*” trans. Susan Bassnett, in *New Theatre Quarterly*, 1 (2), 1985, pp. 208-212, esp. 209-210.

Locating *Krapp's Last Tape* in the Beckett Canon

As the earlier title –“the Magee Monologue”– of *Krapp's Last Tape* indicates, Samuel Beckett wrote the play in 1958 with a particular actor in mind: the Irish actor Patrick Magee. After hearing the “cracked” and the “wearish” quality of the voice of Patrick Magee on the BBC’s Third Programme in December 1957, in which the actor had read excerpts from Beckett’s *Molloy* and *From an Abandoned Work*, Beckett composed *Krapp's Last Tape*.¹³ The play has a remarkable location in the Beckett canon because *Krapp's Last Tape* illustrates, “how Beckett’s adventure of writing ‘acts without words’ and ‘radio plays’ has stylistically echoed themselves in his works written for the stage.”¹⁴ * Furthermore, after *Krapp's Last Tape*, Beckett turned his face on writing *dramaticules* in which the author gradually reduced the notion of character in his texts to minimum with the purpose of moving towards a more theatrical expression.

Together with *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Happy Days*, *Krapp's Last Tape* is the other extended Beckett play that he wrote for the stage. Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot*, and as well as Hamm and Clov in *Endgame* are Beckett’s pair of characters who face with nothingness whenever they make an attempt to find a meaning for their existence. In *Happy Days* there is a pair of characters too: Winnie and her husband Willie. Moreover, in *Endgame* Beckett has given the hints of his minimalism which he would further develop in his *dramaticules*. For instance, Hamm’s parents, the legless Nagg and Nell reside in ashbins, Clov is crippled, and the movements of all of the play characters are diminished to a considerable extent. The same case is true of *Happy Days*. While Winnie gets immersed in the earth gradually during the course of the play, her husband Willie can only crawl. Progressively, Beckett’s plays separated speech from physical movement, through his pair of characters, through the lack of speech, and as well as through the absence of body movement.¹⁵ “Killing time” is common to all of the play

¹³ Cf. Ruby Cohn, *Back to Beckett*, Princeton University Press, 1973, p. 165; James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp's Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, p. xiii; Rónán McDonald, *The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2006, p. 59

¹⁴ Ayşegül Yüksel, *Samuel Beckett Tiyatrosu*, Dünya Kitapları, İstanbul, [1992] 2006, pp. 93-94

* Unless indicated all translations are my own.

¹⁵ Cf. Elaine Aston and George Savona, *Theatre as Sign System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*, London-New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 119

characters who inhabit these Beckett plays: “Like Estragon and Vladimir, like Hamm and Clov, Winnie too must pass the time, fill in the day from morning to night.”¹⁶

In opposition to *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame* and *Happy Days*, *Krapp’s Last Tape* does not include a pair of characters, the play is written for one actor. Although *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* are written in dialogue form and to some extent *Happy Days* includes dialogues, *Krapp’s Last Tape* is essentially monological. As a matter of fact, there is no pair of characters in the play. Still, there is a pair of a character in the piece which Beckett attains through Krapp by way of changing the medium, that is to say, by using a tape-recorder which is a result of his forays into radio drama. The fact that *Krapp’s Last Tape* initial inspiration was auditory is one of the clear-cut examples of the innovative theatrical style Beckett achieves in this play. According to Ruby Cohn, while Beckett’s “earlier plays play with the techniques of their genre, *Krapp’s Last Tape* plays against its genre by using the techniques of another medium.”¹⁷ Indeed, the usage of tape-recorder on stage is innovative in the sense that it solves the everlasting problem of monological plays: the problem of creating a dramatic conflict. In this respect, *Krapp’s Last Tape* –unlike Beckett’s other plays– calls for a dramatic treatment, with one different aspect though: whereas in the Western traditional theatre forms, monologue is the essential voice of a given character, in the Beckettian theatre, monologue works the other way around by multiplying the voices of the play characters. Even though one character is on stage in *Krapp’s Last Tape*, in practice, the persona acquires two different psychologies through the usage of a tape-recorder.¹⁸ Yet, Krapp is split (in the strictest sense of the word) between his personalities: while the older Krapp (at the age of sixty-nine) is “near-sighted”, “wearish”, and dressed in a clownish manner with a “purple nose”, the younger Krapp (at the age of thirty-nine) has a strong and a rather pompous voice which declares to be “sound as a bell” and “intellectually at the crest of the wave or thereabouts.”¹⁹ The two Krapps, however, “share a weakness for drink and bananas, and an ability to laugh at the

¹⁶ Rónán McDonald, *The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2006, p. 67

¹⁷ Ruby Cohn, *Back to Beckett*, Princeton University Press, 1973, p. 165

¹⁸ Cf. Paul Lawley, “Stages of Identity: From *Krapp’s Last Tape* to *Play*”, in John Pilling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, p. 88; Zehra İpşiroğlu, *Uyumsuz Tiyatroda Gerçekçilik*, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, 1996, p. 64; Rónán McDonald, *The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2006, p. 59-60

¹⁹ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’s Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 313

aspirations of an even younger Krapp, though rather in the way that two entirely different persons might share something."²⁰

As Khaled Besbes observes, "*in Waiting for Godot, Happy Days, Endgame, Krapp's Last Tape, and other shorter plays, the characters tend to use special patterns of language and special voice qualities that are highly suggestive of their personalities, their attitudes towards one another and towards the objective reality to which they are exposed.*"²¹ Besbes' observation becomes quite noteworthy when one thinks of the situation of Krapp's split self. The older Krapp's language is in accordance with his physical situation: forsaken, disappointed and worn out. When recording his voice the elder Krapp says: "*Nothing to say, not a squeak. What's a year now? The sour cud and the iron stool. (Pause.) Revelled in the word spool. (With relish.) Spooool! Happiest moment of the past half million.*"²² On the contrary, the younger Krapp's stock of words is so specialized and archaic that the older Krapp can no longer remember what the word "viduity" means and looks it up in his dictionary.²³ Whereas the very word "spool" becomes the elder Krapp's source of joy, the younger Krapp can dream of the moments that he had shared with the one dark young beauty he recalls particularly along with the girl in the punt. It is no surprise that the older Krapp feels the beauty and passion with the girl in the punt at the end of the play when he was recording his voice. After a long pause, the older Krapp, "*suddenly bends over machine, switches off, wrenches off tape, throws it away, puts on the other, winds it forward to the passage he wants, switches on, listens staring front,*"²⁴ and once again listens the beauty of the scene with the girl in the punt.

Another point which deserves mentioning in *Krapp's Last Tape* is the function of the stage directions. To a considerable degree, much of what Beckett has to say in his drama lies in his stage directions, therefore they constitute the core of Samuel Beckett's theatre. What is more, in the Beckett canon one can even find plays, such as *A Mime for one Player, Act Without Words I* and *Act Without Words II* that are comprised entirely of extra-dialogic stage directions. Within this context, the case of *Krapp's Last Tape* becomes

²⁰ Paul Lawley, "Stages of Identity: From *Krapp's Last Tape* to *Play*", in John Pilling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, p. 90

²¹ Khaled Besbes, *Semiotics of Beckett's Theatre: A Semiotic Study of the Complete Dramatic Works of Samuel Beckett*, Universal Publishers, 2007, p. 35

²² Samuel Beckett, *Krapp's Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 317

²³ Cf. *Ibid*, p. 314

²⁴ *Ibid*, p. 318

an exemplary one, since in this play Beckett's extra-dialogic stage directions serve to undermine the reader/spectator's way of inferring a coherent play character, namely, Krapp. Furthermore, through the stage directions, Krapp's divided self manifests itself. Stage directions, however, as Elaine Aston and George Savona rightly point out, "*subject to interpretation by the director, designer, actors and technicians, adhered to with varying degrees of commitment and understanding, on occasion ignored, may or may not survive to inform the production.*"²⁵ From this perspective, one can see why Beckett has put momentous emphasis in the stage directions in his plays both as a playwright and director.

The cuts and changes that Beckett has done in his *Theatrical Notebooks* demonstrate the importance of the stage directions for the author. In accordance with his "*bleakly minimalist representation of human condition,*"²⁶ the opening mime of Krapp's *Last Tape* was cut and adjusted with the purpose of attaining greater simplicity and clarity of line and "*to avoid everything that appeared to be superfluous.*"²⁷ Additionally, the setting of the play is modified and the table on which, a tape-recorder with microphone and a number of cardboard boxes containing reels of recorded tapes are scattered around, is removed from the stage design so as to make Krapp to go to his "cubby-hole" (another addition to the revised stage design of the play) three times: first to fetch his ledger, then the tin boxes containing the spools of recorded tape, and finally the tape-recorder itself.²⁸ In a similar vein, Beckett had Krapp connect the tape-recorder into a lead lying on the floor.²⁹ Moreover, the clownish look of Krapp was modified so as to achieve a balanced production. Hence, the "purple nose" of Krapp together with his clownish dress –too short trousers for him, large white boots and capacious pockets in his waistcoat– which presents Krapp either as a music-hall comedian or a circus clown was omitted from the revised text.³⁰ One further point merits mentioning is the explanations that Beckett provides with respect to the specific aspects of *Krapp's Last Tape*, such as the Manichaeian interpretation of the play which explains the contrast between light and darkness in the play. Manichaeian belief, which stems from the teachings of a third century Iranian philosopher Mani, holds

²⁵ Elaine Aston and George Savona, *Theatre as Sign System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*, London-New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 73

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 162

²⁷ James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp's Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, p. xiv

²⁸ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 3, 14

²⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 4, 19, 183, 185, 272

³⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. xv-xvi with S.E. Gontarski, "Beckett and Performance", in Lois Oppenheim (ed.) *Palgrave Advances in Samuel Beckett Studies*, Macmillan, USA, 2004, pp. 201-202

that, “the world is caught in an unholy blending of good and evil, and the duty of the faithful is, through a renunciation of the ways of the flesh, to liberate the imprisoned light or goodness from its debased entrapment in the evil world of matter.”³¹ According to James Knowlson, the ideas that relevant to *Krapp’s Last Tape* are the following:

*First, in the beginning, called the initium, Light and Darkness were totally separated into two kingdoms until, following a cosmogonic movement, the two substances were mingled in the present time, called the medium, when darkness invaded the realm of light; only in future time, the finis, will the original duality and the separation of the two substances that existed in the beginning be restored through the efforts of the ambassadors of Light – Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus Christ and Mani. Secondly, in present time, it is the duty of man to seek to separate the enslaved light from darkness in life, since man’s soul has fallen into evil world of matter and can be saved only by means of the spirit or intelligence (nous). Thirdly, in order to achieve this separation, the true follower of Mani will lead the of the ascetic – not fornicating or procreating, possessing nothing, eating no meat and drinking no wine.*³²

When this interpretive knowledge is borne in mind, the bizarreness that encompasses Krapp’s divided self becomes clear to a considerable extent. Younger Krapp’s struggle to get over the dualism that he faces in his life manifests itself through his attempts of separating the light from the darkness. Additionally, the contrast between black and white, in a manner evoking the contrast between light and darkness is given throughout the play (black ball given to a white dog, dark nurse, and so on). Moreover, Krapp’s “resolutions” regarding “to drink less in particular” and “plans for a less engrossing sexual life”³³ are the other representative examples of the Manichaeian aspect of the play. The disappointment of the elder Krapp, at the age of sixty-nine, derives from the younger Krapp’s failure in his life. Finally at the age of sixty-nine Krapp’s “opus

³¹ Rónán McDonald, *The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2006, p. 62

³² James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp’s Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, p. xxi

³³ Cf. Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’s Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 314 with James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp’s Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, pp. 5-6

magnum” has, “seventeen copies sold of which eleven at trade price to free circulating libraries beyond the seas.”³⁴

As the analysis of *Krapp’s Last Tape* in line with its revised text indicates, Beckett has never seen his published plays as finished literary products. That Beckett progressed from being a humble advisor on the staging aspect of his plays to taking full care of their productions, he found the chance to re-write his already existing plays, and consequently the chance to re-invent himself as a director. What is more, by re-writing himself Beckett, “*intervened into his own established canon, into texts which already existed in print but which were often well-established in the critical discourse as well.*”³⁵ More significantly, by re-writing himself Beckett questioned the stability of a printed work in a given literary canon. Beckett’s approach regarding his already published works becomes quite striking when one thinks of the notion of the translations of his works into foreign languages and as well as the productions of his plays in foreign countries.

A Critical Approach to the Turkish Translations of *Krapp’s Last Tape*

At the beginning of his essay on Samuel Beckett, Mark Batty mentions how Beckett was, “*notoriously protective of the manner in which his work for the stage ought to be presented.*”³⁶ And further on, Batty sets forth a fundamental question with regards to Beckett’s translated works: “*If so much energy and determination had been put into a defence of a very personal vision as offered by his writing for the stage, why had there never been a similar preciousness applied to the theoretically far more damaging practice of translation of his work into languages other than those already provided for by Beckett himself?*”³⁷ Batty’s question makes more sense when it is taken into consideration in the light of the translated works of Beckett in the Turkish literary system, hence, his staged works in the Turkish theatrical system which can be regarded as a subsystem of the

³⁴ Cf. Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’s Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 317 with James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp’s Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, p. 9

³⁵ S.E. Gontarski, “Beckett and Performance”, in Lois Oppenheim (ed.) *Palgrave Advances in Samuel Beckett Studies*, Macmillan, USA, 2004, p. 202

³⁶ Mark Batty, “Acts with Words: Beckett, Translation, *Mise en Scène* and Autorship”, in Carole-Anne Upton (ed.) *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, St. Jerome, UK, 2000, p. 63

³⁷ *Ibid.*

former.³⁸ Beckett's major works for the stage has been translated into Turkish various times by different translators.³⁹ The same situation is valid for *Krapp's Last Tape* too: as mentioned previously there are three Turkish translations of the play done by Hamdi Koç, Fatih Özgüven, and Uğur Ün respectively.

Sirkku Aaltonen correctly points out how, “*retranslation is an inherent part of text production in the Western text-based theatre, where texts are constantly being rewritten for new performances.*”⁴⁰ In the light of her comment, then, the retranslations of Beckett's works in Turkey acquire a plausible ground. The concurrent publications of the retranslations of *Krapp's Last Tape*, however, were not done on the basis of new performances. It was the interests of the publishing houses which have given rise to the publication of the translations of *Krapp's Last Tape*.

Among the three publishing houses, the situation of Mitos Boyut Publishing House deserves further attention owing to the policy of the company which prefers “*from 'stage' to page' translations, that is, where the focus is on the expectations of the receiving stage.*”⁴¹ Furthermore, Mitos Boyut Publishing House publishes *only* theatrical works, such as plays of domestic and foreign playwrights, and as well as theoretical works on theatre. Therefore, Mitos Boyut Publishing House differs from the other two companies with its publishing policy. Yapı Kredi Publishing House and İletişim Publishing House, on the other hand, offer a wide breadth of published products, like journals and magazines dedicated to philosophy and literature in addition to the theoretical and fictional books they publish. Within this broad range of published materials of Yapı Kredi Publishing House and İletişim Publishing House, it is most probable for one to encounter with theatrical works published either under the title of classics or representative works of a given author. Moreover, the publishing policies of Yapı Kredi Publishing House and İletişim Publishing

³⁸ As far as the notion of translation is concerned, a distinction should be made between the two systems. As Aaltonen puts it, “*'drama translation' as a term includes translation work for both the literary and theatrical systems, whereas 'theatre translation' is confined to the theatrical system alone,*” see Sirkku Aaltonen, *Time-Sharing on Stage*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 2000, p. 33. Aaltonen's distinction becomes quite remarkable when one takes the complexity of a theatrical system, which is comprised of stage designers, technicians, dramaturges, actors and directors into account.

³⁹ For instance, *Waiting for Godot* has been translated into Turkish by Hasan Anamur and was published by Can Publishing House in 1990. In 1992, it was translated by Tuncay Birkan and was published by Kabalıcı Publishing House, and after a year it was published by Mitos Boyut Publishing House with the translation of Uğur Ün. Additionally, *Endgame* was translated by Abet Limnn and was published by Düzlem Publishing House in 1993, and in the same year it was published in the abovementioned volume by Mitos Boyut Publishing House. In 2007, *Endgame* was published by the same publishing house with the translation of the prominent Turkish theatre actor Genco Erkal.

⁴⁰ Sirkku Aaltonen, “*Retranslation in the Finnish Theatre*”, in *Cadernos de Tradução*, No. 11, 2003, p. 141

⁴¹ Sirkku Aaltonen, *Time-Sharing on Stage*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 2000, p. 39

House indicate how theatrical works are regarded as pieces of literary works rather than plays to be staged. A glance at the translations of Samuel Beckett, fortifies the validity of the abovementioned policies of Yapı Kredi Publishing House and İletişim Publishing House to a certain extent. The Turkish translation of *Krapp's Last Tape* was published with another Beckett play, namely *Sketch for Radio*, by İletişim Publishing House as representative works of Samuel Beckett. Yapı Kredi Publishing House, on the other hand, published *Krapp's Last Tape* in the volume *Toplu Kısa Oyunları* (Collected Short Plays). Even though Mitos Boyut Publishing House published *Krapp's Last Tape* in a way that is reminiscent of the policy of Yapı Kredi Publishing House, a close reading of the Turkish translation of the play suggests how the staging aspect of the work has been prioritized by the translator, and hence, by Mitos Boyut Publishing House.

Be that as it may, the copyright law can be the only limitation for the translated texts to be published in book form.⁴² In Turkey, however, the copyright law was not strictly enforced in the publishing sector and only after 1996, the copyright law with regards to the translated texts started to be applied strictly.⁴³ Yet, a glance at the Turkish translations of *Krapp's Last Tape* illustrates, the copyright issue has been seriously taken into consideration by the two publishing companies: while Yapı Kredi and Mitos Boyut publishing houses mention that they are the holders of the Beckett's plays,⁴⁴ İletişim Publishing House does not refer to the copyright issue at all.

According to Katharina Reiss, “*the evaluation of a translation should not focus on some particular aspect or section of it, as is so often done, but it should begin rather with a definition of its text type.*”⁴⁵ Reiss' approach is quite remarkable in the sense that it gives a starting point for the translator critic. Still, the applicability of her text typologies to the domain of theatre translation becomes problematic. For instance, classifying *Krapp's Last Tape*, as a “form-focused text”⁴⁶ would be to neglect the theatrical and aesthetical aspect of the play to a certain degree, while at the same time, the play can be regarded as

⁴² Cf. Sirkku Aaltonen, “*Retranslation in the Finnish Theatre*”, in *Cadernos de Tradução*, No. 11, 2003, p. 155-156.

⁴³ Private conversation with Turhan Yılmaz Ögüt, the owner of Mitos Boyut Publishing House.

⁴⁴ Actually, this case is rather paradoxical since the copyright of the works of a given author is modified in accordance with the agreements between the foreign publishing house and the domestic publishing house. One particular reason for both Yapı Kredi and Mitos Boyut publishing houses to claim to have the copyright of Beckett's works can be the loose implementation of the copyright issue in the publishing sector at the beginning of the 1990s.

⁴⁵ Katharina Reiss, *Translation Criticism – The Potentials & Limitations*, trans. Errol F. Rhodes, St. Jerome, UK, 2000, p. 47

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, pp. 31-38

an “audio-medial text”⁴⁷ in Reiss’ terminology. In this sense, one can see how Reiss’ text types overlap with each other and it becomes rather hard to draw sharp lines between texts, such as *Krapp’s Last Tape*. What is more, *Krapp’s Last Tape* suggests itself as a kind of theatre text which resists classification. Therefore, if any classification is needed, it would be plausible to regard *Krapp’s Last Tape* as a “radical text” which, “*in contradistinction to the ‘bourgeois’ text, the directions work to inscribe a form of theatricality which calls attention to its status as theatricality.*”⁴⁸ As argued previously, with its monological structure along with the usage of tape-recorder on the stage, *Krapp’s Last Tape* undermines the traditional use of an interactive mode of dialogue between the play characters; the play is composed for one play character. So, any translator who aims at translating *Krapp’s Last Tape*, this short, but at the same time one of Beckett’s most demanding plays, must take its “radical” status into consideration.

As far as the contemporary understanding of the study and practice of translation is concerned, the amounts of models that can be taken as a yardstick during the course of evaluating translated texts are sparse. In addition to Katharina Reiss’ above referred work, Raymond van den Broeck’s model⁴⁹ suggests itself quite fruitful in terms of developing a critical approach to the translations of a given culture. Nevertheless, when the model is read with a critical eye, one can infer how the comparative analysis part of it takes the source text as a starting point,⁵⁰ and benefits from the concept of the traditional source-oriented approach in the translation evaluation. Taking the target text as a point of departure, however, would be a firm step to take in the sense of developing a target-oriented approach in translation criticism. The basic analytical model to be applied to the analyses of the Turkish translations of *Krapp’s Last Tape* in this paper will benefit from Raymond van den Broeck’s model in terms of examining the syntactical and lexical elements of the target texts. Additionally, the analysis of the translations will look for the notion of “performability”,⁵¹ which plays a vital role during the course of moving texts

⁴⁷ Ibid, pp. 43-44

⁴⁸ Elaine Aston and George Savona, *Theatre as Sign System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*, London-New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 94, emphasis original.

⁴⁹ Raymond van den Broeck, “Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function” in Theo Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature, Studies in Literary Translation*, Croom Helm, London/Sydney, 1985, pp. 54-62

⁵⁰ Ibid, pp. 57-58

⁵¹ At this point of discussion it should be mentioned that the term “performability” is regarded as a “vexed term which is never defined”, by Susan Bassnett. Cf. Susan Bassnett-McGuire, “Ways Through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts”, in Theo Hermans (ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature, Studies in Literary Translation*, Croom Helm, London/Sydney, 1985, pp. 90-91 with Susan

from page to stage, towards *mise en scène*: “the speaking of the text in a given staging, the way in which its presuppositions, its unspoken elements and its enunciations are brought out that will confer on it a particular meaning.”⁵² For that very reason, the excerpts that are going to be analysed from the Turkish translations of *Krapp’s Last Tape* will be representative of play’s main features, such as the opening mime and younger Krapp. Moreover, the lexical choices of the translators in terms of rendering the older Krapp’s alienation to the younger Krapp, and as well as the situation of older Krapp when he records his voice at the age of sixty-nine will be discussed as further examples of the translation strategies employed by the translators.

*Krapp bir an hareketsiz durur, kocaman iç çeker, saatine bakar, ceplerinde aranır, bir zarf çıkarır, geri koyar, aranır, ufak bir anahtar destesi çıkarır, gözlerine kaldırır, bir anahtar seçer, kalkıp masanın önüne ilerler. ... Sonunda ucunu ısırır, yana döner ve sahnenin kenarında, ışığın içinde bir aşağı bir yukarı yürümeye başlar, yani her iki yöne de dört beş adımdan daha fazla değil, düşünceli düşünceli muz yiyerek. Kabuğun üstüne basar, kayar, neredeyse düşer, kendini toparlar, eğilip kabuğa göz atar ve sonunda onu, hâlâ eğik durumda ayağıyla, sahnenin kenarından orkestra çukuruna iner. [sic.] ...*⁵³

Krapp bir an hiç yerinden kıpırdamaz, derin derin iç geçirir, saatine bakar, ceplerini karıştırır, bir zarf çıkarır, zarfı geri koyar, karıştırır, küçük bir anahtar tomarı çıkarır, havaya kaldırıp bakar, kalkar ve masanın önüne doğru yürür. ... Nihayet muzun ucunu ısırır, yanına döner ve sahnenin kenarında bir aşağı bir yukarı yürümeye başlar, ışıktadır, yani her iki yana doğru da dört, beş adımdan fazla atmaz, düşüncelere dalarak muzun yer. Kabuğa basar, kayar, düşmesine ramak kalır,

Bassnett, “Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre”, in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds.), *Constructing Cultures, Multilingual Matters*, Clevedon, 1998, p. 95 Taking into consideration of the staging aspect of a given play, however, can shed light on the usage of the term in theatre translation analysis. Therefore, in this study, the term will be taken as a criterion during the course of moving texts from page to stage.

⁵² Patrice Pavis, “A Possible Definition of Theatre Semiology”, trans. Susan Bassnett-McGuire, in *Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of Theatre*, Performing Arts Journal Publications, New York, 1982, p. 18. See also Eva Espasa, “Performativity in Translation: Speakability? Playability? Or just Saleability?”, in Carole-Anne Upton (ed.) *Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation*, St. Jerome, UK, 2000, pp. 49-50

⁵³ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’ın Son Bandı*, trans. Hamdi Koç, in *Toplu Kısa Oyunlar 1956-1962*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 87-89, emphasis added.

toparlanır, eğilir, kabuğa bakar, sonunda hâlâ ikibüklüm, [sic.] kabuğu ayağıyla sahneden orkestra çukuruna iter. ...⁵⁴

Krapp bir süre devinimsiz kalır, **derin** bir iç çeker, saatine bakar, ceplerini karıştırır, bir zarf çıkarır, yerine sokar, yeniden aranır, küçük bir **anahtar destesi** çıkarır, gözüne yaklaştırır, bir anahtar seçer, kalkar ve masanın önüne geçer. ... Sonunda muzun ucunu ısırır, döner ve sahnenin kenarında, ışıpta **volta atmaya** koyulur; düşüncelere dalmış muzunu yerken, her iki yönde de en fazla dört ya da beş adım atacaktır. Kabuğa basar, kayar, neredeyse düşecektir, kendini toparlar, eğilir, kabuğa bakar ve hep eğilmiş durarak ayağıyla sahnenin kenarından boşluğa iter. ...

55

Translation is first and foremost a hermeneutic act; therefore, every reading of a given ST by the translator brings out a different translation. The hermeneutical aspect of translation becomes more significant when one thinks of theatre translations in which the staging process of the translated text must be taken into consideration. Thus, “*the task of the theatre translator lies in determining the purpose of his or her translation in a crystal clear manner at the beginning of the translation process.*”⁵⁶ The translation of the stage directions, in this sense, plays a vital role in the course of determining the translator’s purpose. Therefore, paying close attention to the stage directions can facilitate the voyage of the text from page to stage to a considerable degree and help the translator to decide whether to translate a theatre text as a literary work to be read or staged. After all, through the stage directions, actors, directors, stage designers and technicians involved in the staging process can comprehend the dramaturgy of the playwright. As far as the theatre of Samuel Beckett is concerned, the significance of stage directions increases to a certain extent since Beckett’s stage directions, comprise hints concerning neither the psychologies nor the moods of the play characters; they are often composed as short mimes for the actors who will make the text reborn on the stage.

⁵⁴ Samuel Beckett, *Son Band*, trans. Fatih Özgüven, in *Son Band / Radyo Skeci*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 9-12, emphasis added.

⁵⁵ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’ın Son Bandı*, trans. Uğur Ün, in *Tüm Kısa Oyunları*, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 52-53, emphasis added.

⁵⁶ Burç İdem Dinçel, “Çeviri Eleştirisinde Yorumbilimsel Sürecin Önemi ve James Joyce’un *Sürgünler* Oyunu Bağlamındaki Yansımaları”, *Mimesis, Tiyatro/Çeviri Araştırma Dergisi 13*, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, p. 359

A brief glance at the Turkish translations of the opening mime of *Krapp's Last Tape* becomes quite telling in this sense. In the translations of Hamdi Koç (henceforth TT₁) and Fatih Özgüven (henceforth TT₂), for instance, a psychological effect is given to Krapp as an outcome of the word choices, such as “kocaman” and “derin derin” both of which depict Krapp as a sad and a disappointed man. Uğur Ün’s translation (henceforth TT₃), on the other hand, aims at presenting Krapp with the most economical word choice, like “derin”. Additionally, in TT₁ and TT₂ the translators opt to use “yani” (which sounds like an explanatory text rather than a short mime for the actor. TT₃, however, with the usage of a semi-colon divides the sentence into a sub-clause with the purpose of providing a straight text for the actor. The typing error which could be spotted easily in the editorial work of the publication in TT₁ (“orkestra çukuru ina iner”), moreover, distorts the opening mime for the actor to a certain extent. The usage of “orkestra çukuru” in both TT₁ and TT₂ demands the play to be staged in auditorium rather than a theatre stage, whereas “sahnenin önündeki boşluk” in TT₃ sets a distance between the play and the reader/spectator. Furthermore, the usage of “volta atmak” in TT₃ makes the mime to be performed in a rather wider stage, thus offering more space for the actor’s movements. “Bir aşağı bir yukarı” in TT₁ and TT₂, however, do not convey the broad space as the TT₃ conveys. Consulting Beckett’s text at this point of analysis might give further clues regarding the lexical choices of the translators.

*Krapp remains a moment motionless, heaves a **great** sigh, looks at his watch, fumbles in his pockets, takes out an envelope, puts it back, fumbles, takes out a small **bunch of keys**, raises it to his eyes, chooses a key, gets up and moves to front of table. ... Finally he bites off the end, turns aside and begins **pacing to and fro** at edge of stage, in the light, *i.e.* not more than four or five paces either way, meditatively eating banana. He treads on skin, slips, nearly falls, recovers himself, stoops and peers at skin and finally pushes it, still stooping, with his foot over the edge of the stage into pit. ...⁵⁷*

⁵⁷ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp's Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 312, emphasis added.

When the Turkish translations of *Krapp's Last Tape* are re-read in the light of Beckett's opening mime, the reasons that govern the lexical and syntactical constructions of the translations become clear to a certain extent. The syntactical construction of TT₁ – and to some degree the TT₂– for instance, derives from the intention of conveying Beckett's syntax in the translation/s.⁵⁸ As an outcome of this kind of translation strategy, the reader/spectator, and as well as the actor, comes across with a flawed usage of Turkish. Moreover, the reason for the usage of “yani” in both TT₁ and TT₂ derives from Beckett's usage of “i.e.” in the opening mime. As stated in the analysis of the target texts, TT₃ benefits from the syntactical diversities of Turkish through the usage of semi-colon in order to provide a direct text for the actor to perform. The excerpts taken from the target texts also offer a firm example of how the “invariant core” of the ST is subject to interpretation. According to Popović, writes Susan Bassnett, “*this invariant core is represented by stable, basic and constant semantic elements in the text, whose existence can be proved by experimental semantic condensation.*”⁵⁹ TT₂, in this respect illustrates how “bunch of keys” can be rendered as “anahtar tomarı” while TT₁ and TT₃ render it as “anahtar destesi” which seems to be more in line with the “invariant core” of the ST. Speaking of Popović, also brings forth to the concept of “shift of expression” in translations, which Popović defines as: “*All that appears as new with respect to the original, or fails to appear where it might have been expected, may be interpreted as a shift.*”⁶⁰

BANT: ... Bugün otuz dokuz, demir gibi- ... Bugün otuzdokuz, demir gibi sağlam, eski zayıflığım dışında, ve düşünsel açıdan şimdi kuşkulanmak için çok nedenim var... (Duraksar.)... dalganın tepesinde – ya da oralarda. Berbat olayı son yıllarda olduğu

⁵⁸ According to Walter Benjamin, however, the task of the translator is accomplished through fidelity to syntax. Cf. Walter Benjamin “The Task of the Translator”, trans. James Hynd and E. M. Valk, in *Delos A Journal on & of Translation*, National Translation Center, Austin, Texas, [1923] 1968, p. 92. Benjamin also points out how, “literalness in regard to syntax destroys any rendering of sense whatever” and “translation must largely disregard the aim of communication” See, *ibid.* p. 90 and 92. This must be the ultimate goal that any translator would aspire to achieve. Nevertheless, the Gordian knot in Benjamin's essay can be cut through paying close attention to his usage of the very word “context”: “*In all languages and their creations there remains, beyond the communicable, something incommunicable, something symbolizing or symbolized according to context*” See *ibid.* By focusing on the context of a given ST, then, the translator can make the work live again in his or her translation.

⁵⁹ Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, London-New York: Routledge, [1980] 2004, p. 33

⁶⁰ Anton Popović, “The Concept ‘Shift of Expression’ in Translation Analysis”, in James Holmes (ed.), *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences, p. 79

gibi Şaraphanede sessizce kutladım. Tek canlı yoktu. Kapalı gözlerle ateşin önüne oturdum, **taneleri kabuklardan ayırarak**. Birkaç not aldım, bir zarfın arkasına. Odama dönmüş olmak iyi, eski paçavralarım içinde. ... (Duraklama.) Kalkıp içinde dolaşmayı seviyorum, sonra buraya geri dönmeyi... (Duraksar.) ... bana. (Duraklama.) Krapp.⁶¹

TEYP: ... **Otuzdokuzuma bastım bugün**, demir- ... Otuzdokuzuma bastım bugün, demir gibiyim, bir tek o eski zaafım hariç, ve büyük bir gönül rahatlığıyla söyleyebilirim ki, entellektüel [sic.] hayatımın da... [duralar] ... **zirve noktasındayım** – ya da **oralarda bir yerde**. Bu dehşetengiz olayı, son yıllarda olduğu gibi sessiz sedasız kutladım Şarapevinde. Tek Allahın kulu yok. Ateşin önünde gözlerim kapalı oturdum, **sapı samandan ayırarak**. Bir kaç not aldım, bir zarfın arkasına. İnime dönmek ne iyi, üzerime eskilerimi geçirmek. ... [Durur] ... ayağa kalkıp ışığın altında gezinmeyi seviyorum, sonra gene geriye, buraya ... [duralar] ...bana. [durur] Krapp'a.⁶²

BANT: ... **Bugün otuzdokuzuma girdim**, dipdiri – ... Bugün otuzdokuzuma girdim, dipdiri hissediyorum kendimi, şu zayıf yanımlı saymazsak, entellektüel yaşamım da ... (Duraksar.) ... **en üst noktasına ya da buna yakın bir yere ulaştı** anladığım kadarıyla. Şu berbat olayı geçmiş yıllardaki gibi bir meyhanede sakın sakın kutladım. Kimsecikler yoktu. Gözlerimi kapatıp, ateşin önünde oturarak **sapı samandan ayıkladım**. Bir zarfın arkasına bir şeyler çiziktirdim. İnime dönmekten, eski püskü giysilerime kavuşmaktan hoşnuttum. ... (Susar.) Kalkıp inimde şöyle bir dolaşmayı ve sonra buraya... (Duraksar.) ... kendime dönmeyi seviyorum. (Susar.) Krapp'a.⁶³

The excerpt taken from TT₁ indicates how the aim of adhering to Beckett's syntax produces a vague translation in which it becomes hard for the meaning of the text to be conveyed to the reader/spectator/actor. The beginning of the first sentence of Krapp, for example, addresses the third-person singular pronoun and then immediately shifts to "Krapp" by leaving questions in the mind/s of the reader/spectator/actor. Furthermore,

⁶¹ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp'in Son Bandı*, trans. Hamdi Koç, in *Toplu Kısa Oyunlar 1956-1962*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 90-91, emphasis added.

⁶² Samuel Beckett, *Son Band*, trans. Fatih Özgüven, in *Son Band / Radyo Skeci*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 14-15, emphasis added.

⁶³ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp'in Son Bandı*, trans. Uğur Ün, in *Tüm Kısa Oyunları*, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 54-55, emphasis added.

“dalganın tepesinde – ya da oralarda” does not convey a meaning in the entire sentence. Even the context of the sentence, a notion which helps to clear the vagueness of a given text, fails to render the meaning in the translation. On the other hand, in TT₂ and TT₃, the reader/spectator/actor can understand that the voice is recorded when Krapp was thirty-nine years old, and he has reached almost to the peak of his intellectuality. The ambiguity in the TT₁ surfaces at the last part of the excerpt, in which it becomes impossible for one to understand where Krapp likes to take a walk in. In TT₂ and TT₃, however, offer two interpretations of this: while in TT₂, the ambiguity is clarified by mentioning “ışığın altında,” in TT₃, it is mentioned that Krapp likes to take a walk in his den. The stage directions (the word choices, such as “duraklama”, “duraksar”, “durur” and “duralar”) in both TT₁ and TT₂, moreover, indicate –more or less– the same action to be done by Krapp. The stage directions in TT₃ show the difference between the actions of Krapp by the lexical choices like “susar” and “duraksar”.

*TAPE: ... **Thirty-nine today**, sound as a-- ... *Thirty-nine today, sound as a bell, apart from my old weakness, and intellectually I have now every reason to suspect at the ... (hesitates) ... **crest of the wave--or thereabouts**. Celebrated the awful occasion, as in recent years, quietly at the Winehouse. Not a soul. Sat before the fire with closed eyes, **separating the grain from the husks**. Jotted down a few notes, on the back on an envelope. Good to be back in my den in my old rags. ... (Pause.) I love to get up and move about in it, then back here to ... (hesitates) ... me. (pause.) Krapp.*⁶⁴*

Consulting Beckett’s text, one can infer how the ambiguity in TT₁ derives from the translator strategy employed by the translator in which the elements of the source text are consecrated. Rendering “crest of the wave” as “dalganın tepesinde” without taking into consideration the context surrounding the younger Krapp results in producing awkward expressions in TT₁. By way of clarifying the ambiguities inherent in the ST, however, TT₂ and TT₃ make Beckett’s text more perceivable in the eyes of the reader/spectator/actor. Moreover, while “taneleri kabuklardan ayırarak” does not convey a meaning in TT₁; the translators of TT₂ and TT₃ use their rights, “to differ organically, to be independent, as

⁶⁴ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’s Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 313, emphasis added.

long as that independence is pursued for the sake of the original, a technique applied in order to reproduce it as a living work,”⁶⁵ and render “separation the grain from the husks” as “sapı samandan ayırarak” (TT₂) and “sapı samandan ayıkladım” (TT₃). The lexical choices opted in the translations also deserve attention. In TT₁, Krapp’s “den” becomes a mere room through the lexical choice “oda”, whereas in TT₂ and TT₃, the lexical choice of “in” conveys the state of disarray of Krapp’s dwelling place in the translations. The very last part of the excerpts of the translations demonstrates further the general translation strategies employed by the translators. While in TT₂ and in TT₃ the “invariant core” of the ST, that is, “back here to me ... Krapp” is translated as “bana ... Krapp’a” and “kendime dönmeyi seviyorum Krapp’a”, in TT₁, it is rendered as “bana Krapp.”

One of the most important examples of Krapp’s self-alienation in the play can be felt when the older Krapp can no longer remember what the word “viduity” means. He looks the word up in his dictionary and reads, “*state—or condition of being—or remaining—a widow—or widower ... ‘Deep weeds of viduity’ . . . Also of an animal, especially a bird . . . the vidua or weaver bird . . . Black plumage of male . . .*”⁶⁶ From this perspective, one can see how the lexical choices of the translators of *Krapp’s Last Tape* can become quite significant in terms of conveying this sense of self-alienation to the reader/spectator/actor. In TT₁, the word is rendered as “kukumav” with the purpose of building a bridge with “kukumav kuşu” as does the ST build with “weaverbird”. In TT₂ and in TT₃, the word is translated as “ermilelik” and “dulluk” respectively, without the intention to link the word with the name of the animal. Consequently, the lexical choice in TT₁ and TT₂ conveys the feeling of that self-alienation on the part of the reader/spectator/actor, with further creativity on the translator of TT₁, whereas in TT₃ the word is translated as the first probable meaning of the word in question. In addition to the prospective problems that the very word “viduity” might pose on translators, the older Krapp’s language along with his situation can become quite significant during the translation process. Take, for instance, the relationship of the older Krapp’s relationship with women in the Turkish theatrical system:

⁶⁵ Anton Popović, “The Concept ‘Shift of Expression’ in Translation Analysis”, in James Holmes (ed.), *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences, p. 80

⁶⁶ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp’s Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 315

KRAPP: ... Fanny birkaç kez geldi. Kemikli kocamış orospu, hayalet gibi. Fazla yapamadım, ama sanırım **apış arasına tekme atmaktan** daha iyiydi. Son sefer o kadar kötü olmadı. Nasıl başarıyorsun, dedi, bu yaşında? **Ona hayatım boyunca onun için biriktirdiğimi söyledim.**⁶⁷

KRAPP: ... Fanny geldi bir iki defa. Kemik torbası, hortlak gibi ihtiyar orospu. Pek bir şey beceremedim, gene de **bacakarasına bir tekmeden** hallice herhalde. Son kere fena değildi. Nasıl beceriyorsun, dedi, bu yaşta? **Hepsini ömrüm boyunca senin için biriktirdim de ondan, dedim.**⁶⁸

KRAPP: ... Fanny geldi bir iki kez. Bir fahişe kalıntısı, kemik yığını. Pek bir şey yapamasam da, **otuzbirden** iyi olduğunu sanıyorum. Sonuncusunda hiç de kötü değildi. Bu yaşta nasıl beceriyorsun, hayret doğrusu demişti bana. **Bedenimi tüm yaşantım boyunca ona sakladığımı söylemişim.**⁶⁹

A glance at TT₁ and TT₂ demonstrates how a “word-for-word” translation can have the possibility of distorting the essential meaning of a given ST. The translators of TT₁ and TT₂ aptly provide a “word-for-word” translation for Krapp’s words, which in Beckett’s text read as:

KRAPP: ... Fanny came in a couple of times. Bony old ghost of a whore. Couldn't do much, but I suppose better than **a kick in the crutch**. The last time wasn't so bad. How do you manage it, she said, at your age? **I told her I'd been saving up for her all my life.**⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp'in Son Bandı*, trans. Hamdi Koç, in *Toplu Kısa Oyunlar 1956-1962*, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 98, emphasis added.

⁶⁸ Samuel Beckett, *Son Band*, trans. Fatih Özgüven, in *Son Band / Radyo Skeci*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 26, emphasis added.

⁶⁹ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp'in Son Bandı*, trans. Uğur Ün, in *Tüm Kısa Oyunları*, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, p. 62, emphasis added.

⁷⁰ Samuel Beckett, *Krapp's Last Tape*, in John P. Harrington (ed.), *Modern Irish Drama*, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, p. 317, emphasis added.

By rendering the expression “a kick in the crutch” as “apış arasına tekme atmak” (TT₁) and “bacakarasına bir tekme” (TT₂), both translations cling to the words of the ST (once again) and produce a translation with a strange usage of Turkish. Furthermore, it becomes rather hard for one to grasp what Krapp has “saved up” for his entire life when both translations render Krapp’s last sentence as, “ona hayatım boyunca onun için biriktirdiğimi söyledim” (TT₁) and “hepsini ömrüm boyunca senin için biriktirdim de ondan, dedim” (TT₂). Nevertheless, in TT₃, thanks to the “shift of expression” applied by the translator, it becomes possible for the reader/spectator/actor to comprehend how the older Krapp masturbates at the age of sixty-nine and still philanders with a “bony old ghost of a whore.”

All in all, translation is a “decision making process”⁷¹ and every translator’s “‘decisive battle’ is fought on the level of the text individual, where strategy and tactics are directed by type and variety.”⁷² Although *Krapp’s Last Tape* is a text form which resists classification, as argued earlier in this study, the play can be regarded as an explicit example of a “radical text” which serves to undermine the traditional reading habits of the readers, the conventional way of staging the play, and as a matter of fact, the customary way of playing the character on stage. Therefore, the task of the translator of *Krapp’s Last Tape* would indeed be a difficult task, in which the translator is in the position of rendering the “theatrical” aspect of the work with the purpose of providing a play text for the actor to perform it on the stage. The stage directions in this respect play a vital role since in *Krapp’s Last Tape*, Krapp is presented to the reader/spectator through the opening mime of the play. As the analyses of the Turkish translations of *Krapp’s Last Tape* have shown, the lexical choices of Hamdi Koç and Fatih Özgüven were rather in the form of “*unmotivated surplus decisions*”⁷³ which resulted either in the addition of psychological effect on the play character or producing a bizarre text that becomes hard for an actor to make the “meaning” reborn on the stage. Uğur Ün’s translation of *Krapp’s Last Tape*, on the other hand, was directed by a “search for motivation in every broader context,”⁷⁴ such as the

⁷¹ Cf. Jiří Levý, “Translation as a Decision Process”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London-New York, [1967] 2000, pp. 148-159, and Katharina Reiss, “Type, Kind and Individuality of Text, Decision Making in Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London-New York, [1971] 2000 pp. 160-171.

⁷² Katharina Reiss, “Type, Kind and Individuality of Text, Decision Making in Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London-New York, [1971] 2000, p. 166

⁷³ Jiří Levý, “Translation as a Decision Process”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London-New York, [1967] 2000, p. 151

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

“performability” –the *mise en scène*– of the work on stage, so as to create a facilitative play text for the actor who will perform Krapp on the production.

Text in Performance

Since theatre is a form of art which cannot be thought regardless of its staging aspect, it would be plausible to bring into focus the role of a translated text in one of the recent performances of Samuel Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape* in Turkey, that is, the Tiyatro-Z production of the play which took place on 20th of March 2007 at Akatlar Cultural Centre in Istanbul. After all, the ultimate goal of any kind of theatre translation criticism is precisely the same of any kind of theatre criticism: both criticisms have to take the final production of the play and its effectiveness on the audience into account. As Elaine Aston George Savona correctly observe, “*productions of plays in translation are often good examples of whether the theatrical sign-system has been carefully considered for clarity of meaning, because decisions have to be made about how to cross the sign-systems of two societies, languages, cultures and theatrical traditions.*”⁷⁵ Among the three translations analysed in the previous section of this study, Uğur Ün’s translation along with Beckett’s revised text from his *Theatrical Notebooks* were taken as the basis for the construction of the performance text by the actor Beyti Engin who played Krapp in the first Tiyatro-Z production of the play which dates back to 2005. The fact that the director of the production Cem Kenar, did not engage himself with the performance text, in the course of staging is open to discussion. During the course of two years, the play has been staged by the theatre company in various projects like the 3rd Visibility Project organized by GalataPerform in 2007.

Beyti Engin’s construction of the performance text deserves further attention from the perspective of contemporary understanding of the study and practice of translation since it totally removes the name of the translator/s from the production. Yet, there were reasons for that. At the beginning of the project, Beyti Engin, has strictly rejected consulting Hamdi Koç’s translation because of his first encounter with one of the former translations of Koç, that is to say, the dramaturgical notes of James Joyce in *Exiles*. The same translation strategy employed by Koç in his translation of *Krapp’s Last Tape* is

⁷⁵ Elaine Aston and George Savona, *Theatre as Sign System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*, London-New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 100

valid of his translation of the dramaturgical notes of James Joyce (i.e. word for word translations, changing the place names, strict adherence to the ST which causes to produce awkward expressions, and so forth).⁷⁶ In this sense, it can be inferred how the former translations of a given translator haunt his or her later translations, resulting in the “strict” rejections of his or her published translations from the productions thereof. On the other hand, Fatih Özgüven’s translation of *Krapp’s Last Tape* was dismissed on the grounds of the “odd lexical choices”⁷⁷ inherent in the TT. Even though the performance text was adapted for the stage from the Turkish translation of Uğur Ün and revised text of *Krapp’s Last Tape* from the *Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett*, the production neither bears the name of Uğur Ün nor the revised text.⁷⁸ The fact that people involved in the staging process of the play, including Beyti Engin, have not “thought about that aspect”⁷⁹ during the course of the production goes hand in hand with Susan Bassnett’s keen remark regarding the issue: “translation has been perceived as a secondary activity, as a ‘mechanical’ rather than a ‘creative process, within the competence of anyone with a basic grounding in a language other than their own; in short, as a **low status occupation**.”⁸⁰

The Pavis Questionnaire⁸¹ devotes a sub-category with respect to the function of text in performance. The first question in the tenth section of the questionnaire addresses the main features of translation, while the second question is concerned with the role given to the text in performance, and finally the third question is germane to the relationship between the text and image in the *mise en scène*.⁸² In this sense, the Pavis Questionnaire can become quite fruitful in terms of demonstrating the main features of the performance text of the Tiyatro-Z production of *Krapp’s Last Tape*.

⁷⁶ For an account of Hamdi Koç’s translation of James Joyce’s dramaturgical notes in *Exiles*, see Burç İdem Dinçel, “Çeviri Eleştirisinde Yorumbilimsel Sürecin Önemi ve James Joyce’un Sürgünler Oyunu Bağlamındaki Yansımaları”, *Mimesis, Tiyatro/Çeviri Araştırma Dergisi* 13, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, pp. 363-365

⁷⁷ Private conversation with Beyti Engin who was kind enough to answer my questions with regards to the construction of the performance text in the Tiyatro-Z production of *Krapp’s Last Tape*.

⁷⁸ See, <<http://www.tiyatro-z.com/krapp.aspx>>

⁷⁹ Private conversation with Beyti Engin.

⁸⁰ Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, London-New York: Routledge, [1980] 2004, p. 12, emphasis added. For a discussion of the issue in a wider context, that is, the tendency of suppressing the “visibility” of the translators in the Anglo-Saxon culture, see Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, Routledge, London-New York, 1998, ch.1

⁸¹ Patrice Pavis, “Theatre Analysis: Some Questions and a Questionnaire” trans. Susan Bassnett, in *New Theatre Quarterly*, 1 (2), 1985, pp. 209-210. See also, Patrice Pavis, *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, trans. Loren Kruger, Routledge, London-New York, 1991, ch.1 and ch. 6

⁸² Cf. Ibid.

The performance text was adapted by Benti Engin according to the revised text of *Krapp's Last Tape* that was published in *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett*. Therefore, several parts (i.e. the omission of locking and unlocking of the drawers, fatuous sexual innuendo of Krapp with the bananas, the omission of keys, the hymn that Krapp sings, and so forth) of Uğur Ün's translation was cut and changed in line with the revised text of *Krapp's Last Tape*.⁸³ Krapp's "cubby-hole" was introduced in the performance text, so as to make Krapp three trips to there. Be that as it may, the stage setting was not changed in the performance text according to the revised text of the play. The table which should be bare at the beginning of the play, for Krapp to fetch his "cubby-hole" and bring the tin boxes of spools, the ledger, and the tape-recorder, was not bare as in the case of the revised text. And as a matter of fact, Krapp's trips to his "cubby-hole" during the course of the performance have lost their function to a certain extent. Consequently, Krapp could not plug the tape-recorder into the lead that should be found in the stage. One possible explanation for the performance text in terms of not adhering to that aspect of the revised text can be the constraints of the stage in which the production was held. Furthermore, Beckett's momentous emphasis that he puts on the beginning of the play was not taken into consideration: "39 choice and not chance. At curtain up he is thinking of the story of the boat and trying to remember which year it was (how old he was). Doesn't succeed. Tries again during banana 1. (Reseated at table he tries to remember.) Remembers all of a sudden as he starts banana 2 (thanks to $39 = 13 \times 3$ which had struck him at the time) and hastens away to fetch the ledger that will allow him to identify box and tape."⁸⁴ In the light of Beckett's production notes, then, one can see how Krapp should remain motionless, just like in a dream, at the beginning of the play. In the Tiyatro-Z production, however, Krapp enters the stage with a laborious walk with a cigarette in his hand, accompanied by Erik Satie's music, namely, *Buddha Bar*. Krapp's arrival to the stage with a laborious walk deserves further attention because it makes the "dramatic interest" on the part of the spectator to vanish into thin air. In the performance, Krapp's trips to his "cubby-hole" have the possibility of arousing the curiosity on behalf of the spectator and make him or her to ask questions, such as "what is preoccupying the old man so much, and, later, as to what

⁸³ Cf. Beyti Engin, Krapp'in Son Bandı, unpub., 2005, pp. 1-6 with Samuel Beckett, *Krapp'in Son Bandı*, trans. Uğur Ün, in *Tüm Kısa Oyunları*, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, pp. 51-64 and James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp's Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, pp. 3-10

⁸⁴ James Knowlson, *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp's Last Tape*, London, Faber and Faber, 1992, p. 49

he can be searching for on the recorded tape.”⁸⁵ The “dramatic interest” in the Tiyatro-Z production of the play diminishes to a certain extent by making Krapp to enter to the stage with a tiresome walk. Moreover, the usage of music at the beginning of the play contorts the “silence and stillness” of *Krapp’s Last Tape* which Beckett regarded as the most important dramatic features of the play which could create contrasts with sudden moves or sharp and loud sounds.⁸⁶ Within this context, it can be inferred that the role given to the text in performance was not that superior, as a given Beckett text could acquire in a given Beckett production.

Consequently, the insufficient role given to the text in performance hampers the relationship between text and image on the stage. The fact that an easy chair was added on the stage design together with the silhouette of a girl appear at the back of the stage behind the white curtains each time Krapp listens his voice on the tape-recorder related with the girl in the punt, hinders the image that the revised text provides for the spectator since both chair and silhouette of a girl distort the abstract feature of *Krapp’s Last Tape* in the strictest sense of the word. In this respect, it can be surmised that the director of *Krapp’s Last Tape*, Cem Kenar, has paid more attention to the staging aspect of the production without taking into consideration what Beckett’s revised text brings new to the already existing version of the play. Nevertheless, the Manichean aspect of *Krapp’s Last Tape* has been rendered to the spectator through the means of employment of black and white lights in the production.

Because *Krapp’s Last Tape* is a solo performance, the *kinesics*, “*studies of the human body as a means of communication*,”⁸⁷ of the actor can become quite significant in terms examining interactive relationship evolves between the actor and the spectator during the performance. Since in *Krapp’s Last Tape* it is most probable for the spectator to encounter with the absence of speech, the actor’s bodily movements play the vital role during the course of the performance. Beyti Engin’s gestures which foreground the short-sightedness, hearing difficulties, confused state of mind and as well as the disappointments of Krapp are constantly *translated* to the spectator in the entire production. One of the most noteworthy moments in which the interactive relationship is built between the actor and the spectator is attained through the “vacuous look” of Beyti Engin after the first banana business in the opening mime. The same gesture of Engin in the vital points of the play,

⁸⁵ Ibid, p. 251

⁸⁶ Cf. Ibid, p. 251, 273

⁸⁷ Elaine Aston and George Savona, *Theatre as Sign System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*, London-New York: Routledge, 1991, p. 116

such as Krapp's self-alienation to his younger self, his relationship with Fanny, the "bony old ghost of a whore", and as well as the way in which he enfolds his body on the tape-recorder when the elder Krapp listens the younger Krapp's "scene" with the girl in the punt, make the crux of *Krapp's Last Tape* to be *translated* to the spectator through the bodily movements of the actor.

Conclusion

Nothing conclusive can be said about theatre. Samuel Beckett's approach to theatre suggests itself as one of the most explicit examples of this fact. As Beckett developed himself from being a novelist to playwright, and subsequently from being a playwright to a theatrical artist, he did not avoid interfering with his already existing texts which canonized him in the critical discourse. In each production that he directed, Beckett constantly re-wrote his texts with the purpose of providing a new insight for the performances of his plays. Beckett's revised texts in his *Theatrical Notebooks* published in the 1990s plainly demonstrate his creative vision regarding the staging aspect of his plays.

Nothing conclusive can be said about the act of translation as well. As the analyses of the re-translations of *Krapp's Last Tape* have shown, every translation has a hermeneutical aspect; therefore, every translation has its own characteristics. The hermeneutical circle during the translation process, however, has a fragile structure which can easily be broken as an outcome of strict adherence to the lexical elements of the ST. Hamdi Koç's translation of *Krapp's Last Tape*, for instance, can be shown as a representative example of this kind of translated text, in which it is most probable for the reader to encounter with awkward usage of Turkish as a result of clinging strictly to the words of the ST. In a similar vein, Fatih Özgüven's translation of *Krapp's Last Tape* follows more or less the same kind of translation strategy. Uğur Ün's translation of *Krapp's Last Tape*, on the other hand, takes the context of the ST in its entirety, and regards the play as a theatre text to be staged. Since theatre plays are, "very detailed and rather special examples of a 'form' uniting many specific situations (in this case the performances of the play),"⁸⁸ their translations should take first and foremost the staging aspect of them.

⁸⁸ George Turner, *Stylistics*, Penguin Books, UK, 1973, p. 136

As an outcome of the translation strategy employed by Uğur Ün, the text was regarded as a play text to be staged by Beyti Engin who starred Krapp in the Tiyatro-Z production of *Krapp's Last Tape*. One important point merits mentioning with regards to the construction of the performance text is the fact that it is also based on Samuel Beckett's production notes and as well as the revised text of *Krapp's Last Tape* from his *Theatrical Notebooks*. Still, the performance has prioritized the interpretation of the director and as a consequence, leads to a staging approach in which Beckett's re-visions and Cem Kenar's readings into *Krapp's Last Tape* mingle with each other. Yet, the production itself can be considered as a serious step taken towards to the appreciation of Samuel Beckett as a creative director in the Turkish theatrical system. A meticulous dramaturgy work in the light of the revised text of *Krapp's Last Tape*, on the other hand, can result in producing a more straight performance text in the Beckettian sense, and therefore can pave the way for a better appreciation of Beckett's creative theatrical vision in the Turkish theatrical system.

Bibliography

- AALTONEN, Sirkku; **Time-Sharing on Stage**, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 2000
- AALTONEN, Sirkku; “*Retranslation in the Finnish Theatre*”, in **Cadernos de Tradução**, No. 11, 2003, pp. 141-159
- ASTON, Elaine / SAVONA, George; **Theatre as Sign System: A Semiotics of Text and Performance**, London-New York: Routledge, 1991
- BASSNETT, Susan; “*Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre*”, in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds.), **Constructing Cultures**, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 1998, pp. 90-108
- BASSNETT, Susan; **Translation Studies**, London-New York: Routledge, [1980] 2004
- BATTY, Mark; “*Acts with Words: Beckett, Translation, Mise en Scène and Authorship*”, in Carole-Anne Upton (ed.) **Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation**, St. Jerome, UK, 2000, pp. 63-72.

- BECKETT, Samuel; **Krapp's Last Tape**, in John P. Harrington (ed.), **Modern Irish Drama**, Norton Critical Edition, New York and London, [1958] 1991, pp. 311-318.
- BECKETT, Samuel; **Krapp'ın Son Bandı**, trans. Hamdi Koç, in **Toplu Kısa Oyunlar 1956-1962**, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 85-100.
- BECKETT, Samuel; **Son Band**, trans. Fatih Özgüven, in **Son Band / Radyo Skeci**, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 7-29.
- BECKETT, Samuel; **Krapp'ın Son Bandı**, trans. Uğur Ün, in **Tüm Kısa Oyunları**, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, 1993, pp. 51-64.
- BECKETT, Samuel; **Krapp'ın Son Bandı**, adapted for the stage by Benti Engin from the Turkish translation of Uğur Ün and revised text of *Krapp's Last Tape* from the *Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett*, unp., 2005
- BEER, Ann; "Beckett's Bilingualism", in John Pilling (ed.), **The Cambridge Companion to Beckett**, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, pp. 209-221.
- BENJAMIN, Walter; "The Task of the Translator", trans. James Hynd and E. M. Valk, in **Delos A Journal on & of Translation**, National Translation Center, Austin, Texas, [1923] 1968, pp. 76-99.
- BESBES, Khaled; **Semiotics of Beckett's Theatre: A Semiotic Study of the Complete Dramatic Works of Samuel Beckett**, Universal Publishers, 2007
- CHEMBERLAIN, Lori; "'The Same Old Stories': Beckett's Poetics of Translation", in Alan Warren Friedman, Charles Rossman and Dina Sherzer (eds.), **Beckett Translating / Translating Beckett**, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1987, pp. 17-24.
- COHN, Ruby; "Samuel Beckett Self-Translator", in **PMLA** v. 76 no. 5, 1961, pp. 613-621
- COHN, Ruby; **Back to Beckett**, Princeton University Press, 1973
- CONNOR, Steven, **Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory and Text**, Oxford: Blackwell, 1988

- DİNÇEL, Burç İdem; “Çeviri Eleştirisinde Yorumbilimsel Sürecin Önemi ve James Joyce’un *Sürgünler* Oyunu Bağlamındaki Yansımaları”, **Mimesis, Tiyatro/Çeviri Araştırma Dergisi** 13, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, pp. 347-368.
- ESPASA, Eva; “Performability in Translation: Speakability? Playability? Or just Saleability?”, in Carole-Anne Upton (ed.) **Moving Target: Theatre Translation and Cultural Relocation**, St. Jerome, UK, 2000, pp. 49-62.
- ELAM, Keir; “Dead Heads: Damnation-Narration in the ‘Dramaticules’”, in John Pilling (ed.), **The Cambridge Companion to Beckett**, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, pp. 145-166.
- GONTARSKI, S. E.; “Revising Himself: Performance as Text in Samuel Beckett’s Theatre”, in **Journal of Modern Literature** v. 22 no.1, 1998, pp. 131-145.
- GONTARSKI, S. E.; “Beckett and Performance”, in Lois Oppenheim (ed.) **Palgrave Advances in Samuel Beckett Studies**, Macmillan, USA, 2004, pp. 194-208.
- JACOBSON, Roman; “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), **The Translation Studies Reader**, Routledge, London-New York, [1959] 2000, pp. 113-118.
- KNOWLSON, James (ed.); **The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett, Volume III, Krapp’s Last Tape**, London, Faber and Faber, 1992
- LAWLEY, Paul; “Stages of Identity: From *Krapp’s Last Tape* to *Play*”, in John Pilling (ed.), **The Cambridge Companion to Beckett**, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1994, pp. 88-107.
- LEVY, Jiří; “Translation as a Decision Process”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), **The Translation Studies Reader**, Routledge, London-New York, [1967] 2000, pp. 148-159.
- McDONALD, Rónán; **The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett**, Cambridge University Press, UK, 2006
- McGUIRE-BASSNETT, Susan; “Ways Through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts”, in Theo Hermans (ed.), **The**

- Manipulation of Literature, Studies in Literary Translation**, Croom Helm, London/Sydney, 1985, pp. 87-102.
- İPŞİROĞLU, Zehra, **Uyumsuz Tiyatroda Gerçekçilik**, Mitos Boyut Yayınları, İstanbul, 1996
 - PAVIS, Patrice; “A Possible Definition of Theatre Semiology”, trans. Susan Bassnett-McGuire, in **Languages of the Stage: Essays in the Semiology of Theatre**, Performing Arts Journal Publications, New York, 1982, pp. 11-21.
 - PAVIS, Patrice, “Theatre Analysis: Some Questions and a Questionnaire” trans. Susan Bassnett, in **New Theatre Quarterly**, 1 (2), 1985, pp. 208-212.
 - PAVIS, Patrice, **Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture**, trans. Loren Kruger, Routledge, London-New York, 1991
 - POPOVIC, Anton; “The Concept ‘Shift of Expression’ in Translation Analysis”, in James Holmes (ed.), **The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation**, Mouton: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1970, pp. 78-87.
 - REISS, Katharina; “Type, Kind and Individuality of Text, Decision Making in Translation”, in Lawrence Venuti (ed.), **The Translation Studies Reader**, Routledge, London-New York, [1971] 2000, pp. 160-171.
 - REISS, Katharina; **Translation Criticism – The Potentials & Limitations**, trans. Errol F. Rhodes, St. Jerome, UK, 2000
 - TURNER, George; **Stylistics**, Penguin Books, UK, 1973
 - VAN DEN BROECK, Raymond; “Second Thoughts on Translation Criticism: A Model of its Analytic Function” in Theo Hermans (ed.), **The Manipulation of Literature, Studies in Literary Translation**, Croom Helm, London/Sydney, 1985, pp. 54-62.
 - VENUTI, Lawrence; **The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference**, Routledge, London-New York, 1998
 - YÜKSEL, Ayşegül; **Samuel Beckett Tiyatrosu**, Dünya Kitapları, İstanbul, [1992] 2006

- < <http://www.tiyatro-z.com/krapp.aspx>>. (Accessed 13.06.2008)

Özet

Yirminci yüzyılın en önemli oyun yazarlarından biri olan Samuel Beckett, aynı zamanda oyunlarının sahnelenme süreçlerinde aktif bir şekilde yer almıştır. Beckett'in bu özelliği zaman içerisinde kendisine, oyun yazarlığının yanında yönetmen kimliği de kazandırmıştır. Ne var ki Beckett'in yönetmen kimliği, kendisinin oyun yazarlığı kimliğinin gölgesinde kalmaktan kurtulamamıştır. Bununla birlikte, 1990lı yıllarda Beckett'in, "Godot'yu Beklerken", "Oyun Sonu", "Krapp'ın Son Bandı", "Mutlu Günler" ve diğer kısa oyunlarına ilişkin prodüksiyon notlarının yayımlanması, yazarın yönetmen kimliği üzerine daha detaylı çalışmalar yapma imkânını doğurmuştur.

Tiyatronun uygulama alanında bulunmak, Beckett'e edebiyat ve tiyatro söylemi içerisinde kendisine saygınlık kazandırmış olan oyunlarını yeniden yazma fırsatını vermiştir. Böylece Beckett, bir edebiyat ya da tiyatro dizgesindeki metin kavramının durağanlığını da tartışmaya açarak, oyunlarının yayımlanmış metinlerinden farklı sahne metinleri ortaya çıkarmıştır. Yazarın sahnelediği oyunların geneline bakıldığında, "Krapp'ın Son Bandı"nın özel bir konum kazandığı görülmektedir, zira Beckett yönetmen olarak en fazla bu oyunu üzerinde durmuştur. Beckett söz konusu oyunun yayımlanmış metninin tersine, değişik bir sahneleme anlayışı benimseyerek, oyunun farklı bir şekilde alımlanmasına zemin hazırlamıştır.

Samuel Beckett'in yönetmen kimliğini merkeze alan bu makale, yazarın Krapp'ın Son Bandı adlı oyununun Türkçe çevirilerinin eleştirel bir okumasını yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. "Krapp'ın Son Bandı", ilk olarak Hamdi Koç çevirisiyle Yapı Kredi Yayınları tarafından, ardından Fatih Özgüven çevirisiyle İletişim Yayınları'ndan ve son olarak da Uğur Ün çevirisiyle Mitos Boyut Yayınları tarafından 1993 yılında yayımlanmıştır. Makale, belirlenen amaç doğrultusunda, "Krapp'ın Son Bandı"nın Beckett'in oyunları ve estetik anlayışı içindeki konumunu tartışmaya açtıktan sonra, oyunun her üç çevirisinin de eleştirel bir çözümlemesini sunmaktadır. Çözümleme sırasında, çeviri metinlerdeki anlam kaymaları ile çevirmenlerin kelime seçimleri incelenerek, ortaya nasıl bir sahne metni çıkarıldığı araştırılmaktadır. Böylece çalışma, oyunun çevirilerini yazı içerisinde sunulmuş olan kuramsal çerçeveye ışığında

değerlendirmek suretiyle, tiyatro alanındaki çeviri eserlerin incelenmesi konusunda gözlemlenen boşluğu doldurma çabasıdır.

Makalenin başka bir amacı ise “Krapp’ın Son Bandı”nın sahnelenme sürecine ilişkin bir değerlendirme sunmaktır. Sahneleme sürecine dair yapılacak değerlendirmede “Krapp’ın Son Bandı”nın Tiyatro-Z prodüksiyonu incelemeye alınmıştır. Çalışmada Tiyatro-Z prodüksiyonunun ele alınmasının nedeni, bu prodüksiyonda kullanılan sahne metninin, oyunun Uğur Ün çevirisi ve Beckett’in “Krapp’ın Son Bandı”na ilişkin rejî notlarından yola çıkılarak oluşturulmuş olmasıdır. Bu bağlamda düşünüldüğünde, Tiyatro-Z’nin “Krapp’ın Son Bandı” prodüksiyonu, Beckett’in yönetmen kimliğinin Türkiye’de alımlanması sürecinde atılmış önemli bir adım olarak değerlendirilebilir. Makale, Tiyatro-Z’nin “Krapp’ın Son Bandı” prodüksiyonunun eleştirel bir değerlendirmesini sunarak, bu önemli adımın ne ölçüde Beckett’in yönetmen kimliğini sahneye yansıttığını tartışmaktadır. Dolayısıyla incelemede, oyunun sahne metninde ne gibi değişiklikler yapıldığı izlenmekte ve sahneleme sürecinde metnin sahip olduğu rol ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışılmaktadır.