

The Consumption of The Female Body in Kaçar's *Tok* And Kane's *Phaedra's Love* *Kaçar'ın Tok ve Kane'nin Phaedra'nın Aşkı İsimli Oyunlarında Kadın Bedeninin Tüketimi*

Belgin BAĞIRLAR¹

Geliş Tarihi: 07.03.2019 / Düzenleme Tarihi: 11.07.2019 / Kabul Tarihi: 25.07.2019

Abstract

In a day and age where feminism is no longer an extreme phenomenon, female playwrights have become masterful at echoing female emotions, female psychology, and the female body's being perceived as an object in their theatrical works. The aim of this paper is to examine, through a radical feminist lens, how the obliteration of women's bodies is dealt with both in modern British, as well as modern Turkish theatre. In the renowned Turkish playwright Zeynep Kaçar's play *Tok (Full)*, audience members witness the female body being viciously consumed, but in the name of love. In *Phaedra's Love*, on the other hand, Sarah Kane—who is one of the pioneers of in-yer-face theatre—portrays women's bodies as being unimportant, and being worthlessly used at the hands of forbidden love. Both plays ascertain that patriarchy silences and pushes women to the side and, moreover, that it ruthlessly chews and spits out their bodies.

Keywords: Zeynep Kaçar, Sarah Kane, *Tok*, *Phaedra's Love*, Feminist Theatre

Özet

Feminizmin aşırı bir olgu olmadığı günümüzde, kadın yazarlarımız gerek kadınların duygularını, psikolojisini gerekse kadının vücudunun nasıl bir obje olarak algılandığını oyunlarına büyük bir ustalıkla yansıtırlar. Bu çalışmanın amacı, kadın bedeninin nasıl yok edildiğini hem Çağdaş Türk hem de Çağdaş İngiliz Tiyatrosunda radikal feminist bakış açısıyla ele almaktır. Ünlü çağdaş Türk yazarlarından biri olan Zeynep Kaçar'ın Tok isimli oyununda kadın vücudunun aşk adı altında nasıl acımasızca tüketildiği gözler önüne serilir. Yüzüne Tiyatro akımının öncülerinden biri olarak kabul edilen Sarah Kane'nin Phaedra's Love adlı oyununda ise kadın vücudunun önemsizliği ve yasak aşk uğruna nasıl değersiz bir şekilde yok edildiği anlatılır. Her iki oyunda da, yazarlar kadının ataerkil sistem tarafından nasıl bir kenara itildiklerini, sessiz kalmaya zorlandıklarını ve bedenlerinin acımasızca nasıl tüketilip yok edildiğini ortaya çıkarır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Zeynep Kaçar, Sarah Kane, *Tok*, *Phaedra'nın Aşkı*, Feminist Tiyatro

INTRODUCTION

1a- Radical Feminism

It is known that the mind and body are necessary for all healthy living beings. For centuries, however, women have struggled to be the owner of their own bodies and minds. What is more, this struggle is more or less seen in almost every patriarchal country throughout the world. Upon mentioning this struggle in a Turkish context, one cannot overlook the importance of the Ottoman period. The Ottoman Empire was a great empire that brought people of different national and linguistic backgrounds together under one roof. For this reason, it is impossible to talk about a single woman image. However, particularly the influence of the Byzantines and Persians, in particular, is noticed. In fact, Doğramacı (Doğramacı, 1989: 2) argues that it is because of the influence of the Byzantines that harems where women only served men, where their reproductive bodies were used, and where their children were reared, were distinct institutions unique to the Ottoman system. Until the Tanzimat period, women were slaves confined to their homes. There were bans for their dressing up and going out. With the declaration of Gülhane edict (1839), the cultural life of the Ottoman Empire began to change as a result of the exchange of ideas with the West. Thus, upon using the West as a model for itself, Ottoman women gained the right to be educated (1858), and midwifery schools (1842) were opened. In 1886, the first women's magazine, Şukûfezar, was published. II. After the proclamation of the constitution (1908), the number of women's magazines began to increase. The War of Independence had started as a result of the Ottoman Empire's being defeated in several conflicts. Atatürk founded the Republic of Turkey after the war of liberation and brought with him radical changes from both political and social standpoints. In 1924, having an equal education was granted to both men and women. In 1926, the monogamous marriage became official in the eye of the declaration of the Turkish Civil Code. In 1934, women were given the right to suffrage. Thus, women had become a part of both political and economic life. This success of women until the 1930s in terms of the rights they had obtained is also known as the first wave feminism. After this period, the rights women gained about their bodies, such as protection against violence towards their bodies, are classed as the second wave feminism. As of the 2000s, the ban in Turkey on wearing a headscarf in public institutions

¹ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü, Aydın, Türkiye.
E-posta: belgin.bagirlar@adu.edu.tr ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5575-3227

was lifted, thus opening the door to increase in the number of women working in a headscarf. In 2002, the new Turkish Civil Code declared new rights for equality between women and men. In 2007, new laws were enacted to in order better protect especially female victims of violence. However, it is controversial whether these rights are sufficient enough for women to be set free from the masculine system.

In much of the West, both the Industrial Revolution as well as French procurement has sparked a certain increase in women's movements. In the modern world, women are now more determined and willing than ever to seek their rights. While writers such as Mary Wollstonecraft and Simone De Beauvoir, alongside numerous feminists, were looking for where and how female-male inequality began as well as how women could overcome this inequality, emphasized the importance of the female body. Since both the female mind and body are shaped as well as marginalized by the dominant ideology. With the influence of the dominant ideology and culture, the female body, which is the representation of desire and sexuality, has been shaped as being weak, hour-glass figured, curvy, blonde, or brunette, etc. in the name of consumption. In this sense, patriarchal power exerts itself most on the female body. And it is for this reason that the female body has become the focus of modern feminist movements.

Even today when discussing the female body, it is impossible not to talk about the context of gender and sex. Since gender and sex discrimination is the underlying cause of the distinction between men and women. Ann Oakley, a feminist and a sociologist, defines the following distinction between gender and sex:

'Sex' is a word that referred to the biological differences between male and female, whereas 'Gender' ... is a matter of culture: it refers to the social classification into "masculine and feminine". Sex is thus assumed to be constant, an unchanging biological fact; it is natural. Gender, by comparison, is conceived of as neither constant nor natural. Gender differences between men and women vary both over time and across cultures; they are thus socially conditioned, an effect of the process of socialization whereby differently sexed individuals are converted into either masculine or feminine persons." (Oakley qt. in Lloyd, 2007, p.28)

In this sense, gender, in a male-dominated culture, is shaped around the characteristics of men and women alike. In this light, everything from how men and women ought to behave, what they can and cannot do, what they can study, their responsibilities, and what society expects them to do is inextricably tied to culture. Furthermore, culture can change over time just as it can change from one society to the other, and therefore, so do female-male roles--which Judith K. Pringle coins as 'heterogender'. On the other hand, sex is used to describe the congenital differences between male and female reproductive organs and is thus independent of culture. According to feminists such as Adrianna Rich, Gayle Rubin, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, there is an undeniable connection between gender and sexuality. Sedgwick claims that "without a concept of gender there could be, quite simply, no concept of homo or heterosexuality" (Sedgwick, 1991:31). In other words, both gender and sexuality are shaped by culture and imposed on society. And it is the female body that is exploited under this heterosexual imposition.

Not only is the female body molded in the masculine system, but it is also humiliated and crushed. How a woman dresses, how she talks, how she behaves, when she is to marry, and how many children she is to have are all determined by the patriarchal structure. Hence, the woman is deprived of the act of using both her own body and mind according to her own will. In Wollstonecraft's 1792 book, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, she emphasizes that many women have 'docile bodies'. They mimic their own mothers and aunts in order to seem beautiful, behave and talk appropriately. She preaches that women should get out of the home environment in which they are imprisoned, and take part in both the economic and political spheres. Moreover, in the male-dominated society according to Wollstonecraft, the female body is only important in a sexual sense and this is one of the main causes of female oppression.

Simon De Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949), questions how women have been dubbed as the 'other' or the 'second gender' throughout history, and how women have always had to submit to this. According to De Beauvoir, the female body is the main reason for women's oppression and having seen as the other. This is because "it is not the body- object described by biologists that actually exists, but the body as lived in by the subject" (De Beauvoir 1989: 76). In this sense, the female body in De Beauvoir's view is unacceptable and worthless. On the contrary, the female body is controlled by men both where it resides as well as within culture, and for this reason a woman cannot be the subject of herself, that is to say, "she becomes an object, and she sees herself as an object" (De Beauvoir 1989:90). On the other hand, De Beauvoir argues that the female body has incredible power, a 'reproductive capacity', and that the patriarchal system does everything in its power to keep that power under firm control. According to Donovan, "De Beauvoir sees the female body as inherently alienating because it demands so much of women's energy that it saps their potential for engaging in a creative pour-soi activity. Childbearing, childbirth, and menstruation are draining physical events that tie women to their bodies and to immanence" (Donovan, 2012: 121). So, De Beauvoir argues that the burden on the woman's shoulders is too heavy, and this burden imprisons the women via her own body.

According to liberal feminism as a part of modern feminist movements, even though bodies differ one another, each body has a mind. Therefore, individuals cannot be evaluated according to bodily differences. States must provide equal conditions for all individuals so that men and women can be equal. Marxist feminism argues that social improvement is necessary for women in order to be free and only interprets the reason for the injustice done to women's productive bodies through the economic lens. Socialist feminism, on the other hand, in using the fundamentals of Marxist feminism, emphasizes the fact that the female body is consumed both economically and in terms of working power, and argues that women are therefore alienated from their own bodies. Given that radical feminists emerged in the West in the 1970s, whereas they had emerged in Turkey in 1980s; both Western and Turkish radical feminists alike share the same views, in that "our oppression as women is rooted in the body" (Burstow, 1992: 44). Furthermore, the female body is humiliated, despised, and utilized within the patriarchal structure. For "as women, we are reduced primarily to Body by men, and that

body is fetishized: Woman's body is treated not as for -itself or for-herself but as for-him" (Burstow, 1992:44). So, two different worlds and positions exist for women and men. Women take care of both children as well as of those living at home whereas men work, produce, and hold a superior place in both social and political spheres. On top of that, women have to satisfy the sexual needs of men. What is more, the consumption of the female body from an erotic angle as a consumer good is something that we face throughout the world. In the light of this, the female body is objectified, and in many areas such as ads and magazines objectified bodies are used. To Andrea Dworkin "Not one part of woman's body is left untouched, unaltered...From head to toe, every feature of a woman's face, every section of her body, is subject to modification, alteration." (Dworkin, 1974: 113). Dworkin considers that in order to clarify the inequality between men and women, women are continuously belittled. Susan Bordo, like Dworkin, thinks that the "definition and shaping of the body is the focal point for struggles over the shape of power" (Bordo, 2004: 17). On the other hand, "Radical Turkish feminists state that women should like and love themselves by rejecting all attributes directed towards themselves, such as being attractive or repulsive, tall or short, thin or heavy. (Çaha, 1996: 162). In fact, even the stereotyping of the female body is the result of the superiority of men over women. Thus, it is the will of the patriarchal structure to make women alienated from their own bodies.

The institution of marriage is seen as the legalized oppression of the female body in terms of both sexually and manpower. Shulamith Firestone, a radical feminist writer, stood against the institution of marriage through feminism in her book *The Dialectic of Sex* (1970). According to her, the main reason for the classification of the sexes is a reproduction. What is more, the only way to eliminate this problem is to remove patriarchy and that institutions that hold it in place. Therefore, Firestone firmly opposes the institution of marriage. Since with the institution of marriage devoting a female body to her family becomes a legal right. Moreover, it is because of her responsibilities that she loses her freedom in a monetary sense. Finally, while spouses demand loyalty, that loyalty only remains one-sided. Thus, according to Firestone: "as long as we have the institution, we shall have the oppressive conditions built into it." (Firestone, 1970:226). As well, marriage forces both monogamy and heterosexuality. That is to say, marriage is, in fact, an oppressive institution imposed by the patriarchal social order.

While there are women who are forced to marry during their youth or who marry out of love, there are also women who fall in love and marry. Nonetheless, according to radical feminists, love is both a reflection and even an imposition of culture. Firestone complains about television, magazines, and novels always being peppered with stories of romance, and of telling women what they do when they do fall in love. In her view, love/romance is a phenomenon that is imposed on society, and especially on women. Thusly, the woman in love devotes herself to her man and to his happiness. This is to the point that, in Firestone's opinion, "Love between two equals would be an enrichment, each enlarging himself through the other: instead of being one, locked in the cell of himself with only his own experience and view, he could participate in the existence of another – an extra window on the world." (Firestone, 1970:128). To put it differently, love is love when there are equal gains on both sides, and when equally is free on both sides. The fact that women give into closing themselves off in the name of love, means love is merely another name for the exploitation of women. On the other hand, Zeynep Kaçar tells us that even in literature the male perspective is predominant given that woman's feelings and how/what she feels is indescribable (Candan, 2014: 48). Here, radical feminists fight for equality by claiming that it is a different trap for the exploitation of the female body within the institution of marriage and even love.

1b- Zeynep Kaçar

In the wake of the feminist movements of the 1980s, feminist theatre in Turkey has begun to be established since the 1990s. The first feminist theater founded by university students was called *Kadın Tiyatrosu / Women's Theater* (1992). Its aim was to raise awareness of women's rights, whereupon it remained active until 2007. Another theatrical institution, this time formed by the banding together of a group of neighborhood women, is *Tiyatro Öteyüz / Other Face Theatre*. Although this group does not admit itself to being a part of the feminist theater, it nevertheless deals with topics surrounding only the lives of women. In the professional sense, the first feminist theater was established in Istanbul by Zeynep Kaçar and Jale Karabekir, whereby their first play was a feminist adaptation of the story of *Ferhat and Şirin*. In 2008, Zeynep Kaçar founded

Bab-1 Tiyatro and has contributed a great deal of work to this day. In Turkey, moreover, these communities are of tremendous value in terms of their being the country's first feminist theater companies.

Kaçar, who is an actor, director, and critic, was born in Bursa in 1972. In 1999, she successfully completed her studies dramaturgy and theatre criticism. Since 2007 to the present day, as a prolific playwright, she has written nearly 15 plays. Moreover, her works have been translated into English and Chinese, as well as performed throughout Europe. In 2010, she was awarded the *Övgüye Değer Oyun Yazarı Ödülü / Playwright of Distinction Award*, as well as the *En İyi Oyun Ödülü / Award for Best Play* in 2011 for her play *Krem Karamel / Creme Caramel*. In her plays, we see that the problems of women are revealed from both ironic as well as realistic angles.

In her play *'Şimdi Uçuşa Geçiyoruz' / 'And now we are now flying'*, she, just as Angela Carter did in *Bloody Chamber*, uses happily-ever-after love tales through fairy-tale characters. However, when Kaçar's Snow White, Cinderella, Little Red Riding Hood, and Sleeping Beauty begin to live in the real world, Kaçar casts the very existence of fairytale-like love lives into doubt. In *Cream Caramel*, Kaçar through sharp language, criticizes women being stuck, as well as criticizes the roles imposed both on woman alongside on the men who are trying to save her. In *Mekruh Kadınlar Mezarlığı / The Cemetery of Abominable Women*, the female character of Ceren, the victim of an honor killing, is unjustly murdered by her brother because of gossip and the village rejects her funeral to be buried in the village cemetery. She, like her mother, as well as a theatre woman who is raped to death, are all buried in an isolated, far off cemetery. At the end of the play, Ceren's friend tells the grandchildren both the real story as well of how she wishes to be buried in the same cemetery as her friend. In this play, Kaçar faces her audience with the reality of the oppression of women and the fact

that the woman is subjected to torture. In *Var Olmayan Ayşe'nin Muhteşem Maceraları / The Amazing Adventures of Absent Ayşe*, Kaçar reveals how women are created within the patriarchal system. She talks of a silent woman who is groomed in terms of how a woman should behave, how she should dress, and how even she should sing, all in order to please the likes of men. In *Id-Ego ve Süper Kahraman / Id, Ego & Superego* Kaçar this time, against the grain of her plays, puts the spotlight on a man. In a rather humorous way, she shows how male-centric world turns to the audience. In her play *Tok / Full*, she exposes how the female body is consumed by using the theme of brutality.

In Kaçar's first and only novel to date, *Kabuk / Shell*, the inner-world of women takes center stage again. Her common female characters relay to us their thoughts, dreams, despair, the things they wish to forget, and how they have been exposed to physical violence at the hands of men; in short, they speak of whatever comes to their mind.

In almost all of Kaçar's plays, she tries to reflect the patriarchal system in the eyes of women by using a simple and rather ironic language. Therefore, the main theme of her plays is women. Kaçar explicitly states this fact as well. ²"I wish to convey what a woman is really thinking and feeling while she is sitting and splitting beans, doing the laundry, doing everyday chores. What is behind her real world? When we gaze at it from the outside, what are our mothers or women in our lives thinking about? What is going on while they're doing these things?" (Candan, 2014: 38). In her theatre, Kaçar deals with the working woman in the community, or the house woman, with her traditions and customs, alongside the judgments and abuse that she is exposed to. Her aim is to create female literature by destroying the male point of view present in both novels and theatre throughout history until the present day. This is very much in line with the French feminist writer Hélène Cixous' call to all women, "write with your white ink".

1c - Sarah Kane

In the 1990s, there was an explosion of young writers and, of course, plays in British Theater. These playwrights carry the capitalist society, what is hidden from the society, and the unspoken, into the theater, thereby bringing the audience face to face with reality. This period was dubbed by Alex Sierz as *In-Yer-Face*, and by Morton Gottlieb as *Cool Britannia*. According to Sierz, included within this new wave of writers and writing was Sarah Kane, Mark Ravenhill, Simon Stephen, Martin Crimp, and Anthony Neilson.

Sarah Kane (1971 - 1999) was brought up in Essex and graduated from the University of Bristol with a degree in Drama. Through five dramas that she had written, she still, even after her death, is considered to be a successful avant-garde playwright. In Sierz's view, "Kane's work can be explored from a variety of new perspectives, ones which question the established approaches to the appreciation of her work" (Sierz, 2012: 134). In her first and most criticized play *Blasted*, upon being staged at the Royal Court Theatre in 1995, Kane attracted tremendous attention both positively and negatively, because of the theme of violence as well as through her use of brutal language. *Phaedra's Love* (1996), which is based on Seneca's *Phaedra* is the adaptation of a classic drama into a contemporary context with her brutal language, alongside elements of violence and sexual content. In *Cleansed* (1998), Kane uses the theme of love and her play has been interpreted many times in terms of its gender politics. *Crave* (1988), however, shows a significant change in Kane's style. In *Crave*, Kane reduces the themes of violence and sexuality to a minimum. She replaces the characters' names with letters of the alphabet (i.e. A, B, C), which reminds post-dramatic theater. *4.48 Psychosis* (2000) is her last play, which "will always have the dubious honour of carrying the legacy of her life, and inevitably, her death" (Sierz, 2012:128). A year after Kane committed suicide, *Psychosis* which is an open-ended play about mental illness. What is more, critics often try to find traces from Kane's life and the inner workings of her mind there within her last play.

In Elaine Aston's book *Feminist views on the English Stage 1990 - 2000*, she critiques Kane's works, suggestion that they are "a new perspective to the Butler style of 1990s gender philosophizing, one that contests the 'normalizing' forces through which the sexes are kept in place, by making us feel the violence of the symbolic masculine" (Aston, 2003: 80-1). In this respect, Kane's avant-garde feminist style, which includes more violent themes, differs from other women's writing.

2- TOK / FULL

The play *Tok / Full*, starring both Tolga Çıklacıftçı and Zeynep Kaçar, hit stages in 2017 under the direction of Ümit Çıtak. Kaçar claims that ³"*Tok/Full* discusses the relationship between women/men, justice/crime, and power/mass in an abstract world. Just like our modern era... One that is both savage and ironic" (<http://banubaskaya.com/tok-elestiri-yazisi/>). She obviously advocates that she does not hesitate to use the theme of violence in the play because violence is one of the irrepressible issues of our age for her. While Hami Çağdaş praised the play, exclaiming that: ⁴"Both Kaçar's subject, as well as textual dynamics, are extraordinarily successful..." (<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/kitap-sanat/herkes-oldurebilir-sevdigini-40404897>), Banu Başkaya criticizes the play, telling that ⁵"You leave the play having no sense of time or place resting firmly in your mind, you are unable to determine whether the won judging her is society or herself,

² The citation is translated by me. The original one is Turkish. "Bir kadın fasulye ayıklarken, çamaşır yıkarken ya da bizim gördüğümüz çok sıradan işleri yaparken, onun ardındaki dünyada neler düşünüyor, neler hissediyor, bunu anlatmak istiyorum. O dünyanın ardında ne var ve biz dışarıdan baktığımızda, annemiz ya da hayatımızdaki kadınlar ne düşünüyorlar bütün bunları yaparken, kafalarından neler geçiyor, neler yaşıyor" (Candan, 2014: 38).

³ "TOK soyut bir dünyada kadın/erkek, adalet/suç, iktidar/kitle ilişkilerini tartışmaya açıyor. Çağımız gibi... Hem vahşi, hem ironik..." (<http://banubaskaya.com/tok-elestiri-yazisi/>)

⁴ "Kaçar'ın bulduğu konu ve metni işleyişi çok başarılı..." (<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/kitap-sanat/herkes-oldurebilir-sevdigini-40404897>)

⁵ "Oyundan zamanı ve mekanı kafanızda oturtmadığınız, yargılayanın toplum mu, kişinin kendisi mi yi anlayamadığınız, dekor ve rejideki kurguları anlamlandıramadığınız pek çok ayrıntılarla oyundan ayrıntılı olarak yararlanırsunuz" (<http://banubaskaya.com/tok-elestiri-yazisi/>)

and moreover, you're unable to make any sense of the decor or the stage direction." (<http://banubaskaya.com/tok-estiri-yazisi/>). The one-act play consists of two characters, ADAM (English MAN), who is the antagonist, and KADIN (English WOMAN). Kaçar avoids using personal names to refer to her characters, instead opting for more generic terms reflecting male and female---KADIN and ADAM. ADAM is also known religiously speaking as being the first male. In this sense, Kaçar draws attention to the fact that the inequality between women and men has existed since genesis. Another noteworthy character who does not have a role in the play is ADAM's deceased wife. The conversation between KADIN, who is a judge, and ADAM, who comes to defend himself, is really enthusiastic. ADAM starts to talk about his dead wife and eating every part of his body with exhilarating pleasure. But he still doesn't admit that he is guilty because his wife did not resist. According to him, there is an important reason for everything he does. Kaçar reveals through the character of ADAM that men cannot accept women who are superior to them and shows their ambitious attempts at destroying the female body. The character of KADIN continuously shoves ADAM into a corner, so to speak, forces him to confess his crime, only to succumb at the end. Thus, Kaçar draws up a female profile through KADIN and wife of ADAM, who succumb to male hegemony and to their dirty games, even though they are well aware of the dirty games of patriarchy.

On the other hand, ADAM is a character who could not find employment upon graduating from a vocational school. After three years, he applies to a company, whereupon he and his wife met during a job interview. Even if the man is well aware of how poor, ugly and uneducated he is, he also realizes that his to-be wife is a beautiful, well-educated, and kind woman. However, he also knows how to attract women who are superior to him in every sense. He cleverly recites poems in order to woo his wife and tries to win her heart by playing the poor me role. According to ADAM;

⁶“ADAM This is the biggest problem that strong women have. They appear completely inaccessible; however, they are so in need of being reached that they immediately throw themselves at the first man who understands this. Very few men can ever reach that poor, hungry girl lying within that strong woman.” (Kaçar, 2017: 66-67).

According to ADAM, it does not matter how well educated and superior to many a man, a woman is always weak. Therefore, he likens her to a ⁷“poor girl” (Kaçar, 2017: 67) and an unprotected “bird”. There are two types of men; the first group is ⁸“Men who fear beautiful women” (Kaçar, 2017: 69), these men never have a relationship with beautiful women, and the second group is courageous and cunning men who have great ability of convincing women. ADAM who belongs to the second category convinces his beautiful manager to marry.

De Beauvoir says that “It has been said that marriage diminishes man, which is often true; but almost always it annihilates woman” (De Beauvoir, 1989: 322). As De Beauvoir has also pointed out that marriage is unfavorable for women, in *Tok*, Kaçar pairs marriage with negative attributes such as violence, unhappiness, and despair, too. In the play, ADAM continuously repeats that he is less skilled and less attractive than his wife, and knows that the only way for him to have a woman and her body is through marriage. According to him, marriage literally means placing a woman in the cage and possessing her. That is why he constantly summons her as his “masterpiece” and emphasizes that he owns her. Moreover, marriage is not enough for ADAM. To possess her properly, he consumes both his wife's soul and body day after day. He advocates:

⁹ADAM: Not a day passed when I didn't feel like a fly on a piece of shit in her presence. But, she was mine anyway. What could I, a worthless, puny, stamped over man give a woman like her? (Kaçar, 2017: 71-72)

ADAM repeats throughout the play that he consumed her body not because he loved her, but because he felt worthless loser in her presence. For him this is the biggest defense against KADIN, the reason for justifying himself. As he did for his wife before, he plays the “innocent puppy” (Kaçar, 2017: 67) role in front of the judge as well. So, he claims he is innocent. When KADIN asks him why he did not marry someone who is equal to his level, he responds:

¹⁰ADAM: A ghetto who will turn into a fat pig in three years, and who will consume the rest of my days with her petty ambitions? (Kaçar, 2017: 72).

In this sense, ADAM is aware of the injustice he has made to his wife. Before his wife gets the upper hand on him, he consciously and willingly starts to consume his wife's body. That is why there is no meaning the fact that his wife sacrifices her body to him.

According to the patriarchal system, the first task of a woman is to service her husband's needs and to reproduce. The reproductive body is one of the woman's most important features. The woman who has no reproductive body is excluded and humiliated. On the other hand, to be reproductive is just a duty for women. ADAM asks his wife “and what was it you gave me?” (Kaçar, 2017:77), and his wife responds “a child” (Kaçar, 2017: 77), ADAM retorts:

¹¹ADAM A child! Oh, that's just lovely! Together we made something that no one else can make. A child! Even cats, dogs, and rats spawn! Hah, a child (Kaçar, 2017: 77).

⁶ “ADAM Güçlü kadınların en büyük sorunu budur. O kadar ulaşılmaz görünür ama o kadar ulaşılmaya muhtaçtırlar ki, bunu anlayan ilk erkeğe hemen teslim olurlar. Çok az erkek güçlü bir kadının içinde ki o zavallı ve aç kıza ulaşabilir.” (Kaçar, 2017: 66-67).

⁷ “zavallı bir kıza” (Kaçar, 2017: 67)

⁸ “güzel kadınlardan korkan erkekler” (Kaçar, 2017: 69)

⁹ “ADAM Onun yanında kendimi bir bok sineği gibi hissetmeden geçirdiğim bir günüm bile olmadı. Ama o benimdi yine de. Ben, değersiz küçük ezik adam, her şeyi olan bir kadına ne verebilirdi?” (Kaçar,2017: 71-72)

¹⁰ “ADAM Üç yıl içinde şişko bir domuza dönüşüp, küçük hırslarıyla ömrümü yiyip bitirecek bir kenar mahalle kıızıyla mı?” (Kaçar, 2017: 72).

In this sense, to have a reproductive body in the patriarchal system is only not to be excluded so, the female body has to be productive. Furthermore, she is also responsible for her child being normal or abnormal. The character ADAM mentions that his child is 'strange' (Kaçar, 2017: 83), and therefore he confesses that he ate his child as well. His wife leaves work because of her pregnancy. When she expresses the desire to return back to work, ADAM says that he wants to divorce, and accuses his wife of being ungrateful. Besides, he puts psychological pressure on her and gets what he wants. When they are happy, ADAM eats a part of his wife. Kaçar, ironically, combines the consumption of the female body with the man's sense of pleasure. That is why ADAM consumes a bit of his wife every time he feels happy. The female judge, KADIN, upon asking ADAM why would do such a thing, he replies:

¹²ADAM: For some reason I never could feel satisfied. She was mine, she was my wife. But didn't she always look down on me? I was losing my mind. To possess her. For to literally be mine... (Kaçar, 2017: 77)

ADAM begins to eat his wife in order to possess her entire body, but then he notices it is not enough. Not only does he want control over her body, but he also wants full control over her soul as well. A woman's love is not enough for her. Everything that his wife sacrifices for him is not enough to satisfy his ambition. What he wants his wife is to "worship me, quiver she looked at me, and to genuinely like whatever it was she did for me" (Kaçar, 2017: 77). Without hesitating ADAM admits that he physically harms his wife's body and says;

¹³ADAM Beatings makes you feel guilty. Whether you are guilty or not... you're only going to be even more squashed, guiltier, and even more insubordinate. You're a victim and you want revenge (Kaçar, 2017: 80).

ADAM knows that physical violence will not only harm the woman's body, but also her psychology as well. In fact, his only purpose is to create a loser and ugly slave out of his powerful, beautiful, and intelligent wife. Since, MAN, like all other males, does not want a woman to be superior to him. That's why he does everything to make her subordinate. According to ADAM, a woman has no intelligence, and a woman remains only as a 'doll' (Kaçar, 2017: 82) with a beautiful body. For this reason, ADAM insults KADIN's intelligence and he is obviously unable to tolerate her superior position. He confesses:

¹⁴ADAM: There is always a sugar daddy behind every woman's curtain or else, I dunno, legal work isn't the kind of thing that could possibly overload some mannequin's, some doll's mind. (Kaçar, 2017: 82)

Kaçar, through ADAM character, reveals what most men generally think about a woman's intelligence and body. In the patriarchal world, the "other" cannot possess a mind so a woman's body is the only important thing to be consumed. For this reason, he can neither tolerate his successful and a beautiful wife nor can he tolerate the beautiful and brilliant judge who is in a superior position to himself. On top of that, ADAM's eating one of his wife's hands, her pinky finger, and her breasts is not enough for him. At last, he decides to cut her hair as well. He explains;

¹⁵ADAM... She had a silver, artificial hand in place of her left hand, one matching the pinky on her right hand. She was able to camouflage her boobs with silicone bras. So, from the outside, she looked even better than before. Whenever we went out together, she caused jaws to drop. It was that point that I couldn't take it anymore. I couldn't take her always, and I mean always, being beautiful. Maybe if I cut, her hair... (Kaçar, 2017: 87-88)

ADAM, who was unable to accept that she is still more beautiful in her physical form, finally cuts her arms and eats them. Moreover, Kaçar puts forth that women play with their bodies, not for themselves, but for the patriarchal society. According to Wollstonecraft, "to preserve beauty, woman's glory!" (Wollstonecraft, 1988: 55). Although the man's wife's body is ever so gradually consumed, she still tries to obey the patriarchal beauty rules. Actually, she does what she has been taught.

ADAM's wife does not have the strength to resist so she prefers to keep silent. As a result, she becomes totally dependent on ADAM. Now without ADAM, she cannot eat or drink. Furthermore, she becomes a real slave that he can ¹⁶"hug, slap, and love when he so pleases" (Kaçar, 2017: 90). Nevertheless, this does not mean that he owns all of her body. When she tries to escape from him, he cuts off both her legs and delectably eats them. And ADAM's inflicted torture does not finish as she is alive. There is only one heart left to give, and when ADAM asks for her heart, she willingly agrees to give it to him. Since this is the only way the woman will be able to put a stop to her suffering. It is for this reason that ADAM does not see himself as being guilty of anything, because his wife intentionally agrees to give him her heart. For, he creates a 'masterpiece' and consumes it himself.

¹¹ "ADAM Çocuk! Aman ne güzel! Kimsenin yapamadığını yapmışız birlikte. Bir çocuk! Kediler, köpekler, fareler bile yapıyor çocuk! Çocukmuş. (Kaçar, 2017: 77).

¹² "ADAM Bir türlü tatmin olmuyordum. Benimdi, karımdı. Ama o hep tepeden bakan tavrı yok mu? Deliriyordum. Ona sahip olmak. Tam anlamıyla benim olması..."(Kaçar, 2017: 77).

¹³ "ADAM ... Dayak suçlu hissetmenize neden olur. Bir suçunuz olsun olmasın... git gide daha ezik, daha suçlu, daha isyankar olursunuz. Mağdursunuzdur ve intikam almak istersiniz." (Kaçar, 2017: 80).

¹⁴ "Hep bir cici baba vardır perde arkasında. Yoksa böyle ne bileyim, vitrin mankeni, süs bebeği gibi bir karının aklının ereceği şeyler değildir hak hukuk işleri" (Kaçar, 2017:82)

¹⁵ "ADAM ... Sol elinin yerine gümüş bir takma el yaptırmıştı, sağ elinin serçe parmağıyla uyumlu. Memelerini silikonlu sutyenlerle kamufle edebiliyordu. Yani dışarıdan bakıldığında eskisinden bile güzel görünüyordu. Ne zaman birlikte biryerlere gitsek, herkes ona hayranlıkla bakıyordu... Artık dayanamıyordum. Bu kadar güzel olması, hala ve hala hala... hep güzel olması. Belki saçlarını kesersem..."(Kaçar, 2017: 87-88).

¹⁶ "istediği zaman sarılıp, tokat atıp, ya da sevebileceği" (Kaçar, 2017: 90).

KADIN, who is listening to his whole story, decides that ADAM is guilty and declares that he is ¹⁷"arrogant, sly, and despicable" (Kaçar, 2017: 94). However, at the end of the play, ADAM also wants KADIN's heart. Even if she refuses his will, she cannot escape him. At that point, the scene gets dark. When the lights go on again, the audience sees ¹⁸"a bloody heart on a table" (Kaçar, 2017: 95). ADAM takes her place and fully possesses both her body and her life. Finally, Kaçar ends the play with a violent scene and identifies the consequences of the patriarchal system's oppression on women bodies through violence.

3- PHAEDRA'S LOVE

"Some writers choose to adapt a classic as a way of taking a rest from their own inner demons. Not so Kane" (Sierz, 2001:107). Kane modernizes a classic piece of drama using a hamburger, television, and potato chips. Samantha Marlowe, upon watching Kane's self-directed play, *Phaedra's Love*, in 1996, notes "Kane challenges theatrical conventions in a witty, intelligent and mischievous fashion" (qt. Sierz, 2001: 108), thus she praising it as being a tremendously successful adaptation. On the other hand, Kate Basset comments on the play in terms of both its subject and language as being marginal, remarking "speech is terse, truncated. Violence does not reach us by word of mouth. It is in our faces, almost literally as the cast thwack between clumps of seats" (qt. Sierz, 2001: 108). In this sense, Bassett connects Kane's extraordinary play to success in using violence. When *Phaedra's Love* is interpreted from a feministic angle, one sees that Kane exhibits two different male perspectives on the female body. The first one is Hippolytus's, Theseus's son, perception of the female body, whilst the other is Theseus's own perception of the female body.

The play begins with the depiction of Hippolytus's disorganized room, filled with empty candy wrappers, and unwashed socks and underwear. Hippolytus is seen while watching a film and eating hamburgers. Then, he starts to masturbate on the scene where the film shows a violent scene. When he finished, he continues to eat his hamburger. Kane reveals Hippolytus as an indifferent character who is able to masturbate while watching the TV film's most violent scene. In the second scene, the Doctor and Phaedra appear while talking about Hippolytus's depressive state. The beautiful Phaedra marries the powerful Theseus, and hence becomes the stepmother of Hippolytus. In order to rescue Hippolytus from his unhappy and melancholic state, the Doctor suggests that he should find himself a hobby and to clean himself up, and then suddenly he asks Phaedra whether she has sexual intercourse with Hippolytus. Upon responding to this question negatively, Phaedra reminds him that she is married and Hippolytus is just his son. In the meantime, we learn that Phaedra has not seen her husband ever since the two got married and Hippolytus is her best friend. In the third scene, whilst Phaedra's daughter's Strophe and Phaedra are indulged in conversation, it becomes apparent that Phaedra is in love with her stepson, even though Strophe reminds her that she and Hippolytus should not be together in any way which is out of accordance with tradition, Phaedra rejects social traditions and the social order exclaiming that 'he's not my son' (Kane, 2008: 67). While Phaedra's love for Hippolytus burns, Strophe tells her that he is useless and 'shitless' (Kane, 2008: 66).

Strophe Mother. If someone were to find out.

Phaedra Can't deny something this big.

Strophe He's not nice to people when he's slept with them. I've seen him.

Phaedra Might help me get over him.

Strophe Treats them like shit.

Phaedra Can't switch this off. Can't crush it. Can't. Wake up with it, burning me.. (Kane, 2008: 67).

Strophe warns her mother that to Hippolytus, sexual activity has no meaning, and that after he consumes her body for his own personal pleasure, and that she will treat him like absolute dirt. However, in spite of these cautions, Phaedra nevertheless wants to go against the grain of the social order in order to be with Hippolytus claiming she is in love with him, even if it means putting her own life in danger. Strophe, regardless, warns her mother repeatedly, and finally decides upon rescuing her from Hippolytus. This decision is one that is instantaneous, because in Scene Four, Phaedra visits Hippolytus for his birthday with a bunch of gifts in her hands. Out of the blue, Hippolytus asks his stepmother when she last had sex, and repeats, as though he is sick and tired of the rules imposed on him by society, that "everyone wants a royal cock, I should know... or a royal cunt if that's your preference (Kane, 2008: 69)". Hippolytus also complains about the general situation. He does not care about the gifts that come on his birthday, and he deems that there are bigger problems in the world such as rape and murder than his doomed life. In fact, he treats the palace and his royal family as 'shit' (Kane, 2008: 73), and tries to live by doing what he's been taught. "Hippolytus I know what you meant. You're right. Women find me much more attractive since I've become fat. They think I must have a secret...I'm fat. I'm disgusting. I'm miserable. But I get lots of sex..."(Kane, 2008: 73). Indeed, Hippolytus is aware of what he is, and how he is perceived by others. Although his royalty affects people especially women, Hippolytus treats them like dirt with all his brutality. This is Hippolytus only exists to kill time. He believes that he has no life and he is jealous of some people who have a lover and enjoy life. In other words, Hippolytus does not like social order and its judgments, and because he finds them meaningless, he tries to continue his life in a depressive state without any purpose. Phaedra eventually confesses her love to Hippolytus. Hippolytus warns Phaedra many times; and out of despising herself, she beings perform oral sex on him. However; Hippolytus continues to watch television without any reaction and then eats candies. According to Bonnie Burstow, "Traditionally woman's pleasure is seen as irrelevant, undesirable, uncomely" (Burstow, 1992:4).

¹⁷ ""kibirli, düzenbaz, aşâğılık" (Kaçar, 2017: 94).

¹⁸ "masada kanlı bir kalp" (Kaçar, 2017: 95).

Hippolytus, in fact, does not care about Phaedra's sense of satisfaction while Phaedra offers him her body without a second thought. Phaedra remains silent for a period and then begins to cry;

Phaedra I did it because I'm in love with you.

Hippolytus Don't be. I don't like it.

Phaedra I want this to happen.

Hippolytus No you don't.

Phaedra I do....

Hippolytus You enjoyed that?

Phaedra I want to be with you.

Hippolytus But did you enjoy it? No. You hate it as much as me if only you'd admit it. (Kane, 2008: 77).

Hippolytus openly opposes Phaedra, saying that there is no such thing as love; what is more, sexual intercourse between them does not actually appeal to Phaedra. Hence, Hippolytus tells Phaedra that she should re-think. Kane describes Hippolytus as being a different person beyond the boundaries of the social order. Even the father-son solidarity within the patriarchal system is not seen between Theseus and Hippolytus. Theseus, who watches his son's death and stabs him, says: "Son. I never liked you" (Kane, 2008: 96) so he expresses that he is different from his son. In the patriarchal system, the consumption of the female body is reflected as a desire within woman and man. However, by advocating the opposite, Hippolytus says that neither he nor Phaedra enjoys sexuality. In fact, he admits that the women he has slept with are like 'victims' (Kane, 2008: 83) for him. Besides, Phaedra does what she has been taught and serves her own body to make Hippolytus happy, just as patriarchal system desires. Hippolytus, on the other hand, is aware of the rules of the society and warns Phaedra to become aware of this, however, he is unsuccessful. For Hippolytus, sex is only a 'boring' (Kane, 2008: 79) action. Moreover, Strophe, after her mother commits suicide, upon asking Hippolytus whether or not he had sex with her mother, Hippolytus ignores it and looks around for other reasons. Phaedra forces Hippolytus to be with her again, however, he continuously puts her down. Hippolytus confesses that he had a sexual relationship with her daughter, Strophe, in order to take advantage of Strophe's experience. Phaedra, in shock, yet again confesses her love for him, exclaiming "Phaedra: You burn me, Hippolytus Now you've had me, fuck someone else" (Kane, 2008: 79). Hippolytus, in fact, puts forward how men entirely negatively view women. For him, having a female body as valuable until it meets his needs and that it has no other worth--just as patriarchal society has taught him. Hence, Phaedra presents her body as a birthday present to Hippolytus; however, Hippolytus was brutally violent, before leaving the room he asks Phaedra "Do I get my present now?", again showing Phaedra one more time how worthless the female body is. Just as Phaedra is about to leave the room, Hippolytus admits to her that he has gonorrhoea.

Hippolytus Hate me now?

Phaedra (tries to speak. A long silence. Eventually) No. Why do you hate me?

Hippolytus Because you hate yourself. (Kane, 2008: 80)

Hippolytus tells us that Phaedra does not, in fact, really value herself or her body. Actually, according to Hippolytus, Phaedra's hatred for her own body is the reason why she is invisible. Phaedra eventually eliminates herself by committing suicide and leaving a note that Hippolytus raped her as a memorable birthday present. Strophe approaches Hippolytus in order to learn what happened and tells Hippolytus to escape because they are going to lynch him for raping his mother. Hippolytus ignores this, and when he realizes that death is upon him, he says "Life at last," pointing to how unhappy his life is. After Hippolytus is captured, he is thrown into the cell. He doesn't care what the priest says, who has come to forgive him, whereupon he accepts his own guilt. Just as the police wind their way through a hate-filled crowd, Hippolytus escapes from them by throwing his body into the public. All gathered men and women begin to shatter Hippolytus's body with great hatred. Theseus, who is among the audience, splits him up in half with a knife full of hatred. At the end of the play, some parts of Hippolytus's body are thorn away and some of them are eaten by vultures, whereupon Hippolytus closes his eyes peacefully in order to live the life he wants.

In a patriarchal system, Kane, through the character of Theseus, deals with how the female body is consumed and destroyed in a different way. Theseus left Phaedra alone after their marriage, and he only comes to see her at her funeral. Standing next to her corpse, Theseus "tears at his clothes, then skin, then hair, more and more frantically until he is exhausted. But he does not cry" (Kane, 2008: 92). As a husband in grief, Theseus acts how he is supposed to behave by society, but he does not show his real emotions sincerely. He enters among the crowd of people in disguise and praises them for killing his son. Strophe is also among those in disguise. When Strophe shouts at the people not to harm Hippolytus, Theseus pulls Strophe aside and rapes her in front of everyone, so he consumes her body mercilessly. Strophe pays a heavy price for opposing the patriarchal power. Besides, the other people praise his actions through a round of applause instead of saving her. Kane obviously indicates the brutality of patriarchal order and the merciless consumption of the female body. At the end, when Theseus finishes what he is doing, he violently "cuts her throat (Kane, 2008: 95). However, Theseus becomes horrified when he notices that the woman he just raped and killed is Strophe with who he had sexual intercourse before. When he realizes that he is the only one left in his family, Theseus kills himself; here Kane finishes the play with a justifiable end.

CONCLUSION

Micheline Wandor, a critic, claims that "the important plays on important themes tend to be identified in the work of male playwrights, with the occasional token woman to mollify the dominant bias" (Wandor, 1981: 247). Unlike Wandor, both Kane and Kaçar take women at the center of their plays. Rather than reflecting the men's point of view, they express what women think and feel, how they should behave as well as how the system transforms them into slaves. Thus, both authors make valuable contributions to feminist literature.

In *Phaedra*, Kane indicates the female body as a sexual object from two different angles through the characters of Hippolytus and his father Theseus. Hippolytus thinks differently from the patriarchal system, but his relationship with Phaedra and Strophe is still in line with the demands of patriarchal society. Actually, his relationship with women means nothing to him. Even after Phaedra confesses her love for Hippolytus, Hippolytus warns her that there is no such thing as love and claims that Phaedra does not love herself. Nevertheless, Phaedra does not hesitate to present her body as she is taught by the patriarchal system in order to win his love. However, she is upset by Hippolytus' insensitivity. On the other hand, Kane, through Theseus, shows exactly how the patriarchal system has destroyed the female body. Theseus who plays a major role in his son's death, hates his son, Hippolytus, because he is different from him. Besides, upon marrying Phaedra, he never sees her again. He even has a sexual relationship with Phaedra's daughter, Strophe. In this sense, Kane tells us that for Theseus the female body is only an object which is worthless. Theseus, who considers Strophe as a woman from the crowd who opposes to his line of thinking, relentlessly rapes Strophe in front of everyone and kills her. When he realizes what he did, it is too late. Theseus shows no regret while torturing and eliminating a woman's body. At the end of the play, Theseus kills himself and Kane pushes her audience to think about the consuming bodies in the patriarchal system.

In Kaçar's *Tok*, she points out how the bodies of women are consumed. Even though her female characters are economically independent and successful, they are defeated by the patriarchal system. According to Ramazanoğlu, women are "19th sisters who are suppressed in this universe which is owned and controlled by men" (Ramazanoğlu, 1989: 13). Respectfully, as Kaçar herself mentions, women experience violence, and even though they are able to work, they are expected to give birth and look after children. In fact, in *Tok*, Kaçar reveals how the patriarchal system works against women from different angles. Woman's intelligence and fertility are underestimated many times over, whereupon the importance of her beauty is emphasized. In fact, Kaçar goes even further to say that the violence inflicted upon women, especially by the patriarchal order is nothing more than a theory that aims to subject women and create losers. This is because the system cannot stand the woman having the upper hand over the man. The male character marries the owner of a company that he had previously worked at. Before long, he completely replaces her. However, because of his dissatisfaction and the drive to destroy anything stronger than himself, he eats his wife's body. Thus, he possesses both her body and her strength. Nothing satisfies him. Moreover, he destroys the female judge, who is more powerful than her at the end of the play. As a result, both women's bodies are consumed within the patriarchal structure, and this depletion is combined with the theme of violence by the playwright.

²⁰ "Not only do men use concepts of authority (in reference to women) such as the state, the law, and the military in order to exert their power over women, but they also rest to more 'innocent' concepts such as love, 'wombed' and 'natural' in order to describe family and sexuality. That's why Female Liberation opts for reversing these concepts" (Ayşe, 1989: 2). Both Kaçar and Kane use the theme of love and marriage as they describe how the female body is crushed, and both reveal neither love nor innocence is as innocent as they seem. On the other hand, in both *Tok/Full* and *Phaedra*, the authors did choose strong female characters. Phaedra, Strophe, KADIN, and the wife of ADAM (who is not involved in the play) are all socially strong women. While Kane adapts a drama written in the year 1000 B.C. into the twentieth century, she also brings the theme of violence to the forefront. Likewise, Kaçar uses a symbolic name such as ADAM(MAN) in order to emphasize that the oppression and torture on the woman's body throughout the years and she unites it with violence theme, too. In both plays, the institution of marriage is seen as a common area where men dominate women, and women's bodies are consumed under the name of love. While in Kane's play both men and women disappear under the oppression of patriarchy, in *TOK*, the patriarchal structure wins.

In order to be free, a woman must completely have the power of her own body. However, even though we are in the twenty-first century, both Kaçar and Kane make us consider that women are trapped within their own bodies.

References

- Aston, E. (2003). *Feminist Views on the English Stage: 1990-2000*. Cambridge University Press, U.K.
- AYŞE, 1989. "Aptal Dostun Olacağına", *Feminist*, sayı 6.
- Başkaya, B. (31.01.2018). *Tok Eleştirisi* Yazısı. <http://banubaskaya.com/tok-elestiri-yazisi/>.
- Candan, E. (2014). *Türkiye'de Oyun Yazarlığında Eğilimler II, Tiyatro Eleştirilenliği ve Dramaturji (T.E.D.) Bölümü Dergisi / Sayı: 25, 2014/2, 35-73.*
- De Beauvoir, S. (1989). *The Second Sex*. 1949. Trans. and Ed. HM Parshley. New York: Vintage.

¹⁹ "erkeklerin sahip olduğu, control ettiği ve fiziksel olarak baskın olduğu bir dünyada evrensel olarak baskı altında kalmış kız kardeşler". (Ramazanoğlu, 1989:13)

²⁰ "Erkekler kadınların üzerindeki iktidarlarını gerçekleştirmek için yalnızca devlet, hukuk, ordu gibi doğrudan iktidar kavramlarını değil; aşk gibi "masum" kavramları, aile gibi "sığınakları" cinsellik gibi "doğal" işlevleri de kullanıyorlar (onun için) Kadın kurtuluşu böyle alanları, ilişkileri dönüştürmeyi hedefliyor" (Ayşe, 1989: 2)

- Donovan, J. (2012). Feminist theory: The intellectual traditions. A&C Black.
- Bordo, S. (2004). Unbearable weight: Feminism, Western culture, and the body. Univ of California Press.
- Burstow, B. (1992). Radical feminist therapy: Working in the context of violence. Sage Publications, USA.
- Çağdaş, H. (23.03.2017). Herkes Öldürebilir Sevdiğini. <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/kitap-sanat/herkes-oldurebilir-sevdigini-40404897>.
- Çaha, Ö. (1996). Türkiye'de Sivil Toplum ve Kadın. Vadi yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Doğramacı, E. (1989). Türkiye'de Kadının Dünü ve Bugünü. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası
- Dworkin, A. (1974). Woman hating. New York: Dutton.
- Firestone, S. (1970). The dialect of sex. The Case for Feminist Revolution, New York: Morrow.
- Kaçar, Z. (2017). Toplu Oyunları 5: Şimdi Uçuşa Geçiyoruz, Tok. Mitos Boyut.
- Kane, Sarah. (2008). Sarah Kane: Complete Plays: Blasted; Phaedra's Love; Cleansed; Crave; 4.48 Psychosis; Skin (Contemporary Dramatists). Methuen Drama press.
- Lloyd, M. (2007). Judith Butler: From norms to politics (Vol. 20). Polity press, UK.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (Ed.). (1993). Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism. Psychology Press.
- Sedgwick, E.K. (1991). Epistemology of the Closet. Harvester Wheatsheat, London.
- Sierz, A. (2001). In-yer-face theatre: British drama today. Faber & Faber.
- Sierz, A. (2012). Modern British Playwriting: The 1990s: Voices, Documents, New Interpretations. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wandor, Michelene. Carry On. Understudies: Theatre and Sexual Politics. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Wollstonecraft, M. (1988). A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: An Authoritative Text; Backgrounds; The Wollstonecraft Debate. Criticism. Norton Critical, New York.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Dünyadaki bütün eril toplumlarda kadınlar hem bedenlerinin hem de akıllarının sahibi olabilmek için yüzyıllardır savaş vermektedirler. Türkiye'de ve İngiltere'de kadın hakları için belirli ölçüde düzenlemeler getirilmiş olsa da günümüzde kadınlar hala tam olarak eşit haklara sahip olabilmek için mücadele etmektedirler. Hem İngiliz hem de Türk tiyatro yazarlarında kadınların bu mücadelesine oyunlarıyla katkıda bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada hem Türk hemde İngiliz feminist tiyatrosu yazarlarının feminist edebiyata olan katkıları ortaya konulmuştur. Çağdaş Türk Tiyatrosunda önemli bir yere sahip olan Zeynep Kaçar feminist oyunlarıyla kadınların neler yaşadığını, ne hissettiklerini ve ataerkil sistemde maruz kaldıkları baskıyı birçok oyununda dile getirmiştir. Kaçar 2017'de yazmış olduğu Tok isimli oyunu ile kadın bedeninin aşk ve evlilik temaları altında nasıl acımasızca tüketildiğini ortaya koyar. Tek sahnelik oyunda, Kaçar ADAM isimli karakterin kafasında yarattığı hayali bir durumdan bahseder. Böylece erkek bakış açısından, kadının ataerkil sistemde ki yerini seyirciye etkileyici bir şekilde sunar. Oyun ADAM ve KADIN isimli iki karakterin arasında geçer. ADAM, hakim olan KADIN karşısında karısını öldürmek suçundan yargılanır. ADAM her ne kadar karısının organlarını yemiş ve ona fiziksel şiddet uygulamış olsa da karısını öldürdüğünü kabul etmez. Çünkü ADAM'ın bütün yaptığı işkencelerin sebebi karısıdır. Başlangıçta ADAM'ın kendisinden daha başarılı, zengin ve güzel olan karısı, ADAM ile evlendikten sonra çalışmayı bırakır ve ADAM'ın sessiz kölesi haline gelir. Her tartışmadan sonra karısından bir parça kesip yiyen ADAM, sonunda karısının kalbini ister. Ayakları, kolları ve saçları kesik olan kadın gerçek anlamda özgürlüğüne kavuşabilmek için Adam'ın isteğini kabul eder. Bu sebepten Adam karısının ölümünden dolayı suçlu olduğunu kabul etmez. Diğer taraftan kendisinden daha üstün bir pozisyonda olan ve sorularıyla sürekli Adam'ı sıkıştıran Kadın'da, Adam için tehlike arz etmektedir. Ancak oyunun sonunda Adam, güzel ve başarılı olan hakiminden kalbini çıkararak, Kadın'ın yerine geçer. Böylece Kaçar oyununu ataerkil sistemin aç gözlülüğüne ve hırsına yenik düşen başarılı kadınların hazin sonuyla bitirir. Çağdaş İngiliz Tiyatrosunda ise 1990 lara Sarah Kane, şiddet ve cinsellik sahnelerinin baskın olduğu Blasted oyunuyla damgasını vurur. Sadece beş oyun yazmış olmasına rağmen, Kane'nin oyunları feminizm de dahil olmak üzere bir çok açıdan incelenmektedir. Seneca'nın yazmış olduğu Phaedra isimli oyununu Phaedra'nın Aşkını olarak günümüze uyarlayan Kane, seyircisini modernize edilmiş klasik bir oyunla karşı karşıya bırakır. Sürekli çips yiyerek, televizyon izleyen ve hayattan zevk almayan Theseus'un oğlu, Hippolytus, üvey annesi Phaedra'nın kendisine olan aşkını duyduktan sonra cinsel anlamda yaklaşmasına izin verir. Phaedra kendi bedenini aşk adı altında Hippolytus'a sunduktan sonra beklediği yakınlığı göremez ve intihar eder. İlerleyen sahnelerde, Phaedra'nın kızı, Strophe'nin de hem Hippolytus hemde üvey babası Theseus ile ilişkisini öğreniriz. Hippolytus, Phaedra'nın intiharından sonra Phaedra'ya tecavüzden suçlanır ve ölüm ile cezalandırılır. Yaşanılanları duyup gelen Theseus, nefret ettiği oğlunu kurtarmak için hiçbir şey yapmaz hatta oğlunun öldürülmesi için halkı

kışkırtır. Hippolytus' un ölümünü izlemeye gelen halk, polisler tarafından götürülen Hippolytus a saldırır ve Hippolytus'u parçalarlar. Bu sırada onu öldürmemeleri için çılgınlık atan ve kılık değiştirmiş olan Strophe, yine kılık değiştirip halkın içine karışmış olan Theseus tarafından tecavüze uğrar. Kimse Strophe ye yardım etmez hatta Theseus'u destekler ve Theseus, Strophe'yi öldürür. Oğlunun ölümünü izleyen ve Strophe yi öldürdüğünü farkedenden Theseus sonunda kendini de öldürür. Böylece Kane, oyununu adil bir şekilde bitirir. Her iki yazarda, Kane ve Kaçar, oyununda şiddet temalarını kullanarak aşk ve evlilik adı altında tüketilen kadın bedenlerinden bahsederler. Yazarlar her ne kadar güçlü kadın karakterler kullansalar da hiçbiri eril sisteme meydan okuyamaz. Bedenini bir hiç uğruna kullanmaması için Hippolytus Phaedra'yı uyarsada, Phaedra bunu dikkate almaz hatta Hippolytus'un ne dediğini bile tam olarak anlamaz. Çünkü kendisinin en baştan beri öğrendiği şey aşk adı altında kadın bedeninin tüketilmesidir. Hippolytus farklı olan bu düşüncesinden dolayı hem babası tarafından sevilmez hem de eril sistem tarafından nefretle linç edilir. Kane kadın bedeninin cinsel açıdan tüketimini vurgularken, Kaçar ataerkil sistemin güçlü kadın bedenlerini bile nasıl yok ettiğini vurgular. Her iki yazar da evlilik ve aşk temalarını kullanarak ezilen kadın bedenlerini seyircilerine sunarlar. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma hem İngiliz hem de Türk feminist tiyatrosuna değerli katkıları bulunan Kane ve Kaçar'ın oyunlarında kadının eril sistem tarafından tüketilişini ve değersizliğini benzer temalarla nasıl ortaya koyduklarını yorumlar.