

UNKNOWN CHARACTERS AND LOST UNITY: POSTDRAMATIC REFLECTIONS IN MARTIN CRIMP'S *WHOLE BLUE SKY*

Öğr. Gör. Çağlayan DOĞAN

Abstract: This study aims to reveal the postdramatic theatricalities in Martin Crimp's *Whole Blue Sky* (2005). Martin Crimp has been one of the most prolific, controversial and satirical playwrights since his plays were first staged in British theatres in the late 1980s. While his early plays evoke the absurdist tradition, his later plays emphasize innovative theatrical elements labelled in-*yer-face*, postdramatic and New Writing. Considering Crimp's wide-ranging body of work, his distinctive theatrical style is clearly recognizable. Although postdramatic theater is usually associated with theater movements that emerged after the 1990s, it dates back to the theater of Bertold Brecht. For this reason, postdramatic debates are briefly discussed in the Introduction. *Whole Blue Sky* (2005), which is the field of application of this study, is a short play in the collection of *Fewer Emergencies* (2005) and *Face to the Wall* (2005). Moreover, the text in question is completely anonymous and consists of three characters numbered 1, 2 and 3. It is known that character 1 is the only female character in the text. In addition, it is seen that the plot and other traditional principles of theatre evaporate in the play. This study presents an evaluation of Crimp's *Whole Blue Sky* (2005) in terms of postdramatic theatrical features.

Key Words: Martin Crimp, Postdramatic Theatre, Contemporary British Theatre, *Whole Blue Sky*

BİLİNMEYEN KARAKTERLER VE YİTİK BÜTÜNLÜK: MARTIN CRIMP'İN *WHOLE BLUE SKY* OYUNUNDAKİ POSTDRAMATİK YANSIMALAR

Öz: Bu çalışmada Martin Crimp'in *Whole Blue Sky* (2005) adlı oyunundaki postdramatik teatralliklerin ortaya konulması amaçlanmaktadır. Martin Crimp 1980'lerin sonunda oyunlarının İngiliz tiyatrolarında ilk kez sahnelenmesinden bu yana en üretken, tartışmalı ve hicivci oyun yazarlarından biri olmuştur. Yazarın ilk oyunları absürdist geleneği çağrışırsa da, sonraki oyunları in-*yer-face*, postdramatik ve New Writing gibi etiketlerle anılan yenilikçi teatral unsurları ön plana çıkarmaktadır. Crimp'in geniş kapsamlı eserleri göz önüne alındığında, kendine özgü teatral tarzı açıkça fark edilir. Postdramatik tiyatro genellikle 1990'lardan sonra ortaya çıkan tiyatro akımlarıyla ilişkilendirilmesine rağmen Bertold Brecht'in tiyatrosuna kadar uzanmaktadır. Bu nedenle postdramatik tartışmalar Giriş bölümünde öz bir biçimde ele alınmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın uygulama alanı olan *Whole Blue Sky* (2005), *Fewer Emergencies* (2005) ve *Face to the Wall* (2005) oyunlarının derlemesinde yer alan bir kısa oyundur.

ORCID ID : 0000-0001-9596-2998

DOI : 10.31126/akrajournal.1403646

Geliş Tarihi : 12 Aralık 2023 / Kabul Tarihi: 03 Ocak 2024

*Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Bölümü.

Ayrıca söz konusu metin tamamen isimsiz ve 1, 2 ve 3 numaraları ile gösterilen üç karakterden oluşmaktadır. Metinde 1 numaralı karakterin tek kadın karakter olduğu bilinmektedir. Buna ek olarak, oyunda olay örgüsünün ve tiyatronun diğer geleneksel ilkelerinin buharlaştığı görülmektedir. Bu çalışma Crimp'in *Whole Blue Sky* (2005) isimli oyununun postdramatik teatral özellikler açısından değerlendirmesini sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Martin Crimp, Postdramatik Tiyatro, Britanya Çağdaş Tiyatrosu, *Whole Blue Sky*

Introduction

In order to understand the dynamics of postdramatic theatre, it would be appropriate to review traditional dramatic theatre. The ancient Greek word *dran*, meaning to do, is the origin of the English word drama. This term used to refer to poetry written in verse and recited and performed by actors in a quasistage space called the *theatron* (place of vision) (Berton, 2010: 12). Drama is a kind of hybrid form, constituted by both literary and performative principles. In this respect, when the literary side, i.e. the text, is adapted for acting, it is transformed into a theatrical space that has some theatrical characteristics, such as a theatre, a play, characters and an audience. The relationship between the art of drama, which is primarily related to literature, and the art of theatre, which has the characteristics of staging and performance, becomes quite complicated when these terms are arbitrarily used as equivalents for each other. Drama should be used for the literary work that is read, theatre for the stage work that is seen. Theatre construes drama as a term generally applied to the whole text for the theatre, and dramatist as anyone who creates work for the theatre (drama) (Hoad, 2000). Aristotle in his *Poetics* asserts some significant theatrical notions in order to create a tragic action from a mimetic action such as plot, character, intellectual argument (reasoning), language, song and spectacle. In addition, Aristotle points out that tragedy is a theatrical concept described as an imitation of praiseworthy, completed and weighty actions; offering pleasing language; performed by actors; not by means of narration; implementing the purification of such feelings by virtue of pity and fear (Aristotle, 1996: 10).

Another important principle in dramatic theatre is catharsis; if we consider Aristotle's definition of tragedy, it is explicitly seen that catharsis is one of the most essential parts of tragedy. In addition to the imitation of action, tragedy also has some characteristics such as poetic language related to the dramatic instead of narrative representation, affecting circumstances that arouse fear and pity by means of achieving the catharsis of such sensitivities (Aristotle, 1996: 6). This term, which is a key concept for dramatic theatre, is defined as accurately as can be construed with Aristotle's catharsis - which in Greek means purgation or purification (Abrams, 1999: 322). Moreover, in dramatic theatre,

the peripeteia of the action - the point at which the fate of the protagonist is overturned - follows a shrewd realisation (anagnorisis) in the plot. Undoubtedly, this realisation naturally implements the ancient word to know oneself (Rorty, 1992: 12). Thus, the tragic hero will most dramatically evoke both our pity and our fear when he is neither wholly good nor wholly bad, but a mixture of both (Abrams, 1999: 322). As for the tragic effect, it will be solid if the protagonist is better than us, in the sense that he is of higher than typical moral valuation (Abrams, 1999: 322). In this sense, Patrice Pavis describes the framework of dramatic theatre by saying that the spectator is captivated by the action in the scenes and episodes towards denouement. Furthermore, Pavis also describes that dramatic theatre is a type of theatre that has a classical dramaturgy. It refers to realism and naturalism and the structure of the well made to reflect the conventional form of Western theatre (Pavis, 1998: 12). As Pavis points out, dramatic theatre refers to those plays whose structural features were shaped by Aristotelian principles. All dramatic plays have the same structure of exposition, complication, climax and resolution. Hans Thies Lehmann, in his *Tragedy and Dramatic Theatre* (2016), written after his seminal *Postdramatic Theatre* (2006 in English), asserts that:

Classical drama offers just one possibility for the theatre. It does not appear this way only from the perspective of contemporary postdramatic theatre. Through considerations of ancient theatre confirmed and enriched along postdramatic lines, drama also appears as predramatic or as a-dramatic theatre: as a historically specific option that – above and before all else – is structurally limited... inasmuch as it has imposed (and continues to impose) limits on the theatre of which it represents just one form. As a form of the theatre, drama simultaneously stands in convict with the theatre, in which alone it exists (Lehmann, 2016: 12).

Lehmann, here, discusses classical tragedies and dramatic theatre within the scope of postdramatic tendencies in dramatic theatre, and underlines the taxonomy of drama such as predramatic, dramatic, and postdramatic theatre. Lehmann also unveils the significance of performance in postdramatic theatre by criticising the dramatic theatre because of its limitations and hierarchical structures that restrict it as just one form.

Likewise, having its roots in Brechtian theatre, postdramatic theatre brings forward not only new theatrical sensibilities but also criticism on political issues after nineties. In Lehmann's terms, one can mention post-Brechtian theatre that is literally not a theatre that has nothing to do with Brecht. However, it is a theatre that demands and inquiries affect it, thus, it can be asserted that postdramatic theatre comes up with Brecht's plays but can no longer acknowledge Brecht's responses (Lehmann, 2006: 27). Therefore, postdramatic theatre is considered as post Brechtian theatre by prioritizing de-hierarchical

structure, and losing theatrical significance of the text as Lehmann asserted that “Theatre without drama does exist” (2006: 30).

The aim of this study is to examine the postdramatic tendencies in Martin Crimp's *Whole Blue Sky*. This study answers the question of how *Whole Blue Sky* reflects postdramatic theatricalities, how the play represents the principles that are far from dramatic theatre, and how it creates a postdramatic space throughout the play. It first focuses on dramatic and post-dramatic theatre, then looks at postdramatic theatrical signs throughout the play, and the findings are argued in the conclusion.

1. The Features of Postdramatic Theatre

Postdramatic theatre, which has a significant place in contemporary theatre after Lehmann's book *Postdramatic Theatre* (2006), brings together a wide range of theatrical forms by mostly benefiting from Robert Wilson's image theatre in which the action is replaced by a mythic image, narration is replaced by phenomenon, and interpretation is replaced by meditation (Lehmann, 2006: 80). Besides, in Wilson's theatre there is minimal progression, a very different use of time in the form of a continuous present, and indefinable characters (2006: 81). Therefore, postdramatic theatre refers to a non-dramatic theatre in which plays abolish a conventional plot, specific character attributions, and stage directions. In this respect, Vicky Angelaki defines postdramatic theatre as:

The unfolding and blossoming of a potential of disintegration, dismantling and deconstruction within drama itself, what seems to be overlooked is an acknowledgement of the capacity of the dramatic model, in its contemporary manifestation, to achieve precisely the same outcome, through self-reflexive critique (Angelaki, 2012: 13).

Lehmann points out that the theatre is separated from the dramatic text, and it sets aside all fundamentals of traditional dramatic conventions such as the unity of time, space, and action. Rather than these basic elements of dramatic theatre, often in a postdramatic play, spectators are directly addressed, (...). In this way, theatregoers are compelled to reproduce on the essence of the linguistic statements which are suggested as if they were enigmas for them to unravel and to construe (Agusti, 2013: 111). Moreover, since a postdramatic text is a self-reflexive text, the progress of design of the story and characters are brightened to the audience. The story is not explained on the stage but in the heads of the whole spectators including the theatregoers. In other words, it is like vaccinating the story intravenously (Sierz, 2013: 140). Postdramatic theatre extends the concept of drama by aiming to gain new features that associate old and new forms together:

The freedom of interpretation in the auditorium is balanced by a raft of performative rigours involved in resisting representation. While the dramatic theatre has increasingly treated text as a flexible source for a variety of interpretations which go far beyond the imaginings of their writers – modernized Shakespeare is the obvious example but the wealth of possibilities is endless – the postdramatic theatre has to abjure the very methods that have enlivened dramatic theatre over many years (Barnett, 2008: 22).

In postdramatic theatre, theatrical texts, sub-texts, and any one of staging compounds have no hierarchical structures anymore. It is seen that they are equally emphasized. Postdramatic theatre also forces the audience to make reaction to what they receive during the play. That is to say, postdramatic theatre has a lot of signs that disturb the audience, and limit the audience's frequencies by determining a certain blank in their minds. In general, postdramatic theatre abolishes the traditional and comprehensible density of signs, and in place of this, it aims to irritate the traditional unities with the help of performance. In addition to this, Lehmann prioritises the independence of the text from visualisation, from what is logical, and even from the language on the stage. Therefore, this creates different moments, echoes, transfers, and meaning clusters that always remain fragmented. David Barnett explains this by saying that:

... the dialogues *appear* to represent conversations, and this is probably why he views the scenarios as veiled scenes. The apparent naturalism of the language and the clear *allusions* to representation can make the unattributed dashes appear gratuitous or pretentious – why turn normal dialogue into a pointless guessing game? Lehmann remarks that 'postdramatic theatre does not exclude the presence, the taking up, or the continued effectiveness of older aesthetics' – that is, it can critically engage with the dramatic tradition without necessarily using dramatic means (Barnett, 2008: 18).

Similarly, in postdramatic theatre, the language signs and literariness are pushed aside. Audiences are in an empty theatrical space to consciously get this new performative art. As performance is prioritised, the exhibition of the body is totally different from that of dramatic theatre. In postdramatic theatre the body is consciously shown on the stage. The body should reflect the abnormality without any functional or unfunctional benefits. This is predominantly seen in the early twentieth century theatre by featuring nudity, the crazy acts, and sexuality on the stage. For instance, Heiner Müller's *Hamlet Machine*, Mark Ravenhill's *Shopping and F***ing*, Sarah Kane's *Blasted* exhibit these sorts of images on the stage. However, the body features just itself in postdramatic plays.

What is more, in conventional drama, audiences desire to see plays dealing with the subjects of warmer and more emotional relationships such as family and friendship or the conflicts between people's destiny and emotions. How-

ever, in postdramatic theatre, the linguistic signs that lose their meanings, and the structure that breaks the psychological depth create a sort of alienation or in Lehmann's terms, coldness in the audience that is not very common in traditional forms of dramatic theatre.

2. Postdramatic Reflections in *Whole Blue Sky*

Whole Blue Sky (2002) is a playlet consisting of three characters that are totally nameless and indicated with the numbers 1, 2 and 3, and it is known that the number 1 is the only female character. Moreover, the time and place are not certain, and presented as blank. As Clara Escoda Agusti asserts, it (2002) "portrays an upper-middle-class family made up by an absent father, a mother who missed her former, independent life and tormented, scared child called Bobby" (Agusti, 2013: 145). Crimp appeals to domestic violence between genders, and it can be said that in the play Crimp concentrates on the suppressed tensions that form family relationships. As Vicky Angelaki puts it in *The Plays of Martin Crimp: Making Theatre Strange*, the play "centres on the turmoil of ostensibly successful individuals, who consistently define happiness on material terms" (Angelaki, 2012: 140). As it has been seen in the above quotation, the play generally concentrates on contemporary commoditized society that reverberates the pursuit of happiness with bleak and economic issues. In fact, it reproduces three figures' lifestyle by exhibiting these unnamed characters' ostensible success. It can be correspondingly said that the play shows the disintegration of a marriage, in its epiphany of a couple that finds out how the land lies, as it is seen as follow lines:

Haven't they worked? Haven't they struggled to extend this table? Haven't they screamed at each other in private? Punched each other? Haven't they broken each other's skin to open this, for example, bottle of wine?" (Crimp, 2015: 94).

As it is obvious that the unnamed characters symbolize the separation of a marriage with a turbulent life covered by untruth. Crimp generally chooses this kind of topics in terms of one of current problems in society in order to draw contemporary audiences' attention. It should be born in mind that "in *Whole Blue Sky*, Crimp plays with the audience's expectations about how much a writer knows about their own character" (Sierz, 2013: 69) because of ambiguous unspecified character attribution in the play. In doing so, the play abolishes the bounds between text and characters and regular stream of characters' lines in order to make the play far more fragmented and structured in scenic dreamlike performance. In this study, it is aimed to discover Crimp's use of postdramatic aspects such as characterization, space, time, language, and body aesthetics in the play.

As for characterisation, Crimp organizes unspecified character attribution, thus, his unnamed characters are symbolized as 1, 2, and 3 since there is no additional information about any characters, and the performance and the relationships among characters play a significant role in the play. Crimp's deconstruction of dramatic characterisation so as to show his innovative theatricality serves his postdramatic tendencies for this play. Indeed, in doing so, Crimp with these unnamed characters as a postdramatic tenet maintains his postdramatic playwriting after *Attempts on Her Life* (1997).

Whole Blue Sky has been considered as a part of the triptych entitled *Fewer Emergencies*, published in 2015 as a compilation of plays. Aragay et al. put it from Jürs Munby's perspective that "the two short plays [*Face To the Wall*, *Fewer Emergencies*] exemplify the postdramatic turn to performance in new writing for the theatre, a claim that can be extended to the third piece in the triptych" (2012: 134). The play, that is considered a playlet that has postdramatic theatrical signs, also refers to family relationships. Within this context, Miera Aragay et al. underline that: In *Whole Blue Sky*, out of three speakers just character 1 is determined as female, but the genders of 2 and 3 are remained unspecified. They are designed as an ordinary façade family but it also symbolizes relentless violence in such a family unit. At first glance, character 1, wife, seems to have an "interrogative mood ironically working to destabilize a narrow understanding of happiness in terms of a late-capitalist dream" (Aragay et al., 2012: 136). As it is illustrated in the play, Bobby must be a happy child that people always give something as a gift. It is easily seen that the play criticizes the late capitalist society by unveiling the things such as the money, property, and family that make life worth living. When this dominant materialistic theme is considered, according to Adam Ledger, "Crimp's writerly text certainly draws attention to itself as the materiality of communication through its form and function as the construction of a story. Lehmann's suggestion that the postdramatic script can be text as poetry is very useful here" (Ledger, 2010: 122).

Apart from the postdramatic tendencies in the play, it is a writerly text because of its structure that its leitmotif also represents our contemporary late capitalist lifestyle which is considered as Crimp's political side as well. However, Aragay and et al. assert that in the introduction to her English translation of Lehmann's seminal study, Karen Jürs-Munby labels two of the playlets in the triptych, "*Fewer Emergencies* and *Face to the Wall*, postdramatic on the grounds that they are open or writerly texts that require spectators to become active co-writers of the (performance) text ... active witnesses who reflect on their own meaning-making" (Aragay, et. al., 2012: 134). It should be

born in mind that the play is one of the plays in this triptych also has postdramatic theatrical signs, and is also writerly text because of its nature of stimulating the active witnessing process for audiences. In this part, it is aimed to reveal these postdramatic tenets and its resonances in the play. As for the theatrical space, Crimp organizes space as blank in order to create a postdramatic aura in the play. Since the play is quite short, it is relatively difficult to get what is going on. In staging process directors also create different performances, in other words, they try to get in Crimp's mind: Sierz asserts that:

We were looking for some kind of key to help the actors locate what or who they were playing. We quickly discovered that whenever they tried to relate to each other in a naturalistic or psychological way it didn't work, because the text hadn't been written like that and it simply couldn't be reduced to a conventional scene or consistent characters. And finally the penny dropped that the best way to give the actors a reason to speak was to just say: we're all inside Martin's head. (Sierz, 2013: 128).

However, in spite of all the above-mentioned difficulties to stage this play, Crimp unveils new postdramatic tendencies that show the significance of performance instead of dramatic theatricalities. One of the main tendencies of postdramatism is ambiguity in the spatial area, in this play and his other postdramatic plays, Crimp generally refers to blank space as a postdramatic sign. In this regard, Ledger underlines that: "Although Crimp is more overt in this statement of blankness, his world, as in Beckett's late plays, for example, is an action-space, not a fictional locale, and the speakers are simply allocated numbers" (Ledger, 2010: 122).

Apart from Ledger's blank space perception, there isn't any information about the characters' gender in the playtext descriptions in the play. Of course when it is staged, everything is overtly seen, but in this play Crimp maintains his innovative theatricality by prioritizing the performance instead of text, thus, directors can stage the play according to what they imagine from Crimp's performance text. Therefore, since what is understood from Crimp's postdramatic text is dependent on what directors can imagine, they can stage the same play in different ways. On the other hand, Crimp treats same subjects in his above-mentioned triptych, as it is asserted in Sierz's lines: "All three plays – an hour-long trilogy under the title 'FE' – have the same theme, a radical scepticism about the culture of contentment that pervades the middle classes, making them indifferent not only to the suffering of those in distant lands, but also to the poor of their own country" (Sierz, 2013: 68).

Additionally, apart from afore-mentioned lines, Crimp also discusses a late capitalist society in this play. *Whole Blue Sky* starts with the appearance of an actor who holds a pistol. There are some balloons in the air, and there is a

drawing of the dead body is projected on the balloons, as if it was the scene for a crime inquiry. In the beginning, a bit of classical music that is played in a normal volume can be heard, after that it gradually morphs into thunderous heavy music and then ceases all suddenly. Then, one of the actors starts announcing the stage directions neutrally: Three actors required. Time: Blank. Place: Blank. When character 1 appears on the stage, she explodes the balloon by mistake, and laughs as though she sensed ashamed because of such an inconvenient disturbance. From the first minutes, the balloons become an element of threat in the acoustic and physical space of both the audience and the actors. They prevent the actors from moving safely from one point to another, as a balloon could explode at any moment. The balloons are also an echo of the shotguns mentioned repeatedly in the plays (Obis, 2014: 392). Obis describes the décor of the stage that is generally based on balloons. It is easily understood that the décor that is not swaggering, and a little bit simplistic aims to prioritize the performance by using lights in this play.

The playlet starts with a conversation that figure 2 initiates, "She gets married very young, doesn't she?" (Crimp, 2015: 87). Their conversation goes on around her and her marriage some more, but as it has been seen in the other postdramatic plays, it is obvious that this play deconstructs the hierarchical structures that play a significant role in traditional drama, thus, the play contradicts the general tenets of dramatic theatre. In other words, one of the items of theatre can come to the forefront in the play, nominately, time, place: blank, and the décor is not as important as in dramatic theatre in this play. That is to say, this play with its postdramatic paratactic structures has de-hierarchical elements that allow deconstructing the hierarchy of theatre. In parallel, "the success of the production lies in the way it manages to represent this notion of blankness. Moreover, the idea of a blank can also be linked to the form of the play and to its characters as it is more a narrative told by voices, a kind of work in progress, than a play with a plot and fully fledged characters" (Obis, 2014: 391). The postdramatic signs of this play when it is compared with dramatic characteristics with its blank structures play so significant innovative role that it also refers to this kind of de-hierarchical theatricalities so as to create a postdramatic theatrical milieu.

As for simultaneity, in postdramatic theatre, the audience should be exposed to a lot of signs or a sign bombardment whereas in dramatic theatre, there are only a few signs. However, in postdramatic plays these signs are not in the center of the stage. With these sign bombardments, postdramatic plays become more stimulating for the audience because postdramatism stimulates the audience to react to what they are watching, in other words, they are not passive anymore. According to Obis, in *WBS*, "the white balloons are also a way of

alluding to a certain lightness and refer to a space between earth and sky. They look like clouds upon which the actors are walking, especially during the first playlet, *WBS*, where the light is blue and the balloons white" (Obis, 2014: 393). In the play, using colourful balloons as an element of creating imaginative staging makes audiences feel as though they are under the whole blue sky. In this context, "This kind of staging employs these to furnish stagescapes with a tactile feel: for part of the performance, the set was covered in white balloons as all three performers stood downstage and blue light covered the background, fading into the whiteness of the stage" (Angelaki, 2012: 147-48). As it is understood in this quotation, when the play is staged, imaginative use of light, the fading into whiteness, screens, and the other signs create a postdramatic theatrical aura that can be considered as a sign bombardment, thus, audience is exposed to a lot of signs in order to make them react to what they are watching. Therefore, staging the play with this kind of theatrical signs makes the play go beyond the dramatic theatre that generally has a well-organized plot structure, regular character attribution, a single dimensional space, and without sign bombardment.

Whole Blue Sky is like a conversation that unnamed characters discuss about a description of a young woman's life. A quite coarse narrative that is constructed with overlapping, repetitions, and monologues is built up in the way of lines conflicting with each other. The woman's marriage is a sad one. Besides, Bobby, her son, appears on stage with his pet called Bobby, too. In the evening when some guests come home, Bobby discloses that he listens the sounds wandering in his mind. At the end of the play Bobby asks his mother for singing Mummy and Daddy's private song that aggravates her. Along with its postdramatic features such as non-dramatic persona, no specified character attributions, *Whole Blue Sky* also criticizes today's happiness problem that modern people have by introducing figures' dialogues:

1: A picture of happiness. 2: What kind of picture of happiness? 1: What d'you mean: what kind of picture of happiness? 2: What does a picture of happiness look like? 1: It looks like them (Crimp, 2015, p.90).

The figures' searching for the picture of happiness conjures up the satire of current societal tendencies. They try to find the picture of happiness in a way that a figure, 1, explains:

It looks like the three of them –yes-in their hats. It looks like the three of them in the pet shop selecting a pet. It looks just how they look in the toy shop selecting a toy: pictures, pictures of happiness: that's what a picture of happiness looks like (Crimp, 2015: 90).

As it is seen in character 1's lines, the picture of happiness finds its meaning in the shape of toys in this scene that is a bitter satire of current tendency, pretending to be happy. In that respect, this topic is repeatedly mentioned in the

rest of the playlet. They are talking about the picture of happiness again in the following lines and character 1 and 2 suggest some sort of causes of happiness such as owning a pet, and the picture of boat (Crimp, 2015: 90). Since Crimp's text is so open to satire, the lines in the beginning about marriage, especially its problematic sides, unveil the satire of the picture of happiness and the reflections of middle class baby care styles by buying a pet, and building a snowman. In parallel, as a general conception, although postdramatic and political cannot be thought together, especially Crimp's text openly drops its messages about marriage, caring children, and late capitalism. Character 1 stresses good-natured way about all those things that make life worth living. In fact, she, character 1, explains the late capitalistic view that is one of the main topics of the playlet. In the following lines, the character answers to unveil the things that make life worth living (Crimp, 2015: 93). When it is profoundly investigated, Crimp's text irregularly puts the lines together by using a lot of repetitions that sometimes seem to be meaningless connotations that unveil the characteristics of postdramatic theatre that is designed as no distinction between dialogue, description, and narration.

In the playlet, some lines have strong verbal and physical violence connotations. For example, character 1, asks, "Why shouldn't her guests laugh?" (Crimp, 2015: 94) The character 2 answers with some slang words all at ones, and character 3 uses inappropriate, full of slang, statements to show his/her anger by telling about breaking someone's neck. It is easily seen in Crimp's following lines that make it even clearer: "Used the phrase-exactly-say that one more fucking time to me and I'll break your fucking neck in order to hang the tree, for example, with these tiny lamps" (Crimp, 2015: 95). Crimp repeatedly utilizes this type of discourse so as to draw attention to the rising violent tendencies in the society.

Crimp reflects postmodern society by referring to Jean Françoise Lyotard's end of grand narratives, as the play generally consists of short conversations that immediately change the main themes. In his play, Crimp does not try to tell big stories that have a profound impact on history. By cutting out the names of the characters and focusing on unspecified attributions, he evokes the incredulity of metanarratives, because Crimp abolishes the sense of identity by cutting out the names of the characters as 1, 2 and 3, so it should be borne in mind that Crimp deliberately appeals to this kind of character attribution in order to trivialise the value of identity. In this way, unnamed characters begin to tell us their little stories with their trivialised identities, symbolising the insignificance of character names in the play. Crimp foregrounds what is being performed and what is being told, rather than who is telling the stories. In this play, character 1's lines generally reproduce the main politics of the play, such as

1:Money? Property? Family?- The things that make life worth living (Crimp, 2015, p.94).

This line reflects the relationships between these three themes, which have strong connotations with contemporary late capitalist lifestyles. In the play, through money, property and family, showing that this generates contemporary conflicts and, crucially, forces spectators to negotiate their own (ethical and political) response by asking under what conditions it could become more comprehensive (Aragay, Escoda, 2012: 134-135). In postdramatic theatre, the spectator is not only a listener, but also an active participant; in other words, it can be said that in postdramatic theatre, the audience participates in the play in order to question what is being shown. Accordingly, *Whole Blue Sky* makes the audience explore the aforementioned new theatricalities in order to make them react to what is being staged. Thus, as a postdramatic play, it replaces the principles of dramatic theatre with post-dramatic ones, and in doing so, its text reveals a new theatrical space.

Conclusion

The blurred plot, structure and character identities of *Whole Blue Sky* explain why it is considered a post-dramatic play. In addition, like Crimp's other post-dramatic plays, it lacks clear characterisation, a linear plot structure and meaningful dialogue. In addition, *Whole Blue Sky* also contains a powerful critique of late capitalism, undefined-unknown characters without well-developed dialogue. Instead of these dialogues, Crimp's dialogues in the play are generally meaningless lines of dialogue. Moreover, the lines are articulated with many pauses and repetitions. Furthermore, as far as the perception of time and space is concerned, they are completely empty. Remembering Lehmann's postdramatic, simply by leaving the blank, the habitual, dramatic why? of fictionally contextualised, motivationally based acting gives way to the Crimpian what? of each second of performance in real, not fictional, time (Ledger, 2010: 26). As mentioned earlier, postdramatic theatre puts the performance first, rather than relying on the conventional text. In doing so, this empty perception of time and place makes the play more powerful because of the fast-moving scenic structure. The conclusion of this study is that *Whole Blue Sky* represents postdramatic tendencies in terms of the above principles.

WORKS CITED

- Abrams, M. H. (1999). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Heinle & Heinle Thomson Learning: United States.
- Agusti, C.E. (2013). *Martin Crimp's Theatre: Collapse as Resistance to Late Capitalist Society*, Walter De Gruyter, Berlin.

- Angelaki, V. (2012). *The Plays of Martin Crimp: Making Theatre Strange*, Macmillan, Palgrave.
- Aragay, M. & Escoda, C. (2012). Postdramatism, Ethics, and the Role of Light in Martin Crimp's Fewer Emergencies. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 28(2), 133-142.
- Aragay, M, Klein, H, Monforte, E, & Zozaya, P. (2007). *British Theatre of the 1990s Interviews with Directors, Playwrights, Critics and Academics*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aristotle. (1996). *Poetics*. Ed. Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin Books.
- Barnett, D. (2008). When is a play not a Drama? Two Examples of Postdramatic Theatre Texts. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 24(1), 14-23.
- Berton, P., R. (2010). *Committed Drama Within Postdramatic Theatre: A Study of Contemporary German Language Plays*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Colorado.
- Crimp, M. (2015). *Martin Crimp: Plays 3*. Faber and Faber, London.
- Heath, M. (1996). *Introduction. Poetics*. London: Penguin Books.
- Hoad, T.F. (2000). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*.
- Jürs-Munby, K. (2006). *Introduction. Postdramatic Theatre*. Abington: Routledge. 1-15.
- Ledger, A. J. (2010). —Does What? Acting, Directing, and Rehearsing Martin Crimp's Fewer Emergencies. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 26(02), 121-132.
- Lehmann, H.T. (2006). *Postdramatic Theater*. Translated by Karen Jürs-Munby, Abington: Routledge.
- Lehmann, H.T. (2016). *Tragedy and Dramatic Theatre*, Routledge.
- Obis, E. (2014). —Fewer emergencies in Paris: Interpreting the Blank. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 24(3), 390-395.
- Pavis, P. (1998). *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis*. Trans. Christine Shantz. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rorty, A. O. (1992). The Psychology of Aristotelian Tragedy. *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. Ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. New Jersey: Princeton UP.
- Sierz, A. (2013). *The Theatre of Martin Crimp, Bloomsbury Methuen Drama*. Third Edition.