

**T.C.**

**SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ**

**SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ**

**İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI**

**İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI**

**THE OTHER ISSUE AS WOMAN, RACE AND PLACE IN  
SIMON STEPHENS'S *THREE KINGDOMS***

**Zeynep İĞDE**

**YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**Danışman**

**Doç. Dr. Barış METE**

**Konya – 2023**

**DEDICATION**

*To my husband*



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my Supervisor Doç. Dr. Barış Mete for his guidance and polite attitude towards me during the whole process.

Feeling deeply grateful, I would like to thank all my lecturers, herein Selcuk University for their invaluable contributions, guidance, and feedback that enabled me to improve myself and overcome this study.

My special thanks go to my family for their support throughout my education and my entire life, especially my husband, Satılmış İĞDE, who has encouraged and supported me the entire time. I would also thank my father, Harun ÇELİK, and my mother, Adeviye ÇELİK, who grew me up in hard conditions and financed my education throughout their life long. Without their motivation, it was nearly impossible to complete this study.



**T. C.**  
**SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ**  
**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü**



<b>Öğrencinin</b>	Adı Soyadı	ZEYNEP İĞDE	
	Numarası	194208001007	
	Ana Bilim / Bilim Dalı	İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI	
	Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans <input type="checkbox"/>	Doktora
	Tez Danışmanı	Doç. Dr. BARIŞ METE	
	Tezin Adı	Simon Stephens'ın <i>Three Kingdoms</i> Oyununda Kadın, Irk ve Mekan Bağlamında Ötekileştirme Meselesi	

### ÖZET

Bu tez çalışmasının amacı, Simon Stephens'ın 2011 yılında yayımlanan *Three Kingdoms* adlı eserinde kadın, ırk ve yer başlığı adı altında ötekileştirme sorununu incelemektir. Simon Stephens, oyunlarında sosyal meseleleri ele alan çağdaş bir İngiliz oyun yazarıdır. Stephens, *Three Kingdoms* adlı eserinde okuyucusuna seks işçisi bir kadının cinayetini anlatan bir detektif hikayesi sunar. Oyunun başrol İngiliz detektifleri, Ignatius Stone ve Charlie Lee, Londra, İngiltere'deki olayı soruştururlar ve daha sonra katili bulmak için Almanya ve Estonya'ya giderler. Oyun devam ederken, tez boyunca kadın karakterler, farklı ırklar, üç ülke ve şehir birbiriyle karşılaştırılmaktadır. Oyundaki kadın karakterler ötekileştirilmiş karakter olarak ele alınır. *Three Kingdoms*'daki kadın karakterlerin hepsi hayatlarını erkek karakterlerin istediği şekilde ve yönlendirdiği doğrultuda yaşamaktadırlar. Kadın karakterlerden birisi öldürülüp diğerleri hayatta kaldığı için bu noktayı ele almak önemlidir. Bu yüzden Feminist Teorilerden yararlanarak oyundaki o bir kadın karakterin neden

öldürüldüğüne odaklanılır. Bir diğer konu ise oyundaki farklı ırklarla ilgilidir. Okurlar, farklı ırkların çatışmasına ve birbirlerini ötekileştirmelerine tanık olacaktır. Ayrıca ırk sorunları, tezin son konusu olan ülkeler ve şehirler ile de ilgilidir. Neden bazı ırklar kendisinden başkasına hükmediyor? Ülkelerin ve şehirlerin tarihi, sosyal yapısı, kültürü ve gelenekleri o anda devreye girmektedir. Üç ülkeye ve şehirlerine, İngiltere-Londra, Almanya-Hamburg ve Estonya-Tallinn'e göz atılacak ve karakterlerin ülkelerine ve ırklarına karşı tutumları incelenecektir. Sonuç olarak, Simon Stephens ötekileştirme konusunda karakterlerin kadınları, ırkları ve yerleri nasıl düşündüklerini karşılaştırma şansı vermektedir ve bu tezin amacı da *Three Kingdoms*'da yer alan kadınlar, ırklar ve yerler ile ilgili ötekileştirme sorununu açıklamak ve çözümlenektir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Simon Stephens, *Three Kingdoms*, Irk, Kadın, Mekan, Postdramatik Tiyatro



**T. C.**  
**SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ**  
**Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü**



<b>Öğrencinin</b>	Adı Soyadı	ZEYNEP İĞDE
	Numarası	194208001007
	Ana Bilim / Bilim Dalı	İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI
	Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans <input type="checkbox"/> Doktora <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Tez Danışmanı	Doç. Dr. BARIŞ METE
	Tezin Adı	The Other Issue as Woman, Race and Place in Simon Stephens's <i>Three Kingdoms</i>

### ABSTRACT

This dissertation's aim is to analyze the question of the other under the titles of woman, race, and place in Simon Stephens's *Three Kingdoms* first published in 2011. Simon Stephens is a contemporary English playwright who handles social problems in his plays. Stephens submits a detective story, which tells about the murder of a female sex worker in *Three Kingdoms*. The play's lead actors English detectives, Ignatius Stone, and Charlie Lee investigate the event in London, England, and then they travel to Germany and Estonia to find the murderer. As the play goes on, female characters, different races, and three countries and cities are compared with each other throughout the thesis. All female characters are handled as the others in the play; male characters in *Three Kingdoms* conduct female characters' life and these female characters live under the male hegemony within the society. One of female characters is killed, but the others are alive; thus it is focused on why the reason the woman is killed by utilizing Feminist Theories. Another subject is about different races in the play.

The readers will witness the conflict of different races and their marginalizing of each other. Racial issues are, furthermore, relevant to countries and cities, which is the last subject of the thesis. Why do some races dominate other than himself/herself? Countries and cities' history, social structure, culture, and traditions step in at that moment. Characters' attitudes in three countries and cities, England-London, Germany-Hamburg, and Estonia-Tallinn will be studied toward their countries and races. As a result, Simon Stephens gives the chance to compare how characters consider women, races, and places in the context of the other issue, and this dissertation's main aim is to explain and analyze the question of the other dealing with women, races, and places in *Three Kingdoms*.

**Key Words:** Simon Stephens, *Three Kingdoms*, Race, Woman, Place, Postdramatic Theatre

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DEDICATION .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ÖZET .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: FORMS OF DRAMA IN THE TWENTIETH AND THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURIES AND THE OTHER THEORY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. Forms of Drama in the Twentieth and the Twenty-First Centuries .....	5
1.2. The Concept of the Other .....	15
<b>CHAPTER TWO: SIMON STEPHENS AND <i>THREE KINGDOMS</i>.....</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1. Simon Stephens .....	18
2.2. Stephens’s Dramatic Style .....	20
2.3. <i>Three Kingdoms</i> .....	23
<b>CHAPTER THREE: THE QUESTION OF THE OTHER.....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1. Woman as the Other .....	29
3.2. Race as the Other .....	42
3.3. Place as the Other .....	56
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>72</b>



## INTRODUCTION

This dissertation aims to explain the question of the other among female characters, different races, and places in Simon Stephens' *Three Kingdoms* by using the perspectives of gender and cultural studies. The reason why people or societies marginalize the ones who are not like them and what the reasons are to exclude them will be reviewed, and tried to be replied by analyzing the problem of the other in *Three Kingdoms*. Before the question of the other or othering in *Three Kingdoms*, the other maintains its position from the ancient period to the modern world through binary oppositions like man-woman, black-white, eastern- western, Christian-Muslim. As Jacques Derrida states in *Positions* (1981), "one of the two terms governs the other (axiologically, logically, etc.), or has the upper hand", and Derrida keeps up his claim that to reverse the hierarchy is essential "to deconstruct the opposition" (p. 41). Everything exists with its opposition in nature or people's perceptions. If there is no darkness, there is no matter of light, and therefore deficiency and contrast take shape together.

To analyze the question of the other in *Three Kingdoms*, feminist theory and the other theory come into prominence among the subjects of gender and cultural studies. After discussing what the other is, and its reasons in the play within the scope of these theories, the relationship of male and female as the other, the differences of races, and what a place specializes in will be run. Firstly, the thesis will start with theatrical background, which affects Simon Stephens and his theatrical style. Chapter one is about theatre genres in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and the other theory. Four theatrical genres are chosen: The Theatre of Cruelty, Absurd Theatre, In-yer-face Theatre, and Post-dramatic Theatre. Simon Stephens has multiple sides in his plays and the effects of several genres can be seen at the same time, therefore it is difficult to categorize Simon Stephens in a one theatrical genre or movement; however, his plays can be mostly examined in the context of post-dramatic theatre.

In The Theatre of Cruelty, violence moves to the theatre stage, and the events

behind the scenes start to be showcased in the presence of the audience. The spectators have not watched death or punishment during the play, and events happen with a prophecy, or they are conveyed through characters. Violence is there on the stage and it has not been seen before, and the scene shocks the spectators. Therefore, the Theatre of Cruelty becomes the turning point for the theatre world. After the period of The Theatre of Cruelty, Absurd Theatre breathes into the theatre with its new style. The meaning of absurd is inappropriate, unreasonable, or illogical; thus, Absurd Theatre does not utilize three unities in drama: action, time, and place. The plays in Absurd Theatre do not follow one main action, does not cover a single space, or does not take place in twenty-four hours. The unities have been broken, dialogues between characters have converted into meaningless speeches, and the integrity of meaning has depreciated. Therefore, Absurd Theatre's plays get a reaction from the spectators early on, such as Jean Genet's *The Maids*, Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, and Eugene Ionesco's *The Bald Soprano*. After the Theatre of Cruelty and Absurd Theatre, In-yer-face Theatre has exceeded its stance on stage. It is aggressive and provocative, and it shocks the audience with extreme language and images and disturbs moral norms. Nudity is there on stage, the language is nasty, and therefore moral issues and taboos are broken. Violence, humiliation, and unmentionable subjects are seen on stage as well. Sarah Kane, Mark Ravenhill, and Anthony Neilson are some examples of In-yer-face Theatre. Finally, Post-dramatic Theatre is beyond dramatic theatre. It focuses on the audience and performer rather than the text, and it does not abide by character and plot, and it deconstructs some elements, namely, character, plot, spectacle, and music. The written word is removed from the center of the play, and the relationship between the play and the audience is focused. Post-dramatic Theatre makes the audience rethink the performance.

Chapter two will give information about the playwright, Simon Stephens and his play, *Three Kingdoms*. There are Stephens's biography and his theatrical style in detail. Simon Stephens is one of the most prominent contemporary and prolific British playwrights. In the late 1990s, Stephens started to write as a dramatist in literary world. He published his first play, *Bring Me Sunshine* in 1997 and later

*Bluebird* in 1998; thus, he started writing various plays as a dramatist. With Simon Stephens's theatrical style, his plays bear the trace of in-yer-face theatre and post-dramatic theatre; however, his style is mainly post-drama due to his using music, and images, focusing on the performance and performer rather than the text. The play's detailed summary is available in chapter two of the thesis. *Three Kingdoms* is a detective story, which is setup in three different countries, England, Germany, and Estonia. The play consists of three parts and an epilogue. Each part takes place in London, Hamburg, and Tallinn, and an epilogue, again in London. Two English detectives, Ignatius Stone and Charlie Lee investigate the murder of a beheaded woman found in the river. Stone and Lee visit two cities, Hamburg, and Tallinn, and they get help from their colleagues. *Three Kingdoms* is a story that mingles reality and dream, and it shocks the audience by averting their senses.

Chapter three is both the most salient part and the main section of the thesis. This chapter consists of three parts: woman, race, and place as the other. The first part of chapter three handles the woman as the other, and it uses feminist theory to analyze how the woman is seen as other in *Three Kingdoms*. The play is set on the murder of a sex-worker, and the sex-worker is a woman; thus, there is a question about why the sex-worker is killed and whether she deserves to die or not. Is Vera Petrova, the killed sex-worker, a martyr, or a traitor? Why is only Vera Petrova killed although there are several female characters in the play? Male characters think Vera is a traitor; she has not obeyed man's rules and accomplished her female duties such as ironing, cooking, and cleaning; thus, she deserves to die. According to feminist theory, on the contrary, Vera is a martyr. She has not allowed men use her and surrendered their wishes; she has not also let men use her body.

The second part is race as the other, and *Three Kingdoms* has three races: English, German, and Estonian. The English and German have a rooted history, and they are the colonizers while the Estonian is the colonized society, and the Estonian has gained its independence compared to other European societies in the twentieth century. There are different races in the world and this sometimes makes the individual feel superior or inferior especially talking about some characters, such as

Ignatius Stone, and Aleksandr Richter. Is it essential to be a English, or a superior status? Is there any difference among European countries? Aleksandr is a furious character as a German because other races culturally pollute and damage Germany.

The third part is about places or three settings as the other. The place, where one is born or lives, is effective on individuals and shapes societies' structure. That is why people externalize other people from their group even in the same place. *Three Kingdoms* is a melting pot that collects different countries sights for readers. Already mentioned three countries in the play are England, Germany, and Estonia. These countries are European, and on one side England and Germany are among the biggest powers in the world, and on another side, Estonia and Romania are developing countries among European countries. Therefore, it will be mentioned what their similarities and differences are from the characters. Art, social life, health, security, education, and job opportunities vary in terms of the country and its socio-economic power.

In conclusion, this dissertation seeks the reason for the othering among men and women, races, and places in *Three Kingdoms*. Society is divided two classes; men see themselves as the first class of citizens, and women, according to men, is mentioned as the second in society although culture, religion, and traditions cannot be forwarded without women. Not only women but some races, such as English and German, in the developed countries also feel superior and advanced compared to the developing countries' races. Whether it is a man or race, or place, the power determines privileges of the class of societies and individuals. On one side, there is the one, who feels inferior and is angry with everyone except for him/herself; on other side, there is the one, who sees him/herself powerful and self-righteousness, and s/he thinks s/he deserves the best in the world. Consequently, Simon Stephens gives the chance readers and spectators to compare binary oppositions in the context of the question of the other.

## CHAPTER ONE: FORMS OF DRAMA IN THE TWENTIETH AND TWENTY-FIRST CENTURIES AND THE OTHER THEORY

### 1.1 Forms of Drama in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

The twentieth and twenty-first centuries testify over styles in art because of the world's exponentially increasing alteration. All novelties are the results of technological developments and their yields, and wars in the world are effective on individual and social psychology. Theatre has had its share of novelties, and new genres have emerged in a short time in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Especially the First World War and the Second World War are remarkable to be formed of four theatrical genres, which are The Theatre of Cruelty, Absurd Theatre, In-Yer-Face Theatre, and Postdramatic Theatre. Simon Stephens uses these forms of drama in his plays, and *Three Kingdoms* has generally postdramatic features although it has characteristics of In-Yer-Face Theatre and the Theatre of Cruelty. If one does not know earlier theatrical genres, the one cannot perceive the meaning of the play and pile of events.

Firstly, Antonin Artaud is a French theorist who asserts the theatre of cruelty. Artaud develops his ideas about theatre and collects them in his book *The Theatre and Its Double*. Artaud's theatre aims to disrupt the relationship between audience and performer, shock the audience, and go beyond words. Wallace Fowlie states Antonin Artaud's dream would be "not an artistic spectacle, but a communion between spectators and actors" (1959, p. 646). Artaud has two expectations in theatre: one is to go much further, and the second is "frenzy and moving violence which he found in the paintings of Van Gogh" (Fowlie, 199, p. 646); thence, theatre with danger and cruelty has the power in dreams and an incantation in language. Antonin Artaud explains the relationship between theatre and cruelty in detail, and he believes "[a]n idea of the theatre has been lost" (1958, p. 84). The post-war period shows that every person in society has lost their belief in God, humanity, and good things in life as to family, friendship, and vita. Artaud takes up seriously the idea that "theatre must be rebuilt" (1958, p. 85), because

theatre supplies everything about life, such as love, crime, and war for human beings. The stage in theatre is an example of real things, yet it is not exactly a copy of life or reality. That is why terror and cruelty are the things that are used to evoke the spectator's sensations. Artaud explains his opinion about the things in the following quotation:

The reduced role given to the understanding leads to an energetic compression of the text; the active role given to obscure poetic emotion necessitates concrete signs. Words say little to the mind; and objects speak; new images speak, even new images made with words. But space thundering with images and crammed with sounds speaks too, if one knows how to intersperse from time to time a sufficient extent of space stocked with silence and immobility (1958, p. 87).

Artaud argues physical objects are more powerful to explain and denote the sensibility to the spectators. The human mind perceives language and creates an image in the mind, but if the objects are used in reality or models, it is difficult to forget, and the brain stores memories and visual quality. Theatre aims to “convey thoughts or feelings” and “to make the spectator think and feel” as well (Lyons, 1974, p. 125). Because of this, concrete signs on stage speak and shake the spectators; thus, cruelty might be a way to show and make the signs on stage feel to human beings. Artaud prologuizes his cruelty theory on theatre and gives the cruelty theatre's manifesto and clarifies theatre's features saying:

To consider the theatre as a second-hand psychological or moral function, and to believe that dreams themselves have only a substitute function, is to diminish the profound poetic bearing of dreams as well as of the theatre. If the theatre, like dreams, is bloody and inhuman, it is, more than just that, to manifest and unforgettably root within us the idea of a perpetual conflict, a spasm in which life is continually lacerated (1958, p. 92).

According to Artaud, human beings have bloody and inhuman dreams, and these dreams might have gory and inhumane scenes, and theatre has similar characteristics with dreams on that sense. Thus, Artaud does not differentiate between theatre and dreams due to the fact that theatre and dreams consist of sights. To mirror terror on stage, there are “... these symbolical gestures, masks, and

attitudes, these individual or group movements whose innumerable meanings constitute an important part of the concrete language of the theatre..." (Artaud, 1958, p. 94). Gestures and masks are to empower the concrete language on stage; in addition, symbols have countless significations. Artaud, on the contrary, makes clear what he means by "cruelty":

The word "cruelty" should be taken in a broad sense, and not in the rapacious physical sense that it is customarily given. And I claim, in doing this, the right to break with the usual sense of language, to crack the armature once and for all, to get the iron collar off its neck, in short to return to the etymological origins of speech which, in the midst of abstract concepts, always evoke a concrete element (1958, p. 101).

According to Artaud, cruelty does not mean physical violence, or "cruelty is not synonymous with bloodshed, martyred flesh, crucified enemies" (1958, p. 102). It is actually to break the traditional factors in theatre. Artaud's Theatre of Cruelty might be conceived as "a natural space" because theatre of cruelty purifies the stage, and it projects events instead of characters, and cosmic forces, which humanity has suppressed, are liberated (Doherty, 1990, p. 8), and thus cruelty shakes the spectator with concrete things on stage.

As a result, Artaud regarded theatre as necessary to change, and he wrote a series of manifestos on the theatre. His Theatre of Cruelty was the developed form of real life, and it reflected not only everyday life but also the reality of the extraordinary. Artaud reduced emphasis on the written text and scripts, and he emphasized improvisation. The Theatre of Cruelty valued dance, gesture, movement, signs, and violent images on stage were created and those violent images engraved in the minds of the audience.

Secondly, during the First and the Second World Wars, and after the wars, the world started to rapidly change in education, science, health, art, and so on. New movements emerged in art, such as the avant-garde, expressionism, Dadaism, absurdism, and post-modernism. Especially Britain took its share from those movements. After World War II, the absurd theatre was in the limelight in drama with names like Eugene Ionesco, Samuel Beckett, Arthur Adamov, Jean Genet, and

Harold Pinter. The playwrights rejected the system and denied overall meaning to the world and human history (Hornby, 2015, p. 640).

Known as one of the pioneers of absurdism and existentialism, Albert Camus defines the absurd as “a divorce” and he continues, “[i]t lies in neither of the elements compared, it is born of their confrontation” (1955, p. 21). Human beings face their faults, deficiencies, and feebleness in their life, and they sometimes accept them, but sometimes they do not. For that reason, divorce is another version of the absurd. According to Camus, the absurd is neither in man nor in the world, but in presence. Human beings create irregularity due to their presence, and this is absurd. However, absurd theatre got its name from Martin Esslin, who is the name-father of Absurd Theatre. Esslin explains the absurd, and he also introduces lesser-known writers, Senor Fernando Arrabal, Senor Manuel de Pedrolo, and N. F. Simpson in *The Theatre of The Absurd* (1961, p. xii). First, Esslin gives definitions of the “absurd”, which means “out of harmony” in music while it means the “ridiculous” in the English-speaking word (1961, p. xix). The absurd is, in general, a word that is utilized instead of “unreasonable, illogical, senseless, and useless”.

Ward Hooker interprets the absurd “for the ordinary playgoer, may be taken to mean the extremely incongruous, inadequate, or irrelevant” (1960, p. 437). On the contrary, Martin Esslin rejects this usage both in Hooker’s review and in *The New English Dictionary*, which means inharmonious, incongruous, unreasonable, and illogical (1960, p. 671). According to Esslin, absurd means contrary to reason in French. The audience does not laugh at absurd plays because they find the irony in them, but the source of the laughter is in the release of the audience’s feelings of frustration. For Esslin, thereby, it is unfeasible to utilize irony and absurdity together.

On the other hand, according to the absurdist playwrights, a human being’s existence is absurd because of not asking to be born and dying without seeking death, and there is a life between birth and death. Human beings cannot perceive anything completely, with only one perspective. William I. Oliver believes a self-



defeating complex is the only value that human beings can affirm within this scope (1963, p. 225). Oliver continues his arguments that human beings cannot act with complete accuracy and create anything definite, and thus it is impossible to halt acting. The condition of human beings in the twentieth century can be called absurd.

In the introduction part of *The Theatre of The Absurd*, Esslin gives comments about Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* after the audience had watched. He evaluates post-war works in that period when he examines writers, plays, the audience, and the society, and states that:

If a good play must have a cleverly constructed story, these have no story or plot to speak of; if a good play is judged by subtlety of characterization and motivation, these are often without recognizable characters and present the audience with almost mechanical puppets; if a good play has to have a fully explained theme, which is neatly exposed and finally solved, these often have neither a beginning nor an end; if a good play is to hold the mirror up to nature and portray the manners and mannerism of the age in finely observed sketches, these seem often to be reflections of dreams and nightmares; if a good play relies on witty repartee and pointed dialogue, these often consist of incoherent babblings (1961, p. xvii-xviii).

As Esslin tells, absurd theatre plays have no story and plot, have unknown characters, because the reader or the audience is not exactly onto the characters background, and there is no unity in time, setting, or events. Dialogues in the plays are as if they are randomly chosen. Esslin continues to explain that each writer in absurd theatre is an individual and isolates himself in his private world (1961, p. xviii). Every writer has his approach to his work, so it can be asserted that the writer's isolated personality is shown in characters in plays. Richard Hornby agrees with Martin Esslin, and he states that absurdist playwrights represent characters performing repetitive actions, but they do not go anywhere and have no transcendent purpose (2015, p. 640). The dialogues in the plays are cliché, quibbles, and gibberish, and thus, the plays could be perceived as unrealistic.

In the Theatre of the Absurd, the action depicts the disintegration of society and the mind, and it describes the discontinuity of thought and behaviour. Eugene Ionesco and Samuel Beckett are among the most essential representative playwrights of the

Theatre of the Absurd, and thereby L.H. Quackenbush establishes a connection between Ionesco and Beckett's absurdity of action with "the cruelty of Artaud, the anarchistic vision of Genet, the farcical antics of Kopit, and the shocking realism of Pinter" (1975, p. 61). Their plays have abstract staging and the restricted use of props. Especially Samuel Beckett conducts his players to "concrete, simple, and exact actions", and whatever the play is, the stage reality of movement must be simple, because simplicity talks, that the words and the meaning are there (Brater, 1975, p. 197). Consequently, the absurd and the absurd theatre are dealt with by many playwrights and theorists, and, theorists and playwrights interpret the absurd according to their ideas. However, the absurd generally means nonsense and illogical, and the absurd theatre tells human beings' vainness and their loneliness in the world.

Thirdly, in the last part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it is a new trend to use violence, war, and sexual elements on stage. In-yer-face theatre is a theatre movement in the 1990s. The name "in-yer-face" comes from the British critic Aleks Sierz. He has a same-named book, *In-Yer-Face Theatre* published in 2001. To fathom this theatre genre, one must look at Aleks Sierz's books about in-yer-face theatre.

Aleks Sierz defines in-yer-face theatre in *In-Yer-Face Theatre* as "any drama that takes the audience by the scruff of the neck and shakes it until it gets the message" and "a theatre of sensation" (2001, p. 4). This genre touches nerves, provokes, shocks the audience and it questions moral norms. In-yer-face theatre takes on "an emotional journey" and gets "under the skin", in other words, "it is experiential, not speculative" (Sierz, 2001, p. 4). Sierz gives other definitions of the phrase "in-yer-face" in Oxford and Collins English Dictionary, and American sports journalism as well:

The phrase 'in-yer-face' is defined by the *New Oxford English Dictionary* (1998) as something 'blatantly aggressive or provocative, impossible to ignore or avoid'. The *Collins English Dictionary* (1998) adds the adjective 'confrontational'. The phrase originated in American sports journalism during the mid-seventies, and gradually seeped into more mainstream slang over the following decade. It implies that you are being forced to see something close up, that your personal space has been invaded. It suggests the crossing of normal boundaries. In short, it

describes perfectly the kind of theatre that puts audiences in just such a situation (2001, p. 4).

On the other hand, Sierz mentions “in-yer-face theatre was both a new sensibility and a series of specific theatrical devices” (2012, p. 76). Playwrights made much of psychological and emotionally extreme situations, such as the sexual section. That was the reason to break taboos in society, so playwrights used powerful language in their works. Although in-yer-face theatre incorporates inhuman elements, Sierz mentions it has sensibility, and he continues what sensibility means in this genre. It is absolutely “the idea of provocation” (Sierz, 2012, p. 76). Aleks Sierz, besides, mentions in an interview with Mireia Aragay and Pilar Zozaya that in-yer-face’ theatre is “a subset of new writing” (2007, p. 141). Sierz states new writing is “an advertising slogan” (Aragay & Zozaya, 2007, p. 141). New writing centers on the writer instead of the director or the actor. It moreover identifies the Britishness of British theatre. In-yer-face theatre accordingly is the product of British theatre and new writing.

Myles Webber states “Sierz credits in-yer-face authors with putting an ossified British theater establishment back in touch with youth culture” (2002, p. 863). Aleks Sierz believes the British theatre is calloused because it is set on traditional theatrical structure and playwrights repeat themselves in the context of the relationship between them and the audience. The British theatre gains new breathe, and it also has youth and modern world culture on theatre stage (Sierz, 2011, p. 47) with the names such as Sarah Kane, Mark Ravenhill, Philip Ridley, Anthony Neilson, Martin McDonagh, Tanika Gupta, Marina Carr, and Roy Williams. These new British playwrights were a buzz in the air, and “as new work attracted the attention of the general public, it also woke up the funding authorities” (Sierz, 2005, p. 56). They told their stories studded with imagination rather than guides, and all they did was shape the story, not the message. On the contrary, Aleks Sierz interprets the new millennium brought crisis with it; although new talent playwrights emerged such as Simon Stephens, Enda Walsh, Abi Morgan, Charlotte Jones, Rebecca Lenkiewicz, and Joanna Laurens, each of them had their specific theatrical sorts. There were a lot of new plays; however, the originality and the imagination were a crisis of new

and young writing.

In-yer-face theatre has specific theatrical techniques. One of them is a stage language, and the language stresses rawness, fierceness, and profanity. In addition, the language is sharp, filthy, direct, and fast. Secondly, stage images have severe pain and disturbed vulnerability (Sierz, 2012, pp. 76-77). Language and images shock the audience with extremism, and they unsettle the audience with emotional frankness. Then, characters are designated from the complicit victims to the innocents. They humiliate each other, take clothes off, and have sex. Moreover, the characters talk about unspeakable subjects and become aggressive and brutal. "A peculiarly intense embrace of sex and violence" is the characteristic of in-yer-face theatre (Wad, 2013, p. 225). Antagonists shatter taboos, utter the forbidden, and create discomfort. Lastly, a ninety-minute structure is divided into with intervals. Material conditions are requisite for in- yer-face theatre; therefore, the audience can feel as if they were sharing emotions delineated by the actors.

In addition, in-yer-face theatre playwrights question moral norms, and they focus on experiential theatre, thus the audience can feel deep and severe emotions displayed on stage. As far as they can get, theatre playwrights allow moral deviations and forbidden behaviors to display such as rape, nudity, violence, and sex. The plays' themes thrive from humiliation, abuse, dehumanization, and unmentionable subjects. There are disrupted social structures, subverted dramatic devices, and the visceral voice of youth. In-yer-face theatre plays cannot be considered a source of pleasure because the primary goal is not entertainment, but to disgust. At the same time, in-yer-face theatre playwrights confront the problem of living and convey it to the audience through crude dialogues and a new type of violence.

All aspects of in-yer-face theatre make the audience shocked and so much involved in the performance as if the audience experiences the play, and that feels much more about an extreme state of mind than reading about the play. Four-letter words or sexual swear words are part of British culture, and they are stronger in theatre where they are used openly. At the same time, every experience on stage is more unsettling than in real life. Images of sex, nudity or violence on stage increase

uncomfortable feelings, because they are more powerful than in other arts. To sum up, the playwright or author's wish is to disgust and shock the audience with humiliation, pain, and degradation in in-yer-face theatre.

Finally, in the period after World War II, a new era has started with new terminologies. While the globe is rapidly developing, added terms in literature have begun to become a current issue. Every word has post-usage anymore, such as postcolonialism, postmodernism, posthumanism, and so on. After In-yer-face Theatre, the Postdramatic Theatre genre has become popular in the theatre world. This theatre is named by German theatre researcher Hans-Thies Lehmann in his same book *Postdramatic Theatre* in 2006. George Hunka states Lehmann's *Postdramatic Theatre* is a version of Martin Esslin's *The Theatre of the Absurd* for the early twenty-first century: "a means of gathering elements from disparate theatre artists to build an aesthetic perspective on the form of theatre" (2008, p. 126).

Postdramatic theatre tears to pieces dramatic theatre's characteristics, and it transcends dramatic theatre. Hans-Thies Lehmann mentions post-dramatic theatre as "a post-Brechtian theatre" (2006, p. 33). This genre gets new theatrical features and alters the audience's perception. The spectators in post-dramatic theatre are active witnesses and consider their meaning; moreover, they tolerate gaps and put aside the assignment of meaning (Lehmann, 2006, p. 6) unlike dramatic theatre's spectators. While the spectators are active in the play, the actor's mission changes and the spectator no longer watch an actor in a role but they watch a performer.

Hans-Thies Lehmann mentions the stylistic traits of postdramatic theatre in *Postdramatic Theatre*, and he gathers them under eleven titles: parataxis or non-hierarchy, simultaneity, play with the density of signs, plethora, musicalization, scenography or visual dramaturgy, warmth and coldness, physicality, concrete theatre, the irruption of the real, and situation or event. While hierarchization is the universal principle of dramatic theatre, de-hierarchization is that of postdramatic theatre, and de-hierarchization or parataxis is in contradiction with tradition. The non-hierarchical use aims at "a synaesthetic perception" and "contradicts the established hierarchy" (Lehmann, 2006, p. 86). Postdramatic theatre consciously

breaks the unity of the plot and smashes it. Because of this, the spectator of postdramatic theatre cannot perceive an instantaneous meaning. Simultaneity is to be synchronically given signs on stage, and this causes the readers and spectators cannot to handle everything. Theatrical signs are simultaneously presented on stage to spectators, and they cannot comprehend everything at the same time. Different languages can simultaneously be used so that no one is able to take them. The sequential connections of action or plot are hardly comprehensible. Thus, Lehmann believes “[p]arataxis and simultaneity result in the failure of the classical aesthetic ideal of an ‘organic’ connection of the elements in an artefact” (2006, p. 88).

Postdramatic theatre has “a rule to violate the conventionalized rule and the more or less established norm of sign density” (Lehmann, 2006, p. 89). The unexpected density of signs becomes overabundance on stage. The overabundant images lead to the death of images because of perceiving less and less. The aim is to provoke the spectators’ imagination and to become active. Plethora, which is one of postdramatic theatrical features, is that the proliferation of signs disturbs the order of images. A mass of unconnected elements overturns psychology. “The stage is transformed into a playing field or rubbish tip littered with objects, inscriptions and signs, a field of chaotically splintered associations, whose confusing density communicates a sense of chaos, insufficiency, disorientation, sadness and horror vacui” (Lehmann, 2006, p. 91). As a result of the density of signs and plethora, physicality in postdramatic theatre stands out, and there is also the effect of being performed; therefore, the body becomes the central theatrical sign, and sign usage makes theatre interpreted as concrete theatre.

Another sign in postdramatic theatre is musicalization which is an important usage. Not only the playwright but also the director can apply music and rhythm to the play. In this sense, postdramatic theatre does not consider musicalization as a language, and it provides independence for directors. Another conspicuous element is scenography or visual dramaturgy:

Scenography, naming a theatre of complex visuality, presents itself to the contemplating gaze like a text, a scenic poem, in which the human

body is a metaphor, its flow of movement in a complex metaphorical sense an inscription, a 'writing' and not 'dancing' (Lehmann, 2006, p. 94).

Postdramatic theatre dethrones linguistic signs, and it is hard to accept. The relationship between the play and the spectators possesses warmth in dramatic theatre; however, postdrama manifests itself as cold and the relationship between the play and spectators turns to coldness.

Furthermore, postdramatic theatre attacks reality. The frame in theatre is ruined, and hence actors can speak with spectators and incorporate them with the play. "The postdramatic theatre is the first to turn the level of the real explicitly into a 'co-player' – and this on a practical, not just theoretical level" (Lehmann, 2006, p. 100). Therefore, the eruption of the real is an object in postdramatic theatre. Because Lehmann believes that reality is in the form of mistakes. The last feature of postdramatic theatre is event/ situation. Theatrical signs are no longer used in the event and the situation of theatre; besides, they do not represent within the frame. They intend to produce and render a communicative event.

Consequently, the construction in theatre is broken, and the "deconstructed" structure is one of post-dramatic theatre aesthetics. Events hierarchically do not flow; de-hierarchization is another principle of post-dramatic theatre. Lehmann believes post-dramatic theatre is "a type of sign usage in the theatre", and he adds it is "more presence than representation, more shared than communicated experience, more process than product, more manifestation than signification, more energetic impulse than information" (2006, p. 85), because the density of signs purposes to incite the spectators and their imagination. There is no one object in theatre, but a few. Spreading objects can cause complexity in the mind of the spectators to comprehend.

## **1.2 The Concept of the Other**

The Other, according to Christopher Bush, is the "critical ubiquity less as a phenomenological-existential problem than as the problem of cultural difference" (2005, p. 162). The Other or Othering has plenty of types: ethnicity, nationality, race, sex, gender identity, age, language, disability, religion, skin color, economic

status, and so on. Othering types construct binary oppositions as social categories, such as man-woman, black-white, young-old, and poor-rich. These types or categories shape people's ideas about what they think, how they are seen by others, and how they see others.

In *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* (n.d.), the Other is described as “being the one (as of two or more) remaining or not included” and “being the one or ones distinct from that or those first mentioned or implied” while in *Macmillan Dictionary* (n.d.) the Other is described as “treating people from another group as essentially different from and generally inferior to the group you belong to”. The Other, in other words, is unnamed and the second mentioned, and to be otherized contains discriminatory treatment between two affairs. This case influences the way people perceive and conduct each other, and it creates a contrast between being part of the in-group and being part of the out-group. Othering attributes negative characteristics to people, and they think differently about human relationships: “like me” and “not like me”. Not like me negates the other's individuality and prejudices emerge against people and groups. As a result, Othering ascribes people who are like them see positive while people who differ from them see negative, and it makes people believe that unknown people are a threat to their way of life.

Othering is studied in the field of philosophy, psychology, ethics, racism, imperialism, colonialism, gender, and sex. Philosophy requires the Other for defining the self, according to Friedrich Hegel, Edmund Husserl, and Jean-Paul Sartre, who are well-known philosophers from different centuries. The Other ranks as a psychological phenomenon in a person's life, and it is a perception of the consciousness of the self and not a threat to the self. Jacques Lacan and Emmanuel Levinas study each other in the field of psychology. While Lacan reconciles the Other with language, Levinas correlates the Other with moral issues. The individual oversees the other person; thus, the Other is indispensable to the self. The perspective of racism, imperialism, and colonialism supports the othering of non-white peoples. The white man or the European is superior to the other, which is the non-European and colored person. Patriarchal societies handle the female as the



Other, and the female Other exists in the male patriarchy. The male-dominated represents women as the negative others in society, and woman's social roles are identified by their social identity. To sum up, othering issue has several sides to analyze in total; therefore, the Other will be analyzed in the context of gender and sex, racism, and place in this dissertation.



## CHAPTER TWO: SIMON STEPHENS AND *THREE KINGDOMS*

### 2.1 Simon Stephens

Simon Stephens is not only a contemporary English playwright, but he is also a prolific writer because he has wrote 120 new productions despite having his first premiere in the 2002-2003 seasons (Barnett, 2020, p. 112). He studied history at the University of York, and after the university, he worked as a teacher and taught in the Young Writers' Programme at the Royal Court Theatre. He worked as a teacher, barman, and DJ. Moreover, he was a musician in the orchestra, which made music upon the punk rock.

After the generation of playwrights branded 'in-yer-face' transformed the critical and commercial expectations of British 'New Writing', Stephens came to prominence at the Royal Court only a few years later (Bolton, 2013, p. 104) although Stephens is a contemporary of the 1990s in-yer-face playwrights: "the same age as Martin McDonagh, and slightly younger than Mark Ravenhill or Joe Penhall" (Innes, 2011, p. 445). Before the Royal Court, Stephens started his playwriting career on 1 January 2000. Stephens had written his eighth or ninth play, however, after several years, *Bluebird* assured his first professional production as part of the 1998 Royal Court's Young Writers' Festival (Bolton, 2013, p. 103). Bolton then states as giving Simon Stephens's biography "the Royal Court's Artistic Director, Ian Rickson, invited Stephens to become Playwright in Residence at the Royal Court for 2000/2001" (2013, p. 103), and thus "this allows him to categorize himself as part of the post-millennial and post-in-yer-face generation of playwrights, whose main output staged after 2000" (Innes, 2011, p. 445). Stephens won the Pearson Award in 2002 for *Port* and the Olivier Award in 2005 for *On the Shore of the Wide World*. He was Playwright in Residence at the Royal Exchange, Manchester (2001) and the National Theatre, London (2005), and between 2001 and 2005 he was Writers' Tutor for the Royal Court's Young Writers' Programme (Bolton, 2013, p. 103). Simon Stephens produced extraordinary work for the Royal Court and the Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester - a lyrical move on in terms of class and anger

from the Nineties' angry brigade (Eldridge, 2003, p. 56). Stephens got a Professorship of Scriptwriting at Manchester Metropolitan University in 2017. He now lives in London with his wife and three children.

After Simon Stephens's biography, it is time to look at Stephens's personality characteristics. Jasper Rees interviews Simon Stephens for *The Arts Desk*, a journalism website. Rees considers Stephens as "an intoxicating talker" unlike some writers (29 July 2012). Stephens has a strong personality and his words are impressive to inebriate his interlocutor. Besides, Simon Stephens cares about music in his life, and he utilizes music in his plays while writing or performing, and therefore he can speak melodically and friendly. There is another interview with the playwright in *the Guardian*. There are several details about Stephens's life in this interview. He got married in Hackney town hall. Stephens admitted he has thought of London as his home for 20 years; however, he says Stockport (his born place) when someone asks what his hometown is (*the Guardian*, 19 May 2015). Simon Stephens Chronology in Plays 4:

*Bring Me Sunshine* (Assembly Rooms, Edinburgh, and Riverside Studios, London) in 1997, *Bluebird* (Royal Court Theatre, London) in 1998, *Hérons* (Royal Court Theatre) and *Five Letters Home to Elizabeth* (radio play, broadcast on BBC Radio 4) in 2001, *Port* (Royal Exchange Theatre, Manchester, 2002): Pearson Award for Best New Play, 2001 in 2002, *Digging* (radio play, broadcast on BBC Radio 4) and *One Minute* (produced by the Actors Touring Company, Crucible Theatre, Sheffield) in 2003, *Christmas* (Pavilion Theatre, Brighton, and Bush Theatre, London) in 2003/4, *Country Music* (Royal Court Theatre) in 2004, *On the Shore of the Wide World* (Royal Exchange Theatre and National Theatre, London, 2005): Olivier Award for Best New Play in 2005, *Motortown* (Royal Court Theatre): voted Best Foreign Playwright, 2007 by annual critics' poll in Theater Heute magazine (Berlin) in 2006, *Pornography* (Deutsches Schauspielhaus, Hanover) in 2007, *Harper Regan* (National Theatre) and *Sea Wall* (Bush Theatre) in 2008, *Pornography* (adapted screenplay, for Channel 4's 'Coming Up' series), *Heaven* (Traverse Theatre, Edinburgh), and *Punk Rock* (Lyric Hammersmith,

London, and Royal Exchange Theatre) in 2009, *The Trial of Ubu* (co-production by Schauspiel Essen /Toneelgroep Amsterdam), *A Thousand Stars Explode in the Sky* (co-written with David Eldridge and Robert Holman; Lyric Hammersmith), *Marine Parade* (written with Mark Eitzel; Brighton International Festival), and *T5* (Traverse Theatre) in 2010, *Wastwater* (Royal Court Theatre), *I Am the Wind* (a new English version of Jon Fosse's play; Young Vic), and *Three Kingdoms* (Teater NO99, Tallinn, and Die Kammerspiele, Munich) in 2011, *A Doll's House* (a new version of Henrik Ibsen's play; Young Vic), *Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time* (adapted from Mark Haddon's novel; National Theatre), *Morning* (Traverse Theatre and Lyric Hammersmith), and *Three Kingdoms* (Lyric Hammersmith) in 2012, *Blindsided* (Royal Exchange Theatre), *Birdland* (Royal Court Theatre), *Carmen Disruption* (Deutsches Schauspielhaus, Hamburg), and *The Cherry Orchard* (a new English version of Anton Chekhov's play; Young Vic) in 2014 (2015, pp. 7-8).

## 2.2 Stephens's Dramatic Style

Simon Stephens utilizes different dramatic styles in his plays, and thus it is hard to categorize the plays. Although Stephens is contemporary with in-her-face theatre's playwrights and some plays have cruelty, rape, disease, bodily pain, and death, Gülşen Sayın states Stephens differs in the aspect of poetic language, the usage of images, and less obscene language, and therefore Stephens's theatrical style is post-dramatic theatre (2016, p. 117). On the other hand, Vicky Angelaki mentions "[t]he work of Simon Stephens is indicative" (2014, p. 142). Stephens utilizes signs on the stage, and he presents several objects at the same time.

Simon Stephens explains the experiences of reading plays in his *Plays 3*. While Stephens is reading his favorite plays or "the first awkward attempts of a nascent writer", he detects and asks himself to imagine "the practicalities of a theatrical experience", to figure out "the mechanics of stage directions" and to map the "shape of behavior", and at the same time to absorb "the sound and image of the words" (2011, p. 9). He constructs the play in mind to perform, and therefore he determines the play's limitations, and pros and cons. Reading a play and performing

it can differ from each other because of its theatrical features.

Simon Stephens believes in the value of the individual instead of the collective identity and communal action, which was embraced by the previous British political playwrights such as David Hare and Howard Brenton, and he moreover sees him as part of a generation that was identified by Thatcher's reign (Innes, 2011, p. 446). Stephens states he continues the tradition of individualism, which is emblazoned in the plays of John Osborne. Punk music has also become the symbol of his teenage rebellion, and Stephens has played for a band, whose name is Country Teasers, and the band is influenced by New York rock musicians such as Alex Chilton and Jonathan Richman, who founded the first proto-punk garage rock. Music is, therefore, essential for Stephens' plays, as well as the titles of *Country Music* and *Punk Rock*. Except for music, American films, and directors, such as David Lynch and Martin Scorsese, are also influential in his plays.

In the chapter, "Simon Stephens" in *Modern British Playwriting 2000-2009*, Jacqueline Bolton spoke on Stephens's characters and he believes they substantiate "an ongoing improvisation of moral, societal and familial values, an improvisation engendered by the twentieth century's erosion of such ideological certainties as organized religion, elected government and the nuclear family" (2013, p. 104). Stephens, and his characters, in other words, deal with today's problems including morality, religion, and politics. Moreover, Bolton states the bad language, brutal imagery, and gritty realism in Stephens's plays are eligible for subsumption despite in-ye-face banners (2013, p. 104), and thus Jacqueline Bolton promotes Simon Stephens's theatrical style within the modern theatre.

As Stephens's theatrical language, it is perspicuous to see his swearing-in in the plays. Jasper Rees asks Simon Stephens about the swearing-in in an interview for *The Arts Desk*. Stephens explains:

...we're aiming it at 11-year-olds in this country and I think every 11-year-old in this country has used the word fuck, normally behind their parents' back, normally with a sense of daring and a sense of naughtiness. And actually I really cherish the theatrical gesture of allowing the theatre to be a place where

you can be a bit naughty and a bit transgressive (2012).

The swearing is life itself according to Stephens. An 11-year-old uses “fuck” behind people. Stephens’s stage mirrors the real world, and thus his characters can swear with daring and naughtiness. Teenagers and the question of what a home is and how one leaves home and how one ever possibly can return home are of inescapable interest for Stephens (Rees, 2012). Simon Stephens handles the character’s desire to flee and to leave home in *Hérons*, *Christmas*, *Bluebird*, *Port*, and an interest in trying to return home *On the Shore*, *Motortown*, and *Three Kingdoms*.

Consequently, taking his place within the theatre-making hierarchy, Simon Stephens is a playwright being written about himself, and he insists on collaborative production and reception. Moreover, Stephens points out craftsmanship rather than writing and places “the role of the craftsmanship as one craft among others” (Love, 2016, p. 323). Stephens fictionalizes his plays as characteristically open-ended despite being seen as an avoidance of resolution, but ambiguity covenants the minimalist hope that characterizes all his endings. Stephens, on the one hand, breaks naturalistic illusion through some techniques. For instance, he keeps all the actors on stage throughout the performance, and characters can thus observe the others’ scenes. Stephens’ language remains realistic, but David Barnett (2016, p. 305) sees his language as “a flatly naturalistic slice of life” and continues “the use of repeated motifs and more lyrical, reflective moments mark his writing as reaching beyond the everyday while keeping its feet firmly on the ground”, and his plays are experimental, thus, the scenes are tangible and palpable, and they can be developed further. His plays are written; however, all his work can be changed by the production as staging. When Sebastian Nübling is asked why he is constantly directing Simon Stephens stuff, Nübling explains he is a director who depends on text, and Simon Stephens has enough words and leaves space for imagination as well as the unspoken and the dark side between the spoken and the unspoken, thus, according to Nübling, theatre is about words and images from the dark side (2015, p. 13).

The other element in Stephens' plays is his use of music, which divulges the emotions of characters and generalizes their situations. Finally, Stephens uses ecological, environmental, and autobiographical themes in his plays. For instance, *Bluebird* is about his first child while *Hérons* tells the experience of teaching teenagers in Essex and Dagenham. As ecological and environmental themes, global warming or social breakdown can be seen in his plays, such as *On the Shore of the Wide World* and *A Thousand Stars Explode in the Sky*. Stephens' plays invite "empathetic engagement with despairs, doubts, betrayals- and hopes- of a society often fearful to acknowledge these everyday presences" (Bolton, 2013, p. 102). His combination of characters, themes, and creative ambiguity makes him one of the most important among today's British dramatists.

### ***2.3 Three Kingdoms***

Simon Stephens wrote *Three Kingdoms* in 2011, and the play was performed with German director Sebastian Nübling in England, Germany, and Estonia at different times. *Three Kingdoms* is not only the play about the law officers' and sex workers' lives in London, Hamburg, and Tallinn, but also "a play about commodity fetishism, alterity, pornography and globalised national culture and all the other things it is, and isn't quite, about" (Yates, 2012). The play consists of three parts and an epilogue. Two British police officers, Ignatius Stone and Charlie Lee discover an Estonian prostitute's head in the Thames at Chiswick, and they start to investigate the event including the European sex trade. Stephens uses different languages, English, German, and Estonian, and this makes the play complex and challenging.

David Barnett alleges that *Three Kingdoms* is "a response to commissions from both the Traverse in Edinburgh and the Schauspielhaus in Hamburg" (2020, p. 122). Simon Stephens wrote the play for each house; however, the Traverse withdrew for financial reasons and the Schauspielhaus lost faith in the idea, and "[t]he Lyric Theatre in London and the Kammerspiele in Munich both stepped into

the breach and were joined by the NO99 theatre of Tallinn” (Barnett, 2020, p. 122).

Handling *Three Kingdoms*, Henry Hitchings asserts the playwright-director opposition, writing that “Simon Stephens’s new play is a detective story but director Sebastian Nübling has turned it into an extraordinary hallucination” (2012), and he concludes the polyglot production masked Stephens’s writing. Andrew Haydon agrees with Hitchings and states that the play’s tone is much more like an increasingly hallucinatory involuntary journey rather than the suspenseful police procedural (2012, May 12). In her survey of *Three Kingdoms* for the *Guardian*, Maddy Costa comments the play is “either self-indulgent, overstated, too enigmatic by half, or one of the best pieces of theatre you will see this year, a joyride, a captivating dream”, and she expresses *Three Kingdoms* is “unfettered experimentation” that is not welcome in the UK (2012). On the contrary, Maddy Costa believes *Three Kingdoms* “touches on globalisation, social dislocation, abuses of humanity and the little-Englander mentality, and which uses a horrific story of sex trafficking as its trigger” (2012). Costa mentions the play’s dealing with social and global issues. Dan Rebellato declares, another playwright and academic, that the play explores “the newly permeable boundaries between nations, between people, between desire and possible, between right and wrong, between self and other, between who I am and who I am not” (2012). *Three Kingdoms* handles sex workers, different races, different countrysides, and human relationships within the melting pot.

On the other hand, Vicky Angelaki states “there is a sense of dangerous exposure shared amongst the characters and gradually instigated within the spectators”, and he continues “[b]y the end of performance the notions of perpetrator, persecutor and vigilante have become irretrievably blurred. For the spectators the play is a sensory journey conceptualized as a nightmare – and by the end of performance not much is resolved” (2014, p. 142). The play has not had a clear ending, and the audience is responsible for what happened at the end. *Three Kingdoms*, according to Benjamin Fowler, is “contradictory and slippery” (2016, p. 331), and Fowler explains the reason that “Nübling’s production responded with a



progressive fragmentation of naturalism by surrealist elements, generating a theatrical hallucination that... functioned as a kind of contemporary realism, exposing harsh truths about the human condition in advanced capitalism". The play has blurry scenes and fragmentations toward the end.

The first scene is set in London, and the play starts with a definition of London's scene in three languages. There is no character analysis, and because of this, the reader does not know the characters' age, height, or other features, unlike in traditional plays. There are three detectives in the play: Charlie Lee, detective inspector; Ignatius Stone, detective sergeant, and Tommy White. They are in the police station and have an interview with Tommy White. Charlie and Ignatius try to make Tommy talk; however, Tommy is insistent on not talking. He says continuously why he is there and adds he does not know the reason. He is angry when he cannot get an actual answer. Then, Ignatius and Charlie give an envelope, and there are three pictures in the envelope. Tommy takes them, and he does not say anything. Charlie asks questions about throwing the bag in the river, but he cannot get any response from Tommy. Charlie gives another envelope to Tommy. When Tommy looks at the photos inside the envelope, he recoils in horror. After the shock, Tommy starts to tell him what happened. He meets a man in a pub, and then the man offers some amount of money for him to throw the bag into the river. Tommy accepts but he does not know the man although the man speaks first to him "Hello, Tommy". The man gives money and puts the bag on to Tommy, and later he leaves the pub.

After Tommy's investigation, DI Charlie Lee and DS Ignatius Stone are in Charlie's office. They talk about the event, the cut-woman-head found in the river. Though Charlie is tired, Ignatius considers the event. They scatter at home: Ignatius Stone and his wife Caroline Stone are in their flat. They are a married couple. Ignatius is tired and wants to sleep with his wife, Caroline, but she refuses by saying a lot of things to do. The next morning, Charlie, Ignatius, and Peeter Koepell (Estonian) are in Charlie's office. Peeter puts his first report about the event. In this part, the reader learns the cut-head belongs to a female, whose name is Vera Petrova

as the reader learned in section three. She is a porno star and has 14 pornographic films produced by a Russian company. The girl's head is held in a vice and sawed.

Charlie, Ignatius, Hele Kachonov (Estonian), and a Translator are in the terraced home in West London. Charlie and Ignatius examine Hele, who knows Vera Petrova, and she is a sex-worker like Vera. Along with the investigation, Charlie and Ignatius learn the man's name, who is his boyfriend of Hele. In scene six, Charlie, Ignatius, and Aleksandr Richter are together in the reception area outside Richter's office. At first, Aleksandr does not want to speak with detectives but later he speaks, and in the end, he gives a name, the White Bird. He is sent a DVD of what they had done to Vera Petrova. Then, Charlie and Ignatius are in Charlie's office, and they are watching the DVD. They decide to go to German to find the White Bird. In the last scene of the first part, Ignatius and Caroline are in their flat. Ignatius is preparing for his travel to Germany. Caroline wants to come with him, but it is not possible. In this part, the reader learns that Ignatius is fifteen years older than his wife.

The second part starts in the lobby of the Maritim Reichshoff Hotel in Hamburg at 8 p.m. Detective Steffen Dresner meets Ignatius and Charlie. Steffen helps them with the examination in Germany. He gives information that they get. Ignatius translates German into English. In his earlier years, he has lived in Germany, so he remembers a little bit. Later, Ignatius and Charlie go to the bar at the Reichshoff, and they drink. When they return to their hotel, Ignatius meets Stephine Friedman in the doorway of his hotel room. In the morning, Ignatius, Charlie, and Steffen Dresner are together at the breakfast table. Steffen shows them Brandt's photograph in the film.

Steffen, Ignatius, and Charlie are in Georg Kohler's office to interview him. Georg at first does not answer the questions of the detectives; however, later he starts to speak. In this part, the reader learns Georg is a film producer and knows Klaus Brandt, who is one of the lead actors in his films. Detectives are worried about if they can find the White Bird. The next morning, Ignatius, Charlie, and

Stephine are in the breakfast room at the Reichshoff. Stephanie asks questions Ignatius about his job and his special life because of her curiosity. Ignatius translates Stephanie's sayings because Charlie cannot understand Germany.

In scene seven, the setting is Kristina Suvi's flat. Kristina, Ignatius, Michael, and Steffen are there. They ask Kristina questions about the investigation. When she learns Vera is dead, she is shocked. The man is her boyfriend, and so they decide to wait for him. Before that, Steffen and Ignatius are in the hotel bar, then, Charlie joins them, and they chat a little bit and leave to sleep. Ignatius is, meanwhile, in Stephanie's room with her. The next day, Charlie, Ignatius, Steffen, and Klaus Brandt are in an interview room at the Police Station Steindamme, and Klaus does not talk. Steffen, Charlie, and Ignatius return to Steffen's office. Steffen offers Ignatius to go to Tallinn and arrest the man together, but Ignatius finds the idea crazy. Charlie becomes a little bit angry because he cannot understand, and Ignatius does not translate the sayings.

The setting is a room in an apartment in the Lasnamae, Tallinn. There are four men, but those are not their real names. Tom is Andres Rebane; Fredo is Rudi Peiker; Michael is Mart Oper; and Sony is Kristen Reims. Finally, there is a woman named Ola, who is their prisoner. Tom, Fredo, and Olya stay in the room, and the rest goes to eat something. Fredo says Tom to come to his room. Steffen Dresner and Ignatius Stone are in the house of Vera Petrova's father, Mr Petrov. The translator is the same in London, but he is dressed as Mart Oper. Mr Petrov believes his daughter deserves death. In the next scene, that is a hotel room in the Radisson Blu, Tallinn. Rudi Peiker (Fredo) waits with Steffen and Ignatius for Andres Rebane (Tom). Every character speaks their native language. When Rebane enters the room, they catch him.

Rudi Peiker, Ignatius, and Steffen are in a basement bar called the Dragon. They are drinking. Two women, Luiisi and Liisu, are there with the men. The first one resembles Stephanie, and the second one does Hele Kavhonov. Besides, Mr Petrov is there but no one notices him at first. Liisu is the wife of Steffen. This part

is the peak point where reality is irrupted. Ignatius is drunk and Liisu's question about the White Bird creates confusion in his mind. Later, Ignatius realizes the White Bird is Steffen Dresner. Then, Ignatius goes to his hotel, and he resembles a receptionist to Tommy. The next morning meets the spectators or readers odd and confused things, because Ignatius is in an office in a central Tallinn police station, and he is interrogated. He doesnot remember anything. Two police officers, Sonny and Michael resume his real name Paul, and they show him his passport. Ignatius does not understand what they say. He looks at the cyanide; he holds it, sniffs it, and drinks it. At that moment, Martin Lemsalu and Charlie enter. Ignatius learns Steffen turns back Hamburg.

The setting is again London. Ignatius and Caroline are in their flat, and Ignatius wants to take holiday with his wife. In the end, he cannot find true words. Caroline restsher fingers on his lips, and she makes him stop speaking.

## CHAPTER THREE: THE QUESTION OF THE OTHER

Chapter three of the dissertation focuses on the other issue under three categorizations: woman, race, and place. While analyzing these, some theories are used: Feminism Theory for women, The Other Theory, and racist issues for racism and places.

### 3.1 Woman as the Other

This part focuses on the woman as the other in Simon Stephens's *Three Kingdoms*. It is important to include gender studies and feminist theories in this thesis while analyzing the subject. Dealing with the gender issue, throughout history, the relationship between men and women is subject to the fields of art and its reflections on the theatre such as literature, theatre, and cinema. It is the man and woman issue in a general context, because the woman issue is mostly spoken due to feminist studies. Man- woman, male-female, and masculine-feminine should be discussed in the terms of sex, gender, and identity. Then, another part is a woman in theatre, in Christianity, and in modern times. Throughout history, woman's place in theatre has changed, and their representation takes a long way from the ancient times to today. Finally, part three is the main part of the thesis. This chapter tells about *Three Kingdoms*' women characters' representation. Readers witness Simon Stephens's writing style and the interpretation of his female characters.

Man and woman are the main concepts in art, and they are represented in different ways along with the history of literary texts. Writers and authors use certain words to explain man and woman. Within the explanations of "man and woman" by one of famous feminist writers, Simone De Beauvoir, a French writer, feminist, and social theorist, identifies woman:

One is not born, but rather becomes, woman. No biological, psychic, or economic destiny defines the figure that the human female takes on in society; it is civilization as a whole that elaborates this intermediary product between the male and the eunuch that is called feminine (2009, p. 330).

The first sentence is essential and enchanting to consider the woman issue. Simone De Beauvoir believes being a woman is not got inborn as natural but is gained later within society. The woman is the kind of man who has not to have phallus like the man. She is evaluated by being made a comparison with him, and that is appraised. In the other words, to be a woman is a right by experiencing the period after birth. Civilization and culture add value to a woman.

Gender studies and feminist aspects, in this sense; carry on some, which are man-woman, male-female, and masculine-feminine. The readers do not care what they mean or if they are proper in that context; therefore, feminist theories and theorists, such as Kate Millett, Judith Butler, and Simone de Beauvoir are perused. These famous names distinguish woman's issues like sex and gender, and they then explain the place of women in society. In the usage of these terms in literature, on the other hand, there are questions about the representations of women: Are women misrepresented by male writers, or are they not presented in works? Can male writers be objective about women while they adapt their characters in their books, plays, or poems? That point is momentous because men represent women along with history due to a patriarchal society and the power of men upon art. Women keep in the background, and they live and produce in the lead of men in society. However, women start to be seen in the field with feminist studies. It is to analyze the woman issue in the context of sex and gender at first.

The distinction between sex and gender is one of the feminist subjects. "Sex is a biological categorization based primarily on reproductive potential, whereas gender is the social elaboration of biological sex" (Eckert & McConnel-Ginet, 2003, p. 10). Though sex is mentioned as a biological identity, Judith Butler mentions that "gender is culturally constructed; hence, gender is neither the casual result of sex nor as seemingly fixed as sex" (1990, p. 6). A person endows with his/her sex when s/he is born; however, gender identity is alike sex. A person possesses gender identity with one's life within society. Culture, lifestyle, and religion in society are essential to forming one's gender. Gender brings some

questions: Is sex natural, anatomical, or hormonal while gender is not, or is gender the cultural interpretation of sex? Judith Butler answers these questions in *Gender Trouble* (1990, p. 7):

Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pre-given sex (a juridical conception); gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/ cultural means by which “sexed nature” or “a natural sex” is produced and established as “pre-discursive,” prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts.

Furthermore, gender can be defined as the social face of sex occurring in time. It is a creation or construction that sexes form. Butler continues talking about gender and adds “...gender does not denote a substantive being, but a relative point of convergence among culturally and historically specific sets of relations” (1990, p. 10). According to Butler, the cultural and historical phenomenon is indispensable to talking about gender. However, is the distinction between sex and gender clear, or is it easy and simple to state sex is natural while gender is cultural? It is obscure to extricate two terms from each other. On the contrary, Luce Irigaray gives positive perspectives to the reader about gender differentiation in *Between East and West* (2002, p. 96) despite adverse ideas:

If each gender assumes, in itself and for itself, the specificity of its nature and works out its cultivation, a new type of civility will be put in place in which the duality of the genders will become, thanks to their differences, culturally fertile, and not only naturally fertile as it still is too exclusively today.

If someone can benefit from gender differences, one can achieve a peaceful atmosphere in social life. Duality does not always create confusion, and as occasion requires, it procreates diversity. Nevertheless, “[a] gender perspective decouples the biological structure and function of the male or female body from the behaviours, feelings, and roles deemed appropriate to that body” (Green, 1997, p. 405).

*Cambridge Dictionary* defines “identity” as “who a person is, or the qualities of a person or group that make them different from others”. Identity, according to the dictionary, is a classification to differentiate people from each other.

Another definition is “[i]dentity is the individuality of a person and comprises relatively stable personality traits that are especially prevalent in certain situations (role behaviours such as being a parent)” (Salkind, 2008, p. 499). What makes us different from other people? Some major identities help us recognize individuals. Age is one of the significant; the others can be given as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and religion. “[I]dentity is not an essence but a continually shifting description of ourselves so that the meaning of identity categories – Britishness, blackness, masculinity, etc. – are held to be subject to continual deferral through the never-ending processes of supplementary or difference” (Barker, 2004, p. 94). For instance, I am a person who is at twenty-six years old, a Turk, a Muslim, and a woman. The total of them consists of me, or a human being. I have a lot of identities in society as an individual. These identities shape our behaviors in relationships. Tradition, culture, and social life are the center of life. There is an idiom: Start like a Turk, and Finish like a German; another version is: Start like a Turk, Work like a German, and Finish like English. “Start like a Turk” is meteorically used because Turks are blindfolded, determined, and obstinate people while the German is hardworking and diligent. Even adjectives used here determine races’ identities.

Secondly for gender identity, *Britannica* (2020) defines it as “an individual’s self-conception as a man or woman or as a boy or girl or as some combination of man/boy and woman/girl or as someone fluctuating between man/boy and woman/girl or as someone outside those categories altogether”. In other words, gender identity is who you know yourself to be and how you see yourself. Without outside intervention, you can determine your own gender identity; in this respect, it differs from biological sex. Another dictionary, *Merriam-Webster* (n.d.) defines gender identity differently: a person's internal sense of being male, female, some combination of male and female, or neither male nor female. However, gender identity includes a lot of terms rather than only male and female; these are agender, bigender, cisgender, gender fluid, genderqueer, Mx., third gender, transgender, two-spirit, and Ze/Hir (Gender Identity Terms).



In the context of gender identity, it is the role within society, and it is later learned by parental example, social reinforcement, and language. A baby is at first “it” in the womb before sex is known, and after a while, the baby is born and gets his/her gender. Imagine a small boy imitating his father. “As he swaggers and sticks out his chest, he is doing everything he can to be like his father -- to be a man” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 10). On the other hand, the situation of a small girl is the same as the boy. She behaves like her mother as she puts on her mother’s high-heeled shoes and minces around the room. While a child gets his/her identity, a role model is crucial, because gender identity is constructed through culture and language.

Women do not appear on the stage until a certain date whether they are actresses or female playwrights. Men are always at the forefront in every field, and besides in theatre as actors and playwrights, and women are second in male dominance. Till Aphra Behn, there is no professional woman playwright; she is the first professional woman playwright.

Until the Restoration (1660) women were not officially welcome in the professional theatre (although courtly women wrote plays and masques, and women were an active part of itinerant, popular theatre); through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries actresses established themselves more and more firmly, along with the popular concomitant assumption that women performers were but a step away from prostitution (Chambers, 2002, p. 842).

Thanks to feminist works, women are seen on the theatre stage as a playwright. In contrast to woman playwrights, women characters in theatre are need to talk, because the focused play is written by a man, and so it is essential at first to look at the historical background of the usage of a woman character in theatre.

Theatre is based on the period of the Greek and Roman, and the two races are different from each other. When it is studied on their theatre style, actors in the Greek are men and professionals, but in Roman, there can be women actresses on the stage- however, they are amateurs- in contrast to the Greeks. Although the Romans are known as a violent society, they permit women to be on the theatre stage. One name takes over the representation of women characters in theatre in the Greek era; that is Euripides. He

is famous for his plays, *Medea*, *Electra*, *The Trojan Women*, and *Helen*. Euripides criticizes Athenian society because they treat women as inferior (Osnes, 2001, p. 105). “His depictions of women deserve particular attention; it is easy to extract from his plays a long list of heroines who are fierce, treacherous, or adulterous, or all three at once” (Taplin, 20219). He also depicts the indignation of the Athenian woman in his plays despite his being a woman-hater.

Euripides tells a tragedy of a woman, whose name is Medea, being both wife and mother in his play, *Medea*. The story is about Medea’s revenge on her husband, and she murders her husband’s new wife and her two children for vengeance. At the end of *Medea* (Euripides, 1963, p. 42), Medea is talking, and society considers women lazy, fragile, and powerless. Thus, women are not taken seriously even as an enemy. Hence, Medea demands to prove herself and her power. The representation of women in the ancient period is not pleasant because neither they are represented as like they are, nor as like they want to be, and they are portrayed as like the ones in men’s minds.

In Christianity, Mary- the mother of Jesus- is the most prominent woman figure, and her other name is the Virgin Mary. Furthermore, some titles are stated along with the history- the guarantee of the Incarnation, virgin mother, second Eve, mother of God, ever virgin, immaculate, and assumed into heaven (Pelikan, 2021). Especially being a virgin is a symbol of virtue as a woman- Elizabeth I (1533-1603) is called the Virgin Queen in British history. Consequently, Mary is whiter than white and an example woman. According to the religion of Christianity, a woman must copulate only with her husband; otherwise, she is called a prostitute because the woman sleeps with multiple men. Namely, Mary is the symbol of motherhood and a true woman in Christianity.

There is another Mary in Christianity, who is St. Mary Magdalene. According to the Gospel, she is “the first person to see the resurrected Christ” (Britannica, 2019). In addition, she witnesses Jesus Christ’s crucifixion. The Gospel of John

states St. Mary Magdalene is the apostle of the apostles. As opposed to that, she starts to be called MaryMagdalene as a prostitute after Easter sermons, because they conflate her name with other sinful women in Bible. History once tarnishes her name as a sinner. To hear her name, it gives a negative meaning, unlike the Virgin Mary. Whereas St. Mary Magdalene is called a whore, she is indicated as the leader of women in Christianity after Jesus Christ.

In the theatre after Christianity in Britain, there is no women representation on stage, also men. Allegorical plays are there on stage by priests. Morality or miracle plays are there to give moral lessons to the audience. Until the Elizabethan period, there are no significant plays upon the represented man and woman characters, because prohibition is implemented. After the restrictions on the theatre are removed, the theatre idea is reconstructed.

When people have reached modern times, society has changed, and discourses have also been about the man and woman issue. After the feminist movement, women begin to be seen a lot in every area of life. The representation of women in theatre has begun to diversify. Traditional representation of women is as good mothers, wives, lovers, and exemplary people, on the other hand, they are also represented as talkative, gossipy, and feeble. On the contrary, there is a turning point in theatre: Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House* in 1879. The center of play is set in an ordinary family- Torvald Helmer, a bank lawyer, Nora, his wife, and their three children (Britannica, 2021). The play opens on Christmas Eve. The setting is the house of Torvald and Nora. It represents a world. They are out of money and Torvald is sick, and it is needed to be a cure, and Nora takes money from Krogstad. Along with the play, Nora questions her position in life. However, she thinks her marriage is disappointing. The end of the play is the most momentous and unprecedented part. Nora leaves her husband because she feels as if they are strangers to each other although they are married. The end has made an overwhelming impression in the world of theatre. Henrik Ibsen (1879, p. 128) finishes his play with the following:

[She goes out.]

**HELMER** (sinks in a chair by the door with his face in his hands) Nora! Nora! (He looks round and stands up). Empty. She is gone! (A hope inspires him). Ah! The miracle of miracles ?!

[From below is heard the reverberation of a heavy door closing].

It is the miracle for a woman because she begins a new life. The reverberation of a heavy door closing is the symbol of the woman's power over male hegemony. It is like a slap against all cultural identities being determined for women. In the period after the 20<sup>th</sup> century, new movements in theatre occur, and thus the representation of women is unfettered. With Absurd Theatre, Angry Young Men Movement, Kitchen Sink Drama, Theatre of Cruelty, In-ye-face theatre, and Postdramatic Theatre, the spectator is getting accustomed to extraordinary things on stage such as violence, sex, and blood; therefore, similar, and ordinary events since the ancient period are extremely presented in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries.

Simon Stephens utilizes seven female characters in *Three Kingdoms*. While the readers are reading or watching the play, they learn details about the characters; otherwise, Stephens does not describe them, and he lets his readers and spectators' dreams. Within seven female characters, firstly, Caroline Stone is the wife of Detective Sergeant Ignatius Stone, and she is English. She is twenty-eight years old, and Ignatius mentions he is "fifteen years older than" her (Stephens, 2015, p. 66), so Ignatius is forty-three, and they have no child. Besides, Caroline is a writer on local travel journalism (Stephens, 2015, p. 89), and she is interested in flowers. Is she a proper wife? Has she had a powerful personality, or has she achieved to get a successful identity in society as a woman? There is no detailed knowledge in the play about Caroline. That can be only interpreted and extrapolated. Another female character is Olya, who is an Estonian. She is the prisoner of some men, whose names are Tom, Fredo, Michael, and Sonny, in a room in an apartment in the Lasnamae, Tallinn. There is not any knowledge about Olya. Moreover, there are some female names in the play; however, their names are only heard because they die, such as Vera Petrova, Vera Chislova, and Vera Kukk. Other female characters in the play are Stephanie Friedmann (German), Liisi (Estonian), Hele Kachonov

(Estonian), Kristina Suvi (Estonian), and Liisu (Estonian). They are sex workers in their countries. When the name “sex workers” is heard, why are women considered? How does Stephens represent women in his play? Is the woman in the Other statue in society? The aim tries to find the answer to these questions in this thesis.

Firstly, the main aim is to focus on the killed woman, Vera Petrova. She is the same age as Caroline Stone- twenty-eight. While Vera is a sex worker, Caroline is a writer, and Vera is barbarously killed although Caroline lives. Is Vera killed because of her identity in society, or does she deserve to die? Caroline and Vera are women, and their bodies are charming to men. In this sense, Judith Butler states in *Gender Trouble* that “...the body is figured as a mere instrument or medium for which a set of cultural meanings are only externally related” (1990, p. 8). Men and women consider the body as an instrument for each other. Whatever the culture or religion is, society believes women are created for men. On the other hand, according to Simone de Beauvoir in *Second Sex* (2009, p. 29),

[t]he couple is a fundamental unit with the two halves riveted to each other: cleavage of society by sex is not possible. This is the fundamental characteristic of woman: she is the Other at the heart of a whole whose two components are necessary to each other.

Man and woman are the whole as human beings. These two living creatures complement each other. However, the man is stated as the one while the woman is the other. Again, in *Three Kingdoms*, Caroline and Vera are the other, but why is Vera killed although Caroline is alive? Stephens (2015) answers with the mouth of Aleksandrin section six of part one, London:

She made shit money. She had a shit cunt. She fucked like a dead cow. She stank. She was lazy. She never stopped complaining. She was rude to the customers. She never cleaned out her cunt. The clients could smell other men inside her. She deserved to die. She deserved to get her head cut off. She was a stinking rotten piece of fucking meat. She was good for one thing. And even that she fucked up (p. 60).

According to Aleksandr, Vera is passive, lazy, impolite, dirty, and nasty. As a woman, she is off-cast in the eyes of men. In this part, it is possible to state he is a misogynist, which means “a man who hates women or believes that men are much

better than women” (*Cambridge Dictionary*). Misogyny confronts women, and it makes no matter if women are good girls or bad girls because they are forced into the same enigma; “they still arouse lust in men for which they, not those who desire them, are held responsible” (Holland, 2006, p. 45). Misogyny is, according to Özata, consorted by adultery and rape and consolidated by sexual acts (2022, p. 177). Additionally, there is an aversion against women by men in the play. However, Simone De Beauvoir (2009) believes the Other is an original idea like consciousness, and she adds the duality between self and other is found in primitive societies and ancient mythologies; this division does not found in experimental (p. 26). The distinction exists since the first day of the world.

Except for Aleksandr and other men’s ideas, Vera’s murder might be associated with another issue. In the first part, London Ignatius and Charlie talk about the killed woman, and Ignatius remarks (Stephens, 2015, p. 47):

If you remove somebody’s brain you remove their consciousness. Well, actually what you do is you separate their consciousness from their corporality, from their body. So, we have somebody whose intention is to punish this girl in the most extreme way imaginable. In the fifteenth century they used to display heads of traitors on spikes on Bridge Gate. Why did they do that?

The murderer removes Vera’s head from her body. A person is whole with all organs, but Vera is not in this sense. The body without the brain does not have meaning because the brain thinks. The body works and has a function if it is with the brain; otherwise, if there is no brain, you cannot consider and decide, and the body becomes only a piece of meat. Besides, the brain symbolizes ideas and ideologies. If the body and the brain are removed from each other, it is destroyed of thinking, questioning and creating new ideas. In other words, the Other’s thinking way is dead, and the Other cannot defend him/herself.

Moreover, Ignatius compares the event with the ones in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Is Vera a traitor or a martyr? In the Medieval Period, the heads of traitors are removed from their bodies and the kings make them hang on the bridge or in the square to

threaten society in case of treason against the government. A woman's body belongs to her husband according to the traditional point of view, and her husband can freely use it. Yet, the feminist idea states woman's body is incumbent on herself rather than a man- whoever the man is, lover or husband. From a feminist view, on the one side, Vera is a martyr because she is killed by her enemy as if it is in religion, and on another side, Vera is a traitor since she does not belong to a man. In the part of Tallinn, Vera's father mentions she deserves death:

**Mr Petrov** (in Estonian) She was a whore. She was a pain in the arse. She lied. All the time. She had no friends. She smelt fucking disgusting. I really, you know, hated her. I'm not sad. She deserved it. It was always going to happen oneday. It was just a question of time (Stephens, 2015, p. 111).

Vera's father hates her, and thus he is not sad. "It was always going to happen one day" is an infallible situation. It is not bewildering to hear that. There is a proverb to describe what Vera's father states: He who lives by the sword, shall die by the sword. Vera is a whore, and that is an inevitable situation.

On the contrary, Irigaray Luce (2004, p. 97) enounces another perspective on the women's issue. She believes the woman must procreate with a man both bodily and spiritually. Vitalizing men for their bodies and spirit is available in some religious traditions. Luce resists the assimilation and integration of women within men's world. She sees this situation as a danger to private and collective life. Women should remain not only the guardian of love in the traditional sense but also the relational life in private and public life. They should protect their values, yet Simone De Beauvoir does not agree with Irigaray Luce. Beauvoir has a dissimilar idea about woman's safeguarding themselves. In *The Second Sex* (2009, p. 30), she states the following lines: "Refusing to be the Other, refusing complicity with man, would mean renouncing all the advantages an alliance with the superior caste confers on them". According to Beauvoir, to be the other is an advantage to get opportunities in male hegemony. If you reject to be it, you cannot have benefits. In this sense, Vera refuses to be the other and she loses living in *Three Kingdoms*. To be her as a woman ends with her death; but, Caroline Stone, the wife of Ignatius is alive because she has a life that society confirms. She does

her job and maintains her marriage.

In the part of Tallinn, there is the conversation of a male character, Sonny about Olya, his and other men's prisoner. He states what a woman must do:

Train her to fetch our slippers. Train her to make us a gin and tonic. Train her to do something useful instead of just sitting there all day sucking our cocks and fucking whimpering in a language I can't even fucking understand (Stephens, 2015, p. 108).

Sonny has a traditional mentality, and this reminds the Victorian period's values. Queen Victoria is a model as a mother, wife, and queen in Britain. In this part, Sonny considers a woman should be useful to her man, and daily housework should be completed. Men do not wish women to achieve what they do not understand, because they do not want to see them be more successful against him. In addition, other female characters in the play, Stephanie Friedman, Liisi, Hele Kachonov, Liisu, and Kristina Suvi have no function to create their identities. Because they do not step out of the line which men determine. It is not heard that they object to their life as sex workers. "In the contemporary moment, our world is full of people who are physically present, and yet invisible" (Nield, 2008, p. 138). Stephanie, Liisi, Hele, Liisu, and Kristina are silent women on stage, "who are spat at, transfigured as deer (the powerless prey of hungry wolves), or reduced to blankly mopping the floor [is also appalling]" (Haydon, 2012, May 18), and their bodies represent as capital and as a fetish or consumer object.

The animalization of the women debar from their identities, and that makes them defenseless in an erotic place; "it visualizes a contemporary version of the human zoo, reminiscent of the 'atrocities exhibition of post-colonialism', where certain human lives is considered of lesser value" (Zaoluia, 2016, p. 362). At that point, there are dissimilarities between on stage and the text of *Three Kingdoms*, and female characters are strikingly represented as sometimes in underwear and fur coats with a deer head and sometimes as a dog, an animal on stage compared to the text. Haydon justifies "the modern world is excoriated through representation" (2012, May 18). Reinelt sees the design of deer and wolf head-masks for the



prostitutes and pimps as “a distancing device of great brilliance” (2017, p. 249), and he agrees with Haydon’s argument; according to Reinelt, the play “substitutes metaphor for realistic portrayal and in some ways thereby refuses the realism that makes violent and humiliating representations sensational and unethical” (2017, p. 249). In this way, Stephens emcees female representations of the modern world to his readers and spectators.

To sum up, Simon Stephens portrays three kinds of women characters in his play. One of them is Caroline; she is Detective Ignatius’s wife and a writer. The second one is Vera, who is the killed woman by removing her head from her body. She is an Estonian girl and a whore. The last ones are the women working as sex workers. These women’s social identities are different from each other. “Their state of origin will most likely fail to notice their absence; the destination states will usually consider such trafficked women illegal aliens or in any case non-citizens” (Reinelt, 2017, p. 238). Trafficked women or sex workers are judged as non-citizens in both their own countries and foreign ones.

Caroline is the figure of the Virgin Mary in the play. She has a proper marriage and life. It cannot be seen any negative sides to her. However, Vera is killed. Why? Does she merit the barbaric death? It is arduous to answer truly. Two assertions can be given about Vera. The first one is Vera is a betrayer because she turns her back on tradition and culture, and she is in the gutter as a prostitute. Therefore, his father states she deserves death. “[I]f you don't make your bodily devotions, if you sin by omission, you will be punished” (Baudrillard, 1998, p. 131). Aleksandr and other men believe, because of this, it is good for her to die. Yet, Vera rejects being a prostitute, and she does not behave calmly and is attentive to her male customers. Vera can be a martyr because feminist theory mentions every woman should protect her body, soul, and life from men’s tyranny. She wants to save herself from male characters, but she cannot overcome it, and she is defeated and dies.

The other female characters do not reject their roles in society, and they follow the way men’s hegemony decides for them. Women’s abuse onstage,

absence, silence, and oppressive masculine tone mean that there is no limitation of representation on the stage because women are mopping the floor, ridiculed, or spat on. The appearances are extravagant onstage, and women become concealed or invisible; therefore, women's situation makes the readers or spectators cross the borders of New Europe to Old Europe.

Finally, the women in *Three Kingdoms* differently are represented by the playwright. The characterization displays the minor of the reality in the world. Women are evaluated as the second or the Other in society. If one of them wants to change this attitude, she encounters calamity- which is sometimes violence or sometimes death.

### **3.2 Race as the Other**

It aims to analyze the question of the other of race in Simon Stephens's *Three Kingdoms*. The playwright utilizes different races in the play. Simon Stephens treats three races in *Three Kingdoms*- English, German and Estonian. The characteristics of races will be handled in the play and it will be dealt with how races are seen as the other, because "the border which is driven through geographical and representational space produces a second border between the body and its visibility to the law" (Nield, 2008, p. 144). Before races in the play, it must be looked at in some terms, which are race and ethnicity. There are numerous studies on race, racism, ethnicity, and ethnic group; moreover, these terms are interchanged within the texts. Therefore, it is difficult to describe their meanings and their correct usage within the context.

This part will discuss race, ethnicity, and stereotyping. Firstly, in *Cambridge Dictionary* and *Britannica's* definitions of race, *Cambridge Dictionary* defines race as "one of the main groups to which people are often considered to belong, based on physical characteristics that they are perceived to share such as skin color, eye shape, etc." According to *Britannica*, the race is "the idea that the human species is divided into distinct groups based on inherited physical and behavioral differences". In other words, what is the thing that the people in society differentiate

from other societies? *Cambridge* and *Britannica*, in this sense, emphasize physical properties. People's appearance is to be a determinant throughout history.

On the other hand, *Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology* approaches race with a different viewpoint, and the book's editor- British and Australian sociologist- Bryan S. Turner explains the dissimilarity between race and ethnicity as follows:

Race generally refers to genetically transmitted characteristics popularly associated with different human groups (such as skin color, facial features, hair texture, body type, and so forth), while ethnicity is generally used to distinguish between groups with a salient array of culturally acquired characteristics (such as language, religion, or nationality) (2006, p. 490).

According to Turner's definition, race is a biological and congenital issue while ethnicity is an acquired object that is obtained culturally within society. An individual cannot decide his/her physical appearance, the country, family, and race that s/he is born. However, s/he might choose ethnic features, such as language, religion, and culture. While dictionaries define race as per the above paragraphs, Raymond Williams gives details about race and its root in *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* in 1983. Williams asserts that one of the race's early uses is "offspring in the sense of a line of descent - 'race and stock of Abraham' (1570)" (p. 248). Moreover, he alleges race is used in classificatory biology as well as genus and species, and he believes things begin to get hard when race is used for a group of a species, and thus the term is privatized in time.

Except for "race", there are several new terms that should be considered and discussed. Some of the most significant ones are racism, racist, and racial factors. In this regard, Frank Reeves focuses on racial differences and racism in *British Racial Discourse: A Study of British Political Discourse About Race and Race-related Matters*. Firstly, Reeves' statement about the racial issue mentions that "...the recognition of racial difference requires some form of classification, comparison, and judgment of categorial significance" (1983, p. 7). Reeves utilizes "classification, comparison, and judgement" to identify racial distinction. People in society are subjected to some principles because of proving their differences from other people in other societies. Frank Reeves gives seven definitions of "racism" in the following pages of his book. The term is a whole

containing all assumptions. These are:

- (a) that races of human beings exist
- (b) that these races differ from one another
- (c) that the differences are deeply rooted and enduring
- (d) that the differences are significant, possibly because they appear in themselves to be explanatory, or because explanations of other social features may be inferred from them
- (e) that the differences have social consequences, for example, for social policy.
- (f) that the differences between races are of superior to inferior, that they occur in some sort of rank order.
- (g) that the superior race(s) ought to be entitled to more favourable treatment and the inferior to less (1983, p. 12-13).

With the clauses that Frank Reeves gives upon racism, the reader can understand that (a) people generate races, (b) every race is desperate from each other, (c) races' dissimilarities are ingrained- thus, they will hold to the last, (d) besides, races' dissimilarities are prominent, (e) because of the dissimilarities, races may encounter some cases in society, (f) these dissimilarities make race consider their superior or inferior within other races, and (g) finally the superior races get the privilege and hold the power. The existence of races forms chain ring; consequently, it causes race differences and racism problems in society.

The second term is ethnicity, which is sometimes used instead of race, but both are different. These two terms' roots should be attentively studied to decide which one is true according to the context. Ethnicity is derived from the term "ethnic"; thus, it is firstly revised of the meaning of ethnic. Raymond Williams (1983) utters that ethnicity is used in English since the 14<sup>th</sup> century (p. 119), and the term stems from "ethnikos"- heathen in Classical Greek. It is also used in the meaning of heathen, pagan, or Gentile until the 19<sup>th</sup> century. After that period, ethnicity comes "to be used in the United States as what was described in 1961 as 'a politic term for Jews, Italians, and other lesser breeds'" (Williams, 1983, p. 119). On the other hand, another source mentions the origin of the term: "Earlier in English as

a noun, 'a heathen, pagan, one who is not a Christian or Jew' (c. 1400). In modern noun use, it is 'member of an ethnic group,' from 1945" (Harper, n.d.). Ethnic's former usage has a religious meaning while today's usage is upon the group of human beings, and in this way, the term ethnic-ity reaches its modern definition.

How do theorists and sociologists define "ethnicity"? When theorists have started to talk about ethnicity, they stress the group of people. In this sense, Harry Goulbourne defines the term:

...ethnicity may be taken to refer to the awareness of groups of people and/or individuals who believe that they are bound together by one or more factors such as colour, 'race', common culture or destiny, and who are living with, or surrounded by, one or more numerically and/or culturally dominant groups which are themselves marked off from others by a similar set of factors (1991, p. 18).

Ethnicity is the group of people; on the contrary, ethnicity is the awareness of groups of people. Goulbourne states human beings consider themselves as the whole, however, to be the whole is essential to have a common ground as cultural factors. These people live together or are enclosed by shared values, and they experience ethnic elements; therefore, consciousness occurs in all people.

Apart from ethnic and ethnicity, there is a word: ethnic group; two definitions are essential. F. S. Hulse writes an article in 1972, "Ethnic, Caste and Genetic Miscegenation.", and later the editor, Anthony H. Richmond publishes it in *Readings in Race and Ethnic Relations*. Hulse defines an ethnic group that "[a]n ethnic group is a recognizable socio-cultural unit based upon some form of national or tribal distinction, which lives among other people rather than in its own country" (p. 35). On the other hand, Ellis Cashmore mentions in *Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies* that "an ethnic group is not a mere aggregate of people or a sector of a population, but a self-conscious collection of people united, or closely related, by shared experiences" (2004, p. 142). When it is revolved around ethnic groups, it is essential to have cultural knowledge and shared experience instead of the same place and country. The modern era is a world of migration, and millions

of people travel to new cities, countries, and even continents. People live at a distance from the ancestral area, and they bring their genes and parental culture. Consequently, ethnic groups reunite their culture and experiences.

In the last term, stereotyping has an etymologically different story. Its origin is based on 18<sup>th</sup> century French, and then stereotyping comes into the life of social science. In *Online Etymology Dictionary*, Harper Douglas explains stereotyping in detail and its alteration:

1798, "method of printing from a plate," from French stéréotype (adj.) "printed by means of a solid plate of type," from Greek stereos "solid" (see stereo-) + French type "type" (see type (n.)). Meaning "a stereotype plate" is from 1817. Meaning "image perpetuated without change" is first recorded 1850, from the verb in this sense. Meaning "preconceived and oversimplified notion of characteristics typical of a person or group" is recorded from 1922 (Walter Lippmann, "Public Opinion").

The stereotype is a kind of printing material in French in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is not a moving type, but a solid type. The stereotype has an immutable characteristic; therefore, its meaning evolves in other fields except for printing. Especially literature world starts to utilize it to describe characters. Other fields take to explain a stable person, place, or thing. *Cambridge Dictionary* concordantly defines stereotype as "an idea that is used to describe a particular type of person or thing, or a person or thing thought to represent such an idea". It is allowable to be a criterion to delineate one thing from another; thus, the term has got its modern meaning.

In *Public Opinion*, Walter Lippman allocates one chapter to explain stereotypes, and he states modern life's pros and cons. Neither time nor opportunity is insufficient to make sincere contact; instead, people apply available patterns. Lippman utilizes the statement of "the picture in our heads" to define stereotypes (p. 89), because stereotypes are handy knowledge, and "the content of people's stereotypes may not reflect simple evaluative antipathy but, instead, may reflect separate dimensions of warmth (which includes perceptions of trustworthiness, friendliness, and sociability) and competence (perceptions of capability and skill)" (Anderson, 2015, pp. 165-66).

In the context of race and ethnic studies, stereotyping is “central to the representation of racial difference” (Hall, 1997, p. 257). People are categorized according to their race; for example, it is believed that Afro-Americans are stupid and lazy while Germans are systematic and hardworking. As S. A. McLeod puts it, stereotypes cause “social categorization, which is one of the reasons for prejudiced attitudes (i.e., “them” and “us” mentality) which leads to in-groups and out-groups” (2015). Social categorization may misguide to get an idea about societies and races, and it leads to decomposition within individuals in the society. Due to this reason, the stereotype has a negative generalization as regards the in-group (us) and out-group (them).

History and time have witnessed the fighting of races and societies with each other since the beginning of the world. The conflict between “us” and “them”, some races’ alleging superior to others, and the colonial mind-set are on-going in today’s modern world. Different races, however, live together in the same society, and migrations are immensely occurring. At the time, why do races conflict each other although they are in the same country, or distinct? It may be heard its answer in Peter Morey and Amina Yaqin’s mouths: “Clash of civilizations’ discourse begins from the assumption that cultures and nations are fixed, finished, and stable” (2015, p. 80). As a result of immigration, race discrimination starts to disappear, and people’s lifestyles and cultures resemble each other; therefore, they may want to show their discrepancies through conflict.

In *Three Kingdoms* of Simon Stephens, there are three different races, which are English, German, and Estonian. Readers also meet several races that characters in the play describe. It is the usual conflict between people in distinct regions- for example, Asia and Europe, or Europe and America, and that matter can at least becomprehensible. There is, however, a conflict between European races at the same time. Othering between races having the same origin should be studied. Jan Nederveen Pieterse, in this sense, gives a chart explaining others in Europe in “Europe and its Others” published in *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies* in 2002.

Pieterse mentions religion maintains its validity as the other issue from CE to the present, and pagans, nonbelievers, Christianity vs. Islam, and other religions are the external differences while internal differences are Heathens, Heretics, witchcraft, Roman vs. Orthodox Christianity, and Catholicism, and so on (p. 18). Race marginalizes the societies between 1790 and 1950, and race and language are the seen face of the other; but the main reasons are class, status, nation, and national character. Between 1800 and 1970, Pieterse substantiates imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism as the reason for the other, and he adds civilization, savagery, evolution, colonizer, colonization, orientalism, and Eurocentrism are surface and the mainspring backward areas within Europe. The other issues after 1950 are available at present though they have different external and internal reasons. Between 1950 and the present are development, North and South, and its external differences are developed-advanced, underdeveloped-less developed, and developing countries although its internal differences are uneven development within Europe and countries. Furthermore, Europe is seen as the other issue from 1900 to the present, and European civilization, identity, boundaries, and Europeanness are appearing different while Europe of multiple speeds and tension between the deepening and widening of the European Union are internal differences. After 1960, cultural differences arose, and multiculturalism and cultural differences in lifestyle, sexual preference, and age are the main reasons. Lastly, Pieterse gives citizenship and legal status as the European other after 1980. In Fortress Europe, illegal immigrants and asylum seekers are seen; but the reality is citizens and denizens.

Religion is always a criterion to distinguish races from each other. Some are Christianity, Islam, Pagan, and Nonbelievers. A Christian does not accept a Pagan. Moreover, Christianity has sects within itself: Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant. Religion does not expire as an individual's identity. According to the chart, Pieterse gives race between 1790 and 1950 as a boundary; but the race issue still persists in today's world; especially in societies that witness everyday racism events in the frame of social and political life. People believe their race is the best one and superior to the others. In the years between 1800 and 1970, imperialism and colonialism are effective in the world. Schoolmen have theorized about savagery,



the colonizer, and the colonized. After the First and Second World Wars, the world starts to change quickly in every field with the effect of technology. Boundaries for the other issue have varied, and some of them are developed-developing countries, identity, Europeanness, cultural differences, immigrants, and asylum seekers. Finally, according to Pieterse's chart, Europe has diversities by categorizing itself.

When it comes to Stephens' play, *Three Kingdoms*, othering as the race will be analysed with English people and other races. The playwright, Simon Stephens is also English, and he fictionalizes the play from the point of view of an English detective inspector, Ignatius Stone. Before the play, Simon Stephens speaks on a panel at the opening of Stückemart on 8 May 2011 at Haus der Berliner Festspiele. Simon Stephens entitles "Skydiving Blindfolded", and he adds "Five Things I Learned from Sebastian Nübling" as the subtitle. Stephens speaks about English people in the fifth item of the keynote speech.

5 THE ENGLISH ARE POLITE AND ARROGANT. Sebastian came over to London at the start of this year to hear a reading of *Three Kingdoms*. It plays at the Munich Kammerspiele next October after playing in Tallinn in September. He was struck by how nice everybody was to him. The people in the cafés we went to or the people he bought his chewing gum from or the people who sold him his Oyster Card. 'You English are really polite,' he said. 'Polite and arrogant.' It's an arrogance particular to London perhaps. And a residue of being a post-colonial power with the coincidental sharing of language with the USA. It's an arrogance that will almost certainly dissipate in the decades to come as centres of cultural and economic power shift away from Washington, New York and London and towards Beijing or Delhi. But it defines us now. And nowhere more so than in our theatre (2015, p. 18).

Stephens mentions he has learned from Sebastian that English people are both polite and arrogant. England is a country that had colonial power at one time, and therefore it is stated as the empire on which the sun never sets. Having and feeling power give arrogance to the individual as secular emotion leading others to become haughty among other people. Sebastian, because of this, may mention the English as arrogant people. Essentially, Matthew Arnold, who was a Victorian Period poet and critic in England, talks about his English race in *Culture and Anarchy*:

No people in the world have done more and struggled more to attain this

relative moral perfection than our English race has; for no people in the world has the command to resist the Devil, to overcome the Wicked One, in the nearest and most obvious sense of those words, had such a pressing force and reality (2006, p.42).

Matthew Arnold believes the English race is the most contestatory in the world. They fight against the demon and the evil. Other races are not accomplished to overcome inequities in the world. Arnold's thoughts remind the poem "The White Man's Burden" by Rudyard Kipling. The poem was written in the Victorian period, thus, it reflects the period's mentality. The white man's burden is a responsibility and a heavy task of the white man. That is only white men, no other races. His responsibility is to civilize native people, and the poem focuses on the challenges faced by the white man. "Take up the White Man's burden— /Send forth the best ye breed— /Go send your sons to exile /To serve your captives' need" (Kipling, 1899, lines 1-4). A difficult task waits for the white man; he should go forth to other lands and serve foreign people. In other words, the white man is in the position of the master and other races are the servant.

In *Three Kingdoms*, there is a conversation between Ignatius Stone and Stephanie Friedmann below. This part is from the second section set in Hamburg. Ignatius is an English, and Stephanie is a German.

**Stephanie:** I like Englishmen.

**Ignatius:** Well, that's good.

**Stephanie:** You don't look very English.

**Ignatius:** No.

**Stephanie:** You don't look like Paul McCartney at all.

**Ignatius:** What? No. I don't think I do either.

**Stephanie:** You don't look like Hugh Grant.

**Ignatius:** No.

**Stephanie:** You don't look like David Beckham. (Stephens, 2015, p. 79).

The readers learn Stephanie likes English; however, she cannot find Ignatius

as full-blooded English. Stephanie arrays some names: Paul McCartney, Hugh Grant, and David Beckham. She compares Ignatius with these names. When it is looked at who they are, Paul McCartney is a British vocalist, songwriter, composer, bass player, poet, and painter, who was born on June 18, 1942, in Liverpool, England. McCartney earns a reputation with the Beatles. More than a rock musician, McCartney is now regarded as a British institution; an icon like warm beer and cricket, he has become part of British identity (Miles, 2021). On the other hand, Hugh Grant is an English actor, who was born on September 9, 1960, in London. Finally, David Beckham is an English professional footballer, who was born on May 2, 1975, in London. These three famous names are well-known in their period and still represent English in the world.

McCartney, Grant, and Beckham are respectively famous in the field of music, cinema, and sports. Why does the playwright utilize these famous names? With what features of them do they represent the English identity? To answer these questions, the reader must view and learn the characteristics of English. Ralph Waldo Emerson's book may guide them to study English. Emerson is an American essayist and philosopher who lived in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in the United States. Emerson writes a travel book, *English Traits* in 1856, and the book is about a character analysis of people that Emerson meets. Emerson believes the English have "a mild aspect, and a ringing, cheerful voice" (p. 68). Moreover, he continues by adding they are "large natured", "proud", and "private", because "never nation built their party walls so thick, or their garden fences so high" (p. 68). The English have infeasibility to reach their interior because they are offish about reflecting their emotions.

During the play, Stephens emphasizes the characteristics of English. The part below is set in Tallinn, Estonia. Rudi (Fredo in fact), an Estonian, talks to Ignatius about the country, and he asks some questions; however, Ignatius does not answer because of being tired. In this part, Rudi criticizes the English for their knowledge of geography.

**Rudi:** (in English) We're a very technological country. It's like a fucking –

what? A fucking religion. Not what you thought we would be, I bet?

**Ignatius:** I had no idea what to think.

**Rudi** No. But I know what fucking English people think about us. I've seen their football commentaries. I don't think they know the difference between the Baltic Sea and the Balkan Sea half the time. Yes? Am I right? You know how much confidence there is in us lot here?

**Ignatius:** I don't really know what you're talking about. (Stephens, 2015, p. 113).

In *Christianity and Culture*, T. E. Eliot speaks on English's region conception (1948, p.126). Eliot mentions the usual regionalist is interested in his region and believes his neighbors should save their border. However, this situation is a disadvantage to the other. The Englishman, on the contrary, does not think of England as a region. According to Eliot, the Englishman is different from the Scottish and Welsh as an example. While the English perceive differently the region, a Scottish or Welsh considers Scotland and Wales as a region. The Englishman, thereby, annihilates local and racial distinctions because he steps into every region in the world. Eliot states this case is harmful to both England and his neighbors. Their culture suffers and is corrupted. In *Three Kingdoms*, therefore, Rudi may get the idea that the English cannot recognize the difference between the Baltic Sea and the Balkan Sea.

In the following pages, the conversation between Rudi and Ignatius continues. Rudi stresses "impatience" as one of the characteristics of English.

**Ignatius:** (in English) Are you two married?

**Rudi:** Don't be so impatient, Detective Stone. It's a characteristic of your nationality. (Stephens, 2015, p. 120).

The British Council has researched the UK's culture and history in 2014. The research displays the English's best and worst traits in the eyes of the world. The world thinks about the UK's people; their best characteristics are "politeness and good manner", "educated and skilled", "friendly", "respecting the rule of law", and having a "sense of humor". Concerning their worst characteristics, they are "drinking so much", "bad eating habits", "ignorance of other cultures", "too

nationalistic”, and “intolerance towards people from other countries”. According to the report, the English people marginalize other races in the world. Moreover, the people in the survey identify the UK’s cultural icons. That is why Stephanie compares Ignatius with the English celebrities in *Three Kingdoms*.

The British Council asks the question: “Can you name one example of a specific person associated with(...) contemporary UK arts and culture which you are personally interested in?” (Culligan et al, 2014, p. 16). Among people associated with the UK’s contemporary arts and culture, Shakespeare is the most common answer because his name is written in bold, and it is run upon sorts; later the list pursues the names of Queen Elizabeth, David Beckham, Beatles, JK Rowling, Adele, Mr Bean, Elton John, Chaplin, Royal Family, Churchill, and Paul McCartney. They are well-known people, and they represent the English in the world. These names leave a mark in people’s memory when anything is said about English.

Except for the features of the English, there is criticism of other races. Why do some races marginalize other races? It can be possible not to know others. T. S. Eliot explains this attitude:

The majority of men commonly dislike foreigners, and are easily inflamed against them; and it is not possible for the majority to know much about foreign peoples. A nation which has gradations of class seems to me, other things being equal, likely to be more tolerant and pacific than one which is not so organised. (Eliot, 1948, p. 134)

Obscurity sometimes scares people, because there is an unknown floor, and it is rather likely to be the margin of error. Therefore, people may hate foreigners on account of their unknown sides. Eliot, moreover, adds if a nation has class rates, that nation may be indulgent and peaceful. This reason is that diversities in society enable to recognition of more people, thus, obscurity may decrease. In *Public Opinion*, Walter Lippmann states that “[a]ll strangers of another race proverbially look alike to the visiting stranger” (1998, p. 80). All strangers resemble each other because they are mysterious until they are known.

In *Three Kingdoms*, Aleksandr's speech points the reader out:

**Aleksandr:** You walk down the street in this city and you've got Turkish gangsters running your corner shops. Paki dickless wonders doing your dental work. Coons running your local councils and white men driving taxis. You get your moral compass from pop stars. You get your theology from goalkeepers. The human race is like weed. It grows. And then it flowers. It takes over a space and then it kills it. It rots and it dies. Unless you have people like me and my grandfather and my great-grandfather and my great-great-grandfather telling all the stupid dick-fuckers what to do and where to go and what to think and what the fuck to wear. Dignity is not inherent. Human beings are not equal. No right is inalienable. We are not a fucking family (Stephens, 2015, p. 60).

The quotation is from the first part, London. Aleksandr describes London's streets and the city's social structure. It is their criticism of inequality and the alteration of society. England entertains other races, such as Turkish and Paki. Aleksandr is a German, and he mentions his race has taught people what to do, what to think, what to wear, and where to go. It can be interpreted as the Germans being a developed race and they civilize the other races in the world with their colonies. Aleksandr also claims all human beings are not a family; some races are predominant while some are less significant. What are other races doing in England? It is not only England. Every country contains different races within itself. Germany, for example, is an immigration nation, because it starts to intensely take immigrants after the end of World War II.

Not all are guestworkers (Gastarbeiter), the men (and later their families) who arrived during the 1950s and 1960s from Italy, Turkey, and other countries of the Mediterranean Rim. At the time, they were seen not as immigrants but as temporary workers needed to solve a transitional labor shortage in a country depleted by war of millions of able-bodied men and women (Alba et al, 2003, p. 2).

Germany takes other races as temporary workers because it needs people to work after the war's devastating effect. Guestworkers bring their families in the later years, and they settle perennially. Like Germany, England has guests in society from other countries, who leave their country due to economic issues, education, work, and so on. These guests have later melted into the native population.

In the last part of the play, Rudi criticizes the English, and he continues his reproofs; then he speaks upon other races this time:

**Rudi:** (in German) The plague fucked us. The famine fucked us. The Swedes fucked us. The Germans fucked us. The Russians fucked us. But most of all. At the heart of it, was you. It was you, Ignatius. Nobody else. It was all you. (In English.) You fucked us. Cheers. (Stephens, 2015, p. 120).

It is requisite to remember Rudi is an Estonian. Estonia is a country in Northern Europe, and it borders the Baltic Sea and the Gulf of Finland. Estonia has been dominated by foreign powers throughout much of its history (Bater et al, 2021). As Rudi says, Estonia is invaded by the Germans, the Swedes, and the Russians. Throughout history, the English, the Germans, the Russians, and the Swedes pursue an expansionist policy over other races in the world. Because of the past, Rudi is angry as an Estonian, and Rein Ruutsoo explains this situation that “Estonians... felt themselves year after year more and more being ‘robbed’ and “[t]his feeling especially concerned the younger generation who had not experienced strict terror” (1997, p. 86). Rudi has not experienced a formidable and painful fight for freedom in the past, however, he has hatred and fury towards occupying powers, such as the English, the Germans, and the Russians; and Rudi has nationalistic emotions far too much.

To sum up, Simon Stephens utilizes different races in *Three Kingdoms*. The characters are from England, Germany, and Estonia. The main characters are English; they are Ignatius Stone and Charlie Lee. Ignatius Stone, especially, represents the English, Aleksandr Richter is the German, and Rudi is the Estonian. The English people are arrogant and insistent to take ownership. Ignatius insists on catching the murderer of Vera Petrova. He goes to Germany and Estonia to find the murderer, the White Bird. The playwright, also, describes Aleksandr and Rudi’s anger toward other races due to their countries’ situation. German has completed its union after the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and it is being late created a competitive race among all races to want to grow and develop. The German race has begun to study in every field, such as technology, education, art, and science. On the other

hand, the Estonians are a race, which has gained its independence late due to some European countries' invasions; thus, they are angry and annoyed.

### 3.3 Place as the Other

The importance of places in a story is non-negligible because geography influences the individuals' character and personality development. Borders construct the outsider, but –crucially for the theatrical imaginary – they also construct the nation and the idea of 'belonging' (Nield, 2006, p. 67). According to Susan Monroe Nugent, "[a]s we create environments, we make statements about our values" (1986, p. 38). Places contribute the reader's comprehension of characters and plot; moreover, they play an essential role to elicit conflicts in a play or a work. Due to this reason, places in *Three Kingdoms* of Simon Stephens will be analysed and observed the reflections of setting in born and setting in living upon characters.

Simon Stephens utilizes three different settings in *Three Kingdoms*, which are London, Hamburg, and Tallinn. "[T]he play moves away from one of Europe's financial and political centres (London) and focuses on the periphery (Tallinn)," and "Ignatius moves from Old to New Europe" (Zaroulia, 2016, p. 358). Three cities are the center of trade and culture in the world. London and Hamburg have the task of ruling the world although Tallinn is an occupied city. The representations of these cities' borders, territory, and sovereignty have become "the object of an irreversible historical forcing" (Balibar, 2004, p. 5). Cities' differences affect people's features and contribute to their point of view towards events.

One of three cities is England, Great Britain, and the UK. The United Kingdom includes the island of Great Britain- England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland; thus, Great Britain is a state of the island comprising England, Wales, and Scotland. These two terms are however used to refer to each other; the name Britain can substitute for the United Kingdom as a whole (Morrill, 2022); yet the containing countries are different. There are four different countries, and this situation effectuates three different states. These four countries: Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and England consist of The British Isles. Britain among these countries is



well-known in the world. After the Great Exhibition of 1851, Britain has become the center of commerce, culture, and industry. Developments in the industry have caused potently immigration throughout Britain. John Oakland believes immigration to Britain is “a threat to British moral, social and cultural values” (2002, p. 51). Varied races carry their values in Britain, and so immigrants’ specific manners make Britain and its social life change. Oakland furthermore mentions that “there is widespread vandalism and dirtiness in both rural and urban areas” (2002, p. 31). Multiculturalism, in one way, can bring disorder to the country.

England is the southernmost country within the British Isles. London is the capital of England, and it is furthermore one of the world’s commercial, financial, and cultural centers. London is the main setting in *Three Kingdoms*. In *Destination London: The Expansion of the Visitor Economy*, Andrew Smith states London has various nicknames to represent the city, and he gives those names: “the great wen”, “the big smoke”, and “the city of villages”; however, the best epithet of contemporary London might be “the city of tourists or Destination London” (2009, p. 1). The great wen means the great metropolis or “a large overcrowded city” (*Collins*). London is overpeopled city because of immigration and its people in Great Britain. Another term is the big smoke. London has become a city of industry after The Industrial Revolution in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Industrial Revolution has got technological changes, such as the use of materials (iron and steel) and new energy sources (coal, the steam engine, and electricity), the invention of new machines, and developments in the field of communication and transportation (the automobile, airplane, radio, and telegraph). Another one is the city of villages: London rises to prominence with its villages, not towns or burghs. The last and outstanding epithet is the city of tourists. London is visited by numerous people thanks to its historical and natural features.

Andrew Smith pursues his ideas about London, and Smith mentions London is a planned city, but urban development is unplanned and unofficial (2019, p. 4). On the other hand, T. Goevert and A. Towle utter that “London’s high streets have been at the center of its economic, social and civic life since they were first

established along Roman roads such as Watling Street, Ermine Street and Portway Street” (2020, p. 75). As a result, London is one of the world’s centers as part of social, economic, and historical aspects. London’s frivolous construct is notable for both its state and other states.

Another city in *Three Kingdoms* is Hamburg, Germany. As one of the most powerful countries, Germany is in central Europe, and it is named officially the Federal Republic of Germany. It is also a federation with 16 states which have their areas. The 16 states oversee their universities, schools, internal security, and administration, and they implement both their laws and the laws of the federation. Germany, on the other hand, has nine countries as border neighborhoods, which are Poland, the Check Republic on the east; Australia and Switzerland on the south; The Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and France on the west; and Denmark on the north. When Germany’s population structure is studied, Germany is a cosmopolitan country like England, and “[t]he majority of immigrants come from other European countries, such as Turkey, Poland, Russia, and Italy” (Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2017, p. 6). After the Second World War, Germany especially has started to get immigrants owing to its labor force. Yet, most of the immigrants have not returned to their country, and thus Germany’s immigrant population continues to increase.

Germany’s capital is Berlin; however, *Three Kingdoms*’ one part is set on Hamburg, thus its social-economic structure will be handled as a city. After Berlin, Hamburg is the most crowded city in Germany; moreover, Hamburg is “the country’s largest port and commercial centre” (McIntosh, 2021). C. Angus McIntosh and Helmuth Thomsen state that Hamburg keeps its medieval independence, and the people in Hamburg preserve its characteristic individuality (2021). The city’s culture is incomparably held and does not perish within modern culture and globalization. On the other hand, Hamburg is a harbor city and it deals with a large number of nations; because of this side, Hamburg is a cosmopolitan city in Germany.

The last city in *Three Kingdoms* is Estonia, which is a country in north-eastern

Europe. It borders Russia on the east, Latvia on the south, Finland on the north, and the Baltic Sea on the west. "...Estonia and specifically Tallinn emerge as an obscure place, alien to the rest of Europe – this is a place of sexual allure and nightmarish perversions, a place that fails to meet the criteria of European ‘integration’” (Zaroulia, 2016, p. 360). Estonia has foreign-born residents in a large percentage of the population. These ethnic minorities are Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians, and Finns, because foreign powers have ruled Estonia throughout history, moreover, Estonia has got immigration from the other republics during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Estonia has encountered invasions in its history. Vikings are the first invaders of Estonia (Aruja et al, 2022). The 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries are the periods of German conquest, and “the Danes and the Swedes tried to Christianize the Estonians” (Aruja et al, 2022); however, they could not succeed. The Swedish period starts in Estonia after the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries are the Russian conquests. The 20<sup>th</sup> century is the Estonian national awakening and its independence.

Tallinn is both the capital of Estonia and one of the largest cities in the country. The name of Tallinn is Tallin in Russian and Reval in German (Britannica, 2021). Reval is the most known historical name in the world, and it has been officially used in Estonia until 1918. The city’s history is full of invasions like Estonia. Tallinn was ruled by the Danes until 1561, and it later passed to Sweden (Britannica, 2021). After Sweden, Russia captured the city in 1918. In the Second World War, Germany occupied and damaged Tallinn, and in 1991, it became the capital of Estonia. Francisco Martinez shares his ideas about Estonia’s and Tallinn’s environment and building in “Tallinn 2017 chronotype” published in *Remains of the Soviet Past in Estonia: An Anthropology of Forgetting, Repair and Urban Traces* in 2008. Martinez states that “[i]n Tallinn, built legacies show an ambiguous ending” (141), he adds the traces of the past are noticeable in remnants and paths. These built forms are contemporary, but they are unsynchronised; there is no overlapping.

The readers have learned from previous chapters that *Three Kingdoms* starts in

London, and it is set up in Hamburg, Tallinn, and again London. There are various criticisms about other European countries within the play. To start to analyze the question of the other is necessary the conversation between Charlie and Ignatius in the first part, London.

**Charlie:** Great. Three days ago a sports bag washed up on the west bank of the Chiswick Eyot just south of Chiswick Mall. A lot of debris gets washed up there on account of it being an eyot, an island in the curve of the river, and the tide being fairly, what, strong? At exactly that point. Just north of Castelnau. The most remarkable things.

**Ignatius:** Dead dogs. Babies' pushchairs. Motorbikes. Shopping trolleys. Etcetera. Etcetera. (Stephens, 2015, p. 36)

After Charlie and Ignatius investigate the event that there is a cut-woman-head found in the river, they assess the situation and Charlie gives the same names: the Chiswick Eyot and Castelnau. These places are on the River Thames, whose other name is River Isis. The River Thames is "205 miles (330 km long, running 140 miles (226 km) from the source to the tidal waters limit" (Hebbert, 2018). Furthermore, the river is the longest in England. When the Chiswick Eyot and Castelnau are again taken, the Chiswick Eyot is an uninhabited ait or deserted river island; on the other hand, Castelnau is a road in Barnes and the area surrounding the road. Charlie and Ignatius picture the region and its annoying state. The region is ruined and caked with dirt, unlike The Tower Bridge's surroundings.

Charlie continues his speech, and he mentions another place in Chiswick:

**Charlie:** Now. What you might not know is that there's a former Civil Service Sports Ground in Chiswick. Just east of the railway station. It was bought out this spring by King's House School there. It's quite remarkable the facilities it's got. Rugby pitches. Cricket pitches. Football pitches. (Stephens, 2015, 36)

Civil Service Sports Ground is in Chiswick on the west of Castelnau. This area is for sports such as rugby, cricket, and football. There is a belief that "London has long been regarded as a sporting capital" (Humphreys, 2019, p. 92). In comparison with the Chiswick Eyot on the River Thames, the vicinity around the Barnes Bridge is better off, for sports zones should be clean and well-kept. A few

pages later, Tommy confesses his guilt that he threw a bag into the river on the Promenade in Chiswick (Stephens, 2011, p. 44). The Promenade is a hidden corner of London, and it is a road between Civil Service Sports Ground and the River Thames. The Promenade is verdurous, because of this, it cannot be seen by someone when someone trinkles, thence, Tommy does that. In *Three Kingdoms*, Simon Stephens utilizes the surroundings of the River Thames, because they are silent and nook for the crimes.

Aleksandr portrays London streets towards the end of the first chapter. He depicts people in the streets as that “Turkish gangsters running corner shops, Paki dickless wonders doing dental work, coons running local councils, and white men driving taxis” (Stephens, 2011, p. 60). According to Aleksandr’s description, London has colorful human faces due to its multinational structure. Later, Aleksandr criticizes people’s attitudes in London. The moral compass is learned by pop stars and theology from goalkeepers. Human and moral values depreciate in modern times, and individual does not get knowledge from their source. Development of technology and the rapid dissemination of information blur the distinction between right and wrong. Aleksandr, moreover, associates human beings with weed. Then the human race grows, flowers, rots and dies. Aleksandr is so angry with London and its people that he mentions to Charlie: “Everything I value in this country has been made a mockery of by people like you” (Stephens, 2015, p. 61). It can be understood different races’ values are discounted by Londoners. Aleksandr is a German, and so he reacts too strongly.

Vera Petrova is a porno star, and she performs in fourteen pornographic films. The readers learn from Ignatius that a Russian company produces pornographic films. The Russian company is called StudentSexParties.com (Stephens, 2015, p. 52). Why is Russian company? Between 60% and 80% of the women trafficked into Germany come from Eastern Europe, Russia, or the New Independent States (NIS) (Subhan, 2000, p. 41). Victims of trafficking are usually aged between 15 and 21. Pimps employ young girls as prostitutes to service lorry drivers and travelers along the borders of Poland and the Czech Republic. (Subhan, 2000, p. 42).

Simon Stephens does not only focus on his race, country, and city. As Stephens utilizes different races and countries in the play, the readers have a chance to compare them with each other. When Ignatius prepares to go to Germany, his wife Caroline asks whether Ignatius has a friend in Germany or not. Ignatius utters “Not in Hamburg. It’s very different from Heidelberg. It’s practically a different country. I’m really sorry I’m going” (Stephens, 2015, p. 65). Hamburg and Heidelberg are German cities. Along with the play, the readers will witness how Hamburg is different from Heidelberg.

Ignatius and Charlie are in Germany, and Steffen is a colleague of Ignatius in the country. Steffen speaks of Germany’s new face in the quote below:

**Steffen:** It’s changed Germany, in the last twenty-five years.

**Ignatius:** I’m sure it has.

**Steffen:** This city’s got a lot fucking richer.

**Ignatius:** Terrific.

**Steffen:** We’re getting a new Philharmonic Concert Hall.

**Ignatius:** A Philharmonic Concert Hall?

**Steffen:** It’s where all our fucking money’s going. Got no money for any ambulances any more. No money for any fucking new cars for the Criminal Polizei. No money for cleaning the streets or to pay for all the fucking millions offucking Turkish fucking Arab fuck-holes who can’t stop heading fucking northwards but we’re getting a really exciting Philharmonic Concert Hall. (Stephens, 2015, p. 72).

Steffen mentions a new Philharmonic Concert Hall, and the Philharmonic Concert Hall is the Berliner Philharmonic and a concert hall in Berlin. Steffen, however, intends to the Elbphilharmonie, or another name Elbe Philharmonic Hall, whose nickname is Elphi. The Elbphilharmonie is a concert hall in Hamburg. It is constructed on the peninsula of the Elbe River, and it is also one of the biggest concert halls in the world. Steffen is grumbling about the concert hall’s construction because its construction is planned in 2007 and its cost is estimated at £241 million; however, its completion changed and its cost increased (Rauterberg, 2017, p. 21). When it is searched about the Elbphilharmonie, H. Rauterberg and L. Mehling describe the hall: “The Elbphilharmonie has a red base and a white shimmering structure; it is dull at the bottom and dynamic at the top; it may be

rather inward facing yet it remains transparent” (2017, p. 22). As the structure, this concert hall is unique in Germany, even in Europe and in the world. Germany, because of this, has precedence. On the other hand, Hamburg’s revenues are spent on the new Philharmonic Concert Hall instead of ambulances, new cars for the Kriminal Polizei, and cleaning the streets. Germany ignores its social state duties such as economy, health, and security. *Three Kingdoms* is written in 2011 and the Elbphilharmonie cannot be completed in that year, therefore Stephens makes his characters talk about Steffen’s comments about the new concert hall’s construction in Hamburg.

After the new Philharmonic Concert Hall, Steffen states another place, a memorial square for the Beatles near the Kaiserkellar (Stephens, 2015, p. 73). This Beatles square is named The Beatles-Platz in Hamburg, Germany. The Beatles’ metal statues are there: John Lennon, Paul McCartney, George Harrison, and a hybrid of drummers Pete Best, and Ringo Star. The square is built to commemorate the memories of the Beatles in Hamburg. John Stewart explains why Germany is important for the Beatles:

Germany, after all, is where The Beatles’ identity took shape. They learned to perform on the stages of St. Pauli clubs, purchased their iconic equipment at Hamburg music shops, cut their first hit single with Tony Sheridan and Bert Kaempfert, rapidly expanded their repertoire under the pressure of 7-hour sets, and wrote songs collaboratively while living out of each other’s pockets in cramped accommodation (2013, p. 337).

The Beatles is well-known as an English music group, yet the group sets up their music substructure in Hamburg. In the play, Steffen finds the statues stupid although he expresses that he loves The Beatles, and they were great. According to Steffen, the statues are inane and foolish. While Steffen, Ignatius, and Charlie continue talking about Germany and its situation, Steffen speaks of Estonians in Hamburg:

**Steffen:** Yes. We’ve had very few Russians here. They tend to work the Reeperbahn. We’ve had some. Not many. And none of them called Andres Rebane. And we’ve never had Estonians. We’ve not met Estonians. We’ve not

arrested Estonians. We've never charged Estonians. There are no fucking Estonians working vice on the streets of St Georg. We thought maybe they didn't work the streets. Maybe they worked out of the hotels or the flats around here and advertised in the *Morning Post*. It's amazing what people advertise in the *Morning Post* here. So far we've found nothing. Do you want to translate that? (Stephens, 2015, p. 74)

Steffen and his team work on the Reeperbahn. The Reeperbahn is a street and entertainment district in Hamburg. It is one of Hamburg's nightlife centers and the red-light district, and The Beatles, in addition, played clubs around the Reeperbahn (Ward, 2007). Its local name is "die sündigste Meile", which means the most sinful mile (McClane). According to Steffen's conversation, police officers encounter a few Russians, but not any Estonians in the Reeperbahn. Sonia Sarkar writes in "Why a red-light street in Germany's Hamburg, remains forbidden for women and hidden from tourists" in *The Indian Express*: "Young migrants, especially from eastern Europe's Bulgaria and Romania, are sex-trafficked and brought here" (2020). According to Steffen's explanations about Hamburg, Steffen again refers to the sex-chat lines in Hamburg. After the Reeperbahn, there are the sex adverts, and Steffen states "Maybe you should have a bit of a wank watching the adverts for the sex-chat lines. That might help. They don't have those adverts in the UK, do they?" and Ignatius answers "No, they don't" (Stephens, 2015, p. 97). The UK prohibits sexual adverts although Germany permits them because prostitution is legal in Germany.

In the following lines, Ignatius, Steffen, and Charlie continue speaking about the city, of Hamburg (Stephens, 2011, p. 97). Ignatius mentions people spend four and a half thousand million euros on prostitution every year in Hamburg, and Steffen talks about prostitution in Hamburg, and he tries to clarify the matter. However, Steffen believes four and a half thousand million euros is only for the girls. There is more than that. It should be taken into account girls' taxi drivers, their hairdressers, their laundrettes, and their punters. Steffen particularly explains the punters' expense after the girls' that. The punters spend their money in the bars, the bar owners spend it on football matches. The football players spend their money on restaurants, and the restaurants spend it on the theatre. The money does



not drip in Hamburg, but it pours. This circle is built by a Bulgarian teenager. Hamburg is a place where money gurgles. Minute quantities snowball, and thus the Bulgarian teenager's money serve the city's huge economy. It can be stated the conversation between Ignatius, Steffen, and Charlie is Hamburg's economic argument.

The third part of the play is set up in Tallinn, and it starts with dialogues among the gang members, such as Michael, Rudi, Sony, and Tom. All the gang members are Estonian, and thus they advocate for their country against other countries. The first speaker is Michael, and he states, "I think that's one of the things that our customers appreciate about what we do", and Sonny soon responds, "We're not like some fucking Romanian product" (Stephens, 2015, p. 107). Michael and Sonny and other members appraise themselves as precious and useful thanks to their benefits to society.

As the investigation progresses, the team finds Vera Petrova, who is the killed woman and has had dental surgery in the previous years. Dental surgery is dedicated to Estonia. Peeter explains the surgery is not the same as the one in which the dentist popped her fillings in (Stephens, 2015, p. 52). Dentoalveolar surgery is not taught in every country, thus, this dental surgery is special. Peeter believes the most interesting place in Estonia is where dental surgery can be made. Estonia is a country of New World, and the government has invested the latest technological developments in all fields.

In the part of Tallinn, Ignatius expresses his thoughts about the hotel: "There's a remarkable system for charging things from the mini-bar. It's like the mini-bar electronically registers when you've taken something out of the fridge. And charges it straight to your room account. That was quite impressive to me" (Stephens, 2011). Rudi at that point utters they are a very technological country (Stephens, 2015, p. 113). Estonia is one of the high-tech digital countries among other technologically advanced countries in the world despite its size. A good many public services are processed online; taxes, banking transactions, and online elections are including Estonia's digital steps under the name of e-Estonia. Estonia's government has

started to study technological developments after getting its independence in the 1990s. Unlike other small countries, Estonia has completed its digital infrastructure in a little while. That Kersti Kaljulaid, Estonia's 5<sup>th</sup> president between 2016 and 2021, makes her statement in an interview on CNBC, Kaljulaid states the country is growing into a digital generation knowing systems such as e-school and e-health (Amaro, 2018). Except for state affairs (a digital identity, e-tax, e-health, e-voting, e-residency, and digital nomad visa), Estonia has launched a video chatting service, Skype. Online sometimes creates cyber security threats; however, Estonia carries on work on cyber threats. Hereby, Estonia has developed itself with the help of technology, and it goes big despite its small size.

Consequently, Simon Stephens utilizes three different settings- London, Hamburg, and Tallinn, and besides, he describes Russia and Romania except for those settings. Firstly, London is the capital city of England, the center of trade and science, and the micro model of the real world. The first part of *Three Kingdoms* reflects the dark side and just the opposite, the well-known aspect is that London is a sports city. The good and the bad are at close quarters in London. The second city is Hamburg, which is not the capital of Germany but a developed city. Its streets display multicultural scenes. Hamburg has two faces like London: the artistic quality and the sexual side. The new concert hall and the Beatles square mirror that Germany cares about its artistic development within European countries; however, it makes an indelible impression on sexual life on its streets. The last setting is Estonia, Tallinn, and its developed sides are described as a small country in Europe. Estonia got its independence late; nevertheless, it has scientific and technological studies. In *Three Kingdoms*, Estonia and Tallinn are not mentioned negatively; only sex-workers are Estonian, and there is no jarring component as a country.

Apart from London, Hamburg, and Tallinn, Simon Stephens gives speeches on Russia and Romania. Characters state Russia is a sex trade country because it is handled with porno films and stars. On the other hand, Romania is a small country like Estonia. The gangster members compare themselves with Romania, and they decide Estonia is better than Romania in the context of product quality. To sum up,

every country is dealt with its positive and negative sides, and they are marginalized by different countries.



## CONCLUSION

One of the most prolific playwrights in the twenty-first century in England, Simon Stephens completed *Three Kingdoms*, which is a detective story trying to find the murderer of a cut-head woman and it was presented in Tallinn on 17 September 2011, then in Hamburg on 15 October 2011, finally in London on 3 May 2012. *Three Kingdoms* can be perused in the framework of Postdramatic Theatre. Theatre genres before Postdramatic Theatre, such as In-yer-face Theatre, Absurd Theatre, The Cruelty of Theatre, and Modernist Theatre, lead up to Postdramatic Theatre for the spectators and they procreate new styles for the playwrights. As a post-dramatic playwright, Simon Stephens reveals a performer on stage rather than an actor; accordingly, the spectators must be active within the play. The playwright does not give reality and total meaning to the play; at that rate the spectators effectuate their meaning. Furthermore, Simon Stephens simultaneously utilizes a lot of signs on stage, and this situation makes trouble and confusion to perceive. *Three Kingdoms* contains three different countries, languages, and different races, and these differences confuse the spectators.

This dissertation analyzes the question of the other in *Three Kingdoms* as a post-dramatic play. For centuries, we-other, insider-outsider oppositions are disconcertingly and deeply felt to define the world, such oppositions as Christian vs. heathen, town vs. country, believer vs. heretic, civilized vs. barbarian, and, in a later period, white vs. black, modern and progressive vs. old-fashioned; furthermore, the oppositions of north vs. south and west vs. east lasted. The other issue or The Other Theory is too well-rounded to deal with only one side, because the individuals, the people, and the societies marginalize both ones who are like them and the ones who are not like them through sex, gender, race, ethnicity, language, religion, the born place, and the living place, and the list goes on in the context of the other theory. The unknown makes the other feel uneasy and doubtful. That is as the stranger visits the city, and a stranger or foreigner is always mysterious, for s/he and her/his past are not recognized by society.

The question of the other is into three parts in the play: woman, race, and place. Firstly, there are two female models in *Three Kingdoms*, one is Ignatius Stone's wife,

Caroline Stone, and the others are sex workers including the dead and the living. Caroline Stone is not extendedly described by Simon Stephens; she is a wife, she has a job, and she is alive; for this reason, the readers cannot get proper and specific knowledge about Caroline. On the contrary, the rest female characters are sex workers, Vera Petrova (the killed woman), Liisi, Stephanie Friedmann, Hele Kachonov, and some others. Especially, Vera Petrova is an essential character to focus on in the play. Is she a traitor or a martyr? Vera Petrova is a traitor in one way, because she does not want feminine duties, and she objects to male hegemony and to being other. Male characters (Aleksandr and Sonny) believe a woman should respect her man, clean the house, be silent, and she should only serve her man. Vera rejects these duties and it can be interpreted her body and head are separated, and she is killed due to her refusal. As a sex worker, Vera is both feckless and filthy to charm his sex customers; therefore, Aleksandr and Mr Petrov (his father) utter that she deserves death because Vera is a black sheep among women in society as a woman.

On the other hand, Vera Petrova is a martyr according to a Feminists point of view. A martyr is someone, who is killed for their beliefs. Vera's belief is to realize her against the line which is drawn for her by society. The readers do not know whether Vera is willing to be a sex worker or not. It can be comprehended from other characters' mouths that she tries to escape from the imposed life and start a new life. Life is like a war stage, and Vera struggles alone, and she loses her life in the end. Vera does not die in vain, and she is killed for the sake of her female values and her affording to exist as a woman in society. The readers do not know other sex workers whether they reject their life or not except for Vera.

Secondly, the thesis's one part focuses on races as the other in *Three Kingdoms*. That is the story of insistent English, a developed German, and an exploited Estonian. The detectives are English, whose names are Ignatius Stone and Charlie Lee, and their colleagues in other countries are Steffen Dresner (German), Aleksandr Richter (German), Georg Kohler (German), and Rudie Peilker (Estonian). Although Stephanie Friedmann cannot find similarities for Ignatius Stone as English, other characters stress his English side. Ignatius is an ambitious English to find the murderer, and hence he travels to Germany and Estonia. For him, there is no importance of borders and limits. The English itinerate themselves and they do not consider the other/s.

Aleksandr Richter and Rudie Peilker are furious characters in the play. Aleksandr is a German, and he is not glad about the existence of other races in the country. Because Germany is a developed country and other races disrupt its scene and structure. The races of developing countries, such as Turks and Pakis, bring along their cultures, behaviors, and habits; therefore, the other or the others disturb the established order. On the other hand, Rudie Peilker is angry distinct from Aleksandr. While Aleksandr is a citizen of a developed and imperialist country, Rudi is a citizen of a developing and colonial country. Rudi considers other races destructive and suffusive because Estonia is exposed to some invasions until recently. When the behaviors and attitudes of Ignatius, Aleksandr, and Rudi are perused, the other race is always perceived as a menace, and the other race is excluded from society.

Finally, place as the other is the last part of the thesis, and there are three kingdoms or three European countries and their cities: England and London, Germany and Hamburg, Estonia and Tallinn. Within Europe, “the lack of understanding of other national and regional customs and traditions has created opinions of and attitudes towards others”, which causes conflicting interests, scarcity, and other restrictions (Rietbergen, 2015, p. 553). The difficulties that Europe faces begin with the strain between national and supranational interests; therefore, they also include the difficulties of achieving consensus on political and social issues, “in addition to the obvious economic ones, among an expanding membership which is made up of vastly different tradition of government, economic capacities, and welfare and social concerns” (Reinelt, 2001, p. 368). England and Germany are one of the oldest cultures and civilizations in Europe. Estonia, on the other hand, is one of the countries whose independence was won newly. Simon Stephens states both the bright and dark sides of London and Hamburg, but not Tallinn. London’s one side has a sports region because of being the sports city in the world. London has natural beauties and areas, and it is famous for cricket sport, and besides, it has a multicultural structure. Aleksandr in *Three Kingdoms* describes London’s streets and its colorful face. London’s bright side, conversely, includes its dark face, and shadows and desolation breed a criminal element. What distinguishes London from Germany and Estonia is reaching this state in the olden days. The best and the worst are on the same table in London.

Germany is also another developed country in the play. Simon Stephens submits Germany's opposed reality to the readers. One side is art, and another is the underbelly. Hamburg also represents the country, and it is the metropolitan city of Germany. *Three Kingdoms*' German characters are annoyed with other races because of their country's late recovery after the wars. German and Hamburg are indebted to sex workers and their yields. They dissociate England and Estonia from this side according to the information that the playwright gives the readers. After England and German, Estonia and Tallinn are the last places in *Three Kingdoms*. Estonia has lived under the shadow of other countries, such as Russia and Germany. Stephens mentions only the technological and health face of the country. Estonia is different from other countries because it tries to develop itself in the field of technology, education, health, and economy. It is the other according to England and Germany, sex workers come from Estonia, and they disturb their societies' structure.

To sum up, this dissertation tries to explain the other dealing with women, races, and places in *Three Kingdoms*. Through the English playwright's eyes, the readers peruse the play, and the playwright offers to provide the opportunity for comparison. It is seen that the other is in general excluded from society, and the other is crushed under the hegemony. Women are the second class of citizens although they are valuable following culture, religion, and traditions. The grown and developed countries' citizens are in the foreground and superior; therefore, the advanced countries are imposingly depicted. Simon Stephens objectively handles the other issue.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alba, R., Schmidt, P. & Wasmer, M. (2003). Auslander in the Heimat: Ethnocentrism in Contemporary Germany. In R. Alba, P. Schmidt & M. Wasmer (Eds.), *Germans or Foreigners?: Attitudes Toward Ethnic Minorities in Post-Reunification Germany* (pp. 1-17). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Amaro, Silvia. (August 14, 2018). Estonia is unconcerned about a possible Russian cyberattack president says. In *CNBC*, Retrieved May 5, 2022, from <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/14/estonia-not-concerned-about-a-possible-russian-cyberattack-president-.html>.
- Anderson, K. J. (2015). Women Are Wonderful, But Most Are Disliked. In *Modern Misogyny: Anti-Feminism in a Post-Feminist Era* (pp. 164-207). Oxford University Press.
- Angelaki, V. (2014). Witness or Accomplice? Unsafe Spectatorship in the Work of Anthony Neilson and Simon Stephens. In M. Aragay & E. Monforte (Eds.), *Ethical Speculations in Contemporary British Theatre* (1<sup>st</sup> ed., pp. 135-151). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aragay, M. & Zozaya, P. (2007). Aleks Sierz. In M. Aragay, H. Klein, E. Mobforte & P. Zozaya (Eds.), *British Theatre of the 1990s, Interviews with Directors, Playwrights, Critics and Academics* (pp. 139-159). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Arnold, M. (2006). *Culture and Anarchy*. Oxford University Press.
- Artaud, A. (1958). *The Theatre and Its Double*. (M. C. Richards, Trans.). Grove Press.
- Balibar, E. (2004). *We, The People Of Europe?: Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. (J. Swenson, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Barker, C. (2004). *The SAGE Dictionary of Cultural Studies*. SAGE Publications Ltd.



- Barnett, D. (2016). Simon Stephens: British Playwright in Dialogue with Europe  
*Contemporary Theatre Review*, 26:3, 305-310.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2016.1183666>.
- Barnett, D. (2020). Martin Crimp and Simon Stephens: British playwrights as European playwrights. In M. M. Delgado, B. Lease & D. Rebellato (Eds.), *Contemporary European Playwrights* (pp. 112-129). Routledge.
- Bater, J. H., Kööri, A. A., Tarmisto, V. J., Smogorzewski, K. M., Aruja, E., Misiunas, R. J. & Stranga, A. (2021, November 30). Estonia. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved December 2, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Estonia>.
- Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. Sage.
- Beauvoir, Simone De. (2009). *The Second Sex*. (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Best and worst of British in the eyes of the world. (2014, July 29). *The British Council*. Retrieved December 6, 2021, from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/contact/press/best-and-worst-british-eyes-world>.
- Bolton, J. (2013). Simon Stephens. In D. Rebellato (Ed.), *Modern British Playwriting 2000-2009*. Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.
- Brater, E. (1975). The “Absurd” Actor in the Theatre of Samuel Beckett. *Educational Theatre Journal*, 27(2), 197–207. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3206113>.
- Briggs, A., Morrill, J. S., Chaney, W. A., Atkins, R. C., Hastings, M., Frere, S. S., Barr, N. A... (2022, January 9). United Kingdom. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 3, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/place/United-Kingdom>.
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia. (2019, June 27). St. Mary Magdalene. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved May 27, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Saint-Mary-Magdalene>.

- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia. (2020, July 23). Gender identity. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved May 27, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/gender-identity>.
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia. (2021, January 22). Tallinn. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 15, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Tallinn>.
- Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia. (2021, March 9). A Doll's House. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved May 29, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/A-Dolls-House>.
- Bush, C. (2005). The Other of the Other?: Cultural Studies, Theory, and the Location of the Modernist Signifier. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 42(2), 162–180. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40247474>.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. L. J. Nicholson (Ed.). Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus. (n.d.). Identity. In *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus*. Retrieved May 22, 2021, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/identity>.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Misogynist. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved September 18, 2022, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/misogynist?q=misogynist1>.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Race. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved November 03, 2021, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/race>.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Stereotyping. In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved November 22, 2021, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/stereotype>.
- Camus, A. (1955). *The Myth of Sisyphus And Other Essays*. (J. O'Brien, Trans.).

Vintage.

- Cashmore, E. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies*. Routledge.
- Chambers, C. (Ed.). (2002). *The Continuum Companion To Twentieth Century Theatre*. Continuum.
- Collins English Dictionary. (n.d). Wen. In *Collins English Dictionary*. Retrieved January 8, 2022, from <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/wen>.
- Costa, M. (2012, May 16). Three Kingdoms: the shape of British theatre to come?. *TheGuardian*. Retrieved March 3, 2022, from <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/theatreblog/2012/may/16/three-kingdoms-shape-british-theatre-or-flop>.
- Culligan, K., Dubber, J. & Lotten, M. (2014). As Others See Us. *The British Council*.
- Cunningham, J. M. (n. d.). What's the Difference Between Great Britain and the United Kingdom?. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 5, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/story/whats-the-difference-between-great-britain-and-the-united-kingdom>.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions*. The University of Chicago Press; The Athlone Press. (Original work published in 1972).
- Doherty, G. (1990). The Greatest Show on Earth: D. H. Lawrence's "St. Mawr" and Antonin Artaud's Theatre of Cruelty. *The D.H. Lawrence Review*, 22(1), 5–21. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44235424>
- Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eldridge, D. (2003). In-yer-face and after. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, 23:1,55-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1386/stap.23.1.55/0>.
- Eliot, T. S. (1948). *Christianity and Culture*. A Harvest Book.

- Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany. (2017). Do You Know Germany?. German Information Center.
- Emerson, R. W. (1856). *English Traits*. Philips, Sampson, & Company.
- Esslin, M. (1960). The Absurdity of the Absurd. *The Kenyon Review*, 22(4), 670–673. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4334078>.
- Esslin, M. (1961). *The Theatre of The Absurd*. Anchor Book.
- Euripides. (1963). *Medea and Other Plays*. (P. Vellacott, Trans.) Penguin Books.
- Fowler, B. (2016). ‘Draining the English Channel’: The European Revolution in Three Kingdoms and Three Keynotes (by Simon Stephens, David Lan, and Edward Bond). *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 26:3, 328–336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2016.1184149>.
- Fowlie, W. (1959). The New French Theatre: Artaud, Beckett, Genet, Ionesco. *The Sewanee Review*, 67(4), 643–657. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27540543>.
- Goevert, T & Towle, A. (2020). High street places: doing a lot with a little. In, *Design for London: Experiments in urban thinking*, P. Bishop & L. Williams (Eds.). UCLPress, pp. 73–111. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv13xps62.11>.
- Goulbourne, H. (1991). *Ethnicity and Nationalism in Post-Imperial Britain*. Cambridge University Press.
- Green, T. A. (Ed). (1997). *Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Beliefs, Customs, Tales, Music, and Art*. ABC-CLIO, Inc.
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. SAGE Publications and Open University.
- Harper, D. (n.d.). Etymology of ethnicity. In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved November 10, 2021, from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/ethnicity>.

- Harper, D. (n.d.). Etymology of stereotype. In *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved November 23, 2021, from <https://www.etymonline.com/word/stereotype>.
- Haydon, A. (2012, May 12). Three Kingdoms –Lyric Hammersmith. *Postcards from the Gods*. Retrieved September 10, 2022, from <https://postcardsgods.blogspot.com/2012/05/three-kingdoms-lyric-hammersmith.html>.
- Haydon, A. (2012, May 18). Three Kingdoms and Misogyny. *Postcards from the Gods*. Retrieved September 18, 2022, from <http://postcardsgods.blogspot.co.uk/2012/05/three-kingdoms-and-misogyny.html>.
- Hebbert, M. J. (2018, November 15). River Thames. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 16, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/place/River-Thames>.
- Hitchings, H. (2012, May 9). Three Kingdoms, Lyric Hammersmith –Review. *Evening Standard*. Retrieved September 8, 2022, from <http://www.standard.co.uk/goingout/theatre/three-kingdoms-lyric-hammersmith-review-7727877.html>.
- Holland, J. (2006). *A Brief History of Misogyny: the world's oldest prejudice*. Robinson.
- Hooker, W. (1960). Irony and Absurdity in the Avant-Garde Theatre. *The Kenyon Review*, 22(3), 436–454. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4334052>.
- Hornby, R. (2015). Theatre of the Absurd [Review of *The Theatre of the Absurd*, by M. Esslin]. *The Hudson Review*, 67(4), 640–646. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43489358>.
- Hulse, F. S. (1972). Ethnic, Caste and Genetic Miscegenation. In A. H. Richmond. (Ed.), *Readings in Race and Ethnic Relations* (pp. 33-45). Pergamon Press.
- Humphreys, C. (2019). The City of Sport: London's Stadiums as Visitor Attractions. In A. Smith & A. Graham (Eds.), *Destination London: The Expansion of the*

- Visitor Economy* (pp. 91–116). University of Westminster Press.
- Hunka, G. (2008). Charting the Postdramatic [Review of *Postdramatic Theatre*, by H.-T. Lehmann & K. Jürs-Munby]. *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 30(2), 124–126. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30133350>.
- Ibsen, H. (1879). *A Doll's House*. (W. Archer, Trans.). The Greham Press.
- Innes, Christopher. (2011). Simon Stephens. In M. Middeke, P. P. Schnierer & A. Sierz (Eds.), *The Methuen Drama Guide to Contemporary British Playwrights* (pp. 445-65). Methuen Drama.
- Irigaray, L. (2002). *Between East and West: From Singularity To Community*. (S. Pluhacek, Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Kipling, R. (1899). The White Man's Burden. *The American Yawp Reader*. Retrieved December 5, 2021, from <https://www.americanyawp.com/reader/19-american-empire/rudyard-kipling-the-white-mans-burden-1899/>.
- Lehmann, H. (2006). *Postdramatic Theatre*. (K. Jürs-Munby, Trans.). Routledge.
- Lippmann, W. (1998). *Public Opinion*. Transaction Publishers.
- Love, C. (2016). New perspectives on home: Simon Stephens and authorship in British theatre. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 26(3): 319–327. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10486801.2016.1183661>.
- Lyons, J. D. (1974). Artaud: Intoxication and its Double. *Yale French Studies*, 50, 120–129. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2929470>.
- Macmillan Dictionary. (n.d.). Othering. In *Macmillan Dictionary*. Retrieved February 22, 2022, from <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/othering>.
- Martínez, F. (2018). Tallinn 2017 chronotope. In *Remains of the Soviet Past in Estonia: An Anthropology of Forgetting, Repair and Urban Traces* (pp. 135–

- 154). UCL Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3hh4dr.10>.
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Gender identity. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved May 27, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/gender%20identity>.
- Merriam-Webster (n.d.). Other. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved February 22, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/other>.
- McClane, D. (n.d.). Don't Fear The Reeperbahn. *ManvsGlobe*. Retrieved January 19, 2022, from <https://www.manvsglobe.com/st-pauli-reeperbahn-hamburg/>.
- McIntosh, C. A. & Thomsen, H. (2021, August 5). *Hamburg*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 12, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Hamburg-Germany>.
- McLeod, S. A. (2015, October 24). Stereotypes. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved November 23, 2021, from [www.simplypsychology.org/katz-braly.html](http://www.simplypsychology.org/katz-braly.html).
- Miles, B. (2021, June 14). Paul McCartney. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved November 30, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Paul-McCartney>.
- Morey, P. & Yaqin, A. (2011). *Framing Muslims: Stereotyping and Representation After 9/11*. Harvard University Press.
- Nield, S. (2006). On the Border As Theatrical Space: Appearance, Dis-location and The Production of the Refugee. In J. Kelleher & N. Ridout (Eds.), *Contemporary Theatres in Europe: A Critical Companion* (pp. 61-72). Routledge.
- Nield, S. (2008). The Proteus Cabinet, or "We Are Here but Not Here". *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 13(2), 137– 45.
- Nübling, S. (2015). Foreword. In S. Stephens, *Plays 4: Three Kingdoms, The Trial of Ubu, Morning, Carmen Disruption* (pp. 13-15). Bloomsbury Methuen

Drama.

- Nugent, S. M. (1986). Traditional New England in Young Adult Literature. *The English Journal*, 75(7), 38–42.
- Oakland, J. (2002). *British Civilization, An Introduction, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Routledge.
- Oliver, W. I. (1963). Between Absurdity and the Playwright. *Educational Theatre Journal*, 15(3), 224–235. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3204780>.
- Osnes, B. (2001). *Acting: An International Encyclopedia*. S. Gill (Ed.). ABC-CLIO, Inc.
- Özata, C. (2022). A postdramatic reading: misogyny in Simon Stephens's play *Three Kingdoms*. *Humanitas*, 10(19), 171-189.
- Pelikan, J. J. (2021, February 16). Mary. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved May 27, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mary-mother-of-Jesus>.
- Pieterse, J. N. (2002). Europe and its Others. In D. T. Goldbeg & J Solomos. (Eds.), *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies* (pp. 17-24). Blackwell Publishers.
- Quackenbush, L. H. (1975). Theatre of the Absurd, Reality, and Carlos Maggi. *Journal of Spanish Studies: Twentieth Century*, 3(1), 61–72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27740669>.
- Rauterberg, H., & Mehling, L. (2017). Waves of Optimism: First Impressions of The Elbphilharmonie. *Log*, 39, 20–30. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26323995>
- Rebellato, D. (2012, May 12). Three Kingdoms. *danrebellato.co.uk*. Retrieved September 18, 2022, from <http://www.danrebellato.co.uk/spilledink/2013/3/12/three-kingdoms>.
- Rees, J. (2012, July 29). Playwright Simon Stephens. *Theartdesk*. Retrieved May 10, 2021, from <https://theartdesk.com/theatre/theartdesk-qa-playwright->



simon- stephens.

- Reeves, F. (1983). *British Racial Discourse: A Study of British Political Discourse About Race and Race-related Matters*. Cambridge University Press.
- Reinelt, J. (2001). Performing Europe: Identity Formation for a “New” Europe. *Theatre Journal*, 53(3), 365–387. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25068949>.
- Reinelt, J. (2017). Is a trafficked woman a citizen? survival and citizenship in performance. In B. Dutt, J. Reinelt and S. Sahai (Eds.), *Gendered citizenship: Manifestations and performance* (1<sup>st</sup> ed., pp. 237-254). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rietbergen, P. (2015). *Europe A Cultural History, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. Routledge.
- Ruutsoo, R. (1997). The Estonians: Identity of Small Nation in Past and Present. In *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures*, 6(1), 73–99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43234816>.
- Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of Educational Psychology*. SAGE Publications.
- Sarkar, S. (2020, February 18). Why a red-light street in Germany’s Hamburg, remains forbidden for women and hidden from tourists. *The Indian Express*. Retrieved February 13, 2022, from <https://indianexpress.com/article/express-sunday-eye/red-light-street-in-germany-hamburg-remains-forbidden-for-women-hidden-from-tourists-6266512/>.
- Sayın, G. (2016). Simon Stephens Tiyatrosu: Dramatik Metinden Performans Metnine. In D. Bozer (Ed.), *Postdramatik Tiyatro ve İngiliz Tiyatrosu* (1<sup>st</sup> ed., pp. 115-143). Mitoş-Boyut.
- Sierz, A. (2001). *In-Yer-Face Theatre: British Drama Today*. Faber & Faber.
- Sierz, A. (2005). Beyond Timidity? The State of British New Writing. *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 27(3), 55–61. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4140087>.

- Sierz, A. (2011). *Rewriting The Nation: British Theatre Today*. Methuen Drama.
- Sierz, A. (2012). *Modern British Playwriting: The 1990s: Voices, Documents; New Interpretations*. R. Boon & P. Roberts (Eds). Methuen Drama.
- Simon Stephens: Manchester is richer than ever in theatrical potential. (2015, May 19). *The Guardian*. Retrieved January 23, 2022, from <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2015/may/19/simon-stephens-manchester-home-funfair>.
- Smith, A. (2019). Destination London: An Expanding Visitor Economy. In A. Smith & A. Graham (Eds.), *Destination London: The Expansion of the Visitor Economy* (pp. 1–14). University of Westminster Press.
- Stephens, S. (2011). Introduction. In *Plays 3: On the Shore of the Wide World, Marine Parade, Harper Regan, Punk Rock* (pp. 9-23). Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.
- Stephens, S. (2015). *Plays 4: Three Kingdoms, The Trial of Ubu, Morning, Carmen Disruption*. Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.
- Stewart, J. (2013). Review of *The Beatles in Hamburg; Beatlemania: Technology, Business and Teen Culture in Cold War America*, by I. Inglis & A. Millard. *Popular Music*, 32(2), 336–339. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24736774>
- Subhan, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Trafficking in Women*. The European Parliament.
- Taplin, O. & Kitto, H. D.F. (2021, January 29). Euripides. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved May 25, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Euripides>.
- Tarmisto, V. J., Stranga, A., Aruja, E., Smogorzewski, K. M., Misiunas, R. J., Kõörna, A. A. & Bater, . J. H. (2022, January 11). Estonia. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 15, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Estonia>.

- Turner, B. S. (Ed.). (2006). *Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wade, P., Smedley, A. & Takezawa, Y. I. (2020, November 23). Race. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved November 03, 2021, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/race-human>.
- Ward, E. (2007, December 14). The Reeperbahn. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved January 19, 2022, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Reeperbahn-1688481>.
- Ward, I. (2013). Rape and Rape Mythology in the Plays of Sarah Kane. *Comparative Drama*, 47(2), 225–248. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23526756>.
- Weber, M. (2002). Review of *In-Yer-Face Theatre: British Drama Today*, by A. Sierz. *The Georgia Review*, 56(3), 863–865. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41402079>.
- Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. Oxford University Press.
- Yates, D. B. (2012, May 21). Hardcore Critical Girl-on-Girl Action. In N. Tripney (Ed.), *Exeunt Magazine*. Retrieved from September 1, 2022, from <http://exeuntmagazine.com/features/critical-girl-on-girl-action/>.
- Young Scott. Gender Identity Terms. (n.d.). In *Young Scott*. Retrieved May 25, 2021, from <https://young.scot/get-informed/national/gender-identity-terms>.
- Zaroulia, M. (2016). The Invisible Other in Excess: (Dis)placing Europe in Simon Stephens's *Three Kingdoms*. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, 26(3), 319-327.