

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: The Beckettian Narration of Absurdity in Waiting For Godot

AUTHORS: Saman HASHEMIPOUR

PAGES: 760-775

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/3100554>



Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi
Bursa Uludağ University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Philosophy

Araştırma Makalesi | Research Article
Kaygı, 22 (2), 760-775.

Makale Geliş | Received: 24.04.2023
Makale Kabul | Accepted: 22.09.2023
Yayın Tarihi | Publication Date: 30.09.2023
DOI: 10.20981/kaygi.1287095

Saman HASHEMPOUR

Doç. Dr. | Assoc. Prof.
T.C. Haliç Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Amerikan Kültürü ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, İstanbul, TR
Haliç University, Faculty of Arts and Literature, Department of American Culture and Literature, Istanbul, TR
ORCID: 0000-0003-1756-3929
smnpour@gmail.com

The Beckettian Narration of Absurdity in *Waiting for Godot*

Abstract: This study questions whether the hollow of muddy people with a hope for a savior in the current state of the world is significant. The debate polls a thought-provoking result for the purview of no end in sight through a query of the drama play *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett, which abstractly demonstrates a symbolic situation of humanity dramatically. By investigating Beckettian understanding of humanity's universal identity, the study portrays hope's role in the despondent expecters stuck with emptiness, meaninglessness, and feeling of alienation. Beckettian theater, deeply immersed in the constant silence of Beckett's narration, is a shallowed experience beyond the stage. Following the pure consummation of Beckett, a twirl for a resumption is potentially tossing aside the sentimentalization of looking backward. *Waiting for Godot* comprises a message of solidarity of human beings by keeping a loof the conceptualization of a life that is no longer portrayed in the failed form of narration boundaries due to the lack of coherence, rupture, and discontinuity. Beckett, the messenger of universal degeneration, assigns ingenuity to expose human beings' inhuman relations in a frivolous life. He equalizes societies with meaningful essentials and portrays the problems of anyone struggling to get a foothold today. Imaging the absurdity of existence, he demonstrates philosophical absurdity and questions a continuous perpetual certainty in the realm of drama.

Keywords: Waiting for Godot, Samuel Beckett, Theatre of Absurd, Absurdity, Narration.

Godot'yu Beklerken'in Beckettvari Absürt Anlatımı

Öz: Bu çalışma, şimdiki zamanda boşluk hissine kapılan ve bu boşluğu doldurmak için bir kurtarıcı hayalini kuran insanların algısını sorgulamaktadır. Sonuçsuz görünen insanlığın dramatik durumunu Samuel Beckett'in *Godot'yu Beklerken* oyununu vasıtasıyla—düşündürücü ve sembolik biçimde—soyut olarak sergilenmektedir. Beckett'in derin sessizliğe bürünmüş anlatım biçimi, sahnenin ötesinde yüzeysel bir Beckett'in tiyatro deneyimidir. İnsanlığın evrensel kimliğine bağlı olarak Beckett'in anlayışını çözmeye çalışan bu yazı, amaçsızlık, anlamsızlık ve yabancılaşma

Hashemipour, S. (2023). The Beckettian Narration of Absurdity in *Waiting for Godot*, *Kaygı*. Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Felsefe Dergisi, 22 (2), 760-775.
DOI: 10.20981/kaygi.1287095

duygularına saplanmış insanlığa umut'un rolünü, umutsuz beklentisi içindeyken bile, tasvir etmektedir. Bu yeniden başlamaya dönük saf gaye, değişime karşı muhtemel duygusallığı bir kenara itmektedir. Başarısız anlatım biçimi olarak bilinen tutarsızlık, kopukluk ve süreksizlikten faydalanan Beckett, *Godot'yu Beklerken* eserinde, kavramsallaştırılmış yaşamın ötesinde, insanlığa dayanışma mesajını sunmaktadır. Evrensel yozlaşmanın habercisi olan Beckett, insanın uçarı bir yaşam içinde insanlık dışı ilişkilerini teşhir etmek için, yaratıcılığını kullanmaktadır. Beckett, toplumları anlamlı temeller vasıtasıyla eşitliyerek, günümüzde tutunmak için mücadele eden herkesin sorunlarını tasvir etmektedir. Varoluşun absürtlüğünü tasvir eden Beckett, drama vasıtasıyla, felsefi absürt ve devamlılığın belirliliğini, sorgulayarak, sergilemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Godot'yu Beklerken, Samuel Beckett, Absürt Tiyatro, Absürt, Anlatım.

Introduction

The struggle of humanity to define existence through putting legitimacy into content is the sense of mortality. Such a hassle replaces incoherent notions with a meaningful truth through the medium of a savior or a happy ending out on a limb. By creating an expected, inevitable and contemplative end, *Waiting for Godot* (1953) by Samuel Beckett (1906-1989) presents an abstractly dramatic symbolic state of humanity—out of a notion of need-to-know obscurities. “The destiny of waiting” for the play’s protagonists “is not their lot only—billions of people have lived their lives, waiting for their death to come” (Uchman 2012: 55). Beckett’s characters do not consecrate to a specific setting; thus, no impediment is settled ahead of the stance of the reader/audience. Beckett (1983) says, “My work is a matter of fundamental sounds (no joke intended) made as fully as possible and I accept responsibility for nothing else. If people want to have headaches among the overtones, let them. And provide their own aspirin” (109).

Waiting for Godot is the story of Vladimir (Didi) and Estragon (Gogo), who while away the time through conversations. They are waiting for someone named Godot to arrive and be true to his word. At the end of the two acts, periodically, they encounter Pozzo and his slave, Lucky, and a boy who informs them that Godot will fulfill his promise tomorrow. Beckettian characters are not justified in a particular framework, and Beckett keeps himself at bay when explaining his philosophical comments with transcendental idealism. He propounds an improver philosophical approach to existence and truth in his mind. However, his deductive reasoning prevents him from the identity experience of protagonists by keeping

their presence closed in his philosophical approach. Hence, the text examines how humanity must set aside all social values and paradigms and evaluate every event in *Waiting for Godot* from an eternal perspective. Here, the differences between the protagonists' characteristics and the themes make us deeply thought-provoking: "There would be no mental content whatever but rather a complete emptiness, vacuum, void. One would suppose a priori that consciousness would then entirely lapse and one would fall asleep or become unconscious" (Stace 1960: 85).

1. Godot, The Sinner

The protagonists of *Waiting for Godot* are sitting in a remote place where the universe is one-sided, waiting for a redeeming savior—not God but Godot—to come and save them from being lost. Bryden (1998) argues, "the hypothesized God who emerges from Beckett's texts is one who is both cursed for his perverse absence and cursed for his surveillant presence. He is by turns dismissed, satirized, or ignored" (2). Here, Estragon and Vladimir—representing a phallogocentric society—have been exposed to no fear other than vanity. To realize salvation, the idea of innocence versus sin and the dualistic specificities of Godot is crucial.

Vladimir recalls how homeward-bound Godot and gutted Estragon stands upon to be hanged. In responding to Estragon, who asks, "What about hanging ourselves?" Vladimir says, "Hmm. It'd give us an erection" (Beckett 2016: 13). Their position in justifying Godot's arising is not the issue of being a sinner or an innocent. Besides, the purview of a savior is challenging because Godot is different and holds out a ghostwritten figure than the Christian Beckett. Vladimir and Estragon are waiting for a savior who is beating and harassing his helpmate—the boy's brother (Beckett 2016: 48)—who mistaken him for Lord Pozzo, who also harasses poor Lucky.

In the second act, the dried tree of the first scene is re-leafed. Here, "[The] tree is identified by Vladimir as the place where they are to meet Godot. However, Estragon sees a 'bush' and Vladimir a 'shrub' in the tree. Here, the tree is defined

concerning the aesthetic appreciation of its viewers" (Bénard 2018: par.25). The presence of a single tree in the scene is a terminus of the earthly circumstance. It is an option for the crusader Jesus; neither Didi nor Gogo hangs themselves. As things stand, the tree needles the execution of Godot, who is expected to come and be crucified due to the borne of humanity's sins. By projecting Godot's guilt, Beckett aligns how the world and humanity have won futility. Now, the bottom falls out of the world when Godot follows the suit that Cain does with Abel, and Pozzo does with Lucky.

Vladimir: I tell you his name is Pozzo.

Estragon: We'll soon see. (He reflects.) Abel! Abel!

...

Estragon: Perhaps the other is called Cain. Cain! Cain!

Pozzo: Help!

Estragon: He's all humanity.... (Beckett 2016: 80).

"Time has stopped" (Beckett 2016: 33) is the pointed philosophical absurdism of Samuel Beckett that has been demonstrated through the symbolic signs of theater. Beckett's characters invariably feel smothered with loneliness that necessitates them to put everything off. Vladimir and Estragon are like two peas in a pod, and Beckett essentially dimidiates human beings into two halves; they reveal the extent of the commissure of a creature that symbolizes all the capabilities of a unitary savior. "Godot hauls its participants back again and again to this launching-place, from which, as in life, everything always has to be improvised anew" (Malekin & Yarrow 1997: 139). No one trusts the forthcoming of a sinful savior, and the audience or reader instills a current yawning gap between humans and the world. When Alan Schneider asks Beckett what Godot means, he replies that he would have said it if he had known it long ago (Rahimipour 2020: 32). Although "Godot is an illusion" (Ackerly 2004: 46), and the play is "a contraction of ... nicknames," and "the inner self that might alternatively give cohesion to their [Gogo and Didi] lives" (Gordon 2002: 61).

2. Dialogical Monosyllabic Textualization

The thematic structure of *Waiting for Godot* is based on dialogues, which makes this play a unique work of art. Each dialogue must be considered a small coincidence and an outward sign of a futile incident constantly represented through characterization. Expressions and dialogues are also part of the conceptual signs that manifest themes of a purport rather than conveying a concept through vocabulary, which envoys the whole of an abstract image. This play, in two acts, personifies a two-sequence motion that is objectively visualized. Moreover, the dialogues are supported by the objective manner of the characters, which indicates the play's final idea. *Waiting for Godot* is an esoteric challenge to evaluate theater as a professional practice and comprehend the drama thoroughly on the full scale.

The majority of dialogues in *Waiting for Godot* are short and monosyllabic; thus, Esslin (1983) calls the play a "monodrama" (66). A pause transpires after long dialogues and brings about the climax when binary characters follow one another. Besides, interaction always dominates the psyche; short intermittent dialogues settle the characters' dual position—in parallel with the transferring mindsets of the reader/audience. This is the best attitude to define reality, and the play cannot be analyzed sequestered without the intervention of the reader/audience. This mental intervention refers to splitting dialogues that are repeating examined situations. Now, the reader/audience deciphers all the hidden messages of the plays, although some symbolic and allegorical signs remain obscure due to their implications. Here, the protagonists' mental futility is implied as a chronic disease:

Estragon: In the meantime, let us try and converse calmly, since we are incapable of keeping silent.

Vladimir: You're right, we're inexhaustible.

Estragon: It's so we won't think.

Vladimir: We have that excuse.

Estragon: It's so we won't hear.

Vladimir: We have our reasons. (Beckett 2016: 57-58)..

An absurd repetition of meaningless dialogue sometimes bothers the reader/audience stirring with talkative characters who impose their presence. Parts of these dialogues are fragmentary and irrelevant, representing the characters' meaningless mental instability and bouncing off a dramatic objective notion to the interrogative atmosphere that covers the play's unrealistic and ambiguous mind-benders. All nonsense dialogues are in the service of "emptiness," the play's central theme. In Beckett's indirect speeches, Vladimir and Estragon allege they hear the useless words and sounds of the dead. To consider them imprisoned of their subconscious—confirmed by the content—we must find an involuntary answer for all the nonsense. This leads us to understand how they are depleted of unbearable values; for them, talking is a matter of coercion, instinct, and paradox. They chatter in vain as they have nothing to say, and as a dead loss, they are burdened. This is the governing idea of the play in which there is no reason for the characters' existence to tolerate the status. However, Didi and Gogo are, in one way, the dead people whom they talk over.

Vladimir: What do they say?

Estragon: They talk about their lives.

Vladimir: To have lived is not enough for them.

Estragon: They have to talk about it.

Vladimir: To be dead is not enough for them.

Estragon: It is not sufficient. (Beckett 2016: 58).

Didi and Gogo's declination of personality is similar to the mental degeneration of Pozzo and Lucky. Beckett unrolls the irrational and light-minded relationship between Vladimir and Estragon and contrasts it with the eventful intercourse between Pozzo and Lucky to ensure that the reader/audience peruses the consecution evenly. Thus, if the world is summed up in the current duple relations—one formed by habit and instinctual needs and the other by captivity and domination—humans, life, and the world today are drowned in utter futility. Like Beckett, subconsciously, these characters represent themselves through symbolic, allegorical, and hidden subtexts. Gibson (2010) contends that Lucky's

monologue in the play is “compulsive” but “majestically nonsensical” and “in the end, the other characters have violently to floor him” (41).

Waiting for Godot's dialogues describe a mere obligation and the signs of physical life. They do not present anything to the reader/audience but remind them how humanity is waiting in vain for a savior. Beckett clues us about the figure who is supposed to come: “who has your future in his hands” and “we hardly know him” (Beckett 2016: 20). Therein lies the rub that although this savior is often compared to God—due to the similarity of the word ‘Godot’—this interpretation is firmly shot down in flames through conversations. This savior is not God but an earthliness allusion called Godot, like Christ—a referrer for the folk. Here, the most important query of the play is a false hope for someone who prospectively sends a message for his arrival but trifles for expecters. Unfortunately, Godot is a sinner like any human being, and the erotele is how a sinner will save the doomed. Kenner (1973) says Beckett's play “[struggle] to make the audience share the waiting; and to explicate the quality of the waiting” is filled with “beautifully symmetrical structures” (33).

3. The Absurdity of Duple Characters

This comical yet unpleasant absurdism—generally represented in a semi-philosophical comedy—is distinctive from the absurdism or semantics conception of other dramas by playwrights such as Camus and Sartre. However, “Since these writers do not belong to any deliberate or conscious movement, they should be evaluated for their individual concerns, as well as for their contributions to the total concept of the Theater of the Absurd” (Roberts 1980: 6). For Samuel Beckett, no clear final vision is serviced for humanity. Camus and Sartre paid attention to the critical approach of the demobilization of the catastrophe; however, Beckett shrugs off tale-telling in *Waiting for Godot*. Beckett merely expresses two almost identical situations: like a painter, he draws and paints only two similar portraits and puts them together. Then, he leaves all the judgment to the reader/audience

without checking its validity. "*Waiting for Godot* displays the condition of such instability and/or undecidability, and thus allows for a huge influx of interpretations whenever these binary items swap places" (Taghizadeh & Soltani 2016: 115).

The theme distinguishing *Waiting for Godot* from other masterpieces is Beckett's artistic approach implemented in the absurdity of conducting his characters by remotion of the reader/audience's mentality to have this tragedy taped. *Waiting for Godot* does not transfuse straight rationale but assigns repetition, irrelevance, involuntariness, unconsciousness, and the one-sidedness of humanity. Here, norm-aversion to causation, masculinity, minimalism, symbolism, allegory, and paradoxes are assigned means. The characters are disgusted due to the contemplation in the context of misinterpretation.

Estragon: You think all the same.

Vladimir: No no, it's impossible.

Estragon: That's the idea, let's contradict each another.

Vladimir: Impossible.

Estragon: You think so?

Vladimir: We're in no danger of ever thinking any more (Beckett 2016: 59).

Didi and Gogo's mentality is gaugeable due to the paradoxes of the contemporary world. If we remove the paradox from *Waiting for Godot*'s dialogues, the work's foundation collapses. In addition to the philosophical subtext of the work, this is a pivotal and contemplative artistic feature. The commonality of dialogues, formed by denying meaning, re-echoes the mantra. Didi and Gogo are on either side of a very ordinary human, retaining emptiness and futility, neither an independent nor complete being. Four or five accrued leaves on the scened tree surprise the characters, and their pale mind cannot comprehend the trivial issues occurring. "Vladimir is linked to the air and with an upward vertical axis (and with hat, tree), and Estragon with the horizontal axis of the earth (and with boots, ailing feet)." (McMullan 2008: par.4) Vladimir ponders, "But yesterday evening it was all black and bare. And now it's covered with leaves" (Beckett 2016: 61). Besides, "the

Pozzo of the second act may not be the same as the one in the first—he may even be Godot! —, just as we are not sure if the trees in the two acts are identical” (Bizub 2014: 47). Utilizing duple characters, the drama

introduces many different deficiencies and disabilities. Vladimir has problems with his bladder and prostate; he eats garlic which is good for his kidneys yet makes his breath bad. In Estragon’s case, his feet stink, and his foot seems to have shrunk during the night, separating the two acts. All characters seem to suffer because of memory failures which afflict a great number of other Beckett characters. Furthermore, the two characters undergo a rapid, overnight change: Lucky turns dumb, and Pozzo becomes blind (Uchman 2018: p.123).

These despised and abandoned beings, whose position evokes apocalyptic evolution, emphasize the continued suspension of human life and the existence of living beings in today’s world. Didi and Gogo’s mind is all but a bird that peeks at everything rashly, and their conversation does not stick in the mind of the reader/audience. They let the grass grow under their feet and glance aimlessly. Suddenly, during the second act, Vladimir comes to his senses out of nowhere and heralds deeply, and his unserious stance becomes a profound and meaningful presence. Like an involuntary instinctual habit, this ultimate semantic expresses the meaninglessness of life. These short and unwanted sparks of begging for help address all human beings; as Vladimir says, “But at this place, at this moment of time, all mankind is us, whether we like it or not. Let us make the most of it, before it is too late! Let us represent worthily for once the foul brood to which a cruel fate consigned us!” (Beckett 2016: 76). Vladimir’s regressive as a transient state of mind is a fragment of the human soul that emerges from the depths of his soul. However, this spark is not a light to the full enlightenment of darkness.

Waiting for Godot is purely allegorical, summed up in suspension and wandering through a constant wait. Through a deductive approach, the play symbolically represents the human condition. The characters, their endless expectation, the way they dialogue, and the symmetrical situation of Pozzo and Lucky, their blindness and dumbness, the messenger—a son and his brother—and

the sinner Godot represent a dark and inescapable situation in which human beings are surrounded by, narrates the state of wandering and uncertainty humorously. "Vladimir and Estragon's only certainty is the terrible uncertainty of the world, together with their accompanying need to assume that somehow and someday meaning will become manifest" (Gordon 2002: 58). It appears that Didi and Gogo need a guide; although they look mature. In a scene, Vladimir permits Estragon to sleep on his feet like a child and sings a lullaby:

Estragon: I'll try.
He resumes his foetal posture, his head between his knees.
Vladimir: Wait. (He goes over and sits down beside Estragon and begins to sing in a loud voice.)
Bye bye bye bye
Bye bye- (Beckett 2016: 66).

Vladimir feels that something is weighing him down slightly; he "takes off his hat, peers inside it, feels about inside it, shakes it, puts it on again" (Beckett 2010: 6-7). Estragon also "is trying to take off his boot" (Beckett 2016: 5) to get rid of disturbing pebbles. The intolerance of Gogo and Didi for materiality is the primary factor and a preface for the condemned and inevitable subject of how their destiny becomes one-sided. This subjectivity has enhanced their tolerance for awaiting:

Estragon: So long as one knows.
Vladimir: One can bide one's time.
Estragon: One knows what to expect.
Vladimir: No further need to worry.
Estragon: Simply wait.
Vladimir: We're used to it. (Beckett 2016: 35).

There is also a reference to Cain, who killed his brother, Abel, when Estragon says, "We'll soon see. (He reflects.) Abel! Abel!" (Beckett 2016: 80). Here, the oppressive central masculinity domination is represented tacitly. There is no female character in the play, attributed to the effects of World War II, that the men set the world on fire and blood. Twentieth-century childish adults—they misinterpreted man and life—are left to wander alone in loneliness and loss. Their

lives are similar to those of stray dogs; they harass each other—as a gang always beats Estragon. Besides, Godot beats the brother of the boy he serves. Likewise, Pozzo punishes Lucky regularly.

Estragon: Beat me? Certainly they beat me.

Vladimir: The same lot as usual? (Beckett 2016: 5).

...

Vladimir: Whom does he beat?

Boy: He beats my brother, Sir (Beckett 2016: 48).

...

Vladimir: I don't know. Pozzo writhes, groans, beats the ground with his fists. (Beckett 2016: 74).

For Mansouri (2015), “modernism and time manifests itself in...Beckettian characterization” (201). Beckett never states a reason for consecution, such as why Pozzo went blind or Lucky became dumb. Characterization is annihilated in conjunction with the characters’ identity. Vladimir and Estragon do not belong to a specific spectrum or individuality; they look like frames without images. Thus, “the dramaturgy of Beckett abandons ... artistic illusion and, utterly disposing form of its servile function towards idea, it is free to speak the truth of what is individual and released from the limits of any totality” (Rybińska 2017: 75). Since Beckett’s goal is the subject, the reader/audience is considered to be crude contractual elements of shaping the subject in any form. This state “is approached by the process of unknowing; that is to say, the mind becomes less, not more active, eventually leaving the subject-object relationship behind” (Malekin & Yarrow 1997: 28).

4. The Post-World War II Drama

The theatre of Absurd deals with the unknown hidden angles within human beings mixed with futility and meaninglessness and intends to display such a concept in the language of drama to find objective aspects. Here, the rotation from subject to object ways off realism; it is merely the objectification of the imaginary ideas and abstractions that constitute the structure of such a theater—defined by objectivity and on-stage performance. “Beckett’s aesthetics resist audience

intersection and interpretation, leaving a continuing gap of some magnitude between object and subject" (Sollars 2013: 71). To clear up, Beckett says, "I am interested in the shape of ideas even if I do not believe in them. ... It is the shape that matters" (Calderwood 1986: 370). The meaninglessness in the theatre of Absurd does not necessarily mean that life is absurd and worthless. On the contrary, neglecting whatever has led man to existence in vulgarity is the most crucial concern of humanity. Kamyabi Mask (2002) denies Beckett as an absurdist. For him, Beckett's theater is not the theater of absurd, and he only reflects the absurd situations of human existence in the current vile world in the hope of deducting human beings to get a deduction. (20)

Vladimir and Estragon are confused, dependent on life, and expect someone to come and make everything pleasant for them. Beckett demonstrates how futility can come about; he does not address the causes or turn to the reflection of truth to highlight the subject of his play. Instead, he exposes the hidden entity of human beings, the social terms of the twentieth century, and "radical twentieth-century perceptions of the meaninglessness or absurdity of human life" (Graver 2004: 20). "Beckett's œuvre already presupposes this experience of the destruction of meaning as self-evident [...]. Beckett's plays are absurd not because of the absence of meaning, for then they would be simply irrelevant, but because they put meaning on trial..." (Adorno 1997: 153). Reflecting the reality of inappropriate dealings, Beckett places a system of subjects to display allegories and symbols. Beckett does not go for alternatives for imitating reality; rather, he objectifies every reality in imaginative aspects. Hence, every detail is shown in the scope of drama that stands for loneliness, bewilderment, helplessness, futility, evilness, and the comic/bitter situations emblemized through symbols.

Waiting for Godot, published in 1953, depicts a theatrical manifesto of the bewilderment and futility of the post-World War II era, representing the minimalism, absurdity, and the disappearance of European-added social values in

the middle of the twentieth century. Thus, the reader/audience feels the catastrophe inside veraciously. "If it is true that the meaning of being can only be experienced and not explained ... Samuel Beckett may ... offer us a purer insight into ultimate reality even than those philosophers most neatly attuned to it" (Butler 1984: 205). The play is not precisely representing a remote and unknown location, but Didi and Gogo, two transformed beings whose existence is violated by humanistic characteristics, are waiting in vain for a savior who does not arrive. Due to the savior's arrival, their mission description is not identified.

Waiting for Godot is timeserving the challenging dramatic status of Europe after the second world war when Europe was embroiled in ideologies and stereotypes, and political challenges led to Iron Curtain, Cold War, Social Unrest, Political Unrest, Nuclear Age, and Existentialism. In that era, the classic literature's style and context were no longer satisfactory, low-level comedies seemed nauseating, and the reader/audience was thirsty for a new understanding to express how compulsorily imprisoned in a world of their own. Like a dwarf standing on the shoulders of giants, Beckett raises the question of what it means to be human—as all artists and philosophers who questioned it. His response is also shocking; being human is an endless search to find an identity and a world to feast (Levy 1980: 3-4). Camus (1979) says, "in a universe suddenly divested of illusions and lights, man feels an alien, a stranger. His exile is without remedy since he is deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land. This divorce between man and his life, the actor and his setting, is properly the feeling of absurdity" (Camus 2013: 13).

Although Beckett wrote a play "which strove at all costs to avoid definition" (Reid 1962: 130), he is ridiculed for the hard-to-reach concept of peace in the postcolonialist era. Pozzo and Lucky are the symbols of the oppressor and the oppressed, respectively, and the colonizer and the colonized. Pozzo's behavior—as

a master—against his slave symbolizes the relationship of all-time superpowers with poor subordinates, as revealed in the following conversation;

Estragon: You've had enough of him?
Pozzo: In reality he carries like a pig. It's not his job.
Vladimir: You want to get rid of him?
Pozzo: He imagines that when I see him indefatigable I'll regret my decision. Such is his miserable scheme. As though I were short of slaves! (All three look at Lucky.) Atlas, son of Jupiter! (Silence.) Well, that's that, I think. Anything else? (Beckett 2016: 28).

Vladimir and Estragon represent two different dimensions of human existence. Vladimir represents the spiritual dimension of humanity, and Estragon demonstrates animalism; however, they complement each other. The play contains the message of unity and solidarity of human beings with all their differences. According to Beckett, despite religion, race, creeds, and job discrepancy, human beings must put aside their prejudices and unite to endure the world's misfortunes. For this very reason, in the first scene, when Estragon falls asleep, Vladimir feels lonely and longs for him and wakes him up.

Estragon: (restored to the horror of his situation). I was asleep! (Despairingly.) Why will you never let me sleep?
Vladimir: I felt lonely.
Estragon: I had a dream.
Vladimir: Don't tell me!
Estragon: I dreamt that—
Vladimir: DON'T TELL ME!
Estragon: (gesture toward the universe). This one is enough for you? (Silence.) It's not nice of you, Didi. Who am I to tell my private nightmares to if I can't tell them to you? (Beckett 2016: 12).

Conclusion

Denegation of a sense of existence at the age of beings has not been identified thoroughly and has not found legitimacy to follow their exceptional divergence is not the presentment of an interpretation of humanity. Finding meaningful life apropos by replacing meaningful ideas through the facts on the ground. Different readers/audiences—due to age and social class—may interpret *Waiting for Godot* removedly. Even the story's central character, Godot, like other human beings, has

been described as erring, not a symbol of superior power. The authenticity reader/audience comprehends is that Vladimir and Estragon are waiting for Godot, and Beckett ideally benefits from Existentialism to portray his definition of presence. Challenging characters and their struggles with futility and latent entropy is exactly what manifests itself in their behavior (Rahimipour 2020: 33). The setting of the play reflects the climacteric term of occupied France under Hitler's imperialist dynasty during World War II, and Beckett introduces Pozzo, who symbolizes the Gestapo officers, the terror, discouragement, and frustration imposed on Vladimir, Estragon, and the whole humanity. Peacetime is infeasible while war and destruction are spread, and some nations are oppressed. Pozzo and Lucky are symbols of oppressor and oppressed, colonizer and colonized, and omnitemporal habitude with enslaved person symbolizes all superpowers against poor subordinates. Beckett demonstrates that life is a frolic, but an unfortunate habit, and most world literature dramas imitate this notion. The Beckettian context of life is a comic tragedy. Although life is a tragedy, its rigorousness makes it a comedy for the audience. Beckett's grotesque style with minor actions contains humor and compels the reader/audience to muse.

KAYNAKÇA|REFERENCES

- Ackerly, C. (2004). Perfection is not of This World: Samuel Beckett and Mysticism. *Mystics Quarterly*, 30 (1-2), 28-55.
- Adorno, T. W. (1997). *Aesthetic Theory*. Athlone Press.
- Beckett, S. (2016). *Waiting for Godot*. Faber and Faber Ltd.
- _____. (1983). *Disjecta*. Ruby Cohn, ed. John Calder.
- Bénard, J. (018). The Capital of the Ruins by Samuel Beckett: Re-construction as a 'Re-distribution of the Sensible', *Études britanniques contemporaines*, 54, DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/ebc.4282>.
- Bizub, E. (2014). Sounds, Sense and Signature: Beckett's Swerving Identity. *Comparative Studies in Modernism*, 5, 47-57.
- Bryden, M. (1998). *Samuel Beckett and the Idea of God*. Macmillan.
- Butler, L. St J. (1984). *Samuel Beckett and the meaning of Being: A study in ontological parable*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Calderwood, J. L. (1986). Ways of Waiting in Waiting for Godot. *Modern Drama*, 29, 363-375. <https://doi.org/10.3138/md.29.3.363.29-43>.
- Camus, A. (2013). *The myth of sisyphus*. (J. O'Brien, Trans.). Penguin Books.
- Esslin, M. (1983). *The Theatre of the Absurd*. 3rd ed. Penguin Books.
- Gibson, A. (2010). *Samuel Beckett*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Gordon, L. (2002). *Reading Godot*. Yale University Press.
- Graver, L. (2004). *Samuel Beckett, waiting for godot*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kamyabi M., Ahmad, B., Jean-Louis, Eugène I., & Samuel B. (2002). *Conversations with Samuel Beckett, Eugène Ionesco and Jean-Louis Barrault about theater*. Namayesh.
- Kenner, H. (1973). *A Reader's Guide to Samuel Beckett*. Farrar, Straus.
- Levy, E. P. (1980). *Beckett and the Voice of Species: A Study of the Prose Fiction*. Gill and Macmillan.

Mcmullan, A. (2008). History in Tatters: Bodies and Things in Samuel Beckett's Theatre. *Études britanniques contemporaines*, 35, DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/ebc.5953>.

Malekin, P. & Yarrow, R. (1997). *Consciousness, Literature and Theatre: Theory and Beyond*. Macmillan.

Mansouri, S. (2015). The Lie of the Land: Irish Modernism in a Nativist Ireland. *Studi Irlandesi. A Journal of Irish Studies*, 5(5), 183-205. <https://doi.org/10.13128/SIJIS-2239-3978-16345>.

Rahimipour, S. (2020). Dramatic Entropy and Self Ambiguity in Samuel Beckett's Works via the Framework of Choas Theory. [In Persian]. *Journal of Language Teaching, Literature & Linguistics (JLTLL)*, 3(2), 27-46. doi: 10.22034/jltll.v3i2.58.

Reid, A. (1962). "Beckett and the Drama of Unknowing." *Drama Survey*, 2 (autumn), 130-138.

Roberts, J. L. (1980). *Waiting for Godot & Other Plays*. Hungry Minds, Inc.

Rybińska, K. (2017). The Absurd as a Representation: Towards a Hermeneutics of the Inexplicable (The Problematic Case of Godot). *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 51(4), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stap-2016-0020>.

Sollars, M. D. (2013). Kafkaesque Absurdity in the Aesthetics of Beckett and Giacometti. *ENTHYMEMA*, 8, 71-82. <https://doi.org/10.13130/2037-2426/3041>.

Stace, W. T. (1960). *Mysticism and Philosophy*. Macmillan.

Taghizadeh, A. & Soltani, G. M. (2016). The double position of waiting for godot. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 8(3), 105-117. <https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v8n3.13>.

Uchman, J. (2012). Crossing the Borders of Language and Culture: Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot. *Text Matters: A Journal of Literature, Theory and Culture*, 2, 46-61. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10231-012-0054-7>.

_____. (2018). Blindness in the Beckettland of Malfunctioning. *Text Matters: A Journal of Literature, Theory and Culture*, 8, 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.1515/texmat-2018-0008>.