

¹ Samuel Beckett's rough For Theatre I and II: A Revolt against ² Absurdity

3 Dr. Noorbakhsh Hooti¹ and Pouria Torkamaneh²

4 ¹ RAZI UNIVERSITY

Received: 16 December 2011 Accepted: 5 January 2012 Published: 15 January 2012

3 Abstract

8 Deemed as depictions of dejection intermingled with penetrative multiaccentuality,
9 nothingness, and murkiness, Beckett's multilayered texts lead the mind of the reader/observer
10 into a deadlock in rendering a plausible connotation camouflaged in their sub-texts. As a
11 result, the paradoxical and baffling amalgamation of simplicity and complexity in his works
12 keeps the readers and pundits captivated in the fanciful web of the text. Expectedly, this
13 delusive feature has tantalized a bumper crop of articles to mark Beckett down as a paragon
14 of absurdism and atheism over the past few decades. However, by ploughing new fields and
15 charting new territories of his works, we can redefine and re-delineate Beckett's ideologies as
16 non-absurdist and theist and ultimately he himself as an absurdistic writer rather than an
17 absurdist author. Contrary to the mainstream impression of hermeneutists about Beckett's
18 rationalizations that are fallaciously thought to be absurd and purposeless, his argumentations
19 of absurdity are not a stymie to propagandize absurdism, but an initiative to actuate our
20 consciousness to eschew our absurd life in order to lead us to a new sphere of reality and
21 meaning. Therefore, this paper is to underpin the above-mentioned avowals by re-introducing
22 Beckett as a crusader against absurdity and mental stagnation through a comparative review
23 of *Rough for Theatre I* and *II*.

Index terms—

1 INTRODUCTION

27 stylistically discrete and mystifying, writings of Samuel Beckett seem to be more labyrinthine and cryptic than most
28 of the works of his contemporary authors and somehow more elaborate and sinuous than how we usually strive
29 to decode his works via our 'interpretations.' Precisely, his literary works seem to pull the rug from underneath
30 the feet of the philosopher or clouding the mind of the reader by substantiating the possibility of decrypting
31 and comprehending his works as a long shot with expressing too much by saying too little. Studying his works,
32 especially his plays, creates the impression that there are multiple nuances of exegeses, underlay and disguised
33 by the main text, which lead any first time reader down to an impasse in dissecting or even understanding
34 the real and intended connotation of the text. Epistemologically speaking, his works cross-examine the reader
35 in descrying the preconceived purports of his works, that in pursuing them there appears an amalgamation of
36 umpteen possible denotations and connotations, in which each possible meaning 'defers' and contradicts the other
37 'different' meanings, which link up and highlight the role of multiaccentuality of the sign effectively. Relatively
38 speaking, this nature of complication in the subtexts, which are interconnected and make each study more
39 serpentine in certain cases, is oscillating in Beckett's works in which truth and language are somehow lost in
40 their ways in becoming an intelligible and coherent text. Absolutely borderless, his enigmatic works make any
41 dilettante reader fail to grasp the meaning of his works if s/he jumps straight in, out of nowhere proclaiming

2 ABSURDITY ARGUMENT

42 his/her opinions and making rash generalizations. In this regard, Derrida as one of the giant philosophers opines
43 that:

44 When I found myself, with students, reading some of Beckett's texts, I would take three lines, I would spend
45 two hours on them, then I would give up because it would not have been possible, or honest, or even interesting,
46 to extract a few 'significant' lines from a Beckett's text. The composition, the rhetoric, the construction and
47 the rhythm of his works, even the ones that seem the most 'decomposed', that is what 'remains' finally the
48 most 'interesting', that is the work, that is the signature, this remainder which remains when the thematics are
49 exhausted (Quoted in Royle, 1995: 61) Beckett is a playwright who only 'presents' absurdity of life and does not
50 'argue' it. Nonetheless, numerous studies of Beckett's works have vindicated that they still tender a number of
51 areas that deserve exploration, particularly its authentication of antiabsurdism points, which are predominately
52 taken for granted. Accurately, to date, scholars have not yet proffered or consulted a new and state-of-the-art
53 approach in scrutiny of his works' absurdity panorama that limn this vaunted playwright in a contrastive image
54 of how he has customarily been advertised. Insightfully, his works are bolsters of his penchant to knock down
55 all the obstacles of living a rational and hopeful life commingled with his downright endorsement of belief in a
56 metaphysical power and the Hereafter. Therefore, by tracking down the traces of a transcendent belief in the
57 supernatural power and the Hereafter as the highlight of this paper, it endeavors to deracinate and redefine the S
58 unjustifiable labels of absurdity from Beckett's works via a comparative review of *Rough for Theatre I* and *II* as
59 two samples of his countless works. However rather than simply providing answers or decoding and deciphering a
60 text or even solving conundrums, this study strives to introduce a new dimension of Beckett's multifaceted works
61 through these two long-forgotten plays. In fact, to engage effectually with Beckett's works does not mandatorily
62 mean to decode their underneath obscurity, but it is to first inhumate our ego and judgment before appraising
63 the play and then to fuel all expositions espoused by various attitudes as an appreciable and 'possible' vista, as
64 Beckett once said, "the key word in my plays is 'perhaps.' " (1979: 220) Although *Theatre I* and *II* have received
65 inadequate attention, due to other apocalyptic works of Beckett, we cannot disavow the appreciative dexterity
66 of thought, perplexity of dialogues, and idiosyncrasy (although fascinating) captivation of the words, which have
67 been interpolated in these two works premeditatedly. Like his other works, melancholy, prorogation, skepticism,
68 and ambivalence, just to name a few, are the oozed and *prima facie* flavors of *Theatre I* and *II* as well.

69 However, with these well-expounded and oftproclaimed life-is-meaningless doom and gloom catchphrases, the
70 real tenor of his works still seems obfuscating. At the very beginning, he plunges the audience into the terra
71 incognito atmosphere of the play so adroitly that consequently the perplexed readers that are wavering on a
72 contour between the eyes that see and a heart that feels, are gradually dissociated from the real and contrived
73 orientation of the play.

74 Thereby, those who criticize Beckett's works through pessimistic spectacles tend to miss this fundamental
75 difference that as long as things are in the process of ending, they have not yet ended (and perhaps never will),
76 as Rathjen notes, "[his works] deal with the process of ending but seldom or never with an actual end." (2006:
77 163) II.

78 2 ABSURDITY ARGUMENT

79 Though a contrapuntal anatomization of both plays, it seems that the quintessential stream of storylines are
80 after the desire to catch up on the pathetic and piteous living condition, afflicted upon the main characters, in
81 a simple but pre-tailored condition. Critical analysis of the characters in both *Theatre I* and *II* illuminates and
82 functionalizes the radix of debasement and reclusiveness, engaged in their crestfallen life in their own attitude
83 and reaction toward the exterior world.

84 *Theatre I* sets out a character that sustains the ramifications of living a fallaciously irrational, apathetic, and
85 fantasized life of his mind and how it leads him to a poignant living condition and unimagined hell. Settled in the
86 corner of a street with a couple of roads intersected upon it; Billy's chosen position of living is the first impetus
87 to his stagnant and monotonous life. Though he encounters two different paths to explore new experiences
88 and opportunities of life, *de facto* two 'lifeaffirming' options, he spares no efforts to change his atrocious living
89 condition. He is glued to his seat with no penchant of action, and stuck-still like a zombie till he becomes
90 "unhappy enough to die." ??Becket, 1958: 69) The blind man reveals the reminiscence of how his wife deserted
91 him and he is expectantly, although illusively, hearing her back now and again.

92 You were not always as you are," asks the other character curiously, "What befell you? Women? Gambling?
93 God? " but he retorts that, "I am always as I am, crouched in the dark, scratching an old jangle, to the four
94 winds." (68)

95 Although he used to have a euphoric life with his family and 'woman', but he missed her as the chance to be
96 his companion and blames the world for his loneliness. Interestingly the other character appears to be a logical
97 person, and who has had the same experience, berates and wakes him that, "We had our women, had not we?
98 you yours to lead by the hand and I mine to get me out of the chair and back into it again and eventually to help
99 [us], but [we] lost them." (ibid) Therefore, it is demonstrative of how their harrowing life has been (mis)shaped
100 by their own pitfalls. To consummate their collection of altering a hopeful life into a hopeless one (absurd),
101 they miss the most perceptible glitter of hope or window of opportunity of companionship, provided for them
102 by rejecting to help one another reciprocally. Clearly put, these two physically incapacitated characters come to
103 know each other fortuitously and their diametrically opposed deficiencies dispose them to join forces in order to

104 help and make up for each other's impairment. Practically, Billy could simply help the other walk and push his
105 wheelchair and the other could role as the eyes that Billy never possessed, but they dither and rebuff mutual
106 support and finally never get together as a pair.

107 Scrutiny of Theatre II homes in on the same root of calamities through character's own decisions and
108 standpoints toward the world as well. Through torrent of catastrophes of "Sick headaches, irrational fear of
109 vipers, ear trouble, fibroid tumors, pathological horror of songbirds, need of affection, morbidly sensitive to
110 the opinions of others" (82) and many others, there does not exist any cruel reason conclusive to any sign of
111 irrationality from the probable absurdity of life. However, the following incentives emphasize how stimulants like
112 his youth's mischief along with many others initiated, instantiated and precipitated his dispirited life instead of
113 a serene one and eventually probable act of suicide as a means of a gateway out of his life:

114 Age ten runs away from home for the first time, brought back next day, admonished, forgiven?aged seventeen,
115 runs away from home for [fifth and] the last Mr. Peaberry testifies that, "of our national epos he remembered
116 only the calamities, which did not prevent him from winning a minor scholarship in the subject." (80) It is the
117 substantiation of how he has taken the role of hope for granted in certain sections of his life, and the justification
118 of how he was plunged into melancholy that he became unable to alter his desolate state of mind. Completely
119 and successively deteriorated by living as a leashed slave of despondency and nonchalance, arising chiefly from
120 his deep-seated sense of self-alienation; Croker's wrong actions one after the next pile up his hoard of misfortunes
121 and are to lead him to new territories of bad luck. They tangle him in a life bereft of transcendent hope and
122 pessimism, just like the characters in Theater I. As a result, Beckett (with morbid sensitivity to the opinions of
123 others about his works) who has the courage to confront us with how we have sabotaged our living circumstances,
124 revolts against this type of absurdity and presents an analysis of the fundamentals: the core, or 'essence' of what
125 maps out human experience. Accordingly, he abrogates the unjustifiably guided hallucinations about his works
126 that "[his] works are a matter of fundamental sounds, no joke intended" ??Harmon, 1998: 24), which are the
127 sounds of our well-structurally pathetic life. Still and all, we erroneously gauge him and his plays or novels as
128 paragons of absurdism, although he only presents our self-made absurdity in confrontation with the world.

129 These two interconnected, perfectly conflated, and well-crafted plays seem to contribute more than it initially
130 meets the eyes. Predeterminedly, Beckett has supplemented and integrated certain ingredients of both plays to
131 convey a designative point. In Theatre I, Billy has practiced segregation that he seems to have lost his sanity
132 and asks, "if it is day or not", "how the trees are doing" or if "there [is] grass anywhere?" (Becket, 1958: 68) It
133 seemingly anchors his apathy and obvious ennui, which stems from his immobility. Having considered that, the
134 second layer of this utterance qualifies itself in that, apart from Billy's indifference, this excerpt is also indicative
135 of Billy's metaphysical desire for time and peace in which allegorically we, people, look for peace only in the
136 appearance of night. This idea of lack of order and peace that Billy is troubling to regain endlessly to put an
137 end to his perpetual sufferings does not end in that pronouncement. In fact, Beckett does not only suffice it to
138 shed light on how we are making a mess out of our personal lives, but he also takes one more step ahead and
139 underlines how we have managed to traumatize each other's life and destabilize its balance. In the latter parts of
140 Theatre I, Billy needs to know the time and if it is day or night and therefore asks: "Will it not soon be night?
141 which seems to be a simple question. However, the other character provides a relatively knotty respond that
142 "Day?night? sometimes it seems to me the earth must have got stuck?one sunless day?in the heart of winter?in
143 the grey of the evening." (72)

144 3 III. GOD AND THE HEREAFTER

145 A rigorous and attentive exploration of the play's unique textual characteristics reveals Beckett's beliefs in
146 something metaphysical and supernatural, which mysteriously has been seeped 'indirectly' through the text. A
147 detailed inquiry at the linear development of both plays uncovers that the incidents, dialogues, and the plot of
148 Theatre I is proceeded by some pertinent and corresponding coincidences in Theatre II. In fact, Theatre II and I
149 seem to be complementary and interdependent. In truth, Beckett keeps drilling his creeds, argument, and revolts
150 against absurdism by moving into a further sphere of his beliefs portraying and emphasizing the end and after
151 life. Theatre I seems to stage the life of two elderly men who are spending the twilight days of their lives in the
152 secular world and thus Theatre II, in continuity of Theatre I, is sketching out the trial of Croker, probably in the
153 other world, who can be considered samples like the characters in Theatre I.

154 Croker who is catatonic or probably dead is standing in the window, suspended between the earth and the
155 night sky, probably entangled between this world and the other, and therefore, analogous to being judged by
156 Morvan and Bertrand. It can be surmised that he is supposed to be positioned in that location premeditatedly
157 in order to foster the audience have the opportunity to draw conclusion about his life and destiny. Indeed, being
158 scrutinized by two bureaucrats in a gloomy room and being ensnared in time and space, Croker and his life are
159 reckoned to be the tool that Beckett has utilized to influence the audience and let them envisage the last of
160 Croker or even the last of human condition on themselves. Beckett tries to elucidate this freedom of judgment
161 and suspension of Croker simply by putting him on the centre of a high double window, probably closer to the sky
162 (sixth floor), Jupiter planet, and the moon, which highlights the practicality of the notion of the 'theatre on trial'.
163 It somehow feels like Beckett has deactivated the passage of time in order to commingle our consciousness and
164 emotions with a person who is about to take a giant leap into the other world and entitle the reader to speculate

3 III. GOD AND THE HEREAFTER

165 and judge about Croker's destiny as a sample human being. McMullan confirms this feature of Beckett's works
166 as follows:

167 The elements of performance in Beckett's plays foreground the interrelated processes of production, perception,
168 and judgment: both through his characters' attempts to represent and perceive their existence as an image or
169 a narrative and through the structure and texture of the plays, which foreground the production of visual and
170 verbal signifying material for perception and judgment by an audience. (1993 ?? 10) Similarly enough, it is now
171 possible to postulate that Theatre I and II can be viewed as a supplementary two-episode televised serial that
172 never ends as Croker never commits suicide, and therefore Beckett delegates the final assessment of everything
173 upon the observer as the astute director of this bizarre movie. Accurately Theatre I can be read and considered
174 an illusion to the ending days of each human being's life in mundane world(Billy and his only companion), and
175 respectively

176 Theater II can be deemed as the viaduct or window to transfer humans (Theatre I) to the other world and
177 Croker is an example of this transference. Precisely, Bertrand and Morvan, who create the impression that
178 they are not from the mundane world, are providing service to someone out of this ordinary world, and just before
179 starting reading the testimonies Bertrand says, "I still do not understand, why he needs our services? A man like
180 him?and why we give them free?men like us?mystery." ??Becket, 1958: 77) This terse but expressive dialogue
181 indicates someone other than what we initially assume of the antecedent of 'him'. Simply put, it comprehensibly
182 feels like all three characters in Theatre II, (second episode after Theatre I) are beyond our perception of life
183 and this world. Plainly defined, "Beckett places the[se] 'characters' in locations that are beyond life and death."
184 ??Boulter 2008: 8) Considering the bureaucrats as two divine beings, who are supposed to be agents, checking
185 and evaluating people's afterlife, they are mentioning someone whom they are providing service for and it can
186 be presupposed that they are talking about a metaphysical power.

187 Billy who was formerly characterized as a chimerical character describes his feelings as if he sometimes hears
188 people around him whispering. Although both Billy and the other character along with the audience are fully
189 aware that there is no one around who wants to reside in that place, he utters, "Sometimes I hear steps and
190 voices. I say to myself they are coming back, some are coming back, to try to settle again, or to look for something
191 they had left behind, or to look for someone they had left behind." ??Becket, 1958:69) This section of Billy's
192 dialogues can be decoded that if we take the derelict road in which they are residing in, as an allusion of this
193 secular world and its ephemerality, and on the other hand postulate the people who are coming back as those
194 who are living in the other world (afterlife), we can respectively reach the conclusion that Beckett is warning us
195 about something forgotten. Specifically, they are coming back remorsefully for what they lost and ignored, that
196 is living a conscious and objective life; in lieu of spending it improvidently and disgracefully, thus it feels like
197 these two characters are somehow neither in this world, nor in the other. As a hypothesis, they are entrapped
198 between 'Inferno' and 'Paradiso', which is intermediary and is precisely called 'Purgatorio', and are somehow
199 narrating everything from an exterior/dominant panorama or vantage point. These three terms are undoubtedly
200 the three Canticas (sections) which are allegorized by Dante in Divine Comedy, which reveals Beckett's inclination
201 to make use of these metaphors in his own works. According to McDonald, "throughout his works vivid images
202 of suffering from Dante's masterpiece often resurface. His student copy of the Divine Comedy would be at his
203 beside when he died in 1989." (2006: 10) Moreover, Beckett's apprehension of other world can be justified through
204 Palacious (1919) argumentation that Dante derived many features of and episodes about the Hereafter from the
205 spiritual writings of Ibn Arabi and from the Isra and Mi'raj. Therefore, it demonstrates Beckett's awareness
206 of these phases of life and how deliberately he has sketched out these images and stages. Contrary, a bumper
207 crop of articles have constantly been titled and resonated with the idea of a non-religious Beckett, however, the
208 abovementioned avowals seem to inoculate him against the encroachment of a presumed disbelief in someone or
209 something other than what we are cognizant of. As Cronin attests, Beckett always possessed a Bible, at the
210 end more than one edition, and Bible concordances were always among the reference books on his shelves. He
211 certainly knew the book backwards and as a boy he won a prize for knowing it in the diocesan synod examination
212 (1996: 21)

213 Beckett also tries to claw at deeper and greater levels of intuition and experience by stimulating and activating
214 the readers' five senses in certain parts of his plays in an intangible method, although unfortunately, most readers
215 do not get the learning curves of identifying these momentous moments. In one of these instances, he tests the
216 readers' eyesight and consciousness in which he displays something that is not mentioned in the screenplay. He
217 has deposited a pole with a sign submitting a pair of crossed lines in which they put embargo on some sort of
218 an action in that certain part of the street. Crucially enough, that pole has been set right in front of Billy's
219 place of living, which signifies something of great import. It is weird that the street betokens of nothing but
220 deterioration. It shows that how beautifully Beckett has delved into the world of those individuals who have
221 drowned themselves in the convulsive ocean of absurdity and pessimism. However, there seems to be a kind of
222 bamboozling misconceptions on Becket's notions on absurdity, but Beckett does not give an absurd picture of life
223 or existence as a totality. Indeed, he tries to show the innermost layer of those individuals who find themselves
224 too weedy to break the crust of pessimism, the pessimism, which has become a mind blocking obstacle of entering
225 the new arena of the current dominant circumstances of life, which portray the f Global Journal of Human Social
226 Science Volume XII Issue II Version I epistemological truth of existing existence of the individual. The tragic
227 and heart lacerating point of the modern man is that he depends on what he was more than what he is now.

228 We should not take life as a totalizing sequel, but as fragmented forms, and if we do so, we will never grow
229 the sense of absurdity and cynicism within us, because each fragmented episode of life has its own birth and
230 death, which does not affect the birth of a new episode of our life. Each footstep of life has its own melody, and
231 if one melody sounds off-key, it does not mean all the coming tones are bound to be off-key as well. Beckett
232 in his play shows the inner world of those individuals who look at life as a totalizing sequel with a fast moving
233 off-key rhythm. Indeed Beckett is jarred to see such dead but moving characters, who contaminate the world with
234 their frustrating and dejecting dormant notions. Hence, Beckett tries to awaken man from the deep slumber of
235 absurdity, which has grown to be a terrifying nightmare. He wants to say that if we break the fossilized shackles
236 of the nightmare of absurdity, we can enjoy the sweet heartbeats of the moving moments as well.

237 Turning to Theatre II, this idea of credo and faith about the different phases of existence in different moves
238 of life is alluded from the characters' dialogues as well. When Morvan is giving a rundown of another testament
239 about Croker's misfortunes, they drop a hint about somewhere other than his home, since each home represents
240 a different nature of existence.

241 To hear him talk about his life, after a glass or two, you would have thought he had never set foot outside of
242 hell. He had us in stitches. I worked it up into a skit that went down well, *Testimony of Mr. Moore*. ??Becket,
243 1958: 80) First, it simply points to his adverse living condition, but Bertrand clarifies that, "you see! This is not
244 his home and he knows it full well." (ibid.) This perplexing dialogue can be interpreted from various dimensions.
245 First by his home, he means either this place or this world, which indicates the notion of 50/50 chances in
246 Beckett works (uncertainty or multiaccentuality). Croker does not live in that home; instead, he lives in a barge.
247 Therefore, we may deduce that by his home, he is talking about the current context of existence and that sooner
248 or later his present life will die and consequently a new life will be born.

249 Through taking Croker and his heart-rending life into consideration, we may claim that croaking and dying
250 are not necessarily about the declining years of our life or the death itself, but about imprisoning ourselves within
251 a murky dungeon of a paralyzed world, which by itself is dead.

252 Beckett as a dexterous and astute playwright does not leave the subconscious territory of the reader/observer's
253 mind at rest. Theatre II represents how with terse but pregnant and meaningful dialogues, Beckett indoctrinates
254 his beliefs into the innermost section of the audience's mind. Walking in the dark room, Bertrand approaches
255 Croker, who is rooted to that spot and is about to throw himself out of the window, looks at the hopeful bright
256 sky and utters out, "full moon" but Morvan corrects him and says that it is "tomorrow". Then Bertrand asks,
257 "What's the date?", and Morvan responds that, "twenty-fourth?twenty-fifth tomorrow." (78) Why does a person
258 who wants to commit suicide in order to abandon the world, choose a place to throw himself under the bright
259 night sky, the full moon (24 th and 25 th of the month) and on the sixth floor of an apartment? First of all,
260 sixth floor of an apartment is much closer to the sky which symbolizes Beckett's yearning to depict his attention
261 to the celestial bodies. This extraterrestrial depiction is not labeled only with full moon, but also with presence
262 of Jupiter, twinkling in the sky. By resting in the central orbital line of planets, with four planets preceding and
263 four planets extending past it, Jupiter and its position are idealized for justice, central power, and perfect order,
264 which are rarely found on planet Earth. More importantly, the full moon has something to do with creation,
265 manifestation, birth, and rebirth. The full moon completes the cycle, representing death, change, or tying up
266 loose ends. It symbolizes the end chapter, shedding light on the things that we no longer need to hold on to. Full
267 Moon is an opportune time of the month for purging 'rituals' to take place. The light of the full moon illuminates
268 those things that are interfering with our spiritual advancements.

269 Once we have become enlightened to ways that are blocking us, the easier to let go. The full moon occurrence
270 is for releasing or purging the things in our lives that no longer serve us good such as addictions to food, drugs,
271 or sex, relinquishing suffering involved in hurtful relationships, discharging physical and emotional pains, and
272 eventually cleansing our soul as the new moon appears. Respectively, this image of full moon in Theatre II, is
273 echoed in *Waiting for Godot* clearly in which it snags our attention toward revitalization that is mingled with
274 surrealistic replacement and renewal of day and night. Schneider states that, "when the highly stylized 'moon'
275 suddenly rose and night 'fell' at the end of that first act, a simple representation of rebirth affected me beyond
276 all reason." (1958: 192) Accurately, it manifests how Beckett tries to alert us about another world of existence by
277 utilizing full moon, sixth floor of an apartment, Jupiter, and bright night sky, intermingled with hope, and how
278 those can bring us elation and salvation. It authenticates Beckett's endeavors to seek sanctuary in somewhere
279 other than the current existence, from the cruelties and absurdities that we have set up in the world unjustly.

280 However, it should be strongly reminded that though the coruscating moon is the harbinger of hope and
281 rebirth, it does not necessitate this redemption through suicide as a *dues ex machina* or any other fallacious
282 ends, but it can be implied that this is gained through natural death and purposeful life. Thereby, it highlights
283 and underpins Beckett's desire to prove redemption, equilibrium, and justice through something apart from the
284 current fragment of frustrating life, but from each upcoming episode, which has its own pros and cons. Hence,
285 Beckett looks at life with both appreciation and depreciation, which are the integral parts of life. Indeed, Beckett's
286 main worries and concerns are on those individuals who are dressed in the black shroud of darkness and have
287 buried themselves in a marooned island of just depreciation and absurdity.

288 IV.

4 CONCLUSION

289 Rough for Theatre I and II as two convoluted, riveting, and epigrammatic, however forgotten works in Beckett's
290 oeuvre, welcome the opportunity of detaching some of the hasty and predisposed generalizations about his
291 doctrines. Absurdist, atheist, existentialist?, atheist existentialist and many other inequitable labels, encrusted
292 with 'nothingness' are the common but unmerited adjectives affiliated to his works. However, "the whole 'negative
293 way' of Beckett is a 'defiant creation from nothing,' an outpouring of 'reproductive and inventive energy,' which
294 in turn tropes 'the generative power of what is as against the realm of what is not.' ??Wolosky 1991: 228)
295 Scrutinizing every single phrase of these two encoded plays and their gnomic dialogues, this paper attempted to
296 re-introduce Beckett as a tactfully absurdistic, and insightful author and philosopher who only tries to exhort
297 us about some overlooked values and aims of life. The study further tried to unpick how Beckett in Rough for
298 Theater I and II, unravels the mental stagnation of those individuals, whose disappointing Past is always present
299 and the Present itself is never born and consequently no future can come to existence. Hence, such characters
300 who are wedded to a world, which is no more, may not find the physical death or a reclusive life a shift from
301 existence to non-existence. Indeed, such a shift may mean a move from one dungeon to probably a much darker
302 one. Therefore, darkness for them does not mean really darkness since they are not familiar with beauty of light
303 and illumination.

304 To put it in a nutshell, the veiled and sheathed layers of Theatre I and II tend to insinuate that Beckett wants
305 to push us toward a logical, purposeful, and humanistic life and fight against the absurdities brought about by
306 our own actions as human beings. Ergo, Theatre I and II are the apparatus that Beckett uses in order to revolt
307 against this absurdity, even though only unprejudiced readers will uphold this uprising. ^{1 2 3}

¹January

²© 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US)

³Samuel Beckett's rough For Theatre I and II: A Revolt against Absurdity time, crawls back a year later on his hands and his knees, kicked out, forgiven. (84-5)

-
- 309 [Palacious and Asin (1919)] , Miguel Palacious , Asin . http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_Comedy. Accessed 8 October 2005.
- 310
- 311 [Wolosky ()] , Shira Wolosky . 1991.
- 312 [Schneider ()] *Alan Schneider in Chelsea Review*, Alan Schneider . 1958. Routledge, London and New York.
- 313 [Beckett ()] 'Beckett by the Madeleine, Beckett's Letter to Tom Driver, Columbia University Forum'. Samuel Beckett . *Samuel Beckett: The Critical Heritage*, Kegan Routledge, Paul (ed.) (London, Henley and Boston) 1979.
- 314
- 315
- 316 [McDonald ()] *Beckett Exhibition Catalogue*, Stationery Office, Ronan McDonald . 2006. Dublin.
- 317 [Boulter ()] *Beckett: a Guide for the Perplexed*, Continuum, Jonathan Boulter . 2008. New York.
- 318 [Cronin ()] Anthony Cronin . *Samuel Beckett: the Last Modernist*, (Harper Collins, London) 1996.
- 319 [Harmon ()] *No Author Better Served: The Correspondence of Samuel Beckett and Alan Schneider*, Maurice Harmon . 1998. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- 320
- 321 [Rathjen ()] Friedhelm Rathjen . *Neitherways: Long Ways in Beckett's Shorts*, (Rodopi, New York) 2006.
- 322 [Beckett (ed.) ()] *Rough for Theatre I and II*, Samuel Beckett . Faber & Faber (ed.) 1958. 2006. London: Samuel Beckett Collected Shorter Plays.
- 323
- 324 [McMullan ()] *Theatre On trial*, Anna McMullan . 1993. Routledge, London and New York.
- 325 [Royle ()] *This strange Institution Called Literature: an Interview With Jacques Derrida*, Nicholas Royle . 1995. Routledge, London and New York.
- 326