RESEARCH ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA

2395-2636 (Print):2321-3108 (online)

UNMASKING SAMUEL BECKETT'S WAITING FOR GODOT AS A CANDID PARADIGM OF JACQUES DERRIDA'S *DECONSTRUCTION*

SHABIR AHMAD MIR
Student of English Language and Literature
Islamic University of science and Technology, Awantipora, Pulwama
Jammu and Kashmir, India
Email: optimist821@gmail.com
doi: https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.7119.355

SHABIR AHMAD MIR

ABSTRACT

Waiting for Godot, written by the most popular Irish writer, Samuel Beckett is originally written in French and then translated into English in 1954. It is the most notorious play in every corner of the world and considered to be the *de jour* in the modernist movement of which Beckett was also a prominent figure. Therefore, this play has been performed as a drama of the absurd with flabbergasting mega-hit success in Europe, America and the rest of the world in post second world war era. Martin Esslin, known for coining the term "theatre of Absurd" labels it *"One of the successes of the post-wartheatre*(Esslin, Martin, 1980, p.3).The play concerns two tramps, Vladimir and Estragon, who are waiting anxiously and are agog to visit Godot near a dwindled tree in the middle of nowhere. They are not acquainted about his real name, whether he promises to visit them, or if, in fact, he actually exists. However, they are still waiting and waiting for him. Nevertheless, he did never appear. This futile waiting is the main concern of the play, the playwright explicates. It has become a touchstone in explicating the philosophy of existentialism. The inefficacious wait by the two tramps, Vladimir and Estragon as a ramification of the 'Derridean Deconstructive' modus operandi is the premier corollary this paper is going to analyse. Derrida sternly scruples the logo-centric Western tradition of the metaphysics of presence, which has been looked grandiose from Plato's "Phaedrus" until Edmund Husserl's "Origin of Geometry" in Western philosophy. The paperhowever purports to highlight the play with the ambit of Derrideandeconstructive hermeneutics with the help of some key terms associated with it (Deconstruction)

Keywords: de jour, Existentialism, Deconstruction, inefficacious, Jacques Derrida,logo-centric, Samuel Beckett

Objectives of Research

I. To unravel Samuel Beckett's play "Waiting for Godot" and make it applicable for Deconstructive reading.

II. To bring out some of the vigorous neologisms employed by Jacques Derrida while putting forward the philosophy of Deconstruction.

SHABIR AHMAD MIR

KY Publications
www.kypublications.com

III. To unbolt the tactics of meta-theatre (pondering over the nature of its own drama) which make the writer of the "Waiting for Godot" much proficient to move farther away from the terminus of the ethnic stereotypes and ceremonial sundries, grace and traditions of language, theatre and the literary text, which continuously gyrate around messianic logocentrism or phonocentrism in the history of philosophy from Plato to the present times or in simple words we can say to dethrone the authority of logocentrismor phonocentrism.

Some vital Questionsassociated with the research

The study will predominantly focus on the questions mentioned below:

I. How does the writer of "Waiting for Godot" propagate the logos, an insignia of life in his celebrated play "Waiting for Godot"?

II. What is in Beckett's art that make him convenient to deconstruction?

Research Methodology

The study is predominantly chorological with descriptive and coherent method companion to it. The paper will include some vital textual references that serve as evidence and make the study more concrete, the terms central to the philosophy of deconstruction; transcendental signified;aporia, logos, binary oppositions and time are discussed in relation to the text in this research. The list of the works cited in paper are however mentioned at the end under the heading, References.

Defining Deconstruction

Barbara Johnson in her famous critical book *'The Critical Difference'* defines deconstruction as: *"Deconstruction is not synonymous with 'destruction'. It is in fact much closer tothe original meaning of the word 'analysis', which etymologically means 'toundo'…The deconstruction of a text does not proceed by random doubt orarbitrary subversion, but by the careful teasing out of warring forces of signification within the text".(5)*

Sharon Crowley opines that *"Deconstruction amounts to reading texts in order to rewrite them"* (qtd. In Theory into Practice 162).

Derrida once asked by a Japanese friend to suggest an approximate definition of the term. He replied;

All sentences of the type 'Deconstruction is X or Deconstruction isn't X…."

J.A. Cuddon, in his *Dictionary of Literary Terms,* says that in Deconstruction: *A text can be read as saying something quite different from what it appears to be saying… It may be read as carrying a plurality of significance, or as saying many different things which are fundamentally at variance with, contradictory to and subversive of what may be seen by criticism as a single 'stable', meaning. Thus a text may 'betray' itself. (129)* to use the terms of Peter Barry, we can say that *deconstruction is a kind of "textual harassment" or "oppositional reading". Deconstruction aims to show that the text is at war with itself. Further, we can say that deconstruction is a decentring of any philosophical school of thought, any textual proposition etc.* Jonathan Culler's words are apt to quote here. Culler says that, *"to deconstruct a discourse is to show how it undermines the philosophy it asserts, or the hierarchical oppositions on which it relies*."(On Deconstruction 86). *Deconstruction attempts to make manifest that a text has no compact unity or ground to present meanings, that the text is only a series of conflicting significations.* In nutshell, we can say by using Paul Riceour's term that deconstruction is *"hermeneutics of suspicion". It looks at everything with a critical and suspicious eye. Everything is a fish that comes under the net of deconstruction.*

Analysing "Waiting for Godot" in the light of "Deconstruction".

It is an uphill task to analyse waiting for Godot without taking into consideration some of the important notions put forth by Jacques Derrida while disseminating and expounding the theory of Deconstruction. The following terms of Derridean deconstruction are simply relevant to the nature of this research.

Metaphysics of presence

Jacques Derrida advocates that the tradition of west European philosophy from Plato until Edmund Husserl has been the metaphysics of presence or logocentrism. Its persuasive impact and ramifications on human thought have proved to be the encumbering and fossilizing quandaries of aporia of meaning and authoritative fossilized logocentric structures of human thought to investigate new vistas, stimulating it in the cohesive and pre-determined meaning, origin or presence. We cannot imagine the end of the metaphysics of the presence, we can criticise it from within by identifying and reversing the hierarchies it has established.

Jacques Derrida regards all Western philosophic tradition logocentric because it spots at the centerof our sagacity of the universe a concept (logos), which charts and construes the universe for us while remaining outside of the universe it charts and construes. Jacques Derrida says that it is Western philosophy's greatest illusion. Each grounding concept --- Plato's notion of perfect Forms, Rene Descartes' cogito, structuralism's notion of innate structures of human consciousness---is itself a human concept and therefore, a product of human language. In this way, he attacks the basic metaphysical assumptions of Western philosophical tradition since Plato. He also criticises that the notion of innate structures of human consciousness in structuralism has always presupposed a centre of meaning of something, which governs the structure, but is itself not subject to structural analysis (to find the structure of the centre would be to find another centre.)

For this reason, Jacques Derrida claims that Western philosophy has always had a desire "to search for a centre, a meaning, origin or a "transcendental signified" (Derrida, Jacques, 1997, p. 49). He calls this desire for centre "logocentrism or phonocentrism (Derrida, Jacques, 1997, p. 11). However, he opines that all Western philosophy since Plato has tried to ground its basis on meaning, "presence", or "existence" (Derrida, Jacques, 2005, p. 353).

However, when we probe into "Waiting for Godot", we get acquainted about the central theme of the play, which revolves around the waiting for Godot, who actually surface in the play. Nevertheless, the two characters of the play, Vladimir and Estragon, who are homeless vagrants, appear to be ensnarled in the ambush of illusory world of the metaphysics of presence. They are cemented with messianic logocentrism or phonocentrism of the term Godot. Messianic is one of the forms of the metaphysics of presence, which is evident in the concepts of theocentrism and anthropocentrism. Any ideological, religious and political system, which claims to be authorised legitimacy, is messianic logocentrism or phonocentrism. This messianism is dominant in human thought. Jacques Derrida also calls this way of thinking messianicity, according to which Christian hope of a future to come.

Therefore, the word Godot in the play connotes both theocentric as well as anthropocentric messianic logocentrism, which may be noted is, the appanage given to it as Jehovah of "The Old Testament", his wrath frightens, and like Messiah (Jesus Christ) of "The New Testament", his Second Coming will redeem the humankind. He may stand for salvation, donation, rebirth and promise, which is able to be a link between these logi and the two waiting tramps. However, the tramps are fallen in the trap of illusory world of the metaphysics of presence and messianism. Therefore, they are mentally tied up with the logocentric messianic term Godot. Nevertheless, they have taken it for granted that it is a dominant source of redemption and salvation. They attempt to discover the meaning, origin and truth under the umbrella of the presupposed messianic logos Godot.

Therefore, Godot can penalize them if the tramps decamp, redeem, and reward them if they keep waiting for him. The tramps have strong zeal to turn Godot's absence to presence. This desire is identical to the longing of west European philosophy for centre or the stable and fixed signified by the metaphysics of presence. This messianic logocentric metaphysical presence makes a concrete physical anthropocentric entity for the tramps. For instance, Vladimir's yearning to perceive an exact image of Godot's appearance in an anthropomorphic manner,

SHABIR AHMAD MIR

bringing him on the level of human perception is an attempt of this kind:

"Vladimir: (softly) Has he a beard, Mr Godot?

Boy: Yes sir.

Vladimir: Fair or... (He hesitates)... or black?

Boy: I think it's white, sir" (Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 2, p. 92).

In this locution, Vladimir can't discern the image ofGodot without what west European philosophy's tradition of the metaphysics of presence and messianism has set for him as the foundation of messianic logocentrism of his beliefs and thoughts. A non-existent entity of Godot in the play disavows definition, and at this point, it becomes very close to Jacques Derrida's definition of differance than to the metaphysical notion of messianic theocentric or anthropocentric logos. Jacques Derrida explains that differance is *"formation of form"* (Derrida, Jacques, 1976, p. 63)" and the historical and epochal unfolding of Being" (Derrida, Jacques, 1982, p. 22), something that negates origin.

However, the absent Godot puts the notion of the origin of legitimate meaning, into the radical question, because it cannot be dexterously defined, categorized or harmonized to an object outside the text. It can denote multiple meanings of more things concomitant and nonexistence or nothing at all. It is in fact, an aporic being, which withstand interpretation. As a result, the two tramps are seeking for something to give meaning to their existence. For them Mr Godot is a seedbed of solution of their tribulations and gall, the logos that may fill the meaning in their preposterous and absurd existence. The disposition and identity of this absent entity remains unbeknownst in the whole text of the play. As Worton puts it:

"Much has been written about who or what Godot is. My own view is that he is simultaneously whatever we think he is and not what we think he is, he is an absence, who can be interpreted at moments as God, death, the Lord of the manor, a benefactor, even Pozzo. Nevertheless,

Godot has a function rather than a meaning. He stands for what keeps us chained- to and in-existence. He is the unknowable that represents hope in an age when there is no hope; he is whatever fiction we want him to be- as long as he justifies our life-as-waiting" (Worton, Michael, 1995, p. 70-71).

The tramps' throes to procure this nonentity or unknown being in terms of the known messianic logocentrism, by visiting him, are all in vain. Finally, Godot did not appear and tramps turned disappointed and flustered. Therefore, the nexus between language and reality is decimated and words falter and collapse in their enterprise of corresponding feelings and thoughts:

"Vladimir: Say I am happy

Estragon: I am happy

Vladimir: So I am Estragon: So I am.

Estragon: We are happy. (Silence). What do we do now, now that we're happy?"

(Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 2, p. 60).

Therefore, Godot's final absence, however, frustrates the hopes of the tramps and they have become nervous. The following dialogue of the tramps shows their hidden desire to set themselves free from the tiresome act of waiting for an unknown or non-existent messianic metaphysical being:

"Estragon: (His mouthful, vacuously.) We are not tied!

Vladimir: I don't hear a word you're saying.

Estragon: (chews, swallows.) I'm asking if we're tied.

Vladimir: tied?

Estragon: ti-ed.

Vladimir: How do you mean tied?

Estragon: Down

Vladimir: But to whom? By whom?

Estragon: To your man

Vladimir: To Godot? Tied to Godot? What an idea! No question of it. (Pause) For the moment"

(Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 1, pp.20-21).

Finally, the tramps are unable to act, even to commit suicide. For example, the following dialogue makes the point clear:

"Vladimir: We will hang ourselves tomorrow. (Pause.)Unless Godot comes. Estragon: And if he comes?

Vladimir: We'll be saved" s(Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act Two, p. 94).

We can mostly notice their incapability and undecidability to do anything throughout the whole play:

"Estragon: "Why don't we hang ourselves? Vladimir: With what?

Estragon: you haven't got a bit of rope? Vladimir: No.

Estragon: Then we can't.

Vladimir: Let's go.

Estragon: Oh wait, there is my belt.

Vladimir: It's too short.

Estragon: You could hang on to my legs.

Vladimir: And who would hang onto mine?

Estragon: True" (Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act Two, p.93).

Therefore, Samuel Beckett refutes the certainty and stability of the Holy Scripture by dismantling its authorised metaphysical meaning. He uses Christian mythology without having to believe in it. As he states, "Christianity is a mythology with which I am perfectly familiar, and so I use it. But not in this case" (Bair, Deirdre, 1995, p.386). For this reason, he involves the tramps in serious religious debates between the four Evangelists about the saved thief. Vladimir, like the assiduous religious scholar seems to search for truth and certainty in the Holy text of "The New Testament". However, he finds that there is no certainty in this text. In fact, his perplexity is the confusion of a layperson in perceiving the philosophy of the metaphysics of presence, presented to him as messianic logocentrism. The following dialogue between the tramps makes the point clear:

""Vladimir: And yet… (Pause.)… How is it- this is not boring you I hope- how is it that of the four Evangelists only one speaks of a thief being saved. The four of them were there- or thereabouts- and only one speaks of a thief being saved. (Pause.) Come on, Gogo, return the ball, can't you, one in a way?

Estragon: (with exaggerated enthusiasm). I find this most extraordinarily interesting.

Vladimir: One out of four. Of the other three, two don't mention any thieves at all and the third says that both of them abused him.

Estragon: Who?

Vladimir: What?

Estragon: What's all this about? Abused who? Vladimir: The Saviour. Estragon: Why?

Vladimir: Because he wouldn't save them. Estragon: From Hell?

Vladimir: Imbecile! From death.

Estragon: I thought you said hell.

Vladimir: From death, from death.

Estragon: Well what of it?

Vladimir: Then the two of them must have been damned.

Estragon: And why not?"(Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 1, p.13-14).

We find the characters of the play entangled within an illusory web of logocentric illusions of thought that they want to grasp the ultimate truth of life and the universe in a way as logocentric Western tradition of the metaphysics of presence confines their mind to think about the authoritative universal truth, meaning and origin. Nevertheless, they are unable to find it and on the contrary, they confront uncertainty and absurdity as illustrated in the conversations between Estragon and Vladimir about the Holy Scripture, the memories of the past or identity of Godot.

SHABIR AHMAD MIR

Suspecting all the messianic logocentric authorities of founding the texts of Western culture, Samuel Beckett studs Godot and Endgame with references to these very texts in order to make us "think and participate in his anxious oscillation between certainty about what is untrue and uncertainty about what may be true" (Worton, Michael, 1995, p. 85).

However, Vladimir wants to find a proof for existence. His desire for a centre, origin, or logos of Godot is fully illustrated when he says the boy:

"Words, words.(Pause.) Speak" (Beckett, Samuel, Act 1, p.50).

The tramps finally lose their hope for salvation and redemption. Vladimir expresses doubt in the following dialogue between Boy and Vladimir:

"Boy: What am I to say Mr Godot, sir?

Vladimir: Tell him... (He hesitates)...tell him you saw us. (Pause.) You did see us, didn't you?" (Beckett, Samuel, Act 1, p.52).

In this way, Samuel Beckett deconstructs messianic theocentrism and anthropocentricism of the logocentric word of Godot and after disseminating Godot and the

Holy Scripture, Samuel Beckett further goes in Lucky's speech to expand his deconstructive techniques to undo Western philosophical tradition of the metaphysics of presence.

Godot as the transcendental Signified

The character of Godot by its perpetual suspension between presence and absence (words coined by Derrida while expounding he theory of Deconstruction) suggesting interesting parallels with an idea in poststructural linguists, which is central to the idea of deconstruction.

Derrida's transcendental signified surpasses the physical world. . It is the centre that is not subjected to change, because it is fixed. God, truth, essence etc. are usually thought of transcendental signified. It is beyond or is independent of the play of signifiers (any meaningful sound or written mark) which produce other signifieds. Derrida negates the existence of this transcendental signified. A signified is not any independent identity but the product of the interplay of a number of signifiers.so; the search for the signified always leads to an infinite number of signifiers. A transcendental signified as already mentioned above would be however one that escapes this play of signifiers and has a privileged existence. Such a signified, as Derrida reveals is a philosophical fiction. Analogically, we can think of the play a complex set of signifiers in search of a transcendental signified called Godot. This is the most important component of the theory of Deconstruction that makes the play eligible for a deconstructive reading. It would then be clear that like the dog-song at the beginning of Act 2, or a text in the current sense of the term, it can never escape from its endless chain of significations and arrive at that signified- that is, Godot is a fiction and can never arrive. Yet, just as the poststructuralist theory of language has to presume the dubious presence of some transcendental signified, simultaneously generating and generated by the act of *difference*, to explain the origin and functioning of meaning , the text has to presume the presence of a Godot whose arrival give it meaning.

Aporia

A Greek term denoting a logical contradiction and Derrida used it to refer, what he calls the "*blind spots of any metaphysical argument*". It is a kind of textual knot which is very difficult to untie. According to M.H.Abrams "it is an insuperable deadlock, or "double bind," of incompatible or contradictory meanings which are "undecidable" in that we lack any sufficient ground for choosing among them. (*A Glossary of Literary Terms* 58) Aporia's are the knots in a text and an expression of real and feigned doubt or uncertainty, especially for rhetorical effect, by which the speaker appears uncertain as to what he/ she should do, think or say. The speaker already is acquainted about the answer, but he/she still asks himself/herself or his/her audience, what the appropriate manner, to grasp some matter is. The ambiguity of the text forms an aporia, because "it is impossible to decide by grammatical or other linguistic devices, which of the two meanings…prevails (De Man, Paul, 1979 p. 10).

In this view, Samuel Beckett's strongly objects the fossilized denotative process of traditional theatre and adoption of the techniques of meta-theatre lead him to anti-narrative structure of the text, which creates an aporic effects on the minds of the audience and readers that resist interpretation of the text. Therefore, the structural aporia of meaning happens in the text. The opposite poles of meaning are so evident that messianic logocentrism or phonocentrism cannot function anymore. There occurred in the text many *"simultaneously eithers ors" in Derridean term (Derrida, Jacques, 1978, p. 59).*Therefore, the text of the play resists be defining, interpreting, and analysing in a closed system. In addition, the semantic aporia renders Samuel Beckett's dramatic text into multi-dimensionality of meaning, and puts it in opposition with the traditional dramatic texts. The ontological impassivity or aporia of the text prevails the fragmentary form of the play that prevents the audience and readers from fixing a meaning or putting the text in a closed system. For this reason, one finds himself in an aporetic situation in which he/she cannot decide if Samuel Beckett is giving significance of absurdity or its superficiality in comparison to human predicament. In this sense, the open-endedness of the text of the play always invites the audience and readers to interpret it in a new and novel way. Therefore, the readers and audience are prevented from falling in the categorized perception or stereotyped interpretation of the text.

Nonetheless, the common place perception, assorted reception and traditional interpretation of the text fall the readers and audience in the uninhibited recognition, which is situated by hipness, inconvenient by hackneyed reception and stereotyped rubric interpretation of the text. That is why Samuel Becket judiciously employs the symbol of Godot in the play, to delineate dubiety and foppery of human situation in modern capitalist social formation, which makes the text of the play arcane, exposing theextremity of language and aporetic repercussions of it on the minds of human beings.

The symbol "Godot" used by Samuel Beckett recruits here and there other verbal tricks when Vladimir and Estragon speak about him. Therefore, aporia or impasse of meaning is evident when they are defied with boy messenger's message that Godot will not come today but he will come tomorrow. As a result, the tramps are stumbled in aporetic posture in which they resolve to move but they remain in the state of hesitation and fallow to do so:

"Estragon: Well? Shall we go?

Vladimir: Pull on your trousers. Estragon: What?

Vladimir: Pull on your trousers.

Estragon: You want me to pull off my trousers?

Vladimir: Pull on your trousers.

Estragon: (realizing his trousers are down). True.

He pulls up his trousers.

Vladimir: Well? Shall we go? Estragon: Yes, let's go.

They do not move" (Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 2, p.94).

The word Godotemployed in the play is put in a frame trained of more or miscellaneous meanings and its instantaneous recognition are delayed or deferred bydefamiliarization and nebulosity. The nebulosity or ambiguity and alienation discomfort thereferentiality between Godot and its original entity, and its ideal or symbolic presentation in the text, which brings Samuel Beckett very close to Derridean disallowance of the semantic eccentricity and fixity of meaning or concealed transcendental meaning. The aporetic effects on the minds of the tramps fathom themselves in their following dialogue, in which they are struck in deep anxieties and unable to enunciate their pangs and jeopardy.

"Vladimir: It hurts?

Estragon: Hurts! He wants to know if it hurts!

Vladimir: (angrily) No one ever suffers but you. I don't count. I'd like to hear what you'd say if you had what I have.

Estragon: It hurts?

Vladimir: Hurts! He wants to know if it hurts!" (Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 1, p.10).

Binary Oppositions

Forms of binarism have been present in human thought from the earliest times. Human discourse has always used binary oppositions to mark differences in an otherwise random sequence of features and thus give the shape to experience and the universe. Duaisms in philosophy like subject/object, God/man, temporal/eternal, are the very foundation of entire world-views in literary analysis, the discovery of thematic binary polarities within the literary texts is one of the central hermeneutic tools of interpretation of meaning of the literary text. Jonathan Culler suggests, "Certain oppositions are pertinent to larger thematic structures, which encompass other antitheses presented in the text" (Culler, Jonathan, 2002, p. 226).

Therefore, deconstruction operates from the inside of the text in two ways. One is to point to neglected portions in the text and to put them in questioning and find their inconsistencies. The other way is to deal with the binary oppositions in the text. Jacques Derrida gives an analogy about the neglected portions of the text, telling how to deconstruct them. He compares the text to architectonic structures and writes that in some texts there are "neglected" or "defective" corner stones, which need to be levered in order to be deconstructed (Derrida, Jacques, 1989, p. 72).

Jacques Derrida claims that in Western tradition of philosophy, there has always been an opposition between the two concepts and in each pair of concepts always "governs the other (axiologically, logically, etc.), or has the upper hand" (Derrida, Jacques, 1981, p. 41). These polarity opposites have a certain tension between them. For this reason, deconstruction is most simply defined as a critique of the hierarchical oppositions that have structured Western thought: inside -outside, mind-body, literal- metaphorical, speech – writing, presence –absence, nature- culture, form –meaning. Deconstructing an opposition means to show that it is not natural and inevitable but a construction, produced by discourses that rely on it, showing that it is a construction in a work of deconstruction that seeks to dismantle it and reinscribe it –that is, not

destroy it but give it a different structure and functioning (Derrida, Jacques, 1981, p. 120).

The notions of binary opposites like white and black, light and darkness, smart and dull, virtue and evil, ideal and physical, and man and woman, beauty and ugliness may be noted in "Waiting for Godot" that highlight the lack of stability and coherence of the text. However, binary oppositions between Vladimir and Estragon and Pozzo and Lucky are also exist in their ways of thinking, feelings, appearances, social statuses and even their levels of intelligence. We come across the characters come in pairs: Didi/Gogo, Pozzo/Lucky, Ham/Clov, Nagg/Nell in "Waiting for Godot" and other plays of Samuel Beckett.

Therefore, we find in the play "Waiting for Godot", the characters are entangled within the web of binary oppositions. These polar opposites are used in the text as highly applied line of condemnation to the one, which is depreciated. The characters of the play resort to contrast and comparison, whenever they confront an aporetic and manically offensive mode. This is the most pertinent method to convince their addresses about the justification of their claims. In this sense, Samuel Beckett's text is based on individual inferences and linguistic experiences of the reader/ audience and decentring logocentric binaries. In this manner, the logocentric binaries lose their validity and determination in the text, fulfilling Derridean deconstructive aspiration. Therefore, the text refrains the readers from determining only one fixed meaning, and prepares more room for different and deferral meaning and interpretations.

In this way, Samuel Beckett presents the illusory logocentric metaphysical presence in the aporetic form of Godot, which contradicts the logocentric preference for presence, the futility of binary signification and the non-rationality of the logos Godot. Therefore, the text of the play refutes the identity or the meaning of this absent being. Godot's absence in the play that invalidates the characters' presence, probe an insoluble ontological problem, which challenges the conventional interpretive assumptions of the literary text. In this way, Samuel Beckett resists to fix one meaning for

SHABIR AHMAD MIR

KY Publications
www.kypublications.com

Godot, asserting, "If I knew I'd have said so in the play.''(Bair, Deirdre, 1993, p. 382).The concept of the word Godot is like Jacques Derrida's differance, escapes a one-to-one correspondence in the signification system because it does not refer to concrete real being in the objective world.

Conclusion

The current study endeavoured to demonstrate Samuel Beckett's play "Waiting for Godot" from a very unprecedented and promethean vantage through Derridean deconstruction. It revealed how the metaphysics of presence and messianic logocentrism imbue deterrent effects on epistemic structure of human beings, and fall them in theaporetic hazard of ubiquitous and pussiantlogi. Therefore, they demuelt without a single grain of resistance succumb to the authority of the messianic theocentric and anthropocentric logi. The study tries to validate that the strategies of meta-theatre employedin Samuel Beckett's play, castoff thecustomary dramatic realism, make the text of the play delogocentric text, and brings it very close to Derridean deconstruction, which negate and deconstructs the semantic singularity and fixity of meaning or hidden transcendental meaning of the text.

The study endeavoured to uncloak how the nullifying collapsing aporic hodgepodge of orchestrated and centralized structure of the minds of characters make them incarcerated within the illusory snare of the anthropocentric and theocentric messianic logi. The study also consumastes that man cannot anticipate and decipher the text until and unless he knocks down the messianic logocentrism of the surviving tradition of the metaphysics of presence, which positions the presupposed messianic logos in the centre of our perception of the universe.

References

Johnson, Barbara. *The Critical Difference: Essays in the Contemporary Rhetoric of Reading*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1980.Print.

Beckett, Samuel. (1956).Waiting for Godot. London and Boston, Great Britain: Faber and Faber.

Dobie, Anne.B. *Theory into Practice: An Introduction to Literary*

Cuddon, J.A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London:

Penguin, 2000.Print.

Worton, Michael. (1995). Intersexuality, Theories, and Practices. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Criticism. Australia: Cengage Learning, 2012.Print.

Derrida, Jacques, "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences."

Writing and Difference. Trans. Alan Bass. London: Routledge, 1978. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology.* Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Print.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995. Print.

Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. Ithaca, New York Press, 1991.Print

Esslin, Martin. "Samuel Beckett: The Search for the self ." *The Theatre of the Absurd*. United States of America: Anchor Books, 1961. Print.

Calderwood, james.L" *ways of waiting in waiting for Godot" . Modern Drama, 29 (1986).*print

Cullar, Jonathan.*On Deconstruction.*London: Routledge and keegan paul,1987.print

Derrida, Jacques, *Limited Inc.,Northwestern university press*,1988

Worton, Michael. (1995). Intersexuality, Theories, and Practices. Manchester: Manchester University Press.