

# Towards a Deconstructive Text: Beyond Language and the Politics of Absences in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*

Afia Shahid

**Abstract**—The writing of Samuel Beckett is associated with meaning in the meaninglessness and the production of what he calls 'literature of unword'. The casual escape from the world of words in the form of silences and pauses, in his play *Waiting for Godot*, urges to ask question of their existence and ultimately leads to investigate the theory behind their use in the play. This paper proposes that these absences (silence and pause) in Beckett's play force to think 'beyond' language. This paper asks how silence and pause in Beckett's text speak for the emergence of poststructuralist text. It aims to identify the significant features of the philosophy of deconstruction in the play of Beckett to demystify the hostile complicity between literature and philosophy. With the interpretive paradigm of poststructuralism this research focuses on the text as a research data. It attempts to delineate the relationship between poststructuralist theoretical concerns and text of Beckett. Keeping in view the theoretical concerns of Poststructuralist theorist Jacques Derrida, the main concern of the discussion is directed towards the notion of 'beyond' language into the absences that are aimed at silencing the existing discourse with the 'radical irony' of this anti-formal art that contains its own denial and thus represents the idea of ceaseless questioning and radical contradiction in art and any text. This article asks how text of Beckett vibrates with loud silence and has disrupted language to demonstrate the emptiness of words and thus exploring the limitless void of absences. Beckett's text resonates with silence and pause that is neither negation nor affirmation rather a poststructuralist's suspension of reality that is ever changing with the undecidability of all meanings. Within the theoretical notion of Derrida's *Différance* this study interprets silence and pause in Beckett's art. The silence and pause behave like Derrida's *Différance* and have questioned their own existence in the text to deconstruct any definiteness and finality of reality to extend an undecidable threshold of poststructuralists that aims to evade the 'labyrinth of language'.

**Keywords**—*Différance*, language, pause, poststructuralism, silence, text.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE poststructuralists unmake the notion of ultimate meaning in the underlying system of language. The constraints of linguistic system have lent language to become a vulnerable phenomenon in postmodern world. The boundary of language regarding it as an inevitable way to convey meaning is surpassed by poststructuralists to annunciate the sense that meaning lies beyond language too. The use of silences and pauses in the literary text thus, is not

inconspicuous and meaningless rather becomes a tool of propagating poststructuralist's theory itself. The postmodern authors often indulge in the practice of inserting silence and pauses within their work. This unwording in literature or anti-literature especially in the work of Samuel Beckett seeks to present the strain of inconclusiveness and radical crisis of language.

Language is no more regarded a transparent and innocent medium. The presentation of the familiar through language is not unproblematic and "transparency of language is an illusion" [1]. Language embodies within itself the ideological assumptions of those who speak it. The forms of linguistic system are not "ideologically neutral and innocent" [1]. They tend to distort reality and become problematic. This feature of language makes it an inadequate medium for the expression of reality. Reality is unfixed and can have different shapes and forms; ultimately there cannot be one way of representing it. Moreover, the idea that reality is a linguistic construct has rendered its representation through words as distorted and thus denying its existence in "rhetorical stratagem" [2]. Thus the use of language in a modern text is experimental, highly enigmatic and richly ambiguous. Belsey has noted that text tends to distance itself "from the familiar modes of representation to identify the areas on which ideology is silent" [1].

The empirical idea about language as a transparent medium, a window on the reality of the world, reality not contaminated and distorted by language, and experience of knowledge through language has been rejected by poststructuralists. The representational function of language and autonomous voice of self-determined and rational objectivity of text have been severely attacked by Derrida's Deconstruction and Lacan's Psychoanalysis. There is a continuous onslaught on foundationalists' notions of language as Begam has described Derrida's idea about language: "It is a word whose overuse and misuse have so inflated its currency, and so debased its value, that it threatens to lose all significance, to become a word that comprehends everything and means nothing" [3]. The established binaries of 'metaphysics of presence' have been shattered and deconstructed by the radical poststructuralists and the emphasis is on Derrida's 'free play'. The poststructuralists have defied any "final and unquestioned division" as they deny ostensibly the "ultimate determinable meanings and transcendental signified" [1]

The poststructuralists' dissatisfaction with the medium of language is quite problematic to represent the "impossibility

Afia Shahid is working as Assistant professor in Government College Women University, Faisalabad. Punjab, Pakistan (phone: 333-5811368; e-mail: afiashahid1@hotmail.com).

of truth” [4]. Thus the modern authors have rediscovered and radicalized the forms of representation to practice the philosophical and theoretical tendencies, a kind of ‘praxis’ – “a form of ‘doing action’ precisely because its end can only be realized through action and can only exist in action itself” [5]. This paper attempts to delineate the relationship between poststructuralist’s notion of language and the use of silence and pause in Samuel Beckett’s text to indicate the possibility of a deconstructive text beyond the restrictions of the language.

Samuel Beckett’s name has been sounding loudly in the literary circles since the first performance of his play *En Attendant Godot* (1952) at the theater de babylone. The weird reaction of the first amazed audience toward this play could not mark or point to the inherent ability of this artist as the greatest master of art. Since the first emergence of this play, the critics have been coming up with their passionate interpretations. Since the first emergence of this play the critics have been coming up with their passionate interpretations. Beckett has become an exemplary artist who engages himself with the theory and philosophy of his own art. Ihab Hassan has found him “an apocalyptic by reduction” [6]

Beckett has turned to the end of universe to make the beginning anew. He has presented the emergence of new by passing through the process of evacuation. The “art of impossibility” has been reflected through the banishing of words from his works that is “moving steadily, cruelly toward silence immobility” [6]. The lack of words and lack of action in his works have reduced the possibility of any sort of consolation in the objective existence of man. The life has come to a standstill and this perpetuation of immobility and silence is bare and brutal. Unlike Joyce, he has not manipulated the inexhaustible possibilities of language rather turned away from words to change the reality. The impotency of language has been exposed and “reality is dispelled, flesh and body of the logos” [6].

With precision and great economy, Beckett has presented the uncertainty of everything including language in his play *Waiting for Godot*. According to Hassan, the play starts with the two characters, Didi and Gogo, on a road in the evening, one struggling with his boots and other with his physical pain. They somehow shared the bond of affection in the presence of decay of existence. They continued to wait for an unknown Godot without the certainty of place of meeting. They tried to sleep, tried to hang themselves but did nothing except munching carrots and turnips. The entrance of two emissaries Pozzo and Lucky on the stage was at once recognized. These four characters with “four names of different origins: Slavic, French, Italian and English” made the stage to represent this world in which all human beings are waiting for Godot and there is no relief from this waiting [6].

The language in the play is completely disintegrated and erratic. The conversation of the characters has failed to progress any significant communication among them. The words are solely defunct and nastily deteriorated. Talking about the compositional character of language in Beckett’s writing, Farrell has put: “There is an experiencing self that is

here being reduced to a minimal environment, and we feel the pain of its attempt to comprehend the situation in which it now finds itself” [7]. Through their use of language the characters parody or obliterate all myths of meaning and rhetorical arguments, using language against itself so as to prevent its masquerading nihilistic susceptibility. As Fletcher and Fletcher noted: “never before had the fragmentary, low-key, the inarticulate even the incoherent and frankly non-verbal tendencies of theatrical intercourse been so extensively developed” [8]. Thus, the fact of extreme dysfunction of language is so effectively dramatized by Beckett and silence has become quintessential with its sedative powers to provide a relief from the drumming noise of the words. Kenner has pointed out that, in the act of waiting, these spaces and silences are as important as words [9]. The question is why Beckett has placed them in the middle of conversation when the words can do the function of conveying nothingness. The question is why Beckett has placed them in the middle of conversation when the words can do the function of conveying nothingness

The silence, a brief pause in conversation, and a pause in the action of the play have been interpreted as instances of purposelessness of the play. The silence has become nihilistic, gloomy, vexing and empty. Esslin has regarded it the end of action in an “ultimately actionless action”. In this state of nothingness, he continued: “each action leads to another actionless action, an action that goes nowhere” [10]. The music of nothingness with its lyrics “Nothing happens” was played consistently in the act of waiting with a “meditative rhapsody”, that has pointed out, the “on the nullity of human attainment”. The circus clowns were performing it and “bailing out the silence from a sinking ship of a play”. Thus Beckett has disrupted the traditional form of art to play out his melody of malignant [11].

## II. ABSENCES (SILENCE AND PAUSE) IN BECKETT’S TEXT: AN INNATE POTENTIAL

*Waiting for Godot* has relinquished the critics in the world of uncertainties. The language is debased in this play and we find the repetition of words and phrases in the conversation of the characters. There is an errant failure of communication. Language betrays and impedes understanding to perceive the truth. Silence and pauses in Beckett’s drama set readers free from the chains of linguistic system and provide a possible gap to find meaning and ameliorate understanding of reality. The silence and pauses demand a creative intervention of the readers to explore meaning.

Michel Foucault has pointed out to stand “within the gap” of discourse..... a slender gap.....the point of possible appearance [12]. Thus Beckett’s drama gives silence a chance to bespeak meaning, an alternative to general dissatisfaction with language. “We are invited to think language that might actually become silence, that can convert, that can say the unsayable” [13].

Thiher writes: “Silence would be a kind of utopia where voic, divested of the tribe’s language, would have direct access to itself-----unmediated by the alienating otherness of

the tribe's linguistic system" [14]. Language is not a transparent medium to carry out direct communication. Those difficulties inspire to go beyond language and find silence as "beyond language can be approached in terms of silence" [13]. Silence is significant in Beckettian drama as it becomes more eloquent and this eloquence is distinctively audible. "The only true critique of language would be one that escaped the vicissitudes it described, one done without words --in laughter or silence" [13].

The central question is how and why silence has become an alternative of language. The language is incapable to answer the questions of postmodern world. There is no escape from the use of language. It "still remains the deepest habit of mind, our most thorough inheritance from dead and vanished gods" [15]. The meanings convey through language are exhausted and mechanical as Clove uttered: "All life long the same questions, the same answers" [16].

No one depreciates the stature of language more than Beckett in drama, "and no one maintains the tension between silence and speech, death and desire, at a higher degree" [15]. The pauses and silences give a chance to surpass language to reflect on its constraints. Validimir and Estragon have reflected on it as "Let us not speak well of it either. (Pause) Let us not speak of it at all" [16]. Beckett correctly reflects on this phenomenon of esoteric motive. Beckett uses silences and pauses not only to stop the flow of language but also to formulate and explain the theory of poststructuralism. He takes advantages of the double semiotic modality of drama to convey his theory of using silence and pause. Thus a double significance comes up by acting speech and silence together. Language provides a lack of meaning as it is always already determined. Silence and pauses paradoxically invite the carnivalesque notion of them to bring many voices on the stage and to induce meanings subjectively. Kristeva has stated "carnivalesque discourse breaks through the laws of a language censored by grammar and semantics" [17]. The silence and pauses regulate the [un]decidability of meanings. Silence occurs to extend disparate and multiple meanings as Loevlie has pointed about silence that "it is always, already somewhere else" [13].

The literary texts consisted of words and sentences but Peer has argued, in the introduction of his edited work 'The Taming of the Text', that literary texts are also driven by "extra-literary forces". Thus literary texts are "complex cultural phenomena, the understanding of which require a long process of experience, producing knowledge about their structure and meaning as well as intuitive concepts and general expectations as to what such texts are and mean" [18]. Thus meaning in the text or interpretation is not an 'isolated idea' as all textual analysis involves interpretation. And to understand the textuality the function of theoretical perspectives cannot be denied to raise critical questions about text. It does require to combine both linguistic and literary elements of text as Peer has suggested to consider "supra-sentential structure and meaning" of the text to interpret the individual parts in relation to its whole and at the same time it requires pertinently to focus text as a "supra textual phenomena" [18]. It suggests a

specific and critical position of both text and researcher in the process of interpretation.

The critical and theoretical standpoints offer a distinct position to carry on the operation of interpretation as "the issue of theory can no longer be avoided" [18]. In an attempt of interpretation of silences and pauses in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* the linguistic form is not the only determining factor as textual and theoretical contexts are equally important to explore the occurrences of silence and pause through different theoretical lenses and new perspectives.

This research proceeds to interpret the existence of silences and pauses in Beckett's plays as an important strategy to display the tendencies of postmodern philosophy. The silence and pause become a 'différance' of Derrida's deconstruction theory. Derrida in his 'Margins of Philosophy' (translated by Bass) presents a detailed discussion of his idea of 'différance'. He is of the view that 'différance' is "a strategy without finality" [19]. The letter 'a' in 'différance' can act in both ways as Derrida has pointed out: "one can always act as if it made no difference", at the same time it immediately refers to the "insistent intensification of its play" [19]. In the same way silence though remains silent, it provokes to explore the unspoken in its deferred presence. It dislocates the 'origin' of meaning as Derrida has said: "différance which is not a name, which is not a pure nominal unity, and unceasingly dislocates itself in a chain of differing and deferring substitutions" [19].

The silence emanates within language in Beckett's play and sounds like Derrida's *différance* as "the becoming time of space and becoming space of time" [19] which is "différance then, as this interplay of what we like to describe as space and time, is located between speech and writing and beyond the tranquil familiarity which links us to one and other" [20]. Thus, representation of no voice in Beckett's text like Derridian *différance* disavows the authority of author's voice and establishes the poststructuralist's notion of multiplicity of meanings and idea of polyphony. This leads to the reality of meanings in a modern text itself and points to the Derrida's idea that meanings are undecidable in a text and thus a 'text' in postmodern conception, like silence and pause, admits for several interpretations. The constitution of this kind of interpretation advocates the organization of new meanings and significations to Beckett's silence by investigating their relevance through 'différance'.

The language in *Waiting for Godot* has become an inadequate and insufficient medium to represent the reality of characters in the play. Silence and pause do occur within their conversations. They disturb and contradict the very unity of dialogues and even thoughts of the characters. By introducing such silences and pauses right in the middle of words Beckett suspends the state of non-contradictions and celebrates the operation of disturbances and contradictions within a text. The poststructuralist theory invokes the idea of impossibility of meaning or interpretation. It tends to give rise to dissensus and entirely dislodges the myth of consensus. Thus Beckett unmasks the inadequacy of language through silence and pause and destroys the recognized linguistic construct that was empowered previously to connect to the truth of human beings

and was capable of expressing the relation of man direct to his outside world through language.

### III. OCCURRENCE OF SILENCES AND PAUSES AND PLAY OF *DIFFÉRENCE* IN WAITING FOR GODOT

The first breakdown of language occurs when Vladimir tries to reflect on the condition of Estragon's miseries. But finding no hope in his words he stops.

“VLADIMIR: It's too much for one man. [Pause.]” [16].

He stops for a while and then continues his talk by using another set of words. But the brief space, a 'hole' in that dialogue accounts for its positive existence. Somehow the language has come to an end and he thinks to live no more in that labyrinth of words. The space allows the character, the reader and the author to speak out the unsayable. He can continue using words to explain what is 'too much' for him or Estragon or any other individual in this world. But realizing the inadequacy of his means of representation, he presents that insufficiency of his medium of expression through a seemingly non-present 'pause'. The pause becomes a presentation of that unrepresentable which Lyotard refers as destabilization of "closure of modernity" that will "explore the 'unsayable' and invisible" [20]. Vladimir by stopping here in the middle of his dialogue relieves himself and the reader from the tyranny of words. The pause here brings into play the *différance* of Derrida with its two connotations 'to differ' and 'to defer' that are related to Vladimir's rejection of transcendental signified by choosing the realm of silence and pause. The pause does not come as an alternative or alterity of language. It is not the 'Other' or excluded part of language. This marked 'pause' on the other hand refers to the continuity and dispersal of origins. This decentrement of any unified centre displays a continuity of occurrence of multiple voices. Like difference, the pause also calls upon layers of meanings to interpret Vladimir's utterance. All through his life Vladimir has been counting the sufferings of Estragon. He is looking for the alternatives. The pause sets the whole thing into motion. Thus an ambiguity arises which leads to the uncertainty of any absolute meaning. The displacement of fixed meaning sets Vladimir free from any attempt to find alternatives. The readers with Vladimir celebrate this disruption of text and follow the pattern of poststructuralists' notion of indeterminacy.

Another place of occurrence of pause is certainly significant as it derives the sense of part and whole. The whole play is a drama of waiting and this waiting simultaneously makes any philosophy of deciphering it impossible. The "heartly laugh" of Vladimir is immediately followed by his "contorted face" of being in a physical pain out of this act of laughing. He starts:

VLADIMIR: One daren't even laugh anymore.

ESTRAGON: Dreadful privation.

VLADIMIR: Merely smile. (He smiles suddenly from ear to ear, keeps smiling, ceases suddenly.) It is not the same thing. Nothing to be done. [Pause.] Gogo.

ESTRAGON: [Irritably.] What is it? [16].

According to Derrida we cannot think outside the

metaphysics of presence and "escaping logocentrism will involve a way of thinking not yet thought" [21]. In a binary operation the spoken is privileged over silence. Vladimir in his thinking has reversed this binary and placed silence over language. Vladimir replaces his laughter with his smile. When these two opposite forces are operating, laughter becomes language and smile acts as silence. The pain of presence of language strikes Vladimir to find its alternative. By reversing the binary he strives to find solace in the fictive presence of transcendental signified. But he immediately displaces this thinking of bringing the other of silence. He deconstructs this reality and finds "it is not the same thing". The next utterance "Nothing to be done", is often quoted as the ultimate truth of the play '*Waiting for Godot*' where 'nothing is as certain as nothingness'. The absurdity of both conditions takes Vladimir to speak for the absurdity of their living.

To ascertain any such meaning immediately conceives the presence of a consciousness as Derrida puts it: "prior to the sign and outside it, excluding any trace and any *différance*, something like consciousness is possible" [19]. If we exclude the essential pause at the end of the statement and 'place' it at the same centre of idea of nothingness, it makes the possibility of presence of "so-called subjective existence in general" [19]. But this privilege of consciousness of Vladimir and presence of any self or subject is questioned by the immediate pause. It displaces fixity of any subject by differentiating it with other subjects. The pause thus exists within the system with its difference and at the same time by its suspension of any presence of its own. The brief stop provides him a space to destroy the shackles of linguistic construct with all their vulnerability.

The next excerpt is another part of Estragon and Vladimir's conversation about the day and time of Godot's arrival.

ESTRAGON: [Very insidious.] But what Saturday? And is it Saturday? Is it not rather Sunday? [Pause.] Or Monday? [Pause.] Or Friday? .....

VLADIMIR: But you say we were here yesterday.

ESTRAGON: I may be mistaken. [Pause.] Let us stop talking for a minute, do you mind? [16].

Estragon and Vladimir reflect on their loss of memory. Estragon wants to recall the day mentioned by Godot to come. On one hand they are not certain whether they were here yesterday or not. Still they involve themselves in the system of language to make things explicit. In their world of timelessness Estragon seeks to find consolation in language. He is making choices about the days of week according to his own desire. He is unable to decide which day it is. The pause which followed these questions has demystified the mastery of 'Logos'. It questions the myth of intelligibility and rationality of spoken word. The language has presented a chance to Estragon to speak but the pause at the end shows an end of language. This pause serves as a disjunctive moment to take him away from realm of language. The names of the days create an opportunity to decide the possibility of one fixed moment of time. "Sunday? Or Monday?" are signifiers with their direct signifieds. He can rely on language but a much

direct relation of a signifier to a signified is challenged by the pauses. They repudiate construction of meaning and Estragon redeems himself from the suffering of speaking by creating brief silence. Time has become same for Estragon and his use of words is just an attempt to highlight and show the so-called authority of spoken words. Beckett rejects such authority of spoken word and defies like Derrida the phonocentric thought through the enforcement of pause with its 'spatial and temporal' existence and production of *différance*. The pause is related to the space that provides Estragon an opportunity to think about the different significations of the concept of time with its endless possibilities. The meanings of the words 'Sunday' or 'Monday' appear with their different and new significations. But this pause certainly disappears as soon as language comes to sing again. In a way it suspends its own effect of being other to language to provide another ideal time to Estragon. With its absence as an ideal it does not fulfill any desire to get consolation in semantic stability. Thus in those moments of short breaks Estragon avoids to fall in the web of naming things which can put on the burden of forming truth of his and his companion's situation through words. Estragon in his pause has unsettled the formation of truth, this disruption of language through pause helps Beckett to project the paradox of signs and representation.

We see that Lucky is virtually silent; Vladimir is perturbed at the inhuman treatment of Lucky by Pozzo. Estragon is shown as more interested in bones and again Pozzo is busy in exerting his authority and giving the reasons of his desire and need of smoking a pipe. There is a perpetuating intrusion of silence in his long dialogue:

POZZO: ..... I'm not in the habit of smoking two pipes one on top of other, it makes my heart go pit-a-pat. [Silence.] It's the nicotine, one absorbs it in spite of one's precautions. [Sighs.] You know how it is. [Silence.] But perhaps you don't smoke? Yes? No? It's of no importance. [Silence.] [16].

The disruption and disintegration of language in the dialogue of Pozzo precisely alienates him from the other characters. He is constantly referring to silence that has conquered the language to display the critical operation of ending of language with a ceaseless challenge to the idea of final centre of meaning in the text. Smoking makes his heart "go pit-a-pat". Here language seems to come to an end and silence supports him to listen to the 'errie music' of the heart that can go endlessly producing multiple tunes for the play of this music. The erotic impulse of subversion of closure creates silence to unloosen the pattern of meanings and a therapy for the 'pit-a-pat'. Pozzo has followed this pattern of saying the unsaid through silence and asks others to share the experience of same ripple of discontinuity in the very presence of continuity.

The answers of others are of no importance for Pozzo as silence spurns the possibility of naturalizing of reality. The Cartesian dichotomy of consciousness between self and non-self, between what is acceptable and what is not, has brought pervasive influence of ideological assumptions to purge the contradictions in a discourse. Pozzo's display of authority by

establishing such a non-contradictory discourse is disrupted by his pledged silence. The silence has dismantled the authority of unified consciousness of presence and revealed the play of contradictions in the very nature of reality itself. Pozzo also refers to the silence of Vladimir: "I beg your pardon? [Silence.] Perhaps you didn't speak? [Silence.]" [16]. The silence after these words accuses such common utterance and at once acts to destabilize the authority of language. It speaks for the undecidability of postmodern world to 'decreate' the language of common speech. Vladimir speaks or not, "it is of no importance" for Pozzo. The exclusion of language through the practical silence of Vladimir collapses the idea of known meanings. The silence has helped to articulate the unresolved nature of meaning in poststructuralist perspective. The essence of meanings in any form has disappeared as the reality is non-fixed, elusive and caught in the web of contradictions. The back and forth movement of silence, its presence and absence, scattered the origins and suspended the final reality like Derrida's assertion of 'free play of meanings'.

The boy remains silent most of the time but informs Vladimir about Godot that he 'does nothing, sir'. This is followed by the mark [Silence] in the text which serves as a response to Vladimir's silent inquiry of Godot's reality. This allurements of silence invokes the heterogeneous manipulation of diverse and provocative identity of Mr. Godot's inexhaustible communication with these tramps. The fictiveness of fabulous discourse is lost in silence albeit wordlessly but radically performative and immanent. The silence is not an utterance to verbalize yet it doubly recommends to speak and listen and thus continue the promise of representation without final presentation.

Vladimir and Estragon think about the idea of hanging themselves by the tree. However the 'cord' with which they can invoke death or silence is:

"VLADIMIR: Not worth a curse [Silence.]

ESTRAGON: You say we have to come back tomorrow?

VLADIMIR: Yes.

ESTRAGON: Then we can bring a good bit of rope.

VLADIMIR: Yes. [Silence.]" [16].

The silence embodies the qualms about singular reality of 'yes' as an answer to Estragon's concern about the rope. It shows an overt alliance to the postmodern distrust of such verbal articulations. This dislocation of singular origin of meaning springs in silence which has become an urgent strategy to accommodate the apparently unbearable crisis of multiple realities. It formulates a pattern of reinterpreting the 'yes' of Vladimir. The mechanism of silence questions the totality of their linguistic experience of stating a truth. It strives ostensibly to dissipate the indeterminacy of truth by significantly creating a void in the discursive naturalization of reality. It extravagantly posits certain questions about the truth of coming tomorrow, what then if they don't come, and what it would if they arrive and meet Godot. And what if they bring a rope? The silence keeps into play an endless array of interpretations of their life and circumstances. There are loud declarations of their postmodern undecidability and uncertainty

in this inaudible 'space' within the text. The silence vigorously discerns the creative hushed revelation of postmodern aspiration for the unsayable and unspoken to proclaim the dissolution of meanings and its subsequent persuasion of plurality and fluidity of reality. It is an obvious denial of the ultimate fixed 'yes' or truth. But the silence on the other hand also speaks for continuity of 'yes' and promises infinite meanings 'yet to come'. The stillness or void to which the characters of the play strive does not simply present itself as a celebration of irrational. It explores and positively deconstructs the "opposition between the rational and irrational" [22]. Beckett by this kind of silence seeks for a 'praxis' and like Estragon and Vladimir, to 'go on' though by remaining motionless and unspoken.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Silences and pauses initiate the process of exploring what lies beyond language. This attitude leads to determine the significance of 'gaps' within the literary discourse. Even when language seems to end, communication is still possible through these gaps in the form silence and pause. Belsey while quoting Lacanian terms has reflected: "death is the moment when organism finally rejoins the unknowable but inextricable real" [1]. If according to Belsey's interpretation, the subject is not prone to death, what dies then is the organism, which is 'something other than the subject'. At the same time the 'living subject is also destined to death'. So death is one kind of instance of 'signifier at its most opaque'. By relating this idea to the subject of language in Beckett's drama if we consider that silence becomes the death of language, what lies beyond language is the 'silence' that conveys the unreliability about language by highlighting its opacity and contamination and speaks for the undecidability of the poststructuralism. Thus silence and pause in Beckett's text are not paradigmatically impotent. They follow a discreet pattern of perpetuation of language that is freed from the linguistic determinism and a challenge to the tradition of logocentrism. It provides an openness to celebrate the contradictory theoretical strands of poststructuralism.

The speaking silence becomes a vantage of affirmation that silence can hold promise of presenting the unrepresentable. This silence must reveal the intricacies of system of language to determine the ways of expression identified with the persistent literary and philosophical tradition of poststructuralism as Derrida has put about the function of 'différance': "a detour through which I must pass in order to speak, the silent promise it must make ..." [19]. The silence and pause speak throughout the language and contribute to create that unique experience of losing connection with the system of ultimate linguistically determined truth and inevitably envision a 'space' to talk about the crisis of language and its implied multiplicity of discourses in a literary text.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] C. Belsey, *Critical practice*, London: Routledge, 2001.
- [2] M. A. & K. Skoldberg, *Reflexive methodology*, London: Sage

- Publications, 2000.
- [3] R. Begum, *Samuel Beckett and the end of modernity*, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- [4] T. Eagleton, *Literary theory: an introduction* (2nd Ed.), Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- [5] T. A. Schwandt, *Qualitative inquiry: a dictionary of terms*, London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- [6] I. Hassan, *The literature of silence: Henry Miller and Samuel Beckett*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- [7] F. B. Farrell, *Why does literature matter*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- [8] B. S. F. & J. Fletcher, *A students' guide to the plays of Samuel Beckett*, London: Faber and Faber, 1985.
- [9] H. Kenner, *Waiting for godot*, H. Bloom, Ed., New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987, pp. 53-66.
- [10] M. Esslin, *The universal image*. In R. Cohn (Ed.), *Samuel Beckett: Waiting for Godot*, London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1987, pp. 171-174.
- [11] H. Bloom, *Modern critical interpretations: Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot*, New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987.
- [12] M. Foucault, *The archeology of knowledge*, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1972.
- [13] E. Loevlie, *Literary silences in Pascal. Rousseau and Beckett*, New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2003.
- [14] A. Thiher, *Samuel Beckett: humanistic perspectives*, S. E. G. A. P. A. Morris Beja, Ed., Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1983.
- [15] I. Hassan, *The dismemberment of orpheus: toward a postmodern literature* (2nd Ed.), London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.
- [16] S. Beckett, *Samuel Beckett: the complete dramatic works*, London: Faber and Faber, 1986.
- [17] J. Kristeva, *The Kristeva reader*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
- [18] W. V. Peer, *Taming of the text: explorations in language, literature and culture*, London: Routledge, 1991.
- [19] J. Derrida, *Margins of philosophy*, New York: The Harvester Press, 1982.
- [20] S. Burik, *End of comparative philosophy and the task of comparative thinking: Heidegger, Derrida, and Daoism*. Albany: State Univ of New York Pr, 2010.
- [21] M. McQuillan, *Deconstruction: a reader*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- [22] C. Nash, *The unravelling the postmodern mind*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.