

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mohamed Khider University-Biskra-
Faculty of Arts and Languages
Department of Foreign Languages
English Division



Analysis of the two existentialist works:

Beckett's waiting for Godot and Camus's The Stranger in terms of philosophical impact on characters and themes

***Dissertation submitted in partial requirement for the fulfillment of the
"master's degree" in literature and civilization***

Submitted by:

Tarek Baziz

Supervised by:

Mr. Abdelouahab Boukhama

Academic year : 2012/2013

Dedication

To my dear parents who contributed in hugely in the making of this dissertation possible

To all my colleagues and teachers

To my friends

Acknowledgments

The first person that I would like to express my deepest and sincere appreciation, gratitude and honest thank you, is my supervisor Mr. Abdelouahab Boukhama, who stood by my side all the way from day one till this day, providing me with guidance and help for the last two years and especially for his patience and great help during the making of this dissertation.

My deepest gratitude and appreciation for my family who believed in me and supported me by every possible way, whether emotionally or financially and made this work see the light

A special thanks to all my colleagues and teachers who helped me with references and materials, sacrificing their precious time to help me when I faced obstacles.

Also I would like to thank all my friends and every single person who contributed and helped me in any way during the making of this dissertation.

Abstract

In this dissertation we are going to give a general overview about existentialism in its broad definition as a philosophy, then its integration into the world of literature in order to have a general idea about the philosophy's components and thought, and thus bringing the reader closer to understanding the existentialism used and implied within the analyzed works. Then we will analyze two works of existentialist literature: Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and Albert Camus's *The Stranger*.

Samuel Beckett's play, *Waiting For Godot*, is an illustrative example of the existentialist literature. In *Waiting for Godot*, the two tramps Vladimir and Estragon are waiting for a man by the name of Godot who will never come, while staying in nowhere and talking about nothing, a tragic-comedy where nothing happens twice.

The Stranger by Albert Camus is another great example of existential literature, in the novel, the hero Meursault is living an empty life, void of any interest or caring for anything but materialistic vanities. The hero goes through a long chain of changes and ends up with the result that life is not worthy living it, but realizes his fatal mistake after it's too late.

In this work we are going to analyze both works from a philosophical point of view, concentrating mainly on how both writers used existentialism in their works and how they employed the same philosophy differently by adopting and utilizing different aspects of existentialism.

Table of contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgement.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Contents.....	VI
General introduction.....	01
<i>Chapter one: literature review</i>	
1.1. Introduction.....	04
1.2. Existentialism as a philosophy.....	05
1.3. Existentialism as a literary movement.....	09
1.4. Conclusion.....	12
<i>Chapter two: existentialism within characters and themes in Beckett's "waiting for Godot"</i>	
2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Characters:	
2.2.1. Vladimir and Estragon.....	15
2.2.2. Lucky and Pozzo.....	22
2.3. Themes:	
2.3.1. Meaninglessness.....	31
2.3.2. The use of space in "Waiting for Godot".....	35
2.4 Conclusion.....	41
<i>Chapter three: existentialism within characters and themes in Camus's "the stranger"</i>	
3.1. Introduction.....	42
3.2. Characters:	
3.2.1. Meursault.....	44
3.2.2. Raymond sintes.....	48
3.3. Themes:	
3.3.1.The absurd.....	50

3.3.2. Irrationality of the universe.....	53
3.4 Conclusion.....	54
General conclusion.....	55
Works sited page.....	61

General introduction:

Existentialism could be considered as the twentieth-century analogue of nineteenth-century romanticism. The two movements have in common the request that the entire fabric of life be distinguished and considered in our reasoning and acting. Accordingly they express a type of resistance to reductionist breakdowns of life and its significance for humans.

Existentialism focused mainly on single human lives and the piercing unavoidability of languishing and decision over every distinct while romanticism had a tendency to be more situated to the entire of nature and saw mere mortals as a part of that more general picture. Besides, romanticism appeared soon after the wars and genocides of the twentieth century inasmuch as existentialism is conceived betwixt those loathing. (Existentialism).

From one perspective, the existentialists are separated between scholars and philosophers. The philosophical existentialists separate into the worldly and the religious. Søren Kierkegaard is frequently acknowledged to be the father of all of them; however Friedrich Nietzsche is another important figure that played a huge role in the developing line of agnostic existentialism. Different religious existentialists include Karl Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, and Karl Rahner. The skeptical existentialists also includes Martin Heidegger "the non-Christian skeptic captivated by "Being and time", and Jean-Paul Sartre a definitive atheist beguiled by Being and nothingness. (Existentialism).

Existentialism in literary works is a development that focuses mainly on the individual's existence, freedom and choice. While Existentialism was never an arranged development, the tenets of this school of thought have affected numerous writers and, book lovers can recognize existential components in their writings. Authors like William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, Albert Camus and Samuel Beckett uncover existential components in their works.

Maybe the most discussed topic in existentialist writings is that of choice. Humankind's essential qualification, in the perspective of most existentialists, it is the option to choose. Since we are allowed to choose our own particular paths, existentialists have argued that we should acknowledge the risk and responsibility of our choices wherever they lead.

In light of the fact that existentialism is treated as a "lived" reasoning that is understood through how one lives his/her existence instead of a "system" that must be studied from books, it is not unexpected that much existentialist thought might be discovered in literary forms such as books and plays, and not simply in the philosophy books. Without a doubt, a percentage of the most critical illustrations of existentialist thought are found in literary works and not in the pure philosophical writings. (Literary Existentialism Existentialist Thought in Literature and Art).

Albert Camus' literary works are viewed as an essential source of modern existentialist thought. A standard theme in Camus' books is the idea that human life is, pointless. And this will eventually create "absurdity". In spite of the fact that Albert Camus is not maybe a philosopher in the strictest sense, his logic is broadly communicated through his work "The Stranger" and he is for the most part viewed as an existentialist philosopher, although he rejected the label.

The Stranger, Camus' probably most known work shows the uselessness of life from the view of the novel's protagonist, Meursault, in which he acknowledges the absurdity of life and the absence of goal, by tolerating even the most bad sorts of individuals as companions, and not even get irritated when his mother dies or when he slaughters somebody. (Existentialism.).

Samuel Beckett was an existentialist as well. Beckett's work was basically existentialist, his works were filled with the thought that things have no intrinsic importance or meaning, and that our fallacy is to expect significance in everything.

Existential logic came to be common in the twentieth century as an image of the destruction of society following the atrocities of World War II, attesting the misery of mankind and keeping focusing on life in a more reasonable but pessimistic way. The philosophy distinguishes the way that humanity is equipped for incredible ability for evil and has limitless possibilities for destruction. (Existentialism of Samuel Beckett)

The general feeling of isolation in "Waiting for Godot" is existential. The way that Vladimir and Estragon do nothing with the exception of being and existing, highlight existential topics. The two wait for Godot, rather than seeking him out, and, however they need to give up waiting, they never do. Toward the conclusion of the play, one gets the feeling that the two will stay in that weird spot forever, waiting for a man who will never come: "Vladimir: 'well? Should we go?' Estragon: 'yes, we should go.' They don't move. (Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot).

Both Albert Camus in *The Stranger* and Samuel Beckett in *Waiting for Godot* uncover the absolute randomness of life and its lack of concern to humankind. In *The Stranger* Meursault accepts a just about stoic being, remaining not interested in life's trials and tribulations. In *Waiting for Godot* Vladimir and Estragon attempt to stay distracted while waiting for a man named Godot, who will probably never come. Despite the fact that both authors convey a grim view of human being, the characters are recovered by their own particular feeling of validness and responsibility. In *The Stranger* Meursault is depicted as a man who is mentally disconnected from the universe around him. His detachment to ordinary human notion is made by Camus in the opening, yet regardless of the negative aspects in his

characters Meursault is trustworthy to a shortcoming, answering "The witness is correct. The court is astonished and repelled by his directness and honesty. (Authentically Absurd: The Stranger vs. Waiting for Godot).

Chapter one: literature review

1.1 Introduction:

Existentialism had a deep impact on arts, particularly literature, as it has through philosophy. Albert Camus, the author of (The Stranger), among many other books, is maybe the most renowned worldwide of the existentialist writers. Jean-Paul Sartre won Nobel Prize in philosophy and literature. (Nausea) is most likely his best known work of fiction. For the investment of this class, philosophical existentialism may be harshly isolated into skeptical and religious existentialism. Then again it is exceptionally demanding to outline precisely where the division ought to be drawn.

Nietzsche, the self-declared 'anti-Christ,' is an important figure in the improvement of existentialism, as well. Different religious existentialists include Martin Buber, Paul Tillich and Karl Rahner. Gabriel Marcel and Karl Jaspers likewise line up in the religious "camp." Sartre, and the German, Martin Heidegger, are unequivocally skeptical in their philosophical thought, despite the fact that the part of Heidegger's skepticism in his existence all in all is an essential theme around a few understudies of his function. (Existentialism).

In this chapter, we are set to talk about existentialism in the field of philosophy, then its integration into the world of literature and the effect it made on the authors as well as on book lovers. Furthermore by determining the existential thought and segments, we are carrying you closer to make the connection between the school of thought and the two works discussed and analyzed in this dissertation.

1.2 Existentialism as a philosophy:

Existentialism is the movement in nineteenth-and twentieth-century philosophy that addresses crucial issues of human being. The existentialists are not a hesitantly demarcated homogeneous school.

Kierkegaard and Nietzsche are considered the fathers of existentialism, which was arranged to two major topics: the investigation of human being, or Being, and the centrality of human decision. In this way its head speculative energies were dedicated to metaphysics and choice. Existentialism as a reasoning of human being was best communicated in the work of the German rationalist Karl Jaspers (1883–1969), who came to theory from medication and brain science. For Jaspers with respect to Dewey, the point of logic is down to earth. Be that as it may although for Dewey logic is to guide human movement, for Jaspers its design is the disclosure of Being, "the enlightenment of being," the replying of the inquiries of what homo sapiens are and what they can come to be. This brightening is attained, and Being is uncovered generally significantly, through the encounter of "compelling" scenarios that demarcate the human condition clash, blame, enduring, and demise. It is through an encounter with these extremes that the distinctive understands his existential mankind.

The head illustrative of existentialism as a logic of human choice was the French scholar and man of letters Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–80). Sartre too was concerned with being and with the fear encountered after the danger of Nothingness. Anyway he discovered the quintessence of this being in emancipation: in opportunity of decision and the obligation of self-determination. He hence gave much exertion to depicting the human propensity to "lacking honesty," reflected in unreasonable endeavors to deny one's own particular authority and to escape from reality of one's unpreventable opportunity. Sartre did not ignore the real deterrents to opportunity put forth by the truths of spot, nature's domain, social order, and

demise. Nonetheless, he requested that one surmount these constraints through demonstrations of cognizant choice, for just in demonstrations of flexibility does human being realize credibility. In *Le Deuxième Sexe*, 2 vol. (1949; *The Second Sex*), Simone de Beauvoir (1908–86), Sartre's individual rationalist and long lasting buddy, endeavored to activate the existentialist thought of flexibility for the finishes of current women's liberation. After World War II Sartre came to accept that his logic of flexibility had wrongly disregarded issues of social equity. In his later function, particularly the *Critique de la raison dialectique* (1960; *Critique of Dialectical Reason*), he tried to accommodate existentialism with Marxism. (Duignan 206-208).

Existentialism incorporates : Danish protestant theologian and logician Søren Kierkegaard, the heathen German agnostic Friedrich Nietzsche, the German basic cosmologist Martin Heidegger, the German specialist and savant Karl Jaspers, the French feminist logician and writer Simone de Beauvoir, and the French phenomenologist and commentator of 'objective thought' Maurice Merleau-Ponty . Existentialist topics are striking in the writing of Mikhail Lermontov, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, André Malraux, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, Samuel Beckett, Albert Camus and Jean Genet, and noticeable in additional. There is no situated of issues tended to by all and just those masterminds named 'existentialist'. Nonetheless, a large portion of them are intrigued by some of:

What is it to exist? Does being have a reason? Is there a goal contrast between right and off? Is it true that we are free? It is safe to say that we are answerable for our movements? What is the right kind of religious, political or sexual duty? In what capacity would it be advisable for us to face expiration?

The expression "existentialism" just picked up money after the Second World War, so it is connected reflectively (yet not in this manner erroneously) to prior masterminds.

Heidegger declined to acknowledge the mark. At the outset Sartre himself was greatly uncomfortable to be called an existentialist, by the 1970s less so. The saying characteristics in the title of the celebrated internationally October 1945 address Existentialism and Humanism (L'Existentialisme est un Humanisme) which Sartre viewed as an insufficient substitute for perusing his denser meets expectations. The content all things considered remains a phenomenal prologue to Sartrean subjects so is republished beneath in full. What does the expression "existentialism" mean in its requisition to Sartre's logic? To say that something exists is to say that it is. To state something's substance is to state what it is. (Cleric 20-21)

Why is it called existentialism? A more specialized meaning of existentialism uncovers the explanation behind its name. Existentialism is the investigation of being. Provided that you take being to be everything that exists, for example seats and tables, individuals. All theory, science, and religion might appear to have the same subject. Anyway existentialism isn't the investigation of everything that exists; it's the investigation of being itself the investigation of what it implies for something to exist whatsoever rather than not existing. It's likewise the investigation of what it implies for something, rather than nothing, to exist whatsoever. Obviously, the essential center of existentialism is a specific sort of being, the sort of being that incorporates existing things like you, in light of the fact that you're cognizant of your being and equipped for addressing it. (Panza and Gale 13).

What unify the existentialists are the subjects and worries that have a tendency to appear in their function. Here are the top ten topics that repeat over and over in existential reasoning, and also in symbolization, written works, films, and any number of different fields:

Absurdity: For the existentialists, life is crazy; it makes no sense and has no importance or extreme reason, however mere mortals require it to bode well, to have importance and reason.

Rejection of meaning-giving narratives: It isn't sufficient to say that life is ludicrous; the existentialists over and over again make the point that when theory, religion, or science tries to comprehend it, the endeavors dependably fall flat:

Alienation: This is the feeling that you're a more unusual in your own particular life, a weirder on the planet.

Anxiety: This is the feeling of unease you get when you begin to distinguish that life is preposterous.

Forlornness: This is the feeling of forlornness you get when you understand that nobody can help you understand your being.

Responsibility: Everyone bears authority. Provided that not a single person is set to give you a manual to life, you need to manage avocation regarding making your path through it and making a significance for it.

Authenticity: People need genuineness to live in a manner that is in tune with reality of who they are as individuals and the planet they live in.

Individuality: A significant part of advancing a credible and fulfilling life is singularity.

Excuse for why, science, and frameworks that attempt to blanket up the preposterousness of life frequently take uniqueness from you.

Passion/engagement: Being captivated is an additional critical part of living a legitimate life and it's under ambush from the same compels that take away your distinction.

Death: This is a definitive connection for all human movements and a critical wellspring of the absurdity of life. (Panza and Gale 12).

1.3 Existentialism as a literary movement:

The world of art has been hugely impacted by the movement of existential thought, even from its exceptionally beginnings in the nineteenth century. To begin with the novel, and later the silver screen. Numerous existential thinkers have suggested that literature is particularly well positioned to convey the messages of their logic. From this point of view, art has a tendency to act as a lens which either centers or diffuses certain modes of thought which pass through it. In that sense, an existential author absorbs the ideas then and imitates them inside written works. In the same way it is troublesome to fit existentialism perfectly into a container, one can't essentially bubble the written works of existentialism down to a basic formula. There are different strains and varieties from one author to the following, yet still simply enough commons to see the imparted underlying standards. It is maybe more gainful to talk over the work of numerous unique writers than to endeavor a clearing outline of the entire development.

In the world of literature, few have been well appreciated as Fyodor Dostoyevsky. He has been grouped with a few diverse artistic developments in light of the fact that his books introduced such a large number of existential characteristics so well. While his work is uniquely, unmistakably Russian, his characters and their particular difficulties transcend social limits and identify with the imparted issues of all people living in modern times. "Crime and Punishment" is a significant sample of how a portion of the standards of existentialist thinking could be debased, prompting moral rot and individual demolition.

The writings of Franz Kafka have long been connected with twentieth century existentialism. Destined to Jewish folks in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Kafka survived the turmoil of the First World War. The death and destruction which desolated Central and Western Europe without a doubt had an effect on Kafka's feelings. He truly never finished a full-length novel, and is generally extremely popular for his novella "The Metamorphosis", in which a man stirs to end up changed into something terrible. Critics have pointed out that in

the interpretation from German to English; a big part of the wit of Kafka's composing is lost. Nonetheless, the essential topics which Kafka wished to pass on are reasonable in any language. Like numerous existential journalists, Franz Kafka saw the individual as a being caught up in systems and bureaucracies that were beyond comprehension. Indeed, being turns into a sort of control over individual self-governance. The common reaction to this is to leave life, yet Kafka presents the scenario with dry humor. He approaches the terrors of being with a wink and a nod, and grips the craziness of everything.

The name generally synonymous with existential literature is Albert Camus although he himself dismissed the label. His books regularly talk about characters caught up to situations and scenarios well beyond their ability to control, and the courses in which they adapt to such situations are pointless. In *The Stranger*, the hero Meursault essentially randomly commits a homicide on the sunny shore, yet appears to lack profound human emotions. He in every way feels no regret for his enactment, nor bitterness for the later passing of his mother. The predominant subjects of the novel are isolation and segregation, and the feeling of being unimportant inside the bigger frameworks of social order. In the jail anticipating execution, Meursault is incapable of any kind of epiphany regarding his actions or place in the world, all that he grasps is absurdity. The absurd and the isolated nature of human being is without a doubt a repeating subject for Camus. A sort of additional positivist illustration of Camus' outlook might be discovered in *The Plague*, a novel relating a flare-up of the bubonic plague in a little port city. Those trapped inside the city walls with the illness are constrained to summon internal holds of strength and determination despite a definitive negative power of demise.

The twentieth century's most fabulous existential scholar was undoubtedly Jean Paul Sartre. Remarkably, Sartre was the only person to decline the Nobel Prize in Literature award. His literary contributions were moderately few, yet significant. In *The Nausea*, Sartre recounts

the story of an academic who comes to be conscious of the compelling peculiarity of his own being. Objects and even other individuals are totally outside of his encounter, regardless of what steps he takes to give his own particular implications onto them. In the novel, this freedom is alarming. The title illustrates perfectly the feelings of the hero when confronted with his own essential Being. In real life, Sartre saw this complete freedom as an imperative towards action. Given ultimate freedom, humans had ultimate responsibility for their own actions. In this way, Sartre took existentialism in a very positive direction. He advocated for the downtrodden, and continually struggled for a more egalitarian society based on the worth of each person.

The theater of Samuel Beckett unites topics and ideas common to several times of literary and intellectual history. His dramatization is generally as often as possible described by extra, moderate settings, inhabited by creatures that appear deficient and strange. There is a distinct dismissal of customary stage play structures and expectations. The clashes which Beckett exhibits to the gathering of people for all drama must have some clash, are now and again so muddling as to disappoint and distort meaning entirely. Characters don't know where they are or what their purpose is or their reason needs perceptible importance. Audiences regularly find Beckett to a great degree disappointing and difficult to reach, yet one could contend that distance is the point. Existence itself is troublesome, befuddling, disappointing and even at its extremely close declines to unveil any significance other than what the individual has made for him or herself. Because of that, the theater of Beckett is sincerely a mirror expected up to remember the craziness of the modern existence. Obviously fantastic and insignificant settings impersonate those same settings which individuals occupy every day, from the workplace to the shopping center to the tram train. Any individual who has stopped amidst their everyday routine and understood, "This is insane," is a co-conspirator with Samuel Beckett. (Times of Existentialism).

It is then standard to define the modern literary works as a response against its Victorian forerunner. Victorian scholars utilized their works to moralize or romanticize, when their necessities should have been stylish or all the more positively realistic. Their storytellers were unrealistically omniscient, their depictions too dull, and their concerns excessively customary. Their plots started and finished too basically and too flawlessly foreseeable emergencies giving path to simple conclusion, normally in marriage or in passing. Such impediments, inherited by the moderns, discovered them with no manner by which to reflect current times. Modernity had updated everything, carrying worldwide war, urban mayhem, revolutionary technology, sexual freedom; the novel inherited by the moderns, however, appeared to be basically traditional, moderate, staid, set, and unable to match the flux, the bewilderment, the energy that now outlined modern life. Therefore the moderns tried to “make it new” by trading the novel’s regular forms for experimental forms of flux, perplexity, openness, skepticism, freedom, and horror. They replaced omniscience with fixed or fallible perspectives, broke their chapters into fragments, made sex explicit, and dissolved their sentences into the streams and flows of interior psychic life. Time and space dissolved as well, as did any faith that the world’s appearances could reflect its realities, or that “objective” truths existed. Indeed, the moderns went as far as to question reality itself. Whereas the novels of the past had taken too much for granted, the fiction of the future would question all forms of belief, perception, and judgment. It would open itself always to new ways of seeing and representing the world. (Bradshaw and Dettmar 215).

1.4 Conclusion:

The relations between philosophy and literature have been close since the two fields came to be notable practices. For example, philosophers have utilized different literary shapes to communicate their points, like poems and essays. Further, thinkers, for example Nietzsche, Sartre, de Beauvoir, and Murdoch, made philosophical focuses in their books. A few savants,

Nietzsche, for instance, inclined toward literary expression, though a few thinkers, for example Sartre and de Beauvoir, gave their philosophical perspectives a parallel, literary treatment in their books and plays.

Moreover, literary authors have made journeys into philosophy. There is an important amount of works in the western literature in which philosophical perspectives are advanced, inferred, entertained, or generally play a central part. To specify some well-known works:

Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment*, and *The Idiot*; Camus' *Stranger*, *Plague*, and *The Fall*; Calvino's *Baron in the Trees*, *The Nonexistent Knight*, *The Cloven Viscount*, and *If on a Winter's Night a Traveler*; Kundera's *Unbearable Lightness of Being*, and Beckett's *Waiting For Godot*.

Chapter two: existentialism within characters and themes in Beckett's "waiting for Godot"

2.1 Introduction:

Samuel Beckett was born on Friday, 13 April 1906, in Foxrock near Dublin. His parents originated from well-to-do Protestant families and the kid was taught at the prestigious Portora Royal School in Enniskillen. Between 1923 and 1927, he concentrated on cutting edge dialects at Trinity College, Dublin, won numerous prizes and was designated to a trade lectureship at l'école normale supérieure in Paris.

Waiting for Godot is basically about two days in the lives of a couple of men who redirect themselves while waiting for somebody named Godot to arrive. They claim him as an acquaintance yet indeed barely know him, conceding that they might not even distinguish him. To involve themselves, they eat, slumber, talk, argue, sing, play, exercise, swap hats, and ponder on suicide, anything 'to avoid the silence.

The play opens with the character Estragon battling to take off his boot, who inevitably surrenders, murmuring, "nothing to be done"². His companion Vladimir consumes the thought and muses on it, the suggestion being that 'nothing is a thing that must be done' and this pair is set to use whatever is left of the day doing it. The point when Estragon at long last succeeds in uprooting his boot, he looks and feels inside yet finds nothing, only preceding this, Vladimir checks his hat and this theme repeats all through the play. (Beckett 207).

in Existential writing, characters are constrained to answer the existential inquiries by being compelled into utterly futile scenarios, for example to be sentenced to endlessness to push a rock up a mountain (Camus' Sisyphus), or being sentenced to demise and, more awful, watch all you cherish endure and expire, in a concentration camp, (for example throughout the Holocaust), or to be disconnected in a malady-ridden city (Camus' The Plague) or a timeless "Hell" (Sartre's No Exit), or to be scripted into a play (Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead), or to have survived the atomic destruction (Cormac McCarthy's The Road).

In each of these cases, the supposed "Existential Hero" is he or she who can will, or make, his or her importance in these foolish, bound scenarios, then after that still enactment in understanding to an interior ethics. The Existential Failure or screw-up, or failure, conversely, is he or she who is incapacitated by the scenario or his or her own particular keenness and unable to ascend above triviality.

Likewise, in Beckett's "Waiting For Godot" the characters are gotten in silly theoretical scenarios where they are continually sitting tight for intending to touch base (fit as a fiddle of Godot = God) or they squander their opportunity attempting to reply to the inquiry "what does everything mean?" (Existential literature and film).

Samuel Beckett's works have been recognized as a representation of individuals' state of mind and the good-for-nothing ridiculousness of the human condition. The hopeless state of

life in the present, the steady deliberation to make it productive and the flop to succeed in this is depicted in *Waiting for Godot*. The play has been named as one of the major samples in post-innovator symbolization which demonstrates the 'collapsing of reality', the starting focuses for the 'theatre of the absurd'. The understandings of the play are shifted, and they all rely on upon the single gathering of people's perspective. Throughout the paper, the shifted authorities and diverse translations will be utilized to investigate the play to highlight its embodiment. The play gives profound knowledge into the human condition, and reflects a mirror to the crowd which makes them ask, is this me and my existence circumstances.

After the Second World War, a profound emergency of thoughts in Europe forced individuals to reexamine accepted planet sees and general qualities. The French post-war existentialism and the expositive expression of the silly are two of the most huge results of the European philosophical and artistic patterns of that time, and Samuel Beckett's play "*Waiting for Godot*" (1949) was the first to carry the existential plan and style to the theatre scene. This study prescribes an investigation of this play as conveying the existential skeptical thought that includes the thought of God's nonexistence. The play likewise passes on an additional existential thought that the issue of God's being all things considered is of a minor essentialness for a mere mortal. The examination is a nearby perusing of the content of Beckett's play in the perspective of some crucial principals of the existential philosophical idea figured by Jean-Paul Sartre in his established function "*Existentialism Is a Humanism*" (1946).

2.2 characters:

2.2.1 Vladimir and Estragon:

Vladimir and Estragon are excruciatingly careless in regards to their own condition. They go about repeating their actions each day unaware of the dreariness and imprisonment.

They likewise don't enact their brain to address their own particular actions and the thought processes underlying their activities. The "compressed vacuum" in their lives is unvaryingly ignored.

First and foremost mime and tableau, then discourse. Every unit in Act I of the play takes after an expressive superficial action with a conversational trade that first attests something solid about the situation, and after that instantly breaks down that solidity with destructive discourse that comes so rapidly afterward. In the first for example, after the quiet Vladimir spits in nausea at the scent of Estragon's boot, his companion moves to the inside of the stage, ends with his back to the audience, and addresses a remark to the scene: 'charming spot.' Given the stripped scene and the desperation of the characters, each playgoer will smile agreeably at the broad irony here, however what then happens entangles matters impressively. Estragon turns, walks to the front of the stage, faces the audience, and keeps: 'inspiring prospects' – and turning to Vladimir – says 'let's go.'

Vladimir: We can't.

Estragon: Why not?

Vladimir: We're waiting for Godot.

Estragon: (despairingly). Ah! (Pause.)

You're sure it was here? (F, 14; G, 10)

On one hand, we are given basic particular informative content: these two seedy men are waiting for somebody named Godot, and Estragon's tone prescribes the plausibility that they have done it before and had been baffled. (In preparations that Beckett coordinated in Berlin and London in 1975 and 1984, the performing artist playing Estragon said 'ah, yes!' rather than simply "Ah!" which affirms the feeling of commonality and disappointed

need.)But the joke pointed at the audience rapidly subverts our certainty that we know the distinction between deception and actuality, a subversion that comes to be progressively more radical as the play goes on. Likewise more intense are ensuing remarks controlled at the observers, who later on are contrasted as a group with a bog and as and as individuals to corpses and skeletons.

The discussion quickly following the first notice of Godot withdraws any comfort that may have existed in the original statement about waiting. One man says something that he trusts the other will affirm, just to have his companion given occasion to have doubts about whatever thin hope he had basically communicated. The point when Estragon is advised that they should meet Godot close to the tree, he asks what kind of tree it is:

Vladimir: I don't know. A willow.

Estragon: Where are the leaves?

Vladimir: It must be dead.

Estragon: No more weeping.

Vladimir: Or perhaps it's not the season.

Estragon: Looks to me more like a bush.

Vladimir: A shrub.

Estragon: A bush.

Vladimir: A—. What are you insinuating? That we've come to the

Wrong place? (F, 14; G, 10)

Vladimir's 'i don't know. A willow' is a prototypical occurrence of Beckett's Way of simultaneously attesting and withdrawing significance, and its impact is to describe Vladimir as a genuine skeptic in pursuit of assurance, a man got between obliviousness and a necessity to know. In one appreciation, the willow is just a willow, yet in an additional it capacities as what Antonin Artaud once called 'an enlivened hieroglyphic'. On account of their hanging leaves and frequent area close water, willows are frequently connected with sadness for unrequited love or the loss of a mate. Vladimir's statement that the willow must be dead and Estragon's endeavor to put a closure to sobbing seem a convincing enough enterprise to get past one sort of misfortune; yet the sudden expansion about the probability that this maybe is not the time of year for willows, or that the willow may not indeed be a willow whatsoever, puts the suspicion of mistrust about Godot in yet an alternate and considerably all the more terrifying setting.

Actually, then, space is questioned: this may not be the spot where they are to meet Godot. Then afterward time comes in for its steady cross-examination:

Estragon: And if he doesn't come?

Vladimir: We'll come back tomorrow.

Estragon: And then the day after tomorrow.

Vladimir: Possibly.

Estragon: And so on.

Vladimir: The point is –

Estragon: Until he comes.

Vladimir: You're merciless.

Estragon: We came here yesterday.

Vladimir: Ah no, there you're mistaken.

Estragon: What did we do yesterday?

Vladimir: What did we do yesterday?

Estragon: Yes.

Vladimir: Why . . . (Angrily). Nothing is certain when you're about.

(F, 14; G, 10+)

By raising the possibility that Godot may not come, Estragon prompts Vladimir to confirm their relentlessness, yet he needs just to venture the constrained confirmation one day into time to come to uncover its flimsiness and to push his companion into the weaker 'possibly'. Also if tomorrow is questionable, yesterday ends up being more so: not just are they unable to concur that they were here a day prior, yet they can't recall what they did then. With time and the past so unequivocally tossed into inquiry, the main thing that appears to hold its strength is the present. In any case when Vladimir closes 'nothing is sure when you're about', his cleverness word play reminds his companion and us that the present, excessively, rests on a problematic establishment. Toward the conclusion of this normal about the unsteadiness of space and time, the diligent scepticism of Vladimir and Estragon has developed through stylishly executed stichomythic exchange into genuine joke and after that into tumult and alarm, inciting the weary Estragon to call for a truce by inquiring as to whether they may 'stop talking briefly, do you mind?'

In any case to quit talking is to succumb to the silence and the fourth major standard of the first act starts with a mime in which Estragon, having sat down on his mound, floats off

into rest, while the frightened Vladimir paces here and there and then here again halting just to gaze off into the cessation of speech as though searching for relief. Unable to endure the end of discourse, he cries out 'gogo! . . . Gogo! . . . Gogo!' to wake his companion up.

Estragon, 'restored to the loathsomeness of his situation', needs to escape by portraying a dream he has simply had, however Vladimir in his disturbance won't tune in, a refusal that evokes from Estragon a clearing signal towards the universe and the roaring inquiry: 'this one is sufficient for you?' What takes after is a snappy variety on a by now well-known reaction. Estragon doubts that it may not be better for them to part, and to Vladimir's contemptuous 'you wouldn't go far' he sarcastically replies: 'that might be too awful, truly too terrible . . . At the time you think about the magnificence of the way. Also the goodness of the wayfarers. Wouldn't it, Didi?' Estragon's needling, unexpected utilization of a dialect with scriptural hints presses on to give to the commonplace talk a thunder that serves (as much else does here) to grow the enthusiastic extent and thematic suggestions and to present new pictures and themes that will be rehashed and improved later on. (Withanage 09-11).

Right now, a truncated account works in a comparable manner. As their question warms up, Vladimir urges his companion to cool himself; and Estragon energetically gets the word 'calm', strokes it, and inquires as to whether he knows the story of the Englishmen in the brothel. The exchange that accompanies has all the characteristics of an age-old vaudeville schedule. The point when Vladimir concedes he knows the story, Estragon teasingly says 'tell it to me', however when his companion challenges at having been guyed, Estragon unemotionally starts to describe it himself: an inebriated Englishman heads off to a bordello and the madam inquires as to whether he needs 'a reasonable one, a dull one or a red-haired one'. Only then in the depiction, with dazzling timing, Estragon asks his companion to 'go on', yet the bedeviled Vladimir yells 'stop it', and takes off while throwing a mini tantrum.

Right now one can make small a greater amount of the unfinished ribald break, yet the trade about 'do you know the story . . . let it know to me' echoes first experience with the record of the two criminals; and Ruby Cohn reports that in the second demonstration of Beckett's German generation, when Vladimir asks the kid if Mr. Godot's facial hair is reasonable or dark, the German inquiry comes to be 'blonde or . . . (he dithers) dark . . . (he falters) . . . on the other hand red?' (The standard line in English peruses 'fair or . . . (he wavers) . . . on the other hand black?') And Cohn then gives the content of the joke: An Englishman, having tipsy a little more than common, heads off to a massage parlor. The bawd inquires as to whether he needs a reasonable one, a dim one, or a red-haired one. The Englishman answers that he needs a kid. Stunned, the bawd debilitates to call a policeman, and the Englishman contests: 'oh, no, they're excessively gritty.' along these lines Godot is carried into connection to Gogo's coarse story, comparing – as so regularly in Beckett's play – 'the physical and magical, the foul and ethereal' (Journal of Beckett Studies, I (Winter 1976), p. 42, n.2).

As uncovering as this record seems to be, there is no compelling reason to hold up until the close of Act II to perceive how Estragon's bawdy story gives themes for successive unanticipated areas of the play. The fifth significant standard in the early part of Act I starts with a mime in which Estragon signals to hearten the truant Vladimir peeing off stage. Rejoined a couple of minutes after the fact, the two men present their most beloved point – 'what do we do now' – and Estragon recommends that they might as well hang themselves. Vladimir is attracted to the thought in light of the fact that he knows from fables (and maybe from perusing James Joyce's Ulysses) that hanged men of ten get erections. As Joyce has his Dubliner Alf Bergan demonstrates:

“God’s truth . . . I heard that from the head warder that was in Kilmainham when they hanged Joe Brady, the invincible. He told me when they cut him down after the drop it

was standing up in their faces like a poker.” (Ulysses, Random House, New York, 1986, p. 250).

At the same time hanging in Beckett never works out as conveniently as it may in life or in different books. From companionship and a shockingly refined feeling of noblesse oblige, Vladimir and Estragon cleverly concede to each one in turn and get ensnared in a debate about who is the heavier of the two. After a different trade reminiscent of a scene from a Marx-Brothers film, Estragon strangely gets the better of the contention and prescribes they do nothing, in light of the fact that 'it's safer'.

2.2.2 *Lucky and Pozzo:*

Inside the play the significance of the confounding title figure unfolds in distinctive ways. In spite of the fact that the entering Pozzo is sensibly mixed up for Godot (a few qualities make the slip possible and in a few ways tantalizing: the comparable sounding name, the trappings of power, the way that somebody is "tied" to him), he and Lucky import enough importance without anyone else present. From the minute they show up, the howling expert and his shackled slave stand as differentiations to the devastated other couple and appear to exemplify much that is nonattendant in their identities and scenario. Assuming that Vladimir and Estragon are described by their tenuousness – via what they and we don't know of their histories and reason, by the anxious inquiries they ask and the responses denied to them— pozzo and Lucky report themselves quickly as considerable animals of connection and course.

The showy expert radiates power and power; the hampered servant fittingly shows a cowed compliance. 'i present myself: Pozzo . . . Made in God's image!' the whip-wielding figure says and after that gesture with a tyrannical blend of insensitivity and thoughtfulness that seems to reflect a thousand years of inherited run the show. He bluntly tests the two strangers about Godot, is charitable when he studies of their trespassing on his territory, and

settles down pompously to revel in his supper and his funnel. His discourse is stamped by goals, shouts, and influenced apothegms, and he moves here and there and then here again between rave and elocutionary set pieces about the tears of the planet and the foreboding brilliance of the nearby dusk that intrigue in the meantime that they terrify. The slave at the finish of his rope brings and carries on request, practically swoons, however unlike Didi and Gogo never questions his spot.

Vladimir and Estragon are in a flash occupied and abhorrence struck, drawn out of their troubling holding up into the impressive presentation of computed self-presentation. This must be what the planet outside is truly like: all display and surety and altered reason – a sort of considerable theatre. 'i am carrying him to the fair,' says Pozzo of Lucky, 'where I have a specific end goal, which is to get a great cost for him. 'with a dramatic show of such variety and brutality to retain their consideration, Didi and Gogo require not brood about keeping an errand with Godot. At the same time from the begin Pozzo's exhibition is plainly over-resolved, and his power is rapidly uncovered to be encroached, factitious not certified. His solution for Estragon's address concerning why Lucky doesn't put down his packs is a drawn-out spoof of a legitimate clarification; his mannered upheaval about the slave 'killing him' is more confirmation of the void of his own cases to power. One by one he loses his funnel, his atomizer, and his valuable watch – belonging connected with this feeling of dominance.

Pozzo tries to recuperate his power by assuming the part of producer and offering to do something to divert 'these trustworthy colleagues who are having such a dull, dull time', however his offer to have Lucky move or sing or discuss ends up being the welcome that uncovered his own particular weakness and advances at last to his defeat. (Graver 44-45).

Lucky's shocking tirade is the most realistic of all the customs and routines in a play full of extraordinary set arrangements. In the 1950s, when *Godot* was initially performed as

far and wide as possible, the discourse had a tendency to be perused as an unbalanced, show-ceasing aria: a mix of drivel, satire, and ominous imagery. Garbage on the grounds that it was generally conveyed at such breakneck speed that it wouldn't be able to be fathomed by a crowd of people (and remained incomprehensible to an onlooker); spoof on the grounds that it was obviously a ridiculing form of a religious verification ('given the being of an individual God . . . subsequently . . .'); and symbolic on the grounds that the implications to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, to verses by Verlaine and Hölderlin, to Samuel Johnson (in the early British release) and Bishop Berkeley (in the American) prescribed that the torrent of sections reflected a progressed stage in man's mechanical considering the crumple of Western human advancement. The sum of this is crucial, yet all the more as of late the discourse has been deciphered as a significantly more formal and momentous structure than it had been comprehended to be around then the play initially picked up its acclaim (however neither man nor woman might ever need to defuse its drive as a mindboggling tirade by overemphasizing its cognizance).

The point when Beckett coordinated *Godot* at the Schiller Theater in 1975, he shockingly advertised to the performing artists on the first day that practices might start with Lucky's discourse, for it was here, he said, that the 'threads and topics' of the play 'are being accumulated together'. He then continued to clarify the development of the piece in a manner that elucidates its shape and noteworthiness. The talk's subject, he told the throws, is 'to shrivel on an outlandish earth under a detached heaven', and it is partitioned into three parts: an emotionless godliness, waning man, and detached nature. Taking after Beckett's lead, one might need likewise to remark in some detail on the texture and the structure of what Lucky says to illustrate further why – incomprehensible and coherent – it is so integral to a gratefulness and comprehension of the play.

From the beginning, one is surprised by Lucky's heartfelt lecture on the grounds that it comes so shockingly out of the hush: not just had he not spoken some time recently, however he appeared a corrupted animal unequipped for any discourse, not to mention the discourse he gives us. Yet then, from the mouth of this creature comes a frenzy driven talk on the way of God and man in the universe that repeats in its extremely development the vital sensational force of everything in the play that has gone before it. Lucky's convulsive endeavor to start by declaring the being of 'a particular God' who 'loves us sincerely with a few exemptions for explanations unknown' parallels the continuous endeavors of Vladimir and Estragon to create a momentous vicinity in their own particular lives; and the powers of non-sense and cynicism that jumble his attempt are quite a lot such as those that beset theirs.

In any case if their undertaking has been strangely, humorously piercing, his is unnerving not just as a result of the daze in which it is conveyed and yet in light of the fact that he is abruptly demonstrated to convey so much intelligent stuff plus the stuff he really pulls about for Pozzo. Lucky is an unusual resemblance of insightful man at the closure of his tether, beginning to try, through all the education he can gather, to case the biggest reasonability for homo sapiens in the universe. Yet, in spite of the fact that his discourse at the begin takes the manifestation of the old philosophical verification of the being of God, it plunges quickly to an alternate, horrible set of conclusions. The powers on whose work his confirmation rests are a ticket-puncher and a tram-driver (Puncher and Wattmann); the God with the white facial hair (who adores us sincerely for explanations obscure) is portrayed by flexibility from feeling, imperturbability, and the misfortune of the ability to utilize spoken or composed dialect (apathia, athambia, aphasia). The commotion that appears to be automatically to cut Lucky's confirmation ('quaquaquaqua') is identified both to extreme significance and extreme rubbish: "qua" as 'essential being, in the character or limit of . . .' or 'quaquaversal', truly: 'where so ever turned, turned all over the place, inclining descending

from the focal point in all bearings' (which Beckett once called an awesome quality).

However the staccato "quaquaquaqua" resembles the disparaging clamors made by Ovid's frogs and the skeptic Soliony when he needs to disparage and quiet other individuals in Chekhov's Three Sisters.

As Lucky's distress increments so does the burning disdain guided at foundations and scholastics, all named in coarsely dismissive ways: the Acacacademy of Anthropopometry of Essy-in-Possy is both excremental and sterile (esse = 'to be'; group = 'to be able'; i.e. in this setting, 'not to have the capacity to measure man'), and Testew, Cunard, Fartov, and Belcher represent themselves. In any case if the phrasing is rough and convoluted and the way hypercritically prolix, the memo is clear: if God exists, He is truant, inert to us, and in spite of proclaimed strides in sustenance, particular hygiene, drug, and conveyance, mere mortals waste and pine, shrink and decrease.

In spite of the fact that Lucky's destructively humorous, miserable proposition is expressed at practically the definite center of this seventy-two line discourse, the second half is of equivalent imperativeness, for not just does it finish the talk about an uninterested nature supplementing an unresponsive God, yet it presents the key (and from various perspectives startling) Beckett note of safety. Simply at the focus when the contention is generally chillingly prophetically calamitous (the vision of the blurring human skull in the homestead stones), Lucky starts his two end abstains: 'i resume' and 'on on . . .' unstable utterances – rehashed half-twelve times in the second 50% of the discourse, when they were not exhibit whatsoever in the first half. 'to resume': 'to consume or run on with again after interruption' – this is the thing that Lucky does and what Vladimir and Estragon have been doing (and will press on to do) when they reconstitute a burning out planet by some purposive activity or verbal journey.

The interference here, as it regularly is in Beckett's function, is an interruption of some troubling, unwelcome truth, a vital actuality that has beforehand been prohibited by the characters' penchant to live in the grasp of propensity and schedule. 'habit', Vladimir will let us know in his second-enactment talk, is 'a incredible deadener', and Beckett unchangingly copartners it with the human limit for avoidance and self-insurance. Propensity, he composed at twenty-four in his article on Proust, is a tradeoff effected between the single and nature's turf, a 'guarantee of dull inviolability' against the unstable minutes when 'the fatigue of living is traded by the enduring of being'.

Lucky's tirade is one such shattering addition, and when he himself is savagely hushed by Vladimir's pulling off his cap, the movement comes back to the universe of propensity to which we had prior been usual – the carnival universe of indulgent drama with its hinting indications of occasions that are accounted for to have occurred at Calvary (Latin for 'skull') or Golgotha (Hebrew for 'skull'); or, in Lucky's terms: 'on on the skull the skull the skull the skull in Connemara . . .'

After Lucky falls, he is blunderously raised by the two companions in a ridiculous yet troubling farce of the execution. (Pozzo's 'raise him up' emulated by Estragon's (to damnation with him'.)The responses of the others might be taken as a list to the effect of Lucky's 'interruption'. A significant part of the energy of the tirade hails from its having the conclusiveness of a savage fixation: no further examination is conceivable. Not just does it uncover Pozzo's dictator posing, yet it helps Vladimir and Estragon to remember the bleak terms and states of the planet in which they have been holding up to keep their errand with Godot. The abrasive parody of Pozzo's goodbye – the production about the lost watch, the silly cross-cutting trade of 'adieu . . . yes no no' – are compelled enterprises to avoid the implications of lucky's speech , a travesty of habit at the end of its tether. (Graver 47).

After Pozzo and Lucky make their incredible passageway, the zealous movement of the play takes a different imperative turn. We find Vladimir and Estragon in an alternate temperament from that in which we saw them soon after the master/slave exhibition happened. The definitive door of Pozzo and Lucky had eminently expanded the cast offs' feeling of plausibility: the enormous man may be Godot; he could be carrying something to consume; the shenanigans of the voyaging pair might be a yearned for preoccupation. However those illusions are gone the minute Didi and Gogo are separated from everyone else.

Presently they appear considerably a bigger number of cognizant than before of the distress of their scenario and of the dramatic part of their own lives. Throws around the takeoff of what was the main show in town and by an instinct that the crazed Lucky has faultlessly demarcated the states of the planet in which they exist, they begin speaking again about how to hang loose while holding up for Godot. As of right now, on the other hand, there is a discussion that changes both the tone and the suggestions of the movement. Out of the blue, Vladimir comments 'how they've changed!' and the exchange that accompanies uncovers the conceivability that the experience with Pozzo and Lucky may have happened before – a divulgence that abruptly opens the prior activity to another go of elucidations. Assuming that, as now appears conceivable, the two down-and-outers have been acting from the beginning, shrewdly playing stupid for explanations we can just start to conjecture, we may be (as they may be) even further into an universe of riddle and unknowingness than we had acknowledged.

The impacts of the disclosure that much of this may have happened before are complex. To begin with, it further puzzles the gathering of people about the significance and suggestions of the movement. Also, it uplifts the imperativeness of the occasions of the play as theatre, as the knowing mirror image of activities that probably have an actuality somewhere else. Also, at last, it stresses the requirement for the observers and book fans to fix

all available attention all the more eagerly on how Vladimir and Estragon react to occasions – the way they perform their parts – as opposed to on the criticalness of the occasions general.

As observers and book fans, we have been mindful from at an opportune time that in Beckett's dreamscape the coherence of circumstances and end results and of ordinary clarification has broken down. Anyway we have accepted, excessively, that for Didi and Gogo what has been occurring on this nation street is this present reality, questionable as they may be if some of it happened before or not. For sure, the unlikely talk, the repetitiveness and unusual goings-on are as vividly true for them as the events and discussion of our day by day lives are liable to be for u us – yet this stuff redundancy may be putting these goings-on in mistrust.(Graver 50).

2.3 themes:

One of the complexities of Literature of the Absurd is that it is regularly challenging to describe a topic, since the exact ridiculousness of the work is centered (as a rule) on man's failure to comprehend things. Given that, then again, there are some recognizable strings of topic in *Waiting for Godot*. To start with, the human condition is a troubling and distressful state. The neglected man battles to live or rather exist, in a threatening and wanton planet. A feeling of stagnancy and exposedness spellbinds man, and whenever he tries to state himself, he is controled. In Beckett's statements, human life is the perseverance and tolerance to "the fatigue of living" "traded by the enduring of being." These expressions talk volumes of a theory resulting from the pitiless human substances.

Any exchange of the appalling in the current period must recognize where those journalists who have been described as fitting in with the 'theatre of the Absurd' stand in connection to it. "Absurdist" composing has an in number connection to Modernism, generally evidently through the work of Samuel Beckett, however it is a type of Modernism

that in the second 50% of the twentieth century sees small if any reason for trust or assurance. Does absurdist composing have any connections with the views on the shocking formerly talked over or would it be a good idea for it to be seen as post-lamentable, that is withdrawing fundamentally from the shocking as a thought or catastrophe as memorable structure? The originator of the expression, 'theatre of the Absurd', Martin Esslin, outlines it hence in his book of the same name.

Albert Camus had utilized "absurdity" to portray the human scenario in 1942 in his book *The Myth of Sisyphus*: 'this separate between man and his existence, the performer and his setting, positively constitutes the feeling of Absurdity', and Eugène Ionesco had outlined it therefore in 1957: 'absurd is that which is without reason . . . Cut off from his religious, magical, and transcendental roots, man is lost; all his movements come to be silly crazy, useless.' For Esslin '[t]his feeling of powerful anguish at the ludicrousness of the human condition'² portrays the absurdist scholars he talks about in his book. The inquiry is the thing that connection this has, if any, to the appalling. (Newton 144).

Thematically talking, *Godot* has everything --from the normal to the brilliant, from the enduring of putting on a loner boot to the enduring created by a perfect nonattendance. From a religious perspective, the play is in the vicinity of a journey for the transcendental request, disillusioned by a radical absence of its vicinity, whereby the salvation-condemnation (the *Two Thieves* segment mention to Augustine) and sin-reclamation doubles come to be extremely essential. The thought of being and a validation of being through the look of the different is a different major thematic issue at function. Recollect what Vladimir tells the young men in both the gesture, that he must tell Godot that he saw the two of them. Holding up, which is the essential state of the couple on the stage, is yet a different topic in the play. Through Lucky and Pozzo, the subjects of authority and servitude and the ever tricky force dynamic is brought into the play. A dormant homosocial if not homoerotic bond between the

Beckettian pseudo-couple Didi and Gogo, The Great Fall of Man (Lucky and Pozzo's fall in Act II), Crucifixion (they succumb to the manifestation of the cross posturally), the discourse hush dichotomy, suicide and the serio-funny spoof of its existentialist figuration, unending cyclicity of time and space, the inconceivability of conclusion, a battle between nothingness and verbose non-sense, absence of the occasion are the other thematic issues at work in the play. (themes in waiting for godot).

2.3.1 Meaninglessness

In *Waiting for Godot*, Samuel Beckett produces a genuinely mysterious function. On first investigating the play, one is not certain of what, if anything, happens or of the title character's hugeness. In endeavoring to disentangle the topics of the play, mediators have extricated a wide mixture imagery from the Godot's name. Some, taking an evident indication, have recommended that Godot stands for God and that the play is fixated on religious imagery. Others have taken the name as inferring from the French word for a boot, *godillot*. Still, others have inferred an association between Godot and Godeau, a character who never shows up in Honore de Balzac's *Mercadet; Ou, le faiseur*. Through all these exertions, there is still no conclusive reply as to whom or what Godot acts for, and the essayist has denied that Godot acts for a particular thing, notwithstanding a certain uncertainty in the name. Upon study, then again, one understands that this uncertainty in importance is the precise significance of Godot. In spite of the fact that he appears to make more amazing imagery and hugeness in the name Godot, Beckett really rejects the idea of truth in dialect through the inconsequentiality of the title character's name. By making a false impression of religious imagery in the name Godot Beckett advances the translator to a deadlock.

For one to make a companionship between God and the title character's name is totally intelligent. Actually, in processing the totally evident inference, Beckett invites the mediator

to accompany a way of religious imagery. All through the play, references to Christianity are so regularly specified that one can hardly recognize a religious undercurrent; the vicinity of religion is not by any stretch of the imagination underneath the surface. In the opening minutes of the play, Vladimir asks "Hope conceded make something debilitated, who said that?" (8a). The legitimate citation, "Hope conceded maketh the heart diseased," hails from Proverbs 13:12 of the Bible. Soon after, Vladimir inquires as to whether Estragon has ever perused the Bible and proceeds an examination of the Gospels, the "Saviour," and the two cheats encompassing Christ throughout the torturous killing (8b-9b). By embeddings religious dialogues in the beginning couple of minutes play, the dramatist sways the translator to expect the play's subjects are incredibly joined with religion. At that point, when the discourse turns to Godot, Estragon partners their appeal from Godot with "A sort of supplication to God" (13a). The association between God and Godot is obviously solidly made, leaving space for a mixture of translations. Vladimir and Estragon are the loyal followers to God, and sit tight for Him, or a messianic figure, to come. Maybe Vladimir and Estragon are agents of trust by exhibiting unflinching trust to a God who does not display himself or, then again, are indicating the habit of visually impaired confidence as upheld by Beckett. Recognizing Lucky's troubles and enduring and his modification on Jesus' final expressions in his discourse, «unfinished," he could be a Christ figure (29b). Pozzo could speak for the natural manifestation of a God that treats his disciples such as he treats Lucky. The extent of conceivable religious translations is for all intents and purpose unending.

In truth, the advocates of these understandings have succumbed to a ploy, for Godot does not stand for God. Acknowledging that the work comes to be almost unfathomable on occasion, one discovers the religious illustration too straightforward. Provided that Beckett furnishes such clear references to religion, it appears he would essentially call his title character God. Besides, Beckett, himself, has prevented the being from claiming a crux or

myth to the play. The dramatist did not prepare religious ambiguities in light of the fact that Godot stands for God; the ambiguities themselves hold the correct essentialness. The expression Godot is useless in itself, and those who copartner the statement with religious topics are tricked by Beckett's dialect. The play leads some along a long and dull way of translation; at last, the way hits a deadlock. Dialect is not synonymous with truth, and the translator rises with nothing.

The insignificance of Godot is further illustrated through its association with godillot or Estragon's boots. The play starts as "Estragon, sitting on a level hill, is attempting to take off his boot. He pulls at it with both hands, gasping. He surrenders, depleted, rests, tries once more. As after" (7a). The point when Godot is substituted for the boot, the importance comes to be clear. The mediator battles with the criticalness of the statement, wears out himself, and starts once more. Minutes after the fact, Estragon increments the level of power, tearing at the boot (7b). At last, Gogo "with a matchless undertaking succeeds in pulling off his boot. He companions inside it, feels about inside it, turns it upside down, shakes it, looks on the ground to check whether anything has dropped out, gem nothing, feels inside it once more, gazing sightlessly before him" (8a). After much function, one can discover the importance of Godot, and, similarly as Estragon reports, "There's nothing to show" (8a). The significance of Godot is nonexistent, and the deliberation to discover one is worthless and depleting. Regardless of how often one hunts, one won't find noteworthiness in the statement. The movement proceeds in the second enactment, when the two identify that Estragon's boots have been updated. The two talk over the scenario: "Estragon: Mine were dark. These are tan. Vladimir: You're certain yours were dark? Estragon: Well they were a sort of ash. Vladimir: And these are tan. Show. Estragon: Well they're somewhat green. 43b" The discussion shows the utter negligibility of Godot. Gogo can't even choose the real nature of either match of boots. Each thought or activity to uncover the importance of Godot is crazy. The translations of the name change, at

the same time, exactly as in the boots, there is nothing inside. Though the boots in the first enactment were too tight, Estragon chooses that these are "too huge" and finishes up the talk disappointed, maxim, "That's sufficient about these boots" (45a). The quest for significance in Beckett's dialect is baffling and pointless, and, since there is no genuine intending to Godot, the translator can never get all the noteworthiness to meet up. A precise fit is unrealistic.

As the irrelevance of Godot is created the absence of significance develops to different names in scenes with Pozzo. Pozzo, himself, avows the absence of significance in a name as he occasionally implies "Godin . . . Godet . . . Godot . . . at any rate you see who I mean" (24a). He befuddles the name with different expressions and clearly feels no legitimate need to study the right one. Despite the dialect he utilizes, Vladimir and Estragon comprehend what he implies. By accurately naming Godot, Pozzo might give an excessive amount of noteworthiness to the name. In declining to even view the name as essential, Pozzo imparts the misdirecting nature of Beckett's dialect and acts fittingly. Moreover, Vladimir and Estragon broaden the extent of futility to different names when Pozzo first meets the pair. Presenting himself, Pozzo shouts, "I am Pozzo!" and asks "I say does that name mean nothing to you?" (15b). The name does, indeed, mean completely nothing. In the same way that Godot is trivial, so are the play's different names. Vladimir and Estragon press on to rehash the name Pozzo, while trading it with Bozzo, and Vladimir closes, "I once knew a family called Gozzo" (15b). The unimportance of every last one of expressions goes to the fore. Pozzo, Bozzo, Gozzo, and Godot are unclear babble. The point when Vladimir and Estragon are implied with their handles, every one of the five names of the play have two syllables and close in a vowel sound. Moreover, if the quiet, last letter is uprooted from Godot, it shows up as a negligible variety of Gogo and Didi as Godo. Along these lines, characters' names are decreased to immeasurable utterances that a toddler may make. Beckett's dialect is completely

divide from learning or truth. His names can't be recognized from each other and are totally without any genuine importance.

Godot, an unimportant word or negligible sound, uncovers the unimportance of all Beckett's dialect. While the play holds clear ambiguities into the saying's importance, they are for show. There is no legitimate importance. The translation of Godot's religious essentialness, while this noteworthiness is obviously implied, accelerates mediator into a long, obscured back street of aimlessness. In the same way that Estragon's boots hold nothing inside them, there is no midway intending to the saying Godot. Moreover, this pointlessness might be stretched to all of Beckett's dialect; full of indications of a more stupendous hugeness, dialect shrouds the detail of all things portrayed. Just after this disclosure would one be able to at last get towards the centermost significance of Beckett's play; there is no importance. His characters take part in crazy dialect to relax and to "give [them] the impression [they] exist" (44b). Illusions of noteworthiness proceed all through the play, at the same time, in truth, the play originates from nothing and eventually closes in nothing. Beckett uncovered the pitfalls of a dialect that endeavors to make importance when none exists. Holding up for Godot is not a critique on religion or truly anything so far as that is concerned. Its significance comes in its uselessness. That is the play's more excellent truth.

The thought that God or destiny or some Supreme Being with control toys with the lives of men is startlingly clear. Each minute of each day, humanity holds up for some sign from God that his enduring will close. Also each day, God does not arrive. "The Meaninglessness of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. (Meaninglessness theme in *Waiting for Godot*).

2.3.2 The use of space

It is sufficient to begin with a short prologue to Beckett's landscape, since practically all his meets expectations are totally not quite the same as what we use in the theatre and also actually. The vast majority of his plays show no items whatsoever, for example *Footfalls*, *Come and Go* and *Play*, and some have just a tree, a seat or not many items incorporating *Act Without Words I*, *Act Without Words II*, *Rockaby*, *Krap's Last Tape*. Consistent with Martin Esslin, Beckett might have utilized basic, irregular and phenomenal landscape in his works to stress the distinction between his plays and tried and true ones, which is a different excuse for why that his lives up to expectations are ordered in the kind of the crazy (esslin 21-22).

His stage shows with the characterization of abnormality, strangeness, vacancy and untidiness, with characters who are "tramps, wanderers, and that all are dejected" (*The Theatre of the Absurd*, 33). As a substitute for utilizing the appeared, complex environment he utilizes a dim, bleak, modest and purge organize in the vast majority of his plays incorporating *Footfalls*, *Rockaby*, *Come and Go*, *Play*, *Act Without Words I* and *II*. From Esslin's reference it could be comprehended that the stage regularly gives the gathering of people informative content about the characters, for example their nature and their experience history. This may be the excuse for why that Beckett utilized modest and destroy landscape within his stage foundation. Angela Hotaling additionally demands in her paper on *Waiting for Godot* "The precise area is obscure and it creates the impression that the characters are put in some 'distant region' that could be anyplace" (1).

In *Waiting for Godot* a space without Id of its experience, either really or socially, is made or applies to the planet by and large. This permits the crowd to concentrate on the exchange itself as opposed to the view. The crowd is given a forsaken, new and peculiar space where just about nothing exists. Nothing detectably updates in the presence of the stage, with the exception of not many leaves developing on the tree in the second day of the second demonstration.

The tree is the main protest that exists amidst vacancy. Interestingly, the first bewildering absurdist component, the tree, appears battling to make due with the tramps and capacities as everything that the tramps have aside from the apparel that they are wearing. Yet it appears the tree means nothing for them since they take nothing from it to influence their present circumstances. The tramps' regard for the tree is rehashed in the play:

Estragon: What is it?

Vladimir: I don't know. A willow.

Estragon: Where are the leaves?

Vladimir: It must be dead (10).

At the end of the second act, they mention the tree for the last time:

Vladimir: Everything's dead but the tree.

Estragon: (looking at the tree). What is it?

Vladimir: It's the tree (59).

Keeping just a tree without whatever viable questions appears to be Beckett's endeavor to highlight characters and progressing occasions on the stage, in light of the fact that numerous protests on the stage occupy the activity and the proposed note. The tree may symbolise numerous potential outcomes, for example expiration, survival, change, and life. The tree which has no leaves or foods grown from the ground could be a representation of death and passing, despite the fact that it is making due all through the barbarous circumstances; moreover the tree in the winter time looks pale and dead. Possibly that tree gradually starts to change, developing leaves, and maybe recapturing life.

Symbolictionary.net, one of symbolic importance of the tree is "The manifestation of demise

in the winter-losing their leaves, just to grow new development with the reappearance of spring. This perspective makes the tree an image of restoration".

Image dictionary.net likewise prescribes that the tree could symbolize the association between life and passing, "Egyptian's Holy Sycamore stood on the limit of life and passing, joining the planets". In the play this thought reflects the tramps who battle between holding up and suicide, regularly acknowledging the thought of suicide, however they return to the same focus to hold up.

Despite the fact that, there is no change in the plot on the second gesture, the space updates by developing not many takes off. The tree's stirring at the second day with not many leaves may symbolise trust for tomorrow, which in the tramps' case is Godot. Nonetheless, void space might stand for the unfilled souls of the tramps holding up to be filled by Godot.

Despite the fact that the tramps discuss the tree, they appear uninterested in their area, maybe on the grounds that they feel that the spot does not have any effect when the scenario is still the same for them. Despite the fact that the impression we get is that they have been sitting tight in the spot for Godot's landing for "Fifty years possibly" (35), they are new to the place that they were the day preceding, as they banter in act one:

Estragon: In my opinion we were here.

Vladimir: (looking round). You recognize the place?

Estragon: I didn't say that.

Vladimir: Well?

Estragon: That makes no difference (10).

Similarly, in act two in the same circumstance, they doubt about the place they were the day before:

Estragon: And here where we are now?

Vladimir: Where else do you think? Do you not recognize the place?

Estragon: (suddenly furious). Recognize! What is there to recognize? (39).

Vladimir is savvy to the spot and its air, on the grounds that he acts for the pioneer around the two of them, always demanding that they fulfil their aim to conclusively meet Godot by staying in the same spot. He likewise "recalls past occasions" (The Theatre of the Absurd, 48), in spite of the fact that he regularly remains skeptical about his memory. His companion Estragon acts for the weaker around the two of them on the grounds that he has no memory whatsoever and in this manner he needs to rely on upon Vladimir. Estragon "has a tendency to overlook", past occasions "when they have happened" (The Theatre of the Absurd, 48), practically everything incorporating where he went through yesterday night with Vladimir. Accordingly, despite the fact that it appears intelligent to say he overlooked the spot, he is disillusioned by Vladimir's address, "Do you not distinguish the spot?" (39). His response makes the hopeless circumstances of his existence and its existing condition clearer: (Suddenly angry). Distinguish! What is there to distinguish? All my lousy life I've crept about in the mud! What's more you converse with me about view! (Looking uncontrollably about him) Look at this muckheap! I've never mixed from it! (39).

In such a scenario view does not assist him. He is worried about his essential living condition, which is additionally the excuse for why that he holds up for Godot: to live agreeably. Subsequently, he gives careful consideration to landscape, when he has nothing to consume, no spot to slumber, and no suitable shoes for feet, it is pointless to converse with him about view.

The space in the play can additionally be seen as endlessness. As per Anthony Chadwick's religious outlook "Both past and future are illusions, and seen under this perspective, we start to taste the thought of interminability". The separation between the planet the tramps are trapped in and the separation from the tramps to Godot or the spot where they can delight in agreeable lives could be forever. They are positively not blissful about the current state of their lives; still, they are not fit for modifying their present circumstances for better ones in place of squandering time for Godot. They trust that maybe he will carry the euphoria and thriving into their lives, as Angela Hotaling demands "Godot will carry reason and intending to Estragon's and Vladimir's existence" (12). It appears as though they are sick of attempting on the earth as Estragon whines "I've tried everything" (44), and that they have surrendered on defending life; thus, the play recommends, that they are holding up to end their hardship on the earth and begin it in a great place to succeed in their lives with the direction of Godot; a spot to fulfill everything they flopped on the earth and find an additional space where everything exists. This thought is furnished when Vladimir inquires as to whether he has ever perused the Bible and his past memory returns:

I recall the maps of the blessed land. Coloured they were. Extremely pretty. The Dead Sea was pale blue. The exact look of it made me thirsty. That is where we'll go, I used to say, that is where we'll try for our vacation. We'll swim. We'll be upbeat (8).

The space in the play could be deciphered in various ways. It could be damnation; an impression of the sad scenario the tramps are in. It could be limbo; sitting tight for Godot or it could be paradise; where they hope to live completely and cheerfully ever after the gathering with Godot. Whatever the space happens to be, if it is either unmistakable or intangible, appears ridiculous in both angles. We are to expect that the obvious space is not the one we are accustomed to seeing in expected plays or in all actuality; the space in the play rather gives the impression of emptiness and vacancy. (Kelsch 38).

2.4 Conclusion:

“On the grounds that the play is so stripped down, so natural, it welcomes different varieties of social and political and religious elucidation" composed Normand Berlin in a tribute to the play in Autumn 1999, "with Beckett himself put in distinctive schools of thought and diverse developments The endeavors to bind him have not been auspicious, however the longing to do so is common when we experience a scholar whose moderate craftsmanship arrives at for bedrock actuality”. “Less" compels us to search for "additional," and the necessity to discuss Godot and about Beckett has brought about an enduring overflowing of books and articles.

Broadly talking, existentialists hold that there are sure essential inquiries that each person must deal with in the event that they are to consider their subjective beings important and with natural worth. Inquiries, for example expiration, the significance of human being and the spot of (or absence of) God in that being are around them. All around, the speculations of existentialism declare that cognizant actuality is extremely perplexing and without a "destination" or generally known esteem: the single must make esteem by avowing it and living it, not by essentially discussing it or philosophizing it in the brain. The play may be seen to touch on the sum of these issues.

Much of Beckett's work incorporating Godot is regularly acknowledged by philosophical and abstract researchers to be part of the development of the Theatre of the Absurd, a manifestation of theatre which stemmed from the Absurdist rationality of Albert Camus. Absurdism itself is a limb of the accepted declarations of existentialism, pioneered by Søren Kierkegaard, and sets that, while intrinsic significance may great exist in the universe, homo sapiens are unequipped for finding it because of some manifestation of mental or

philosophical restriction. Consequently mankind is bound to be confronted with the Absurd, or unquestionably the preposterousness of being in absence of natural reason.

Chapter three: existentialism within characters and themes in Camus's "the stranger"

3.1 Introduction:

The legacy of written works in the French dialect is rich, differed, and noteworthy in time and space, and engaging both to its instantaneous open, bookworms of French, and additionally to a worldwide gathering of people arrived at through interpretations and film accommodations. The primary extraordinary works of this repertory were composed in the 11th century in northern France, and now, at the starting of the 21st century, French written works incorporate writers composing in numerous parts of the planet, going from the Caribbean to Western Africa, whose lives up to expectations are accessible in bookshops and libraries in France and in other French-talking nations. For numerous hundreds of years, French was likewise a dialect of refined and scholarly elites all through Europe. (Lyons 14).

Both "French" and "writing" are tricky terms. What are the limits of 'french'? Truly, the adequate mastery of the "French" dialect around the populace living inside the limits of today's "France" was acknowledged just at the close of the 19th century, when general educating carried the dialect of Paris and the elites to the speakers of such tongues as Breton (Brezhoneg) spoken on the Brittany landmass, Basque (Euskara) on the southwest coast, mixtures of Occitanian (Lengad'òc, for example Gascon and Provençal in the south, and Alsatian (Elsässerditsch) in the northeast. In addition, there are numerous critical writers who have composed and now compose in French who don't live inside the outskirts of the European region regarded as 'france', however much of the time they are natives of France (the occupants of Martinique, Guadeloupe, New Caledonia, et cetera) or of previous states of France, for example Quebec and Senegal. A few writers whose first dialect is not French

have decided to compose a noteworthy parcel of their work in French, case in point Samuel Beckett. Different writers, conceived in France and French nationals, have picked not to compose in 'french': Frédéric Mistral, for example Beckett a victor of the Nobel Prize in Literature, composed in Provençal. Concerning 'literature', the present utilization of the term dates from the 19th century, when what had long been called "verse" or beauties letters was amalgamated with different works, for example diaries and expositions as the groundwork for abstract ponders in colleges. It is a touch flippant, however of service, to consider literary works what we read when we don't need to – what we read without instantaneous, fortuitous reason. (Lyons 15).

Albert Camus regularly said that all his work hailed from a couple of extreme pictures that were profoundly installed in his creative energy in right on time adolescence. Rather than pictures of expiration, the warmth of the sun, the joys of swimming, and the cool Mediterranean nights stood for positive explanations behind being. The more you ponder his existence, the more you can perceive how these reactions to physical sensations straight impacted his representation of Meursault in this book. (Warsh 6).

The production of *The Stranger* in 1942 put Camus in touch with a large portion of the advancing French scholars of the day, around them Andre Malraux, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Simone de Beauvoir. After the war, he accepted work as a spectator of compositions for the Gallimard distributed association and started take on a second novel, *The Plague* (1947), dependent upon his encounter in the battle against Fascism. Throughout World War II he joined a hostile to Nazi Resistance conglomeration in France and came to be editorial manager of *Combat*, the development's daily paper.

Camus' familiarity with expiration gave his existence and work individual importance. It additionally gave, and presses on to give, his followers an essential and disputable legacy. His books conquer any hindrance between theory and expositive expression and press on to

address our worries about existence's significance in the cutting edge, edginess ridden planet. (Warsh 12).

The Stranger was considered significantly engaging when it was initially distributed, and for numerous years after, youthful bookworms specifically saw it as tending to their situation. While The Stranger was distributed when World War II was in advancement, Camus really had been dealing with the title and its key thoughts much prior. At the time he first consumed the idea of the function, the planet as of recently had experienced too much World War I. While all had not been so perfect before World War I, the closure of the clash left individuals feeling that the planet was horrific and boundless and that innovation could be a power not simply of headway however of pulverization. For Camus the war had an individual toll, asserting his father and decreasing his family's circumstances thus.

In The Stranger, Camus makes a fiction that communicates his crux thought the silly. This thought appeared to talk straight to the verifiable period in which the book was at first distributed. In the meantime, the novel stood not simply as a reaction to the detestations of sweeping wars however as a dream of the timeless battle of people making their route through life. All the more explicitly, the absurdist thought is that individuals live in an universe that has no significance, notwithstanding a powerful human seek for intending to exist. In Camus' view, people should come to distinguish that this is the scenario; with this distinguishment, individuals can then move to another state, joyful, notwithstanding the inauspicious substances of the scenario. (Bloom 13).

3.2 characters:

3.2.1 Meursault:

Meursault, the protagonist of L'Etranger, is a sort of Adam, a man substance simply to live and who poses no questions. At the same time like Melville's Billy Budd, Meursault kills

a man. He is then judged to be liable, however why? The prosecutor, attorney, and cleric response the inquiry in accepted semi-social, semi-religious, Occidental terms, however these authorities act for dynamic elements and their responses mean nothing to Meursault nor to a silly man like Meursault's companion, Céleste; obviously their clarifications don't have any significant bearing to the case as Camus concocted it.

Anyhow as the tale improves it appears clear that Meursault's blunder falsehoods accurately in his antagonism. He acts in a human scenario just as human relationships, and in this way obligations, don't exist, and before he knows it he is included in Raymond's primary however rough show. That Meursault executed the Arab is a reality. That his demonstration was not planned and that there was incitement is additionally a certainty. However at the trial what both indictment and protection put forth to the jury are all the irrelevant occasions in Meursault's existence between his mother's passing and the homicide; these occasions are displayed in a sensibly formed entire as the support of an elucidation of Meursault's identity. As Meursault sits in puzzled astonish through this reproduction of his wrongdoing, he starts to feel that he is being sentenced to passing since he was considered blameworthy of not shouting at his mother's memorial service. What's more it might be said he is correct. Truth be told he is denounced, consistent with Camus himself, "in light of the fact that he doesn't play the amusement." He is a more bizarre to social order, on the grounds that he declines to make any concession whatsoever to its codes and customs. He sees no connection whatsoever between his mother's passing and the way that he heads off to see a comic film two days after the fact, and he secures none. Furthermore, seeing through his eyes, we are just about in complete concurrence with him. He is, as Camus himself has said, the man who declines to lie. (Bloom 46).

Meursault's demeanor at the outset just uncovers how subjective and shallow are the codes with which we blanket up the stark vastness of life; for instance, we can feel it is

sufficient, in the vicinity of expiration, assuming that we essentially forgo smoking a smoke. With a certain furious cleverness Camus utilizes his champion to shake us out of our contentness and to derision our priggishness. However when Meursault goes even further, declining to cleverness the prosecutor's Christian sentiment since he sees no connection between his own particular enactment and the cross, declining to take the "leads" of his legal counselor, which play on a stock set of traditional zealous qualities, he turns into a sort of social saint, a man who "bites the dust instead of falsehood" in reply to an inquiry. It is not, in any case, the parody of a social order and the unsuccessful labor of equity that give the tale its key importance. With the shooting of the Arab, Meursault lets us know, "everything started," and all the more in particular as of now, "everything started" in the jail after Marie's specific visit, "everything," that is Meursault's sinner change.

Here and there over the span of the tale we get a sight of a prior Meursault, for instance the scholar who had once been to Paris: probably he had not dependably existed in the aloof, independent state in which we find him. In this admiration his forerunner, Patrice (*La Mort heureuse*), gives us a magnificent hint to Meursault's experience which, for example his own particular, is basically profound in nature. At one stage in his profound vocation Patrice had tried to come to be comparable to an item, to live timelessly and to be unified with the planet. Meursault appears to have realized this state at the starting of *L'etranger*.

"Meursault, for me," composes Camus, is "an unfortunate and bare man, enamored with the sun which leaves no shadows. He is far from being completely denied of affectability for he is vivified by an enthusiasm, significant on the grounds that it is inferred, the enthusiasm for indisputably the and for truth. It is still a negative truth, reality of being and feeling, yet a truth without which no triumph of the self or the planet is conceivable." That is the reason, until the exact end, Meursault is the man who answers yet never poses a question, and all his responses alert a social order which can't stand to take a gander at reality. (Bloom 48).

Anyway the pistol shot jars Meursault out of his immaculately negative state. Around then he is cognizant that he has carried out an unsalvageable enactment: "I comprehended that I had annihilated the balance of the day, the abnormal hush of a sunny shore where I had been joyful." As on account of Dimitri Karamazov, the genuine wrongdoing is not the one for which Meursault is being tried, however an additional which he will grasp completely at the finish when he agrees to another level of cognizance, vanquishing the planet and himself as he handles the way of that bliss of which he had an ambiguous feeling on the beach.

Instantly after his detainment, Meursault like Patrice in Prague after the homicide of Zagreus plunges into another timeless planet, the perpetual, uniform jail day. There he reveals three endless yet totally shut subjective planets: the universe of memory; the universe of doze; and, as he sweeps again and again a daily paper thing (a homicide story), the universe of human individuality. In this manner he "kills time," living, figuratively speaking, a timeless being, yet a being which carries him just unresponsive bitterness. To him in his jail, his face is presently that of a more unusual, an outcast.

The last disclosure comes like a glimmer simply before Meursault's expiration. Despite Meursault, the jail minister has come to talk about pardoning, of an after-life in which all may be recovered. To many people's surprise since he shot the Arab Meursault is shocked out of his detachment and in a right to gain entrance of fury he roughly shakes the cleric. There is no after-life. There is stand out life, his existence as he knew it the swims and the beaches, the nights and Marie's light dresses and delicate form an exceptional, radiant life that needs no reclaiming, no laments, and no tears. Why yell at his mother's memorial service? Why mourn his own particular demise? After all he is no unique in relation to whatever possible person: all are sentenced to demise similarly as he may be, aside from that he knows both the radiance of life and the baseless nature of expiration. His wrongdoing and his disclosure are as one. He devastated and is obliterated. For this demolition there is no

description, reason, or payment. The anguished hours of self-torture in his jail cell are over; he no more extended ascertains interminably how he might escape. Rebellious and clear, he will head off to his passing blissful: "As if my extraordinary upheaval of resentment had cleansed me of malice, exhausted now of all trust, eye to eye with a night substantial with signs and stars, I surrendered myself to the delicate aloofness of the planet. Feeling it . . . so brotherly at final, I knew I had been blissful, and that I was still euphoric. With the intention that all may be consummated, with the goal that I may feel less separated from everyone else, all that was left for me to wish was that there ought to be numerous onlookers the day of my execution and that they might as well welcome me with cries of disdain."

Meursault here turns into a conciliatory schmuck; his closure is an apotheosis, what might as well be called Patrice's "euphoric expiration," a drop into the ocean and sun, a reintegration into the universe. The more interesting has in his jail cell, on the edge of expiration, discovered his kingdom: the vital, each minute life of a common homo sapien who by a mystifying announcement of destiny is predetermined to expiration. Meursault, as Camus imagined, should vanish with this disclosure.

It is clear that Meursault's beginning mental state of mind demonstrates deficient to adapt to even the most effortless of lives. The exact pith of l'absurde for his situation is that out of lack of interest he interfaced constrains with brutality and passing, not with fondness and life. Like Parsifal in the legend of the Fisher-King he neglects to pose any question and accordingly gravely fails. In *L'etranger* Camus in this manner recommends that despite the absurd, no man can bear the cost of latently simply to exist. To neglect to address the significance of the scene of life is to denounce both ourselves, as people, and the entire planet to nothingness. (Bloom 49).

3.2.2 Raymond Sintes:

Raymond goes about as an impetus to *The Stranger's* plot. After Raymond beats and ill-uses his paramour, he clashes with her sibling, an Arab. Raymond draws Meursault into clash with "the Arab," and possibly Meursault slaughters the Arab without hesitating. By drawing Meursault into the clash that in the long run brings about Meursault's capital punishment, Raymond, it might be said, reasons Meursault's destruction. This authority on Raymond's part is symbolized by the way that he gives Meursault the weapon that Meursault later uses to slaughter the Arab. Be that as it may, in light of the fact that the homicide and resulting trial realize Meursault's acknowledgement of the detachment of the universe, Raymond can additionally be seen as a stimulator of Meursault's "illumination."

Since Raymond's character qualities differentiate extraordinarily with Meursault's, he additionally capacities as a foil for Meursault. While Meursault is basically irreverent, Raymond is decidedly corrupt. Raymond's medication of his special lady is vicious and pitiless, and he almost murders the Arab himself before Meursault talks him out of it. Also, inasmuch as Meursault latently responds to the occasions around him, Raymond launches activity. He welcomes Meursault to supper and to the sunny shore, and he searches out the Arabs after his first battle with them.

A great bargain of equivocalness exists in Raymond's association with Meursault. From one viewpoint, Raymond utilizes Meursault. He effortlessly influences Meursault to help him in his plans to discipline his courtesan, and to testify for his sake at the police headquarters. Then again, Raymond appears to feel some unwaveringness to Meursault. He declares Meursault's honesty at the homicide trial, attributing the occasions hinting at the murdering to "risk." It is conceivable that Raymond starts his association with Meursault proposing just to utilize him, then afterward, such as Marie, comes to be attracted to Meursault's eccentricities. (*The Stranger* Albert Camus).

3.3 themes:

3.3.1 The absurd:

Jean-Paul Sartre said about Camus's Portrayal of the Absurd "The absurd, to be sure, resides neither in man nor in the world, if you consider each separately. But since man's dominant characteristic is "being-in-the-world", the absurd is, in the end, an inseparable part of the human condition. Thus, the absurd is not, to begin with, the object of a mere idea; it is revealed to us in a doleful illumination. "Getting up, tram, four hours of work, meal, sleep, and Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, in the same routine ...", and then, suddenly, "the setting collapses", and we find ourselves in a state of hopeless lucidity."

Assuming that we have the ability to deny the misdirecting help of religion or of existential methods of insight, we then own certain fundamental, evident actualities: the planet is disorder, a "celestial proportionality conceived of turmoil"; tomorrow does not exist, since we all kick the bucket. "In an universe abruptly denied of light and illusions, man feels himself an outcast. This outcast is unavoidable, since he has no remembrances of a lost country and no trust of a guaranteed area." The excuse for why is that man is not the planet. "In the event that I were a tree around different trees ..." this life might have an importance, or rather this issue might have none, for I might be part of this planet. I might be this planet against which I set myself with my whole personality... It is unbelievable excuse for why which sets me against all creation." This demonstrates, partially, the title of our novel; the outcast is man going up against the planet. M. Camus may too have picked the title of one of George Gissing's meets expectations, Born in Exile. The pariah is likewise man around men. "There are days when ... you discover that the individual you've adored has turned into a more unusual." The more abnormal is, at long last, myself in connection to myself, that is,

regular man in connection to brain: "The more bizarre who, at certain minutes, goes up against us in a mirror."

Anyway that is not all; there is an ardor of the foolish. The ludicrous man won't bind suicide; he needs to live, without surrendering any of his conviction, without a fate, without trust, without dream and without renunciation either. He gazes at passing with fervent consideration and this interest frees him. He encounters the "heavenly flightiness" of the denounced man. (Bloom 52).

Since God does not exist and man burns out, everything is reasonable. One encounter is tantamount to an alternate one; the essential thing is basically to procure whatever number as would be prudent. "The perfect of the preposterous man is the present and the succession of present minutes after an ever-cognizant spirit."⁶ Confronted with this "quantitative ethic" all qualities cave in; hurled into this planet, the crazy man, insubordinate and reckless, has "nothing to support". He is blameless, pure as Somerset Maugham's savages soon after the entry of the minister who shows them Good and Evil, what is legitimate and what is prohibited. For this man, everything is legitimate. He is as blameless as Prince Mishkin, who "exists in an everlasting present, delicately tinged with grins and detachment." Innocent in each feeling of the statement, he too is, whether you like, an "Idiot".

Also now we completely grasp the title of Camus' novel. The untouchable he needs to depict is unequivocally one of the aforementioned horrible innocents who stun social order by not tolerating the principles of its diversion. He exists around untouchables, however to them, too, he is an outcast. That is the reason some individuals such as him—for instance, his special lady, Marie, who is partial to him "since he's odd". Others, for example the court swarm whose disdain he all of a sudden feels mounting towards him, loathe him for the same explanation for why. Also we ourselves, who, on opening the book are not yet acquainted

with the feeling of the foolish, vainly attempt to judge him as per our typical benchmarks. For us, too, he is an outcast.

Accordingly, the stun you felt when you opened the book and read, "I believed that here was a different Sunday over with, that Mama was covered now, that I might about-face to function again and that, in general, nothing had altered," was purposeful. It was the aftereffect of your first experience with the preposterous. Be that as it may you most likely trusted that as you advanced your uneasiness might blur that everything might be gradually cleared up, might be given a sensible legitimization and clarified. Your trusts were baffled. The Outsider is not a logical book. The ludicrous man does not clarify; he depicts. Nor is it a book which demonstrates anything...

There is not a solitary unnecessary portion, not one that is not come back to later on and utilized within the contention. What's more when we close the book, we understand that it would be unable to have had whatever available resolution. In this planet that has been stripped of its causality and put forth as preposterous, the most diminutive occurrence has weight. There is no single one which does not serve to lead the courageous person to wrongdoing and the death penalty. The Outsider is an established function, a precise function, created about the silly and against the ludicrous. Is this truly what the creator was pointing at? I don't have even an inkling. I am basically showing the onlooker's conclusion. How are we to group this clear, dry function, so precisely created underneath its appearing jumble, so "human", so open, excessively, once you have the nexus? It can't be known as a story, for a story clarifies and co-ordinates as it portrays. It substitutes the request of causality for sequential grouping. M. Camus calls it a "novel". The novel, then again, requires constant length of time, advancement and the show vicinity of the irreversibility of time. I might delay to a degree to utilize the expression "novel" for this succession of dormant introduce minutes which permits us to see, from underneath, the mechanical economy of something deliberately

arranged. Then again, assuming that it is a novel, it is so as in *Zadig* and *Candide* are books. It may be viewed as a moralist's short novel, unified with a circumspect touch of parody and an arrangement of humorous portraits,⁷ a novel that, for all the impact of the German existentialists and the American authors, stays, at base, exceptionally near the tales of Voltaire. (Bloom 44-54).

3.3.2 The Irrationality of the Universe:

In spite of the fact that *The Stranger* is a work of fiction, it holds an in number reverberation of Camus' philosophical idea of foolishness. In his papers, Camus declares that unique lives and human being as a rule have no judicious importance or request. Nonetheless, since individuals have trouble tolerating this thought, they always endeavor to recognize or make sound structure and importance in their lives. The expression "preposterousness" depicts mankind's worthless endeavor to find balanced request where none exists.

Despite the fact that Camus does not unequivocally imply the thought of ludicrousness in *The Stranger*, the tenets of preposterousness work inside the novel. Not, one or the other the outer planet in which Meursault lives nor the inner universe of his contemplations and demeanor has any sound request. Meursault has no discernable explanation behind his movements, for example his choice to wed Marie and his choice to slaughter the Arab.

Social order in any case endeavors to manufacture or infringe judicious clarifications for Meursault's unreasonable activities. The thought that things here and there happen for no excuse for why, and that occasions off and on again have no importance is disruptive and undermining to social order. The trial grouping in Part Two of the novel speaks for social order's endeavor to produce objective request. The prosecutor and Meursault's attorney both offer demonstrations for Meursault's wrongdoing that are dependent upon consistency, explanation for why, and the thought of circumstances and end results. Yet these descriptions

have no support actually and serve just as endeavors to defuse the startling thought that the universe is nonsensical. The whole trial is thusly an illustration of craziness an occurrence of mankind's vain endeavor to infringe levelheadedness on a silly universe. (Weiss 793).

3.4. Conclusion

Acknowledged as a novel that fixes all available attention on the silly and incorporates three passages, *The Stranger's* subjects and characters the characters in *The Stranger* hold substantially fluctuating disposition to rot and demise. Salamano adores his rotting, scab-secured pooch and he qualities its camaraderie, in spite of the fact that generally individuals find it nauseating. Meursault does not demonstrate much feeling according to his mother's demise, yet the social order in which he exists accepts that he ought to be troubled with despondency. Also, inasmuch as Meursault is substance to accept that physical expiration acts for the complete and last end of life, the pastor expects quick to remember the thought of a the hereafter.

A crucial part of Meursault's character improvement in the novel is his dealing with his own particular mentality about demise. At the closure of the novel, he has at long last gripped the thought that demise is the one inescapable truth of human life, and has the capacity to acknowledge the actuality of his looming execution without despondency.

The Stranger speaks for a crux work of French existential writing. Failing to offer any perceivable purpose behind his movements, Meursault guarantees that nothing in life matters since we will all unavoidably kick the bucket. Segregated and indifferent, Meursault "stands for the quintessential existential champion" (Galens 54). Similarly, he accepts that "an individual's character does not exist in anything with the exception of that individual's activities." As such, Meursault "is outside of the limits of social request and at last estranged even from those closest to him" (Galens 57). In positively gripping the thought that human

being holds no more excellent significance, Meursault not just deserts all trust for time, and yet acknowledges the common purposelessness of the planet.

General conclusion

In the wake of testing and showing the existentialist thought incorporated in the characters and topics of Beckett's "sitting tight for Godot" and Camus' "the more abnormal", we are set to show and demonstrate how did every one of these existential authors suggests and utilizes diversely the expansive school of thought to pass on the same plans in distinctive courses by distinctive means and parts of the same theory.

Beginning with "sitting tight for Godot", Vladimir and Estragon appear on stage without any priori avocation. While they endeavor to resolve their reason, they are relinquished in nothingness and unimportant furnished just with their potential for symbolic movement. They know they are sitting tight for somebody named Godot, however they don't know why this is the situation or when, if ever, Godot will come. They consider, notwithstanding, that would it be advisable for them to find Godot, their reason will be concluded, that is, all will be well. Beckett, obviously, does not allow them to find Godot or permit Godot to find them yet this need of reason or defense from Vladimir and Estragon speaks for the Sartrean lacking honesty or the drive towards perfect recognizable proof. Godot, for them, stands for an intentional reason by which, in their psyches, they can escape the immaculate possibility of their scenarios. They symbolically connect with each other and Pozzo, who irregularly shows up on stage, in light of the fact that they need to, not in light of the fact that they need to, eventually, they might want to escape from being so as to be with Godot. Vladimir and Estragon are not allowed to departure themselves or their symbolic movement. Vladimir cries out, at one focus, "Let us not squander our chance out of gear talk!" (51). It deceives Beckett's endeavor to point out our condition, which is dependably arranged

in the specific, not the conceptual, and legislated by the anguish and estrangement. It is the reason Vladimir proceeds in the accompanying way:

Anyhow at this spot, at this minute of time, all humankind is us, if we like it or not. Gave us a chance to benefit as much as possible from it, before it is past the point of no return! Gave us a chance to act for commendably for once the foul brood to which a pitiless destiny cosigned us! [...] The tiger limits to the assistance of his congeners without the slightest reflexion, or else he lurks away into the profundities of the thickets. Anyhow that is not the inquiry. What are we doing here, that is the inquiry. Yes, in this massive perplexity one thing distant from everyone else is clear. We are holding up for Godot to come." (51-52)

Vladimir distinguishes the key possibility and pervasiveness of preposterousness and aimless yet at last rejects it. He wishes to be like a creature of the wild, or capacity through the lands of sheer movement. Provided that just, for Vladimir and Estragon, they could respond like creatures and not need to think or correspond with others. Vladimir neglects to understand that there is no such thing as unmoving talk. All dialect is deliberate in and of itself to a specific end through its intersubjective, explanatory texture. The demonstration of conveyance requires a planet pregnant with importance, yet Vladimir and Estragon, regardless of their verbal flurry with each other, can't distinguish this. They have "lacking honesty" in light of the fact that they need to discredit their own particular capacity to banter with others.

As the play unfolds, it comes to be clear Vladimir and Estragon need out of this nothingness and aimless, silly scenario, yet Beckett denies them this conceivability. It is the reason, in the last pages of Beckett's play, the two prevailing characters think about suicide. They can't maintain the significance in life without some more terrific reason coming into centering. "I can't go ahead similar to this," says Estragon in the conclusion to the play, showing his irritation with being an image utilizing creature (61). "We'll hang ourselves to-

morrow," Vladimir reacts, including the admonition, "Unless Godot comes." "And provided that he comes?" asks Estragon, to which Vladimir replies: "We'll be safeguarded." a few lines later, the play finishes with Vladimir inquiring as to whether they might as well go; Estragon concurs, "Yes, how about we go," yet Beckett's last word after the window ornament is the stage bearing, "They don't move." The stage, is unpreventable. The characters are suspended in open flux on stage as the drapery attracts to a nearby. They can't escape the dramatic phase of being.

Camus then again utilized ridiculousness and the void, purposeless life which made the model lives in a persistent state of anguish, lacking honesty and absence of investment in anything, parts of the existential thought which might accelerate numerous different parts display obviously by Camus through the movements of Meursault.

Meursault is described as isolates and emotionless, two of the parts of existentialism. In Meursault, Camus makes a character he proposes his followers to identify with, since he makes characters set in sensible scenarios. He needs the spectator to shape a modifying, questionable estimation of Meursault. From what Meursault depicts to the onlooker in the novel, the onlooker can grasp why he endeavors to find request and comprehension in a confounded and confusing planet.

Meursault is removed from situated plans, aspirations, wants, love, and feelings by and large. He has a demanding time with feelings, for example lament and empathy. The spectator sees the way of his disposition in the beginning couple of lines of the novel: "Maman passed on today. Additionally yesterday possibly, I don't have a clue." When he becomes aware of the demise of his mother through a telegram, he is unattached, and could be acknowledged merciless. His mother's passing serves to intrude on the stream of Meursault's existence, a life committed to acknowledging unmistakable things. He wished she had not kicked the bucket,

yet her expiration made no genuine effect on his existence other than for a short time irritating his everyday lifestyle. The distress on the transport and the oppressively sultry entombment were brought on by her demise. He reviews this uneasiness as he shoots the Arab. Yet Meursault does not compel himself to fake feelings, which is presumably why he harbors so small hatred. His obvious absence of feeling is the thing that terrains him not in a favorable position in the court, for individuals think his inclination to be that of a coldblooded killer. He does have some generally great qualities, for example his trustworthiness. Meursault additionally has the capacity to consistently assess a scenario without getting hysterical. Everything he does and says is in such an unconcerned way, to the point that one ponders what it takes to make him tense.

It is the movements of Meursault, the primary character, that make the novel and describe existentialism. With his complete apathy to the planet, Meursault turns into the case of an existentialist. He sees the planet as an inane series of occasions that give no reason to being. Meursault has an energy for reality. He is an untouchable consequently, and is segregated from others on the grounds that they can't confront the truths of the planet as he observes them. Meursault has a lack of concern to different people and their affections, and emerges in sharp complexity to whatever is left of the planet. The novel did acquaint the plans of existentialism with me. Upon finalizing the book, the onlooker is left to contemplate the importance of life as exhibited by existentialism. Meursault is indifferent to the point that he doesn't distinguish his feelings until he is going to burn out. Existentialism in the novel truly indicates through Meursault's character. It is not so much evident concerning whether he accepts there is an intending to life until the close when he comprehends it. It is in all probability that his lack of concern permits him to think less about if life has importance. It was odd that Meursault comes to be so distracted or perhaps captivated by his own particular demise. He in any event contemplates it, which indicates that he forethoughts. Maybe it is a

path for him to make up for himself. He is an existentialist model through his comprehension of the significance of life. It is an intricate hypothesis in a short, straightforward novel.

By the nearby of the novel, Meursault has modified. He doesn't think as much about the physical planet. His most amazing change comes in the type of profound considering. He starts this while in jail, where he has nothing else to do. This is likely not quite the same as his previous stance. He likewise identifies that there is something to live for: life itself.

Unexpectedly, he finds significance in his existence just when he is sentenced to cease to exist.

Both lives up to expectations are artful culminations of up to date existentialist and ridiculous literary works, the two creators suggested the school of supposed they had faith in (however they both declined the name of existentialists) through the movements of their characters, centering primarily on the French existentialism of "Jean Paul Sartre" and its nonbelieving thoughts and angles.

In "Waiting for Godot" we perceive how the two tramps experience being disconnected in No place, with nothing to do however trade vain discussion and holding up for somebody they never met, and are not even beyond any doubt assuming that he's nearing or not. This shows how Beckett utilized nothingness, unimportance and space to convey his existential considered. Despite the fact that the play was laid open to an incredible bargain of distinctive elucidations, not a single person can deny the way that it is an existential play in regardless.

Camus used other aspects of the same philosophy to deliver his thought. The hero in "The Strange" is uncaring and he doesn't give any attention for moral values such as love, compassion, regret or anything else, all he cares about is the material world. Meursault lives a stressful life, purposeless and vain, even his life became unimportant to him, he can't see why

life is worthy and he tries to find the answers for the existential questions: why we are here? What's the purpose of life? But without finding any convincing answer.

Here we can see how did Camus employed the meaningless of life, a feeling that Meursault had throughout the novel, which resulted in him taking life as absurd, worthless and void of any pleasure. Also, when Meursault finally finds the answers to his existential questions, that the purpose of life is just to live it and enjoy it, he is condemned to die, irony of life that can enhance the idea of the absurd life.

At the end we can say that both works, despite their different genres, and use of the existential themes and implications, came to enrich the world of literature with two of the most recognized and well appreciated works of the modern literature, written by two gigantic figures of the existential literature that will live forever.

Works Cited

- "*Authentically Absurd: The Stranger vs Waiting for Godot.*" *Mega-essays*. N.p., n.d. Web. 08 June 2013. <<http://www.megaessays.com/viewpaper/97092.html>>.
- Beckett, Samuel. *Waiting for Godot*. London: Faber and Faber, 2010 (1956). 10. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *Albert Camus's The Stranger Bloom's Guides Comprehensive Research and Study Guides*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2008. Pdf.
- Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: The Stranger*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2001. Pdf.
- Bradshaw, David, and Kevin J.h Dettmar. *A Companion to Modernist Literature and Culture*. Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. Pdf.
- Cline, Austin. "*Literary Existentialism: Existentialist Thought in Literature and Art.*" About.com. N.p., n.d. Web. 2013.
- Duignan, Duignan. *Modern Philosophy: From 1500 Ce to the Present (The History of Philosophy)*. New York: Britannica Educational Publishing, 2011. Pdf.
- Esslin, Martin. *The theatre of the absurd*. London: Methuen Publishing Limited, 1961. Pdf
- "Existentialism." *Existentialism*. N.p., n.d. Web. 08 June 2013.
- Graver, Lawrence. *Beckett: Waiting for Godot (Landmarks of World Literature)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pdf.
- "*Is Samuel Beckett's Work "Waiting for Godot" Existential?*" Existentialabsurdist.blogspot. N.p., 30 Jan. 2010. Web. 2013. <<http://enexisttialabsurdist.blogspot.com/2010/01/is-samuel-becketts-work-waiting-for.html>>

Kelsch, L. Amanda. *Reading Waiting for Godot through the Lens of Christian Existentialism*. Eastern Michigan University, 2007. Pdf

K.M, Newton. *Modern Literature and the Tragic*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 2008. Pdf.

Lyons, John .D. *French Literature A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc, 2010. Pdf.

Morrison, Matthew. "Existentialism of Samuel Beckett." Studymode.com. N.p., 05 Dec. 2008. Web. 2013.

Panza, Christopher, and Gregory Gale. *Existentialism for Dummies*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Wiley Publishing, Inc., 2008. Pdf.

Priest, Stephen. *Jean-Paul Sartre: Basic Writings*. London: Routledge, 2001. Pdf.

Rahn, Josh. "Existentialism." Literature Network. N.p., 2011. Web. 2013. <<http://www.online-literature.com/periods/existentialism.php>>.

"The Meaninglessness of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*." 123helpme.com. N.p., 25 Mar. 2013. Web. 2013. <<http://www.123helpme.com/view.asp?id=2713>>.

"The Stranger – Albert Camus." Martita's Place – Literature in English and Spanish. N.p., 2006. Web. 2013. <<http://mhgaray.wordpress.com/2006/01/23/the-stranger-albert-camus/>>.

Warsh, Lewis .D. *Albert Camus's The Stranger*. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1993. Pdf.

Weiss, Daniel. *Spark Notes 101: Literature. 150 Novels and Plays. one Book*. New York: SparkPublishing, 2004. Pdf.