



ISSN: 2074-9554 (Print)

Journal of Al-Frahedis Arts

available online at: <http://www.jaa.tu.edu.iq>

JOFA
Journal
of Al-Frahedis Arts

The Identity Crisis in Beckett's Endgame and Not I

Asst.Lecturer. Salah Ibrahim Hamadi

Tikrit University / College Political Science

E-mail: salah69@tu.edu.iq

Article info.

Article history:

- Received
- Accepted

Keywords:

- Drama
- Absurd theatre
- Beckett
- identity crisis
- Endgame
- Not I

Abstract: The identity crisis is a pivotal theme in the Absurd theatre. It is so much connected with the whole idea of the Absurd theatre which is intended to depict the dilemma of the modern man especially after the Second World War. The best voice and pioneer of this theatre and its philosophy is Samuel Beckett. He manipulates all elements of this theatre and uses them to serve his purpose of exploring the theme of the identity crisis in his plays Endgame and Not I.

In these plays, he presents to us unwell-observed characters through a disintegrated dialogue, which most of the time seems meaningless outwardly. He depends on depicting images rather than actions or events to unveil his theme. He does not present the plot in a conventional sense of the word nor the structure, the setting, the character and their conflict.

These plays take the form of something like a dream or nightmare flowing through symbolically maimed characters uttering outwardly nonsensical language. However, his genius shows itself when he gradually and philosophically reveals his main theme of the loss of identity throughout and at the end of each play. He makes the experience of going through these plays very enriching and enjoyable.

Introduction:

The artistic movement of the theatre of the Absurd meets with and departs from the traditional theatre, with its old conventions, in many ways. For instance, they meet in the "pure theatre" as in the mimes, in the clowning and the mad scenes, in the verbal nonsense and in taking the form of dreams and nightmares. [1] Yet, it departs from the traditional theatre in that it presents unmotivated and unwell-observed characters, a dialogue that seems to be meaningless and a circular form. [2] In addition to that, the theatre of the Absurd presents plays that have no plot in the conventional sense nor do they have the conventional structure. These plays have also a different kind of themes to reveal. Furthermore, they depend on poetic images rather than events and actions in revealing these themes. However, if there is anything new in this theatre, "it is the unusual way in which various familiar attitudes of mind and literary idioms are interwoven" in it. [3]

Samuel Beckett, as a masterful figure in this theatre, manipulates these elements with a preoccupation with the theme of the identity crisis in the recent years of his artistic carrier. He "is celebrated as the truest voice of a ravaged post-war world. The skeletal creatures and pared-down sets of his plays ... are regarded as the proper artistic expression of a world bereft of transcendent hope ... or even the solace of a stable selfhood." [4] In his plays *Endgame* and *Not I*, he uses every possible way to make this theme absolutely clear. He makes every aspect of his plays – the setting, characters, plot, conflict, structure, language and even the stage directions – reflect it.

Chapter One: Setting, Plot and Language

Beginning with the setting, he shocks the audience with almost the same image in both of these plays. In *Endgame*, we are confronted with "bare interior", "Grey light" and "left and right back, high up, two small windows, curtains down." [5] In *Not I*, he starts as gloomily and shockingly "stage in darkness but for Mouth,... faintly lit from close-up and below, rest of face in shadow." "Auditor... tall standing figure, sex undeterminable, enveloped from head to foot in loose black djellaba, with hood." [6] the visual effect of the light focused only on Mouth and Auditor makes one feel that they "seem to hang in space, and it may increase the likely hallucinatory effects for a viewer concentrating on a small point of light." [7] The case is even more confusing if one tries to fully comprehend the symbolic meanings of the setting not because they are too difficult to guess but simply because this is the effect they are originally and deliberately intended to give. Trying to associate clear referential meanings with the symbols would be at the expense of the aesthetic value of the Beckett's plays like *Endgame*. We should not focus solely on symbols but we cannot avoid them at the same time. This communicative dilemma is the reason why the aesthetic response is not connected to the referential meanings but in the strategies leading to the aesthetic experience of the play. Gabriele Schwab states this idea so elegantly and says:

This displacement becomes most evident when one tries to hold on to one's notions of "identity." An audience whose expectations are still geared to characters having a circumscribed identity will be bitterly disappointed. The main characters, Hamm and Clov, don't seem to commit themselves to any psychic continuity as a basis for identity. To be sure, they display forms of behavior and speech which resemble certain manifestations of an inner life. However, as soon as one attempts to assemble these manifestations into some coherent notion of personality, the characters shift to a different level of self-presentation. [8]

The stage directions also have their share in confusing the audience. The quite unnatural big number of the stage directions of "Pause" intermingled

with Hamm's and Clov's dialogue in *Endgame* and the continuously repeated "brief laugh" and "good laugh" by Mouth in *Not I* are incomprehensible at first sight. This, of course, arises from their symbolic meanings. The recurrent "Pause" constantly breaks the flow of the speeches of the characters and thus disconnects the audience's ideas and adds to the sense of having nothing inside and the sense of uncertainty which in turn leads to the characters' not having definite identities. While the "brief laugh" and "good laugh" in *Not I* signify the distracted and unstable state of mind of the characters, such stage directions cannot be found in the traditional theatre as in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* for instance. Hamlet's seeming madness or unstable state of mind is indicated through the dialogue. Through such a dialogue, almost everything is depicted like the setting of the action and the characters' entering and leaving in the middle or end of each scene.

The plot in its conventional sense is not to be found in Beckett's plays. He merely presents a situation of the human condition in them. This situation is shown from different aspects through a certain image or images. Therefore, his plays are static in this sense for they do not depend on actual action like Shakespeare's but rather they depict the working of the mind with all its ideas, feelings and psychological depth. Beckett "states bluntly that the task of art is to contemplate and not to solve problems." [9] Contemplation of the situation of the characters in the play and contemplation, through them, of the whole human situation or condition. Actually nothing happens in *Endgame* and "the only event of some note is Nell's death about two thirds" of the play. [10] The original situation is that of waiting, waiting for the inevitable end to come. In *Not I*, the situation is that of non-stop babbling of Mouth with this character's continuous negation of any organic identification of herself. There is no hope of any kind of plot in these plays. Even when one hopes of some action on the part of Clov in *Endgame*, when he finally decides to leave Hamm, one is disappointed to see him at the end of the play standing with his hat and coat on and umbrella in hand just staring at Hamm without leaving. Hamm indicates that "this is not much fun. (Pause.) But that's always the way at the end of the day." [11] In a few lines later, he asks Clov about what is happening only to receive the answer that "something is taking its course." While in fact nothing is taking its course. And as Colin Duckworth, who directed some of Beckett's plays like *Waiting for Godot*, puts it "All we have is a brief reference to the small boy sitting outside in the corpsed world. Otherwise, Nothing ... none of the four characters seems remotely interested in what brought them to this dire situation." [12] Nothing also happens in the character's life in *Not I* "nothing of note till coming up to sixty when - ... what? ... seventy? ... good God! ... coming up to seventy." [13] It is evident that the character's life here is intended to

be either mere waiting or mere emptiness to symbolize the situation sketched by Beckett for the purpose of suiting his dramatic form and matching his theme of the futility of life. It is for this particular reason we find this sense of emptiness paralleled by the absence of plot in a play like *Hamlet* because the theme here of a young nobleman revenging his father's murder requires a coherent plot consisting of actions leading to the fulfillment of this purpose even if it meant the death of the hero.

In such a play, the conflict is generally external while in Beckett's plays the inner conflict is central. It builds up the whole dramatic situation of the play. It is presented in a kind of psychological and philosophical insight into the depths of the characters who are representations of great multitudes of human beings or sufferers. This technique is not chosen randomly by Beckett for he knows that the inner conflict with what it requires of tension, pulling the soul, self or the whole being or identity between two or more extremes must undoubtedly serve the presentation of his theme best. However, Beckett confronts a technical problem which is keeping the audience interested in a theme that revolves around the futility and pointlessness of life. In *Endgame*, "his dramatic technique had become more sophisticated and varied. His poet's ear for the exact nuance and weight of every word had been transformed into a dramatist's equivalent of absolute pitch: an uncanny sense of ellipses and elisions of talk, the gaps between words, those pauses and silences which work on stage to create tension." [14]

This is also why he tends to use a very contracted form in his plays. In contrast to the traditional plays of five and three acts, he uses the form or structure of the one act play. In the traditional plays, we have a plot to prepare for and expose, starting with the beginning, rising action, climax, falling action and conclusion or end. It is only natural then that it needs five or three acts to comprise. On the other hand, in Beckett's play – and the modern drama in general – we have a situation presented like a static painting that can be seen from a different prospective or different angle. And naturally, to intensify its meanings, Beckett resorts to reduction and contraction. This, in fact, is the reason behind the complexity of his dramas. During the very short time of the presentation of these plays, the audience is given a very short time to have a glimpse at the characters and to set off in search with these characters for their identity.

Since Beckett's characters lead a meaningless, purposeless, aimless and futile life in a world which is bereft of all certainties, their language must in conformity reflect this nothingness and meaninglessness by being vacant and meaningless itself. It is worth mentioning here that this sense of the futility of life and the uncertainty of the long-established beliefs (especially the religious ones) on the part of people is a result of the two World Wars with their catastrophic consequences. Language must convey nothing

because there is nothing to convey. Beckett's literary attitude towards this is clearly stated by him in a letter to his German friend, Axel Kaun, in 1937 in which he says: "Grammar and style. They appear to me to have become... obsolete... a mask." [15] In *Endgame*, Beckett explicitly states this attitude as he does in his letter. Clov asks Hamm: "What is there to keep me here?" Hamm answers straightforwardly: "The dialogue." [16] Thus, the main purpose of words is the mere dialogue, just to break the silence without anything to communicate. However, if *Endgame* transcends rational language and logical explanation, this does not mean it does not communicate with us and affect us in a powerful way. "The German philosopher and critic T. W. Adorno ... can praise it for putting 'drama in opposition to ontology' for dramatising an incoherent situation, untranslatable into the language of rationality and conceptuality." [17]

Beckett intentionally creates an absurd dialogue by making one character unnecessarily repeats what the other character has already said "Clov: Then I'll leave you." "Hamm: You can't leave us." And Clov again "Then I shan't leave you." A few lines later Clov says: "I couldn't finish you." Hamm repeats: "Then you shan't finish me." [18] This sense of the inability to communicate original ideas is not in isolation of the circumstances and complications that led to this horrifying disintegration of language. Martin Esslin comments:

In a purposeless world that has lost its ultimate objectives, dialogue, like all action, becomes a mere game to pass the time, as Hamm points out in *Endgame*: '... babble, babble, words, like the solitary child who turns himself into children, two, three, so as to be together and whisper together in the dark ... moment upon moment pattering down.' [19]

It is very interesting to notice how the characters are sometimes unable to find the right words to say. They become like someone who is suffering from amnesia. The loss of memory is somehow a loss of one's identity. Hamm asks Clov: "Have you not have enough?" Clov: "Yes! (Pause) Of what?" Then Hamm does not find the right words to answer: "Of this ... this ... thing." [20] Clearly, the characters here are not expressing themselves through a meaningful language because there is nothing real, true or dependable to express. Ironically, this meaningless language is the best means to exquisitely portray the nothingness of either the lives or identities of the characters. "The total situation of *Not I* is an unchanging but hallucinatory visual image, plus language. And no more than language." [21] The disproportioned and non-stopping flow of words from Mouth which is "pouring it out ... steady stream ... mad stuff ... half the vowels wrong ... no one could follow." is quite dominant throughout the whole play.

The decorated and grand language which is used in the traditional plays, like *Hamlet*, is not to be found in Beckett's plays. And "from being a noble instrument of genuine communication, language has become a kind of ballast filling empty spaces." [22] This explains Beckett's dramatic technique in his plays which depends on the extensive use of ellipses, elisions and pauses. The kind of language used here is deliberately meant to be meaningless and disintegrated in order to reflect the emptiness, frustration, loss and despair of the characters which lead ultimately to their despair of finding an identity and thus stating the whole theme (the identity crisis) of the play.

Chapter Two: Theme and Characters

The organic relation between this theme and the language used in *Not I* is very interesting indeed. We have a character that hides her identity behind an exasperating yet subtle and charming mixing up of the references of the pronouns. Here, the pronoun "it" has various references to things scattered throughout the play. They are summed up as follows:

'the brain' as in ("... but the brain still ... still sufficiently ... oh very much so ... at this stage ... in control ... under control to question even this ... for that April morning ... so it reasoned ... ") ...; 'the voice' as in ("... no idea what she was saying! ... till she began trying to ... delude herself - . it was not hers at all ... not her voice at all ...") ...; 'the existence' as in ("something she had to tell ... could that be it? ... something that would tell ... how it was ... how she ... what? ... had been? Yes ... something that would tell how it had been ... how she had lived") ...; and 'the unknown solution' as in ("hit on it in the end ... then back ... God is love ... tender mercies.") [23]

We can realize and appreciate Beckett's mystifying use of this pronoun if we take into consideration that he uses it first to refer to the newly born babe that later on came to be referred to as (she) "... out ... into this world ... this world ... tiny little thing ... before its time ... in a godfor- ... what? ... girl? ... yes tiny little girl." [24] The identity of the character here is so much blurred to the extent that it almost expires or breaks down together with the disintegrated language itself. "Language in Beckett's plays serves to express the breakdown, the disintegration of language. Where there is no certainty, there can be no definite meanings." [25] And since there are no definite meanings, there can be no distinct identities because what shapes the identities of the characters is mainly what they say and mean.

Above all, Beckett's artifice in presenting his theme and views culminates in his way of characterization. He demonstrates his characters' lost identities in four major ways: by depicting the as deformed, incomplete and puppet-like characters, by showing them as schizophrenic

characters whose identities are lost between two different moods or more, by presenting them as void or vacant personalities and finally by exposing them as mad people.

In *Endgame*, we have a group of shockingly maimed people: Hamm is an old man sitting in a wheel chair, Nell and Nagg, his parents, have lost their shanks and are driven to live in dustbins. All of them cannot move and Clov, the only moving character cannot sit. Moreover, we have a whole flesh and blood character reduced into a mere mouth on the stage in *Not I*. This process of crippling or reduction of characters effectively symbolizes their incomplete, almost removed identities.

Clov, with his "stiff, staggering walk" and absolute obedience to Hamm's orders and whistle acts just like a puppet with no independent personality or identity. He says "I'll lean on the table, and look at the wall, and wait for him to whistle me." [26] About the middle of the play, he says: "Do this, do that, and I do it. I never refuse. Why?" [27] And near the end, he asks Hamm "There is one thing I'll never understand ... why I always obey you. Can you explain that to me?" [28]

Even when we try to look beyond the master/slave dialectic and look at the play through the colonial, historical or hegemonic context, as Nels Pearson does in his comment, we can still perceive the split, mixed up, maimed, mad or codependent identities of the characters. The result of which is an identity crisis in the full sense of the word:

What we initially find by placing *Endgame* in the context of Irishness and colonialism is that we are dealing with a play that dramatizes many unresolved paradoxes of decolonization known acutely by the Irish and the Irish writer – most notably language dispossession and the codependency of identity between long-standing colonizer and colonized. But on a deeper level, we discover a play that ... repeatedly asks the audience to see *outside* of the master/slave dialectic ... It becomes a farsighted, mocking challenge to the essentializing discourse, hegemonic historical (re)production, and violent opposing of contrived originary identities that thrive not only in the imperial/colonial situation itself but also in many contemporary, (supposedly) liberal, intellectual, and artistic attempts to speak for the oppressed. [29]

Beckett's characters seem to develop split identities, a schizophrenic condition of the mind. Hamm, in *Endgame*, waits for his end, his death, and cannot bear any sign of life around him. He orders Clov to exterminate anything that seems to be alive at the end of the play: the flea, the rat, or the boy outside his house. Yet, at the same time he is choking with the feeling of guilt for not helping and saving those whom he could have helped like Mother Pegg "All those I might have helped. (Pause.) Helped!

(Pause.) Saved. (Pause.) Saved! (Pause.) The place was crawling with them!" [30] Interestingly, this feeling of guilt could be traced back to Beckett's own feeling of guilt towards his mother. According to his friend and doctor, Dr. Geoffrey Thomson, the key to understanding Beckett is found in his relationship with his own mother. "She was both loving and domineering, attentive and stern, and Beckett's love-hate relationship with her is at the crux of his intense feelings of anxiety and guilt." [31] Clov, on the other hand, in spite of being tortured by Hamm's orders, he bears him stoically and never leaves. In fact, throughout the play, Clov wonders about the reason or reasons for his staying with Hamm despite Hamm's torturing of him. The reasons could be his sense of obligation or his shared sense of fear to be alone, despite his declaration otherwise. One final reason might be his compassion as Hamm overtly suggests at the end of the play. His schizophrenic mood is externalized by his movements between the two windows forgetting the ladder behind and going back and forth several times.

This is similar to the character's condition in *Not I*. She walks "a few steps then stop ... stare into space ... then on ... a few more ... stop and stare again ... so on." [32] The complexity and confusion here lie in the fact that she is trying to negate any connection between herself and her different organs by arousing a welter of pronoun references as mentioned earlier in this research. Interestingly, these organs seem to have distinct identities and not belonging to one person. This is shown by the brain's stopping and correcting Mouth all the time in a conversational manner "as of course till then she had not ... and not alone the lips ... the cheeks ... the jaws ... the whole face ... all those ... what? ... the tongue? ... yes ... the tongue in the mouth." [33] Whenever there is a possibility of her being recognized or associated with any of her organs or the "I," she resorts to the climatic questioning or negation throughout the play: "what? ... who? ... no! ... she!"

The sense of void, emptiness or vacancy in the setting clearly reflects the emptiness of the characters of any kind of identity. In *Endgame*, Clov looking through the telescope at the dead land and the dead sea outside always reports "zero" and "nothing" to be seen. He always says "there is no more nature." [34] As for Hamm, he, in fact, is "a personification of the void." [35] He is also suffering from contradictions that confuse his personality or for that matter his identity as a whole:

Hamm's great fear is that existence is cyclical; that beginnings and endings are fused in the grand scheme of things and that life will spring up again. But contradictions confuse his desires. He is terrified of the flea and rat that Clov finds and wants to exterminate them in case "humanity might start from there all over again," but he also proposes that he and Clov go South to

other "mammals." He wants to be left alone, but clings to Clov and does anything he can to pull him back into the room. Most confusingly, he believes that nature is changing, though all evidence indicates that it has "zero" change. Under his misanthropic exterior is a desperate neediness, a fear of being alone that has been with him ever since childhood (as Nagg tells it). [36]

He, like Clov and the others, is devoid of any identity. What proves this is their meaningless dialogue which conveys no coherent ideas and because there are no ideas and logic, then there is really no identity behind. Hamm's world is one of void and not a "solipsist's world" [37] as Hugh Kenner suggests because the characters know nothing about themselves for they mean nothing. Hamm asks: "We're not beginning to ... to ... mean something?" Clov answers: "Mean something! You and I, mean something! (Brief laugh.) Ah that's a good one!" [38]

Another way in which they cannot know anything about themselves is because the self is not attainable. This is because "The flow of time confronts us with the basic problem of being – the problem of the nature of the self, which, being subject to constant change in time, is in constant flux and therefore ever outside our grasp." [39] Hamm himself points this out "Moment upon moment, pattering down, like millet grains of ... (he hesitates) ... that old Greek, and all life long you wait for that to mount up to a life." [40]

In *Not I*, the sense of emptiness arises from the character's life itself. In spite of the continuous talk of Mouth, there is not any kind of description of her life throughout the whole period from birth till the age of seventy "nothing of any note till coming up to sixty when - ... what? ... seventy? ... good God! ... coming up to seventy ... wandering in a field ... looking aimlessly for cowslips ... to make a ball ..." [41] It is as if there is nothing of significance in her life. It is a life of maddening emptiness that is directly connected to an empty self and absent identity.

The mad talk and mad behavior of the characters is yet another way in which these characters are portrayed, involving in a direct manner the theme of the identity crisis. Because, really, how can there be a logical identity for a mad person? Hamm, by insisting on having his toy dog though it is not finished and lacks one leg, reveals a kind of mental deterioration. He asks Clov: "You feel normal?" then "Clov: (irritably.) I tell you I don't complain!" then he says "I feel a little queer." [42] Clov, in the last third of the play, says: "Sometimes I wonder if I'm in my right mind." [43] Then, shouting at Hamm, he cries "You drive me mad, I'm mad!" [44]

Mouth, in *Not I*, talks feverishly and "pouring it out ... steady stream ... mad stuff... half the vowels wrong ... no one could follow." [45] The brain

itself is getting mad in trying to stop Mouth "and the brain ... raving away on its own ..." [46]

Conclusion:

So the common feature among Beckett's characters is the negation of the self and the common certainty they share is "that of everlasting ignorance of self." [47] But why is this refusal of the characters to acknowledge themselves and their identity? The reason can be linked with the existential feeling that prevailed in the post second world war period in the twentieth century. If the characters acknowledge themselves and their identity, they will have to face their tragedy that they are forced to be born, to suffer for nothing in a futile living and to die for nothing eventually. Thus, they are paying for a guilt that is not their own "that notion of punishment ... for some sin or other ... or for the lot ..." [48]

Beckett's artistic skill in making the whole structure of his plays reflect the theme he has in mind is obviously the reason behind the success of such plays and the reason for their complexity at the same time. "Beckett's art avoids definition because he believes passionately that 'art has nothing to do with clarity, does not dabble in the clear and does not make clear.'" [49] Complex and misleading his plays might be, yet we can still receive them with our hearts, feelings or nerves rather than with our intellect as Beckett himself suggests "I hope my piece may work on the nerves of the audience not on its intellect." [50]. This appeal to the "nerves" of the audience and not to their "intellect" is what should help us fully appreciate, understand and consequently enjoy Beckett's characters and their identity crisis in their bleak world.

Notes

- [1] Martin Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, (London: Penguin Books, 1974) p.328.
- [2] Martin Esslin, ed, *Absurd Drama*, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967) p.7.
- [3] Martin Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, p.398.
- [4] Ronan McDonald, *The Cambridge Introduction to Samuel Beckett*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) p.2.
- [5] Samuel Beckett, *Endgame*, (London: Faber & Faber, 1973) p.11.
- [6] Samuel Beckett, *Not I*, (London: Faber & Faber, 1978) p.1.
- [7] Beryl S. Fletcher et al, *A Student's Guide to the Plays of Samuel Beckett*, (London: Faber & Faber, 1978) p.193.
- [8] Gabriele Schwab, "Dialectics of Closure and Opening in Samuel Beckett's *Fin de Partie*," *Concepts of Closure*, (1984-1-1) p.193.
<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1b91t068>
- [9] John Pilling, *Samuel Beckett*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976) p.18.
- [10] Fletcher et al, p. 87.
- [11] Beckett, *Endgame*, p. 17.
- [12] Colin Duckworth, "Re-Evaluating *Endgame*," *Samuel Beckett's Endgame*, ed. Mark S. Byron, (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi,

- 2007) p. 28.
- [13] Beckett, *Not I*, pp. 1-2.
- [14] A. Alvarez, Samuel Beckett, (New York: The Viking Press, 1973) p.88.
- [15] Pilling, p.18.
- [16] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.39.
- [17] McDonald, p.44.
- [18] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.29.
- [19] Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, p. 87.
- [20] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.13.
- [21] Fletcher et al, p. 197.
- [22] Esslin, ed, *Absurd Drama*, p.14.
- [23] Saad Fadhil Al Hassani, "The Split Identity in *Not I*", *Al Mustansirya Bulletin*, Vol. 10, (Baghdad: Al Jamia'a Publishing House, 1984), pp. 69-70.
- [24] Beckett, *Not I*, p.1.
- [25] Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, p.86.
- [26] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.12.
- [27] *Ibid*, p.31.
- [28] *Ibid*, p.48.
- [29] Nels Pearson, "'Outside of Here it's Death': Co-dependency and the Ghosts of Decolonization in Beckett's *Endgame*." *ELH: English Literary History* 68(2001): 215-239. P. 216.
- [30] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.44.
- [31] McDonald, p.7.
- [32] Beckett, *Not I*, p. 2.
- [33] *Ibid*, p. 6.
- [34] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.16.
- [35] Ronald Hayman, Samuel Beckett, (London: Heinemann, 1974) p.26.
- [36] SparkNotes Editors, "SparkNote on *Endgame*," SparkNotes LLC. n.d.. <http://www.sparknotes.com/drama/endgame/> (accessed November 15, 2016).
- [37] Hugh Kenner, *A Reader's Guide to Samuel Beckett*, (London: University Publishing House, 1968) p. 14.
- [38] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.27.
- [39] Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd*, p.51.
- [40] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.45.
- [41] Beckett, *Not I*, pp. 1-2.
- [42] Beckett, *Endgame*, p.13.
- [43] *Ibid*, p.47.
- [44] *Ibid*, p.49.
- [45] Beckett, *Not I*, p. 10.
- [46] *Ibid*, p. 7.
- [47] Ross Chambers, " Beckett's Brinkmanship," *Beckett: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Martin Esslin, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Printice - Hall, 1965) p.153.
- [48] Beckett, *Not I*, p.3.
- [49] Fletcher et al, p. 35.
- [50] Steven Connor, *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory, and Text*, (Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988) p.157.

Bibliography

- Al Hassani, Saad Fadhil. "The Split Identity in Not I". Al Mustansirya Bulletin, Vol. 10. Baghdad: Al Jamia'a Publishing House, 1984.
- Alvarez, A. Samuel Beckett. New York: The Viking Press, 1973.
- Beckett, Samuel. Endgame. London: Faber & Faber, 1973.
- Beckett, Samuel. Not I. London: Faber & Faber, 1978.
- Chambers, Ross. "Beckett's Brinkmanship." Beckett: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Martin Esslin. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice - Hall, 1965.
- Connor, Steven. Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory, and Text. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Duckworth, Colin. "Re-Evaluating Endgame." Samuel Beckett's Endgame, ed. Mark S. Byron. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007.
- Esslin, Martin, ed. Absurd Drama. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967.
- Esslin, Martin. The Theatre of the Absurd. London: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Fletcher, Beryl S. et al. A Student's Guide to the Plays of Samuel Beckett. London: Faber & Faber, 1978.
- Hayman, Ronald. Samuel Beckett. London: Heinemann, 1974.
- Kenner, Hugh. A Reader's Guide to Samuel Beckett. London: University Publishing House, 1968.
- Pearson, Nels. "'Outside of Here it's Death': Co-dependency and the Ghosts of Decolonization in Beckett's Endgame." ELH: English Literary History 68(2001): 215-239.
- Pilling, John. Samuel Beckett. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Schwab, Gabriele. "Dialectics of Closure and Opening in Samuel Beckett's Fin de Partie." Concepts of Closure. (1984). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1b91t068>
- SparkNotes Editors. "SparkNote on Endgame." SparkNotes LLC. n.d.. <http://www.sparknotes.com/drama/endgame/> (accessed November 15, 2016).