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Abstract

Roars, hoofbeats and crashes resound in the 1960 play *Rhinocéros* by Eugène Ionesco, while silence, pause, and rhythmic play pique the ear in the 1953 play *En attendant Godot* by Samuel Beckett. Using R. Murray Schafer’s conception of “soundscapes,” this analysis discusses each play’s aural atmosphere, such as those of chaos, of uncertainty, and of spectacle. These ‘soundscapes’ are determined by analyzing the place, purpose and position of different sounds within the plays’ scripts, even the sound of silence. The twentieth century played host to new developments in artistic conceptions of sound, as classical music underwent fundamental fractures while becoming integrated with technological advances in sound and music production. In fact, Michel Philippot, the director of sound at the world premiere of *Rhinocéros*, was a composer of early electronic music, and brought artistry into dramatic sound production. *En attendant Godot* does not feature sound production besides that of the spoken or silent voice, therefore silence, pause, rhythm, repetitions, dynamic tones, and musical vociferations such as singing and humming are the focus of its analysis. The two plays differ acoustically, yet each uses sound effects in compelling and meaningful ways.
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Introduction

During the twentieth century, artists from all regions of art began to question not only the limits but also the principles of art and aesthetics. Through different movements, they posited an art that did not seek to please or to resemble the art of the past. Music lost its comforting tonality and began to jar the ear with repetitive, atonal, and unmusical elements. Artists like Jackson Pollock threw paint at a canvas and dared the viewers to redefine what they considered to be ‘art.’ *En attendant Godot* by Samuel Beckett and *Rhinocéros* by Eugène Ionesco are two plays that exhibit this same questioning through their manipulation of sounds both on- and off-stage. Their introduction of spectacular and quiet sound effects in theater is a small part of this large movement of fracturing aesthetics. This thesis presents an analysis of sound elements in two well-known plays often classified under the French Theatre of the Absurd.¹

Eugène Ionesco’s *Rhinocéros* contains numerous indications in its text requiring the production of engineered sounds. This was done by one of the early composers of electronic music, Michel Philippot. His artistic compositions created an auditory environment, or soundscape,² of chaos and confusion, one in which the play’s title characters are brought to life through *musique concrète*. Like other musicians of the time, Philippot furthered the musical movement, but with his work in *Rhinocéros*, he stretched the limits of both theatrical and musical aesthetics. In this play, soundscapes of chaos are formed when human soundstorms devolve into animal soundstorms. The first act of the play aurally transforms repetitive villagers into animals through the devolution of language, or *logos*, into bare voices, or *phoné*. Strange music makes this *phoné* bizarre and enticing, and Michel Philippot’s *musique concrète* added several unexpected sounds to the mix. Ionesco’s *Rhinocéros* has been studied and written about at great length, but this thesis will add to this research in analyzing the abundance of its sound effects and how they fulfill their functions.

¹ The term “absurd” should be read with circumspection, in light of the fact that neither Beckett nor Ionesco were wholeheartedly content to be thought of as writers of “absurdist” literature. Martin Esslin’s *The Theatre of the Absurd* (New York: Anchor Books, 1961) brought together writers who defied easy description like Harold Pinter, Jean Genet, and Arthur Adamov alongside Beckett and Ionesco, and became the label by which these playwrights and authors are now known, for better or for worse.

² The concept of soundscapes was first posited by R. Murray Schafer in his work *The Tuning of the World* (New York: Knopf, 1977).
Samuel Beckett’s *En attendant Godot*, in contrast, uses different sound effects to create different soundscapes. First, pause, silence and questions create soundscapes of uncertainty that put the plot, the characters and life in general into question. An abundance of intentional silences in the play, as loquacious as the characters themselves, create aural holes in the dialogue. Beckett’s text clearly indicates these silences in the stage directions, and in so doing, questions the aural aesthetics of theater further. In certain portions of the dialogue soundscapes of spectacle are created through rhythm, repetition, dynamics and music. These elements are reminiscent of vaudevillian performance, melding the melodic and the comedic. Beckett uses stage direction to indicate desired tones, volumes, and rhythms of the dialogue. These contrasting aural soundscapes of uncertainty and spectacle add to the fundamental ambiguity of the play and help keep any overall meaning out of reach. The monologue found at the close of the first act acts as an aural focal point against this clashing background. In drawing connections between sound and Beckett’s theater, this thesis draws upon the work of other researchers in sound studies and in word and music studies, and contributes by suggesting the presence of soundscapes in *En attendant Godot*. This analysis also benefits from several recent publications, for example, the 2011 publication of the second volume of *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*, compiled by Martha Dow Fehsenfeld and Lois More Overbeck, which contains correspondence from the period in which *En attendant Godot* was written, was premiered, and became a phenomenon.

The analyses to follow draw upon the recordings of the French premieres of the plays. Using these recordings as well as primary and secondary source material, this work analyzes their original sound production and sets it within an historical context of art.

In “Drama, Performativity, and Performance,” W. B. Worthen discusses the “conceptual crisis” in theater studies during the twentieth century regarding whether the identity of a theatrical work lies in its textual canon or in its dramatic interpretation and innovation.\(^3\) Discussed below are two very different plays, written by very different people, who had each a certain conception of ideal theater. Eugène Ionesco understood a play to have an identity separate of the author, and described it as having a ‘voice’:

> On demande à l’auteur de nous confier ce qu’il pense de son œuvre. Après que l’œuvre a été exposée, jouée ou éditée, on peut savoir ce qu’en pensent les

---

critiques: on se précipite, donc, sur ce que ceux-ci ont écrit puis on va de nouveau à l’auteur pour lui demander de dire ce qu’il pense de ce qu’on pense de son œuvre et de lui-même...Dans le tumulte du débat, on n’entend plus la voix de l’œuvre; dans les développements des points de vue de toutes sortes, c’est toujours l’œuvre qui est perdue de vue.  

While Ionesco accepted the inevitability of the director’s interpretation of his plays, Beckett was much more proactive in expressing his desires for performative adherence to his text, even requesting from across oceans that he be notified of any modifications to the script, should the director of a production feel the need:

All I ask of you is not to make any changes in the text without letting me know...Not, as you know, that I am intransigent about changing an odd word here and there or making an odd cut. But do please let me have the opportunity of protesting or approving.”

The two authors differed on text to production processes, so one cannot expect that their uses of sound effects in their respective plays would be similar.

This exploratory analysis of sound effects ventures into the realms of aurality studies. Aurality and the study of sound and noise has become a greater topic of discussion across interdisciplinary lines throughout the last century, analyzing the place of sound in many aspects of life. After the aural technological revolutions provided by the inventions of the phonograph and the telegraph, sound could be manipulated for the first time, even dislocated in time and across great distances. Igor Stravinsky shocked the musical public with his jarring and aurally violent Sacre du Printemps in 1913, and forcibly opened his audiences’ ears to then unheard-of possibilities for aesthetic sound. Afterwards, noise became a topic in the Futurist movement of

---

4. Eugène Ionesco, Notes et Contre-notes (Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1966), 101-102. “We ask the author to tell us what he thinks of his work. After the work has opened, been played, or edited, we can find out what the critics think: we jump, then, on what they wrote and then go back to the author to ask him what he thinks of what people think of his work and of him...In the tumult of the debate, we no longer hear the voice of the work; in the developments of all kinds of points of view, it’s always the work that is lost from sight.”

5. C. Valoge, « Ionesco » Lettres Françaises, 21 January 1960, in [Recueil. "Rhinocéros" de Eugène Ionesco (Document d’archives, Bibliothèque Nationale de France)], 1961, 8- RSUPP- 6267. « Chaque metteur en scène a son rythme, chaque acteur aussi... » “Every director has his own rhythm, every actor, too...”

Italian art that declared the superiority of all that was manmade, modern and urban. These young European war hawks believed that technology was the future of humanity. This focus on control and mechanization, coupled with fears of immigration, resulted in xenophobic beliefs, but their love of urban sounds resounds in L’arte dei rumori. Aleksei Kruchenky and Velimir Khlebnikov, two Russian futurists, developed a transrational language used in their poetry called zaumny yazyk, combining infant-like speech patterns, and vocabulary from ancient languages, schizophrenic speech forms, among other things. Poems and writings gained more new sounds in Dada and Surrealist poetry during this time, stretching the limits of art and sound. Nikolai Kublin wrote in 1914 What is the Word? questioning the use of words in poetry. In the twenties, Jean Cocteau began placing bizarre noises in his theater, such as the sound of a vacuum and the droning of an inter-dimensional radio in his work Orphée. With the music and writings of John Cage beginning in the thirties, musicology began to include the study of other sound elements besides anticipated notes, such as silence engagement and the anticipation of the unknown in experimental music, which he used to great effect in his composition 4’33”.

The advent of new recording methods and technologies caused huge diversions in music in the latter half of the century. Musique concrète in France gave noise and sound new definitions as music. Later, musical groups like the Beatles and Pink Floyd began mixing noise into their popular songs. These new understandings of how to manipulate sound and time gave rise to popular music culture, as well as to the popularity of the electric guitar and other electric instruments that have capabilities for distortion and effects. Later, during the sixties, ethnographers and anthropologists such as Edmund Carpenter, Marshall McLuhan and Walter Ong began dissecting orality, and by necessity, the prominence of hearing in illiterate cultures. In 1977, R. Murray Schafer questioned our aural interaction with our environment in his The

---


Tuning of the World. Jacques Attali at the same time gave human-produced noise an economic explanation, and predicted its productive place in the future. Today, synthesized patterns of noise have even begun to dominate or completely eclipse rhythms and melodies in the myriad forms of electronic music, i.e. house music, dubstep, electronica, etc.

The study of sounds has recently become a topic in other fields, as well: cognitive neuroscientist Daniel Levitin has made musical interaction with the brain and its place in human evolution his subject of choice for the past two decades. Mladen Ovadia’s Dramaturgy of Sound in the Avant-garde and Postdramatic Theatre provides a historical catalog of the changing artistic conceptions of sound in the early and mid-twentieth century. After the works of Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault in linguistics and literary critique, a brand of literary theory called “word and music studies,” and sometimes “melopoetics,” began to emerge in the late twentieth century literature, from the works of theorists such as Werner Wolf, Steven Paul Scher, Walter Bernhart and Calvin S. Brown, questioning the boundaries between literature and music, from topics that dealt with literature in music, to those that described music’s place in literature.


Sound is the sole focus in Jim Drobnick’s *Aural Cultures*, and is the only thread that connects the myriad of articles which range from seventeenth-century historical practices of listening, to modern art installations involving audio guides.\(^\text{15}\) Recently, editor Jonathan Sterne’s *The Sound Studies* was published, compiling the major Western works in sound studies in the last fifty years.\(^\text{16}\) In this, one finds that even historians have ventured into sound studies, with the new field of ‘historical acoustemology’: Emily Thompson’s *The Soundscape of Modernity*, Richard Cullen Rath’s *How Early America Sounded*, Mark Michael Smith’s *Hearing History*, and Bruce R. Smith’s *The Acoustical World of Early Modern England*, among others seek to ‘hear’ the past.\(^\text{17}\)

In detailing their auditory wishes for their plays within their texts, the playwrights themselves created sound effects which, when read, must be aurally imagined, and when played, must be aurally produced. The “off” gains a voice in both plays: as animals in the first, and as silent malice in the second. The authors not only knew their narrative arcs and characters, but also intended for certain atmospheres to be created with sound effects. Luckily, recordings of both French premieres of the plays have been preserved. What is also greatly helpful is the film *Beckett Directs Beckett*, featuring a production of *Waiting for Godot* based on the *mise-en-scène* of the playwright himself.

Although both plays have been translated into a multitude of other languages, this thesis will only concern itself with the French texts of both. Translations, except where noted, are my own. They have been included in order to facilitate comprehension for researchers interested in sound, but unfamiliar with the French language. Recordings and other primary source material

---


were accessed at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, as well as at the Beckett Collection at the University of Reading, in Reading, England.
Chapter 1

Soundstorms and Musique Concrète in Eugène Ionesco’s *Rhinocéros*

Mais comment arriver à représenter le non-représentable ? Comment figurer le non-figuratif, non figurer le figuratif ?

—Eugène Ionesco, *Notes et Contre-notes* 18

In his play *Rhinocéros*, Eugène Ionesco uses a range of sounds in the quest to ‘represent the unrepresentable.’ Written into the script in the form of stage directions, and engineered for the 1960 French premiere by composer Michel Philippot, these sounds range from the stamping of hooves and the bellowing of beasts to the sound of a fire truck’s siren. 19 These roars and stampings are interpreted to be sounds produced by sources beyond the limits of the stage. The full bodies of the rhinoceroses are never seen in the play, and so these noises become the aural embodiment of the character, always heard and never fully seen. Mladen Ovadija writes, “In theatre, as in life, sound is born and dies with action.” 20 This serves to remind us that sounds always have sources, and that playwrights use sounds to suggest events or actions in the “off.” Without these sounds in *Rhinocéros*, the play lacks a key element that provides much of the presence of these creatures. Ionesco lamented directors’ disregard of such stage directions: 21

J’ai souvent été en conflit avec mes metteurs en scène : ou bien ils n’osent pas assez et diminuent la portée des textes en n’allant pas jusqu’au bout des impératifs scéniques, ou bien ils « enrichissent » le texte en l’alourdissant de bijoux faux, de pacotilles sans valeur parce que inutiles. Je ne fais pas de littérature. Je fais une chose tout à fait différente ; je fais du théâtre. Je veux dire que mon texte n’est pas seulement un dialogue mais il est aussi « indications

18. “But how does one arrive at representing the unrepresentable? How does one figure the unfigurative, or unfigure the figurative?”


20. Ovadija, 11.

scéniques ». Ces indications scéniques sont à respecter aussi bien que le texte, elles sont nécessaires, elles sont aussi suffisantes.²²

Stage directions specifying these sounds create soundscapes of chaos. Jim Drobnick describes the power of sound in informing human understanding: “Representation and interpretation are issues in which sound shares with pictures and text, yet sound reconfigures these very issues by inflecting representation with affect, and interpretation with embodiment.”²³ Transforming stage directions into sound, composer Michel Philippot engineered compositions that turned the ordinary into fantasy, and the calm into chaos.

Existing scholarship mentioning this element of Ionesco’s theater is scarce and brief. Nancy Lane does discuss the sounds of Rhinocéros in Understanding Eugène Ionesco: “Sound effects also have a major role in representing the displacement of the human realm by the rhinoceroses,” and comments on the acts’ increasing volume and variety of sounds.²⁴ This aural analysis only spans the better part of one page, however, and goes no further. Parts of the mise-en-scène used in the premiere at the Théâtre de l’Odéon have been published by Simone Benmussa, but the only mention of sounds is the word, “Bruitage,” indicating the presence of sound effects.²⁵ Kwang-Joo You’s Éléments d’analyse comparée du théâtre de Beckett et de Ionesco has a detailed comparative analysis of both authors’ overall work, as well as a discussion of Ionesco’s use of language, but does not mention scripted sound effects within Rhinocéros.²⁶ Other studies of Eugène Ionesco and his theater are numerous,²⁷ but do not include a

---

²² Eugène Ionesco, Notes et Contre-notes, 285. “I have often been in conflict with my directors: either they don’t dare enough and diminish the weight of the texts in not following the stage directions exactly, or they ‘enrich’ the text in weighing it down with false jewelry, with cheap useless junk. I don’t write literature. I do something completely different; I write theatre. I mean that my text is not just a dialogue but also ‘stage directions.’ These stage directions should be respected as much as the text, they are necessary, and they are sufficient.”

²³ Jim Drobnick, “Listening Awry,” in Aural Cultures, 10.

²⁴ Nancy Lane, Understanding Eugène Ionesco (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994).


performative or textual analysis concerning sounds in his plays. Noise is a frequent part of analyses concerning Ionesco’s use of language to devolve reason into nonsense. Deborah B. Gaensbauer writes of this when discussing La Cantatrice Chauve:

As the erratically striking clock marks the tempo for the breakdown of language and logic, the conversation breaks up into a hostile crossfire of nonsensical aphorisms, neologisms, non sequiturs, puerile obscenities, the days of the week recited in English, “choo choo train” noises, and the grunted sounds of empty but menacing letters and syllables…Language, and all the human qualities it represents, has turned into a dehumanized mechanism which assaults the spectator.  

Josephine Jacobsen’s Ionesco and Genêt: Playwrights of Silence does not discuss sound effects in Ionesco’s theater, but focuses on the theme of loss, as in the loss of hope, the loss of language, and the loss of life.

The play’s conception during the late 1950s was concurrent with the development of a musical style called “musique concrète.” Pioneered by artists such as Pierre Schaeffer, the movement sought to redefine the parameters of music by splicing recorded sounds to create a musical composition. An album of compositions described their work thus:

C’est ainsi que travaille le compositeur de Musique Concrète, à partir d’objets sonores qui sont l’équivalent des images visuelles, ce qui renouvelle entièrement les habitudes de la composition musicale.  

Michel Philippot, one of the members of this movement, was commissioned to engineer recorded sounds for the French premiere of Rhinocéros. Having analyzed the script and

---


29. Michel Philippot and Pierre Henry, Deuxième Panorama de Musique Concrète (Paris: Ducretet Thompson, 1957) 320C102, 33 rpm, 1 two-sided phonograph record), fourth image. “This is how a composer of musique concrète works, drawing from sonorous objects which are the equivalent of visual images, which entirely renews the practices of musical composition.”
collaborated with Ionesco, Philippot created the sounds that the script required, from the tolling of bells to the marching of beasts. This was undoubtedly a daunting task, given the numerous indications for sound effects in the script. Compared to his normal compositions (which were of a far more avant-garde nature), Philippot’s products for *Rhinocéros* were tame, with overtones of the strange. Critics in the popular press however, still found his compositions unsettling, and made detailed note of the sounds they heard in their articles. One reads:

…Soudain, une musique étrange…C’est comme si barbotraient, mélodieusement, dans une mare géante, des centaines de buffles, des milliers d’antilopes…Des glouglous harmonieux comme des plaintes, de l’eau battue, barattée, comme un fleuve de lait et de sucre…Des sabots arrachent des sons à la vase, avec une volupté animale…

These recordings were, in fact, used again five years later in the first televised production of the play, broadcast throughout France. The musique concrète used in the play was therefore approved by the playwright as an acceptable interpretation of his stage directions. Through sounds, Ionesco creates aural atmospheres of chaos in *Rhinocéros*. The “off” becomes alive with the sounds of beasts and humans. These effects create the world in which the action takes place and deprive the stage of reason and sense. The study of sound in theatrical performances raises a number of the fundamental issues in the debates within theater studies regarding textual authority and performance. Mladen Ovadija posits that sound *is* performance. However, without the text’s authority, multiple performances would have no continuity. Sound is therefore a conduit between text and performance.

30. There is ample room for more research concerning this composer. His efforts in furthering electronic music resulted in several published works, one of them “Arnold Schoenberg and the Language of Music” in Perspectives of New Music 13, no. 2 (1975): 17-29, as well as several other articles on the aesthetics of electronic music. His work was featured in several albums with Pierre Schaeffer and Pierre Henry.

31. Jean-Paul Weber, “Le Rhinocéros de Ionesco,” Figaro Littéraire, January 23, 1960, in [Recueil. "Rhinocéros" de Eugène Ionesco (Document d’archives, Bibliothèque Nationale de France)], 1961, 8- RSUPP-6267. “…Suddenly, a strange music…It is as if hundreds of buffalo, thousands of antelope, in a giant sea, were splashing melodiously…Harmonious ‘glug glugs’ of the battered, churned water, like sighs, like a river of milk and sugar…Hooves pull sounds from the mud, with an animal delight…”


33. Ovadija, 11.
This world of *Rhinocéros* is not simply evoked through spoken dialogue, stage decoration and the movement of actors. It calls for an aural element that was supplied by one of the first sound technicians in existence, Michel Philippot, who believed that music and recorded sounds were not mutually exclusive. His dedication to Ionesco’s auditory imaginings were a crucial element in bringing the world of Ionesco to life.

**A Sound-Dominant Play**

During the play there are numerous scenes which require off-stage noise production. The playwright indicates them in the script with « *On entend…* », « *Bruits de…* » and other similar stage directions. Throughout the play, bells ring, animals stampede, roar, pant and crash, sirens wail, engines rumble, brakes screech, phones rings, radios play and crowds march. Many, but not all of these, are vocal utterances seemingly produced by characters off-stage, namely the rhinoceroses. These animals must have their presence ‘figured’ through the magic of stage production. Some sounds create atmosphere, what R. Murray Schafer would term ‘soundscapes,’ such as the carillon in the opening of the play and the sounds of marching at the close. Other sounds imply danger, such as the roars, pants and gallops of the rhinoceroses, or the arrival of a fire truck. All sounds emanating from offstage were chosen and recorded by Philippot.

Producing sounds for the production through this new technique of recorded music stemmed from Ionesco’s desire to create aural soundscapes of disarray and chaos. In his *Notes et Contre-notes* he writes that ‘sound and fury’ in theater create ‘chaos’ and ‘distress.’ Frightening and displaced sounds can be very affecting to our person, for as David Burrows points out, sound exceeds even the intimacy of touch:

> To see [something] I must turn toward it and focus on it, reach out myself and touch it with my attention; and nothing would be easier than to withdraw my touch by shutting my eyes or looking away. The sound, like the touch of a hand

---

34 “We hear…” “Noises of…” Note: “Bruit” is translated into English as both “sound” and “noise,” usually the former when neutral and the latter when displeasing or unexpected.

moved by a will other than my own, is not so easily ignored: I cannot shut non-existent earlids. And sound goes beyond touch, which respects the perimeter of my skin, and beyond its degree of intimacy in seeming to be going on within me as much as around me.\(^{36}\)

This inability to ignore a loud sound presents a weakness in our perceptive processes. The playwright describes his discovery of this inability during his childhood:

>Aussi, je m’aperçus que ce que j’entendais pouvait également être associé à ce que je voyais, à ce que je touchais. Quand je ne pouvais comprendre d’où venait, à qui, à quoi de ce que je voyais ou touchais pouvait s’associer avec ce que j’entendais, je devais éprouver une angoisse très grande. (emphasis mine)

The author recreates the same ‘anguish’ in his audience when he fabricates an environment full of sounds without source. This type of listening is called acousmatic listening.\(^{37}\)

Playwrights, musical composers, and others who deal in sound production can manipulate this susceptibility to sound, as Ionesco does, to inspire emotions that range from joy and comfort, to uncertainty and fear. Stanley Kubrick does the latter in his 1968 film \textit{2001: A Space Odyssey} when, before the opening credits, there is an extended period in which the screen shows nothing, but the sound track projects abstract and ominous sounds.\(^{38}\) Ionesco had done the same in 1960 when he specified these acousmatic sound effects.

The play requires loud and forceful sounds in order to create its villains. Ionesco wrote, « on se laisse trop facilement entrainer par ceux qui sont les plus forts. »\(^{39}\) These recorded sounds begin offstage, but quickly spread onstage in the form of dialogue devolving into noise and roars. As the rhinoceritis spreads from person to person, the theater is filled with more and more din. What results is a soundstorm of noise, sometimes fear-inducing and other times strangely melodious. Once the population has transformed into beasts, their celebrations become


\(^{37}\) The term was coined by Pierre Schaeffer, an early composer of \textit{musique concrète}.


\(^{39}\) Paul Giannoli, “Les Colères de M. Ionesco.” Unknown newspaper, 7 December 1961, in [\textit{Eugène Ionesco} \textit{[Document d’archives]: dossier biographique}] (Document d’archives, Bibliothèque Nationale de France), 1961-1963, 8- SW- 1342. “we are too easily persuaded by the ones who are the loudest.”
background music to the final soundstorm of Bérenger’s lone human voice versus a hoard of roars.

**Human Soundstorm**

Other interesting sound effects in *Rhinocéros* are written into the dialogue itself. Through repetition and verbal counterpoint, Ionesco transforms words and phrases into mere noise. This play is just one of Ionesco’s plays that feature what has come to be termed as a “crisis of language.” While this term covers a large number of topics in mid-twentieth century European theater, it also describes a phenomenon of Ionesco’s writing style whereby language loses its sense.

Aristotle realized the potential to break down language. In *Politics*, he described the difference between two modes of speech, *phoné* and *logos*. The former is ‘bare voice,’ the universal animal and human capability to express fear, pain and joy through the voice, while the latter describes reasoned speech found only in the interactions of those capable of judging good from bad, and right from wrong. Aristotle reserved reason to male citizens in his writings, while women, children and slaves are put in the category of those capable of *phoné* (1253b). The ‘crisis of language’ in Ionesco is well documented, but the isolation of *phoné* from *logos* in *Rhinocéros* is not. Instead of trying to understand the invasion of rhinoceroses, the characters argue over the continent of the animals’ origin, and wind their way through rabbit trails of useless circumlocution. Aristotle’s vocal philosophies are illustrated to great effect in *Rhinocéros*, and create the ‘crisis of language’ found in two of his other plays, *La Cantatrice Chauve* and *La Leçon*. In both of these the characters on-stage see their *logos* devolve into *phoné*. In this way *Rhinocéros* creates a cycle of vocal transformation, as people speaking like animals become animals.

Through the repetition of exclamations, polite exchanges devoid of meaning, and nonsense, the dialogue ceases to communicate anything of value and only parodies real conversation. David I. Grossvogel, describing the final scene of *La Cantatrice Chauve*, writes, “Eventually, the play attains a verbal frenzy of sense-voided sounds.”

---

shouts of “What is it?” “Of all things!” “Oh!” and “Ah!” pepper the air in the first act, as well as the Logician’s professions of nonsensical syllogisms. Ronald Hayman also discusses the ‘breakdown of language’ in La Cantatrice Chauve:

As the erratically striking clock marks the tempo for the breakdown of language and logic, the conversation breaks up into a hostile crossfire of nonsensical aphorisms, neologisms, non-sequiturs, puerile obscenities, the days of the week recited in English, “choo choo train” noises, and the grunted sounds of empty but menacing letters and syllables.  

What was a ‘hostile crossfire’ of language in La Cantatrice Chauve is a soundstorm of noises and words in Rhinocéros. Another of his plays that features this ‘crisis of language’ is La Leçon, whereby the phrase « J’ai mal aux dents. » is a statement that evolves from a complaint, into an excuse and finally into a plea, because the student is inexplicably only able to say those five words over and over until she is killed. Ionesco’s penchant for denaturing the dialogue in his plays happens by turning language into pure sound, through simultaneous dialogue or repetition, both involving words and phrases which take the dialogue further and further away from the real conflicts at hand.

Often during Ionesco’s play, the inhabitants of the village serially repeat themselves, or perhaps imitate each other. Reactions in response to the surprising events of the rhinoceros stampedes are identical among the villagers. Throughout the majority of the first act, reason is absent in the villagers’ fearful shouts and screams of surprise or pain. In this way, repetition in Rhinocéros turns conversation into mere noise. Many phrases of dialogue are repeated, sometimes in separate conversations happening simultaneously, other times as part of a group conversation. One must however have a certain set of criteria in order to assess which phrases can be deemed significant by their repetition: the phrases used are repeated at least three times, by three characters on stage in the same scene (see appendices for full list). The first phrase repeated multiple times is, « Oh ! un rhinocéros ! » This line returns twelve times in the first half of the play. In the first entrance of the rhinoceros, in the square, the phrase is cried only four

---

41. Hayman, 62, emphasis mine.


43. Ionesco, Rhinocéros, 22-23, 60-61. “Oh, a rhinoceros!”
times, but at the second passage, it is yelled eight more times. Soon after, «Ça alors!» is exclaimed eight times in succession as the characters follow the path of the rhinoceros with their gaze, and an additional three times at its second passing. The cat’s demise provokes five utterances of «Pauvre petite bête!» There are other repeated exclamations, but none as numerous as these three. Ionesco even makes it clear that the indicated repetitions are not enough when he writes: «On entend des pas précipités de gens qui fuient, des oh! des ah! comme toute à l’heure.» Even the lines of the villagers must be reinforced by unscripted exclamations which verbalize their fear and confusion.

Three specific observations can be made of these repetitions: 1. All the most obvious repeated phrases are found in the first act. Afterwards, because of the scarcity of characters who are still human, this kind of repetition does not occur; 2. These examples are phrases said by villagers who, at those moments, are clustered in a group, experiencing things en masse; 3. These are all short exclamations, using very common language, like “Oh!” “Well of all things!” and even “What is it?” From these details it is clear that the social and communal setting is central to the play. Therefore, these repeated phrases are the result of a sense of community. Villagers afraid of the unknown take comfort in their similar reactions to the events around them. They imitate each other, to consent, to empathize, to follow a communal line of logic, or simply to resemble each other. But after the first utterance of a phrase, it ceases to have meaning; its continual repetition becomes simply an echo of the first person. The playwright tells his audience that regardless of individual differences, our society as a group reacts in the same way. The community on-stage seeks the comfort of the herd when faced with the unknown.

Just after the arrival of the first rhinoceros, friends Jean and Bérenger are alone at the café. Soon after, another pair arrives, and their conversation is added into the mix, the subject of which is logic. The two new patrons of the café are a teacher (the Logician) and student (the Old Man), a dynamic similar to that of another of Ionesco’s plays, La Leçon. The two conversations occur simultaneously. To make matters worse, they sound the same: both consist of a self-

44. Ibid., 25-26, 62. “Well, of all things!”

45. Ibid., 63. “Poor little thing!”

46. Ibid., 61. “We hear precipitated steps of people fleeing, and oh’s and ah’s as before.”
appointed tutor directing the logical processes of their willing student. Jean, overbearing and
strident in his adherence to societal norms, tries to teach Bérenger how to live a fulfilling life,
while the Logician attempts to explain different kinds of logic to his student, the Old Man. Both
teachers and students use, every so often, the same phrase in concert. And as Jean pontificates,
the other conversation has us bear witness to the process by which Socrates becomes a cat (50-
51).

The idiocies of the Logician, coupled with his self-assurance, reflect themselves onto
Jean’s sermon, and both are rendered all the more ridiculous in this surreal moment of communal
nonsense. Ionesco does not allow the audience the time sufficient to separate the two
conversations, since they both occur and develop simultaneously. Both are playing, the one off
of the other, like a vaudeville two-man act, except as a two-pair act. And like similar melodies,
the ear cannot isolate both conversations, nor understand them separately. They are intertwined
with precise timing, and what results is a jumble of nonsense and confusion.

One might also describe this scene as an exercise in “verbal counterpoint.” In the musical
sense, where two concurrent melodies share common structures, namely a tonal center and pitch
ranges. The two are played or sung simultaneously and may even share certain motifs. This
musicological structure is highly reminiscent of the way in which Ionesco presents the two
concurrent café dialogues.

Critics of the first production greatly appreciated this scene, and made positive mentions
of it in their reviews, sometimes even using the word ‘counterpoint’ to describe it. Jean
Vigneron, once again for La Croix, described the scene’s interlacing conversations:

…En arrière-plan, en contrepoint, deux autres personnages poursuivent un
dialogue qui fait, curieusement, écho à l’entretien des deux premiers… De ces
deux conversations qui, tantôt alternent, tantôt s’entrecroisent, en une joute
savoureusement farfelue, l’auteur a tiré, tout en achevant de « dépouiller le vieil
homme », de bien réjouissants effets comiques…47

47. Jean Vigneron, “Au Théâtre de France : Rhinocéros de Ionesco,” La Croix, February 4, 1960, in
{Recueil "Rhinocéros" de Eugène Ionesco (Document d’archives, Bibliothèque Nationale de France)}, 1961, 8-
RSUPP- 6267. “…Downstage, in counterpoint, two other characters pursue a dialogue which is, curiously, an echo
of the tête-à-tête of the two previous gentlemen… From these two conversations which, sometimes, alternate, and
other times interconnect, in a deliciously bizarre joust, the author creates, while at the same time ‘robbing the old
man,’ joyous comic effects indeed.”
Five years later, Vigneron would use the same word in his critique of the television broadcast: « En contrepoint, dialoguant au fond du plateau, un logicien pédant… »

René Farabet, writing for *Couchet-Recherches Scéniques* also used musical terms in his article:

Le premier acte, par le chevauchement continu des répliques, l’enchevêtrement des conversations en contrepoint qui se rejoignent parfois sur une phrase identique, réclame des comédiens une grande virtuosité technique, une netteté extrême de diction, une « relance » constante du rythme.

His use of the terms “rhythm” and “counterpoint” bring to light once more the commonalities in this scene between theater and musical performance.

**Animal Soundstorm**

Very often, the animals not only stamp, but also roar, drowning out the humans by the end of the play. In this way, the human and animal soundscapes start to mix, as rhinoceroses become emotional and people become animalistic. These roars continue to signify the presence of the animals while also serving as their personal expression; in order to communicate, the rhinoceros must use its roar to express joy, sadness or anger, as indicated by the script.

The first roars are in the first act, in the square. The animal soundscape interacts with the human with the arrival of Monsieur Bœuf at the office: « On entend, venant d’en bas, des

---


50. The French verb « barrir » and its accompanying noun « barrassement » are the sound signifiers in all cases in the script, and while these are both typically used to refer to the trumpeting of elephants and rhinoceroses, the translation chosen will hereafter be the noun “roar” or verb “to roar” in order to describe the vocal cries of these animals.

51. Ionesco, *Rhinocéros*, 21. « À ce moment, on entend le bruit très éloigné, mais se rapprochant très vite, d’un souffle de fauve et de sa course précipitée, ainsi qu’un long barrassement. » “At this moment, we hear the far-off, but quickly approaching sound of a beast’s panting, and its precipitous charge, as well as a long roar.”
barrissements angoissés. » The dangerous animal becomes emotional, and even pitiful. Soon after, « Le rhinocéros barrit abominablement. », to which Daisy responds, « Pauvre bête ! » The animal quickly goes from dangerous beast, to anguished and pitiful beast, then tender husband in quick succession, once it is established that the rhinoceros is human. It roars again in a fashion that is « …violent, mais tendre. » Once reunited, Monsieur and Madame Bœuf depart, as the audience hears, « …venant d’en bas, le rhinocéros barrir tendrement. » The roars become progressively more and more emotionally exaggerated, and so the evolving soundscape at this point is a mixture of animal aggression and human tenderness.

Very soon after, the sounds of Jean’s transformation reveal how humanity becomes more and more violent, until the moment when his green skin and horned head are revealed. The stage directions repeat over and over that Jean’s voice is « une voix rauque/de plus en plus rauque/encore plus rauque/etc. » Finally, Jean is no longer content to express himself in just words, and he roars in anger, written in the play as « Brrr… » (154, 155, 157). At the French premiere, William Sabatier transitioned his performance from yell to roar through long monosyllabic yells, like ‘Paaaaah!’ His voice becomes « méconnaissable »58, his breath harshens, and he gives in to the bestial roar (160, 164). His use of speech lessens and the voice of the victim becomes « difficilement compréhensible… [il] prononce des paroles furieuses et incompréhensibles, fait entendre des sons inouïs… à peine distinctement… » The transformation completes itself, and the last words the audience hears from Jean (« l’animal ») are furious calls amid the sounds and roars, yelling ‘I’m furious! Swine!’ (164). The

52. Ibid., 113. “We hear, from below, anguished roars.”
53. Ibid., 117. “The rhinoceros roars abominably.” “Poor thing!”
54. Ibid., 119. “…violent but tender.”
55. Ibid., 123. “…from below, the rhinoceros tenderly roars.”
56. Ibid., 138, 143, 144, 147. “…has become more and more hoarse/is even hoarser/very hoarse/etc.”
58. Ionesco, Rhinocéros, 157. “…unrecognizable”
59. Ibid., 161, 162. “difficult to understand…pronouncing furious and unintelligible words, making unheard of sounds…hardly distinguishable…,” emphasis mine.
degeneration of Jean’s voice into animal roar is a pivotal moment in the play demonstrating that the disease is one of chaotic and ‘unheard-of’ sounds, confusion, and loss of communication.

The adjective given in the dialogue to describe Jean’s voice, « enroué », made a previous appearance in Ionesco’s diaries from the year 1940, when Romania was forcibly acquired by the German state. Ionesco saw this hoarse yelling as characteristic of politicians in World War II who wanted to sound like the Führer:

…on entend à travers la cloison la voix du vice-président…la voix est imitée de celle d’Hitler…Le vice-président n’est pas hitlérian, et, cependant, il est, d’une façon, hitléranisé, il hurle, puis la voix devient plus molle, puis elle redevient stridente, puis il hurle à nouveau, puis c’est la déclamation pathétique…Hitler a la voix enrouée. Le vice-président du conseil roumain pense qu’il doit être enroué aussi.60

Ionesco writes of a speech he heard during that time on the radio: « J’entends toujours la voix du vice-président du conseil parlant dans le nouveau style de discours politique, le style et les intonations de Hitler, et je distingue, parmi les hurlements, par-ci, par-là, quelques paroles… »61 This is the voice of Jean as he transforms.62

Strange and Melodious Crescendos

In the third act, music accompanies the march of the rhinoceroses and their bestial noises: « On entend du dehors un grand bruit d’un troupeau de rhinocéros, allant à une cadence très rapide. On entend aussi des trompettes, des tambours. »63 The din is musicalized, specifically with trumpets and drums. Philippot’s creations before this point are mostly straightforward, fulfilling requirements of roars and trampling, but in this ultimate crescendo, he fully reveals the

60. Ionesco, Présent Passé Passé Présent, 258-259. “…we hear from across the partition the vice president’s voice…the voice is imitating Hitler’s voice…The vice president isn’t ‘hitlerian,’ and yet, he is, in a certain way, ‘hitleranized,’ he yells, then his voice becomes soft, then piercing once more, then he yells again, the comes the poignant ranting.”

61. Ibid., 258. “I still hear the voice of the vice president of the council, speaking in the new style of political speeches, the style and intonations of Hitler, and I distinguish, among the yells, here and there, some words…”


63. Ionesco, Rhinocéros, 212. “A great noise of a herd of rhinoceroses travelling very fast is heard outside. Trumpets and drums are also heard.”
art of musique concrète. The musicalization of these sounds is sudden: a rumbling, reminiscent of an earthquake, but with a melody in a minor key, forms the foundation of these sounds, while above the rumbling is heard the marching of boots, the roaring of rhinoceroses, bastardized neighs, and the rolling of drums. Fanfares of trumpets and the chanting of voices add to this aural atmosphere. Some of these sounds require instruments to produce them that are outside of the body itself. While noises of galloping, stampedes, panting, and roars can be produced by the rhinoceroses as individuals, the addition of musical sounds indicate that they have organized sufficiently to create a kind of music: « On entend les bruits puissants de la course des rhinocéros. Ces bruits sont musicalisés cependant. » Soon after, the music appears again, and becomes a constant:

Les bruits s’entendent de partout…De droite, et de gauche, dans la maison on entend des pas précipités, des souffles bruyants de fauves. Tous ces bruits effrayants sont cependant rythmés, musicalisés…Cependant, les bruits diminuent et ne constituent plus qu’une sorte de fond sonore et musical.

Philippot added this musical foundation in the use of low tones accompanying the aforementioned rumbling. In a scene reminiscent of the sirens in the Odyssey, this music becomes ‘melodious’: « Bruits devenus mélodieux des rhinocéros. » The rhinoceroses, then, are suddenly worthy of the term “beautiful” in Daisy’s eyes: « Ils chantent, tu entends ?…et puis, regarde, ils jouent, ils dansent…Ils sont beaux. » Philippot chooses steel drums to embody this music. This percussive instrument is capable of multiple tones and so is the natural link between percussion and melody. The stampeding and roaring become music meant for dancing. For Daisy, it is an enticing sound. Hugh Dickinson writes in Myth on the Modern Stage, “Rhinoceros evokes the myth of Ulysses resisting the spell of Circe while his men are transformed into

64. Ionesco, Théâtre de France, Eugène Ionesco, “Rhinocéros” Extraits.

65. Ionesco, Rhinocéros, 219. “Powerful noises of moving rhinoceroses are heard, but somehow it is a musical sound.”

66. Ibid., 232, 233. “Noises come from everywhere at once…From left and right in the house, the noise of rushing feet and the panting breath of the animals. But all these disquieting sounds are nevertheless somehow rhythmical, making a kind of music…However, the noise does diminish, merely forming a sort of musical background.”

67. Ibid., 240-241. “The rhinoceros noises have become melodious.” “Daisy: They’re singing, do you hear it?…and look, they’re playing, and dancing…They’re beautiful.”
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swine.”68 However, the presence of music in this portion of the play suggests that a different chapter of the Odyssey, that of the singing of the sirens, would be equally appropriate.

The particular kind of musicality indicated by the playwright at this scene becomes an important point. Ionesco specifically mentions drums and trumpets. These instruments have very strong relations to the theater of war. The sounds of these militaristic instruments, along with the serious nature of the conflict between the humans and rhinoceroses, highlight the societal division that has become violent. The journals Ionesco kept in Romania in the 1930s, describing the Nazi sympathizers as rhinoceroses, are often cited by critics. The addition of these sounds in the play’s performance in 1960 provoked memories of the war-era for many of those in attendance at the play’s premiere. Philippot’s noises were a key element of this aurally referential play. Literary critic Jean-Paul Weber, writing for Le Figaro Littéraire, wrote:

> Des sabots arrachent des sons à la vase, avec une volupté animale…Puis un soupçon de marche militaire, un chant mugissant et viril…Où, quand ai-je donc entendu ces marches martiales et biologiques ? —Oh, qu’est-ce que c’est ? Qui a fait cette musique ?…—Un musicien concret…Philippot…69

A few journalists in attendance at the premiere also made mention of what they heard in the musique concrète. Guy Leclerc, writing to the readers of Humanité, observed: « dans la musique “concrète” qui accompagne le spectacle se sont glissées quelques notes d’un chant que scandalisent les nazis en défilant dans nos rues. »70 Michel Philippot accessed, through his compositions, memories of the occupation in Paris, and in doing so conveyed even further the play’s allegorical message. Jean Vigneron, in an article for La Croix praised, with reluctance, the musique concrète’s ability to transport the audience to the Occupation:

---


70. Guy Leclerc, “Sur les scènes parisiennes par Guy Leclerc: Rhinocéros d’Eugène Ionesco; (pièce à thèses),” Humanité, January 25, 1960, in ibid. “the ‘musique concrète’ that accompanies the show has inserted notes inserted into it from a song the Nazis chanted marching down our streets...”
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N’avions-nous pas entendu… « le piétinement sourd de légions en marche » ?
N’avions-nous pas, dans l’oreille (grâce à la musique concrète—pour une fois efficace et percutante—de Michel Philippot) l’écho des marches guerrières allemandes ? 71

Even a critic who disparaged the play’s allegorical message was still impressed by the ‘technical resources’ of the play’s sound production:

En mêlant aux barrissements de fauves des refrains de l’occupation nazie, Michel Philippot a confirmé les ressources techniques du laboratoire de musique concrète de la R.T.F., mais il a souligné encore le symbolisme trop appuyé de la pièce.72

Another disdainful critic writing also for Humanité even heard sounds in the musique concrète that were not specifically mentioned in the script:

...personne ne peut se tromper sur la signification de la pièce, on ne fait pas plus direct. Tout y est : la couleur gris-vert des rhinocéros, les barrissements de la musique concrète où l’on entend concrètement des mots allemands, ce bruit énorme avec, ici et là, celui, bien connu, des bottes.73

This play has characters anchored in the sounds they produce, noises suggesting actions off-stage, and nonsense creating cacophony on-stage, all of which create soundscapes of chaos and soundstorms of confusion. Beyond the clear allegory of the play is a commentary on noise itself and the anguishes of language that turn the calm and quiet of cool reason into an entrancing, melodic and violent din.

71. Jean Vigeron, “Au Théâtre de France: Rhinocéros de Ionesco,” La Croix, February 4, 1960, in ibid. “…Did we not, a moment before, hear “the deafening stampede of marching legions”? Did we not have (thanks to the musique concrète—for once useful and striking—of Michel Philippot) the echo of German military marches?”

72. Bertrand Poirot-Delpech, “Rhinocéros d’Eugène Ionesco au Théâtre de France,” Unknown newspaper, January 23, 1960, in ibid. “…In adding to the roars of the beasts refrains from the Nazi occupation, Michel Philippot confirmed the technical resources of his laboratory of musique concrète of the Radiodiffusion Française, but he underlined once more the overly apparent symbolism of the play.”

73. Humanité, “Dans ‘Les Lettres Françaises’ Elsa Triolet dit ce qu’elle pense de Rhinocéros,” January 28, 1960, in ibid. “…no one can be confused as to the meaning of the play, it couldn’t be more direct. Everything is there: the grey-green color of the rhinoceroses, the roars of the musique concrète in which one hears concretely words in German, this enormous noise with, here and there, another, well known, of boots.”
Chapter 2

Soundscapes, Silence, and the Search Beyond the Word in Samuel Beckett’s
En attendant Godot

This analysis of En attendant Godot posits the creation of aural soundscapes in the play through silence and musical elements, in order to create a silent-dominant work in which sounds combat against silence. Pauses, silences, and questions create soundscapes of uncertainty, while rhythm, repetition, dynamics, and music create soundscapes of spectacle. In a reflection of the period’s aesthetic questionings, Samuel Beckett reshapes the aural landscape of drama through silence in the same way he redefines action with skeletal plot of En attendant Godot. This section uses a range of studies concerning Beckett’s connections to sound in order to further understand the barriers between sound and literature in general. It also features primary and secondary source material that explore the exacting vision Beckett had in terms of the way he felt his works should sound. Like a piece of a narrative tapestry, the sound effects in En attendant Godot were a part of the twentieth-century aesthetic environment of exploration and reimagining.

Beckett was among a group of artists who chose to use silence in their art. In the late nineteenth century, the world of classical music had placed a premium on music with high emotive content, and a group of Eastern European composers became well-known for their nationalistic works incorporating melodies of folk music. This change in the classical world was fundamental, since it introduced other musical possibilities to the Western ear. The twentieth century played host to another wave of changes as movements of Modernism took hold in other arts. In France, composers like Erik Satie, Claude Debussy, Maurice Ravel, and Darius Milhaud

---

all sought to create something new through their use of multiple or a-tonality and their unafraid use of silence. Debussy’s *Clair de Lune* has abundant pauses all throughout its flowing melodic path. Satie’s *Gymnopédies* are thought to be minimalism fifty years in advance, since it is in their simplicity and silence that their genius lies. In America, John Cage and other experimental composers began to use chance to compose music. Cage used this method to write an entirely silent piece, *4'33”*.  

Silence also occupied an important place for Beckett, whether in literature or music. In his July 7, 1936 letter to Thomas McGreevy discussing an English translation of a work by Paul Éluard, he expressed his belief in translating not only the words, but also the intervals between them: “No attempt seems to have been made to translate the pauses. Like Beethoven played strictly to time.” Another letter to Axel Kaun expressed a desire to render literature more beholden to silence:

> Und immer mehr wie ein Schleier kommt mir meine Sprache vor, den man zerreissen muss, um an die hinterliegenden Dinge (oder das hinterliegende Nichts) zu kommen… Hoffentlich kommt die Zeit, sie ist ja Gott sei Dank in gewissen Kreisen schon da, wo die Sprache da am besten gebraucht wird, wo sie am tüchtigsten missgebraucht wird…Ein Loch nach dem andern in ihr zu bohren, bis das Dahinterkauernde, sei es etwas oder nichts, durchzusickern anfängt - ich kann mir für den heutigen Schriftsteller kein höheres Ziel vorstellen.  

This idea of understanding what was underneath words was a great curiosity of Beckett’s. He sought to give literature elements of music that made words as moving as melody, and besieged them with silence:

> Oder soll die Literatur auf jenem alten faulen von Musik und Malerei längst verlassenen Wege allein hinterbleiben? Steckt etwas lähmend heiliges in der Unnatur des Wortes, was zu den Elementen der anderen Künste nicht gehört? Gibt es irgendeinen Grund, warum jene fürchterlich willkürliche Materialität der Wortfläche nicht aufgelöst werden sollte, wie z.B. die von grossen schwarzen

---


76. Samuel Beckett to Axel Kaun, Dublin, 9 July 1937, in ibid., 513-521. “And more and more my language appears to me like a veil which one has to tear apart in order to get to those things (or the nothingness) lying behind it…It is to be hoped the time will come, thank God, in some circles it already has, when language is best used where it is most efficiently abused…To drill one hole after another into it until that which lurks behind, be it something or nothing, starts seeping through - I cannot imagine a higher goal for today’s writer.”
Pausen gefressene Tonfläche in der siebten Symphonie von Beethoven, so dass wir sie ganze Seiten durch nicht anders wahrnehmen können als etwa einen schwindelnden unergründliche Schlünde von Stillschweigen verknüpfenden Pfad von Lauten?77

His frustration with those who did not seek silence, as he did, did not dissuade him in his ultimate goal of using silence to write works whose meanings transcended mere words:

Ich weiss, es gibt Leute, empfindsame und intelligente Leute, für die es an Stillschweigen gar nicht fehlt. Ich kann nicht umhin, anzunehmen, dass sie schwerhörig sind...Selbstverständlich muss man sich vorläufig mit Wenigem begnügen. Zuerst kann es nur darauf ankommen, irgendwie eine Methode zu erfinden, um diese höhnische Haltung dem Worte gegenüber wörtlich darzustellen. In dieser Dissonanz von Mitteln und Gebrauch wird man schon vielleicht ein Geflüster der Endmusik oder des Allem zu Grunde liegenden Schweigens spüren können.78

This letter has notable musical and aural imagery at its conclusion, in its references to ‘dissonance of instrument and usage,’ as well as the ‘whispering of the end-music or of the silence underlying it all.’ Beckett obviously considered his craft very tied to the act of listening. He also felt that literature’s effect could be more like that of musical composition, especially those of Ludwig van Beethoven. Mary Bryden writes, “The intensity of listening is to be found everywhere in Beckett’s writing.”79

Beginning with the author’s study of Proust and Schopenhauer, and tracing the echoes of musical metaphor and matter through Beckett’s subsequent works, Eric Prieto in his work

*Listening In: Music, Mind and the Modernist Narrative* gives a full account of the musical keys

77. Ibid. “Or is literature alone to be left behind on that old, foul road long ago abandoned by music and painting? Is there something paralysingly sacred contained within the unname of the word that does not belong to the elements of the other arts? Is there any reason why that terrifyingly arbitrary materiality of the word surface should not be dissolved, as for example the sound surface of Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony is devoured by huge black pauses, so that for pages on end we cannot perceive it as other than a dizzying path of sounds connecting unfathomable chasms of silence?”

78. Ibid. “I know there are people, sensitive and intelligent people, for whom there is no lack of silence. I cannot help but assume that they are hard of hearing.. Of course, for the time being, one makes do with little. At first, it can only be a matter of somehow inventing a method of verbally demonstrating this scornful attitude vis-à-vis the word. In this dissonance of instrument and usage perhaps one will already be able to sense a whispering of the end-music or of the silence underlying it all.”

that unlock meaning throughout the author’s œuvre. He champions Beckett as the author and literary integrator of music par excellence. In an analysis of Beckett’s critical work Proust (an author whose work delved into the mystery of music in repeated instances) reveals foreshadowing of this aural direction of the author’s future prose, poetry and theater. Beckett praised Marcel Proust’s dedication to the “concrete,” as opposed to the “concept,” which dichotomy Prieto aligns with music, saying,

It is crucial for our understanding of the role of music in Beckett’s work to emphasize that the concept…is superficial, that is, limited to a surface understanding of phenomena…Having aligned the concept with the surface of phenomenal reality, Beckett turns to music as an art aligned with perception, the thing-in-itself, and the beyond of noumenal ideality. Because it does not use concepts, music can, when interpreted correctly, remove the intellectual barriers that keep human understanding on the phenomenal surface of things and communicate an experience approaching the status of the contemplation of the thing-in-itself.81

Silence and music were both tools Beckett used in his search beyond the word. These subjects have occupied much thought among Beckettian researchers. As Colin Duckworth explains, “One feature of Beckett’s dramatic style is very easy to imitate or parody—but extremely difficult to render on stage with all its potential intensity of effect: silence. The fragility of his style derives from the fact that it is composed as much of silence as of words…”82 Mary Bryden’s Samuel Beckett and Music compiles multiple forays into Beckett’s musical writing and musical responses to his works. Indeed, they show that En attendant Godot is comparatively lacking in musical imagery in its text in comparison with others plays and novels he wrote. And by no means did Beckett restrict his interactions with music to poetry and prose standing alone: indeed, Edith Fournier writes of how Beckett worked on an opera with Marcel Mihalovici, spending days working with the composer on how the score and text should sound together. She writes of the silences in their collaboration: “…Marcel Mihalovici and Samuel Beckett both have the rare gift of encompassing silence (which is just as much an essential material as sound or


81. Ibid., 172-173.

word) within their respective art forms, endowing it with emotional hues and expressive possibilities.”

Deborah Weagel writes “En attendant Godot/Waiting for Godot is another case of music in literature, in that one finds musical qualities in Beckett’s treatment of dynamics, sentiment, and tempo, and in his use of rests and pauses.”

Lois Oppenheim compiled several publications concerning Beckett’s connections with multiple art forms in *Samuel Beckett and the Arts: Music, Visual Arts and Non-Print Media.*

Bryden is the editor of the work *Samuel Beckett and Music,* which compiles essays on the “significance of music in the work of Beckett.”

Beckett’s preoccupations with sensory involvement in the arts has been explored in the publications of these and other researchers who analyze the musical effects of Beckett’s works or seek to highlight the multi-aesthetic elements of his writing. Having focused primarily on the musical elements, there is considerable precedent for more extensive work to be done on the multi-sensory isolation Beckett experiments with throughout his career.

**Soundscapes of Uncertainty**

*En attendant Godot* is normally characterized as bleak, confusing, pointless, and a host of other adjectives concerning its ambiguous location, plot, and characters. From its opening moments, the environment of the play is peppered with questions, resignations of impotence and pauses. These create soundscapes of uncertainty that contain few answers and only obfuscate the play further. At the world premiere in 1953 at the Théâtre de Babylone, Alain Robbe-Grillet watched and later, wrote:

*Tout se passe comme si les deux vagabonds se trouvaient en scène sans avoir de rôle…* Ils ne semblent pas avoir de texte tout préparé, et…de même qu’ils n’ont

---


rien à réciter, ils n’ont rien à inventer non plus ; et leur conversation…se réduit à des fragments dérisoires.87

During these ‘pathetic’ and badly improvised conversations, full of holes and unanswered questions, the play’s plot grinds to a halt and the soundscape of uncertainty takes hold of the theater. Jacques-Henry Jouheaud called it ‘a climate of intense interest’ created by ‘puerile words,’ and ‘the absence of any stage music.’88 He was partially right.

Questions

James Knowlson’s understanding of Beckettian drama points out the importance of questions in En attendant Godot:

The essential qualities of uncertainty, ignorance and impotence that fill the lives of the characters emerge in the form of hundreds of questions that receive no answers—some of them, indeed almost seem to expect none, since, although interrogatives, they are followed by no question mark. In an unpublished linguistic analysis of the play that I have seen, it has been calculated that twenty-four percent of the utterances are questions while only twelve percent are replies. And many which seem to take the form of answers are not this at all, since they leave the troubling problems that provoked the questions entirely unresolved. The same qualities of uncertainty and irresolution emerge in the form of stories that are never concluded, actions that are left deliberately unexplained, and in the form of concrete visual images that reveal man as essentially befuddled, disoriented, lost and bewildered.89

These questions are asked and never answered, and cement the uncertainty of the play’s setting and action. One moment that first illustrates this incomprehension occurs early in the play:

Estragon (inquiet) : Et nous?

87. Alain Robbe-Grillet, “Samuel Beckett ou la présence sur la scène,” Pour un nouveau roman (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1961), 103. “It’s as if the two vagabonds found themselves on-stage with no part…They don’t seem to have prepared their text and…just as they can’t recite anything, they can’t invent anything either; and their conversation…withers in pathetic fragments.”


Vladimir : Plaît-il ?
Estragon : Je dis, Et nous ?
Vladimir : Je ne comprends pas.
Estragon : Quel est notre rôle là-dedans?90

The pair is unsure of their exact relation to Godot, in addition to being unsure of their location, the time, and the events of the previous day. At the close of each act, the exchanges of question and response between Vladimir and the Boy repeatedly demonstrate that sometimes, responses do not provide answers:

Vladimir : La mémoire nous joue de ces tours…Je t’ai déjà vu, n’est-ce pas ?
Garçon : Je ne sais pas, monsieur.
Vladimir : Tu ne me connais pas ?
Garçon : Non, monsieur.
Vladimir : Tu n’es pas venu hier ?
Garçon : Non, monsieur.91

Despite the certainty with which the boy responds yes and no, the answers do not illuminate their situation any further. Asking about Godot only leads to vague physical traits, and the boy seems as plagued by memory loss as the two older men. The aural environment created by these unanswered queries is one of longing to understand, and receiving no reply. The 2012 Cort Theatre production in New York City added another effect to add to this questioning atmosphere: the call of a mourning dove. The birdsong swooped upward, and gave three soft, pitiful hoots at two or three moments of extended silence. No response was heard in the theater.


“Estragon (worried): And we?
Vladimir: I beg your pardon?
Estragon: I said, and we?
Vladimir: I don’t understand.
Estragon: Where do we come in?”

91. Ibid., 70.

“Vladimir: Extraordinary the tricks that memory plays!...I’ve seen you before, haven’t I?
Boy: I don’t know, Sir.
Vladimir: You don’t know me?
Boy: No, Sir.
Vladimir: It wasn’t you came yesterday?
Boy: No, Sir.”
Pauses

En attendant Godot contains eighty-eight pauses in its script, indicated by “Repos,” “Un temps,” or “Pause.” “Un temps” is the most common occurrence, and constitutes almost all eighty-eight. More than half of the pauses in the play are found in the first act. Together with silences, pauses help create the soundscapes of uncertainty in the play. These are fueled by the numerous moments of indecision and hesitation. Rests and pauses pass by quickly, while silences’ longer durations create a more tangible absence of sound. According to Peter Hall, who directed the first English premiere, “One of the main difficulties facing the actors…was Beckett’s insistence on precisely timed pauses and silences, some of which the actors feared might make it appear they had forgotten their lines.” Indeed, these pauses and the soundscape they create seem to contradict the fundamental idea that everything in a play is ‘staged,’ that is, that every moment, every gesture, and every word is intentional and prescribed, either by the playwright, the director, or by personal decision of the actor. En attendant Godot features rude language, smelly shoes, farts, and eighty-eight moments of pause.

For Roger Blin, not just the pauses, but even the punctuation plays a role in the ‘poetry’ of the play, and he describes ellipsis points as allowing the text to ‘breathe’:

Mais la poésie des textes de Beckett vient essentiellement de la quantité de points autour desquels s’articulent les phrases. Toutes les phrases sont ponctuées abondamment. Il y a dans les textes de Beckett des phrases que l’on peut dire d’une seule traite que les comédiens sont tentés de dire d’une seule traite, mais qui sont entrecoupées de points qui font évoluer le sens de la phrase vers autre chose. C’est la quantité de points et leur place dans les répliques qui donnent le rythme et la respiration du texte, le rythme lyrique qui oblige le comédien à un travail très particulier.

92. For a complete list of these pauses and silences, see the appendices.


94. Roger Blin, Souvenirs et propos de Roger Blin, recueillis par Lynda Bellity Peskine (Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1986), 94. “But the poetry of Beckett’s texts comes essentially from the amount of ellipsis points around which the phrases articulate themselves. All the lines are abundantly punctuated. There are phrases in Beckett’s scripts that one could say in one go, and that actors are tempted to say in one go, but which are divided up with ellipsis points that steer the meaning of the phrase toward something else. It’s the amount of ellipsis points and their places in the lines that give the text its rhythm and respiration, the lyrical rhythm that gives the actor a very particular kind of work.”
In Blin’s opinion, the spaces between words and phrases had tremendous value and meaning, and force the actor to study them in order to determine how they change meanings of phrases. They are numerous: in Act One alone there are 131 ellipsis points. These could be studied from a linguistic perspective in how their placements serve prosodic functions in the spoken dialogue. Michael Worton writes, “The pauses…are crucial. They enable Beckett to present silences of inadequacy…silences of repression…and silences of anticipation…Furthermore, such pauses leave the reader-spectator space and time to explore the blank spaces between the words…”

Where these pauses were concerned, Beckett was very difficult to please. After seeing the 1955 Criterion Theatre production in London (the British premiere), Beckett said to director Peter Hall, “It’s fine, but you don’t bore the audience enough. Make them wait longer. Make the pauses longer. You should bore them.” Indeed, he even subsequently sent a long list to Peter Hall of his notes, most of which extend pauses and create more boredom-inducing moments:

9 and the other…damned. He should take longer to find the word.

[...]

11 But what Saturday? etc Much slower and more broken. Pause after each question. Each question a banderilla. Let each day sink in before passing on to next.

[...]

13 Long embarrassed silence after horse.

[...]

14 Ti-ed. Two syllables.
For the moment. Longer pause before.

[...]

17 Oh I say…It’s the chafing. A little too fast. More value to 5 successive it’s. A trifle effeminate etc. A little too fast.

[...]


[...]

38 What a day. Out of a silence.

39 Full value to silence between Estragon’s We are happy and What do we do now etc.

40 Say something. Anguished. Full value to preceding silence.

[...]

---


96. Croall, 43.
They concentrate bare-headed. Longer. More parodic. Same effect as in Act I when Vladimir, Estragon and Pozzo concentrate.

Vladimir’s walk in his shirt-sleeves should last longer. The coat should fall to the ground when Estragon wakes with a start. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

Vladimir should inspect audience at much greater length before saying Well I can understand that. All this passage played too fast. [⋯]

The playwright writes this letter after he is prevented by Alan Schneider from giving each of the actors of the 1955 London production individual lists of corrections to make in their performances. Many of the playwright’s notes describe silences, hesitations, or moments of lengthening written in the script, and were important enough as to warrant this detailed letter of critique.

Many of these critiques given by the playwright ask for longer silences and hesitations between words, generating greater quantities of time in which silence speaks on-stage. Beckett specified these moments of emptiness in his stage directions and even wanted their presence to be emphasized. Throughout his career, Beckett was unafraid of, and sometimes even happy to be defying expectations in this manner. He once said to actress Billie Whitelaw, “Bore them to death […] Bore the pants off them.” In a letter to an American publisher, even the structure used in the publication of the play was, according to him, a visual reinforcement of a central theme of the play:


98. Ibid., 579n1.

À la rigueur, if you wish, simple capitals, E. for Estragon and V. for Vladimir, etc., since no confusion is possible, and perhaps no heavier in type than those of the text. But I prefer the full name. Their repetition, even when corresponding speech amount to no more than a syllable, has its function in the sense that it reinforces the repetitive text. The symbols are variety and the whole affair is monotony.\textsuperscript{100}

Silences

Silence is a dominant presence in the play. It begins each act as the characters enter onstage, and ends each act as Vladimir and Estragon sit unmoving. The play can be described as silent-dominant in its constant returning to moments without any sound. «Silence.» is written as a stage direction in the script of En attendant Godot 117 times.\textsuperscript{101} In these moments, the playwright specifically termed the absence of sound “silence” instead of “pause.” This suggests that pauses simply were not long enough. Silence also receives special distinction in certain passages when its length must be increased for moments of «Long silence.» and «Grand silence.» In terms of distribution, there are more silences in the second act (seventy-four) than in the first (fifty-three). The relative quiet of Pozzo in the second act as compared to his larger-than-life presence in the first is one reason for this crescendo of silences, as well as the heavy focus in Act Two on Vladimir and Estragon’s quieter exchanges. “Silence” is the most frequent noun in the script, and it could be argued that silence is so frequent that it ‘speaks,’ like a character.\textsuperscript{102} Ionesco writes that “silence is a character” in theater.\textsuperscript{103} These silences, then, are a character alongside the quartet. Beckett wrote twenty years prior to Godot, “The experience of my reader shall be between the phrases, in the silence, communicated by the intervals, not the


\textsuperscript{101} There are several differences between the French and English translations of the play. However, these present more of a complication to this particular thesis than an addition, therefore it can serve as the subject of another analysis.

\textsuperscript{102} This result came from a text analysis tool called Voyant Tools that formulates statistical data about input text.

\textsuperscript{103} Ionesco, Notes et Contre-notes, 361.
terms, of the statement.”¹⁰⁴ He was writing about his novels, but his attention to the ‘intervals’ did not change when he wrote En attendant Godot, and it even continued throughout his career. Marjorie Perloff writes of the ‘pathos’ of silence in Beckett’s radio play Embers when she writes, “On stage or in film ‘silence’ is represented by having some sort of visual movement… during which nothing is ‘said.’”¹⁰⁵ This is precisely the realm into which this thesis ventures.

Beckett wrote in his letter to Axel Kaun that he desired to make words slaves to ‘huge black pauses.’ These silences do just that. However frequently the characters Vladimir and Estragon speak and ‘blather,’ their discourse will never conquer the silence that awaits them. As Irving Wardle wrote, “…every little canter between Didi and Gogo is followed by an appropriate silence for the black chasm to reopen under their feet.”¹⁰⁶ These natural termini of phrases in pauses can serve as the break between one idea and another, but silences often appear at the moment when the conversation has nowhere else to venture. Vladimir and Estragon are particularly sensitive to silence, as will be shown. The absence of sound draws them back into a void both aural and temporal and agonizes the pair with its inevitable victory over all their efforts.

One of these unendurable voids occurs after Estragon falls asleep for a short time. Vladimir suddenly wakes him, claiming he felt ‘lonely.’ Estragon’s questioning Vladimir if ‘this [dream]’s enough for you?’ is followed by a silence, maintaining the tension created in their spat (19). The absence of sound immediately following this question effectively gives it a resonance that both provokes and provides for further reflection.

The exchange of « Vladimir : Dis quelque chose ! / Estragon : Je cherche. », is surrounded by two long silences.¹⁰⁷ The aural void envelopes them despite their best efforts to keep it at bay by singing, dancing, insulting one another, exercising, etc. Vladimir and

---


¹⁰⁶. Irving Wardle, Times, January 27, 1971, as quoted in Duckworth, 83.

Estragon’s discussion of what lies within silence explains why they constantly try and overcome it:

Vladimir : Nous avons des excuses.
Estragon : C’est pour ne pas entendre.
Vladimir : Nous avons nos raisons.
Estragon : Toutes les voix mortes.
Vladimir : Ça fait un bruit d’ailes.
Estragon : De feuilles.
Vladimir : De sable.
Estragon : De feuilles.
(Silence.)

In this exchange they discuss a sound heard only by themselves, the sound of ‘dead voices.’ These voices have been quieted by death, and no longer resound, but their absence instills fear and anguish into the two men, who seek to avoid ‘hearing’ this unendurable quiet by speaking. With this explanation from the pair, silence is no longer empty, but represents voices who can no longer speak, that Martin Esslin describes as “voices of the past…that explore the mysteries of being and the self to the limits of anguish and suffering.” One is reminded of a letter Beckett wrote saying that the dialogue in En attendant Godot « s’agit d’une parole dont la fonction n’est pas tant d’avoir un sens que de lutter, mal j’espère, contre le silence, et d’y renvoyer. » The silence returns and overwhelms the two, only to be held back once more by their ‘blathering.’ In a skirmish of sound versus silence, the two return to their first descriptions of the ‘voices’ before the final silence, this time accentuated in its length:

108. Ibid., 87.
“Vladimir: We have that excuse.
Estragon: It’s so we won’t hear.
Vladimir: We have our reasons.
Estragon: All the dead voices.
Vladimir: They make a noise like wings.
Estragon: Like leaves.
Vladimir: Like sand.
Estragon: Like leaves.
[Silence.]”


110. Samuel Beckett to Edouard Coester, Paris, 11 March 1954, in The Letters of Samuel Beckett 1941-1956, 474-475. “concerns speech whose function is not so much to have meaning, as it is to struggle, badly I hope, against the silence, and to overwhelm it.”
Vladimir: Ça fait comme un bruit de plumes.
Estragon: De feuilles.
Vladimir: De cendres.
Estragon: De feuilles.

(Long silence.)\textsuperscript{111}

Despair is only aggravated by the silence after Pozzo’s essay at lyric recitation: « C’est comme ça que ça se passe sur cette putain de terre. Long silence. »\textsuperscript{112} ‘This bitch of an earth’ is such a strong statement that it necessitates an uncomfortable silence afterwards.

Before Lucky’s monologue truly begins, there is a long, tense silence in Pozzo’s call to wait, as they search for Pozzo’s spray (57). They wait for something unknown and unrevealed. Then, the longest silence in the entire play comes after the ghastly and interminable monologue Lucky babbles. This « Grand silence, » demonstrates at once the weariness of the speaker, Pozzo’s anguish, and Estragon and Vladimir’s stupefaction (62).

Later, when Estragon and Vladimir announce their presence to the now-blind Pozzo with « Nous sommes des hommes. », the lengthened silence questions their humanity and ability to help Pozzo at all.\textsuperscript{113} These silences continually return the characters to the realm of uncertainty, hesitation and fear.

**Soundscapes of Spectacle**

Regardless of Beckett’s professed preference to keep theater strictly within the realms of speech and acting, elements of other types of dramatic performance bled through in his writing. Through the use of rhythm, repetition, dynamics and music, the playwright creates soundscapes of spectacle that contrast sharply against soundscapes of uncertainty in the play. These soundscapes of spectacle are reminiscent of music hall and vaudeville. These are frequent terms


“Vladimir: They make a noise like feathers.
Estragon: Like leaves.
Vladimir: Like ashes.
Estragon: Like leaves.
[Long silence.]”

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 52. “That’s how it is on this bitch of an earth. [Long silence.]”

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 115. “We are men.”
used in describing certain two- and three-man scenes in En attendant Godot. For example, Fred Miller Robinson discusses in his article “Tray Bong! Godot and Music Hall” the preponderance of ‘music hall’ routines in the play, and the possibility of viewing it as one music hall variety show. These scenes do not contain awkward pauses and uncomfortable silences; they are rhythmic, rhyming, and well-timed. Not all silences in the play are painful. For example, in the beginning of the play, a humorous, yet pathetic moment is enhanced by a silence following a comment from Estragon:

Vladimir: Tu aurais dû être poète.
Estragon: Je l’ai été. (Geste vers ses haillons.) Ça ne se voit pas?
Silence.

Almost anticipating the audience’s reaction, the playwright seems to provide for the necessary moment of comprehension, and for the subsequent chuckle, with that moment of silence. Humor is an element of these scenes, as well. If this is performed effectively, the audience’s own laughter, and not the silence, becomes part of the soundscape of spectacle.

**Rhythm**

While Estragon claims that his talks with Vladimir are nothing but ‘blathering’, certain of their exchanges have a distinctly rhythmic feel to them. Some words even rhyme or have similar syllabic counts. For example, the discussion of Godot’s relation to Estragon and Vladimir exhibits similar phrase structure, which creates a sense of rhythm:

Vladimir: Tu n’étais pas là?
Estragon: Je n’ai pas fait attention.
Vladimir: Eh bien… Rien de bien précis.
Estragon: Une sorte de prière.
Vladimir: Voilà.

---


“Vladimir: You should have been a poet.
Estragon: I was. [Gesture towards his rags.] Isn’t that obvious?
[Silence].”

116. Ibid., 92. « Estragon: Eh ben… Nous avons dû bavarder. » “Estragon: Do… I suppose we blathered.”
Estragon : Une vague supplique.
Vladimir : Si tu veux.
Estragon : Et qu’a-t-il répondu ?
Vladimir : Qu’il verrait.
Estragon : Qu’il ne pouvait rien promettre.
Vladimir : Qu’il lui fallait réfléchir.
Estragon : À tête reposée.
Vladimir : Consulter sa famille.
Estragon : Ses amis.
Vladimir : Ses agents.
Estragon : Ses correspondants.
Vladimir : Ses registres.
Estragon : Son compte en banque.
Vladimir : Avant de se prononcer.
Estragon : C’est normal.
Vladimir : N’est-ce pas ?
Estragon : Il me semble.
Vladimir : À moi aussi.

*Repos.*\(^{117}\)

---

\(^{117}\) Ibid., 24.

“Vladimir: Were you not there?
Estragon: I can’t have been listening.
Vladimir: Oh... Nothing very definite.
Estragon: A kind of prayer.
Vladimir: Precisely.
Estragon: A vague supplication.
Vladimir: Exactly.
Estragon: And what did he reply?
Vladimir: That he’d see
Estragon: That he couldn’t promise anything.
Vladimir: That he’d have to think it over.
Estragon: In the quiet of his home.
Vladimir: Consult his family.
Estragon: His friends.
Vladimir: His agents.
Estragon: His correspondents.
Vladimir: His books.
Estragon: His bank account.
Vladimir: Before taking a decision.
Estragon: It’s the normal thing.
Vladimir: Is it not?
Estragon: I think it is.
Vladimir: I think so too.

[Silence.]”
This first example of a rhythmic rally has no syllabic parallels, as later ones do, but the style of the delivery is such that each expounds upon the remarks of the other. Fournier points out Beckett’s love of repetition:

In this case, which is so frequent in Samuel Beckett’s *œuvre*, the return has the same value as that which is called ‘recurrent series’ in the field of mathematics: a series in which each term is a dependent variable of the terms immediately preceding. Each new statement both encompasses and exceeds the one before.  

This continues for some lines, until it comes to a natural close in the final repose. No pauses break this section of dialogue. Another of these moments of vaudeville occurs when the pair wonders whether they should be doing their exercises (106).

The rhythms heard in this play were desired by the playwright. Contemporaries suggested he was very particular about them, and not just concerning *En attendant Godot*: “One of the elements that mattered most to [Beckett] was the precision of the text’s rhythm, as was made very clear one day while he was directing *Happy Days* at the Court [Theatre], when he brought a metronome into rehearsals, placed it on the floor, and said: ‘This is the rhythm I want.’”

**Repetitions**

This play is complex for many reasons, but one of the most taxing, according to Peter Hall, is its repetitions. There is great importance in the repetitions of *En attendant Godot*: while watching Beckett direct a late 1974 production in Schiller, Germany, Walter D. Asmus notes, “It should be done very simply, without long passages, to give confusion shape, he says, a shape through repetition, repetition of themes.” This element of Beckett’s theater certainly has not gone unnoticed. Thomas Cousineau writes an entire chapter on “Repetition and Difference” in his *Waiting for Godot: Form in Movement*. He distinguishes two kinds of repetition in his study of Beckett’s mise-en-scène: simple repetition and ‘repetition of

---

118. Fournier, 136.

119. Croall, 88.

120. Ibid., 51. “[*En attendant Godot*] is a fiendishly difficult play to learn, because of all the repetition.”

difference,’ which he describes as “a form of repetition…involving different elements [which] provokes none of the tedium that we feel when confronted with repetitions of the same.” These repetitions are not limited to sounds, but also include gestures and positioning on stage. Comparative similarities between the two acts are also presented: “On the one hand, repetition produces an effect of routine and fatigue; we feel bored and want something different to happen…At the same time, we take pleasure in observing the significant differences that Beckett introduces into the general pattern of repetition.” In the play’s absence of any reliable chronological measure, Cousineau sees repetition as a cog in the machine that strips time of its normal place of precedence in the theater.  

Jonathan Croall in The Coming of Godot describes a moment from a rehearsal of a 2005 British production in which, “The frequent repetition of certain phrases still occasionally causes the actors to lose their bearings.” For certain, these repetitions make the performance a challenge, but they are, in analysis, found to have two different types of iteration: isolated passages of interior repetition, and returning passages of similar or repeated phrases in both acts. Each kind of repetition aurally reinforces the play’s concern with memory. Sometimes these reiterations emphasize vaudevillian atmosphere, and at other times, they emphasize certain key passages.

The 1988 VHS set Beckett Directs Beckett contains a filmed production of Waiting for Godot, directed by Walter D. Asmus. Filmed in Paris, under Beckett’s watchful eye, Asmus had the playwright’s complete confidence in making directorial decisions consistent with his vision. This production, therefore, contains ample material for understanding how Beckett heard and saw his play during that time. For example, pauses and silences are ponderously drawn out: the first sound of the play is not heard for a full two minutes. Gestures, as well as vociferations, are highly controlled and greatly exaggerated in this production. For example, Estragon makes the same grunt three times as he tries to take off his boot, and the movement of his arms is just as


123. Croall, 65.
precise and repetitive. These productions, however, are not meant to provide perfect performances of the plays. They were intended to serve as “points of departure from which present and future theater and television and film artists can explore other interpretations.”

As Henri Bergson in *Le Rire*, writes, « Là où il y a répétition, similitude complète, nous soupçonnons du mécanique fonctionnant derrière le vivant. » Estragon’s questionings of locale and time use this first isolated kind of repetition, and are some of the first indications of uncertainty:

Estragon: …Tu es sûr que c’est ici ?
Vladimir: Quoi ?
Estragon: Qu’il faut attendre.
Vladimir: Il a dit devant l’arbre.

Not a minute later, the audience hears the same parallel phrase structure:

Estragon: Tu es sûr que c’était ce soir ?
Vladimir: Quoi ?
Estragon: Qu’il fallait attendre ?
Vladimir: Il a dit samedi. (*Un temps.*) Il me semble.

Shortly after, there is another rhythmic exchange describing the human condition as the pair experiences it:

---


   “Estragon: …You’re sure it was here?
   Vladimir: What?
   Estragon: That we were to wait.
   Vladimir: He said by the tree.”

128. Ibid., 18.
   “Estragon: You’re sure it was this evening?
   Vladimir: What?
   Estragon: That we were to wait.
   Vladimir: He said Saturday.”
Vladimir : On n’y peut rien.
Estragon : On a beau se démener.
Vladimir : On reste ce qu’on est.
Estragon : On a beau se tortiller.
Vladimir : Le fond ne change pas.
Estragon : Rien à faire.129

Again, they each expound upon the remark of the other. Later, when Estragon and Vladimir respond to Pozzo’s dramatic thoughts on the sky, their impressions mimic their previous comments on the human condition. The exchange is the same in length, subject, and again uses the subject pronoun « on ». However, the first to speak this time is Estragon, instead of Vladimir:

Estragon : Du moment qu’on est prévenus.
Vladimir : On peut patienter.
Estragon : On sait à quoi s’en tenir.
Vladimir : Plus d’inquiétude à avoir.
Estragon : Il n’y a qu’à attendre.
Vladimir : Nous en avons l’habitude.130

Estragon’s pathetic positivity at the second half of the play is another example of isolated repetition: « On ne se débrouille pas trop mal, hein, Didi, tous les deux ensemble ? … On trouve toujours quelque chose, hein, Didi, pour nous donner l’impression d’exister ? »131 His syntactic

129. Ibid., 28.
“Vladimir: Nothing you can do about it.
Estragon: No use struggling.
Vladimir: One is what one is.
Estragon: No use wriggling.
Vladimir: The essential doesn’t change.
Estragon: Nothing to be done.”

130. Ibid., 29.
“Estragon: So long as one knows.
Vladimir: One can bide one’s time.
Estragon: One knows what to expect.
Vladimir: No further need to worry.
Estragon: Simply wait.
Vladimir: We’re used to it.”

131. Ibid., 97.
“Estragon: We don’t manage too badly, eh Didi, between the two of us?
Vladimir: Yes yes. Come on, we’ll try the left first.
Estragon: We always find something, eh Didi, to give us the impression we exist?”
repetition creates a parallel between the two questions, while the second question ventures into psychological regions of identity and purpose. Like a melody, the variance in the second phrase deepens the effects of the first while still adhering to its structure.

Vladimir’s confusion as to their having met Pozzo and Lucky previously is another strong example of repetition: « À moins que ce ne soient pas les mêmes. » Through the repetition of these words, the audience gains an understanding of the potentially cyclical nature of the relationship between Vladimir, Estragon, Lucky and Pozzo. What the aural repetitions engender is a strong sense of unease emanating from Vladimir’s uncertainty:

Vladimir: Nous les connaissons, je te dis. Tu oublies tout. (Un temps.) À moins que ce ne soient pas les mêmes.
Estragon: La preuve, ils ne nous ont pas reconnus.
Vladimir: Ça ne veut rien dire. Moi aussi j’ai fait semblant de ne pas les reconnaître. Et puis, nous, on ne nous reconnaît jamais.
Estragon: Assez. Ce qu’il faut— Aïe ! [Vladimir ne bronche pas.] Aïe !
Vladimir: À moins que ce ne soient pas les mêmes.132

Sometimes repetition engenders humor, especially between Estragon and Vladimir. These moments lighten the more somber qualities of the play, and help dispel the desperation found in the shadow of its unanswered questions. For example, Vladimir quotes Estragon’s words back to him and makes light of Estragon’s complaining. Thus, in repetition, there is mocking:

Estragon: Mal ! Il me demande si j’ai mal !
Vladimir: (avec emportement) Il n’y a jamais que toi qui souffres ! Moi je ne compte pas. Je voudrais pourtant te voir à ma place. Tu m’en dirais des nouvelles.
Estragon: Tu as eu mal ?
Vladimir: Mal ! Il me demande si j’ai eu mal !133

132. Ibid., 67-68.
“Vladimir: We know them, I tell you. You forget everything. [Pause. To himself:] Unless they’re not the same…
Estragon: Why didn’t they recognize us then?
Vladimir: That means nothing. I too pretended not to recognize them. And then nobody ever recognizes us.
Estragon: Forget it. What we need— ow! [Vladimir does not react.] Ow!
Vladimir: [to himself] Unless they’re not the same…
Estragon: Didi! It’s the other foot! [He goes hobbling towards the mound.]
Vladimir: Unless they’re not the same…”

133. Ibid., 11.
Reiterations of phrases of dialogue also give a comedic twist in the contrasting deliveries between Vladimir and Estragon, as the former tries to cheer the latter:

Vladimir : Dis, Je suis content.
Estragon : Je suis content.
Vladimir : Moi aussi.
Estragon : Moi aussi.
Vladimir : Nous sommes contents.
Estragon : Nous sommes contents. [Silence.] Qu’est-ce qu’on fait, maintenant qu’on est content?134

Their scouting of the stage, expecting danger, also uses repetition to humorous effect, as their diminished hearing works against them:

Estragon : Toi tu vas te poser là. […] Dos à dos comme au bon vieux temps ! [Ils continuent à se regarder un petit moment, puis chacun reprend le guet. Long silence.] Tu ne vois rien venir ?
Vladimir : Comment ?
Estragon [plus fort] : Tu ne vois rien venir ?
Vladimir : Non.
Estragon : Moi non plus.
[Ils reprennent le guet. Long silence.]
Vladimir : Tu as dû te tromper.
Estragon (se retournant) : Comment ?
Vladimir (plus fort) : Tu as dû te tromper.
Estragon : Ne crie pas.
Ils reprennent le guet. Long silence. 135

“Estragon: [angrily] Hurts! He wants to know if it hurts!
Vladimir: [angrily] No one ever suffers but you. I don’t count. I’d like to hear what you’d say if you had what I have.
Estragon: It hurts?
Vladimir: [angrily] Hurts! He wants to know if it hurts!”

134. Ibid., 84.

“Vladimir: Say, I am happy.
Estragon: I am happy.
Vladimir: So am I.
Estragon: So am I.
Vladimir: We are happy.
Estragon: We are happy. [Silence.] What do we do now, now that we are happy?”

135. Ibid., 105-106.

“Estragon: Do you see anything coming?
Vladimir: [turning his head] What?
Estragon: Do you see anything coming?
Vladimir: No.
One is reminded of comedic acts such as the Three Stooges in these moments, when the infirmities of the characters become humorous. In the English translation the playwright wrote himself, Vladimir’s repeats “You want to get rid of him?” so many times that his exertions devolve into “You waagerrim?” whereas in the French version, « Vous voulez vous en débarrasser ? » never undergoes the same devolution (42-3). There are several such variations in the text from the French to the English, and all fascinating in what they reveal about the playwright’s evolving conceptions of the play.

Estragon frequently questions Vladimir’s reasoning, reiterating his words in order to do so:

Vladimir : Si on l’aidait d’abord ?
Estragon : À quoi faire ?
Vladimir : À se relever.
Estragon : Il ne peut se relever ?
Vladimir : Il veut se relever.
Estragon : Alors, qu’il se relève.
Vladimir : Il ne peut pas.
Estragon : Qu’est-ce qu’il a ?
Vladimir : Je ne sais pas.\textsuperscript{136}

This odd couple is even joined in their repetitions by Pozzo, whose addition renders their antics ridiculous as they each try to politely say goodbye (65). Under the weight of the two men’s courtesy, Pozzo is powerless to escape before he must reciprocate each of their statements,

\begin{quote}
Estragon: Nor I. \textit{[They resume their watch. Silence.]}
Vladimir: You must have had a vision.
Estragon: \textit{[turning his head]} What?
Vladimir: \textit{[louder]} You must have had a vision.
Estragon: No need to shout! \textit{[They resume their watch. Silence.]}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., 110.
“Vladimir: Perhaps we should help him first.
Estragon: To do what?
Vladimir: To get up.
Estragon: He can’t get up?
Vladimir: He wants to get up.
Estragon: Then let him get up.
Vladimir: He can’t.
Estragon: Why not?
Vladimir: I don’t know.”
creating a comical scene making light of social customs. More isolated repetitions occur in discussing the importance of giving Lucky his hat in order to ‘think’ (58).

Other phrases or exchanges come back multiple times in both the first and second acts. These returning passages contain similar or repeated phrases and syntactic structures. Many times, the theme of these moments is memory. The example most often repeated is between Estragon and Vladimir:

Vladimir: On ne peut pas.
Estragon: Pourquoi ?
Vladimir: On attend Godot.
Estragon: C’est vrai.137

A total of six identical recapitulations after the first appearance give this play its central thread, yet there are also variations on the theme. Cousineau details this repetition as evidence of Godot’s control over Estragon and Vladimir, in that even their language is servant to a habitual restatement of the rendezvous that was made.138 My analysis of these repetitions considers them, rather, as the musical theme of the play. Like Marcel Proust’s “petite phrase,” in Du Côté de chez Swann, this small phrase returns again and again in the dialogue, bringing the audience back to the central focus of the play. Variations do occur, however: for example, in his affirmations in the second act, Vladimir states their goal in waiting: « Nous attendons que Godot vienne. »139 At another point, Estragon says petulantly, « J’attends Godot. »140 Like a musical leitmotif, the words seem to echo throughout the play, reminding the two forgetful men of the reason for their wait. Beckett himself made careful note of these particular recapitulations in his 1975 Schiller

137. Ibid., 16, 67, 95, 100, 109, 118, 131.
   “Estragon: Let’s go.
   Vladimir: We can’t.
   Estragon: Why not?
   Vladimir: We’re waiting for Godot.
   Estragon: [despairingly] Ah!”

138. Cousineau, 45.

139. Beckett, En attendant Godot, 112. “We are waiting for Godot to come.”

140. Ibid., 123. “I’m waiting for Godot!”
production notebooks as well, and marked them as either ‘model’ or ‘variant,’ supporting this leitmotif understanding:

**Komm wir gehen**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>13 Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>21 Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>85 Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>114 Variant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

141. Knowlson, ed., *The Theatrical Notebooks of Samuel Beckett* (London: Faber and Faber, 1993), 345, 347. “Let’s go.” (These models and variants, as well as their page numbers, refer to the German script used in this particular production, which differed from both the English and French texts).

Knowlson describes the function of these particular reiterations:

The models all present the first of three choices that are theoretically open to Didi and Gogo, i.e. they might leave. The variants present the two theoretical alternatives. First, they might decide to wait, for, in a passage that has been restored to the English text, Vladimir seducingly offers the possibility that if they do wait, they might be rewarded by sleeping in Godot’s loft. Secondly, in a variant especially created in the revised text, it is Vladimir who suggests that they might go and Estragon who presents the alternative, ‘Why don’t we hang ourselves?’ He does not offer his despairing or resigned ‘Ah yes’ until Vladimir has confirmed (in B5) that they cannot hang themselves. The motif calls attention to the fact that there are only three options: to go, to wait, or to commit suicide. But their repeated inability either to leave or to hang themselves makes it clear that their only real possibility is to wait for Godot to come.142

Not only do these repetitions create a sense of bewilderment, but they also create a cyclical pattern. Certain phrases are present in both the first and second acts that intimate a continuing timeline for the characters on-stage. For example, when the boy arrives to tell Vladimir and Estragon of Godot’s delay, Estragon says, « Ça recommence. »143 This line is in the first act, and

142. Ibid., 100-101.

is reiterated in the second act when Vladimir exclaims, « Reprenons. »

Their intentions of leaving are also what close both acts:

Estragon: Alors, on y va?
Vladimir: Allons-y.
*Ils ne bougent pas.*

The only change in this passage from the first to the second act is that the roles are reversed:

Vladimir: Alors, on y va?
Estragon: Allons-y.
*Ils ne bougent pas.*

Despite their intentions, the pair never moves, and the play seems to bring to a close yet another revolution in an unending cycle of waiting.

**Dynamics**

Deborah Weagel compares the text of *En attendant Godot* to a score, and highlights the author’s indications of tempo and dynamics that he frequently interspersed through the stage direction. In the musical realm, the word “dynamics” refers to changes in volume or tone of the melody being played. In the same way, one may examine the “dynamics” of other theatrical representations, such as dramatic works of theater. Weagel writes: “Beckett seemed exceptionally sensitive to the musical nature of the human voice and of the possibility that words might be treated like notes.” By categorizing and listing in parallel typical expressions indicating a change in dynamics or tempo, alongside Beckett’s stage directions, Weagel argues that the play’s cohesion depends, in part, on Beckett’s meticulous stage directions indicating

144. Ibid., 129. “Off we go again.”

145. Ibid., 75.
“Estragon: Well, shall we go?
Vladimir: Yes, let’s go.
They do not move.”

146. Ibid., 134.
“Vladimir: Well, shall we go?
Estragon: Yes, let’s go.
They do not move.”

tone, pitch and volume. These dynamics direct the manner in which lines are recited, which in turn provides direction for the overall dialogue of the play.

For instance, early in the play, the actor playing Vladimir is directed to speak softly after Estragon’s request for quiet (19). Estragon must then speak with his mouth full while eating the carrot (27). At his entrance, Pozzo names himself with ‘a terrible cry’ (29). As he brings his later efforts at emotional rhetoric to a close, his voice and even his fingers are directed by the playwright:

\[\ldots \text{Il y a une heure (\ldots ton prosaïque) environ (ton à nouveau lyrique) après nous avoir versé depuis (il hésite, le ton baisse) mettons dix heures du matin (le ton s’élève) sans faiblir… la nuit galope (la voix se fait plus vibrante) et viendra se jeter sur nous (il fait claquer ses doigts) pfft ! comme ça — (l’inspiration le quitte) au moment où nous nous y attendrons le moins. (Silence. Voix morne.)}\]

Later, Lucky’s outburst begins in a ‘monotone’ (59). Within just one line in the beginning of the second act, Vladimir’s voice goes from happy, to neutral, to sad, once again at the direction of the playwright (82), while later on, he will sing, first loudly, then more softly (99). After which, Estragon loudly repeats ‘I’m going,’ in order to get Vladimir’s attention (115). These dynamic stage directions indicate direction and emotion for the actors, in controlling the ways in which these lines are delivered.

**Music**

Eric Prieto writes that “Beckett eschews the traditional theatrical uses of music—as accompaniment or as background, mood, or incidental music—and integrates it wholly into the dramatic fabric of these plays.” There are not only elements of music hall, but even music in *En attendant Godot*: among the many musical elements, the play has four instances of music being sung in the play, outlined in the playwright’s notes for the 1975 Schiller production: the song which begins Act Two, the lullaby Vladimir sings not long after, the walk taken after

---


“Pozzo: …An hour ago […prosaïc] roughly [lyrical] after having poured forth ever since [he hesitates, prosaïc] say ten o’clock in the morning [lyrical] tirelessly…night is charging [vibrantly] and will burst upon us [snaps his fingers] pop! Like that! [his inspiration leaves him] just when we least expect it. [Silence. Gloomily.]”

149. Prieto, 166.
Estragon’s nightmare, and the reconciliatory waltz. He decided against the ‘dog tune,’ a German folk song called “Ein Hund kam in die Küche”, as being the melody of all four. This ‘dog tune’ is the song that begins Act Two in the script, and details the cyclical story of a dog who was beaten and killed for eating a sausage, and is buried by other dogs who tell others that a dog was beaten and killed for stealing a sausage, etc. (79-80). This tune is the first point of music in the play. In his notes concerning this part of the play, James Knowlson writes that the playwright wished Vladimir’s vaudevillian and raucous start into singing to diminish with each passing reference to death: “According to [Walter Asmus] it was sung loud and fast except that, at each mention of the tomb, Vladimir’s voice grew quieter, higher pitched, and sadder and more ‘pitiful.’” This song also features a great deal of repetition, as Vladimir begins the song once more, and returns to certain somber passages in reflecting on the theme of death. What began as a humorous moment of a man singing at an ear-splitting volume, with hands joined together at the waist, like an opera singer, ends tragically as neither the dog in the song, nor the singer can escape the inevitable ‘tomb’ that awaits them both.

Afterwards, Estragon asks Vladimir to sing him to sleep (99). The script indicates no lyrics besides the common “Do,” and no tune, either. In his notes for the 1975 Schiller production, however, Beckett indicates the tune should be that of “Schlafle mein Prinzchen,” a famous German lullaby, the melody of which is attributed to Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. The production notebook’s subsequent indication for the humming of Frédéric Chopin’s very recognizable and ominous Marche Funèbre (written in the notebook as Trauermarsch) after Estragon’s nightmare is actually quite humorous in light of the fact that Vladimir is seeking to cheer Estragon (99). The fourth melody written in Beckett’s production book, “Merry Widow Waltz,” is referring to a waltz in the operetta Die lustige Witwe, (“The Merry Widow”), composed by Franz Lehár. This is another famous melody that would have been sung while Estragon and Vladimir dance with each other after being reconciled in the second act (107).


151. Ibid., 147n1584.

152. Ibid., 252, 254.

153. Ibid., 252, 254.
The choice of these particular tunes cannot be assumed to be definitive for all productions of *En attendant Godot* as it was before a German audience that the play was produced. Beckett may have wished to use melodies the audience would be familiar with in an effort to create further parallels between the men on stage and those in the audience. Knowlson remarks:

The alternation of sombre round and soothing lullaby, mournful funeral march and cheerful waltz is the sound of a life of monotony, pain, and death intermittently relieved by moments of solace and attempts to find pleasure. The dissolution from the complete song ‘with words’, to ‘tunes’ with syllables, to fragmentary hummed waltz incorporates a new element in the unsuccessful effort in the play to find musical resolution. Act I contains no music of any kind. The prospect of a song from Lucky is never realized. Act II opens with a song, but the song fizzes out into a whisper…The failure to find musical resolution is completed when Lucky, now dumb, cannot, of course, complete his repertoire.\(^{154}\)

The 1955 British premiere of *En attendant Godot* used music and sounds not indicated in the script to ‘create atmosphere’: “According to Hall, they included an ethereal air for the entry of the Boy, and fragments that began whenever Lucky moved, and ended when he stopped. ‘The wisps of music were bits of Bartok, very light, very delicate—and very wrong,’ Hall remembers. ‘I blush to think of them now.’”\(^{155}\) Beckett was not satisfied with many things about the production, as he himself made clear in his letter to Peter Hall.\(^{156}\) Alan Schneider, who went with the playwright on five nights to see the play, indicated that “[Beckett] was worried about what he saw as a sentimental element…and pauses which were not long enough, and which were, to make matters worse, filled with heavenly music.”\(^{157}\)

The continual back-and-forth between soundscapes of spectacle and of uncertainty inhibits any continuity of atmosphere during the play. Bernard Dort described the juxtaposing soundscapes thus:

Les mots…utilisés tantôt selon l’ordre de la prose…tantôt selon celui de la poésie…la succession instantanée, sans transition, de ces deux modes de langage

\(^{154}\) Ibid., 147n1584.

\(^{155}\) Croall, 43.

\(^{156}\) See note 97.

\(^{157}\) Croall, 43.
aboutit à les dévaluer tous deux. Ne restent plus alors que les mots nus, inutiles, insignifiants. Un langage de sourds, d’exclus.\(^\text{158}\)

These two soundscapes become the ever-shifting background of the play, upon which the action develops.

**Lucky’s Think**

Against the soundscapes of uncertainty and spectacle, Lucky’s monologue is an aural focal point in the play, drawing attention by its contrasting frenzy and fervor against hesitation and silence within one terrifying recitation. Understandably, a reviewer at a 1955 British production described it thus:

…one remembers the first occasion when, for the pleasure of the party, the slave Lucky is ordered to think. There is a noise like machinery, long rusted, that grinds slowly into action. Something seems of a sudden to click, and with a roar Lucky is off upon a preposterous monologue, all sound and fury and mad repetition. With a clanking and a shrilling and a heaving, a weight of words pours down upon us. Covered, as it were, with this mildewed bran, we sit laughing helplessly (though it ought, maybe, to sadden us). On the night I listened, the playgoer on my right slept through the first deluge, woke with a grumbled “Still at it!”, and then sat with one of the most startled expressions I have observed on a human face while Lucky stammered desperately toward the peroration that never begins.\(^\text{159}\)

The use of this image of a machine is not limited to this British review. At the French premiere in 1953, Jacques Brenner, writing for the newspaper *Arts*, wrote: « …Ici, on voit un homme transformé en mécanique, il récite une leçon incomprise où manque la moitié des mots. »\(^\text{160}\)

---

\(^{158}\) Bernard Dort, “En attendant Godot, pièce de Samuel Beckett,” *Les Temps modernes*, 1 May 1953, as quoted in Nerval, 80. “The words…sometimes used as prose…sometimes as poetry…the instantaneous succession, without transition, of these two modes of language ends up devaluing both of them. Nothing remains but naked, useless, insignificant words. A language of mutes, of outcasts.”


\(^{160}\) Jacques Brenner, “L’avant-garde au théâtre s’est reformée,” *Arts*, January 1, 1953, as quoted in Nerval, 22. “…Here, we see a man transformed into machine, he recites a misunderstood lesson in which half the words are missing.”
Another review, a week later, in Combat, said something similar: « Pense ? Éjecte un vertigineux chapelet de propositions absurdes et sans liens. La machine est en mouvement. »

The effect this particular portion of the premiere had on the audience was astonishing: « La composition que Jean Martin fait de Lucky est d’un pathétique si terrible qu’on en a le souffle coupé. » Another journalist, writing of the Arts Theatre production in 1955, describes a similar reaction: “…Commanded to think, Lucky stammers out a ghostly, ghastly, interminable tirade…” Harold Hobson describes the same production:

The long speech into which the silent Lucky breaks, crammed with the unintelligible, with vain repetition, with the lumber of ill-assorted learning, the pitiful heritage of the ages, the fruits of civilisation squashed down and rotten, is horrifyingly delivered by Mr Timothy Bateson.

This monologue lasts for several minutes, and requires of the actor playing Lucky enormous powers of memorization and stamina. The phrases of which the monologue is made are reminiscent of the elaborations of those suffering from schizophrenia, as Benjamin Keatinge points out in his article “Beckett and Language Pathology”:

Lucky exhibits at least five of the main features of schizophrenic thought disorder. He is guilty of ‘derailment,’ juxtaposing entirely unrelated words and themes; for example, from speaking of ‘the labours lost of Steinweg and Peterman’ he diverts to ‘the great plains in the mountains by the seas’…which have no obvious connection. His ‘loosening of associations’ is further illustrated by the lack of any central, cohesive thread. Philosophical themes, evocations of landscape and miscellaneous speculations are tangled up in disorganized fashion. Towards the end he becomes rambling and incoherent and his speech is so jumbled that it is little more than a schizophrenic ‘word salad’…


162. Ibid., “The composition that Jean Martin makes as Lucky is so terribly moving that one’s breath is taken away.”


These seemingly interminable babblings, replete with philosophical undertones are concluded by the greatest instance of silence in the entire play.

Beckett’s concern with this particular portion of the play suggests that it was intended to be the focal point. The first actor to play the role, Jean Martin, noted that Beckett’s diction requirements were exacting in rehearsal. He said, “Beckett does not want his actors to act” in reference to his frustration at the playwright’s focus on the precision of the recitation of the lines. A recording made of Martin’s performance contains recognizable rhythm, pitch, tempo, and dynamics (four key elements of musical composition). Later in his career, Beckett would take careful notes on what he called “L’s Think.” In his notebook, he outlines the monologue into three sections: “Indifferent heaven”, “Dwindling man”, and “Earth abode of stones & cadenza.” The use of the word ‘cadenza’ here is extremely telling, since a cadenza is a musical term describing the brilliant final passages of a virtuosic instrumental, or even vocal, solo performance. Beckett, in some fashion, envisioned Lucky’s monologue as being showy enough to merit the descriptive word ‘cadenza.’ Interestingly, this portion of a solo performance, historically, was improvised. Beckett’s notes, however, leave very little to chance. He indicates words or phrases to be stressed, and also what he specifies should be “Main shocks,” in notes reminiscent of those of an orchestral conductor. In Walter Asmus’ rehearsal diary of a production, he notes, “Beckett insists on an exact, rhythmical rendering…”

We have reason to believe that Beckett considered Jean Martin’s Lucky the definitive French performance: In a letter concerning recording portions of his works on a compact disc,

166. Croall, 86.
169. Ibid., 289, 291.
170. Ibid., 293, 295.
171. Ibid., 297, 299.
three years after the French premiere, Beckett indicated “…With regard to some readings in French, I have approached Martin and Blin with the suggestion that the former should record Lucky’s speech…” He writes a month later, “…If Martin does not record then perhaps nothing.” Pierre Mélèse, in his work Beckett, recounts,

Tous les témoignages confirment celui de Jean-Marie Serreau (directeur du théâtre de Babylone) : Beckett « est un monstre de précision » … « Il apporte un soin extrême à la diction, au rythme de l’intonation. » « Il va jusqu’à faire travailler les syllabes. »

Since the playwright was so demanding, the original recording of Jean Martin’s performance is an intriguing example of Beckett’s wishes. Performing Lucky’s monologue in French, given the language’s lack of stressed syllables has a unique rhythmic sound. Martin’s performance of this portion of the play was recorded, along with other portions in 1952 during rehearsals in an attempt to advertise the play’s premiere on the radio. The aforementioned descriptions of his performance as “mechanical” are entirely just. Martin begins rather slowly, not unlike a train groaning to life, but as he picks up speed, his words become unintelligible and his voice uncontrollable. Roger Blin recalls in his memoirs the power of this monologue on the audience: « Il est arrivé que des spectateurs quittent la salle car ils ne supportaient pas certains passages que Martin, tremblant et bavant, parvenait à rendre parfaitement insoutenables. » Not only does Martin’s performance feature a metronome-like adherence to a tempo, which accelerates, but he also uses pitches to emphasize the repeated syllables in “quaquaquaqua,” “quaqua,” “Acacacacadémie d’Anthropopopométrie,” “qu’à la lumière,” and “inachevés.”


175. Pierre Mélèse, Beckett (Paris: Editions Seghers, 1966), 150. "All the eyewitness accounts confirm that of Jean-Marie Serreau (director of the Théâtre de Babylone): Beckett ‘is a monster of precision.’ ‘He demands an extreme attention to the diction, to the rhythm of the speaking.’ ‘He goes so far as to work on the syllables.”


177. Trincal.

178. Blin, 93. “It happened that members of the audience left the room because they could not stand certain passages that Martin, trembling and drooling, succeeding in making perfectly unbearable.”
The rapid pace he attains cannot be maintained though, and the machine breaks as Lucky starts yelling out words and short phrases, slowing, until he is forcibly silenced by the others.

Even in English, the monologue seems to have been of extreme importance to Beckett. Colm Tóibín recounts that Jack MacGowran, playing Lucky in a 1964 Irish production of *Waiting for Godot*, asked Beckett to make a recording of the monologue with the proper ‘cadences,’ which the playwright agreed to do.  

Beckett’s writing process depended, in great part, on his hearing: « Quant à moi, et pour mon malheur sans doute, je ne peux partir que les paupières fermées. »  

In his search to discover what lay underneath the surface of the word, Beckett explored the aural boundaries of theater and silence. In using questions, pauses and noted silence, uncertainty plagues the stage, while rhythm, repetition, dynamics and music make dialogue sound rehearsed. These shifting soundscapes create an aural imbalance that affects the entire play, and contributes to the play’s infamous atmosphere of ambiguity.

---


182. Blin, 89. “Indications concerning their physical aspect were non-existent in Beckett’s text, and he himself couldn’t describe them or their costumes. He told me, ‘No, I don’t see them, but they’re wearing bowler hats.’ He spoke about not seeing them but hearing them…”
Conclusion

A theater is one of the only places large groups of people gather for an extended period of time with a desire to listen closely. From the moment a dramatic production begins, a hush falls over the crowd in order to give way to theatrical sounds. Whether sound-dominant or silent-dominant, or somewhere in between, a play depends upon sound. Samuel Beckett and Eugène Ionesco understood this, and in experimenting with sound effects, made their plays more multi-sensory and nuanced than others. Like Schoenberg, Cage, Milhaud, Satie, and even Philippot, these two playwrights opened aural avenues in using sounds and silence in ways that became known as essential and iconic features of these two famous plays. For Rhinocéros, this iconic aural signature lies in its din and nonsense, while that of En attendant Godot lies in its questions, its contrasting comedy and its quiet. These soundscapes, effects, rhythms, etc., create feelings and characters both on- and off-stage. Ionesco and Beckett used sound effects to ‘represent the unrepresentable,’ each in their own way. The aural innovations they wrote in their ‘necessary’ stage directions reaffirm the power of sound, and are historical precursors to cinematic sound production, a field wherein composers, engineers, and editors to this day test aural boundaries in the hopes of transporting an audience to another world.
Appendix A

Les “bruits” des rhinocéros

Acte premier p. 21:
Jean : Notre ami Auguste ? On ne m’a pas invité, moi, pour l’anniversaire de notre ami Auguste...
À ce moment, on entend le bruit très éloigné, mais se rapprochant très vite, d’un souffle de faune et de sa course précipitée, ainsi qu’un long barrissement...Les bruits sont devenus très forts.

Acte premier p. 22
Jean, à Bérenger et criant presque pour se faire entendre, au-dessus des bruits qu’il ne perçoit pas consciemment...
Les bruits sont devenus énormes...Les bruits du galop d’un animal puissant et lourd sont tout proches, très accélérés; on entend son halètement.

Jean : Oh ! un rhinocéros ! (Les bruits produits par l’animal s’éloigneront à la même vitesse, si bien que l’on peut déjà distinguer les paroles qui suivent ; toute cette scène doit être jouée très vite, répétant : ) Oh ! un rhinocéros !

Acte premier p. 25
Le patron, regardant toujours vers la gauche, suivant des yeux la course de l’animal, tandis que les bruits produits par celui-ci vont en décroissant : sabots, barrissements, etc.

Acte premier p. 26
Jean : Ça alors ! (À Bérenger.) Vous avez vu ?
Les bruits produits par le rhinocéros, son barrissement se sont bien éloignés; les gens suivant encore du regard l’animal, debout, sauf Bérenger, toujours apathique et assis.

Acte premier p. 58
Le logicien, au Vieux Monsieur : Vous faites déjà des progrès en logique !
On commence de nouveau à entendre, se rapprochant toujours très vite, un galop rapide, un barrissement, les bruits précipités des sabots d’un rhinocéros, son souffle bruyant, mais cette fois, en sens inverse, du fond de la scène vers le devant, toujours en coulisse, à gauche.

Acte premier p. 59
Jean, criant pour dominer le bruit venant de la boutique...Grands bruits couvrant les paroles des quatre personnages.

Acte premier p. 60
Jean, prenant conscience des bruits qui sont très proches : Mais que se passe-t-il ?
Le logicien : Mais qu’est-ce que c’est ?
Jean se lève, fait tomber sa chaise en se levant, regarde vers la coulisse gauche d’où proviennent les bruits d’un rhinocéros passant en sens inverse : Oh ! un rhinocéros !
Acte premier p. 61
*On entend des pas précipités* de gens qui fuient, *des oh! des ah!* comme tout à l’heure.

Acte premier p. 62
*On entend un miaulement déchirant*, puis *le cri*, tout aussi déchirant, d’*une femme*… Presque au même instant, et tandis que *les bruits* s’éloignent rapidement, apparaît la *Ménagère* de tout à l’heure, sans son panier, mais tenant dans ses bras un chat tué et ensanglanté.

Acte II, tableau I p. 113
*Madame Bœuf*, *faisant un grand effort pour préciser*, et *montrant* *du doigt* *en direction* *de l’escalier* : Il est là, en bas, à l’entrée. Il a l’air de vouloir monter l’escalier. 
Au même instant, *un bruit* se fait entendre. On voit *les marches* de l’escalier qui s’effondrent sous un poids sans doute formidable. *On entend*, *venant d’en bas*, *des barrissements angoissés…* *les barrissements continuent de se faire entendre*.

Acte II, tableau I p. 117
*Le rhinocéros barrit abominablement.*

Acte II, tableau I p. 118
Entre-temps, tandis que *le rhinocéros n’avait cessé de barrir*, *Mme Bœuf* s’était levée et avait *rejoint* le groupe.

Acte II, tableau I p. 119
*Le rhinocéros répond par un barrissement violent, mais tendre.*

Acte II, tableau I p. 120
*On entend barrir.*

Acte II, tableau I p. 122

Acte II, tableau I p. 123
*On entend*, *venant d’en bas*, *le rhinocéros barrir tendrement.*

Acte II, tableau I p. 129
*On entend le bruit et le signal de la voiture des pompiers qui arrive*. *On entend les freins de la voiture*, qui *stoppe brusquement* sous la fenêtre.

Acte II, tableau I p. 130
*On entend*, *en bas*, *un remue-ménage*, *un branle-bas*, *les bruits de la voiture.*

Acte II, tableau II p.164
Jean, *dans la salle de bains* : Je te piétinerai, je te piétinerai.
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Grand bruit dans la salle de bains, barrissements, bruit d’objets et d’une glace qui tombe et se brise ; puis on voit apparaître Bérenger tout effrayé qui ferme avec peine la porte de la salle de bains, malgré la poussée contraire que l’on devine.
Bérenger, poussant la porte : Il est rhinocéros, il est rhinocéros ! (Bérenger a réussi à fermer la porte. Son veston est troué par une corne. Au moment où Bérenger a réussi à fermer la porte, la corne du rhinocéros a traversé celle-ci. Tandis que la porte s’ébranle sous la poussée continue de l’animal, et que le vacarme dans le salle de bains continue et que l’on entend des barrissements mêlés à des mots à peine distincts, comme : je rage, salaud, etc., Bérenger se précipite vers la porte de droite.)

Acte II, tableau II p. 166
Bérenger : Ils débordent sur le trottoir, par où sortir, par où partir ! ... Rhinocéros ! Rhinocéros !
(Bruits, la porte de la salle de bains va céder.)

Acte III p. 169-170
Bérenger : Les cornes, gare aux cornes ! (Pause. On entend les bruits d’un assez grand nombre de rhinocéros qui passent sous la fenêtre du fond... Il met la main à son front, l’air effrayé, puis se dirige vers la glace, soulève son bandage tandis que les bruits s’éloignent... Il veut se diriger de nouveau vers son divan, mais on entend de nouveau la course des rhinocéros sous la fenêtre du fond... Les bruits cessent, il se dirige vers la petite table... Il se regarde de nouveau une seconde dans la glace, en toussant, ouvre la fenêtre, les souffles des fauves s’entendent plus fort, il tousse de nouveau.)

Acte III p. 178
On entend des rhinocéros galoper sous la fenêtre du fond.

Acte III p. 185
Dudard, l’interrompant : Je ne dis certainement pas que c’est un bien. Et ne croyez pas que je prenne parti à fond pour les rhinocéros...

Nouveaux bruits de rhinocéros passant, cette fois, sous l’encadrement de la fenêtre à l’avant-scène.

Acte III p. 190
Bruits lointains de rhinocéros.

Acte III p. 198
Bruits plus forts des rhinocéros, passant d’abord sous la fenêtre du fond, puis sous la fenêtre d’en face.

Acte III p. 199
Bérenger : C’est quelqu’un dans votre genre, quelqu’un de bien, un intellectuel subtil, érudit.
(Bruits grandissants des rhinocéros. Les paroles des deux personnages sont couvertes par les bruits des fauves qui passent sous les deux fenêtres ; pendant un court instant, on voit bouger les lèvres de Dudard et Bérenger, sans qu’on puisse les entendre.) Encore eux ! Ah ! ça n’en finira pas ! (Il court à la fenêtre du fond.) Assez ! Assez ! Salauds !
Les rhinocéros s’éloignent, Bérenger montre le poing dans leur direction.
Acte III p. 201

*Bérenger ferme la fenêtre en face, se dirige vers la fenêtre du fond, par où passent d'autres rhinocéros qui, vraisemblablement, font le tour de la maison.*

Acte III p. 202

*Bérenger : Ouvrez, si vous voulez!* 

*Il continue de regarder les rhinocéros dont les bruits s'éloignent, sans plus rien dire. Dudard va ouvrir la porte.*

Acte III p. 212

*Bérenger : Comment, vous, un juriste, vous pouvez prétendre que... (On entend du dehors un grand bruit d'un troupeau de rhinocéros, allant à une cadence très rapide. On entend aussi des trompettes, des tambours.) Qu'est-ce que c'est ?*

Acte III p. 219

*Bérenger : Ils ont la rue. Des unicorns, des bicornus, moitié moitié, pas d'autres signes distinctifs ! (On entend les bruits puissants de la course des rhinocéros. Ces bruits sont musicalisés cependant.)*

Acte III p. 222

*Bérenger : Tu gagnes à être connue, et tu es si belle, tu es si belle. (On entend de nouveau un passage de rhinocéros.)*

Acte III p. 229

*Bérenger : ...Allô? (Pour toute réponse, des barrissement se font entendre venant de l'écouteur.) Tu entends ? Des barrissements ! Écoute !*

Acte III p. 231

*Daisy : Oui, il faut savoir où nous en sommes ! (Des barrissements partent du poste. Bérenger tourne vivement le bouton. Le poste s'arrête. On entend cependant encore, dans le lointain, comme des échos de barrissements.)*

Acte III p. 232-233

*Bérenger : Toi ! Les bruits s'entendent de partout. Les têtes de rhinocéros remplissent le mur de fond. De droite, et de gauche, dans la maison on entend des pas précipités, des souffles bruyants de fauves. Tous ces bruits effrayants sont cependant rythmés, musicalisés. C’est aussi et surtout d’en haut que viennent les plus forts, les bruits des piétinements. Du plâtre tombe du plafond. La maison s’ébranle violemment...Cependant, les bruits diminuent et ne constituent plus qu’une sorte de fond sonore et musical.*

Acte III p. 240-241

*Bruits devenus mélodieux des rhinocéros.*

Acte III p. 244
Bérenger : …car il n’y a plus personne. *(Nouveaux barrissements, course éperdues, nuages de poussière.)*

Acte III p. 245
Bérenger : …une nudité décente, sans poils, comme la leur ! *(Il écoute les barrissements.)* Leurs chants ont du charme, un peu âpre, mais un charme certain ! Si je pouvais faire comme eux…Ahh, ahh, brr ! non, non, ce n’est pas ça, que c’est faible, comme cela manque de vigueur !
Appendix B

Les « barrissements » de Rhinocéros

Acte premier p.21:
Jean : Notre ami Auguste ? On ne m’a pas invité, moi, pour l’anniversaire de notre ami Auguste...
À ce moment, on entend le bruit très éloigné, mais se rapprochant très vite, d’un souffle de fauve et de sa course précipitée, ainsi qu’un long barrissement...Les bruits sont devenus très forts.

Acte premier p.25
Le patron, regardant toujours vers la gauche, suivant des yeux la course de l’animal, tandis que les bruits produits par celui-ci vont en décroissant : sabots, barrissements, etc.

Acte premier p.26
Jean : Ça alors ! (À Bérenger.) Vous avez vu ?
Les bruits produits par le rhinocéros, son barrissement se sont bien éloignés; les gens suivant encore du regard l’animal, debout, sauf Bérenger, toujours apathique et assis.

Acte premier p.58
Le logicien, au Vieux Monsieur : Vous faites déjà des progrès en logique !
On commence de nouveau à entendre, se rapprochant toujours très vite, un galop rapide, un barrissement, les bruits précipités des sabots d’un rhinocéros, son souffle bruyant, mais cette fois, en sens inverse, du fond de la scène vers le devant, toujours en coulisse, à gauche.

Acte II, tableau I p.113
Au même instant, un bruit se fait entendre. On voit les marches de l’escalier qui s’effondrent sous un poids sans doute formidable. On entend, venant d’en bas, des barrissements angoissés.

Acte II, tableau I p.113
Bérenger : Calmez-vous !
Pendant ce temps, M. Papillon, Dudard et Botard se précipitent à gauche, ouvrent la porte en se bousculant et se retrouvent sur le palier de l’escalier entourés de poussière; les barrissements continuent de se faire entendre.

Acte II, tableau I p.118
Monsieur Papillon : Je plaisantais ! Entre-temps, tandis que le rhinocéros n’avait cessé de barrir, Mme Bœuf s’était levée et avait rejoint le groupe.

Acte II, tableau I p.119
Madame Bœuf : Je le reconnais, je le reconnais. Le rhinocéros répond par un barrissement violent, mais tendre.

Acte II, tableau I p.123
Bérenger : Je n’ai pas pu la retenir. *On entend, venant d’en bas, le rhinocéros barrir tendrement.*

Acte II, tableau II p.164
Jean, *dans la salle de bains* : Je te piétinerais, je te piétinerais.

   Grand bruit dans la salle de bains, *barrissements*, bruit d’objets et d’une glace qui tombe et se brise ; puis on voit apparaître Bérenger tout effrayé qui ferme avec peine la porte de la salle de bains, malgré la poussée contraire que l’on devine.
Bérenger, *poussant la porte* : Il est rhinocéros, il est rhinocéros ! (Bérenger a réussi à fermer la porte. Son veston est troué par une corne. Au moment où Bérenger a réussi à fermer la porte, la corne du rhinocéros a traversé celle-ci. Tandis que la porte s’ébranle sous la poussée continue de l’animal, et que le vacarme dans la salle de bains continue et que l’on entend des *barrissements mêlés à des mots à peine distincts, comme : je rage, salaud, etc.* Bérenger se précipite vers la porte de droite.)

Acte III p.229
Bérenger : Je dois répondre à leur appel. Ça ne peut plus être personne d’autre. *(Il décroche l’appareil.)* Allô ? *(Pour toute réponse, des barrissements se font entendre venant de l’écouteur.)* Tu entends ? *Des barrissements !* Écoute !

Acte III p. 231
Daisy : Oui, il faut savoir où nous en sommes ! *(Des barrissements partent du poste. Bérenger tourne vivement le bouton. Le poste s’arrête. On entend cependant encore, dans le lointain, comme des échos de *barrissements.*)"

Acte III p. 244-245
Bérenger : Pauvre enfant abandonnée dans cet univers de monstres ! Personne ne peut m’aider à la retrouver, personne, car il n’y a plus personne. *(Nouveaux barrissements, courses éperdues, nuages de poussière.)* Je ne veux pas les entendre. Je vais mettre du coton dans les oreilles. *(Il se met du coton dans les oreilles et se parle à lui-même dans la glace.)… Comme je voudrais avoir une peau dure et cette magnifique couleur d’un vert sombre, une nudité décente, sans poils, comme la leur ! *(Il écoute les barrissements.*) Leurs chants ont du charme, un peu âpre, mais un charme certain ! Si je pouvais faire comme eux. *(Il essaye de les imiter.)* Ahh, ahh, brr !
Appendix C

Des sons « musicalisés » de Rhinocéros

Acte III p. 212
Bérenger : Comment, vous, un juriste, vous pouvez prétendre que... (On entend du dehors un grand bruit d’un troupeau de rhinocéros, allant à une cadence très rapide. On entend aussi des trompettes, des tambours.) Qu’est-ce que c’est ?

Acte III p. 219

Acte III p. 232
Bérenger : Toi !

Acte III p. 233
Daisy : Ils ne t’écouteront pas !
Cependant, les bruits diminuent et ne constituent plus qu’une sorte de fond sonore et musical.
Appendix D

Repeated phrases in *Rhinocéros*

*Acte premier*

“Mais qu’est-ce que c’est ?” 2x, p. 22 ; 3x, p. 60-61
“Oh ! Un rhinocéros !” 4x, p. 22-23 ; 9x, p. 60-61
“Ça alors !” 8x, p. 25-27 ; 3x, p. 62
“Je n’en reviens pas !” 3x, p. 33
“Pauvre petite bête !” 6x, p. 63-64
“Ça, c’est trop fort !” 2x, p. 64
“Calmez-vous, Madame.” 2x, p. 65
“Ça fait de la peine, quand même.” 2x, p. 65
“Qu’est-ce que vous en dites ?” 3x, p. 66
“Voilà !” 2x, p. 69
“…Logicien…” 4x, p. 79-80
“…si vous aviez vu…” 3x, p. 82
“…à deux cornes…” 2x, p. 83 ; 2x, p. 85
“…à une corne…” 2x, p. 83
“C’est possible.” 2x, p. 84
“…asiatique ou africain…” 3x, p. 84-85
“…africain ou asiatique…” 4x, p. 85
“Nous ne pouvons pas (le) permettre…” 3x, p. 87

*Acte deuxième*

“Après vous.” 10x, p. 135
Appendix E

Pauses in En attendant Godot

1. Vladimir [accablé]: C’est trop pour un seul homme. [Un temps. Avec vivacité.] p. 10


4. Vladimir : Seulement sourire…Ce n’est pas la même chose. Enfin…[Un temps.] Gogo… p. 13

5. Vladimir : Ça passera le temps. [Un temps.] C’étaient deux voleurs, crucifiés en même temps que le Sauveur. On… p. 14

6. Vladimir : Et cependant… [Un temps.] Comment se fait-il que… p. 15

7. Vladimir : Comment se fait-il que des quatre évangélistes un seul présente les faits de cette façon ?…Et un seul parle d’un larron de sauvé. [Un temps.] Voyons, Gogo, il faut me renvoyer la balle de temps en temps. p. 15

8. Estragon : Je ne comprends rien… [Un temps.] Engueulé qui ? p. 15

9. Estragon : C’est vrai. [Un temps.] Tu es sûr que c’est ici ? p. 16

10. Vladimir : Il a dit samedi. [Un temps.] Il me semble. p. 18

11. Estragon : Je peux me tromper. [Un temps.] Taisons-nous un peu, tu veux ? p. 19


Repos.
Estragon [inquiet]: Et nous ? p. 24


Vladimir : Où ? [Un temps.] Ce soir on couchera peut-être chez lui… p. 25
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21. Vladimir : Tant mieux, tant mieux. [Un temps.] Qu’est-ce que tu voulais savoir ? p. 26


23. Pozzo [d’un geste large]: Ne parlons plus de ça. [Il tire sur la corde.] Debout ! [Un temps.] Chaque fois qu’il tombe il s’endort. p. 31

24. Vladimir : Ce n’est pas sûr. [Un temps.] Pose-lui une question. p. 34

25. Pozzo : Je suis indiscret…il n’est pas dans mes habitudes de fumer deux pipes coup sur coup, ça [il porte sa main au cœur] fait battre mon cœur. [Un temps.] C’est la nicotine, on en absorbe, malgré ses précautions. p. 37

26-27. Pozzo [avec colère]: Ne me coupez pas la parole ! [Un temps. Plus calme.] Si nous parlons tous en même temps nous n’en sortirons jamais. [Un temps.] Qu’est-ce que je disais ? p. 41


29. Vladimir [tendrement]: Je te porterai. [Un temps.] Le cas échéant. p. 44

30. Pozzo : Savez-vous qui m’a appris toutes ces belles choses ? [Un temps. Dardant son doigt vers Lucky.] Lui ! p. 45

31. Pozzo : …À côté de lui j’ai l’air d’un jeune homme, non ? [Un temps. À Lucky.] Chapeau ! p. 45

32. Pozzo : Oh ! [Un temps.] À la bonne heure. p. 48

33. Pozzo : Non non, ce n’est pas la peine. [Un temps. À voix basse.] Insistez un peu. p. 50

34-35. Pozzo [qui n’a pas écouté]: …Il est pâle et lumineux, comme n’importe quel ciel à cette heure de la journée. [Un temps.] Dans ces latitudes. [Un temps.] Quand il fait beau. p. 51


40. Vladimir : Oui. Mais moins vite. [Un temps.] p. 66

42. Vladimir : Nous les connaissons, je te dis. Tu oublies tout. [Un temps.] À moins que ce ne soient pas les mêmes. p. 67

43. Vladimir : Évidemment. [Un temps.] Approche. p. 68

44. Estragon : Peur de quoi ? De nous ? [Un temps.] Réponds ! p. 69

45. Vladimir : On dit ça. [Un temps.] Eh bien, continue. p. 71

46. Vladimir : C’est comme moi. [Un temps.] Où c’est que tu couches ? p. 72

47. Garçon : Oui, monsieur. [Un temps.] Vladimir : Bon, va-t’en. p. 72

48. Vladimir : Dis-lui… [Il hésite.] Dis-lui que tu nous as vus. [Un temps.] Tu nous as bien vus, n’est-ce pas ? p. 72

49. Estragon : Je les laisse là. [Un temps.] Un autre viendra, aussi… aussi… que moi, mais chaussant moins grand, et elles feront son bonheur. p. 73

50. Vladimir : Il a dit que Godot viendra sûrement demain. [Un temps.] Ça ne te dit rien ? p. 74


54. Vladimir : On ne commande pas à son humeur. Toute la journée je me suis senti dans une forme extraordinaire. [Un temps.] Je ne me suis pas levé de la nuit, pas une seule fois. p. 82

55. Vladimir [après un moment d’incompréhension]: Nous aviserons. [Un temps.] Je te dis qu’il y a du nouveau ici, depuis hier. p. 84


57. Estragon : Je suis fatigué. [Un temps.] Allons-nous-en. p. 95

58. Vladimir : On attend Godot.
Estragon : C’est vrai. [Un temps.] Alors comment faire ? p. 96

59. Estragon : Puis ce sera encore le jour. [Un temps.] Que faire, que faire ? p. 100

60-61. Vladimir : Alors je peux le garder. Le mien me faisait mal. [Un temps.] Comment dire ? [Un temps.] Il me grattait. p. 102
64. Vladimir : Ne perdons pas votre temps en vains discours. [Un temps. Avec véhémence.] p. 111
65. Vladimir : Ou que la nuit tombe. [Un temps.] Nous sommes au rendez-vous, un point c’est tout. p. 112
66. Estragon : Je m’en vais. [Un temps. Plus fort.] Je m’en vais. p. 115
69. Vladimir : Eh bien ? [Un temps.] Qu’est-ce qu’il a de si extraordinaire ? p. 118
70. Vladimir : On attend Godot.
   Estragon : C’est vrai. [Un temps.] Que faire ? p. 118
71. Estragon : Flûte ! C’est vrai. [Un temps.] Qu’il dit. p. 120
72. Vladimir [rassurant] : …Mais ce n’est pas pour rien que j’ai vécu cette longue journée et je peux vous assurer qu’elle est presque au bout de son répertoire. [Un temps.] À part ça, comment vous sentez-vous ? p. 121
73. Vladimir : Laisse-le tranquille. Ne vois-tu pas qu’il est en train de se rappeler son bonheur. [Un temps.] Memoria praeteritorum bonorum – ça doit être pénible. p. 121
74. Pozzo : Un beau jour je me suis réveillé, aveugle comme le destin. [Un temps.] Je me demande parfois si je ne dors pas encore. p. 122
75. Pozzo : Ne me questionnez pas. Les aveugles n’ont pas la notion du temps. [Un temps.] Les choses du temps, ils ne les voient pas non plus. p. 122
76. Pozzo : C’est ça, que votre ami y aille. Il sent si mauvais. [Un temps.] Qu’est-ce qu’il attend ? p. 123
79. Vladimir : Mais non ! Mais non ! [Un temps.] Mais non. p. 128
80-82. Vladimir : …Il parlera des coups qu’il a reçus et je lui donnerai une carotte. [Un temps.] À cheval sur une tombe et une naissance difficile…Moi aussi, un autre me regarde, en se disant,
Il dort, il ne sait pas, qu’il dorme. [Un temps.] Je ne peux pas continuer. [Un temps.] Qu’est-ce que j’ai dit ? p. 128

83. Vladimir : Reprenons. [Un temps. Au garçon.] Tu ne me reconnais pas ? p. 129

84. Vladimir : Qu’est-ce qu’il fait, monsieur Godot ? [Un temps.] Tu entends ? p. 130

85. Vladimir : Tu lui diras – [il s’interrompt] – tu lui diras que tu m’as vu et que – [il réfléchit] – que tu m’as vu. [Un temps. Vladimir s’avance...] p. 130

86. Vladimir : Attendre Godot.
Estragon : C’est vrai. [Un temps.] Il n’est pas venu ? p. 131

87. Estragon : Et si on le laissait tomber ? [Un temps.] Si on le laissait tomber ? p. 132

88. Vladimir : On se pendra demain. [Un temps.] À moins que Godot ne vienne. p. 133
Appendix F

Silences in *En attendant Godot*

1. Estragon [avec irritation]: Tout à l’heure, tout à l’heure. [*Silence.*] p. 10

2. Vladimir : Toujours les mêmes ?
Estragon : Les mêmes ? Je ne sais pas.
[*Silence.*] p. 10

3. Vladimir : ... Ça devient inquiétant. [*Silence, Estragon agite son pied, en faisant jouer les orteils, afin que l’air y circule mieux...*] p. 13

4. Vladimir : Tu aurais dû être poète.
Estragon : Je l’ai été. [*Geste vers ses haillons.*] Ça ne se voit pas ?
[*Silence.*] p. 14

5-6. Estragon : Je peux me tromper. [*Un temps.*] Taisons-nous un peu, tu veux ?
Vladimir [faiblement] : Je veux bien. [...] Vladimir s’arrête devant Estragon.] Gogo… [*Silence.*] Gogo… [*Silence.*] GOGO ! p. 19


8-12. Estragon [*avec douceur*] – Tu voulais me parler ? [...] Tu avais quelque chose à me dire ?
[*Silence. Autre pas en avant.*] Dis, Didi.
Vladimir [*sans se retourner*] : Je n’ai rien à te dire.
Vladimir : C’est pour les reins. [*Silence, Estragon regarde l’arbre avec attention.*] Qu’est-ce qu’on fait maintenant ? p. 21


14. Estragon : Tu m’as fait peur.
Vladimir : J’ai cru que c’était lui.
Estragon : Qui ?
Vladimir : Godot.
Estragon : Pah ! Le vent dans les roseaux.
Vladimir : J’aurais juré des cris.
Estragon : Et pourquoi crierait-il ?
Vladimir : après son cheval.
[*Silence.*] p. 25
15. Estragon : Pas toute la nuit.
Vladimir : Il fait encore jour.
[Silence.] p. 25

16-17. Pozzo [d’une voix terrible] : Je suis Pozzo ! [Silence.] Ce nom ne vous dit rien ?
[Silence.] Je vous demande si ce nom ne vous dit rien ?


Vladimir [éclatant] : C’est une honte !
[Silence.] p. 36

[ … ]
Estragon : Demandez-lui


[ … ]

29. Pozzo : Il se figure qu’en le voyant infatigable je vais regretter ma décision. Tel est son misérable calcul. Comme si j’étais à court d’hommes de peine ! [Tous les trois regardent Lucky.]
Vladimir : Vous voulez vous en débarrasser ? p. 43

30-32. Pozzo : [ … ] Ne disons donc pas de mal de notre époque, elle n’est pas plus malheureuse que les précédentes. [Silence.] N’en disons pas de bien non plus. [Silence.] N’en parlons pas. [Silence.] Il est vrai que la population a augmenté. p. 45
33. Pozzo [gémissant, pourtant ses mains à sa tête] : Je n’en peux plus… plus supporter… ce qu’il fait… pouvez pas savoir… c’est affreux… faut qu’il s’en aille… [il brandit les bras]… je deviens fou… [Il s’effondre, la tête dans les bras.] Je n’en peux plus… peux plus…
[Silence.]

34. Pozzo : […] Patience, ça va venir. Mais je vois ce que c’est, vous n’êtes pas d’ici, vous ne savez pas encore ce que c’est que le crépuscule chez nous. Voulez-vous que je vous le dise ?
[Silence, Estragon et Vladimir se sont remis à examiner, celui-là sa chaussure, celui-ci son chapeau. Le chapeau de Lucky tombe, sans qu’il s’en aperçoive.] Je veux bien vous satisfaire. [Jeu du vaporisateur.] Un peu d’attention, s’il vous plaît. p. 50


38. Pozzo : C’est que ma mémoire est défектueuse.
[Silence.] p. 53

39. Vladimir : Ce n’est pas folichon. [Silence. Pozzo se livre une bataille intérieure.]
Pozzo : Messieurs, vous avez été… [il cherche] … convenables avec moi. p. 53

40. Pozzo : Mais certainement, rien de plus facile. C’est d’ailleurs l’ordre naturel. [Rire bref.]
Vladimir : Alors, qu’il danse.
[Silence.] p. 55

41-42. Pozzo : Attendez ! Tous les trois se découvrent simultanément, portent la main au front, se concentrent, crispés.
[Long silence.]
[ […]
Pozzo : Voilà.
Vladimir : Afin de danser.
Estragon : C’est vrai.
[Long silence.] p. 57

43. Vladimir : Je vais le lui mettre.
Il contourne Lucky avec précaution, s’en approche doucement par derrière, lui met le chapeau sur la tête et recule vivement. Lucky ne bouge pas. Silence. p. 58

44. Pozzo : Son chapeau !
Vladimir s’empare du chapeau de Lucky qui se tait et tombe. Grand silence. Halètement des vainqueurs. p. 62
45. Pozzo : Attendez. [Il se plie en deux, approche sa tête de son ventre, écoute.] Je n’entends rien ! [Il leur fait signe de s’approcher.] Venez voir [Estragon et Vladimir vont vers lui, se penchent sur son ventre. Silence.] Il me semble qu’on devrait entendre le tic-tac. p. 64

Pozzo : Adieu.
Vladimir : Adieu.
Estragon : Adieu.
[Silence, personne ne bouge.]
Vladimir : Adieu.
Pozzo : Adieu.
Estragon : Adieu.
[Silence.] p. 65

48. [Silence.]
Pozzo : Je n’arrive pas… [il hésite]… à partir. p. 65


50. Vladimir : C’est la première fois que tu viens ?
Garçon : Oui, monsieur.
[Silence.] p. 71

51. Vladimir : Mais là-bas il faisait chaud ! Il faisait bon !
Estragon : Oui. Et on crucifiait vite.
[Silence.] p. 73

52-53. Estragon : Maintenant ce n’est plus la peine.
[Silence.]
Vladimir : C’est vrai, maintenant ce n’est plus la peine.
[Silence.]
Estragon : Alors, on y va ?
Vladimir : Allons-y.
Ils ne bougent pas. p. 75

54. Vladimir : Encore toi ! [Estragon s’arrête mais ne lève pas la tête. Vladimir va vers lui.] Viens que je t’embrasse !
Estragon : Ne me touche pas !
Vladimir suspend son vol, peiné. Silence. p. 81

55. Vladimir : Veux-tu que je m’en aille ? […] Où as-tu passé la nuit ? [Silence, Vladimir avance.] p. 81
56. Estragon : Pour moi, elle est terminée, quoi qu’il arrive. [*Silence.*] Tout à l’heure, tu chantais, je t’ai entendu. p. 82

Estragon : Nous sommes contents. [*Silence.*] Qu’est-ce qu’on fait, maintenant qu’on est content ?
Vladimir : On attend Godot.
Estragon : C’est vrai.
[*Silence.*] p. 84

59. Vladimir : Mais là-bas tout est rouge !
Estragon [excédé] : Je n’ai rien remarqué, je te dis !
*Silence.* Vladimir soupire profondément. p.86

60. Vladimir : Tu dis toujours ça. Et chaque fois tu reviens.
[*Silence.*] p. 87

Estragon : De feuilles.
[*Silence.*]
Vladimir : Elles parlent toutes en même temps.
Estragon : Chacune à part soi.
[*Silence.*] p. 87

Estragon : Elles murmurent.
[*Silence.*]
[ … ]
Vladimir : Il ne leur suffit pas d’être mortes.
Estragon : Ce n’est pas assez.
[*Silence.*]
[ … ]
Vladimir : De cendres.
Estragon : De feuilles.
[*Long silence.*]
Vladimir : Dis quelque chose !
Estragon : Je cherche.
[*Long silence.*]
Vladimir [angoissé] : Dis n’importe quoi !
Estragon : Qu’est-ce qu’on fait maintenant ?
Vladimir : On attend Godot.
Estragon : C’est vrai.
[*Silence.*] p. 88

68-69. Vladimir : Oui, mais il faut se décider.
Estragon : C’est vrai.
[Silence.]
Vladimir : Aide-moi !
Estragon : Je cherche.
[Silence.] p. 89

70. Estragon : Qu’est-ce que tu veux ?
Vladimir : Je sais, je sais.
[Silence.] p. 91

71. Estragon : Pas encore assez.
[Silence.]
Vladimir : Si tu les essayais ?
Estragon : J’ai tout essayé. p. 96

Il cherche des yeux où s’asseoir, puis va s’asseoir là où il était assis au début du premier acte.
Vladimir : C’est là où tu étais assis hier soir.
[Silence.] p. 98

74-75. Estragon : Pense, cochon !
[Silence.]
Vladimir : Je ne peux pas !
[ … ]
Vladimir : Danse, porc ! […] Gogo ! [Silence.] p.103


77-78. Estragon : Toi tu vas te poser là. [ … ] Dos à dos comme au bon vieux temps ! [Ils continuent à se regarder un petit moment, puis chacun reprend le guet. Long silence.] Tu ne vois rien venir ?
Vladimir : Comment ?
Estragon [plus fort] : Tu ne vois rien venir ?
Vladimir : Non.
Estragon : Moi non plus.
[Ils reprennent le guet. Long silence.] p. 105

79. Estragon : Ne crie pas. [Ils reprennent le guet. Long silence.] p. 106

Vladimir : Misérable !
Estragon : C’est ça, engueulons-nous. [Échange d’injures. Silence.] p. 106

82-84. Estragon : Allons-y. [Ils s’embrassent. Silence.]
Vladimir : Comme le temps passe quand on s’amuse !
[Silence.]
Estragon : Qu’est-ce qu’on fait maintenant ?
Vladimir : En attendant.
Estragon : En attendant.

[Silence.] p. 107

Pozzo : A moi !
Vladimir : Nous sommes là.
Pozzo : Qui êtes-vous ?
Vladimir : Nous sommes des hommes.

[Silence.]

Estragon : Ce qu’on est bien, par terre !
Vladimir : Peux-tu te lever ?
Estragon : Je ne sais pas.
Vladimir : Essaie.
Estragon : Tout à l’heure, tout à l’heure.

[Silence.] p. 115


[Silence.]

[ … ]


[Silence.] p. 116

91. Vladimir [angoissé] : Monsieur Pozzo ! Reviens ! On ne te fera pas de mal !

[Silence.] p. 117

Vladimir [Levant les yeux] : Où ?
Estragon : Là, au zénith.
Vladimir : Eh bien ? [Un temps] Qu’est-ce qu’il a de si extraordinaire ?

[Silence.]

[ … ]

Estragon : Mais à quoi ?
Vladimir : Ah, voilà !

[Silence.] p. 118

95. Vladimir : Vous ne nous remettez pas ?
Pozzo : Je suis aveugle.

[Silence.] p. 119

96. Estragon : Ça dépend de la saison.
Pozzo : C’est le soir ?

[Silence. Vladimir et Estragon regardent le coucher.] p. 120

97. Pozzo : Oui, elle était bien bonne.
80

98. Vladimir : On s’est vus hier. [Silence.] Vous ne vous rappelez pas ? p. 124

99-100. [Ils sortent. Vladimir les suit jusqu’à la limite de la scène, les regarde s’éloigner. Un bruit de chute, appuyé par la mimique de Vladimir, annonce qu’ils sont tombés à nouveau. Silence. Vladimir va vers Estragon qui dort, le contemple un moment, puis le réveille.] [ … ]

Vladimir : Tais-toi ! [Silence.] Je me demande s’il est vraiment aveugle. p. 127


[ … ]

Garçon : Non, monsieur.
Vladimir : C’est la première fois que tu viens ?
Garçon : Oui, monsieur.

[Silence.]
[ … ]

Vladimir : Sûrement.
Garçon : Oui, monsieur.

[Silence.]

Vladimir : Est-ce que tu as rencontré quelqu’un ?
Garçon : Non, monsieur.
Vladimir : Deux autres [il hésite] … hommes.
Garçon : Je n’ai vu personne, monsieur.

[Silence.] p. 129


[Silence.]
Vladimir : Comment va ton frère ?
Garçon : Il est malade, monsieur.
Vladimir : C’est peut-être lui qui est venu hier.
Garçon : Je ne sais pas, monsieur.

[Silence.]
Vladimir : Il a une barbe, monsieur Godot ?
Garçon : Oui, monsieur.
Vladimir : Blonde ou… [il hésite] … ou noire ?
Garçon [hésitant] : Je crois qu’elle est blanche, monsieur.

[Silence.]
Vladimir : Miséricorde.

[Silence.] p. 130

109-112. Vladimir : [ … ] Dis, tu es bien sûr de m’avoir vu, tu ne vas pas me dire demain que tu ne m’as jamais vu ?

[Silence. Vladimir fait un soudain bond en avant, le garçon se sauve comme une flèche. Silence. Le soleil se couche, la lune se lève. Vladimir reste immobile. Estragon se réveille, se déchaussse, se lève, les chaussures à la main, les dépose devant la rampe, va vers Vladimir, le regarde.]
Estragon : Qu’est-ce que tu as ?
Vladimir : Je n’ai rien.
Estragon : Moi je m’en vais.
Vladimir : Moi aussi.
[Silence.]
Estragon : Il y avait longtemps que je dormais ?
Vladimir : Je ne sais pas.
[Silence.] p. 131

[ … ]
Estragon : Viens voir. [Il entraîne Vladimir vers l’arbre. Ils s’immobilisent devant. Silence.] Et si on se pendait ? p. 132

[Silence.]
Estragon : Tu dis qu’il faut revenir demain ?
Vladimir : Oui.
Estragon : Alors on apportera une bonne corde.
Vladimir : C’est ça.
[Silence.] p. 133

Estragon : C’est vrai. [Il relève son pantalon. Silence.]
Vladimir : Alors, on y va ?
Estragon : Allons-y.
p. 134
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