DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

MASTER OF ARTS- ENGLISH

SEMESTER -III

THE MODERNS III

SOFT CORE 303

BLOCK-1

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

Postal Address:

The Registrar,

University of North Bengal,

Raja Rammohunpur,

P.O.-N.B.U., Dist-Darjeeling,

West Bengal, Pin-734013,

India.

Phone: (O) +91 0353-2776331/2699008

Fax: (0353) 2776313, 2699001

Email: regnbu@sancharnet.in ; regnbu@nbu.ac.in

Wesbsite: www.nbu.ac.in

First Published in 2019

All rights reserved. No Part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from University of North Bengal. Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this book may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

This book is meant for educational and learning purpose. The authors of the book has/have taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person in any manner whatsoever. In the even the Authors has/ have been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for corrective action

FOREWORD

The Self Learning Material (SLM) is written with the aim of providing simple and organized study content to all the learners. The SLMs are prepared on the framework of being mutually cohesive, internally consistent and structured as per the university's syllabi. It is a humble attempt to give glimpses of the various approaches and dimensions to the topic of study and to kindle the learner's interest to the subject

We have tried to put together information from various sources into this book that has been written in an engaging style with interesting and relevant examples. It introduces you to the insights of subject concepts and theories and presents them in a way that is easy to understand and comprehend.

We always believe in continuous improvement and would periodically update the content in the very interest of the learners. It may be added that despite enormous efforts and coordination, there is every possibility for some omission or inadequacy in few areas or topics, which would definitely be rectified in future.

We hope you enjoy learning from this book and the experience truly enrich your learning and help you to advance in your career and future endeavours.

THE MODERNS III

BLOCK – 1

Unit 1 SHAW – SAINT JOAN -1 6
Unit 2. SHAW- SAINT JOAN - 2 29
Unit 3.SHAW – SAINT JOAN -3 54
Unit 4. SHAW – SAINT JOAN -4 88
Unit 5. BECKETT - WAITING FOR GODOT - 1 110
Unit 6. BECKETT - WAITING FOR GODOT - 2 136
Unit 7. BECKETT - WAITING FOR GODOT - 3 157

BLOCK – 2

Unit-8 Brecht – Mother Courage and Her Children -1
Unit-9 Brecht – Mother Courage and Her Children -2
Unit-10. Brecht – Mother Courage and Her Children -3
Unit-11. Brecht – Mother Courage and Her Children -4
Unit-12 Camus – The Outsider – 1
Unit-13 Camus – The Outsider – 2
Unit-14 Camus – The Outsider – 3

BLOCK-1 THE MODERNS III

Introduction to Block 1

Unit 1 – George Bernard Shaw's Life

Unit 2 – George Bernard Shaw's Work, Beliefs, Opinions, Legacy and Influence

Unit 3 – Summary of Saint Joan by George Bernard Shaw

Unit 4 – Saint Joan's Themes, Characters, Analysis.

Unit 5 – Samuel Barclay Beckett's Life and Education.

Unit 6 – Plot, Characters, Themes, Setting And The Works which were inspired by "Waiting for Godot" by Samuel Beckett.

Unit 7 –Analysis, Interpretations, Production History, Adaptations, American Reception and Related Works Of Waiting For Godot By Samuel Beckett.

UNIT 1 SHAW – SAINT JOAN -1

STRUCTURE

1.0 Objectives

1.1Introduction

1.2 About George Bernard Shaw's Life

1.3 Let us Sum Up

1.4 Keywords

1.5 Questions for Review

1.6 Suggested Readings

1.7Answers to Check your Progress

1.0 OBJECTIVES

Once you go through this unit, you should be able to:

- know about George Bernard Shaw's Life.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

George Bernard Shaw, also known as Bernard Shaw, was an Irish playwright, critic, polemicist and political activist. Bernard Shaw's influence on Western theatre, culture and politics expanded over the period of 1880s to untill his death and even today. He wrote more than sixty plays, most famous one are- Man and Superman (1902), Pygmalion (1912) and Saint Joan (1923). With a range incorporating both contemporary satire and historical allegory, Shaw became the leading dramatist of his generation. In 1925, he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature.

Shaw was born in Dublin and then moved to London in 1876, where he struggled to establish himself as a writer and novelist, which led to him embarking on a rigorous process of self-education. By the mid-1880s he had already become a respected theatre and music critic. After a political awakening, he joined the gradualist Fabian Society and became its most

prominent pamphleteer. He had been writing plays for years before his first theatrical success, known as Arms and the Man in 1894. HE was influenced by Henrik Ibsen and sought to introduce a new realism into English-language drama. He used his plays as driving force to integrate his political, social and religious ideas. By the horizon of twentieth century his reputation as a dramatist was enhanced with a range of critical and popular successes that included Major Barbara, The Doctor's Dilemma and Caesar and Cleopatra.

Shaw's expressed views were often controversial; he notoriously promoted eugenics and alphabet reform, and actively opposed vaccination and organized religion. He denounced both sides in the First World War as equally culpable, and although not a republican, castigated British policy on Ireland in the postwar period but these stances had insignificant effect on his standing or productivity as a dramatist; the inter-war years saw a series of often ambitious plays, which achieved varying degrees of popular success. In 1938 he provided the screenplay for a filmed version of Pygmalion for which he received an Academy Award. His appetite for politics and controversy remained undiminished and by the end of 1920s he had largely renounced Fabian Society gradualism and often wrote and spoke favorably of dictatorships of the right and left—he expressed admiration for both Mussolini and Stalin. In the final decade of his life he made fewer public statements, but continued to write prolifically until shortly before his death at the age of ninety-four refused all the state honors, including the Order of Merit in 1946.

Since Shaw's death scholarly and critical opinion about his works has diversed, but he has regularly been rated among great British dramatists as followed by only Shakespeare. The analysts recognize his extensive influence on generations of English-language playwrights. The word Shavian has been added in the language as encapsulating Shaw's ideas and his means of expressing them.

1.2ABOUT GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S LIFE

Notes

Early years

Shaw was born at 3 Upper Synge Street in Portobell in a lower-middle-class part of Dublin. He was the youngest child and only son of George Carr Shaw (1814–1885) and Lucinda Elizabeth (Bessie) Shaw (née Gurly; 1830–1913). His elder siblings were Lucinda (Lucy) Frances (1853–1920) and Elinor Agnes (1855–1876). The Shaw family was of English descent and belonged to the dominant Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland; George Carr Shaw, an ineffectual alcoholic, was among the family's less fortunate members. His relatives secured him a sinecure in the civil service, from which he was pensioned off in the early 1850s; thereafter he worked irregularly as a corn merchant. He married to Bessie Gurly In 1852. As per Shaw's biographer Michael Holroyd she married to escape a tyrannical great-aunt If, as Holroyd and others surmise, George's motives were mercenary. Later he was disappointed, as Bessie brought him little of her family's money. She came to despise her ineffectual and often drunken husband, with whom she shared "shabby-genteel poverty" as described by their son.

By the time of Shaw's birth, his mother had become close to George John Lee, a flamboyant figure well known in Dublin's musical circles. Shaw retained a lifelong perception that Lee could have been his biological father all along but there is no consensus among Shavian scholars on the likelihood of this. The young Shaw suffered no harshness from his mother, but he later recalled that her indifference and lack of affection hurt him deeply. He found comfort in the music that was played in the house. Lee was a conductor and teacher of singing and Bessie had a fine mezzo-soprano voice. She was influenced by Lee's unorthodox method of vocal production. The Shaw's house was often filled with music, with frequent gatherings of singers and players.

In 1862, Lee and the Shaws agreed to share a house in Hatch Street, Dublin, and a country cottage at Dalkey Hill, overlooking Killiney Bay. Shaw, a sensitive boy, found the less salubrious parts of Dublin shocking and distressing, and was happier at the cottage. Lee's students often gave him books, which the young Shaw read avidly; thus, as well as gaining a

thorough musical knowledge of choral and operatic works, he became familiar with a broad spectrum of literature.

Between 1865 and 1871, Shaw gone to four schools, all of which he despised. His encounters as a schoolboy cleared out him baffled with formal instruction: "Schools and schoolmasters", he recalled it as "detainment facilities and turnkeys in which children are kept to anticipate them exasperating and chaperoning their parents." In October 1871 he cleared out school to gotten to be a junior receptionist in a Dublin firm of arrive operators, where he worked very hard, and rapidly rose to ended up head cashier. Amid this period, Shaw was known as "George Shaw"; after 1876, he dropped the "George" and styled himself "Bernard Shaw". In June 1873, Lee cleared out Dublin for London and never returned. A fortnight afterward, Bessie taken after him; the two young ladies joined her. Shaw's clarification of why his mother left Lee was that without the latter's monetary commitment the joint family had to be broken up. Cleared out in Dublin with his father, Shaw compensated for the nonappearance of music within the house by educating himself.

London

Early in 1876 Shaw learned from his mother that Agnes was biting the dust of tuberculosis. He surrendered from the land agents, and travelled to Britain to connect his mother and Lucy at Agnes's memorial service. He never once more lived in Ireland, and did not visit it for twenty-nine years. Initially, Shaw denied looking for clerical work in London. His mother permitted him to live free of charge in her house in South Kensington, but he in any case required a salary. He had deserted a adolescent desire to gotten to be a painter, and had no thought however of composing for a living, but Lee found a small work for him, ghost-writing a melodic column printed beneath Lee's title in a satirical weekly, The Hornet. Lee's relations with Bessie disintegrated after their move to London.

Shaw kept up contact with Lee, who found him work as a practice piano player and intermittent singer. Eventually Shaw was driven to applying for office jobs. In the interim he secured a reader's pass for the British Museum Reading Room (the forerunner of the British Library) and spent

most weekdays there, reading and writing. His first endeavor at dramatization, started in 1878, was a clear refrain ironical piece on a strict topic. It was surrendered incomplete, just like his first attempt at a novel. His originally finished novel, Immaturity (1879), was too horrid to even consider appealing to distributers and didn't show up until the 1930s. He was offered to join quickly by the recently framed Edison Telephone Company in 1879–80, and as in Dublin accomplished fast advancement. In any case, when the Edison firm converged with the opponent Bell Telephone Company, Shaw decided not to look for a spot in the new association. From there on he sought after a full-time profession as a creator.

For the following four years Shaw made an insignificant salary from composing and was sponsored by his mom. In 1881, for economy, and progressively as an issue of rule, he turned into a veggie lover. He grew a whisker to conceal a facial scar left by smallpox. In fast progression he composed two additional books: The Irrational Knot (1880) and Love Among the Artists (1881), however neither found a distributer; every was serialized a couple of years after the fact in the communist magazine Our Corner.

In 1880 Shaw started going to gatherings of the Zetetical Society, whose goal was to "look for truth in all issues influencing the interests of humankind". Here he met Sidney Webb, a lesser government employee who, similar to Shaw, was occupied with instructing himself. Regardless of distinction of style and demeanor, the two immediately perceived characteristics in one another and built up a deep-rooted companionship. Shaw later reflected: "You knew everything that I didn't know, and I knew everything you didn't know ... We had everything to learn from one another and brains enough to do it".

Shaw's next attempt at drama was a one-act playlet in French, Un Petit Drame, written in 1884 but not published in his lifetime. In the same year the critic William Archer suggested a collaboration, with a plot by Archer and dialogue by Shaw. The project foundered, but Shaw returned to the draft as the basis of Widowers' Houses in 1892, and the connection with Archer proved of immense value to Shaw's career.

Political awakening: Marxism, socialism, Fabian Society

On 5 September 1882 Shaw attended a meeting at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon, addressed by the political economist Henry George. Shaw then read George's book Progress and Poverty, which awakened his interest in economics. He began attending meetings of the Social Democratic Federation (SDF), where he discovered the writings of Karl Marx, and thereafter spent much of 1883 reading Das Kapital. He was not impressed by the SDF's founder, H. M. Hyndman, whom he found autocratic, ill-tempered and lacking leadership qualities. Shaw doubted the ability of the SDF to harness the working classes into an effective radical movement and did not join it—he preferred, he said, to work with his intellectual equals.

After reading a tract, Why Are The Many Poor?issued by the recently formed Fabian Society, Shaw went to the society's next advertised meeting, on 16 May 1884. He became a member in September, and earlier than the year's stop had furnished the society with its first manifesto, published as Fabian Tract No. 2. He joined the society's government committee in January 1885, and later that yr recruited Webb and also Annie Besant, a first-class orator.

From 1885 to 1889 Shaw attended the fortnightly conferences of the British Economic Association; it turned into, Holroyd observes, "the nearest Shaw had ever come to college schooling." This experience modified his political ideas; he moved far from Marxism and had become an apostle of gradualism. When in 1886–87 the Fabians debated whether or not to embody anarchism, as advocated with the aid of Charlotte Wilson, Besant and others, Shaw joined the majority in rejecting this technique. After a rally in Trafalgar Square addressed via Besant became violently damaged up by the government on 13 November 1887 ("Bloody Sunday"), Shaw became convinced of the folly of attempting to assignment police strength. Thereafter he in large part prevalent the precept of "permeation" as recommended by way of Webb: the notion wherein socialism may want to best be finished by using infiltration of human beings and thoughts into existing political events. Throughout the Eighties the Fabian Society remained small, its

message of moderation regularly unheard among more strident voices. Its profile changed into raised in 1889 with the e-book of Fabian Essays in Socialism, edited by Shaw who additionally provided two of the essays. The second of those, "Transition", details the case for gradualism and permeation, declaring that "the need for cautious and slow exchange ought to be obvious to all people". In 1890 Shaw produced Tract No. 13, What Socialism Is, a revision of an earlier tract in which Charlotte Wilson had defined socialism in anarchistic terms. In Shaw's new version, readers had been confident that "socialism may be introduced about in a superbly constitutional way via democratic establishments".

Novelist and critic

The mid-1880s marked a turning point in Shaw's life, both personally and professionally as he lost his virginity, published two novels, and became a critic. He had been celibate until his twenty-ninth birthday, when his shyness was overcome by Jane (Jenny) Patterson, a widow some years his senior. Their affair continued, not always smoothly, for eight years. Shaw's sex life has caused much speculation and debate among his biographers, but there is a consensus that the relationship with Patterson was one of his few non-platonic romantic liaisons.

The published novels, neither commercially successful, were his two final efforts in this genre: Cashel Byron's Profession written in 1882–83, and An Unsocial Socialist, begun and finished in 1883. The latter was published as a serial in Today magazine in 1884, which did not appear in book form until 1887. Cashel Byron appeared in magazine and book form in 1886.

In 1884 and 1885, through the influence of Archer, Shaw was engaged to write book and music criticism for London papers. When Archer resigned as art critic of The World in 1886, he secured the succession for Shaw. The two figures in the contemporary art world whose views Shaw most admired were William Morris and John Ruskin, and he sought to follow their precepts in his criticisms. Their emphasis on morality appealed to Shaw, who rejected the idea of art for art's sake, and insisted that all great art must be didactic.

Of Shaw's diverse reviewing activities inside the 1880s and Nineties it was as a track critic that he turned into first-rate recognised. After serving as deputy in 1888, he became musical critic of The Star in February 1889, writing beneath the pen-call Corno di Bassetto. In May 1890 he moved back to The World, in which he wrote a weekly column as "G.B.S." for greater than four years. In the 2016 version of the Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Robert Anderson writes, "Shaw's gathered writings on music stand by myself in their mastery of English and compulsive readability." Shaw ceased to be a salaried tune critic in August 1894, however published occasional articles at the issue throughout his career, his closing in 1950.

From 1895 to 1898, Shaw was the theatre critic for The Saturday Review, edited by his friend Frank Harris. As at The World, he used the by-line "G.B.S." He campaigned against the artificial conventions and hypocrisies of the Victorian theatre and called for plays of real ideas and true characters. By this time he had embarked in earnest on a career as a playwright: "I had rashly taken up the case; and rather than let it collapse I manufactured the evidence".

Playwright and politician: 1890s

Subsequent to utilizing the plot of the prematurely ended 1884 joint effort with Archer to finish Widowers' Houses (it was arranged twice in London, in December 1892), Shaw kept composing plays. From the outset he gained moderate ground; The Philanderer, written in 1893 yet not distributed until 1898, needed to hang tight until 1905 for a phase creation. So also, Mrs Warren's Profession (1893) was composed five years before production and nine years before arriving at the stage.

Shaw's first play to bring him money related achievement was Arms and the Man (1894), a fake Ruritanian parody caricaturizing shows of adoration, military respect and class. The press found the play overlong, and blamed Shaw for remarkableness, jeering at gallantry and energy, relentless keenness, and replicating W. S. Gilbert's style. People in general took an alternate view, and the administration of the venue organized extra matinée exhibitions to fulfill the need. The play ran from April to July, visited the areas and was arranged in New York. It earned

him £341 in eminences in its first year, an adequate total to empower him to surrender his salaried post as a music pundit. Among the cast of the London generation was Florence Farr, with whom Shaw had a sentimental connection somewhere in the range of 1890 and 1894, much detested by Jenny Patterson.

The accomplishment of Arms and the Man was not promptly imitated. Candida, which displayed a young lady settling on a regular sentimental decision for offbeat reasons, got a solitary exhibition in South Shields in 1895;in 1897 a playlet about Napoleon called The Man of Destiny had a solitary arranging at Croydon. In the 1890s Shaw's plays were preferable known in print over on the West End organize; his greatest achievement of the decade was in New York in 1897, when Richard Mansfield's generation of the chronicled acting The Devil's Disciple earned the creator more than £2,000 in royalties.

In January 1893, as a Fabian representative, Shaw went to the Bradford gathering which prompted the establishment of the Independent Labor Party. He was doubtful about the new party, and despised the probability that it could switch the loyalty of the average workers from game to politics. He convinced the meeting to embrace goals annulling circuitous tax assessment, and exhausting unmerited salary "to extinction". Back in London, Shaw delivered what Margaret Cole, in her Fabian history, terms an "amazing philippic" against the minority Liberal organization that had taken power in 1892. To Your Tents, O Israel abraded the legislature for disregarding social issues and focusing exclusively on Irish Home Rule, an issue Shaw announced of no significance to socialism. In 1894 the Fabian Society got a considerable inheritance from a sympathizer, Henry Hunt Hutchinson—Holroyd specifies £10,000. Webb, who led the leading group of trustees delegated to manage the heritage, proposed to utilize the vast majority of it to establish a school of financial aspects and legislative issues. Shaw challenged; he thought such an endeavor was in opposition to the predetermined motivation behind the heritage. He was in the long run

convinced to help the proposition, and the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) opened in the mid-year of 1895.

By the later 1890s Shaw's political exercises reduced as he focused on making his name as a dramatist.[85] In 1897 he was convinced to fill an uncontested opening for a "vestryman" (ward councilor) in London's St Pancras locale. In any event at first, Shaw took to his civil duties seriously; when London government was improved in 1899 and the St Pancras vestry turned into the Metropolitan Borough of St Pancras, he was chosen for the recently shaped ward council.

In 1898, because of exhaust, Shaw's wellbeing poor down. He was breast fed by Charlotte Payne-Townshend, a rich Anglo-Irish lady whom he had met through the Webbs. The earlier year she had suggested that she and Shaw ought to marry.He had declined, however when she demanded nursing him in a house in the nation, Shaw, worried this may cause outrage, consented to their marriage The service occurred on 1 June 1898, in the register office in Covent Garden. The lady and husband were both matured forty-one. In the perspective on the biographer and pundit St John Ervine, "their coexistence was completely felicitous". There were no offspring of the marriage, which it is by and large accepted was rarely fulfilled; regardless of whether this was entirely at Charlotte's desire, as Shaw jumped at the chance to propose, is less broadly credited. In the early long stretches of the marriage Shaw was highly involved composing his Marxist examination of Wagner's Ring cycle, distributed as The Perfect Wagnerite late in 1898. In 1906 the Shaws found a nation home in Ayot St Lawrence, Hertfordshire; they renamed the house "Shaw's Corner", and lived there for the remainder of their lives. They held a London level in the Adelphi and later at Whitehall Court.

Stage achievement: 1900–1914

During the main decade of the twentieth century, Shaw verified a firm notoriety as a writer. In 1904 J. E. Vedrenne and Harley Granville-Barker set up an organization at the Royal Court Theater in Sloane Square, Chelsea to exhibit current dramatization. Throughout the following five years they organized fourteen of Shaw's plays.The main, John Bull's Other Island, a parody about an Englishman in Ireland, pulled

in driving government officials and was seen by Edward VII, who chuckled so a lot of that he broke his chair. The play was retained from Dublin's Abbey Theater, inspired by a paranoid fear of the attack it may provoke, despite the fact that it was appeared at the city's Royal Theater in November 1907. Shaw later composed that William Butler Yeats, who had mentioned the play, "got preferably progressively over he expected ... It was uncongenial to the entire soul of the neo-Gaelic development, which is keen on making another Ireland after its own optimal, though my play is an extremely firm presentment of the genuine old Ireland." Nonetheless, Shaw and Yeats were dear companions; Yeats and Lady Gregory attempted ineffectively to convince Shaw to take up the empty co-directorship of the Abbey Theater after J. M. Synge's demise in 1909. Shaw appreciated different figures in the Irish Literary Revival, including George Russell and James Joyce, and was a dear companion of Seán O'Casey, who was enlivened to turn into a writer subsequent to perusing John Bull's Other Island.

Man and Superman, finished in 1902, was a triumph both at the Royal Court in 1905 and in Robert Loraine's New York generation around the same time. Among the other Shaw works displayed by Vedrenne and Granville-Barker were Major Barbara (1905), delineating the differentiating profound quality of arms makers and the Salvation Army;The Doctor's Dilemma (1906), a for the most part genuine piece about expert ethics; and Caesar and Cleopatra, Shaw's counterblast to Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, seen in New York in 1906 and in London the accompanying year.

Presently prosperous and built up, Shaw tried different things with unconventional dramatic structures portrayed by his biographer Stanley Weintraub as "discourse dramatization" and "genuine farce". These plays included Getting Married (debuted 1908), The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet (1909), Misalliance (1910), and Fanny's First Play (1911). Blanco Posnet was prohibited on strict grounds by the Lord Chamberlain (the official venue blue pencil in England), and was created rather in Dublin; it filled the Abbey Theater to capacity. Fanny's First Play, a satire about suffragettes, had the longest starting run of any Shaw play—622 performances.

Androcles and the Lion (1912), a less strange examination of certified and counterfeit exacting mindsets than Blanco Posnet, ran for around two months in September and October 1913. It was trailed by perhaps the best plays, Pygmalion, written in 1912 and masterminded in Vienna the following year, and in Berlin in a matter of seconds afterwards. Shaw commented, "It is the custom of the English press when a play of mine is conveyed, to teach the world that it's definitely not a play—that it is dull, insolent, detested, and fiscally incapable. ... Along these lines developed a squeezing enthusiasm concerning the head of Vienna and Berlin that I should have my plays performed by them first." The British age opened in April 1914, highlighting Sir Herbert Tree and Mrs. Patrick Campbell as, separately, an instructor of phonetics and a cockney bloom youngster. There had before been a wistful contact among Shaw and Campbell that caused Charlotte Shaw noteworthy concern, anyway when of the London debut it had ended. The play pulled in limit onlookers until July, when Tree requested taking some time off, and the age shut. His co-star by then chatted with the piece in the US.

Fabian years: 1900–1913

In 1899, when the Boer War started, Shaw wished the Fabians to take an unbiased position on what he esteemed, similar to Home Rule, to be a "non-Socialist" issue. Others, including the future Labor leader Ramsay MacDonald, needed unequivocal restriction, and left the general public when it pursued Shaw. In the Fabians' war pronouncement, Fabianism and the Empire (1900), Shaw proclaimed that "until the Federation of the World turns into a cultivated truth we should acknowledge the most capable Imperial organizations accessible as a substitute for it".

As the new century started, Shaw turned out to be progressively baffled by the restricted effect of the Fabians on national politics. Thus, albeit a designated Fabian agent, he didn't go to the London gathering at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street in February 1900, that made the Labor Representation Committee—antecedent of the cutting edge Labor Party. By 1903, when his term as precinct councilor lapsed, he had lost his prior excitement, expressing: "Following six years of Borough Counselling I am persuaded that the ward chambers ought to be abolished”.

Nevertheless, in 1904 he remained in the London County Council decisions. After an offbeat battle, which Holroyd describes as "[making] sure beyond a shadow of a doubt of not getting in", he was properly vanquished. It was Shaw's last invasion into constituent politics. Nationally, the 1906 general political race created a colossal Liberal greater part and an admission of 29 Labor individuals. Shaw saw this result with incredulity; he had a low assessment of the new leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and considered the to be individuals as insignificant: "I am sorry to the Universe for my association with such a body"

In the years after the 1906 political decision, Shaw felt that the Fabians required new administration, and saw this as his individual essayist H. G. Wells, who had joined the general public in February 1903. Wells' thoughts for change—especially his recommendations for closer collaboration with the Independent Labor Party—put him inconsistent with the general public's "Old Gang", drove by Shaw. According to Cole, Wells "had negligible limit with respect to putting [his ideas] crosswise over in open gatherings against Shaw's prepared and rehearsed virtuosity". In Shaw's view, "the Old Gang didn't douse Mr. Wells, he obliterated himself". Wells left the general public in September 1908. Shaw stayed a part, yet left the official in April 1911. He later pondered whether the Old Gang ought to have offered approach to Wells a few years sooner: "God just knows whether the Society had worse have done it". Although less dynamic—he accused his propelling years—Shaw stayed a Fabian.

In 1912 Shaw contributed £1,000 for a one-fifth offer in the Webbs' new distributing endeavor, a communist week by week magazine called The New Statesman, which showed up in April 1913. He turned into an establishing chief, marketing expert, and at the appropriate time a donor, for the most part anonymously. He was soon inconsistent with the magazine's proofreader, Clifford Sharp, who by 1916 was dismissing his commitments—"the main paper on the planet that will not print anything by me", as indicated by Shaw.

First World War

"I see the Junkers and Militarists of England and Germany seizing the opportunity they have ached for futile for a long time of crushing each other and building up their very own government as the predominant military intensity of the world."

Shaw: Common Sense About the War (1914)

After the First World War started in August 1914, Shaw created his tract Common Sense About the War, which contended that the warring countries were similarly culpable.Such a view was an abomination in an environment of intense energy, and outraged a significant number of Shaw's companions; Ervine records that "his appearance at any open capacity caused the moment flight of a large number of those present."

Regardless of his errant notoriety, Shaw's proselytizer aptitudes were perceived by the British specialists, and from the get-go in 1917 he was welcomed by Field Marshal Haig to visit the Western Front war zones. Shaw's 10,000-word report, which underscored the human parts of the officer's life, was generally welcomed, and he turned out to be to a lesser extent a solitary voice. In April 1917 he joined the national agreement in respecting America's entrance into the war: "a five star moral advantage for the basic reason against junkerism".

Three short plays by Shaw were debuted during the war. The Inca of Perusalem, written in 1915, experienced issues with the blue pencil for burlesquing the adversary as well as the British military order; it was performed in 1916 at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre.O'Flaherty V.C., parodying the administration's frame of mind to Irish enlisted people, was restricted in the UK and was introduced at a Royal Flying Corps base in Belgium in 1917. Augustus Does His Bit, a cheerful sham, was allowed a permit; it opened at the Royal Court in January 1917.

Ireland

Shaw had since quite a while ago bolstered the guideline of Irish Home Rule inside the British Empire (which he thought ought to turn into the British Commonwealth). In April 1916 he composed brutally in The New York Times about activist Irish patriotism: "In purpose of adapting nothing and overlooking nothing these individual loyalists of mine leave

the Bourbons nowhere." Total autonomy, he declared, was illogical; union with a greater influence (ideally England) was essential. The Dublin Easter Rising soon thereafter shocked him. After its concealment by British powers, he communicated frightfulness at the synopsis execution of the revolutionary heads, however kept on putting stock in some type of Anglo-Irish association. In How to Settle the Irish Question (1917), he conceived a government course of action, with national and royal parliaments. Holroyd records that at this point the dissenter party Sinn Féin was in the ascendency, and Shaw's and other moderate plans were forgotten.

In the after war time frame, Shaw gave up all hope of the British government's coercive approaches towards Ireland, and joined his individual journalists Hilaire Belloc and G. K. Chesterton in openly denouncing these actions. The Anglo-Irish Treaty of December 1921 prompted the segment of Ireland among north and south, an arrangement that frightened Shaw. In 1922 common war broke out in the south between its star bargain and against settlement groups, the previous of whom had set up the Irish Free State.Shaw visited Dublin in August, and met Michael Collins, at that point leader of the Free State's Provisional Government.Shaw was tremendously dazzled by Collins, and was disheartened when, after three days, the Irish chief was trapped and killed by hostile to settlement forces. In a letter to Collins' sister, Shaw expressed: "I met Michael for the first and keep going time on Saturday last, and am happy I did. I celebrate in his memory and won't be so traitorous to it as to cry over his valiant death". Shaw stayed a British subject for his entire life, however took double British-Irish nationality in 1934.

1920s

Shaw's first significant work to show up after the war was Heartbreak House, written in 1916–17 and performed in 1920. It was delivered on Broadway in November, and was coolly gotten; as indicated by The Times: "Mr. Shaw on this event has more than expected to state and accepts twice the length regular to state it". After the London debut in October 1921 The Times agreed with the American pundits: "As normal

with Mr Shaw, the play is about an hour excessively long", despite the fact that containing "much stimulation and some beneficial reflection". Ervine in The Observer thought the play splendid however awkwardly acted, aside from Edith Evans as Lady Utterword.

Shaw's biggest scale dramatic work was Back to Methuselah, written in 1918–20 and arranged in 1922. Weintraub portrays it as "Shaw's endeavor to battle off 'the unlimited pit of a totally disheartening pessimism'". This cycle of five interrelated plays delineates development, and the impacts of life span, from the Garden of Eden to the year 31,920 AD. Critics found the five plays strikingly uneven in quality and invention. The first run was brief, and the work has been restored infrequently. Shaw felt he had depleted his staying imaginative powers in the gigantic range of this "Metabiological Pentateuch". He was currently sixty-seven, and expected to compose no more plays.

This mind-set was fleeting. In 1920 Joan of Arc was declared a holy person by Pope Benedict XV; Shaw had since quite a while ago discovered Joan an intriguing recorded character, and his perspective on her veered between "idiotic virtuoso" and somebody of "outstanding sanity".

He had pondered creating a play about her in 1913, and the canonisation affected him to return to the subject.Shaw came back to the auditorium with what he called "a political party", The Apple Cart, written in late 1928. It was, in Ervine's view, out of the blue mainstream, taking a traditionalist, monarchist, hostile to fair line that engaged contemporary spectators. The debut was in Warsaw in June 1928, and the principal British generation was two months after the fact, at Sir Barry Jackson's debut Malvern Festival. The other famous imaginative craftsman most intently connected with the celebration was Sir Edward Elgar, with whom Shaw appreciated a profound companionship and common regard. He portrayed The Apple Cart to Elgar as "an outrageous Aristophanic vaudeville of popularity based governmental issues, with a brief however stunning sex interlude".

During the 1920s Shaw started to lose confidence in the possibility that society could be changed through Fabian gradualism, and turned out to

be progressively intrigued with domineering strategies. In 1922 he had invited Mussolini's increase to control in Italy, seeing that in the midst of the "indiscipline and obfuscate and Parliamentary gridlock", Mussolini was "the correct sort of tyrant". Shaw was set up to endure certain domineering overabundances; Weintraub in his ODNB true to life sketch remarks that Shaw's "tease with tyrant between war systems" set aside a long effort to blur, and Beatrice Webb thought he was "fixated" about Mussolini.

1930s

"We the undersigned are late guests to the USSR ... We want to record that we saw no place proof of financial servitude, privation, joblessness and pessimistic give up on improvement. ... Wherever we saw cheerful and excited average workers ... setting a case of industry and lead which would incredibly advance us if our frameworks provided our laborers with any motivation to tail it."

Letter to The Manchester Guardian, 2 March 1933, marked by Shaw and 20 others.

Shaw's energy for the Soviet Union dated to the mid 1920s when he had hailed Lenin as "the one truly fascinating statesman with regards to Europe". Having turned down a few opportunities to visit, in 1931 he joined a gathering drove by Nancy Astor. The painstakingly overseen trip finished in a long gathering with Stalin, whom Shaw later portrayed as "a Georgian man of honor" with no perniciousness in him. At a supper given in his respect, Shaw told the social occasion: "I have seen every one of the 'dread' and I was horrendously satisfied by them". In March 1933 Shaw was a co-signatory to a letter in The Manchester Guardian fighting at the proceeding with deception of Soviet accomplishments: "No untruth is excessively phenomenal, no defamation is too stale ... for work by the more crazy components of the British press."

Shaw's appreciation for Mussolini and Stalin showed his developing conviction that autocracy was the main suitable political game plan. At the point when the Nazi Party came to control in Germany in January

1933, Shaw portrayed Hitler as "an entirely surprising man, a truly capable man", and maintained himself glad to be the main essayist in England who was "circumspectly obliging and just to Hitler". His central reverence was for Stalin, whose system he supported uncritically all through the decade.Shaw saw the 1939 Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact as a triumph for Stalin who, he stated, presently had Hitler under his thumb.

Shaw's first play of the decade was Too True to be Good, written in 1931 and debuted in Boston in February 1932. The gathering was apathetic. Rivulets Atkinson of The New York Times remarking that Shaw had "respected the motivation to compose without having a subject", passed judgment on the play a "meandering aimlessly and impassively repetitive discussion". The reporter of The New York Herald Tribune said that the greater part of the play was "talk, amazingly long talks" and that despite the fact that the crowd delighted in the play it was puzzled by it.

During the decade Shaw voyaged broadly and oftentimes. The majority of his adventures were with Charlotte; she appreciated journeys on sea liners, and he discovered harmony to compose during the long spells at sea.Shaw met an eager greeting in South Africa in 1932, regardless of his solid comments about the racial divisions of the country. In December 1932 the couple set out on a round-the-world voyage. In March 1933 they landed at San Francisco, to start Shaw's first visit to the US. He had before would not go to "that dreadful nation, that unrefined spot", "unfit to oversee itself ... illiberal, superstitious, rough, savage, anarchic and arbitrary". He visited Hollywood, with which he was disinterested, and New York, where he addressed to a limit group of spectators in the Metropolitan Opera House. Harried by the meddling considerations of the press, Shaw was happy when his ship cruised from New York harbour.New Zealand, which he and Charlotte visited the next year, struck him as "the best nation I've been in"; he asked its kin to be increasingly sure and release their reliance on exchange with Britain.He utilized the weeks adrift to finish two plays—The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles and The Six of Calais—and start deal with a third, The Millionairess.

In spite of his disdain for Hollywood and its stylish qualities, Shaw was energetic about film, and in the decade composed screenplays for forthcoming film renditions of Pygmalion and Saint Joan.The last was rarely made, yet Shaw depended the rights to the previous to the obscure Gabriel Pascal, who delivered it at Pinewood Studios in 1938. Shaw was resolved that Hollywood ought to have nothing to do with the film yet was feeble to keep it from winning one Academy Award ("Oscar"); he portrayed his honor for "best-composed screenplay" as an affront, originating from such a source. He turned into the main individual to have been granted both a Nobel Prize and an Oscar. In a 1993 investigation of the Oscars, Anthony Holden sees that Pygmalion was before long talked about as having "lifted motion picture making from absence of education to literacy".

Shaw's last plays of the 1930s were Cymbeline Refinished (1936), Geneva (1936) and In Good King Charles' Golden Days (1939). The initial, a dream improving of Shakespeare, established little connection, yet the second, a parody on European tyrants, pulled in more notice, quite a bit of it unfavorablespecifically, Shaw's spoof of Hitler as "Herr Battler" was viewed as mellow, nearly sympathetic. The third play, a verifiable discussion piece previously observed at Malvern, ran quickly in London in May 1940.James Agate remarked that the play contained nothing to which even the most traditionalist crowds could protest, however it was long and ailing in emotional activity just "stupid and inactive" theatergoers would object.After their first runs none of the three plays were seen again in the West End during Shaw's lifetime.

Towards the decade's end, the two Shaws started to endure sick wellbeing. Charlotte was progressively debilitated by Paget's infection of bone, and he created vindictive weakness. His treatment, including infusions of concentrated creature liver, was fruitful, however this rupture of his veggie lover doctrine upset him and cut down judgment from aggressor vegetarians.

Second World War and final years

Although Shaw's works since The Apple Cart had been received without great enthusiasm, his earlier plays were revived in the West End throughout the Second World War, starring such actors as Edith Evans, John Gielgud, Deborah Kerr and Robert Donat.In 1944 nine Shaw plays were staged in London, including Arms and the Man with Ralph Richardson, Laurence Olivier, Sybil Thorndike and Margaret Leighton in the leading roles. Two touring companies took his plays all round Britain.The revival in his popularity did not tempt Shaw to write a new play, and he concentrated on prolific journalism.A second Shaw film produced by Pascal, Major Barbara (1941), was less successful both artistically and commercially than Pygmalion, partly because of Pascal's insistence on directing, to which he was unsuited.

"The rest of Shaw's life was quiet and solitary. The loss of his wife was more profoundly felt than he had ever imagined any loss could be: for he prided himself on a stoical fortitude in all loss and misfortune."

St John Ervine on Shaw, 1959

Following the outbreak of war on 3 September 1939 and the rapid conquest of Poland, Shaw was accused of defeatism when, in a New Statesman article, he declared the war over and demanded a peace conference. Nevertheless, when he became convinced that a negotiated peace was impossible, he publicly urged the neutral United States to join the fight.The London blitz of 1940–41 led the Shaws, both in their mid-eighties, to live full-time at Ayot St Lawrence. Even there they were not immune from enemy air raids, and stayed on occasion with Nancy Astor at her country house, in 1943, the worst of the London bombing over, the Shaws moved back to Whitehall Court, where medical help for Charlotte was more easily arranged. Her condition deteriorated, and she died in September.

Shaw's final political treatise, Everybody's Political What's What, was published in 1944. Holroyd describes this as "a rambling narrative ... that repeats ideas he had given better elsewhere and then repeats itself". The book sold well—85,000 copies by the end of the year. After Hitler's suicide in May 1945, Shaw approved of the formal condolences offered by the Irish Taoiseach, Éamon de Valera, at the German embassy in

Dublin.Shaw disapproved of the postwar trials of the defeated German leaders, as an act of self-righteousness: "We are all potential criminals".

Pascal was given a third opportunity to film Shaw's work with Caesar and Cleopatra (1945). It cost three times its original budget and was rated "the biggest financial failure in the history of British cinema". The film was poorly received by British critics, although American reviews were friendlier. Shaw thought its lavishness nullified the drama, and he considered the film "a poor imitation of Cecil B. de Mille".

In 1946, the year of Shaw's ninetieth birthday, he accepted the freedom of Dublin and became the first honorary freeman of the borough of St Pancras, London. In the same year the government asked Shaw informally whether he would accept the Order of Merit. He declined, believing that an author's merit could only be determined by the posthumous verdict of history. 1946 saw the publication, as The Crime of Imprisonment, of the preface Shaw had written 20 years previously to a study of prison conditions. It was widely praised; a reviewer in the American Journal of Public Health considered it essential reading for any student of the American criminal justice system.

Shaw continued to write into his nineties. His last plays were Buoyant Billions (1947), his final full-length work; Farfetched Fables (1948) a set of six short plays revisiting several of his earlier themes such as evolution; a comic play for puppets, Shakes versus Shav (1949), a ten-minute piece in which Shakespeare and Shaw trade insults; and Why She Would Not (1950), which Shaw described as "a little comedy", written in one week shortly before his ninety-fourth birthday.

During his later years, Shaw enjoyed tending the gardens at Shaw's Corner. He died at the age of ninety-four of renal failure precipitated by injuries incurred when falling while pruning a tree. He was cremated at Golders Green Crematorium on 6 November 1950. His ashes, mixed with those of Charlotte, were scattered along footpaths and around the statue of Saint Joan in their garden.

Check your progress -1

1. Where was George Bernard Shaw

born?____

2. Who was George Bernard Shaw's mother?

3. WhendidGeorge Bernard Shaw move to London?

1.3LET US SUM UP

In this unit we read about George Bernard Shaw's life.

1.4 KEY WORDS

- **Affliction:** Suffering
- **Apparitions:** Visions or spirits
- **Abstemious:** Tending to eat or drink only in small amounts
- **Bourgeoisie:** Families and individuals who are not landowners but who make money through professional occupations such as banking, law, or medicine. They could range from middle-class to quite high-class and tended to be well-educated.

1.5 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- Write in brief about the life of George Bernard Shaw during second world war and final years.
- Write a note on George Bernard Shaw's stage achievements.

Notes

- Write a short note on George Bernard Shaw's Stage achievement from 1900 to 1914.

1.6 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Holroyd 1997, pp. 13–14.
2. ^ Rosset 1964, pp. 105 and 129.
3. ^ Dervin 1975, p. 56.
4. ^ O'Donovan 1965, p. 108.
5. ^ Bosch 1984, pp. 115–117.
6. ^ Holroyd 1990, pp. 27–28.

1.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. George Bernard Shaw was born in Dublin. (**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.1)**

2. Lucinda Elizabeth Shaw was George Bernard Shaw's mother. **(answer for check your progress- 1 Q.2**)

3. George Bernard Shaw moved to London in 1876. . **(answer for check your progress- 1 Q.3**)

UNIT 2. SHAW- SAINT JOAN - 2

STRUCTURE

2.0 Objectives

2.1 Introduction

2.2 George Bernard Shaw's Work

2.3 George Bernard Shaw's Beliefs and Opinions

2.4 George Bernard Shaw's Legacy and Influence

2.5 Let us Sum Up

2.6 Keywords

2.7 Questions for Reviews

2.8 Suggested Readings

2.9 Answers to Check your Progress

2.0 OBJECTIVES

Once you go through this unit, you should be able to understand:

- George Bernard Shaw's work, beliefs, opinions, legacy and influence.

2.1INTRODUCTION

Irish playwright, George Bernard Shaw, was born in Dublin on July 26, 1856. Beginning his career as a writer in London, Shaw wrote extensively in his initial years to make ends meet. After his novels failed repeatedly on being rejected by publishers, Shaw turned to writing plays. As his plays went on to become huge successes, his satirical, witty style established him not only as a genius playwright, but also as a social commentator of his time. Shaw was also the first writer to win both the

Nobel Prize for Literature in 1925 and the Academy Award for the Best Adapted Screenplay of his play, Pygmalion, in 1938.
Out of the 60 plays George Bernard Shaw wrote during his lifetime.

2.2 GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S WORK

Plays

Shaw published a collected edition of his plays in 1934, comprising forty-two works. He wrote a further twelve in the remaining sixteen years of his life, mostly one-act pieces. Including eight earlier plays that he chose to omit from his published works, the total is sixty-two

Early works

1890s

Full-length plays

- Widowers' Houses
- The Philanderer
- Mrs. Warren's Profession
- Arms and the Man
- Candida
- You Never Can Tell
- The Devil's Disciple
- Caesar and Cleopatra
- Captain Brassbound's Conversion
- Adaptation
- The Gadfly
- Short play
- The Man of Destiny

Shaw's first three full-length plays dealt with social issues. He later grouped them as "Plays Unpleasant".Widower's Houses (1892) concerns the landlords of slum properties and introduces the first of Shaw's New Women—a recurring feature of later plays. The Philanderer (1893) develops the theme of the New Woman, draws on Ibsen, and has

elements of Shaw's personal relationships, the character of Julia being based on Jenny Patterson. In a 2003 study Judith Evans describes Mrs. Warren's Profession (1893) as "undoubtedly the most challenging" of the three Plays Unpleasant, taking Mrs. Warren's profession—prostitute and, later, brothel-owner—as a metaphor for a prostituted society.

Shaw followed the first trilogy with a second, published as "Plays Pleasant". Arms and the Man (1894) conceals beneath a mock-Ruritanian comic romance a Fabian parable contrasting impractical idealism with pragmatic socialism. The central theme of Candida (1894) is a woman's choice between two men; the play contrasts the outlook and aspirations of a Christian Socialist and a poetic idealist. The third of the Pleasant group, You Never Can Tell (1896), portrays social mobility, and the gap between generations, particularly in how they approach social relations in general and mating in particular.

The "Three Plays for Puritans"—comprising The Devil's Disciple (1896), Caesar and Cleopatra (1898) and Captain Brassbound's Conversion (1899)—all center on questions of empire and imperialism, a major topic of political discourse in the 1890s. The three are set, respectively, in 1770s America, Ancient Egypt, and 1890s Morocco. The Gadfly, an adaptation of the popular novel by Ethel Voynich, was unfinished and unperformed. The Man of Destiny (1895) is a short curtain raiser about Napoleon.

1900–1909

Full-Length Plays

- Man and Superman
- John Bull's Other Island
- Major Barbara
- The Doctor's Dilemma
- Getting Married
- Misalliance
- Short plays

- The Admirable Bashville
- How He Lied to Her Husband
- Passion, Poison, and Petrifaction
- The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet
- Press Cuttings
- The Fascinating Foundling
- The Glimpse of Reality

Shaw's major plays of the first decade of the twentieth century address individual social, political or ethical issues. Man and Superman (1902) stands apart from the others in both its subject and its treatment, giving Shaw's interpretation of creative evolution in a combination of drama and associated printed text. The Admirable Bashville (1901), a blank verse dramatisation of Shaw's novel Cashel Byron's Profession, focuses on the imperial relationship between Britain and Africa.John Bull's Other Island (1904), comically depicting the prevailing relationship between Britain and Ireland, was popular at the time but fell out of the general repertoire in later years.Major Barbara (1905) presents ethical questions in an unconventional way, confounding expectations that in the depiction of an armaments manufacturer on the one hand and the Salvation Army on the other the moral high ground must invariably be held by the latter.The Doctor's Dilemma (1906), a play about medical ethics and moral choices in allocating scarce treatment, was described by Shaw as a tragedy. With a reputation for presenting characters who did not resemble real flesh and blood, he was challenged by Archer to present an on-stage death, and here did so, with a deathbed scene for the anti-hero.

Getting Married (1908) and Misalliance (1909)—the latter seen by Judith Evans as a companion piece to the former—are both in what Shaw called his "disquisitionary" vein, with the emphasis on discussion of ideas rather than on dramatic events or vivid characterization.Shaw wrote seven short plays during the decade; they are all comedies, ranging from the deliberately absurd Passion, Poison, and Petrifaction (1905) to the satirical Press Cuttings (1909).

1910–1919

Full–length plays

- Fanny's First Play
- Androcles and the Lion
- Pygmalion
- Heartbreak House
- Short plays
- The Dark Lady of the Sonnets
- Overruled
- The Music Cure
- Great Catherine
- The Inca of Perusalem
- O'Flaherty V.C.
- Augustus Does His Bit
- Annajanska, the Bolshevik Empress

In the decade from 1910 to the aftermath of the First World War Shaw wrote four full-length plays, the third and fourth of which are among his most frequently staged works.Fanny's First Play (1911) continues his earlier examinations of middle-class British society from a Fabian viewpoint, with additional touches of melodrama and an epilogue in which theatre critics discuss the play.Androcles and the Lion (1912), which Shaw began writing as a play for children, became a study of the nature of religion and how to put Christian precepts into practice. Pygmalion (1912) is a Shavian study of language and speech and their importance in society and in personal relationships. To correct the impression left by the original performers that the play portrayed a romantic relationship between the two main characters Shaw rewrote the ending to make it clear that the heroine will marry another, minor character. Shaw's only full-length play from the war years is Heartbreak House (1917), which in his words depicts "cultured, leisured Europe before the war" drifting towards disaster.Shaw named Shakespeare (King Lear) and Chekhov (The Cherry Orchard) as important influences on the piece, and critics have found elements drawing on Congreve (The Way of the World) and Ibsen (The Master Builder).

The short plays range from genial historical drama in The Dark Lady of the Sonnets and Great Catherine (1910 and 1913) to a study of polygamy in Overruled; three satirical works about the war (The Inca of Perusalem, O'Flaherty V.C. and Augustus Does His Bit, 1915–16); a piece that Shaw called "utter nonsense" (The Music Cure, 1914) and a brief sketch about a "Bolshevik empress" (Annajanska, 1917)

1920–1950

Full length plays

- Back to Methuselah
- Saint Joan
- The Apple Cart
- Too True to Be Good
- On the Rocks
- The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles
- The Millionairess
- Geneva
- In Good King Charles's Golden Days
- Buoyant Billions
- Short plays
- A Village Wooing
- The Six of Calais
- Cymbeline Refinished
- Farfetched Fables
- Shakes versus Shav
- Why She Would Not

Holy person Joan (1923) drew far reaching acclaim both for Shaw and for Sybil Thorndike, for whom he composed the title job and who made the part in Britain.In the perspective on the pundit Nicholas Grene, Shaw's Joan, a "straightforward spiritualist, Protestant and patriot before her time" is among the twentieth century's exemplary driving female roles. The Apple Cart (1929) was Shaw's last prevalent success.He gave both that play and its successor, Too True to Be Good (1931), the caption

"A political spectacle", despite the fact that the two works contrast extraordinarily in their subjects; the main displays the legislative issues of a country (with a short regal love-scene as a break) and the second, in Judith Evans' words, "is worried about the social mores of the individual, and is nebulous." Shaw's plays of the 1930s were written in the shadow of exacerbating national and worldwide political occasions. Indeed, with On the Rocks (1933) and The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles (1934), a political parody with a reasonable plot was trailed by a reflective show. The principal play depicts a British head administrator considering, however at last dismissing, the foundation of an autocracy; the second is worried about polygamy and selective breeding and finishes with the Day of Judgement.

The Millionairess (1934) is a ludicrous portrayal of the business and parties of a fruitful businessperson. Geneva (1936) parodies the weakness of the League of Nations contrasted and the despots of Europe. In Good King Charles' Golden Days (1939), portrayed by Weintraub as a warm, rambling high parody, additionally delineates dictatorship, however less satirically than Geneva.As in prior decades, the shorter plays were by and large comedies, some authentic and others tending to different political and social distractions of the creator. Ervine composes of Shaw's later work that in spite of the fact that it was still "amazingly energetic and vivacious" it gave indisputable indications of his age. "The best of his work in this period, be that as it may, was brimming with intelligence and the magnificence of brain regularly showed by elderly people men who keep their brains about them."

Music and dramatization surveys

Music

Shaw's gathered melodic analysis, distributed in three volumes, races to more than 2,700 pages.It covers the British melodic scene from 1876 to 1950, however the center of the assortment dates from his six years as music pundit of The Star and The World in the late 1880s and mid -

1890s. In his view music analysis ought to intrigue everybody as opposed to simply the melodic élite, and he composed for the non-pro, keeping away from specialized language—"Mesopotamian words like 'the predominant of D major'". He was savagely factional in his segments, advancing the music of Wagner and censuring that of Brahms and those British writers, for example, Stanford and Parry whom he saw as Brahmsian. He crusaded against the common style for exhibitions of Handel oratorios with gigantic novice ensembles and expanded arrangement, requiring "a tune of twenty proficient artists". He railed against show creations ridiculously organized or sung in dialects the group of spectators didn't speak.

Show

In Shaw's view, the London theaters of the 1890s exhibited such a large number of restorations of old plays and insufficient new work. He battled against "acting, wistfulness, generalizations and destroyed conventions". As a music pundit he had much of the time had the option to focus on breaking down new works, however in the theater he was frequently obliged to fall back on examining how different entertainers handled surely understood plays. In an investigation of Shaw's work as a theater pundit, E. J. West composes that Shaw "perpetually thoroughly analyzed craftsmen in translation and in strategy". Shaw contributed in excess of 150 articles as theater pundit for The Saturday Review, in which he surveyed more than 212 productions. He advocated Ibsen's plays when numerous theatergoers viewed them as preposterous, and his 1891 book Quintessence of Ibsenism stayed a great all through the twentieth century. Of contemporary screenwriters composing for the West End organize he evaluated Oscar Wilde over the rest: "... our solitary exhaustive writer. He plays with all the fixings: with mind, with reasoning, with dramatization, with on-screen characters and crowd, with the entire theatre". Shaw's gathered reactions were distributed as Our Theaters in the Nineties in 1932.

Shaw kept up a provocative and often self-opposing mentality to Shakespeare (whose name he demanded spelling "Shakespear").Many discovered him hard to pay attention to regarding the matter; Duff Cooper saw that by assaulting Shakespeare, "it is Shaw who seems a ludicrous pigmy shaking his clench hand at a mountain." Shaw was, by the by, a proficient Shakespearian, and in an article wherein he expressed, "With the single special case of Homer, there is no famous essayist, not even Sir Walter Scott, whom I can disdain so totally as I scorn Shakespear when I measure my brain against his," he additionally stated, "Yet I will undoubtedly include that I feel sorry for the man who can't appreciate Shakespear. He has outlived a great many abler masterminds and will outlive a thousand more". Shaw had two standard focuses for his increasingly extraordinary remarks about Shakespeare: undiscriminating "Bardolaters", and entertainers and chiefs who exhibited obtusely cut messages in over-expound productions. He was persistently moved back to Shakespeare and composed three plays with Shakespearean subjects: The Dark Lady of the Sonnets, Cymbeline Refinished and Shakes versus Shav. In a 2001 investigation of Shaw's Shakespearian reactions, Robert Pierce presumes that Shaw, who was no scholarly, saw Shakespeare's plays—like all theater—from a creator's down to earth perspective: "Shaw causes us to escape from the Romantics' image of Shakespeare as a titanic virtuoso, one whose craftsmanship can't be dissected or associated with the unremarkable contemplations of dramatic conditions and benefit and misfortune, or with a particular arranging and cast of actors."

Political and social works

Shaw's political and social discourses were distributed differently in Fabian tracts, in papers, in two full-length books, in countless paper and diary articles and in introductions to his plays. Most of Shaw's Fabian tracts were distributed namelessly, speaking to the voice of the general public as opposed to of Shaw, in spite of the fact that the general public's secretary Edward Pease later affirmed Shaw's authorship.According to Holroyd, the matter of the early Fabians, predominantly affected by

Shaw, was to "change history by reworking it". Shaw's ability as a pamphleteer was put to quick use in the creation of the general public's pronouncement—after which, says Holroyd, he was never again so succinct.

After the turn of the twentieth century, Shaw progressively spread his thoughts through the vehicle of his plays. An early pundit, writing in 1904, saw that Shaw's dramatizations gave "a wonderful signifies" of converting his communism, including that "Mr. Shaw's perspectives are to be looked for particularly in the introductions to his plays". After relaxing his ties with the Fabian development in 1911, Shaw's works were progressively close to home and regularly provocative; his reaction to the following the issue of Common Sense About the War in 1914, was to set up a continuation, More Common Sense About the War. In this, he condemned the radical line embraced by Ramsay MacDonald and other communist pioneers and broadcasted his preparation to shoot all peaceful resistor as opposed to surrender them control and influence. On the exhortation of Beatrice Webb, this handout remained unpublished.

The Intelligent Woman's Guide, Shaw's principle political treatise of the 1920s, pulled in both deference and analysis. MacDonald thought of it as the world's most significant book since the Bible; Harold Laski thought its contentions obsolete and ailing in worry for individual freedoms.Shaw's expanding tease with tyrannical strategies is clear in a considerable lot of his consequent proclamations. A New York Times report dated 10 December 1933 cited an ongoing Fabian Society address in which Shaw had lauded Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin: "They are attempting to complete something andare receiving techniques by which it is conceivable to get something done". As late as the Second World War, in Everybody's Political's What, Shaw accused the Allies' "misuse" of their 1918 triumph for the ascent of Hitler, and trusted that, after thrashing, the Führer would escape revenge "to appreciate an agreeable retirement in Ireland or some other unbiased country". These notions, as per the Irish savant writer Thomas Duddy, "rendered a great part of the Shavian standpoint antiquated and contemptible".

"Innovative advancement", Shaw's adaptation of the new study of selective breeding, turned into an expanding subject in his political composition after 1900. He presented his hypotheses in The Revolutionist's Handbook (1903), a reference section to Man and Superman, and created them further during the 1920s in Back to Methuselah. A 1946 Life magazine article saw that Shaw had "constantly would in general take a gander at individuals more as a researcher than as an artist".By 1933, in the prelude to On the Rocks, he was composing that "in the event that we want a specific kind of progress and culture we should eliminate the kind of individuals who don't fit into it";basic sentiment is partitioned on whether this was proposed as irony. In an article in the American magazine Liberty in September 1938, Shaw incorporated the announcement: "There are numerous individuals on the planet who should be liquidated".Many observers expected that such remarks were planned as a joke, despite the fact that in the most exceedingly terrible conceivable taste.Otherwise, Life magazine finished up, "this irrationality can be classed with his progressively blameless awful guesses".

Fiction

Shaw's fiction-composing was to a great extent restricted to the five ineffective books written in the period 1879–1885.

Letters and diaries

Shaw was a productive reporter for an incredible duration. His letters, altered by Dan H. Laurence, were distributed somewhere in the range of 1965 and 1988.Shaw once evaluated his letters would involve twenty volumes; Laurence remarked that, unedited, they would fill numerous more.Shaw composed in excess of a fourth of a million letters, of which around 10% have endure; 2,653 letters are imprinted in Laurence's four volumes. Among Shaw's numerous standard reporters were his beloved companion Edward McNulty; his showy partners (and amitiés amoureuses) Mrs. Patrick Campbell and Ellen Terry; authors including

Lord Alfred Douglas, H. G. Wells and G. K. Chesterton; the fighter Gene Tunney; the sister Laurentia McLachlan; and the workmanship master Sydney Cockerell.In 2007 a 316-page volume comprising completely of Shaw's letters to The Times was published.

Shaw's journals for 1885–1897, altered by Weintraub, were distributed in two volumes, with an aggregate of 1,241 pages, in 1986. Exploring them, the Shaw researcher Fred Crawford expressed: "Despite the fact that the essential enthusiasm for Shavians is the material that enhancements what we definitely think about Shaw's life and work, the journals are likewise important as a chronicled and sociological report of English life toward the finish of the Victorian age." After 1897, weight of another composing drove Shaw to quit any pretense of keeping a diary.

Different and Personal

Through his reporting, leaflets and infrequent longer works, Shaw composed regarding numerous matters. His scope of intrigue and enquiry included vivisection, vegetarianism, religion, language, film and photography, on all of which he composed and talked abundantly. Assortments of his works on these and different subjects were distributed, for the most part after his demise, together with volumes of "mind and intelligence" and general journalism.

Regardless of the numerous books expounded on him (Holroyd tallies 80 by 1939) Shaw's personal yield, aside from his journals, was generally slight. He offered meetings to papers—"GBS Confesses", to The Daily Mail in 1904 is an exampleand gave representations to would-be biographers whose work was dismissed by Shaw and never published.In 1939 Shaw attracted on these materials to deliver Shaw Gives Himself Away, a randomness which, a year prior to his demise, he updated and republished as Sixteen Self Sketches (there were seventeen). He made it unmistakable to his distributers this thin book was in no sense a full autobiography.

Check your progress -1

1. In which year did Shaw receive the Nobel Prize for Literature?____

2. In which year did Shaw receive the Academy Award for the Best Adapted Screenplay?

____

3. When was George Bernard Shaw born?

____

2.3GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S BELIEFS AND OPINIONS

All through his lifetime Shaw declared numerous convictions, regularly opposing. This irregularity was halfway a deliberate incitement—the Spanish researcher statesman Salvador de Madariaga portrays Shaw as "a post of contrary power set in a people of constructive electricity". In one region at any rate Shaw was consistent: in his deep-rooted refusal to pursue typical English types of spelling and accentuation. He supported old spellings, for example, "shew" for "appear"; he dropped the "u" in words like "respect" and "support"; and any place conceivable he dismissed the punctuation in compressions, for example, "won't" or "that's". In his will, Shaw requested that, after some predefined heritages, his residual resources were to shape a trust to pay for central change of

the English letters in order into a phonetic form of forty letters. Though Shaw's goals were clear, his drafting was defective, and the courts at first governed the planned trust void. A later out-of-court understanding gave an entirety of £8,300 to spelling change; the main part of his fortune went to the residuary legatees—the British Museum, the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art and the National Gallery of Ireland. Most of the £8,300 went on an uncommon phonetic version of Androcles and the Lion in the Shavian letters in order, distributed in 1962 to a to a great extent aloof reception.

Shaw's perspectives on religion and Christianity were less steady. Having in his childhood broadcasted himself a nonbeliever, in middle age he clarified this as a response against the Old Testament picture of a wrathful Jehovah. By the mid twentieth century, he named himself a "spiritualist", in spite of the fact that Gary Sloan, in an article on Shaw's convictions, debates his qualifications as such. In 1913 Shaw proclaimed that he was not strict "in the partisan sense", adjusting himself to Jesus as "an individual of no religion". In the introduction (1915) to Androcles and the Lion, Shaw asks "Why not give Christianity a possibility?" battling that Britain's social request came about because of the proceeding with decision of Barabbas over Christ. In a communicate just before the Second World War, Shaw conjured the Sermon on the Mount, "a moving urging, and it gives you one top notch tip, which is to do great to the individuals who despitefully use you and oppress you". In his will, Shaw expressed that his "strict feelings and logical perspectives can't at present be more explicitly characterized than as those of an adherent to innovative revolution". He mentioned that nobody ought to infer that he acknowledged the convictions of a particular strict association, and that no commemoration to him should "appear as a cross or some other instrument of torment or image of blood sacrifice".

Shaw upheld racial fairness, and between marriage between individuals of various races. Despite his communicated wish to be reasonable for Hitler, he called hostile to Semitism "the contempt of the languid, uninformed dim-witted Gentile for the pertinacious Jew who, educated

by affliction to think carefully to the most extreme, exceeds him in business". In The Jewish Chronicle he wrote in 1932, "In each nation you can discover raging individuals who have a fear against Jews, Jesuits, Armenians, Negroes, Freemasons, Irishmen, or essentially outsiders thusly. Ideological groups are not above abusing these feelings of dread and jealousies."

In 1903 Shaw participated in a contention about inoculation against smallpox. He called inoculation "a particularly squalid bit of witchcraft"; in his view vaccination crusades were a modest and insufficient substitute for a tolerable program of lodging for poor people, which would, he announced, be the methods for killing smallpox and different irresistible diseases. Less disagreeably, Shaw was definitely keen on transport; Laurence saw in 1992 a requirement for a distributed investigation of Shaw's enthusiasm for "bicycling, motorbikes, cars, and planes, peaking in his joining the Interplanetary Society in his nineties". Shaw distributed articles on movement, took photos of his adventures, and submitted notes to the Royal Automobile Club.

Shaw endeavored all through his grown-up life to be alluded to as "Bernard Shaw" instead of "George Bernard Shaw", yet confounded issues by proceeding to utilize his full initials—G.B.S.— as a by-line, and regularly marked himself "G. Bernard Shaw". He left guidelines in his will that his agent (the Public Trustee) was to permit distribution of his works just under the name Bernard Shaw. Shaw researchers including Ervine, Judith Evans, Holroyd, Laurence and Weintraub, and numerous distributers have regarded Shaw's inclination, in spite of the fact that the Cambridge University Press was among the special cases with its 1988 Cambridge Companion to George Bernard Shaw.

2.4GEORGE BERNARD SHAW'S LEGACY AND INFLUENCE

Showy

Shaw, apparently the most significant English-language writer after Shakespeare, created a monstrous oeuvre, of which in any event about six has remain influence of the world collection. ... Scholastically unfashionable, of constrained impact even in zones, for example, Irish dramatization and British political theater where impact may be normal, Shaw's novel and obvious plays continue getting away from the securely dated classification of period piece to which they have regularly been committed.

Shaw didn't find a school of producers all things considered, however Crawford affirms that today "we perceive as second just to Shakespeare in the British showy custom ... the defender of the auditorium of thoughts" who struck a final knockout to nineteenth century melodrama. According to Laurence, Shaw spearheaded "canny" theater, in which the group of spectators was required to think, along these lines making ready for the new types of twentieth-century dramatists from Galsworthy to Pinter.

Crawford records various dramatists whose work owes something to that of Shaw. Among those dynamic in Shaw's lifetime he incorporates Noël Coward, who based his initial parody The Young Idea on You Never Can Tell and kept on drawing on the more seasoned man's works in later plays.T. S. Eliot, in no way, shape or form an admirer of Shaw, conceded that the epilog of Murder in the Cathedral, wherein Becket's slayers disclose their activities to the group of spectators, may have been impacted by Saint Joan. The pundit Eric Bentley remarks that Eliot's later play The Confidential Clerk "had every one of the reserves of Shavianism ... without the benefits of the genuine Bernard Shaw". Among later British screenwriters, Crawford marks Tom Stoppard as "the most Shavian of contemporary playwrights";Shaw's "not kidding joke" is proceeded underway of Stoppard's peers Alan Ayckbourn, Henry Livings and Peter Nichols.

Shaw's impact crossed the Atlantic at a beginning time. Bernard Dukore takes note of that he was effective as a screenwriter in America ten years

before making practically identical progress in Britain. Among numerous American essayists declaring an immediate obligation to Shaw, Eugene O'Neill turned into an admirer at seventeen years old, subsequent to perusing The Quintessence of Ibsenism. Other Shaw-affected American writers referenced by Dukore are Elmer Rice, for whom Shaw "opened entryways, turned on lights, and extended horizons"; William Saroyan, who felt for Shaw as "the beset maverick against the philistines"; and S. N. Behrman, who was motivated to compose for the venue subsequent to going to an exhibition of Caesar and Cleopatra: "I figured it is pleasant to compose plays like

2.5LET US SUM UP

Shaw built up a wide information on music, craftsmanship, and writing because of his mom's impact and his visits to the National Gallery of Ireland. In 1872 his mom left her significant other and took her two little girls to London, following her music instructor, George John Vandeleur Lee, who from 1866 had imparted family units in Dublin to the Shaw. In 1876 Shaw set out to turn into an essayist, and he joined his mom and senior sister (the more youthful one having kicked the bucket) in London. Shaw in his 20s endured persistent dissatisfaction and destitution. He relied on his mom's pound seven days from her better half and her profit as a music educator. He spent his evenings in the British Museum understanding room, composing books and perusing what he had missed at school, and his nights looking for extra self-instruction in the talks and discussions that portrayed contemporary working-class London scholarly exercises.

His fiction bombed completely. The semiautobiographical and relevantly titled Immaturity (1879; distributed 1930) repulsed each distributer in London. His next four books were comparably cannot, as were a large portion of the articles he submitted to the press for 10 years. Shaw's underlying artistic work earned him under 10 shillings per year. A piece after death distributed as An Unfinished Novel in 1958 (however composed 1887–88) was his last bogus beginning in fiction.

Regardless of his disappointment as an author during the 1880s, Shaw wound up during this decade. He turned into a vegan, a communist, an entrancing speaker, a polemicist, and likely a writer. He turned into the power behind the recently established (1884) Fabian Society, a working-class communist gathering that went for the change of English society not through transformation however through "saturation" (in Sidney Webb's term) of the nation's scholarly and political life. Shaw included himself in each part of its exercises, most noticeably as proof-reader of one of the works of art of British communism, Fabian Essays in Socialism (1889), to which he additionally contributed two areas.

In the long run, in 1885, the dramatization pundit William Archer discovered Shaw consistent journalistic work. His initial news coverage ran from book audits in the Pall Mall Gazette (1885–88) and workmanship analysis in the World (1886–89) to splendid melodic segments in the Star (as "Corno di Bassetto"— basset horn) from 1888 to 1890 and in the World (as "G.B.S.") from 1890 to 1894. Shaw had a decent comprehension of music, especially show, and he enhanced his insight with a splendour of diversion that gives many his notification a lasting intrigue. However, Shaw really started to make his imprint when he was enlisted by Frank Harris to the Saturday Review as theatre pundit (1895–98); in that position he utilized all his mind and polemical powers in a battle to dislodge the counterfeits and deceptions of the Victorian stage with a performance centre of crucial thoughts. He additionally started composing his own plays.

First Plays

At the point when Shaw started composing for the English stage, its most unmistakable screenwriters were Sir A.W. Pinero and H.A. Jones. The two men were attempting to build up a cutting-edge reasonable dramatization, however neither had the ability to split away from the sort of counterfeit plots and customary character types expected by theatregoers. The destitution of this kind of dramatization had gotten obvious with the presentation of a few of Henrik Ibsen's plays onto the

London arrange around 1890, when A Doll's House was played in London; his Ghosts followed in 1891, and the probability of another opportunity and earnestness on the English stage was presented. Shaw, who was going to distribute The Quintessence of Ibsenism (1891), quickly repaired a fruitless satire, Widowers' Houses, as a play conspicuously "Ibsenite" in tone, making it turn on the infamous outrage of ghetto landlordism in London. The outcome (performed 1892) spurned the beat-up sentimental shows that were all the while being misused even by the bravest new writers. In the play a good-natured youthful Englishman experiences passionate feeling and afterward finds that the two his forthcoming dad in-law's fortune and his very own private pay get from misuse of poor people. Conceivably this is sad, however Shaw appears to have been constantly resolved to keep away from disaster. The unpleasant sweethearts don't draw in compassion; it is the social fiendishness and not the sentimental problem on which consideration is concentrated, and the activity is kept well inside the key of amusing parody.

The same emotional inclinations control Mrs. Warren's Profession, written in 1893 however not performed until 1902 because the ruler chamberlain, the control of plays, declined it a permit. Its subject is sorted out prostitution, and its activity turns on the revelation by a knowledgeable young lady that her mom has graduated through the "calling" to turn into a section owner of massage parlours all through Europe. Once more, the monetary determinants of the circumstance are accentuated, and the subject is dealt with callously and without the titillation of stylish comedies about "fallen ladies." As with many Shaw's works, the play is, inside limits, a show of thoughts, yet the vehicle by which these are introduced is basically one of high satire.

Shaw called these first plays "unsavoury," since "their sensational power is utilized to constrain the observer to confront undesirable actualities." He tailed them with four "charming" plays with an end goal to discover the makers and crowds that his stringent comedies had irritated. The two gatherings of plays were reconsidered and distributed in Plays Pleasant and Unpleasant (1898). The first of the subsequent gathering, Arms and

the Man (performed 1894), has a Balkan setting and makes carefree, however at times stringent, fun of sentimental misrepresentations of both love and fighting. The second, Candida (performed 1897), was significant for English dramatic history, for its effective generation at the Royal Court Theatre in 1904 empowered Harley Granville-Barker and J.E. Vedrenne to shape an association that brought about a progression of splendid creations there. The play speaks to its champion as compelled to pick between her administrative spouse—a commendable yet harsh Christian communist—and a youthful artist who has fallen uncontrollably infatuated with her. She picks her apparently certain spouse since she recognizes that he is really the more fragile man. The writer is juvenile and crazy in any case, as a craftsman, has an ability to revoke individual bliss in light of a legitimate concern for some huge inventive reason. This is a critical topic for Shaw; it leads on to that of the contention between man as otherworldly maker and lady as gatekeeper of the organic progression of mankind that is fundamental to a later play, Man and Superman. In Candida such theoretical issues are just gently addressed, and this is genuine likewise of You Never Can Tell (performed 1899), in which the saint and champion, who trust themselves to be separately a practiced amorist and a completely balanced and liberated lady, wind up in the grasp of an imperative power that assesses these ideas.

The strain of composing these plays, while his basic and political work went on unabated, so sapped Shaw's quality that a minor disease turned into a significant one. In 1898, during the procedure of recovery, he wedded his informal medical attendant, Charlotte Payne-Townshend, an Irish beneficiary and companion of Beatrice and Sidney Webb. The clearly chaste marriage endured for their entire lives, Shaw fulfilling his enthusiastic needs in paper-enthusiasm correspondences with Ellen Terry, Mrs. Patrick Campbell, and others.

Shaw's next assortment of plays, Three Plays for Puritans (1901), proceeded with what turned into the conventional Shavian prelude—an

early on exposition in an electric composition style managing as much with the subjects proposed by the plays as the plays themselves. The Devil's Disciple (performed 1897) is a play set in New Hampshire during the American Revolution and is a reversal of conventional drama. Caesar and Cleopatra (performed 1901) is Shaw's first incredible play. In the play Cleopatra is a ruined and horrendous 16-year-old youngster instead of the 38-year-old seductress of Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra. The play delineates Caesar as a desolate and grim man who is as a lot of a savant as he is a warrior. The play's remarkable achievement settles upon its treatment of Caesar as a sound report in generosity and "unique profound quality" as opposed to as a superhuman saint on a phase platform. The third play, Captain Brassbound's Conversion (performed 1900), is a message against different sorts of imprudence taking on the appearance of obligation and equity.

Worldwide Importance

In Man and Superman (performed 1905) Shaw explained his way of thinking that mankind is the most recent stage in an intentional and unceasing developmental development of the "existence power" toward ever-higher living things. The play's saint, Jack Tanner, is set on seeking after his own otherworldly improvement as per this way of thinking as he escapes the decided conjugal quest for the courageous woman, Ann Whitefield. At last Jack remorsefully enables himself to be caught in marriage by Ann after perceiving that she herself is a ground-breaking instrument of the "existence power," since the continuation and in this manner the predetermination of humankind lies eventually in her and other ladies' conceptive limit. The play's non-realistic third act, the "Wear Juan in Hell" dream scene, is spoken venue at its generally operatic and is frequently performed autonomously as a different piece.

Shaw had just gotten set up as a significant writer on the Continent by the presentation of his plays there, be that as it may, inquisitively, his notoriety slacked in England. It was uniquely with the generation of John Bull's Other Island (performed 1904) in London, with an uncommon

exhibition for Edward VII, that Shaw's stage notoriety was belatedly made in England.

Shaw proceeded, through high parody, to investigate strict cognizance and to call attention to society's complicity in its own shades of malice.

Works After World War I

World War I was a watershed for Shaw. From the outset he stopped composing plays, distributing rather a questionable leaflet, "Sound judgment About the War," which called Great Britain and its partners similarly guilty with the Germans and contended for exchange and harmony. His anti-war talks made him infamous and the objective of much analysis. In Heartbreak House (performed 1920), Shaw uncovered, in a nation house setting on the eve of war, the otherworldly chapter 11 of the age liable for the war's carnage. Endeavouring to prevent from falling into "the no-limit pit of a completely demoralizing cynicism," Shaw composed five connected plays under the aggregate title Back to Methuselah (1922). They elucidate his way of thinking of innovative development in an all-inclusive sensational story that advances through time from the Garden of Eden to 31,920 CE.

The canonization of Joan of Arc in 1920 stirred inside Shaw thoughts for an annal play about her. In the subsequent perfect work of art, Saint Joan (performed 1923), the Maid is dealt with not just as a Roman Catholic holy person and saint yet as a blend of viable spiritualist, sinful holy person, and motivated virtuoso. Joan, as the unrivalled being "squashed between those powerful powers, the Church and the Law," is the exemplification of the shocking courageous woman; her passing encapsulates the Catch 22 that mankind fears—and frequently murders—its holy people and legends and will continue doing as such until the higher good characteristics it fears become the general state of man through a procedure of transformative change. Approval for Saint Joan prompted the granting of the 1925 Nobel Prize for Literature to Shaw (he rejected the honour).

In his later plays Shaw escalated his investigations into tragicomic and non-realistic imagery. For the following five years, he didn't compose anything for the performance centre however dealt with his gathered release of 1930–38 and the all-encompassing political tract "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism" (1928). At that point he created The Apple Cart (performed 1929), a cutting edge high parody that accentuates Shaw's inward clashes between his lifetime of radical governmental issues and his basically preservationist question of the regular man's capacity to oversee himself. Shaw's later, minor plays incorporate Too True to Be Good (performed 1932), On the Rocks (performed 1933), The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles (performed 1935), Geneva (performed 1938), and In Good King Charles' Golden Days (1939). After a wartime rest, Shaw, at that point in his 90s, created a few additional plays, including Farfetched Fables (performed 1950), Shakes Versus Shav (performed 1949), and Why She Would Not (1956), which is a dream with just flashes of the prior Shaw.

Impudent, contemptuous, and constantly an actor, Shaw utilized his light mind to keep himself in people in general eye as far as possible of his 94 years; his wiry figure, bristling facial hair, and dandyish stick were also referred to all through the world as his plays. At the point when his significant other, Charlotte, passed on of a waiting ailment in 1943, amidst World War II, Shaw, slight and feeling the impacts of wartime privations, made lasting his retreat from his London condo to his nation home at Ayot St. Lawrence, a Hertfordshire town where he had lived since 1906. He kicked the bucket there in 1950.

George Bernard Shaw was not simply the best comic producer of his time yet in addition one of the most critical dramatists in the English language since theseventeenth century. A portion of his most noteworthy works for the stage—Caesar and Cleopatra, the "Wear Juan in Hell" scene of Man and Superman, Major Barbara, Heartbreak House, and Saint Joan—have a high reality and exposition excellence that were unparalleled by his stage peers. His improvement of a dramatization of good enthusiasm and of scholarly clash and discussion, his revivifying of the parody of habits, and his endeavours into emblematic sham and into a

venue of incredulity helped shape the performance centre of his time and after. A visionary and spiritualist whose way of thinking of good enthusiasm saturates his plays, Shaw was likewise the most trenchant pamphleteer since Swift, the most intelligible music pundit in English, the best theatre pundit of his age, a massive speaker and writer on governmental issues, financial matters, and sociological subjects, and one of the most productive letter journalists in writing. By carrying a strong basic knowledge to his numerous different regions of intrigue, he helped form the political, financial, and sociological idea of three ages.

2.6 KEYWORDS

- **Assessors**: Judges
- **Cassock**: A garment worn by a priest
- **Celestial**: Heavenly or godly
- **Chivalry**: Good manners, especially courtly treatment of women

2.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- Describe thebeliefs and opinionsof George Bernard Shaw.
- Write a short note on legacy and influence of George Bernard Shaw.
- Write a note on George Bernard Shaw's work.

2.8 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. The Times, 27 March 1924, p. 12.
2. ^ The Nobel Prize in Literature 1925.
3. ^ Quoted in Kamm 1999, p. 74.
4. ^ Holroyd 1997, p. 530.
5. ^ Jump up to:[a] [b] Holroyd 1993, pp. 128–131.
6. ^ Jump up to:[a] [b] Holroyd 1993, p. 373.

2.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Shaw won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1925. (**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.1)**

2. Shaw received the Academy Award for the Best Adapted Screenplay in 1938. (**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.2)**

3. George Bernard Shaw was born on July 26, 1856.(**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.3)**

UNIT 3.SHAW – SAINT JOAN -3

STRUCTURE

3.0 Objective

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Saint Joan

3.2.1 Summary

3.3 Let Us Sum Up

3.4 Keywords

3.5 Questions for Review

3.6 Suggested Readings and References

3.7 Answers to Check Your Progress

3.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you should be able to learn about:

- Summary of Saint Joan by George Bernard Shaw

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Holy person Joan accounts the life, demise, and heritage of Joan of Arc. George Bernard Shaw distributed the play in 1924 and won the Nobel Prize for writing the next year. You'd figure the person would be upbeat right? The Nobel is essentially one of the most regarded honours on Earth. Shaw didn't see it that way. He kept in touch with one of his companions, "The Nobel was a ghastly catastrophe for me. It was actually nearly as awful as my 70th birthday celebration" (source). It's justifiable why Shaw responded this way. If an author wins a Nobel Prize, it builds up him perpetually as genuine and absolutely standard. Shaw, be that as it may, had fabricated his profession on being rebellious. He invested wholeheartedly in it. A significant number of his convictions conflicted with the standard of his day, similar to his confidence in communism. He felt that free enterprise enabled rich

individuals to keep all the cash, and didn't he mind educating individuals regarding it. For quite a long time he was an individual from the Fabian Society, a conspicuous communist gathering.

He was likewise an impassioned protector of ladies' privileges, which, tragically, was not a well-known perspective at the time. Considering all that, you may have the option to gather why Shaw would be pulled into an authentic figure like Joan. She made his disobedience look miniscule in examination. In addition to the fact that she challenged the spot of ladies, however her activities assaulted the whole power structure of medieval society. By making the King responsible for everything, she removed power from the primitive masters. By saying she got her data straightforwardly from God, she tested the intensity of the Church. The incongruity that Joan was made a holy person by a similar association answerable for her execution positively didn't sneak past Shaw. It at that point makes it doubly amusing that a play that is so insurgent was the very thing that set up Shaw for eternity.

3.2 SAINT JOAN

3.2.1 Summary

Scene One

- Stage bearings reveal to us that it's a beautiful spring morning in the manor of Vaucouleurs in the year 1429.
- In front of an audience we see a radiant room made of stone with a major oak table in the center.
- Lurking about this room is, Captain Robert de Baudricourt, a military squire. He's the person in control around here.
- We're told, in the stage bearings, that he's attractive, buff, yet confused.
- Robert compensates for his failings by tormenting his hireling, a diseased, thinning up top, unfortunate Steward.

- At present, the Captain is objecting at the Steward in light of the fact that there are no eggs.
- The Steward says it's not his issue that the hens aren't laying; it's a demonstration of God. Anyway, what's he expected to do about it? Dislike he can lay eggs.
- Robert isn't intrigued with his Steward's comical inclination. He continues to consider his worker each dreadful name he can consider.
- The Captain blames his worker for taking the eggs and offering them to different hoodlums.
- Robert makes certain there's been burglary in light of the fact that there wasn't sufficient milk the day preceding.
- There's a revile on us, says the Steward.
- His supervisor doesn't get it and guides him to bring him eggs and milk by early afternoon or he'll… well, he doesn't state precisely, however whatever it is it'll be ridiculously awful and stuff.
- The Steward tells the Captain that there'll be no more milk or eggs until he sees The Maid.
- Robert gets considerably increasingly testy. Clearly the Maid has been hanging outside the entryway for two days. He advised his worker to dispose of her, however he hasn't.
- The Steward says this is on the grounds that the young lady appears to be so certain about herself. She has a great deal of boldness and she causes the individuals around her to have fortitude also.
- He recommends that maybe Robert should have a go at frightening him away himself, since terrorizing is the thing that he does best.
- The Steward says that she's been investing the majority of her energy conversing with officers and supplicating.
- Robert says that any young lady investing that much energy with warriors has been accomplishing more than talking. (Supplement: interesting wink.)
- The Captain punches his head out the window and roars for The Maid to come up.

- His hireling reveals to him the young lady needs to be a warrior. She needs him to give her fighter's garments, protective layer, and a sword.
- Joan shows up in the entryway.
- Stage headings reveal to us that she is a nation young lady around 17 or 18. The frowning Robert doesn't appear to unnerve her one piece.
- Joan tells the Captain that God has requested him to give her a pony, reinforcement, and a few troopers so she can head out to see the Dauphin. (Actually, dislike Flipper. Dauphin was the French expression for the person who's beneficiary to the position of royalty.)
- Robert discloses to her that she's totally nuts.
- That is the thing that they all state from the start, says the young lady. God will make you see my side of things. For instance, God has just altered your perspective on giving me access here.
- The Captain is losing ground here.
- Joan discloses to him that she'll be requiring all the stuff she's mentioning, in light of the fact that she should break the attack of Orleans.
- Robert is floored.
- Truly without a doubt, says Joan. God is sending me to save Orleans.
- She's as of now persuaded three regarding the Captain's warriors to go with her, including some person named Polly.
- Robert simply needs to give his seal of endorsement. It's everything orchestrated.
- Joan discloses to him that he will support her and that he'll go to Heaven for it. She's very certain about this since holy people Catherine and Margaret advised her so straightforwardly. (Clue: Catherine and Margaret are since a long time ago dead.)
- Robert chooses he needs to converse with Polly pretty much this.
- He sends Joan out with the Steward.
- Polly, Bertrand de Poulengey, comes into the room.
- The Captain sits him down for a caring talk, saying that he realizes that Polly is just claiming to need to take Joan to the Dauphin.

- Robert is certain that Polly simply needs to steal her away and have his way with her.
- This unadvisable, however, says Robert in light of the fact that Joan's family is white collar class and may have a few associations which could raise hell for them.
- Poulengey immovably denies that he is in any case intrigued explicitly in Joan.
- He says there's only something about her that makes him and a portion of his mates need to pursue her.
- Robert reveals to him that he hasn't got any rational.
- Polly says that they're past the purpose of conventional. He proceeds to reveal to us exactly how terrible off everything is.
- Half of their territory has been taken over by the English.
- The Dauphin is caught like a rodent and is hesitant to battle. He should be the beneficiary to the honored position, however the Queen has denied that he's even her child.
- Poulengey is certain that the English will before long take Orleans. There's some person named the B - d there, who is attempting to drive them away, however his men are low in confidence.
- Essentially everything is terrible and the main thing that can spare them is a wonder.
- Robert says there aren't any marvels any longer.
- Polly discloses to him that Joan is a supernatural occurrence and backs up his feeling by saying he'll pay for Joan's pony.
- Robert says that Polly is similarly as insane as Joan, yet that he'll converse with her once more.
- Joan returns and Robert cross examines her a piece.
- He asks what she implied when she said that St. Catherine and St. Margaret conversed with her.
- She says, I mean precisely what it seems like I implied: they converse with me.
- Robert asks her what they're similar to, however she won't broadly expound.
- He discloses to her it's simply in her creative mind.

- She says, obviously it is. That is the means by which God sends His messages.
- The incredulous Captain asks her what precisely God has been advising her to do.
- Joan answers that she's to raise the attack at Orleans, crown the Dauphin in Rheims Cathedral, and kick the English out of France all together.
- Robert says wryly that she most likely thinks disposing of the English at Orleans will be as simple as pursuing dairy animals.
- Joan discloses to him that it won't be troublesome, in light of the fact that God is her ally. The English are just men. God gave them their own nation and they should remain there. God likewise gave them their own language, and it's without wanting to that they come to France and attempt to talk theirs.
- The Captain doesn't perceive what language has to do with it. All that should matter to a trooper is the thing that his primitive master guides him to do. (He most likely would think so – he's a primitive master.)
- Joan says that the only thing that is important is the thing that God guides him to do.
- God has nothing to do with what we're discussing, answers the Captain. We're stressed over pragmatic things, similar to the way that the English are great fighters. They have a person called the Black Prince and he's meaner than the Devil.
- The Maid illuminates his that she thoroughly understands English fighters. They attacked her town of Domrémy. Three of them were injured and left behind. She became acquainted with them and was none excessively intrigued. She was more grounded than each of the three of the "godd - s."
- Robert reveals to her that they're called godd - s since they're continually approaching God to d- - n their very own spirits to h- - l.
- God will act tolerantly toward them says Joan, when they return to England where they have a place.
- She's thoroughly understands this Black Prince character. As indicated by her, the Devil had him when he set foot on French soil.

Notes

Something very similar would happen to her in the event that she attempted to attack England.

- The Captain calls attention to that that is absolutely why she won't break the attack at Orleans. The English are altogether controlled by the Devil, improving them much warriors.
- Joan says that if French warriors battle with confidence in God, the English won't get an opportunity.
- She proceeds to state that the fundamental explanation the French continue losing is on the grounds that they're battling for an inappropriate reasons. The knights are simply attempting to get paid. She can rouse them to give their lives for God and nation.
- Robert reveals to Polly this may all be bundle of bull, yet that the officers may get it. All the more significantly the Dauphin may trust it, and that person needs some genuine inspiration.
- The Captain at long last surrenders and lets Joan have all that she needs: protective layer, steeds, troopers.
- He "arranges" her to go with Polly and his pals to see the Dauphin.
- Poulengey asks how Joan should get in to see the Dauphin.
- Robert says, most likely about a similar way she got in to see me.
- Joan gets very energized and runs out.
- The Captain shakes Polly's hand. Despite the fact that Robert is as yet distrustful, the two men concur that there's something extraordinary about Joan.
- Polly trails her.
- The Steward surges in, extraordinarily energized. He's conveying a basketful of eggs. The hens are laying like there's no tomorrow.
- Robert crosses himself. Now, he's completely persuaded that The Maid has originated from God.

Scene Two

- Stage headings reveal to us we are in Chinon, Touraine. It is the eighth of March, 1429.

- The Archbishop of Rheims and the Lord Chamberlain, Monseigneur de la Trémouille are hanging out in the position of royalty room of a palace.
- La Tremouille is depicted as "immense" and "haughty," while the Archbishop said to be "forcing" (2.1).
- At present the Lord Chamberlain is grumbling that the Dauphin owes him an excessive amount of cash.
- The Archbishop comments that the Dauphin owes him cash as well. He has no clue where all the cash goes, as the Dauphin dresses and eats like a bum.
- A Page enters and discloses to them that a man is coming named Monsieur de Rais, a.k.a. Bluebeard. Stage headings reveal to us that he does undoubtedly have a short blue whiskers.
- Bluebeard enters, welcomes them recognizably, and inquires as to whether they've seen someone named La Hire.
- La Tremouille remarks that La Hire has likely swore himself to death. (Evidently La Hire has a genuine reviling issue.)
- Bluebeard says that the inverse is valid. A person named Foul Mouthed Frank was as of late informed that he shouldn't swear such a great amount, since he was near death.
- The Archbishop inquires as to whether the Frank was to be sure near death.
- Bluebeard illuminates him that, not long in the wake of being told in this way, Frank tumbled down a well and drowned.
- Chief La Hire enters and discloses to them all that it wasn't simply one more officer who forecasted Foul Mouthed Frank's demise, it was a holy messenger.
- He goes to state that the "heavenly attendant" has cleared her path through the absolute disarray that is the French field with just twelve warriors. Clearly, they got right to Chinon without getting in a battle.
- La Hire swears he'll never swear again.
- The Page reenters and declares the Dauphin.
- The stage bearings disclose to us that he's truly King Charles VII, since his dad kicked the bucket. Sadly for him, no royal celebration has occurred, so he's stuck being known as the Dauphin.

- We're additionally informed that he's sort of thin and unimposing. In any case, he's not dumb or anything and still figures out how to stand his ground.
- Charles moves toward the Archbishop with a letter in his grasp. Things being what they are, it's from our old pal from scene one, Robert de Baudricourt.
- The Archbishop isn't keen on the letter and tells Charles so in a scornful sort of way.
- La Tremouille grabs the letter out of the Charles' hand and attempts to understand it. He's basically ignorant, however, so he needs to gradually solid out the words.
- Charles grumbles that nobody regards him since he owes them all cash and isn't any great at battling. He says that he has the illustrious blood and they better perceive.
- The Archbishop answers that it's not by any means sure that Charles has regal blood. (Recall in scene one when we discovered that the Queen has denied her child?)
- Charles tells the Archbishop that he's tired of all his ill bred talks. In the event that the Archbishop is so incredible, why he doesn't have holy people and heavenly attendants coming to see him?
- The minister is all similar to: what are you discussing?
- Charles instructs him to ask La Tremouille, who is as yet attempting to peruse the letter.
- The Archbishop takes it and peruses.
- He says that he expected increasingly presence of mind out of Robert de Baudricourt. He's sent some insane nation young lady to them.
- Charles says, no, he's sent a blessed messenger and a holy person.
- In addition, she's desiring him no of these different folks who single out him unsurpassed. He's extraordinary, not them so nah.
- The minister will not give the Dauphin a chance to see the young lady.
- The Dauphin says he will on the off chance that he needs. The two his granddad and father had holy people in their courts, so he ought to have one as well.

- The Archbishop says that the young lady isn't a holy person by any stretch of the imagination. Truth be told she's a notorious lady who dresses in men's garments and goes around the wide open with officers.
- La Hire at long last comes to an obvious conclusion and makes sense of this must be the exceptionally same "heavenly attendant" who revealed to Foul Mouthed Frank that he was going to pass on.
- Charles says this is verification of her wonderful forces.
- Everyone begins quarreling about whether this is in fact a supernatural occurrence or a fortuitous event. (It appears to be everything anyone does at this court is squabble.)
- Bluebeard proposes that they test the young lady's forces. They'll welcome the young lady in to see the Dauphin. Interestingly, the Dauphin she'll meet will truly be Bluebeard in mask. In the event that she sees through the misleading, at that point that demonstrates her capacities.
- The Archbishop puts his foot down and takes steps to ban Charles on the off chance that he sees the young lady by any stretch of the imagination. (Banishment = being kicked out of the Church = interminable punishment.)
- Charles makes a stride back yet calls attention to that De Baudricourt says the young lady will kick the butts of the English at Orleans.
- Bluebeard says that they have Jack Dunois (a.k.a. the Bastard) accountable for the soldiers at Orleans. He's obviously super studly and a marvelous officer.
- The Dauphin inquires as to why Dunois can't beat the English if he's so extraordinary.
- The breeze is the issue, says La Hire. Dunois must sail his soldiers upriver, so they can get behind the English and dismiss them from a deliberately significant scaffold.
- La Hire exhorts that they should give the young lady a took shots at another marvel. What would it be able to harmed?
- The Archbishop is starting to reexamine.
- He brings up that De Baudricourt appears to be very intrigued by the young lady.

- La Hire says that Baudricourt is a good for nothing, in any case, on the off chance that he trusts it, different warriors may as well.
- La Tremouille encourages the Archbishop to tune in to La Hire. On the off chance that something isn't done soon to motivate the troopers they're altogether screwed.
- The Archbishop at long last concurs yet says the Church needs to favor of her before anything is chosen.
- Bluebeard and Charles head out to set up the little trickery that Bluebeard proposed before.
- La Tremouille thinks about whether she'll have the option to choose the genuine Dauphin.
- It most likely won't be quite a bit of an issue, says the Archbishop. She'll know who Bluebeard is on the grounds that – well, he has a blue whisker. The Dauphin will be anything but difficult to discover in light of the fact that she'll know like every other person that he's the scrawniest person at court.
- La Tremouille says that that implies it won't be a supernatural occurrence in the event that she picks the perfect individual.
- Obviously it will be a marvel, the Archbishop lets him know. An occasion is a wonder as long as it makes confidence. In the event that it rouses individuals to have confidence in God, it doesn't make a difference if it's to some degree fake. (All in all, an untruth is alright as long as it causes individuals to accept reality? Well.)
- A window ornament opens to uncover the full court – knights and women, and so forth.
- Everyone is hanging out, holding back to check whether the young lady will see through the duplicity.
- Bluebeard is remaining on a dais claiming to be Charles. The Duchess de la Trémouille (La Trémouille's better half) professes to be the Dauphin's significant other.
- The Page declares Joan as she enters.
- Since last we saw her, she has trimmed her hair truly short.
- The Duchess La Trémouille ridicules her.
- Joan declares that she wears her hair along these lines since she is a trooper.

- She asks where the Dauphin is.
- Bluebeard announces magnificently that he is the Dauphin.
- Joan is all similar to, Bluebeard please – where the genuine Dauphin at?
- Everyone giggles, including Joan.
- Joan checks out the group and selects Charles with no issue.
- She curtseys to him and says that she's gone to the spare Orleans, drive the English out of France, and crown him King at Rheims house of God.
- Ha! says Charles, to his court, I told you all I was the genuine King.
- He discloses to her she must go converse with the Archbishop before he can be delegated at Rheims.
- Joan tumbles to her knees before the Archbishop and beseeches him to favor her.
- The minister is significantly complimented.
- He reveals to Joan that there is peril in being so enamored with religion.
- The court giggles at Joan's over energetic demonstration of respect toward the Archbishop.
- The Archbishop addresses them like a cantankerous granddaddy.
- Joan inquires as to whether she can be distant from everyone else with Charles.
- He concurs and tells everyone that Joan was sent by God.
- After everyone leaves, Joan asks Charles for what reason he gives them a chance to menace him.
- He says he can't resist. He never needed to the beneficiary to the honored position. It was pushed onto him. Executing is unpleasant for him. He'd preferably live his own particular manner.
- Joan says she'll place some fearlessness into him.
- He doesn't need any. A decent comfortable bed is more his style.
- It's either be a ruler or a bum, Joan lets him know. He's not fit to be whatever else.
- She says that the individuals won't acknowledge him as King until he gets the heavenly oil poured on him at Rheims.

Notes

- Joan likewise calls attention to that he needs some new garments and inquires as to why his are so ratty.Charles tells her that he spends all the money on his wife's clothes. He doesn't care what he looks like.
- The Maid sees that there is some decency him, however it's not up to royal norms yet.
- The Dauphin discloses to her that he's substantially more into arranging bargains than he is making war.
- Joan says that on the off chance that the English win the war, at that point they'll make the arrangement, and the French won't have diddley.
- We need to implore; she lets him know.
- Charles educates her that he doesn't care for individuals that implore constantly.
- Joan feels awful for him and recommends that she show him how to implore.
- The Dauphin is tired of being instructed anything. He has his very own child; he's finished with learning.
- The Maid attempts to motivate him to battle for the sake of his child.
- This strategy neglects to rouse, in light of the fact that Charles can't stand the young man.
- Getting somewhat touchy, Charles says that Joan and every other person should tend to their very own concerns.
- Joan gets up on her overinflated ego and reveals to him that he ought to do God's the same old thing. He should be delegated at Rheims as God wishes. In the event that he is, at that point France will be his blessed territory and any of the nobles who hold him up will be opposes God.
- Charles at last gets motivated.
- He gets back to the entire court in and declares that Joan is presently responsible for the military.
- La Trémouille whines that he should be responsible for the military.
- For a second, Charles nearly yields, however Joan puts a hand on his shoulder supporting his fearlessness.

- Charles expels his old harasser with an expound royal signal.
- Joan shouts to the group triumphantly, asking who is with God and her.
- They all yell that they're with her. Hurrah.

Scene Three

- It is April 29, 1429, state the stage bearings. We are on the bank of the stream Loire in Orleans.
- Dunois, an attractive 26-year-old general, is pacing to and fro. (This is a similar person they were getting back to the Bastard back at court. No, they're not calling him names or anything; he's the ill-conceived child of the Duke of Orleans.)
- His Page, a little youngster, is spread out on the grass viewing the waterway stream by.
- Dunois' spear is stuck into the ground. There's a pennon attached to the top. It's waving like a banner in a solid breeze.
- Shockingly for Dunois, the East wind is as of now blowing. In the event that you'll recall from the past scene, he needs the West wind to take his soldiers up the waterway.
- As of now, Dunois is taking out his disappointment by creating a lyric out loud to the missing West wind.
- The West wind is clearly not a verse fan, however, in light of the fact that she isn't blowing.
- The Page hops up and focuses at something offstage.
- Dunois gets all energized and inquires as to whether it's The Maid.
- Nah, it's only a kingfisher his Page lets him know.
- From the start Dunois hollers at the kid for making him think it was Joan, however when the kid sees two additional flying creatures Dunois gets into it. (Clearly, feathered creature viewing was a well-known approach to pass the pauses in war. Who knew?)
- All of a sudden, Joan walks in wearing some gleaming protective layer.
- As she enters the pennon at the highest point of the spear stops to blow. It just hangs flaccidly.

- Joan is frantic on the grounds that she's been taken to the contrary side of the stream from Orleans.
- Dunois reveals to her that he requested it so.
- He gives Joan an overview of the circumstance. There's just one extension they can assume control over the stream. The issue is that are there two strongholds brimming with "goddams" guarding that scaffold.
- Huge amounts of Englishmen don't startle Joan. She has God on her side.
- Dunois is intrigued with her battling soul; however he reveals to her that she's enamored with war.
- Joan comments that the Archbishop revealed to her that she was enamored with religion.
- Would you like to be a lady with two spouses, asks Dunois.
- She says she never needs a spouse. Truth be told, before she took off on her heavenly mission, a person sued her in court for breaking a commitment.
- I lack the capacity to deal with trivial ladies' fantasies, she lets him know. I'm substantially more intrigued driving charges and shooting huge firearms.
- Dunois and Joan banter the advantages of gunnery. Joan believes it's ideal to explode large stone dividers; Dunois inclines toward simply approaching them with a stepping stool. (Gee, we'd go with Joan's arrangement.)
- Joan says she'll lead a charge over a stepping stool, as well. She's not apprehensive.
- Dunois resembles: OK, relax for a second. The thing is we can't take the fortress by hurrying over the scaffold and stuff. We must take a few pontoons up the waterway and sneak up on the "goddams" from the back. The main issue is the breeze in blowing the incorrect way.
- I'll go request up some wind from God, says Joan. What direction to the Church?
- Simply then the West wind begins to blow.
- Dunois is appropriately dazzled.
- He bows before Joan and reveals to her that she directions the military.

- The pontoons are cruising up the stream towards the English.
- They all run off to get their battling on.

Scene Four

- Stage bearings advise us that we are in a tent in the English camp.

- A Nobleman is sitting in an extravagant seat and coolly perusing a Book of Hours (an outlined medieval supplication book).
- A Chaplain is hectically composing.
- The Nobleman remarks on how beautiful books are.
- He likewise watches the way that individuals really read them nowadays, instead of simply looking at the photos.
- The Chaplain discloses to him that he's taking all their ongoing thrashings pretty tranquilly.
- Things being what they are, Joan and organization kicked some "goddam" butt at Orleans and a lot of different spots.
- These annihilations have made the Chaplain angry. He says he can't remain to see his individual kinsmen persistently vanquished.
- The Nobleman solicits the Chaplain he thinks from himself as an Englishman, the manner in which that the individuals battling for Joan are beginning to consider themselves to be French.
- It would be terrible for the two of us, says the Nobleman, if everyone begins thinking along these lines. He's stressed that if the individuals start distinguishing themselves with a bigger country as opposed to their medieval rulers, nobles like him and minister like the Chaplain will lose the entirety of their capacity.
- The Chaplain couldn't care less what occurs as long as they get the chance to consume Joan.
- The Nobleman guides him to relax. He has the Bishop of Beauvais coming to set up the entire consuming thing.
- He's likewise set a colossal cost on Joan's head.
- It's all the fault of the Jews, says the Chaplain, as he complains about having to pay a ransom for Joan.

- This irregular flare of against Semitism is controlled by the Nobleman, who says that Jews are typically reasonable in professional interactions. He would say, it's Christians who attempt to get stuff for nothing.

- A Page reports that the Bishop of Beauvais, Monseigneur Cauchon, has shown up.
- The Nobleman presents himself as Richard de Beauchamp, the Earl of Warwick.
- The Chaplain says his name is John Boyer Spencer de Stogumber, Bachelor of Theology and Keeper of the Private Seal to His Eminence the Cardinal of Winchester. (We're starting to get the feeling that the Chaplain is somewhat loaded with himself.)
- They take a seat at a table and get serious.
- Our aristocrat, Warwick, reveals to Cauchon that Charles is going to be delegated at Rheims, and there's nothing they can do about it.
- The Chaplain interrupts, saying it's Joan's black magic that is enabled the English to be beaten.
- Cauchon calls attention to that in light of the fact that an English armed force was beaten by Joan's French one doesn't really demonstrate there was black magic included. The French have the Bastard, Dunois, on their side too. It's superbly sensible to accept that the English were vanquished reasonable and square.
- Be that as it may, in Orleans, says the irate little Chaplain, Joan got shot with a bolt in her throat and lived. Likewise, the extension unexpectedly burst into flames, throwing Englishmen into the water. Did the Bastard do that? Sounds like some genuine witchcraft was going on. (Or on the other hand perhaps the story got made a huge deal about)
- Warwick apologizes for the Chaplain's madness, yet indicates out Cauchon that Dunois couldn't win before Joan appeared. Isn't there some caring black magic going on here?
- Cauchon says he's not absolutely denying that there's something heavenly going on, yet dislike Joan is out there approaching the intensity of Satan. She's out there with the names of holy people on her standard.

- Warwick inquires as to whether Cauchon is on The Maid's side.

- He answers that, in the event that he was, he would not be chilling with them at this moment.
- Cauchon includes that he's certain that Joan is being controlled by the Devil.
- Warwick is glad to hear this.
- The Bishop continues for a little while discussing the unobtrusive ways that Satan has of assaulting humankind. It's the Church's consecrated obligation to ensure the poor honest spirits in its consideration.
- He affirms that Joan is an instrument of the Devil.
- I let you know in this way, says the Chaplain. She's a witch.
- Cauchon furiously redresses him, saying that Joan is a blasphemer, not a witch. He says that every last bit of her wonders can without much of a stretch be clarified away. (Fundamentally, he feels that Joan isn't doing something amazing spells, yet her activities are crafted by the Devil.)
- He says that his first obligation it to attempt to spare Joan's spirit.
- Warwick focuses that the Church has a background marked by consuming spirits that can't be spared.
- Cauchon says that the Church doesn't consume anyone. In the event that somebody is viewed as an unrepentant blasphemer they are sliced off and gave over to the common arm.
- Wonderful, says Warwick, I'm about more or less common. Simply hand her over to me.
- The Bishop is getting truly irate. He says that he's weary of the honorability utilizing the Church for their own political needs. Joan's spirit is similarly as commendable as any ruler's and he genuinely trusts it is his consecrated obligation to attempt to spare it.
- The Chaplain hops up and calls Cauchon a deceiver.
- Cauchon irately says the Chaplain is the trickster. He's putting his nation before the Church, much the same as Joan.

- Warwick mediates and says there is a miscommunication going on here. In England trickster implies not faithful to England while in French it implies somebody who unfaithful and unscrupulous.
- Cauchon purchases this clarification and relaxes a piece.
- Warwick apologizes for downplaying the entire consuming Joan at the stake thing.
- He says that, being a fighter for his entire life, he's simply become acclimated to awful things.
- He calls attention to that Cauchon, having seen such a significant number of burnings, presumably hear what he's saying.
- The Bishop concedes this and says that it's a horrible obligation which he pays attention to very.
- He legitimizes it by saying it's to benefit the blasphemers' spirits. Their bodies don't make a difference. They were going to bite the dust at some point or another in any case.
- The Chaplain pipes in once more, however more unassumingly this time. He asks how they should convict Joan of sin if she's constantly asking and offering commendation to God.
- This dispatches Cauchon into a long tirade. He brings up that, by Joan saying that she can talk legitimately to God, she's removing the Church through and through. It should be the church's business to tell individuals what God thinks.
- He proceeds to call attention to how Joan is a ton like Mahomet (Muhammad), who nearly spread Islam all over Europe.
- What might occur if everyone figured they could talk straightforwardly to God like both Joan and Mahomet?
- Everything would be confusion if the Church wasn't in charge. Cauchon swears that if Joan doesn't atone her apostasy, she will be scorched.
- Warwick isn't dazzled with this enemy of Muslim talk. He's been down to the Holy Land and met bunches of Muslims there. He says they're truly not all that awful. In reality, he believes they're essentially a similar thing as Christians. There's no requirement for bias.
- Cauchon gets all insulted at being known as a biased person.

- Warwick advises the Bishop that contrasting Joan with Mahomet may persuade other pastor, however it's not the best contention to persuade the aristocrat.
- The remainder of the privileged is substantially more worried about Joan putting Kings on such a high platform. The nobles have enabled Kings to exist since it gives society a nonentity. In the event that the individuals become more faithful to Kings than medieval masters, Warwick and every one of his amigos will lose their capacity and impact.
- Cauchon says that they'll never go anyplace on the off chance that they continue quibbling among themselves.
- The Bishop and the Nobleman offer names to Joan's belief systems.
- Warwick says that on the off chance that he needed to put a name to Joan's act of talking legitimately to God, he'd call it "Protestantism."
- Cauchon calls her solid faithfulness to a King "Patriotism."
- Warwick perceives that he needs to consume her for Nationalism and that Cauchon needs to consume her for Protestantism.
- The Chaplain doesn't comprehend these extravagant new words that the other two are discussing.
- He needs to consume her for a wide range of reasons: she opposes England, wears men's garments, and is allied with Satan.
- Cauchon repeats that he will give a valiant effort to spare her spirit.
- Warwick expresses that he laments being so extreme, and that he will save her on the off chance that he can.
- The Chaplain says in the event that he would, he'd be able to murder her himself.

Scene Five

- We are in the Cathedral at Rheims, the stage bearings let us know.
- Joan, dressed actually pleasantly, is supplicating before a cross.
- Dunois enters. He's dressed truly well, as well.
- He discloses to Joan that the group outside is requiring her.

- She wouldn't like to go out there. The King ought to get all the wonder, she says.
- Dunois reveals to her it won't be as terrible as the scaffold at Orleans.
- Joan says she wishes they were there now.
- Dunois encourages her to relax with the entire war thing.
- The Maid sees that Dunois has become her companion.
- He says that it is valid, and that she sure needs one with every one of these haters around.

- Joan doesn't comprehend why the greater part of the individuals at court scorn her. After all she's brought them heaps of triumphs and delegated the King simply like she said she would. She's scarcely approached anything for herself. What's their arrangement?
- Dunois reveals to her that they abhor her since she shows them up constantly.
- Joan pledges to return to the nation after they take Paris.
- Her pal cautions her that the court likely won't let her take the city.
- The Maid groans that the world is unreasonably mischievous for her.
- She continues for a long while about how her voices are the main thing that prop her up.
- She discusses how she hears them addressing her from the ringing of chimes.
- Dunois hinders and says that it makes him uneasy when she discusses her voices.
- He'd think she was insane in the event that she didn't give strong purposes behind doing the things they advise her to do.
- Joan says that she makes up the great strong reasons since he doesn't have confidence in her voices. The voices start things out, however.
- Dunois inquires as to whether she's furious.
- She says she's not frantic at any rate.

- Charles enters with Bluebeard and La Hire.
- Dunois gets some information about having been blessed King.
- Charles says it sucked. The regal robes were too substantial and heavenly oil possessed a scent like crap.
- Joan reveals to Charles that, since he is King now, she'll be returning to the family ranch.
- Charles is alleviated to hear it, which makes Joan pitiful.
- She observes that none of them will miss her.
- La Hire discloses to her that he will for sure miss her, and that she will miss the battling.
- She inquires as to whether he will execute all the English on French soil.
- She forecasts that she won't live to see the day.
- Joan inquires as to whether he thinks they'll have the option to dispose of the English.
- He promises to take care of business somehow.
- It all of a sudden jumps out at her that they should take Paris before she returns to the homestead.
- Charles feels that is a horrendous thought. He's tired of battling. He'd much rather make an arrangement.
- The Archbishop enters.
- The King snitches on Joan, advising the Archbishop that she needs to continue making war.
- Joan resembles: no doubt, truth is stranger than fiction. She requests that the Archbishop back her up and state that God needs them to continue battling.
- The Archbishop says he's not as secure with what God needs as she may be.
- He feels that her affirmation is an indication that she is liable of the wrongdoing of pride.
- Joan says that she can't resist in the event that she knows superior to every other person. Her voices give her within scoop.
- Charles inquires as to why voices don't come to him since he's the King.

- Joan discloses to him this is on the grounds that he doesn't tune in for them.
- Once more, she demands that they should go take Paris.
- La Hire concurs.
- Dunois says it's an ill-conceived notion and that they should realize when they're beaten.
- Joan is all similar to: what're you discussing? We're winning.
- She calls attention to that they'd in any case be stuck in Orleans if not for her asking them to battle.
- Dunois gives her kudos for rousing their triumphs, yet calls attention to that he took part in it too. It takes more than supernatural occurrences to run a military.
- Joan reprimands his method for making war. Really soon everyone will begin utilizing guns. What great are knights against black powder? What's more, every one of the knights are wusses. They battle for cash, not God and Country like they should do. She says that the ordinary citizens comprehend her perspective. They'll pursue her simply as they did at Orleans, when every one of the nobles were reluctant to battle.
- The Archbishop blames her again for pride.
- Joan says she couldn't care less if it's pride if what she's idiom is valid.
- La Hire backs her up.
- Dunois says that he has figured out how to battle in another manner. He's taken in his exercises while battling with Joan.
- He discloses to Joan that she surges quick into things without considering the results.
- They'll be dwarfed on the off chance that they attempt to take Paris. No measure of confidence in God will prevent them from being squashed.
- Dunois says that, in the event that she attempts it, she'll be caught, and he won't let any of his officers kick the bucket attempting to save her.
- Joan says that France will presumably pay her payment.

- No, says the King. I'm penniless. The subject of royal celebration has taken my each and every penny.
- What about the Church, she asks the Archbishop.
- He reveals to her that the Church will consume her as a witch.
- This shocks Joan.
- The Archbishop discloses to her that Cauchon has recently copied a lady in Paris for saying that what she's been doing is correct.
- Joan approaches him on the off chance that he'd support her at any rate. Possibly, they'd hear them out since he's Mr. Huge Church Man.
- He says probably not. You're excessively brimming proudly.
- How am I loaded proudly, asks Joan. I simply do what my voices let me know. They originate from God. Why is doing God's will terrible?
- The Archbishop reveals to her that the Church is God's voice on Earth; her voices are only her pride talking.
- She answers that, regardless of whether her voices originate from her own psyche and aren't sent from God, aren't they in every case right?
- Everyone gives her one final admonition, emphasizing that, on the off chance that she gets caught attempting to free Paris, they won't lift a finger to support her.
- Joan is disillusioned in every one of them.
- She understands now how alone she really is. It's OK, however, on the grounds that God is distant from everyone else also. As she exits to welcome her admirers outside, she's chosen to place her trust in the Lord.
- After she leaves, the men express some lament at forsaking her, however they don't perceive any path around it

Scene Six

- Stage headings state it's a heavenly spring morning in Rouen.
- The date is May 30, 1431.
- We're in another stone room in a palace. It's set up like a court.
- Warwick and his Page enter.
- The Page gets all cheeky and tells his supervisor that shouldn't be there. This is Church court and they are not Churchly.

Notes

- Warwick instructs him to run along and discover Cauchon.
- He needs to address his old mate, the Bishop of Beauvais, before the preliminary beginnings.
- The Nobleman reminds his Page to not be cheeky with the Bishop.
- Simply at that point, Cauchon enters with two other Church folks. One is a Dominican priest and the other is a group. (Actually, dislike a weapon. A group was a specialist of law and religious philosophy.)
- The Page reports Cauchon and rushes away.
- Cauchon presents his peeps.
- The Dominican priest's name is Brother John Lemaitre. He is an Inquisitor.
- The other person is Canon John D'Estivet. He is the Promoter in the preliminary. We'd consider him an examiner. (It sounds a lot more pleasant to call him Promoter, however, doesn't it?)
- Warwick grumbles that the preliminary is taking excessively long.
- It's been some time since Joan was taken prisoner at Compiegne by the Burgundians.
- He paid a great deal of cash to have her dispatched over to the Church. What gives?
- The Inquisitor grins, and says that the preliminary hasn't started.
- There's been fifteen assessments, however he's just been at two of them.
- The Inquisitor says from the outset he would not like to mess with Joan's preliminary since he thought it was only a political issue. He felt like there was no genuine sin so it wasn't any of his concern.
- Presently, in the wake of hearing Joan talk, he's persuaded that it's the most pessimistic scenario of sin he's at any point seen. (Poor Joan doesn't have the foggiest idea when to keep her mouth shut.)
- Warwick is glad to hear this and concedes that he was getting anxious.
- Cauchon says that the Nobleman's anxiety has been really self-evident, since his fighters have been taking steps to suffocate anybody engaged with the preliminary who underpins Joan.

- Warwick acts all guiltless.
- The Bishop discloses to Warwick that he's resolved to give Joan a reasonable preliminary.
- The Inquisitor says that he's never observed a more attractive preliminary. It's reasonable for the point that Joan doesn't require a guard lawyer, since everyone here is attempting to spare her.
- The Promoter, D'Estivet, concurs. He says that on the off chance that he didn't know that everyone here is attempting to help Joan, he'd guard her himself. In addition, they've been extremely pleasant to her. They haven't tormented her or anything.
- Warwick remarks that, however he thinks twice about it, it is vital politically that Joan pass on.
- Cauchon cautions the Nobleman that, if Joan is cleared by the Church and somebody murders her at any rate, that individual will get a clerical smack down.
- The Inquisitor removes in and focuses that they needn't quarrel over it. Joan is the cause all her own problems. All that she says burrows a more profound gap.
- Warwick says that's good. He'd hate to have to act without the Church's permission.
- The Nobleman exits.
- Cauchon, The Inquisitor, and D'Estivet settle down for the trial.
- Cauchon makes the point that English nobles are all scoundrels.
- The Inquisitor says that all secular power corrupts. The aristocracy isn't pure and clean and wonderful like the Church.
- All kinds of clergyman start pouring into the court room and take their seats.
- Our furious little companion from scene four, the Chaplain de Stogumber, is among them. Learn to expect the unexpected. He's as yet irate.
- He's joined by a person named Courcelles, who is the Canon of Paris.
- The Chaplain and Courcelles gripe to Cauchon that they buckled down on a detailed prosecution of Joan.

- They thought of 64 violations they figure she ought to be indicted for.
- Someone has diminished the quantity of arraignments without asking them.
- The Inquisitor says he's the person who decreased the number. Truth be told he's chopped the prosecutions down from 64 to 12.
- The Chaplain and Courcelles are offended.
- Shouldn't something be said about the way that Joan's voices address her in French, asks the Chaplain. St. Margaret, St. Catherine, and the lead celestial host Michael plainly should've spoken in English.
- The Inquisitor causes the Chaplain to notice the way that everyone here concurs that Joan's voices are truly Satan talking. Is the Chaplain suggesting that English is the language of the Devil? (Great one.)
- The Chaplain can't think about a decent rebound and plunks down.
- Courcelles isn't done with them, however. He blames Joan for the reprehensible sin of taking the Bishop of Senlis' steed.
- Cauchon is getting tired of this drivel.
- The Inquisitor discloses to them that The Maid claims she paid for the steed and at any rate the charges of sin will be sufficiently very to convict her on.
- He proceeds to state that the stuff that they put in the prosecutions about Joan imploring at enchantment wells and moving around pixie trees is futile. They'd need to consume a large portion of the worker young ladies in France on the off chance that they indicted her for that.
- Another Dominican priest named Ladvenu inquires as to whether there's any genuine damage to Joan's blasphemy. Numerous holy people in the past have directed comparable sentiments toward Joan.
- The Inquisitor dispatches into a fantastically long monolog about the risks of blasphemy.
- First he says that the most exceedingly terrible blasphemies consistently begin with someone who appears to be devout and straightforward. It appears to be guiltless from the start yet then everything gets way wild.

- He says that when ladies start dressing like men they wind up being pursued simply like John the Baptist.
- The before you know it you have wild groups of people who go around bare in the forested areas.
- Everyone has intercourse with every other person and in a little while you have polygamy and interbreeding.
- It's the Church's business to shield humanity from this franticness.
- He tells the court that Joan won't appear to be an individual who could cause such loathsomeness.
- The pride that is driven her to this end is shrouded in lowliness. Still they need to carry out their responsibility to benefit everybody.
- The Inquisitor orders anybody in the court who has brutal goals toward Joan to leave right away.
- The Inquisition is a lenient association he contends. It's spared several blasphemers from being cold-bloodedly destroyed and stoned by laborers. The Inquisition, by correlation, handles apostates with kindness.
- He says that he is a sympathetic sort of fellow and is just doing this in light of the fact that the outcomes of giving apostasy a chance to spread are awful.
- He closes his discourse by saying that they should continue not with outrage or even pity, however with leniency.
- Cauchon includes that the most genuine blasphemy of Joan's is a seemingly insignificant detail called Protestantism.
- (Fundamentally, he's shocked at the possibility that somebody may address God legitimately, without the Church as a go-between.)
- Every one of the individuals murmur to one another. They've never known about Protestantism.
- Okey doke, we should get Joan, says the Inquisitor.
- Joan enters.
- She's wearing a dark page's suit and is somewhat more awful for the wear. With everything taken into account, however, despite everything she appears to be crucial and solid.
- The Inquisitor asks how she's doing.
- She says she ate some carp that made her wiped out.

- Cauchon discloses to her he requested that she have new fish.
- Joan says she simply doesn't care for carp.
- She whines that she's been left in the hands of the mean early English and not the Church.
- They have clearly tied her to a log, which isn't extremely fun by any means. What do they think, that she's going to take off?
- D'Estivet says that is actually what they think.
- Before they tied her she bounced out of the sixty foot tower that she's detained in. How might she have endure the fall in the event that she wasn't a malicious flying witch?
- Joan brings up that the pinnacle appears to get taller each time D'Estivet grills her about the occurrence.
- D'Estivet says that by attempting to escape Joan submitted apostasy.
- Joan reveals to him he's a trick. For what reason is it blasphemy to attempt to escape when you're detained? It's just good judgment.
- Cauchon cautions her not to be so snide.
- The Inquisitor cuts in and orders that Joan be confirmed. She needs to put her hand on the Gospels and guarantee to tell every bit of relevant information.
- Joan cannot, saying that it's difficult to tell every bit of relevant information since God hasn't uncovered every last bit of it to humankind.
- Courcelles recommends that they torment Joan.
- The Executioner says that the torment gadgets are all set.
- Joan discloses to them that torment would be pointless. She'd simply state anything they desired her to and afterward take everything back a short time later.
- Ladvenu says this bodes well, and that they ought to continue leniently.
- Courcelles cries that they generally torment individuals. It's standard methodology.
- Cauchon puts his foot down. No torment permitted.
- Joan calls Courcelles a noodle. (Truly, she does.)
- This was obviously extremely halfback at that point, in light of the fact that Courcelles calls her a wanton. (Wanton=promiscuous lady.)

- The Inquisitor settles everyone down.
- Cauchon inquires as to whether she'll begin complying with the Church.
- Forget about it, she says, as long as you all don't ask me do outlandish things like not comply with my voices.
- Your voices are from Satan, however, says the Inquisitor. We say as much and we're the Church. Don't you know we're savvier than you?
- Joan counters that God is smarter than everyone and she does what He says.
- Everyone reveals to her that she's denouncing herself by saying she's realizes God's desires superior to the Church.
- Courcelles raises the taken pony once more.
- Cauchon considers him a moron.
- The Inquisitor inquires as to whether they're going to keep on pushing all these hogwash charges.
- We should, says the Promoter, however the most genuine ones are that she converses with underhanded spirits and dresses like a man.
- Alright, shouldn't something be said about these shrewd spirits, the Inquisitor asks Joan.
- She repeats that they're not malicious. They originate from God.
- The Inquisitor requests the last time in the event that she'll quit wearing men's garments.
- No, she says. It's simply sound judgment. She was a warrior. She lived with warriors and now she's detained by them. On the off chance that she begins dressing like a lady they'll think about her as a lady. At that point they may be enticed to exploit her.

- Ladvenu calls attention to that what Joan is stating sounds progressively like the straightforward presence of mind of a worker than sin.
- Joan answers that, if everyone back on the ranch was as straightforward as these Church folks, there'd be no bread for anybody.
- We're just attempting to spare you, Ladvenu advises her. You don't see it since you're loaded proudly.

Notes

- Joan doesn't comprehend what she's said wrong. To the extent she sees it, she's just been coming clean.
- Ladvenu guides her focus toward the Executioner remaining behind her.
- He educates her this is her last opportunity to apologize before she's taken of to the market to be scorched at the stake.
- Hold up, shouts Joan. The stake? No doubt? My voices revealed to me I wouldn't be scorched.
- Cauchon hollers at her that her voices have clearly been lying, sense she is going to be scorched.
- Joan is getting blown a gasket now.
- She persuades herself that it's OK to abnegate. God gave her sound judgment and no individual with any sense would simply give themselves a chance to be singed.
- She chooses to yield.
- Ladvenu fires preparing an admission for her to sign.
- The Chaplain is obviously angry. He says that all Frenchman are messy double crossers and that it doesn't make a difference if this court clears her. There's a huge amount of English troopers outside and they'll consume her at any rate.
- The Inquisitor guides him to sit.
- He says, no I'm going to stand.
- Alright, stand at that point, says the Inquisitor.
- The Chaplain chooses to sit.
- Ladvenu peruses so anyone can hear the admission that Joan should sign.
- It essentially says that she's been an exceptionally trouble maker. She's spent time with fiendish spirits, dressed like a man, been commonly insubordinate, and is brimming proudly.
- Ladvenu causes her sign her name.
- Hurrah, says Ladvenu. Joan is spared.
- The Inquisitor pronounces that she'll never again be scorched. Notwithstanding, her irreverences are incredible to such an extent that she'll must be detained for an amazing remainder.
- Joan isn't having that.

- She tears up the admission and discloses to them that living in a cell for an amazing remainder wouldn't live by any means. She proceeds to state that the way that they sentenced her to such a destiny is a certain sign that they are the ones doing the Devil's work, not her.
- That practically does what needs to be done.
- Cauchon and the Inquisitor announce that she's a blasphemer.
- The Chaplain requires the fire to be lit and she's trucked away.
- Everyone surges out to the execution with the exception of Cauchon and the Inquisitor.
- Cauchon says they should go ensure the execution is finished by the best possible system.
- The Inquisitor discloses to him it's not their obligation any longer. He proceeds to state that it's a terrible thing when a guiltless individual is executed. She had no genuine comprehension of how sinful her convictions were.
- Warwick enters. He and Cauchon exchange some short remarks before Cauchon and the Inquisitor exit to watch the consuming.
- The aristocrat is disregarded in the court. He gets out for anyone, yet they've all gone to the execution.
- Simply at that point, the Chaplain comes running in.
- He's crying. (Hold up, shouldn't he be glad?)
- Turns out he has no stomach for executions. Watching Joan get scorched caused him to acknowledge what a butthole he's been.
- Warwick instructs him to settle down and encourages him to avoid executions in the event that they crack him out to such an extent.
- This does nothing to stop the Chaplain's fuming.
- He discloses to Warwick that an English warrior gave Joan two sticks that she could hold together like a cross. He includes that there were individuals out there snickering at Joan. He's certain they were French.
- Ladvenu reenters conveying a cross.
- He says that he was attempting to hold it up so that Joan could see it while she consumed.
- Joan disclosed to him that he shouldn't on the grounds that they'd copy him, as well.

- He's presently persuaded that Joan was guiltless, in light of the fact that no one who was guided by the Devil would be so magnanimous despite death.
- Ladvenu says that when she shouted to Jesus as she was kicking the bucket, that she must've truly observed him floating in the sky.
- He includes that he heard individuals snickering and he's almost certain they were English.
- Now, the Chaplain goes insane and runs out shouting about how he must go hang himself.
- Warwick advises Ladvenu to go ensure he doesn't hurt himself.
- The Executioner appears and reports that everything is done. The entirety of Joan's remaining parts have been dumped in the waterway. This incorporates her heart, which, for reasons unknown, wouldn't consume.
- He pronounces that they've heard the remainder of her.
- As the scene attracts to a nearby, Warwick isn't sure to such an extent this is valid.

Check your progress – 1

1. When did George Bernard Shaw distribute the play?

____

____

____

2. Who was Captain Robert de Baudricourt?

____

____

____

3.3 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we read about "Saint Joan" by George Bernard Shaw" and its summary.

3.4 KEYWORDS

- Consternation: Worry Or Distress
- Contemptuously: Disapprovingly
- Coronation: The Ceremony Of Crowning A Queen Or King

. Eccentric: Unusual Or Unexpected

3.5 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- Write the summary of Scene 1 of Saint Joan by George Shaw.
- Summarize scene 6 of Saint Joan by George Shaw.
- Give the summary of Scene 2 and 3 of Saint Joan by George Shaw

3.6 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Holroyd, Michael (14 July 2007). "A tragedy without villains". The Guardian. Retrieved 2009-01-18.

2. ^ Fielden, John (July 1957). "Shaw's Saint Joan as Tragedy". Twentieth-Century Literature. Hofstra University. 3 (2): 59–67. doi:10.2307/441003. JSTOR 441003.

3. ^ Robertson, J. M. (1926). Mr. Shaw and "The Maid". London: Cobdon-Sanderson. p. 85.

4. ^ Preface to the play

5. ^ Billington, Michael (12 July 2007). "Saint Joan: Olivier Theatre, London". The Guardian. Retrieved 2009-01-18.

3.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. George Bernard Shaw distributed the play in 1924. (**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.1**)

2. Captain Robert de Baudricourt was a military squire.**(answer for check your progress- 1 Q.2**)

UNIT 4. SHAW – SAINT JOAN -4

STRUCTURE

4.0 Objectives

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Themes

4.3 Characters

4.4 Analysis

4.5 Let us sum up

4.6 Keywords

4.7 Questions for review

4.8 Suggested readings and writings

4.9 Answers to check your progress

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After the completion of this unit you should be able to learn about:

- Saint Joan's themes, characters, analysis.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Saint Joan, chronicle play in six scenes and an epilogue by George Bernard Shaw, performed in 1923 and published in 1924. It was inspired by the canonization of Joan of Arc in 1920, nearly five centuries after her death in 1431.

Shaw attributes Joan's visions to her intuition and understanding of her historical mission. The action of the play follows historical events. Shaw's Joan leads France to victory over the English by dint of her innate intelligence and leadership and not through supernatural guidance. As in the historical record, she is captured and sold to the English, who convict her of heresy and burn her at the stake. Joan is the personification of the tragic heroine; her martyrdom embodies the paradox that humans fear—and often kill—their saints and heroes.

The play's epilogue concerns the overturning of the church's verdict of heresy in 1456 and her canonization.

4.2 THEMES

Power

The conflict in Saint Joan is built around some pretty major power clashes. The Catholic Church and the English feudal lords are all challenged by Joan's rise. Her allies desert her for fear of losing the power she has helped them gain. In the end she is crushed by all of these converging forces. Saint Joan could be viewed as a case study on the disturbing lengths people will go to in order to maintain and gain power.

Religion

Ain't Joan chronicles the life of a Catholic saint. As such, we're sure it's no big surprise that religion is a major theme. In the play, we see the one of the earliest clashes of Protestantism and Catholicism. There's also much discussion of popular religious topics such as faith, heresy, martyrdom, and repentance.

Women and Feminity

Joan was an early pioneer of women's equality. In a time where it was completely unheard of, she wore men's clothes, became a soldier, and advised the most powerful men of her day, as Saint Joan details. She has inspired generations of women to challenge gender roles.

Society and Class

Medieval society was rigidly divided by class and position. Saint Joan investigates the inner workings of this intricate structure. Among the things examined are the tiers of power within the Church, the political factions of kings and feudal lords, and the lot of common peasants and soldiers. We also see just how severe the punishment was for people who defied this rigid hierarchy.

Versions of Reality

Joan of Arc is well known for claiming to hear voices sent to her by God. The Church chose a different view, saying they were demonic in origin. Some of her friends told her that the voices were just her own common sense talking to her. Joan's refusal to submit to anyone's version of reality but her own, was one of the main factors that led to her execution. Saint Joan is in a sense a battle for the definition of reality.

Warfare

Saint Joan is set in medieval France, which was at the time in the throes of the Hundred Years War. There are many different factions vying for power, the main ones being the English, the Burgundians, and the Armagnacs. In the play, Joan sets off on a mission from God, to make war on all those who oppose uniting France under the rule of the Armagnac, and heir to the French throne, Charles VII. Saint Joan depicts warfare as everything from a unifier to a divider to a holy right.

Pride

Just about everybody in Saint Joan accuses Joan of pride. It is unclear as to whether she's guilty of this or not. Her every decision lead to success for her and those around her. She also believes that she gets her orders directly from God. In her mind, that all adds up to the idea that everyone should just listen to her and do what she says. The rich and powerful, however, view this as insufferable pride, when coming from an upstart teenage girl.

Admiration

Joan can inspire such admiration, that she launches a movement which eventually unites a country, shifting its entire power structure in the bargain. Even the men who put her to death can't help but respect her courage and tenacity. Her spirit was so strong that it continued to inspire for hundreds of years after her death. She became a symbol for generation after generation. Eventually, admiration for her grew so much

that the Catholic Church made her a saint. Saint Joan chronicles the life, death, and legacy of this inspirational figure.

Check your progress – 1

1. How many scenes are there in Saint Joan?

____

____

____

2.When was Saint Joan published?

____

____

____

3. When was Saint Joan first performed?

____

____

____

4. From where was Saint Joan inspired?

____

____

____

4.3 CHARACTERS

Joan

Character Analysis

- That practically does what needs to be done.

- Cauchon and the Inquisitor announce that she's a blasphemer.

- The Chaplain requires the fire to be lit and she's trucked away.

- Everyone surges out to the execution with the exception of Cauchon and the Inquisitor.

Notes

- Cauchon says they should go ensure the execution is finished by the best possible system.

- The Inquisitor discloses to him it's not their obligation any longer. He proceeds to state that it's a terrible thing when a guiltless individual is executed. She had no genuine comprehension of how sinful her convictions were.

- Warwick enters. He and Cauchon exchange some short remarks before Cauchon and the Inquisitor exit to watch the consuming.

- The aristocrat is disregarded in the court. He gets out for anyone, yet they've all gone to the execution.

- Simply at that point, the Chaplain comes running in.

- He's crying. (Hold up, shouldn't he be glad?)

- Turns out he has no stomach for executions. Watching Joan get scorched caused him to acknowledge what a butthole he's been.

- Warwick instructs him to settle down and encourages him to avoid executions in the event that they crack him out to such an extent.

- This does nothing to stop the Chaplain's fuming.

- He discloses to Warwick that an English warrior gave Joan two sticks that she could hold together like a cross. He includes that there were individuals out there snickering at Joan. He's certain they were French.

- Ladvenu reenters conveying a cross.

- He says that he was attempting to hold it up so that Joan could see it while she consumed.

- Joan disclosed to him that he shouldn't on the grounds that they'd copy him, as well.

- He's presently persuaded that Joan was guiltless, in light of the fact that no one who was guided by the Devil would be so magnanimous despite death.

- Ladvenu says that when she shouted to Jesus as she was kicking the bucket, that she must've truly observed him floating in the sky.

- He includes that he heard individuals snickering and he's almost certain they were English.

- Now, the Chaplain goes insane and runs out shouting about how he must go hang himself.

- Warwick advises Ladvenu to go ensure he doesn't hurt himself.

- The Executioner appears and reports that everything is done. The entirety of Joan's remaining parts have been dumped in the waterway. This incorporates her heart, which, for reasons unknown, wouldn't consume.

- He pronounces that they've heard the remainder of her.

- As the scene attracts to a nearby, Warwick isn't sure to such an extent this is valid.

Timeline

- Dunois swears loyalty to Joan and liberates Orleans with her.

- He helps lead the French to victory after victory.
- He advises Joan against liberating Paris.
- Dunois does nothing to rescue her after she is caught, but he continues to fight after her death, eventually liberating France.
- Dunois writes a letter to help clear Joan's name.

4.4 ANALYSIS

Symbolism, Imagery, Allegory

The Wind

When the wind changes directions on the banks of the Loire, Dunois is convinced that it's a miracle. He's sure that Joan has been sent by God. To him it's symbolic of God's blessing on Joan. It could also be seen as having a greater symbolism. Joan's presence will change the direction the war is going. It's also a change for Joan herself. She goes from talking about taking back France to actually doing something about it. When the wind changes, so will her life, so will France, so will history.

Joan's Heart

The fact that Joan's heart doesn't burn can be seen as symbolic. The undamaged heart could represent her eternal spirit, which doesn't die along with her body. Her memory lives on to inspire many more generations to come. The play recognizes this in the epilogue, when the Gentleman comes from the future to tell us that Joan has been made a saint. Like Christ, Joan is resurrected in a sense by her canonization. Of course, this is a Shavian play, so no triumph comes without a twist of irony. The epilogue hypothesizes that, if she did come back to life literally, as is said of Jesus, that she would just be burnt all over again. Perhaps, the spirit that her unburned heart symbolizes is all the world ever really needed or wanted from her.

The Eggs

The very first scene starts off with Robert de Baudricourt brow beating his poor Steward because there aren't any eggs. We can understand. We

also get grumpy when there's no breakfast. The hens haven't been laying ever since Robert refused to see Joan. The scene ends with Robert giving in and supplying Joan with the soldiers and supplies she needs to go see the Dauphin. Immediately, the hens start laying again. Is this just complete randomness on Shaw's part or is it incredibly symbolic? Let us examine:

Eggs are an ancient symbol of birth and renewal. It seems pretty logical, right? Eggs=little baby birds=birth. This symbolism goes all the way back before the Romans and Greeks.

It's so old that nobody even knows where it came from. Ever heard of an Easter egg? Ever wondered what they have to do with Jesus being resurrected? It comes from when the Catholic Church was going around converting all the pagans. "Pagan" is the term Catholics made up for any and all of the indigenous religions they came into contact with. Pagan basically meant you weren't Catholic. Anyway, the pagans had lots of holiday traditions that they were pretty reluctant to give up – one of which was celebrating the spring equinox with eggs. Get it? Eggs=little baby birds=birth=spring.

The Catholic priests found that it was a lot easier to convert people if they let them hold on to a few of their old traditions. They were like: "OK, you can still have your spring festival and your symbolic eggs, but we're going to celebrate Jesus' resurrection now instead of the renewal of the earth." (Incidentally the word Easter comes from the Saxon goddess Eastre.) The pagans were cool with this switcharoo. So, now we have: eggs=little baby birds=birth=Jesus' resurrection. (You can learn more about Easter here.)

When Robert decides to help Joan begin her quest, it's a birth of a sort. Only, instead of a fuzzy little chick, a saint is born. The symbolism is doubly meaningful because Joan is a Christ figure. She ends up being martyred just like Jesus and even resurrected in a way when she is made into a saint. OK, so the final equation is: eggs=little baby birds=birth=Jesus' resurrection=Saint Joan of Arc.

Joan as Nationalism

Notes

You may ask, what is this Nationalism of which you speak? We'll let Bishop Cauchon explain: "I can express it only by such phrases as France for the French, England for the English, Italy for the Italians, Spain for the Spanish, and so forth" (4.120).

This may not seem like such a radical idea today, but back then it was crazy talk. During Joan's time, people that mostly spoke French and lived in a land referred to as France didn't necessarily call themselves French. If you zoomed back in time and asked your average French speaking peasant where they came from, they might say Normandy or Aquitaine, but never France. The land was divided among lots of smaller duchies and fiefs. People were more loyal to their feudal lord than the king. In Shaw's play we see Joan burst onto the scene with a new philosophy. She thinks that all these people going around speaking French ought to be united under a strong French king.

Joan comes to symbolize this new Nationalism, and as a result she terrifies the feudal lords, French and English alike. The Earl of Warwick will elucidate us as to why: "Men cannot serve two masters. If this cant of serving their country once takes hold of them, goodbye to the authority of their feudal lords" (4.19). He goes on to say, " If the people's thoughts and hearts were turned to the king, and their lords became only the king's servants in their eyes, the king could break us across his knee one by one; and then what should we be but liveried courtiers in his halls?" (4.112).

This is exactly what happens in the future. If you want a good example, watch Henry VIII on The Tudors; you'll see the absolute power that future monarchs hold. Eventually the feudal lords become exactly what Warwick describes, only the king's servants. When Warwick orchestrates Joan's execution, in his mind, he's burning a symbol of this new Nationalism that threatens his power.

Note: It should be recognized that Shaw's use of the word Nationalism, is anachronistic, meaning that it is out of place in this time period. The term didn't come into use for several centuries after Joan's death. Shaw

says in his preface that he chose to do this to better help modern audiences understand the play.

Joan as Protestantism

At Joan's trial, Bishop Cauchon tells everybody that, "The mighty structure of Catholic Christendom […] may be […] brought to barbarous ruin and desolation, by this arch heresy […] Protestantism" (6.74). But what exactly is Protestantism and why is it so dangerous to the Church? Warwick gives a good definition, saying "It is the protest of the individual soul against the interference of priest or peer between the private man and his God" (4.117).

Basically, Protestants in this novel believe that they should be able to talk to God themselves rather than having a priest do it for them. You can probably understand why the priests might not be fans of this idea. If everybody goes around communing with God on their own, won't all the clergy lose their job? Cauchon and his peers feel this is very dangerous because your average everyday Joe doesn't know enough to interpret God's will. They think it takes a trained and educated Churchman to get it right. For example, how is a layman supposed to know the difference between God's voice and Satan's?

Joan, of course, thinks she has every right to commune with higher powers on her own. She claims to the very end that her voices are sent from God, despite the fact that the Church tells her that they're demonic in origin. Joan even goes so far as to say, "I know that your counsel is of the devil, and that mine is of God" (6.233). Whoa, that's a harsh accusation. Not only is she claiming their interpretation is wrong, but also that it's been influenced by the Devil.

What's ironic is that Joan doesn't start out as a rebel against the Church at all. When she first meets the Archbishop at Charles's court she is extremely reverent, so much so that the nobles make fun of her. Even for most of her trial she is generally respectful of the Church as an institution. Nevertheless, her faith in her own interpretation of her voices over the Church's brands her as a heretic. The Church sends her to the flames because they can't allow this symbol of Protestantism to survive.

Note: Once again we have an anachronism. The word "Protestant" didn't come into popular use until Martin Luther's Protestant Reformation in the 1500s. Shaw, of course, is well aware of this, and chose to include the term its modern implications.

Setting

Where It All Goes Down

France, mid-1400s

Overall Political Situation

During Joan's time, France was a mess and had been for a while. The Hundred Years War had been going on since 1337. It was an extended conflict made up of lots of smaller wars. Basically, you had two families with claims to the French throne – the House of Valois and the House of Plantagenet. The Valois thought they should rule France, while the Plantagenets claimed both France and England. To make things even harder to sort out, both had legitimate claims, depending on how you looked at it. The families and their various allies wreaked havoc on the land for years and years.

Before Joan showed up, our buddy the Dauphin, Charles of Valois, was in pretty bad shape. He was surrounded by enemies. First there were the Burgundians. Charles had tried a couple times to make peace with their Duke, John the Fearless. Guess John shouldn't have been so fearless, though, because at the second "peace talk" Charles's men rose up and assassinated him. It's unclear as to whether Charles knew about this beforehand. Whatever the case, it was a pretty bad idea. The Burgundians were understandably kind of mad about the whole their-leader-getting-butchered thing. John's son, Philip the Good, allied Burgundy with Charles's big dog enemies, the English.

Things got worse for Charles when his mother, Isabella, who had committed adultery, and his father, Charles VI, who suffered from schizophrenia, disinherited him. There were rumors buzzing around that Charles wasn't the legitimate heir. People thought he might be the product of one of his mother's affairs. In any case, his parents signed the Treaty of Troyes, with King Henry V of England. This document

declared that the English heir, Henry VI, would take the throne after Charles's father died. Luckily for Charles, his father and Henry V both died really soon after the treaty was signed. Henry VI was just a baby and so was more concerned with his bahbah than conquest. Still, a huge chunk of northern France, including Paris, was occupied by the English. Charles didn't really take any decisive action to kick them out, even though he had more soldiers. Why? We don't know.

By the time Joan arrived at Charles's court in 1429, France was in total chaos – so much so, that most people didn't even think of themselves as French. Shaw recognizes the country's general state of disarray by having La Hire say, "She has made her way from Champagne with half a dozen men through the thick of everything: Burgundians, Goddams [English], deserters, robbers, and Lord knows who" (2.20). La Hire also describes her as "An angel dressed like a soldier" (2.18). This description turns out to be pretty accurate. It's Joan's influence that inspires Charles to rise up and take control of the country. By 1453 he's expelled the English and united France under his rule.

On the Micro Level

The specific places where Shaw chooses to set the actual scenes are remarkable for the fact that they're pretty unremarkable. Let's do a rundown: we've some rooms in castles, the bank of a river, a room in a cathedral, and a bedroom. Shaw chooses these places in a play where giant crazy battles, a grand coronation, and a massive public execution take place. Of course, all these events happen offstage.

Shaw says in his preface to Saint Joan that grander settings would be a mistake. He seems to have no patience for spectacle. He writes that building the "elaborate scenery" that would be required by having Joan burnt on stage and having an "obviously sham fight" for the bridge across the Loire would be a waste of time. He says that audiences would go home cursing him "for writing such inordinately long and intolerably dreary and meaningless plays." That's the key word here – "meaningless." It seems that fancy sets were far less important to Shaw than giving audiences something to really think about. The simple

settings he chooses provide a forum for his intellectual discussions to take place.

Narrator Point of View

Who is the narrator, can she or he read minds, and, more importantly, can we trust her or him?

None

Though all works of literature present the author's point of view, they don't all have a narrator or a narrative voice that ties together and presents the story. This particular piece of literature does not have a narrator through whose eyes or voice we learn the story.

Genre

Drama, Tragedy, Biography, Historical Fiction

It's a play, so it falls in the category of drama. More specifically, it's a tragedy, because the heroine's choices are the cause of her own destruction. Furthermore, Shaw called it a chronicle play, meaning that he wanted to document the life of Joan. This is just another way of saying that it's a biography. Last but not least, it's historical fiction, or maybe historical drama would be more accurate. In any case it's based on historical people from and past events. Shaw condensed a lot of historical events and personages for dramatic effect, but the core story is still there.

Tone

Take a story's temperature by studying its tone. Is it hopeful? Cynical? Snarky? Playful?

Evenhanded

Shaw gives all of his characters a fair shake. In his preface he declares that, "There are no villains in the piece." All of the people at Joan's trial end up convicting her for understandable reasons (at least from their point of view). Her former friends who abandon her to death don't lie about it or anything. They tell her straight up that they won't help her if she tries to free Paris on her own. She knows what she's getting into. Then there's Joan, herself. Rather than making her the perfect one-

dimensional heroine, Shaw draws a rich and complex character. She's brave, proud, funny, sentimental, and faithful. Shaw's refusal to reduce his characters to melodramatic stereotypes elevates the play to the level of high tragedy.

Writing Style

Shavian

Shaw was such a respected playwright that the critics gave him his very own adjective: Shavian. The word is still used today to compare other pieces of literature to Shaw's work. Saint Joan bears all of Shaw's trademarks. Many of the characters are hyper articulate. They're able to understand complex concepts and enjoy debating them passionately, sometimes at great length and detail. You get plenty of this in Saint Joan. In Joan's trial, it's Joan's beliefs vs. Church doctrine. Another good example is Warwick and Cauchon's discussions of Nationalism and Protestantism.

If a play is described as Shavian it usually means that it turns the stage into a forum for ideas. Another hallmark of Shavian style is wittiness. Shaw punctuated his intellectual discussions with a sharp sense of humor. As soon as the play is in danger of getting bogged down, he keeps us engaged with some witty observation. Once again, Joan's trial is a good example. All the long debates are peppered with sassy comebacks from our heroine.

What's up with the Title?

At first this may seem like a question that's not even worth asking. The play is titled Saint Joan. It's about a saint. Her name was Joan. There you go. If you think about it a wee bit longer, though, it becomes pretty clear that Shaw wasn't guilty of lazy titling. The fact is that Joan wasn't recognized as a saint in her lifetime. She had a lot of fans, though. Many admired her courageous leadership and even believed that she'd worked miracles. Unfortunately, her success made her a lot of enemies as well; not the least of which was the Catholic Church.

One of great ironies of Joan's story is that she was branded a heretic and burnt alive by the very same organization that would recognize her as a saint over 400 years later. In his book, Contradictory Characters, Albert Bermel suggests that the title itself is ironic. He says, "The play asks a riddle: When is a saint not a saint? The answer is: when she's alive." Is Bermel right? Did Shaw title his play Saint Joan to point out this irony? Was he suggesting that the world may never be able to accept extraordinary people like Joan while they're alive? The last line of the play would seem to support this theory. Joan appeals to God saying, "O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive Thy saints? How long, O Lord, how long?" (E.170)

What's up with the Ending?

Saint Joan ends with an epilogue, in which a good number of the characters materialize in a dream and discuss Joan's legacy on earth. In it we learn how King Charles had Joan's name cleared twenty-five years after he let her be executed. Also, a guy shows up from the future (1920) to tell them all that the Church has recognized Joan as a saint. The ending is a big shift in tone for the play. We go from high tragedy to high comedy. We go from straightforward realism to not-so-straightforward surrealism. What gives, Shaw? Why would you do such a thing?

It turns out that a lot of people were asking that question when the play was first produced. So much so, that he felt the need to defend it in his preface. He writes, "It was necessary by hook or crook to shew the canonized Joan as well as the incinerated one" (source). Shaw felt that if he didn't address in some way the fact that Joan was later recognized as a saint, he hadn't really done the job of chronicling Joan's story. She was one of those rare people whose death had just as large an effect on the world as her life.

He also felt it was very important to express his opinion that, if Joan were to come back to life today, she would just be executed all over again. He makes this point pretty darn clear in the play's very last moments. The characters all praise Joan after they find out she's been canonized. She's like, "Awe shucks, does this mean I should come back to Earth as a living person?" Everybody's like, "Uhh, not so much," and

they disappear. In the end, Joan is left alone in pool of light asking, "O God that madest this beautiful earth, when will it be ready to receive thy saints?" (E.170). Read it. Decide what you think. Is Shaw's epilogue heavy handed? Or is it the work of pure genius?

Plot Analysis

Most good stories start with a fundamental list of ingredients: the initial situation, conflict, complication, climax, suspense, denouement, and conclusion. Great writers sometimes shake up the recipe and add some spice.

Initial Situation

Joan sways Robert de Baudricourt

The first scene does a great job of establishing Joan's character. Her charm, courage, and faith are on full display as she sways Robert and his soldiers to her side. The scene also establishes the generally stately state of France. By the end of it we've got a good idea of who our protagonist is and the world she lives in. The stage is set for her to sally forth and kick some English butt.

Conflict

Joan sets off to liberate France

Once Joan wins over Charles and gets control of the army, she can really get down to business. Her goals aren't small. She wants to raise the siege at Orleans, crown Charles at Rheims Cathedral, and expel the English out of France for good. The main conflict of the play is crystal clear.

Complication

Joan's enemies plot against her

In Scene Four, we see the Earl of Warwick and the Chaplain de Stogumber forming plans to take Joan down. They enlist the help of Cauchon, the Bishop of Beauvais, who agrees to try her for heresy. By the end of this scene, we know better than Joan the barriers that are standing in her way.

Climax

Notes

Tensions erupt after Charles's coronation

After Charles gets crowned at Rheims, Joan's buddies want to sit back and relax. Joan, however, demands they get off their lazy butts and keep the fight going. The English aren't all gone. Paris isn't under French control. Tempers flare when her allies refuse to help her and accuse her of being prideful.

Suspense

Joan swears to liberate Paris alone

Joan's friends warn her that if she continues the fight and gets captured, they won't lift a finger to help her escape. Perhaps foolishly, perhaps bravely, she swears to trust in her voices and continue the fight without them.

Denouncement

Joan is sentenced to death for heresy.

The action of the play begins to resolve as the captured Joan is convicted of heresy and is burnt at the stake.

Conclusion

In a dream sequence, we learn of Joan's legacy on Earth.

Shaw ends the play with a dream sequence. We learn that, after Joan was executed, her name was cleared, and she was made a saint. A bunch of characters show up and tell Joan they're sorry that they dissed her back in the day. However, when Joan asks them if she should come back to Earth, they all freak out and leave. Joan ends the play by asking God if the world will ever be ready for saints.

Booker's Seven Basic Plots Analysis

Christopher Booker is a scholar who wrote that every story fall into one of seven basic plot structures: Overcoming the Monster, Rags to Riches, the Quest, Voyage and Return, Comedy, Tragedy, and Rebirth.

Plot Type: Tragedy

Anticipation Stage

Joan arrives at Vaucouleurs, a country girl on a mission from God.

Joan shows up at the Castle of Vaucouleurs full of determination. She wastes no time in making her goals clear to Robert de Baudricourt and his soldiers. God has given her a mandate to unite France under Charles and give the English the boot. At the end of this stage she's off to the Dauphin, Charles, to make her dreams a reality.

Dream Stage

Joan wins over Charles and his allies.

Everything is looking good for Joan. She impresses the Archbishop, inspires Charles, and convinces the less jaded members of the court that she has been sent by God. Charles grants her command of the army, and she heads to Orleans. There she gains Dunois' respect with her courage. When the wind changes in a favorable direction for his ships, he's convinced that God is on her side. As the stage comes to a close, Joan and Dunois charge off to glorious battle.

Frustration Stage

Joan's enemies plot against her. Her friends diss her.

Good things never last, at least in tragedies. In scene four, Warwick, the Chaplain, and Cauchon plot to try Joan for heresy. Her friends all give her the cold shoulder in scene five. Charles has been crowned and they're all ready to stop the fighting, even though France is not yet united. Joan, true to her mission, can't rest until the job gets finished. Charles, the Archbishop, and even Dunois all tell her that they'll do nothing to help her if she gets captured. Ultimately, Joan sticks to her guns and goes it alone.

Nightmare Stage

Joan is tried for heresy.

True to the tragic structure, it is Joan who causes her own destruction in the end. She's given a chance to repent over and over again. For a brief moment, it seems like she will. She signs a confession saying that her

voices were demons and that she was a bad, bad girl. When she learns that the Church is going to lock her up for life, she rips up the confession and chooses to be executed. Joan dies a firm believer in herself and God. In the epilogue, Shaw highlights the even greater tragedy of Joan. He uses a dream sequence to hypothesize that she wouldn't be accepted even if she came back to life as a saint.

Three Act Plot Analysis

For a three-act plot analysis, put on your screenwriter's hat. Moviemakers know the formula well: at the end of Act One, the main character is drawn in completely to a conflict. During Act Two, she is farthest away from her goals. At the end of Act Three, the story is resolved.

Act I

Scenes One through Three make up the first act. Basically, we watch Joan convince everybody that she's legit. She starts with Captain Robert de Baudricourt, moves on to Charles and the Archbishop, and ends with Dunois. One by one she convinces these guys that she is the lady with the plan. By the end of scene three she's got everything she needs to fulfill the tasks that her voices have given her.

Act II

In the second act Joan's good fortunes begin to erode. Scene Four shows Warwick and the Chaplain plotting against her. When they team up with the well-intentioned (but perhaps incredibly misguided) Bishop Cauchon, we know that Joan is in some serious trouble. Oh, but her friends will help her out right? Nope. In Scene Five, King Charles and company give her the cold shoulder, telling her that, if she gets captured, she's on her own.

Act III

The play builds to its final peak and resolution in the third act. Scene Six gives us a glimpse into Joan's trial. Cauchon and the Inquisitor do their best to convince Joan to say she was wrong about the whole voices thing. In the end, Joan goes to her death for her beliefs. Shaw ends the play

with an epilogue. This dream sequence lets us know that Joan was eventually made a saint by the same organization (the Church) that burned her for a heretic over 400 years earlier. The play ends with Joan asking God when the world will be ready for His saints.

Trivia

Joan was illiterate.

Joan is patron saint of France, soldiers, and prisoners among other things.

Shaw's picture appears on the cover of Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band, the famous Beatles album.

Shaw and his wife were good friends with Lawrence of Arabia.

Shaw was a vegetarian.

Steaminess Rating

Exactly how steamy is this story?

You won't find any sex in Saint Joan. She goes to her death a virgin. Joan only seems to be in love with warfare, France, and God.

Allusions

When authors refer to other great works, people, and events, it’s usually not accidental. Put on your super-sleuth hat and figure out why.

- Literature and Philosophy
- Book of Hours
- Fouquet's Boccaccio
- Biblical/Christian Personages

Note: Joan hears the voices of Saint Catherine, Saint Margaret, and the Archangel Michael. These are referenced quite often throughout the play. God, Jesus Christ, and Satan are also referenced consistently.

- Saint Denis/ Saint Dennis (1.154) (2.102) (3.78)
- The Anti-Christ (4.91)
- Saint Peter (4.100) (5.84)
- John the Baptist (6.73)
- Moab (6.74)

- Ammon (6.74)
- Judas (2.175), (6.294)
- Saint Athanasius (6.178)
- King David (E.21)

Historical References

Note: This play is based on historical events and people. As such nearly every character is a historical shout out. Below we've documented references to people that would've been historical to the characters in the play.

- Aristotle (2.109)
- Pythagoras (2.109) (2.110)
- William the Conqueror (4.20)
- Charlemagne (E.21)
- Mahomet (4.91) (4.93) (4.96) (4.100) (4.104)
- Hus (4.93)
- WcLeef (4.93)
- Julius Caesar (5.78)
- Alexander the Great (5.78)

4.5 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we went through the themes, analysis and characters of "Saint Joan".

4.6 KEYWORDS

- **Ecclesiastical:** Religious; related to the ceremonies and practices of an official church
- **Endured:** Tolerated
- **Excommunication:** The act of someone being cast out from an official religion; they will no longer be seen as a member of the community and will be forbidden from participating in religious rituals
- **Fatalistically:** Accepting of all events as part of fate and destiny.

4.7 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Write the themes used in Saint Joan by George Shaw.
2. Analyze Saint Joan written by George Shaw.
3. Mention the characters of Saint Joan by George Shaw

4.8 SUGGESTED READINGS AND WRITINGS

1. Clapp, Susannah (15 July 2007). "Joan burns bright in a match made in heaven". The Observer. Retrieved 2009-01-18.

2. ^ "Saint Joan – Donmar Warehouse". www.donmarwarehouse.com. Retrieved 2016-09-11.

3. ^ "Condola Rashad to Star in Saint Joan on Broadway". www.playbill.com. Retrieved 2018-02-20.

4. ^https://www.nytimes.com/1993/02/01/theater/review-theater-getting-know-joan-who-saintly-shavian-just-bit-unlikable.html

5. ^ "Spring Opera Productions". The University of Sheffield. Archived from the original on 2008-12-23.

4.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Saint Joan consists of six scenes. **(answer to check your progress – 1Q1)**
2. Saint Joan was published in 1924. **(answer to check your progress – 1 Q 2)**
3. Saint Joan was first performed in 1923.**(answer to check your progress – 1 Q 3)**
4. Saint Joan was inspired by the canonization of Joan of Arc in 1920. **(answer to check your progress – 1 Q 4)**

UNIT 5. BECKETT - WAITING FOR GODOT - 1

STRUCTURE

5.0 Objectives

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Samuel Barclay Beckett's Life and Education

5.3 Let us sum up

5.4 Keywords

5.5 Questions for review

5.6 Suggested readings and writings

5.7 Answers to check your progress

5.0 OBJECTIVES

After the completion of this unit you should be able to learn about:

- Samuel Barclay Beckett's Life and Education.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Samuel Barclay Beckett was an Irish novelist, playwright, short story writer, theatre director, poet, and literary translator. A resident of Paris for most of his adult life, he wrote in both French and English.

Beckett's work offers a bleak, tragicomic outlook on human existence, often coupled with black comedy and gallows humor, and became increasingly minimalist in his later career. He is considered one of the last modernist writers, and one of the key figures in what Martin Esslin called the "Theatre of the Absurd."

Beckett was awarded the 1969 Nobel Prize in Literature "for his writing, which—in new forms for the novel and drama—in the destitution of modern man acquires its elevation." He was elected Saoi of Aosdána in 1984.

5.2 SAMUEL BARCLAY BECKETT'S LIFE AND EDUCATION

Samuel Beckett was born in Dublin on Good Friday, 13 April 1906, to William Frank Beckett (1871-1933), a quantity surveyor and descendant of the Huguenots, and Maria Jones Roe, a nurse, when both were 35. They had married in 1901. Beckett had one older brother, Frank Edward Beckett (1902–1954). At the age of five, Beckett attended a local playschool in Dublin, where he started to learn music, and then moved to Earlsfort House School in Dublin city centre near Harcourt Street. The Becketts were members of the Anglican Church of Ireland. The family home, Cooldrinagh in the Dublin suburb of Foxrock, was a large house and garden complete with tennis court built in 1903 by Samuel's father, William. The house and garden, together with the surrounding countryside where he often went walking with his father, the nearby Leopardstown Racecourse, the Foxrock railway station and Harcourt Street station at the city terminus of the line, all feature in his prose and plays.

In 1919/1920, Beckett went to Portora Royal School in Enniskillen, County Fermanagh (which Oscar Wilde had also attended). He left 3 years later, in 1923. A natural athlete, Beckett excelled at cricket as a left-handed batsman and a left-arm medium-pace bowler. Later, he was to play for Dublin University and played two first-class games against Northamptonshire. As a result, he became the only Nobel literature laureate to have played first-class cricket.

Early Writings

Beckett studied French, Italian, and English at Trinity College Dublin from 1923 to 1927 (one of his tutors was the eminent Berkeley scholar A. A. Luce, who introduced him to the work of Henri Bergson). He was elected a Scholar in Modern Languages in 1926. Beckett graduated with a BA and, after teaching briefly at Campbell College in Belfast, took up the post of lecteur d'anglais at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris

from November 1928 to 1930.[9] While there, he was introduced to renowned Irish author James Joyce by Thomas MacGreevy, a poet and close confidant of Beckett who also worked there. This meeting had a profound effect on the young man. Beckett assisted Joyce in various ways, one of which was research towards the book that became Finnegans Wake.

In 1929, Beckett published his first work, a critical essay entitled "Dante... Bruno. Vico.. Joyce". The essay defends Joyce's work and method, chiefly from allegations of wanton obscurity and dimness, and was Beckett's contribution to Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress (a book of essays on Joyce which also included contributions by Eugene Jolas, Robert McAlmon, and William Carlos Williams). Beckett's close relationship with Joyce and his family cooled, however, when he rejected the advances of Joyce's daughter Lucia owing to her progressing schizophrenia. Beckett's first short story, "Assumption", was published in Jolas's periodical transition. The next year he won a small literary prize for his hastily composed poem "Whoroscope", which draws on a biography of René Descartes that Beckett happened to be reading when he was encouraged to submit.

In 1930, Beckett returned to Trinity College as a lecturer. In November 1930, he presented a paper in French to the Modern Languages Society of Trinity on the Toulouse poet Jean du Chas, founder of a movement called le Concentrisme. It was a literary parody, for Beckett had in fact invented the poet and his movement that claimed to be "at odds with all that is clear and distinct in Descartes". Beckett later insisted that he had not intended to fool his audience.When Beckett resigned from Trinity at the end of 1931, his brief academic career was at an end. He commemorated it with the poem "Gnome", which was inspired by his reading of Johann Wolfgang Goethe's Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship and eventually published in The Dublin Magazine in 1934:

Spend the years of learning squandering
Courage for the years of wandering

Through a world politely turning

From the loutishness of learning

Beckett travelled in Europe. He spent some time in London, where in 1931 he published Proust, his critical study of French author Marcel Proust. Two years later, following his father's death, he began two years' treatment with Tavistock Clinic psychoanalyst Dr. Wilfred Bion. Aspects of it became evident in Beckett's later works, such as Watt and Waiting for Godot.In 1932, he wrote his first novel, Dream of Fair to Middling Women, but after many rejections from publishers decided to abandon it (it was eventually published in 1992). Despite his inability to get it published, however, the novel served as a source for many of Beckett's early poems, as well as for his first full-length book, the 1933 short-story collection More Pricks Than Kicks.

Beckett published essays and reviews, including "Recent Irish Poetry" (in The Bookman, August 1934) and "Humanistic Quietism", a review of his friend Thomas MacGreevy's Poems (in The Dublin Magazine, July–September 1934). They focused on the work of MacGreevy, Brian Coffey, Denis Devlin and Blanaid Salkeld, despite their slender achievements at the time, comparing them favorably with their Celtic Revival contemporaries and invoking Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, and the French symbolists as their precursors. In describing these poets as forming "the nucleus of a living poetic in Ireland", Beckett was tracing the outlines of an Irish poetic modernist canon.

In 1935—the year that Beckett successfully published a book of his poetry, Echo's Bones and Other Precipitates—Beckett worked on his novel Murphy. In May, he wrote to MacGreevy that he had been reading about film and wished to go to Moscow to study with Sergei Eisenstein at the Gerasimov Institute of Cinematography in Moscow. In mid-1936 he wrote to Eisenstein and Vsevolod Pudovkin to offer himself as their apprentice. Nothing came of this, however, as Beckett's letter was lost owing to Eisenstein's quarantine during the smallpox outbreak, as well as his focus on a script re-write of his postponed film production. In 1936, a friend had suggested him to look up the works of Arnold Geulincx,

which Beckett did, and he took many notes. The philosopher's name is mentioned in Murphy and the reading apparently left a strong impression.Murphy was finished in 1936 and Beckett departed for extensive travel around Germany, during which time he filled several notebooks with lists of noteworthy artwork that he had seen and noted his distaste for the Nazi savagery that was overtaking the country. Returning to Ireland briefly in 1937, he oversaw the publication of Murphy (1938), which he translated into French the following year. He fell out with his mother, which contributed to his decision to settle permanently in Paris. Beckett remained in Paris following the outbreak of World War II in 1939, preferring, in his own words, "France at war to Ireland at peace".His was soon a known face in and around Left Bank cafés, where he strengthened his allegiance with Joyce and forged new ones with artists Alberto Giacometti and Marcel Duchamp, with whom he regularly played chess. Sometime around December 1937, Beckett had a brief affair with Peggy Guggenheim, who nicknamed him "Oblomov" (after the character in Ivan Goncharov's novel).

In January 1938 in Paris, Beckett was stabbed in the chest and nearly killed when he refused the solicitations of a notorious pimp (who went by the name of Prudent). Joyce arranged a private room for Beckett at the hospital. The publicity surrounding the stabbing attracted the attention of Suzanne Dechevaux-Dumesnil, who previously knew Beckett slightly from his first stay in Paris. This time, however, the two would begin a lifelong companionship. At a preliminary hearing, Beckett asked his attacker for the motive behind the stabbing. Prudent replied: "Je ne sais pas, Monsieur. Je m'excuse" ["I do not know, sir. I'm sorry"]. Beckett eventually dropped the charges against his attacker—partially to avoid further formalities, partly because he found Prudent likeable and well-mannered.

World War II and French Resistance

After the Nazi German occupation of France in 1940, Beckett joined the French Resistance, in which he worked as a courier. On several occasions over the next two years he was nearly caught by the Gestapo.

In August 1942, his unit was betrayed and he and Suzanne fled south on foot to the safety of the small village of Roussillon, in the Vaucluse département in Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur. There he continued to assist the Resistance by storing armaments in the back yard of his home. During the two years that Beckett stayed in Roussillon he indirectly helped the Maquis sabotage the Germanarmy in the Vaucluse mountains, though he rarely spoke about his wartime work in later life.

Beckett was awarded the Croix de guerre and the Médaille de la Résistance by the French government for his efforts in fighting the German occupation; to the end of his life, however, Beckett would refer to his work with the French Resistance as "boy scout stuff".While in hiding in Roussillon, he continued work on the novel Watt (begun in 1941 and completed in 1945, but not published until 1953, though an extract had appeared in the Dublin literary periodical Envoy).

Fame: novels and the theatre

In 1945, Beckett returned to Dublin for a brief visit. During his stay, he had a revelation in his mother's room: His entire future direction in literature appeared to him. Beckett had felt that he would remain forever in the shadow of Joyce, certain to never best him at his own game. His revelation prompted him to change direction and to acknowledge both his own stupidity and his interest in ignorance and impotence:

"I realized that Joyce had gone as far as one could in the direction of knowing more, [being] in control of one's material. He was always adding to it; you only have to look at his proofs to see that. I realized that my own way was in impoverishment, in lack of knowledge and in taking away, in subtracting rather than in adding."

Knowlson argues that "Beckett was rejecting the Joycean principle that knowing more was a way of creatively understanding the world and controlling it ... In future, his work would focus on poverty, failure, exile and loss – as he put it, on man as a 'non-knower' and as a 'non-can-er.'"The revelation "has rightly been regarded as a pivotal moment in his entire career". Beckett fictionalized the experience in his play Krapp's

Last Tape (1958). While listening to a tape he made earlier in his life, Krapp hears his younger self say "clear to me at last that the dark I have always struggled to keep under is in reality my most...", at which point Krapp fast-forwards the tape (before the audience can hear the complete revelation). Beckett later explained to Knowlson that the missing words on the tape are "precious ally".

In 1946, Jean-Paul Sartre’s magazine Les Temps modernes published the first part of Beckett's short story "Suite" (later to be called "La Fin", or "The End"), not realising that Beckett had only submitted the first half of the story; Simone de Beauvoir refused to publish the second part. Beckett also began to write his fourth novel, Mercier et Camier, which was not published until 1970. The novel presaged his most famous work, the play Waiting for Godot, which was written not long afterwards. More importantly, the novel was Beckett's first long work that he wrote in French, the language of most of his subsequent works which were strongly supported by Jérôme Lindon, director of his Parisian publishing house Les Éditions de Minuit, including the poioumenon "trilogy" of novels: Molloy (1951); Malone meurt (1951), Malone Dies (1958); L'innommable (1953), The Unnamable (1960). Despite being a native English speaker, Beckett wrote in French because—as he himself claimed—it was easier for him thus to write "without style".

Beckett is most famous for his play En attendant Godot (1953) (Waiting for Godot). Like most of his works after 1947, the play was first written in French with the title En attendant Godot. Beckett worked on the play between October 1948 and January 1949. His partner, Suzanne Dechevaux-Dumesnil, was integral to its success. Dechevaux-Dumesnil became his agent and sent the manuscript to multiple producers until they met Roger Blin, the soon-to-be director of the play.

Blin's knowledge of French theatre and vision alongside Beckett knowing what he wanted the play to represent contributed greatly to its success. In a much-quoted article, the critic Vivian Mercier wrote that Beckett "has achieved a theoretical impossibility—a play in which nothing happens, that yet keeps audiences glued to their seats. What's

more, since the second act is a subtly different reprise of the first, he has written a play in which nothing happens, twice." The play was published in 1952 and premièred in 1953 in Paris; an English translation was performed two years later. The play was a critical, popular, and controversial success in Paris. It opened in London in 1955 to mainly negative reviews, but the tide turned with positive reactions from Harold Hobson in The Sunday Times and, later, Kenneth Tynan. After the showing in Miami, the play became extremely popular, with highly successful performances in the US and Germany. The play is a favourite: it is not only performed frequently but has globally inspired playwrights to emulate it. This is the sole play the manuscript of which Beckett never sold,donated or gave away. He refused to allow the play to be translated into film but did allow it to be played on television.

Beckett translated all of his works into English himself, with the exception of Molloy, for which he collaborated with Patrick Bowles. The success of Waiting for Godot opened up a career in theatre for its author. Beckett went on to write successful full-length plays, including Fin de partie (Endgame) (1957), Krapp's Last Tape (1958, written in English), Happy Days (1961, also written in English), and Play (1963). In 1961, Beckett received the International Publishers' Formentor Prize in recognition of his work, which he shared that year with Jorge Luis Borges.

Later life and death

The 1960s were a time of change for Beckett, both on a personal level and as a writer. In 1961, he married Suzanne in a secret civil ceremony in England (its secrecy due to reasons relating to French inheritance law). The success of his plays led to invitations to attend rehearsals and productions around the world, leading eventually to a new career as a theatre director. In 1957, he had his first commission from the BBC Third Programme for a radio play, All That Fall. He continued writing sporadically for radio and extended his scope to include cinema and

television. He began to write in English again, although he also wrote in French until the end of his life.

Beckett bought some land in 1953 near a hamlet around 60 kilometers (40 mi) northeast of Paris and built a cottage for himself with the help of some locals.

From the late 1950s until his death, Beckett had a relationship with Barbara Bray, a widow who worked as a script editor for the BBC. Knowlson wrote of them: "She was small and attractive, but, above all, keenly intelligent and well-read. Beckett seems to have been immediately attracted by her and her to him. Their encounter was highly significant for them both, for it represented the beginning of a relationship that was to last, in parallel with that with Suzanne, for the rest of his life." Barbara Bray died in Edinburgh on 25 February 2010.

In October 1969 while on holiday in Tunis with Suzanne, Beckett heard that he had won the Nobel Prize for Literature. Anticipating that her intensely private husband would be saddled with fame from that moment on, Suzanne called the award a "catastrophe". In true ascetic fashion, he gave away all of the prize money. While Beckett did not devote much time to interviews, he sometimes met the artists, scholars, and admirers who sought him out in the anonymous lobby of the Hotel PLM St. Jacques in Paris near his Montparnasse home.Although Beckett was an intensely private man, a review of the second volume of his letters by Roy Foster in the 15 December 2011 issue of The New Republic reveals Beckett to be not only unexpectedly amiable but frequently prepared to talk about his work and the process behind it.

Suzanne died on 17 July 1989. Confined to a nursing home and suffering from emphysema and possibly Parkinson's disease, Beckett died on 22 December. The two were interred together in the cimetière du Montparnasse in Paris and share a simple granite gravestone that follows Beckett's directive that it should be "any colour, so long as it's grey".

Works

Beckett's career as a writer can be roughly divided into three periods: his early works, up until the end of World War II in 1945; his middle period, stretching from 1945 until the early 1960s, during which he wrote what are probably his best-known works; and his late period, from the early 1960s until Beckett's death in 1989, during which his works tended to become shorter and his style more minimalist.

Early works

Beckett's earliest works are generally considered to have been strongly influenced by the work of his friend James Joyce. They are erudite and seem to display the author's learning merely for its own sake, resulting in several obscure passages. The opening phrases of the short-storycollection More Pricks than Kicks (1934) affords a representative sample of this style:

It was morning and Belacqua was stuck in the first of the canti in the moon. He was so bogged that he could move neither backward nor forward. Blissful Beatrice was there, Dante also, and she explained the spots on the moon to him. She shewed him in the first place where he was at fault, then she put up her own explanation. She had it from God, therefore he could rely on its being accurate in every particular.

The passage makes reference to Dante's Commedia, which can serve to confuse readers not familiar with that work. It also anticipates aspects of Beckett's later work: the physical inactivity of the character Belacqua; the character's immersion in his own head and thoughts; the somewhat irreverent comedy of the final sentence.

Similar elements are present in Beckett's first published novel, Murphy (1938), which also explores the themes of insanity and chess (both of which would be recurrent elements in Beckett's later works). The novel's opening sentence hints at the somewhat pessimistic undertones and black humour that animate many of Beckett's works: "The sun shone, having

no alternative, on the nothing new". Watt, written while Beckett was in hiding in Roussillon during World War II, is similar in terms of themes but less exuberant in its style. It explores human movement as if it were a mathematical permutation, presaging Beckett's later preoccupation—in both his novels and dramatic works—with precise movement.

Beckett's 1930 essay Proust was strongly influenced by Schopenhauer's pessimism and laudatory descriptions of saintly asceticism. At this time Beckett began to write creatively in the French language. In the late 1930s, he wrote a number of short poems in that language and their sparseness—in contrast to the density of his English poems of roughly the same period, collected in Echo's Bones and Other Precipitates (1935)—seems to show that Beckett, albeit through the medium of another language, was in process of simplifying his style, a change also evidenced in Watt.

Middle period

After World War II, Beckett turned definitively to the French language as a vehicle. It was this, together with the "revelation" experienced in his mother's room in Dublin—in which he realised that his art must be subjective and drawn wholly from his own inner world—that would result in the works for which Beckett is best remembered today.

During the 15 years following the war, Beckett produced four major full-length stage plays: En attendant Godot (written 1948–1949; Waiting for Godot), Fin de partie (1955–1957; Endgame), Krapp's Last Tape (1958), and Happy Days (1961). These plays—which are often considered, rightly or wrongly, to have been instrumental in the so-called "Theatre of the Absurd"—deal in a darkly humorous way with themes similar to those of the roughly contemporary existentialist thinkers. The term "Theatre of the Absurd" was coined by Martin Esslin in a book of the same name; Beckett and Godot were centerpieces of the book. Esslin argued these plays were the fulfilment of Albert Camus's concept of "the absurd"; this is one reason Beckett is often falsely labelled as an

existentialist (this is based on the assumption that Camus was an existentialist, though he in fact broke off from the existentialist movement and founded his own philosophy). Though many of the themes are similar, Beckett had little affinity for existentialism as a whole.

Broadly speaking, the plays deal with the subject of despair and the will to survive in spite of that despair, in the face of an uncomprehending and incomprehensible world. The words of Nell—one of the two characters in Endgame who are trapped in ashbins, from which they occasionally peek their heads to speak—can best summarise the themes of the plays of Beckett's middle period: "Nothing is funnier than unhappiness, I grant you that. ... Yes, yes, it's the most comical thing in the world. And we laugh, we laugh, with a will, in the beginning. But it's always the same thing. Yes, it's like the funny story we have heard too often, we still find it funny, but we don't laugh any more."

Beckett's outstanding achievements in prose during the period were the three novels Molloy (1951), Malone meurt (1951; Malone Dies) and L'innommable (1953: The Unnamable). In these novels—sometimes referred to as a "trilogy", though this is against the author's own explicit wishes—the prose becomes increasingly bare and stripped down. Molloy, for instance, still retains many of the characteristics of a conventional novel (time, place, movement, and plot) and it makes use of the structure of a detective novel. In Malone Dies, movement and plot are largely dispensed with, though there is still some indication of place and the passage of time; the "action" of the book takes the form of an interior monologue. Finally, in The Unnamable, almost all sense of place and time are abolished, and the essential theme seems to be the conflict between the voice's drive to continue speaking so as to continue existing, and its almost equally strong urge towards silence and oblivion. Despite the widely held view that Beckett's work, as exemplified by the novels of this period, is essentially pessimistic, the will to live seems to win out in the end; witness, for instance, the famous final phrase of The Unnamable: 'I can't go on, I'll go on'.

After these three novels, Beckett struggled for many years to produce a sustained work of prose, a struggle evidenced by the brief "stories" later collected as Texts for Nothing. In the late 1950s, however, he created one of his most radical prose works, Comment c'est (1961; How It Is). An early variant version of Comment c'est, L'Image, was published in the British arts review, X: A Quarterly Review (1959), and is the first appearance of the novel in any form.). This work relates the adventures of an unnamed narrator crawling through the mud while dragging a sack of canned food. It was written as a sequence of unpunctuated paragraphs in a style approaching telegraphese: "You are there somewhere alive somewhere vast stretch of time then it's over you are there no more alive no more than again you are there again alive again it wasn't over an error you begin again all over more or less in the same place or in another as when another image above in the light you come to in hospital in the dark" Following this work, it was almost another decade before Beckett produced a work of non-dramatic prose. How it is generally considered to mark the end of his middle period as a writer.

Late works

Throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, Beckett's works exhibited an increasing tendency—already evident in much of his work of the 1950s—towards compactness. This has led to his work sometimes being described as minimalist. The extreme example of this, among his dramatic works, is the 1969-piece Breath, which lasts for only 35 seconds and has no characters (though it was likely intended to offer ironic comment on Oh! Calcutta!, the theatrical revue for which it served as an introductory piece).

In his theatre of the late period, Beckett's characters—already few in number in the earlier plays—are whittled down to essential elements. The ironically titled Play (1962), for instance, consists of three characters immersed up to their necks in large funeral urns. The television drama Eh Joe (1963), which was written for the actor Jack MacGowran, is

animated by a camera that steadily closes in to a tight focus upon the face of the title character. The play Not I (1972) consists almost solely of, in Beckett's words, "a moving mouth with the rest of the stage in darkness".Following from Krapp's Last Tape, many of these later plays explore memory, often in the form of a forced recollection of haunting past events in a moment of stillness in the present. They also deal with the theme of the self confined and observed, with a voice that either comes from outside into the protagonist's head (as in Eh Joe) or else another character comments on the protagonist silently, by means of gesture (as in Not I). Beckett's most politically charged play, Catastrophe (1982), which was dedicated to Václav Havel, deals relatively explicitly with the idea of dictatorship. After a long period of inactivity, Beckett's poetry experienced a revival during this period in the ultra-terse French poems of mirlitonnades, with some as short as six words long. These defied Beckett's usual scrupulous concern to translate his work from its original into the other of his two languages; several writers, including Derek Mahon, have attempted translations, but no complete version of the sequence has been published in English.

Beckett's prose pieces during the late period were not so prolific as his theatre, as suggested by the title of the 1976 collection of short prose texts Fizzles (which the American artist Jasper Johns illustrated). Beckett experienced something of a renaissance with the novella Company (1980), which continued with Ill Seen Ill Said (1982) and Worstward Ho (1984), later collected in Nohow On. In these three "'closed space' stories," Beckett continued his preoccupation with memory and its effect on the confined and observed self, as well as with the positioning of bodies in space, as the opening phrases of Company make clear: "A voice comes to one in the dark. Imagine." "To one on his back in the dark. This he can tell by the pressure on his hind parts and by how the dark changes when he shuts his eyes and again when he opens them again. Only a small part of what is said can be verified. As for example when he hears, You are on your back in the dark. Then he must acknowledge the truth of what is said."Themes of aloneness and the

doomed desire to successfully connect with other human beings are expressed in several late pieces, including Company and Rockaby.

In the hospital and nursing home where he spent his final days, Beckett wrote his last work, the 1988 poem "What is the Word" ("Comment dire"). The poem grapples with an inability to find words to express oneself, a theme echoing Beckett's earlier work, though possibly amplified by the sickness he experienced late in life.

Collaborators

Jack MacGowran

Jack MacGowran was the first actor to do a one-man show based on the works of Beckett. He debuted End of Day in Dublin in 1962, revising it as Beginning To End (1965). The show went through further revisions before Beckett directed it in Paris in 1970; MacGowran won the 1970–1971 Obie for Best Performance By an Actor when he performed the show off-Broadway as Jack MacGowran in the Works of Samuel Beckett. Beckett wrote the radio play Embers and the teleplay Eh Joe specifically for MacGowran. The actor also appeared in various productions of Waiting for Godot and Endgame, and did several readings of Beckett's plays and poems on BBC Radio; he also recorded the LP, MacGowran Speaking Beckett for Claddagh Records in 1966.

Billie Whitelaw

Billie Whitelaw worked with Beckett for 25 years on such plays as Not I, Eh Joe, Footfalls and Rockaby. She first met Beckett in 1963. In her autobiography Billie Whitelaw...: Who He?, she describes their first meeting in 1963 was "trust at first sight". Beckett went on to write many of his experimental theatre works for her. She came to be regarded as his muse, the "supreme interpreter of his work", perhaps most famous for her role as the mouth in Not I. She said of the play Rockaby: "I put the tape in my head. And I sort of look in a particular way, but not at the

audience. Sometimes as a director Beckett comes out with absolute gems and I use them a lot in other areas. We were doing Happy Days and I just did not know where in the theatre to look during this particular section. And I asked, and he thought for a bit and then said, 'Inward' ". She said of her role in Footfalls: "I felt like a moving, musical Edvard Munch painting and, in fact, when Beckett was directing Footfalls he was not only using me to play the notes but I almost felt that he did have the paintbrush out and was painting.""Sam knew that I would turn myself inside out to give him what he wanted", she explained. "With all of Sam's work, the scream was there, my task was to try to get it out." She stopped performing his plays in 1989 when he died.

Jocelyn Herbert

The English stage designer Jocelyn Herbert was a close friend and influence on Beckett until his death. She worked with him on such plays as Happy Days (their third project) and Krapp's Last Tape at the Royal Court Theatre. Beckett said that Herbert became his closest friend in England: "She has a great feeling for the work and is very sensitive and doesn't want to bang the nail on the head. Generally speaking, there is a tendency on the part of designers to overstate, and this has never been the case with Jocelyn."

Walter Asmus

The distinguished German director Walter D. Asmus began his working relationship with Beckett in the Schiller Theatre in Berlin in 1974 and continued until 1989, the year of the playwright's death. Asmus has directed all of Beckett's plays internationally.

Legacy

Of all the English-language modernists, Beckett's work represents the most sustained attack on the realist tradition. He opened up the possibility of theatre and fiction that dispense with conventional plot and

the unities of time and place in order to focus on essential components of the human condition. Václav Havel, John Banville, Aidan Higgins, Tom Stoppard, Harold Pinter and Jon Fosse have publicly stated their indebtedness to Beckett's example. He has had a wider influence on experimental writing since the 1950s, from the Beat generation to the happenings of the 1960s and after. In an Irish context, he has exerted great influence on poets such as Derek Mahon and Thomas Kinsella, as well as writers like Trevor Joyce and Catherine Walsh who proclaim their adherence to the modernist tradition as an alternative to the dominant realist mainstream.

Many major 20th-century composers including Luciano Berio, György Kurtág, Morton Feldman, Pascal Dusapin, Philip Glass, Roman Haubenstock-Ramati and Heinz Holliger have created musical works based on Beckett's texts. His work has also influenced numerous international writers, artists and filmmakers including Edward Albee, Avigdor Arikha, Paul Auster, J. M. Coetzee,Richard Kalich, Douglas Gordon, Bruce Nauman, Anthony Minghella,Damian Pettigrew and Charlie Kaufman.

Beckett is one of the most widely discussed and highly prized of 20th-century authors, inspiring a critical industry to rival that which has sprung up around James Joyce. He has divided critical opinion. Some early philosophical critics, such as Sartre and Theodor Adorno, praised him, one for his revelation of absurdity, the other for his works' critical refusal of simplicities; others such as Georg Lukács condemned him for 'decadent' lack of realism.

Since Beckett's death, all rights for performance of his plays are handled by the Beckett estate, currently managed by Edward Beckett (the author's nephew). The estate has a controversial reputation for maintaining firm control over how Beckett's plays are performed and does not grant licences to productions that do not adhere to the writer's stage directions.

Historians interested in tracing Beckett's blood line were, in 2004, granted access to confirmed trace samples of his DNA to conduct molecular genealogical studies to facilitate precise lineage determination.

Some of the best-known pictures of Beckett were taken by photographer John Minihan, who photographed him between 1980 and 1985 and developed such a good relationship with the writer that he became, in effect, his official photographer. Some consider one of these to be among the top three photographs of the 20th century. It was the theatre photographer John Haynes, however, who took possibly the most widely reproduced image of Beckett: it is used on the cover of the Knowlson biography, for instance. This portrait was taken during rehearsals of the San Quentin Drama Workshop at the Royal Court Theatre in London, where Haynes photographed many productions of Beckett's work.An Post, the Irish postal service, issued a commemorative stamp of Beckett in 1994. The Central Bank of Ireland launched two Samuel Beckett Centenary commemorative coins on 26 April 2006: €10 Silver Coin and €20 Gold Coin.

On 10 December 2009, the new bridge across the River Liffey in Dublin was opened and named the Samuel Beckett Bridge in his honour. Reminiscent of a harp on its side, it was designed by the celebrated Spanish architect Santiago Calatrava, who had also designed the James Joyce Bridge further upstream opened on Bloomsday (16 June) 2003. Attendees at the official opening ceremony included Beckett's niece Caroline Murphy, his nephew Edward Beckett, poet Seamus Heaney and Barry McGovern.The newest ship of the Irish Naval Service, the LÉ Samuel Beckett (P61), is named for Beckett. An Ulster History Circle blue plaque in his memory is located at Portora Royal School, Enniskillen, County Fermanagh.

Happy Days Enniskillen International Beckett Festival is an annual multi-arts festival celebrating the work and influence of Beckett. The festival, founded in 2011, is held at Enniskillen, Northern Ireland where Beckett spent his formative years studying at Portora Royal School.

In 1983, the Samuel Beckett Award was established for writers who in the opinion of a committee of critics, producers and publishers, showed innovation and excellence in writing for the performing arts. In 2003, The Oxford Samuel Beckett Theatre Trust was formed to support the showcasing of new innovative theatre at the Barbican Centre in the City of London.

Music for three Samuel Beckett plays (Words and Music, Cascando, and ...but the clouds...), was composed by Martin Pearlman which was commissioned by the 92nd Street Y in New York for the Beckett centennial and produced there and at Harvard University.

In January 2019 Beckett was the subject of the BBC Radio 4 programme In Our Time.

Samuel Beckett's prolific career is spread across archives around the world. Significant collections include those at the Harry Ransom Center,Washington University, the University of Reading, Trinity College, Dublin, and Houghton Library. Given the scattered nature of these collections, an effort has been made to create a digital repository through the University of Antwerp.

Honours and awards

- Croix de guerre (France)
- Médaille de la Résistance (France)
- 1959 honorary doctorate from Trinity College, Dublin
- 1961 International Publishers' Formentor Prize (shared with Jorge Luis Borges).
- 1968 Foreign Honorary Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences
- 1969 Nobel Prize for Literature.
- Saoi of Aosdana (Ireland)

- 2016 The house that Beckett lived at in 1934 (48 Paultons Square, Chelsea, London) has received an English Heritage Blue Plaque

Selected works by Beckett

Dramatic works

Theatre

- Human Wishes (c. 1936; published 1984)
- Eleutheria (written 1947 in French; published in French 1995, and English 1996)
- En attendant Godot (published 1952, performed 1953) (Waiting for Godot, pub. 1954, perf. 1955)[82]
- Acte sans Paroles I (1956); Act Without Words I (1957)
- Acte sans Paroles II (1956); Act Without Words II (1957)
- Fin de partie (published 1957); Endgame (published 1957)
- Krapp's Last Tape (first performed 1958)
- Fragment de théâtre I (late 1950s); Rough for Theatre I
- Fragment de théâtre II (late 1950s); Rough for Theatre II
- Happy Days (first performed 1961); Oh les beaux jours (published 1963)
- Play (performed in German, as Spiel, 1963; English version 1964)
- Come and Go (first performed in German, then English, 1966)
- Breath (first performed 1969)
- Not I (first performed 1972)
- That Time (first performed 1976)
- Footfalls (first performed 1976)
- Neither (1977) (An "opera", music by Morton Feldman)
- A Piece of Monologue (first performed 1979)
- Rockaby (first performed 1981)
- Ohio Impromptu (first performed 1981)
- Catastrophe (Catastrophe et autres dramatiques, first performed 1982)
- What Where (first performed 1983)

Notes

Prose

- The Trilogy
- Molloy (1951); English version (1955)
- Malone meurt (1951); Malone Dies (1956)
- L'innommable (1953); The Unnamable (1958)

Novels

- Dream of Fair to Middling Women (written 1932; published 1992)
- Murphy (1938); 1947 Beckett's French version
- Watt (1953); 1968, Beckett's French version
- Comment c'est (1961); How It Is (1964)
- Mercier and Camier (written 1946, published 1970); English translation (1974)

Short prose

- More Pricks Than Kicks (1934)
- "Echo's Bones" (written 1933, published 2014)
- "L'Expulsé", written 1946, in Nouvelles et Textes pour rien (1955); "The Expelled" Stories and Texts for Nothing (1967)[84]
- "Le Calmant", written 1946, in Nouvelles et Textes pour rien (1955); "The Calmative", Stories and Texts for Nothing (1967)
- "La Fin", written 1946, partially published in Les Temps Modernes in 1946 as "Suite"; in Nouvelles et Textes pour rien (1955); "The End", Stories and Texts for Nothing (1967)
- "Texts for Nothing", translated into French for Nouvelles et Textes pour rien (1955); Stories and Texts for Nothing (1967)[85]
- "L'Image" (1959) a fragment from Comment c'est[86]
- '"Premier Amour" (1970, written 1946); translated by Beckett as "First Love", 1973[82]
- Le Dépeupleur (1970); The Lost Ones (1971)
- Pour finir encore et autres foirades (1976); For to End Yet Again and Other Fizzles (1976)
- Company (1980)
- Mal vu mal dit (1981); Ill Seen Ill Said (1982)
- Worstward Ho (1983)

- "Stirrings Still" (1988)
- "As the Story was Told" (1990)
- The Complete Short Prose: 1929–1989, ed S. E. Gontarski. New York: Grove Press, 1995

Poetry collections

- Whoroscope (1930)
- Echo's Bones and other Precipitates (1935)
- Poèmes (1968, expanded 1976, 1979, 1992)migrationid:060807crbo_books| Search : The New Yorker
- Poems in English (1961)
- Collected Poems in English and French (1977)
- What is the Word (1989)
- Selected Poems 1930–1989 (2009)
- The Collected Poems of Samuel Beckett, edited, annotated by Seán Lawlor, John Pilling (2012, Faber and Faber, 2014, Grove Press)

Radio

- All That Fall (broadcast 1957)
- From an Abandoned Work (broadcast 1957)
- Embers (broadcast 1959)
- Rough for Radio I (published 1976) (written in French in 1961 as Esquisse radiophonique)
- Rough for Radio II (published 1976) (written in French in 1961 as Pochade radiophonique)
- Words and Music (broadcast 1962)
- Cascando (broadcast:1963 French version; 1964 English translation)

Television

- Eh Joe with Jack MacGowran (broadcast 1966)[83]
- Beginning To End with Jack MacGowran (1965)
- Ghost Trio (broadcast 1977)
- ... but the clouds ... (broadcast 1977)
- Quad I + II (broadcast 1981)

- Nacht und Träume (broadcast 1983); Night and Dreams, published 1984
- Beckett Directs Beckett (1988/92)

Cinema

Film (1965)

Non-fiction

- "Dante...Bruno. Vico..Joyce" (1929; Beckett's contribution to the collection Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress)
- Proust (1931)
- Three Dialogues (with Georges Duthuit and Jacques Putnam) (1949)
- Disjecta: Miscellaneous Writings and a Dramatic Fragment (1929–1967)

Translation collections and long works

- Anna Livia Plurabelle (James Joyce, French translation by Beckett and others) (1931)
- Negro: An Anthology (Nancy Cunard, editor) (1934)
- Anthology of Mexican Poems (Octavio Paz, editor) (1958)
- The Old Tune (Robert Pinget) (1963)
- What Is Surrealism? Selected Essays (André Breton) (various short pieces in the collection)

Check your progress – 1

1. Who was Samuel Beckett?

____

____

____

____

2. When did Samuel Beckett win Nobel Prize for Literature?

____

____

____

3. In which year was he elected as Saoi of Aosdána?

4. Where was Samuel Beckett born?

5. When was Samuel Beckett born?

5.3 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we read about Samuel Becketts life and education.

5.4 KEYWORDS

1. **Abstraction**: An abstraction is something that you can't directly experience using your five senses. Love. War. Culture. If you know it exists, but you can't see it, smell it, taste it, touch it, or hear it, that's an abstraction.
2. **Catastrophe**: The catastrophe is a pivotal point in the plot of a story, especially classical tragedies. It comes after the climax and before the dénouement, and, well, it's about as bad as it sounds.
3. **Climax**: The climax is the most intense part of the story—when everything hits the fan, and you're not quite sure yet how it's all going to play out. On Freytag's triangle, a diagram we use to talk about the structure of a plot, the climax is right there at the tippy top. It's the turning point, the point of no return, the moment when everything changes.

4. **Conflict**: Any fan of reality television knows all about conflict. Whether in a novel, a play or the latest episode of Survivor, conflict is what drives the plot and fuels the action.

How do authors build conflict in literature? Well, in lots of different ways. Conflict can occur between two characters, like the struggle between Victor Frankenstein and the Monster in Mary Shelley's novel Frankenstein. Often these scenarios will play out as a struggle between protagonist and antagonist.

Or a character can be in conflict with an external force like nature or society in general. Macbeth, for example, seems to be struggling against time. J.D. Salinger's oh-so-alienated protagonist Holden Caulfield is in conflict with society in The Catcher in the Rye. In Mark Twain's Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Huck bumps up against the rules and order of the antebellum South.

Conflict can be internal, too. Lots of novels are interested in their protagonist's inner struggles, such as those of Humbert Humbert in Vladimir Nabokov's Lolita or Henry Fleming in Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage.

5.5 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Write a brief note on Samuel Beckett’s work.
2. Write a brief note on Samuel Beckett’s life.
3. Write a short note on Samuel Beckett’s education.
4. Write a short note on Samuel Beckett’s legacy.

5.6 SUGGESTED READINGS AND WRITINGS

1. Fathoms from Anywhere – A Samuel Beckett Centenary Exhibition".

2. ^ Muldoon, Paul (12 December 2014). "The Letters and Poems of Samuel Beckett". The New York Times. Retrieved 13 December 2014.

3. ^ Cakirtas, O. Developmental Psychology Rediscovered: Negative Identity and Ego Integrity vs. Despair in Samuel Beckett's Endgame. International Journal of Language Academy.Volume 2/2 Summer 2014 p. 194/203. http://www.ijla.net/Makaleler/1990731560_13.%20.pdf

4. ^ "The Nobel Prize in Literature 1969". Nobel Foundation. 7 October 2010. Retrieved 7 October 2010.

5. ^ "Samuel beckett −1906-1989". Imagi-nation.com. Retrieved 12 December 2013.

6. ^ "Samuel Beckett". Wisden Cricketers' Almanack. ESPNcricinfo. Retrieved 6 March2011.

5.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Samuel Barclay Beckett was an Irish novelist, playwright, short story writer, theatre director, poet, and literary translator. **(answer to check your progress – 1Q1)**
2. Samuel Beckett won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1969. **(answer to check your progress – 1Q2)**
3. Samuel Beckett was elected as Saoi of Aosdána in 1984. **(answer to check your progress – 1Q3)**
4. Samuel Beckett was born in Dublin. **(answer to check your progress – 1Q4)**
5. Samuel Beckett was born on13th April 1906. (**answer to check your progress – 1 Q5)**

UNIT 6. BECKETT - WAITING FOR GODOT - 2

STRUCTURE

6.0 Objectives

6.1 Introduction

6.2 Plot

6.3 Characters

6.4 Themes

6.5 Setting

6.6 Works Inspired by Godot

6.7 In Popular Culture

6.8 Let us sum up

6.9 Keywords

6.10 Questions for review

6.11 Suggested readings and writings

6.12 Answers to check your progress

6.0 OBJECTIVES

After the completion of this unit you should be able to learn about:

- theplot, characters, themes, setting and the works which were inspired by "Waiting for Godot" by Samuel Beckett.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Waiting for Godot is a play by Samuel Beckett, in which two characters, Vladimir (Didi) and Estragon (Gogo), wait for the arrival of someone named Godot who never arrives, and while waiting they engage in a variety of discussions and encounter three other characters. Waiting for Godot is Beckett's translation of his own original French-language play, En attendant Godot, and is subtitled (in English only) "a tragicomedy in two acts". The original French text was composed between 9 October 1948 and 29 January 1949. The premiere, directed by Roger Blin, was on

5 January 1953 at the Théâtre de Babylone, Paris. The English-language version premiered in London in 1955. In a poll conducted by the British Royal National Theatre in 1990, it was voted the "most significant English language play of the 20th century".

6.2 PLOT

Act I

The play opens on an outdoor scene of two bedraggled companions: the philosophical Vladimir and the weary Estragon who, at the moment, cannot remove his boots from his aching feet, finally muttering, "Nothing to be done." Vladimir takes up the thought loftily, while Estragon vaguely recalls having been beaten the night before. Finally, his boots come off, while the pair ramble and bicker pointlessly. When Estragon suddenly decides to leave, Vladimir reminds him that they must stay and wait for an unspecified person called Godot—a segment of dialogue that repeats often. Unfortunately, the pair cannot agree on where or when they are expected to meet with this Godot. They only know to wait at a tree, and there is indeed a leafless one nearby.

Eventually, Estragon dozes off and Vladimir rouses him but then stops him before he can share his dreams—another recurring activity between the two men. Estragon wants to hear an old joke, which Vladimir cannot finish without going off to urinate, since every time he starts laughing, a kidney ailment flares up. Upon Vladimir's return, the increasingly jaded Estragon suggests that they hang themselves, but they abandon the idea when the logistics seem ineffective. They then speculate on the potential rewards of continuing to wait for Godot, but can come to no definite conclusions.When Estragon declares his hunger, Vladimir provides a carrot (among a collection of turnips), at which Estragon idly gnaws, loudly reiterating his boredom.
"A terrible cry" heralds the entrance of Lucky, a silent, baggage-burdened slave with a rope tied around his neck, and Pozzo, his arrogant and imperious master, who holds the other end and stops now to rest.

Pozzo barks abusive orders at Lucky, which are always quietly followed, while acting civilly though tersely towards the other two. Pozzo enjoys a selfish snack of chicken and wine, before casting the bones to the ground, which Estragon gleefully claims. Having been in a dumbfounded state of silence ever since the arrival of Pozzo and Lucky, Vladimir finally finds his voice to shout criticisms at Pozzo for his mistreatment of Lucky. Pozzo ignores this and explains his intention to sell Lucky, who begins to cry. Estragon takes pity and tries to wipe away Lucky's tears, but, as he approaches, Lucky violently kicks him in the shin. Pozzo then rambles nostalgically but vaguely about his relationship with Lucky over the years, before offering Vladimir and Estragon some compensation for their company. Estragon begins to beg for money when Pozzo instead suggests that Lucky can "dance" and "think" for their entertainment. Lucky's dance, "the Net", is clumsy and shuffling; Lucky's "thinking" is a long-winded and disjointed monologue—it is the first and only time that Lucky speaks. The monologue begins as a relatively coherent and academic lecture on theology but quickly dissolves into mindless verbosity, escalating in both volume and speed, that agonizes the others until Vladimir finally pulls off Lucky's hat, stopping him in mid-sentence. Pozzo then has Lucky pack up his bags, and they hastily leave.

Vladimir and Estragon, alone again, reflect on whether they have met Pozzo and Lucky before. A boy then arrives, purporting to be a messenger sent from Godot to tell the pair that Godot will not be coming that evening "but surely tomorrow". During Vladimir's interrogation of the boy, he asks if he came the day before, making it apparent that the two men have been waiting for a long period and will likely continue. After the boy departs, the moon appears, and the two men verbally agree to leave and find shelter for the night, but they merely stand without moving.

Act II

Suddenly, Pozzo and Lucky reappear, but the rope is much shorter than during their last visit, and Lucky now guides Pozzo, rather than being

controlled by him. As they arrive, Pozzo trips over Lucky and they together fall into a motionless heap. Estragon sees an opportunity to exact revenge on Lucky for kicking him earlier. The issue is debated lengthily until Pozzo shocks the pair by revealing that he is now blind and Lucky is now mute. Pozzo further claims to have lost all sense of time, and assures the others that he cannot remember meeting them before, but also does not expect to recall today's events tomorrow. His commanding arrogance from yesterday appears to have been replaced by humility and insight. His parting words—which Vladimir expands upon later—are ones of utter despair. Lucky and Pozzo depart; meanwhile Estragon has again fallen asleep.

Alone, Vladimir is encountered by (apparently) the same boy from yesterday, though Vladimir wonders whether he might be the other boy's brother. This time, Vladimir begins consciously realizing the circular nature of his experiences: he even predicts exactly what the boy will say, involving the same speech about Godot not arriving today but surely tomorrow. Vladimir seems to reach a moment of revelation before furiously chasing the boy away, demanding that he be recognized the next time they meet. Estragon awakes and pulls his boots off again. He and Vladimir consider hanging themselves once more, but when they test the strength of Estragon's belt (hoping to use it as a noose), it breaks, and Estragon's trousers fall down. They resolve tomorrow to bring a more suitable piece of rope and, if Godot fails to arrive, to commit suicide at last. Again, they decide to clear out for the night, but again, they do not move.

Check your progress – 1

1. What is Waiting for Godot about?

____

____

____

____

____

2. Waiting for Godot is translated from where?

____
____
____
____

3. Name the two major characters of Waiting for Godot.

____
____
____
____

6.3 CHARACTERS

Beckett refrained from elaborating on the characters beyond what he had written in the play. He once recalled that when Sir Ralph Richardson "wanted the low-down on Pozzo, his home address and curriculum vitae, and seemed to make the forthcoming of this and similar information the condition of his condescending to illustrate the part of Vladimir ... I told him that all I knew about Pozzo was in the text, that if I had known more I would have put it in the text, and that was true also of the other characters."

Vladimir and Estragon

When Beckett started writing he did not have a visual image of Vladimir and Estragon. They are never referred to as tramps in the text, though are often performed in such costumes on stage. Roger Blin advises: "Beckett heard their voices, but he couldn't describe his characters to me. [He said]: 'The only thing I'm sure of is that they're wearing bowlers.' " "The bowler hat was of course de rigueur for male persons in many social contexts when Beckett was growing up in Foxrock, and [his father] commonly wore one." That said, the play does indicate that the clothes worn at least by Estragon are shabby. When told by Vladimir that he should have been a poet, Estragon says he was, gestures to his rags, and asks if it were not obvious.

There are no physical descriptions of either of the two characters; however, the text indicates that Vladimir is possibly the heavier of the pair. The bowlers and other broadly comic aspects of their personas have reminded modern audiences of Laurel and Hardy, who occasionally played tramps in their films. "The hat-passing game in Waiting For Godot and Lucky's inability to think without his hat on are two obvious Beckett derivations from Laurel and Hardy – a substitution of form for essence, covering for reality", wrote Gerald Mast in The Comic Mind: Comedy and the Movies. Their "blather", which indicated Hiberno-English idioms, indicated that they are both Irish.

Vladimir stands through most of the play whereas Estragon sits down numerous times and even dozes off. "Estragon is inert and Vladimir restless." Vladimir looks at the sky and muses on religious or philosophical matters. Estragon "belongs to the stone", preoccupied with mundane things, what he can get to eat and how to ease his physical aches and pains; he is direct, intuitive. He finds it hard to remember but can recall certain things when prompted, e.g., when Vladimir asks: "Do you remember the Gospels?" Estragon tells Vladimir about the coloured maps of the Holy Land and that he planned to honeymoon by the Dead Sea; it is his short-term memory that is poorest and points to the fact that he may, in fact, be suffering from Alzheimer's disease. Al Alvarez writes: "But perhaps Estragon's forgetfulness is the cement binding their relationship together. He continually forgets, Vladimir continually reminds him; between them they pass the time." They have been together for fifty years but when asked–by Pozzo–they do not reveal their actual ages. Vladimir's life is not without its discomforts too but he is the more resilient of the pair. "Vladimir's pain is primarily mental anguish, which would thus account for his voluntary exchange of his hat for Lucky's, thus signifying Vladimir's symbolic desire for another person's thoughts." These characterizations, for some, represented the act of thinking or mental state (Vladimir) and physical things or the body (Estragon). This is visually depicted in Vladimir's continuous attention to his hat and Estragon, his boots. While the two characters are temperamentally opposite, with their differing responses to a situation,

they are both essential as demonstrated in the way Vladimir's metaphysical musings were balanced by Estragon's physical demands.

The above characterizations, particularly that which concerns their existential situation, is also demonstrated in one of the play's recurring theme, which is sleep. There are two instances when Estragon falls asleep in the play and had nightmares, which he wanted to tell Vladimir when he woke. The latter refuses to hear it since he could not tolerate the way the dreamer cannot escape or act during each episode. An interpretation noted the link between the two characters' experiences and the way they represent them: the impotence in Estragon's nightmare and Vladimir's predicament of waiting as his companion sleeps. It is also said that sleep and impatience allow the spectators to distinguish between the two main characters, that sleep expresses Estragon's focus on his sensations while Vladimir's restlessness shows his focus on his thoughts. This particular aspect involving sleep is indicative of what some called a pattern of duality in the play. In the case of the protagonists, the duality involves the body and the mind, making the characters complementary.

Throughout the play the couple refer to each other by the pet names "Didi" and "Gogo", although the boy addresses Vladimir as "Mister Albert". Beckett originally intended to call Estragon "Lévy" but when Pozzo questions him he gives his name as "Magrégor, André" and also responds to "Catulle" in French or "Catullus" in the first Faber edition. This became "Adam" in the American edition. Beckett's only explanation was that he was "fed up with Catullus".

Vivian Mercier described Waiting for Godot as a play which "has achieved a theoretical impossibility—a play in which nothing happens, that yet keeps audiences glued to their seats. What's more, since the second act is a subtly different reprise of the first, he has written a play in which nothing happens, twice." Mercier once questioned Beckett on the language used by the pair: "It seemed to me...he made Didi and Gogo sound as if they had earned PhDs. 'How do you know they hadn't?' was his reply." They clearly have known better times, a visit to the Eiffel Tower and grape-harvesting by the Rhône; it is about all either has to say about their pasts, save for Estragon's claim to have been a poet, an

explanation Estragon provides to Vladimir for his destitution. In the first stage production, which Beckett oversaw, both are "more shabby-genteel than ragged...Vladimir at least is capable of being scandalised...on a matter of etiquette when Estragon begs for chicken bones or money."

Pozzo and Lucky

Although Beckett refused to be drawn on the backgrounds of the characters, this has not stopped actors looking for their own motivation. Jean Martin had a doctor friend called Marthe Gautier, who was working at the Pitié-Salpêtrière Hospital, and he said to her: " 'Listen, Marthe, what could I find that would provide some kind of physiological explanation for a voice like the one written in the text?' [She] said: 'Well, it might be a good idea if you went to see the people who have Parkinson's disease.' So I asked her about the disease ... She explained how it begins with a trembling, which gets more and more noticeable, until later the patient can no longer speak without the voice shaking. So I said, 'That sounds exactly what I need.' " "Sam and Roger were not entirely convinced by my interpretation but had no objections." When he explained to Beckett that he was playing Lucky as if he were suffering from Parkinson's, Beckett said, " 'Yes, of course.' He mentioned briefly that his mother had had Parkinson's, but quickly moved on to another subject."

When Beckett was asked why Lucky was so named, he replied, "I suppose he is lucky to have no more expectations..."

It has been contended that "Pozzo and Lucky are simply Didi and Gogo writ large", unbalanced as their relationship is. However, Pozzo's dominance is noted to be superficial; "upon closer inspection, it becomes evident that Lucky always possessed more influence in the relationship, for he danced, and more importantly, thought – not as a service, but in order to fill a vacant need of Pozzo: he committed all of these acts for Pozzo. As such, since the first appearance of the duo, the true slave had always been Pozzo."[24] Pozzo credits Lucky with having given him all the culture, refinement, and ability to reason that he possesses. His rhetoric has been learned by rote. Pozzo's "party piece" on the sky is a

clear example: as his memory crumbles, he finds himself unable to continue under his own steam.

Little is learned about Pozzo besides the fact that he is on his way to the fair to sell his slave, Lucky. He presents himself very much as the Ascendancy landlord, bullying and conceited. His pipe is made by Kapp and Peterson, Dublin's best-known tobacconists (their slogan was "The thinking man's pipe") which he refers to as a "briar" but which Estragon calls a "dudeen" emphasising the differences in their social standing. He confesses to a poor memory but it is more a result of an abiding self-absorption. "Pozzo is a character who has to overcompensate. That's why he overdoes things ... and his overcompensation has to do with a deep insecurity in him. These were things Beckett said, psychological terms he used."

Pozzo controls Lucky by means of an extremely long rope which he jerks and tugs if Lucky is the least bit slow. Lucky is the absolutely subservient slave of Pozzo and he unquestioningly does his every bidding with "dog-like devotion". He struggles with a heavy suitcase without ever thinking of dropping it. Lucky speaks only once in the play and it is a result of Pozzo's order to "think" for Estragon and Vladimir. Pozzo and Lucky have been together for sixty years and, in that time, their relationship has deteriorated. Lucky has always been the intellectually superior but now, with age, he has become an object of contempt: his "think" is a caricature of intellectual thought and his "dance" is a sorry sight. Despite his horrid treatment at Pozzo's hand however, Lucky remains completely faithful to him. Even in the second act when Pozzo has inexplicably gone blind, and needs to be led by Lucky rather than driving him as he had done before, Lucky remains faithful and has not tried to run away; they are clearly bound together by more than a piece of rope in the same way that Didi and Gogo are "tied to Godot". Beckett's advice to the American director Alan Schneider was: "[Pozzo] is a hypomaniac and the only way to play him is to play him mad."

"In his [English] translation ... Beckett struggled to retain the French atmosphere as much as possible, so that he delegated all the English

names and places to Lucky, whose own name, he thought, suggested such a correlation."

The Boy

The cast list specifies only one boy.

The boy in Act I, a local lad, assures Vladimir that this is the first time he has seen him. He says he was not there the previous day. He confirms he works for Mr. Godot as a goatherd. His brother, whom Godot beats, is a shepherd. Godot feeds both of them and allows them to sleep in his hayloft.

The boy in Act II also assures Vladimir that it was not he who called upon them the day before. He insists that this too is his first visit. When Vladimir asks what Godot the boy tells him, "He does nothing, sir." We also learn he has a white beard—possibly, the boy is not certain. This boy also has a brother who it seems is sick but there is no clear evidence to suggest that his brother is the boy that came in Act I or the one who came the day before that.

Whether the boy from Act I is the same boy from Act II or not, both boys are polite yet timid. In the first Act, the boy, despite arriving while Pozzo and Lucky are still about, does not announce himself until after Pozzo and Lucky leave, saying to Vladimir and Estragon that he waited for the other two to leave out of fear of the two men and of Pozzo's whip; the boy does not arrive early enough in Act II to see either Lucky or Pozzo. In both Acts, the boy seems hesitant to speak very much, saying mostly "Yes Sir" or "No Sir", and winds up exiting by running away.

Godot

The identity of Godot has been the subject of much debate. "When Colin Duckworth asked Beckett point-blank whether Pozzo was Godot, the author replied: 'No. It is just implied in the text, but it's not true.' "

Deirdre Bair says that though "Beckett will never discuss the implications of the title", she suggests two stories that both may have at least partially inspired it. The first is that because feet are a recurring theme in the play, Beckett has said the title was suggested to him by the

slang French term for boot: "godillot, godasse". The second story, according to Bair, is that Beckett once encountered a group of spectators at the French Tour de France bicycle race, who told him "Nous attendons Godot" – they were waiting for a competitor whose name was Godot.

"Beckett said to Peter Woodthorpe that he regretted calling the absent character 'Godot', because of all the theories involving God to which this had given rise.""I also told [Ralph] Richardson that if by Godot I had meant God I would [have] said God, and not Godot. This seemed to disappoint him greatly." That said, Beckett did once concede, "It would be fatuous of me to pretend that I am not aware of the meanings attached to the word 'Godot', and the opinion of many that it means 'God'. But you must remember – I wrote the play in French, and if I did have that meaning in my mind, it was somewhere in my unconscious and I was not overtly aware of it." (Note: the French word for 'God' is 'Dieu'.) However, "Beckett has often stressed the strong unconscious impulses that partly control his writing; he has even spoken of being 'in a trance' when he writes." While Beckett stated he originally had no knowledge of Balzac's play Mercadet ou le faiseur, whose character Godeau has an identical-sounding name and is involved in a similar situation, it has been suggested he may have been instead influenced by The Lovable Cheat, a minor adaptation of Mercadet starring Buster Keaton, whose works Beckett had admired and who he later sought out for Film.

Unlike elsewhere in Beckett's work, no bicycle appears in this play, but Hugh Kenner in his essay "The Cartesian Centaur" reports that Beckett once, when asked about the meaning of Godot, mentioned "a veteran racing cyclist, bald, a 'stayer', recurrent placeman in town-to-town and national championships, Christian name elusive, surname Godeau, pronounced, of course, no differently from Godot." Waiting for Godot is clearly not about track cycling, but it is said that Beckett himself did wait for French cyclist Roger Godeau (1920–2000; a professional cyclist from 1943 to 1961), outside the velodrome in Roubaix.

Of the two boys who work for Godot only one appears safe from beatings, "Beckett said, only half-jokingly, that one of Estragon's feet was saved"

The name "Godot" is pronounced in Britain and Ireland with the emphasis on the first syllable, in North America it is usually pronounced with an emphasis on the second syllable, Beckett himself said the emphasis should be on the first syllable, and that the North American pronunciation is a mistake. Georges Borchardt, Beckett's literary agent, and who represents Beckett's literary estate, has always pronounced "Godot" in the French manner, with equal emphasis on both syllables. Borchardt checked with Beckett's nephew, Edward, who told him his uncle pronounced it that way as well.

6.4THEMES

1. **Choices:**

Waiting for Godot consists of two men unable to act, move, or think in any significant way while they kill time waiting for a mysterious man, Godot. The characters fail to realize that this very act of waiting is a choice; instead, they view it as a mandatory part of their daily routine. Even when these men manage to make a conscious decision, they can’t translate that mental choice into a physical act. They often "decide" to leave the stage, only to find that they are unable to move. Such inaction leads to stagnancy and repetition in the seemingly endless cycle of their lives.

2.Philosophical Viewpoints: The Absurd

Waiting for Godot is hailed as a classic example of "Theater of the Absurd," dramatic works that promote the philosophy of its name. This particular play presents a world in which daily actions are without meaning, language fails to effectively communicate, and the characters at times reflect a sense of artifice, even wondering aloud whether perhaps they are on a stage.

3. **Truth**

Waiting for Godot is a play driven by a lack of truth—in other words, uncertainty. Characters are unable to act in any meaningful way and claim this is because they are uncertain of the consequences. Without the presence of objective truth, every statement is brought into question, and

even common labels (color, time, names) become arbitrary and subjective.

4. **Life, Consciousness, And Existence**

The portrait of daily life painted by Waiting for Godot is a dismal one. It is repetitive and stagnant. It lacks meaning and purpose and entails perpetual suffering. The solution (which none of the characters take) would seem to be action and choice despite the ever-presence of uncertainty, and an awareness of one's surroundings and past actions. As one character says, "habit is a great deadener"—our actions should stem from conscious choice rather than apathy.

5. **Time**

Time presents a slew of problems in *Waiting for Godot*. The very title of the play reveals its central action: waiting. The two main characters are forced to whittle away their days while anticipating the arrival of a man who never comes. Because they have nothing to do in the meantime, time is a dreaded barrier, a test of their ability to endure. Because they repeat the same actions every day, time is cyclical. That every character seems to have a faulty memory further complicates matters; time loses meaning when the actions of one day have no relevance or certainty on the next.

6. **Religion**

Religion is incompatible with reason in Waiting for Godot. Characters who attempt to understand religion logically are left in the dark, and the system is compared to such absurd banalities as switching bowler hats or taking a boot on and off. Religion is also tied to uncertainty, since there is no way of knowing what is objectively true in the realm of faith.

7. Friendship

Friendship is tricky in *Waiting for Godot*, as each character is fundamentally isolated from each other. Relationships teeter between a fear of loneliness and an essential inability to connect. This tension is central to the play. The problems that keep characters apart vary from physical disgust to ego to a fear of others' suffering.

8. **Freedom and Confinement**

Every character in Waiting for Godot seems to live in a prison of his own making. Each is confined to a state of passivity and stagnancy by his own inability to act. The one character who is literally the slave of another is no more restricted than those who are technically free; in fact, he may be freer because he is at least aware of his imprisonment.

9. Suffering

Suffering is a constant and fundamental part of human existence in Waiting for Godot. Every character suffers and suffers always, with no seeming respite in sight. The hardships range from the physical to the mental, the minor to the extreme. Suffering drives some men to find companionship (so as to weather the storm together), causes others to abuse their companions (to lessen the suffering of the self), and motivates others isolate themselves (since watching people suffer is a kind of anguish on its own).

10. Mortality

None of the characters in Waiting for Godot shy away from the fact that death is inevitable. In fact, death becomes at times a solution for the inanity of daily life. The main characters contemplate suicide as though it were as harmless as a walk to the grocery store, probably because there's nothing in their lives worth sticking around for anyway. They ultimately do not commit suicide because they claim not to have the means, but also because they are uncertain of the result of their attempt (it may work, it may fail). Because they can't be sure of what their action will bring, they decide on no action at all.

6.5 SETTING

There is only one scene throughout both acts. Two men are waiting on a country road by a tree. The men are of unspecified origin, though it is clear that they are not English by nationality since they refer to currency as francs and tell derisive jokes about the English – and in English-language productions the pair are traditionally played with Irish accents.

Notes

The script calls for Estragon to sit on a low mound but in practice—as in Beckett's own 1975 German production—this is usually a stone. In the first act the tree is bare. In the second, a few leaves have appeared despite the script specifying that it is the next day. The minimal description calls to mind "the idea of the lieu vague, a location which should not be particularised".

Other clues about the location can be found in the dialogue. In Act I, Vladimir turns toward the auditorium and describes it as a bog. In Act II, Vladimir again motions to the auditorium and notes that there is "Not a soul in sight." When Estragon rushes toward the back of the stage in Act II, Vladimir scolds him, saying that "There's no way out there." Also in Act II, Vladimir comments that their surroundings look nothing like the Macon country, and Estragon states that he's lived his whole life "Here! In the Cackon country!"

Alan Schneider once suggested putting the play on in a round—Pozzo has often been commented on as a ringmaster—but Beckett dissuaded him: "I don't in my ignorance agree with the round and feel Godot needs a very closed box." He even contemplated at one point having a "faint shadow of bars on stage floor" but, in the end, decided against this level of what he called "explicitation". In his 1975 Schiller Theater production, there are times when Didi and Gogo appear to bounce off something "like birds trapped in the strands of [an invisible] net", in James Knowlson's description.

6.6 WORKS INSPIRED BY GODOT

An unauthorized sequel was written by Miodrag Bulatović in 1966: Godo je došao (Godot Arrived). It was translated from the Serbian into German (Godot ist gekommen) and French. The playwright presents Godot as a baker who ends up being condemned to death by the four main characters. Since it turns out he is indestructible, Lucky declares him non-existent. Although Beckett was noted for disallowing productions that took even slight liberties with his plays, he let this pass without incident but not without comment. Ruby Cohn writes: "On the

flyleaf of my edition of the Bulatović play, Beckett is quoted: 'I think that all that has nothing to do with me.' "

In the late 1990s an unauthorised sequel was written by Daniel Curzon entitled Godot Arrives.

A radical transformation was written by Bernard Pautrat, performed at Théâtre National de Strasbourg in 1979–1980: Ils allaient obscurs sous la nuit solitaire (d'après 'En attendant Godot' de Samuel Beckett). The piece was performed in a disused hangar. "This space, marked by diffusion, and therefore quite unlike traditional concentration of dramatic space, was animated, not by four actors and the brief appearance of a fifth one (as in Beckett's play), but by ten actors. Four of them bore the names of Gogo, Didi, Lucky and Pozzo. The others were: the owner of the Citroën, the barman, the bridegroom, the bride, the man with the Ricard [and] the man with the clubfoot. The dialogue, consisting of extensive quotations from the original, was distributed in segments among the ten actors, not necessarily following the order of the original."

Gujarati playwright Labhshankar Thakar, along with Subhash Shah, wrote a play Ek Undar ane Jadunath based on Godot in 1966.

It's the Great Pumpkin, Charlie Brown documents the wait for a mysterious figure who never arrives.

6.7 IN POPULAR CULTURE

In November/December 1987, Garry Trudeau ran a week-long spoof in his Doonesbury syndicated comic strip called "Waiting for Mario" in which two characters discussed—and dismissed—each other's hopes that Mario Cuomo would declare as a candidate in the 1988 Democratic Primary for President.

In 1990, French synthesizer artist Jean-Michel Jarre released the music album Waitingfor Cousteau, which was dedicated to his friend, scientist and environmentalist Jacques Cousteau. The album title is a pun on Beckett's play. The title track is a 46-minute ambient composition that seemingly never ends.

Notes

In 1992 Sesame Street had a short video in their segment "Monsterpiece Theater" entitled "Waiting for Elmo". Two muppets wait by a bare tree for Elmo to appear. They discuss their situation: If Elmo arrives, they'd be ″happy″, if not they'd be ″angry″. Elmo never appears. David Williams, professor at the University of London, in his essay "The ruins of time", considers Waiting for Elmo an example of a "popular cultural doxa" that stems from the play, as a reiteration of the "Waiting for Godot meme/silhouette" in "parodic form" – a "sophisticated if throwaway distillation of a version of Beckett's play", that compacts ideas from it including, "the push/pull entrapment within the dynamic immobility of the quintessentially Beckettian palindrome 'no'/'on'."

The play is mentioned in Kevin Smith's 1997 film Chasing Amy, when comic book creator Holden McNeil (played by Ben Affleck) responds to a dimwitted fan's referral of his characters as "Bill & Ted meets Cheech & Chong", saying that he prefers to think of them as a modern-day "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern meet Vladimir and Estragon", to the fan's consternation.

Godot is the name of a prosecutor in the 2004 video game Phoenix Wright: Ace Attorney − Trials and Tribulations who looks like a stylized version of Beckett.

Several programs on the Adult Swim network have drawn inspiration from the works of Samuel Beckett. Eric Andre, host and creator of The Eric Andre Show on Adult Swim, has explicitly acknowledged the thematic influence of Waiting for Godot on the show's surrealist format.

A sketch in March 2017 on The Late Show with Stephen Colbert, "Waiting for Godot's Obamacare Replacement", Colbert and Patrick Stewart satirised the Trump administration's failure to implement their announced "repeal and replace" of Obamacare.

6.8 LET US SUM UP

Summary

Two men, Vladimir and Estragon, meet near a tree. They converse on various topics and reveal that they are waiting there for a man named Godot. While they wait, two other men enter. Pozzo is on his way to the market to sell his slave, Lucky. He pauses for a while to converse with Vladimir and Estragon. Lucky entertains them by dancing and thinking, and Pozzo and Lucky leave.

After Pozzo and Lucky leave, a boy enters and tells Vladimir that he is a messenger from Godot. He tells Vladimir that Godot will not be coming tonight, but that he will surely come tomorrow. Vladimir asks him some questions about Godot and the boy departs. After his departure, Vladimir and Estragon decide to leave, but they do not move as the curtain falls.

The next night, Vladimir and Estragon again meet near the tree to wait for Godot. Lucky and Pozzo enter again, but this time Pozzo is blind and Lucky is dumb. Pozzo does not remember meeting the two men the night before. They leave and Vladimir and Estragon continue to wait.

Shortly after, the boy enters and once again tells Vladimir that Godot will not be coming. He insists that he did not speak to Vladimir yesterday. After he leaves, Estragon and Vladimir decide to leave, but again they do not move as the curtain falls, ending the play.

Characters

Vladimir - One of the two main characters of the play. Estragon calls him Didi, and the boy addresses him as Mr. Albert. He seems to be the more responsible and mature of the two main characters.

Estragon - The second of the two main characters. Vladimir calls him Gogo. He seems weak and helpless, always looking for Vladimir's protection. He also has a poor memory, as Vladimir has to remind him in the second act of the events that happened the previous night.

Pozzo - He passes by the spot where Vladimir and Estragon are waiting and provides a diversion. In the second act, he is blind and does not remember meeting Vladimir and Estragon the night before.

Lucky - Pozzo's slave, who carries Pozzo's bags and stool. In Act I, he entertains by dancing and thinking. However, in Act II, he is dumb.

Boy - He appears at the end of each act to inform Vladimir that Godot will not be coming that night. In the second act, he insists that he was not there the previous night.

Godot - The man for whom Vladimir and Estragon wait unendingly. Godot never appears in the play. His name and character are often thought to refer to God.

Themes

Chaotic Condition of Man: The prime theme of the play is the loss and chaotic condition of modern man where there is so much confusion and paralysis that it renders man incapable of any change unless there is an intervention by the Sublime and Mighty God. In "Waiting for Godot", Samuel Becket has portrayed a dismal and shocking condition of man. The characters and relationships create a sheer sense of loss and chaos. All the relationships remain unable to support each other in finding solution to their problem but it seems that the matter has gone beyond the reach of human wisdom and prowess.

Importance of society: The role of society has been highlighted which play a great role either it be the deterioration or improvisation in the elevation of human civilization. Society is always needed be it hell or heaven. Similarly, the characters in this play are dependent on each other; Pozzo is dependent on Lucky while Estragon cannot do without Vladimir. Similarly, Vladimir also wants Estragon to remain with him. They even think of suicide together.

Hope: Though the modern man's plight is unbearable and no rescue is at hand, yet we do find certain hope with the relation of Estragon and Vladimir. The relationships are important in associating rays of hope, sympathy and wit as well. Probably, it is due to these relationships that the characters are able to bear the pain and misery.

Role of Time: The impact of time reflects the burden of existence for these characters which is contrasted and reflected in their relationships. Further, time has lost its meaning and relevance. It does not matter it took a night or a year or a whole youth in the forming of new leaves to a "yesterday's" bare tree. It does not matter how long ago it was when Pozzo had eyes. It's similarly irrelevant of what time Godot would come but the characters are quite sure that he would come.

6.9 KEYWORDS

- **Chapter**: Novels are typically broken into sections called chapters. While that probably doesn't come as much of a surprise, you might be shocked to learn that chapters didn't become standard in publishing until the 18th century. Fancy that, fancypants.
- **Character**: Characters are the fictional people that populate the world of whatever book you're reading.
- **Criticism:** Literary criticism functions the same way. Simply put, it's the practice of judging literature based on its merits.
- Contradiction: A contradiction occurs when two statements don't seem to agree with each other. "The Sound of Silence" is a contradiction. (It also happens to be an awesome song.) A paradox is a type of contradiction.

6.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- Write the plot of Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.
- Write the characters of Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.
- Write the themes of Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.
- List down the works inspired by Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.

6.11 SUGGESTED READINGS

Beckett, Samuel (1952). En attendant Godot. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. Printer's Notice at rear of the first edition states "achevé d'imprimer sur les presses de l'imprimerie habauzit a Aubenas (Ardèche), en septembre mil neuf cent cinquante deux. Dépôt légal 3e trimestre 1952".

^ McCrum, Robert (15 August 2016). "The 100 best nonfiction books: No 29 – Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett (1952/53)". The Guardian. Retrieved 18 January 2019.

^ Knowlson, James (1971). Samuel Beckett: An Exhibition Held at Reading University Library, May to July 1971. London: Turret Books. p. 61.

^ Cohn, Ruby, From Desire to Godot (London: Calder Publications; New York: Riverrun Press), 1998, pp. 153, 157

^ Knowlson, James, Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett (London: Bloomsbury, 1996), pp. 387, 778 n. 139

6.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. Waiting for Godot is about the two characters, Vladimir (Didi) and Estragon (Gogo) who wait for the arrival of someone named Godot who never arrives, and while waiting they engage in a variety of discussions and encounter three other characters.(**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.1**)

2. Waiting for Godot is translated from Beckett's original French-language play, En attendant Godot.(**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.2**)

3. Vladimir (Didi) and Estragon (Gogo) are the two major characters of Waiting for Godot. (**answer for check your progress- 1 Q.3)**

UNIT 7. BECKETT - WAITING FOR GODOT - 3

STRUCTURE

7.0 Objectives

7.1 Introduction

7.2 Analysis

7.3 Interpretations

7.4 Production History

7.5 Adaptations

7.6 American Reception

7.7 Related Works

7.8 Let us sum up

7.9 Keywords

7.10 Questions for review

7.11 Suggested readings and writings

7.12 Answers to check your progress

7.0 OBJECTIVES

Once you go through this unit, you should be able to learn about:

- the analysis, interpretations, production history, adaptations, american reception and related works of Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Waiting for Godot, tragicomedy in two acts by Irish writer Samuel Beckett, published in 1952 in French as En attendant Godot and first produced in 1953. Waiting for Godot was a true innovation in drama and the Theatre of the Absurd's first theatrical success.

The play consists of conversations between Vladimir and Estragon, who are waiting for the arrival of the mysterious Godot, who continually

sends word that he will appear but who never does. They encounter Lucky and Pozzo, they discuss their miseries and their lots in life, they consider hanging themselves, and yet they wait. Often perceived as being tramps, Vladimir and Estragon are a pair of human beings who do not know why they were put on earth; they make the tenuous assumption that there must be some point to their existence, and they look to Godot for enlightenment. Because they hold out hope for meaning and direction, they acquire a kind of nobility that enables them to rise above their futile existence.

7.2 ANALYSIS

- **Symbolism, Imagery, Allegory**

Duality

Double Your Pleasure, Double Your Fun

Waiting for Godot is chock-full of pairs. There's Vladimir and Estragon, the two thieves, the Boy and his brother, Pozzo and Lucky, Cain and Abel, and of course the two acts of the play itself.

With these pairs comes the repeated notion of arbitrary, 50/50 chances. One thief is saved and other damned, but for no clear reason:

Vladimir

Our Saviour. Two thieves. One is supposed to have been saved and the other... (he searches for the contrary of saved)... damned. (1.64)

If Vladimir and Estragon try to hang themselves, the bough may or may not break. One man may die, one man may live. Godot may or may not come to save them. In the Bible, Cain's sacrifice was rejected and Abel's accepted for no discernible reason.

So many pairs and so much arbitrary damnation. Even the tone of Waiting for Godot is filled with duality: two-person arguments, back-and-forth questions, disagreement-agreement, questions and (often inadequate) answers.

The Tree

Tree of Life, Tree of Strife

The tree is the only distinct piece of the setting, so we're pretty sure it matters. (Also, if you check out the painting that inspired Beckett, you'll see that a big tree features prominently.) Right off the bat you've got the biblical stuff: Jesus was crucified on a cross, but that cross is sometimes referred to as a "tree." That Vladimir and Estragon contemplate hanging themselves from the tree is likely a reference to the crucifixion, but it also parodies the religious significance. If Jesus died for the sins of others, Vladimir and Estragon are dying for… nothing. (There's that pesky "nothing" again. You just can't get rid of it in this play.)

But you can also think of the two men not as Jesus, but rather as the two thieves crucified along with Jesus. This fits quite nicely with gospel's tale as Vladimir tells it; one thief is saved and the other damned, so Didi and Gogo are looking at a fifty-fifty chance. (Duality! Again.) The uncertainty that stems from the inconsistency between the four gospels is fitting, too, since Vladimir can't be certain if Godot is coming to save either one of them. (Uncertainty! Again.) (Repetition! Again.)

There's more. Vladimir reports that he was told to wait for Godot by the tree. This should be reassuring—it means the men are in the right place. Right? Wrong. As Estragon points out, they're not sure if this is the right tree. And, come to think of it, they can't even be sure if this is a tree or not. It kind of looks like a shrub.

Now what we find to be completely baffling is the tree's random sprouting of leaves in between Act 1 and Act 2. This is regeneration: it is hopeful, it is growth, it is life! And that doesn't sound anything like Waiting for Godot, especially when you look at how everything else degenerates from Act 1 to Act 2 (we're thinking in particular of Pozzo's going blind and Lucky mute, as well as Gogo and Didi's increasing uncertainty and suffering).

So what gives? Take a look at Vladimir's line early in Act 1:

Vladimir

(musingly) The last moment . . . (He meditates.) Hope deferred maketh the something sick, who said that? (1.32)

As we've mentioned, Vladimir is referring to the biblical proverb that goes a little something like this: "Hope deferred makes the heart sick; but a desire fulfilled is a tree of life" (Proverbs 13:12).

See that? Tree of life. So the tree's random blooming would suggest that it is something of a tree of life. And, according to the proverb, that means a desire has been fulfilled.

Of course, as far as we can tell, no desires have been fulfilled. At all. This could mean that the proverb is completely without truth and reason, which fits with Godot's general stance on religion. Then again, the tree's sprouting leaves could be an ironic symbol pointing out that, far from fulfilled desires, hopes have been deferred yet another day—much like Vladimir's ironic claim in Act 2 that "things have changed here since yesterday" when, clearly, nothing at all has.

Or it could be something else all together.

Nightfall and The Rising Moon

Nighttime is the Right Time

While Vladimir and Estragon wait for Godot, they also wait for nightfall. For some reason (again, arbitrary and uncertain), they don't have to wait for him once the night has fallen. The classic interpretation is that night = dark = death. The falling of night is as much a reprieve from daily suffering as death is from the suffering of a lifetime.

There's also the issue of the moon, as its appearance in the sky is the real signal that night has come and the men can stop waiting for Godot. Estragon, in one of his wicked smart moments, comments the moon is "pale for weariness […] of climbing heaven and gazing on the likes of us:"

Vladimir

At last! (Estragon gets up and goes towards Vladimir, a boot in each hand. He puts them down at edge of stage, straightens and contemplates the moon.) What are you doing?

Estragon

Pale for weariness.

Vladimir

Eh?

Estragon

Of climbing heaven and gazing on the likes of us.

Vladimir

Your boots, what are you doing with your boots? (1.819-23)

Though the man remembers nothing of yesterday, he does in this moment seem to comprehend the endless repetition of his life. And if the moon is weary just from watching, imagine what that says about the predicament of the men themselves.

Vladimir's Song That Never Ends

Repetition, banality, and a comically macabre subject matter? We think you can handle this one on your own.

- **The Carrot**

Some Seriously Philosophical Root Veggies

Carrots and turnips are in one sense just a gag reel for Vladimir and Estragon's comic bits. But we're interested in their disagreement over the vegetable:

Estragon

Fancy that. (He raises what remains of the carrot by the stub of leaf, twirls it before his eyes.) Funny, the more you eat the worse it gets.

Vladimir

With me it's just the opposite. (1.278-9)

On the one hand, this could be a completely meaningless conversation—the point is simply that Vladimir disagrees, playing at opposites, adding to the bickering duality between himself and Gogo.

On the other hand, the carrot could be about the meaning of life. Exclamation point! Okay, so the carrot probably isn't about the meaning of life. But it could be a hint as to the differences between the way Vladimir and Estragon live their lives.

Vladimir's subsequent comment, an addendum to his carrot claim, is:

Vladimir

I get used to the muck as I go along.

[…]

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. (1.281-290)

He resigns himself to banality. Estragon, on the other hand, wearies as time passes—much like the weary moon he observes in Act 2. When Pozzo later dishes about smoking, he claims:

Pozzo

(having lit his pipe) The second is never so sweet . . . (he takes the pipe out of his mouth, contemplates it) . . . as the first I mean. (He puts the pipe back in his mouth.) But it's sweet just the same. (1.400)

This is a third and distinct answer to the carrot question.

Lucky's Dance

Not the 1995 Sandra Bullock Vehicle

When Lucky is commanded to dance in Act 1, Pozzo reveals that he calls his dance "The Net":

Pozzo

He used to dance the farandole, the fling, the brawl, the jig, the fandango and even the hornpipe. He capered. For joy. Now that's the best he can do. Do you know what he calls it?

Estragon

The Scapegoat's Agony.

Vladimir

The Hard Stool.

Pozzo

The Net. He thinks he's entangled in a net. (1.589-92)

You would think a guy tied up on a rope leash would feel confined enough. Of course, the image of Lucky writhing in an imaginary net is a lasting image for the play as a whole, and especially for the plight of Vladimir and Estragon, who, as we've said before, are confined in a prison—or perhaps a net —of their own imaginations.

The Hats, The Boots, The Vaporizer

Vaping Before It Was Cool

There seems to be no shortage of inane props in Waiting for Godot, and these three have one thing in common: they are all absurd objects on which the men have developed irrational dependencies.

Lucky cannot think without his bowler. Pozzo needs his vaporizer to speak. Estragon seems condemned to forever take his boots on and off, as does Vladimir with his hat. This is another great combination of the

tragic and the comic; the situation is hilarious for its absurdity, but uber-dismal at the same time.

- **Smell**

Where's the Febreeze?

Estragon is repeatedly repelled by smells in Waiting for Godot. Vladimir stinks of garlic, Lucky smells like who knows what, and Pozzo reeks of a fart in Act 2. It seems every time Estragon tries to get close to a person, he is repelled by their odor.

It looks to us like smells represent one of the barriers to interpersonal relationships. Estragon isn't just repelled by odors—he's repelled by the visceral humanity of those around him. There's something gritty and base about the odor of a human body, and for Estragon it's too much to handle.

- **Setting**

Where It All Goes Down

A Country Road—Unknown Time and Place

This ain't an ornate set, guys. And—apart from a pretty dismal tree—there isn't a lot to look at.

We're never really sure whether Act 1 and Act 2 take place in the same location, other than the fact that Beckett describes it as such in the stage directions. We also don't know what lies offstage, since Vladimir and Estragon are always forced back onto the stage in some form or another.

Depending on the design of the production, the set is more or less ornate. Sometimes there is literally nothing else onstage but the actors and the tree. The effect of Beckett's minimally described set is that we have absolutely no idea where Vladimir and Estragon are, either in time or in place. The past? The future? Earth? An imaginary place in one of their heads? We just don't know.

Uncertainty is a huge theme in the play, and we as the audience experience it the same way Vladimir and Estragon do... with very little window-dressing.

It's also important to note the fact that the two men are on a road together. Where does this road lead? Again, we don’t know. But it might as well be to nowhere since it becomes pretty clear that Estragon and Vladimir aren’t making any progress along it. This is sad. Possibly even tragic(omic).

The presence of the tree and a rock of some sort is apparently important, at least according to Beckett —the setting, he says, is complete with animal, vegetable, and mineral. This lends a high sense of contrivance to the play. We’ve already seen the meta-fictional quality of Waiting for Godot in certain key lines (like Pozzo’s question of whether or not this is the Board, or stage), so this sort of artificiality fits right in.

Having all three elements present—animal, vegetable, and mineral—would seem to suggest that the world of Waiting for Godot is a complete one. Nothing is missing, everything is present, and yet still the world is barren and empty. Still the world is without purpose because characters fail to provide it with meaning through their actions.

- **Narrator Point of View**

Who is the narrator, can she or he read minds, and, more importantly, can we trust her or him?

Though all works of literature present the author’s point of view, they don’t all have a narrator or a narrative voice that ties together and presents the story. This particular piece of literature doesn't have a narrator through whose eyes or voice we learn the story... because it's a play, and the audience only really gets at the bowler-hatted characters romping around onstage.

- **Genre**

Drama, Modernism, Philosophical Literature, Surrealism, Tragicomedy

Ooof. With a list like that, we sure have our work cut out for us. But you can't just fit Waiting For Godot into one genre because this brilliant, game-changing play breaks the whole dang genre mold.

So let's break this bad boy down.

Drama is an easy one, since the work is a play and the conflict is entirely expressed in emotion-revealing drama.

The labels of both "Modernism" and "Surrealism" have to do with the play's lack of a real plot and its break from narrative traditions... you know, the things that making Waiting for Godot so Waiting for Godot-errific. Waiting for Godot is Modernist in the sense that it defies classic standards, and it's Surrealist in that Vladimir and Estragon's world has no clear system of logic or rules. Remember that line when Vladimir wonders aloud if he's sleeping and merely under the illusion of consciousness? That's Surrealism in a nutshell.

The label "tragicomedy" is in the title, so you know it's a biggie. Also, check out the fact that Gogo and Didi's exchanges vacillate between absurdly comic discussions of turnips and horrible, tragic, vague suspicions that life is meaningless. The bowler hats even remind us of Charlie Chaplin, who's the ultimate tragicomedian.

Lastly, Waiting for Godot is most definitely a work of philosophical literature, exploring the arguments of the absurd (that the universe is irrational and without meaning) and existentialism (that the solution to such irrationality is to become conscious of one's freedom and live life anyway through a series of choices and actions). Notice we said that Waiting for Godot explores these themes—whether or not it agrees with them is totally subject to debate.

- **Tone**

Take a story's temperature by studying its tone. Is it hopeful? Cynical? Snarky? Playful?

Bleak, Comic

Yes, both these adjectives are simultaneously possible. That's why they call it a tragicomedy. But what's interesting about the tone is that isn't just bleak and comic; it's bleak because it is comic, and it is comic because it is bleak. The common factor here is absurdity. Life is comic because of the absurdity of talking about turnips and carrots:

Estragon

Fancy that. (He raises what remains of the carrot by the stub of leaf, twirls it before his eyes.) Funny, the more you eat the worse it gets.

Vladimir

With me it's just the opposite. (1.278-9)

But it's also bleak because men waste away their days talking about… turnips and carrots.

- **Writing Style**

Sesame Street, Sparse

Did you notice the sort of sunny, PBS kiddie show-style banter between the characters? Because that thought came to us when we heard Vladimir ask:

Vladimir

Do you want a carrot?

Estragon

Is that all there is?

Vladimir

I might have some turnips.

Estragon

Give me a carrot. (Vladimir rummages in his pockets, takes out a turnip and gives it to Estragon who takes a bite out of it. Angrily.) It's a turnip!

Vladimir

Oh pardon! I could have sworn it was a carrot. (1.253-7)

It sounds just like a warped Big Bird. Today's Beckett play was brought to you by the letter "C," for carrot! And the number "2," for duality!

But if you need to put some academic jargon-esque labels on the style, we would probably go with "sparse," "minimalistic," or, if you were feeling ready dangerous, "barren."

- **What's up with the title?**

Waiting for Godot: A Tragicomedy in Two Acts is just that: a play about waiting. And waiting. And waiting some more. For some dude named (maybe?) Godot.

The title reflects the lack of action—or as one critic says, the less than action—that fills the time normally taken up by plot. "Tragicomedy" is an apt description of the play's genre, since it combines the absurdly farcical with the tragically poignant melancholy of daily life. That "two acts" part of the title is significant too, since duality is an important theme for the work—take a gander at our "Symbolism, Imagery, Allegory" section for more on this duality business.

- **Plot Analysis**

Most good stories start with a fundamental list of ingredients: the initial situation, conflict, complication, climax, suspense, denouement, and conclusion. Great writers sometimes shake up the recipe and add some spice.

Not applicable, folks. Nothing happens, nobody comes, nobody goes. Or, as scholar David Bradby says in his criticism of Godot, "less than nothing happens."

- **Booker's Seven Basic Plots Analysis**

Christopher Booker is a scholar who wrote that every story falls into one of seven basic plot structures: Overcoming the Monster, Rags to Riches, the Quest, Voyage and Return, Comedy, Tragedy, and Rebirth. Shmoop explores which of these structures fits this story like Cinderella's slipper.

- **Plot Type: Tragedy**

Vladimir and Estragon are tragic figures throughout the play, with seemingly no control over their life situation. The difference between Booker's Tragedy plotline and the plotline of Waiting for Godot is that no one dies and nothing really new happens.

Things do go wrong, but that's not exclusive to the start and end of the play; things have been going wrong for as long as we can imagine, and

we expect that they will continue to do so long after we leave the theater. So basically, we have the last stage of the Booker Plot ("Destruction or Death Wish Stage") throughout the entire work.

This makes sense, since the concept of change or movement (in this case from one of Booker's Stages to another) would be inconsistent with the stagnant world of Waiting for Godot.

- Trivia

Depending on the production and country, some actors pronounce "Godot" like "God-oh" instead of "Guh-doh," thus emphasizing the allusion to God. Beckett once said the emphasis should be on the first syllable.

Beckett was elected Saoi of Aosdána in 1984. Aosdána, Irish for "people of the arts," is an association for distinguished Irish artists. The title of Saoi is the highest honor that the group awards its members, and only five living people can be Saoi at one time.

Beckett became good friends with fellow Irish writer James Joyce and contributed ideas to Joyce's groundbreaking novel, Finnegan's Wake. In fact, many of Beckett's first published works were essays on Joyce's writing. Some say Beckett was afraid of being in Joyce's shadow. Whereas Joyce wrote with a style of having "more," Beckett decided he was going to emphasize less: stark, minimalist dialogue.

Beckett worked as a courier for the French Resistance for two years during WWII while Germany occupied France.

In the introduction to an abridged radio reading of the play, Beckett sent a note that included the following: "I don't know who Godot is. I don't even know (above all don't know) if he exists. And I don't know if they believe in him or not—those two who are waiting for him. The other two who pass by towards the end of each of the two acts, that must be to break up the monotony. All I knew I showed. It's not much, but it's enough for me, by a wide margin. I'll even say that I would have been satisfied with less. As for wanting to find in all that a broader, loftier meaning to carry away from the performance, along with the program and the Eskimo pie, I cannot see the point of it. But it must be possible…

Estragon, Vladimir, Pozzo, Lucky, their time and their space, I was able to know them a little, but far from the need to understand. Maybe they owe you explanations. Let them supply it. Without me. They and I are through with each other."

Beckett said his inspiration for Waiting for Godot was a painting by Caspar David Friedrich, and we know that the painting is either "Man and Woman Contemplating the Moon" (from 1824) or "Two Men Contemplating the Moon" (from 1819).

- **Steaminess Rating**

Waiting for Godot has no plot, no action—and zero sexy times. The closest we get is Vladimir's genital pain from his long-aching prostate, which doesn't surprise us—suffering is par for the course in this play.

There's also the "hanging will give us an erection!" excitement—once again, suffering and pain and the most morbid arousal possible. And in addition to there being no sex in the play, there are also no women... which means no chance for new life.

- **Allusions**

When authors refer to other great works, people, and events, it's usually not accidental. Put on your super-sleuth hat and figure out why.

Literature, Philosophy, and Mythology

Søren Kierkegaard: Fear and Trembling (1.410)

Atlas (1.444)

Jupiter (1.444)

Pan (1.515)

The Bible: "A dream deferred makes the heart sick; but a desire fulfilled is a tree of life," Biblical Proverb (1.32); the Bible in general (1.51-64); Christ (1.826-30); Cain and Abel (2.620-4)

7.3 INTERPRETATIONS

"Because the play is so stripped down, so elemental, it invites all kinds of social and political and religious interpretation", wrote Normand Berlin in a tribute to the play in Autumn 1999, "with Beckett himself placed in different schools of thought, different movements and 'ism's. The attempts to pin him down have not been successful, but the desire to do so is natural when we encounter a writer whose minimalist art reaches for bedrock reality. 'Less' forces us to look for 'more', and the need to talk about Godot and about Beckett has resulted in a steady outpouring of books and articles.

Throughout Waiting for Godot, the audience may encounter religious, philosophical, classical, psychoanalytical and biographical – especially wartime – references. There are ritualistic aspects and elements taken directly from vaudeville and there is a danger in making more of these than what they are: that is, merely structural conveniences, avatars into which the writer places his fictional characters. The play "exploits several archetypal forms and situations, all of which lend themselves to both comedy and pathos." Beckett makes this point emphatically clear in the opening notes to Film: "No truth value attaches to the above, regarded as of merely structural and dramatic convenience." He made another important remark to Lawrence Harvey, saying that his "work does not depend on experience – [it is] not a record of experience. Of course you use it."

Beckett tired quickly of "the endless misunderstanding". As far back as 1955, he remarked, "Why people have to complicate a thing so simple I can't make out."[68] He was not forthcoming with anything more than cryptic clues, however: "Peter Woodthorpe [who played Estragon] remembered asking him one day in a taxi what the play was really about: 'It's all symbiosis, Peter; it's symbiosis,' answered Beckett."

Beckett directed the play for the Schiller-Theatre in 1975. Although he had overseen many productions, this was the first time that he had taken complete control. Walter Asmus was his conscientious young assistant director. The production was not naturalistic. Beckett explained.

It is a game, everything is a game. When all four of them are lying on the ground, that cannot be handled naturalistically. That has got to be done artificially, balletically. Otherwise everything becomes an imitation, an imitation of reality [...]. It should become clear and transparent, not dry. It is a game in order to survive."

Over the years, Beckett clearly realised that the greater part of Godot's success came down to the fact that it was open to a variety of readings and that this was not necessarily a bad thing. Beckett himself sanctioned "one of the most famous mixed-race productions of Godot, performed at the Baxter Theatre in the University of Cape Town, directed by Donald Howarth, with [...] two black actors, John Kani and Winston Ntshona, playing Didi and Gogo; Pozzo, dressed in checked shirt and gumboots reminiscent of an Afrikaner landlord, and Lucky ('a shanty town piece of white trash') were played by two white actors, Bill Flynn and Peter Piccolo [...]. The Baxter production has often been portrayed as if it were an explicitly political production, when in fact it received very little emphasis. What such a reaction showed, however, was that, although the play can in no way be taken as a political allegory, there are elements that are relevant to any local situation in which one man is being exploited or oppressed by another."

Political

"It was seen as an allegory of the Cold War" or of French Resistance to the Germans. Graham Hassell writes, "[T]he intrusion of Pozzo and Lucky [...] seems like nothing more than a metaphor for Ireland's view of mainland Britain, where society has ever been blighted by a greedy ruling élite keeping the working classes passive and ignorant by whatever means."

Vladimir and Estragon are often played with Irish accents, as in the Beckett on Film project. This, some feel, is an inevitable consequence of Beckett's rhythms and phraseology, but it is not stipulated in the text. At any rate, they are not of English stock: at one point early in the play,

Estragon mocks the English pronunciation of "calm" and has fun with "the story of the Englishman in the brothel".

Freudian

"Bernard Dukore develops a triadic theory in Didi, Gogo and the absent Godot, based on Sigmund Freud's trinitarian description of the psyche in The Ego and the Id (1923) and the usage of onomastic techniques. Dukore defines the characters by what they lack: the rational Go-go embodies the incomplete ego, the missing pleasure principle: (e)go-(e)go. Di-di (id-id) – who is more instinctual and irrational – is seen as the backward id or subversion of the rational principle. Godot fulfills the function of the superego or moral standards. Pozzo and Lucky are just re-iterations of the main protagonists. Dukore finally sees Beckett's play as a metaphor for the futility of man's existence when salvation is expected from an external entity, and the self is denied introspection."

Jungian

"The four archetypal personalities or the four aspects of the soul are grouped in two pairs: the ego and the shadow, the persona and the soul's image (animus or anima). The shadow is the container of all our despised emotions repressed by the ego. Lucky, the shadow, serves as the polar opposite of the egocentric Pozzo, prototype of prosperous mediocrity, who incessantly controls and persecutes his subordinate, thus symbolising the oppression of the unconscious shadow by the despotic ego. Lucky's monologue in Act I appears as a manifestation of a stream of repressed unconsciousness, as he is allowed to "think" for his master. Estragon's name has another connotation, besides that of the aromatic herb, tarragon: "estragon" is a cognate of estrogen, the female hormone (Carter, 130). This prompts us to identify him with the anima, the feminine image of Vladimir's soul. It explains Estragon's propensity for poetry, his sensitivity and dreams, his irrational moods. Vladimir appears as the complementary masculine principle, or perhaps the rational persona of the contemplative type."

PhilosophicalExistential

Broadly speaking, existentialists hold that there are certain fundamental questions that all human beings must come to terms with if they are to take their subjective existences seriously and with intrinsic value. Questions such as life, death, the meaning of human existence and the place of God in that existence are among them. By and large, the theories of existentialism assert that conscious reality is very complex and without an "objective" or universally known value: the individual must create value by affirming it and living it, not by simply talking about it or philosophising it in the mind. The play may be seen to touch on all of these issues.

Martin Esslin, in his The Theatre of the Absurd (1960), argued that Waiting for Godot was part of a broader literary movement that he called the Theatre of the Absurd, a form of theatre which stemmed from the absurdist philosophy of Albert Camus. Absurdism itself is a branch of the traditional assertions of existentialism, pioneered by Søren Kierkegaard, and posits that, while inherent meaning might very well exist in the universe, human beings are incapable of finding it due to some form of mental or philosophical limitation. Thus, humanity is doomed to be faced with the Absurd, or the absolute absurdity of the existence in lack of intrinsic purpose.

Ethical

Just after Didi and Gogo have been particularly selfish and callous, the boy comes to say that Godot is not coming. The boy (or pair of boys) may be seen to represent meekness and hope before compassion is consciously excluded by an evolving personality and character, and in which case may be the youthful Pozzo and Lucky. Thus Godot is compassion and fails to arrive every day, as he says he will. No-one is concerned that a boy is beaten. In this interpretation, there is the irony that only by changing their hearts to be compassionate can the characters fixed to the tree move on and cease to have to wait for Godot.

Christian

Much of the play is steeped in scriptural allusion. The boy from Act One mentions that he and his brother mind Godot's sheep and goats. Much can be read into Beckett's inclusion of the story of the two thieves from Luke 23:39–43 and the ensuing discussion of repentance. It is easy to see the solitary tree as representative of the Christian cross or the tree of life. Some see God and Godot as one and the same. Vladimir's "Christ have mercy upon us!"could be taken as evidence that that is at least what he believes.

This reading is given further weight early in the first act when Estragon asks Vladimir what it is that he has requested from Godot:

Vladimir: "Oh ... nothing very definite.
Estragon: "A kind of prayer."
Vladimir: "Precisely."
Estragon: "A vague supplication."
Vladimir: "Exactly."

Other explicit Christian elements that are mentioned in the play include, but not limited to, repentance, the Gospels, a Saviour, human beings made in God's image, the cross, and Cain and Abel.

According to biographer Anthony Cronin, "[Beckett] always possessed a Bible, at the end more than one edition, and Bible concordances were always among the reference books on his shelves."Beckett himself was quite open on the issue: "Christianity is a mythology with which I am perfectly familiar so I naturally use it." As Cronin argues, these biblical references "may be ironic or even sarcastic".

"In answer to a defence counsel question in 1937 (during the libel action brought by his uncle against Oliver St. John Gogarty) as to whether he was a Christian, Jew or atheist, Beckett replied, 'None of the three' ". Looking at Beckett's entire œuvre, Mary Bryden observed that "the

hypothesised God who emerges from Beckett's texts is one who is both cursed for his perverse absence and cursed for his surveillant presence. He is by turns dismissed, satirised, or ignored, but he, and his tortured son, are never definitively discarded."

Autobiographical

Waiting for Godot has been described as a "metaphor for the long walk into Roussillon, when Beckett and Suzanne slept in haystacks [...] during the day and walked by night [... or] of the relationship of Beckett to Joyce."Beckett told Ruby Cohn that Caspar David Friedrich's painting Two Men Contemplating the Moon, which he saw on his journey to Germany in 1936, was a source for the play.

Sexual

Though the sexuality of Vladimir and Estragon is not always considered by critics,[some see the two vagabonds as an ageing homosexual couple, who are worn out, with broken spirits, impotent and not engaging sexually any longer. The two appear to be written as a parody of a married couple. Peter Boxall points out that the play features two characters who seem to have shared life together for years; they quarrel, embrace, and are mutually dependent. Beckett was interviewed at the time the play was premiering in New York, and, speaking of his writings and characters in general, Beckett said "I'm working with impotence, ignorance. I don't think impotence has been exploited in the past." Vladimir and Estragon consider hanging themselves, as a desperate way to achieve at least one final erection. Pozzo and his slave, Lucky, arrive on the scene. Pozzo is a stout man, who wields a whip and holds a rope around Lucky's neck. Some critics have considered that the relationship of these two characters is homosexual and sado-masochistic in nature. Lucky's long speech is a torrent of broken ideas and speculations regarding man, sex, God, and time. It has been said that the play contains little or no sexual hope; which is the play's lament, and the source of the play's humour and comedic tenderness.Norman Mailer wonders if

Beckett might be restating the sexual and moral basis of Christianity, that life and strength is found in an adoration of those in the lower depths where God is concealed.

Beckett's objection to female actors

Beckett was not open to most interpretative approaches to his work. He famously objected when, in the 1980s, several women's acting companies began to stage the play. "Women don't have prostates", said Beckett, a reference to the fact that Vladimir frequently has to leave the stage to urinate.

In 1988 a Dutch theatre company, De Haarlemse Toneelschuur, put on a production directed by Matin Van Veldhuizen with all female actors, using a French-to-Dutch translation by Jacoba Van Velde. Beckett brought an unsuccessful lawsuit against the theatre company. "The issue of gender seemed to him to be so vital a distinction for a playwright to make that he reacted angrily, instituting a ban on all productions of his plays in The Netherlands."This ban was short-lived, however: in 1991 (two years after Beckett's death), Judge Huguette Le Foyer de Costil ruled that productions with female casts would not cause excessive damage to Beckett's legacy, and allowed the play to be duly performed by the all-female cast of the Brut de Beton Theater Company at the prestigious Avignon Festival.

The Italian Pontedera Theatre Foundation won a similar claim in 2006 when it cast two actresses in the roles of Vladimir and Estragon, albeit in the characters' traditional roles as men. At the 1995 Acco Festival, director Nola Chilton staged a production with Daniella Michaeli in the role of Lucky.

7.4 PRODUCTION HISTORY

"[O]n 17 February 1952 ... an abridged version of the play was performed in the studio of the Club d'Essai de la Radio and was

broadcast on [French] radio ... [A]lthough he sent a polite note that Roger Blin read out, Beckett himself did not turn up." Part of his introduction reads:

I don't know who Godot is. I don't even know (above all don't know) if he exists. And I don't know if they believe in him or not – those two who are waiting for him. The other two who pass by towards the end of each of the two acts, that must be to break up the monotony. All I knew I showed. It's not much, but it's enough for me, by a wide margin. I'll even say that I would have been satisfied with less. As for wanting to find in all that a broader, loftier meaning to carry away from the performance, along with the program and the Eskimo pie, I cannot see the point of it. But it must be possible ... Estragon, Vladimir, Pozzo, Lucky, their time and their space, I was able to know them a little, but far from the need to understand. Maybe they owe you explanations. Let them supply it. Without me. They and I are through with each other.

The play was first published in September 1952 by Les Éditions de Minuit and released on 17 October 1952 in advance of the first full theatrical performance; only 2500 copies were printed of this first edition. On 4 January 1953, "[t]hirty reviewers came to the générale of En attendant Godot before the public opening ... Contrary to later legend, the reviewers were kind ... Some dozen reviews in daily newspapers range[d] from tolerant to enthusiastic ... Reviews in the weeklies [were] longer and more fervent; moreover, they appeared in time to lure spectators to that first thirty-day run" which began on 5 January 1953 at the Théâtre de Babylone, Paris. Early public performances were not, however, without incident: during one performance "the curtain had to be brought down after Lucky's monologue as twenty, well-dressed, but disgruntled spectators whistled and hooted derisively ... One of the protesters [even] wrote a vituperative letter dated 2 February 1953 to Le Monde."

The cast comprised Pierre Latour [fr] (Estragon), Lucien Raimbourg [fr] (Vladimir), Jean Martin (Lucky) and Roger Blin (Pozzo). The actor due

to play Pozzo found a more remunerative role and so the director – a shy, lean man in real life – had to step in and play the stout bombaster himself with a pillow amplifying his stomach. Both boys were played by Serge Lecointe. The entire production was done on the thinnest of shoestring budgets; the large battered valise that Martin carried "was found among the city's refuse by the husband of the theatre dresser on his rounds as he worked clearing the dustbins", for example.

A particularly significant production – from Beckett's perspective – took place in Lüttringhausen Prison near Remscheid in Germany. An inmate obtained a copy of the French first edition, translated it himself into German and obtained permission to stage the play. The first night had been on 29 November 1953. He wrote to Beckett in October 1954: "You will be surprised to be receiving a letter about your play Waiting for Godot, from a prison where so many thieves, forgers, toughs, homos, crazy men and killers spend this bitch of a life waiting ... and waiting ... and waiting. Waiting for what? Godot? Perhaps." Beckett was intensely moved and intended to visit the prison to see a last performance of the play but it never happened. This marked "the beginning of Beckett's enduring links with prisons and prisoners ... He took a tremendous interest in productions of his plays performed in prisons ... He even gave Rick Cluchey, a former prisoner from San Quentin, financial and moral support over a period of many years." Cluchey played Vladimir in two productions in the former Gallows room of the San Quentin California State Prison, which had been converted into a 65-seat theatre and, like the German prisoner before him, went on to work on a variety of Beckett's plays after his release. (The 1953 Lüttringhausen and 1957 San Quentin Prison productions of Waiting For Godot were the subject of the 2010 documentary film The Impossible Itself, produced and directed by Jacob Adams.)

The English-language premiere was on 3 August 1955 at the Arts Theatre, London, directed by the 24-year-old Peter Hall. During an early rehearsal Hall told the cast "I haven't really the foggiest idea what some of it means ... But if we stop and discuss every line we'll never open."

Again, the printed version preceded it (New York: Grove Press, 1954) but Faber's "mutilated" edition did not materialise until 1956. A "corrected" edition was subsequently produced in 1965. "The most accurate text is in Theatrical Notebooks I, (Ed.) Dougald McMillan and James Knowlson (Faber and Grove, 1993). It is based on Beckett's revisions for his Schiller-Theatre production (1975) and the London San Quentin Drama Workshop, based on the Schiller production but revised further at the Riverside Studios (March 1984)."

Like all of Beckett's translations, Waiting for Godot is not simply a literal translation of En attendant Godot. "Small but significant differences separate the French and English text. Some, like Vladimir's inability to remember the farmer's name (Bonnelly), show how the translation became more indefinite, attrition and loss of memory more pronounced." A number of biographical details were removed, all adding to a general "vaguening" of the text which he continued to trim for the rest of his life.

In the 1950s, theatre was strictly censored in the UK, to Beckett's amazement since he thought it a bastion of free speech. The Lord Chamberlain insisted that the word "erection" be removed, " 'Fartov' became 'Popov' and Mrs Gozzo had 'warts' instead of 'clap' ". Indeed, there were attempts to ban the play completely. Lady Dorothy Howitt wrote to the Lord Chamberlain, saying: "One of the many themes running through the play is the desire of two old tramps continually to relieve themselves. Such a dramatisation of lavatory necessities is offensive and against all sense of British decency." "The first unexpurgated version of Godot in England ... opened at the Royal Court on 30 December 1964."

The London run was not without incident. The actor Peter Bull, who played Pozzo, recalls the reaction of that first night audience:

Waves of hostility came whirling over the footlights, and the mass exodus, which was to form such a feature of the run of the piece, started

quite soon after the curtain had risen. The audible groans were also fairly disconcerting ... The curtain fell to mild applause, we took a scant three calls (Peter Woodthorpe reports only one curtain call) and a depression and a sense of anti-climax descended on us all.

The critics were less than kind but "[e]verything changed on Sunday 7 August 1955 with Kenneth Tynan's and Harold Hobson's reviews in The Observer and The Sunday Times. Beckett was always grateful to the two reviewers for their support ... which more or less transformed the play overnight into the rage of London.""At the end of the year, the Evening Standard Drama Awards were held for the first time ... Feelings ran high and the opposition, led by Sir Malcolm Sargent, threatened to resign if Godot won [The Best New Play category]. An English compromise was worked out by changing the title of the award. Godot became The Most Controversial Play of the Year. It is a prize that has never been given since."

The play had its Broadway premiere at the John Golden Theatre on April 19, 1956 in a production directed by Herbert Berghof with Bert Lahr as Estragon, E. G. Marshall as Vladimir, Alvin Epstein as Lucky, and Kurt Kasznar as Pozzo.

In the Australian premiere at the Arrow Theatre in Melbourne in 1957, Barry Humphries played Estragon opposite Peter O'Shaughnessy's Vladimir.

Although not his favourite amongst his plays, Waiting for Godot was the work which brought Beckett fame and financial stability and as such it always held a special place in his affections. "When the manuscript and rare books dealer, Henry Wenning, asked him if he could sell the original French manuscript for him, Beckett replied: 'Rightly or wrongly have decided not to let Godot go yet. Neither sentimental nor financial, probably peak of market now and never such an offer. Can't explain.' "

In 1978, a production was staged by Walter Asmus at the Brooklyn Academy of Music in New York City with Sam Waterston as Vladimir,

Austin Pendleton as Estragon, Milo O'Shea as Lucky and Michael Egan as Pozzo.

A young Geoffrey Rush played Vladimir opposite his then flatmate Mel Gibson as Estragon in 1979 at the Jane Street Theatre in Sydney.

In 1980, Braham Murray directed a production at the Royal Exchange Theatre in Manchester with Max Wall as Vladimir, Trevor Peacock as Estragon and Wolfe Morris as Pozzo.

The Mitzi E. Newhouse Theater at Lincoln Center was the site of a 1988 revival directed by Mike Nichols, featuring Robin Williams (Estragon), Steve Martin (Vladimir), Bill Irwin (Lucky), F. Murray Abraham (Pozzo), and Lukas Haas (boy). With a limited run of seven weeks and an all-star cast, it was financially successful, but the critical reception was not particularly favourable, with Frank Rich of The New York Times writing, "Audiences will still be waiting for a transcendent Godot long after the clowns at Lincoln Center, like so many others passing through Beckett's eternal universe before them, have come and gone."

The play was revived in London's West End at the Queen's Theatre in a production directed by Les Blair, which opened on 30 September 1991. This was the first West End revival since the play's British première. Rik Mayall played Vladimir and Adrian Edmondson played Estragon, with Philip Jackson as Pozzo and Christopher Ryan as Lucky; the boy was played by Dean Gaffney and Duncan Thornley. Derek Jarman provided the scenic design, in collaboration with Madeleine Morris.
In June 1999 the Royal Exchange, Manchester staged a production directed by Matthew Lloyd with Richard Wilson as Vladimir, Brian Pettifer as Estragon and Nicky Henson.

Neil Armfield directed a controversial production in 2003 with Max Cullen as Estragon at Sydney's Belvoir St Theatre.

On 2 and 3 November 2007, two performances were staged in the Lower Ninth Ward of New Orleans, two years after the neighborhood had been devastated by the failure of the federal levee system caused by Hurricane Katrina. This was followed by two performances in the similarly damaged neighborhood Gentilly on 9 and 10 November. The production was staged by American artist Paul Chan, the NYC-based arts organization Creative Time, and the Classical Theatre of Harlem. It featured New Orleans native Wendell Pierce as Vladimir and J. Kyle Manzay as Estragon.

On 30 April 2009, a production with Sir Ian McKellen as Estragon and Sir Patrick Stewart as Vladimir, opened at the Haymarket Theatre in London's West End. Their performances received critical acclaim, and were the subject of an eight-part documentary series called Theatreland, which was produced by Sky Arts.The production was revived at the same theatre in January 2010 for 11 weeks and, in 2010 toured internationally, with Roger Rees replacing Stewart as Vladimir.

A 2009 Broadway revival of the play starring Nathan Lane, John Goodman, John Glover and Bill Irwin was nominated for three Tony Awards: Best Revival of a Play, Best Performance by a Featured Actor in a Play (John Glover), and Best Costume Design of a Play (Jane Greenwood). It received rave reviews, and was a huge success for the Roundabout Theatre. Variety called it a "transcendent" production.

For Ontario's Stratford Festival's 61st season in 2013, Jennifer Tarver directed a new production at the Tom Patterson Theatre starring Brian Dennehy as Pozzo, Stephen Ouimette as Estragon, Tom Rooney as Vladimir and Randy Hughson as Lucky.
A new production directed by Sean Mathias began previews at the Cort Theatre on Broadway in late October 2013, with Ian McKellen as Estragon, Patrick Stewart as Vladimir, Billy Crudup as Lucky and Shuler Hensley as Pozzo.

The Sydney Theatre Company staged Godot in November 2013 with Richard Roxburgh as Estragon and Hugo Weaving as Vladimir, Philip Quast as Pozzo, directed by Andrew Upton.

In November 2018, the Druid Theater Company staged "Godot" at the Gerald W. Lynch Theater at John Jay College in Manhattan, starring Garrett Lombard, Aaron Monaghan, Marty Rea and Rory Nolan, and directed by Garry Hynes.

7.5 ADAPTATIONS

Becket received numerous requests to adapt Waiting for Godot for film and television.The author, however, resisted these offers, except for occasional approval out of friendship or sympathy for the person making the request. This was the case when he agreed to some televised productions in his lifetime (including a 1961 American telecast with Zero Mostel as Estragon and Burgess Meredith as Vladimir that New York Times theatre critic Alvin Klein describes as having "left critics bewildered and is now a classic"). When Keep Films made Beckett an offer to film an adaptation in which Peter O'Toole would feature, Beckett tersely told his French publisher to advise them: "I do not want a film of Godot." The BBC broadcast a production of Waiting for Godot on 26 June 1961, a version for radio having already been transmitted on 25 April 1960. Beckett watched the programme with a few close friends in Peter Woodthorpe's Chelsea flat. He was unhappy with what he saw. "My play", he said, "wasn't written for this box. My play was written for small men locked in a big space. Here you're all too big for the place."One analysis argued that Becket's opposition to alterations and creative adaptations stem from his abiding concern with audience reaction rather than proprietary rights over a text being performed.

On the other hand, theatrical adaptations have had more success. For instance, Andre Engel adapted the play in 1979 and was produced in Strasbourg. In this performance, the two main characters were fragmented into 10 characters. The first four involved Gogo, Didi,

Lucky, and Pozzo while the rest were divided into three pairs: two tramps, a pair of grim heterosexuals, and a bride raped by her groom. Each of these embodied some characteristics of Estragon and Valdimir. A similar approach was employed by Tamiya Kuriyama who directed his own adaptation of the play in Tokyo. These interpretations, which only used extracts from the dialogues of the original, focused on the minds of the urban dwellers today, who are considered to be no longer individuals but one of the many or of the whole, which turned such individuals into machines.

A web series adaptation titled While Waiting for Godot was also produced at New York University in 2013, setting the story among the modern-day New York homeless. Directed by Rudi Azank, the English script was based on Beckett's original French manuscript of En attendant Godot (the new title being an alternate translation of the French) prior to censorship from British publishing houses in the 1950s, as well as adaptation to the stage. Season 1 of the web series won Best Cinematography at the 2014 Rome Web Awards. Season 2 was released in Spring 2014 on the show's official website whilewaitingforgodot.com.

7.6 AMERICAN RECEPTION

Planning for an American tour for Waiting for Godot started in 1955. The first American tour was directed by Alan Schneider and produced by Michael Myerberg. Bert Lahr and Tom Ewell acted in the production. The first part of the tour was a disaster. Initially, the play was set to be shown in Washington and Philadelphia. However, low advanced sales forced the play to be performed in Miami for two weeks, where the audience was made up of vacationers. It was first described as "the laugh sensation of two continents" in the advanced publication done by Myerberg in the local newspapers. However, when it was shown to the audience, theatregoers would leave after the first act, describing it as a play where "nothing happens", and taxi drivers would wait in front of the theatre to take them home. The Miami showing caused the cancellation of the showings in New York. By April 1956, new showings were

planned. That month, Schneider and most of the cast were replaced. Herbert Berghof took over as director and E. G. Marshall replaced Tom Ewell as Vladimir. The New York showing of the play prompted discussions of the play being an allegory. One reviewer, Henry Hewes of the Saturday Review, identified Godot as God, Pozzo as a capitalist-aristocrat, and Lucky as labour-proletarian. This prompted Beckett to issue a rare statement, stating that the reaction was based on a misconception of the play. To Beckett, the play tries to not be able to be defined. The New York showing of the play was well-received with critics. Brooks Atkinson of The New York Times praised Lahr for his performance as Estragon.

After the New York showing, the play was taken over by The Actors Workshop of San Francisco in 1957. Herbert Blau directed the play. The attitude of this troupe was to move it away from a commercial attitude to an avant garde attitude. As well, the play did not have competition between the actors playing Vladimir and Estragon for being the star of the show. The most successful showing was in November 1957 at the San Quentin prison, where the play had a profound impact on the inmates and spurred them to start a drama group in the prison. They would go on to produce seven of Beckett's works. In 1958, the play, produced by the San Francisco Actors Workshop, would be chosen to go to Brussels for the 1958 World's Fair.

7.7 RELATED WORKS

Racine's Bérénice is a play "in which nothing happens for five acts."In the preface to this play Racine writes: "All creativity consists in making something out of nothing." Beckett was an avid scholar of the 17th-century playwright and lectured on him during his time at Trinity. "Essential to the static quality of a Racine play is the pairing of characters to talk at length to each other."

The title character of Balzac's 1851 play Mercadet is waiting for financial salvation from his never-seen business partner, Godeau.

Although Beckett was familiar with Balzac's prose, he insisted that he learned of the play after finishing Waiting for Godot.

Many critics[who?] regard the protagonists in Beckett's novel Mercier and Camier as prototypes of Vladimir and Estragon. "If you want to find the origins of Godot", he told Colin Duckworth once, "look at Murphy."Here we see the agonised protagonist yearning for self-knowledge, or at least complete freedom of thought at any cost, and the dichotomy and interaction of mind and body. Mercier and Camier wander aimlessly about a boggy, rain-soaked island that, although not explicitly named, is Beckett's native Ireland. They speak convoluted dialogues similar to Vladimir and Estragon's, joke about the weather and chat in pubs, while the purpose of their odyssey is never made clear. The waiting in Godot is the wandering of the novel. "There are large chunks of dialogue which he later transferred directly into Godot."

Waiting for Godot has been compared – thematically and stylistically – with Tom Stoppard's 1966 play, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead. Parallels include two central characters who – at times – appear to be aspects of a single character and whose lives are dependent on outside forces over which they have little control. There are also plot parallels, the act of waiting as a significant element of the play, during the waiting, the characters pass time by playing Questions, impersonating other characters, at times repeatedly interrupting each other while at other times remaining silent for long periods.

Check your progress – 1

1. The title character Mercadet of Balzac's 1851 play is waiting for what?

____

____

____

2. Who directed the first American tour of Waiting for Godot?

3. Who produced the first American tour of Waiting for Godot?

4. Who acted in the first American tour of Waiting for Godot?

7.8 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we went through the analysis, interpretation, related works, American reception and adaptations of “Waiting for Godot”.

7.9 KEYWORDS

- **Dialogue**: This term just refers to words exchanged between characters in a novel or a play.

- **Diction:** Generally speaking, diction is just word choice. Which words is the author using, and what's their effect?
Should you call your crush "sweetie," "dearest," "darling," "beloved," "boo," "sugar pie," or "Hey, you"? It makes a difference. Trust us.
See, diction creates tone, and tone is one of the most important aspects up for discussion in literature. So, when your teacher asks, what's the tone of this novel? Just ask yourself: what words are being used?

- **Drama:** When you use the word drama to describe your day-to-day life, you're probably not referring to dialogue and actors on a stage. More than likely, you're talking about some crazy stuff going down. Though drama has taken on a new meaning these days, it has a very specific definition in literature.

In literature, drama refers to a literary work written for performance by an actor or actors. Drama typically consists of dialogue broken up into acts and scenes. There are lots of dramatic subgenres, such as comedy, tragedy, and tragicomedy. A closet drama is drama that's not meant to be performed—only read. We also sometimes also use the word drama to refer to serious, rather than comic, work.

Drama got started way back in the classical period and has flourished in various historical periods, including the Renaissance, the 18th century and Enlightenment, and the modern theater of the 20th century.

What's the difference between drama and theater? Drama refers to the play's text itself while theater emphasizes the performance of the script. That is, theater is all about the stage, whereas drama typically refers to stuff on the page.

- **Essay:** An essay is a short piece of writing about one subject.

- **Euphemism:**A euphemism is a nice way of saying something not so nice. We see euphemisms all the time, especially when talking about things that are, um, kind of hard to talk about, like sex, death, and race.
  - Examples? Check out all of the hilarious ways Shakespeare talks about sex in The Taming of the Shrew, the many euphemisms for death in Thomas Hardy's poem "Afterward", or the United States Constitution's rather feeble attempt to avoid saying "slave."

7.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

- Analyze Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.
- Write the interpretation of Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.
- Mention the adaptations from Waiting for Godot by Samuel Beckett.

7.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

Notes

1. Katherine Waugh & Fergus Daly (1995). "Film by Samuel Beckett". Film West. 20.

2. ^ Alan W. Friedman (2009). "Samuel Beckett Meets Buster Keaton: Godeau, Film, and New York". Texas Studies in Literature and Language. 51 (1): 41–46. doi:10.1353/tsl.0.0023. JSTOR 40755528.

3. ^ Kenner, H., The Cartesian Centaur, (Perspective, 1959)

4. ^ Croggon, Alison. "Enter all those wary of Samuel Beckett". The Australian. 11 May 2010

5. ^ Clements, Toby. "Cyclists as postmen with raggle-taggle dreams". The Telegraph. 26 July 2004.

6. ^ Ackerley, C. J. and Gontarski, S. E., (Eds.) The Faber Companion to Samuel Beckett, (London: Faber and Faber, 2006)

7. ^ Thecampuschronicle.com

7.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. The title character of balzac's 1851 play mercadet is waiting for financial salvation from his never-seen business partner, godeau. (answer to check your progress – 1 q 1)

2. The first american tour of waiting for godot was directed by alan schneider. (answer to check your progress – 1 q 2)

3. The first american tour of waiting for godot was produced by michael myerberg. (answer to check your progress – 1 q 3)

4. Bert Lahr and Tom Ewell acted in the first American tour of Waiting for Godot. (answer to check your progress – 1 Q 4)