Being-in-the-World: A Gestaltist View of Beckett's Dramatic Theory

Aroosa Kanwal

Abstract

In this paper, I draw a nexus between Gestalt and existentialist approaches to study mind-body relations in Samuel Beckett's plays that have a tremendous capacity for re-evaluating the already exhausted possibilities of the self to cope with the world, dominated by the impossibility of divine rescue on the one hand and the angry rejection of God on the other. Beckett's perceptual world is not dominated by purely visual experiences. Therefore, all the outward actions in his plays are manifestations of inner mental processes. Broadly speaking, given his obsession with sciences of the brain and psychology, critics have often emphasised the superiority of mind over body in Beckett's oeuvre. For them, the rational perception of the external world is informed by the symmetrical articulation of internal holism. Nevertheless, taking a Gestaltist position, my aim in this paper is to rethink and reconfigure the notion of mechanistic holistic rationality, which tends to reveal a sense of order in both inner and outer worlds. Gestalt psychologists, in their focus on how new material that the subject ingests undergoes figure-ground cognitive and existential remodelling, seem to cater to Beckett's innermost desire to problematise the body-self relationship. By discussing Beckett's dramatic strategies in the light of Gestalt psychology, my purpose in this paper is to suggest and emphasise the inextricable tension between body and mind, physical and sensory experiences, exteriority and interiority, rather than simply seek a sense of order in external and internal worlds.

Keywords: *Gestalt psychology; Samuel Beckett; self and existence; dramatic art; body-mind relationship; figure-ground relationship; top-down processing; holism; consciousness; cognition*

1. Introduction

The growing scepticism in the post-Second World War and post-Holocaust era made people contemplate issues involving the world and existence. The strong impact of existentialism on post-War Europe was quite natural due to the crumbling of faith. No wonder then that Beckett's dramatic work, born from the trenches and trauma of war, portrays human figures whose perception of the outer world is constructed against a background of meaningless, chaotic and disorderly sequences or situations. Therefore, his plays act as a window that allows his audience and readers to perceive the external distorted and convoluted realities through inner fields. But in so doing, as Lalita Ramakrishna (1997) notes, "Beckett discards the notion of clear ideas through which man can apprehend reality. It is confusion that enables the self . . . to know that you are beyond knowing" (p. 3). Given this, I am particularly interested, in this paper, in exploring the ways in which Beckett's plays foreground the complexities of dualism and binaries in physical and spiritual perceptions and experiences.

2. Chaos and Form: Beckettian Canon and Gestalt

Against the backdrop of the chaos into which the Second World War had thrown Europe, Beckett resorts to certain strategies which, I suggest, are informed by Gestalt principles of psychology that help to understand the polarities of life and existence in the post-War era. For example, Beckett's theatrical landscapes are populated by characters who are always grouped in pairs, governed by the laws of perceptual organisation. Didi/Gogo, Pozzo/Lucky, Hamm/Clov and Krapp present/ Krapp past are all tied together in relations that can be understood not by the laws of proximity or similarity but by laws of contrastive association. These pairs in Beckett's plays mostly possess opposite characteristics and natures and yet are grouped together. The contrastive relations in which they stand with another person, in a pair, are meant to foreground the confusion and polarity that characterise man's existence, one flickering between neurotic and logical extremes of expectancy. In a similar vein, verbal communication and outward actions are minimalised to the extreme; silences and pauses replace communicative dialogues and human flotsam becomes Beckettian ideal representations. All these strategies help to dramatise the emptiness of the lives of Beckett's protagonists as well as their movement from the banal to the bizarre and back to solace. Nevertheless, such unfamiliar and abstruse representations can only be perceived through a holistic view of dramatic material. If taken and analysed in isolation, the various components – language, characters, setting, drapery and theme – might appear meaningless and absurd. Context plays an important role in making any sense of these nonsense situations. Dialogue, inferring characteristics in a play, the setting in which the characters are placed, a character's company, the relationships between dialogues are but threads of the same contextual string. As Ramakrishna (1997) notes:

> *The formal features in the play like structure, movement, symbol etc. are an integral part of the themes and to look for a meaning separate from the manner of the work would be 'as foolish as trying to discover the clear outlines hidden behind the chiaroscuro of a painting by Rembrandt by scraping away the paint'. (p. 81)*

Gestalt psychologists elucidate the idea that the significance of the parts depends upon their relation to the system, as a whole, in which they are functioning. This context-determined approach is the crux of the Beckettian theory of drama. Beckett's minimalist presentation of dramatic material, whether it is action, character or setting, actually forces the audience to direct their attention towards selected perceptual elements being offered for their intense involvement. This is the main reason for avoiding an elaborate stage setting, as this would tend to divert the spectators' attention away from the main purpose. Beckett does not intend to overload his stage with so many concepts or characters. For example, the plainness of the stage in *Waiting for Godot* gestures towards Beckett's underlying plan to make his characters and audience experience and feel the never-ending miseries of life, these being foregrounded in the play through Vladimir's and Estragon's prolonged waiting, on a country road with a bare tree in the background, for an unknown person called Godot, who remains absent throughout the play. Making a stylised use of space to reflect the inner state of mind of the characters, Beckett's theatre "focuses on dialectic between formal structure and interpretation, establishing a dynamic tensional relation between the two" (McMullan, 1994, p.199). Without cluttering the stage and using confinement as a governing mechanism, the landscape of *Happy Days* is the simplest of all the Beckett plays. Featuring an elderly contrasting couple, half-buried Winnie in a mound of desiccated earth and her largely offstage, passive and silent husband, Willie, are literally living in a 'world without end'. Similarly, blocking and choking off all the activity, the legless and senile father and mother in *Endgame* and the Auditor, enveloped in a loose black jellaba with hood from head to toe and dead-still throughout in *Not I*, can only be perceived in relation to the post-apocalyptic contexts that inform the physical

impairment of the characters in the plays. Similarly, the staccato dialogues and communication between the characters in *Waiting for Godot* can only be comprehended in contextual frames. Estragon's repetition of Pozzo's words "Ah! That's better" (p. 28) can only make some sense to the reader or audience when analysed in light of the context in which Pozzo utters these words. The circumstances might be similar but they are not identical. The relationships between dialogues, how utterances relate to previous utterances, how the statements or utterances of one character relate to the statements or utterances of other characters can only be understood in context.

From the foregoing discussion and examples it is evident that Beckett's plays follow top-down processing whereby the entire pattern is hypothesised before dealing with other related fields. Max Wertheimer has famously argued for the significance of *von oben nach unten* processing in perceptual organisation, according to which the "global configuration has a prevalence on the parts that compose a totality" (cited in Luccio, 2011, p. 96). Given this, Culpeper's (2001) description of dramatic structure corroborates Wertheimer's notion of top-down processing:

> *[In drama] characterization depends on function; what a character is follows from what he has to do in the play. Dramatic function in its turn depends on the structure of the play; the character has certain things to do because the play has such and such a shape. The structure of the play in its turn depends on category of the play. (p. 51)*

This top-down approach, at work in Beckett's plays, can be explained thus: his plays belong to the genre of the Absurd theatre, precisely because of their relentless emphasis on the philosophy of Existentialism. Since Existentialists perceive the world as chaotic and absurd, the structure of Beckett's plays accords with the theme delineated. Plots are circular in nature and all the events in a play must diverge towards a larger pattern already hypothesised by the dramatist. For this reason, the Beckettian theatrical world makes a crucial departure from the tradition of an exposition, a climax and a denouement. Beckett prefers a cyclical structure, commonly described as a "diminishing spiral" (Worton, 1994, p. 69). *Waiting for Godot* is a quintessential example of such repetition of gestures, dialogues and actions that are circular in nature and move "within a prescribed circumference, a circle of consciousness, the circle of a mind … seeking a reference point outside itself" (Lane, 1996, n.p). As Harry Feiner (2012) notes: "The process of creating art imposes a structure on the disparate elements of experience by taking the elements brought into focus by intuition from the disorder of our stream of consciousness and connecting them into a unified whole" (p. 133). The most significant example of this in *Waiting for Godot* is manifested in the dog song, which appears irrelevant if taken in isolation. But when interpreted in the context of the whole structure of the play, it provides "a better grasp of meaning and continuity" (Child, 1973, p. 169). For example, the dialogues between Vladimir and Estragon at the beginning of the play actually refer to the previous night's happenings or events: Estragon gets beaten up by the "same lot as usual" (p. 9). Both acts have similar endings; despite Godot's failure to come, the two tramps are adamant that they will go on waiting for him until he makes an appearance. They are shown to be waiting for him at the beginning of the play, they keep waiting for him in the middle and continue to do so until the end of the play. There is a return of motives, something that is reflected in the dog song. Hence, the circular nature in "the dog song is a model of the circularity in the whole play" (Ramakrishna, 1997, p. 91). Normand Berlin's observation about the dog song is pertinent. According to him, the circularity in the dog song is part of "the pattern of setting up expectations and modifying them, keeping us ever alert as an audience, shaping our responses" (2008, p. 68). This is precisely what Beckett intends to achieve in *Waiting for Godot* though a presentation of "balances and antitheses". The minimal stage activity, where nothing happens, in fact "leads to much happening" through Beckett's

"perplexing use of conventional dichotomies" (Berlin, 2008, p. 68), such as day and night, life and death, womb and tomb, speech and dumbness, sight and blindness. These dichotomies, as I argue in my introduction, are a rejection of the ideas of conclusiveness and finality and therefore serve to create tensions in our understanding of being and existence by "dramatizing 'the perhaps' of our lives", thereby "pushing doubt and ambiguity" (Berlin, 2008, p. 68).

Similarly, Beckett's unkempt morons, depicted in animal-like postures, also gesture towards the working of larger patterns that Gestaltists call 'mosaic perception'. Unable to elevate themselves to the stature of Aristotelian ideal-tragic protagonists, Beckett's morons fall too far below the tragic to be called humans. Estragon's pouncing on Pozzo's discarded chicken bones in *Waiting for Godot*, Willie's crawling in reptilian fashion in *Happy Days*, Nell's scratching against the rim of the bin and Nag's being fixed into bins in *Endgame* are symbolic of man's self reduced to the level of matter. It is interesting to note how much more amusing such caricatural representations can be when they are considered in the context of the larger patterns of life. "All the individuals are subsumed under the genetic frame of man and this again comes under the larger pattern of life" (Ramakrishna, 1997, p. 102). This is what the characters in the plays assert. Gogo's nightmares are terrifying for him because they are a constant reminder of losing not only his individual identity but also his human identity. As Ramakrishna (1997) puts it: "In Beckett's plays the particular is enclosed in larger and larger frames rather in the nature of the arrangement in a Chinese box" (p. 104). There are hardly any events in Beckett' plays, "[w]hat happens is that an interpreting being makes a selection and forms a gestalt" (Ramakrishna, 1997, p. 101).

No wonder then that Gestalt researchers, while focusing on mental organization, emphasize the role of prior knowledge or schemata in how we interpret new experiences in the light of old ones. Most importantly, our schematic knowledge "shapes how we view, remember, and make our new inferences about new information. In other words, schemata may form the basis of top-down or conceptually driven cognitive processes . . . schemata are anticipations by which the past affects the future" (Culpeper, 2001, p. 64). The cognitive scientist Rumelhart describes this top-down processing as "expectation-driven processing", and according to him these "schema-based expectations" tend to guide and pilot our perception, memory and inferences (as cited in Culpeper, 2001, p. 65). In *Waiting for Godot*, Beckett draws our attention to the ways in which characters (re)construct their relationship with Godot according to their predictions and expectations. The ambivalence of the Godot-character relationship hinges predominantly on the knowledge represented in the characters' schema, which provides the basis for raising a number of expectations. In the second act, Vladimir's last encounter with the messenger boy is quintessential of the role of a schema in inferential processes. He enquires about Godot:

VLADIMIR. (*softly*) Has he a beard, Mr. Godot?
BOY. Yes, sir.
VLADIMIR. Fair or. (he hesitates) . . . or black?
BOY. I think it's white, sir. *Silence*
VLADIMIR. Christ have mercy on us! (p. 92)

Vladimir's perception of Godot is informed by Biblical speculation about divine justice based on information about God having a white beard, which is part of his schema. Vladimir's remark "God have

mercy on us!" (p. 92) shows us that he is reminded of Jehovah, God of the Day of Judgment, responsible for punishing humanity. The way Godot and Jehova are merged into a blurred picture on the basis of a white beard and the way Vladimir cogitates the whole concept of God in negative terms actually gestures towards his insightful learning. Calder (2001) aptly describes the situation: "God is usually pictured by Beckett's characters as conventionally as he is presented to children in Sunday School, and by priests to the unquestioning believer with no desire to think religion, who wants only to be told what to believe and what to expect after death" (p. 107). Vladimir seems to register his disillusionment with seeing through the lens of customary sources of knowledge, with their false promises. His previous experiences of life affect the present ones, enabling him to critically evaluate the present situation of the world that is also characterised by false promises. Vladimir is indubitably a neurotic intellectual type, highlighting the fact that he is a cogitative being, struggling to find his way in this chaotic world scheme. This interpretation fits Vladimir's schematic knowledge and shows his power to comprehend. Rumelhart and Ortony describe this process thus:

> *[T]he bulk of processing in a scheme-based system is directed towards finding those schemata which best account for the totality of the incoming information. On having found a set of schemata which appears to give a sufficient account of the information, the person is said to have comprehended the situation. (as cited in Culpeper, 2001, p. 67)*

This past experience or schema also plays a significant role in perceptual organisation based on the figure-ground relationship, as I will discuss.

3. All Life is Figure and Ground

The Gestalt principle of a figure-ground relationship, which tends to trigger more than one perception, is the most significant feature of Beckett's extra-linguistic world of Beckettian theatre, in particular, *waiting for Godot*. The figure-and-ground relationship enables the Beckettian protagonists Vladimir and Estragon, as well as his audience, to perceive this world of chaos in a new dimension, one "lying between the extremes of chaotic overdifferentiation and primordial homogeneity" (Tsur, 2009, p. 241). Tsur defines primordial homogeneity as a sort of "nothingness" and chaotic overdifferentiation as a kind of "too muchness" (p. 241). Gestalt psychologists have usefully described the in-between space of this perceptive distinction between figure and ground as "relative differentiation". Tsur (2009) further argues that:

> *'[c]haotic overdifferentiation' constitutes perceptual overload of the cognitive system, which alleviates this overload by dumping it into the background as an undifferentiated mass. Thus good shapes tend to stand out as figures, whereas both 'primordial homogeneity and chaotic overdifferentiation' tend to be relegated to ground. (p. 241)*

In light of the foregoing, it is interesting to note that what stands out as a figure in one moment in the play depends upon the perceiver's momentary interest as well as upon what Gestaltists perceive as "patterns of sensory stimulation". For example, how do we understand the word 'Godot' in *Waiting for Godot*? This neologism may be understood in two ways, depending on the figure-ground orientation. Sometimes the word 'God' becomes the figure, against the word 'dot' as the ground. This interpretation or working of God as a figure against the ground of characters' sufferings is associated with the hope of the two tramps that all the miseries of life will come to an end if (the good figure) Godot comes. Such an interpretation of the word Godot as a saviour of humanity is also informed by Vladimir and Estragon's momentary interest in their otherwise meaningless universe. As Vladimir, resorting to

existential micawberism, says to Estragon: "Yes, in this immense confusion one thing alone is clear. We are waiting for Godot to come" (p. 51). Vladimir and Estragon's waiting in the play need not necessarily be considered a symbol of hope, but at the same time it also gestures towards the impossibility of divine rescue.

However, Lucky's peroration reverses the foregoing figure-and-ground relationship by dumping the divine chaotic overdifferentiation in the godless world of "divine apathia", "divine athambia" and "divine aphasia" (p. 43). Unlike Bishop Berkeley's unwavering trust in God's love for his creations, Beckett's God seems to be reduced to the status of a 'dot' when seen in the context of the bitter reality that Lucky unveils in his unpunctuated tirade; despite the existence of a loving God, man is dwindling, shrinking and suffering. My reading of Lucky's tirade corroborates Calder's observation that "Beckett's driving desire [in the speech] was to look at the full horror of the situation into which God (or whatever the cause of our suffering can be called) has put us, and to realize it fully and absolutely with nothing to deflect that gaze" (2001, p. 76). We can visualise the world of *Waiting for Godot* as totally bereft of divinity, where man is left to the misery of malignant fate. Lucky indubitably asserts in his nonsensical monologue that even were God to exist, the fact of his existence would not make any difference. Given this situation, the status of the God is no more than that of an insignificant and niggling dot. In so doing, Beckett's play offers alternate choices of figure and ground with regard to the concept of God, and this dualism also persists in Vladimir's monologue, as he says: "Astride of a grave and a difficult birth. Down in the hole, lingeringly, the gravedigger puts on the forceps" (p. 91). Vladimir expresses an uncertain vision of life: man passes straight from the womb to the tomb, assisted by the gravedigger's forceps. This is a world in which "God is dead" (Copleston, 1972, p. 154), there is nothing beyond, and what is in-between is meaningless and negligible. This tension between the self and its dissolution is the crux of the Beckettian universe. And as Tsur (2009) points out, "[t]he emotional disorientation aroused by this understanding is reinforced by the grotesque image. In our everyday perception, birth is the beginning of life, death its cessation. What matters is life itself" (p. 241). Beckett's image presents two extremes, birth and death, or the womb and the grave, which become the figure and life; what is between these two extremes serves only to connect them.

> *The shorter the connection, the more meaningless life becomes . . . the excerpt from Beckett could be paraphrased in a straightforward conceptual language. But this is quite misleading. What is important here is not so much the message conveyed, but the insight resulting from the shift of mental sets. (Tsur, 2009, p. 241)*

A similar shift of mental sets is highlighted in Act II when the tree as a figure is exceptionally foregrounded. When taken as a metaphor for life and hope, it becomes a figure against a dull, monotonous stage setting. And the same dull, pale setting emerges as a figure against the tree in a state of complete hopelessness; the tramps perceive the tree as a shrub, bush or willow, pretending that they are completely oblivious to its presence, or even failing to remember that it was there yesterday.

Beckett's characters are obsessed with their desperate and contingent being, continuously reminded of past moments retrieved or recalled inevitably through cues, one of the significant devices Beckett introduces in his plays. Gestalt-trace theory is helpful in understanding the importance of the recall system: "to initiate retrieval a cue is needed, either from an external stimulus or by a person's conscious effort to search through the memory store for a link with material already in the working memory" (Child, 1973, p. 154). The reactivation of a memory trace results in a re-experiencing of the original perceptual experience. As a result, man's relation to the past becomes inevitable. Nevertheless, I suggest

that Beckett complicates and ruptures the individual's relationship with the past to blur the boundary between existence and non-existence. In *Krapp's Last Tape*, Krapp's own recorded voice from his youth activates his memory traces, reminding of and refreshing bitter memories and desperation. "By re-playing the recordings of his own voice, made when he was much younger, Krapp displays the effect key events had on his state of mind at the time they were recorded, and the effect they generate while he is listening in the present" (Grant, 2005, n.p). Though memory fails to give Krapp any meaning or insight into himself, it ensures insightful learning of the audience and the reader. It is interesting to note how Beckett collapses the space between character and audience by making Krapp the audience for his own performance. When Krapp reimagines his past memories through the medium of mechanical spools of tape, the audience, rather than seeing the end of a love affair, in fact "watches an old man sit rigidly while listening to the memory of the end of his love affair. He becomes an audience member to his own past" (Weiss, 2013, p. 31). In his efforts to take control of his past or, in other words, his life, Krapp ends up altering his own past memories; as a result he messes with his self, both present and past. Consequently, "Krapp's past recordings structure and distort his present undertaking and the viewers' perception of Krapp" (Weiss, 2013, p. 35). Through the blurring of this boundary between Krapp, the character and Krapp the audience, Beckett is in fact collapsing the space between character and audience; in so doing, he tends to activate the memories of the audience so that they may also find their lost self in a contingent world. Eric P. Levy (2007) has rightly described "Krapp as the Beckettian version of Everyman" (p. 181). Irit Degani-Raz (2008) also notes that in his "solitude and self-alienation Krapp becomes a representative of a modern human being . . . who, by applying blind domination over nature with no self-reflective thought about its consequence, becomes the victim of the same conditions that constituted him as master: a victim of his own creation" (p. 193). Since memory connects the individual's every moment with the past and the future, by transposing Krapp's dismal failure to have full control of his existence to the audience (by making Krapp the audience for his own recording), Beckett suggests the cessation of life; here, Beckett seems to allude to Marcel Proust by construing Krapp's discontinuous subjectivity, which is now "drowned in dreams" (p. 25) as "a succession of individuals" (Beckett, 1999, p. 19). Beckett foregrounds the ways in which Krapp's retrospective project 'backfires' and consequently leads to a loss of identity. As Levy (2007) notes: "Krapp has no identity except through regretting the past and abdicating responsibility to constitute his identity through striving toward the future" (p. 185). According to Gestalt-trace theory, the usefulness of a memory trace is manifested not only in its storage and the form of its recording but also in its retrieval mechanism through playback. Krapp's failure to retrieve his past memory through cues recorded on the tape captures the problematic associated with existence and non-existence. Thus by engaging not only Krapp but also the audience, a tension is created between past and present, reality and illusion that is the essence of the Beckettian canon. The characters in *Waiting for Godot* also confront such fractured voices from the past. The holy maps remind Estragon of their falling state and man's present plight. The Eiffel Tower is reminiscent of clochards in Paris, who are now the rejects of destiny. Lucky's long unpunctuated speech, filled with great troubles, carries a burden of nostalgic feelings. More precisely, the most significant memories of the characters involve pain, limping, oozing, crawling etc. Lucky is recalled by Estragon because of the kick he received on his shin. He remembers Pozzo because of the discarded chicken bones he received from him.

Of course, none of this can be understood without involving the audience in an experiential activity in such a way that they feel trapped in a tremendous emotional tension. Thus, a reading of Beckett's plays in the light of Gestalt principles reveals the importance of Beckett's technique of involving his spectators in an experiential activity. Spectators are made to feel those moments of agony which are felt by the characters; they too suffer as the characters suffer, and they too learn the lessons of life and

existence as the characters learn these in the course of dramatic presentation. Hence, it would not be wrong to say that it is not only the characters who are active on the stage but also the audience. Beckett had an acute awareness of how this insight and experiential activities should be shared by both characters and audience. And it is because of this type of involvement in mental activities that the role of drama in learning activities gained importance in the twentieth century. Gestalt therapists have also been involved in the study of aural and visual recordings, which play an important role in the individual's overall perception of life. Beckett too believed that the spectator's intense concentration on signs and tropes is impossible without being emotionally involved in them.

Like Gestalters, Beckett's overindulgence in perceptual experience led him to contrive such strategies in which the real emphasis is on thinking that forms the basis for outward actions. Beckett was not only concerned with episodic memory but also with semantic memory. Hence, drama in the minds of the characters is more important and more active and outer actions can only be comprehended when the inner drama is fully understood. Beckett's dramatic performances are representations of the mind, an effort to identify consciousness with the activity of the thinking mind. The Gestalt principle of the figure-ground relationship makes Beckett's treatment of dramatic material unique as it has helped the dramatist to present absurdity in an absurd manner, leaving his cogitative beings in a state of pure bewilderment, which is the essence of the Beckettian canon. Similarly, Beckett's minimalist representation of dramatic material seems to endorse the Gestalt approach. There is little action in the plays, sometimes no action at all. But the minds of characters as well as of the audience are crowded and clouded with uninterrupted thinking processes, mostly nostalgic and revisionist in nature. Hence, through an intersection of the principles of Gestalt psychology and dramatic art, Beckett's plays often feature convoluted and fragmented communication and experiences of anguished beings, ranging from anger, confusion and fear to a sense of betrayal or abandonment of and by God, thereby problematizing the Beckettian uncertainty and the inextricable tension between interiority and exteriority, leading to cognitive and existential remodelling.

References

Beckett, S. (1956). *Waiting for Godot.* London, UK: Faber and Faber Ltd.

Beckett, S. (1999). *Proust and three dialogues*. London, UK: John Calder.

Calder, J. (2001). *The philosophy of Samuel Beckett.* London, UK: Calder Publications.

Child, D. (1973). *Psychology and the teacher.* London, UK: Continuum.

Copleston, F. (1972). *Contemporary philosophy.* New York, USA: Newman Press.

Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language and characterisation: People in plays and other texts.* Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Feiner, H. (2012). Intuition in practice: Emotion and feeling in the artistic process. In Megan Alrutz et al., (Eds). *Playing with theory in theatre practice.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grant, S. (2005). Embers. *Samuel Beckett's radio plays: Music of the absurd* 20 July. <http://www.samuel-beckett.net/ch3.html>.

Lane, R. (1996). Beckett's Godot: A bundle of broken mirrors. *The Palm at the end of the mind http://www.samuel-beckett.net/LaneGodot.html*

Levy, E. (2007). *Trapped in thought: A study of the Beckettian mentality.* Syracuse, US: Syracuse University Press.

Luccio, R. (2011). Gestalt psychology and cognitive psychology. *Humana Mente* 17, 95-128.

McMullan, A. (1994). Beckett as director: The art of mastering failure. In Pilling, J. (Ed). *The Cambridge companion to Beckett.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.

Moorjani, A. (2008). *Beckett at 100: Revolving it all.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Normand, B. (2008). The tragic pleasures of Waiting for Godot. In Bloom, H. (Ed). *Waiting for Godot – Samuel Beckett.* New York, US: Infobase Publishing.

Raz, Irit D. (2008). The spear of telephus in Krapp's Last Tape. In Ben-Zvi, L and Ramakrishna, L. (1997). *Samuel Beckett: Time and self in his plays.* New Delhi, India: Harman Publishing House.

Tsur, R. (2009). Metaphor and figure-ground relationship: Comparisons from poetry, music and visual arts. In Geert B., and JeroenV (Eds). *Cognitive poetics: Goal, gains and gaps.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 21 August. < http://www.tau.ac.il/~tsurxx/Figure-ground+sound.html>.

Weiss, K. (2013). *The plays of Samuel Beckett.* London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Worton, M. (1994). Waiting for Godot and Endgame. In John Pilling (Ed.). *The Cambridge companion to Beckett.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.