

“LITERATURE OF THE NON-WORD”:

THE PARADOX OF BILINGUALISM IN SAMUEL BECKETT’S FICTION

by

Julia de Vasconcelos Magalhães Pinto

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of “Mestre em Estudos Literários, Área de Concentração Literaturas de Expressão Inglesa”

Thesis Advisor

Prof. Thomas LaBorie Burns, Ph.D.

Belo Horizonte

Faculdade de Letras da UFMG

2012

Dissertação intitulada "*Literature of non-word: the paradox of of bilingualism in Samuel Beckett*", de autoria da Mestranda JÚLIA DE VASCONCELOS MAGALHÃES PINTO, apresentada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Literários da Faculdade de Letras da UFMG, como requisito parcial à obtenção do título de Mestre em Estudos Literários.

Linha de Pesquisa: Poéticas da Modernidade

Área de Concentração: Literaturas de Expressão Inglesa

Aprovada pela banca examinadora constituída pelos seguintes professores:



Prof. Dr. Thomas LaBorie Burns - FALE/UFMG - Orientador



Prof. Dr. Luiz Fernando Ferreira Sá - FALE/UFMG



Prof.ª. Dra. Suely Maria de Paula e Silva Lobo - PUC/MG



Prof. Dr. Jacyntho José Lins Brandão
Subcoordenador do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Estudos Literários da UFMG

Belo Horizonte, 28 de fevereiro de 2012.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I offer my sincere gratitude to my friendly advisor Prof. Thomas Burns, without whom this master's thesis would not have been possible at all. His great knowledge and careful assistance were essential in every stage of the process of writing this thesis.

My deepest gratitude to my family, especially my mother who has so carefully planned all the lines, leaving to me the possibility to repaint it as I wish to, and my father, for the love of literature. I am eternally grateful to them for raising me with all the love and support.

I owe my gratitude to Prof. Lúcia Castello Branco, for the guidance in my first steps on academic research.

Prof. Ram Mandil to have first encouraged me in Samuel Beckett studies and to have suggested to me the guidance of Thomas Burns.

Prof Ana Cecília Carvalho for her friendship and supervision in the early stages of the project.

Prof. Elizabeth Richmond-Garza for helping me with a source that I could not have reached in any other way.

And, finally, I would like to thank my friends for the patience and encouragement.

André, because a love like that “ne se commande pas”, for the support during the final stages of this thesis.

ABSTRACT

To contribute to the study of the works of Samuel Beckett by focusing on the trilogy *Molloy*, *Malone Dies* and *The Unnamable*—especially the last book, this master’s thesis aims to highlight Beckett’s achievement as a bilingual author. The thesis I attempt to prove is that beyond the geographical self-exile, the linguistic one has facilitated the process of turning the experience of being a foreigner into a theme, in Beckett’s search for a kind of aesthetic project—a “literature of the non-word”, as he himself denominated it. I will demonstrate that the bilingual experience is the main motif of *The Unnamable*. Besides, the work also consolidates itself in an in-between space—between nations and languages. This research hopes to find in Beckett’s work, as author and translator, justifications for the development of the hypothesis that the bilingualism as well as the translating effort have changed Beckett’s writing in a direction in which the relationship between language and reality and the dissolution of the “I” configure themselves as main topics.

Key words: Bilingualism, self-translation, “literature of the non-word”, Samuel Beckett

RESUMO

Para contribuir com o estudo da obra de Samuel Beckett, com foco na trilogia *Molloy*, *Malone Dies* e *The Unnamable* – especialmente o último, esta dissertação de mestrado tem por objetivo destacar a realização de Beckett enquanto um autor bilíngue. Nossa tese é a de que além do autoexílio geográfico, o autoexílio linguístico facilitou o processo de tornar a experiência de ser estrangeiro em um tema, na busca de Beckett por uma espécie de projeto estético – a “literatura da despalavra”, como ele mesmo o denominou. Demonstraremos que a experiência do bilinguismo é o eixo central em *The Unnamable*. Além disso, a obra também se consolida num entre-lugar—entre nações e línguas. Esta pesquisa busca encontrar no trabalho de Beckett, como autor e como tradutor, justificativas para o desenvolvimento da hipótese de que tanto o bilinguismo quanto o trabalho de tradução mudaram a escrita de Beckett numa direção em que a relação entre língua e realidade e a dissolução do “Eu” se configuram como eixo principal.

Palavras-chave: Bilinguismo, autotradução, “literatura de despalavra”, Samuel Beckett

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
RESUMO	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
“LITERATURE OF THE NON-WORD”: AN AESTHETIC PROJECT	7
1.1 Samuel Beckett: The Man In-Between	7
1.2 The Bilingual Experience.....	11
1.3 Bilingualism and Translation: Why Write in a Foreign Language?	13
1.4 The Paradoxes of a “Literature of the Non-Word”	18
THE POST – WAR TRILOGY AND THE CHANGE OF STYLE.....	22
2.1 <i>Dream of Fair to Middling Women</i> and <i>Watt</i> —an Outline of a Project	22
2.2 Beckett’s Work Before and After the Switch to French	27
2.3The Construction of the Post-War Trilogy.....	31
2.4 <i>The Unnamable</i> : “Plot” and Language Structure.....	34
2.5 Bilingualism as a Theme in <i>The Unnamable</i>	37
LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION	41
3.1 The Foreign Language and the Translating Effort.....	41
3.2 The Foreign Language of the Unconscious.....	44
3.3 The Paradoxes of Bilingualism: Language as Inevitably “the Words of Others”	52
CONCLUSION	55
WORKS CITED.....	60

INTRODUCTION

In my first attempt to analyze Samuel Beckett's oeuvre, I proposed a bilingual reading in which I was going to compare the two versions of the trilogy—*Molloy*, *Malone Dies*, *The Unnamable*—in order to understand the differences between them. I realized, however, that this not only was a very ambitious goal for a master's thesis but also that it would lead to a more linguistic approach instead of a literary one—which was what really interested me. Besides, what struck me from the beginning was the label, "translated into English by the author", that I came across in the book, *The Unnamable*. While reading Samuel Beckett for the last three years, after having, as most of his readers, read only *Waiting for Godot*, a long time before, I realized that Beckett had translated his books from French into his own language and, thus, had been writing extensively in a foreign language.

This fact did not appear to be completely separate from the theme of the book I was trying to comprehend. It changed completely the reading I could have made of *The Unnamable* if I had not been aware of this. Even though the problematic nature of language portrayed by the book might have been noted without this information, it is more interesting and worth investigating its relationship to the bilingual experience of an author that deliberately chose to write in a foreign language. The struggle of the character to find the right words that could finally name him—or perhaps it—as well as the efforts of the reader to read this Dantesque scenario of an "I" that could not be named, with its disintegrating body and inhuman aspect, cannot be separated from the experience of any person who faces the insufficiency of language. If Beckett's early works had already brought up existentialist and humanistic questions, here, after the turn to French, it points to the foreign aspect of language itself.

The fact of an author who wrote most of his books in a foreign language and then translated them into his own language could not therefore be overlooked. I was already trying to decipher the themes of his books, beyond the absurdist and the humanistic aspects extensively dealt with in the

criticism. Having graduated in psychology and working especially with psychoanalysis, I have always been interested in the many different philosophical and psychological approaches to language. I would work in this area—“Literatura e Psicanálise”—when the theme of my project itself brought me to “Literaturas de Expressão Inglesa”. As a professor warned me of what just now I realize, it would be useful for me to have the bilingual experience myself. As I was working with translation studies in the “Iniciação Científica” at “FALE” while teaching English and studying French, one could say that Beckett brought me some amazing material with which to work.

This master’s thesis, then, addresses Samuel Beckett’s striking choice to write in a foreign language—French—in order to understand how the bilingual experience has changed his writing in the direction of an aesthetic project, a “literature of the non-word” (Beckett, “Letter” 520), as he himself has named it. Beckett affirmed in the letter to Kaun in 1937, “On the road toward this, for me, very desirable *literature of the non-word*, which some form of nominalistic irony can of course be a necessary phase. However, it does not suffice if the game loses some of its sacred solemnity. Let it cease altogether! . . . Word-storming in the name of beauty” (520, emphasis added). A literature without words or created with non-existing words, whatever the interpretation one could make of this expression, definitely leads to a contradiction in terms. This paradox also defines Beckett’s oeuvre itself, as a large number of books about this “non-word” has been paradoxically written in two different languages.

The paradoxical experience of being between nations and languages is essential for the understanding of this author’s oeuvre. I will demonstrate how Beckett’s choice to write in a foreign language and his subsequent translating effort ought to be considered in any attempt to interpret his books. Samuel Beckett is an Irish bilingual writer, dramatist, critic, and translator, known especially as one of the founders of the *Theatre of the Absurd*. Being inserted in the modern and post-war context, Beckett realized a change in the organized way that the world used to be seen and represented,

questioned pre-established patterns, and proposed new forms of expression. Critics have aligned him with the modernist *avant-garde* movement in recognition of his innovative style. The literary scene also placed him in an honored position, awarding him with the Nobel Prize in 1969. For a long time, though, Beckett's unique bilingualism and his "foreign" oeuvre, a central aspect of his work, have been fairly ignored.

Even Beckett's criticism has been, for a long time, nationally and linguistically divided between Literatures in French or English. In fact, Beckett's bilingualism could be easily ignored by his readers, as only discreet notes make reference to his self translations in his books, which is not even mentioned in the theatre. Beyond that, there are few books that have been published as a bilingual edition so far, although this seems to have been the author's own wish, as one can see in the *Samuel Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*, directed by Dirk Van Hulle. Initiated in 1986 by Charles Krance, with the permission and support of Samuel Beckett, the project provides a series of bilingual online editions with the intention of reuniting his manuscripts in a single source to facilitate researches of all kinds. Critics before the 1980s have been either unaware of Beckett's bilingualism or have just relegated it to a detail of his biography. More recently, Beckett's switch to French has become more commented on and its implications have been addressed from different perspectives. I will demonstrate that beyond Beckett's geographic exile, the linguistic one is a turning point for his work and, moreover, it is essential to understanding it.

The first chapter will provide background information on Beckett and his criticism that is relevant to understand the switch to French and his literary project, which are undoubtedly connected. Beckett has chosen French to be his literary language, and, what is even more unique, he has never abandoned the two languages: he translated his books into English and returned to write in English, later on. I am not adopting a cultural analysis of the author's exile; I am rather claiming that writing in-between languages configures a literary project or a writing strategy that the author has deliberately

chosen for specific purposes, even though the consequences of this choice may have gone beyond his own perception and premeditated intention. Biographical data, taken from James Knowlson and C.J. Ackerley works, will be given in this chapter just enough to understand the context and motivations in which this important switch took place. This will provide the required information that enables us to understand the need for language and translation studies to approach this theme in Beckett's works. I will demonstrate how the paradox, one could even say the absurdity, of a "literature of the non-word" is a kind of aesthetic project that is linked with the bilingual experience that includes the realization of the alienating and insufficient character of language itself.

In the second chapter I will examine the impact of Beckett's bilingualism in his writing, as a recurrent theme of his oeuvre seems to be the language that is paradoxically necessary to constitute an "I" at the same time that it restricts it to a fiction. The validity of this standpoint will be analyzed through a reading of the post-war trilogy, with the focus on the last book, *The Unnamable*, as to do an analysis of the entire trilogy would require much more time and exceed the purpose of this work, as I explained before. The last book is where the bilingualism and the problematic of language are mostly evident, as a natural consequence of the others. Some references will be made to other of his works whenever necessary, as the paradox of bilingualism that leads to the paradox of language itself is being considered here as the tone of his whole oeuvre. In this chapter, remarks will be made about the different periods into which one can divide Beckett's work and the importance of the switch to French. I will demonstrate how Beckett's writing has changed and how this could be related to the switch to French.

In the third and last chapter, after having analyzed Beckett's literary work, I will deal with studies on language and translation theory necessary to understand Beckett's choice to write in a foreign language and its impact on his work. With the awareness of language as a main concern for most of the modernists, I will show its centrality in Beckett's work. The focus here is not linguistic, but literary; therefore I will deal only with the most well-known articles of literary translation theory, notably "The

Task of the Translator” by Walter Benjamin. Octavio Paz and Wilhelm von Humboldt, will also be considered, among others assembled in the book edited by Rainer Schulte: *Theories of Translation. An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. As for the study of language, I will consider mainly George Steiner’s book *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* as the possibility for another work and a different approach. Psychoanalytical theory will also serve as support for it deals with language as being itself a foreigner—and as the structural material of the unconscious.

This last chapter will offer theoretical bases to finally reach the conclusion that writing in a foreign language has provided Beckett with a perspective that has opened up the possibility of a new form of expression that otherwise could not be achieved—for many reasons that will be mentioned—in his mother tongue. This master’s thesis therefore hopes to make possible further investigations into language, translation theories, and psychoanalysis. It hopes to contribute to a wider view of Beckett’s oeuvre with a spotlight on its bilingual character, which some critics, as Brian T. Fitch and Julien F. Carrière, have been recently trying to analyze. If the author could only have consolidated his style in a foreign language, it would be an inalienable experience that could not be generalized. In short, I am pointing up a specificity of Beckett, which could also shed some light on an important literary notion that considers a link with literature and the foreign character of language. That view is aligned, for instance, with what Gilles Deleuze defined as the writer as being “a foreigner in his own language” (*Essays Critical and Clinical* 110).

CHAPTER 1: “LITERATURE OF THE NON-WORD”: AN AESTHETIC PROJECT

1.1 Samuel Beckett: The Man In-Between

Beckett was born in 1906 in Foxrock, in the South of Dublin. He became a student at Portora Royal School, the same secondary school that Oscar Wilde attended, and started studying French at that time. In 1923, he entered Trinity College, Dublin, where he began his academic experience that would be interrupted later on. He devoted his studies to modern languages—French and Italian—and to Dante’s works. Not only Beckett had an exemplary education, but he also had the privilege to be in contact with several important names of the literary scene. He came to know a lot of artists, such as Alberto Giacometti, Marcel Duchamp, and the brothers Geer and Bram van Velde. He became a close friend of James Joyce—and his secretary at the time Joyce was writing *Finnegans Wake*— and was also introduced to Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, W. B. Yeats and T.S. Eliot, among other important figures.

In 1928, Beckett went to Paris on an exchange program between Trinity College and the École Normale Supérieure and stayed there for two years. That was the time when he was introduced to the group of James Joyce and Alfred Perón. He published his first critical essay in 1929, *Dante... Bruno... Vico... Joyce*, on the so-called “Work in Progress” by Joyce, that later became known as *Finnegans Wake*. At that time he met Suzanne Deschevaux, who was to become his wife. Beckett returned to Dublin in 1930, when he was invited to teach French at the University. In the same year he wrote the monograph *Proust*, about his newly-completed masterpiece *À la Recherche du Temps Perdu* [*Remembrance of Things Past*]. In 1932, he resigned from university and went to Paris, where he started working on literary articles. Beckett also translated some works by Arthur Rimbaud, as well as poems by Paul Éluard and André Breton. James Knowlson stated that “George Duthuit’s letters, kept by his son, Claude, show that

Beckett did far more translations than anyone had realized, for many of them appeared, at his own request, unsigned” (334). During the time he was in France he wrote his first novel *Dream of Fair to Middling Woman*, which was published posthumously, in 1992. Beckett returned to Ireland in the period of his father’s death, in 1932. In 1937, he definitively returned to Paris, which would be his home for the next fifty three years. During the Second World War, Beckett joined the French Resistance and, in 1942, to escape from the Gestapo, he took refuge in a non-occupied city in the South of France. There, he finished *Watt* and he only returned to Paris in 1945, after the city was liberated.

It is difficult to place Beckett’s work, or even the man himself, in the literary scene with a single label or without having to deal with paradoxes. In 1969, when Beckett was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature, but did not attend the ceremony, Karl Ragnar Gierow described the event in this speech: “Mix a powerful imagination with a logic in absurdum, and the result will be either a paradox or an Irishman. If it is an Irishman, you will get the paradox into the bargain. Even the Nobel Prize in Literature is sometimes divided. Paradoxically, this has happened in 1969, a single award being addressed to one man, two languages and a third nation, itself divided”.

This situation of being in-between nations and languages is a determinant for the understanding of Beckett’s oeuvre. His bilingualism has been neglected by most of the critics who have taken it into account only to analyze him as a translator. Nevertheless, critics have not extensively examined this important issue on its own, which has an impact upon the author’s writing itself. As one can see in his biography, from 1946 on, Beckett began to translate his own books, most of them first written in French and then translated into English, as is the case of *First Love*, as with *Mercier and Camier*, the first of his novels written in French in 1946. Beckett’s first work written in French was actually a short story “Suite”, written in 1946, which would be later and ironically called “The End”, published together with “The Expelled” and “The Calmative” as *Stories*. The book *From an Abandoned*

Work was the first written directly in English since *Watt*, written in 1945. Almost ten years had gone by without Beckett writing anything in English, except for his own translations. The French period has been the most productive, and it is when one can notice a change in Beckett's writing. For instance, if *Murphy*, written in English in 1936, still keeps the fundamentals of the traditional novel, such as characters and temporality, after *Molloy* these familiar fictional aspects are definitely abandoned.

Between 1947 and 1950, Beckett wrote the *Texts for Nothing* and the books that are known as the post-war trilogy, *Molloy*, *Malone Dies* and *The Unnamable*. At that time, the author also wrote the play *Eleutheria*—which was published posthumously, in 1995—and *Waiting for Godot*. Through the latter, the author became well-known in Brazil and in the universal theatre as one of the founders of the *Theatre of the Absurd*. About this period, Beckett said, in an interview with Israel Shenker, an American journalist (1956):

I wrote all my work very fast—between 1946 and 1950. Since then I haven't written anything. Or at least nothing that has seemed to me valid. The French work brought me to the point that I felt I was saying the same thing over and over again. For some writers writing gets easier the more they write. For me it gets more and more difficult. For me the area of possibilities gets smaller and smaller (162).

Despite that statement, Beckett would produce radiophonic and teletext plays, which were broadcast by the BBC, as well as a short film and various books in French and English. The more Beckett dealt with different genres and media, the more complex became his relation to translation, as he was working with different kinds of transpositions—for instance translation between languages, or intersemiotic translation. It is interesting to note that in the author's biography the completion of what can be identified as a literary project of the "non-word" clashes with his choice of adopting French as his literary language. Nabokov, a Russian who wrote in English; Ionesco, a Romanian who wrote in French or Pessoa, a Portuguese who sometimes wrote in English, are other rare examples of bilingual authors who

expressed themselves in a language other than their mother tongue. More recently, however, a vast number of contemporary exiled authors fit the same case. Beckett, nevertheless, was not only a bilingual writer who studied several languages, but he also voluntarily went into exile and chose a different language from his mother tongue to write most of his work and extensively translated almost all his own books.

As Paulo Leminski observes “[u]nder the cultural point of view, to change languages must be the maximum pain. Beckett has deliberately done this change without being forced to do so by no other historical circumstance greater than literature” ‘Sob o ponto de vista cultural, mudar de língua deve ser a dor máxima. Beckett fez essa mudança deliberadamente, sem ser forçado a isso por nenhuma circunstância histórica maior que a literatura’ (Beckett, *Malone Morre* 150). With this in mind, I am supposing that Beckett took a kind of shortcut through French to unlearn his own language and recreate in translation a language that is not English anymore; nor is it French, but his own literary language. Dealing with several languages therefore would be a fact of his biography that deeply concerns his work and in a final analysis constitutes a literary project—or in a broader perspective, an aesthetic one.

1.2 The Bilingual Experience

Steiner writes about his multilingualism: “I have no recollection whatever of a first language”. In his case, he acquired German, French, and English at the same time and in a very early age, as he was inserted in a multilingual context, speaking German and French at home and English at school. He remarks,

For a human being possessed of several native tongues and a sense of personal identity arrived at in the course of multilingual interior speech, the turn outward, the encounter of language with others and the world, would necessarily be very different, metaphysically, psychologically different, from that experienced by the user of a single

mother tongue . . . In what language am I, suis-je, bin *ich*, when I am inmost? What is the tone of self? (125).

Bilingualism is an experience that brings up inevitable questions, as we can see from Steiner's perspective. In the field of linguistics, some authors have even distinguished bilingualism according to the way it was acquired. Suzanne Romaine affirms that Uriel Weinrich was the first one to identify different types of bilingualism considering the way the languages were encoded by the bilingual person. His theory would be reinterpreted several times by other authors for the next 20 years. According to him, there is the *compound bilingualism*, when the person learns the two languages in the same context so that different words and phrases have the same associations in meaning for the bilingual person. There are two different language systems that function together—but they are interdependent—so that the person switches from one to another with the change of language. Steiner would probably fit this type. The second kind is the *coordinate bilingualism*, in which the person has acquired the two languages in different contexts—like family and school, for instance. Thus, different systems and meanings would be formed for different words—the languages would be independent. Beckett would fit the *coordinate* bilingual, as he acquired French as a second language, in school. In the third type, the *subordinate*—or *sub-coordinate*, as the name indicates, there is a first and second language, but one language is dominant.

Suzanne Romaine explains,

According to Weinreich, then, the compound bilingual would have one set of meanings and two linguistic systems tied to them. The coordinate bilingual has two sets of meanings and two linguistic systems tied to them. The sub-coordinate bilingual, however, has a primary set of meanings established through their first language, and another linguistic system attached to them (79).

Wolfgang Klein, discussing the same subject, has represented Weinreich's ideas in this table.

1

Compound	Coordinate	Subordinate
<p style="text-align: center;">'chair' - 'chaise'</p> <p style="text-align: center;">/ \</p> <p style="text-align: center;">t e r e z</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">'chair' 'chaise'</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p style="text-align: center;">t e r e z</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">chair</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p style="text-align: center;">t e r</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p style="text-align: center;">e z</p>

More recently, however, these distinctions are not considered essential to understand the bilingual experience or, at least, as Wolfgang Klein states “[i]t is not inconceivable that the distinction between *compound* and *coordinate bilingualism* is of some relevance, but for the time being it has proved to be more confusing than beneficial” (12,13).

What I am considering so far is that a bilingual person would simply be the one who has fluency in two languages. Besides, Beckett could even be considered multilingual, although the emphasis here is French and English, because they were the two languages he used for literary purposes. Moreover, one could be a *compound* bilingual in relation to some words or phrases and a *coordinate* in relation to other. Even one for whom the two languages work in an interdependent relationship, the strangeness towards language—which counts the most for the present purpose—seems to occur the same way, and differently from a monolingual person.

1.3 Bilingualism and Translation: Why Write in a Foreign Language?

The most fascinating stylistic questions that arise in connection with Malone Dies concern the translation. The phenomenon of an author writing in a foreign language and then translating his work, after a time-lapse of nearly ten

¹ “Table 1. Three kinds of bilingualism” (12).

years, into his mother tongue, is so rare in literature as to be of considerable interest. For not only Beckett, as an excellent translator of the writings of others, far better placed than anyone else could be to translate his own work satisfactorily, *he was also provided with an unique opportunity to alter or modify the tone of his text*, as his subsequent development and feeling about the novel inclined him. (Fletcher, *The Novels of Samuel Beckett* 162 emphasis added).

It is significant that Beckett's "literature of the non-word", which was effectively consolidated in *The Unnamable*, was achieved at the same time that the author started to write in a foreign language. As this epigraph announces, writing in French and translating his own books into English, his native tongue, is a specificity of his work that cannot be ignored. An analysis of Beckett's themes and style has to include translation as a main issue, not only when considering *Malone Dies*, but all his books. As Ann Beer emphasizes, one can be totally unaware of Beckett's bilingualism. The references to his self-translations are very discreet, in the labels of the books, and not even mentioned in the theatre. This might explain why many critics completely ignored it before the 1980s. Even after that, although his bilingualism and self-translation have been extensively addressed, the first time that they were definitely considered as a problem worth tackling was in Brian T. Fitch's work *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work* in 1988.

Other critics have approached his bilingualism and self-translations within the perspective of linguistics, not as a literary topic. This is the case of most of the articles that compose the book by Allan Warren Friedman *Beckett Translating/Translating Beckett*, for example Ruby Cohn's essay "Samuel Beckett Self-Translator", as well as many others. Fitch has made an attempt to determine the status of the second versions through the perspective of their different production and reception. Considering the changes that Beckett has made in his own translations as well as the fact that the first texts can be considered not as "original" versions but already as a translation—as they were written in a foreign language by the same author—it is extremely important to note that there are two different works that

also have an undeniable exchange relationship. Fitch concludes that “. . . just as Beckett is the Man-between (languages), each of his creations as a writer is a Work-between (texts)” (161).

After 1987, with Friedman, bilingualism became a focus on Beckett's oeuvre and there are many different studies available or still being produced that may help us to go beyond translation theories and the problematic of self translation towards an approach to bilingualism as the tone of the author's oeuvre itself. It is in the scope of this master's thesis to show how the experience of writing itself could be an inevitable immersion in a language that is always, in a way, “foreign”. Generally speaking there is a point that is worth investigating, especially considering Beckett's works, where writing and translating cannot be totally separated.

There are some steps that we must follow first. Provided that I am considering, here, that Beckett had a literary project of showing the paradoxes of human communication—such as the fact that words are used to communicate, but, at the same time, “the words fail” (“The Unnamable”, 413)—we can assume that it was not possible to write the “non-word” in such a “naturalized” language, that is, his own language. As some other writers have presumably done this, one may suppose that this strangeness that one can feel while working in a foreign language—and that Beckett has transformed into a main theme in his books—is actually there, in the language itself, whether it is native or foreign. This will be better explained upward when we get into an analysis of language, in chapter three of the present work. Still, Beckett has purposely radicalized this experience of facing the “non-word”, when he has voluntarily chosen a foreign language to write most of his works and thereby raises several questions that are in the scope of literary translation theories.

We will see that when comparing the original works in French with their translation into English by the author, it is possible to follow the steps of the process of translating/recreating of a writer who became famous for re-writing his texts many times. It is possible to think that the translation was another excuse, as well as an opportunity for Beckett to modify his own texts, to search for the most

accurate word. Considering this, he forced himself to be more precise as he was writing in a language he surely did not know as well as he knew his mother tongue. Paradoxically the consequence is that instead of conveying meaning Beckett has actually conveyed a silence—a silence “full of murmurs” (“The Unnamable”, 414). After all, in the constant attempt to express, his words fall into nonsense, into what is inexpressible—or in other words, *The Unnamable*. Therefore, it seems that this is what the author thought to be the actual aim of the modernist writer, as he wrote in a letter to Axel Kaun (1937), “To drill one hole after another into it [language] until that which lurks behind, be it something or nothing, starts seeping through—I cannot imagine a higher goal for today’s writer” (518). Overall it is important that this goal was reached through the process of translating, and that is why it is worth considering it here.

As a translator of his own books, several times Beckett omitted words or entire sentences, changing them in the new language. As C. J. Ackerley affirms, “The texts of this middle period [considering the period in which he was writing in French] exist in two languages and two forms, the French being the original but the English less a translation than a reinvention in a different linguistic mode, something quite different from even the genius of Nabokov’s self-translations” (208). Beckett’s translations are not another text, but the shadows of the “original” remain in such a way that it is even more difficult to talk about the polemical relationship of original and translation, for the two texts seem to exist together as “originals”—so that one should reconsider the very idea of the existence of an original text. It is even more difficult if we think that there are no evidences that Beckett has not, sometimes, worked in the two languages simultaneously. Actually, in the Manuscript of *Dream of Fair to Middling Woman*, that I will mention further, the two languages indeed appear together. By analogy, this procedure can be compared to the “pentimento” in fine arts. As Lilian Hellman explains,

Old paint on a canvas, as it ages, sometimes becomes transparent. When that happens it is possible, in some pictures, to see the original lines: a tree will show through a

woman's dress, a child makes way for a dog, a large boat is no longer on an open sea. That is called *pentimento* because the painter 'repented,' changed his mind. Perhaps it would be as well to say that the old conception, replaced by a later choice, is a way of seeing and then seeing again. (Introd.)

For instance, the famous picture "The Old Guitarist", by Pablo Picasso, when submitted to X-rays reveals at least three completely different sketches of paintings that the experts could identify beneath the "original". Beckett, in an analogous way, sometimes changes his mind, adds or removes words and sentences to better shape the text in a way that his translators could also choose the text—English or French—that suits better or even mix them both. As Leminski affirms there are not so many differences—at least concerning *Malone Morre*, but the few changes made by Beckett are infinite in their different effect in English or French (fwd.149).

Unfortunately, this is not what seems to happen, at least in the Portuguese translations, where with the exception of *Malone Morre* all the editions bring only the French source—as the "original"—with rare mentions to the English version. It is implicit then, not only that the translation has been done using only the French version, but also that what I am supposing here as being Beckett's literary project has been completely ignored.

Beckett's translators into other languages have to—or at least should—deal with this additional difficulty of having two different texts that must be examined. For instance, Leminski, when translating "*Malone Dies*" [Malone Morre] by Beckett into Portuguese had to use, as the "original" source, both the French and English versions. He gave us an example of a passage in which he had to be inventive when he translated the sentence "Ce qui ne manque pas de sel" and "Very pretty"—Beckett's translation— as "O que não deixa de ter lá a sua graça" (27n). He has found a solution to the translation once he has considered the two versions. Therefore, Beckett brings an additional problem to his translators/readers as he has written mainly first in a foreign language—one may consider it as a

translation—as well as he has translated his own texts, not hesitating on recreating them as he, the author, was “free” to do so. This makes one deal with necessarily two texts, maybe two “originals”. A point that is often overlooked by most of his critics is how Beckett’s oeuvre calls for a bilingual reading or at least a reading of the problematic of bilingualism, which necessarily includes translation—that will finally lead us directly to the problematic of language itself so much approached by Beckett.

As Fitch realized, Beckett’s work is actually in neither of the French or English version, but in the “space between” (160)—in the tension between two languages—and the two versions are incompatible as well as interdependent. This is to say that Beckett’s works should not be read only as originals and translations, but as works that are always operating across languages as, up to a point, there was no way for him to avoid the interference of the other language, being it French or English. The strangeness that was mentioned previously was unavoidable. As Fitch remarked,

if both languages take on, for the bilingual writer, something of the strangeness that characterizes any foreign language, it is because whichever of his two languages he is working in there remains ever present, ever available, ready to hand, the other alternative language. The ‘otherness’ of alternatives, somewhere between the two of which the writer finds himself to be situated. Being between both, he is necessarily outside them both. (160)

These are key points to understand any of Beckett’s books and the problematic that, being part of a greater project—a “literature of the non-word”— they put forth. This master’s thesis will show how the interference of this “otherness” becomes an explicit theme in *The Unnamable* and how the choice of this bilingual writer to write in a foreign language cannot be separated from any interpretation of his books.

1.4 The Paradoxes of a “Literature of the Non-Word”: An Experience Turned into a Theme

Only from time to time do I have the consolation, as now, of being allowed to violate a foreign language as involuntarily as, with knowledge and intention, I would like to do with my own language, and—Deo juvante—shall do. (Beckett, "Letter" 520)

No other author in literary history has written as many works in a foreign language, and also—or even simultaneously—translated them into the mother tongue, and the other way round, as Beckett did. Moreover, Beckett's writing has changed once he had decided to write in French. As J. M. Coetzee argues, "It can fairly be said that Beckett did not find himself as a writer until he switched to French" ("Samuel Beckett" 169). One could also argue that such a relationship between the writer's biography and his works is not important. Thus, the aim of this master's thesis is really not to examine his life, but to consider Beckett's bilingualism as an essential problem for the understanding of his oeuvre. The aim is to discover whether the process of writing in a foreign language as well as the self-translations are relevant to grasping the problematic of language so depicted in his books, in order to understand the connection between writing in French and the search for a "literature of the non-word".

Reading Beckett is indeed a confrontation with these paradoxes, and words are full of silence as they do not seem to be communicating anything but the nothingness. This paradox of trying to convey silence through words that can indeed never cease to convey meaning is in all the formal aspects of the text. Friedman observes that "an urgent need exists for a solid thorough, definitive study of Beckett's bilingualism and his activity as a self-translator . . . not merely to note differences or variants, but to arrive at an 'aesthetic' of bilingualism, or better yet to arrive at a 'poetics' of such activities" (9). Finally, bilingualism concerns Beckett's life—as we have previously found—but it is also part of the meaning of his works and is essential to interpret them. Moreover, if one considers that the problematic of language is their main topic, that could actually be perceived without any reference to bilingualism is, in fact, only totally apprehended by considering it. Consequently, only through a bilingual reading and

with a consideration of the importance of the fact that a text was written purposely in a foreign language, it is clearer the problematic of language that the books portray.

Indeed, the paradoxical experience of bilingualism and of writing in a foreign language—metaphorically, the state of being always in exile—has a clear impact on Beckett's writing. To build himself through "the words of others" ("The Unnamable" 314), as the narrator of *The Unnamable* says, has been an experience that Beckett was able to transform into a theme. As Leslie Hill states, this switch to French has allowed the author to "approach the whole problem of language differently" (86). That is, if language is already a problematic issue for an Anglo-Irish author, when he has voluntarily chosen to switch to French, Beckett has radicalized this experience by confronting himself with a language that was literally other. It is being considered, here, that all the languages, even our native tongue carry a foreign aspect, as they necessarily leave something unsignified, unnamable.

The paradox—when two self-contradictory statements are put together— is a recurrent theme in Beckett's books. *Waiting for Godot*, like most of his plays, is paradoxically a play without action. *Endgame* is an ending game that actually never ends. The book *Happy Days* could also be about anything but happiness. As Martin Coyle affirms, paradox in a work is usually an effort to recover the contradictions of experience. Beyond its clearly philosophical issues, paradox permeates Beckett's oeuvre through the structure of language itself and denounces the essential need of language as well as its failure in the attempt to communicate or to represent reality, that is, one cannot escape language but it is never enough.

An important issue for literary criticism is the distinction made between everyday language and literary language. This subject has often been criticized, for instance by Stanley E. Fish, in his well known article "How ordinary is ordinary language?", but it still cannot be dismissed when analyzing a text like Beckett's. As Lois Tyson affirms, although everyday language can be connotative and expressive, in general it is practical in its intention, that is, to communicate, to explain. Literary

language, on the contrary, is systematically connotative, for its purpose is to achieve an “aesthetic experience, a world of its own” (Tyson, 138). Therefore, even if Beckett’s text searches for finality, up to a point we know that it is hopeless and that there is really nothing behind the words. The sense is the lack of sense itself.

CHAPTER 2: THE POST-WAR TRILOGY AND THE CHANGE OF STYLE

2.1 *Dream of Fair to Middling Women* and *Watt*: An Outline of a Project

Beckett's first novel, *Dream of Fair to Middling Women*—written in English in 1931-32 while he was in Paris—remained unpublished for sixty years. Its publication was an important event, as ironically it was his first novel and the only one published in Ireland, by the Black Cat Press. It was refused by many English publishers like Chatto and Windus—who had published *Proust*—and was, later, shelved by Beckett. The original manuscript remained with Beckett till 1961, when he gave it to Lawrence E. Harvey, finally expressing his desire for it to be published, but only after his death.

Eoin O'Brien affirmed that editing *Dream* was much more complex than he had first imagined.

In *Dream*, Samuel Beckett crossed the barriers of language from English—and English as used by the Irish—to French, from German to Italian and Spanish, and he resorted quite often to Latin. He also experimented with words and deliberately flaunted grammatical convention at times outrageously so that in truth there were occasions when only he could have said what was intended. (fwd. xviii)

Thus word-play, coining of sentences and typographical errors made the work difficult for the editors. In fact, this book, together with *Eleutheria*, which also had a posthumous publication—it was written in 1947—are the only ones that were translated into English by someone other than the author.² Beckett's first works like *Dream* and *Watt* have many foreign words which make them difficult for translators and readers.

In this book, one can identify Beckett's first sketch of what would be his later works. For instance the dark humor that lies in the manipulation of the language. There one can already have an

² Only *Molloy* was translated by Patrick Bowles in collaboration with Beckett and some of his short prose by Richard Seaver.

idea of the form his writing would take. As Belacqua, his fictional character, affirms “[t]hey [Racine and Malherbe] have no style, they write without style, do they not, they give you the phrase, they sparkle, the precious margaret. *Perhaps only the French can do it. Perhaps only the French language can give you the thing you want*” (Beckett, *Dream* 48, emphasis added). As this book carries a clearly autobiographical tone, this assertion is commonly attributed to Beckett himself, who would soon adopt French as his preferred literary language.

The importance of *Dream* is still unrecognized, as seen by the fact that Beckett’s most recent publishing, *The Selected works of Samuel Beckett*, includes all Beckett’s books with the exception of *Dream and Eleutheria*. *Dream* is usually considered too autobiographical—Belacqua is a young writer and a teacher very similar to Beckett—and carries much obvious influences from James Joyce. The conclusion even parodies the end of Joyce’s “The Dead” with rain rather than Joyce’s snow falling all over Ireland: “It began to rain again and now it would rain on through the night until morning . . . What would Ireland be, though, without this rain of hers” (Beckett, *Dream* 239-40). However, Beckett’s characters do not have epiphanies; they simply “must go on” (“The Unnamable”, 414). Over time Beckett overcame Joyce’s influence, consolidating his own mark of a literature with no style—or with the style of the no style—that is characterized by silence, failure.

Watt, Beckett’s last book written in English before the French period marks the transition from French to English. It establishes the ground for Beckett’s aesthetic project, which would be totally consolidated in French, in the trilogy, as we will see in this chapter. Beckett’s characters are rarely described; their actions, memories, appearance, impressions and stories are inconsistent. Mr. Knot, for example, is a wordless protagonist—more present for his absence— from which we only paradoxically know through the words of the narrator, Sam, who is retelling a story told by Watt, whose words one cannot rely on, as they fail him. As we see in this passage: “. . . which Watt was not familiar, with reference to these words. And this perhaps worthy of mention, because it was with Watt a common

experience, where words were concerned" (Beckett, *Watt* 269). Watt's experience is that of the detachment of the words from reality that they cannot describe.

As another example, take the long paragraph describing the inconsistent appearance of Mr. Knott. "For one day Mr. Knott would be tall, fat, pale and dark, and the next thin, small flushed and fair, and the next . . ." (Beckett, *Watt* 340). The narrative itself, although it is simple, has also the same indefinites as its "characters"—if one can call them so. Watt, who is a servant in Mr. Knott's house, fails to name things, to define Mr. Knott and understand his needs and has to leave, ending up in a "mansion" that looks more like a mental hospital: "It was about this time that Watt was transferred to another pavilion . . . Watt seldom left his mansion and I seldom left mine" (291). We realize only in the third chapter that the chronology is totally distorted by the narrator to whom Watt is telling the story in the asylum, as we can see in this passage: "As Watt told the beginning of his story, not first, but second, so not fourth, but third, now he told its end. Two, one, four, three, that was the order in which Watt told his story" (Beckett, *Dream* 345). This distortion is the chronology related by Sam of Watt's story, and the reader does not know which event is actually the "reality", the time when Watt is at Mr. Knott's house or when he is at the asylum, or neither of these. This breaking of the expectations of the reader is an artifice that would be broadly used by Beckett. There is no solution, no ending to the stories, and no answer to all the questions that it provokes.

James Knowlson, Beckett's biographer, stated that *Watt* ". . . is such an extraordinary book that it stretches the very limits of language itself. One long section even contains a language that is scarcely English at all" (323). The book indeed contains passages in Latin, German and Italian, but the passage Knowlson is mentioning may be the famous one of the "pot". It is a long passage but worth quoting here:

For Watt now found himself in the midst of things which, if they consented to be named, did so as it were with reluctance. . . . Looking at a pot, for example, or thinking

at a pot . . . it was in vain that Watt said Pot, pot. Well, perhaps not quite in vain, but very nearly. For it was not a pot, the more he looked the more he reflected, the more he felt sure of that, that it was not a pot at all. It resembled a pot, it was almost a pot, but it was not a pot of which one could say, Pot, pot, and be comforted . . . and Watt preferred on the whole having to do with things of which he did not know the name, though it was too painful to Watt to having to do with things of which the known name, the proven name, was not the name, any more, for him . . . For the pot remained a pot, Watt felt sure of that, for everyone but Watt. For Watt alone it was not a pot, any more. Then, when he turned for reassurance to himself, who was not Mr. Knott's, in the sense that the pot was, who had come from without and whom the without would take again, he made the distressing discovery of finding himself too he could no longer affirm anything that did not seem as false as if he had affirmed it of a stone (Beckett, *Watt* 232-33).

As already pointed out, it seems necessary to do a bilingual reading of Beckett's books, including the ones written in English first. I am here expanding the meaning of bilingual reading, not only considering that his books should preferably be published in a bilingual edition or that one should compare the French with the English versions, but that one should, at least, be aware that it is an inevitable bilingual oeuvre that deals with language—and even bilingualism—as one of its main themes. This passage of the pot, for example, can be read considering a bilingual experience. "Pot" is the same word in French and English and therefore does not require a translation, and is an example of word-play that demonstrates how the French was already part of the author's universe and would soon be his preferred literary language. It does not matter if a word—"pot" — is the same in the other language; the object can never be totally described by a word. If Watt never stops asking "What", he only hears the silence, the negation of Knott that is the absence itself. Watt could be a foreigner that does not know

the names of things and his bilingual experience can be actually expanded to any man's experience towards language and reality.

The names of Beckett's characters usually suggest a meaning and are English names, even in the French versions. Mr. Knot, in *Watt*—which itself may refer to “What”—may signify: “not”, “knot”, “naught”, or the German “*Not*”—anguish—or all of these. It is important to note that this presents another difficulty for translators and can be completely ignored by readers of the French version. For instance Winnie, one of the characters of the play *Happy Days*, which was written in English, has an interesting reference to “wind”, which was masterfully used in the construction of the scenario when it was performed by the Italian Company Changing Performing Act (2010). The play ends with a blank sheet trapped at the top of the stage that moves with the strong sound of the wind in the background. These subtleties require a reading of Beckett's work that considers the importance of its bilingual character; otherwise, one would not recognize this possibility of interpretation, as the name Winnie does not refer to anything in French and the scenario is not described in this way in the book.

2.2 Beckett's Work Before and After the Switch to French

Many remarks have been made about Beckett's switch to French, but not much about his later return to English, when he also started to use different media—he composed plays for radio at BBC and a film: “Film”. Julien F. Carrière in his thesis on Beckett's bilingualism has focused on the equal importance of the return to English. The author has separated Beckett's oeuvre into three different parts, which were divided by the language that Beckett used to write the books in each period—starting from the English (1931), then the French (1945) and the return to English (1955). It is evident the importance that was given to language, which confirms how this is a central issue when analyzing Beckett's works. As his thesis shows, the later English phase, after the author's having written almost ten years in a foreign language differs significantly from the first phase. Furthermore, not only has the

switch to French marked a change in Beckett's writing, but the effect of the switch was also finally transposed to English.

Although one has to recognize the importance of the later English period, I am adopting a different methodological division that focuses on the switch to French, which I consider the crucial point in understanding the change. As has been pointed out before, here, Beckett has never really abandoned his mother tongue, as he has continuously translated his own works into English. English has an overwhelming presence throughout his work, but it is after the switch that the French influence revealed itself impossible to be ignored although it had been already present, as I have pointed out, even in his early works. Moreover, Beckett did not stop writing in French, even in the last period, as well as translating both in French and English. One example would be *Act Without Words*, written between 1956-8 and his last work *What is the Word* written in the late 1988.

One therefore comes to the important conclusion that the translating effort is what really matters when considering the change that the French has brought to the work. That is, when Beckett started to use a foreign language, writing was no longer different from translating and would never be again. Actually, this became part of a literary project and the translation and relation to a foreign language could not ever be separated from the tone of Beckett's oeuvre. I argue that after the French we will always find not only the two languages inevitably in a mutual influence, but also the language manipulation and rewriting that come together with the author's translation. As Ackerley affirms "the texts of this middle period exist in two languages and two forms, the French being the original but the English less a translation than a reinvention in a different linguistic mode, something quite different from even the genius of Nabokov's self-translations" (208).

To better explain this, when Beckett translated the lines: "Des traces, elle veut laisser des traces, oui, comme laisse l'air parmi les feuilles" (Beckett, *Nouvelles et Textes pour Rien* 216), he could not avoid making a pun in English: "A trace it wants to leave a trace, yes, like air leaves among leaves"

(Beckett, "Text for Nothing" 337). Writing, translating and rewriting were a part of his creative process throughout his oeuvre after the switch to French.

Beckett is usually compared with James Joyce, mainly because of the first English period. They are connected not only in a literary perspective, but they were also good friends. Besides both being Irish and contemporary authors, Beckett worked with Joyce, and was undoubtedly influenced by his "master". Their later works, however, differ considerably; while Beckett searches for silence, bareness and minimalism, Joyce's texts are quite the opposite—rich and enigmatic. The English works from Beckett's first period—especially *Murphy*—are more conventional, and also carry more influences from Joyce, especially when compared to the later works both in French and English.

The switch to French was followed by Beckett's recognition in the literary scene with *Waiting for Godot*, and was marked by a change of style in a search for a "literature of the non-word". Among the few comments that Beckett made about the switch to French, he said once that "in French it was easier to write without style" (apud Knowlson 324). Paradoxically, he has consolidated his style in French, a language that offered him new possibilities, but, at the same time, one that he could use as an instrument, having total control of it. To better explain this, I will refer to J. M Coetzee's thesis on Beckett in which he proposed an analysis of his style. The author compared Beckett's last work in English, *Watt* —written in 1941—and his first work in French, "Suite", that would be later called "La Fin"—published in 1955 in *Nouvelles et Textes pour Rien*, but written in 1945— to describe the relation between form and content in both. Coetzee's aim was to explore and compare the expressive potentials of English and French. According to his perspective "to write without style is to write with full control of expression" (Coetzee, *The English Fiction* 4). The author claimed that literary English is more difficult to control due to its more connotative aspect. Moreover, as Coetzee states ". . . the crisis in his relations with English points to a crisis in the relation of form and content in his fiction, one in which certain kind of form, associated with the English language, is no longer adequate to express a certain kind of

content" (Coetzee, *The English Fiction* 3). Therefore, to write in French would be rather a necessity that concerns stylistic purposes.

As Beckett's biography by Knowlson shows, this linguistic change was not such an abrupt choice as it may appear. Besides the translations he had already done, there is evidence that shows that Beckett might have worked on the two languages simultaneously. For instance, Beckett's first work in French, "Suite", was not even written entirely in French, as the manuscripts show that the 20 first pages were actually written in English. Beckett affirmed in an interview by Shenker, that writing in French was "more exciting" (qtd. in Graver, 148). It appears that the French language may have been an important way to avoid the erudition, automatism and exuberance characteristic of his early works.

Carrière also highlights these differences between French and English as a possible reason for Beckett's choice. He considers that Beckett's works written in English are more erudite and poetic than the ones written in French, which also tends to be less musical. Carrière states that "Beckett either knew or intuited that English had a larger vocabulary than French and therefore allowed for a greater variety of connotations and, in some cases, subtlety of meaning reminiscent of poetry" (39).

Although I agree with Carrière and Coetzee that Beckett has deliberately chosen French for stylistic purposes, I believe that this is due not only to supposed characteristics of that language, but rather for its foreign character. As Prof. Rudmose Brown affirmed in his letter to the University of Cape Town in 1937, "Mr. Beckett graduated in 1927 with the very highest distinction in French and Italian. He knows both languages thoroughly and in scholarly way, as well as German". (524). Thus, Beckett might have chosen to write in Italian or German, two other languages he knew quite well, so that we might have perceived in his works the same consequence—the "foreign effect". As Ann Beer states, "to have two tongues, two modes of speech, two ways of responding to the world is to be necessarily outside the security of a single viewpoint" (209). Therefore, the paradox is that, although dealing with a foreign language is a way of putting oneself out of a security zone provided by the mother tongue, it is exactly

for this very same reason that it is easier for the writer to control it. The use of a foreign language provides a necessary strangeness towards the words that may be taken for granted while using the mother tongue. It requires, then, more caution and, at the same time, opens wider possibilities. In conclusion, what is essential to understand is that Beckett could no longer write—at least what he was willing to write—in English; or that he could only do that after the switch to French, when his mother tongue had also become “foreign”.

2.3 The Construction of the Post-War Trilogy

The post-war trilogy, *Molloy*, written in 1947, *Malone Dies*, written in 1948, and *The Unnamable*, conceived in 1950, marks a radical change of style in Beckett’s works that, however, could have been foreseen in *Watt*. This happened—and I believe that it is not by coincidence—just after the author switched from English to French. As he wrote in the already mentioned letter to Axel Kaun, in 1937: “It is indeed getting more and more difficult, even pointless, for me to write in formal English. And more and more *my language appears to me like a veil which one has to tear apart in order to get those things (or nothingness) lying behind it*” (Beckett 518, emphasis added).

Indeed, his language began to express the “nothingness” in a very particular way, through a foreign language. Beckett’s writings henceforth became more and more unadorned, minimalist, as is evident in subsequent texts, such as *Texts for Nothing*, finished in 1952 and the play *Not I*, written in English in 1972—. In this play, for instance, Beckett used a spotlight to focus on the narrator that is just a mouth that pronounces a sequence of apparently disconnected words. It says, for example, “... a few steps then stop... stare into space... then on... a few more... stop and stare again... so on... drifting around... when suddenly... gradually... all went out...” (Beckett, “Not I” 402) Also, in *Texts for Nothing*, there is no character, but a voice: “Where would I go, if I could go, who would I be, what would I say, if I had a voice, who says this, saying it’s me? . . . It’s the same old stranger as ever, for whom alone

accusative I exist, in the pit of my inexistence" (114). So, in Beckett's later books the character is gradually reduced to a mere voice; there is no temporality and even the body is disintegrating till its complete disappearance. Most of the subsequent works that were written after the trilogy, and even some before it have this hallmark of a search for the "non-word" as one can note in some titles: *as Texts for Nothing*, and *Act Without Words*, among others. Some titles are even "non-words" themselves, as is the case of *Ping [Bing]*, *Endgame [Fin de Partie]* and the poem *Whoroscope*.

Therefore, reviewing the trilogy is the best way to outline the path of this change in Beckett's writing. In the first book, *Molloy*, the story is divided into two parts that may be mutually exclusive. The book starts from an intriguing perspective from which the narrative proposes to solve the enigma of how the character ended up sick in his mother's room. Moran, the character of the second part of the story searches for Molloy, whose face he does not know. It is not possible to think, here, of a novel in the traditional meaning of the term, either in a narrative way, considering the plot, or in a psychological way, considering the characters. The chronology is also completely subverted. The enigma, what the characters are looking for—the mother for Molloy or Molloy himself for Moran, conceals a search for the origin that is as uncertain as the end.

After all, the same space, his mother's room, where Molloy is standing, can only be confirmed by his memories, which, however, do not really confirm anything. The lack of sense in Moran's search resembles the waiting in *Waiting for Godot*, as well as what happens in the play *Endgame*: the ending, in both cases, cannot be precisely determined. Nothing really happens, Godot never appears. A similar thing happens in *Molloy*, where the enigmas are indeed false enigmas, as they were never supposed to be solved. Moreover, as Ethel F. Cornwell states "[w]hen Moran refers to himself as a man exiled in his manhood, what he means is that one's existence as man is a kind of exile" (47). So, if language is necessary for the existence as manhood is, it is also paradoxically a foreigner, a continuous lie, a kind of self alienation.

In *Malone Dies*, there is a character dying who does not know where he is or how he ended up in that limited space of a room. Differently from Molloy, Malone does not want to know what happened or how he came to be there, but he writes to pass the time, to keep his mind off his agony and his tragic situation. In this book, there is nothing to be revealed, not even a false enigma—a waiting that proves itself to be for nothing or a search for an origin or an end, or for a story that never forms itself—as there still was in *Molloy*. Even the narrator/character in *Malone Dies* alerts us, from the beginning, that all the stories that he writes are invented and that he shall not explain anything. Malone himself starts doubting if he is not already dead, and all the waiting, here, is again, without purpose.

In the last book of the trilogy, *The Unnamable*, Beckett's criticism of the established patterns of the novel reaches its peak. In this work, there are no more characters, and neither a narrative nor a chronology. The principles that guide the traditional realistic novel, which in the first two books were melting away, have here completely disappeared, and Beckett's radicalism even *affects* the "I". After all, who speaks in *The Unnamable*? It is not even possible to affirm that it is a monologue, as we cannot identify this "I", sentenced to name *The Unnamable*, who wanders from one being to another without being anyone. *The Unnamable* has put Beckett in a deadlock from which he was unable to escape—the impossibility of returning to traditional writing, the impossibility of continuing, and, once more, the need to continue, but in a different way.

Here, again, one could relate these changes to the idea of the "absurd" as well as modernist writing that indeed help us realize that the way of seeing and expressing reality has completely changed. The focus of this work, however, is to show how Beckett managed to convey his individual experience into a universal one, that is, the paradoxically necessary and alienating human experience in relation to language and how this can be noted in the "text itself", especially considering the last book, because, among other reasons, "bilingualism is very much the overlooked topic of *L'Innomable/The Unnamable*" (Fitch, IX).

2.4 *The Unnamable*: Plot and Language Structure

Where now? Who now? When now? Unquestioning. I, say I. Unbelieving (Beckett, "The Unnamable" 291).³

In *The Unnamable*, one cannot precisely determine where, who or when, which are the basic required parameters for constructing a story. The book starts with the most crucial philosophical questions that are not even answered and with an "I". *The Unnamable* is the construction of this "I", the narrator itself, of this narrative, that has neither a beginning nor an end. Maurice Blanchot affirms that to think that the narrator, this "I", in *The Unnamable* is the author himself is only an attempt to find a name for it, when actually it is precisely the experience of impersonality that is being staged there (23). In the last book of the trilogy, we discover that even Molloy and Malone are all inventions, fictional masks of this "I": "All these Murphys Molloyes and Malones do not fool me. They have made me waste my time, suffer for nothing, speak of them when, in order to stop speaking, I should have spoken of me and of me alone . . . It is now I shall speak of me, for the first time" (303).⁴ The "I" is in construction and it is the unnamable, the nothingness or something that precedes language, but cannot exist without it.

The association of Mahood—one of the characters that the "I" in *The Unnamable* tries to create—with manhood is also possible if not inevitable. In the same way, Worm is the name to escape from this Mahood—Manhood? This can be showed in this passage, "But it's time I gave this solitary a name, nothing doing without proper names. I therefore baptize him Worm. It was high time. Worm. I don't like it, but I haven't much choice. It will be my name too when the time comes, when I needn't be

³ The following references of the next 2 topics, when not specified, refer to Beckett, "*The Unnamable*". In the notes that follow them one may find the quotes from the French editions.

⁴ "Ces Murphys, Molloy et autres Malone, je n'en suis pas dupe. Ils m'ont fait perdre mon temps, rater ma peine, en me permettant de parler d'eux, quand il fallait parler seulement de moi, afin de pouvoir me taire . . . C'est maintenant que je vais parler de moi, pour la première fois" (33).

called Mahood anymore, if that happy time ever comes” (337).⁵ In English, the last sentence gains the word “happy” that is not in the French version “if that happy time ever comes” (337) suggesting that this escape from a nomination—from language, one important acquisition that helps to define what it is to be human—is very desirable.

A bilingual oeuvre like Beckett’s requires a bilingual criticism. Indeed, these interpretations are only feasible if bilingualism is considered, as Mahood or Worm does not refer to anything in French but proper names. In English, it is possible to associate this Worm with bodily disintegration or with a literal escape from manhood that coincides with the “character” appeal that is again not possible to be perceived in French. On the other hand, it is extremely important that these English words mark the “foreigner”, this other, in the French text, as a repeated sentence in *The Unnamable* shows “*All lies . . . Having nothing to say, no words but the words of others, I have to speak*” (314, emphasis added).⁶ The English version shows that this entire attempt to construct characters that are to be built from language is a way to keep lying: “All lies”, a sentence that was supposed to translate “A balayer” in French is actually an addition that, once again, marks the problematic of language that is, “Having nothing to say, no words but the words of others” (314).

Beckett’s books cannot be read as novels, or only if we consider David Lodge’s definition of non-fictional novels insofar as they are novels about themselves. The subject of the novel is itself and the narrative is an attempt to demonstrate its own failure. Lodge states that the situation of the modernist novelists today can be compared to a man standing in the crossroads. However, the main theme believed here is the failure of language itself, that can only be fully grasped if one considers its paradoxical bilingual dimension, as the “I” in *The Unnamable* says “How can I say it, that’s all words,

⁵ “Mais il va falloir que je lui donne un nom, à ce solitaire. Sans noms propes, pas de salut. Je l’appellerai donc Worm. Il était temps. Worm. Je n’aime pas ça, mais je n’ai guère le choix. Ce sera mon nom aussi, au moment voulu, quand je n’aurai plus m’appeler Mahood, si jamais j’y arrive” (103).

⁶ “A balayer . . . J’ai à parler, n’ayant rien à dire, rien que les paroles des autres” (55).

they're all I have, and not many of them, *the words fail*" (413, emphasis added).⁷ In the same passage in English, we see this slight but important addition—in emphasis. The words, again, are all this “I” has, but they fail to give the “I” a name, to achieve a true meaning, as the narrator says. It fails because it is a foreign language, a language that escapes from this “I”.

The Unnamable, like most of Beckett's books, usually lacks paragraphs, chapters, or other kinds of division and punctuation marks. It is also full of repetitions, rhymes as well as puns and paradoxes, as can be noticed in this sentence: “I don't know, perhaps it's all a dream, all a dream, that would surprise me, I'll wake, in the silence, and never sleep again, it will be I or dream, dream again, *dream of a silence, a dream silence, full of murmurs*” (414, emphasis added).⁸ Here one can see all the devices used to dismantle any predictable logic of a sentence. In fact, it is exactly this lack of logic that contributes to create a kind of dream effect. The repetition of the word “dream” and the inversion marked above, as well as the paradox of “a dream silence, full of murmurs” creates an effect of suspension of sense and of beauty that are all, in the ultimate analysis, part of the text's meaning. As W. K. Wimsatt says about Archibald MacLeish's famous couplet, “a poem should not mean / but be”, “[i]t is an epigram worth quoting in every essay on poetry” (94). In the same way, *The Unnamable* is not about the failure of language to completely represent an experience, but it is the failure dramatized in the text itself. Beyond the plot, the disintegration finally reaches the language itself.

2.5 Bilingualism as a Theme in *The Unnamable*

Even Mahood stories *are not any old thing*, though no less foreign, to what, *to that unfamiliar native land of mine*, as unfamiliar as that other where men come and go, and feel at home, on tracks they have made themselves ... so that is never dark, never deserted, that must be terrible. So be it (Beckett, “The Unnamable” 314, emphasis added).

⁷ “Comment dire, ce sont des mots, je n'ai que ça, et encore, ils se font rare, la voix s'altère” (259).

⁸ “Je ne sais pas, c'est un rêve, c'est peut-être un rêve, ça m'étonnerait, je vais me réveiller, dans le silence, n'est plus m'endormir, ce sera moi, ou rêver encore, rêver un silence, un silence de rêve, plein de murmures” (261-62).

As this epigraph announces, the “I” in *The Unnamable* is like a foreigner trying to find the words to define him and he never accomplishes the right word that would finally justify his existence, to nominate him. This book pictures everything that I have discussed so far and can exemplify how Beckett’s work operates in the direction of a “literature of the non-word”. In *The Unnamable*, there is nothing behind the words. With no narrative, no temporality, this novel could be read as dissolution of the romance, instead. There, the words do not link themselves in order to construct a story or, if it does, it is only in an attempt to destroy it, to find a way of “failing better”. As the “I” says, “I am doing my best and failing again, yet again. I don’t mind failing, it’s a pleasure, but I want to go silent” (310).

One fails in every attempt to follow a linear progression in this text. There is no scenario to construct. We know that “the place is no doubt vast” (293), that it is grey. The “I” also affirms: “That I am not stone deaf is shown by the sounds that reach me” (295). We also know that he cannot move and that his eyes are “fixed always in the same direction” (297). However, the narrative deceives us, as the narrator affirms one thing and immediately denies it. For instance, these passages contradict all the previous ones cited here. “I see nothing” (305); “I don’t care a curse what I just said” (303); “And the sounds? No, all is silent . . . No grey either, black is what I should have said . . . And Basil and his gang? Inexistent, invented to explain I forget what. Ah yes, all lies . . .” (304) This voice that speaks tells us the story of Basil, but soon decides that it is actually Mahood—“I’ll call him Mahood instead, I prefer that, I’m queer” (309). Or it could be only “a big talking ball, talking about things that do not exist” (305). Soon after, it is *Worm* and the body starts to decompose. He is “a billy in the bowl . . . yet another, mutilate” (315). All this “troop of lunatics” (308), these “avatars” (315), are “vice exister[s]” (315) of this “I” that is seeking silence, but is obliged to speak “perhaps I shall be obliged, in order not to peter out, to invent another fairy tale” (307). He constantly pulls the rug out from the reader, undercuts what he affirms, which makes the narrative impossible.

“Literature of the non-word” can be read as literature without words, or of non-existing words. Anyway it is a literature that avoids inventing another fairy tale, avoids making a narrative, telling a story. In all possible interpretations of this typically Beckettian paradox, the aim is to dismiss language and at the same time testify its primacy, as it is impossible not to name without naming first. By denying the “words of others” (314) the “I” fails to nominate himself, to nominate reality: “how can I say it, that’s all words, they’re all I have, and not many of them, *the words fail*” (413). The negation is also a method that this “I” continuously uses to erase everything it has just said as the words can only be fiction—lies.

In fact reading *The Unnamable* is a way of being put in the position of facing an inescapable strangeness and oblivion as if we were, together with the “I”, all “foreigners in an unfamiliar land” (314). The words seem in a moment to be constructing a story that all of a sudden disappears as the “I have to speak. No one compels me to, there is no one, it’s an accident, a fact. Nothing can ever exempt me from it, there is nothing, nothing to discover, nothing to recover, nothing that can lessen what remains to say, I have the ocean to drink, so there is an ocean then” (314). That is a relevant image, as if the words were written in the sand and washed out by the constant movement of the sea, at once, before we could even remember them. One can stop the sound, but how can someone make the silence stop? What if the words could say what they inevitably carry with them, silence? “If I could speak and yet say nothing, really nothing?” (303).

The challenge I have proposed here is to notice that Beckett’s works are an attempt to achieve not words and stories, but silence, or the silence that lays in the words themselves and that is the main and essential paradox of *The Unnamable*. That is, language can and is indeed used to communicate, to nominate, but it, in a way, fails in both attempts, as there is a rest—we can call it silence, “nothingness”, or even the unnamable—that can never be completely denominated. The presence of this absence is just as unbearable as it is inevitable in all the lines of the text. Failure and the

extreme necessity of language altogether are what we can read in this text that was written in a foreign language.

CHAPTER 3: LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION

3.1 The Foreign Language and the Translating Effort

The problematic issue of language and translation cannot be separated from literature, especially when considering Beckett's achievement as a bilingual writer and self-translator. The Literary Theory of Translation may enable us to understand how the translating effort could have facilitated the consolidation of Beckett's literary project—the "literature of the non-word". For this purpose, some important works that deal with translation will be of great importance, especially "The Task of the Translator", published as a preface to Benjamin's translation of Baudelaire into German, which is a landmark in the literary translation studies. In a time when the view of linguistics—which had the scientific formalization of translation as a purpose—prevailed over others, Benjamin recovered its eminently literary nature. Much more than an attempt to reach the readers who do not understand the original language, Benjamin argues that a literary translation should convey a meaning that goes beyond the element of communication. It would be the element of mystery, or what one might call the poetic.

Benjamin asserts that literal translation which tries to find the equivalent words in the other language to achieve what it aims to communicate in the original eventually becomes an inaccurate conveyor of an inessential content, since it makes impossible the reproduction of a sense that is much more literary than literal. About literalness, Benjamin remarks,

Fragments of a vessel that are to be glued together must match one another in the same smallest details, although they need not to be like one another. In the same way a translation, instead of resembling the meaning of the original, must lovingly and in detail incorporate the original's mode of signification, thus making both the original and the translation recognizable as fragments of a greater language, just as fragments are part of a vessel (79).

Translated works, just like their originals, are therefore incomplete, only a provisional solution for the weirdness of language. According to Benjamin, the “task of the translator” is paradoxically trying to achieve an impossible “pure language” (80). Derrida, interpreting Benjamin’s essay, clarifies this idea when he argues that “For if the structure of the original is marked by the requirement to be translated it is that in laying down the law the original begins by indebteding itself as well with regard to the translator. The original is the first debtor, the first petitioner; it begins by lacking and by pleading for translation” (227). In short, if the original needs to be translated it is because it carries the absence, the untranslatable, from the beginning. The absence would be in the very attempt to nominate for the acquisition of language requires a necessary loss, which also represents the main paradox of the human relationship to language: it frees at the same time that it alienates.⁹

It is specific of the literary word, especially the poetic one, not sustain itself only by its meaning, but by its sound, the echo, or even by its very silence. This is the part of the word that refers to the nothingness, that is, to the object which is not there anymore but through its representation. This nothingness could refer to the absence of the object as well as the impossibility of expression, of communication, the main paradox of language. The poet exploits this impossibility by manipulating the words, playing with their sounds, their silence. A literal translation provides us with words full of meaning, but lacking in poetic sense. In this line of thought, a literary translation must include the “untranslatable” to be able to express the significant meaning that the poet tries to convey. This “untranslatable” seems to have a lot of affinity with Beckett’s *The Unnamable*. As Humboldt has already claimed, apart from the difficulty that a literary work presents to the translator, “no word in one language is completely equivalent to a word in another” (55). Moreover, Beckett’s works show us that no word is enough in either of the two languages he has used to write the “literature of the non-word”. The limitation is in the language itself, although these questions usually arise when one is dealing with a

⁹ Further on, I am going to deal with psychoanalytic theories that, among others, might clarify this paradox so much endorsed by Samuel Beckett’s oeuvre.

foreign language. Translation is part of Beckett's process of writing as well as all the questions that have arisen with it.

In fact, following Steiner's broad definition of translation, human communication is itself an act of translation. As Steiner clearly indicated, one is in between languages, even inside one's own language, when he took to its ultimate consequences the argument that a study of language cannot be separated from a study of translation. As Paz acknowledges, "when we learn to speak, we are learning to translate . . . In this sense, translation within the same language is not essentially different from translation between two tongues, and the histories of all peoples parallel the child's experience" (152). According to Paz, the strangeness we feel when listening to words of a foreign language that we do not know soon transforms into strangeness towards our own language. Therefore, when we talk about translation, we are necessarily including a study of language as well. The linguistic models of "sender and receiver" or "source-language" and "receptor-language" (Steiner, *After Babel* 49) that are used in the theories of translation all require interpretation, decipherment, and decoding functions that also apply to an intra-lingual approach. As Steiner observes "on the inter-lingual level, translation will pose concentrated, visibly intractable problems; but these same problems abound, at a more covert or conventionally neglected level, intra-lingually" (*After Babel* 49). The very same act of interpreting a code and establishing a communication is an act of translation. Moreover, as Steiner acknowledges, "to meditate thought about language is an attempt to step outside one's own skin consciousness, a vital cover more intimately enfolding, more close-woven to human identity than is the skin of our body" (*After Babel* 115). The act of building the "Ego", as Beckett's "I" in *The Unnamable* is also an act of translation, including the necessary loss that it represents.

To conclude, while people are immersed in their own native language—believing that it seems natural—they rarely realize how arbitrary language is. A bilingual person, nevertheless, cannot escape from the silence, the weirdness that all foreign words inevitably carry. In the ultimate analysis, a

bilingual person cannot avoid dealing directly with this weirdness, which, however, could revert to a question about writing itself. Along the same line, one may argue about the task of the writer, who notably works with words and tries to find a way to convey meaning to thoughts, feelings, things that do not always—not to say never— correspond to the words. If the translation is never sufficient, my hypothesis is that Beckett's works shows us how the writing itself is processed at the limit of what is impossible to express. When the possibilities of writing have run out and there is no more to write, we may still have a "literature of the non-word". Perhaps in the attempt to write the nothingness, the author may have believed he could make a shortcut by writing in a foreign language, and working with the translation of his own books, returning to the starting point: the impossibility.

3.2 The Foreign Language of the Unconscious

Psychoanalytic theory also considers the limits of the possibility of representation and it is worth considering as another theoretical support for this master's thesis, but it is important to establish a difference from what I am proposing here and the usual psychological approach to literature. Psychoanalytic theory has been broadly used in the literary field as a way to get to the psyche of an "implied author",¹⁰ as well as of the characters—in a mimetic relation, that is, as if they were real people. Beyond other limitations of this kind of approach—of the character—to the literary work, it evidently applies much better, or perhaps only to, traditional realistic novels, which is definitely not the case of Beckett's novels. However, it has to be emphasized that some critics have followed this perspective. An example is Dagbjört Vésteinsdóttir's thesis that applies Lacan's theories to a reading of the short play *Rockaby*. The author remarks, "I find that the double self of the protagonist in *Rockaby* is evidence of the alienated self constructed in the mirror stage" (Vésteinsdóttir 3). In my opinion, this

¹⁰ This technique can be found in "The Uses of Psychology: Characters and Implied Authors", by Bernard Paris.

kind of interpretation adds little to a literary discussion of Beckett's texts, although, on the other hand, it might well serve to illustrate and clarify psychoanalytical concepts.

From the other perspective—that of the author's— one could consider Beckett's books as valuable material to grasp his unconscious motifs—or even more radically, by relating them directly to his life, in an autobiographical reading—which is not the focus, here. For instance, Alfred Hornung has done this, when he states that “. . . the first three tales of *Stories and Texts for Nothing* relate Beckett's final decision to leave Ireland and to live in France. His first novel, *Murphy*, can be interpreted as a fictionalization of Beckett's mental disposition at a time when he underwent psychiatric treatment in London” (n.pag.). Although the idea of a fictionalized self may serve us here, as I am going to discuss below, there is no theoretical foundation to relate it fully to the author himself or his life.

I must emphasize that I am using psychoanalysis here as a supporting theory for, like literature, it has language as one of its main objects, as we will see further. Moreover, interpreting the author or the characters is far short of the possibilities that the psychoanalytical theory can offer, especially for the themes that Beckett's oeuvre calls up: bilingualism, translation, and the foreign character of language. I want to make the point that writing in a foreign language made a different mark on Beckett's writing and enabled him to get to the paradoxical “literature of the non-word” that is aligned with his translating effort. Psychoanalysis can help us understand the link between language and its impossibility of representing everything. It can be supposed, also from the psychoanalytic point of view, that writing goes beyond the writer and his intention, bearing in itself the contradiction of always being too much or not enough.

In psychoanalytical theory, we can also find considerations about language and its limitations in totally representing reality and, even more, the subject.¹¹ Julia Kristeva, addressing the role of

¹¹ There is an important distinction made between the “Ego” and the “subject”. The last term was actually introduced in Lacan's theory, in which he states that the “Ego” carries the alienation while the “subject” is related to the unconscious and cannot be recognized except for its effects.

language in psychoanalysis, affirms that “. . . the signifying system studied by Freud has a universality that ‘traverses’ constituted national languages, for it is definitely a question of a *function of language* belonging to all languages” (272). Language indeed occupies a special position in psychoanalysis, as it is essential and inherent to all the psychic mechanisms.

To better mark off this, one may begin by realizing how often the term “translation” appears in Freud’s writings. It is either used to designate the dream’s translation from thought into words or images—in the dreams—or to mention the translation of the unconscious. Even the divisions of the *psychic apparatus* and the structure of the neurosis are connected to the language structure—especially when we consider Jacques Lacan’s reading of Freud, which relies upon the advances of linguistics and structuralism, but can also be foreseen in Freud’s theory. In the well-known letter of Freud to Wilhelm Fliess of 1896, he used the term “failure of translation [to refer to] what is known clinically as ‘repression’”¹² (“Letter 52” 208). I will consider a brief analysis of the psychoanalytical work of Freud and Lacan only insofar as to understand the possible link of language—and consequently translation—with psychoanalysis. This will help us understanding the claim that every language is “foreign” when one considers the constitution of an identity. The psychoanalytical theory also provides us the necessary tools to understand Beckett’s proposition of dismantling the traditional logic of discourse to create another logic that, analogically, follows the very same principles of the language of the unconscious as Sigmund Freud has proposed.

If we consider the translation of thoughts into images in dreams, it follows that it has no relation with the translation of the meaning, as communication. Freud affirms, in 1900, that “. . . the productions of the dream-work, which, it must be remembered, *are not made with the intention of being understood*, present no greater difficulties to their translators than do the ancient hieroglyphic scripts to those who seek to read them” (*The Interpretation of Dreams* 359). Therefore, the unconscious

¹² It is worth to note that the concept *verdrängung* has presented difficulties for translators. It has been translated as *recalque*, *recalcamento* and *repressão* in Portuguese and only *repression* in English.

material that is made from signifiers disguises itself to escape from consciousness and does not want to communicate anything. In that sense, the dream images do not have a literal correspondent, and most of the times are related to something completely different that has escaped conscious awareness.

Freud divided the dream content in *latent*, which lies behind the obvious and depends on interpretation, and the *manifest*, which is the content that the person would consciously remember—and what the dream appears to be about. No matter how much the *manifest content* appears to be the actual and only meaning, it is usually a representation of something completely different that has been masterfully disguised by unconscious *defensive weapons*. So this process that Freud called the *dream-work* consists of the transformation of the *latent content* into the *manifest* through *symbolism*, *displacement*, and *condensation*—three possible *defensive weapons*. An unbearable emotion associated with an experience—or its representation—tends to be detached from its origin, displaced, through *symbolism*, at the same time that this new object—or symbol—is no longer connected with the original emotions. Several different themes can also be condensed into one single image, so that one symbol, feeling or wish might stand for several thoughts.

To read dreams means to go beyond their *manifest content* through a complex net of symbols that demands interpretation. So if dreams can be interpreted, it is surely not by means of literal translation, but mostly through the *affects* that the images may cause. This is possible with *free association*, in which the patient talks about whatever comes to his mind and, in that way, the censorship loosens and the unconscious material can come to the surface. Therefore, the translations from images into words are subjective and unique. Psychoanalysis, since Freud, has focused on the patient's speech and on the particular meaning that he gives to his experience that may be related to reality or not. Freud's theory goes from a more organicist perspective of his early works—with the *seduction theory*—to the formulation of a *psychic reality*. Especially in the Conference that Freud gave in 1896 that was published as "The Etiology of Hysteria". The "Seduction Theory" is known later as

Freud's attempt to relate the psychic trauma directly to a real experience of infant abuse. He proves, later, to be wrong, as one can notice in this passage of "Femininity" written in 1933: "In the period in which the main interest was directed to discovering infantile sexual traumas, almost all my women patients told me that they had been seduced by their father. I was driven to recognize in the end that these reports were untrue and so came to understand that hysterical symptoms are derived from fantasies and not from real occurrences" (120). This has extended to several discussions that will not be mentioned here as this would lead us out of the focus of this work. In essence, the crucial point is that there would be no difference for the psyche if a trauma was caused by a real event or if it resulted from a fantasy—or if there was, it would be only for diagnostic purposes. What matters to psychoanalysis are the affections and the consequences for the patient.

Freud's use of metaphors as a resort to explain his theory is widely known. In 1937, in "Constructions in Analysis", he compared the psychoanalyst and the archeologist as they use the residuals of wreckage to recompose what was already buried (260); that is, as the ruins of a city once covered in ashes like Pompeii, the essence is preserved. So, in a way, nothing is lost in the psyche, even though it may be presented only as *memory traces* ("Letter 52" 207), as ruins. The memory that the patient recovers is not the same as the original, nor is it a new one. This process, which is quite similar to a translation, implies an inevitable loss as well as a gain, as new arrangements can always be constructed. Besides, for psychoanalytical effects, the most important memory is exactly the one which has been forgotten, or the experiences that cannot be transposed into words, that only appear in a mistake—through "slips"—in the body, in the form of anguish or through an action—*acting out*, or in *repetitions*.¹³

When Lacan discusses Freud's theory by giving an emphasis to language, the relationship between the translation and the psychic process itself becomes even clearer. If we consider Lacan's

¹³ These concepts are well explained by Freud in "Recollection, Repetition, and Working Through", in 1924.

highest aphorism—that is developed through his entire theory—that “*the unconscious is structured like a language*” (*The Seminar* 203), translation could be considered a part of the psychic process itself rather than only a metaphor for it. Although language is always “foreign”, in the sense that it existed before the unconscious was founded in each subject, the two coexist in an intrinsically interdependent relation. When Lacan remarks that he is claiming that the unconscious is structured “like”—*comme*—a language and not “by”—*par*—it, he goes far beyond that, even refusing the common sense interpretation that language constructs the unconscious. Thereby instead of establishing a cause and effect relationship Lacan creates a fundamental analogy between the two structures, emphasizing that they have the same mechanisms of operation. Taking this argument to its ultimate consequences, Lacan has used concepts of linguistics, even though he has subverted its meanings, to explain the psychic mode of operation, for instance when he proposed a link of *displacement* and *condensation* with the poetic functions of metonymy—as a connection of meaning—and metaphor—as a substitute of meaning. (“The Function and Field of Speech” 221-22)

Although Freud didn’t have the linguistic support, and therefore did not use these terms, Lacan’s theory can be foreseen in Freud’s theory, in which the latter proposed a structural model of the psyche—what he called *psychic apparatus*. In the “Letter 52” of 1896, one can find a sketch of this thought, when Freud organizes the unconscious into different structures that keep traces, registers—visibly similar to linguistic signs—that would compose memory. He argues that “our psychical mechanism has come into being by a process of stratification: the material present in the form of memory-traces being subjected from time to time to a *re-arrangement* in accordance with fresh circumstances to a *re-transcription*” (“Letter 52” 207). So our memory and unconscious registers would not be ready-made, but constructed through an incessant process of translation. That is exactly the conclusion that Freud reaches in the “Letter 46” of 1896, when he situated the origins of neurosis through the different periods in which the experiences—scenes—were marked as signs or traces that

could be transposed into words. He even conceives the existence of a very premature period in the psyche in which these impressions have the essential characteristic of being “untranslatable” (“Letter 46” 187).¹⁴

Hence in 1914, in “Recollection, Repetition, and Working Through”, Freud has brilliantly realized and assumed the existence of memories of which one has never had conscious awareness—they present themselves, but are not represented; for which there are no registers, no possible representation. These ideas were formalized in 1920, in the essay “Beyond the Pleasure Principle” and three years later in “The Ego and the Id”, where he divided the unconscious into three different instances. The memories that cannot be remembered—of a trauma, for instance—because they cannot even be represented, manifest themselves through the *repetition-compulsion*, led by the *death-drive*, a desire to “re-establish a state of things that was disturbed by the emergence of life” (“The Ego and the Id” 40). Therefore, whereas one part of the psyche seeks pleasure and relief, another part paradoxically searches for the nothingness, non-existence.

The importance of these formulations to psychoanalysis is beyond measure. The idea that one can recover a memory that has never been represented before and thus construct a story is the key to opening new paths, new possibilities. With the help of psychoanalysis, it can also be supposed that a foreign language, as it is not attached to original *affects* related to the mother tongue, would open whole new possibilities of associations and expressions that would be with hardly reached in another way. As is widely known, Beckett’s search for anonymity was radical and he wanted to be detached from his oeuvre in such a way that it would speak for itself. He avoided giving any explanations and the sketch of a literary project can only be found in his letters and, even there, in a very discreet way.

¹⁴ It has to be emphasized that Freud did not maintain this chronological approach. The different nature of the traces is divided into some that can be transposed into words—translated—and others that cannot, even though these differences are not always based on chronology, that is, on the time that the experience has occurred.

3.3 The Paradoxes of Bilingualism: Language as Inevitably “the Words of Others”

This voice of/from *The Unnamable* speaks to us all, even though we cannot name it. In Beckett’s books, language is used in such a subversive way—he stretches it to its limit, testing and exhausting all the possibilities—that it finally reaches silence.¹⁵ Rather than communicating or signifying, Beckett’s words may be like the “foreign” language of the unconscious itself. Reading them, just as interpreting—in a psychoanalytical perspective—means going beyond the logic of the *signified* and *signifier*, as the text is not logical, but poetic. The oeuvre explains itself, “There is nothing but a voice murmuring a trace. A trace it wants to leave a trace, yes, like air leaves among leaves.” (Beckett, “Texts for Nothing” 337).¹⁶

Although one can relate Beckett’s bilingual experience to his books, we may emphasize that it has a universal aspect. That is, the strangeness within language and within ourselves is an experience that can be avoided, “repressed” in a psychoanalytical perspective, but that concerns us all. As Lacan affirms in “Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis”: “I identify myself in language, but only by losing myself in it like an object” (247). That is the main paradox of human relationships to language analyzed by the present work. The paradox or even the irony is that dealing with a foreign language is a way of being detached from ourselves, at the same time that this is impossible, and language is foreign, whether in a strict sense or not.

Therefore, beyond the possible differences and similarities between English and French, what seems to be of utmost importance is that a new language opens new possibilities of expression and necessarily limits the scope of connotations, whatever the language may be. However, language will never be enough, no matter if it is a foreign language or the mother tongue. The “I”—like Beckett’s character— can really never be nameable except through fiction. Moreover, what is of utmost

¹⁵ Fábio de Souza Andrade has brilliantly demonstrated this in his thesis *Samuel Beckett: O Silêncio Possível*. The silence in Beckett’s *oeuvre* has been studied by many authors, for instance George Bataille or Carla Locatelli.

¹⁶ “Des traces, elle veut laisser de trace, oui, comme en laisse l’air parmi les feuilles” (*Nouvelles et Texts pour Rien*, 216).

importance here is that Beckett has transformed this into his main theme. Beckett's characters do not even search for identity; on the contrary, they seek for the dissolution of all the references that could identify them, that is, the words. Following this line of thought, a "literature of the non-word" negates the function of a word as well as the parameters to define literature itself, at the same time that it opens up new possibilities. In an interview with Tom Driver, Professor of Literature and Theology at the Union Theological Seminary, in 1961, Beckett affirmed

The confusion is not my invention . . . It is all around us and our only chance now is to let it in. The only chance of renovation is to open our eyes and see the mess. It is not a mess you can make sense of. What I am saying does not mean that there will henceforth be no form in art. It only means that there will be new form and that this form will be of such a type that it admits the chaos and that it does not try to say that the chaos is really something else. (218-19)

If it is true that Beckett's novels deviate from traditional realistic ones, there is also another turn that is important to make here. According to Nelson Goodman, one calls an art realistic, not because it resembles reality, but insofar as it is aligned with the standard system of representation. He remarks, "That a picture looks like nature often means only that it looks like the way nature is usually painted . . . Resemblance and deceptiveness, far from being constant and independent sources and criteria of representational practice are in some degree products of it" (Goodman 39). Thus the way of representing reality can change with the variations of the way one interprets it. It is a mark of modernism that the way of understanding and representing reality—after the huge tragedy of the world wars—has considerably changed. In that way, Beckett's use of the absurd and the incapacity of language to communicate is totally aligned with an absurd and chaotic reality.

All the identifications for the "I" are words, and words given by others, so the very act of saying "I" carries a lie and the "I" is, finally, always a fiction of oneself. As the narrator in *The Unnamable*

says “I, of whom I know nothing” (304).¹⁷ Malone’s memories are constructed with more absences than a story that makes connections. If Molloy is searching for himself and Malone does not even know where he is and what has happened to him, they are all “unnamables”. As even the title of Ethel F. Cornwell’s article reveals, what we can identify in Beckett’s heroes is “A Flight from the Self” (41). His characters are all dying people, wanderers, tramps, vagabonds that are finally turned into the unnamable that, in the attempt to avoid the words, transformed “itself” into them.

The characters in *The Unnamable* are the words themselves, as the “I” is never really constructed and the empty discourse, the words that lie, cannot even be stopped. The “I” speaks a foreign language: like the language of the unconscious. That is why Beckett’s words can also be seen as “[...] pure sounds, free of all meaning.[...] It is true that in the end, by dint of patience, we made ourselves understood, but understood with regard to what, I ask you, and what was the purpose?” (Beckett, “Molloy” 50), as one of Beckett’s characters says.

¹⁷ “Moi, dont je ne sais rien” (34).

CONCLUSION

I want it to go silent, it wants to go silent, it can't, it does for a second, then it starts again, that's not the real silence, it says that's not the real silence, What can be said of the real silence, I don't know, that I don't know what it is, that there is no such thing, that perhaps there is such a thing, yes, perhaps there is, somewhere, I'll never know (Beckett, "The Unnamable" 408).

The word "silence" itself reappears throughout *The Unnamable*, but it does not refer to the absence of words, but to what lies inevitably within them. This "real silence" (Beckett, "The Unnamable" 408) is the final point of Beckett's search for a "literature of the non-word", which paradoxically could never be reached. In fact, even Beckett's characters usually cannot stop uttering a burst of ceaseless words that end up in an abyss. For instance, the ending, "never anything / there / anymore" (Beckett, "Malone Dies" 288) ¹⁸ does not offer any closing or solution and it is even marked by the lack of punctuation marks.

Modern art welcomes silence and takes to an ultimate consequence inquires about the capacity of language to communicate. In a different way, it demonstrates the incommunicability of experience, the incapability of words to represent an absurd reality. Beckett approached this in a peculiar way: by writing extensively in a foreign language. As Gilles Deleuze explains, a writer creates stories

. . . but when it is a matter of digging under the stories, cracking open the opinions, and reaching regions without memories, when the self must be destroyed, it is certainly not enough to be a "great" writer, and the means must remain forever inadequate. Style becomes nonstyle, and one's language lets an unknown foreign language escape from it, so that one can reach the limits of language itself . . . (*Essays Critical and Clinical*, 114, emphasis added).

18 "voilà jamais/ voilà voilà/ plus rien" (*Malone Meurt* 191)

Thus, beyond Beckett's bilingualism it is important to realize that the necessary dissolution of the self that this specific use—the subversion—of language requires, entails that a writer holds his own language as if he were a foreigner. Thereupon, when Beckett proposes a “literature of the non-word”—or a style of the non-style—one could say, using Deleuze's words, that he is not mixing two languages, but what he does “. . . rather, is invent a minor use of the major language, much as in music, where the minor mode refers to dynamic combinations in perpetual disequilibrium” (*Essays Critical and Clinical* 109-10).¹⁹ This specific use of language characterizes Beckett's oeuvre as a search for the non-word, or the silence within the words—a silence “full of murmurs” (Beckett, “The Unnamable” 414).

Although this is an experience that concerns a kind of “minor literature”, as Deleuze in *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* conceives it, there is a specificity of Beckett's work that has been broadly emphasized here. It is clear that the kind of depersonalization, or better, the attempt at turning oneself into a foreigner in relation to the text, requires a distance from the words that compose it. Beckett, however, found in a foreign language and later in his own language—when he finally reached the starting point from which all languages are foreign—when even his mother tongue was detached from him, the way of becoming a foreigner in his own language, taking this radical distance from the text. Thus he has paradoxically reinvented himself as a fictionalized self that gives us an impression of a *mise en abyme*. The *mise en abyme* meaning *placed in an abyss* relates to the experience of standing between two mirrors, which causes the effect of seeing an infinite reproduction of one's image. This effect of reproducing an image to the infinite was extended to several different theoretical uses in different areas. The *mise en abyme* would include the film within a film, a play within a play, and a story within a story.

¹⁹ As Deleuze's definition in *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, “. . . the first characteristic of minor literature in any case is that in it language is affected with a high coefficient of deterritorialization”. (16) Thus, a minor author is “a sort of stranger *within* his own language” (26).

I am considering, here, Beckett's bilingual experience, his "bilingual oeuvre" and the bilingualism/language as its main theme in a way that his oeuvre mirrors his own experience as well as the character's experience mirrors the theme of the book itself. To better explain this, for example, in the trilogy the "character" is constructing—and failing to construct—a story. More radically, *The Unnamable* has the failure of language to represent reality or the "I" as its main theme and the book is this very same failure—as if staged through the "character".

Hence, reading Beckett causes an effect of dismantling all pre-established paradigms that one may have about the "I", language or reality. The characters are not characterized, the story does not follow a linear progression, and each line or paragraph denies or erases the previous one. All these effects could be interpreted through many different perspectives. Here, I have tried to maintain the focus in the importance of a bilingual reading and to highlight the bilingual character of this disruptive oeuvre.

I have approached Beckett's bilingualism by avoiding a comparison study of his self translations, which would require a linguistic approach. Actually, I have only emphasized the necessity of an analysis of the theme that would consider his bilingualism in a literary perspective, as the approach to language is the tone of Beckett's oeuvre itself. The experience of writing is purposely mixed with a constant translating effort from English to French, and the other way round. Many different conclusions can be made out of this and all inevitably lead to further studies.

It is also important to highlight the practical result of this approach. If Beckett's bilingualism has proved to be so essential in any attempt to interpret his books, it also cannot be ignored in a translation, whether from a book that was firstly written in English or in French. Although I have tried not to get into a comparison of the two works, I believe this is eventually necessary, considering that the author himself started a project with this purpose—which was later transformed into a digital project—*The Digital Manuscript Project*. A further goal, after comparing the two versions, would be to finally

reach a translation of this inevitably bilingual work, regarding both versions in a linguistic and, even more—considering the specificity of this author—literary perspective.

This master's thesis therefore points to further on possible work with the analyses of Beckett's books in the two versions that an adequate translation into Portuguese, for instance, would demand. All the works that were—most of them very recently—translated into Portuguese were derived from a consultation of only, or mainly, the French versions. If both versions were considered, this is not even mentioned in the books. When the book has a label, it says "translated from the French". This is the case of all the editions published so far with the exception of the brilliant translation of *Malone Morre* which carries the label "translated from French and English, foreword and notes by Paulo Leminski" "tradução do francês e do inglês, posfácio e notas Paulo Leminski" (title page). Indeed, Leminski's foreword emphasizes the fact that Beckett wrote in two languages and that he considered both in the translation. To do justice to Beckett's literary project, a "literature of the non-word", one must not ignore bilingualism as an unavoidable mark of his works that should be carefully and always be taken into consideration.

All things considered, Samuel Beckett's works is surely still to be explored and this master's thesis necessarily opened up more possibilities. Bilingualism is indeed a peculiar characteristic of Beckett's oeuvre that reveals itself to be literarily amazing when aligned with an aesthetic project. At the same time that I focused on this aspect, I also made an overview of his works and became familiarized with Beckett's oeuvre and his criticism. Overall I have attempted to establish the bases that I could need for a probable future study.

WORKS CITED

- Ackerley, C. J.; Gontarski, S.E. *The Grove Companion to Samuel Beckett. A Reader's Guide to his Works, Life and Thought*. New York: Grove Press, 2004. Print.
- Andrade, Fábio de Souza. *Samuel Beckett: O Silêncio Possível*. São Paulo: Ateliê Editorial, 2001. Print.
- Auster, Paul, Ed. *The Selected Works of Samuel Beckett*, 4 Vols. New York: Grove Press, 2010. Print.
- Bataille, George. "Molloy's Silence". Bloom, *Samuel Beckett's 'Molloy'* 13-22.
- Beckett, Samuel. "An Interview with Beckett". Graver, *Samuel Beckett: The Critical Heritage* 246-49.
- . *Collected Poems in English and French*. New York: Grove Press, 1994. Print.
- . *Dream of Fair to Middling Woman*. Eds. Eoin O'Brian and Edith Fournier. Fwd. Eoin O'Brian. New York: Arcade Publishing, 1992. Print.
- . *Endgame and Act Without Words*. New York: Grove Press, 1958. Print.
- . "First Love". Trans. Samuel Beckett. Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol IV: 229-46.
- . "From an Abandoned Work". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol IV: 341-48.
- . "Happy Days". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol III: 269-304.
- . "Letter to Axel Kaun", 9 Jul 1937. Fehsenfeld, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*. Vol I: 516-21.
- . *L'Innommable*. Paris: Minuit, 1953. Print.
- . "Malone Dies". Trans. Samuel Beckett. Beckett, *Three Novels* 177-288.
- . *Malone Morre*. Trans. and fwd. Paulo Leminski. São Paulo: Códex, 2004. Print. Grandes Letras.
- . "Molloy". Trans. Patrick Bowles in collaboration with Samuel Beckett. Beckett, *Three Novels* 7-176.
- . "Murphy". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol I: 1-168.

- . "Not I". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol I: 1-168.
- . *Nouvelles et Textes Pour Rien*. Paris: Minuit, 1958. Print.
- . "Ping". Trans. Samuel Beckett. Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol: IV 371-74.
- . "Rockaby". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol III: 455-66.
- . "Stories, Texts, Novellas". Trans. Samuel Beckett. Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol IV: 229-39.
- . "Texts for Nothing". Trans. Samuel Beckett. Auster, *The Selected Works* 295-339.
- . "The Unnamable". Samuel Beckett. Beckett, *Three Novels* 289-414.
- . *Three Novels by Samuel Beckett: Molloy, Malone Dies, The Unnamable*. New York: Grove Press, 1955.
Print.
- . "Tom Driver in Columbia University Forum". Graver, *Samuel Beckett: The Critical Heritage*
217-23.
- . *Waiting for Godot. A Tragicomedy in Two Acts*. Bilingual Edition. Trans. Samuel Beckett. Intr.
S.E.Gontarski. New York: Grove Press, 2010. Print.
- . "Watt". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol. I: 169-379.
- . "Whoroscope". Auster, *The Selected Works*. Vol IV: 3-7.
- Beer, Ann. "Beckett's Bilingualism". Pilling, *The Cambridge Companion* 209-221.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator". Trans Harry Zohn. Schulte, *Theories of Translation* 71-82.
- Blanchot, Maurice. "Where now? Who Now?". Bloom, *Samuel Beckett's 'Molloy'* 23-29.
- Bloom, Harold, ed. *Samuel Beckett's 'Molloy', 'Malone Dies', 'The Unnamable'*. New York: Chelsea
House, 1988. Print. Modern Critical Interpretations.

Brown, Rudmose. Letter to the University of Cape Town, 5 Jun 1937. Fehsenfeld, *The Letters of Samuel Beckett*, Vol I 524-25

Carrière, Julien F. "Samuel Beckett and Bilingualism: How the Return to English Influences the Later Writing style and gender roles of 'All that Fall' and 'Happy Days'". diss. Louisiana State U, 2005. *Louisiana State University: Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Collection*. Web. 10 July 2010.

Coetzee, J. M. "Samuel Beckett, the Short Fiction". *Inner Workings Essays: 2000-2005*. London: Penguin Books, 2007. 169-73. Print.

---. *The English Fiction of Samuel Beckett: An Essay in Stylistic Analysis*. Ph.D., University of Texas at Austin, 1969.

Cohn, Ruby. "Samuel Beckett Self-Translator". *Modern Language Association*, Vol. 76, n. 35 (Dec., 1961): 613-21. JSTOR. Web. 30 June 2010.

Cornwell, Ethel F. "Samuel Beckett: The Flight from Self". *Modern Language Association*, Vol. 88, no.1 (Jan., 1973): 41-51. JSTOR. Web. 8 July 2010.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Essays Critical and Clinical*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco. London: Verso, 1998. Print.

---. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. Dana Polan. Fwd. Réda Bensmaïa. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1986. Print. *Theory and History of Literature*, 30.

Derrida, Jacques. "From Des Tour de Babel". Trans. Joseph F. Graham. Schulte, *Theories of Translation* 218-27.

Fehsenfeld, Martha Dow; Lois More Overbeck. *The Letters of Samuel Beckett: 1929-1940*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Fish, Stanley E. "How Ordinary Is Ordinary Language?" *New Literary History*. Vol. 5, n. 1: What Is Literature?. Maryland: The Johns Hopkins UP. 41-54. JSTOR. Web. 7 July 2010.

Fitch, Brian T. *Beckett and Babel: An Investigation into the Status of the Bilingual Work*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1988. Print. Romance Series.

Freud, Sigmund. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle". Strachey, *The Standard Edition*. Vol. XVIII: 1-64.

---. "Constructions in Analysis". Strachey, *The Standard Edition*. Vol. XXIII 255-269.

---. "Letter 46". Masson, *The Complete Letters* 187-190.

---. "Letter 52". Masson, *The Complete Letters* 207-214.

---. "Recollection, Repetition, and Working Through". *Further Recommendations in the Technique of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Joan Riviere. *Collected Papers, Vol 2*. New York: Basic Books, 1959. 366-376. Print.

---. "The Ego and the Id". Strachey, *The Standard Edition*. Vol. XIX 3-66.

---. "The Etiology of Hysteria". Strachey, *The Standard Edition*. Vol. III: 189-221.

---. "Femininity". Strachey, *The Standard Edition*. Vol. XXII: 112-135.

---. *Sigmund Freud. The Interpretation of Dreams*. Ed. and Trans James Strachey. New York: Basic Books, 2010. Print.

---. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud 1856-1939*.

(SE). Ed. and Trans James Strachey, in collaboration with Anna Freud, assisted by Alix Strachey and Alan Tyson. London: Hogarth Press, 1953-1975. 24 Vol. Print.

Friedman, Alan Warren; Charles Rossman and Dina Sherzer, eds. *Beckett Translating/ Translating Beckett*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State UP, 1987. Print.

Gierow, Karl R. Award Ceremony Speech of the Nobel Prize in Literature, 1969: Samuel Beckett. Stockholm, 1970. Web. 27 Jun 2010. Speech.

Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of art: an approach to a theory of symbols*. 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1976. Print.

Graver, Lawrence; Raymond Federman. *Samuel Beckett: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1979. Print.

Happy Days. By Samuel Beckett. Dir. Bob Wilson (EUA/ Italy). Perf. Adriana Asti e Giovanni Battista Storti. Décimo Festival Internacional de Palco e Rua. Palácio da Artes. Belo Horizonte. 14 Ago. 2010. Performance

Hellman, Lillian. *Pentimento: A Book of Portraits*. New York: Signet, 1973. Print.

Hill, Leslie. "Fiction, Myth and Identity in Samuel Beckett's Novel Trilogy". Bloom, *Samuel Beckett's 'Molloy'* 85-94.

Hulle, Dirk Van; Mark Nixon. *Beckett Digital Manuscript Project*. Under the auspices of the Centre for Manuscript Genetics (University of Antwerp), the Beckett International Foundation (University of Reading), the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center (Austin, Texas) and the Estate of Samuel Beckett. Web. 10 Jan 2012.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. "From Introduction to His Translation of *Agamemnon*". Trans. Sharon Sloan. Schulte, *Theories of Translation* 55-59.

Klein, Wolfgang. "Compound and coordinate bilingualism". *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. 11-13 Google Book Search. Web. 21 Jun 2011. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.

Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. New York: Grove Press, 2004. Print. Grove Great Lives.

Kristeva, Julia. "Psychoanalysis and Language". *Language- the Unknown: An Initiation into Linguistics*. Trans Anne M. Menke. New York: Columbia UP, 1989. 265-77. Print. European Perspectives.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis". *Écrits: The first complete Edition in English*. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006. 197-268. Print.

---. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan Book XI- The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981. Print.

Locatelli, Carla. "Delogocentering Silence: Beckett's Ultimate Unwording". *The Theatrical Gamut: Notes for a Post Beckettian Stage*. Ed. Enoch Brater, Ann Arbor. Michigan UP, 1995. 67-90. Google Book Search. Web. 10 Aug. 2011.

Lodge, David. *The Novelist at the Crossroads and other Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971. Print.

Masson, Jeffrey Moussaieff, ed. *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess: 1887-1904*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1985. Print.

MLA: *Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 7th Edition. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2009. Print.

Paris, Bernard. "The Uses of Psychology: Characters and Implied Authors". *A psychological approach to fiction. Studies in Jhackeray, Stendhal, George Eliot, Dostoevsky, and Conrad*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2010. 1-27. *Google Book Search*. Web. 06 Nov 2010.

Paz, Octavio. "Translation: Literature and Letters". Trans. Irene del Corral. Schulte, *Theories of Translation* 152-62.

Picasso, Pablo. *The Old Guitarist*. 1903. Oil on panel. Web. 30 Aug 2011.

Pilling, John, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Web. 19 Jul 2011. Cambridge Collections Online.

Romaine, Suzanne. "The Bilingual Brain and the Bilingual Individual". *Bilingualism*. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 1993. *Google Book Search*. Web. 21 Jun 2011

Schulte, Rainer; John Biguenet, eds. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1992. Print.

Steiner, George. *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge. Print.

Vésteinsdóttir, Dagbjört. *A Mother's Love. A Lacanian Psychoanalysis of Samuel Beckett's Rockaby*. May 2011. Web. 20 Nov 2010.

Wimsatt, W. K. *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington: Kentucky UP, 1954. Print.