

Theatre Of Absurd In "Birthday Party" & "Waiting For Godot"

AYA NAJEM ABED¹

DR. G. CHENNA REDDY²

¹ **Research Scholar, Department of English, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur. AP
Email: aymennajm1992@gmail.com**

² **Assistant Professor, Department of English, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Nagarjuna
Nagar, Guntur. AP**

ABSTRACT

Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and Harold Pinter's *The Birthday Party* as far as their discharge of the attributes of the customary dramatization, and investigates in what ways these plays are ridiculous. The development of preposterous dramatization ascended in Paris, France now that it was regarded as the focal point of the craft of the world about them. Absurd Drama opposes the customary types of ordinary dramatization which has a formula in light of solid roots, and in it the grating between the person and the world is drawn. The Absurd Drama limits all the visual and touchy components in front of an audience. The most known producers are Samuel Beckett, Harold Pinter, Eugene Ionesco and Arthur Adamov, who censure the regular Drama and its components in their whole kit in an immediate or roundabout way and make them dangerous while trying to expose their own particular theater origination

The absurd drama rejects the great plot. It allows for the assembly of people to dream the end of the level. The preposterous theater, created against the structures and criteria of the established Drama in the

twentieth century. As recognized by screenwriters and the pundits, the status of the person is babble and with no point fundamentally. The thoughts of ludicrous Drama dramatists influence the form and construction of their capers and they don't employ the sound structure of the established dramatization. At that place are a couple of regular emotional activities in their deeds. For example, there is no plot in *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett. The play creates around two purposeless characters investing their energy while sitting tight so far not knowing for whom or what in an atemporal and roundabout climate.

THEATRE OF ABSURD

Samuel Beckett is said to be the disputable writer on account of his uncommon way in squeezing out his brain through his play, *Waiting for Godot*. Samuel Beckett makes *Waiting for Godot* as the encroachment of the ordinary drama and as the method for expressionism and surrealism test in dramatization and theater. *Sitting tight for Godot* qualifies as one of Samuel Beckett's most popular kits and caboodle. At

first written in French in 1948, Beckett really made an understanding of the play into English. The world presentation was held tight January 5, 1953, in the Left Bank Theater of Babylon in Paris. The play's notoriety spread gradually through informal and it soon grew to be high. Different creations far and wide quickly emulated, in spite of the fact that the play at first fizzled in the United States, perhaps as a result of being misspelled as "the chuckle of four mainlands." An ensuing creation in New York City was all the more deliberately promoted and collected a few accomplishments.

Informed both by knowledge of absurdest philosophy and by his friendship with Samuel Beckett, Martin Esslin provides a vital definition of absurd drama. For Esslin, the Theatre of the Absurd is a darkly comic form that puts heavy demands upon audiences, taking them to juxtapose in congruences and to make sense out of often horrific laughter. So, as a kind of dark humor, it "may be riotously funny, wildly exaggerated and oversimplified, vulgar and garish. But it will invariably face the viewer with a real intellectual problem, a philosophical paradox, which he will have to try to solve even if he knows that it is most probably insoluble."

The plays of Samuel Beckett, Arthur Adamov and Eugene Ionesco have performed with amazing success in France, Germany, Scandinavia and English – Speaking countries. A piece of the authors, notwithstanding, deliver their own particular type of absurdity; in Beckett it is melancholic colored by a spirit of futility born from the disillusionment of old years and chronic helplessness. Adamov's are more actively aggressive, earthy and tinged own fantastic knock about the flavor of tragical slowing. The Theater of the Absurd

Dramas the universe as an unlimited circumstance. The onlookers see the happenings on the stage completely all things considered, while never understanding the full significance of these unusual examples of occasions, as recently arrived guests may observe live in a nation of which they have not yet aced the dialect. The Drama down of the audience with characters and happenings which they are not quite able to comprehend makes it unacceptable for them to partake in the dreams and emotions portrayed in the frolic. The real substance lies in the acting in the frolic of "Theatre of the Absurd.

ABSURD AS A THEME

Absurdism in theatre has mostly been drawn up with a well-known classification made by Martin Esslin; and regarded with the phrase The Theatre of the Absurd. However, absurdest predicament as a tendency has been ground in theatre since the time of the Ancient Greeks. In this absurdism in the theatre will be seen as a movement than as a tendency, Samuel Beckett – who is counted as two of five characteristic playwrights of the movement by Esslin- will be mentioned briefly as pioneering absurdist.

Samuel Beckett is considered the master of Absurdity.. The key motif in his whole kit is the meaninglessness of the human being. "Absurd" originally means "out of concord" in a musical context. Consequently its word reference definition: "out of congruity with reason or legitimacy; muddled, preposterous ideological". In vernacular usage, "absurd" may essentially signify 'rediculous', however this is not the sense in which Camus utilizes the word, and in which it is utilized when we talk about the Theater of Absurd. In an

exposition on Kafka, Ionesco characterized his comprehension of the term as takes after:

"Absurd is what is without reason... Cut off from his religious, magical, and supernatural roots, man is losing; every one of his activities wind up plainly silly, dumb, pointless. This feeling of magical anguish of the unreasonableness of the human condition is; agonizing talking the topic of the plays of Beckett, Adamov, Ionesco, Genet, and alternate writers examined in this book. But it is not only the subject – matter that points of confinement what is here called the Theater of the Absurd.

A similar sense of the senselessness of life, of the inevitable devaluation of ideals, purity and determination, is likewise the subject of much of the work of dramatist like Giraudoux, Annouilh, Salacrou, Sartre and Camus himself. Even thus, these writers differ from the dramatist of the Absurd in an important respect they Drama their mother wit of the irrationality of the human condition in the form of highly lucid and logically constructed reasoning, while the Theatre of the Absurd strives to, give tongue to its sense of the senselessness of the human condition and the inadequacy of the rational approach by the open abandonment of rational devices and discursive thought. While Sartre or Camus communicates the new limit in the old tradition, the Theater of the Absurd goes above and beyond in attempting to accomplish a solidarity between its fundamental suppositions and the example in which these are pressed away. In a few detects, the Theater of Sartre and Camus is less satisfactory as a part of the logic of Sartre and Camus – an aesthetic, as unmistakable from rational, term – than the Theater of the Absurd.

The Absurd Drama predominantly concentrates on the social deterioration, the decay of good values in the breaking down society, the disintegration of dialect and activity on the stage. The producers like Beckett, Pinter and Stoppard have attempted to present loss of character of person and depicted him not as an individual but rather as a machine. These play dependably endeavor to make something new by re-having a go at, subverting, rising above and changing. In the preposterous sensational convention we don't locate an all around characterized storyline yet delineation of occasions that crowd is allowed to decipher. It concentrates on the immeasurability of the world and makes an introduction of a request less world. In these dramatizations dialect goes about as boundary for correspondence with exchanges without an unmistakable importance. It delineates a domain which is brimming with separation. The absurd screenwriters tries to legitimize that the human presence is astoundingly to this world without making a request to be conceived and furthermore pass on without looking for death for themselves. People are caught between this birth and demise. The misery of human presence is dramaed in the compositions of the silly writers. The theater of silly is additionally called as theater of non-correspondence.

CRITICS OF SAMUEL BECKETT

A standout amongst the most essential parts of silly drama is its doubt of dialect as a methods for correspondence. Discourse correspondence, it appears to state, has progressed toward becoming only a vehicle for conventionalized, stereotyped, good for nothing trades. Dr. Culik clarifies, "Words neglected to express the embodiment of human experience, not having the capacity

to infiltrate past its surface. The Theater of the Absurd constituted as a matter of first importance an assault on dialect, constituting it as an extremely inconsistent and deficient instrument of correspondence. Absurd drama utilizes conventionalized, discourse, adages, trademarks and specialized language, which it twists, satires and separates. By mocking conventionalized and stereotyped discourse designs, the Theater of the Absurd tries to make individuals insightful of the likelihood of going past ordinary discourse traditions and conveying more authentically."Absurd dramatization subverts rationale. It appreciates the startling and the sensibly impossible. According to Sigmund Freud, there is a clue of flexibility we can appreciate when we can desert the straitjacket of rationale.

CRITICS OF HAROLD PINTER

Harold Pinter is a standout amongst the most noticeable living screenwriters of the age. The seventy-three year old Pinter, who has composed twenty-nine plays and twenty-one screen plays and who has coordinated twenty-seven theater preparations, is one of the early specialists of the Theater of the Absurd which began in the fifties. Silly, which is one of the a wide range of parts of his works, capacities as a methods for getting into the truth that is Pinter's primary concern. In his own particular site he composes, In 1958 I composed the following: 'There are no hard qualifications between what is genuine and what is unbelievable, nor between what is valid and what is false. A thing is not really either genuine or false; it can be both valid and false'. I trust that these affirmations still bode well do in any case apply to the investigation of reality through workmanship. So as an essayist I remain by

them yet as a native I can't. As a native I should ask: What is valid? What is false?

The nonexclusive examination of Harold Pinter's works has been one of the fundamental interests of and, in the meantime, disputable issues among his critics. Numerous critics see him as one of the transcendent figures of the Theater of the Absurd, and his works have been drawn nearer in the light of the hypotheses and teachings of this cutting edge writing. Despite the fact that exceptionally illuminating and supportive to the perusers, the Theater of the Absurd has additionally been the reason for questionable perspectives among perusers and critics. Some have attempted to demonstrate that Pinter is an insignificant absurdist playwright, and some others have given pieces of information to nail home he varies in many regards from the professionals of the Absurd dramatization. Joseph Hynes (1992) records the terms utilized by various critics as to Pinter and his play, terms, for example, "'absurdist', 'existentialist', 'hostile to humanistic' and 'flippant'".

The possibility of the Absurd is not new ever. It was experienced by the old individuals who endeavored futile to accomplish everlasting status and tested both destiny and the agonies brought on by the impedance of divine beings and goddesses in their lives. The very awareness that made such powerful saints as Achilles, Siegfried and so forth vouches for the way that man has constantly attempted to escape from the craziness of his reality through mettle, chivalrous activities and, most importantly, the power that was picked up either through learning (e.g. Odysseus) or boundless physical quality (e.g. Achilles). In any case, there is a distinction between the craziness that existed in the old

circumstances, metaphorically depicting a man (to be specific, Sisyphus) rolling a bit of shale to the highest point of the slope and thinking that its declining once more, and the one encountered by the twentieth-century man who is profoundly required in the ludicrousness of his life. He knows what it truly intends to feel silly without the would like to pick up a radiant learning or physical quality.

CONCLUSION

In the wake of seeing two fine recoveries of plays by Samuel Beckett and Harold Pinter — "Waiting tight for Godot" and "The Birthday Party" we come to know how ravenous I was their dialect in the theater with graceful thickness and coarseness. Beckett, twentieth century playwriting's No. 1 distinct advantage, and Pinter, his most unique follower, were journalists saturated with writing. . They were cutting ways for themselves as colossal men of letters, to utilize an expression that has unfortunately gone the way. The colossal specialists, for example, Beckett and Pinter are peculiar. However there's something to be gained from the case of two journalists whose dynamite fates can be witnessed in their abstract beginnings.

Beckett, a splendid understudy of Romance dialects, had a developmental relationship with James Joyce, composed an entering article on Proust right off the bat in his profession, and was as acquainted with Dante as he was with the major philosophical streams of his day. Strikingly, he ended up having as significant an effect on the novel as he had on Drama. Pinter, a youthful devourer of Dostoevski, Kafka and Joyce, was an on-screen character and chief and also a writer and screenwriter, however

his way of life as an artist went before his emotional work and he restricted himself to verse (and political riffraff stirring) in the most recent years of his life. Albeit Julian Sands' current exclusive tribute to Pinter at the Odyssey Theater Ensemble didn't persuade me that Pinter's remaining as an artist matches his remaining as a writer, the rigidity of his exchange, with nary an unessential work, is indivisible from his long lasting beautiful works.

The "absurdist" mark has adhered to Beckett and Pinter since the production of Martin Esslin's original book "The Theater of the Absurd" in the mid 1960s. Esslin's assignment given a helpful if to some degree unrefined method for separating this new (and a long way from homogenous) harvest of dramatists from the existentialist authors. To put it plainly, it wasn't such a great amount of vision as specialty that isolated the plays of Beckett and Pinter from the emotional works of Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus. The same mystical questions and unavoidable doubt about dialect were in play, just now they were being exemplified in word usage, character and the bewildering illogic of what stayed of plot.

This history merits underscoring on the grounds that there is frequently a presumption by vanguard hard-liners that on the off chance that you laud a writer's artistic ability you're likely the kind of individual who might like to peruse a play than see it in front of an audience. In any case, Beckett and Pinter (to state nothing of Shakespeare) Drama the way dramatic verse, to conjure Cocteau's term once more, can start on the page. Beckett, actually, was very unyielding that directors fast to what he composed, issuing cordially censuring letters to his partners when even apparently coincidental freedoms were taken — and

nobody would set out call him hostile to dramatic.

A merciless economy and thorough tender loving care are signs of both dramatists' styles. Beckett and Pinter coordinate dialect and motion the way an awesome artist creates a lyric — by refining out every one of the inessentials. No big surprise as they got more seasoned their works became shorter, just as in an unending race to touch base at more refined adaptations of themselves. The opening of "Godot" offers a microcosm of Beckett's whole play, which exchanges straight improvement for an extending reflection. "Nothing to be done," reports Estragon. "I'm starting to come round to that feeling," answers Vladimir.

Samuel Beckett, better known for his silly dramatizations when all is said in done and "Waiting for Godot" specifically, has risen as a silly author too. Beckett has composed a decent majority of fiction additionally that revolves around the 'Set of three', 'Molly', 'Malone Dies', 'The Unnamable', 'Murphy'. A considerable measure of research has been attempted on the silliness in the Dramas of Beckett. It was thought to concentrate on silliness in the books of Beckett on the grounds that under the flotsam and jetsam of Beckett's Dramay written work or emotional works, Beckett's acclaim and potential as a absurd author needs to be revealed. Consequently, the present research work focuses on foolishness obvious in Beckett's select books.

Absurdity is catchphrase, primary topic and the focal thought of Beckett's sensational and anecdotal work. He asks extremely basic and essential question-if there is any importance in/to our presence by any stretch of the imagination. At the end

of the day, preposterousness emerges from worries of existentialism. Silliness in dramatizations and books demonstrates cases that there is no reason in the universe. It rotates around the thought that human life is essentially trivial and worthless. Living is excruciating. Samuel Beckett considered as the most eminent and compelling essayist of absurdism in dramatization and in composition fiction, was an Irishman living in Paris who regularly wrote in French and after that made an interpretation of his works into English. Samuel Beckett's books are multi-dimensional pictures-interfacing scholarly workmanship with visual one. They give us, as novel, a confirmation of the creator's close to home understanding. There is no faltering in seeing Beckett's craft as an outflow of his most cozy vision on the fundamental philosophical question about the place of individual on the planet around. The Drama extend dares to endeavor the foolishness in Samuel Beckett's chosen books.

This paper thinks about Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot also, Harold Pinter's The Birthday Party regarding their dismissal of the attributes of the customary dramatization, and breaks down in what ways these plays are foolish. The development of ludicrous Drama ascended in Paris, France now that it was viewed as the focal point of specialty of the world around then. Absurd Drama opposes the customary types of routine dramatization which has a convention in view of solid roots, and in it the discordance between the individual and the world is depicted. The ludicrous dramatization limits all the visual and touchy components in front of an audience. The most known screenwriters are Samuel Beckett, Harold Pinter, Eugene Ionesco and Arthur Adamov, who censure the routine dramatization and its components in their works in an immediate

or roundabout way and make them dangerous while attempting to uncover their own particular theater conception. All taking all things together, in preposterous Drama the discordance between the person and the world is depicted using dialect and practices of the characters however disparately the dialect and the activities appear to be ridiculous which suggest that life itself is silly, and this circumstance is depicted in Pinter's and Beckett's works.

The absurdistic theater created against the structures and standards of the established Drama in the twentieth century. As recognized by producers and commentators, the condition of person is rubbish and with no point essentially. The thoughts of preposterous dramatization writers influence the frame and structure of their plays and they don't utilize the coherent structure of the traditional Drama. There are couple of regular emotional activities in their works. For example, there is no plot in waiting for Godot of Samuel Beckett. The play creates around two careless characters investing their energy while waiting tight yet not knowing for whom or what in an atemporal and roundabout climate. The dialect connected in the absurd theater is adulterated and loaded with plays on words, redundancies and unessential talks, that is to state, the characters in these works utilize casual dialect similarly as the pointless discoursed amongst Vladimir and Estragon and Meg and Petey.

REFERENCE

1. M. S. Sabljo and c. University of Zadar, "Beckett ' s bilingualism , self-translation and the translation of his texts into the Croatian Mirna Sindi sabljo," 2011.Dark

- Humor edited by Harold Bloom, horaciotoledano,, 2009, Page No. 29 to 42
2. Waiting for Godot - Samuel Beckett, New Edition, edited by Harold Bloom Page No. 25 to 29
3. Knowles, Ronald, Understanding Harold Pinter (Columbia, SC: University of Southern Carolina Press, 1995).
4. Billington, Michael, The Life and Work of Harold Pinter (London: Faber, 1996); rev. edn published as Harold Pinter (London: Faber, 2007).
5. Bair, Deirdre. Samuel Beckett: a biography. Simon and Schuster, 1990., page no. 445-
6. 446
7. Beckett: Waiting for Godot By Lawrence Graver PageNo. 22,26 & 27 , 2004
8. The Cambridge Guide to Theatre, edited by Martin Banham, Page No. 262
9. Harold Pinter, 'Writing for the Theatre', Plays One (London: Methuen, 1986 (1976)), pp.12–13. 'Writing for the Theatre' was the speech made by Pinter at the National Student Drama Festival in Bristol in 1962