"WAITING FOR GODOT": A MODERN "DON QUIXOTE"?

FREDERICK A. BUSI
University of Massachusetts

Se dió a entender que no le faltaba otra cosa sino buscar una dama de quien enamorarse: porque el caballero andante sin amores era árbol sin hojas y sin fruto y cuerpo sin alma.

DON QUIXOTE (I, 1)

Don Quichotte est si pur enfin, qu'il ne prétend pas au succès. Il croit à sa mission, mais non à sa victoire.

ANDRÉ SUARÈS

AT THE BEGINNING of the modern novel's development there stands and remains the greatest one of all, *Don Quixote*. It is not very surprising that contemporary critics have discovered the precursors of anti-literature—specifically Beckett's ironical creations—in the fiction of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[1] Various themes link these distant periods, not the least significant of which is the sense of ambiguity and incompleteness that characterizes these works. Robert Adams, in *Strains of Discord*, is especially impressed by the structure of Cervantes' novel which he characterizes as illustrative of the open form, that type of literary expression which, through a particular pattern of meaning, deliberately remains incomplete and unresolved.[2] It was not, he states, Cervantes' intention to provide a neat solution to the problem of Don Quixote's madness; the novelist invites the reader to enter into, momentarily, the workings of his character's mind in order to experience directly the terrible ambiguity which confronts him. Ihab Hassan also makes a similar point in his discussion of Beckett's work which he views in the context of a literary and esthetic progression from open form to anti-form.[3] Much has already been written about Beckett's contributions as an example of anti-drama, and it would be pointless here to pursue this aspect of his work. It would be more instructive to examine both masterpieces in order to reveal their profound similarities and, of course, their differences; to evaluate their respective impact, the one work, standing at the beginning, the other at the end of modern western literature. Those critics who link Cervantes, along with Furetière and Sterne, to Beckett have done so in very general terms. It would be, to repeat, more profitable to subject *Don Quixote* and *Waiting for Godot* to a closer examination, to reveal the deeper links that unite them in matters of theme, detail, myth and purpose.

Although Beckett never mentions Cervantes in his critical writings there exists a tenuous relationship, a genealogy of purpose between them. Hugh Kenner writes: "for Beckett is the heir of Joyce as Joyce is the heir of Flaubert."[4] He could also add that Flaubert is the heir of Cervantes. *Madame Bovary* has been rightly described as a female Don Quixote, her mind glutted by cheap romantic books just as the knight's was by books on chivalry. And just as Flaubert memorized entire passages of Cervantes so Joyce committed to memory many of Flaubert's best pages. To be sure, this lineage is rather delicate, and while Joyce and Beckett openly hold other artists in the highest esteem, the pervasive influence of Cervantes is undeniable. His parodic fiction opened new possibilities in the development of characterization and literary psychology. Just as he parodies the effects of books on chivalry, Flaubert parodies the impact of romantic literature; Joyce *the Odyssey;* Beckett, according to some viewpoints, travesties the biblical myth of redemption. In the opinion of Paul Hazard Cervantes' book is pivotal in western literature through its incorporation of medieval

and modern perspectives.[5] It has become, he writes, "le livre romantique par excellence," and its message, however altered by nineteenth century writers, remains a chief source of inspiration for European and American artists. It is neither surprising nor entirely regrettable that it continues to engender so many conflicting interpretations and responses far beyond its creator's declared purpose, for as Erich Auerbach writes: "a book like *Don Quijote* dissociates itself from its author's intention and leads a life of its own."[6] Judging by the bulk of criticism on Beckett, his work, too, gives signs of sustained exegetical interest.

It is always a difficult and hazardous task to compare two authors, especially from different cultures and historical periods. Yet when there is sufficient compelling evidence to justify such an undertaking, the critic must proceed with caution and circumspection. He would be well advised to follow the same discretion used by Américo Castro, for example, in his illuminating article on the possible influence of Cervantes on this century's other great playwright, Pirandello.[7] Castro declares that the Italian probably did not consciously intend to use the same themes and techniques as the Spaniard, however, the latter's unmistakable imprint is to be found in his theater. And what unites these two artists is their respective handling of the conflict between reality and illusion.[8] In this same line of thought, it may be stated that Beckett's work also bears an uncanny resemblance to that of Cervantes', in which the main characters are hard pressed to distinguish their perception from its stimuli, to draw objective connections between what they experience and what they wish to experience. It is precisely this dislocation of judgment which allows different voices to speak in the same passage.

The general spiritual climate of *Waiting for Godot* bears certain similarities to that of *Don Quixote*. Again, the connection is indirect, but it is worth recalling that Beckett's and T. S. Eliot's works have been compared, the latter's poetic despair considered to be a forerunner of Beckett's nihilistic fiction.[9] Comparisons have also been established between the characters of Prufrock and Vladimir, both figures enunciating strikingly similar notes of discord concerning the human condition.[10] What Eliot and Beckett have in common is their overriding concern with the spiritual aridity of this century, its cheapness, absurdity, its ambiguous quest for metaphysical certainty. To be sure, other writers have been compared to Beckett, especially those about whom he has written. Still, it is significant to note the total absence of references to Eliot in Beckett's critical work, despite the fact that the latter had written critical reviews for Eliot's magazine and must certainly have been familiar with this major contemporary poet. Lack of mention neither proves nor disproves affinities, but in this case Harry Levin rightly observes that this somber spiritual atmosphere really has its roots in the barren world of La Mancha, that Cervantes is the true precursor of much of contemporary philosophical fiction.[11] Both Don Quixote and Vladimir seek to overcome their terrestrial limitations, to discover, like the Fisher King, a source of fruitfulness and creativity, but to no avail. In a detailed analysis of their characters this theme will become more apparent. For the moment, however, all the similarities hitherto mentioned rest on rather tenuous, vague presumptions and indirect observations. There is more immediate evidence to relate resemblances to common sources and intentions.

The major characters of Cervantes' and Beckett's chief works are, above all, clowns. They may be variously described as wanderers, gentlemen, servants or tramps, but ultimately their character and actions bear the stamp of the buffoon. Not merely in the matter of their playfulness, mock-ser-

iousness or tendency toward improvisation, but rather in their particular conduct may one discover the source of their deeds. But there are clowns and there are clowns. Beckett's are dressed like tramps, whereas Cervantes' are initially attired in costumes befitting their roles as squire and eccentric gentleman. Their actual rapport is evidenced by their common background in the oldest continuing theatrical comic tradition, namely the *commedia dell' arte*. This does not mean that both characterizations are exclusively inspired by Italian sources, but it is noteworthy that both authors have given strong evidence of such influences. Cervantes, for example, was quite familiar with contemporary Italian literature, especially the theater, and was in Italy from 1569 till 1575. Moreover, his favorite playwright, Lope de Rueda, based much of his theater on Italian models.[12] In Spain Cervantes also had ample opportunity to view the plays performed by travelling bands of Italian comics, who maintained their own theater in Madrid from 1574 till 1588.[13] Of greater significance is the similarity of function between characters like Pierrot and Sancho, and Harlequin and Don Quixote. Pierrot, in the early stages of his dramatic evolution—variously known as Piero, Bertoldo, Bertoldino, and Pedrolino—is usually a valet, a glutton and is often employed by Harlequin, the two forming a comic pair.[14]

In many respects Harlequin resembles Don Quixote. Among his numerous adventures, there is one in which he is captured by pirates and tries to escape from the Turks, certainly an experience which could have appealed to Cervantes who actually underwent such trials. Harlequin is occasionally given to philosophy, has trouble distinguishing reality from illusion, dwells in a fantasy life, and has "a weakness for inventing a distinguished parentage for himself."[15] There is also a revealing print of Harlequin, dating from Cervantes' time, which depicts him mounted, wearing decrepit armor and a pot on his head, carrying a lance, going off to uphold the beauty of his mistress before the entire world.[16] Critics have also noted a similarity between this comic tradition and Beckett's.[17] And deeper bonds of affinity may be observed from attentive comparison of Cervantes' and Beckett's main characters.

Much has been written about the possible origins of Sancho Panza. His lineage may be traced to a workman that Cervantes supposedly knew, or he may even serve as a veiled satire of Tirso de Molina.[18] But for the general reader such motives have little meaning; what counts is the character's role and effect he produces. His most outstanding trait is revealed by his name, Sancho Panza, which, as one well knows, simply means Saintly Paunch or Holy Belly. This gastronomical descriptiveness indicates the usual inclination of his habits, helping to determine and reveal his gluttonous nature. Sancho eats and sustains the life forces, whereas his master prefers abstinence to maintain his high level of consciousness of a realm beyond reality. Sometimes he is also known as Sancho Zancas, referring to his legs and thus suggesting his attachment to the earth. Beckett, too, is sensitive to such a naming process in *Endgame*, for example, where the two main characters are called Hamm and Clov. In much the same manner he gives a culinary designation to Estragon, a name equally rich with comestible associations. Like Sancho, Estragon appears to be inferior in intelligence to his companion, he consumes scraps of food thrown away by passers-by, constantly mispronounces names, is not quite certain about his friend's mission, yet remains faithful, and receives undeserved beatings which increase thanks to his partner's interventions. Estragon also has a double designation, occasionally being known as GoGo; in the French version he also calls himself Catulle, and in the English, Adam. His

principal name, however, Estragon (in English Tarragon) is an herb which supposedly contains properties capable of curing his companion's malady.[19]

Don Quixote's significance is the object of no less speculation, having been linked to a relative of Cervantes or to a satirical portrait of his rival Lope de Vega. Once again, family and literary quarrels aside, the etymological suggestiveness of his name gives clues to his character. Scholars cannot agree on Cervantes' original intention in choosing this particular name because his use of appelations is varied: the knight is also known as Quixada, Quesada, Quixotiz, and finally Alonso Quixano. Since this book is a parody of chivalric literature the evidence tends to support the belief that the name Quixote was patterned after the knight errant, Lanzarote, in so far as the gentleman from La Mancha selects his own name after an illustrious predecessor. Cervantes, moreover, could have chosen this, as Leo Spitzer suggests, because it sounds like a hybrid term incorporating the word *quij*—meaning jaw, with the humorous suffix—*ote,* producing in effect the implication that here is a foolish man who is addicted to words, language, ideals, and philosophy.[20] Spitzer, however, does not care to accept additional suggestions concerning this name which could be derived from a special term designating the piece of armor for covering the thigh.[21] In all these literary associations, however, it is important to keep in mind the advice of the critic Constantino Comneno who states that these eponymic identifications should be taken "no en sentido literal, sino metafórico."[22] After all, Cervantes does devote much attention to the knight's armor, to his weakness for words; and his concern in selecting that particular piece of armament to reflect his character may be fraught with Freudian understones, alluding to the hero's extreme vulnerability in his quest for ultimate beauty.

From the same linguistic perspective it is possible to conjecture that Beckett selected the designation Godot to indicate his elusive central character. Ruby Cohn points out that although the equation of Godot with God may be too simplistic, the name does seem to be for most readers some sort of composition suggesting such a union.[23] The suffix *-ot* in French bears the same humorous resonance as *-ote* in Spanish with, however, a slightly pejorative overtone. The connection of Godot, who never seems to appear, with the other characters will become clearer below. Cohn also suggests that their nicknames, Didi and Gogo, reflect their primary functions, namely telling (French *dire*) and going. Vladimir, who answers to Didi and Mister Albert, is the name of a slavic saint and means ruler of the world. He may be equally reluctant to remain with his friend for his name could suggest some Latin-Teutonic barbarism meaning "fly from me." Their only certainty is that the friends are condemned to remain together in a quest they scarcely understand.

Vladimir is neatly differentiated from Estragon during their initial discussion over their ailments. The latter clearly complains about his foot problem, whereas the former, painfully shuffling about "with short, stiff strides, legs wide apart," seems to suffer from some obscure malady affecting his pubic area. It may simply be some urinary ailment afflicting the kidneys. Don Quixote also suffered from kidney problems. Yet their obscene jokes and desperate attempts at suicide merely to induce an erection would tend to indicate a fanciful desire on their part to overcome the utter sterility of their predicament, the impotence of their hopes.

It is a commonplace of criticism to reduce Sancho Panza and Don Quixote to an allegorical pair of irreconcilable attitudes, the real as opposed to the ideal. Much the same has been written about the relationship of Estragon and Vladimir. These

are unwarranted oversimplifications: upon closer scrutiny, the relation is complementary and its complexity is only borne out in the unfolding of their adventures.

Cervantes' work is as rich in detail as Beckett's is poor. Indeed, one of the most frequent criticism of the latter's fictional world—voiced by the characters themselves—is that nothing ever happens. And it may seem overly ambitious to try to compare the 126 chapters of the novel with its motley throngs and widespread topography to the two acts of the play, with its barren landscape and unfortunate couples. Yet without doing violence to the texts of either classic, it is possible to focus on certain episodes which are strikingly similar in detail and effect. Of course, it is not the letter but the spirit of the work that counts, and certain episodes are so alike that comparison is justified. The structure of Beckett's play is formed around a series of dialogues, and Cervantes himself, Márquez Villanueva observes, is also susceptible to this type of representation.[24] Certain minor details seem similar, such as Sancho's and Gogo's concerns over eating turnips and understanding the fate of hanged thieves, but they really bear no internal relationship to one another. Other episodes, however, are worth considering.

Don Quixote mistakes a barber's basin for Mambrino's helmet (I, 21). He refuses to be dissuaded and insists on wearing it, hoping to gain, somehow, from the magical powers he believes it possesses. His view of this simple head gear allows him to enter into his fantasy world with more justification. Sancho does not really understand his master's enthusiasm, but he joins in the game by stripping the barber's mule for his own profit. Sancho also suffers from what Spitzer terms "polyonomasia," a tendency to confuse words: and so does Estragon, particularly in his encounter with Pozzo, which will be examined below in greater detail. This defect, however, serves more than comic effects; it also allows the reader to penetrate the various levels of linguistic and psychological perspectives offered by the author. In this instance, Sancho refers to Mambrino's helmet as belonging to "Malino," the evil one.[25] He senses the strange numinous power it possesses, at least in his master's imagination.

It should be noted that the headgear of Pozzo's ironically named, subhuman servant Lucky also seems endowed with similar powers. On two occasions his hat permits its wearer, unwittingly, to enter into special spiritual realms. In act one Lucky wears it while delivering his magnificent ghastly monologue, and in act two, Vladimir tries it on during the hat exchange routine with Estragon, which culminates with the brief yet significant episode of the play within a play. In both cases the hat seems empowered to stimulate the imagination and increase perceptive abilities.

At the outset of his adventures Don Quixote comes upon a young shepherd, Andrés, who is being beaten by his master for having lost some sheep (I, 4). This is an example of singular naiveté or indifference to the boy's fate on the part of the knight whose intervention only serves to increase the victim's misery. One is reminded of the young messenger who announces Godot's arrival who upon questioning reveals that Godot beats his brother who minds sheep. Both Sancho and Estragon are victims of mysterious and unwarranted thrashings which their companions strive to avert. Regarding violence and misplaced charity, Sancho and Don Quixote come upon a group of galley slaves which they promptly free, and as a reward for their concern they are abused and stoned by the thankless beneficiaries (I, 22). This episode brings to mind Estragon's initial concern for Lucky the slave who kicks him in the leg. In both cases their solicitude for brutes is unappreciated.

In the second part of the *Quixote* the

two wanderers come upon a curious scene, the wedding of Camacho, where, in order to gain his beloved's hand, Basilio feigns suicide and triumphs (II, 21). Vladimir and Estragon also contemplate suicide and actually attempt it in order to realize their desires. Immediately after Camacho's deception, Sancho and Don Quixote undergo one of the most important experiences of the novel, the descent into the cave of Montesinos (II, 22). No scene more clearly illustrates the gap separating the two friends' perceptions of reality. Although he merely spent one hour in the hole, according to Sancho, the knight insisted he was there for at least three days and three nights, and that he had finally beheld the vision of Dulcinea del Toboso. Sancho humors his master but sardonically muses when he himself falls into a hole that "there Don Quixote saw beautiful and delightful visions, but here I truly believe I shall see toads and snakes" (II, 55). No scene more subtly underscores the incompatibility of views and the native intelligence of the unsophisticated subordinate.

Estragon and Vladimir react in a similar manner toward the arrival of Pozzo, whose name means a "well" in Italian and suggests a creature of infernal proportions. Some critics see in Pozzo the true identity of Godot, grotesquely depicted as the biblical deity, and Wylie Sypher makes a good case for considering his two appearances as burlesques of the Old and New Testaments' images of God.[26] The problem is not quite as simple as this, but if he is the Godot whom Vladimir awaits, he would indeed be as monstrous as Dulcinea (who appears as Aldonza Lorenzo) is really ugly. On three occasions Estragon identifies Pozzo as the awaited one. In both instances the idealist cannot admit reality, and the simple companion hits upon the truth. Though the circumstantial details differ, the encounters underlie the visionary's reluctance, protected by some mysterious shield, to surrender to common sense, to abandon his noble standards in spite of the evidence.

Throughout both novel and play one is struck by the central importance the authors give to encounters with passers-by. Though the number and variety of types met by Don Quixote cannot be matched by the two couples met by Estragon and Vladimir, it is possible to narrow the focus to one significant sort of meeting, the encounter with the self. It is thus at the level of the apparently chance meetings that the elusive truth may be sought. The refutation of the knight's imagination is not directly achieved by the well-meaning plots of his friends to bring him back to reality: rather it is effected indirectly when the knight realizes, quite unintentionally, his true nature as the reflection of himself as seen in other characters.

The first significant episode of this sort is the account of Cardenio's madness (I, 23). The hermit is insane, driven mad by what he considers the infidelity of his beloved Lucinda, and he wanders around in the wilds of the Sierra Morena. Curiously enough, Cardenio is also capable of returning to sanity, especially when he narrates the details of his plight, and he, too, seems to have suffered greatly from reading *Amadís de Gaula*. Sancho and his master discuss this strange hermit, and for a moment he seems on the verge of recognizing his own madness, but he quickly lapses back into his autistic illusions.

The importance of these encounters with similar individuals is heightened by the two meetings with Sansón Carrasco. The bachelor has been sent twice by fellow townspeople to beat the knight at his own game in order to induce him to return. At first he appears as the Knight of Mirrors and then as the Knight of the White Moon. In both cases his contrived titles serve to indicate his function as a mirror to reflect the truth to Don Quixote. Between these two chapters there is another revealing encounter, this time with Diego

de Miranda, the Knight of the Green Coat, the prototype of the reasonable human being, the man of Aristotelian moderation, but also of supine mediocrity (II, 16, 18). His name, too, is doubly meaningful: according to Richard Predmore, Miranda is derived from the verb *admirarse* which he claims is the most frequently used word by Cervantes in the novel, a term which literally means "to look at oneself."[27] And Don Diego's title may indicate the mythical origins of his role as a healer of lunatics.[28] Equally significant is Don Quixote's chat with Diego's eccentric son, Lorenzo, whose passion for poetry is compared to the quest for Dulcinea. Instead of being converted, Don Quixote's magic becomes contagious, and he leaves the house unchanged. It is only during his second encounter with Carrasco, dressed as the Knight of the White Moon, that he drops his mask, his lunacy; even his manner of speaking changes, and he seems to return to sanity.

Before returning home, however, Don Quixote is not completely cured. At one point he and Sancho become entangled in a net and meet a group of people playing shepherdesses (II, 63). Their fantasy life appears to be as convincing and real as Don Quixote's, and the green net only serves to reinforce the psychological bonds to illusions which are not so easily broken. It is worth recalling that when Lucky makes his first entrance, Pozzo informs the tramps that his servant was able to do a dance called "the Net." When master and slave return in the second act all four characters are joined, thrashing and kicking as if intertwined, and fall to the ground.[29] This physical coming together signifies the inseparable connection between the sets of couples, a relationship which is better illustrated by a particular literary device used by Cervantes and Beckett.

Both authors employ the artifice of the play within the play in order to reinforce and give depth to a central idea of their works, the complex relationship of reality and illusion. Don Quixote constantly meets groups of people who are engaged in playing at something which does not reflect their usual actions. At first Don Quixote mistakes an inn for a castle, and later he discovers a castle whose inhabitants are all too eager to go along with his fantasies. The knight attacks a puppet show, unable to see any distinction between real men and figures. The most obvious example of this device is Cervantes' constant reference to his own book throughout the narrative. Beckett, too, is careful to emphasize his tramps' awareness of their artificial situation, their presence on the stage.

In the middle of act two Beckett has his characters engage in a brief play in which Estragon takes Pozzo's role and Vladimir Lucky's. In both cases roles are reversed and a true revelation of their status regarding one another is made manifest. Salvador de Madariaga describes the nature of this transformation whereby Sancho gradually becomes more like Don Quixote who in turn becomes more like his servant in so far as he regains his sanity.[30] The sharp division between their allegorical roles pitting reality against illusion is reduced, and, as Cohn remarks regarding Beckett's work, the distinctions separating Vladimir and Estragon tend to blur, until there is a fusion of personality.[31]

This transformation is not effected without a certain degree of radical dislocation, however inconspicuous, toward the opposing types. And this mutation has its origins in the dominant religious tradition which provides the mythical background for the development of Western literature.[32] At one point, to underscore the antagonism between master and servant, Sancho turns on Don Quixote and beats him out of exasperation (II, 60). As Madariaga observes: "Sancho is, up to a point, a transposition of Don Quixote in a different key."[33] This transmogrification is equally

subtle in the play. After their little skit Estragon hits Lucky and Vladimir strikes Pozzo. The master and slave are thus transpositions of the tramps, and their brutal relationship is but a magnification, a grotesque exaggeration of Vladimir's and Estragon's strained association. Just as Vladimir promises Estragon salvation, Pozzo now leads Lucky off to the market of the Holy Savior. Pozzo's actions are a vengeful mockery,[2] burlesque of Vladimir's. This is the main point about the short play within a play. The incompatible relationship, the tension between irreconcilable world views cannot endure. The violence which attends this metamorphosis should not be construed as merely the subordinate's revenge. The reason is more subtle than that. It is the only means by which the process of undeception may be approached.

Despite their friendship they cannot really go on together. Don Quixote, once returned to reality, like Emma Bovary, has no choice but death. Vladimir, on the other hand, does not face so terrible an end. Indeed, the main thrust of the play is that the opposing forces are fatefully not fatally linked. Vladimir and Estragon suffer from what David Grossvogel calls "the difficulty of dying."[34] They would like to put an end to it all, but they cannot somehow find the means to obliterate themselves hence they are forced, like the sinners in Dante's *Inferno* or Sartre's *No Exit*, to resign themselves to eternal torment.

Beckett's characters are not entirely disenchanted: they may have some vague glimmer into their true condition, but the principle of hope, though shaken, is not completely shattered. If for no other reason it must be preserved as a defense against utter nihilism. Vladimir seems to persist in his illusory expectation: it is the only cause of hope at hand. Without it he, too, would despair and die. Yet in the end he appears to continue in the same old manner. He may no longer believe with complete confidence, he may not even believe at all, but he persists with the doubt in mind that his mission has lost its former certainty.

At the end of the novel Don Quixote returns to sanity, yet strangely enough, he does not really find peace of soul back in society: he finds it incompatible, this new recognition, and he dies. Vladimir's suffering may be endless, but he is not without some modest token of awareness. Throughout his absurd vigil he is told that Godot's arrival will be postponed till tomorrow. After experiencing Lucky and Pozzo, his faith is somewhat jarred, an undeception to which he cryptically alludes: "Now it's all over. It's already tomorrow."[35] He may realize here that his expectation is ill-founded, that his ideal vision of Godot will never arrive, that his real image is already present in his fellow man, Gogo, as dramatically revealed by his encounter with Pozzo. By this discreet dramatic transposition of perspective, exemplified by the reversed mirror image, Don Quixote and Vladimir are defeated by the brutal forces of reality represented in the grotesque apparitions of their spiritual subordinates. The spirit rarely survives such contacts, it cannot suffer such confrontations.[36] Reality always triumphs in the end and allows the spirit to linger on as a token of its indefatigable impotence.

In spite of the similarities between the two works under question, the differences are also important. On the most obvious plane, Cervantes' world is not Beckett's. Yet behind all the frenzied activity there is the barren landscape of La Mancha, similar to Beckett's wastelands where life is barely sustained. Just as Cervantes must have intended to create something larger than "honesto entretenimiento," Beckett, too, produced a work whose implications go beyond the mere elaboration of an unprinted earlier novel. Their testimonies of

loyalty aside, the subordinates submissiveness is difficult to accept at face value. Sancho Panza probably does love his master, and Estragon may remain with Vladimir, *faute de mieux;* nevertheless, their associations must prove to be as precarious, ultimately, as Homais' good intentions toward Emma Bovary. Cervantes and Beckett stand at opposite poles, but the axis is the same.

NOTES

[1]See Christine Brooke-Rose, "Samuel Beckett and the Anti-Novel," *London Magazine,* 5 (December, 1958), 38-46; and John Fletcher, "Beckett and the Fictional Tradition," *Annales Publiées par la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humanines de Toulouse,* n.s, 1, no. 1 (1965), 147-58.

[2]Robert Adams, *Strains of Discord* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 3-18.

[3]Ihab Hassan, *The Literature of Silence* (New York: Knopf, 1967), pp. 111-200.

[4]Hugh Kenner, *Flaubert, Joyce and Beckett* (Boston: Beacon, 1962) p. 70. Referring to Beckett's work, Gabriel Vahanian writes: "The whole play is constructed around the irrelevance of Christian concepts and especially around the nonsensical or quixotic quality of Christian existence." *The Death of God* (New York: Braziller, 1961), p. 120.

[5]Paul Hazard, *Don Quichotte de Cervantes* (Paris: Mellottée). p. 349.

[6]Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis* (New York: Anchor, 1957), p. 311.

[7]Américo Castro, *Hacia Cervantes* (Madrid: Taurus, 1967), pp. 477-85. See also J. Chaix-Ruy, "Cervantes, Flaubert et Pirandello," *Anales Cervantinos,* 6 (1957), 123-32.

[8]Concerning Don Quixote's tendency to confuse reality with illusion see Richard Predmore, *The World of Don Quixote* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1967), pp. 53-97. For the same theme in Beckett see Raymond Federman, "Beckettian Paradox," *Samuel Beckett Now* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970), pp. 103-17.

[9]See August Closs, "Formprobleme und Möglichkeiten zur Gestaltung der Tragödie in der Gegenwart," *Stil und Formprobleme,* 5 (1960), 483-91.

[10]See Renato Oliva, *Samuel Beckett* (Milan: Mursia, 1967), pp. 61-72.

[11]"In a broader sense, the arid region of La Mancha is timeless and placeless. It bears a striking resemblance to that expatriate wasteland which T.S. Eliot invokes, ever awaiting its wounded hero whose quest is the promise of ultimate fertility." Harry Levin, *Contexts of Criticism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 100.

[12]Angel Valbuena Prat, *Historia de la literatura española* (Barcelona: Gili, 1960), vol. I, 785.

[13]Allardyce Nicoll, *The World of Harlequin* (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), p. 167. See also A. Pellizzari, "Saggio di uno studio sulla relazioni del Cervantes con l'Italia," *Rassegna* (1916), p. 319.

[14]Kay Dick, *Pierrot* (London: Hutchinson, 1960), p. 41.

[15]Ibid., p. 95.

[16]Nicoll, op. cit., p. 168.

[17]Hugh Kenner, *Samuel Beckett* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), p. 67. Harold Clurman, *Lies like Truth* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 220-25.

[18]W. S. Hendrix, "Sancho Panza and the Comic Types of the Sixteenth Century," *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal* (Madrid: Hernando, 1925), II, p. 485-94. Francisco Márquez Villanueva, "Sobre la génesis literaria de Sancho Panza," *Anales cervantinos,* vol. 7, (1958), pp. 123-55.

[19]Gastronomically and etymologically, Gogo's main appelation provides additional clues to his identity and function: "L'estragon est employé en médecine comme stimulant, apéritif et stomachique." *Encyclopédie Larousse.* See also *Culpeper's Complete Herbal* (London: Foulsham), p. 363. "Thus the strange form *tarragon* is nothing but *dragon* in a form changed by passing through an Oriental language, and decked in Spanish with a Latin suffix (viz.—*tia*)" W. W. Skeat, *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), p. 630. Gogo may be considered a demonic counterpart to Didi, a monster responsible for his companion's downfall. The maleficent character of Sancho and Gogo will be treated in greater detail in note 28.

[20]Leo Spitzer, *Linguistics and Literary History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948), p. 49.

[21]Martín de Riquer, *Aproximación al Quijote* (Barcelona: Teide, 1967), pp. 82-83.

[22]Constantino Láscaris Comneno, "El nombre de Don Quijote," *Anales cervantinos,* 2, (1952), p. 364.

[23]Ruby Cohn, *Samuel Beckett: The Comic Gamet* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1962), p. 213.

[24]Villanueva, op. cit., p. 155.

[25]Spitzer, op. cit., p. 45.

[26]Wylie Sypher, *The Loss of the Self* (New York: Random House, 1962), p. 157.

[27]Predmore, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

[28]In an illuminating chapter, "The dragon and the hero," Esther Harding traces the origin of the wandering knight back to the earliest legends concerning Saint George whose shrine is found in the Palestinian village bearing his name Al-Khudr and whose feast day is April 26. "The latter day is called 'the feast of Spring, which makes everything green'; Al-

Khudr means 'The Green One' or 'the Ever Living One.' This saint, under the name either of George or of Al-Khudr, was believed to have peculiar powers—in particular, power to heal lunatics. The procedure prescribed to bring about a cure was as follows. At the time of the saint's feast, the sick person was brought to the shrine and a lamb was offered in sacrifice. The sick man was then shut into dark cavern at the back of the shrine, where he spent the night alone." *Psychic Energy* (New York: Pantheon, 1963), p. 254. This passage closely follows in detail Don Quixote's encounter with the Knight of the Green Coat, shortly after which he descends into the cave of Montesinos. Whether Cervantes was or was not familiar with this early Christian legend, the importance revolves around what Harding describes as the hero's confrontation with the dragon viewed as the destructive side of himself. In Jungian terms, the hero and dragon may be one and the same creature. In varying degrees Sancho and Estragon fulfill this function in that they lead their companions to awareness of themselves and reality.

[29]See John Sheedy, "The Net," *Casebook on Waiting for Godot* (New York: Grove, 1967), 159-66.

[30]Juan de Madariaga, *Don Quixote* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 137-56. See also René Girard, *Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque* (Paris: Grasset, 1961), pp. 145-57.

[31]Cohn, op. cit., p. 214.

[32]Thomas Mann perceptively comments on this spiritual orientation in reference to the knight's encounter with the lion: "In no other place comes out so strongly as here the author's utter readiness to exalt and to abase his hero. But abasement and exaltation are a twin conception the essence of which is distinctly Christian. Their psychological union, their marriage in a comic medium, shows how very much Don Quixote is a product of Christian culture." *Essays,* "Voyage with Don Quixote," (New York: Vintage, 1958), p. 455. Beckett's tramps are also cast from a Christian mold but which has been stood on its heads for parodic effect.

[33]Madariaga, op. cit., p. 121.

[34]David Grossvogel, *The Blasphemers* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1965), p. 85.

[35]Unamuno, referring to Cervantes' classic, also anticipates Vladimir's anguish when he writes: "There is no future: there is never any future. What is known as the future is one of the greatest lies. The true future is today. What will become of us tomorrow? There is no tomorrow!" *Our Lord Don Quixote* (New York: Bollingen, 1967), p. 11.

[36]In this context, Kafka's parable, *The Truth about Sancho Panza,* is worth considering. In it Kafka expresses the belief that Sancho, ironically, exorcises his demon, named Don Quixote, and, "out of a sense of responsibility," follows him, tolerantly, around on his crusades. *The Complete Stories* (New York: Schocken, 1971), p. 430. See also Karl-Ludwig Selig, "Cervantes y Kafka," *Anales cervantinos* 5, (1955), 265-66.