



ARTAUD'S THEATRICAL INNOVATIONS EXPLORED IN ROUGH FOR THEATRE I AND II

¹ Daniel Dabitlang M Cajee and ² Dr. Nabamita Das

¹Research Scholar ²Associate Professor

¹ Department of English,

¹⁰ Assam Don Bosco University, Sonapur, India

Abstract: The understanding and analysis of the two plays of Samuel Beckett's *Rough for Theatre I* and *Rough for Theatre II* from the perspective of the Theatre of Cruelty and the dramatic techniques of Antonin Artaud add more insights into the aforementioned plays. The study aimed to conduct a critical analysis of the two plays using the method of textual analysis. The study identified the various dramatic techniques that Antonin Artaud used in his plays and some of those techniques have been applied to better understand the two plays of Samuel Beckett. The Theory of Cruelty propounded by Artaud in his *The Theatre and its Double* (1958), was the main platform for analysis. A critique into the two plays revealed the harrowing experiences of the characters involved, even to the point of death, a grave form of cruelty. It also revealed that the objects (props) in the plays have been turned to objects of cruelty and pain. The juxtaposition of the words and the usage of light and sounds interchangeably heightened the sensibility of the audience, as desired by Artaud.

Index Terms - Cruelty, struggles, death, light, dark, objects, hostility, shock, fear, suicide.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is very crucial to understand that Artaud has got a penchant for performances. He goes into the minutest details when it comes to staging plays. This article deals exclusively on the two important plays of Samuel Beckett - *Rough for Theatre I (Fragment de théâtre I)* and *Rough for Theatre II (Fragment de théâtre II)*. They are given the same title except for the sequence. Both the plays were written originally in French. The first play was written in the later 1950s. The first English translation was published by Grove Press in 1976 (Beckett 226). The second play was written in the later 1950s. The first English translation was published by Grove Press in 1976 (226). Helen Penet-Astbury followed that same thought pattern of Stan Gontarski who stated that the two plays "remain sketches that lack finish" (126).

ROUGH FOR THEATRE I

The enigmatic setting of *Rough for Theater I* or simply called *Theatre I* especially the empty, dilapidated street in "ruins" serves as a compelling backdrop. The profound sense of desolation prompts one to ponder on the origins of such devastation. Typically, extensive damage to an urban or rural landscape is often attributed to human-made disasters such as war, mutiny, or sudden enemy attacks. Alternatively, natural calamities like earthquakes, floods, landslides, or tsunamis may leave a place in ruins. Over and above, the place is desolate and unoccupied.

A: *Sometimes I hear steps. Voice. I say to myself, they are coming back, some are coming back, to try and settle again, or to look for something they had left behind, or to look for someone they had left behind.*

B: *Come back! [Pause.] Who would want to come back here?*

(Beckett 229)

The deliberate choice of an uninhabited and desolate environment in the play raises questions about the circumstances leading to its current state. The absence of occupants increases the sense of abandonment, adding layers of complexity to the narrative. The setting itself compels one to explore not only the physical ruins but also the metaphorical aspects that may mirror the internal struggles or conflicts of the characters. The harshness of the setting could be understood from the expressions of the two characters:

A: *How are the trees doing?*

B: *Hard to say. It's winter, you know.*

(Beckett 228)

Apart from the cruel setting that places the characters in a precarious situation, the presence of just two characters makes the environment of the play all the more hostile for the simple reason that these two characters have no other alternatives but to interact and confront each other. The two principal characters namely - character A and character B. The description of the predicament of the characters is also gruesome:

A, *blind, sitting on a folding-stool, scrapes his fiddle. Besides him the case, half open, upended, surmounted by alms bowl.*

Enter **B** right, in a wheelchair which he propels by means of a pole.

(Beckett 227)

The narrative above unfolds the poignant circumstances of two characters, creating a deeply moving and heart-wrenching scene. Character A, bereft of eyesight, grapples with the challenge of finding joy in life, ultimately relying on playing the fiddle as his sole source of sustenance. Conversely, character B has lost a limb, hindering his ability to move freely. Despite possessing a wheelchair for mobility, the absence of assistance propels him to ingeniously employ a pole to navigate his surroundings.

The convergence of these two characters not only underscores their individual struggles but also illuminates the stark reality of their shared predicament. The poignant exchange, where character B, upon witnessing character A's plight, labels him a "Poor wretch," serves as a blunt commentary on the harshness of their respective destinies. Inversely, character A also addressed character B in like manners:

A: *Cripples? [Without emotion] Poor Wretch.*

(Beckett 228)

The stage is lit as explained by character B since the other character is not able to see. The interplay of the words - "light", "dark", "day", "evening" and "night" in the text as well as the overlapping of these words one after the other along with the juxtaposition of the images and movements involved placed the audience in a very cruel and discomfoting situation. This is a concept that Artaud expounded in the second manifesto of The Theatre of Cruelty (124).

A: *Is it **day** or **night**?*

B: *Oh... [he looks at the sky] ... **day**, if you like. No sun of course, otherwise you wouldn't have asked.*

A: *But **light**?*

B: *Yes [Looks at sky.] Yes, **light**, there is no other word for it. [Pause] Shall I describe it to you? [Pause] Shall I try to give you an idea of this **light**?*

(Beckett 228)

The text above relays the sensation of coldness because the heat of the sun is not felt by character A, who is blind. The absence of heat places the blind character in a perplexed situation in connection to the day-night binary. The variation of light on the stage conveys the required sensation of the environment.

A: *I was always as I am, crouched in the **dark**, scratching an old jangle to the four winds.*

(Beckett 228)

B: *Oh me you know, observe...I sit there, in my lair, in my chair, in the **dark**, twenty-three hours out of the twenty-four.*

(Beckett 229)

The usage of the word “dark” can be understood from two different angles. The literal darkness of the environment for character B who sits on a wheel chair all alone in a dark corner, practically the whole day, and the darkness of the world for character A who is blind. The sensation that the darkness, the absence of light, creates in the mind of the audience would be that of insecurity and fear. This is what Artaud would like his audience to go through - a change of light effects on stage in order to ‘arrest the sensibility’ (91) of the audience.

A: *Is it still **day**?*

B: ***Day**? [Looks at sky]. If you like. [Looks.] There is no other word for it.*

A: *Will it not soon be **evening**? ...*

A: *Will it not soon be **night**? [B looks at sky]*

B: ***Day...night...[looks]. It seems to me sometimes the earth must have got stuck, one sunless day, in the heart of winter, in the grey of **evening**.***

(Beckett 232)

The sense of perplexity and confusion is also created by the light effect on stage which also led to the inability to determine the hour of the day. The “rigid control”, which Artaud spoke about in the *Theatre and its Double*, of the situation on stage which is but a cruel assault on the characters and the audience who witness such acts.

The playing of the fiddle by character A adds more cruelty to the scene because the manner it was played is jarring to the ears. The text describes character A who “scrapes his fiddle” (Beckett 227), in other words to scrape the fiddle would mean to rub against its strings in a very unpleasant way, thereby, producing noise instead of a pleasant music. He characterizes his style of playing the fiddle as ‘scratching’ which clearly indicates that it is unpleasant and painful to listen to, this is experienced by both the characters and the audience. The character himself describes it very plainly

A: *I was always as I am, crouched in the dark, scratching an old jangle to the four winds.*

(Beckett 228)

There is also the interaction of the characters with the various scenic decors and objects in the play. Character A interacts with the ‘fiddle’ that he plays in order to keep himself occupied and ward off the sense of loneliness. He is being supported by a ‘folding-stool’ which he used to sit and play the fiddle. The ‘arms bowl’ which is the object and the only means of livelihood. There is a close bond between character B with the objects around him especially with the ‘fiddle’ and the ‘bowl’

A: *It seems to me sometimes I spend the night here, playing and listening. I use to feel twilight gather and make myself ready, I put away fiddle and bowl and had only to get to my feet, when she took me by the hand.*

(Beckett 228)

The ‘sack of nuts’ that he tripped over, became the source of his sustenance to keep himself from starving. He also had a ‘little harp’ which he interacted prior to his interaction with the fiddle. He made many references to a harp which he lost. His interaction with the harp goes way back to the days before he encountered the fiddle.

A: *Dora used to say, the days I hadn’t earned enough, You and your harp! You’d do better crawling on all fours...You and your harp!*

B: *Your harp? [Pause] what’s all this about a harp?*

A: *I once had a little harp.*

(Beckett 232)

Character B too has his share of interaction with the objects on stage. His first and primary object of interaction is his ‘wheelchair’ which is his only means of transport, keeping in mind his state of being a cripple and immobile:

A: Let go my hand! You want me to help you and you hold my hand!.....Have you only one leg?

B: Just the one

A: And the other?

B: It went bad and was removed.

(Beckett 231)

The pole is another object which is closely in touch with character B, without which he would not be able to move around. He confessed that it is the pole that is so close and dear to him and the only one that helps him in such a condition:

“Enter B right, in a wheelchair which he propels by means of a pole.”

(Beckett 227)

The pole became not only an object that helped character B to move around but it also became an object of defense:

B: Stop! [He strikes behind him with a pole. A lets go the chair, recoils. Pause. A gropes towards his stool, halts, lost.]

(Beckett 230)

The striking of the character A by the other character changes the cordial environment and instills in the audience the sense of fear and pain, in other words a sense of cruelty has invaded the affable space.

The costumes of both the characters are that of poor and wretched people as inferred from the statement made by character A

A: A penny for a poor old man, a penny for a poor old man.

(Beckett 227)

The condition of their pathetic state could be greater deciphered from the statement made about their inability to get proper food. They eat anything just to keep themselves alive

B: Corned beef, Billy, just corned beef. Enough to keep body and soul together, till summer, with care. [Pause]

(Beckett 227)

A: Corned beef, did you say? B: Apropos, what have you been living on, all this time? You must be famished.

A: There are things lying around.

B: Edible?

A: Sometimes.

(Beckett 229)

There are various instances in the play wherein the character's gestures and movements indicate a sense of violence and cruelty. Actions that demonstrate a deep sense of anger, displeasure and impulses of resentment.

A: [Violently] I was always as I am, crouched in the dark....

B: [Violently] We had our women.....

(Beckett 228)

B: [Violently] What would you have me observe?

(Beckett 229)

A: After all those hours of darkness you don't -

B: [Violently] No! [Pause]....

(Beckett 230)

At various junctures of the play, the expressions and the way things are communicated are done with a deep sense of anger and hostility.

A: Pushing the chair.] It's a gift! A gift!

B: Stop! [He strikes behind him with the pole. A lets go of the chair, recoils.

B: Now I've lost him. He was beginning to like and I struck him. He'll leave me and I'll never see him again. I'll never see anyone again.

(Beckett 230)

The tussle between the two characters clearly showed that there is also an inner conflict within them, which overflows through their actions. There is also the feeling of closeness and the fear of losing the other as well as the feeling of irritation at the other.

A: [Irritated] Let go my hand! You want me to help you and you hold my hand!

(Beckett 231)

B: Eh Billy, what would you say to that? [Pause]. There croaking to the winter wind [rime with unkind], having lost his little mouth organ. [He pokes him in the back with the pole] Eh Billy? [A whirls round, seizes the end of the pole and wrenches it from B's grasp]

(Beckett 233)

The climax of the play ends with a sense of anger and enmity between the two characters. The fight became more evident as the anger gets materialized. The play ends abruptly without any further action, its final denouement is left unattended. There are instances of camaraderie, moments of comedy and moments of antagonism. There are certain actions, movements and gestures of the characters which depict the sense of fright, fear and at times shocking. There was an instance wherein character B pushed the wheel chair that he sat on, forward and backward, with great irritation and unpleasant attitude. His feeling of anger at not being able to walk and the need to push himself around.

B: [Violently.] No! [Pause] Of course if you wish me to look about me I shall. And if you care to push me about, I shall try to describe the scene, as we go along.

A: You mean you would guide me? I wouldn't get lost anymore?

(Beckett 230)

B: Why don't you let yourself die?

A: On the whole I have been lucky. The other day I tripped over a sack of nuts.

B: No!

A: A little sack, full of nuts, in the middle of the road.

B: Yes, all right, but why don't you let yourself die?

A: I have thought of it.

B: [Irritated]. But you don't do it!

A: I'm not unhappy enough. [Pause] That was always my unhap, unhappy, but not unhappy enough.

B: But you must be everyday a little more so.

A: [Violently]. I am not unhappy enough!

(Beckett 229)

There is a deep sense of anguish and pain and at the same time a sense of helplessness at the situation of character A not dying even though he 'tripped', the action was not so severe so as to make it gruesome and viable for an accidental death.

Apart from gestures and actions there is the expression of the sensations of pain and agony through sounds of groaning by both the characters

B: [Groaning] Do something for me, before you go!

A: There! Do you hear it? [Pause. Groaning] I can't go!

[Pause] Do you hear it?

(Beckett 230)

After character B struck character A with his pole, the sense of pain is visible from the way character A groaned. Even character B groaned but his groaning was because he felt pain at the loss of a relationship with character A.

ROUGH FOR THEATRE II

In the theatrical narrative of the play *Rough for Theatre II*, there are three pivotal characters and they are denoted as A, B and C. Character A is identified as Bertrand, Character B bears the name Morvan, and Character C is referred to as Croker. The unfolding drama transpires within the confines of an office setting, enveloped in the luminosity emanation from an ambient external light source, filtering through a window. The temporal context is nocturnal, as the events transpire during the night. There are several props on the stage which are meticulously arranged to set the scene. Two small tables adorned with table lamps, each accompanied by two chairs, creating a sense of balance and symmetry. A briefcase rests in anticipation, perhaps holding secrets or crucial elements to unfold. There is also the presence of a double window which is open. Notably concealed from view is a bird cage, its significance poised to be revealed in the unfolding narrative.

At the very outset of the play, the room stands in solitary, inhabited solely by the enigmatic presence of Character C

Downstage left door.

Standing motionless before left half of window with his back to stage, C.

(Beckett 237)

Taking a cue on the position of character C, it is discerned that he may be contemplating suicide. This is deduced from the remarks articulated by character A and character B throughout the progression of the play. It is very evident because at the very start of their probe into the life history of character C. He is ripe for suicide, they conclude, hunting through a pile of quirky, written testimonies which note his tendency to dwell too much on the dark side of things (Worth 49). The nuanced expressions and interactions among the two characters, who are investigators, serve as indicators, suggesting a potentially distressing contemplation within the narrative

B: Rearing

A: We attend

B: Let him jump.

A: When?

B: Now

A: From where?

B: From here will do. Three to three and a half metres per floor, say twenty-five in all.

[Pause]

A: I could have sworn we were only on the sixth. [Pause]. He runs no risk?

B: He has only to land on his arse, the way he loved. The spine snaps and the tripes explode.

(Beckett 238)

Artaud stated very clearly that “Death is cruelty” (103). The very contemplation of character C for a face-to-face wrestle with death is itself a cruel thought. Suicide is a deliberate and premeditated act of taking away of one’s life which goes against the very principle of preservation of life. The reason for character C to contemplate suicide can be because of a list of personal reasons that culminated in his depressive mood:

...sick headaches ... eye trouble ... irrational fear of vipers...ear trouble.... fibroid tumours...pathological horror of songbirds...throat trouble...need of affection...inner void...congenital timidity ...nose trouble...morbidly sensitive to the opinion of others...

(Beckett 242)

The other reason for him to contemplate suicide can possibly be his inability to shine in his literary career and not able to send his letter to an 'admiratrix' whose name is not mentioned. A history of a disturbed childhood was discovered by character A as he went through the files in connection to character C. These factors must have pushed character C to the point of considering suicide as the only solution to put an end to all the problems plaguing his life. For Artaud, it is the 'absolute determination' of the individual to commit an act with full consciousness is what makes it crueler. He stated that "from the point of view of the mind, cruelty signifies rigor, implacable intention and decision, irreversible and absolute determination" (101).

As the play unfolds, not only does character C grapple with thoughts of suicide, but there is also a poignant moment where Character B articulates a profound desire for death. This yearning emerges as a perceived remedy to alleviate the ceaseless sufferings inflicted by mental anguish and persistent irritation at the various happenings around him. Character B's contemplation of death by suicide serves as a powerful thematic element on the cruelty which Artaud spoke about.

B: It's my nerves. [Pause] Ah if I were only twenty years younger, I'd put an end to my sufferings!

A: Fie! Never say such horrid things! Even to a well-wisher!

(Beckett 243)

The entrance of Character A, also known as Mr. Bertrand, onto the stage, coupled with the deliberate act of illuminating the space by switching on the lamp, undoubtedly evoked a sense of astonishment and shock among the audience. This strategic utilization of theatrical elements, particularly the juxtaposition of light dispelling darkness, serves as a powerful and symbolic gesture within the performance. The intentional manipulation of ambience and the employment of the light not only engages the audience visually but also instigates an emotional roller coaster for the audience. The recurrent action of switching the lamp on and off becomes a motif in the play. Character A engages in this ritual three times and similarly, Character B follows suit, with the distinction that the latter switches it on for the final occasion, i.e., the fourth time, without subsequently turning it off. At a later stage, the light goes off by itself and would later be restored. This interplay of light brightening the stage and then plunging it into darkness, either spontaneously or through the characters' volition, engenders an atmosphere of fear and tension for the audience immersed in the theatrical experience. There is also a dynamic on stage that involved a nuanced interplay of voluntary and involuntary actions, particularly in relation to the manipulation of light. Significantly, a considerable duration of the play unfolds in darkness, intensifying the dramatic impact on the audience.

In the understanding of Artaud, the objects in the play usually interact with the characters of the play in order to bombard the audience with their presence. In the realm of theatrical expression, Antonin Artaud's profound assertion on the interplay between characters and objects resonate with the essence of consciousness and cruelty. As articulated by Artaud, "There is no cruelty without consciousness and without the application of consciousnesses" (103). In other words, the conscious action done by the characters in connection to the objects on stage carry an inherent element of cruelty.

Artaud's perspective prompts consideration on the subtle dynamics within a performance. The conscious interaction between characters and objects becomes a channel through which cruelty is expressed, transcending mere physicality to delve into the realms of conscious thought and intentions. This interconnectedness between consciousness and cruelty adds layers of depth to the theatrical experience, inviting both performers and spectators to engage with the profound implications of intentional actions on stage.

The briefcase of character B, along with the papers it contains, serves as poignant objects that subtly convey a profound sense of despair and anguish in response to the grim circumstances surrounding the case of character C - a figure entangled in the complexities of suicide, a cruel and distressing phenomenon. The recurring action of character B 'rummaging' through the papers within the briefcase becomes a symbolic representation of the exhaustive search for details and documentation related to character C's case, a suicidal case that placed the other two characters in a very discomfiting and rigor situation - a prime element of the concept of 'cruelty' (Artaud 101).

The stage directions include additional cues that subtly convey a sense of hostility within the scene. These cues evident through various words and actions, further accentuating the nail-biting atmosphere surrounding the unfolding events. As characters manoeuvre the complexities of the narrative, the carefully crafted stage directions serve as an extra layer of communication, providing insights into the underlying emotions of hostility that permeate the scene.

B: [Irritated] Where?

A: [Irritated] There?

A: [Irritated] I forget, I forget!

(Beckett 239)

A: Now let's have the positive elements.

B: Positive? You mean of a nature to make him think.... [hesitates, then with sudden violence] ...that someday things might change?

(Beckett 240)

A: [Irritated] I forget, I forget! And he, does he not - [Pause]

(Beckett 241)

B: [Violently, slapping down his hand on the pile of paper.] There's the record, closed and final. That's what we're going on. Too late now to start saying that [slapping to his left] is right and that [slapping to his right] wrong. You're a pain in the arse.

(Beckett 246)

B: [Vexed, slapping on his paper.] Here, as far as I'm concerned, the client is here and nowhere else.

(Beckett 246)

A volley of emotional hostility unfolds sequentially, bombarding the audience with intense feelings of insecurity and cruelty. This relentless succession of emotional upheavals aligns with Artaud's theatrical technique, which involves bombarding the audience with a combination of sounds, images, and movements (Artaud, p. 124).

The other significant objects on the stage are the sparrows and the cage. The cage was covered with a green silk cloth fringed with beads

B takes up the lamp and shines it inside the cage. They peer, stooped. Long Pause.

B: There's one dead.

[They peer]

A: Have you a pencil? [B hands him a long pencil. A pokes it between the bars of the cage.

Pause.] Yes. [He withdraws the pencil, puts it in his pocket.]

(Beckett 248)

The presence of a dead bird on stage adds a layer of profound cruelty to the unfolding scene. Notably, as character C grapples with a contemplation of suicide and character B subtly hinting at a profound longing for death, the theatrical presentation aligns with the perspective of Antonin Artaud. He perceived death not merely as an inevitable event but as a manifestation of cruelty in itself. In Artaud's framework, scenes laden with mortality, such as the one described, serves to thrust the audience into an experimental vortex of horror, discomfort, internal turmoil and conflicting emotions. The deliberate induction of these intense reactions forms a crucial component of Artaud's 'Theatre of Cruelty', aiming to stimulate the sensibility of the spectators. The primary objective here is to transcend traditional theatrical boundaries and immerse the audience in an immersive and profound encounter that extends beyond the ordinary. It is through this unsettling journey where in the audience are subjected to a mélange of emotions that the 'Theatre of Cruelty' seeks to elicit a transformative impact on the sensibilities of the audience, aligning with the broader artistic and philosophical intentions of Artaud's avant-garde vision.

There are objects on the stage and objects not seen on stage but their presence is felt or experienced. For instance, the moon is not visible on the stage or by the audience but its bright light is felt by the audience and it helped the audience to see the movement on the stage as well as it helped the characters to move about on the stage. In his pursuit of creating a heightened and thrilling theatrical experience, Artaud demonstrated a

keen interest in the integration of light, sound, and various effects. As Morris notes, Artaud employed the technique of illuminating different segments of the stage to establish dynamic contrasts and isolate specific areas within the theatrical space (88). This approach is evident in the staging of “Rough for Theatre II”, where certain areas are strategically lit while others remain in shadow. The deliberate play of light becomes a significant element as characters, particularly A and B, move between illuminated and less illuminated spaces based on their roles in the unfolding drama. Notably, character C is silhouetted against the bright moonlight, creating a sharp black-and-white contrast that adds visual intensity to the performance.

Artaud’s emphasis on the interplay of light and shadow serves not only as a technical aspect but also as a means to convey deeper thematic nuances within the play. The deliberate manipulation of lighting contributes to the overall sensory experience, engaging the audience and enhancing the dramatic impact of the theatrical production. This thoughtful integration of visual elements aligns with Artaud’s broader artistic vision, aimed at pushing the boundaries of conventional theatrical norms to evoke powerful emotional responses from the spectators.

Moreover, the narrative elements made use of by the characters contribute to the cultivation of a profound sense of violence and cruelty within the audience. In a noteworthy conversation between characters A and B, the discussion revolves around an individual named Smith. Described vividly as a ‘big fat red-haired’ person known for his lack of industriousness; Smith becomes the focal point of a gruesome incident recounted by character A:

Reputed to have lost his genitals in a shooting accident. His own double-barrel that went off between his legs in a moment of abstraction, just as he was getting set to let fly at a quail.
(Beckett 247)

This gruesome incident, detailed in the narrative, serves as a climactic moment that elevates the audience’s perception of cruelty. The account takes a more distressing turn when Smith learns from others that his wife, Mrs. Mildred, has ‘gone under an ambulance’ (Beckett 247). This revelation intensifies the emotional impact, adding layers of tragedy and brutality to the unfolding story.

As the play unfolds, there are series of notable actions and gestures that vividly portray a spectrum of violence, reflecting a noteworthy degree of cruelty and rigidity on the part of the characters. These theatrical elements contribute to a narrative, rich in intensity, underscoring the harshness and inflexibility inherent in the characters depicted on stage.

The lamp goes out. B bangs on the table with his fist. The lamp goes out again. Pause.
(Beckett 243)

*A: [Forcibly] let’s get it over and go to bed.
[B rummages in his papers].*
(Beckett 244)

*A: Oh it was only so as not to see me. He must have opened them again since. [Pause. Violently]
You’d need to stare them in the face day and night! ...*
(Beckett 245)

There are varied impactful instances in the play wherein characters resort to slapping as a manifestation of anger and discontentment. These physical expressions of emotions serve as potent vehicles to evoke the sensibility of the audience. The act of slapping, laden with great intensity, becomes a visual and emotional punctuation, punctuating the narrative with moments of enhanced tension and conflict.

*B: [Violently, slapping down his hand on the pile of papers.] too late now to start saying that [slapping to his left] is right and that [slapping to his right] wrong.
B: [Vexed. Slapping on his papers.] ...*
(Beckett 246)

The amalgamation of Artaud's approach with Beckett's thematic exploration creates a theatrical experience that goes beyond mere observation, drawing the audience into the intuitive and unsettling dimensions of the play. Artaud's techniques play a pivotal role in eliciting a heightened sensibility from the audience. In his "Theater of Cruelty" theory, Artaud explicitly articulates the importance of a new language in his theatrical approach. It is a language that 'seeks to exalt, to benumb, to charm, to arrest the sensibility...' (91). This innovative language serves as a transformative tool, aiming not only to communicate narrative elements but also to provoke a profound and instinctive response from the spectators. Artaud stated very clearly that

This language cannot be defined except by its possibilities for dynamic expression in space as opposed to the expressive possibilities of spoken dialogue. And what the theatre can still take over from speech are its possibilities for extension beyond words, for development in space, for dissociative and vibratory action upon the sensibility (89).

CONCLUSION

The exploration of Samuel Beckett's plays, particularly "Rough for Theatre I" and "Rough for Theatre II", through the lens of Antonin Artaud's perspectives underscores the richness of diverse analytical approaches applied to Beckettian works. The distinct settings of each play contribute significantly to unraveling Artaud's unique views on drama. Notably, the nuanced use of Artaudian techniques, such as the manipulation of light, plays a pivotal role in creating an environment that not only captivates the audience but also serves as a medium for profound communication. The characters, through their gestures, movements, costumes, and sounds, engage in a multifaceted form of communication, providing a deeper layer of meaning to the theatrical experience.

Furthermore, it is crucial to acknowledge that communication extends beyond the characters themselves to encompass objects and scenic decors on stage. Viewing these elements through the lens of Artaud enhances our understanding of the subtle yet impactful ways in which inanimate components contribute to the overall narrative. In essence, this comprehensive examination underscores the richness of interpreting Beckett's plays with an Artaudian perspective, offering a more profound insight into the intricate layers of communication embedded in the theatrical realm.

REFERENCES

- Artaud Antonin, *The Theatre and its Double*, Trans. Mary Caroline Richards, New York: Grove Press, 1958.
- Beckett Samuel, *The Complete Dramatic Works*, Faber and Faber, 2006.
- Barber, Stephen, *Antonin Artaud: Blows and Bombs*, London: Faber & Faber, 1993.
- Bermel, Albert, *Artaud's Theatre of Cruelty*, New York: Taplinger Publishing, 1977.
- Braun, Edward, *The Director and the Stage*, London: Methuen, 1982.
- Brustein, Robert, *The Theatre of Revolt: An Approach to the Modern Drama*, London: Methuen, 1965.
- Chambers, Ross, *Aspects of Drama and Theatre*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1965.
- Derrida, Jacques and Thévenin, Paule, *The Secret Art of Antonin Artaud*, trans. Mary Ann Caws, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
- Esslin, M, *Theatre of the Absurd*, London: Penguin, 1988.
- Esslin, M, *Antonin Artaud: The Man and His Work*, London: Calder Publications, 1976.
- Goodall, Jane, *Artaud and the Gnostic Drama*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Greene, Naomi, *Antonin Artaud: Poet Without Words*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970.
- Hayman, R, *Artaud and After*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Knapp, Bettina L, *Antonin Artaud: Man of Vision*, Chicago and London: Swallow Press, 1980.
- Labelle, Maurice Marc, *Alfred Jarry: Nihilism and the Theatre of the Absurd*, New York and London: New York University Press, 1980.
- Marowitz, Charles, *Artaud at Rodez*, London: Marion Boyars, 1977.
- Morris Blake, *Antonin Artaud*, Routledge, 2022.
- Penet-Astbury Helen. *Rough for theatre I and II* and why they stayed that way, or when Beckett's French theatre became Irish again. In: *Études irlandaises*, 2008, pp. 125-133.
- Plunka, Gene, A (ed.), *Antonin Artaud and the Modern Theatre*, Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994.
- Poggioli, Renato, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Rowell, Margit (ed.), *Antonin Artaud: Works on Paper*, New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1997.
- Schechner, Richard, *Performance Theory*, London: Routledge, 1988.
- Stoppelman, Gabriela, *Artaud for Beginners*, London: Writers & Readers Publishing Inc., 1999.
- Worth Katharine (1999), *Samuel Beckett's Theatre*, Oxford University Press.

