



RESEARCH PAPER

Interpreting the Divine: A Post-Structuralist and Deconstructive Analysis of *Waiting for Godot*

¹Asad Hussain* , ²Wisal Ahmed and ³Sana

1. M. Phil Scholar, Department of English linguistics & literature, Muslim Youth (MY) University Islamabad, Pakistan
2. M. Phil Scholar, Department of English linguistics & literature, Muslim Youth (MY) University Islamabad, Pakistan
3. M. Phil Scholar, Department of English linguistics & literature, Muslim Youth (MY) University Islamabad, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author**

asadhayati786@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research paper explores the concept of interpreting the divine through the lens of Post Structuralism and Deconstructivism in Samuel Beckett's play *Waiting for Godot*. This study revolves around the notion that is Divine -Godot has meaningless meaning; it means there is nothing for faith on divine. Even though Divine means power of faith but Godot is not coming in play, both major characters Estragon and Valdmir and their waiting for the mysterious character Godot, whom they believe will bring them salvation. But divine becomes in play colorless, meaningless, pointless, and faithless. It investigates the representations of faith and religion in the play and its characters. This research also portrays how post structuralists depict how this text's interpreting the divine through the Foculat and Bradth's concept of this movement, and deconstruction theory of Derrida about the divine has special term of différance in his theory of deconstructive in play. Hence, the study contributes a deeper understanding of Backet's selected work and explore the broader discourse on post structuralism and deconstructionism in the field of literature, and future study of *Waiting for Godot* suggest that belief in the divine is futile , or does the very act of waiting itself hold ethical or spiritual significance through the lens of nihilism and ethical writings.

KEYWORDS

Deconstruction, Difference, Divine, Post Structuralism

Introduction

It is really tough to go through life knowing that the person you want to spend the rest of your life with never sees you. It can be really hard to deal with hoping that someone will notice you and hoping that they feel the same way about you one day. How long can we keep up hope? How long do people who believe have to wait? In some way, that's what everyone is waiting for. Still, why is this the way everything always has to be? Why does it seem like we always end up disappointed whenever we wait for anything or someone? Maybe we become caught in the waiting trap, where there's no way out except to wait some more. Albert Camus was an early thinker to make the relationship between faith and the ridiculous in philosophy.

French philosopher and writer of Algerian origin argues in his seminal work *The Myth of Sisyphus* that "the absurd is born out of this confrontation between the human need and the unreasonable silence of the world" (28). A lack of trust, one might say, in something greater than oneself, in unfulfilled desires and in the heavenly calmness, is what

makes life seem ridiculous and lonely. Without Divine, there is no fundamental meaning to human existence or human suffering (Absurdism 3). One could say that the lack of faith, the lack of something to believe in, the unfulfilled wants, and the holy silence are what make life so strange and lonely. "Absurdism 3" one says that in a world without Divine, life and pain have no value on their own.

This may be the kind of faith Vladimir and Estragon (mostly Vladimir) have in their quest for salvation and their determination to keep going even though things are hard. Another definition, also found in the OED, goes: "Belief in and acceptance of the doctrines of a religion, typically involving belief in a god or gods and in the authenticity of divine revelation" ("Faith"). This kind of faith, on the other hand, might only be about gods and spiritual forces, though. There is this kind of faith in the way Vladimir and Estragon treat the Godot figure. When I look at the play and its characters, I use both of these meanings because they fit together well and add to each other. Both play important roles in the play.

The idea of the divine has always been at the heart of human society, text form, and philosophy. A lot of the time, the divine is a central figure in writing that deals with faith, meaning, and life. This study paper more than anything else shows that *Waiting for Godot* is a story about sticking with things even when they're hard, having faith in something bigger, and the search for hope and meaning.

The play *Waiting for Godot* was first written by Samuel Beckett in French in 1949. It was then turned into English in 1954. Everywhere in the world, *Waiting for Godot* is the most-read book. As a result, this play has been presented as an absurdist drama to great acclaim in Europe, the United States, and other parts of the world after World War II. It's "one of the successes of the post-war theater" (Esslin, Martin, 1980, p.3) because of this. The concept of waiting remains the play's primary focus throughout its whole. A stunted tree in the midst of nowhere is where the two strays, Vladimir and Estragon, are waiting with nervousness to pay Godot a visit. In truth, they are unaware of his true identity, whether or not he has promised to pay them a visit, or even whether he is really genuine. The fact is, however, that they are still waiting and waiting for him. Despite this, he never emerged from the shadows.

With the play *Waiting for Godot* as a focal point, this research project aims to investigate the divine via post-structuralism and deconstruction. While deconstruction especially looks at the imbalances and conflicts within texts, post-structuralism questions the concept of fixed meanings and binary oppositions. These strategies taken together will provide a complex view of how the divine is portrayed, challenged, and deconstructed in *Waiting for Godot*.

Literature Review

In 2013, a research paper titled "*Camus' Absurdity in Beckett's Plays: Waiting for Godot and Krapp's Last Tape*" was written by Abhinaba Chatterjee. This paper provides a significant analysis of the two dramatic texts of Samuel Beckett, examining them from Albert Camus' existentialist perspective. The research paper entitled "*Futility, Hopelessness and Meaninglessness: Central Forces Leading towards Absurdity in Beckett's Waiting for Godot*" (2013) was authored by Darsha Jani. This paper serves as an existentialist study of the play. The researcher, Komal Rakwal, authored a research paper titled "*Today's Fear of Being in Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot*," wherein the exploration of existentialist themes in the text is undertaken (Chatterjee 2013).

Another layer of post-structuralist analysis concerns the paradox of waiting for a being (Godot/God) who may never arrive. The play's exploration of the theme of waiting without resolution is in line with the skepticism towards final truths that is characteristic of post-structuralism. According to George Steiner and other critics, Beckett's work explores the concept of divine certainty and challenges the traditional belief that faith offers solace or solutions. Beckett's depiction of endless waiting can be interpreted through a post-structuralist lens, suggesting that religious faith involves navigating the unknown without any guarantee of finding the solution (Steiner 1989)

Researchers frequently place Beckett's work within a wider postmodern analysis of faith. *Waiting for Godot* is often interpreted as engaging with postmodern skepticism towards major themes, such as faith-based salvation. The concept of "incredulity towards metanarratives" proposed by Jean-François Lyotard is applicable in this context, indicating that Beckett's play offers a critique of the grand narrative of divine forgiveness. The act of waiting for Godot can be interpreted as a potential challenge to the concept of a predetermined divine plan or meaning in human existence. By highlighting doubts about fundamental beliefs, the drama is in line with postmodern criticisms of religious metanarratives (Lyotard 1984).

As an alternative to structuralism's hard forms, post-structuralism offers a way to look at the divine as a changing and flexible idea. To fully grasp how power, language, and meaning relate to the idea of the divine, you need to read the works of Michel Foucault and Roland Barthes. We use Foucault's ideas about power and knowledge (Foucault, 1980) and Barthes' idea of the "death of the author" (Barthes, 1977) as starting points to look at how the divine is built and broken down in *Waiting for Godot*.

The approach of deconstruction developed by Jacques Derrida provides a means of deconstructing the language of the text in order to expose the instability of meaning. Derrida's term of "*différance*" (Derrida, 1982) and his criticism of binary oppositions is employed in order to investigate the tension that exists between presence and absence, trust and doubt, in the representation of the divine in the text. We analyze how *Waiting for Godot* simultaneously upholds and challenges conventional concepts of divinity by building on previous deconstructive studies of religious texts, such as John D. Caputo's *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida* (Caputo, 1997). This study will expand on previous research that has been conducted on religious literature.

While *Waiting for Godot* has been the subject of various critical interpretations, there is a gap in the literature concerning its analysis through the combined lenses of post-structuralism and deconstruction. Previous studies have primarily focused on existentialist interpretations, with scholars like Martin Esslin (1961) situating the work within the Theater of the Absurd. This research aims to offer a fresh perspective by shifting the focus from existentialism to the fluid and contested nature of the divine in the text (Esslin 1961).

Material and Methods

The study employs a qualitative research approach. The textual references are provided as evidence to support the argument of this study. The research explores the key concepts of deconstruction and post-structuralism in relation to the text. The Derridean deconstructive theory of examining and analyzing the text is a crucial component of this research. Using Foucault's ideas on power and knowledge (Foucault, 1980) and Barthes' concept of the "Death of the Author" (Barthes, 1977) as theoretical frameworks, this study examines the construction and deconstruction of the divine in Samuel Beckett's play, *Waiting for Godot*. The researcher has collected relevant quotations, references, and extracts

in MLA style from primary and secondary data sources regarding the subject of the present study. The list of sources cited is provided under the heading of works cited at the conclusion of this research article.

Using the theoretical frameworks of Foucault and Barthes, the research explores how the divine is constructed within the text and how this construction interacts with broader structures of power and meaning.

Foucault's Concept of Divine

When examined within Foucault's framework, the notion of the divine is revealed to be a construct employed by religious institutions to exercise power and influence over individuals, rather than a neutral or universally accepted truth. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), Foucault's concept of discourse is explored. According to research, the concept of the divine is not considered an objective or universal entity. Instead, it is influenced and shaped by the historical and social discourse surrounding religion. According to Foucault, it can be argued that various historical periods give rise to distinct discourses concerning the divine. These discourses are shaped by the prevailing power dynamics and knowledge frameworks of their respective eras. Many post-structuralist interpretations of *Waiting for Godot* draw attention to the uncertainty of language and meaning in the drama by using writings of Foucault. Reflecting the post-structuralist perspective that meaning is uncertain and perpetually deferred, Beckett's characters, Vladimir and Estragon, participate in circular talks that refuse ending. This concept of postponed meaning fits the greater religious concept that God, or the divine, is an absent figure never coming and never speaking directly. The language used in *Waiting for Godot* functions as a critical analysis of fixed faith-based convictions, arguing that the concept of the divine may be a paradoxical fabrication. Hence, it examines how the divine is constructed as a site of power and how this construction is destabilized within the text (Foucault 1980)

Barthes' Concept of Divine

Roland Barthes, a key figure in post-structuralism, explored the relationship between language, signs, and meaning, which can extend to discussions about the divine. Although Barthes didn't directly write about the divine extensively, his concepts of *myth*, *the death of the author*, and *the nature of signs* can be applied to the understanding of the divine in literature and culture. We are aware that a text is not a collection of words that conveys a singular "theological" meaning (the "message" of the Author God), but rather it is a space that encompasses many dimensions, in which different types of writing are mixed and challenged, none of which is original: the text is a tissue of citations, which is the result of the thousands of sources of culture. Barthes' notion of myth may be extended to religious beliefs, illustrating the manner in which the divine is often organized via language and symbols, and how these structures are seen as inherent or immutable realities. In a literary work such as *Waiting for Godot*, the character of Godot might be seen as a breakdown of the mythological concept of Divine, a mysterious being that people await but never really come across. According to Barthes' theory, the concept of Divine being the "author" of the universe or religious texts can be deconstructed. This theory suggests that the meaning of divine or sacred texts is not determined by an ultimate creator. On the contrary, these texts can be interpreted in a multitude of ways. In *Waiting for Godot*, the absence of Godot may be interpreted as a representation of the "death of the author," suggesting that the divine figure does not provide a definitive meaning or resolution. When examined from a researcher's perspective, the divine can be understood as a symbol that acquires significance based on cultural contexts and associations. In texts

such as *Waiting for Godot*, the concept of the divine (represented by Godot) functions as an empty signifier. This means that it symbolizes a larger idea (Divine) but its meaning remains ambiguous and postponed. Barthes' work suggests that the divine should not be seen as an absolute truth, but rather as a symbol that can change in meaning depending on the interpretation of various readers (Barthes 1977).

Derridean Deconstruction

In *Waiting for Godot*, Derridean deconstruction tests binary oppositions and questions the existence or non-existence of God. The drama is often seen as a deconstructing of conventional religious writing, in which the lack of Godot emphasizes the vulnerability of theological certainty. Deconstruction criticizes Western metaphysics of presence, which Jacques Derrida labels logocentrism or phonocentrism. The Greek term *logos* means pure meaning before language. Logos-derived logic is the sphere of pure meaning. "In the beginning, was the logos, and the logos was with God, and the logos was God" (Good News Bible, 1981, p. 118). According to Jacques Derrida, there is a hidden linguistic process underlying both logic and logocentrism, which assumes the existence of a realm of meaning that precedes language. This process then gives preference to thought over speech, writing over utterance, and originality over imitation. The researcher argues that Derrida states that Saussure's theory of linguistics is both engaged in and problematic for the project of logocentrism or phonocentrism. The researcher discovers counter-logic present in Ferdinand de Saussure's work. Structuralist linguistics focuses on the concept of the first term, which includes not only the human aspect of speech but also the broader notion of *logos*, which refers to self-identical meaning and the divine. Jacques Derrida says that writing is not a copy of speech that stands for a whole meaning. It is central because meaning is always having problems with breaking up and deferring, which are the endless mistakes of signifiers that make up writing. This is why Jacques Derrida says, "There is nothing outside the text" (Derrida, Jacques, 2003, p. 227). Derrida's deconstructive techniques is applied to the text to reveal the inherent contradictions, instabilities, and ambiguities in its portrayal of the divine. This will involve analyzing binary oppositions, the play of language, and the notion of "*différance*."

Results and Discussion

Evidence of Divine by the lens post structuralism

There does not appear to be anything in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. Without a clear place or sense of time, Beckett constructs an abstract universe. Vladimir and Estragon, two tramps, have little more than a language and the desire to see Godot. Since they don't accomplish anything physically in the text, it's improbable that they're at separate locations waiting for Godot. Aside from the "willow" tree, which unexpectedly sprouts leaves, they don't see anything else. Contrary to popular belief, language is not "referential" and can only operate in contexts where there are "referents." However, the characters in this play have very nothing to relate to, contrast with, or identify with in the play's environment. Because of their current predicament, they have no choice but to commiserate with one another. "Nothing happens, nobody comes, nobody goes, it's awful!" Estragon says, exposing the play for what it really is. Bennett (28).

In this drama, Godot is a presence-filled creature from Lacan's "the Real" beyond the symbolic order. So Vladimir and Estragon's "desire" comes from their world's "lack" of presence. Unattainability drives the quest for "the Real". The act of "being there" and waiting for Godot affirms their being as two individuals, not a quest for meaning.

The permanent deferral of meaning is central to post-structuralism, which is greatly influenced by Foucault. Words always postpone meaning as they relate to other words in a structure of signification; language does not exactly connect to fixed meanings. Vladimir and Estragon's conversation in *Waiting for Godot* is riddled with meaningless repetition and cyclical discourse. Symbolic of the concept that meaning is always postponed and never really present, the characters wait for Godot, who never comes.

"VLADIMIR: Let's wait and see what he says. ESTRAGON: Who? VLADIMIR: Godot. ESTRAGON: Good idea." (Beckett, 10).

As the characters wait for Godot to answer their questions or fulfill their purposes, this conversation emphasizes the deferral of meaning. Foucault's theory, which states that meaning is perpetually postponed, is mirrored in the framework of the play. "Beckett's play stages the endless postponement of meaning, its failure to arrive, as Vladimir and Estragon wait for a presence that never materializes" (Cohn 53)

Post-structuralists reject fixed centers of authority, such as Divine, the author, or any metaphysical foundation. In *Waiting for Godot*, the figure of Godot, often interpreted as representing Divine or some higher authority, never arrives, symbolizing the decentering of divine authority. The absence of Godot (who could be seen as a stand-in for God) suggests the absence of a central, organizing principle or meaning in the characters' lives.

"VLADIMIR: What are we doing here, that is the question. And we are blessed in this, that we happen to know the answer. Yes, in this immense confusion one thing alone is clear. We are waiting for Godot to come –" (Beckett, 51).

This passage reflects the characters' futile search for meaning or purpose through the figure of Godot, who represents the absent center. The absence of Godot signifies the absence of a central authority or ultimate meaning. Post-structuralist thought, especially in the work of Foucault, challenges the idea of a stable, coherent subject. Identity is seen as fragmented, constructed by discourse, and subject to constant flux. In *Waiting for Godot*, the characters exhibit fragmented, incoherent identities, questioning their existence and constantly shifting their roles and memories.

"ESTRAGON: In the meantime, let us try and converse calmly, since we are incapable of keeping silent. VLADIMIR: You're right, we're inexhaustible." (Beckett, 9).

The inability of the characters to maintain coherent conversation and their constant confusion about their past reflects the post-structuralist view of the fragmented self. Foucault's idea of the fragmented subject is evident in the characters of *Waiting for Godot*. "Vladimir and Estragon's fragmented sense of identity is emblematic of the post-structuralist view that subjectivity is not fixed but constructed and reconstructed through discourse.

The repetitive, meaningless actions of the characters (e.g., Estragon constantly taking off and putting on his boots) underscore the absurdity of life and the lack of inherent meaning in their actions.

"VLADIMIR: We'll hang ourselves tomorrow. (Pause.) Unless Godot comes." (Beckett, 109).

This line emphasizes the absurdity of the characters' situation—waiting for something that may never happen while contemplating meaningless actions. Beckett's

absurdity aligns with post-structuralist deconstruction. "The absurdity of waiting for an event that never comes deconstructs the traditional search for meaning, revealing its inherent futility.

Interpreting the Divine by the lens of Deconstructive theory

We realise that the wait for Godot is endless and eternal. The meeting with him is perennially deferred with perpetual uncertainty from one day to another. Michael Worton explicates on Godot being emblematic of deferral of hope: "... he is simultaneously whatever we think he is and not what we think he is: he is an absence, who can be interpreted at moments as Divine, death, the lord of the manor, a benefactor, even Pozzo, but Godot has a function rather than a meaning. He stands for what keeps us chained to and in existence, he is the unknowable that represents hope in an age when there is no hope, he is whatever fiction we want him to be – as long as he justifies our life-as-waiting. Beckett originally thought of calling his play *En attendant (without Godot)* in order to deflect the attention of readers and spectators away from this „non-character“ onto the act of waiting." (Worton quoted in Bloom 75) Godot, hence, can be seen to stand for the struggling and the hopeful who live lives with a teleological aim of some prospective attainment even though the word „Godot“ has been widely viewed as a slight variation of the word „Divine.“ It is human nature to pine hopes on a constant factor, which might be perennially suspended to a state of prospective yearning (low- or high-level), and fix it onto that. In *Waiting for Godot*, it is this hope of meeting the “unknown” which keeps the two major characters, Vladimir and Estragon, dangling to the edge in the liminal space of hope and despair. These sentiments are expressed by Vladimir in Act Two as he says: “But that is not the question. What are we doing here, that is the question. And we are blessed in this that we happen to know the answer. Yes in this immense confusion one thing is clear. We are waiting for Godot to come” (72) It is this hope that keeps them inspired to come tomorrow and then day after tomorrow. However, this is an unending process and if one hope is achieved or desire fulfilled, the desire is not satiated and it moves on to some other object.

Hence, it is not the person named Godot who is of significance; it is the act of waiting which is of primary importance over anything else. It not only restrains the „many voices“ in a text but also divests the text of its suggestive power as it goes beyond the dermal level of the text. As Beckett puts it in Proust, “We are disappointed at the nullity of what we are pleased to call attainment. But what is attainment? The identification of the subject with the object of his desire? The subject has died – and perhaps many times – on the way.” (13- 14). Like other texts, Beckett’s text is a text full of suggestions and inferences, one cannot and should not reduce it to one rigid frame and must abstain from a sedulous one-to-one allegorical mapping. He himself described it as “striving all the time to avoid definition”. (Beckett cited in Graver and Federman 10.) Suggesting no determinate fixation with the inferences on one set of meanings, Rónán McDonald expresses: “The play will not be pinned down or located, a clear meaning will not arrive for us, just as Godot does not arrive for Vladimir and Estragon. They can be confused and uncertain about where they are, where they were and where they will be, and the audience, by extension, can feel bewildered by the elusive themes of a play which, while orbiting around philosophical and religious issues, tends to keep them at a distance, to keep us in a state of interpretative suspension.” (30)

Beckett’s deft use of words and his refusal to divulge what he meant has led to a wide interpretation of his texts. It has helped enrich the text and taken it into that realm of mental faculty which is unfathomable to a novice reader. It could be through the use of words with same meaning etymologically or otherwise such as dying (which

etymologically means “something given or played”) and amusing and through the use of phrases in different contexts such as „Ah! That’s better“ which produces two meanings in contradistinction to each other when used in different contexts. Hence, Sarah Gendron observes Beckett as occupying a liminal space between modernism and postmodernism: “In questioning the authority of the author/narrator, in confronting the limits of beginnings and endings and the boundaries of meaning, Beckett’s words and works exemplified the writer and the writerly during a critical time when modernism was unfolding into postmodernism. His work was emblematic of crossing over; of change, as Foucault suggests, as it was in the process of changing.” (xix)

The major topic of the play "*Waiting for Godot*" is revealed to us as we examine the play. This theme focuses on the characters *waiting for Godot*, who does not appear in the play. In spite of this, the two main characters in the play, Vladimir and Estragon, who are vagabonds living on the streets, seem to be caught in the trap of the illusory world of the metaphysics of presence. Both the messianic logocentrism and the phonocentrism of the phrase Godot are strongly associated with them. One of the manifestations of metaphysical concept of existence, messianic is well seen in the ideas of anthropocentrism and theocentrism. Any ideological, religious, political system claiming to be approved authority is messianic logocentrism or phonocentrism. Human perspective mostly reflects this messianism. According to Jacques Derrida, this kind of mentality is messianicity; so, Christian faith of the future to come is based on this.

So, in the play, the word "Godot" stands for both theocentric and anthropocentric messianic logocentrism. It should be noted that, like Jehovah in "The Old Testament," his wrath scares people, and like Messiah (Jesus Christ) in "The New Testament," his Second Coming will save people. He could stand for rescue, giving, life, and hope, which would connect these four things to the two tramps who are waiting. Through the lens of the claimed divine logos, they try to find the meaning, origin, and truth of Godot.

But Godot's absence calls the idea of where real meaning comes from into serious question because it's hard to describe, group, or adapt to something outside the text. It can mean more than one thing at the same time, as well as nothing or nothing at all. It is actually an aporic being that is hard to explain. So, the two tramps are looking for something that will give their lives value. For them, Mr. Godot is the gateway to happiness, the logos that can give their meaningless lives some meaning. The identity of this absent entity remains unknown in the whole text of the play.

By going to see him, the tramps try to catch this non-entity or unknown being in terms of the known messianic logocentrism, but they fail. Finally, Godot failed to show up, which made the tramps angry and unhappy. So, the connection between language and reality is broken, and words can't express how people feel or what they think.

Vladimir: Say I am happy Estragon: I am happy Vladimir: So I am Estragon: So I am.

Estragon: We are happy. (Silence). What do we do now, now that we're happy?" (Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 2, p. 60).

It's disappointing that Godot won't be coming back, though, and the tramps are getting worried. This conversation between the tramps shows that they really want to be free from waiting for a divine spiritual being that doesn't exist or isn't known to them:

Estragon: (His mouthful, vacuously.) We are not tied!

Vladimir: I don't hear a word you're saying.

Estragon: (chews, swallows.) I'm asking if we're tied.

Vladimir: tied?

Estragon: ti-ed.

Vladimir: How do you mean tied?

Estragon: Down Vladimir: But to whom? By whom?

Estragon: To your man Vladimir: To Godot? Tied to Godot? What an idea! No question of it. (Pause) For the moment" (Beckett, Samuel, 1956, Act 1, pp.20-21).

In Western philosophy, Jacques Derrida says that these two ideas have always been at odds with each other and that one idea always "governs the other (axiologically, logically, etc.), or has the upper hand" (Derrida, Jacques, 1981, p. 41). These two polar opposites are tense with each other. It is a criticism of the hierarchical oppositions that have shaped Western thought, such as inside-outside, mind-body, literal-figurative, speech-writing, presence-absence, nature-culture, form-meaning, and so on. If we want to dismantle and re-inscribe an opposition – that is, not destroy it but give it a new structure and function – then we need to deconstruct it. This means that the opposition is not inherent but rather a product of discourses that depend on it (Derrida, Jacques, 1981).

There are ideas of black and white, light and darkness, smart and dull, good and bad, ideal and real, man and woman, and beauty and ugliness in "Waiting for Godot." These ideas show that the text is not stable or logical. There are, however, two big differences between Vladimir and Estragon and Pozzo and Lucky in the way they think, feel, look, social status, and even how smart they are. In Samuel Beckett's plays, characters often appear in pairs. For example, Didi and Gogo, Pozzo and Lucky, Ham and Clovis, and Nagg and Nell.

Because of this, we see that the people in the play *Waiting for Godot* are caught in a web of opposites. These complete opposites are used as harsh lines of criticism against the one that is being criticized. When the characters in the play have to deal with an aporetic and wildly offensive mode, they use contrast and comparison. This is the most effective way for them to show their addresses why their claims are true. In this way, Samuel Beckett's writing is based on the reader's or audience's own experiences with language and on breaking down logocentric categories. In this way, the logocentric categories lose their meaning and power in the text, which is what Derrida meant by "deconstructive aspiration." So, the text doesn't want readers to come up with just one meaning. Instead, it leaves more room for different meanings and readings to come up. So, the idea of the word "Godot," like Jacques Derrida's "différance," doesn't fit into the system of meanings because it doesn't relate to a real person in the external world.

Conclusion

This research proposal outlines a plan to explore the divine in *Waiting for God* through the lenses of post-structuralism and deconstruction. By combining these two critical approaches, the study will offer a nuanced interpretation of the text, contributing to both literary criticism and the broader understanding of how religious themes can be analyzed using contemporary theoretical frameworks.

References

- Able, L. (2003). *Tragedy and Meta-theatre: Essays on Dramatic Form*. Holmes and Meier,
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath, Hill and Wang,
- Caputo, John D. (1997). *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida: Religion without Religion*. Indiana University Press,
- Cohn, R. (1987) *Beckett: Waiting for Godot*. Casebook Series, Macmillan Education
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and Difference*. University of Chicago Press
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Dissemination*. University of Chicago Press
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of Philosophy*. Translated by Alan Bass, University of Chicago Press
- Derrida, Jacques. (1989). *Memoires for Paul De Man*. Columbia University Press
- Esslin, M. (1961). *The Theatre of the Absurd*. Anchor Books, 1961.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books
- Liotard, Jean-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press
- Schwab, G. (1992). "On the Dialectic of Closing and Opening in Endgame." *Waiting for Godot & Endgame*, edited by Steven Connor, Macmillan
- Steiner, G. (1989). *Real Presences: Is There Anything in What We Say?*. University of Chicago Press, 1989.