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[Int] is the act and not the object of perception that matters.

Introduction

The Irish Nobel laureate Samuel Beckett’s (1902-1989) early writings of the 1930s and 1940s depict the cities of Dublin, London and Saint-Lô in post-war France, with affective, comedic and existential flourishes, respectively. These early works, besides reflecting the experience of Beckett’s travels through interwar Europe, illustrate a shift in his literary perspective from a latent Cartesian verisimilitude to a more phenomenological, fragmented and dissolute impression of place. This evolution in Beckett’s writing style exemplifies a wider transformation in perception and thought rooted in epistemological, cultural and philosophical trends associated with the Continental avant garde emerging in the wake of the fin de siècle. As Henri Lefebvre has noted:

Around 1910, the main reference systems of social practice in Europe disintegrated and even collapsed. What had seemed established for good during the belle époque of the bourgeoisie came to an end: in particular, space and time, their representation and reality indissociably linked. In scientific knowledge, the old Euclidian and Newtonian space gave way to Einsteinian relativity. But at the same time, as is evident from the painting of the period—Cézanne first of all, then analytical Cubism—perceptible space and perspective disintegrated. The line of horizon, optical meeting-point of parallel lines, disappeared from paintings.²

At the age of fourteen, Beckett, a son of the Protestant Anglo Irish bourgeoisie, witnessed in the largely Catholic nationalist uprising in Ireland, something

symptomatic of the wider political and cultural dissolution sweeping across
the landscapes of Europe during the early twentieth century. According to John
Pilling, “The sight of Dublin blazing Easter Week 1916, as he and his father
looked on from the hills above the city...remained deeply impressed on his
mind.” Consequently, images of cities in ruins and denuded existential land-
scapes would come to serve as backdrops for his later dramas and works of fic-
tion.

In 1934 Beckett wrote, “it is the act and not the object of perception
that matters,” defining one aspect of the embodied practice of writing. In pre-
vieus studies of writers, geographers have recognized “the artist’s perceptive
insight: literature is the product of perception, or, more simply is percep-
tion...providing thereby a basis for a new awareness, a new consciousness.”
The embodied practices of perception and writing produce a corpus of litera-
ture which geographers have noted can form “the basis for a new [and]
cleansed’ perception.”

The evolution of Beckett’s practices as a writer established him as a
leading figure in twentieth century literature for just such reasons. In studying
the practices of writers, geographers have also recognized “the importance of
looking at the personality and idiosyncrasies of [the] author when examining
his/her literary landscapes.” This biographical context is salient in regards to
Beckett because cultural studies of the period in which he produced his early
pieces of fiction recognize:

[T]here was a formative relationship between literary innovation
and the cross-cultural status of many modernist and avant-garde
artists, those who during the first half of the century came to Lon-
don, Paris or Berlin from 'colonized or capitalized regions [within
Europe]...linguistic borderlands...[or] as exiles...from rejecting or
rejected political regimes.'

Therefore an exposition of what Beckett’s biographers have called his “Wan-
derjahre years” of the 1930s and 1940s can provide a foundation from which
to extirpate the intellectual and aesthetic influences which shaped the Beck-
ettian landscape which became so prominent in later and better known works
such as *En Attendant Godot* (1952).

**Early Influences**

Beckett enrolled in Trinity College Dublin in 1923 and read French
and Italian. At Trinity he began cultivating a life-long passion for Dante
Alighieri’s (1266-1321) *Divine Comedy*. In 1928 he undertook a two-year fel-
lowship as Lecteur d’Anglais at l’Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris. One of
Beckett’s colleagues, “Jean Beaufret, who was the Heidegger expert,” encouraged his sustained reading of René Descartes (1596-1650), the French math-
ematical philosopher. In many ways this was apt, for, as Eugene Webb notes, “Cultural histories of the Western world have long interpreted Descartes as the thinker who marks the dividing point between the medieval and the modern world views.[10] Descartes remains a convenient symbol of the breakup of the unitary world view of Aquinas and Dante.” Moving on from the works of the medieval Italian poet, Descartes’ *cogito, ergo sum* influenced Beckett’s initial conviction “that all existence was in the head and all ‘external’ contact was an illusion [however] soon his prose was to graduate from Descartes to the pre-established harmony” of Gottfried Leibniz’s (1646-1716) concept of relational or social space. Beckett also shifted his attentions to the works of Arnold Geulincx’s (1624-1669) whose “astonishing occasionalism, according to which mind and body, although completely separate, are fortunately synchronized, like a film and its sound track.”

Between 1928 and 1929, Paris witnessed a proliferation of new small private presses and alternative journals which hugely benefited Beckett’s early literary efforts. He collaborated with James Joyce and frequented Shakespeare & Co., the bookshop owned by Sylvia Beach who published Joyce’s *Ulysses* in 1922. Beckett also contributed pieces and translation work for the journal *transition*, whose manifesto decried “THE HEGEMONY OF THE BANAL WORD, MONOTONOUS SYNTAX, STATIC PSYCHOLOGY, DESCRIPTIVE NATURALISM.” The Parisian coffee shop and bar milieu, shaped by post-war writers and artists of the interwar “lost generation,” immersed Beckett in “philosophical ideologies systematized by Nietzsche, Freud, and the phenomenologists.” Consequently, Beckett’s writing bore traces of a “vertiginous mixture of the Left and Right—Futurism, Dadaism, Surrealism, and even the less political, residual Cubism and early forms of Abstract Expressionism.” In 1930, Beckett won first prize for a poem (*Whoroscope*) centering on the life of Descartes and the subject of time. This success led to a commission for a study entitled *Proust*, in which Beckett would dissect the modern concept of time. This, in turn, influenced Beckett’s increasingly fragmented representation of space in his subsequent works. Returning to a Trinity lectureship in French later that year, Beckett soon concluded that his teaching position constituted a “grotesque comedy.” Living in a city centre room at college he felt socially alienated from the Dublin literati and the cultural nationalism of the Free State.

In 1931 Beckett resigned from Trinity and travelled to Paris where he spent the spring and summer of 1932 completing an unpublished novel, *Dream of Fair to Middling Women*. Unable to secure a publishing deal in France, Beckett travelled to London where, again, publishers also rejected his manuscript. He returned to Dublin and spent 1933 re-drafting his manuscript into stories which were published as *More Pricks than Kicks* in May 1934. Beckett’s collection was banned in Ireland under the 1929 Censorship Act, despite his title’s allusion to the New Testament’s Acts IX:5 in which the apostle Paul is ad-
monished: “I am Jesus whom thou persecutest; it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,” prior to his conversion on the road to Damascus.

Beckett composed the majority of his stories between “the bad years” of 1931 and 1933. Suffering from boils and panic attacks, he agonised over resigning from Trinity College and was estranged from his strict and frigid mother May. She had discovered erotic allusions in his writing and had banished him from the family home. However, Beckett’s emotional penumbra occurred with the death of his father, William, in June 1933, to whom he was especially close. Soon after, Beckett suffered a breakdown near Trinity College:

After my father’s death I had trouble psychologically....I’ll tell you how it was. I was walking down Dawson Street. And I felt I couldn’t go on. It was a strange experience I can’t really describe. I found I couldn’t go on moving. So I went into the nearest pub and got a drink just to stay still.

Seeking medical advice, Beckett was told to travel to London. As he later recalled of 1930s Free State Ireland: “psychoanalysis was not allowed in Dublin at that time. It was not legal.”

Altered Perspectives

Between 1933 and 1935, Beckett underwent psychoanalysis at the Tavistock Clinic, a care centre established in London for “shell-shocked” veterans of the First World War. He presented his analyst W.R. Bion with symptoms that included “a bursting, apparently arrhythmic heart, night sweats, shudders, panic, breathlessness and, at its most severe, total paralysis.” Bion’s “reductive analysis” revisited “nuclear incidents” repressed from childhood memory. Affected by his mother’s “savage loving,” Beckett had been instilled with a sense of superiority, but constrained by her rigid sense of morality and emotion, from which he rebelled. Employing free association and dream analysis, Bion’s method had an immediate impact: “I certainly came up with some extraordinary memories of being in the womb. Intrauterine memories. I remember feeling trapped, of being imprisoned and unable to escape.” Over the course of his analysis, Beckett realised that “the fatuous torments which I had treasured as denoting the superior man were all part of the same pathology. That was the picture as I was obliged to accept it.” Beckett realised his personality, nurtured by his mother and enabled by the solipsistic intellectual wombs of Trinity and the Ecole Normale, was “a composition that was invalid from the word ‘go’” and that he had “to be broken up altogether.”

The analogy Beckett employed to describe his persona at that point in time revealed his deep fascination with the visual arts. Indeed, during his period of analysis, Beckett spent his free time walking and reading whilst his deep
interest in painting found him visiting London’s various art galleries. After viewing a work by Paul Cézanne at the Tate Gallery in 1934, Beckett began to intuit that the artistic perspective of space, established in Western tradition from the Renaissance had begun to fragment. In a letter to his friend the Irish poet Thomas MacGreevy, Beckett noted:

Cézanne...seems to have been the first to see landscape and state it as material of a strictly peculiar order, incommensurable with all human expressions whatsoever. Atomistic landscape with no velleities of vitalism, landscape with personality a la riguer, but personality in its own terms.21

This echoed John Ruskin’s (1819-1900) observation on the disintegration of perspective as a constituting principle of landscape in the *Storm Cloud of the Nineteenth Century* (1844): “The harmony is now broken, and broken the world around: fragments still exist.”22 Beckett’s 1934 essay *Recent Irish Poetry* reflected a similar sensibility towards literary themes in its discussion on “the breakdown of the object, whether current, historical, mystical or spook,”23 a perception commensurate with his analysis of Cézanne. In the essay he declared:

[That] the artist who is aware of this may state the space that intervenes between him and the world of objects; he may state it as a no-man’s-land, Hellespont or vacuum, according as he happens to be feeling resentful, nostalgic or merely depressed.24

Beckett’s recognition of this emerging trend was confluent with his experience of psychoanalysis and his living as a déclassé Irish man in London. Despite his privileged upper-class Protestant background, Beckett was exposed to the levelling experience of the Irish Catholic working class in Britain: “They always know you’re an Irish man. The porter in the hotel. His tone changes. The taxi man says ‘another sixpence, Pat.’ They call you Pat.”25 The fragmentation of aesthetic perspective, and his alienating experiences in London, would embellish his first published novel *Murphy*, concerning an Irish emigrant living in England.

**Exile and Language**

Beckett’s return to Dublin in 1936 was short-lived. Despite the alienating experience of London he found his native country culturally stifling. Acting as a witness in a libel trial in 1937 at the Four Courts against the author St. John Gogarty, he was pilloried in the Irish press: “The Dublin evening papers carried banner headlines: THE ATHEIST FROM PARIS.”26 He recalled in later years: “I didn’t like living in Ireland. You know the kind of thing—theocracy, censorship of books, that kind of thing.”27 The eruption of the Sec-
ond World War in 1939 caused Ireland to adopt a policy of neutrality, designated as the “Emergency.” As a result, Beckett returned to Paris and joined the French Resistance in response to Nazi treatment of Jewish friends and colleagues. An informer caused him to take refuge from the Gestapo in the village of Roussillon in Vichy France until 1945. During this time he drafted a novel entitled Watt, his last work in English. At the end of the war, Beckett volunteered with the Hospital of the Irish Red Cross at Saint-Lô in Normandy, before returning to Paris in January 1946 and embarking upon a “frenzy of writing,” switched from English to French. In 1957 he explained his linguistic transition as a necessary means to “strip language to the bare essentials of his vision,” and later commented: “Parce qu’en français c’est plus facile d’écrire sans style [In French it’s easier to write without style].”

As early as 1937, Beckett had been struggling with expressing himself in the English language, a problem compounded by the significant Joycean influence which critics recognized in his works to date. He noted at the time: “More and more my own language appears to me a veil, to be torn apart to approach the things (or Nothingness) behind it. Grammar and Style! They seem to me as superannuated as a Victorian bathing suit or the dignity of a gentleman.” Notwithstanding his retreat from English, in his 1929 essay Dante... Bruno. Vico.. Joyce. Beckett defended Joyce’s use of language in the early drafts of Finnegans Wake:

Nor is he by any means the first to recognize the importance of treating words as something more than polite symbols. Shakespeare uses fat greasy words to express corruption: ‘Duller shouldst thou be than the fat weed that rots itself in death on Lethe wharf.’ We hear the ooze squelching all through Dickens’s description of the Thames in Great Expectations.

The essay found him castigating intellectual and aesthetic assumptions concerning the mimetic function of language in prose and poetry, an epistemology which generally characterized European literary practice and criticism during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Beckett wrote “the danger is in the neatness of identifications,” and instead underscored Joyce’s writing as simultaneously conveying and providing an embodied, affective and sensual experience: “It is to be looked and listened too. His writing is not about something; it is that something itself....When sense is sleep, the words go to sleep...when the sense is dancing, the words dance.”

Beckett’s essay proffers ideas that were “opposed not only to the vulgarly materialistic language of commerce, journalism and ape-like chattering, but ultimately to representational language—versions of the view that language mirrors the world (mimesis).” This avant-garde perspective which would emerge in the post-war years in the works of Beckett and other writers in the French language attempted to “[reconstruct] either the raw materiality
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To locate a starting point from which to chart an evolution of Beckett’s literary perspective from a mimetic to a more phenomenologically-oriented impression of place, a brief exegesis of Beckett’s 1931 essay on the works of fin de siècle French writer Marcel Proust (1871-1922) is necessary. As Josephine Jacobson and William Mueller have suggested, by “explicating Proust’s concept of time, along with time’s attributes of habit and memory, Beckett [in his essay] leads us a great deal further toward an understanding of his own work.”

Beckett read the sixteen volumes of Proust’s *A la Recherche du Temps* (1913-1927) during the summer of 1930. Imbibing its theme of transcendence through thought, feeling and impression, Beckett’s resulting essay, *Proust*, interrogates, with phenomenological echoes, the human faculties of memory and habit as impediments to the perception and representation of individual experience and place. He acknowledged Proust “accepts regretfully the sacred ruler and compass of literary geometry,” but conceded “he will refuse to extend his submission to spatial scales, he will refuse to measure the length and weight of man in terms of his body instead of in terms of his years.” Voluntary memory, Beckett wrote, “is of no value as an instrument of evocation, and provides an image as far removed from the real as the myth of our imagination or the caricature furnished by direct perception.” Moreover, “[t]here is no great difference...between the memory of a dream and the memory of reality.” An individual upon waking finds that “habit assures him that his ‘personality’ has not disappeared with his fatigue.” Of this faculty Beckett wrote: “Habit is a compromise effected between the individual and his environment.”

“Memory” and “Habit” thus provide individuals with the perception of order, without which individuals suffer the “agony” of insecurity. The myths an individual possesses are anchored in the higher constructs of the sciences, humanities and ethics. Indeed, Beckett observed that “life is a succession of habits, since the individual is a succession of individuals; the world being a projection of the individual’s consciousness.” From a Beckettian perspective individuals who seek a demythologised experience of life “are willing to undergo the agony of insecurity for perceptions of things as they are and an experience of time as it is, unmanacled from Memory and Habit.” Quoting Proust, Beckett notes that the process of disentangling the act of perception from Memory and Habit is “longer and more difficult than the turning inside out of an eyelid, and which consists in the imposition of our own familiar soul on the terrifying soul of our surroundings.”

It can be gathered that Proust influenced Beckett’s view that the nature of time was repetitious, rather than linear. Beckett’s belief that a writer’s “sense of the world of time and space, will of course affect both [their] theory
and [their] practice of writing” was also clearly Proustian.43 Furthermore, as Webb has recognized, “Proust, like Beckett, saw human reality as fragmentary.”44 As the next section explores, utilising passages from *More Pricks than Kicks* (1934), *Murphy* (1938), the poem *Saint-Lô* (1945), and the short story *Le Fin* (1946), Beckett’s perspective evolved from a latent Cartesian verisimilitude in his 1930s works to a clear phenomenological perspective in the post-war years.

**Beckett’s Dublin: Bottled Climates**

Beckett called the stories in *More Pricks than Kicks* (1934) a collection of “bottled climates.” The stories convey vivid impressions of Dublin, portrayed through the joint lenses of affect and mood. Beckett’s description of his collection invokes a Spinozian analogy comparing emotions to the properties of heat, cold, storm and thunder.45 Indeed, in his earlier studies of Descartes, Bennett also read the post-Cartesian works of Benedict Spinoza (1632-1677). In his unpublished manuscript—*Dream of Fair to Middling Women*, a work which rejected the “chloroformed world” of nineteenth century fiction and its “clockwork cabbage” characters46—Beckett’s stories are conveyed in the third person through the eyes of a marginalised figure, Belacqua Shuah, “an unprepossessing figure with...ruined feet, recurrent impetigo, capon belly and [a] habit of picking his nose.”47 Belacqua Shuah is based upon a figure drawn from Canto IX of Dante’s *Purgatorio* named Belacqua, a Florentine lute maker whose sloth and indolence in life have condemned him to spend an equivalent afterlife on the Mountain of Purgatory before entering Paradise. Belacqua Shuah, in turn, is a slothful student of Dante at Trinity College.

The collection of stories has a touch of the absurd about them, something which Beckett in *Dream of Fair to Middling Women* makes explicit in the words of Belacqua: “The reality of the individual...is an incoherent reality and must be expressed incoherently.” Beckett’s portrayal of Dublin conveys that “cities may be seen as roiling maelstroms of affect. Particular affects...are continually on the boil and these affects continually manifest themselves in events which can take place either at a grand scale or as simply as a part of continuing everyday life.”48 A traffic accident in the story *Ding-Dong* illuminates the ubiquitous and varied range of emotion colouring Beckett’s cityscape:

> All day the road was a tumult of buses, red and blue and silver. By one of these a little girl was run down just as Belacqua drew near to the railway viaduct...[S]he was in such a childish fever to get back in record time with her treasure to the tenement in Mark Street.49

Shock and pity precede a sense of numbing detachment: “The good milk was all over the road and the loaf, was sitting up against the kerb for all the world
as though a pair of hands had taken it up and set it down there.”50 This incident provokes a collective curiosity and vicarious thrills for several onlookers. “The queue standing for the Palace Cinema was torn between conflicting desires: to keep their places and to see the excitement....Only one girl, debauched in appearance...fell out near the string of the queue and secured the loaf.”51 Troubled, Belacqua takes a left onto “Lombard Street, the street of sanitary engineers,”52 enters a working class pub, and finds pity despite his grotesque appearance:

He was tolerated, what was more, and left alone by the rough but kindly habitués of the house, recruited for the most part from among dockers, railwaymen and vague joxers on the dole. Here also art and love, scrabbling in dispute or staggering home, were barred, or, perhaps better, unknown. The aesthetes and the impotent were far away.53

Beckett extends the city’s affective dimension to its southern hinterland in the story Love and Lethe. Enveloped by a landscape of depression, Belacqua and his companion Ruby contemplate suicide while out hill walking in the Dublin Mountains:

To the west in the valley a plantation of larches nearly brought tears to the eyes of Belacqua, till raising those unruly members to the slopes of Glendoo, mottled like a leopard, that lay beyond, he thought of Synge and recovered his spirits. Wicklow, full of breasts with pimples, he refused to consider. Ruby agreed. The city and the plains to the north meant nothing to either of them in the mood they were in. A human turd lay within the wrath.54

Inhabiting all of the “bottled climates” of Beckett’s collection, Belacqua “enlivened his solipsism...with the belief that best thing to do was to move constantly from place to place.”55 Belacqua’s peregrinations through the streets of Dublin often commenced from the public toilets under the Thomas Moore Statue and the “hot bowels” of McLouglin’s pub adjoining the front gates of Trinity College. The pub’s motto, “Perpetuis futuris temporibus duraturum” (It will last into endless future times),56 underscores Beckett’s evolving ideas, linked to the Proustian notion of the repetitious nature of time.

In Ding-Dong Beckett frames “the sunset up the Liffey till all the colour had been harried from the sky, all the tulips and aerugo expunged,”57 as a euphoric space which stands in emotional contrast with Belacqua’s perception of the dreary, misty neon streetscape of College Green in A Wet Night:

Bright and cheery above the strom of the Green, as though coached by the Star of Bethlehem, the Bovril sign danced and danced through its seven phases.58
Furthermore, the presence of civil offices, places of commerce and traffic imprint themselves upon Belacqua’s consciousness as he makes his way down Pearse Street, that is to say, long straight Pearse Street, its vast Barrack of Glencullen granite, its home of tragedy restored and enlarged, its coal merchants and Florentined Fire Brigade Station, its two Cervi saloons, ice-cream and fried fish, its dairies, garages and monumental sculptors, and implicit behind the whole length of its southern frontage the College...its highway dehumanised in a tumult of buses. Trams were monsters, moaning along beneath the wild gesture of the trolley. But buses were pleasant, tires and glass and clash and no more.59

Despite official Saorstát representations of Ireland as a rural, Gaelic country, Beckett’s acts of perceptions convey a modernist urban impression of Dublin as it existed in the 1930s. Although, as Cohn has observed, the character “Belacqua was conceived when Beckett was rootless geographically and professionally,”60 Beckett’s native city and his Joycean influence undeniably left a strong imprint on the stories. As Michael Robinson has suggested:

The Dublin background of More Pricks than Kicks is carefully documented after the manner of Ulysses: the street names, the Liffey, Trinity College and the statue of Thomas Moore, combined to present the busy city landscape against which Belacqua is drawn.61

The perpetual motion of modernity embodied in Belacqua’s various walks, bicycle trips and motor car journeys through the city’s districts, as well as his hill walking in the countryside surrounding Dublin, illustrate Beckett’s impressionistic depiction of his native city. As Ben Singer has stated, “modernity implies a phenomenal world—a specifically urban one—that was markedly quicker, more chaotic, fragmented, and disorienting than in previous phases of human culture.”62

London: The Cartesian Comedy

Centred on the Irish emigrant experience of London in the early 1930s, Murphy (1938) culminates in Beckett’s protagonist’s denouement after taking up employment in a lunatic asylum to prevent his fiancée, an erstwhile prostitute named Celia, from resuming her profession. A sub-plot revolves around a cast of Irish characters travelling from Dublin to London in vain pursuit of Murphy, who dies as a result of a gas explosion in his garret at the Magdalen Mental Mercyseat before they can locate him. In Murphy Beckett is preoccupied with lampooning the rational Cartesian framing of space and experience, along with the Cartesian construction of identity as a self-contained
thinking subject (or *cogito*). Accordingly, there is a distinct contrast between the geographical settings of the novel, which are firmly situated in Cartesian space, and Beckett’s representation of Murphy’s perception of the outer world which constitutes time and place as a “big blooming buzzing confusion,” as he moves through the London streets and the wards of the asylum. Cartesinan metaphors in Beckett’s narrative consist of garrets, pens, prisons, asylums and their padded cells. However the most significant embodiment of Cartesian dualism in Beckett’s novel consists of his depiction of Murphy’s mind, which pictured itself as a large hollow sphere, hermetically closed to the universe....Thus Murphy felt himself split in two, a body and a mind. They had intercourse apparently, otherwise he could not have known that they had anything in common.

In the novel, the Cartesian perspective of London enhances Murphy’s increasingly Leibnizian perceptions of relational space, perceptions he tries to avoid by consulting the horoscopes and tying himself to a rocking chair and rocking himself towards the state of pure solipsism epitomized by Descartes’ *cogito*.

Beckett foreshadows these contrasts between rational and social perspectives of space early in the novel in a set piece in which Murphy’s guru Neary, a proprietor of the Pythagorean Academy of meditation in Cork admonishes his pupil thus: “Murphy, all life is figure and ground,” to which Murphy enigmatically replies: “But a wandering to find home.” Murphy then flees to London, a journey Beckett charted after consulting the 1935 edition of *Whittaker’s Almanac* and by taking long walks from his lodgings in Paulson Square and Gertrude Street through Chelsea and West Brompton to the Thames Embankment. Impressions gathered by Beckett during these walks ground Murphy’s embodied performances of the human landscape spanning the Battersea and Albert Bridges where Celia is depicted taking a respite from her trade:

Artists of every kind, writers, underwriters, devils, ghosts, columnists, musicians, lyricists, organists, painters and decorators, sculptors and statuaries, critics and reviewers, major and minor, drunk and sober, laughing and crying, in schools and singly, passed up and down. A flotilla of barges, heaped high with waste paper of many colours, riding at anchor or aground on the mud, waved to her from across the water. A funnel vailed to Battersea Bridge.

In linguistic terms, Beckett’s composition of the streetscapes of London consists of “a set of proper nouns that signify manufacture, labor, the force of law, slaughter, and commerce.” Spaces of capital and industry such as the Vis Vitae Bread Co., and The Marx Cork Bath Mat Manufactory, as well as the
location of the apartment that Celia and Murphy share “in Brewery Road between Pentonville Prison and the Metropolitan Cattle Market,” anchor “a hard, alienating reality.” Beckett’s prose cartography acts as the backdrop for the bleak comedy he intuits inherent in Cartesian dualism, which holds that “all things are either bodies or minds; substances are either spatial or conscious: *res extensae* and *res cogitantes.*” Beckett deconstructs this modern illusion in the example of the tragi-comic love affair of the Irish immigrant couple. Murphy, an aspiring *cogito,* “felt himself split in two…. [O]ne part of him never left [his] mental chamber that pictured itself as a sphere full of light fading into dark, because there was no way out.” Tied to his rocking chair, Murphy “lapsed in body… felt himself coming alive in mind, set free to move,” over its three zones to a space which “lay just beyond the frontiers of suffering, it was the first landscape of freedom.” However, Murphy’s physical and emotional attraction and subsequent engagement to Celia, who demands that he get “on the job path” and “cultivate the sense of time as money” or else she will return “to walking the streets,” thwarts his aspirations in achieving the freedoms of a solipsistic landscape. “The part of him that he hated craved for Celia, the part that he loved shrivelled up at the thought of her.” As a result, she leaves Murphy, returns to her profession and their relationship unravels, its Cartesian nature untenable.

**Magdalen Mental Mercyseat**

Murphy attempts to win Celia back by taking up the only employment he can find—as an orderly at the Magdalen Mental Mercyseat, a place which Beckett introduces with an aphorism from the French writer Andre Malraux: “*Il est difficile a celui qui vit hors du monde de na pas rechercher les siens* [It is hard for someone who lives outside society not to seek out his own].” Murphy’s lunatic asylum, based on the Bethlehem Royal Hospital established at Beckhenham in 1247, acts as a further analogy for the Beckettian notion of “absurdity.” The Magdalen Mental Mercyseat is “ideally situated in its own grounds on the boundary of two counties,” and its interior is subdivided into “padded cells, known to the wittier as the ‘quiet rooms,’ ‘rubber rooms,’ or ‘pads.'” Here, Cartesian reason, dualism and the dissection of space into grids and schemata are exposed as absurdities.

In contrast, Murphy’s perception of the asylum is framed in “terms and orientation of church architecture, the layout of the wards was that of the nave and transepts.” The spatial metaphor Beckett employs to portray Murphy’s perspective anticipates Michel Foucault’s contention that “the asylum is a religious domain without religion, a domain of pure morality, of ethical uniformity,” in which enlightenment rationalist practices, have replaced medieval religious pieties. The advent of enlightenment reason promulgated by figures such as Descartes was accompanied, as Foucault notes, by the identifica-
tion of madness and its categorization through which “disease is given organisation, hierarchised into families, genera and species.”

Beckett’s depiction of the modern embodied practices of “madness” in the Magdalen Mental Mercyseat identifies the patients as symptoms, rather than people: “Paranoids, feverishly covering sheets of paper with complaints against their treatment....An emaciated schizoid, petrified in toppling attitude as though condemned to an eternal tableau vivant.” Beckett writes, “[o]n the basis of this the patients were described as “cut off” from reality....[T]he function of treatment was to bridge the gulf.” Murphy, in contrast, loathes the “textbook attitude towards” the patients, and is sceptical of “the complacent scientific conceptualism that made contact with outer reality the index of well-being.” Beckett constructs a heavily ironic interior monologue to parse the essence of Murphy’s loathing and scepticism:

the nature of outer reality remained obscure. The men, women and children of science would seem to have as many ways of kneeling to their facts as any other body of illuminati. The definition of outer reality, or of reality short and simple, varied according to the sensibility of the definer....All this was duly revolting to Murphy, whose experience as a physical and rational being obliged him to call sanctuary what the psychiatrists called exile and to think of the patients not as banished from a system of benefits, but as escaped from a colossal fiasco.

Murphy’s attraction to the space of “sanctuary” afforded by the asylum foreshadows his demise as an aspiring cogito. This occurs after a nocturnal chess match with Mr. Endon, a “schizophrenic of the most amiable variety” who possessed a “psychosis so limpid and imperturbable that Murphy felt drawn to it as Narcissus to his fountain.” The match takes place during Murphy’s night shift, as his duties require of him to complete a round of the patients’ cells, take a gaze through the Judas hole in the door, and press a light switch that electronically registers the visit in the head nurse’s chamber. Beckett’s depiction of Murphy’s rounds, anticipates Foucault’s analysis of the panoptic modality of power and techniques of surveillance imbedded in the Cartesian framing of space,

in which individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and periphery.

On each visit to Endon’s cell, Murphy moves his chess pieces in response to the schizophrenic’s, thinking that in some way he is communicating with an individual whom he believes has achieved the ultimate state of solipsism. How-
ever, “the sad truth was, that while Mr Endon for Murphy was no less than bliss, Murphy for Mr Endon was no more than chess.” Panoptic records which typically reflected the unitary and linear nature of Murphy’s night rounds, instead record Endon’s schizophrenic perception of chess pieces moving across a checkerboard. Thus the conclusion gathered by the head nurse in his chamber the next day after reading the record of Murphy’s night rounds is that he “went mad with his colours nailed to the mast.”

This impression is bolstered by the fact that Murphy, after recovering from his swoon, had returned to his garret on asylum grounds and was accidentally killed in a gas explosion, which the staff at the Mental Mercyseat, mistook for a suicide. Beckett’s depiction of the fragmentation of Murphy’s final thoughts as he travels to his garret before the explosion carries phenomenological overtones:

He could not get a picture in his mind of any creature he had met, animal or human. Scraps of bodies, of landscapes, hands, eyes, lines and colours evoking nothing, rose and climbed out of sight before him.

Murphy’s erstwhile girlfriend Celia identifies his remains through a birthmark, which remained untouched on his shattered corpse. As the novel winds down, Beckett depicts Murphy’s friends from Dublin arriving to claim the remains of his body, which have been cremated. Murphy’s last request is for his remains to be flushed down the toilet at the Abbey Theatre in Dublin, “if possible during the performance of a piece.” Cooper, one of his Irish friends agrees to carry out the request, but before he can flush Murphy away into the sewers of his native city, Cooper, a tea-totaller for most of his life, stops for a drink at a London pub:

Some hours later Cooper took the packet of ash from his pocket...and threw it angrily at a man who had given him great offence. It bounced, burst, off the wall on to the floor, where at once it became an object of much dribbling, passing trapping, shooting, punching, heading and even some recognition from the gentleman’s code. By closing time the body, mind and soul of Murphy were freely distributed over the floor of the saloon; and before another dayspring greyend the earth had been swept away with the sand, the beer, the butts, the glass, the matches, the spits, the vomit.

Thus, the novel concludes with the detritus of Murphy’s “body, mind and soul,”
a deliberately ironic tripartite which questions the viability of Descartes’ perspective, scattered.

France: *Saint-Lô (1945)* and *Le Fin (1946)*

The desolate beauty of the poem *Saint-Lô* and the dislocation which characterizes Beckett’s first French language short story *Le Fin (The End)* intimates the fire bombing of Saint-Lô which occurred on 25 July 1944 during the Allied invasion of Normandy. Occupied by the German Army at the time, the town located on the river Vire, served as a landmark for the high-altitude Allied bombing raids of Operation Cobra. The target area was “pounded with elemental fury” and “saturated with 50,000 general purpose and fragmentation bombs.” In 1946 Beckett prepared a radio broadcast entitled *The Capital of Ruins* for Radio Telefis Eireann documenting the post-war reconstruction of the town. “Saint-Lô was bombed out of existence in one night. German prisoners of war, and casual labourers attracted by the relative food plenty, but soon discouraged by housing conditions, continued, two years after the liberation, to clear away debris, literally by hand.” As Weisberg has suggested, perhaps as a result of Beckett’s experience of this landscape of ruin his “first post war fictions take place in, and are structured by, the dissolution of the city as the ordering, social matrix of narrative mimesis.” Beckett even distilled the remains of Saint-Lô in a short poem:

Vire will wind in other shadows
unborn through the bright ways tremble
and the old mind ghost-forsaken
sink into its havoc.

The lines echo the theme of his radio address by tracing the path of the River Vire winding through the town’s apocalyptic landscape. As such, a phenomenological counterpoint to the quotidian objectivity of Beckett’s piece of broadcast journalism can be intuited in the poem’s:

[T]iny structure: two lines about Saint- Lô, two lines about the speaker, the halves of the poem, by a baffling geometry, at once parallel and divergent. Cities, its theme runs, are renewed like rivers; men die. The Vire is a Heraclitean stream with a future of self-renewal; and the bombed city too will be rebuilt and cast shadows again. The mind...unlike the river will grow old, and will ‘sink’ and its ‘havoc’ unlike the city’s will precede no second rising.

Beckett’s short-story *Le Fin* also intimates a post-war cityscape simultaneously alien and familiar. He began writing the story in English, but completed it in French. *Le Fin* is narrated from the perspective of an existen-
tial figure with “[a] mask of dirty old hairy leather, with two holes and a slit” who is expelled rather than released from a charitable institution. He finds upon his release that “the city had suffered many changes, Nor was the country as I remembered it.”

Authorial perspectives of Cartesian verisimilitude which characterized Beckett’s earlier depictions of cities were replaced with impressions of existential and phenomenological dislocation:

In the street I was lost. I had not set foot in this part of the city for a long time and it seemed greatly changed. Whole buildings had disappeared, the palings had changed position and on all sides I saw in great letters, the names of tradesmen I had never seen before and would have been at a loss to pronounce. There were streets where I remembered none, some I did remember had vanished and others had completely changed their names. The general impression was the same as before.

The city, built on the mouth of a bay, with two canals and mountains to the south, intimates Dublin: “the general appearance of the river flowing between its quays and under its bridges, had not changed. Yes the river still gave the impression it was flowing in the wrong direction.”

Yet the vestigial landscape of 1930s Ireland, marked by the social and economic blight resulting from the Free State’s economic war with Britain, emerges and fades in Le Fin under Beckett’s transposition of the human and physical desolation he encountered along the banks of the Vire in the bombed out ruins of Saint-Lô. Accordingly, “a fictional space is created that is related to the geographical space but has its own more universal validity.” As Weirberg has posited, for Beckett the setting of “the postwar city does not function as a representation of social chaos....Rather, Beckett presents the ‘greatly changed’ city as a space of narrative debility.” This is enhanced by his protagonist’s incomprehension of his surroundings: “the eyes rose to a confusion of low houses, wasteland, hoardings, chimneys, steeples and towers.”

The story concludes with an implosion of narrative perspective: “The sea, the sky, the mountains and the islands closed in and crushed me in a mighty systole, then scattered to the uttermost confines of space.” Beckett’s experience of Saint-Lô, coupled with his memory of watching the fires of the Easter 1916 Uprising were distilled in the story’s last image of impending destruction:

It was evening, I was with my father on a height, he held my hand. I would have liked him to draw me close with a gesture of protective love, but his mind was on other things....And on the slopes of the mountains, now rearing its unbroken bulk behind town, the fires turned from gold to red, from red to gold.

*Le Fin* is marked by a dissolution of the Cartesian perspective and by Beckett’s
narrative transition from third person English to first person French, which left an indelible “image of the storyteller whose primitive, suffering, deathless existence is itself an emblem of the ruins into which stories, for Beckett, had collapsed.”

Conclusion

By 1946 Beckett’s literary perspective had travelled beyond the scaffolding of space erected by Descartes in the seventeenth century. He would later observe “the confusion is not my invention....It is all around us and our only chance now is to let it in. The only chance of renovation is to open our eyes and see the mess.” His later works, such as *Molloy* (1955) in which he wrote “all that inner space one never sees, the brain and heart and other caverns where thought and feeling dance their sabbath,” would reflect the embodied nature of existence and a phenomenological perception of place. As Webb has stated:

Beckett is not a Cartesian. His works...show the futility and naïveté of imaging the mental world to be any less intractable than the physical. Beckett sees the world and man not as dualistic but as fragmentary.

However, his early works did exhibit a latent Cartesian verisimilitude. The urbanist perspective taken by Beckett in *More Pricks than Kicks* depicts the affective streetscapes of Dublin, anchored by a modernist sensibility that constituted the bourgeois metropolis as an organizing principle and space for fictional narrative. The Cartesian comedy of interwar London in *Murphy* depicts his protagonist’s attempted retreats from the “malignant proliferations of urban tissue,” the “miasma of laws” and the “mercantile gehenna” which composed the city of London, into the chamber of his mind located “beyond the frontiers of suffering” to experience “the first landscape of freedom.” In contrast, the post-war fragility of the poem *Saint-Lô* heralds the emergence of the existential Beckettian landscape, a narrative setting in which identity and place have been dislocated from the modernist metropole and located in the fragmented geographies comprised of alienated streetscapes, ditches, rooms, and ruined cities. It has been noted that “Beckett’s first post-war fictions take place in, and are structured by, the dissolution of the city as the ordering, social matrix of narrative mimesis” and are characterized by a “paratactic, associative wandering through spaces that refer to a social world left behind, in ruins, rejected, forgotten, unbelievable, cancelled out.”

These indices of repetitious time and dislocated space in Beckett’s post-war work have their roots in his early readings and critiques of Descartes and Proust, respectively. Further, his views on the fragmentation of visual perspective and the embodied nature of language were informed by the works of
Cézanne and Joyce. Collectively, it can be gathered that these influences shaped his use of language, Beckett’s writings remained bleakly comedic but nonetheless shifted during his “Wanderjahre years” in Europe from a highly academically referenced word play in third person English to a pared down minimalist French prose in the first person.

One way to view Beckett’s evolving spatial sensibility and his decisions to write in French and relocate from Free State Ireland to Paris is perhaps that Beckett needed to follow a genealogical impulse, something he excavated through the embodied practices of travel and writing. One of his biographers has suggested that “when he left Dublin in 1937 to live permanently in Paris, Beckett reversed the migration that had brought his ancestors to Ireland in the late seventeenth century. Originally named “Becquet,” they were French Huguenots who moved to Ireland for economic and religious freedom.” Murphy’s reply to Neary, that all life was “a wandering to find home,” perhaps reflected such an embodied sensibility and in Proust Beckett noted that “the only fertile research is excavatory, immersive, a contraction of the spirit, a descent. The artist is active, but negatively, shrinking from the nullity of extra-circumferential phenomena, drawn into the core of the eddy.” In conclusion, Beckett’s early writings as products of the embodied practice of perception, travel and writing, can be seen to contain a “predominantly philosophical bent: their aim is a search for the nature of reality [rather] than the construction of plausible fictions.”
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