

NOTHING TO BE DONE: A STUDY OF ATHEISTIC EXISTENTIALISM AND THE CRISIS OF MEANING IN *WAITING FOR GODOT*

Dr. Abdul Waheed Jatoi^{*1}, Ammara Maryam², Muhammad Farman³

^{*1}Assistant Professor of English Literature, University of Sindh Campus Thatta

²M.Phil scholar, Lahore Garrison University

³ Department of Chemistry, University of Okara, Okara, 56300, Pakistan

^{*1}waheed.jatoui@usindh.edu.pk, ²ammkham@gmail.com, ³farmanrafique@uo.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23263307>

Keywords

Existentialism, Waiting, Godot, Sartrean, Atheistic, Bad Faith, Nihilism, Nothingness, Essence, Absurdity

Article History

Received: 30 June 2026

Accepted: 21 September 2026

Published: 06 October 2026

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Dr. Abdul Waheed Jatoi

Abstract

Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* presents a dramatic world in which inherited guarantees of purpose have weakened, yet the desire for meaning remains persistent. This paper examines the play through atheistic existentialism, especially Jean-Paul Sartre's concepts of freedom, responsibility, contingency, bad faith, and self-definition, while using existential psychology to clarify the emotional consequences of living without secure meaning. It argues that Vladimir and Estragon's crisis arises not simply from an empty universe but from their repeated transfer of responsibility to the absent Godot. Waiting becomes an existential strategy of postponement: action is deferred, identity remains provisional, and the future is imagined as something that will arrive from outside the self. The paper analyzes the refrain "nothing to be done," circular time, unstable memory, repetitive routines, companionship, humor, bodily suffering, Lucky's speech, and recurrent thoughts of suicide. These elements reveal psychological attempts to manage anxiety, uncertainty, loneliness, and the threat of meaninglessness. The study also resists reducing the play to uncomplicated nihilism. Vladimir and Estragon continue to speak, improvise, remember, care for one another, and return to the same place. Their persistence suggests that the failure of transcendent certainty does not extinguish the human demand for significance. Beckett's drama therefore exposes a central paradox of modern existence: human beings may be free to create meaning, yet they can remain psychologically attached to the hope that meaning will be supplied for them. The study names this double movement "deferred freedom": waiting limits self-directed agency while simultaneously protecting the characters from the psychological exposure of acting without guarantees.

1. Introduction

Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* has become one of the defining dramatic representations of twentieth-century uncertainty. Its stage is almost empty, its action is deliberately restricted, and its two central figures spend most of the play waiting for a person whose identity remains uncertain and whose arrival is repeatedly postponed. The apparent simplicity of the situation produces a much larger philosophical problem: how does a person continue living when no stable explanation of existence can be confirmed? The question is intensified by the play's first declaration, "Nothing to be done," which immediately joins practical frustration to a wider atmosphere of existential limitation [1].

The play emerged in a European intellectual environment shaped by war, displacement, religious doubt, philosophical challenges to essential human nature, and an acute awareness of contingency. Existentialist philosophy did not constitute a single doctrine, but its major thinkers repeatedly addressed freedom, anxiety, death, responsibility, absurdity, and the problem of creating or discovering meaning [2–5]. Sartre's atheistic existentialism is particularly useful for this study because it denies a divinely fixed human essence and places the burden of self-definition on human choice. His formulation that existence precedes essence means that human beings first exist and subsequently define themselves through their projects and actions [2]. Such freedom can be experienced not as liberation alone but as a burden, because no transcendent authority can finally assume responsibility for one's life.

Waiting for Godot creates a striking dramatic tension with this philosophical position. Vladimir and Estragon possess the capacity to leave, act, separate, improvise, or redirect their lives, yet they continually organize existence around Godot. Their waiting gives them a purpose while simultaneously preventing them from confronting the possibility that purpose must be made without Godot. The absent figure therefore matters less as a puzzle to be solved than as a structure of expectation. Godot represents the hoped-for arrival of an explanation, command, rescue, recognition, or future that would relieve the characters of the need to authorize their own lives. The play can be read as dramatizing a crisis of meaning produced by the conflict between existential freedom and the psychological desire for externally guaranteed purpose. Atheistic existentialism provides the philosophical framework, while existential psychology helps explain why the characters repeatedly evade the freedom that philosophy appears to grant them. Their routines, jokes, quarrels, embraces, memory failures, fantasies of departure, and discussions of suicide are not random comic fragments. They are ways of managing the anxiety of continued existence. The result is neither a simple illustration of Sartre nor a straightforward statement that life is meaningless. Beckett stages the difficulty of living when certainty is unavailable but the need for certainty persists.

2. Literature Review and Research Gap

Critical discussion of *Waiting for Godot* has long centered on absurdity, existentialism, religion, language, temporality, and the problem of interpretation. Esslin's influential account of the *Theatre of the Absurd* located Beckett among dramatists who abandoned conventional dramatic

logic in order to represent a world in which inherited structures of meaning had become unreliable [6]. Subsequent criticism has shown, however, that Beckett's relation to existentialism cannot be reduced to a direct philosophical affiliation. Gordon reads the play's purposelessness and its characters' efforts to fill existential emptiness as central to its dramatic force [7]. Other studies have emphasized anguish, the search for meaning, and the circularity of existence [8].

A second strand of criticism focuses on the religious implications of *Godot*. The name inevitably invites theological speculation, while biblical allusions, the story of the two thieves, the tree, salvation, and the messenger boy encourage religious readings. Christian-existential interpretations have therefore examined the play through Kierkegaardian faith and paradox [9]. Yet the dramatic text never confirms *Godot* as God, salvation, or a reliable transcendent authority. Beckett's refusal to stabilize the symbol is crucial: the characters wait for something they cannot adequately define. The interpretive problem is consequently not only whether *Godot* is divine, but why the characters need the absent figure to make waiting seem necessary. Sartrean readings produce a productive disagreement. Some critics find existential themes in the characters' lack of rational certainty and their confrontation with an unstable world, while others argue that Vladimir and Estragon fail to embody Sartrean existentialism precisely because they avoid responsibility and wait for a savior-like authority [10]. This objection is valuable. The characters need not be successful existentialists for Sartrean concepts to illuminate the play. Their failure to assume freedom can itself be read through Sartre's account of bad faith: the attempt to flee the disturbing implications of one's own freedom by treating oneself as fixed, determined, or dependent upon an external necessity [2].

Recent criticism has also complicated the tendency to identify the play with absolute nihilism. Work on Beckett and hope argues that the drama can sustain a minimal, self-aware form of hope without restoring metaphysical certainty [11]. Philosophical readings of nihilism similarly note that Vladimir and Estragon continue to insist that there must be something for which they wait, suggesting not the disappearance of meaning but an inability to cease demanding it [12]. Psychological and interdisciplinary work has further connected the play with existential anxiety, suicide, waiting, emotional fragmentation, and the search for purpose [13–15].

The research gap addressed here lies at the intersection of these debates. Many studies identify existentialism or absurdity as themes, and others pursue theological or psychological interpretations. Less attention is given to the precise contradiction between atheistic existential freedom and the characters' psychological dependence on an external source of meaning. *Waiting*, on this reading, works at once as a philosophical problem and a psychological refuge. Philosophically, it postpones self-definition; psychologically, it protects the characters from the anxiety of acting without guarantees. This integrated approach also explains why companionship, repetition, memory, humor, and suicide occupy such prominent positions in a play where almost nothing conventionally "happens."

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Atheistic Existentialism: Freedom, Responsibility, and Bad Faith

Sartre's atheistic existentialism begins from the absence of a divine creator who has designed a universal human essence. If there is no predetermined essence, human beings cannot appeal to a fixed metaphysical blueprint to determine what they must become. They are "condemned to

be free”: thrown into existence without choosing to be born, yet responsible for the choices through which they subsequently define themselves [2,3]. Freedom is therefore inseparable from anguish. A choice cannot be guaranteed in advance by an objective cosmic instruction, and refusing to choose is itself a way of choosing.

Bad faith describes an attempt to escape this uncomfortable freedom. A person may imagine that a social role, circumstance, authority, personality, or external command completely determines what can be done. Sartre does not deny factual limits; rather, he distinguishes the conditions one inherits from the meanings and projects one forms within them [2]. This distinction is especially relevant to Vladimir and Estragon. Their poverty, bodily vulnerability, uncertainty, and limited environment are real constraints, but the claim that they cannot leave because they are waiting transforms a chosen project into something that appears compulsory.

Atheistic existentialism also clarifies the difference between meaninglessness and meaning-creation. The absence of predetermined purpose does not logically entail that no purpose can exist. Instead, it removes the guarantee that purpose arrives ready-made. Human projects become the medium through which significance is produced. This distinction separates existentialism from simple nihilism and is central to the present reading of Beckett.

3.2 Existential Psychology and the Need for Meaning

Existential psychology translates philosophical questions into problems of lived experience. Frankl identifies the search for meaning as a powerful human motivation, while Yalom emphasizes death, freedom, isolation, and meaninglessness as fundamental existential concerns [16,17]. Contemporary psychological research similarly treats meaning in life as involving dimensions such as coherence, purpose, and significance [18,19]. When these dimensions weaken, people may experience uncertainty, anxiety, disorientation, or a heightened need to restore a stable interpretive framework.

This perspective does not require diagnosing Beckett’s characters. Vladimir and Estragon are dramatic constructions, not clinical cases. Psychological concepts are used here to illuminate the functions of their behavior. Repetition can create predictability; companionship can reduce isolation; humor can make distress temporarily manageable; memory can support continuity of identity; and future-oriented expectation can prevent the present from appearing entirely closed. Waiting for Godot combines all of these mechanisms, even as it repeatedly shows their fragility.

4. Methodology

The analysis is based on close reading, with philosophical and psychological scholarship used to clarify patterns already present in Beckett’s text. Waiting for Godot is treated as the primary literary text, with attention to dialogue, stage directions, dramatic structure, characterization, recurring motifs, temporal patterns, and the relation between speech and action. The philosophical framework is drawn principally from Sartre’s atheistic existentialism, supported by Camus where absurdity and suicide are relevant. Existential-psychological scholarship is used to interpret the characters’ responses to uncertainty and threatened meaning.

The discussion is organized thematically and does not assume that Beckett set out to dramatize a single philosophical system. The distinction matters because literary texts can test, complicate, or resist philosophical categories. The aim is therefore not to label Beckett a Sartrean dramatist.

Instead, Sartrean concepts are used as analytical tools for understanding the tension between freedom and waiting, while psychological concepts clarify the emotional need that sustains that tension.

5. “Nothing to Be Done”: From Practical Failure to Existential Condition

The opening phrase “Nothing to be done” begins with Estragon’s inability to remove his boot, but its resonance rapidly exceeds the immediate action [1]. Beckett repeatedly allows concrete physical problems to open onto metaphysical ones. A boot, a hat, hunger, pain, sleep, or a carrot remains stubbornly material, yet each object appears within a world in which the characters cannot establish a larger direction. The sentence therefore captures two levels of impotence: there is a specific task that has failed, and there is a broader feeling that action itself may not change anything essential.

From a Sartrean perspective, however, “nothing to be done” is unstable. Vladimir and Estragon do many things. They converse, argue, reconcile, exchange hats, consider hanging themselves, meet Pozzo and Lucky, question the boy, and repeatedly discuss leaving. What is missing is not activity but transformative commitment. Their abundant small actions occupy time without altering the project that governs their existence. They remain waiting. The apparent absence of possibility is therefore partly created by the rule they have accepted: they must remain available for Godot.

This is where Beckett’s comedy becomes philosophically sharp. The characters behave as if waiting were imposed by the structure of reality, but the audience repeatedly hears that they themselves are choosing to continue. Their famous intention to go is followed by immobility. Stage action contradicts verbal intention. The body remains where speech says it will not remain. Beckett converts existential indecision into theatrical form.

6. Godot and the Externalization of Meaning

Godot never appears, but absence does not make him dramatically insignificant. On the contrary, his absence organizes almost everything. Vladimir and Estragon do not know precisely what they asked of him, what he promised, whether they are in the correct place, or even whether they would recognize him. Yet they repeatedly treat his expected arrival as decisive. The less determinate Godot becomes, the more clearly he functions as an empty position into which the characters can place the hope of future resolution.

This structure resembles an externalization of existential responsibility. If Godot arrives, the characters imagine that something will change: they may receive instruction, recognition, shelter, salvation, or simply confirmation that their waiting was justified. Until then, they need not create a radically different project. The future is delegated to an absent other. Sartre’s account of bad faith is useful here because the characters transform a chosen dependence into an apparent necessity [2]. They repeatedly say, in effect, that they cannot leave because they are waiting. The project becomes its own justification.

This does not mean that independence would automatically make them happy. Beckett provides no guarantee that leaving would produce meaning. Atheistic existentialism is demanding precisely because it offers no such guarantee. What matters is that Vladimir and Estragon prefer an uncertain promise from outside themselves to the frightening openness of self-directed action.

Godot protects them from meaninglessness by giving them something to wait for, but he also protects them from freedom by allowing meaningful life to remain perpetually in the future.

7. Circular Time and the Psychology of Waiting

Time in *Waiting for Godot* does not develop in a conventional dramatic progression. Act II resembles Act I; events return in altered form; the characters are uncertain about what happened yesterday; and the messenger again announces that Godot will not come today but will come tomorrow. The future is always near enough to sustain expectation and distant enough to prevent fulfillment. This structure turns waiting into a permanent present.

Psychologically, waiting can preserve hope because it gives the future an object. Yet prolonged uncertain waiting can also suspend agency. Kirtsoglou and Simpson describe Beckettian waiting as a form of endurance oriented toward a future that remains unavailable [15]. This helps explain why the promise of “tomorrow” is simultaneously consoling and destructive. It prevents complete despair, but it also allows the characters to postpone a confrontation with the present.

The circular structure additionally weakens ordinary narratives of progress. In conventional stories, earlier events lead toward consequences, recognition, or resolution. Beckett removes that assurance. The characters cannot confidently accumulate experience because memory itself is unreliable. Without stable memory, yesterday cannot securely instruct today. Without a dependable future, today cannot confidently prepare for tomorrow. The result is temporal disorientation: existence continues, but its direction remains uncertain.

8. Memory, Identity, and the Fragility of Coherence

Memory is one of the play’s most persistent psychological problems. Estragon frequently forgets events that Vladimir remembers, while other characters appear altered or unable to confirm previous encounters. The uncertainty of memory affects more than factual recall. Identity depends partly on the ability to connect past and present into a coherent narrative. If yesterday cannot be established, the self becomes difficult to stabilize.

Vladimir often performs the role of remembering for the pair. He recalls appointments, biblical stories, earlier encounters, and the reason they remain by the tree. Estragon, by contrast, repeatedly returns to immediate bodily experience: boots, hunger, fatigue, beating, and sleep. Their companionship therefore contains a psychological division of labor. Vladimir helps preserve narrative continuity; Estragon anchors experience in the body and the present. Neither mode is sufficient alone.

This fragility supports the paper’s larger argument. A self that lacks secure continuity may become especially dependent on an external organizing story. “We are waiting for Godot” supplies such a story. It tells the characters why they are there and what they are doing even when almost everything else is uncertain. Waiting becomes an identity: they are the ones who wait. The project is impoverished, but it gives coherence to an otherwise unstable existence.

9. Companionship, Isolation, and Mutual Dependence

Vladimir and Estragon repeatedly threaten to separate, yet separation never becomes permanent. Their relationship is irritable, comic, affectionate, and necessary. Each can frustrate the other, but each also protects the other from complete solitude. In existential psychology, isolation does

not simply mean physical aloneness; it also refers to the ultimate separateness of individual consciousness and responsibility [17]. Beckett dramatizes both forms. The two men are together, but neither can fully enter the other's suffering or make the other's choices.

Their companionship nevertheless creates local meaning. They invent games, exchange words, embrace, quarrel, reconcile, and perform routines. These acts do not solve the metaphysical problem, but they make time inhabitable. The relationship is therefore more than comic decoration. It demonstrates that meaning can emerge horizontally between persons even when vertical or transcendent meaning remains uncertain.

That pattern makes it difficult to claim that the play depicts total meaninglessness. If Godot represents the fantasy of final meaning, Vladimir and Estragon's relationship represents a smaller, imperfect meaning already present. They often fail to recognize its value because they remain oriented toward what has not arrived. Beckett thereby creates an irony: the characters wait for a source of significance while continually producing fragments of significance through their interaction.

10. Humor, Repetition, and Coping with Existential Anxiety

The play's bleak themes coexist with persistent comedy. Physical routines, verbal misunderstandings, hat exchanges, failed departures, exaggerated politeness, and sudden quarrels repeatedly transform distress into performance. Humor does not erase suffering; it changes the form in which suffering can be endured. The characters entertain one another because empty time is difficult to face directly.

Repetition serves a related function. Familiar routines reduce the uncertainty of the moment. When the larger world lacks dependable order, small repeated acts can create temporary structure. Yet Beckett makes this coping mechanism double-edged. The routines help the characters survive, but they can also prevent change. What comforts them also confines them.

Theatre itself becomes implicated in this process. Vladimir and Estragon perform for one another, and Beckett's actors perform their waiting for an audience. The spectators laugh at routines that expose mortality, loneliness, and failure. The comic form therefore demonstrates a psychological truth within the theatrical experience: unbearable questions can be approached indirectly through play, rhythm, repetition, and laughter.

11. Lucky's Speech and the Collapse of Rational Explanation

Lucky's long speech offers one of the play's most concentrated attacks on the expectation that language and reason will produce coherent explanation. Once ordered to "think," Lucky releases a torrent of fragmented academic, theological, philosophical, and pseudo-scientific language [1]. The speech contains recognizable structures of intellectual argument but repeatedly breaks their connections. Words accumulate while meaning becomes increasingly unstable.

The episode is especially relevant to atheistic existentialism because it parodies systems that claim to explain human existence from above. References to a remote or apathetic deity coexist with descriptions of human decline and unfinished knowledge. Rational discourse does not restore a secure metaphysical order. Instead, the speech dramatizes the breakdown of explanatory language itself.

Psychologically, this collapse intensifies the crisis faced by Vladimir and Estragon. If inherited systems of religion, philosophy, science, and scholarship cannot deliver a final account, then the characters are returned to their own existence without certainty. Lucky's speech is therefore not meaningless noise in a simple sense. It stages the failure of excessive explanation and reveals the desperation behind the demand that someone, somewhere, should be able to tell human beings what their condition means.

12. Suicide, Death, and the Boundary of Meaning

The possibility of suicide appears repeatedly in the play, often through comic discussion of hanging from the tree. Camus famously begins *The Myth of Sisyphus* by treating suicide as the fundamental philosophical question raised by absurdity: if life lacks ultimate justification, why continue? [4]. Beckett places a related question on stage but refuses solemn philosophical presentation. Vladimir and Estragon discuss death through practical problems, bodily comedy, uncertainty about the strength of the branch, and the failure of available materials.

Their inability to carry out suicide should not be interpreted simply as cowardice. The episodes reveal ambivalence. The characters are distressed by existence, yet they remain attached to it. They imagine ending life, but they also eat, sleep, converse, seek companionship, and wait for tomorrow. The future retains enough possibility to interrupt final negation.

Recent work on the play has similarly examined the relationship between absurdity, meaning, spiritual well-being, and suicide [13]. In this reading, the suicide motif exposes the boundary between meaninglessness and the continuing demand for meaning. Vladimir and Estragon cannot establish a final reason to live, but neither can they conclusively establish that there is no reason. Godot's promised tomorrow keeps the question open.

13. Is Waiting for Godot Nihilistic?

Calling *Waiting for Godot* nihilistic captures part of its atmosphere but risks flattening its philosophical complexity. The characters inhabit a world without confirmed transcendent purpose, stable memory, reliable progress, or final explanation. Yet nihilism in the strong sense would imply that significance is impossible or worthless. The play does not clearly establish that conclusion.

Vladimir and Estragon continue to value things. They seek food, shelter, sleep, companionship, recognition, and relief from pain. They care whether Godot comes. They sometimes care for one another and respond to the suffering of others. Their actions may be inconsistent, but inconsistency is different from the absence of value. Philosophical criticism has accordingly argued that the play portrays not straightforward nihilism but the human inability to stop searching for meaning even under conditions that repeatedly frustrate that search [12].

The ending preserves this ambiguity. The characters remain unable to convert the intention to leave into departure, and Godot remains absent. From one perspective, nothing has changed. From another, they have survived another day together. Beckett refuses to tell the audience whether persistence is heroic, comic, pathetic, hopeful, or futile. That refusal is central to the play's power because any final label would provide precisely the interpretive certainty that the dramatic world withholds.

14. Discussion: The Crisis of Meaning as Deferred Freedom

Taken together, the philosophical and psychological evidence suggests that the crisis of meaning in *Waiting for Godot* is not adequately described as the simple discovery that life has no meaning. The more precise crisis is that externally guaranteed meaning cannot be secured, while the characters are reluctant to assume responsibility for creating provisional meaning themselves. Godot becomes the mechanism through which this contradiction is sustained.

Sartrean freedom helps explain the ethical dimension of the waiting. Vladimir and Estragon repeatedly treat themselves as bound by an obligation whose basis they cannot clearly remember or verify. Their language turns choice into necessity. Existential psychology explains why such an evasion can be attractive. Radical openness produces anxiety. A fixed project—even an unproductive one—can provide coherence, identity, routine, and a future orientation. Waiting therefore injures and protects them at the same time.

The psychological motifs of the play reinforce this pattern. Memory failure threatens continuity, so the appointment with Godot supplies a repeated narrative. Isolation threatens the self, so companionship supplies mutual presence. Empty time threatens purpose, so routines fill the day. Anxiety threatens stability, so humor converts distress into performance. Death threatens existence, so the promise of tomorrow postpones final decisions. Each coping strategy is incomplete, but together they allow the characters to continue.

It also helps explain why a purely theological identification of Godot is unnecessary. The important function of Godot is structural. He occupies the position of whatever the individual expects to arrive before life can properly begin: divine command, certainty, recognition, rescue, opportunity, explanation, or permission. The play's modernity lies partly in this indefinite form. The audience can recognize the logic of postponement without agreeing on the content of the awaited object.

At the same time, the drama does not simply endorse Sartrean self-creation. Beckett exposes how difficult such freedom is when bodies hurt, memories fail, relationships are unstable, knowledge is uncertain, and material circumstances restrict action. The play thus humanizes the philosophical demand for responsibility by showing the psychological cost of living without guarantees. Freedom exists, but it is experienced through fatigue, fear, dependency, and uncertainty rather than as an abstract ideal.

15. Conceptual Clarification: Existentialism, Absurdism, and Nihilism

The three concepts most often attached to *Waiting for Godot* are related but not interchangeable. Sartrean atheistic existentialism begins from the absence of a divinely fixed human essence and therefore emphasizes freedom, choice, responsibility, and self-definition. Absurdism, particularly in Camus, describes the collision between the human demand for intelligibility and a world that does not answer that demand. Nihilism is a stronger claim: it questions or denies the reality or authority of value and meaning. Beckett's play can dramatize absurdity and the temptation of nihilism without affirming that meaningful human relations are impossible. This distinction matters because Vladimir and Estragon continue to value companionship, relief from suffering, recognition, hope, and the possibility of tomorrow even while they cannot establish an ultimate justification for those values.

16. Dramatic Form as Philosophical Argument

Beckett's formal choices do philosophical work. The nearly empty setting strips the dramatic world of the social and material density expected in conventional realism. The circular two-act structure frustrates progression; pauses and silences expose the limits of speech; repetition turns habit into both protection and confinement; and stage directions repeatedly contradict verbal intention. The ending is the clearest example: the characters announce departure while remaining physically still. Meaning is therefore not discussed only in dialogue. The theatrical form makes deferred agency visible.

The boots and hats sharpen this division between body and thought. Estragon's recurring struggle with his boots keeps existence tied to bodily discomfort, while the hat routines, particularly those surrounding Lucky and Vladimir, parody the association of thought with rational mastery. The objects are comic, but their repetition also reveals how small material routines occupy consciousness when larger purposes cannot be secured. Beckett's tragicomedy refuses to separate metaphysical anxiety from sore feet, hunger, fatigue, and slapstick.

Lucky's speech extends this formal breakdown. Its academic and theological fragments initially resemble systematic reasoning, yet syntax and conceptual sequence progressively disintegrate. The scene does not simply declare that thought is useless. It dramatizes the instability of intellectual systems when they are asked to provide a final explanation of existence. The failure is theatrical: the audience hears the machinery of explanation continue after coherent explanation has begun to collapse.

17. Counterargument: Why the Play Is Not Simply Sartrean

A Sartrean framework is illuminating only if it is not mistaken for an authorial key. Beckett did not construct *Waiting for Godot* as a philosophical demonstration, and criticism has repeatedly warned against reducing the play to a single intellectual system. Pormouzeh and Nilchian, for example, argue that Vladimir and Estragon's dependence and refusal of responsibility complicate a straightforward Sartrean classification [10]. More recent scholarship similarly emphasizes uncertainty, dramatic form, embodiment, hope, and the openness of Godot as a signifier rather than treating the play as a coded statement of one philosophy [11,31–34].

This objection strengthens rather than defeats the present argument. Vladimir and Estragon need not exemplify authentic Sartrean existence. Their repeated retreat from freedom is precisely what makes freedom analytically important. "Deferred freedom" names the contradiction rather than resolving it: the characters possess possibilities of action, but repeatedly place the authority to transform their lives in an absent future. Beckett's drama then complicates philosophy by showing why such postponement can be psychologically necessary. Freedom is experienced through vulnerable bodies, uncertain memory, loneliness, fatigue, and fear, not as an abstract capacity detached from circumstance.

18. Revised Contribution: Deferred Freedom

The phrase "deferred freedom" captures the central tension of the play. Godot functions as an external guarantor whose anticipated arrival allows Vladimir and Estragon to preserve the belief that meaning will eventually be supplied while avoiding the full burden of constructing meaning in the present. Waiting has two simultaneous functions. It is existentially restrictive because it

postpones self-directed action, but psychologically protective because it supplies coherence, routine, identity, companionship, and future orientation. This double function explains why the characters remain attached to a practice that repeatedly disappoints them.

“Deferred freedom” also connects the play’s dramatic form with its philosophical and psychological pressures. Beckett’s repetition and circularity formalize deferral; Sartrean freedom identifies the responsibility that deferral evades; existential psychology explains why uncertainty makes such evasion attractive. The result is not a diagnosis of fictional characters but an account of the play’s representation of human vulnerability when transcendent certainty is unavailable.

Figure 1. Conceptual framework of deferred freedom

Absence of transcendent certainty	Existential freedom and uncertainty	Waiting for Godot as external guarantor	Deferred agency and repetitive existence
Meaning crisis and anxiety	Coping through companionship and humor	Routine, memory, and future orientation	Temporary endurance without final certainty

The upper pathway shows the philosophical sequence from the loss of guaranteed meaning to deferred agency. The lower pathway shows the psychological mechanisms that make waiting sustainable. The two pathways converge because the same practice that limits agency also helps the characters endure uncertainty.

19. Conclusion

Waiting for Godot remains compelling because it transforms the philosophical problem of meaning into a concrete theatrical situation: two people remain beside a tree because someone may come tomorrow. Through that minimal premise, Beckett stages questions about freedom, responsibility, hope, memory, death, companionship, and the human need for purpose. Atheistic existentialism illuminates the central contradiction. In a world where no transcendent source of meaning is confirmed, Vladimir and Estragon continue to behave as though meaningful action must wait for authorization from outside themselves.

Their waiting can therefore be understood as deferred freedom. Godot supplies a reason not to decide, while his absence ensures that the decision is never finally resolved. Yet the play also shows that human beings do not live by metaphysical answers alone. Vladimir and Estragon create temporary forms of meaning through companionship, conversation, routine, humor, care, and persistence. These forms are fragile and sometimes absurd, but they prevent the dramatic world from collapsing into absolute nihilism.

Psychologically, waiting is more than a philosophical mistake. It gives the men a routine, a shared identity, and a reason to imagine another day. Repetition gives shape to time; companionship makes isolation bearable; and the promise of tomorrow keeps final despair at a distance. The same habits that restrict their agency also help them survive.

Beckett leaves the crisis unresolved. Godot does not arrive, Vladimir and Estragon do not leave, and no authoritative explanation settles what their waiting means. The audience is therefore

placed in a position close to theirs: certainty is withheld, but interpretation continues. “Nothing to be done” is not merely a verdict on existence. It becomes a question about what people make of life when no external authority can finally tell them what to do.

References

- Beckett, S. (2006). *Waiting for Godot: A tragicomedy in two acts*. Faber and Faber. (Original work published 1952/1953).
- Sartre, J.-P. (1956). *Being and nothingness* (H. E. Barnes, Trans.). Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1943).
- Sartre, J.-P. (2007). *Existentialism is a humanism* (C. Macomber, Trans.). Yale University Press. (Original lecture delivered 1945).
- Camus, A. (2005). *The myth of Sisyphus* (J. O'Brien, Trans.). Penguin. (Original work published 1942).
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Blackwell. (Original work published 1927).
- Esslin, M. (2001). *The theatre of the absurd* (3rd ed.). Vintage. (Original work published 1961).
- Gordon, L. (2002). *Waiting for Godot: The existential dimension*. In *Reading Godot* (pp. 55–69). Yale University Press.
- Asker, Ö. (2017). The representation of existential anguish in absurd drama as reflected in Beckett's play: *Waiting for Godot*. *International Journal of Media Culture and Literature*, 3(6).
- Kelsch, A. L. (2007). *Reading Waiting for Godot through the lens of Christian existentialism* [Master's thesis, Eastern Michigan University].
- Pormouzeh, A., & Nilchian, E. (2019). Essence or existence? Existentialist reading of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 7(3).
- Waiting for Godot*. (2025). *Angelaki*, 30(5). <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725X.2025.2554197>
- Florida Philosophical Review. (n.d.). *Nihilism and the eschaton in Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot*.
- D'Souza, A. (2025). Spiritual well-being and meaning in response to the absurd mediating the act of suicide in Beckett's 'Waiting for Godot'. *Journal for the Study of Spirituality*, 15(2), 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20440243.2025.2468709>
- Khan, M. Y., & Khattak, N. J. (2024). Echoes of absurdity: *Waiting for Godot* and the quest for meaning in a post-pandemic world. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 7(4).
- Kirtsoglou, E., & Simpson, B. (2022). Depressing time: *Waiting*, melancholia, and the psychoanalytic practice of care. In *The anthropology of waiting*.
- Frankl, V. E. (2006). *Man's search for meaning*. Beacon Press. (Original work published 1946).
- Yalom, I. D. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. Basic Books.
- Steger, M. F. (2012). *Experiencing meaning in life: Optimal functioning at the nexus of well-being, psychopathology, and spirituality*. In P. T. P. Wong (Ed.), *The human quest for meaning* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

- Martela, F., & Steger, M. F. (2016). The three meanings of meaning in life: Distinguishing coherence, purpose, and significance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11(5), 531–545.
- Critchley, S. (1997). *Very little... almost nothing: Death, philosophy, literature*. Routledge.
- Badiou, A. (2003). *On Beckett* (N. Power & A. Toscano, Eds./Trans.). Clinamen Press.
- Adorno, T. W. (1991). Trying to understand Endgame. In *Notes to literature* (Vol. 1, S. W. Nicholzen, Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Kenner, H. (1973). *A reader's guide to Samuel Beckett*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Graver, L., & Federman, R. (Eds.). (1979). *Samuel Beckett: The critical heritage*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cohn, R. (1962). *Samuel Beckett: The comic gamut*. Rutgers University Press.
- Cronin, A. (1996). *Samuel Beckett: The last modernist*. HarperCollins.
- Knowlson, J. (1996). *Damned to fame: The life of Samuel Beckett*. Bloomsbury.
- Zia, T. S., Junejo, M., Malik, W., & Shah, A. (2022). Perceptions about Waiting for Godot: Insights from Pakistani undergraduate students. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2022.1002.0220>
- Sultana, I. (2019). Waiting for Godot: Not just an enigma. *International Journal of English and Education*, 8(3), 51–63.
- Priya, P., & Ranjan, V. (2026). Absurdity and the human condition in Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot. *International Journal for Research Trends and Innovation*, 11(2), a213–a216.
- Simpson, H. (2022). Cruelty, contagion, and comedy: Waiting for Godot. In *Samuel Beckett and the Theatre of the Witness: Pain in Post-War Francophone Drama* (pp. 55–77). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192863263.003.0003>
- Randolph, B. (2025). Waiting for Godot: The fragmentation of hope. *Angelaki*, 30(5), 116–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969725X.2025.2554197>
- Gontarski, S. E. (2025). *Beckett's Co-authors: Rewriting Waiting for Godot*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.3366/edinburgh/9781399529334.001.0001>
- Al Shams, A., Alqaryouti, M., & Alhasan, R. (2026). Waiting in the age of uncertainty: A modern reading of Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.58256/q44p73>
- Hussain, A., Ahmed, W., & Sana. (2024). Interpreting the divine: A post-structuralist and deconstructive analysis of Waiting for Godot. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 8(III). [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024\(8-III\)37](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024(8-III)37)
- Khan, M. Y., & Khattak, N. J. (2024). Echoes of absurdity: Waiting for Godot and the quest for meaning in a post-pandemic world. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, 7(4).
- Akhter, T., & Al-Kadery, S. A. (2025). Nihilism, absurdity and Waiting for Godot: An existential approach. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 10(5), 434–439. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.105.71>
- Kirtsoglou, E., & Simpson, B. (2020). *Depressing time*. In *The Time of Anthropology: Studies of Contemporary Chronopolitics*. Routledge.
- Jatoi, Dr. Waheed. (2017). *Wujoodiat ain Sindhi Adab (Existentialism & Sindhi Literature)*, (original work published in 2001)