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This study is an attempt to mark out the possible postmodern schizoid tendencies in Beckett’s *Molloy*, schizophrenia as a postmodern concept; the study aims to find the way in which postmodern theorists construe the clinical form rather than clinical designations of schizophrenia. Beckett’s groundbreaking novel with its eccentric characters, Molloy and Moran, entails a twofold quality of paranoia and schizophrenia. The novel consists of two parts with two heroes, or more appropriately two anti-heroes; the first of whom, Molloy, gives us several evidence for some schizophrenic features (fragmented self, becoming minority, and being anti-social which resonate the attitude of thinkers such as Deleuze and Guattari), and the second hero, seemingly a paranoid individual with features in stark contrast to Molloy’s, ends up in a schizoid Molloy-like character; thus, the second part of the novel and its move from paranoia to schizophrenia, along with the first part, indicates noticeable proclivity for schizophrenia and its ramifications. Beckett demystifies the previously-held, clear-cut and epistemological concepts of self and its integrity and calls into question the coded social myth by creating his anti-social fragmented subjects.
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INTRODUCTION

A schizoanalysis schizophrenizes in order to break the holds of power and institute research into a new collective subjectivity and a revolutionary healing of mankind. For we are sick, so sick, of our selves (Deleuze and Guattari, *And-Oedipus*, xxii).

Beckett’s *Molloy* is an appropriate case to support his penchant for schizophrenia. Beckett’s first incursion, *Molloy*, as many critics hold, is one of the most original of literary creations which has been considered as eccentric in its time of publishing due to its unconventional features. Hassan believes that *Molloy* has been “the first novel to be written in the new manner” (In *Molloy* “the old principals of causality, psychological analysis and symbolic relations….principles on which the bourgeois novel once comfortably rested, began to tremble” (Hassan, 1969). Generally speaking, schizophrenia has a special significance in postmodernism. There are some clues in Beckett’s novel that can be interpreted as the same kind of penchant for schizophrenia and its symptoms. Deleuze celebrates the “schizo” against the paranoid. Moreover; Ihab Hassan in his “Toward a Concept of Postmodernism” draws a chart in which he contrasts the features of modernism and postmodernism where modernism’s paranoia opposes postmodernism’s schizophrenia (Hassan, 1993). However, at the first glance, the hero of the second part of the novel seems to be a paranoid character that denies any schizoid feature, he steps into an endless process of becoming and schizophrenia and proves to be the continuation to Moran.
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SCHIZOID VS. PARANOID

In *Molloy*, Beckett presents Molloy as a postmodernist character with a schizoid tendency against a paranoid modernist character, Moran. The main character and the writer of the first part of the novel, *Molloy*, who some critics believe to be older than Moran of the second part, is more fragmented than the main character of the second part. Still the Moran's part gets more and more schizophrenic as it proceeds; that is to say, it gradually deviates from his ordered and logical mores, controlled personality, and arborescent identity. Beckett satirizes the concept of well-preserved identity and integrated self by dividing the novel into two parts with two characters, Molloy and Moran, which can symbolize one person’s fragmented self. Moran, a private detective sent to search for Molloy, is seemingly the most conventional novel character. At first, he is a religious person with a "methodical mind". He adores "punctuality", "decorum", and at the same time "abhors vagueness". But once starting his quest, he is tempted to "commit sacrilege" with no reason at all. Moran is a normal paranoid person at first, but as he starts his quest to find Molloy, he gradually metamorphoses into a self-fragmented, schizoid person which results in his self-deterioration. He confesses his "disintegration" and his "great inward metamorphoses" in his way to Ballyba (Molloy's hometown). In this process, Moran identifies with his opposite Molloy, an old, ill, forgetful, and a half human, and his murder of an arrogant person in search of Molloy is in fact a murder of his own definable identity. He admits that, "I not only knew who I was, but I had a sharper and clearer sense of my identity than ever before". Moran, then, murders his self: "Physically speaking it seemed to me I was now becoming rapidly unrecognizable... [T]he face my hands felt was not my face any more, and the hands my face felt were my hands no longer", and starts to act and speak the way Molloy does; he even seems to develop into an exact copy of Molloy: "Then I was nothing but uproar, bulk, rage, suffocation, effort unceasing, frenzied and vain. Just the opposite of myself in fact. It was a change;" and, "that is the kind of man I have become". Even at a structural level, both Molloy and Moran, who are physically on the road and are both looking for someone, share certain common features. When they start their journey, each one has a stiff leg, but as they move on, their other leg stiffens and at the end of their journey, they are reduced to crawling like beasts. Moran becomes Molloy and wanders like him, indulges in the same poor jokes, and falls prey to the same disabilities. He increasingly becomes physically disabled and wanders blindly, like Molloy: "Perhaps I shall meet Molloy. My knee is no better. It is no worse either. I have crutches now. I shall go faster, all will go faster. ...I have been a man long enough, I shall not put up with it any more, I shall not try anymore." Interestingly, he wonders if he is secretly glad that this has happened to him, perhaps even to the point of not wanting to get well. Moran is hesitant about this new world and self and is dubious about leaving his previous character, yet he wants to have Molloy's face, and at the same time, he has a desire to get rid of it. His schizoid Moran-like unconscious seems to leap up when he says:

And then I saw a little globe swaying up swaying up slowly from the depths, through the quiet water, smooth at first, and scarcely paler than its escorting ripples, then little by little a face, with holes for the eyes and mouth and other wounds, and nothing to show if it was not an effect of the water trembling between it and the light (M 137).

His character at the beginning of his part shows some egoistical, pessimistic, paranoid features, as it is observed in some occasions like when he thinks his son is going to deceive him; when he suspects father Ambrose of having fobbed him off with unconsecrated bread; when he thinks his son has a very special way of saying papa to hurt him; when he suspects that the son is lying to him when he says that he has an ache; when he believes that his son's dentist tries to insinuate something by using the word "naturally"; when he does not completely trust his servant; and above all, when he fancies himself as every man (Main features of paranoia include: pessimism toward other people and being egoistical). All these can be interpreted as symptoms of paranoia. But suddenly the schizoid Molloy-like part of him rises up within him and the hard, logical Moran begins to feel sorry for Molloy. He mentions, "Quiet Moran, quiet. No emotion, please", yet, he cannot be as before and he exclaims miserably, "I missed my son!". Even Moran, the man with strict discipline and planning, is ready to go without having consulted neither map nor time-table, considered neither itinerary nor halt heedless of the weather outlook, with only the vaguest notion of the outfit he would need, the time the expedition was likely to take, or the money he would require and even the very nature of the work to be done, and consequently the means to be employed. Thus, he approaches a schizoid and self-fragmented quality with no identity, as echoed in his own words, "a frenzied collapsing of all that had always protected me from all I was condemned to be".

Basically, there has always been a potential correspondence between the worldview of postmodernists and the way the schizophrenic leads his life; the disintegration and chaos hover in both. The tendency of hero-narrators for schizoid quality can be mapped out in the first novel of *Trilogy*. In *Capitalism and schizophrenia*, Deleuze aptly refers to Beckett's characters as illustrations of "schizo" and claims that Beckett knows more about schizophrenia than any psychiatrist (Deleuze 1990) (Even Louis a. Sass...
argues that Beckett is schizoid as his characters. *L. A. Sass, Madness and Modernism: Insanity in the Light of Modern Art, Literature, and Thought* (London: Harvard UP, 1992). In the process of applying a given conception of the schizoid to Beckett’s works to determine whether the characters exhibit schizoid tendencies, we need to trace schizoid characteristics in the novel. The schizoid person tends to have a fragmented self and society’s attempt to impose an illusion of integrated self on all individuals is doomed to failure in the case of schizoid individuals, since the schizoid basically goes beyond the pre-coded identity that the society enforces by the process in which the individual becomes a “minority”. Subsequently, the process of self fragmentation, becoming minority, and being anti-social of the two heroes are addressed in this study.

**SELF FRAGMENTATION**

One basic schizoid tendency is the tendency to self-fragmentation. Derrida holds that not only structuralism, but the history of Western thought has been based on fixed identity, and argues that Hegel’s philosophy represents the typical Western suppression of the difference, the tendency to reduce difference to some grounding identity. According to this model, the self is determined and known only through self-presence (as cited in Gendron, 2004). In terms of identity, Deleuze’s philosophy can be seen as a critical attempt to cure us of the self-destructive dependence on identity as opposed to multiplicity (Parr, 2005) (Similarly, Lacan, deconstructing the traditional concept of the self like other post-structuralists, rejected “the unity of subject” (Lacan, 1977). Deleuze contends that, the most significant feature of the object is that it “lacks its own identity”. It is born of a split within itself that causes it to be forever “displaced in relation to itself”. Therefore, split into “[at least] two parts” where one part is “always missing from the other,” the virtual object is the embodiment of self-estrangement: of being other within itself (Deleuze, 1994). One good example that totally represents the concept of multiple selves can be the following monologue by Molloy: “I don’t know where, for I stayed where I was, with regret, mild regret. For in me there have always been two fools, among others, one asking nothing better than to stay where he is and the other imagining that life might be slightly less horrible a little future on” (Samuel Beckett, *Molloy* in *Trilogy* (London: Picador, 1979). Hereafter referred to as M). One can think of the character of Molloy, who is always becoming, and never quite having a unified self. Molloy epitomizes this fragmented schizophrenic subject immensely. In fact, he shows a strong desire for self-negation. From time to time, he refers to an “other” within himself: “I cannot stoop, neither can I kneel, because of my infirmity, and if ever I stoop, forgetting who I am, or kneel, make no mistake, it will not be me, but another”. In one occasion, he refers to someone “inside” himself who was laughing as if someone else started laughing. As it will be argued below, Beckett in *Molloy* shows that there is no single unified self and the identity his character defines for himself is merely an illusion. Instead, in his novel, self has a schizophrenic quality, because Molloy and later Moran like a schizoid person never specify an essential authentic self for themselves. Beckett denounces the construction of the stable, distinct, authoritative subject—a conventional concept of the self that was theorized by Descartes, Rousseau, Hegel, and countless other Western philosophers.

The protagonists in *Molloy* seem to have no unified identity. As Moran says: “The fact was there were three, no four Molloys”. Moreover, Moran’s and Molloy’s journeys can be taken as metaphorical representations of an endeavor at mental self-exploration that fails. In the same line, Iser suggests that Molloy’s attempt at self-observation leads inevitably into fiction (Iser, 1985). To put some meat on these bones, providing some pertinent examples from the novel is necessary. For instance, at Louise’s house, Molloy contemplates his identity and states that at times he forgets who he is and feels like a stranger to himself; there were times when he forgets “not only who I was, but that I was, forget to be”. Likewise, in another occasion he forgets his own identity and construes himself as a stranger: “who I was (excusably) and spoken of myself as I would have of another, if I had been compelled to speak of another. Yes it sometimes happens and will sometimes happen again that I forget who I am and strut before my eyes, like a stranger”. The schizoid Molloy always complains that there are other “creatures” within him; in his own words, “I was no longer a sealed jar to which I owed my being so well preserved”; hence, he defines no sealed confining identity for himself. Another supporting evidence for this lack of defined and external identity is the time when Molloy is stopped by the police as he enters the town, he has nothing to prove that he officially exists; he cannot find any papers showing his identity and the only papers he has are some scraps of newspaper that he uses to wipe himself with.

In Deleuzian terms, a salient inclination of the schizophrenic is the schizoid shifting between the first and third person; this reflects self-fragmentation (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983). The schizophrenic sometimes tends to address himself as a third person. He often refuses to use the word I and prefers to refer to himself as a third person. As observed in the following, Beckett makes use of such a modus operandi. Molloy refers to himself alternatively in the first and third person. In his last sentence, Molloy says about himself, “Molloy could stay, where he happened to be.” Or when speaking about himself he says: “Before he died like a Cartesian monk, but with his collar and lead”. Once again, he speaks of
himself as a third person: “Chameleon in spite of himself, there you have Molloy, viewed from a certain angle. And in winter, under my great coat, I wrapped myself in swathes of newspaper, and did not shed them until the earth awoke, for good, in April “.

Another way in which Beckett satirizes the conventional concept of self and identity is playing with names and making advertent mistakes in using them. That is to say, abundance of identities within oneself is also echoed in Molloy, monologues, and so are the writings of Moran. Thus, most of his narratives are rambling interior two first-person narratives - the first of Molloy’s, the be all but entombed within a skull; certain identity or self, i.e. Molloy. All characters novels including on forgetting his own name just as he finds himself a stranger to himself. As held by Iser, in Beckett’s trilogy of further, Beckett’s Molloy, can be read as monologues of a fragmented self with multiple voices. This means that all the characters in the fiction are different aspects of a certain identity or self, i.e. Molloy. All characters seem to be all but entombed within a skull: Molloy is divided into two first-person narratives - the first of Molloy’s, the second of Jacques Moran’s, the agent. Molloy, an elderly cripple, is writing his story in a room, but in fact Molloy and Moran are not two separate entities; once a week, a man brings Molloy money and takes away what he has written. Most of his narratives are rambling interior monologues, and so are the writings of Moran. Thus, in Molloy, Molloy and Moran seem to be two opposing but complementary sides of the same self. Moran can be Molloy’s other self who first seems to be the opposite of him but comes out to be the same as him. That’s why Moran says that Molloy is not a stranger to him.

Molloy calls his journey an “unreal journey” probably because the journey is at a metaphorical level, meaning a journey in search of self. To be exact, Molloy says he is writing his story in a room which he believes to have been his mother’s, although he does not know how he got there; interestingly, throughout his quest he is searching for his mother’s house, an indication of the fact that Molloy is not taking an outside journey but an inside quest.

**FRAGMENTED WORDS**

Molloy’s fragmented self is reflected in his fragmented words. Schizoid language is replete with fragments of absurdly vague phrases, contradictions, irrationality and incoherence. In fact, Deleuze created the term “schizoanalysis” to describe his own approach and goal to the primacy of impersonal and mobile fragments. Harland also argues that the schizophrenic lives the world as signs. To him, there are neither people nor things but meanings endlessly and everywhere. The schizophrenic, as Freud himself recognized, takes words for things (Harland, 1998). Since Molloy’s words equal things, he cannot imagine things and names separated from each other. Molloy says, “There could be no things but nameless thing.” He emphasizes the nameless thing because for him even the words (names) stand as things; this becomes clear when he says “even my sense of identity was wrapped in a namelessness often hard to penetrate, as we have just seen I think; and so on for all the other things” (Samuel Beckett, *Molloy* in Trilogy (London: Picador, 1979). Hereafter referred to as M).

In his monologues, Molloy very often speaks in an inconsequent manner, reminding us of schizoid talk. By way of illustration, one can refer to the following set of fragmented sentences which seem to lack coherence:

For what possible end to the wastes where true light never was, nor any upright thing, nor any foundation, but only theses leaning things, forever lapsing and crumbling away, beneath a sky without memory of morning or hope of night. These things, what things, come from where, made of what? And it says that here nothing stirs, has ever stirred, will ever stir, except myself, who do not stir either, when I am there, but see and am seen. Yes a world at an end, in spite of appearances, its end brought it forth, ending it began, it is clear enough.

Paradoxical speech of Moran can serve as a good example of the contradictory words of a schizoid individual. His language approaches what Deleuze calls rhizome; he writes in the last sentence, “I went back into the house and wrote, ‘It is midnight’. The rain is beating on the windows. It was not midnight. It was not raining”. As noticed, the language is not a language used by normal people but a grotesque, meaningless, nihilistic language presented by self-seeking schizophrenics.

Throughout the novel, fragmented language can be detected as an offshoot of fragmented self; nonetheless, the concept of bodiless self (the tendency of the schizoid to avert their bodies) and having problem with signs, words and language go hand in hand. The double plot of the novel consists of two parts narrated by Molloy and
Moran. In the first, Molloy’s fruitless quest for his mother, Molloy speaks incessantly; initially one of his legs, soon later on, both get paralyzed. At the end of the first part, he who has lost his both legs and bicycle reaches the edge of the forest and drops into a ditch where he becomes totally incapable of moving. The second part involves Moran, the private detective sent on search for Molloy. Moran loses his characteristics and progressively assimilates Molloy. At the end of the novel, unable to find Molloy, Moran returns home while he has an inarticulate language and a lame leg.

**Bodiless self**

Essentially the schizophrenic does not experience himself as a complete person but rather as split in various ways, perhaps as a mind more or less vaguely linked to a body, as two or more selves (Laing, 1959). Therefore, having a fragmented self brings about the individual’s alienation from his body. The schizophrenic individual is challenged in accepting his body. Thus, schizophrenia is a psychosis resulting from the intensification of the divisions of the self. There are basically two manifestations of the self: one is the expressed (embodied) and materialized self, which is realized when one feels the body as real and alive; the other is the self separated from its own body, a disembodied self. Laing adds that an individual could try to free himself from his body in order to achieve the desired state of bodiless spirituality. A sense of reality depends on the unity between mind and body, on temporal continuity, and on relationships to other people (Losing the sense of reality resulted from self-fragmentation causes visual and auditory hallucinations which are among major features of schizophrenia and can be seen in Molloy and Moran. To exemplify his visual hallucination we can refer to “the other”, the man with the stick who hears his cries, turns, and waits for him, or take when he was in the way and he felt the faces turning to look after him, “calm faces and joyful faces, faces of men, of women and of children. It seemed to hear, at a certain moment, a distant music” A and C who Molloy speaks about at the beginning of the novel, can be considered as visual hallucination as well; A and C are not occurring in the real world “perhaps I’m seeing things.” “Perhaps I’m remembering things.” Moran as well has visual hallucinations. While waiting for his son to come, he claims to have seen a dim man, with dim body. It turns out to resemble his own face at first: “Same little abortive moustache, same little ferrety eyes, same paraphimosis of the nose”. He asks Moran if he had seen an old man with a stick pass by. Suddenly, says Moran, “The voice seemed to have come to me from afar...his body too grew dim, as if coming asunder.” And now he claims he does not look like him at all. It was clearly one of schizoid features emerging in Moran who has started showing schizoid tendency. At the end of the novel, Moran says that the “phantoms of the dead” tried to prevent him from getting home, in obedience to Youdi’s command. Moreover, the schizophrenic individual often hears some uncontrollable noise, voice or music which cannot be heard by ordinary people. Molloy and Moran are plagued by some sounds or voices which their origin, as Molloy tells us, “is in the head” not the real outside world. Likewise, Beckett often represents his characters as confined in an intellectual prison of the mind by having them closeted in jars and other closed spaces with the body and mind isolated from one another. Molloy, for example, tends to evade from his body which seems to him like “a sealed jar”:

> Yes, there were times when I forgot not only who I was, but that I was, forgot to be. Then I was no longer that sealed jar to which I owed my being so well preserved, but a wall gave way and I filled with roots and tame stems...the recess of and the imminence of dawn, and then the labour of the planet rolling eager into winter of that winter I was the precarious calm, the thaw of the snows. But that did not happen to me often, mostly I stayed in my jar which knew neither seasons nor gardens.

There is the same concept of lacking unified self revealed in the character’s alienation from body in the following speech by Molloy: “He gave me a shove. I had been touched, oh not my skin, but none the less my skin had felt it, it had felt a man’s hard fist through its coverings...as if I had been someone else”.

In Molloy, one can observe the physical subjugation of the subjects and motor disturbance is one of the features of schizophrenia that is observed in this novel. As if the schizoid individual cannot accept wholly his body as part of himself. To illustrate this in Molloy and Moran, we can refer to groundless lameness of Molloy and Moran. Although Molloy and Moran of the novel are capable, at one point, of walking and riding a bike, they both eventually need to rely on crutches or sticks to support themselves and both end up unable to leave their beds.

Molloy frequently has a problem in recognizing his body members. Once he mentions that the face his hands felt was not his face anymore, and the hands his face felt were no longer his hands. Likewise, Molloy claims that his hands are not his and that he has no arms at all:

> when I see my hands, on the sheet, which they love to floccillate already, they are not mine, less than ever mine, I have no arms, they are a couple, they play with the sheet, love play perhaps, trying to get up perhaps, one on the top of the other. But it doesn’t last, I bring them back, little by little, towards me, it’s resting time. And with my feet it’s the same sometimes, when I see them at the foot of the bed, one with toes, the other without.

He claims that his legs, corresponding to his arms of a moment ago, are both stiff now and very sore. Yet he
should not be able to forget them as he can and have forgotten his legs. It seems he wants to transcend his body as one of manifestations of limiting human beings to certain frames. Yet, defying the acceptance of his body does not suffice him, he totally breaks the pre-given restrictive frames by identifying with “minority.”

Becoming minority

Deleuze’s “schizo” is a way of thinking of a life not governed by any fixed norm or image of the self – a self in flux and becoming. The “schizo” is an image of the self – a self changing and becoming rather than a self that has submitted to the law of being. The schizoid is a challenge to the way we think and write (Colebrook, 2002). In Deleuze’s work, fixed self or identity is perhaps the most heavily criticized concept from the philosophical tradition; there is no integrated self, but rather unidentifiable processes of becoming; becoming as the opposite of the fixed identity. Deleuze and Guattari draw a distinction between the minoritarian and the majoritarian. The Minoritarian and majoritarian are ways of drawing distinctions. They regard majoritarian to be a Western disease that traces all becomings back to some origin. Becoming minority shows that becoming is a transformation with no external end rather than an original fixed identity. So, “man” is a majoritarian term. We imagine that there is some general being and a fixed identity, the human. The opposition between man and woman and man and animal is majoritarian. We think of “woman” other than or different from man. Deleuze describes “woman” or “becoming-woman” and “animal” and “becoming animal” as examples of minoritarian (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987).

“Woman” opens the human to new possibilities. “Woman” is a minoritarian term only if it remains an open term in becoming (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Molloy, for instance, avoids fixed sexual signs of self just as represented in a Deleuzian manner of becoming. He occasionally refers to himself as a woman, in dress of a woman, or in place of a woman. Once describing his own state, Molloy voices, “look at me floating about inside another man’s night dress, another woman’s probably, for it was pink and transparent and adorned with ribands and frills and lace.” Molloy once again shows his intimacy with a woman, namely his mother; he says his name is the same as his mother’s: “And suddenly I remembered my name, Molloy. My name is Molloy, I cried, all of a sudden, now I remember….they let me keep my hat on, I don’t know why. Is it your mother’s name? Said the sergeant…Molloy? Very likely. Her name must be Molloy too, I said”. At the very beginning of the novel, Molloy indicates that he is writing his story from his mother’s room and states that he has “taken her place” and that he resembles her increasingly; in his own exact words, “I have taken [my mother’s] place. I must resemble her more and more”; this suggests a refusal of fixed sexed identity on the part of Molloy. As a matter of fact, the mother that Molloy is seeking all the time, is a symbol for what Molloy is really trying to reach; that is, the meaning of becoming and becoming minority. Another clue for Molloy’s escape from predetermined notion of self to a sexless becoming (becoming a woman) is that Molloy seeks to kill off his self by killing off his mother. This symbolic suicide might take the form of identification with the mother.

A minoritarian mode of difference does not ground the distinction on a privileged term, and does not see the distinction as an already-given order, but we limit our life by restricting our becomings (through pre-given moral codes or norms). However, practically human beings can also expand their perception to encounter other becomings, such as becoming animals (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Deleuze insists that we value action and becoming, freed from any human norm or end. This is why becoming begins with becoming “woman”, becoming other than man (or becoming animal) (Colebrook, 2002). Molloy does not restrict his becomings. The concept of becoming animal can also be seen in Molloy and late Moran. Molloy’s behavior is not much humanlike. He is not a typical human with a privileged and original fixed identity at all. For instance, Molloy has the state of becoming a dog. When Molloy and Ms. Louise are burying her dog, Molloy becomes a dog in its Deleuzeian terms. He feels that it is his own burial. Molloy states, “It was she dug the hole, put in the dog, filled up the hole. On the whole I was a mere spectator, I contributed my presence. As if it had been my own burial. And it was.” He goes on, “She would see him no more, her teddy she had loved like an only child. She takes care of her. I wish I take the place of her dog”. Moreover, the Moran we find at the end of Moran’s narrative, not being identical to the Moran we find at the beginning of his narrative, starts “becoming” as he sets out to find Molloy. Moran decides at the end of his story to not to be “a man” anymore and he begins to learn the language of the wild birds and of his inner voice: “I have been a man long enough, I shall not put up with it any more, I shall not try any more”. That is to say, he likes to stop having a privileged and fixed identity like “a man”; he is engaged in the process of becoming endlessly, and is becoming minority. Therefore, Beckett’s hero never allows himself to be coded by the society as a pre-determined “man”, but that is not the end of the story. The society is also anti-schizophrenic (as Deleuze asserts, the society both nurtures and stifles schizophrenia) (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983).

BEING ANTISOCIAL

To Laing, a prominent theorist of schizophrenia, the term
schizoid refers to an individual the totality of whose experience is split in two main ways; in the first place, there is a rift in his relation with his world and, in the second, there is a disruption of his relation with himself; such a person experiences himself in despairing loneliness and isolation. What makes the schizophrenic especially significant for poststructuralists is that he is anti-social because of his rejection of the conventional codes and structures. The schizophrenic refuses to deal with social meanings as society would have them deal with, because he refuses to observe boundaries between them. Deleuze in *Anti Oedipus* mentions, “...there is no doubting the fact that the schizo is constantly subjected to interrogation, constantly cross-examined” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983). In the same way, Molloy is interrogated by the policemen who can be taken as the imposing control of society. Actually, Deleuze exemplifies his idea with Molloy. He says, “the questions put to him are formulated in terms of the existing social code: your name, your father, your mother?” In the course of his exercises in desiring-production, Beckett’s Molloy is cross-examined by a policeman.

“Your name is Molloy, said the sergeant. Yes, I said, now I remember. And your mother? Said the sergeant. I didn’t follow. Is your mother’s name Molloy too? Said the sergeant. I thought it over. Your mother, said the sergeant, is your mother— Let me think! I cried. At least I imagine that’s how it was. Take your time, said the sergeant. Was mother’s name Molloy? Very likely. Her name must be Molloy too, I said. They took me away, to the guardroom I suppose, and there I was told to sit down. I must have tried to explain” (as cited in Deleuze and Guattari, 1984).

Thus, Molloy, being antisocial and being unable to communicate in society, uses language as a means to express his fragmented stream of thought in monologue.

Besides, Molloy shows his despicable or primitive sides and illustrates a rather disagreeable anti-hero. He is physically retarded, incapable, and filthy. He has criminal, antisocial tendencies; he steals silver teaspoons from his hostess and Louise; he violently murders a man in the forest (Moran as well after showing schizoid tendencies commits murder) (M 62, 84); and the police arrests him for his contempt for traffic rules. He is considered so antisocial that he is arrested by the police for setting “a deplorable example for the people”. Once arrested by the policemen without a serious reason, he admits that he has been full of fear all his life, “I hastened to answer blindly, fearing perhaps lest my silence fan their anger to fury. I am full of fear, I have gone in fear all my life”. Laing contends that a schizoid person has an indefinite feeling of guilt that can lead the individual to her own destruction (Laing, 1959). The point is that this insecurity is caused by the society. The schizophrenic is an unsecure person under a pressure of feeling guilt (However, there would seem to be various sources of guilt within the individual’s being. In a being that is split into different ‘selves’ one has to know which self is feeling guilty about what. In other words, in a schizoid individual there is not and cannot be a non-contradictory unified sense of guilt. On general principles, one might suppose that one sense of guilt might have its source in the false self, and another source of guilt might arise in the inner self (Laing, 1959). A sense of guilt and fear of sin sometimes exacerbates Molloy. Molloy, like a schizoid person, feels “anxiety” and “embarrassment” frequently without committing a crime. As Molloy describes himself, “He had nothing to fear, though he went in fear, he had nothing to fear, there was nothing they could do with him, or very little...ye, he saw himself threatened, his body threatened, his reason threatened, and perhaps they were, in spite of his innocence”. He is saying to himself, “laboriously, it’s my fault, Fault? That was the word but what fault?”. Thus, he conceives himself guilty without knowing for which fault.

As a ramification, many of schizophrenics live in silence and catatonia away from the society. But according to Deleuze, this is merely a secondary state brought about by the society which medicalizes them ((Deleuze and Guattari, 1983). Molloy is in the same state. While he is speaking seemingly endlessly, others try to stop him. We notice a silence in Molloy; a silence which is broken into abrupt flow of speech. This silence in the same way can be a secondary state of catatonia. Molloy once utters, “i avoid speaking as much as possible. For, I always say either too much or too little”.

**ANTI-OEDIPAL QUALITY**

Another way in which society limits individuals is through pre-given oedipal codes that is, by limiting human psycho to oedipalization. To Deleuze, the schizophrenic is anti-oedipal and decodes all those bourgeois codes of oedipalization coded by psychiatrists; that is to say, Deleuze is “anti-psychiatry”. The society represses schizophrenia and re-imposes control over them. What the society de-territorializes in one hand, it re-territorializes with other. Such re-territorialization operates especially within the nuclear family and especially through the structures of oedipalization by psychiatry. *Anti-Oedipus* followed on from, and extended, a criticism of social convention and the restriction of desire to bourgeois or ‘familial’ forms (Colebrook, 2002). Once, Moran expresses that “I lost interest in my patients, once I had finished with them”. Thus, the relationship of Molloy and Moran seems to be that of a schizoid person and a psychiatrist who tries to make an ordered character out of his chaotic, schizophrenic patient, but ends in failure. In *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Deleuze mentions that Beckett’s characters escape all oedipal references. This also can be true for Molloy; Molloy’s narrative reverses the Oedipus myth. It starts with the Oedipus myth but
leads away from it. Molloy’s search for his mother is a representation of Oedipalization. Molloy starts with a fervent search for his mother; but this search leads to nowhere. Moreover, he gradually stops his search. In Moorjani’s account, Molloy’s life cannot be made to yield meaning in such a simple, linear fashion. It is constructed out of a familiar pattern, but that pattern has been re-assembled, and its new meaning remains obscure. In reality, Molloy is an anti-Oedipus: “for instead of solving the riddle of the sphinx and attaining sovereignty, Molloy in a regressive moment recedes from his mother’s room via the sphinx to the killing of the stranger at the crossroads to the final crawling on all fours out of the forest and into the bowels of the earth” (Moorjani, 1982).

Molloy deconstructs Freud and Oedipalization in other ways as well. In Part II of Molloy, Beckett satirizes libido and the pleasure principle by making references to them as “fatal pleasure principle” and “Obidil,” (an untidy reversal of “libido”).

To Deleuze and Guattari, the schizophrenic represents, a non-exclusive logic of either, or, or... in place of the old exclusive logic of “either/or”. This is not that the schizophrenic is simply unaware of the differences between, say, the self and the other, the child and the parent, but he is aware of the differences only to cross them. He recognizes the boundaries only to transgress them. He is the child or the parent, not both but one at the end of the other, like the two ends of a stick in a non decomposable space. For example, in Molloy Moran’s self or character is dominated by the father figures Youdi and Moran himself. However, Molloy mentions, at the beginning of his account, that he may have a son somewhere, nearly as old as himself, and later on, he notes that his own mother would take him for his father. Thus Molloy is both father and son, and the same is true of Moran, who has given his son the same Christian name as himself.

Taken together, Beckett’s antiheroes in Molloy with their fragmented, bodiless selves, becoming minority, and being repressed by the society show a penchant for schizophrenia. Beckett, as a forerunner or an ‘inaugurator’ of a literary and cultural postmodernism, portrays a patent propensity for schizophrenia against normal but paranoid modernist man, in a manner that postmodern thinkers do. This is in line with the opinion of those who argue that schizophrenia creates new connections, opens the experience up to the new beginnings, and allows us to think differently.
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