

Memories and Consciousness in Samuel Beckett's "Whoroscope"

PRIYANKA MEHTA

Research Scholar, Manav Bharti University, H.P., India

-----◆-----

1. INTRODUCTION

Harold Bloom in his book *Genius: A Mosaic of One Hundred Exemplary Creative Minds* (2002) embarks on juxtaposing one hundred geniuses of language according to the Sefirot. Kabbalah as a body of speculation relies upon a highly figurative language. "Chief among its figurations or metaphors is the Sefirot, attributes at once of God and of the Adam Kadmon or Divine Man, God's Image,"

These attributes or qualities emanate from a center that is nowhere or nothing, being infinite, to a circumference both everywhere and finite. [...] in Kabbalah the Sefirot stay within God or the Divine Man. Since the Kabbalists believed that God created the world out of himself, he being Ayin (nothing), the Sefirot chart the process of creation; they are the names of God as he works at creating. (Bloom, 12)

Bloom categorizes the geniuses of language in the world under the Sefirot – the large metaphors of "lights, texts, or phases of creativity ... attributes of God's genius, inwardness" (Bloom, 13). Keter (Being everyone and no one; the genius of Shakespeare, Cervantes, Milton), Hokmah (Wisdom; the genius of Socrates, Plato, Muhammad), Binah (Intellect in a receptive mode; the genius of Nietzsche, Kafka, Beckett), Hesed (The beautiful covenant of love; the genius of Donne, Pope, Swift), Din (Strict judgment; the genius of Dickinson, Frost, the Romantics), Tiferet (Beauty; the genius of Swinburne, Rossetti, French Symbolists), Nezah (Eternal endurance; the genius of Homer, Joyce, Twain), Hod (Splendor or majesty with prophetic force; the genius of Whitman, Crane, Lorca), Yesod (Foundation; the genius of Borges, Rilke, Flaubert), and the final Sefirah, Malkhut (Transcendence of sexuality; the genius of Browning, Lewis Carroll, Yeats).

Beckett is Binah; "intelligence-as-realized-knowledge, or a prism breaking open illumination into what can be apprehended" (Bloom, 191). Beckett breaks the light in

order to answer this question: "How is it we keep going on, after going on seems as unlikely as is immortality?" He is the master of "negation"; his negative energetics according to Bloom resembles Schopenhauer's Will-to-live; to keep going on when you can't go on. Beckett's Binah is an openness of intelligence, reception of the world despite its non-reception of humans. He breaks through the prism of life, shatters the solidarity of its components. The residues, traces, fragments are more revealing than the foundations, wholes and centers. Reality thus becomes nothing but a make-belief, a superstition, better to be analyzed/read through the myths, illusions, and signs. One of the best tools for re/reading such a text/life is Horoscope, which pro-tells, pre-tells, and within-tells the text/life. The astrological signs are the myths and stories that tell stories about the stories in the text/life; groundless, in *medias res*, fragments that nullify the poses of foundational, essentialist reality.

But what if the horoscope turns out to be a Whoroscope? Whoroscope foretells the fortune of the whores and the pimps, whether that day would be the day of profit with abundant customers. Beckett in his first poem "Whoroscope" sets off his career as the ironist of all times by his choice of title. "Whoroscope" was first published as an independent book by Nancy Cunard in 1930. In 1929 Cunard announced a prize for £10 for the best poem on the subject of time, not to exceed 100 lines. Beckett entered, and won the prize. The poem "registers but also parodies intense moments being relived in the mind of Rene Descartes as he lies dying, thoughts called to the surface of consciousness by his feverishly active mind" (Rainey, 1078). "Whoroscope" as the parodic irony of measurable, objective, Cartesian time, breaks the prism of life by showing how re/reading one's life makes it as worthless and marginal as the life of prostitutes reading and waiting for their fortune.

Descartes' reading of his Whoroscope and his evaluation of time in this poem can be read within the scope of

Deleuzoguattarian criticism. Deleuze and Guattari as one of the prominent philosophers of late twentieth century proposed "an exuberant and iconoclastic synthesis of Marxist and Freudian motifs within an anti-structuralist, Nietzschean thematics of liberation" (Bogue, 1). The tyranny of Hegelian dialectics, Saussurean signifier, Lacanian lack, hierarchical modes of interaction between the staff and the patients in the conventional psychoanalysis, all led them to revolutionary ideas such as the interrelation of power and desire, nomadism, anti-Oedipal psychoanalysis (Schizoanalysis), desiring-machines, regimes of signs, and lots of other controversial concepts.

This paper is an attempt to trace some of the magnificent Deleuzoguattarian moments in Beckett's "Whoroscope", not applying but enjoying such moments via the lines of Beckett. The role of memory is to be read in line with Deleuzean notions of desire and the machine. What follows is divided according to the motifs extracted from Deleuze and Guattari's major works such as *Anti-Oedipus* (1968), *Kafka for Minor Literature* (1975), *The Machinic Unconscious* (1979), and *Thousand Plateaus* (1980). Let's bear in mind that for Deleuze and Guattari literary theory does not offer the standpoint of transcendence; it just lays bare the idea that a text is "a Becoming world" and language "a creative shattering." So let's just track the various Becomings in the text and never forget that they converge, diverge, and overlap with one another.

Essence, Eternal Return, Affect

Deleuze (before his collaboration with Guattari) pertains to the Nietzschean idea of existence, which is a composite of interrelated forces and fluxes which form a body. The active and reactive forces of a body are in constant, ceaseless transaction with each other; an eternal dynamo. Henceforth, the world is in germinal flow of change, movement, diversion, and transgression. Nietzschean Will to Power "determines the relation, quality, and quality of the forces in the body" (Bogue, 21). It is the general orientation of Becoming, it joins forces, and differentiates them; it is the capacity of being *affected*. Accordingly, Deleuze reads Nietzsche's Eternal Return as another manifestation of Becoming. For him Eternal Return is not just cyclicity of history, but the return of Becoming; the synthesis of past, present, and future at the moment of Becoming. In other words, as Deleuze puts it, Will to Power is the power of Becoming, and Eternal Return the synthesis of Becomings. A network of differences, flows, and relations constructs the very essence of entities.

Deleuze's notion of essence is quite intriguing. "Essence is difference [...] a chaos, spatio-temporal multiplicity that

unfolds and diversifies itself in entities. But each diversification is explication or repetition of the difference" (Bogue, 57). Essence is the repetition of internal differences, and chaos. So isn't it possible to conclude that the human as a body has different essences? Also in Deleuzean agenda, life is a merging together of affects of images, noises, sounds, colors, and flows; affects of the senses. Humans live by "attaching concepts and meanings to such affects" (Wolfreys, 223). Art and poetry are the best means to liberate affects from their mundane, run-of-the-mill associations. In this regard, poetry sustains the possibility of noises, stutters, slips rather than language and meaning.

In this regard, "Whoroscope" is Descartes' world of Becoming. "What's that? An Egg?" begins the poem. "Descartes discovered after experimentations that eggs were best eaten when they had lain under the hen from 8 to 10 days" (Rainey, 1078). The metaphor of egg overshadows the whole poem, a minor discovery! in Descartes' life, though. What is behind Beckett's image of an egg? The answer emerges in the second stanza where Descartes hallucinates about Galileo,

Galileo how are you

We're moving he said we're off – Porca Madonna!
That's not moving, that's *moving*.

Beckett here is alluding to the Galilean idea of relative motion: "The earth moves round the sun, although it is motionless with regard to the ether that carries it along, and with regard to us on its surface" (Rainey, 1078). That which seems to be moving is not moving and that which seems not to be moving is moving. The egg which seems not to be moving is moving on the inside, it is growing, metamorphosing. Thus the initial, overbearing metaphor of the egg along with the reference to Galileo's relative motion verifies Deleuzoguattarian Becoming. Descartes is Becoming-Descartes; at his deathbed, being on the verge of immobility and awaiting the terminus, he is in the network of constant thoughts, memories, hallucinations, and above all affects. He is no more to move but as a body of forces he is moving through. The enclosed egg as a body is open, flowing, and relational on the inside. Bodies can never stop the Eternal Return of Becoming due to the fact that Will to Power is the will towards Becoming. The past, present, and future are fused together in a way that spatio-temporality of incidents in this poem are of insignificance. The Descartes-body is still Becoming Descartes in Beckett's lines. Beckett intentionally is referring to some minor incidents in Descartes' life. Isn't he parodying the cogito of Descartes? Isn't he subverting the Cartesian dualism of inside and outside? Doesn't this mean that the supremacy of "I" over

the outside is just as affect?

Descartes as one of the later betrayers of Western culture (the first, unpardonable betrayers were Socrates and Plato in Nietzsche's words) laid the foundation of Enlightenment by his now humdrum axiom: "I think therefore I am." But what if the thinking part is just an affect of the senses? What if, like the case of egg, under what we think as the apparent Truth (not moving) lies another version of the same truth (moving)? What if I think that I am thinking and not truly thinking; do I still exist? The egg and the moving-not-moving metaphors of Beckett are both affects of the senses, so is thinking-Descartes-thinking. Thinking is an affect of mind, thus not an excuse for existence.

The human-essence is thus a sum of all affects that are interconnected in a body. "Whoroscope" displays a host of such affects which have formed Descartes-body; the affects of sight such as the egg and its implications, the memories of his immature love for the "doaty", memories of his charlatan brother, of his fighting days as a soldier, the reminiscence of his scientific discoveries, the cause of his death, and so on. Descartes-body is a construct/convergence of all these images, thoughts, senses and memories. Here again the pseudo-scientific objectivism of Cartesian Enlightenment is radically questioned and parodied by Beckett. Objective pretexts for life and essence now are toppled down by the unconscious, schizophrenic impulses and affects. The following sections shed more light upon such affects and schizophrenic dimensions of the Descartes-body.

Desiring-Production

Anti-Oedipus by Deleuze and Guattari embodies some of their major ideas regarding Schizoanalysis. "All desire is social not familial," Oedipal family structure is one of the primary modes of restricting desire in capitalist societies, and psychoanalysis helps to reinforce that restriction. Capitalism tends to reduce all social relations to commodity relations of universal equivalency. In this process, it deterritorializes desire by subverting traditional codes that limit and control social relations and production, such as kinship systems, class structures, religious beliefs, folk traditions, customs, and so on. Yet it also simultaneously reterritorializes desire by channeling all production into the narrow confines of the equivalent-form. The Oedipus complex ensures that human desire is concentrated in the nuclear family. [...] Capitalism in its deterritorializing guise, then, sets adrift schizophrenic fluxes of bits and scraps of things, people, words, customs, and beliefs, which it then reterritorializes in the neurotic Oedipal triangle of papa-mama-me. (Bogue, 89-90)

Desire is thus production; desiring-production not lack or

acquisition. It is the realm of multiplicities, a plane of fluxes. Every body is thus a production; production of pain, pleasure, consumption, production, etcetera. Lack makes the desire victim of the fear of not having the needs satisfied.

Desiring-production has three components; desiring-machines, body without organs, and nomadic subjects. Desiring-machines are the a-structured parts in a body that are interconnected with one another. Everything is a machine, an aleatory point that transverses the borders. In the body, the chain of desiring-machines makes possible the passage of flows; material flows (milk, saliva, blood), energy flows (sounds, heat, air), cyber flows (information, data). All in all, the desiring machines are devoid of structurality, organicism, and order.

During the desiring-production, a moment comes when desiring machines "congeal and form an enormous, undifferentiated object. Everything stops dead for a moment, everything freezes in place" (*Anti-Oedipus* 13). This mass is body without organs, a zero-degree moment of intensity, a moment of anti-production that should be broken down by the desiring-machines in order to produce. Body without organs is the synthesis of desiring-machines which otherwise function separately (a mouth desiring-machine functioning as speaking-machine, eating-machine, breathing-machine).

Nomadic subject migrates from one desiring-machine to another; it cuts across the body without organs. The nomadic subject never suffices to the production of one desiring-machine, it transverses the body without organs, experiments with the novel machines, experiences the untaken territories, and deterritorializes the borders and norms. The nomad as a transversal with the utmost Becoming undergoes various coming-to-bes, and re-configurations.

How does the desiring-production function in "Whoroscope"? Descartes' mind after the initial entanglement with the egg, sets up an illusory conversation with Galileo. The third and the fourth stanzas are a Return to the egg this time with more disturbing associations than moving-not-moving,

What's that?

A little green fry or a mushroomy one?

Two lashed ovaries with prostiscuitto?

How long did she womb it, the feathery one?

Three days and four nights?

Give it to Gillot.

The desiring-production in the Descartes-body surfaces in these lines; it is the desire that produces the so-called illegitimate sexual intercourse with the whores. The

desiring-production is embedded in the unconscious as the means of self-liberation from the capitalist burdens of rationality. Descartes-the-man-of-reason produces the desire of the irrational, the dark (not the enlightened!), the other rather than the thinking, decision-making "I". In the second stanza, "'lashed' means 'whipped' or 'tied off' as is ovary of a hen when it delivers an egg, and so in this sense not unlike some prostitutes who have their ovaries tied to avoid reproduction; an omelette made of these and prosciutto, conflated with the word prostitute" (Rainey, 1097). Hasn't then Descartes become a schizoid, in Deleuzoguattarian sense of the word, a body seething with the flows of the unconscious, emancipated from the grips of desire-as-lack? Beckett divulges a new façade for Descartes in which the double is the irrational.

Another instance of desiring-production is in the seventh and the eighth stanzas,

My squinty doaty!

I hid and you sook.

And Francine my precious fruit of a house-and-parlourfoetus!

What an exfoliation!

Her little grey flayed epidermis and scarlet tonsils!

My one child

Scourged by fever to stagnant blood –

Blood!

Francine as the illegitimate child of Descartes and a servant died young. This is a drastic assault on the Oedipal family of capitalist society. Again the irony lurks in the fact that Beckett uses the unrecognized aspects of Descartes' life as a refuge from the objective, fact-oriented, the-major-events biography.

Desiring-Machines, Body without Organs, Nomadic Subjects

The desiring-machines in Descartes-body function to see, to hear, to remember, and to speak. But it can be surmised that the most functional of all desiring-machines in Descartes-body is the flow of memory. Each memory acts as a machine by producing *lines of flight* in Descartes-body. Memory bridges the gaps in temporality; it opens up the possibility for merging of different machines, and flows. In the twelfth stanza, Descartes also remembers his three dreams in a row. In the first one, he saw himself "limping in a violent, gusty storm." In the second one he saw the shrine of Virgin Mary at Loreto, after which he promised to visit "if he were successful in his intellectual endeavors." And finally he dreamed of a poem by the Latin poet Ausonius which begins thus: "What road shall I pursue in life" (Rainey, 1080). Indeed the impact of egg metaphor should not be taken for granted, as Descartes says: "(Kip of Christ hatch it!)," that

is to say, the visits to the shrine will be hatched/accomplished by the Christ's kip (sleep) on them. The dream/memory of a pilgrimage is thus resembled to getting hatched. Mind as a desiring-machine produces the flows of dreams, memories, and unconscious impulses. The point is that the moving-not-moving motif surfaces again when the illusory objective statics of Me/World is supplanted by the schizoid dynamics of me/world/me/meworld/.

The desiring-machine of memory as the dominant machine in "Whoroscope" congeals and generates the body without organs. But when and where does this congealment happen? Is it really possible to detect a single moment for the emergence of body without organs, since the relation between the body without organs and the desiring-machines is that of constant congealment and de-congealment? The egg metaphor is the embodiment of body without organs; the intermittent (de)congealment of memory-machines. Various, non-correlated memories are territorialized and congealed heuristically in the egg. But each of them breaks away, and deterritorializes the body without organs in order to put an end to the non-productive moment of congealment. In this regard, the whole poem begins, proceeds and ends via the references to egg. Descartes is waiting for the egg to be ready for use; he repeatedly asks for it,

What's that?

An egg?

What's that?

A little green fry or a mushroomy one?

What's that?

How long?

Sit on it.

How's that Antonio?

In the name of Bacon will you chicken me up that egg.

The repetitive anchorage of egg substantiates the idea that each reference to the egg is like a clot, a mass of forces, and machines that momentarily stop the productivity of Descartes-body. But as aforementioned, the body without organs is a just a phase, a moment of non-productivity, and it should be broken down by the movements and flows of the machines. Such alternative movements happen immediately after Descartes is being distracted by the egg.

Thus the memories clot in the egg metaphor, and then de-clot as they trigger other memories in the mind. In Deleuzoguattarian definition,

A relationship of repulsion and attraction arises between the desiring-machines and the body without organs,

forming first a paranoiac machine in which the body without organs repels the desiring-machines as so many persecuting objects, and then a miraculating machine in which the body without organs attracts the desiring-machines, and the desiring-machines seem to emanate from it as a quasi-cause. (Bogue, 93)

"Paranoiac repulsion" and "miraculating attraction" are modes by which the body without organs and the desiring-machines function. Descartes-body's constant repulsion of the memories, and asking for the egg, along with the repetitive indulgence in the memories demarcate "Whoroscope".

The third feature in the desiring-production is the nomadic subject. Descartes-body is nomadic. It transverses; it cuts across the desiring-machines of seeing, hearing, speaking, and remembering. It scrambles the norms of temporality by oscillating between past, present and future. As a nomad, the Descartes-body remembers his lost child (Francine), his "childish love for a cross-eyed little girl whom he doted," (Raine, 1080) his three dreams, his answer to "Faulhaber, Beckman and Peter the Red" (who had challenged him), and finally he remembers his answer to William Harvey, the British doctor who discovered the circulation of blood:

Oh Harvey beloved

How shall the red and the white, the many in the few,
(dearbloodswirling Harvey)

Eddy through that cracked beater?

Descartes believed that "blood was white in the arteries and red in the veins" (Raine, 1080). Then he is appalled by the way "Anna Maria" appears to his mind; the woman he hid so that she could hear a lecture at the University of Utrecht.

All these recalls and reminiscences are travesties of Descartes-the-philosopher. The knowing, calculating, analyzing man with his objective theories for explaining the phenomena ranging from the thunder and avalanche ("Faulhaber, Beeckman and Peter the Red, come now in the cloudy avalanche") to blood circulation, and ripening of egg. The nomadism of Descartes-body, its incessant movement, its cutting through the hierarchy of self over the world, all make "Whoroscope" a tribe. The poem's tribal restlessness as it travels vast spans of time in Descartes' life is revisionist, in other words, culminates into this ironically not-Cartesian confession in the line 73: "Fallor, ergo sum!" (I err, therefore I am.) This remark that he takes from St. Augustine's "Si enim fallor sum ..." (If I err, I am ...) is the manifesto of nomadism; trial and error, testing, being-there, being-in-the-world not outside the world (Heideggerian Dasein), re-takings, re-readings, labyrinthine mappings, getting lost, orientating, disorientating, re-orientating,....

At this point, Deleuzoguattarian concepts of paranoia and schizophrenia should be illuminated with respect to the nomadism of Descartes-body. In their book *Kafka: for a Minor Literature* (1986), they introduce two kinds of desire in the capitalist societies; "Molar-paranoiac" and "Molecular-schizophrenic". Molar-paranoiac is the way desire is crystallized, and finalized. It is hierarchical or in Deleuzoguattarian terminology "arborescent." Such a desire is encumbered with a paranoiac attitude toward the world outside, the society, and law. Accordingly, it is possible to conjecture that "Whoroscope" calls forth and reveals the paranoiac drives in Descartes-body. Such a release, which is done via the remembrance of the things past, soothes the former fears of Descartes-the-scientist. The dualism of the self and the world as the main cause of paranoia is overcome by schizoid merging of the interior and the exterior, by parody, and by re-reading of the past. The nomad is a schizoid who destroys the gulfs between illusion and reality, self and the world. The nomadism of molecular-schizophrenic is in Deleuzoguattarian terminology "rhizomatic"; a network of relations and connections at the level of surface and appearance. The rhizome of "Whoroscope" lies in its multiple *lines of flight* away from signification, and hierarchy. Each stanza is as incidental and arbitrary as the occurrence of the memories in Descartes-body. The following lines corroborate the rhizomatic nomadism of Descartes-body,

I'm a bold boy I
know

so I'm not my son
(even if I were a concierge)
nor Joachim my father's
but the chip of a perfect block that's neither old nor new
the only petal of a great high bright rose.

"[N]either old nor new" is the characteristic of the rhizome of Descartes-body, which is just a "petal" not the whole, arborescent "rose."

"The nomadic distribution"^[1] is the combination of "singular points taking on no set and prescribed configuration, but, like a flock of sheep in an open plain, occupying as much space as they can, forming structural relations, and then moving on without marking any territorial boundaries or sedentary domains" (Bogue, 76-77). This is a Deleuzoguattarian concept of structure, A structures chaos or chaos-structure: a nomadic distribution of singular points, each point undetermined within a range of possible actualization, set in differential relations with other points through connective, conjunctive and disjunctive syntheses by an aleatory point that transverses all series and in the process envelops all problems within a single question. (Bogue, 77)

Thus it can be concluded that "Whoroscope" is the "nomadic distribution" of memories, images, and associations which are chaotically structured on the surface relations. The panorama of the images in the Descartes-body is totally irrelevant and haphazard as the example aforementioned testify. The link between the memories is missing as is the link between fact and fiction. Whoroscope as aforementioned predicts the number of possible customers for the whores. Whores are also nomadic subjects who transverse the linear norms. Henceforth, their whoroscope also shows their "nomadic distribution." Randomization, homelessness, and being sporadic make the Descartes-body follow the procrastinated, unknown routes by the whoroscope. In line 66, Francis Bacon's natural philosophy is juxtaposed to "cave-phantoms" or illusions.

In the name of Bacon will you chicken me up that egg.

Shall I swallow cave-phantoms?

In other words, the nomadism of illusions and dreams in Descartes-body nullifies any kind of naturalism or empiricism.

Regimes of Signs

Deleuze and Guattari in *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1980) set forward their notion of "regime of signs"; "[T]he primary function of language [...] is not to transmit information or allow communication, but to issue *mots d'ordre*" (Bogus, 136). This phrase has been translated as "watch-words" or "slogans" or "words of order and command." *Mots d'ordre* as part of the regime of signs impose a collective order of dualisms, codes, privileges, and power relations upon the subjects. The difference between John Austin's "Speech Act Theory" and Deleuzoguattarian *mots d'ordre* is in the latter's emphasis on the fact that all language is the language of obligation and power (more Foucauldian). The function of *mots d'ordre* is the imposition and inducement of "incorporeal transformations"; acts produced by the signs on the part of the subjects. For instance, In an airplane hijacking, the threat of the pirate who brandishes a revolver is obviously as action, as is the execution of hostages, if this should take place. But the transformation of the passengers into hostages, and of the airplane-body into a prison-body, is an instantaneous incorporeal transformation, a mass-media act, in the sense that the English speak of speech-act. (DG, 103)

Deleuze and Guattari specify four types of regimes of signs; pre-signifying of primitive societies, signifying of despotic societies, post-signifying of capitalist societies, and finally counter-signifying of nomads. The pre-signifying regime of signs belonged to the primitive

societies in which the main body was the body of earth and territory. Flows were strictly channeled through kinship, exchange, and gift-exchange. The oral regime of signs was connotative, and plurivocal. The signifying regime of signs in despotic societies had as its main body the state. The despot invented the writing with its implications of legislation, bureaucracy, tax, justice, and historiography. Signifiers (like Saussurean signifiers) gave voice to the despot.

The post-signifying regime of signs in capitalism has first deterritorialized the primitive and the despotic signs with their senses of cruelty and terror, and then has reterritorialized the signs for its own benefit. Now subjects are dealing with non-signifying regimes with multidimensionality, and abstraction. There are three steps in the formation of post-signifying signs: Subjectification, speaking subject (mental reality), and subject of speech (dominant reality). Subjectification is the phase when the speaking subject (subject's mental reality) is overwhelmed by the sign (God, cogito, food, beloved). Instead of resisting the sign, the speaking subject gets dis-oriented, delirious, and fixated by the sign. It falls into the vortex of unlimited obsession with the sign, which enforces the subject of speech (dominant reality of religion, rationality, nutrition, love). Hence, the post-signifying regime of capitalism ensures the conformity of subject's mental reality to the dominant reality by subjectification, and normalization.^[2]

The counter-signifying regime is nomadic, revolutionary, and resistant. It defies, and deterritorializes the subjectification of post-signifying regime. It voyages through the dominant *and* the residual while retaining no position at all. Such a regime breaks away from the tyranny of sign as it blurs the borders of language.

Now "Whoroscope" can be read along with the regimes of signs. The whole poem belongs to the counter-signifying regime in opposition to the post-signifying regime of Cartesian cogito, and reason. The counter-signification is deeply embedded in the metaphor of the egg with its variegated undertones. Egg as the hen egg, egg as a scientific discovery, egg as the cosmos, egg as the ovary, egg as the offspring, egg as just a distraction, all function as singular instances of "nomadic thought." Such transitory moments can never subjugate the reader to the coercion of post-signification.

In this regard, the lines from the last stanza are quite telling,

Are you ripe at last,
my slim pale double-breasted turd?
How rich she smells,
this abortion of a fledgling!
I will eat it with a fish fork.
White and yolk and feathers.
Then I will rise and move moving

Toward Rahab of the snows,
the murdering maternal pope-confessed amazon,
Christina the Ripper.

"White and yolk and feathers" are the manifestations of borderlessness, and in-betweenness. Having waited for the egg to ripen; now it is time relish the surface rather than the depth. The ripening of the egg juxtaposes the eddying of Descartes, pertaining to the idea that the lines separating life and death are very fragile, like the crust of egg.

The poem ends with the following lines: "[...] grand me my second starless inscrutable hour." Inscrutability counter-signifies; it is meant to be a void, facelessness, an aporia. It counter-signifies the post-significations of concepts such as time, existence, beginning and end. "Whoroscope" ends with being inscrutable and starless; without the post-signifying stars with their poses of real light. It is better to stay in the darkness of counter-signification. It is better to remain inscrutable than scrutinized by post-signification. Beckett's insertion of "I err, therefore I am" in line 72, is one of the main instances of counter-signification in "Whoroscope." Cartesianism is the doctrine of subjectification; subjugating the speaking subject (human mind) to the subject of speech (rationality). To err is to counter-signify. In order to counter-signify, the speaking subject needs to Become rather than Be. Beckett's Descartes is a Becoming-Descartes which undergoes a host of other Becomings too: Becoming-intense, Becoming-superficial, and Becoming-inscrutable.

Conclusion

This paper was an attempt at reading Beckett's poem "Whoroscope" in line with Deleuzoguattarian theoretical framework. Essence is a repetitive, differential chaos. It is also reified in the affects of the senses rather than profound foundationalism. The Descartes-body in this poem is the amalgamation of diversified affects, memories, and images that split the self into the fragments of mind, in other words, the dualism of mind and the world crumbles. Nietzschean Eternal Return embodies Deleuzoguattarian Becoming; the eternal, incessant movement of the Descartes-body amongst the surfaces, and networks of relations as it recalls some randomized scenes from the past.

Desiring-production with its desiring-machines congeals, and forms the body without organs. The references to the egg-metaphor are the moments of congealment, which should be broken down in order to produce. Each egg-metaphor breaks down into another memory, another moment of production.

"Whoroscope" is a counter-signification. It's regime of

signs belongs to nomadism, in-betweenness, and transversality. The post-signifying regime of reigns in Cartesianism is parodied by the nomadic signs such as the "err" sign that precludes any territorialization.

Bibliography

1. Bloom, Harold. *Genius: A Mosaic of One Hundred Exemplary Creative minds*. New York: Warner Books, 2002.
2. Bogue, Roland. *Deleuze and Guattari*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
3. Colebrook, Claire. *Gilles Deleuze*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002
4. Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. P. Patton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
5. ---. *The logic of Meaning*. Paris: Minuit, 1968.
6. ---. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Trans. H. Tomlinson. London: Athlone, 1983.
7. Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.
8. ---. *Kafka: For a minor Literature*. Paris: Minuit, 1975.
9. ---. *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Paris: Minuit, 1980.
10. ---. *What is Philosophy?*. Trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchill. London: Verso, 1994.
11. Linstead, Stephen, and Alison Pullen. "Gender as Multiplicity: Desire, Displacement, Difference and Dispersion." *Human Relations*. Vol. 59. No. 9 (2006): 1287-1310.
12. Linstead, Stephen, and Torkild Thanem. "Multiplicity, Virtuality and Organization: The Contribution of Gilles Deleuze." *Organization Studies*. Vol. 28. No. 10. (2007): 1483-1501.
13. McGee, Kyle. "Machining Fantasy: Spinoza, Hume and the Miracle in a Politics of Desire." *Philosophy Social Criticism*. Vol. 36. No. 7. (2010): 837-856.
14. Nietzsche, F. *The Gay Science: With a Prelude in Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs*. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.
15. ---. *Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and No One*. Trans. R. J. Hollingdale. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961.
16. Rainey, Lawrence. *Modernism: An Anthology*. Ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
17. Vandenberghe, Frédéric. "Deleuzian Capitalism." *Philosophy Social Criticism*. Vol. 34. No. 8. (2008): 877-903.
18. Wolfreys, Julian. *Introducing Criticism at*

21st Century. Ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University
Press, 2002.