

Flight as Affirmation in Two Plays of Eugène Ionesco

This study will show the centrality of the theme of affirmation of life in two dramas of Eugène Ionesco, an aspect of his work which has been greatly underestimated by many of his critics. In these two plays it is the symbol of being able to fly which chiefly represents affirmation. This affirmation of life has an implicit theological orientation, even though that orientation belongs not within the framework of traditional Christianity, but rather in the context of "death of God" theology. Ionesco, like the rest of the absurdists, sees a great deal of the world with sad eyes; so much of human experience is negative. But there is also a vitality and an affirmation within the terror which has not been sufficiently brought to light.

After a brief examination of the theological dimension in Ionesco, the paper will turn to a discussion of the pure life of spirit, of spirit freed from the usual earthly limitations, as presented in *Amédée, ou s'en débarrasser* and in *Le piéton de l'air*. Thus the treatment will be principally thematic rather than aesthetic, and the theme of spiritual "lightness" will be the focus (though, of course, all of his major plays incorporate a rich and wide mixture of themes).

By "theme" I mean to indicate the development of a concept or an idea presented not through rational and discursive means as in an essay, but rather one presented through artistic and symbolic means. A theme in creative literature is handled indirectly, not by overt rhetoric but rather through dialogue, imagery, symbolism, setting, and so forth. In effect, this approach treats the themes or evolved ideas in some detachment from the artistic elements of the plays, but it does not thereby ignore the artistic elements. For the drama itself is the substance out of which the ideas are created and presented. Significantly, Ionesco was cited in 1965 as a prime instance of the effort to communicate concepts which cannot be adequately expressed by discursive logic. In an essay, "The Meaning of Un-Meaning", Richard Coe relates Ionesco to Buddhism saying that Nirvana can only be described in terms of what is not and that Ionesco's dramas "incarnate in sensory and conceptual terms those things they are not, in order that we may—however hazily and unclearly—grasp, or approximately grope towards, the things they are".¹ These themes emphasize the affirmation of life in the midst of absurdity and death.

Thus Ionesco's work is directly concerned with man's metaphysical position in the universe. According to Martin Esslin, one of Ionesco's two

*Dr. Altizer is Assistant Professor of English, Spelman College, Atlanta.

basic themes is "the protest against the deadlines of present day mechanical, bourgeois civilization, the loss of real *felt* values, and the resulting degradation of life. Ionesco attacks a world that has lost its metaphysical dimension" ² I contend that Ionesco offers, in *Amédée* and *Piéton*, a vision of man struggling in a world which is bereft of those "felt" values and which is therefore basically alien to him. In this situation, he seeks to find and reaffirm his essence which has gotten lost in the morass of today's existence . . . an essence which is *good* and which could transform present existence.

Ionesco's more positive characters (here, Amédée and Bérenger) may in some ways be naive and trite, but if they are examined in the light of my analysis, then it seems to me that their faith could represent not obtuse ignorance but rather childlike unsophisticated sensitivity and trust. One is reminded of Paul Tillich's treatment of Eden in Volume Two of his *Systematic Theology* wherein he describes it as a "dreaming innocence", as a state of totally innocent "essence" before that essence joins itself to the state of "existence", of concrete actuality, in which tension between existence and essence is inherent because only in God are they one. ³

Ionesco's characters live in a godless world, a world where values, if they exist at all, are fluctuating and/or empty. Jacobsen and Mueller place Ionesco against the general background of the theatre of absurd and of meaninglessness in the modern world generally. In so doing, they speak of the Death of God:

The most terrifying absurdity of our century is the phrase "God is dead". To come to the belief, after many centuries in which the world's order, meaning, and purposes have been predicated on God's being, that God has absented himself is to feel a strange emptiness, homelessness, and disappearance of familiar guides and landmarks. ⁴

The theatre of the absurd witnesses "not only to man's sense of mortality, alienation and robotization but also to his sense of God's death". ⁵

In an essay which devotes much attention to Kafka, Ionesco has commented upon the metaphysical feeling which one has in an absurd world:

This theme of man astray in the labyrinth, without a guiding thread, is primordial, as we know, in Kafka's work: If man has no guiding thread, it is because he no longer really wanted one. Hence his feeling of guilt, his anguish, the absurdity of history. Anything without a goal is absurd: and the ultimate goal can only be found outside history, it ought to guide the history of mankind, in other words to give meaning. Whether we like it or not, this reveals the profoundly religious character of all Kafka's work . . . ⁶

Ionesco himself draws attention not so much to a "guiding thread" or a goal as to a condition in which the positive and the negative are both present in all parts of life, as "the obsessive truths [love, death and wonder] that are most fundamental to us". ⁷ He also obliterates the dichotomy between comedy and tragedy.

"As far as I am concerned", says Ionesco, "I have never been able to understand the difference that is made between the comic and the tragic. As the comic is the intuition of the absurd, it seems to me more conducive to despair than the tragic. The comic offers no way out. I say 'conductive to despair', but in reality it is *beyond despair or hope*." But this is precisely the liberating effect of laughter . . . "To become conscious of what is horrifying and to laugh at it is to become master of that which is horrifying

... logic reveals itself in the illogicality of the absurd of which we have to become aware. Laughter alone does not respect any taboos; the comic alone is capable of giving us the strength to bear the tragedy of existence. The true nature of things, truth itself, can be revealed to us only by fantasy, which is far more realistic than all the realisms".⁸

Ionesco's words "beyond despair or hope" seem quite important to me because they support my thesis that his plays are not ideological battlefields upon which either hope or despair is to be defended as the ruling constituent of the universe. Rather, Ionesco attempts, through comedy, to describe and make present man's ultimate position in the universe, and that position has much that is positive about it.

In *Ionesco and Genêt*, Jacobsen and Mueller⁹ also adopt a thematic approach which is metaphysical and, more specifically, theological. They assert that Ionesco presents "a panoramic view of man's history" in four stages: "(1) What was the nature of the original paradise? (2) How was that paradise lost? (3) What is the nature of the present fallen world? (4) What is the way, if any, of regaining paradise?"¹⁰ Thus they seek a mythical structure (listing *Amédée* under original paradise and *Piéton* under redemption) whereas I seek a structure of "meaning" in life and therefore treat the two plays together as representing free, creative spirit as it struggles to overcome the world's barriers to its life.

Ionesco has two sets of thematic categories which he himself has devised:

Two fundamental states of consciousness are at the root of all my plays These two basic feelings are those of evanescence on the one hand, and heaviness on the other; of emptiness and of an overabundance of presence; of the unreal transparency of the world, and of its opaqueness The sensation of evanescence results in a feeling of anguish, a sort of dizziness. But all of this can just as well become euphoric; anguish is suddenly transformed into liberty.

. . . . This state of consciousness is very rare, to be sure.

. . . . I am most often under the dominion of the opposite feeling: Lightness changes to heaviness, transparency to thickness; the world weighs heavily; the universe crushes me. A curtain, an insuperable wall, comes between me and the world, between me and myself. Matter fills everything, takes up all space, annihilates all liberty under its weight Speech crumbles¹¹

It is the sense of heaviness which is, of course, most familiar to Ionesco's audience. And this "heaviness" is at least in part due to the death of God, to the disappearance of "real, felt values". Nevertheless, within this "heaviness" there is a desperate struggle to live effectively which is often overlooked, and it is the element of *struggle* which makes even his most devastating plays positive. But here the intent is to examine two plays where "lightness" momentarily reigns supreme. This lightness occasionally overpowers some of his characters, carrying them far beyond the confines of ordinary existence. Here there is not struggle, but rather sheer joy which simply overwhelms, which somehow—even if only temporarily—abolishes and nullifies all the pain and ugliness and uncertainty and horror. Such is the case with the hero in both *Amédée* and *Piéton*.

"Lightness" and "Heaviness" are, of course, metaphorical terms and need to be translated into critically viable terms. One way to express them is to contrast euphoria and evanescence with depression and paralysis.

Within these overall terms are three sets of opposing categories which appear in both of these plays: *self-expression* versus sterility, *love* versus alienation from the loved one, and *freedom* versus alienation from society and/or capitulation to it. In both plays lightness and euphoria are symbolized by the spontaneous flight of man.

Amédée, in *Amédée*, has been weighed down for fifteen years by a deadly, sterile marriage, by an inability to write his play and by a corpse—a corpse growing steadily by geometric progression—in his bedroom. His wife, Madeleine, is unable to share the love, tenderness, vision of freedom and evanescence Amédée tries to offer her. She is steady and dependable, but cold and rough. Amédée is finally driven, by the corpse's sheer bulk (it is growing larger than the apartment) to take it onto the streets and dispose of it. Suddenly, this ponderous body becomes a gigantic balloon and Amédée floats away; when his wife objects, he protests loudly and pathetically (though the crowd comments that he *looks* happy enough) that he cannot help abandoning her. He ascends in spite of himself. As he floats ever higher, he generously disperses his clothing and cigarettes to the crowd below.

Thus freedom and euphoria are seen as joyous, as compelling and as irresponsible. For if he floats away forever, he can never finish his play (self-expression) and cannot achieve union with his wife (love). His freedom is consequently somewhat Gnostic in that the concrete, material world must be abandoned in order to reach such freedom. It is entirely conceivable, however, that Amédée will return, and the play closes as the crowd speculates on this possibility. If he does return, it is not impossible that the experience of liberation and the disappearance of the corpse will render him better able both to write and to draw Madeleine into his vision and experience of love. The flight is thus both a defense against his present failure, an escape from his inability to cope, and also a liberation which may open the way for future fulfillment.

In *Le piéton de l'air*, Bérenger (also a writer), his wife and daughter (Joséphine and Marthe, respectively), are living in England (temporarily, it seems). The family goes for a Sunday stroll and Bérenger suddenly starts to walk a foot or so above the ground. His practical wife and other adults scold at such frivolity, while his daughter and other children in the area are entranced. Bérenger insists that true flight is a natural capacity of *man*; it has nothing to do with the technology of the airplane but is rather innate and childlike, something we have forgotten how to do, something most have forgotten that we *ever* knew how to do. Here one is reminded of Mircea Eliade (a friend and countryman of Ionesco) who conceives of the condition of modern man as constituting a "second fall", a symbol which parallels the death of God. Eliade contends that the fall occurred when man ceased to be wholly at one with the sacred and that at this point religion arose, for man still remembered "that time" or paradise and sought to return to it by re-creating it through sacred ritual.¹² Today, he contends, man has lost the memory of "that time" and has therefore also lost any conscious desire to return to it.¹³ Ionesco's adults have lost the conscious desire to fly.

Faith and desire play perhaps the most important role of all in the recovery of the ability to fly. "It's perfectly simple. All you need is the will to do it. You've got to have confidence", declares B erenger. We learn that truly desiring to fly is sufficient to make flight possible, even easy, provided one accepts it as natural and approaches with confidence rather than with fear. Loss of faith, and consequently loss of altitude, occur when one does not believe in and accept it as natural.

One thinks here of some close parallels with certain New Testament themes, particularly in the Synoptic Gospels. To desire the Kingdom of God truly, desire it enough to put one's whole confidence in it, is to be assured that God will admit one. One must turn away from what *seems* to be the natural order of things, from all that seems obvious in the worldly point of view, from the "old aeon", and accept instead life in the Kingdom as the true estate to which God summons us in our deepest natures.* Similarly, B erenger in *Pi eton* refutes the obvious "fact" that man cannot fly, despite the ridicule and criticism of all those around him except Marthe, the child, who truly believes and can see reality as he sees it. The rest catch only fleeting glimpses or do not see it at all.

As Jesus emphasizes the need for faith, and often, in the healing stories, tells the cured man that his *faith* has healed him, so B erenger emphasizes the need to believe that flying is natural and to have confidence so as not to fall. One is reminded of the story of Walking on Water as told in Matthew. When Peter, following his Master, begins to doubt, he begins to sink, and Jesus rebukes his lack of faith.¹⁵ This theme is also similar to Jesus' calming the storm and rebuking the disciples for being afraid.¹⁶

Much of the message of Jesus emphasizes the simplicity, directness, spontaneity and total absorption of faith, and it is commonly held that these are the qualities of childlikeness which are needed to enter the Kingdom. Similarly, simplicity, directness, spontaneity and utter fascination characterize the children in Ionesco, and also Marthe and B erenger. Their complete absorption again parallels Jesus' repeated demand for total dedication to the Kingdom along with his claim that such dedication is a joy and a delight, not a burden, for the Kingdom is something which captivates one completely by its attractiveness.¹⁷

The Kingdom is, however, something which comes *into* this world and transforms it, not a far away land to which we *escape* from this world, and in his second flight B erenger is soon to discover a vast difference between his joyful flight within the world and his flight beyond. Gradually, he rises and flies out of sight; then he returns, much saddened to tell his family that beyond the horizon there is only a terrible Apocalypse-like vision of men with heads of geese, "Men licking monkeys' behinds and drinking the sows' piss".¹⁸ He saw giant grasshoppers, fallen angels and

*This is not to suggest, as did nineteenth century liberalism, that the Kingdom of God is found by man's following his "natural" and moral impulses, that man in his present nature just needs to improve his standards. Rather, it is a radically new and transformed nature to which man essentially belongs, just as the naturalness of flying is radically opposed to and different from what man in his present state deems "natural".

vanquished archangels; thousands of men being whipped, the whole of paradise in flames where the Blessed were burning, and knives and tombs. Ultimately, Bérenger went beyond our spatial directions and "reached the ridge of the invisible roof where space and time come together".¹⁹ He saw bottomless pits on deserted plains. At this point the crowd draws apart in fear, just as they did when he suggested that they come with him and learn to fly. Only his family hears of the final scenes of infinite expanses of ice and fire. "Deserts of ice, deserts of fire battling with each other and all coming slowly toward us . . . nearer and nearer and nearer".²⁰ Unlike the others, his daughter and his wife believe him, and the latter asks him to take them immediately—one under each arm—and fly them "much further away, far on the other side of Hell". But Bérenger replies, "I'm afraid I can't my darlings. After that, there's nothing . . . nothing but abysmal space . . . abysmal space".²¹

The Gnostic tinge does not appear in this play, not only because Bérenger returns to his wife and family, to the earth—which is the most important point—but also because the life of spirit flying unfettered and separated from earth encounters not joy and salvation, but infinite terror. Bérenger returns to cry and conquer *this* world.

Just as Bérenger describes the abyss to his family, they see the red lights in the distance and hear music which is "tristement 'gaie' ".²² Marthe confesses she is afraid, but Bérenger assures her it is only the festival, a sort of English July fourteenth. With bowed heads, they turn toward the village.

Despair may seem to be the only answer, and yet Bérenger is relieved that, for now at least, reality presents only firecrackers, not deserts of fire. Also Marthe—who represents both vision and realism—has the final lines, saying: "Perhaps that's all that's going to happen, just firecrackers . . . Perhaps it will all come right in the end . . . Perhaps the flames will die down, perhaps the ice will melt, perhaps the depths will rise. Perhaps the . . . the gardens . . . the gardens . . ." ²³ They go out as a family bound together and reunited after all have seen terrible visions, some earthly and some beyond this world. Marthe has been able to see beyond the nightmare phantoms of her mother and is able to express hope even after Bérenger's testimony about the beyond. And in spite of everything, they are united in love. God is dead and infinity or the beyond appears only under the guise of terror. Nevertheless, here and now, love and unity reduce the apocalyptic horror to the proportions of mere firecrackers.

The meaning of flight in the preceding seems to be that flight is a legitimate, joyous and creative power which symbolizes the lightness, freedom and evanescence which belong to man's spirit. It constitutes an imagination not weighed down by the banality and emptiness of much of ordinary life. However, flying too far, flying beyond the world (instead of flying within the world as Bérenger does at first) cuts both Amédée and Bérenger off from literary creativity and from family and love, at least for the duration of the flight beyond. And for Bérenger it involves a vision of ultimate terror. The symbol of flight is thus an ambiguous one representing freedom and imagination and also isolation and horror.

Flight is necessary to man's happiness, as Bérenger claims, but it must be carried on without cutting oneself off from the real world. Like the Kingdom of God, it should be a transformation *within* the world, not an escape from it.

Given the ambiguity of the symbol, it is not surprising that critical interpretations are varied and often negative. Flight could mean either that the world is hopeless since the ultimate reality Bérenger sees is one of infinite terror, or it could mean that flight is an escape from reality and man must find his salvation otherwise.

I offer here the interpretations of three critics, ranging from negative to positive. On the negative side, Jacobsen and Mueller say that Bérenger has ventured "into the world of physical death, where, he hopes, he will find the joys of which this world has furnished an imitation".²⁴ However, his return is "heralded by a graying landscape" and lovely country turned to smoking ruins. Buoyancy is destroyed because the other world is a bottomless abyss filled with horror: he has seen that the "desert wastes of *this* world are but dim adumbrations of the full horror and nothingness which is to come".²⁵ His answer that beyond Hell there is nothing is an acknowledgement of the Killer's shrug.²⁶ Marthe's curtain lines offer no more than "a ghost of a hope".²⁷ I feel that this interpretation is far too negative, that the flight is liberating as well as terrifying and that the end does offer hope.

Pronko offers a mildly positive interpretation. First he attributes to Gouhier the declaration that the Bérenger characters are "symbolic of the refusal to submit to the pressures of society." Man's nature, memory and dreams seem to point to "a being perfectly integrated in nature, to whom flying, like walking, is second nature".²⁸ He is at ease and joyous. "But, alas", Pronko says, "Bérenger's story is simply one of wish fulfillment, for although he claims man can fly as high as infinity, his experience shows that sooner or later he must bump his head against the sky and come tumbling down".²⁹ Pronko, however, sees the voyage into outer space as also being a voyage within, through which he discovers his own personal death as well as "the possible annihilation of the human race". The Bosch-like visions suggest the terror of war in the atomic age. The flight itself he sees, nevertheless, less as a wish fulfillment than as an expression of the creative spirit. The more level-headed and unimaginative wife is embarrassed by the poetic and physical flights and tries to hold him down, but the daughter shares his visions "which suggests . . . that the poetic and childlike are neighboring worlds". For his flight "represents his inspiration, his writing. He flies because he is powerless to do otherwise . . ." ³⁰ Against those who seek a more practical purpose for his levitation, he stands opposed to mechanization "for a human universe" and for going back to "natural ways of doing things".³¹ Thus the flight is valuable for its own sake, regardless of what the terrors of the universe may be. With this much I can agree. I cannot, however, accept his statement that the end of the play offers "no affirmation, simply the wish that the garden might bloom again".³²

Finally, Sénart offers an interpretation which—curiously enough—is

by far the most religiously orthodox and explicitly theological and which, at the same time, presents the most positive view of the conclusion of *Piéton*. Ionesco offers, he says, a theatre where man tries to reclaim God's promise through a rediscovery of childhood.³³ But, says Sénart, Bérenger mistakenly believes that to wish to fly is to be able to fly and he interprets this attitude to mean that Bérenger thinks he can be God if he likes.³⁴ Thus Sénart's assessment of flight is negative. Redemption, he argues, does not come from attaining high altitude as Bérenger believes. Salvation comes from re-entering one's own heart which is where the Father dwells.³⁵ Rather than imitating angels, we should nail ourselves to the Cross if we wish to become God. He says Amédée perhaps accomplishes man's Passion in extricating the corpse ("la Faute") from his apartment, and he appears to agree with Bérenger that if we love men, there'll be no more strangers and no more Hell.³⁶ Bérenger flies free and can go where he wishes . . . to the end of the world if he likes. But the world has no end.³⁷

Nevertheless, he sees in Bérenger's return to earth and to the family a positive outcome, perhaps Ionesco's most positive one. The road along which M. Ionesco and his family travel is not a "dead end" (as Sénart believes the throne to be in *Exit the King*—an interpretation I would strongly resist), but a road which continues to wind through the countryside towards shadowy gardens and uncertain hopes.³⁸ I would agree that the outcome is positive as Sénart says, though I am far from embracing his theological tenets which wholly ignore the chaotic, modern world for which "God is Dead", and to which I believe M. Ionesco primarily directs his writings.

It is important that Sénart links the flight to the return to earth, even though I do not agree that the flight was quite simply a mistake. For the meaning of the flight must be considered in terms of its effect on meaningful human relationships as well as in itself. Sénart sees the ending not as a defeat forcing Bérenger to return, but as a positive affirmation of the world and of the emphasis placed on love and human ties in the play. I would add that the flight has also deepened and enriched these ties.

Flight represents lightness, freedom from heaviness. True it is in part a defensive reaction. Both Amédée and Bérenger are trying to escape from defeat and/or frustration. But the symbol of flight is basically ambivalent; the negative aspects do not rule out the positive values. In my view, Bérenger's flights, both the early one within the world and the later one beyond it—for the two are quite distinct, however, often that distinction may be ignored—are each positive. The former offers joy and exuberance and creativity here and now, a sort of living both within the world and beyond it. (One might be reminded of Paul's admonition to be *in* the world but not of it.) The later flight confronts Bérenger with the ultimate horror of life in its most brutal and unmitigated form. The fact that he finds darkness rather than light in the higher reaches does not prove that he should have stayed earthbound any more than the Crucifixion and the Descent into Hell prove that Jesus should never have preached and led the disciples. The fact that Bérenger returns to earth and the family does

not prove that he should never have left in the first place. For he returns with a deeper awareness than he had when he left. His childlike exuberance may have been partly destroyed or seriously chastened; Joséphine's fears have been confirmed by the reality of what he saw.

Yet he is stronger when he returns than when he left. Shaken and saddened, he still takes charge of his family, and reassures them concerning the fading fireworks of the festival. And although he affirms that there is nothing beyond Hell but the infinite abyss, he emphatically adds (twice) that there is no danger "pour le moment". The only present "horror" is harmless firecrackers. And to this is added Marthe's hopeful closing speech.

The play ends, as Sénart contends, with the family headed uncertainly into the future; and in the end they are decidedly earthbound. But quite a lot of wisdom, liberating as well as saddening, has been gained in the course of the play. Flying is neither as simple nor as joyous as it initially seemed; like all else, it is accompanied by tragedy. Orthodox theology has no place here, but nevertheless there is a kind of immanent "death of God" faith which asserts the value of going beyond the world in order to enter more deeply into it. The resurrection is not an erasure of pain and an ascension to heaven, but rather a return—with far deeper awareness—to the total context of life and to a family bond of love which will henceforth be stronger, whatever the future may hold.

NOTES

¹ Richard N. Coe, "Eugène Ionesco: The Meaning of Un-Meaning", in *Aspects of Drama and the Theatre*, ed. Kathleen Robinson Committee (Sydney, New South Wales: Sydney University Press, 1965), p. 10.

² Martin Esslin, *The Theatre of the Absurd* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., 1961), p. 137.

³ Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume II: Existence and the Christ* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 33 ff.

⁴ Josephine Jacobsen and William R. Mueller, *Ionesco and Genêt: Playwrights of Silence* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), p. 26.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14

⁶ Eugène Ionesco, *Notes and Counter Notes: Writings on the Theatre*, trans. Donald Watson (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964), pp. 256-257.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁸ Esslin, p. 133. (Italics mine)

⁹ Jacobsen and Mueller, p. 26.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Quoted in Esslin, p. 105.

¹² Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of Eternal Return*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Published for the Bollingen Foundation by Pantheon Books, 1954), p. 4.

¹³ Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row Publishers, 1961), p. 213.

¹⁴ Eugène Ionesco, *A Stroll in the Air; Frenzy for Two, or More*, trans. Donald Watson (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1965), p. 79.

¹⁵ Matt. 14:28-31

¹⁶ Matt. 8:25-26

¹⁷ See Rudolph Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion*, trans. Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Wolf (London: Lutterworth press, 1943), *passim*.

- ¹⁸ Ionesco, *A Stroll in the Air*, p. 112.
¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 114.
²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 116.
²¹ *Ibid.*
²² Eugène Ionesco, *Théâtre III* [Rhinocéros, Le Piéton de L'air, Délire à deux, Le Tableau, Scène à quatre, Les Salutations, La Colère], (Paris: Gallimard, 1963), p. 198. (The reference to "sadly 'gay'" music is omitted in Watson's English translation).
²³ Ionesco, *A Stroll in the Air*, p. 117.
²⁴ Jacobsen and Mueller, p. 69.
²⁵ *Ibid.*
²⁶ See Eugène Ionesco, *The Killer and Other Plays* [The Killer, Improvisation: or, The Shepherd's Chamelon, Maid to Marry], trans. Donald Watson (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1960).
²⁷ Jacobsen and Mueller, p. 92
²⁸ Leonard C. Pronko, *Eugène Ionesco, Columbia Essays on Modern Writers*, No. 7. (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. 37.
²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 38.
³⁰ *Ibid.*
³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 30
³² *Ibid.*
³³ Phillippe Sénart, *Ionesco* (Paris: Editions Universitaires [Classiques de XX^e Siècle], 1964); p. 110.
³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 112.
³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 113.
³⁶ *Ibid.*
³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 101
³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 116-117.