

Relativity and Indeterminacy in Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*

Mehdi Sepehrmanesh¹

Abstract

Propounding the notions of relativity and subjectivity with regard to truth by such thinkers as Nietzsche and also the promoters of Modern physics such as Einstein has induced a kind of revolution in human thought. Nietzsche argues that what is called truth is nothing more than an illusion, because all phenomena differ day by day and thus our appraisal of them cannot be the same in different times. Einstein holds that everyone has their own assessment of reality due to their specific situation in the world; therefore different people have different views about the same phenomenon. In his *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, Pirandello shows the significance of the characters' situation in determining their views of reality – hence the relativity and indeterminacy of both reality and truth. Moreover he blurs the borderline between reality and illusion by mingling them and thereby creates a diversity of perceptions for his readers and audience. The relativity, indeterminacy and polyphony that exist in his play do not let the readers or the audience to grasp any solid truth or firm meaning out of it.

Keywords: relativity, indeterminacy, reality, truth, the observer's position

Introduction

The present paper seeks to investigate the notion of indeterminacy in the text of the play, *Six Characters in Search of an Author* by Pirandello with regard to truth. In Pirandello's play, this indeterminacy can be viewed through the relativity occupying the spaces of his plays.

¹ MA-holder in English Literature, Instructor at Islamic Azad University, Jam Branch, Bushehr, Iran.
Email: Mehdi.sepehr330@gmail.com, ID: LLT-1029

Different days will bring the characters different experience and in different circumstances, the characters retain various views toward their surroundings. The researcher intends to illustrate the influence of this concept on the work of Pirandello.

Luigi Pirandello, the son of a wealthy owner of sulfur mines, was born in Sicily in 1867. He did not follow his father's desire to become a businessman. He pursued his study in philosophy at the University of Bonn in Germany where he got his doctorate in 1891. Pirandello began his literary career as a poet but soon turned to fiction and published his first widely recognized novel, *The Late Mattia Pascal*, in 1904. He wrote more than forty plays, the most well-known of which are *Is It So!* (1916), *Six Characters in Search of an Author* (1921) and *Henry IV* (1922), and *Each in His Own Way* (1924). He was awarded the noble prize for literature in 1934 and died in 1936. Michael L. Green states that Pirandello in his plays questions the "objective" or "scientific observation" as a means of ascertaining truth... his characters as well are put in a situation to challenge the meaning of truth and illusion (2001:1466). Pirandello's plays have influenced much of the twentieth century's playwriting. Martin Essline, who coined the term theatre of absurd, affirms: "Pirandello has transformed our attitude to human personality and the whole concept of *reality* in human relations by showing that the personality-character in stage terms- is not fixed and static entity but an infinitely fluid, blurred, and *relative* concept" (1993:189-190).

Method

After the Wars a sense of skepticism preoccupies the thinkers' and theorists' mind, and Pirandello, as a writer and philosopher, could not escape the influence too, and in his plays he has reflected his ideas along with the growing skepticism about the "objective reality" which was long-held by philosophers and theorists, defending modernity. Pirandello's idea and philosophy may have best been summed up in what Olga Ragusa remarks that "truth is always relative", and a person's view of reality to a great extent depends on his or her circumstance (2001:1205). *Six Characters in Search of an Author* (1921) is the greatest dramatic play of Luigi Pirandello by which the borderline between reality and illusion is put into question. Pirandello believes that truth is relative depending on a person's situation; the illusory meaning of what is real is different for different people. Robert Burstein holds, Pirandello might believe in the existence of objective truth. Though he illustrates that how this truth cannot be "grasped" by human's mind because it is in a "continual state of flux" and changes with each individual (1964:295).

Everyone can have his or her own view of reality. Modern physics also alongside the twentieth century thinkers conducts the relativity of truth and that truth is something subjective not objective. Consequently, everyone can have his or her measure of reality based on his or her circumstance. Likewise, Heisenberg, one of the forerunners of quantum physics asserts that when we are attempting to verify the truth of observation, the observer's existence must be taken into consideration. This is what happens in modern physics that no definite or single perception toward events exists. Different people see the truth in his position and all of them are simultaneously true. Nietzsche is the other philosopher talking about truth calling it illusion. Nietzsche himself in his essay "On Truth and Lying in a Non-Moral Sense" (1873) puts it very clearly by bringing some examples that "we believe that when we speak of trees, colors, snow and flower, we have knowledge of the things themselves, and yet we possess only metaphors of the things which in no way corresponds to the original entities" (1873:877). By this, Nietzsche means that what we observe in the world is one thing and what we perceive through our mind is something else. We are translating that world of things only by naming, through metaphor, which is not "truth" because we are experiencing a different world.

He also adds that another problem arising from this perception is that we use the same name or term to designate different experience. As a case in point, we call today's leaf by the same name we used to name yesterday's. Thus, Nietzsche asserts, every concept comes into existence by making similar and equivalent that which is not equivalent and similar through forgetting those characteristics that make one thing differs from another (*Ibid* 871). This is where Nietzsche coincides with poststructuralist theorists. He pulls the veils of illusion from our eyes and argues that there is not an absolute truth. Truth falls into the trap of language and metaphors, which refer it to something else. In his famous assertion Nietzsche defines truth as "a mobile army of metaphors, metonymies"...in which human relations are subjected to rhetorical perceptions and translations which after having been used for a long time have established themselves as 'canonical and binding'. Truths are nothing but illusion; metaphors which after being used for a long time have lost their effect and we have become oblivious to them that they are merely illusions and metaphors (*Ibid* 881). Thus, when there is no truth why are we searching for it? Nietzsche replies that "truth is a useful illusion, one that serves as a fundamental drive to survive" (Leitch, 1873: 871). Truth is an illusion by which we have beguiled ourselves that it exists in order to have an excuse for survival.

Discussion

Father' and Mother' View in Relation to Reality

As we can see in this play *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, there are six characters coming on the stage while at the same time another play is in the making, maintaining that they are in search of an author to write down their drama which, as they say, is inside them. Furthermore, there are some challenges occurring between the characters and actors on the stage on which the characters' and actor's identity could be revealed thus aggravating the conflict between the "reality" and "illusion". Accordingly, the very notion that truth is relative to different groups can be embarked upon from disparate perspective. Through the play, we can observe that characters' view toward each other vary depending on their circumstance. One of these relations takes place between The Father and The Mother.

After having come on the stage, these characters, as told, have a drama inside them needing to be written down by an author. The story of the drama goes in a way that The Father, a character of the play, has let the mother go off with another man working as a secretary for The Father. He did so in order to make The Mother happy. It is better to see his wife happy than cage her at home, The Mother thinks that he has been so cruel to do that. She argues that she did not leave the house for passion, as The Mother says, "I didn't abandon my house and my son through any fault of mine, nor from any willful passion" the argument The Father accepts, "it is true. It was my doing" (1952:I.222). The Father explains that he saw them, his wife and his secretary, had fallen in love with each other. He got the man fired but he saw that his wife was suffering a lot staying at home. He then decided to let her go to make her happy while these years he had been suffering having her away. This is The Father's view and thinks he is right in his judgment. However, this very act of compassion of his, as he believes, is received by The Mother as the most ferocious of cruelties. The Mother argues that she had been compelled by The Father to leave the house, as she says to The Father "you drove me away" and The Father answers, "do you hear that? I drove her away! She believes I really sent her away" (1952:I.224), and he elaborates his reason to The Manager why he sent her away,

The Father: Very well then: listen! I had in my service a poor man, a clerk, a secretary of mine, full of devotion, who became friends with her. [*indicating the Mother.*] they understood one another, were kindred souls in fact, without, however, the least suspicion of any evil existing. They were incapable even of thinking of it.

The Manager: And why didn't you send him away then__ this secretary of yours?

The Father: Precisely what I did, sir. And then I had to watch this poor woman drifting forlornly about the house like an animal without a master, like an animal one has taken in out of pity. (I.225-226)

These were the reasons The Father brings about why he had dismissed The Mother. He wanted to see her happy with the secretary but he caused them and himself to live in misery and misfortune. The Mother, however, believes that he had forced her to go away and thereby live in wretchedness with the secretary. The Mother sees the reality of her life this way. Both of them are correct in observing the truth in their situations. Alongside with relativity, the concept of indeterminacy may as well be traced. Who is right? Who is wrong? Both of them believe they are right in their judgments. Moreover, The Mother also claims that The Father had stolen The Son from her and did not let him go with her while The Father believes states that he did that because he wanted him to grow up in a better situation,

The Mother: He took my son away from me first of all.

The Father: But not from cruelty. I did it so that he should grow up healthy and strong by living in the country. (I.226)

The Father summed up this indeterminacy and relativity in the fact that each of us has within ourselves a world of words, designating different things outside. We think we are able to know the others' world, translating what they have through our mind and find out that we have reached the truth. I have done something as I have believed it to be the right thing which is ,though, perceived by The Mother as something quite different to what I have given value to. Everybody has his own translation of the world based on the value he gives to the things around that might be to a certain extent contrasting to the other's translation,

The Father: But don't you see that the whole trouble lies here. In words, words. Each one of us has within him a whole world of things, each man of us his own special world.

And how can we ever come to an understanding if I put in the words I utter the sense and the value of things as I see them; while you who listen to me must inevitably translate them according to the conception of things each one of you has within himself. We think we understand each other, but we never really do (I.224).

This is actually the motto Pirandello presents to the world about our perception of it that we, furthermore, cannot be sure of what we are to the others as we are to ourselves. Everyone has his reading and translation of you based on his circumstance and point of view of you.

The son's and The Mother's argument

In another occasion, The son is criticized by The Step-Daughter and The Father for having been cruel toward The Mother after her come back home. The Step-Daughter is also very angry with The Son for treating her sister and brother badly compelling them to live in misery. The Father blames The Son for his misbehavior toward his mother. The Son declares that how he was to know that she was his mother when a person out of nowhere had come stating that I am your mother. The Son actually has his own outlook of reality,

The Son: It's easy for them to put me always in the wrong. But imagine, gentlemen, the position of a son, whose fate it is to see arrive one day at his home a young woman of impudent bearing, a young woman who inquires for his father, with whom who knows what business she has. This young man has then to witness her return bolder than ever, accompanied by that child there.... He asks money of him in a way that lets one suppose he must give it to her, *must*, ... because he has every obligation to do so.

The Father: But I have, as a matter of fact, this obligation. I owe it to your mother.

The Son: How should I know? When had I ever seen or heard of her? One day there arrive with her [*indicating* Step-Daughter.] that lad and this baby here. I am told : "This is *your* mother too, you know."

I divine from her manner [*indicating* Step-Daughter *again*.] why is it they have come home. I had rather not say what I to feel and think about it. ...

The Father: What? It is just because you are so that...

The Son: How do you know what I am like? When did you ever bother you about me? (I.232-233).

The son has his own perception of reality and sees in his standing his own truth. He has been accused of treating his mother and the children of his mother badly. He defends himself, arguing that he has not heard from them and suddenly he is told that she is your mother. This is his condition. However, they have bitterly blamed him for his treatment in spite of the fact that he says I have my own truth in that situation and thereby I am to be believed too. The truth here is relative. Both sides are true. All these characters have truth in their situation different from one another.

Characters' Truth against Actors'

After having accepted to write down the drama of the characters, The Manager assigns some actors to play out the roles of the characters. Some characters, especially The Father and The Step-Daughter, are not satisfied with the way their roles have been acted out. At one point of the play, when these actors are going to play the roles, The Step-Daughter disagrees because she says that it is not the real setting she used to be in. She proceeds that it is not the real place. The Property Man replies that this is all we have. We cannot make the scene according to what you want and we do not have the facility to do that. At the same time, The Manager sets the scene for the actors to play out the role of The Step-Daughter. This arises the objection of The Father. He contends that we are real characters and actors are going to pretend what we really are. They cannot play our roles. Even when The Manager decides to change the real name of The Mother for the play, The Father again objects that it is her name and why it should be changed.

The Step-Daughter as well objects that I cannot see myself in another costume. The Father again insists that we should ourselves play our own roles because we are real characters and no one else can play our roles. The Manager points out that via make up the will look real. They are going to pretend reality through make up just making the actors to appear fictitious.

The father believes truth exists in us, not in the actor. Moreover, unlike the actors who consider the characters as illusory, the characters claim that they are real and it is actors who are illusory, fictitious, and just through make up want to pretend that they are real. In one part of the play, The Father makes a distinction between the character and the actor,

The Father: ... A character may always ask a man who he is. Because a character has really a life of his own, marked with his especial characteristics; for which reason he is always "somebody". But a man__ I'm not speaking of you now__ may very well be "nobody".

...

The Father: But only in order to know if you, as you really are now, see yourself as you once were with all the illusions that were yours then, with all the things both inside and outside of you as they seemed to you ... but the very earth under you feet is sinking away from you when you reflect that in the same way this you as you feel it today__ all this present reality of yours__is fated to seem a mere illusion to you tomorrow?

The Manager [*without having understood much, but astonished by the specious argument*]: Well, well! And where does all this take us anyway?

The Father: Oh, nowhere! It's only to show you that if we [*indicating the Characters.*] have no other reality beyond the illusion, you too much not count overmuch on your reality as you feel it today, since, like that of yesterday, it may prove an illusion for you tomorrow ...

The Father: That is the very difference! Our reality doesn't change: it can't change! It can't be other than what it is, because it is already fixed for ever. It 's terrible.

Ours is an immutable reality which should make you shudder when when you approach us if you are really conscious of the fact that you reality is a mere transitory and fleeting illusion, taking this form today and that tomorrow, according to the conditions, according to your will, your sentiments ... (III.265-266)

First The Father mentions that a character is real since he has a life on his own and the man, actor, is "nobody". He clarifies the point to The Manager by illustrating that you are living as you know yourself and you are confident of that.

You think that your today's life is the same as your tomorrow's as it has been of your yesterday's. He argues that they are not the same as The Manager thought it to be. "All this present reality of yours is fated to seem a mere illusion to you tomorrow". You are different people in different situations. We have no other reality beyond illusion. You see yourself as you are living today and think it is all reality to your tomorrow and yesterday while each day you are a different person. Nietzsche contends that one of the problems arising from our perception to reality is that we use the same term to designate different experience. We bring every concept into existence by making similar that which is not similar or equivalent. We call today's leaf as we call tomorrow's, It is just the illusion. Today's leaf is not like that of tomorrow. Likewise, The Father says that our today's personality is not like that of yesterday, nor tomorrow. As Pirandello, in his essay "Umoreismo", says "that objective value which we commonly presume to attribute to our knowledge of the world and of ourselves does not exist; it is a continuous illusory construction"(1966:470).

Consequently, they (actors) cannot perform the role of characters as characters can do. They are pretending to be real; however, characters believe that we are real in our existence and do not need pretending to be real in order to be like ourselves. At the end of the play, when the two characters, The Boy and The girl die, the whole party of the actors are perplexed by the event. They are unable whether to accept it as truth or something fictitious. They are questioning the meaning of truth whether this scene is real or not. In some other parts of the play when the actors are playing The Step-Daughter's role, she for several times makes the play stop by laughing at them. She laughs when seeing herself acted out by another person. The actors get angry and want to leave the stage. The Step-Daughter believes that she cannot see herself acted out because they are not her. She maintains that I am a real character but they are pretending to be me through make up. They are just an illusion of me, [The Step-Daughter *noticing the way the Leading Man enters, bursts out laughing.*]

The Manager [*furious*]. Silence! And you please just stop that laughing. If we go on like this, we shall never finish.

The Step-Daughter: Forgive me, sir, but it's natural enough. This lady [Indicating Leading Lady.] stands there still; but if she is supposed to be me, I can assure you that if I heard anyone say " Good afternoon" in that Manner and in that tone, I should burst out laughing as I did. (II.255)

The Step-Daughter in accord with The Father holds that this is a fact that we are real and cannot be acted out by the fictitious characters. The Manager actually somehow agrees with The Step-Daughter but he goes on that we cannot show the truth because we are actors and just can demonstrate the truth to some certain points,

The Manager: For heaven's sake! What are you saying?

The Step-Daughter [*crying out excitedly*]: The Truth! The Truth!

The Manager: It may be. I don't deny it, and I can understand all your horror; but you must surely see that you can't have this kind of thing on the stage. It won't go.

The Step-Daughter: Not possible, eh? Very well! I'm much obliged to you- but I'm off. (II.258)

As Einstein says, truth is relative depending on the situation of each person. Both actors and characters are right in their perception of reality since each group sees the truth of what they perceive. Actors believe the characters are illusory while characters believe them as real. Nietzsche defines truth as an illusion we have created for ourselves in order to beguile ourselves that existing as an excuse for survival. The characters think that they are real and the actors on the stage are an illusion, especially "The Father" who seems most "dependent on vital lies for survival"(Abbot, 1959: 216).

Madam Pace's Coming on the Stage

In one part of the play, the actors are going to make the stage as the workshop of the Madam Pace. However, that does not seem much like reality. At this time The Father furnishes the stage by use of the hats and clothes of the actors like that of Madam Pace "trade" in order to show the reality of their drama.

He sets the scene by means of the actors' stuff in order to make Madam Pace appear on the stage. Madam Pace comes on the stage and suddenly all the actors get shocked by this scenery and argue that this is a trick. The Father claims that this is a real situation and the actors cannot play it since the actors pretend to be real and want to appear real through make up but we, as characters, are real and need no pretention.

No one can play Madam Pace as she does. The following is the part when Madam Pace comes on a stage and the actors think it is a trick,

The Manager: What sort of a trick is this? ...

Leading Lady: A vulgar trick!

The Father [*dominating the protests*]: Excuse me, all of you! Why are so anxious to destroy in the name of a vulgar, commonplace sense of truth, this reality which comes to birth attracted and formed by the magic of the stage itself, which has indeed more right to live here than you, since it is much truer than you_ if you don't mind my saying so? Which is the actress among you who is to play Madam Pace? Well, here is Madam Pace herself. And you will allow, I fancy, that the actress who acts her will be less truer than this woman here, who is herself in person. You see my daughter recognized her and went to her at once... (II.248)

The difference between the actor's view and character's toward reality is very beautifully depicted. Actors perceive the presence of Madam Pace on the stage as pure illusion whereas the characters see it as pure reality. As soon as The daughter sees Madam Pace, she goes to her as a person really existing while the actors on the stage observe her as a trick made by the father. Each group on the stage has a contrasting idea toward the appearance of Madam Pace. The identity of Madam Pace is floating as being the reality or illusion. However, both of them are true in their observation toward her as Modern Physics argues.

What adds to the uncertainty of the play more is when the actors become shocked by the appearance of Madam Pace on the stage in "which they no longer stood back stupified, but in fear rushed wildly off the stage into the auditorium, so by physical association encouraging the audiences' own uncertainty"(Styan,2003: 82). The audience, who might until now have no reaction to the play's uncertainty, becomes bewildered by the actors' unusual behavior in which the actors stand back seeing Madam Pace all of a sudden come into sight.

The Exchange of Roles between the Characters and the Actors

"*Six Characters* is a moving stage image of shifting roles in the process of definition" (Paolucci, 2003: 59). His characters exchange roles between each other. Characters are seeking to become actors; actors are going to be the audience of the characters and etc, which causes, as we can see through the play, Pirandello's characters to live in "a constant fluid, never fixed, [and] never tangible" (Bontempo, 1934: 586). In the play as well in several cases, the characters and actors change the roles and become another person, virtually adding to the indeterminacy of the play. They do not have a fixed stance. The actors become the characters and the characters become the actors. The Manager, who is the director, becomes the author of the drama, which is inside them. The six characters come on the stage in search of an author to write down their drama. They beg The Manager to help them exist, writing their play. They are real characters made by an author but he has refused to write their play. After some discussion with The Manager, he finally agrees to become the author of their drama. He becomes the author, actually making the actors surprised by this very act of his, from being a director to an author,

L'Ingenu: Vanity! He fancies himself as an author now.

Leading Man: It's absolutely unheard of. If the stage has come to this ... well I'm ...

Fifth Actor: It's rather a joke.

Third Actor: Well, we'll see what's going to happen next. (I.237)

The Step-Daughter also in some parts takes the place of The Manager and leads Madam Pace how to play her role. The Manager first becomes perplexed and then irritated. He orders The Step-Daughter to leave the scene and let him continue the play since now he is their author. Father even remains puzzled about the event,

The Step-Daughter: [*Addressing the Company imperiously.*] We've got to do this scene one way or another, haven't we? Come on! [*To Madam Pace*] you can go!

Madam Pace: Ah yes, I go'way! I go'way! Certainly! [*Exit furious*]

The Step-Daughter [*to the Father*]: Now you make your entry. No. you needn't go over here. Come here. Let's suppose you've already come in. like that, yes! I'm here with bowed head, modest like. Come on! Out with your voice! Say "Good morning, Miss" in that peculiar tone, that special tone ...

The Manager: Excuse me, but are you the Manager, or am I? [*To the Father, who looks undecided and perplexed*] Get on with it, man! Go down there to the back of the stage. You needn't go off. Then come right forward here. (II.251)

The Step-Daughter acts as a director here who is going to lead the actors and Madam Pace how to play their roles. The characters suddenly change third role and even when they say their role is fixed and will never change it, during the course of the event it changes. It shows the indeterminacy of the play and the behavior of its characters that even we cannot rely on what they say that we are fixed in our roles.

When six characters at the beginning of the play come on the stage, another play at the same time is in the making with some actors acting out their roles. What is meant by that is that here the characters are the audience of the actors. As the time goes on, the same actors become the audience of the characters who are playing their roles.

Leading Man [*to the Company*]: What a spectacle!

Leading Lady: We are the audience this time.

Juvenile Lead: For once, in a way.

The Manager [*beginning to get really interested*]: Let's hear them out. Listen! (I.222) In another occasion when some of the actors ask the manager, "what we have we to do then?" The manager says, "nothing. For the moment you just watch and listen"(I.242). When the characters are acting, the actors are left without a role to play and they do not know what to do and even when they ask the manager what they should do , he just wants them to be the audience of the characters.

Surprisingly, during the course of the play, some actors begin to play the roles of the characters to which the characters protests that this is not how their roles should be acted out. This time the characters again become the audience watching the actors acting.

Indeterminacy

At the beginning of the play, the characters call themselves immortal. They would not die but the actors will die someday. They are alive out of text. Paradoxically, they want to live at the same time but they cannot live without an author to write down their drama. As The Father contends,

The Father: Yes, that is the word! [*To Manager all at once.*]In the sense, that is, that the author who created us alive no longer wished, or was no longer able, materially to put us into a work of art. And this was a real crime, sir; because who has had the luck to born a character can laugh even at death. The man , the writer, the instrument of creation will die, but his creation does not die. (I.218)

However, at the end of the play we witness the death of The Boy and The Girl. As The Father mentions, they are truly dead. It is truth not the illusion. Previously, it was held that they were immortal and would never die but now The Boy and The Girl are dead. If we interpret that they are dead they have recanted their previous assertion of being immortal which actually creates an atmosphere of uncertainty and indeterminate. On the other hand, if we perceive them to be just an illusion in which they are acting as actors do, and it will, in fact, create another layer of meaning as De man states. At the end, as some actors and The Manager becomes confused about the uncertainty of the suicide of these two characters, whether it is illusion or reality, The Father denies his previous statement saying that they are really dead,

Some Actors: He is dead! He is dead!

Other Actors: No, no, it's only make believe, it's only pretence!

The Father[*with a terrible cry*]: Pretence? Reality, sir, reality!

The Manager: Pretence? Reality? To hell with it all! Never in my life has such a thing happened to me. I've lost a whole day over these people, a whole day! (III.276) This scene is one of the deciding points, in shattering the expectation of both the audience and actors of the play. They all come to question the meaning of reality and illusion. This scene also gives us another clue about the indeterminate identity of the characters who call themselves alive and immortal. Nevertheless, as Ann Balakian argues, "a real life event_ the actual drowning of a little girl and the suicide of the boy_ brings art and reality into collision, violating the created reality of the fixed characters. They cannot be represented if they no longer exist" (2003:63). More interestingly, the indeterminacy, which we observe through the play, is multidimensional. This compounds to the problem of putting on definite interpretation of the play so as to comprehend which layer is more true than the others with the fact that all layers have a truth on their own. As Harland Hatcher asserts, we are dealing with three levels of reality, none of them more real than the others, actors, characters and the fluid situation of six people in search of an author (1941:523). We cannot say which level is more real than the others.

Audience Perspective toward the Character

We as an audience are faced with different layers of reality and illusion. As was mentioned above, characters regard themselves as real, though actors see them as illusory. To compound this, not only do we see them as illusory but also our own existence comes into question. Because like the actors and characters, we as human beings are playing different roles in our daily life without certainly comprehending "what is real" and "what is illusion", and without knowing our reason for existence, we are left in search of an author like what we have in *Waiting for Godot*. Like this play, which does not come to any conclusion, both the characters and actors of the drama are left unfinished, plotless and indeterminate, and we as human beings are not sure of our ending and conclusion in life.

"This radical uncertainty closes the play as the line between what is acted and what is lived onstage is obliterated, and the manager exasperatingly"(Burt, 2008: 260) shouts: "Pretence? Reality? To hell with it all! Never in my life has such a thing happened to me". This is actually, what happens in our own life. How are we to distinguish between what is reality and what is illusion?

This matter is exacerbated when the director is asked to be an author, when The Step_Daughter plays the role of the director, when the actors are playing the role of the characters, our expectation, as an audience watching the play is also shattered.

We are left baffled to mull over “what is real” and “what is illusion”, and to question our existence as being changed and played out. Here again we see that as we are playing different roles in our life, when our roles change, our behaviors change too. Therefore, we have in each circumstance of life different perspectives toward life, thereby different views toward people. The striking thing is that the Characters of the play do not have any name and we just know them as The Father, The Mother, Step-Daughter and etc. Pirandello by this point may want to show that each of us may be one of these characters looking for their author who after having created them, refused to give them role and let them by themselves. All of the audience believes that the characters have come on the stage at will. Pirandello in this play shows that it is not so. Like our creation, which is not at our will, the characters also have come on the stage unwillingly. Pirandello meticulously tries to depict the relationship between art and life and draw our attention to our own existence. One of these "relationships between life and art is that we discover our own slippery truths through confrontations with our inventions of selves in art" (Gilman, 1974: 180).

Results

In *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, it can be seen that different groups of people have diverse ideas about the other group depending on their situation of observing that event. Characters themselves condemn each other of being mistreated by another one while both see the situation according to their own view and have convincing evidence for their proof. We as an audience give right to both of them. Further complicating the play is that characters see actors as an illusion of truth, those who through make up want to act out the real characters. However, the actors view them as illusion, not as they claim (truth).

The same relativity adds to the indeterminacy of the play. We are left uncertain to decide which group is right or is there any absolute truth? We as an audience are left confused to take side with any of them and even our own existence comes into question when seeing the play. Are we dealing with truth or illusion in our daily life? Nietzsche believes that no absolute truth exists, as today is different from yesterday and tomorrow.

Nevertheless, we give the same name to our different experience of life. Truth is an illusion with which we have deceived ourselves to survive.

References

- Abbott, Anthony S. (1989). *The Vital Lie: Reality and Illusion in Modern Drama*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Balakian, Ann (2003). "Pirandello's Six Characters and Surrealism". *Bloom's Major Dramatists: Luigi Pirandello*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publisher.
- Bontempo, O. A. (1934). "Italian Literature in 1934". *The Modern Language Journal* 8(1935). 12 Jun. 2010 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/315372>>
- Brustein, Robert.(1964). *The Theatre of Revolt: An Approach to Modern Drama*. London: Little Brown.
- Burt, Daniel S.(2008). *The Drama 1000: A Ranking of the Greatest Plays of Our Time*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.
- Esslin, Martin. (1993). "Pirandello: Master of Naked Masks" (1969). *Drama Criticism*. Ed. Lawrence J. rudeau. Vol. 5. Derroit: Gale Research Inc. 189-192
- Gilman, Richard. (1974). *The Making of Modern Drama: A Study of Buchner, Ibsen, Strindberg, Chekov, Pirandello, Brecht, Becket, and Hanke*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Greenwald, Michael L, et al. (2001). *The Longman Anthology of Drama and Theatre: A Global Perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Hatcher, Harlan. (1941). *Modern Continental Dramas*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Leitch, Vincent B. (2001). *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. (2001). "On Truth and Lying in a Non-Moral Sense (1873)". Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. Trans. Roland Speirs. *Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc. 870-883
- Paolucci, Ann. (2003). "Pirandello's Exploration of Theater as a Medium". *Bloom's Major Dramatists:Luigi Pirandello*.Ed.Harold Bloom. Philadelphia:Chelsea House Publisher.
- Pirandello, Luigi.(1966). "Umorismo". *Modern Drama: An Authoritative Texts, Backgrounds, and Criticism*. Ed. Anthony Caputi. New York: Norton.
- . *Naked Masks*.1952). Ed. Eric Bentley. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc.
- Styan, J.L. (2003). "Pirandello's Innovations". *Bloom's Major Dramatists: Luigi Pirandello*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publisher. 80-83