

# The Strange Case of Samuel Beckett vs. Artistic Freedom in Theatre

## Thomas Pallen

In 1957, Samuel Beckett wrote **Endgame**, a script that begins with the following stage direction:

Bare interior. Grey light. Left and right back, high up, two small windows, curtains drawn. Front right, a door. Hanging near door, its face to wall, a picture. Front left, touching each other, covered with an old sheet, two ashbins. Center, in an armchair on casters, covered with an old sheet, **HAMM**. Motionless by the door, his eyes fixed on **HAMM, CLOV**. Very red face. Brief tableau.<sup>1</sup>

The passage goes on to describe at length a series of actions by Clov that precedes the opening dialog. Throughout the script, Beckett distributed other stage directions that indicated blocking, character interpretation, and pauses in dialog.

Beckett had established this pattern of elaborate stage directions in his earlier play, **Waiting for Godot**. The opening set description reads tersely enough, "A country road. A Tree. Evening." But here, as in the later **Endgame**, Beckett provides descriptions of actions ("Estragon, sitting on a low mound, is trying to take off his boot. He pulls at it with both hands, panting. He gives up, exhausted, rests, tries again. As before."), movements ("advancing with short, stiff strides, legs wide apart"), and emotions ("irritably. . .gloomily. . .feebly").<sup>2</sup>

Alan Schneider directed the first United States production of **Endgame**, at New York's Cherry Lane Theatre, in 1958. He communicated closely with Beckett and followed the playwright's instructions precisely. In "Waiting for Beckett: A Personal Chronicle," Schneider described Beckett's stage directions for this play as, "essentially and specifically valid." explaining that he followed those directions faithfully and expected actors and designers to follow suit.<sup>3</sup>

Later in the same article, Schneider noted, "Throughout, I kept constantly in touch with Sam, letting him know all about our ups and downs, and continuing to question him in detail—his answers always opening up new vistas and new possibilities."<sup>4</sup>

Here, we have one possible paradigm for theatrical production, a director who maintains close contact with the playwright and makes every effort to follow the writer's wishes precisely. This model is fairly typical of first productions of plays, or, as in this case, a premiere in a major theatre center of a particular country, situations in which the playwright is likely to take an interest in the production and remain open for questioning. It also typifies revival productions of the works of certain playwrights, notably the 1984 revival of **Death of a Salesman**, with which Arthur Miller worked as extensively as with the premiere of **Salesman** in China. This approach to production does not by any means indicate a weakness or lack of originality on the part of the director. Rather, it represents a legitimate and respectable artistic choice, the decision to follow the playwright's intention as expressed through dialog, stage directions, and, if possible, direct contact.

There exists, however, another potential prototype, a production in which the director chooses to interpret the playwright's script more broadly, even if the interpretation results in what some would consider a violation of the writer's vision and design. This model comes into use most frequently as a result of one of two conditions. On the one hand, the director may have seen a faithful production of the play in question and, like David Hays approaching the design of Schneider's **Endgame**, determined "to do everything exactly differently."<sup>5</sup> This directorial choice may emerge from a feeling that the faithful production was flawed in some way or from that sense of artistic experimentation, investigation, and expression that has led artists through the ages to revisit old themes and subjects. On the other hand, the director may decide that the play as written would not communicate its ideas to a modern audience. This latter approach has led to a great many reinterpretations of Greek, Roman, Elizabethan, Neoclassical, and Restoration dramas.

Having dubbed the first model "faithful," I will label this one "conceptual," meaning that the director brings to the play an idea different in some way from the playwright's own. When this approach meets the scripts of deceased playwrights, the director stands on safe ground, at least until the concept encounters the challenges posed by audiences and critics. Difficulties can occur much earlier, though, when the playwright is still alive to dispute the director's concept.

Such a problem struck the 1984 American Repertory Theatre (ART) production of **Endgame**. Director Joanne Akalaitis took a conceptual approach to the play by setting it in an abandoned subway tunnel. Writing in **Theatre**, Jonathan Kalb provided the following description of David Stein's scenography:

Broken steel girders outline the top of the back wall, which is about twenty feet high and made of metal plates. . . . To the left and right are partial lifesize subway cars, situated diagonally, no track in sight, as if strewn there by a tremendous explosion. Their windows have no glass and are charred at the top edges, indicating a fire. The electric lights on the cars are unaccountably illuminated, as are a line of theatre striplights offhandedly lying in a rubbish pile in front of Nagg and Nell's ashbins. Centered in the floor of black mud is a large puddle that reflects the various stage lights, and beside the pool is a charred human body.<sup>6</sup>

The production also featured a score by Philip Glass that included introductory and incidental music. According to *Theatre Crafts*, "The set and music of the ART production was [sic.] anticipated as being part of an exciting new interpretation of a modern classic" by artistic director Rober Brustein and his company.<sup>7</sup>

Samuel Beckett did not see it that way. Or, to be more accurate, Fred Jordan, the Vice President of Grove Press, did not see it that way. After attending a preview performance, Mr. Jordan reported what he had seen to Barney Rossett, President of Grove Press, whose company publishes the American editions of Beckett's works and who acts as the writer's American agent. Mr. Rossett, in turn, contacted Beckett, who lives in Paris and, like Mr. Rossett, never actually saw the ART production. Beckett subsequently ordered his New York lawyer, Martin Garbus, to file suit to stop ART from opening and running *Endgame*. According to accounts published in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, Beckett objected to the departure from his scenic description, to the Glass score, and to the casting of two black actors in the roles of Hamm and Nagg, which, according to Beckett, "Introduced the topic of 'miscegenation' into the play."<sup>8</sup>

Jordan, Rossett, and Garbus each commented on the ART interpretation. A *New York Times* article quoted Rossett as claiming that, "Beckett, for better or worse, writes in an extremely precise way. . . . Apparently, some people believe in a play only the dialogue counts. With Beckett, the silence, the set, the costumes, the lighting all count. It's all of a piece. The same article cites Garbus as arguing,

For example—some of Beckett's plays are set in the desert. . . . He's very much interested in images of aridity, desperation. Here they have images of water. Beckett's plays deal with timelessness. This production takes place in a subway after a nuclear holocaust. It might be a valid vision. It is not his vision.

Jordan added, "Beckett doesn't want to be interpreted. (He has said in the past,) by interpreting me, you destroy my meaning."<sup>9</sup>

On Beckett's behalf, then, Mr. Garbus, "Threatened to file suit in U.S. District Court in Boston to stop the theatre from staging 28 planned performances of the play on the grounds that the author's copyrights had been violated."<sup>10</sup> This suit raises an interesting and vital question. How far do the playwright's copyrights extend? Do they simply keep theatre companies from producing a script without paying royalties or do they commit the director, designers, and actors to following the script's text, both dialog and stage directions, to the letter?

Current copyright law protects the playwright's text in two ways. First, no one may use the text or any part of it in any way without the original author's permission. Second, no one may produce the play without the original writer's permission. In either case, these protections endure for the life of the playwright plus fifty years and permission is usually obtained not directly from the writer but indirectly through a publisher or agent.

The first of these provisions received a test in 1968 from Arthur Miller. A company called the Wooster Group had invited Miller to attend a rehearsal of a 45-minute segment from *The Crucible* that they planned to incorporate into a new production titled *L.S.D.* Miller refused permission to use the segment and a letter from Miller's agent, Steve Sultan, to the Wooster Group's Artistic Director, Elizabeth LaCompte, stated that, "Mr. Miller feels, strongly, that extensive use of language, characters and scenes amounts to an unacknowledged complete rendering of the play." Nevertheless, the Wooster Group opened *L.S.D.* with the *Crucible* segment cut to 20 minutes but still present. Mr. Miller subsequently had his lawyer, John A. Silberman, threaten to seek an injunction that would stop the show because, "Any and all performances or other uses of *L.S.D.* constitute an infringing use of. . . valuable and protected copyright."<sup>11</sup>

The Beckett case addresses the second provision of copyright law, asking to what extent a production company must adhere to the playwright's text. This question has led to two incidents within recent years, one in which the playwright stopped a production. (The playwright was Edward Albee, the play *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*)

Theatre Arlington in Arlington, Texas, attempted to produce *Woolf* with an all-male cast. I can remember hearing for years rumors that Albee originally intended the play to be performed in this manner, rumors that obviously do not sit well with the playwright. Albee sued the theatre to stop production, contending successfully that an all-male production violated the intentions of his script. A UPI dispatch quoted Mr. Albee as saying that, "Several aspects of the plot, such as the disclosure of an hysterical pregnancy by one character, make a homosexual version ludicrous." Albee also maintained that, "All the copies of my plays have a number of clauses which say that they must be performed without any changes or deletions or additions and must be performed by actors of the sex as written."<sup>13</sup>

Mr. Albee's first claim makes a great deal of sense; his second statement, however, is not quite true. In published and acting editions of Albee's scripts, as in scripts by other playwrights, a version of the following boiler-plate paragraphs usually appears on the verso of the title page:

Anyone presenting the play shall not commit any act of omission by which the copyright of the play or the right to copyright same may be impaired.  
No changes shall be made in the play for the purpose of your production unless authorized in writing.<sup>14</sup>

While Albee is correct about additions and changes, he is mistaken about the gender of actors or characters, although the judge in this case held for the playwright.

Similar statements appear in the American editions of Beckett's plays as published by Grove Press.<sup>15</sup> Note that the second paragraph does not state whether permission for changes should be secured directly from the playwright or from an agent or publisher.

In the instance of the **Virginia Woolf** production in Texas, a court decided that these conditions had been violated. Samuel Beckett's lawyer, however, settled out of court, apparently feeling that the playwright's rights had not been sufficiently violated to secure a judgment against the ART. As is the case with most laws, the copyright statutes contain more grey than black and white.

To recapitulate, the ART production of **Endgame** bothered Beckett and his agent and lawyer in these respects: 1) ART set the play in an abandoned subway tunnel rather than in the space described by Beckett, who called for a bare room with two small windows, a door, and a picture; 2) the ART production included music by Philip Glass, whereas Beckett had not indicated music in his script; 3) the cast included two black actors, playing Hamm and Nagg; 4) a puddle of water appeared on stage as part of the setting.

An examination of each of these points seems in order, beginning with the puddle of water objected to by Mr. Garbus. To support his feelings about the puddle, Mr. Garbus contended that, "Some of Beckett's plays are set in the desert. . . . He's very much interested in images of aridity, desperation. Here they have images of water."<sup>16</sup> Mr. Garbus may be correct in claiming that **Endgame** contains images of desperation. As for images of aridity, they certainly occur in other Beckett plays, but not in this one. Beckett states that one of the two windows looks toward an ocean. Both Hamm and Clov discuss this ocean, and Nagg and Nell reminisce about their honeymoon near a lake. The fact that "Some of Beckett's plays are set in the desert" has nothing to do with this play, which Beckett set in a structure located on the edge of a sea.

The objection to racially-mixed casting raises an issue that is simultaneously more serious and more ridiculous than the puddle of water. Barney Rossett protested the use of Ben Halley, Jr., and Rodney Hudson in the roles of Hamm and Nagg in a letter to Robert Brustein, claiming that "two of the actors are purposefully black" and that their presence led to a production that "wants to know about miscegenation," since a white actress played Nell.<sup>17</sup>

Since Beckett, Rossett, et.al. based their threat to sue on copyright law, the text of the play becomes the proving ground for the validity of this objection. At various points in the script, stage directions describe Hamm and Clov as having "very red" faces, Nagg and Nell as having "very white" faces.<sup>18</sup> The dialog contains only one reference to skin color. About two thirds of the way through the play, Hamm asks, "Am I very white?" to which Clov replies, "Not more so than usual."<sup>19</sup> Neither dialogue nor stage directions contains any direct statement that identifies any character racially. Beckett does not provide any explanation as to why Hamm's face is "very red" while his parents' faces are "very white," or why Hamm, with his "very red" face should ask whether he is "very white."

Jonathan Kalb felt that the racially mixed cast "implies that these four people are simply arbitrary survivors who happened to be trapped together when the bomb exploded," a notion that ignores the obvious familial relationship linking Hamm, Nagg, and Nell.<sup>20</sup>

Ignoring for the moment the concept of miscegenation, a case could be made that while a black person might well be described as having a red face, having a black character ask if he is "very white" seems every bit as ridiculous and contradictory as having a male character describe his hysterical pregnancy. In opposition to this position, consider that the spirit of the two plays in question differs considerably. **Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?** is a dark, menacing play about human relationships. **Endgame** also treats human relationships, but in a comic spirit. Conversations between Hamm and Clov embody the spirit of vaudeville or burlesque routines. The almost farcical nature of the action becomes apparent at the very start of the play when Clov, attempting to check the view from the windows, continually forgets that he needs a stepladder to reach them and then fails to realize that he does not need the ladder to uncover the ashbins in which Nagg and Nell reside.

Given this pervasive comic atmosphere and Hamm's ruddy countenance, it seems fair to ask whether Hamm's question should be taken seriously. Indeed, the absurdity of having a black Hamm ask, "Am I very white?" seems absolutely right for the play. The juxtaposition of black, red, and white also suits Akalaitis' overall attempt to suit the play to a modern audience living in a world in which these three skin pigmentations possess connotational permutations that did not exist when Beckett wrote **Endgame**. Furthermore, giving Hamm a black father and a

white mother, far from introducing the subject of miscegenation, makes the same kind of sense as having each parent ensconced in an ashbin.

In a resolution opposing Rossett's objection to the presence of black performers, Actors Equity stipulated that, "The union of stage actors' strongly abhors any suggestion that nontraditional casting is inappropriate in Mr. Beckett's "Endgame," which speaks to the universality of the human condition."<sup>21</sup>

Nor does the use of music specifically violate the intention of Beckett's text, particularly the music of Philip Glass. Glass is a member, indeed one of the founding members, of a school of music referred to by critics as "minimalism." His compositions feature repetitive, pulsing ground phrases beneath rhythmic figures separated in identity only by occasional small alterations in tone or timbre. According to Jonathan Kalb, Glass's score of *Endgame*,

sounds like a steel drum and guitar pulsing in quick syncopation as a deep, repeating electric bass line creates an ominous, epic undertone and another string instrument (a zither?) builds a sense of progression with a treble melody. Primitive rhythms on ultramodern instruments, like rock and roll tribal dancing.<sup>22</sup>

Would the presence of such music violate Beckett's dramatic intentions? While the stage directions do not stipulate music, neither do they insist upon any absence of music. Many of the conversations between Hamm and Clov embody images of change that is not change, Beckett's expression of the familiar French epigram, "Plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose."<sup>23</sup> This same theme permeates Glass's music, making the score and the script eminently compatible. In a *New York Times* review, Mel Gussow felt that the music also complemented the scenery, terming Glass's score "peripheral but supportive, a fierce scraping, like the sound—to extend the underground imagery—of a subway car careening off the track at high

Finally, I come to the matter of the ART's subway setting. Beckett describes the physical location of the action as an empty room with two high-placed windows and a door. The dialog of the play suggests but does not explicitly state that Hamm, Clov, Nagg, Nell, and an anonymous boy are the last remnants of the human race. The play does not contain any direct reference to a disaster or catastrophe that might have reduced the population to these five individuals. Apparently, other species have nearly disappeared as well. Hamm orders Clov to kill both a rat and a flea because they might serve as progenitors for another human race.

The room described by Beckett suggests a partially-buried shelter in the midst of a desolate landscape, with the sea on one side and barren land on the other. For the first U.S. production, Alan Schneider and his designer, David Hays, used the Cherry Lane Theatre's stage itself to realize this setting. As Schneider explained,

After (Hays) had submitted several designs, all of which were rejected, we discovered that the stone-and-brick walls of the Cherry Lane stage were marvelously available and suited to represent Hamm and Clov's "shelter"—even to the extent of having a doorway at the proper location for Clov's "kitchen." This discovery provided us with a most useful and authentic interior whose actual walls and floor produced sound of great effectiveness and which could be lit well and simply. How to manage the windows posed our only problem; eventually, and with Sam's wholehearted approval—we painted them, complete with window frames, boldly and theatrically on the wall at the back. (One part of the frame was made practical to allow for its opening near the end of the play.)<sup>25</sup>

Today, we have largely forgotten the concept of the fallout shelter that would have naturally occurred to us as a setting for this play in the 1950's. With that image dead, director Akalaitis and designer Douglas Stein sought an equivalent and settled on an abandoned subway tunnel. They believed that this environment would convey Beckett's setting to theatre audiences in contemporary Boston, a city possessing a subway system.

The design alters Beckett's stage directions in several specific ways. First, Stein took Beckett very literally in regard to placing the two windows "high up," locating them so high on the set's upstage wall that they were nearly hidden from the audience. Clov reached these lofty portals by climbing two ladders built into the wall.<sup>26</sup> The presence of these integral ladders unfortunately obviated much of Clov's wonderfully farcical business with the "steps" business described in great detail by Beckett in the opening stage direction:

CLOV goes and stands under window left. Stiff, staggering walk. He looks up at window left. He turns and looks at window right. He goes and stands under window right. He turns and looks at window left. He goes out, comes back immediately with a small stepladder, carries it over and sets it down under window left, gets up on it, draws back curtain. He gets down, takes six steps (for example) towards window right, goes back for ladder, carries it over and sets it down under window right, gets up on it, draws back curtain. He gets down, takes three steps toward window left, goes back for

ladder, carries it over and sets it down under window left, gets up on it, looks out of window. Brief laugh. He gets down, takes one step towards window right, goes back for ladder, carries it over and sets it down under window right, gets up on it, looks out of window. Brief laugh. He gets down, goes with ladder towards ashbins, halts, turns, carries back ladder and sets it down under window right, goes to ashbins, removes sheet covering them, folds it over his arm.<sup>27</sup>

The diminution of this burlesque dumbshow, particularly at the very start of the play, is unfortunate. None of the critics or the complainers mentions how Akalaitis handled this or other places in which Clov forgets or remembers the “steps.”<sup>28</sup>

Aside from the ladders, the presence of burned and abandoned subway cars, theatrical striplights in a trash heap, and a charred human body certainly complicates Beckett’s “bare interior.” Reviewer Mel Gussow noted that, “Douglas Stein’s set is the opposite of an empty room. . . . One could consider the set a visualization of what Clov refers to in the play as a ‘muck-heap’.”<sup>29</sup>

Beckett’s challenge to these alterations produced the following results in an out-of-court settlement with the ART’s Artistic Director, Robert Brustein. First, the ART agreed not to use Beckett’s name in any advertisements for the production unless they also contained the following statement, written by Beckett or by one of his representatives:

Any production of **Endgame** which ignores my stage directions is completely unacceptable to me. My play requires an empty room and two small windows. The American Repertory Theatre production which dismisses my directions is a complete parody of the play as conceived by me. Anybody who cares for the work couldn’t fail to be disgusted by this.<sup>30</sup>

Second, the company agreed to insert a sheet into the program that repeated these denunciations and reproduced Beckett’s description of the set. This page also included “A statement from (Barney) Rossett which decried ART’s refusal to stop the production, remove Beckett’s name from it, or indicate that it was an adaptation.”<sup>31</sup> The opposite page of the insert carried rebuttals from Artistic Director Brustein, arguing that, “Plays are living documents, that the effort to make a theatre company observe every parenthesis in the text will turn the theatre into a waxworks.”<sup>32</sup> According to Hillary DeVries, writing in the **Christian Science Monitor**,

A printed statement of support (from) James Leverett, a director of the theatre Communications Group, called the action by Grove Press and Beckett ‘deeply disturbing’ and one that ‘seems to be denying the basic energies of the collaboration that distinguished theatre from the other arts.’<sup>33</sup>

A number of writers have raised their voices to oppose Beckett’s attempted interference with ART’s production. In defense of Stein’s scenography, Mel Gussow maintained that, “If we accept the metaphorical setting of the play to be a bunker in a world after the nuclear holocaust—a view that is supported in the text—then Miss Akalaitis could be credited with having made a defensible scenic interpretation.” He also upheld the ART’s respect for the play itself, noting that, “The director has not only respected the meaning of the dialogue, she has been attentive to the author’s pauses, silences and intonations. . . . this is a valid representation of the original work.”<sup>34</sup>

Alice Hale, writing in **Theatre Crafts**, cautioned that,

The potential danger here seems to be that modern plays will become museum pieces after their first (and supposedly definitive) production. . . . While the impact this could have on directors is clear, the threat to a designer’s work is also visible.<sup>35</sup>

Dan Sullivan, of the Los Angeles **Times**, defended the director’s position as a collaborative artist while claiming that,

It was time, then, for a playwright of stature to speak out in defense of the text. But when you look at Beckett’s specific objections to ART’s ‘Endgame’ production, you wonder if he doesn’t demand more allegiance to the text than it’s in the nature of the theatre to allow—more than would be healthy even if the theatre could allow it.<sup>36</sup>

Finally, Jonathan Kalb added,

A 1985 audience comes to a performance of **Endgame** with a very different consciousness from that of the audience which saw the play when it first appeared in 1957. The distinctly contemporary set of facts and prejudices they carry into the theatre

color their perceptions of the play in ways that a shrewd director does well to appreciate.<sup>37</sup>

None of these writers mentioned the rather intriguing possibility raised by Barney Rossett, that a director who wishes to interpret a play be allowed to do so, provided that the resulting production is clearly labeled. Directors such as Peter Brook and Harold Prince already do this as a matter of course. We have had "Peter Brooks' Production of *Marat/Sade*, for example, and, more recently, "Harold Prince's Production of *Candide*." While this presents an engaging solution to the copyright problem, it also conjures the specter of programs and posters proclaiming, "John Doe's Interpretation of Alan Schneider's Production of Samuel Beckett's *Endgame*." Printers, at least, would love it.

Fortunately for the ART, Beckett and his associates did settle out of court and their objections probably helped rather than harmed the production by drawing critical and spectatorial attention to this *Endgame*. In her *Theatre Crafts* article, Alice Hale compared Beckett's actions to other recent intrusions upon theatrical interpretation, including the insistence by Music Theatre International that companies wishing to produce *Fiddler on the Roof* use the original Jerome Robbins choreography and the possibility of "restrictions. . . on the construction and operation of *Audrey II*," the maneating plant at the center of (*Little Shop of Horrors*).<sup>36</sup> These two examples, like others cited by Hale, involve requirements explicitly stated as part of a licensing agreement between publishers or agents and a production company. The Beckett challenge was not so straightforward.

Stein and Akalaitis did not violate a clause in a license. Rather, they exercised the kind of artistic interpretation traditionally understood as a prerogative of designers and directors, the right to translate the script's stage directions into a visualization that suits the production and the audience at hand. This is a right that playwrights deny at their own risk, since, as Alice Hale contended, interference with the directorial or design process "might limit possible future production of their works."<sup>39</sup> Faced with a dictatorial playwright, companies might well choose to produce other scripts while waiting for the copyright to expire. If a playwright insists upon controlling every detail of *mise-en-scene*, many directors and designers will bypass that writer's work in favor of a script that keeps open the door marked "Artistic Freedom."

It seems very likely that the unwritten guarantee of a share in the creative process drew designers and directors to theatre in the first place; cancellation of that guarantee could easily drive them out again. While some playwrights would no doubt see this as an attractive situation, the theatre would find itself a considerably poorer art form as a result.

Finally, while the question of racially-mixed or nontraditional casting calls for a separate study, I want to return to it briefly. Had Mr. Rossett not raised this question in regard to ART's *Endgame*, would anyone have noticed it? Unfortunately, little evidence exists upon which to base an answer.

A few years ago I directed a production of Archibald MacLeish's *J.B.*, in which black actors played both Mr. Zuss and Mr. Nicles, the two circus employees who assume the roles of God and Satan as the drama proceeds. This production took place in a small Southern town with an economy based largely upon industry and agriculture, and on a university campus known for its conservative taste in practically everything. In this atmosphere, where adverse comments regarding my casting choices would seem quite natural, they proved almost nonexistent. Indeed, the only direct reference to race that I can recall hearing came from a colleague of mine in the Philosophy Department. To begin a discussion session after one of the performances, he remarked in a semi-jocular tone, "I've always known that Satan was black, but I didn't realize that God was, too."

Racially blind casting occurs far less often in theatre than in opera, where the practice has gone unquestioned long enough that having Placido Domingo play Pinkerton to Kathleen Battle's Cho-Cho-San would not bother or even effect audiences or critics in the least, provided that both singers performed well. The producers and directors of opera base their selection of performers upon questions of talent and reputation rather than race. Their color blindness has by now become part of the conventions of opera production. While followers and practitioners of "legitimate" theatre might consider many of opera's conventions ridiculous, they would do well to imitate this one.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Beckett, *Endgame*, trans. Beckett (New York: Grove Press, 1958), 1.

<sup>2</sup>Samuel Beckett, *Waiting for Godot* (New York: Grove Press, 1954), 6,7,8.

<sup>3</sup>Alan Schneider, "Waiting for Beckett: A Personal Chronicle," *Chelsea Review*, Sept., 1958, 3,9-17,19-20; rpt. in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of ENDGAME*, ed. Bell Gale Chevigny (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), 18-19.

<sup>4</sup>Schneider, 21.

<sup>31</sup>Hale, 21.

<sup>32</sup>Kastor, C9.

<sup>33</sup>Hillery DeVries, "Playwrights Dispute: Testing Theatre's Collaborative Role," **Christian Science Monitor**, Dec. 19, 1984, 24.

<sup>34</sup>Gussow, C13.

<sup>35</sup>Hale, 65.

<sup>36</sup>Sullivan, 41.

<sup>37</sup>Kalb, 88.

<sup>38</sup>Hale, 69.

<sup>35</sup>Hale, 65.

<sup>5</sup>Schneider, 20, explains that Hays made this determination after seeing photographs of the original Paris production of **Endgame**.

<sup>6</sup>Jonathan Kalb, "The Underground **Endgame**," **Theatre**, Spring, 1985, 88-89.

<sup>7</sup>Alice Hale, "Whatever Happened to Poetic License?" **Theatre Crafts**, 19:5, 64.

<sup>8</sup>Dan Sullivan, "Playwright vs. Director: Who Has the Last Word?" **Los Angeles Times**, Feb. 10, 1985, 41.

<sup>9</sup>Kastor, Elizabeth, "Beckett's Blast," **New York Times**, Dec. 13, 1984, C9.

<sup>10</sup>Kastor, C9.

<sup>11</sup>Samuel G. Freedman, "Miller Fighting Group's Use of Segment from 'Crucible'," **New York Times**, Nov. 17, 1984, 14.

<sup>12</sup>Freedman, 14.

<sup>13</sup>UPI, "Albee Seeking to Close an All-Male 'Woolf'," **New York Times**, Aug. 3, 1984, C5.

<sup>14</sup>These are the standard paragraphs used by Samuel French, Inc., in scripts. Other publishers use similarly worded statements. In this case, the paragraphs come from John Guare's **The House of Blue Leaves** (New York: Samuel French, 1971), 2. As in most scripts, this page also contains lengthy statements regarding production royalties and copying of the script.

<sup>15</sup>For **Endgame**, the copyright statement reads as follows: "All Rights Reserved. . . . CAUTION: This play is fully protected, in whole, in part, or in any form under the copyright laws of the United States of America, the British Empire including the Dominion of Canada, and all other countries of the Copyright Union, and is subject to royalty. All rights, including professional, amateur, motion picture, radio, television recitation, public reading, and any method of photographic reproduction, are strictly reserved. For amateur and stock rights, apply to Grove Press, Inc....", Beckett, **Endgame**, /ii/.

<sup>16</sup>Kastor, C9.

<sup>17</sup>Freedman, Samuel G., "Actors Equity Protests Beckett Cast Criticism," **New York Times**, Jan. 9, 1985, C17.

<sup>18</sup>**Endgame**, 1, 2, 9, 14.

<sup>19</sup>**Endgame**, 64.

<sup>20</sup>Kalb, 90.

<sup>21</sup>Freedman, "Actors Equity. . .," C17.

<sup>22</sup>Kalb, 89.

<sup>23</sup>See for example, **Endgame**, 4, 13-14, 45.

<sup>24</sup>Mel Gussow, "Stage: Disputed 'Endgame' in Debut," **New York Times**, Dec. 20, 1984, C13.

<sup>25</sup>Schneider, 19.

<sup>26</sup>Kalb, 89.

<sup>27</sup>**Endgame**, 1.

<sup>28</sup>For example, **Endgame**, 28, 73.

<sup>29</sup>Gussow, C13.

<sup>30</sup>Quoted by Kalb, 88.