CrossMark

Hannah Simpson

Trying Again, Failing Again: Samuel Beckett and the Sequel Play

Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* has spawned several unauthorized sequel plays, which see Godot arrive on stage in 1960s Yugoslavia, 1980s Ireland, 1990s North America, and early 2000s Japan. The sequel play is a largely ignored phenomenon in literary scholarship, with the sequel form itself routinely dismissed as a derivative and inevitably disappointing text. Yet the sequel also re-situates and re-evaluates the original text, and its reiterative nature aptly parallels the paradox of non-ending in Beckett's original *Waiting for Godot.* Focusing on four unauthorized stage sequels to Beckett's play – Miodrag Bulatović's *Godo je došao* (*Godot Has Arrived*, 1966), Alan Titley's *Tagann Godot* (*Godot Arrives*, 1987), Daniel Curzon's *Godot Arrives* (1999), and Minoru Betsuyaku's *Yattekita Godot* (*Godot Has Come*, 2007) – this article examines how these sequels rework the cultural logic of Godot's arrival to their own critical and political ends. These playwrights draw on the very recursive, even frustrating, nature of the sequel form itself as an exegetic framework, reproducing the trope of non-ending that characterizes Beckett's own work. Hannah Simpson is the Rosemary Pountney Junior Research Fellow in British and European Drama at St Anne's College, University of Oxford. She is currently working on two forthcoming Beckett-related monographs: *Witnessing Pain: Samuel Beckett and Post-War Francophone Theatre* and *Samuel Beckett and Disability Performance.*

Key terms: Waiting for Godot, Miodrag Bulatović, Alan Titley, Daniel Curzon, Minoru Betsuyaku, ending, repetition, intertextual allusion.

THE SEQUEL, and particularly the sequel play, is a largely ignored phenomenon in literary scholarship, and yet it is neither a new nor an uncommon occurrence. From the dynastic family cycles of classical Greek theatre through to early modern history plays such as Shakespeare's Henriads and the 'spin-off' *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (published 1602), the sequel play has a rich presence in theatre history. In more recent decades, John Osborne revisited anti-hero Jimmy Porter from his ground-breaking *Look Back in Anger* (1956) in the sequel *Déjàvu* (1989). After *Long Day's Journey into Night* (written 1942, premiered 1956), Eugene O'Neill revived Jamie Tyrone in *A Moon for the Misbegotten* (written 1943, premiered 1957), and Larry Kramer followed *The Normal Heart* (1985) with the Pulitzer-nominated *The Destiny of Me* (1992). Nevertheless, the sequel play remains an under-theorized entity in theatre scholarship and, even when discussed, is typically derided as an inevitably dissatisfying, derivative form of creative production. As Carolyn Jess-Cooke observes, 'the very concept of sequelization is often met with a collective groan'.[1]

This article offers a new conceptualization of the sequel play as an unstable but regenerative and often politically inflected force, read through the proliferation of unauthorized sequel plays to Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot.* Four unauthorized sequels to Beckett's famous play are examined here: Miodrag Bulatović's Serbo-Croatian *Godo je došao* (*Godot Has Arrived*, 1966), Alan Titley's Irish *Tagann Godot* (*Godot Arrives*, 1987), Daniel Curzon's North American *Godot Arrives* (1999), and Minoru Betsuyaku's Japanese *Yattekita Godot* (*Godot Has Come*, 2007).[2]

These four texts are representative of the broad geographical and historical spread of sequel responses to *Waiting for Godot*.[3] In 1960s Yugoslavia, 1980s Ireland, 1990s North America, and early 2000s Japan, Vladimir and Estragon return to their country road – and Godot

 © CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS doi:10.1017/S0266464X21000166
https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appears before them. Yet Godot's long-awaited arrival brings no anticipated end to the waiting and suffering of Beckett's original play; instead, these texts rework the cultural logic of Godot's arrival to their own critical ends. Extending the framework of Beckett's original play to re-situate the resonances of disappointment, failure, and agonized continuance, these sequel plays re-instrumentalize Beckett's concerns in the service of their own specific social and political critiques.

Waiting for Godot and the Sequel Play

If Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* is the play in which 'nothing happens, twice', it is also the play that does not end, twice.[4] In lieu of Godot's arrival, the same static tableau is reprised at the close of Acts I and II:

ESTRAGON: Well, shall we go?
VLADIMIR: Yes, let's go.
(*They do not move.*)
Curtain.[5]

Following such carefully crafted inconclusion, the idea of a sequel to *Waiting for Godot* might seem misguided: a self-indulgent attempt to edit, clarify, or resolve this most ambiguous of endings. Indeed, for a writer to presume to offer a sequel to a play widely recognized as one of the cornerstones of modern theatre may in itself seem an act of startling literary audacity. This sentiment is exacerbated by the typically low esteem in which the sequel form is held more generally. The sequel has routinely been dismissed in both critical and popular conversation as 'a textual leech, a formulaic financial format',[6] a derivative way of 'recycl [ing] the characters of a previously successful story in order to exploit them'.[7] More generously, even if the sequel form more sincerely attempts to fill the void left by the cessation of the original text – who has not, after all, felt the pang of ending on closing a beloved book, or exiting the theatre auditorium? – it reaches for a fundamentally impossible goal. As Todd Berliner puts it, 'at the same time a sequel calls to mind the charismatic original, it also recalls its absence, fostering a futile, nostalgic desire to re-experience the original aesthetic moment'.[8]

Sequels, then, are positioned in awkward conditional relation within our cultural framework, since 'their meaning and value is premised upon something outside of themselves: the original text or pretext', and they can rarely succeed in satisfying the reader or spectator's desire for a continuation or repetition of the pleasures of the original textual experience.[9] As Terry Castle observes, the sequel 'cannot literally reconstitute its charismatic original. Readers know this; yet they are disappointed. . . . Their secret mad hope is to find in the sequel a paradoxical kind of textual doubling – a repetition that does not look like one.'[10] To create or consume a sequel is a masochistic exercise, a desperate Scheherazadesque gesture of determined continuance at all costs.

Yet the sequel also bears the unsettling power to work retroactively on the original text. The sequel text offers a continuance of the narrative, characters, and/or setting of a previous text; the earlier work taken alone may seem complete in itself, but the sequel both extends and redounds upon the original, forcing us to reconceive its boundaries and reframing our understanding of the first text in a 'kind of enforced retro-interpretation'.[11] The sequel form disrupts the boundaries of the original, extending the previously discrete, singular entity, and ultimately undermining 'any notion of definitive closure or definitive origin'.[12] The textual framework becomes still more unstable when, rather than an autographic sequel scripted by the writer of the original text, we encounter an unauthorized, allographic sequel by another writer altogether – or, in the case of *Waiting for Godot*, multiple unauthorized, allographic sequels, each scripted by different individuals spanning several geographical continents and historical decades.[13]

Thus the very traits typically cited as marring the sequel form – a failure of originality, and the disruption of discrete narrative completion – offer a neat correlative to some of the central concerns in Beckett's own body of work. The recurrent sequelizing of *Waiting for Godot* aptly parallels the paradox of non-ending

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

found in the original play, where the imperative of coming to an end is held in tension with the apparent impossibility of ever doing so. The idea of any discrete ending already bears little meaning in Beckett's writing and even less so in the case of *Waiting for Godot*, which doubles its refusal of any conventional expected conclusion at the close of each act. As Michael Austin observes, 'When the expectation for narrative closure is left unfulfilled, the groundwork has already been laid for a sequel'; it is perhaps entirely predictable that we should find such a prevalence of scripted sequels to so ambiguously 'concluded' a text as *Waiting for Godot*.[14] As a play of iconic cultural status, deliberately inconclusive in both narrative and ideological conclusion, *Waiting for Godot* is particularly susceptible to such revisionary creative practice.[15]

Indeed, throughout his own career, Beckett was fixated on the inevitable failure of creative originality, conceiving of each apparent original text as a reiterative version, or what he termed 'endless substantial variations' on what has gone before, another 'approximately adequate and absolutely non-final formulation of another kind'.[16] Beckett's 'Three Dialogues' on modern painting (1949) provides an explicit statement of his sense of the intertwined necessity of both artistic failure and the continuance of continuation itself. Here, the speaker 'B' articulates his frustration with the artist's 'obligation to express' despite there being 'nothing to express, nothing with which to express', describing the challenge of continued creative expression in terms of inexorable sequence, 'of doing a little better the same old thing, of going a little further along a dreary road'.[17]

In this context, a 'fidelity to failure' becomes the only 'acceptable conclusion' for the modern artist, the only possible 'new occasion, a new term of relation'.[18] The 'new' exists only in restricted relation to what has gone before it, a 'sequel' that is derivative yet which constitutes the only possibility of creative continuance. Thus the sequel text, as a paradoxical form of both renewal and non-renewal, fits neatly with the comparable refusal of any clear-cut sense of ending in Beckett's work: the repeated imperative of arriving at a conclusion countered by the apparent impossibility of ever doing so. It is a horror neatly summarized by Vladimir and Estragon themselves in *Waiting for Godot*:

ESTRAGON: And if he doesn't come?
VLADIMIR: We'll come back tomorrow.
ESTRAGON: And then the day after tomorrow.
VLADIMIR: Possibly.
ESTRAGON: And so on.
VLADIMIR: The point is –
ESTRAGON: Until he comes.
VLADIMIR: You're merciless.[19]

If reiterative failure is a necessary part of continued artistic creation, as Beckett suggests, and every text another 'absolutely non-final formulation' of what came before it,[20] then the inevitable failure or disappointment commonly ascribed to the sequel form becomes its crucial functioning element as a vehicle of determined non-ending, of continued creative failure. No form but the sequel can perhaps so neatly serve the modern dramatist following in Beckett's wake.

Bearing Beckett's own re-scriptive drive in mind, closer inspection of allographic sequel plays to *Waiting for Godot* reveals how the sequel form can function as a critically engaged, even a performative, continuation of these literary concerns. During periods of cultural or political destabilization, the appearance of a sequel text (and particularly an allographic sequel text) often enacts a regeneration or rejection of a prevailing value system. A writer may re-invoke an iconic figure in order to revive the established cultural tradition or ideological value which they epitomize. Simon McEnteggart has traced, for example, how post-millennium 'superhero sequels' have turned to the superhero figure as the embodiment of traditional North American values resistant to external forces of evil in order to rebuild post-9/11 patriotic confidence in the face of international terrorism.[21]

Alternatively, the sequel text may attempt to reshape the value of an emblematic figure as a statement of cultural change, as

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

exemplified by Dacre Stoker and Ian Holt's *Dracula the Un-dead* (2009), a sequel to Bram Stoker's 1897 text that stages a new vision of female agency in resistance to masculine incompetence and cruelty. In the case of Bulatović's *Godo je došao*, Titley's *Tagann Godot*, Curzon's *Godot Arrives*, and Betsuyaku's *Yattekita Godot*, these sequel plays borrow something from both ends of this regeneration–rejection spectrum, drawing on Beckett's original sceptical impulse to stage their own ideological critiques, but often with startling iconoclastic irreverence. Working self-referentially both within and against Beckett's confrontation with restrictive social hierarchies, high–low culture divides and failed progress, these plays reinvoke Godot to refract the social and political concerns of their own contemporary moment.

Miodrag Bulatović, *Godo je došao* (1996)

The staging of *Waiting for Godot* at the Theatre Ateljie 212 in Belgrade, Yugoslavia,[22] in December 1956 constituted the first performance of the play open to the public across Eastern Europe, where the text had been censored in most Communist-led countries.[23] A decade later, Miodrag Bulatović (1930–1991), one of the foremost Serbian authors of his generation, produced his unauthorized sequel, *Godo je došao* (*Godot Has Arrived*, 1966). The curtain rises to reveal Vladimir and Estragon in their familiar position from the close of Beckett's text, pondering their broken rope. The Boy enters and announces Godot's imminent arrival with Biblical fervour. Pozzo and Lucky appear, and Pozzo mocks Vladimir and Estragon for continuing to wait for Godot. When asked where Godot is, the Boy calmly replies, 'Godot is at the post office.'[24]

A storm breaks out, accompanied by the noise of a mattress's creaking springs, and as Vladimir and Estragon fall to their knees in prayer, the Boy brings an end to Act I by announcing, 'He's coming . . . It's Godot, he's just banging the postmistress!'[25] In Act II, Godot appears. He is '*an ordinary man . . . Likeable, covered in flour, with a strong nose and bushy hair*', and introduces himself as a baker; the onstage figures are visibly disappointed at his appearance.[26] Disappointment turns to terror as he grabs Estragon and begins force-feeding him handfuls of flour until Vladimir pulls him away, at which point he sets himself to building a makeshift bakery on stage, musing that he is regularly called to towns where inevitably 'the help that I bring is pitiful and imperfect . . . they don't let me finish, and I hit the road again': any conclusive 'ending' is again apparently deferred.[27] Vladimir and Estragon discuss their sufferings, and beg Godot to vomit so that they may feed, offering to stick their fingers down his throat to aid the process; he is shocked, but tries unsuccessfully to do so, in order to be of some help to them. Horrified by the general state of affairs, he demands an explanation:

> ESTRAGON: You ask why we're like this? It's well known. It's that nothing happened. Nobody came. . . .
>
> VLADIMIR: Our poor eyes have seen endless disgraces and horrors . . . Fires and assassinations, and so many lies of all sorts. . . . And while I talk to you quietly like this, they are torturing someone, I can feel it, they are cutting off his ears, they are tearing out his tongue . . . stuffing his mouths with familiar words, vile words, venom.[28]

Pozzo commands Lucky to entertain them:

> [LUCKY] *takes off his white gloves and pulls out a rubber doll in the shape of a man.*
>
> LUCKY (*striking the rubber doll on the head with his fist*): You are guilty! You are guilty! You are guilty! I have never seen you before, but you must answer for your shadowy past![29]

Bulatović parodies the repressive political machinations of his contemporary 1960s Yugoslavia by way of the tramps' invocation of torture and propaganda and this mock trial. The elaborate bureaucratic machinery of President Josip Broz Tito's oppressive authoritarian regime accommodated the frequent extrajudicial action of the secret police, and a large-scale repression enacted against Tito's alleged opponents, particularly in the decade following the Second World War, when Tito's split from Stalin's Cominform ushered in a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

new era of political instability.[30] Godot declares his intention to liberate Lucky, while begging Estragon and Vladimir again to eat his flour – 'If you eat it, your tears will be at an end!'– and they demand that he leave.[31] The four stage an imaginary battle and, at the end of the act, Godot grabs Lucky's chain and makes off with him, stuffing handfuls of flour in his mouth as he goes.

Act III opens with Vladimir and Estragon in the abandoned bakery surrounded by sacks of flour, worrying that Godot might return. The Boy reappears, prompting the pair to look offstage at the apparent sight of Godot and the postmistress: 'He's torturing her! He's torpedoing her from behind, like an ass!' – while feeding her flour.[32] Lucky and Pozzo re-enter, but this time Lucky holds Pozzo at the end of the chain, mocking Godot for thinking 'that bread and love are everything!'[33] Godot reappears and offers Vladimir and Estragon flour once more, declaring that he cannot leave without first helping to ease their pain and freeing Pozzo from Lucky's tyranny, but Lucky reasserts a determined principle of continuance:

> GODOT: And why not both of you be free together?
> LUCKY: Impossible! (*He looks Godot straight in the face.*) The rope MUST be around a neck.[34]

Vladimir and Estragon join with Lucky's threats, complaining that 'We were waiting on someone else . . . a Godot . . . not a baker . . .',[35] emphasizing the disappointment of Godot's long-awaited arrival, and Lucky arraigns Godot in a public trial. Vladimir and Estragon testify against him, complaining that 'We were never free before and then he came, and talked about it to us in order to upset us', and Pozzo declares him guilty.[36] For a few tense minutes, Godot looks set to be executed but, as another storm rises, Vladimir and Estragon announce that Godot no longer exists, and leave him alone onstage. The Boy re-enters, bruised and battered; Godot swears that he will love and protect him as his own henceforth, but the Boy rejects him, and Godot tells him sadly that he is sure that their paths will cross again one day. The play ends with Godot speaking directly to the audience:

> I hope you'll free yourself from your own swamp. (*Looking in front of him.*) But before you are freed from everything that chokes you, I beg you, forgive me. . . . At least I built a bakery here. I hope they'll discover that its foundations are deep. . . . I also leave lots of flour. . . . See you soon, my sad, my unlucky, my ridiculous brothers![37]

The trope of failed expectations runs through Bulatović's sequel. Developing the religious references from Beckett's original play, Bulatović's Godot is framed as a Christ-like figure of compassionate redemption, 'carrying meal and bread to a starving humanity' but scorned by those whom he comes to save.[38] The play's indexing to the contemporaneous Yugoslavian political terrain likewise emphasizes the disappointment of hopeful expectations in direct relation to the staging of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot.* Among other repressive measures, Tito's government began censoring theatre plays soon after their rise to power,[39] which led to the Belgrade Drama Theatre (Beogradsko Dramsko Pozoriste) self-censoring a planned first production of *Waiting for Godot* in January 1954: Godot would very literally *not* arrive in Yugoslavia for some time. The eventual staging of *Waiting for Godot* in 1956 resulted in part from Yugoslavia's beginning to permit increasing artistic influence from the West over the course of the 1950s to showcase its rift from Stalinism.[40] As such, Godot's arrival – or rather, *Godot*'s arrival – seemed to herald a new period of social and political change.

Yet this was to be another disappointed expectation. Tito's regime continued under an only slightly modified guise in what was still 'a matter-of-fact communist state',[41] under a regime which continued to arrest and torture its citizens and subject its political opponents to forced labour in the country's internment camps.[42] Indeed, Nick Miller records that the Ateljie 212's long-running production of *Waiting for Godot* continued to cause political problems for the theatre's management, as it regularly 'tweaked the bureaucratic sensibilities of Serbia's communist

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

leadership in the late 1960s and 1970s'.[43] The frustrated expectations that characterize both Beckett's play and the political landscape against which *Godot* arrived in Yugoslavia are replicated in the disappointing arrival in Bulatović's sequel of a Godot 'incapable of bringing forth the expected utopian social order'.[44]

The final lines of Bulatović's play reinforce the nightmare of endlessly disappointed hopes actualized in the sequel form itself. Bulatović's Godot promises the Boy and the audience that they will see him again, and leaves behind a bakery and flour, which Clas Zilliacus reads optimistically as representative of 'stored hope' for the future.[45] But Bulatović's sequel defers hope interminably to some unspecified point in the future, ending without ending like the final scene of Beckett's play, leaving us once again awaiting Godot's arrival and the associated hope of an improved existence. Endless non-ending is enacted simultaneously at the level of political allegory, narrative development, and the reiterative form of the sequel play itself.

Alan Titley, *Tagann Godot* (1987)

Just over two decades after Bulatović's *Godo je došao*, Alan Titley's Irish-language *Tagann Godot* (*Godot Arrives*, 1987) appeared. Titley (b. 1947) is a professor of Modern Irish at University College Cork and the author of a number of novels, short stories, and plays. *Tagann Godot* was produced at the Abbey Theatre in February 1990; Beckett himself allegedly wrote a personal letter to Titley prior to the play's production, wishing him luck with the project.[46] Once again, the sequel play opens on the same scene as that which ends Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*: the two tramps waiting on a country road beneath a tree, with a bit of broken rope. The opening dialogue mimics the original play closely:

ESTRAGON: I can't go on like this.
VLADIMIR: That's what you think.
ESTRAGON: And if we left? That would perhaps be best.
VLADIMIR: And if we hang ourselves tomorrow? (*Pause*) That's it. Unless Godot comes. . . .
VLADIMIR: Let's go, then.
ESTRAGON: Yes, let's go.
(*They don't move. Pause.*)[47]

Further nods to the play's status as a sequel pepper the ensuing dialogue, emphasizing the reiterative nature and potential disappointment of the sequel form:

VLADIMIR: It's never as good the second time round. It's fresh the first time.
ESTRAGON: I'm not sure about that. Me, I missed everything the first time around.[48]

The Boy enters, and promises that Godot will arrive soon. Shortly thereafter, a new group of characters arrive: the well-groomed Progastoron, the beautiful Momo wearing a Las Vegas-style bikini and a fake smile, and Mí-Ábha, whose name puns on the Irish word for 'unlucky', thus reversing the connotations of Beckett's Lucky.[49] Mistaking Progastoron for Godot, Vladimir and Estragon join in his game show, tempted by the promise of prizes. The game is farcically rigged: strapping Mí-Ábha into an electric chair, Progastoron and Momo declare all his answers incorrect, punishing him with a painful electric shock each time, whereas Estragon's equally nonsensical answers win him a refrigerator, a food mixer, home cinema equipment. Eventually, Estragon wins the grand prize, 'Eternal life!', and is promptly hanged from the tree, with shockingly brusque efficiency.[50] Progastoron, Momo and Mí-Ábha then turn menacingly on Vladimir, when a sudden puff of smoke brings the first act to a close, with:

the appearance, once the smoke has cleared slightly, of a little man with the look of Charlie Chaplin, except that he has a long grey beard and a little suitcase like that of a family doctor. He smiles maliciously.

GODOT: And they said that I'd never come![51]

Act II opens '*a little prior to the end of the first act*' with Estragon's body still hanging from the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tree, but no Godot in sight.[52] The game-show trio again approach Vladimir, and this time succeed in strapping him into the electric chair, before Godot's entrance is replayed, in an odd reiterative moment that echoes Beckett's characteristic pseudo-sequelizing repetitions in his own plays. Godot challenges Progastoron over his materialistic motivations and his cruel treatment of Vladimir. Progastoron mocks Godot's ideals and attempts to attack him; Godot hypnotizes the game-show trio before revealing his identity. At Vladimir's request, he then reluctantly revives Estragon – 'Certain people are better off when they're dead', he warns[53] – but Estragon is displeased, berating Godot for having returned him to the pain of his physical existence. Godot threatens to leave since he is not appreciated, and Estragon persuades Vladimir that they must put Godot to death. An unresisting Godot allows Estragon to lead him to the electric chair, and Estragon kills him with a lengthy and painful electric shock. The pair hide Godot's body in the fridge, and then contemplate their situation:

VLADIMIR: There's nothing else to do.
ESTRAGON: There's nothing else to say.
VLADIMIR: There's nowhere else to go.
ESTRAGON: But we still have to go on.
VLADIMIR: In one way or another.
ESTRAGON: We must go on.
VLADIMIR: It's unavoidable.[54]

Left in the familiar Beckettian position of desiring to end but being forced to continue, the two determine to enjoy their game-show winnings. However, in a scene reminiscent of Beckett's *Act Without Words I* (1957), each time they approach a prize it is whisked offstage. Finally, the only objects left onstage are the car and the fridge; the pair open the fridge door to find Progastoron's body, 'shrieking and bleeding', in place of Godot's.[55] The pair slam the door shut and retreat, then Godot emerges from the fridge; he makes the fridge disappear, then exits in the car. The Boy re-enters, and tells them that Godot apologizes for not having been able to come today, but that he will arrive without fail tomorrow. Vladimir tells the Boy that they did see Godot, and the Boy replies, 'that couldn't have been Godot. He'll come tomorrow. For sure,'[56] leaving the tramps alone onstage in the same frustrated impasse that marked the end of *Waiting for Godot.*

There are several marked parallels here with Bulatović's earlier sequel play. Once again, Godot appears and attempts to intervene in the onstage cruelty, but garners little appreciation as a result. The Christian resonances remain, too, in Godot's Lazarus-like raising of Estragon from the dead and in the manner in which Godot himself is killed by those he seeks to redeem, before himself rising from the dead and promising (or threatening?) a second coming, leaving Vladimir and Estragon to wait despondently for Godot's promised arrival 'tomorrow'. *Tagann Godot*'s repeated denial of death's permanency introduces a literalized version of non-ending. There is a sardonically self-referential subtext in Godot's warning that 'Certain people are better off when they're dead', located as it is within a sequel text; in Titley's play, progress is markedly worse than cessation.

Indeed, *Tagann Godot* seems deliberately to exploit the 'low-art' reputation of the modern sequel form, replete as it is with elements apparently chosen specifically to jar with the audience's expectations of what might belong in a 'Beckettian' text: a showgirl in a bikini, Mickey Mouse and Santa Claus, Miss World, Vladimir's accusation to the Boy messenger that he is a young drug addict because 'All the kids are into drugs these days', and Estragon's evocation of 'AIDS, paedophilia, necrophilia'.[57]

This is, then, a darkly pessimistic sequel, ending with the tramps in continued deadlock, still more radically alienated from Godot, in a script that erases the highbrow cultural echoes that counterbalance Beckett's popular and lowbrow references in the original play – W. B. Yeats, the Bible, classical mythology – in favour of the contemporary kitsch and grotesque.[58] The play is symptomatic of Titley's own historico-cultural misgivings in a 1980s Ireland that was no longer

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

animated by the optimism of newly won independence, and with its traditional markers of cultural prestige and national exceptionalism seemingly on the wane. Titley's academic writing frequently laments the lack of recognition afforded to historical Irish literature and historiography, and the demise of the Irish language and of 'Irish Ireland': *Tagann Godot* stages a similar critique of modern capitalist culture.[59] Progastoron's game show reflects a creeping Americanization of Irish culture – MTV USA launched in Ireland in February 1984 – in which populist politics were replaced by pop-culture appeal in a modern Ireland now familiar in the global imagination for having won the Eurovision Song Contest twice in the 1980s. Yet against this consumerist backdrop, Ireland was in a period of economic recession, marked by widespread unemployment and emigration reaching similar levels to that of the 1950s.[60] According to Titley's vision of Irish life and his deliberately crass sequel to Beckett's play, 'progress' seems more like steady degeneration, a prolonged failure.

Daniel Curzon, *Godot Arrives* (1999)

Daniel Curzon (b. 1938) is a North American academic and prolific writer of queer novels and non-fiction texts. He published *Godot Arrives* in 1999, and claims not to have been aware of Titley's identically titled sequel when he began work on his own version.[61] Curzon's play again opens on the final scene of *Waiting for Godot*, and immediately launches into metatheatrical engagement with the audience and repeated reference back to Beckett's original play, establishing the performance firmly as a self-reflexive sequel text:

ESTRAGON: (*about audience*) *They're* laughing. Or at least smiling. So far.

VLADIMIR: Well, what do they know! We're not funny. (*To audience*) We're not funny!

ESTRAGON: (*blustering*) We're serious. . . . I remember. We were in a play.

VLADIMIR: A minor work.

ESTRAGON: But deep.

VLADIMIR: I'm not so sure. Easy to bamboozle people.[62]

Very soon, Godot arrives and sets about re-educating the pair, offering to 'purge' Vladimir by sticking his finger into his mouth or anus.[63] He has Vladimir lick Estragon's sweat-salted armpit, then offers and withdraws water in another pastiche of Beckett's *Act Without Words I*. The lesson, he tells them, is that 'whatever you want – you *can't* have,' and, emphasizing the dialect between continued endurance and expected ending, he teaches the pair to undergo both physical pain (kicks) and pleasure (ear-lobe fondling) without showing any reaction.[64] As the intermission approaches, Godot announces the imminent arrival of Bozo, reminiscent of Vladimir's mishearing Pozzo's name as 'Bozzo' in Beckett's original play.[65]

In Act II, Vladimir and Estragon initially continue joking with Godot, and then, declaring themselves tired of his 'profundity', they tell Godot to leave them alone.[66] The lights go out, and when the stage is re-illuminated, Bozo, a '*sinister clown*',[67] stands in his place. Bozo sets to work to counteract Godot's earlier lessons in self-denial, showering Vladimir and Estragon with snacks and teaching them to worship and adore 'the belly' and their 'wienies'.[68] After an extended period of clowning, striptease, song and dance, and recreational drug use – during which Godot occasionally reappears onstage to lament their activities – an initially playful badminton match causes conflict between Vladimir and Estragon under Bozo's malevolent supervision:

VLADIMIR: You fucking little shithead. You can't win fairly so you fuck around and think we'll give you points because you're so fucking cute! Well, you're not. You're a fuck! That's all you are!

ESTRAGON: And do you know what you are? You're an asshole. You're worse than an asshole. You're an asshole with semen and shit dribbling out of your crack.[69]

Bozo takes the opportunity to hand knives to Vladimir and Estragon, encouraging them to kill themselves to finally bring an end to the play. After some brief hesitation, holding the knives alternately to their own throats and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

then to each other's, Vladimir and Estragon turn on Bozo, chasing him offstage where they enact his grisly murder:

BOZO: No! No!

(*They kill* BOZO *offstage, stabbing and stomping him. Pause.*)

ESTRAGON: He's still twitching.

VLADIMIR: There!

(*They give a final stomp.*)[70]

Reappearing onstage, the pair chase Godot through the audience to the back of the theatre, and kill him too. Some intertextually rich discussion as to the best way to end the play follows. 'Hell is other people,' Estragon complains, borrowing the closing words of Jean-Paul Sartre's *Huis clos*; 'The rest is . . . ?' Vladimir ponders, quoting the last words of Shakespeare's Hamlet – and then the two men leave the auditorium arm in arm, still clutching their knives '*for protection*'.[71] In the play's final moments, Godot and Bozo re-enter the stage, taunt the audience for their naivety at having been fooled into thinking that they might actually be dead, and then set off after Vladimir and Estragon.

Following the readings above of Bulatović's and Titley's sequels, the progression of Curzon's play is by now eerily familiar: extended metatheatrical and intertextual humour; the tramps' rejection of Godot's proffered help; an explosion of violence; and a dejected but broadly inconclusive ending. However, Curzon pushes the trope of desperate non-ending still further than do Bulatović and Titley, insistently foregrounding textual recycling and character resurrection. Both Bulatović's and Titley's plays recycle dialogue and setting elements from Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, but Curzon lifts text wholesale not only from Beckett but from Sartre and Shakespeare as well, seemingly corroborating Beckett's own suspicion that all artistic creations might simply be 'endless substantial variations' on what has gone before.[72] A gloomy interrogation of the limits of individual agency runs through the play: 'It's up to *us*!' Vladimir and Estragon realize,[73] but they signally fail to live up to Godot's utopian assertion of their potential capacity for self-directed action, manifesting a 'fundamental discrepancy between an ideal and the human capacity to enact it'.[74]

The pessimistic disavowal of individual agency established in Beckett's original play remains in force in *Godot Arrives*, emphasized by the play's status as a sequel, necessarily bound and conditioned to some degree by its conditional relationship to Beckett's originary text.[75] Indeed, the repeated metatheatrical emphasis on Vladimir and Estragon's status as actors in Curzon's script underlines how far forces beyond their own control condition their doings. Even their eventual scripted exit from the auditorium does not liberate them. Where both Bulatović and Titley use the threat of Godot's death to dangle the (eventually denied) possibility of a definitive ending, Curzon allows Vladimir and Estragon to triumphantly escape from the stage space following Godot and Bozo's deaths, apparently drawing the cycle of action to a close . . . only to resurrect Godot and Bozo in the play's final seconds, dramatically enacting the principle of relentless non-ending that typifies both the original *Waiting for Godot* and the sequel form itself. The play's final lines emphasize the insistent continuance of the play's established framework:

ESTRAGON: Okay, let's go together . . . at least for now.

VLADIMIR: . . . At least for now.

(*They go off together arm in arm – at least for now.* GODOT *and* BOZO *enter from where they were killed.*)

GODOT: (*to audience*) Well, what else did you –

BOZO: – expect *from us*?

BOTH: Death? . . . (*They laugh.*)

(GODOT *and* BOZO *follow* VLADIMIR *and* ESTRAGON, *with determination. Lights out.*)[76]

Curzon plays with the dialectic between change and continuance here, borrowing the repeated phrase 'Let's go' from Beckett's play but modifying its phrasing and – in marked contrast to the famous final direction '*They do not move*' from *Waiting for Godot* – allowing the pair to actually leave.[77] Yet the repeated hint 'at least for now'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

underlines the strictly provisional nature of any apparent ending within the Beckettian framework, and Godot and Bozo's subsequent dialogue mockingly recalls the audiences to the 'proper' horizon of expectations set by the sequel form, in which no permanent ending or escape is possible – even, it seems, via death

Minoru Betsuyaku, *Yattekita Godot* (2007)

Breaking the cycle of these sequels' repeated impasse endings is Minoru Betsuyaku's *Yattekita Godot* (*Godot Has Come*, 2007). Minoru Betsuyaku (1937–2020) was a prominent Japanese writer, particularly well known as part of Japan's 'theatre of the absurd' movement.[78] Beckett's work has occupied a prominent position in the country's literature since the first Japanese translation of *Waiting for Godot* by Shinya Ando in 1956, and the play's popularity was given a fresh boost by the new translation by Ando and Yasunari Takahashi in 1967, which 'was quickly embraced by [a] young generation seeking social transformation'.[79]

Betsuyaku himself has testified to Beckett's influence on his writing as an alternative to realist theatre, and his sequel text stages several close similarities to Beckett's original play, with some variation.[80] Estragon wrestles with his shoe on his first appearance on the stage, complaining, 'Nothing to be done.'[81] Lucky is still chained to Pozzo, carrying his bags and obeying his commands, but is now able to converse in intelligible, if somewhat bewildered, short sentences. New action is generated by a group of unnamed women who people the stage. Woman 1 is waiting for a bus; she reveals she is going to see her estranged son, who has written to her after thirty years of absence, and Vladimir and Estragon discover that the letter was apparently written by Estragon himself. Woman 4 pushes around a pram, claiming to be looking for the child's father, who is named Vladimir. In place of the trope of characters being raised from the dead in the earlier sequel plays, here the literalized 'sequel form' is the apparent offspring of Beckett's protagonist.

Woman 2 and Woman 3 take on various administrative roles throughout the play, imbuing the waiting action with a bureaucratic officiousness. They first set up a reception desk and demand that the other characters register with them, although it is not clear what they are registering for. Later, the setting becomes an ambiguously defined 'waiting area for those who have been received', and then a hospital waiting room.[82] In Act II, the space becomes a funeral home. It is these women who first meet Godot onstage in Act I, occasioning his first farcical misrecognition in the play – is he 'Mr Goro', 'Goto', 'Gobo', or 'Gozo'?[83] – recalling the similar confusion over 'Godet . . . Godot . . . Godin . . .' in the first act of Beckett's original play.[84] Godot is eventually registered as 'GOGO?' in an intertextual allusion to Estragon's nickname in *Waiting for Godot*.[85]

When Godot meets Vladimir and Estragon, he has recovered sufficiently to introduce himself correctly, but the pair are distracted by the women searching for them and fail to take in the significance of his arrival. Godot in turn does not recognize them, and for some time the mutual confusion continues. In Act II, Godot eventually realizes his mistake, and laments Vladimir and Estragon's behaviour to Woman 1: 'I've seen them several times since yesterday, but there's been nothing like, "What the hell? You're Godot?" . . . I simply want them to know that I am who I am.'[86] The play spirals from playful farce into surreal violence. As a moon slowly rises, Vladimir and Estragon reappear onstage carrying coffins, with Lucky pushing Pozzo in a wheelchair, and Godot forces them to acknowledge him:

GODOT: I am Godot.
VLADIMIR: (*to Estragon*) He says he's Godot.
ESTRAGON: Godot?
VLADIMIR: He said so just now.
GODOT: I am Godot.
ESTRAGON: Oh.
VLADIMIR: That.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Minoru Betsuyaku, *Yattekita Godot* (*Godot Has Come*), Theatre Natori (2012). Left to right: Genjiro Mori (Estragon), Yuga Yoshino (Godot), and Mitsushi Matsumoto. Photo: Kazuyuki Matsumoto and Theatre Office Natori.

ESTRAGON: Yes.

GODOT: That Godot.

VLADIMIR: I thought so. (*To Lucky.*) But speaking of the trumpet.

GODOT: (*grabbing Vladimir's shoulders*) I AM HERE!

VLADIMIR: What?

GODOT: GODOT.

VLADIMIR: I told you, 'I know'.

ESTRAGON: Wait a minute. He must have something else to say.

GODOT: GODOT HAS ARRIVED.

VLADIMIR: (*to Godot*) You have arrived. (*To Estragon.*) And what else would he like to say besides he's here?[87]

As in the previously examined sequel plays, Godot's arrival is a disappointment, a failure of expectations on both sides. The infuriated Godot eventually loses his temper and, goaded by Pozzo, he and the women attack Vladimir and Estragon. The tramps are quickly beaten into submission ('We both get it now. You're Godot and you're here. You have come,' Vladimir begs),[88] but Godot insists that they still haven't properly understood, and continues their punishment. Lacking any further satisfaction or resolution, the other characters eventually exit, and Godot is left alone with the coffins on stage to pronounce the play's cryptic final lines:

GODOT: I am Godot. You may have heard it already. That night, Godot walked slowly towards a tobacco shop after turning the corner at the post office. (*Opens his umbrella.*) Like this.

(GODOT *walks slowly and leaves from stage left. Only the coffin is left onstage.*
Blackout.)[89]

Unlike in the other sequels discussed here, Godot does not offer Vladimir and Estragon any new philosophy of life. He has simply arrived, and is disappointed to discover that this in itself is not sufficient to win over the pair. The consequent break between Godot

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Minoru Betsuyaku, *Yattekita Godot* (*Godot Has Come*), Theatre Natori (2012). Godot, Estragon, and Vladimir, with (right) Tsuginobu Honda (Pozzo) and (far right) Shingi Yamaguchi (Lucky). Photo: Kazuyuki Matsumoto and Theatre Office Natori.

and the tramps feels more definitive than in the previous sequel plays examined here, and the final onstage image of the coffin reinforces this sense of a permanent ending to the cycle of preceding action, in sharp contrast to the promises of further waiting or return that close Beckett's, Bulatović's, Titley's, and Curzon's plays.

Betsuyaku's own relation to Beckett's work offers an instructive parallel to the final scene of his sequel play. Although noting that Beckett's theatre provided him with a generative new model for playwriting in the 1950s and 1960s, Betsuyaku declared that by the 1970s he had begun 'to deliberately separate myself from the Beckett influence', seeking a more 'extroverted' theatre, 'a celebration of things external', in contrast to what he calls the 'autistic' plays of internal dilemma which he felt Beckett's influence was driving him to produce.[90] In discussing his work, Betsuyaku habitually framed an East–West dialectic of literary tradition,[91] and as early as 1972, David Goodman highlighted the new necessity of recognizing Betsuyaku's culturally specific 'Japanese absurd' in place of a simply European-inflected theatre style.[92]

From his early self-alliance with European literary influences, Betsuyaku increasingly turned towards the specificity of regional Japanese theatre practice, in reaction against an increasingly globalized and de-signified world.[93] In this respect, *Yattekita Godot* is written in the spirit of apostasy rather than of inheritance. Where the other sequels discussed here frame Vladimir and Estragon's rejection of Godot as a mistake that returns them to a familiar Beckettian impasse at the close of each play, Betsuyaku depicts a logical disinterest in a figure who no longer offers them anything of tangible value in the new confusion of their lives.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press



The moon rises. Minoru Betsuyaku, *Yattekita Godot* (*Godot Has Come*), Theatre Natori (2012). Jun Arai, Chikako Hashimoto, Ayaji Miyauchi, and Mai Morio as the Four Women. Photo: Kazuyuki Matsumoto and Theatre Office Natori.

Foregrounding a framework of familial succession via the focus on Estragon's alleged mother and Vladimir's alleged son, Betsuyaku's play introduces a new, more urgent, and more local structure of continuance, one that takes precedence over Godot's – and *Godot*'s – legacy.

Conclusion: Regenerative Failure

From Bulatović's satire of Titoist repression and state censorship, via Titley's critique of capitalist consumption and Curzon's irreverential shockfest, to Betsuyaku's turn away from the western literary lineage to a more independent Japanese theatre of the absurd, the sequels examined here provide an insight into how Beckett's *Godot* has been adopted and adapted to each playwright's own critical ends at particular historical moments and in particular cultural climates, with varying degrees of adherence and rejection. It is not simply that the technically derivative sequel text can succeed despite its limitations; rather, these playwrights draw on the very recursive, even frustrating, nature of the sequel form itself as a crucial exegetic framework. The sequel as a mode of regenerative failure formally reiterates the various political, cultural, and ideological disappointments which these playtexts trace: the long-awaited arrivals that fail to live up to expectations, and deferred hope further deferred.

Moreover, in staging Godot's arrival as no more conclusive than his non-arrival, another 'absolutely non-final formulation of another kind', these sequel plays reproduce the trope of non-ending that we encounter across Beckett's work, the generative tension between the desire to end and the need to continue.[94] Beckett declares an inevitably 'failed', reiterative and yet regenerative form of writing to be the only possible mode of artistic continuance. Aligning the derivative and the creative together, the sequel form is itself bound up in this same impulse, allying continued artistic creation with Beckett's 'fidelity to failure'.[95] If we are dismayed by the incongruous events of these sequels – or if we still find the very action of writing a sequel to Beckett's masterpiece too audacious to accept – we might reflect that there is a crucial thematic resonance to the disappointment. These sequel plays stitch frustration and rejection into the very fabric of both Godot's arrival and their larger creative endeavour. The disappointment of the sequel text echoes Godot's disappointing arrival, and the failure of the sequel text echoes the failure of Godot himself onstage, in an acutely appropriate confluence of form and content. We can appreciate rather than condemn the sequel as a vehicle aptly suited to critically and intertextually engaged forms of continued creative failure, and one which neatly replicates Beckett's own model of 'endless substantial variations'.[96] Or, as Vladimir more pithily concedes in *Waiting for Godot*: 'Vladimir, be reasonable, you haven't tried everything. And I resumed the struggle.'[97]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Notes and References

1. Carolyn Jess-Cooke, *Film Sequels: Theory and Practice from Hollywood to Bollywood* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), p. vii.

2. Because of the rarity of English translations of Bulatović's and Titley's plays, quoted material here is comprised of my own English translations of Claude Bailly's 1967 French translation of Bulatović's *Godo je došao* as *Il est arrivé* for Éditions du Seuil, and of Láns Ó Baoil's 2006 French translation of Titley's *Tagann Godot* as *Volià Godot!* for ForSai. The page references given correspond to these texts. The English translation of Betsuyaku's *Godot Has Come* cited here is by Marc Menish and Mariko Hori Tanaka. My thanks to Toshiyuki Natori at Theatre Natori and Mathieu Guertin at Infinithéâtre for their help in sourcing printed scripts of Betsuyaku's *Godot Has Come*, and to Ken Alba at Boston University for his help in sourcing Bulatović's *Il est est arrivé*. Thanks also to William Davies and James Brophy for their comments on early drafts of this article.

3. Other sequels to *Waiting for Godot* not examined here include Žarko Komanin's *Godot Has Arrived to Collect His Dues* (*Godo je došao po svoje*, 2002) and Kohei Tsuka's *Matsugaura Godot no Imashime* (*A Lesson from the Matsugaura Godot*, 1974). Indeed, *Waiting for Godot* is not even the only one of Beckett's plays to spark attempts at a sequel: Cindy Oswin's 1992 *Scenic Flights*, produced by Paines Plough, sees Winnie from *Happy Days* (1961) embark on a round-the-world cruise.

4. Vivian Mercier, 'The Uneventful Event', *The Irish Times* (18 February 1956), p. 6.

5. Samuel Beckett, *Waiting for Godot*, in Beckett, *The Complete Dramatic Works* (London: Faber and Faber, 2006), p. 88.

6. Carolyn Jess-Cooke and Constantine Verevis, 'Introduction', in Jess-Cooke and Verevis, eds., *Second Takes: Critical Approaches to the Film Sequel* (New York: State University of New York, 2010), p. 4.

7. Umberto Eco, 'Innovation and Repetition: Between Modern and Post-Modern Aesthetics', *Daedalus*, CXIV, No. 4 (1985), p. 161–84 (p. 167).

8. Todd Berliner, 'The Pleasures of Disappointment: Sequels and *The Godfather, Part II*', *Journal of Film and Video*, LIII, Nos. 2–3 (2001), p. 107–23 (p. 109).

9. Desirée Henderson, 'Illegitimate Children and Bastard Sequels: The Case of Susanna Rowson's *Lucy Temple*', *Legacy*, XXIV, No. 1 (2007), p. 1–23 (p. 2).

10. Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), p. 134.

11. Jess-Cooke, *Film Sequels*, p. vii.

12. William H. Hinrichs, *The Invention of the Sequel: Expanding Prose Fiction in Early Spain* (Suffolk: Boydell & Boyars, 2011), p. ix.

13. This article follows William H. Hinrich's lead (see previous note) in using the terms 'autographic' (literally, 'same hand') to refer to a sequel text written by the same author as the original text, and 'allographic' (literally, 'other hand') to refer to a sequel text written by a different author to that of the original text.

14. Michael Austin, 'The Figural Logic of the Sequel and the Unity of *The Pilgrim's Progress*', *Studies in Philology*, CII, No. 4 (2005), p. 484–509 (p. 486).

15. For a further analysis of fan-writing in relation to Beckett's work, see Hannah Simpson, 'Waiting for GOdoT: Samuel Beckett and HBO's *Game of Thrones*', in Paul Stewart and David Pattie, eds., *Pop Beckett: Intersections with Popular Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), p. 227–46.

16. Samuel Beckett, 'Dante . . . Bruno . Vico . . Joyce', and '*Intercessions* by Denis Devlin', in Ruby Cohn, ed., *Disjecta: Miscellaneous Writings and a Dramatic Fragment* (London: Grove, 1984), p. 22, 91.

17. Ibid., p. 139.

18. Ibid., p. 145.

19. Beckett, *Godot*, p. 16.

20. Beckett, '*Intercessions*', p. 91.

21. Simon McEnteggart, 'Sequelizing the Superhero: Postmillennial Anxiety and Cultural "Need"', in Jess-Cooke and Verevis, eds., *Second Takes*, p. 171–89.

22. Yugoslavia existed under various formulations of the name 'Yugoslavia' from 1918 until 2003 – that is, all of Bulatović's life – until it reformed as Serbia and Montenegro and subsequently dissolved into these constituent independent states. Belgrade is now the capital of Serbia. Bulatović was a fierce Serbian nationalist, and his play was written in Serbo-Croatian, a South Slavic language common throughout the region.

23. Predrag Todorović, '*Godot* in Belgrade', *The Beckett Circle*, XXXIV, No. 2 (2011), p. 8–10 (p. 10). This public performance was preceded by a clandestine coterie production in Mića Popović's atelier in Belgrade in early 1954.

24. Miodrag Bulatović, *Il est arrivé*, trans. Claude Bailly (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967). See Note 2 above for further details.

25. Ibid., p. 35.

26. Ibid., p. 45.

27. Ibid., p. 52.

28. Ibid., p. 61–2.

29. Ibid., p. 64.

30. Dominic McGoldrick, 'From Yugoslavia to Bosnia: Accommodating National Identity and International Law', *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, VI, Nos. 1–2 (1998–9), p. 1–63 (p. 8).

31. Bulatović, *Il est arrivé*, p. 69.

32. Ibid., p. 85.

33. Ibid., p. 97.

34. Ibid., p. 99.

35. Ibid., p. 100.

36. Ibid., p. 112.

37. Ibid, p. 136.

38. Clas Zilliacus, 'Three Times *Godot*: Beckett, Brecht, Bulatović', *Comparative Drama*, IV, No. 1 (1970), p. 3–17 (p. 9).

39. Todorović, '*Godot* in Belgrade', p. 8.

40. Predrag Todorović, 'Beckett in Belgrade', in S. E. Gontarski, ed., *The Edinburgh Companion to Samuel Beckett and the Arts* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014), p. 453–64 (p. 453).

41. Ibid., p. 454.

42. Matthew Mestrovic, 'Introduction', in Venko Markovski, *Goli Otok: The Island of Death. A Diary in Letters* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), p. viii–xi.

43. Nick Miller, *The Nonconformists: Culture, Politics, and Nationalism in a Serbian Intellectual Circle, 1944–1991* (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2007), p. 49.

44. Snežana Kalinić, 'Godot's Arrivals: Beckettian and Anti-Beckettian Discourses in Bulatović's *Godot Has Arrived* and Komanin's *Godot Has Arrived to Collect his Dues*', in Thirthankar Chakraborty and Juan Luis Toribio

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Vazquez, eds., *Samuel Beckett as World Literature* (London: Bloomsbury, 2020), p. 181–91 (p. 186).

45. Zilliacus, 'Three Times *Godot*', p. 12.

46. Máirtín Coilféir, 'Godots Arrivent: More Morality Plays for our Times', *Performing Ethos*, VII (2017), p. 13–24 (p. 14); personal correspondence with the author.

47. Alan Titley, *Voilà Godot! Tragique Comique en Deux Actes*, trans. Láns Ó Baoill (Dublin: ForSai Publications, 2006), p. 9.

48. Ibid., p. 11

49. Coilféir, 'Godots Arrivent', p. 16. In Láns Ó Baoil's French translation, Mí-Ábha is called 'Lapoisse'; in French, *poisse* is a colloquial term for 'bad luck'.

50. Titley, *Voilà Godot!*, p. 27.

51. Ibid., p. 31.

52. Ibid., p. 32.

53. Ibid., p. 41.

54. Ibid., p. 52.

55. Ibid., p. 53.

56. Ibid., p. 54.

57. Ibid., p. 16, 12.

58. For example, in Beckett's *Godot* we find Yeats evoked in Estragon's allusion to the 'wind in the reeds' (p. 21), Proverbs 13:12 in Vladimir's musing that 'Hope deferred maketh the something sick, who said that?' (p. 12), and a muddling of ancient Greek and Roman mythology in Pozzo's description of Lucky as 'Atlas, son of Jupiter!' (p. 31).

59. See, for example, Alan Titley, 'Patrick Dinneen: Lexicography and Legacy', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, CIII, No. 412 (2015), p. 485–98 (p. 485); 'The Hidden History of Ireland: An stair nach n-instear', *American Journal of Irish Studies*, X (2013), p. 75–91 (p. 82, 90); and 'The Jesuits and Irish Scholarship', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, CI, pp. 401 (2012), p. 17–29 (p. 17–18).

60. Luke Gibbons, 'The Global Cure? History, Therapy, and the Celtic Tiger', in Peadar Kirby, Luke Gibbons, and Michael Cronin, eds., *Reinventing Ireland: Culture, Society and the Global Economy* (London: Pluto Press, 2002), p. 89–105 (p. 94).

61. Coilféir, 'Godots Arrivent', p. 14.

62. Daniel Curzon, *Godot Arrives* (1999), available online at <http://danielcurzon.com/fulllengthplaysannotat.html>, p. 1 (to which subsequent page references are made); also published as 'G.D. Arrives' in *Collected Plays of Daniel Curzon: Volume VI (1996–1999)* (San Francisco: IGNA Books, 2004).

63. Ibid., p. 8.

64. Ibid., p. 10.

65. Beckett, *Godot*, p. 23.

66. Curzon, *Godot Arrives*, p. 20.

67. Ibid., p. 1.

68. Ibid., p. 24.

69. Ibid., p. 29.

70. Ibid., p. 36.

71. Ibid., p. 36–7.

72. Beckett, 'Dante . . . Bruno', p. 22.

73. Curzon, *Godot Arrives*, p. 54.

74. Coilféir, 'Godots Arrivent', p. 23.

75. The issue of agency in Beckett's dramatic work has received valuable scholarly attention in recent years. See, for example, Amanda Dennis, 'Compulsive Bodies, Creative Agency: Beckett's *Quad* and Agency in the Twenty-First Century', *Journal of Beckett Studies*, XXVII, No.1 (2018), p. 5–21; Paul Lawley, 'Krapp at the Hawk's Well: Beckett, Yeats, and Joyce', *Modern Drama*, LVIII, No. 3 (2015), p. 370–90; Carrie Preston, 'Taking Direction from Beckett: *Noh*/No, *Footfalls*/*Pas*' in Tomasz Wiśniewski, ed., *Back to the Beckett Text* (Gdansk: University of Gdansk Press, 2012), p. 155–78.

76. Curzon, *Godot Arrives*, p. 70.

77. Beckett, *Godot*, p. 88.

78. Mariko Hori Tanaka, 'Forgetfulness of the Past as Revealed in Minoru Betsuyaku's *Godot Has Come*: A Play Inspired by *Waiting for Godot*', in Chakraborty and Vasquez, eds., *Samuel Beckett as World Literature*, p. 203–20 (p. 206).

79. Minako Okamuro, '*Godot* in Japan: A History and a New Translation', *The Beckett Circle* (Autumn 2019), <https://thebeckettcircle.org/2019/12/24/godot-in-japan-a-history-and-a-new-translation/>.

80. Minoru Betsuyaku, interview with Hirofumi Okano, in *Performing Arts Network Japan* (2007), <https://performingarts.jp/E/art_interview/0709/3.html>.

81. Minoru Betsuyaku, *Godot Has Come*, trans. Marc Menish and Mariko Hori, undated translation, personal copy, p. 1. See Note 2 above for further details.

82. Ibid., p. 15.

83. Ibid, p. 5.

84. Beckett, *Godot*, p. 29.

85. Betsuyaku, *Godot Has Come*, p. 5.

86. Ibid., p. 25.

87. Ibid., p. 31.

88. Ibid., p. 34.

89. Ibid., p. 35. This otherwise unexplained closing reference to 'the post office' here might serve as an intertextual allusion to the repeated invocation of the offstage post office and post mistress of Bulatović's *Godo je došao*, or even to C's reference to 'the Post Office' in Beckett's 1976 playlet *That Time*, another overcrowded site of apparently non-ending continuation: 'as if it couldn't end the old year never end like time could go no further that time in the Post Office all bustle' (*Complete Dramatic Works*, p. 393; my thanks to Nick de Somogyi for this suggestion). Betsuyaku's reference here also accords with the play's broader concern with institutional organizations and the transposition of the action of waiting from Beckett's metaphysical framework to a disquietingly familiar modern bureaucratic form, represented onstage by the women's 'institutionalizing' of the stage space.

90. Betsuyaku, interview with Okano.

91. Ibid.

92. David Goodman, 'The Japanese Absurd', *Books Abroad*, XLVI, No. 3 (1972), p. 366–73.

93. Betsuyaku, interview with Okano.

94. Beckett, '*Intercessions*', p. 91.

95. Ibid., p. 145.

96. Beckett, 'Dante . . . Bruno', p. 22.

97. Beckett, *Godot*, p. 11.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X21000166 Published online by Cambridge University Press