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Chapter I
Figurator

To those of us incurably addicted to piecing together scraps of manuscript, forcing squiggles into words, and generally tinkering with an author's notes, revisions and corrections, Beckett's Watt is a literary tease. Beckett tantalizes us with breaks in his narrative: "MS illegible," "Hiatus in MS," and addenda of "precious and illuminating material," a curious blend of false starts and discarded incidents. ¹ He rekindles in us the old hope of certain knowledge by obliquely suggesting that the manuscript of Watt may reveal more than the printed text. If the critic could fill in the hiatus or read through the ink blots and cancellations, he might learn what-not (or what's what) about Watt and Knott.

The Beckett oeuvre is sprinkled with temptations for the textual critic. It is filled with characters themselves writers, struggling to write or cease writing. The reader or viewer eavesdrops on the creative process as he watches Hamm, or the Unnamable, or Winnie write, revise, shape, and clarify their tales: Winnie, "The sun was not well up when Milly rose, descended the steep ...
(pause) ... slipped on her nightgown, descended all alone the steep wooden stairs ...." (55) 2 The characters invite interest in the creative process. And even the indolent Murphy has a passing interest in textual problems. He wonders whether Wordsworth's "fields of sleep" from "Intimations of Immortality" is not simply a compositor's error for "fields of sheep." 3

But the hope of finding a single, simple key to Beckett's work is as futile as the wait for Godot. Professor J. M. Coetzee, evidently a fellow addict, prowled the Watt papers at the University of Texas. Although the problem of the gaps and blots remains, as a problem without solution must, Professor Coetzee's observations remain a substantive contribution to Beckett studies. His analysis of early character names, the addenda, plot alterations, and especially the symmetrical structuring of the final version contributes to our understanding of what Beckett is up to. 4 While the unpublished versions of Beckett's work will not serve as a philosopher's stone, they nonetheless can provide an approach to the literature that is both illuminating and concrete.

While textual analysis of modern manuscripts is still a nascent field, critical attention to the notes and drafts of modern authors (e.g., Faulkner, Lawrence,
Hemingway, Fitzgerald, Beckett) is beginning to produce not only accurate texts and valuable information on the work habits of these authors, but an additional critical perspective for the literature itself. Critics of modern literature are beginning to discover that knowing how an author works, or what sorts of additions, excisions, or alterations he makes, is often a valuable aid to literary criticism. It is both interesting and significant, for instance, that Joyce's method of composition for Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man was reversed for Ulysses. While Portrait was pared considerably from the bulky Stephen Hero, Ulysses was the product of a steady accretion. The method of composition for the latter work reflects Joyce's encyclopaedic purpose, and study of the Ulysses Notesheets has been a substantial critical asset to our understanding of Ulysses itself.

Probing an author's notes and early drafts is more than an excuse to look at the work habits of an author, more than a curiosity or literary gossip. Manuscript analysis is most broadly useful when it serves as still another means of elucidating the finished work of art. As Phillip Herring notes in his Introduction to Joyce's 'Ulysses' Notesheets in the British Museum, manuscript analysis "is also a reflection of the growing awareness on the part of scholars that the ultimate solution to
many textual and critical problems is to be found in the manuscripts .... The study of an author's creative process can supplement many of the critical approaches to literature currently espoused by our graduate schools, since it forces one to look beyond the text, as it were, to discover how it arrived in its published form."

Yet, despite the amount of fruitful manuscript analysis already produced, critics occasionally yield to the temptation to speculate about an author's process of composition and the significance that process has for the completed work of art without the apparent benefit of having examined the manuscripts themselves, or at least without having examined them thoroughly. Writing on Samuel Beckett, Martin Esslin, for one, has conjectured that Beckett:

is the least consciously intellectual of writers. His method of work is spontaneous and always has as its starting point the deeply concentrated evocation of the voice within his own depths .... allusions and a wealth of cross references ... are the outcome of a process that is largely subconscious, and certainly wholly free of any pre-meditation or display of euphuistic cleverness. The intricate texture the critic has to unravel is therefore nearer, in its structural principle, to the organic associative organization of images in a dream than to the calculated pattern of a cross-word puzzle .... the reader ... must accept the text as a spontaneous flow of images and allow himself to be carried along by it with equal spontaneity.
Certainly, a number of characteristics of Beckett's work make him a likely target for speculation about the ease of creativity. His prose, especially in the drama, is deceptively sparse and, in the novels, often gives the impression of free-associative flow. And Colin Duckworth, for one, implies that *En attendant Godot* was written *d'une traite* between October 1948 and the end of January 1949. Yet even without a rigorous examination of manuscripts, Esslin's blanket assertion about Beckett's creative process is suspect. First, the assertion fits the early criticism and poetry poorly. Beckett began his literary career as a man of letters, as much critic as artist. He opens his analysis of Proust with a scholarly judgment: "The references are to the abominable edition of the *Nouvelle Revue Française*, in sixteen volumes." The early poem "Whoroscope," hardly suggests spontaneity; it is filled with esoteric learning and linguistic gymnastics, a consciously intricate parody which, once it is deciphered, may finally be a "display of euphuistic cleverness." Lawrence Harvey notes that "He wrote Whoroscope with a three-inch-high sheaf of pages filled with notes on the life and works of Descartes at his side." The poems of *Echo's Bones* also hardly seem spontaneous. As Ihab Hassan suggests, "The poems tend to take the form of bizarre intellectual puzzles and glacial aphor-
isms ...." Beckett's appendix to Watt, with notes and complications the author chose not to develop and include in the final text, should warn the critic against general assertions about the spontaneity of creativity. And the trilogy of novels, produced during Beckett's period of high productivity, is largely about the difficulty, if not ultimately the impossibility, of writing. In fact, none of Beckett's characters composes easily.

Second, although Esslin stops short of linking Beckett directly with surrealist experiments with automatic writing, his analysis emphasizes the spontaneity and free flow of Beckett's creativity. Indeed Beckett, along with Thomas McGreevy and Hans Arp, signed a manifesto published in Transition which approaches some of Surrealists' aims in art. But as John Fletcher concludes, "It is not likely that Beckett took any of this too seriously." And Professor Harvey reports that Beckett "vigorously denied that his enterprise had anything at all to do with surrealist formlessness." A suggestion of creative spontaneity also conflicts with recent work on Beckett's manuscripts, work which suggests that Beckett's literary blood line runs not from Breton, but from the meticulous Joyce. The ten versions of "Bing" (a short prose piece) appended to the Federman and Fletcher bibliography of Beckett's works demonstrate a "complex and changing development from the
first conception to the final copy ...." 13

Admittedly, Beckett's own statements on art provide some basis for conjectures such as Esslin's. In his analysis of Proust, Beckett has asserted, "... the work of art is neither created nor chosen, but discovered, uncovered, excavated, pre-existing within the artist, a law of nature." (Proust, p. 64) And Beckett did have at least a brief burst of creativity. As Ruby Cohn suggests, "Today, Beckett tends to speak nostalgically of his five-year period of free-flowing creation (1946-50), during which he produced the bulk of his works. Since that time, he has found writing an increasingly arduous task. The French original of Endgame (Fin de Partie) is the first product of that difficult time that extends to today." 14

But neither the fact that Beckett had a creative outburst, nor the fact that he considers the creative process a matter of discovery or excavation necessarily means that Beckett's works are produced spontaneously. Beckett goes on in his essay on Proust to argue for Proust's distinction between artist and writer. Inspiration may explode in an artist, but at that point, the artisan, the writer, takes over. "The artist has acquired his text; the artisan translates it. 'The duty and task of a writer (not an artist, a writer) are those of a
translator." (Proust, p. 64) Also, an attempt to sever the creative period too cleanly from the previous trials distorts the continuity and complexity of Beckett's creative process. The roots of many of Beckett's works reach back into earlier, discarded attempts. The celebrated products of the creative period are, to one degree or another, derivative of earlier or discarded works. At the edge of the creative period, for instance, lie Beckett's first French novel, Mercier et Camier (ca. 1945 and which Beckett called a "dreadful book"), and the uncharacteristic drama, Eleutheria (ca. 1947, a play in three acts with seventeen characters). Recent textual study has uncovered some significant parallels between these two discarded works and the critically acclaimed works produced during the creative period, parallels which raise serious questions about how easily isolable Beckett's creative period is from the preceding struggles. John Fletcher, for example, argues that both parts of Molloy are closely related to earlier works: Part I to the Nouvelles (especially "La Fin" published originally as "Suite" in Les Temes Modernes, July, 1946); Part II to Mercier et Camier. Colin Duckworth, in his study of the genesis of En attendant Godot, concludes that "the source of dialogue between the boy and Vladimir is to be found in the unpublished play, Eleutheria." He adds
that "There are many coincidences of style and theme in Mercier et Camier and Godot ... namely, the setting of the play; the origins and meaning of the tree; Godot; the rendezvous and the theme of waiting; the creation of the characters and the relationships between them ...." 17

And the pattern of reworking discarded material is not restricted to the highly-productive French period. Lawrence Harvey traces parallels in imagery and theme between the unpublished "Dream of Fair to Middlin Women" (ca. summer 1932) and two early publications, More Pricks Than Kisses (1934) and Echo's Bones (1935). 18

If we see the years 1945-1950 as an isolated, spontaneous phenomenon, the complexity of Beckett’s creative process is distorted. The artist may indeed discover and excavate the work of art from within himself, but the translation of that discovery onto paper and then into an acceptable final form is often a laborious task; and it is with that translation, a look at Beckett the writer, the shaper, that the following analysis concerns itself.

What is clear from such conjectures as Esslin’s is that a careful scrutiny of Beckett manuscripts needs to be undertaken if critics are to speak with accuracy and authority about Beckett’s writing process and the significance that process has for the published work of art. The pioneer work on Beckett’s manuscripts is val-
uable for suggesting the possibilities of textual analysis, but because of the difficulty of locating complete manuscripts for any particular work, it generally remains incomplete. Thorough work on Beckett's manuscripts has just begun. Colin Duckworth's study of the making of Godot, for instance, is a valuable examination of Beckett's assimilation of rejected material and his reworking earlier themes and pieces into new works. Duckworth deserves credit for tracing parallels between Godot and the two discarded works, Eleutheria and Mercier et Camier. (Although Hugh Kenner's analysis of similar parallels appeared in 1961, it was not nearly as complete and specific as Duckworth's.) And Duckworth is quick to follow up Beckett's suggestion that "If you want to find the origins of En attendant Godot, look at Murphy." But as a thorough analysis of the growth and composition of Godot, Duckworth's study is not complete.

For his study, Duckworth used only a single manuscript, which he examined for two hours in Beckett's Paris flat, April 1965. Beckett also had a number of typescripts for Godot, but these Duckworth did not (evidently could not) see. Duckworth's implication is that the original holograph of Godot (or at least the one with which he worked) does not significantly differ from the printed text and therefore examination of additional
manuscripts is unnecessary. The holograph Duckworth does describe is curious; Beckett evidently wrote the play on both sides, verso and recto, of a copy book, a practice inconsistent not only with the Happy Days holographs, but with other available holographs as well. "Beckett wrote on each right-hand page to the end of the book, then continued on each left-hand page beginning at the beginning of the book again." 22 Evidently the notebook verso pages contain no notes, drawings, or revisions. The close similarity of the holograph version to the printed version, and the lack of Beckett's characteristic notes and doodles, seem suspect even for a work produced during the creative period. 23 If Godot sprang fully grown onto the pages of Beckett's first draft, the spontaneous birth would be inconsistent with the severe difficulties of composition he had with works before and after Godot (i.e., Watt and Fin de Partie respectively). Yet, Beckett himself admits that the composition of Godot was easy. (In the following exchange C.D. is Colin Duckworth, S.B., Samuel Beckett.)

C.D.: Were the symmetrical beauty and balance of Godot achieved without preparation?

S.B.: Yes. I didn't have too much trouble with it.

Duckworth's examination of the holograph confirmed Beckett's statement: "... I found out when I studied the
manuscript months later, he was telling nothing less than the truth." 24

Disparity in Beckett's method of composition is certainly not impossible, but at the present time the disparity is impossible to re-examine since the Godot manuscripts remain unavailable. The two holographs on deposit at the University of Texas are useless for genesis study. Although the Texas copy of En attendant Godot is listed by Federman and Fletcher as the "Original French Ms," both Texas documents, En attendant Godot and Waiting for Godot, are fair copies which do not vary from the printed versions. Until all of Beckett's notes and drafts for Godot are located and studied, a thorough history of the making of Beckett's most famous play is impossible.

One possible explanation of the disparity in Beckett's method of composition is that Duckworth may not have examined Beckett's earliest draft. As we shall see shortly, a Beckett holograph is not necessarily an early draft. Beckett does not write out all his drafts first and then type successive versions. He often alternates, typing from the holograph, then writing out the next version by hand. A typescript then is very often a fair copy of a previous holograph, corrected and revised after typing. The fourth holograph version of Happy Days, for instance, is actually the seventh stage of the play's composition
and indeed is remarkably close to the printed version.

To be fair to Mr. Duckworth, it should be stated that his intention was not to follow the play's compositional progress fully. He worked with the material Beckett made available, and the study is an invaluable beginning, but it nonetheless poses a number of questions which remain unanswered. The danger is in oversimplifying Beckett's creative process. If we accept at face value the dates of composition reported by Duckworth, Godot was written in a little over three months. But as John Fletcher points out: "... the text we now possess has gone through a considerable polishing process in manuscript and print, both on stage and off it. When we recall that this development has taken place over a period of some fifteen years, the transition from the jetisoned Eleuthéria is not as abrupt as might at first sight appear. Although the first draft of Godot was written quickly, in a matter of just over three months, the way had been prepared for it by Eleuthéria as well as other Beckett works." 25

Ruby Cohn's analysis of the Fin de Partie manuscripts, on the other hand, focuses on a relatively complete set of preliminary versions. She explores the development of the play through successive drafts (an holograph and three successive typescripts). But the
results of her study are suggestive rather than fully
developed. She mentions the structural shift from two
acts to one, describes most of the excised scenes, but
makes little attempt to turn the changes back on the
text and use them critically. She concludes that Fin
de Partie was "revised into rightness," but does not,
for instance, follow the development of themes or the
shifting tone through the drafts. Her purpose was to
suggest "some of the fascination of the earlier version."
Her comment that a Variorum Endgame is needed "to sup-
plement Duckworth's recent publication of a Variorum
Godot" 26 is at least a tacit recognition that her own
work on the manuscripts was incomplete. The suggestion
for a Variorum Endgame was evidently heeded by John
Fletcher. But while Fletcher's Introduction and notes
represent a critical use of manuscript material, his
analysis of the play's composition is brief. 27

Finally, the ten versions of "Bing" published as an
appendix to the Federman and Fletcher bibliography are
an enormous revelation of the extent of Beckett's rev-
isions and alterations for even this very short work.
The bibliography's dust jacket bears the following
assertion: "An appendix provides the first ten drafts of
Bing ...." The assertion is, however, inaccurate. The
ten appended versions are themselves an incomplete record
of this prose piece. Federman had available only Beckett's typescripts. In fact, six holograph versions of "Bing" also exist, versions which were alternated with the typescripts Federman and Fletcher published. The entire sixteen versions are now available at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.  

While the ten versions that Federman and Fletcher print are revealing, they are not a complete record of the development of "Bing."

As more of Beckett's manuscripts, notebooks and unpublished works are located and examined, a clearer, more accurate and complete description of his process of composition will emerge, a description founded less on incomplete documents, conjecture, or the author's nostalgic backward glance. Two studies are worth mentioning which do present comprehensive analyses of the manuscripts of a single Beckett work: J. M. Coetzee's study of the revisions of Watt, mentioned earlier, and Richard L. Admussen's analysis of the early versions of Play. The following analysis of the composition of Happy Days is, hopefully, another. For while Happy Days premiered at the Cherry Lane Theater in New York less than a year after work on it had begun, the play was shaped through a preliminary notebook and seven heavily-revised versions before it found its way to the printer and director. During the composition of the play, both structure and content underwent substantial change. This study of the
composition of *Happy Days* will take two directions. The first will be an examination of the similarities of *Happy Days* to Beckett's earlier critical and creative work. The second will focus on the manuscripts themselves: with an early notebook and seven complete versions with which to work, Beckett's careful shaping of the play from the beginning to its English printed and produced forms can be followed closely. By examining and comparing the excisions, additions, and alterations, the critic can follow the emphasis or de-emphasis on the major themes, the shifts in tone, the adjustments in dramatic style, and, in the case of *Happy Days* especially, the changing pattern of literary echoes and direct literary references.

One problem with the above division is that the categories of tone, themes, style, and literary allusions overlap considerably. The suggestion that each of the categories is a neat, separate unit is a distortion of a work of art, especially Beckett's, and needs to be avoided. Defending Joyce's *Work in Progress*, Beckett warns, "The danger is in neatness of identifications .... Must we wring the neck of a certain system in order to stuff it into a contemporary pigeon-hole, or modify the dimensions of that pigeon-hole for the satisfaction of the analogymongers? Literary criticism is not book-
keeping." The danger against which Beckett warns is certainly real, especially when one severs too cleanly form from content. In *Work in Progress*, Beckett notes, they are one: "Here form is content, content is form.

You complain that this stuff is not written in English, It is not written at all. It is not to be read -- or rather it is not only to be read. It is to be looked at and listened to. His writing is not about something; it is that something itself .... When the sense is sleep, the words go to sleep .... When the sense is dancing, the words dance." And Beckett praised Proust shortly thereafter because "he makes no attempt to dissociate form from content." (*Proust*, p. 6?)

The process of separating the whole of a work of art into pieces is artificial and some of the distinctions are arbitrary, but hopefully the reduction of literary criticism to book-keeping can be avoided. But the result is some overlap in the discussion and an occasional gerrymandering of categories. Since his vigorous (and at times over-zealous) defense of Joyce's experiment, Beckett himself has made some distinctions between form and content in his own work. The inseparable coupling of the two can lead to a nonsensical imitative fallacy, especially when the theme is the fundamental chaos of human experience, and Beckett is careful not to argue
himself into the imitative fallacy. He acknowledges
the need to shape "the mess":

What I am saying does not mean that there will henceforth be no form in art. It only means that there will be new form, and that this form will be of such a type that it admits the chaos and does not try to say that the chaos is really something else. The form and the chaos remain separate. The latter is not reduced to the former. That is why the form itself becomes a preoccupation because it exists as a problem separate from the material it accommodates. To find a form that accommodates the mess, that is the task of the artist now.

And it is with form, the process of shaping, that the focus of the following discussion is maintained. The shaping of themes, tone, the pattern of literary allusions, and the overall structure of the play are all, fundamentally, matters of form. A primary task of the critic studying the composition of a Beckett play is to follow the author's struggles in shaping the chaos, his search for a form to contain the mess, a form which does not distort it or try to say it is something else.
Notes: Chapter I


12. Harvey, p. 249.


15. Duckworth, p. 91.


17. Duckworth, pp. 91-92.


20. Duckworth, p. 89.


28. My thanks to Professor Richard Admussen at Washington University for this information.


33. Beckett cited by Tom F. Driver, "Beckett by the Madeleine," Columbia University Forum, 4, No. 3 (1961), 23. The reader, however, should bear in mind that Beckett considers Driver's account of their meeting misleading.
Chapter II
Primary Documents and Compositional History

Part of the attraction of examining Beckett's *Happy Days* is that the primary documents available provide the most complete compositional record of any major Beckett work. In addition to a preliminary notebook and seven full versions of the play, a number of ancillary and supporting documents exist, including the annotated typescript Alan Schneider used for his direction of the world premiere of the play, and the eighty-five page notebook Beckett prepared for the German production of *Happy Days*, *Glückliche Tage*, which he directed. The German production, at the Schiller Theatre, Werkstatt, opened on September 17, 1971, ten years to the day after the New York world premiere.

Not all the documents used in this study were available in original holograph or typescript. The seven complete versions of the play were, and consequently a detailed physical description of these documents is possible. Beckett's earliest draft (an incomplete holograph),
Schneider's working script, and Beckett's German notebook, however, were available only in Xerox copies. A brief physical description of these Xeroxed documents will acquaint the reader, at least superficially, with these items.

I

Beckett's earliest version of Happy Days cohabits a graph-paper notebook with an early draft of Krapp's Last Tape. The "Krapp" portion of the notebook is entitled Magee Monologue (the play was evidently written for the Irish actor Patrick Magee) and dated February 20, 1958 (i.e., 20. 2. 58); the Happy Days portion, headed "illegible Female Solo," is dated Ussy, October 8, 1960 (i.e., 8. 10. 60). The fact that the early versions of these two plays appear in the same notebook tempts one to speculate about parallels between the two. But even if Beckett originally conceived of Happy Days as a sort of female counterpart to "Krapp," the design changed quickly and Happy Days evolved along lines very different from Krapp's Last Tape.

A Xerox copy of the Happy Days fragment from the ETE 56 notebook was used for this study. This earliest version begins with the set description and ends with
Winnie's mention of her "occasional mild migraine" headaches. From the first, the holograph fragment reveals Beckett's emphasis on the austerity and "severe symmetry" of the set, Winnie's burial, and her morning ritual. After only four pages of script, and in a flurry of changes about Willie's position at rise and Winnie's waking him, the first version stops, and Beckett uses the notebook subsequently for random notes and possible ideas about the play, some of which are included in the first full holograph version, others of which are simply ignored. Beckett used the notebook throughout the composition of the play, for some of the brief notes represent additions and revisions which Beckett made late in the play's composition. The text of the play itself was transferred to another notebook, the holograph now at Ohio State, and begun anew the same day.

The Happy Days section of the ETE 56 manuscript is twenty pages long, paginated only on the recto, pp. 36-45.² The fragment of text is on pages 36-39, with the verso of pages 37 and 39 having extensive revisions. The remaining six recto pages (40-45) contain the notes. The only verso revision in the notes section is a single sentence on the verso of page 40. The others are blank.
Of the seven unpublished versions of *Happy Days* on deposit at the Ohio State University Library, three are in holograph, four in typescript. The three holograph versions are contained in a common student's notebook: 22 x 17 cm (exterior measurement), soft paper cover (now a faded green), the spine reinforced with a black cloth strip. In the upper-center of the front cover sits a drawing of a square-rigged sailing ship, 7 x 6 cm, and beneath it, the brand-name, *Corvette*. Above the ship Beckett has printed in ball-point pen: *HAPPY DAYS/ OCTOBER 60 -- MAY 61*. The back cover is blank. Inside, the cover is supported by a heavy paper front-piece and end-piece, and the 142 leaves of coarse, unwatermarked graph-paper\(^3\) are sewn together in 12 gatherings:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{coll: (16}\frac{3}{4} \times 22 \text{ cm):} & \quad \text{unsigned 1–5, 12, 17,}\nonumber \\
& \quad \text{unsigned 6, 10, 11, 12, 17,}\nonumber \\
& \quad \text{unsigned 10, 11, 12}.
\end{align*}
\]

The text of the play is written only on the recto sides of the graph-paper. The verso is reserved for notes Beckett makes to himself, ideas to be included in the text, fragments of dialogue, and most conspicuously, doodles of gargoyles, animal mutations, and geometric designs. The notebook is unpaginated, but the transcript
quoted in this study is paginated with consecutive arabic numerals, and follows the notebook beginning with the first page written on, i.e., the verso of the first graph-paper leaf; so that with the exception of the recto of the first leaf of graph-paper, all the pages, blank and filled, are assumed to be numbered consecutively to the end of the text. The first version contains only a single act, which eventually becomes Act I of the printed version, and runs from page 1-72. The second version, which Beckett calls "REWRITE" contains two acts, begins on page 74 and ends on page 158. The final holograph version, titled "Happy Days / Rewriting II," begins on 160 and ends on 234. Pages 235-283 are blank.

The four typescripts were acquired and are currently stored in a blue, manila "Wallet File" folder, bearing the imprint of the British stationer, Walter Gillett Ltd., Brighton. Across the top of the folder Beckett has printed, again in ballpoint, HAPPY DAYS. The paper on which the four versions are typed varies little in quality, weight and size, and is a standard sort of typing paper usually, allowing some variation for age and wear, 21 x 27 cm. The first act of Typescript I contains two varieties of paper. The first 12 sheets are a coarse, yellowed paper with no watermark. The remaining five
sheets are a fresh, clean, French typing paper bearing the watermark, Parcheminé Guérimand Voiron and a shamrock insignia. Act II of Typescript I and both acts of Typescript II are also typed on the Parcheminé Guérimand Voiron paper. Typescripts III and IV are on a heavier stock with the watermark, Extra Strength / A.R.M.

The first typescript is identified by the author’s headnote, "Typescript I," and bears no designation of acts. There are 17 sheets of paper in what eventually becomes Act I, but the final page is numbered 18, the result of an error in pagination between pages 12 and 14: no sheet is marked 13. Apparently, Beckett paused after typing page 12. The page is a few lines short of the 50 per page which Beckett averages, and the last line is incomplete, even though no paragraph break follows. A note at the bottom of page 12 may indicate that one reason Beckett paused was to estimate the running time of the play; the note simply says, "30 minutes." Similar estimates appear in the first typescript version of Fin de Partie, the two act version, where at the end of Act I, Beckett notes 75 minutes, and Act II, 35 minutes. Page 14 begins on the Parcheminé Guérimand Voiron paper, and with a line which was first revised then excised at the bottom of page 12. Despite the irregularities,
pages 14-18 are clearly part of this first typed version of Act I since this is the only typescript in which the characters do not yet have their final names. (See Appendix A.) On pages one through seven, the two characters are called B and W (Bee and Winnie); on eight through 18, the names have been changed to E and M (Edward and Mildred).

The first typed version of Act II is catalogued along with Act I as part of Typescript I, but the coupling of the two is misleading since Act II was typed much later than Act I and belongs to a different stage of the development of Happy Days. Act II was typed after the second holograph version was written, and contains the final names of the two characters, Winnie and Willie. An error in pagination exists in this first typed version of Act II also: both the penultimate and ultimate pages are numbered six, but seven sheets comprise the act.

The second typescript is identified by Beckett's note at the top, "Typescript II," and contains two acts, both marked as such. There are no errors in pagination in this version, but curiously both acts are paginated separately: Act I, pp. 1-17; Act II, 1-7. The separate pagination may be a hint that Act II was typed before Act I, and hence immediately after the first typed version of Act II.
Typescript III is identified by the author in an abbreviated fashion, "T III," and is the first version in which both acts are paginated consecutively, 1-24, but unfortunately the opening page of Act II, page 18, is missing and apparently lost. The final typescript, "T IV," is the manuscript sent to the printer and contains a formal title page (HAPPY DAYS / A Play in 2 Acts / by / Samuel Beckett) and a separate sheet for the characters in addition to the twenty-eight pages of text. Unlike earlier typescripts, this final version contains few revisions, but does contain thirteen carefully written out literary quotations complete with author and title of the work cited.

The eight versions of Happy Days do not, however, give a complete indication of the number of stages in the play's composition. The preliminary notes in the Reading University ETE 56 notebook are often revised before inclusion into the body of the play. In the Ohio State notebook, key passages are written and rewritten on the verso before inclusion in the text. Each version, holograph and typescript, is also revised a number of times with, similar to Joyce's cancellations with different color pencils in the Ulysses Notesheets, a distinguishably different writing instrument. Finally,
because of the apparent uncertainty about the number of acts a play would have, the eight manuscript versions actually represent nine stages of development. Using the manuscript revisions as evidence, the following order of composition can be established. References to the manuscripts hereafter will be to the form in parenthesis.

Stage 1: Incomplete holograph; begun October 8, 1960, no final date. (ETE 56)

Stage 2: First full holograph version, Act I only; begun October 8, 1960, completed January 14, 1961. (H-1)

Stage 3: First typescript, Act I only; n.d. (Tss-1)


Stage 5: First typescript, Act II only; n.d. (Tss-1)

Stage 6: Second typescript, Acts I and II; Act II probably typed before Act I; n.d. (Tss-2)


Stage 8: Third typescript, Acts I and II; n.d. (Tss-3)

Stage 9: Fourth typescript, Acts I and II; n.d. (Tss-4)
Happy Days then was apparently first designed or conceived as a one-act play. Three versions of Act I were completed before work on Act II was begun, and none of those three early drafts bears any heading indicating that it is the first act. Although Beckett was apparently working on the play steadily, finishing the first version in just over three months, typing that version in one day (between the completion of version one, January 12, 1961, and the beginning of version three, January 14), and then immediately beginning the third, there is an uncharacteristic break of eleven days between the completion of the third version of Act I and the beginning of Act II. This is the only time during the composition of the play where a break of any length is apparent. In addition, when Act II was finally begun, Beckett averaged slightly over two written pages per day, five or six days for thirteen holograph pages which finally typed out to slightly over six pages. If Beckett had Act II planned from the start and simply delayed setting it down because he knew it would be short and essentially, as in Godot, a repeat of Act I, then the delay and rate of production seem unusual.

If, on the other hand, the reason for the eleven day delay was structural difficulty, it was not the first
time Beckett was plagued with such difficulty. The composition of Watt, for example, presented problems. Although the bulk of the revisions in the Watt manuscripts are stylistic, Beckett apparently had some trouble with the original first section which was first discarded and then incorporated into the addenda. Beckett also had a serious structural problem with Endgame. Among the very few letters of Beckett's allowed to be published are fragments of the author's correspondence with his director, Alan Schneider, printed in the Village Voice. The letters were used to muster publicity for the forthcoming production of Endgame, which Mr. Schneider was directing, and permission to publish even these excerpts was given very reluctantly by Beckett. The letters are, however, enormously revealing about the kind of structural problems Beckett had while composing Endgame. Beckett was dissatisfied with the play because of its instability (at the time it was a two-act play); he compared it to a three-legged giraffe. In a letter to Schneider, April 12, 1956, Beckett writes: "I did finish another, but didn't like it. It has turned out a three-legged giraffe, to mention only the architectonics, and leaves me in doubt whether to take a leg off or add one on."5 Evidently Beckett did not find
the image of a two-legged giraffe upsetting for the
solution to the imbalance of *Endgame* was surgery; the
two acts became one as material, including an interesting
burlesque scene in which Clov is dressed like a girl and
an ending where Clov is disguised as the boy, was cut.
For *Happy Days*, the solution was to shape another limb,
and on February 2, 1961 work on the prosthesis was begun.
Once the decision was made, Beckett wrote three succes-
sive versions of Act II, one holograph and two type-
scripts, before returning to continue the polishing of
Act I.

Naturally, despite the amount of circumstantial
evidence, much of the preceding argument is conjecture,
and one bit of curiously haunting evidence exists to
the contrary. Toward the end of the first version of
Act I, Beckett outlined the play's (or the act's) con-
cluding action on the verso of the notebook (p. 65) as
follows:

Some days (i.e., between waking and sleeping
bells) much longer than others

Edward emerges from hole "to have another
read"

his definition X X of "hog" as she puts
back toothbrush

all back in bag. Long pause. She takes
off hat and puts in bag
Her song

Ed. "Wanted bright boy" *(Long pause. Curtain.)*

All the action in the outline is included in this version except the song. Winnie never mentions the song at the end of the first holograph. It is possible, of course, that Beckett changed his mind about the concluding song, or as a more remote possibility, it may have slipped his mind. When the first holograph was typed out, again no reference was made to the song, but the typescript would most probably be a fair copy of the holograph. Revising the typescript *(Tss-1)*, Beckett penciled in some additional dialogue for Winnie to pray and wrote a note at the end, "Sing yr. song, W." Having Winnie express a desire to sing, yet not be able to, would not be an unusual way for Beckett to end a play; in fact, it would be another statement of a familiar Beckett theme, a play on the Cartesian and subsequent Occasionalists’ theories about the disjunction between mind and body, a theme particularly appropriate to *Happy Days* where Winnie’s body is imprisoned, yet her mind constantly reaffirms themes of joy and mercy. Certainly both acts of *Godot* end with this sort of disjunction:

Vladimir: Well? Shall we go?
Estragon: Yes, let’s go.
They do not move.
And we are never sure whether or not, at the close of Endgame, Clov can or does leave: "Enter Clov, dressed for the road. Panama hat, tweed coat, raincoat over his arm, umbrella, bag. He halts by the door and stands there, impassive and motionless, his eyes fixed on Hamm, till the end." The revisions of the first typescript, the mention of song without the actual song, would have restated one of Beckett's old themes.

III

Alan Schneider read a typescript of Happy Days while visiting Beckett in Paris, liked it, and offered to find an American producer for it. He probably read an unfinished version, for Mr. Schneider reports having made some suggestions for the final version. He recounts that when he first read the play, Beckett was undecided about the final title and about Winnie's song. Beckett suggested four titles to Schneider: "Tender Mercies," "Many Mercies," "Great Mercies," and "Happy Days." Evidently he had already eliminated the working titles in the ETE 56 manuscript: "Female Solo," and "A Low Comedy." Schneider suggested "Happy Days," and Beckett obviously concurred. He suggested to James Knowlson that the title was at once
a descriptive statement, a cheery toast, and a reference
to the popular song. For the final song, Beckett was
undecided between "When Irish Eyes are Smiling," and the
Waltz Duet, "I Love You So," from The Merry Widow.
Mr. Schneider, for better or worse, suggested the latter.

Schneider received his working script from Grove
Press before the play was published, and he is unsure
whether his typescript was prepared by Beckett or the
Grove staff. It was probably not prepared by Beckett,
however. The format and pagination of Schneider's script
differ drastically from all four of Beckett's typescripts.
Act I of Schneider's script is paginated 1-2 to 1-31
(first page unpaginated); Act II, 2-1 to 2-16. In all,
48 pages to Beckett's 28 (Tss-4). None of the stage
directions is underlined in Schneider's script. In both
holograph and typescript versions, Beckett meticulously
underlined each stage direction. Beckett's enigmatic
stage direction, "Do." is written out "ditto" throughout
the director's copy. Finally, Schneider's copy origin-
ally contained a number of errors and omissions (subse-
quently corrected in pencil); Beckett simply prepares his
manuscripts too carefully to allow such obvious errors,
some of which alter the sense of a passage, to slip by
for such an important final version.
Even if Schneider's script is not an original Beckett typescript, it remains a helpful document because of the director's notes. There are not, of course, a great many directorial changes. A director does not tamper lightly with Beckett's script. Schneider himself feels a strong responsibility to the author's intention:

"In all the Beckett plays I get credit and blame for following the author's intentions. Rightly or wrongly, I consider that to be my responsibility; if the intention is specifically stated, I try to follow it as specifically as it's stated." Not all directors are, however, so faithful to the author's text. Of the two early British productions of *Happy Days*, Jack MacGowran's at Stratford East altered Beckett's text considerably, "dimming the 'blazing light' he requires to a mere glow, and muting the 'piercing bell' to the merely nagging buzz of an alarm clock. This was undoubtedly a concession to the audience's comfort, but resulted in quite a few points being missed or understated."

Schneider did suggest that Beckett make one change, however. During the toolshed reminiscence, Winnie recalls, in all the published versions, seeing "tangles of bast" hanging from the rafters. Schneider thought the reference to the herb was much too esoteric, and suggested to Beckett
that he change it. Beckett complied, in a fashion, and suggested "raffia" instead. For the world premiere of Happy Days, Winnie recalled seeing "tangles of raffia," not "bast."

Schneider's script does not contain a great many notes. Happy Days is essentially a static play with only two actors and the script contains few blocking notes. In fact, overall, the script is only lightly annotated, and most of the annotations are simply question marks. Nonetheless the script reveals some of the qualities of the original production and as such is a helpful ancillary document to the study of the play. First, the script reveals some stage business added to the original script (i.e., "try to sing," p. 1-25 and "use of gun," p. 1-28). Second, passages Schneider thought were especially important are starred. Finally, the script is divided into beats; each beat reflects the point at which the director thought a shift in thought or tone occurred. These smaller units indicate something of the director's understanding of the play. Within the text of this study, Schneider's script will simply be referred to as "Schneider's Notebook."

The second supporting document is a notebook which Beckett prepared for his direction of the German produc-
tion of *Happy Days, Glückliche Tage*. Like the *Happy Days* holograph notebook, Beckett's director's notebook is also written on graph-paper. The bulk of the text appears on the recto sides of the pages. Most of the notes were evidently made before rehearsals began. Some of the notes are stated tentatively, others are corrected and revised. These additions and revisions are, for the most part, entered on the verso pages and are keyed into the recto text with either arrows or numbers. Conspicuously absent from this notebook are the doodles and gargoyles which populate the *Happy Days* notebook. Evidently the stress of directing is much less than the original creative effort. Also the handwriting throughout the notebook is clear and precise, Beckett's public hand. References to the play are in German, keyed to the German edition published by Suhrkamp (1968).

The 86 pages of the notebook are paginated as follows: 1-15, (16, 17 missing), 18-27, 27A, 27B, 28-85. The verso facing page one, apparently the inside cover of the notebook, contains a table of contents, complete, with page numbers for handy reference. The notebook is divided into the following categories: Bag, Willie, Bell, Turn to Willie, I, Eyes to Willie,
II, Text with Action, In which Hand, Repetition Text, Interruption Text, Repetition Action, Variation Action, Interruption Action, Quotations, With Glasses and Without, Possible Cuts, Unmuth Bright Durch (roughly, indignation breaks through), Smile, Sound, Requisiten (props).

The notebook is revealing in a number of ways. First, it reveals further Beckett's artistic fastidiousness, his preoccupation with detail and minutia (and as such it stands in sharp contrast to Schneider's Notebook). The "known contents" of Winnie's bag are detailed, including items which are never shown (i.e., her comb and brush) and a cryptic "miscellaneous" category. The number of times Willie speaks and the number of words he uses are carefully noted throughout: "In all 17 sentences 45 words." Willie's movement behind the mound, where he is not visible to the audience, is carefully diagrammed. Winnie's smiles and happy expressions are meticulously outlined: 31 smiles, 5 happy expressions, Beckett notes.

Second, Beckett's breakdown of the play reveals its symmetrical structure. On page one, the first act is broken down into eight separate sections, the second act into four. Act I: 1. opening to "Old eyes";
2. to the point where Willie fans himself visibly and
Winnie takes up her magnifying glass; 3. Winnie's "Fully
guaranteed" to Willie's "It"; 4. to end of laugh;
5. to Winnie's "No one. (Smile off. Looks at parasol:)");
6. to Winnie's "... (voice breaks, head down)...things...
so wonderful"; 7. to end of Shower-Cooker story and end
of nail filing; 8. to end. Act II: 1. to Winnie's "And
now?"; 2. from Winnie's "The face" to "Gently Winnie";
3. to Winnie's "Sing your old song, Winnie"; 4. to end.
Professor Cohn, whose divisions I follow here since
Beckett's are in German, dismisses the breakdown: "These
divisions are in no sense structural, but a matter of
mechanical convenience for rehearsal purposes only."8
But neither are they completely arbitrary. At the very
least, Beckett's divisions reveal points at which the
author-director thought shifts in the play occurred.

Finally, the notebook contains throughout occasional
philosophical and descriptive statements which explicitly
reveal or reinforce some of the play's thematic concerns.
The sense of decay permeates Beckett's description of
the props. In speaking of Winnie's disintegration in
Act II, the interruptions of her action and speech, her
idea of time, Beckett comments: "Relate frequency of
broken speech and action to discontinuity of time ....
Her time experience incomprehensible transport from one inextricable present to the next, those past unremembered, those to come inconceivable." (Regiebuch, p. 62) Also, the stylized and repetitious description of action which Beckett calls for in the Regiebuch is not only a source of physical comedy for the play, but also a clue to the means of Winnie's adjustment to her environment -- habit. While the Regiebuch is not a code-book to the play, it reveals, in places somewhat more concretely than the published version of the play itself, what Beckett had in mind, as well as the kind of changes he made looking at the play afresh after ten years. The notebook will be cited as Regiebuch throughout the text.

IV

Finally, a word needs to be said about a major problem of manuscript analysis: the author's handwriting. Early notes and drafts are not usually meant to be public documents and an author with a clear public hand may not take the pains to write legibly when preparing an early manuscript, one which he is essentially writing to himself. An analyst of Joyce's manuscripts,
Richard E. Madtes, for instance, divides Joyce's handwriting into three categories: the personal, the epistolary, and the publication hands. The last two are clearly legible; the first virtually indecipherable. For Beckett, the problem is a bit more complicated since even his epistolary hand tends to be difficult to read. And of course, the handwriting problem is compounded since the early drafts are filled with cancellations and additions crammed in. Ironically, Beckett dramatizes the transcriber's plight in *Happy Days* as Winnie, immobilized, hunched over and squinting, tries to read or guess at the words written on her toothbrush handle: "-- (examines handle, reads) -- pure ... what? .... (examines handle, reads) -- genuine ... pure ... what? -- (lays down brush) -- blind next .... (examines handle of brush) -- slight headache sometimes -- (examines handle, reads) -- guaranteed ... genuine ... pure ... what? -- (looks closer) -- genuine pure ...." (10-11)

Handwriting difficulties consequently have an effect on the completeness of the transcript. Illegible words are simply noted with an X. Other problems result from the difficulty of distinguishing individual characters in a word, or between upper and lower case letters. If a word is distinguishable but the spelling uncertain,
it has been regularized in the transcript without notation. The pattern followed for capitalization is one established by Beckett. For proper nouns and words following terminal punctuation, upper case is used even when the case of the letter in manuscript is uncertain. When Beckett punctuates with dashes or dots, lower case letters are used. Aside from these emendations, the transcript follows the holograph as faithfully as possible.

The symbols used in the transcript are as follow:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle > \ldots \rangle & \quad \text{Word inserted above with caret} \\
\langle \neq \ldots \rangle & \quad \text{Word inserted above without caret} \\
\langle \ < \ \rangle & \quad \text{Replaces} \\
\ldots \ldots & \quad \text{Legible word canceled by lining out} \\
--X-- & \quad \text{Illegible word canceled by lining out} \\
\langle \ldots ? \rangle & \quad \text{Word or letter is conjectured} \\
\langle \rightarrow \rangle & \quad \text{Addition made in margin, brought into text} \\
\langle \ 1 \ \rangle & \quad \text{Corresponding bracketed number on verso fits here} \\
X & \quad \text{Illegible word.}
\end{align*}
\]
Notes: Chapter II

1. Both the copy of the Happy Days section of the ETE 56 ms. and Beckett's Regiebuch for Glückliche Tage were kindly provided, with the permission of Samuel Beckett, by Professor James Knowlson of the University of Reading. Professor Knowlson has been a frequent and invaluable aid throughout this project. See also Professor Knowlson's description of these items in his catalogue of the Reading exhibition: Samuel Beckett: an exhibition (London: Turret Books, 1971).

2. The pagination, however, is not Beckett's, but probably Professor Knowlson's.

3. Curiously, some of Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets are also written on graph-paper notebooks.

4. The fact that page 13 is missing is no doubt purely coincidental and no inference of triskaidekaphobia should be drawn. Murphy, one may recall, has thirteen chapters.


6. Alan Schneider, "Reality is not Enough," Tulane Drama Review, 9, No. 3 (1965), 129.


8. Ruby Cohn, "Beckett Directs Happy Days," Performance, 1, No. 2 (April, 1972), 112.

Chapter III

Variations on a Still Point: *Happy Days* and Beckett's Persistent Themes

*Happy Days* represents, in some ways, a departure for Beckett. It is Beckett's first full-length play written in English, the first major work in English since *Watt*, published 1953. Its main character is female, a sentimental petite bourgeoisie, and an apparently happy one at that. Even the title seems to be a departure from the usual Beckett gloom. But the departures from the corpus are for the most part superficial; Winnie's physical plight is as serious as the rest of Beckett's crippled army. And as Richard M. Eastman concludes, "*Happy Days* is another projection of the basic Beckett myth," that is, his "recurrent dramatic pattern."\(^1\)

Winnie, or at least one of her avatars, has appeared as early as 1934 as the first of Belacqua Shuah's lovers in "Fingal," from *More Pricks Than Kicks*.\(^2\) The story recounts the end of an affair between Belacqua, Beckett's
transformation of Dante's Belacqua from Canto IV of the
Purgatorio, and Winifred Coates. Of her, the narrator,
apparently Belacqua recounting the story from the safety
of Taylor's pub, says, "... she was to all appearance
in high spirits, enjoying the warm spirit and the pro-
spect." (MPTK, p. 23) Her first words in the story
parallel Winnie's "Another heavenly day" at the opening
of Happy Days: "The Dublin mountains ... don't they
look lovely, so dreamy." (MPTK, p. 23) Apparently,
Belacqua is suffering from a sadness after sexual inter-
course, a variation on the Cartesian conflict of mind
and body which preoccupies many of Beckett's early charac-
ters: "They had not been very long on the top before he
began to feel a very sad animal indeed." (MPTK, p. 23)
In Happy Days Winnie ponders a similar problem, attri-
buting it mistakenly to Aristotle: "Sadness after
intimate sexual intercourse one is familiar with of
course .... You will concur with Aristotle there,
Willie, I fancy." (57) Belacqua, unsettled by the
romantic encounter, leaves her in the hands of her
friend, Dr. Sholto, steals a bicycle, and takes refuge
in a pub, "Taylor's public-house in Swords." (MPTK, p. 35)

In several fundamental respects, as "Fingal" sug-
gests, Beckett's literary and critical corpus remains
remarkably consistent, and *Happy Days* introduces no surprisingly new themes into the Beckett canon. As F.-L. Mignon notes, "Pour Samuel Beckett chaque travail nouveau procède du précédent, chaque travail secrète le suivant." The continuity of Beckett's themes is echoed by Eugene Webb: "One reason that Beckett's works show such a remarkable continuity of theme is that his characteristic view of life seems to have been formed very early in his career. Even his earliest writings reveal preoccupations with the same problems that he examines in his later works." Although Professor Webb's analysis is somewhat oversimplified, Beckett's concern for space and time, habit and memory, stasis and flux have dominated his published work since the 1931 essay on Proust. The explanation of much of the behavior of Winnie and Willie, and the pattern of action in *Happy Days* can be found in the Proust essay. Winnie is one of Beckett's supreme creatures of habit, and it is habit, both Beckett and Proust argue, which effectively blocks any self-realization. Habit deadens awareness. "Habit," says Beckett, "is a compromise effected between the individual and his environment, or between the individual and his own organic eccentricities, the guarantee of a dull inviolability .... Habit is the ballast that chains
the dog to his vomit. Breathing is habit. Life is habit." (Proust, pp. 7-8) The cause of Winnie's burial is never explained in the play, nor is her initial response to it. We see her after she is settled, after her environment has become familiar to her. Winnie has adjusted to her curious circumstances with three habits: the habit of her trivial daily ritual, the habit of language, and the habit of hope. All three protect her from the pain of realization, the agony of self-awareness. At one point Winnie says, "I used to perspire freely .... Now hardly at all .... The heat is much greater .... The perspiration much less .... That is what I find so wonderful .... The way man adapts himself .... To changing conditions." (35) Winnie's ability to adapt is a comfort to her, a horror to us since it represents a persistence and continuation of the mind and body in the traps of space and time. The adaptation is possible precisely because, as the Occasionalist philosopher Arnold Guelinox has argued, man's mental and physical systems are separate. Winnie's habits keep her from being aware of the full implication of her physical imprisonment.

Winnie is trapped in time and space, in her own consciousness, and in a world near its end, where change has apparently ceased. Even natural laws have altered
in Winnie's world. She fears that gravity may have failed (although the gravity of her predicament increases), and that she will be sucked up into the cosmos like gossamer: "Ah well, natural laws, natural laws, I suppose it's like everything else, it all depends on the creature you happen to be. All I can say is for my part is that for me they are not what they were when I was young and ... foolish ...." (34) For his production of Happy Days Beckett told his actress (Eva Katherina Schultz) that Winnie was like a bird, and "her voice should convey her weightlessness." Beckett added: "Winnie's fate is all the more pathetic because this weightless being is devoured by the earth." But the fears of floating away or being devoured by the earth are apparently not enough to worry Winnie seriously. She can at least protect herself with habit and reason (itself a convention and habit). Gravity for Willie at any rate has not failed. He like Winnie remains firmly rooted to the earth. And his occasional disappearance into the earth, into his cave, is only temporary. But Winnie and nature are deteriorating: "What a blessing nothing grows, imagine if all this stuff were to start growing." (34) Her means of adaptation are her distortion of her
circumstances and her determination to pattern her existence with every-day ritual, which itself is an attempt to impose an order on the chaos, the void, the mess. "What is one to do .... Brush and comb the hair, if it has not been done, or if there is some doubt, trim the nails if they are in need of trimming, these things tide one over." (24) Until what? one is tempted to ask.

Language is also little more than habit. Winnie's prattling guarantees her insensitivity; it is another insulation from self-realization. Ihab Hassan's observations on Beckett's language are here pertinent:

"Beckett considers language a dead habit; his rhetoric cunningly demonstrates the point. Sentences end by denying the assertions with which they began. Questions receive further questions for an answer. Misunderstandings, contradictions, repetitions, and tautologies abound. The syntax is often the syntax of nonsense, the grammar of absurdity. And silence, literal silence, invades the interchanges between human beings." The general and pervasive techniques Hassan describes are the techniques of Happy Days. Also important to Winnie's habitual language is Willie, a comforting part of the environmental furniture. His presence, or at least the illusion of his presence, helps maintain the illusion of
communication and comforts Winnie: "...just to know that in theory you can hear me even though in fact you don't is all I need, just to feel you there within earshot and conceivably on the qui vive is all I ask." (27) The fact that Willie occasionally speaks, makes sounds, is more important to Winnie than what he says, the meaning he conveys. In answer to her question about the meaning of the word hog, Willie presents a gross image of insensitivity: "Castrated male swine .... Reared for slaughter." Winnie's response is joyous: "Oh this is a happy day!" (47) The fact that Willie may be revealing something about his own condition never enters her mind.

The language she herself uses is also little more than sound, noise; it is redolent with banalities, cliches, half-remembered literary quotations and misquotations. And the title itself, repeated ad nauseum throughout the play, is the most hollow of the banalities. Language generally in Beckett's world is not a means of conveying meaning, but a balm for the sores of existence; words are opaque not transparent; "they form that impenetrable barrier of language which forever keeps us from knowing who we are, what we are." Language is a reflection of the impotence of mind.
Language has a definite function, however. It is a means of familiarizing the vast unknown, the cosmic void, a means of ordering and compartmentalizing phenomena. Richard Coe argues: "Give Mr X -- that indefinable Other, that alien Self -- a name, and we can enclose him in our orbit, assimilate him, make him ours, familiar, harmless, three dimensional .... Nothing is mysterious, or frightening, or hostile, provided that words are there to 'explain'." Naming and the ability to verbalize all possibilities in a situation are means of stability for Watt. But as words fail him, he fragments into incoherence. Words no longer order and familiarize Watt's world because he expects from them more than they can possibly produce. Winnie, on the other hand, never demands meaning from words, that the word and the object be permanently and divinely one.

For Proust and Beckett, habit is second nature, but a second nature which veils the first, the primary, the essential. "'If Habit,' writes Proust, 'is a second nature, it keeps us in ignorance of the first ....' Our first nature, therefore, corresponding ... to a deeper instinct than the mere animal instinct of self-preservation, is laid bare during ... periods of abandonment." (Proust, p. 11) Only when we abandon habit
then, or when it is destroyed or disturbed, can we penetrate beneath the protective second nature. In Winnie's existence, periods of abandonment, conduits to her primary self, are rare. Through most of the play we see only the facade of Winnie's second nature, but a facade which makes possible her "happy days."

Habit provides serenity and stability. Tension, however, occurs when habit and dullness are threatened, when we approach a crack in the second nature. The dramatic pattern of Happy Days is an irregular oscillation between maximum dullness (contentment) and the realization of sorrow (suffering). "The fundamental duty of Habit," writes Beckett, "...consists in a perpetual adjustment and readjustment of our organic sensibility to the conditions of its worlds. Suffering represents the omission of that duty, whether through negligence or inefficiency, and boredom its adequate performance." (Proust, p. 16) The dramatic pendulum in Happy Days swings between Suffering, "a window on the real" and Boredom, "the most tolerable because the most durable of human evils." Each time Winnie's habits are disturbed, she is threatened with awareness. In Act I, the arc of dramatic action is lopsided, barely swinging away from anesthetized serenity. Her rituals
and habits are threatened throughout the act, but only mildly. Did she brush and comb her hair? What exactly is a hog? Is the word hair singular or plural? And Winnie fears the disturbance of her ritual, a disturbance which would lead to a confrontation with the nothingness and force introspection: "... the fear so great, certain days, of finding oneself ... left, with hours still to run, before the bell for sleep, and nothing more to say, nothing more to do, that the days go by, certain days go by, quite by, the bell goes, and little or nothing said, little or nothing done .... That is the danger .... To be guarded against." (35) (Italics mine.) She is incapable of simply confronting the nothingness. Such a confrontation is as close as we come to heroic action in Beckett's world. The protagonist in "Act Without Words, I" is capable of denying the dictates of the outside force and asserting his total self. He is Camus' rebel. He can simply resist and refuse to pursue the very elemental essence of life, water, even if the refusal insures his own destruction. There is a touch of victory in his defiance. But Winnie is incapable of such resistance: "... what could I do, all day long, I mean between the bell for waking and the bell for sleep? .... Simply gaze before me with
compressed lips .... Not another word as long as I
drew breath, nothing to break the silence of this place."
But approaching the void, the wilderness, a confronta-
tion with her Self, she recoils almost immediately;
she needs relief and takes refuge in her appearance,
"Save possibly, now and then, every now and then, a sigh
into my looking-glass." (21) Fortunately for Winnie's
serenity, she does not run out of things to say and
things to do simultaneously. When she finds nothing to
do, she can speak; when words fail, she finds things to
do. "Fortunately I am in tongue again .... That is
what I find so wonderful, my two lamps, when one goes
out the other burns brighter." (36-37)

In Act II, the dramatic arc is more regular, the
swing of action more symmetrical. Willie is apparently
gone. The tension, pathos, and fear of Act II are the
result of a major disturbance in Winnie's world. To com-
bat the disruption, Winnie erects illusions to replace
the missing environmental furniture. If Willie is not
physically present, she will demand that he be. "I say
I used to think that I would learn to talk alone ....
By that I mean to myself, the wilderness .... But no ....
No no .... Ergo you are there .... Oh no doubt you are
dead, like the others, no doubt you have died, or gone
away and left me, like the others, it doesn't matter, you are there." (50)

Another threat to Winnie's adaptation and serenity is Time itself, "that double-headed monster of damnation and salvation," (Proust, p. 1): salvation because it is an instrument of death; damnation, because, in the form of the past, it is a permanent part of us and has altered us; memory is sealed into our being and presents a threat if it is allowed to surface. "There is no escape from the hours and the days. Neither from tomorrow nor from yesterday. There is no escape from yesterday because yesterday has deformed us, or been deformed by us." (Proust, p. 2) Habit is a means of escaping time, especially that time that is locked into the Self, the past. But memory is a constant threat, "a clinical laboratory stocked with poison and remedy, stimulant and sedative." (Proust, p. 22) Beckett, following Proust, speaks of two sorts of memory, voluntary and involuntary. Winnie, like Proust, has a bad memory -- or at least a bad voluntary memory -- and she struggles with it throughout the play trying to recall petty things voluntarily: some literary quotations, the phrase on the toothbrush handle, people's names, the definition of hog. But the inability to
recall information from her memory poses no real threat to her serenity; she can simply dismiss the problem if it poses too great a threat. "What exactly is a hog? ... A sow of course I know, but a hog .... Oh well what does it matter." (19) And she never actively and deliberately tries to recall past events which lead to her present predicament. Voluntary memory, that part of the past which Winnie can willfully recall, poses no great threat in itself. As both Beckett and Proust have argued, it is inessential.

Involuntary memory, on the other hand, poses the serious threat. When dull habit is disturbed, involuntary memory crashes through. "It is only necessary for its (the individual's memory) surface to be broken by a date, by any temporal specification allowing us to measure the days that separate us from a menace -- or a promise."

(Proust, p. 5) Winnie's uncertainty about having brushed and combed her hair disturbs her habit and the result is an intrusion of involuntary memory: "(Pause. She raises hand, frees a strand of hair from under hat, draws it towards eye, squints at it, lets it go, hand down.) Golden you called it, that day, when the last guest was gone -- ... -- to your golden ... may it never ... may it never ... That day ... What day? ...
What now?" (24) The Shower-Cooker memory is also involuntary. "There floats up -- into my thoughts -- a Mr Shower." (41) "Strange thing, time like this, drift up into the mind." (44) And it is Mr. Shower who asks the most pertinent and hence the most threatening questions: "What's she doing? ... What's it meant to mean? ... Why doesn't he dig her out?" (42-43) But Winnie keeps filing her nails through the Shower-Cooker episode. As her voice breaks, she quickly returns to her bag.

Act II is the more desperate act. It opens with Winnie's failure to perform her full morning ritual. She speaks no prayer. With her ritual disturbed, she struggles for the remainder of the play to restore the stability and dullness of the opening act, but the lapses of second nature are more frequent as she is virtually bombarded with involuntary memories. The result is that Winnie even approaches a realization of her condition (albeit temporarily): "The bell ... It hurts like a knife ... A gouge .... One cannot ignore it." (54) But again she has a refuge, her story, an autobiography, but told in the safety of the third person. With her autobiography Winnie withdraws into words.
Winnie has still another habit which helps her through her day, hope, and hope is another narcotic. The hope that Godot will come keeps Vladimir and Estragon from facing the reality of the human condition and seeing "themselves in the harsh light of fully conscious awareness." As Vladimir suggests, "...habit is a great deadener." Winnie's sustaining hopes are first that day will end, and second that perhaps Willie will come live in front of the mound and that the two characters will be joined. The latter is a personal desire based on Winnie's memory of Willie's affection. Both hopes, however, are as futile as the hope of Godot's arrival, for if we accept David Helsa's ingenious analysis, Godot is future time which by definition cannot exist in the present or it would no longer be future time. Godot defines hope. He is the carrot at the end of the stick, always out of reach. Winnie's hopes provide her with insulation from the reality of her condition and reveal her lack of awareness of the flux of human personality. The hope of Willie's moving in front of the mound was occasionally a sustaining desire for Winnie, but once it is apparently fulfilled, Winnie's attitude changes; her tenderness disappears: "(mon-daine). Well this is an unexpected pleasure! ...
Reminds me of the day you came whining for my hand ....

I worship you, Winnie, be mine .... Life a mockery
without Win .... What a get up, you do look a sight!

... Where are the flowers? That smile today ....

What's that on your neck, an anthrax?" (61) The

explanation of Winnie's apparent personality reversal can
be found in Beckett's comments on Proust. "The aspira-
tions of yesterday were valid for yesterday's ego,
not for today's. We are disappointed at the nullity
of what we are pleased to call attainment. But what
is attainment? The identification of the subject with
the object of his desire. The subject has died --
and perhaps many times -- on the way." (Proust, p. 3)

When, by some freak chance, we grasp the carrot at the
end of the stick, we realize that we really wanted a
radish.

The second hope sustains her throughout the play,
the hope that day (or existence) will end. In violent
contrast to this hope is the changelessness of Winnie's
circumstances, a contrast which provides much of the
paradox and dramatic irony of the play. The play opens
on an ironic note of changelessness as Winnie reveals
more than she realizes with the phrases, "Another
heavenly day," and, "World without end Amen." (8)
Heaven itself is a static, eternal condition. And certainly the opening image, Winnie buried up to above her waist is one of Beckett's vivid and concrete images of stasis, immobility and hence a sort of changelessness.

There is of course apparent change during the play. As previously suggested, Winnie's attitude toward Willie has been altered during the course of the play, and she recognizes that the natural world itself has changed; to speak of days, at least days measured by the regular rising and setting of the sun, is to speak in the "old style" for nature no longer functions as it did in the past. In Act II, Winnie is apparently further immobilized, buried now up to her neck, but her essential condition has not significantly altered as the tree's having sprouted a few leaves in Godot has not significantly altered the predicament of Vladimir and Estragon. Death itself may be such a superficial change for it does not affect the problems of consciousness, and perhaps, if we examine Beckett's "Play," does not even solve the individual's social agony. Winnie too is waiting in a world which is running down. As in Endgame, things are running out for the protagonists. Willie is running out of Vaseline. Winnie is out of toothpaste, lipstick, and, like Hamm, pain killer or medicine. Her
eyes are deteriorating; Hamm's have. Even nature has almost stopped. Winnie: "Do you think the earth has lost its atmosphere, Willie?" (51) Clov: "There's no more nature." (Endgame, p. 11) The themes of cachexia and entropy run throughout Godot, Endgame, and Happy Days. Ihab Hassan's suggestions about Godot apply equally to Endgame and Happy Days: "The inaction of the play is cyclical, and its events are endlessly repetitious; its two acts are symmetric, both equal images of an absence. Two acts, as Beckett knew, are enough to represent a sequence stretching to infinity. And yet the force of entropy may be felt even in a cyclical system; the world of the play tends to run down." 

Beckett's description of the props he used in his own production reveals that he wanted the decay and deterioration reflected in the physical objects of the production. The toothbrush has hardly any hairs left. Only fragments of a label remain on the toothpaste tube. The medicine bottle has a damaged label. Winnie's handkerchief, Willie's boater and newspaper are all yellowed. Winnie's necklace has more thread than pearls. (Regiebuch, pp. 82-83)

The conflict then seems paradoxical: change and no change simultaneously. These are as Winnie suggests,
"difficulties here, for the mind." (51) For Winnie herself verbalizes the paradox, with little or no indication of its real import: "To have been always what I am -- and so changed from what I was .... I am the one, I say the one, then the other." (51) Within the superficial changes she observes, her elemental condition is unaltered. Even the increased heat is not a significant change. "With the sun blazing so much fiercer down, and hourly fiercer .... It is no hotter today than yesterday, it will be no hotter tomorrow than today ...." (38) Wylie notes that changelessness might have advantages: "while one may not look forward to things getting any better, at least one need not fear their getting any worse. They will always be the same as they always were." (Murphy, 58) But, in Beckett's world, Wylie's view is excessively optimistic; it fails to consider the paradoxical cachexia.

Thematically then, Happy Days is strikingly related to Endgame. Like Hamm and Clov, Winnie and Willie are complementary characters, opposites. Despite her partial burial, Winnie remains in the dignified vertical position, a thinking animal; Willie, a beast on all fours, leering over a pornographic postcard. In both plays
words fail, that is, fail in their essential function as conveyors of real meaning and agents of communication, and the failure of words represents a failure of controlling order, a failure of God. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (John, 1:1) In both plays an insect represents the possibility of continued life. Clov is bothered by a flea, and Hamm, the anti-Noah at this point, yells, "But humanity might start from there all over again."

(Endgame, p. 33) Winnie is fascinated by an emmet, carrying its eggs. Both Hamm and Winnie pass the time by telling thinly-disguised autobiographical stories and both fantasize about being watched: Hamm -- "All kinds of fantasies! That I'm being watched." (Endgame, p. 70) Winnie -- "Someone is looking at me still .... Caring for me still." (49) As Clov prepares to leave Hamm, he is dressed with mild ostentation:

"Panama hat, tweed coat, raincoat over his arm, umbrella, bag." (Endgame, p. 82) Clov, in addition to carrying Beckett's standard array of props, is like Willie "dressed to kill." In both plays the distinction between day and night has ended. In Endgame, there is only grey. In Happy Days, the opposite -- blazing sun; night and its promised relief, never come. In one of
the earlier versions of *Endgame*, while the play was still two acts, the second act opened with Hamm's ironic remark about the beauty of life. The scene was cut from the final version of *Endgame*, perhaps because Hamm, acutely aware of his condition, would simply be mouthing a heavy-handed irony. But Beckett apparently did not want to waste the scene, for it forms the core of *Happy Days*. A similar remark opens both acts of *Happy Days*, but with the important difference that Winnie is never aware of the irony. Thematically, the two plays explore the confluence of tragedy and comedy. Nell suggests one of *Endgame*'s primary themes: "Nothing is funnier than unhappiness." In *Happy Days*, the confluence is seen from another angle: nothing is more painful (or tragic, or ironic) than happiness.

But perhaps the most significant parallel between the two plays is the paradoxical, absurd desire to end coupled with the inability to end. Like Vladimir and Estragon, Winnie is waiting for Godot, her salvation, an end. "Finished," says Clov, echoing what Beckett has called in *Murphy* "Christ's parthian shaft" (72), "it's finished, nearly finished, it must be nearly finished." (*Endgame*, p. 1) Part of the frustration of *Endgame* is that the results of the agonizing game
will not be checkmate, an end with some discernible consequence, but a stalemate, with nothing accomplished, no change. The young boy may replace Clov who may replace Hamm who may move into the garbage can (as Watt moved from the ground floor to the first), but the essential agonies of existence remain unaltered. Change is a minor readjustment of objects in space, but it does not affect the essence of the objects. As in Murphy's chess game with Mr. Endon, where at the end of forty-three moves neither side has lost a piece (although Murphy has tried), and Mr. Endon is preparing to move his king into its original position, the possibility of accomplishing nothing after hours of play is omnipresent. The schizophrenic Mr. Endon refuses to allow Murphy the solace of End, but forces him on.

The most forceful image of the inability to end in Endgame is the reference to the grains of millet.
"That old Greek," probably Zeno or Parmenides, demonstrates that the "movements and thoughts of a finite being in space and time are unrelated to, and incompatible with, the 'reality' of the Universe, since the essence of reality is infinity." Transferring a heap of millet from one spot to another by moving half the original pile at a time is impossible in a finite world. "In an
infinite universe, the heap could be complete; in a finite universe, never, for the nearer it gets to the totality, the slower it increases." Attaining the Unit by halves is impossible, i.e., \( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{32} \ldots \), never equals one. Another of the Eleatic paradoxes disproves motion; that is, change and motion are illusory. The proof suggests that an arrow in flight is actually at each instant of time at rest. Is motion then the sum of these still points? Motion is illusion as is the apparent change in Winnie's condition.

Zeno's paradoxes are particularly significant to *Endgame* when applied to the end of time. The closer we approach the end, the slower time moves, the more impossible the end becomes. "Moment upon moment," says Hamm, "patterning down, like the millet grains of ...." (*Endgame*, p. 70) In *Happy Days*, Winnie is buried in the heap of millet, or half buried, at any rate. In the second act, half again of her remaining self is buried. She is being buried by moments, time, but she will never be completely buried. As such Winnie's condition forms an interesting parallel with the Unnamable's:

... the question may be asked, off the record, why time doesn't pass, doesn't pass from you, why it piles up all about you, instant on instant, on all sides, deeper and deeper, thicker and thicker, your time, others' time, the time of the ancient dead and the dead yet unborn, why it buries you grain by grain
neither dead nor alive, with no memory of anything, no hope of anything, no knowledge, no history and no prospects, buried under the seconds, saying any old thing, your mouth full of sand, oh I know it's immaterial, time is one thing, I another, but the question may be asked, why time doesn't pass, just like that, off the record, en passant, to pass the time."

The apparent change we see between the acts of Happy Days is actually no change at all. As Winnie herself suggests about her own condition, "No better, no worse, no change." (13) The parasol, ostensibly destroyed in Act I, reappears in Act II: "Bag and parasol as before." In fact almost nothing has changed: "Scene as before." In Act II, Winnie approaches the realization of the impossibility to end: "There always remains something .... Of everything .... Some remains." (52) But she is again saved by her habitual use of language. She never fully understands the import of the words she uses. What remains, of course, is some part of being, the consciousness, the I, the preceptere. Winnie's case is not so strange. We are all being buried alive by Time. Habit is Winnie's defense against the agony of consciousness and the impossibility of finishing. But Winnie never fully realizes her plight. That lack of awareness provides the play with its central dramatic irony, that is, the audience understands more
about Winnie's plight than does Winnie, but it also deprives her of any tragic dimension. Awareness and recognition are crucial to tragedy. As Camus suggests of both Oedipus and Sisyphus, "Oedipus at the outset obeys fate without knowing it. But from the moment he knows, his tragedy begins." And with that knowledge comes the possibility of victory. Winnie never knows. Habits protect her from knowing. And although the lack of knowledge makes her happiness possible and keeps her from being tragic, it also blocks her victory.

* * * *

The visual image of immobility, of Winnie buried up to her waist, was present in Beckett's earliest notes for Happy Days. (In fact, the central image is very like the Unnamable's vision of Malone: "There are no days here, but I use the expression. I see him from the waist up, he stops at the waist ..." (Three Novels, p. 292.) But originally Willie (Tom at this point) was also part of the opening tableau. One of Beckett's first revisions was to eliminate Willie from the opening, a change consistent with Beckett's working, descriptive title at the top of the page, "female solo."
The revision reveals Beckett's changing focus for the play; the audience attention will be primarily on Winnie. Unlike earlier plays, the complementary nature of the two characters will not be so balanced. Winnie's opening lines, which establish the primary dramatic irony, a conflict between Winnie's plight and her attitude toward it, were at first simply, "Another glorious day" (ETE 56, p. 37), and the two Amens after her silent prayer. Praise for the day, given her plight, would establish the central irony, but only on a single level. Beckett's revisions of this opening monologue reveal a masterful bit of dramaturgy since they reinforce the theme of elemental stasis within apparent change and increase the importance of the religious irony introduced with the silent prayers.

The revision of a single word altered the direction of the entire opening scene: "glorious" was revised to "heavenly." With that change, the level of complexity of Winnie's plight is increased with the introduction of another paradoxical contrast, the conflict between the traditional blissful notion of heaven and its potential horror, its changelessness, its eternity, its blandness. The day Winnie praises as heavenly, looks more like hell, and the substance
of Beckett's early revisions reinforce the hellish nature of the day and its contrast with the ideal, established with the inclusion of a quote from Milton's *Paradise Lost* about the "Holy Light." The image conflicts with Winnie's observation, "blaze of hellish light." (11)

In revision, Beckett creates an increasingly hostile environment. The countryside is altered from, "grassy expanse rising gently," to the final, "expanse of scorched grass rising centre." The original lighting description is changed: "Strong sunlight," becomes "Blazing light." As the hellishness of the environment and its association with the eternal stasis of heaven increase, the ironies intensify.

The horror of heavenly stasis is reinforced by two additional changes Beckett made in Winnie's opening speech. Rather than have Winnie's morning prayers totally inaudible, Beckett had her speak two fragments. As the play was nearing its final form (Typescript III) Beckett added the two fragments in the margin: "For Jesus Christ sake," and the more devastating reflection of the impossibility of termination, "World without end." Horror emerges from these relatively innocent prayers when one realizes, something Winnie never does,
that the traditional Christian concept of an eternal heaven is exactly the opposite of what Beckett's characters, including Winnie, actually desire. Winnie wants an end, if only to the day, but heaven is perpetuation, endlessness, the opposite of the eternal peace, sleep, unconsciousness, that "Belacqua bliss" Winnie so admires in Willie. Heaven is the perpetuation of that something which always remains, the I.

But Winnie is Beckett's eternal optimist and believes, like Hamlet, that perhaps the hellish sun can help her end, destroy her flesh. Hamlet's problems would end, he believes, if his solid and sullied flesh would melt. Winnie dreams of a similar end: "...and wait for the day to come ... the happy day to come when flesh melts at so many degrees ...." (18) And again, for it is a profound hope: "Shall I myself not melt perhaps in the end, or burn, oh I do not mean necessarily burst into flames, no, just little by little charred to a black cinder, all this ... visible flesh." (38) The horror is in the little by little, and even then perhaps her agony would not abate for the hope is superficial, for the flesh. Something would remain. In Endgame, Hamm understands the impossibility of ending as Winnie never does. He can speak of the "last
million last moments." (Endgame, p. 83) Winnie never realizes that being charred to a black cinder may not be an end. For the audience, her parasol is a reminder. It was consumed by flames in the first act, but appears unscarred in the second. Hamlet too perhaps misses the same irony when he fails to recognize that death was not an end for his father.

Fortunately for her, Winnie never hears her prayer. It is simply part of her morning ritual. She becomes an ironic victim by her own innocent unawareness. She moves on to brush her teeth. She inspects them and in the first typescript, Beckett added two other ironic religious phrases, both of which have for Winnie lost their meaning: "Good Lord ... Good God." The good is ironic, a counterpoint to her condition, but Winnie is again saved from meaning by her habitual use of language and almost total lack of awareness. She sees no irony because words have no meaning for her other than as sustaining sound. She is never bothered, as is Clov, by the failure of words. In a fit of temper Clov can shout, "I use the words you taught me. If they don't mean anything anymore, teach me others." (Endgame, p. 44)

The theme of the stasis and changelessness is brilliantly emphasized with the addition of the second
act. Despite the peculiarities of Act I, Act II is "as before." But Winnie is buried now up to her neck, and the opening visual image creates the initial impression of change. Yet the change is as superficial and circular as the apparent change in the book of Ecclesiastes, in which the sun dominates as an image as it does throughout Happy Days:

The wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north: it whirleth about continually, and the wind returneth again according to his circuits .... The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us.

(Ecclesiastes 1:6, 9-10)

Winnie echoes these lines: "Yes, something seems to have occurred, something has seemed to occur, and nothing has occurred, nothing at all, you are quite right, Willie .... The sunshade will be there again tomorrow, beside me on this mound, to help me through the day ... I take up this little glass, I shiver it on a stone ... I throw it away ... it will be in the bag again tomorrow, without a scratch, to help me through the day." (39)

The stasis is further bolstered when Beckett added the phrase "no change" twice to Winnie's opening monologue.
The themes of stasis and entropy which Beckett so carefully reinforced in his revisions of Winnie's opening monologue and then orchestrated throughout the entire play are fundamental to Happy Days. Stasis, cachexia, and entropy form a hub from which other themes derive like spokes. Stasis and deterioration intensify Winnie's problems of adjustment and force her defensive response with a variety of habits. And habit itself is an effective protection of the self because of a Cartesian, or more exactly an Occasionalist, split between mind and body, two separate, unrelated systems. Man, or Woman, has very little control over his actions because the system of mind does not control (or even work in harmony with) the system of body. Winnie cannot put down her parasol even though holding it up serves no useful function; it brings no relief. On the contrary, it increases pain; it only wearies the arm. The parasol is another of the inadequate tools with which man must try to work. Like the scissors in "Act Without Words, I" it is useless as a real aid. Yet Winnie cannot simply stop using it. "I am weary, holding it up, and I cannot put it down. ... I am worse off with it up than with it down, and I cannot put it down. ... Reason says, Put it down, Winnie, it is not helping you, put the thing down and get on with
something else .... I cannot .... I cannot move."

(36) Song cannot emerge from the body simply because the mind wills it. Song, says Winnie, "must come from the heart." (40) Alan Schneider's off-Broadway production brilliantly emphasized the Cartesian split between mind and body by adding to Beckett's script several attempts on Winnie's part to sing. No song emerged.

The Cartesian theme is a variation of Murphy's plight:

Thus Murphy felt himself split in two, a body and a mind. They had intercourse apparently, otherwise he could not have known that they had anything in common. But he felt his mind to be bodtight and did not understand through what channel the intercourse was effected nor how the two experiences came to overlap. He was satisfied that neither followed from the other. He neither thought a kick because he felt one nor felt a kick because he thought one. (Murphy, p. 109)

The visual image of the Cartesian split is, of course, the characters themselves. Willie wallowing along the earth on all fours, often naked, is the physical side of man's nature, while Winnie is the intellectual, albeit limited and defective. Such a neat dichotomy is naturally an oversimplification of a complex relationship, but it is necessary to see the relationship of character development to a philosophical premise. As Beckett conceived of Winnie's body being more and more
imprisoned, Willie spends more time in his cave. His role is gradually reduced in revision. Their relationship is an orchestration of the theme of the impossibility of harmonious union between the two and as such, the play, like Endgame, can be viewed as a monodrama. Like Words and Music in the play of the same name, and Voice and Music in "Cascando" (the word itself echoes decay), Willie and Winnie are structurally incompatible, portions of a self which cannot unite. The theme is voiced by Winnie, but without any real understanding: "I know it does not follow when two are gathered together ... in this way ... that because one sees the other the other sees the one ...." (28) The Biblical echo of when two are gathered is here a bitterly ironic statement of disjunction.

Despite her literary quotations, Winnie is not one of Beckett's thinkers. She never has the sort of self-awareness and insight which haunt Murphy, Watt, and the Unnamable. She does not, as many scholars argue, grow through her experiences. Edith Kern, for one, suggests that Winnie comes "to resemble Kierkegaard's 'knight of infinite resignation' who, convinced that there is no happiness and knowing the absurdity of existence, shares the humdrum life of his fellow
citizens, but does so with that inner freedom that only his particular awareness can lend him."19 (Italics mine.) But Professor Kern's inventive analysis would lead us to ignore much of the play's ending.

As the play nears its end, Willie's role begins. Until the final scene we have seen Willie primarily through Winnie's consciousness, an interesting structural achievement in the drama. Such a subjective treatment of a character is unusual for the drama, which of all the literary genres is the most objective. But Beckett has always been expanding and destroying traditional forms, testing the limits, the breaking points, of a genre. In the drama and fiction Beckett has demonstrated new possibilities, altering those two genres permanently. Although Happy Days contains two characters, it remains essentially a "female solo." Almost all of our knowledge of Willie comes through Winnie; it is filtered through that same consciousness that has managed to avoid seeing and understanding its own plight. The impression that Winnie provides of Willie is that he is reasonably content, in a sort of "Belacqua bliss." He sleeps, unaffected by the bell; he admires the models on the pornographic post card;
we are reminded that he is the brute beast that Winnie occasionally envies. But in the final scene, we find the contrary. Willie, "dressed to kill," makes a desperate attempt to attain the one symbol of ending that has been present throughout the play, and which Winnie failed to recognize as such, the revolver. We realize, perhaps for the first time, that Willie is also in torment and is desperately trying to end his own life, Winnie's, or both.

The key to the ending is Winnie's attitude to Willie's struggle. Her attitude to the gun throughout has been romantic and scientific. When she first pulls it from her bag, she gives this phallic symbol a kiss. She wonders about the intellectual problem it poses, why natural laws have not pulled the heavy gun into the lower depths of the bag. It sits conspicuously on the mound throughout the play, a possible means of ending her agony. And although the gun as Beckett described it for his production is very old, decaying along with everything else, and probably would not work even if one of the characters tried to use it, Winnie, nonetheless, leaves its potential unexplored. And we are certain that she does not understand its possibilities nor the reason Willie is trying to attain
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it; Willie's quest only rekindles ideas of romance in her head. She sings a sentimental waltz duet while Willie musters all his strength to end, a physical attempt that Winnie was never capable of. Willie struggles to end, and hence to "Win," and Winnie sings: "It's true, it's true, you love me so!" The two have not united. The day has not ended. We have moved in an incredibly symmetrical circle. Tomorrow, to speak in the old style, it will all begin again.
Notes: Chapter III


11. Ibid., pp. 37, 40.


15. Coe, p. 89.

16. Ibid., p. 90.


Chapter IV

Beckett's Dramatic Style: The Vaguening of Happy Days

Since Colin Duckworth's study of the making of 
En attendant Godot^1 aroused interest in Beckett's
manuscript revisions, other critical discussions of
Beckett's early drafts and creative process have
emphasized his "detailed revisions"^2 and stylistic
precision. Ruby Cohn, for one, has demonstrated the
"tightened revision" of the Endgame manuscripts.^3
But while most analyses of Beckett's manuscripts
have outlined the structural progression of a work and
noted his meticulous craftsmanship, few have completely
characterized the revisions or examined them against
the backdrop of Beckett's philological and aesthetic
premises. The emphasis of stylistic care and detailed,
meticulous revision, the careful reshaping of characters,
scenes, symbols from discarded works into new ones
(e.g., Duckworth's analysis of the Mercier et Camier
and Eleuthèria material used in Godot) seem, for exam-
ple, at odds with Beckett's professed distrust of
language and the power of the artist to communicate.
For Beckett, the artist cannot convey meaning; he is
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doomed to failure, working as he does in ignorance and impotence. Beckett claims that, unlike Joyce, he is not the master of his material: "The more Joyce knew the more he could. He's tending toward omniscience and omnipotence. I am working with impotence, ignorance." Yet, Beckett continues the struggle to form the chaos, to master his material.

The paradox has no easy solution, and certainly this chapter attempts none. It simply suggests that while the manuscript revisions and tinkerings of *Happy Days* still reveal Beckett's characteristic and paradoxical preoccupation with the exact word, the exact phrase, the exact rhythm and balance of words in a phrase, they also reveal development more consistent with the author's distrust of language and disdain for realistic detail. In many ways, the early drafts of *Happy Days* are more "realistic" than the printed version. The major structural and thematic alterations in the manuscripts demonstrate not an evolution toward fuller explanation of characters and situation, but the opposite, a development away from what Beckett has called, "the grotesque fallacy of a realistic art -- 'that miserable statement of line and surface,' and the penny-a-line vulgarity of a literature of notations,"
In a sense, the process of composition in *Happy Days* is almost decomposition, a direction consistent with Beckett's professed aesthetic: "The artistic tendency is not expansive, but a contraction."

Beckett's development of *Happy Days* is virtually a microcosm of his overall artistic development. The pattern from *Godot* to "Breath," from *Murphy* to *The Lost Ones* is toward silence (itself an impossible end for the artist). And in the drama even names for characters are used less and less frequently.

Between the beginning of the first draft, October 8, 1960, and the production of the play, September 17, 1961, *Happy Days* went through eight versions, each of which was itself frequently revised. During the fourth version, Beckett altered the structure from one to two acts (a structural solution the reverse of the *Endgame* composition). In the first five versions, Beckett repeatedly struggled with the physical description of the set. From the first, the play's setting remained that of the printed version, but Beckett originally tried to describe the dimensions of the mound more specifically. Beckett's earliest notes on the play (*ETE 56*) contain a set description which is virtually revision free. But the first full version of the play
(H-1) has three separate attempts to render the set description with mathematical precision, the most labored of which is as follows:

Grassy expanse rising gently front to a low mound summit about 4' high. The swell of the ground is broken, on either side of the summit by two ledges, the lower about 2' from the ground, the upper about 1' below summit. The summit exactly in the centre and would effect one of severe symmetry

(H-1, p. 2).

By the second typescript, actually the fifth version of the play, Beckett has simplified the description somewhat: "Expanse of scorched grass rising front to low mound. The summit, 4' high and at exact centre of rise, is a flattened area about 3' square. The slopes leading up to it on either side are identical in contour. Effect of strict symmetry." (Tss-2, p. 1) But evidently the description left Beckett dissatisfied, for it is canceled, and in the margin he jotted a telling comment which characterizes many of the major revisions in the Happy Days manuscripts. The note says simply, "Vaguen." The result is the abstracted, less precise final version: "Expanse of scorched grass rising centre to low mound. Gentle slopes down to front and either side of stage."
Back an abrupter fall to stage level. Maximum of simplicity and symmetry." While the change in set description does not affect the structure or thematic details of the play, it does reveal a characteristic distrust of or reluctance for definite explanation and development. As Beckett revealed to Tom Driver, "The key word in my plays is "perhaps"."  

A pattern of revision tending toward greater ambiguity is evident in the manuscripts of a number of Beckett's works. One of the important observations Colin Duckworth makes about the Godot revisions is that the arrangement for Vladimir and Estragon to wait for Godot was not originally just verbal, but written down, and by Godot himself. "For Godot to have written down the words himself," Duckworth concludes, "he must have a physical reality; this obvious consequence led to the omission of the piece of paper. But we see from this version something not entirely without significance, that Beckett originally envisaged the two characters to be waiting for a real reason."  

In the final version, the reason, the reality of Godot, and the relationship of the two waiters to him are more ambiguous. Richard Admussen observed a similar pattern of dramatic composition in the manuscripts of "Play" where, he notes, "the dialogue moves from the concrete to the vague."
Describing the \textit{Happy Days} manuscripts for the 1971 Reading University exhibition on Samuel Beckett, Professor James Knowlson has noted, "the setting is made vaguer, whereas the figure of the woman (Winnie) is described in greater detail." But the pattern of vaguening is more pervasive in the revisions of \textit{Happy Days} than Prof. Knowlson suggests. While we do learn a bit more about Winnie's physical appearance in the first full holograph version (i.e., she is about fifty, not forty, and plump), and still more by the final version (i.e., "blond for preference, ... low bodice ... pearl necklet"), the overall pattern of revision throughout the manuscripts is an excision of revealing, sometimes realistic and concrete, details, and a movement toward more ambiguous conflicts.

One of the play's ambiguous scenes, for instance, occurs near the end as Willie, dressed to kill, ascends the mound. As the scene developed, Beckett added some concrete dialogue for Winnie, but the specific diction was undercut by the retention of a vague verb and a revision which drives the entire scene toward greater ambiguity. The scene is worth some attention since it is characteristic of Beckett's dramatic style in \textit{Happy Days}. Beckett's earliest note on Winnie's dialogue as
Winnie ascends the mound says simply: "She: Is it the revolver you are after, dear, or me." (ETE 56, p. 41) The next note is partly more specific, but introduces an ambiguity about the alternative to Winnie. Is she referring to the poet or to the brand name of the gun? "Is it a kiss you're looking for -- or Browning?" (H-1, p. 153) When the bit of dialogue is incorporated into the text a few pages later, the tendency away from mentioning the revolver begins: "Is it me you're after, Willie ... or is it something else? (Pause.) Is it a kiss you're after, Willie ... or is it Browning?" (H-2, p. 156) The final version appears in the first typed copy of Act II (Tss-1): "Is it me you're after, Willie ... or is it something else? ... Wd. you like to touch my face ... again? (Pause.) Is it a kiss you're after, Willie ... or is it something else?"

Although "touch" and "kiss" make the scene more concrete, the incident is dominated by the vague phrase which, with repetition, takes on a sinister air, "or something else?" The earliest choice Winnie posed was simply, "the revolver ... or me." The retention of the vague verb "to be after" and the excision of the specific reference to the revolver, make the scene extremely ambiguous. Is Willie struggling toward Winnie, the
revolver or both? And to what end: to kiss or kill her? -- or to end his own misery? Does the "something else" also create at least a faint ring of sexual desire in Winnie? Moreover, twice in the EPE 56 notebook Beckett has noted the possibility that Winnie believes that Willie may be coming to dig her out: "End: Come to dig me out?" The increased ambiguity of Winnie's remarks is important to her characterization since it decreases her awareness of the object of Willie's quest. She may not even be aware that Willie is possibly struggling toward the gun. Notwithstanding the addition of some specific diction to this final scene, the overall pattern of revision is toward increased ambiguity and multiple possibility.

One of Beckett's major revisions alters the fundamental conflict of the whole play. In the first three versions of *Happy Days*, Winnie is awakened not by the piercing bell, which Beckett has called Winnie's enemy, but by an alarm clock, which rings softly. With the clock, Winnie has more knowledge about the progress of the day than without it, knowledge which she can use to regulate and order her own activities, pace herself to avoid gaps in time with nothing to do, shape her day with a beginning, middle, and end. The alarm clock offered
Winnie a guide to the possible relief from the trials of the day (day's end), a guide not usually available to other Beckett characters. Near the end of the first typescript (the play's third version), for instance, Winnie consults her alarm clock: "(Pause. She takes up and consults clock.) The day is now well advanced according to this. Perhaps I should set it for bedtime, while I think of it. (She sets and winds clock. As she does so.) Otherwise one is liable to overshoot the hour. (Winding.) And there is not much point in that." But Beckett was evidently bothered by the alarm clock, even though he stipulated that the face should face the audience. First, he moved the alarm clock into Winnie's bag (ETE 56, p. 40), then finally cut it all together: "Cut out alarm clock. Invisible bell." (ETE 56, p. 42)

The revision from alarm clock to piercing bell affects the shape and direction of the entire play; the essential conflict is altered and intensified. The tension and conflict in the earlier version depend on a variation of the Cartesian split between mind and body, on the counterpoint between Winnie's struggles to regulate her day and the futility of human action, where one is even powerless to doff one's hat: "To
think there are times when one simply cannot take off one's hat, not if one's life (→ were at stake). Times when one cannot put it on, times one cannot take it off." (Tss-1, p. 7) This earlier conflict is personal; the obligation for ordering the day is Winnie's. If the result is chaos, the failure is individual, a failure of self, and such individual failure is the basis of tragedy, classical tragedy at any rate. In revision, however, the play moves toward the pathetic, toward what Jan Kott calls the grotesque, as the self is more the helpless victim of a vague outside force. The result is a conflict more cosmic, but less clearly defined since little is said specifically of the force directing Winnie. Like the protagonist in Beckett's first mime, "Act Without Words, I," Winnie's struggle is with some loosely defined outside force which is not really God, nor nature, nor history, nor others. Unlike the protagonist of the mime, however, the Winnie of the final version does not have the quasi-heroic potential in her personality of refusing to play the game. While she regulated her action with the alarm clock, she retained a certain freedom of choice; she could conceivably choose not to respond to the gentle summon of the alarm, or she might simply switch it off.
and return to sleep. In the earlier drafts, the relationship between Winnie and the clock is clearly less hostile than between Winnie and the bell. "Alarm rings loudly, runs down, stops. Neither has stirred. Thirty seconds. Alarm rings softly. Woman starts awake." (ETE 56, p. 37) In revision the intensity of the summons is increased and the duration between summons shortened. "A bell rings piercingly, say ten seconds, stops. She does not move. Pause. Bell more piercingly, say five seconds. She wakes." (8) Choice and what limited free will Winnie had are eliminated as the play developed. The bell is violent and demanding: "how often I have said, Ignore it, Winnie, ignore the bell, pay no heed, just sleep and wake, sleep and wake, as you please .... But no." (54) She can only comply to the demands of the grotesque, absurd force. As Jan Kott describes the grotesque, paltry man is pitted against the absolute, which "is not endowed with ultimate reasons; it is stronger, and that is all. The absolute is absurd."9

At the end of the final version of Happy Days, the conflict between Winnie and the blind mechanism is acute. Having finished her romantic love-song, she closes her eyes to end a perfect day, but the bell has
the last jab: whatever serenity she was building towards is shattered when, "Bell rings loudly." The final pain is crueler than tragedy, for it is punishment without justice, but it is the view of tragedy that Beckett expressed in his essay on Proust: "Tragedy is not concerned with human justice. Tragedy is the statement of an expiation, but not the miserable expiation of a codified breach of a local arrangement, organised by the knaves for the fools. The tragic figure represents the expiation of original sin, of the original and eternal sin of him and all his 'soci malorum,' the sin of having been born." (Proust, p. 49)

Cutting the alarm clock sequence destroys the possibility of Winnie's measuring the day's progress. Winnie is no longer sure when, or if, her day will end. With the clock she might know that day is not ending, that perhaps days no longer end. The knowledge might shatter her artificial yet carefully established serenity. The possibility of endlessness, a glimpse at the void, is precisely the vision which must be kept from her to maintain her character. Beckett decreases awareness and the possibility of ordering her day with ritual with another excision. An oversized shopping bag lies beside Winnie throughout the play. In it are various
objects which help her pass the time when words fail. In the earlier drafts, she knew and could enumerate more of the bag's contents. The bag, as Beckett described it, is her friend, and when she knew more about the bag's contents, the possibilities of enduring the day were greater. In the second draft, she could say: "I could name many things of course, those I require daily, others of occasional utility, perhaps forty or fifty all told, but all, no, I could not name all .... No .... The deeper layers in particular, who knows what forbidden treasures -- letters, favours, tokens, trinkets, petals, dance-cards with pencils, theatre and concert programmes. (Pause. Break in voice.) Prospectuses. (Pause. Do.) Buttons." (Tss-1, p. 11)

In the final version, the list is eliminated and with it an indication that time or days still pass, as they did in "the old style," and that her ritual varied. We are deprived of this residue of Winnie's life, drags which provided specific details of Winnie's past. What remains in the final text is a suggestion of additional objects hidden in the depths of her bag: "Could I, if some kind person were to come along and ask, What all have you got in that big black bag, Winnie? give an exhaustive answer? ... No .... The depths in
particular, who knows what treasures ... What comforts."

(32) Curiously, when Beckett prepared a list of the contents of Winnie's bag in his production *Regiebuch*, he listed them under the heading "known contents" and included comb and brush, neither of which is shown in the play and a rather mysterious "miscellaneous" category also marked "not shown." (*Regiebuch*, p. 3) Winnie, with fewer known objects, is more alone and helpless, has fewer comforts; she has or knows of fewer objects with which to pass time. If the bag is Winnie's friend, as Beckett suggests, she now has less of a friend.

The second significant change is the decrease in Willie's role. In the earlier versions of the play, Willie is still the reticent counterpart to the loquacious Winnie, but he speaks more frequently and the extra tidbits he reads from the *Reynolds News* provide more concrete information about the couple's plight. In the final version, we have no idea why Willie can only crawl, why Winnie is buried -- they simply are, examples of the modern human condition which is itself beyond explanation. But in the first two drafts of the play (*H-1, Tss-1*), the two characters appear to be part of an entire world gone mad. Both *Endgame* and
Happy Days are permeated with the suggestion of nuclear devastation, but critics generally shy away from any such specific, realistic interpretation. In the early manuscripts of Happy Days, however, Beckett himself suggests explicitly that Willie and Winnie are part of a larger technological world out of control. Willie, called simply "B" at this point, reads from his yellowed paper: "'Rocket strikes Pomona, seven hundred thousand missing' .... 'Rocket strikes Man, one female lavatory attendant spared.' .... (→ 'Aberrant rocket strikes Erin), eighty-three priests survive'." (Tss-1, p. 4) The seriousness of the devastation is undercut by the incongruous scatological and anti-clerical suggestions, but Beckett originally followed the horror with a brilliantly comic understatement: "Opening for smart youth." With seven hundred thousand missing one would expect at least several openings. The horrible blend of grotesque and comic must have been difficult to cut. Beckett's initial impulse was to expand the scene by having Winnie echo: "Sixty-three priests, did you say? (Pause.) Was it 63 priests I heard you say, Edward?" Edward's response was typically curt: "83." But this note Beckett wrote to himself in the ETE 56 notebook was never incorporated into the text
and Beckett finally cut the entire scene. If the section on technological insanity were allowed to stand, the focus of the play would broaden to include a world-wide madness and the isolated examination of the couple would be lost. And perhaps the madness of modern technological existence and the arbitrariness of survival (a favorite Beckett theme) are too self-evident for Beckett to dramatize so blatantly. But even if the excision of the rocket attacks helps Beckett maintain his vision isolated on his two specimens, a microscopic vision, and moves the play from a realistic to a more ethereal, metaphysical reality, it also suggests Beckett's preference for (a preference which dominates his later work) less clearly defined situations, a desire to move beyond the realistic, recognizable world. Beckett has praised the work of the painter Bram Van Velde because he was "the first to submit wholly to the incoercible absence of relation ...."10 With the excision of the rocket attack, Beckett moves further away from relation. His characters, as Hugh Kenner observes, "will not fit into some vast social or fictional machine .... Nor, in the late phases of the enterprise, will they fit into any known world."11 A realistic explanation of how Beckett's characters got into their predicament may
finally be irrelevant. They are there -- born, on
earth -- and there is no cure for that. A realistic
and accurate explanation of their past, if such were
possible, is no help to them or us since the past is
not something one uses to make sense of the present.
As Mrs. Nixon suggests of Watt, "What does it matter
who he is? ... Or what he does .... Or how he lives.
Or where he comes from. Or where he is going to.
Or what he looks like. What can it possibly matter,
to us." (Watt, p. 23) Beckett's artistic aim is not
to explain the mess: "The only chance of renovation
is to open our eyes and see the mess. It is not a
mess you can make sense of."^12

The third set of revisions affects the level of
Winnie's characterization. As Beckett reshaped the
structure of Happy Days from one to two acts, two scenes
which focus on Winnie's past and develop sympathy for
her are cut. The cuts are consistent with the new
tonal pattern established by Beckett for the two act
structure: Act I is predominantly comic, with serious
revelation often undercut with comic action; pathos and
desperation are reserved for Act II. The result is a
second act more repetitious than Godot's since in
Happy Days the major difference between the acts is
tone. Once Beckett decided on a second act, he made a number of cuts in the original material to increase Winnie's comic detachment from the audience and ensure that in the first act at least she remains more caricature than character; with the cuts, however, some intimate information about Winnie's past and an emotional dramatization of her growing desperation are lost.

In the one act version of *Happy Days*, the first holograph and typescript, the sexual overtones of both the Charlie Hunter (at one stage called Bunny Hunter) and Johnston reminiscences are more explicit. Winnie was originally confronted with sexual advances from a man old enough to be her grandfather: "A Mr Johnston, or Johnson, very bushy moustache, (very brown), I suppose that is what vanquished my scruples. Old enough to be my father in those days and indeed it later transpired my grandfather. He was eager I recall to put his tongue in my mouth." (Tss-1, p. 4) The original reminiscence has no interruption between the Johnston story and the Hunter story; given the sexual nature of the Johnston story, one suspects that the Most Reverend Hunter, not long ago elevated (a sexual pun Beckett evidently could not resist), with the fifteen-year-old Winnie sitting on his knee, may have had more than
paternal affection for her. In revision, definition of the relationship is vaguened; the sexual advance and the mention of Johnson's age are cut; the connection of the two reminiscences is decreased by Willie's interruption, "Opening for smart youth." The sexual overtones of the final version are carried by the word "tool." As a result of the excision Winnie is less the victim of the men in her life and sympathy for her is decreased in the first act to maintain its comic tone.

The allusion to Winnie's youthful sexual experience is not, however, dropped altogether. It reappears metaphorically, if not euphemistically, in the more desperate second act. When Winnie tells her autobiographical story about young Mildred (a name which in earlier versions was used for Winnie), Beckett includes an image of a mouse running up her leg, a sexual image. John Fletcher characterizes the narrative as a "burlesque tale of how little Mildred was deflowered by a mouse ...."13

The second excised scene dramatized Winnie's growing desperation, her overtly stated need for, if not communication itself, at least the illusion of communication, and the awareness of her isolation. The section follows an allusion to Cordelia's analysis of her estrangement from Lear, that not having "that glib and oily art ...."
Hath lost me in your liking." (Lear, 1:1; 224, 233)
The allusion suggests something of Winnie's exile.

There was a time, do you remember, when once
a month was enough for me . . . . Don't you
remember? ... Once a month! ... Then once
a fortnight . . . . The tally-sticks, don't you
remember the tally-sticks, Edward, they must
be lying about somewhere still, every thir-
tieth notch, then every fifteenth . . . . Then
weekly, I would wake up as usual, refreshed
for the day and without a care, for what
is there to care about, and suddenly before
I had time to as much as wash my teeth this
feeling of anxiety -- can he still hear me
from his hole? -- and I knew another week
had flown . . . . Then finally daily . . . .
One just wakes up and finds out . . . . This
irritates you I know Edward, the first
thing every morning, but it simplifies life
for you in a way too at the same time, no
more scorekeeping, that is what you should
bear in mind when you refuse to satisfy me.
(Tss-1, p. 8)

This incident is interesting for a number of
reasons. First, Winnie has a reasonably accurate
measure of the passage of time and is acutely aware of
her growing desperation. The tally-sticks, as did the
alarm clock, give her a means of measuring the passing
of time. Neither her awareness nor her ability to
measure time is conducive with the final comic tone of
the first act, the dramatic irony which results from
Winnie's inability to assess her condition accurately,
and the irony of hoping for change in a "heavenly" world
where nothing changes. In the final version, Winnie approaches realization of her plight in Act II and then with less coherence as her thoughts become increasingly fragmented.

Second, the excised scene provides some concrete explanation of Winnie's opening paradoxical behavior: praise for Willie's serenity and ability to sleep, yet waking him violently. Willie has not responded to the alarm clock (and later the bell), and Winnie's motive for waking him is obscure at first. This excised section provides a rational explanation for her action and states a familiar Beckett theme explicitly: one reason for communication is to reassert one's own existence. Communication is a selfish act. Winnie needs the security of knowing someone is there, listening, caring, testifying to her existence. As Beckett states in the preliminary remarks to *Film*, "Esse est percipi." In the first typescript Winnie's need for the other, at least the illusion of another, is dramatically emphasized when Winnie, imitating Willie's voice, creates the illusion of a listener. Quoting Isaac Watt's version of Psalm 90, Winnie begins: "A thousand ages in thy sight are as an evening gone. (Pause.) Did you hear that, Edward? (Pause. Imitating his voice.) Yes. (Own
voice. ) What? (Pause. Imitating his voice. ) A thousand ages in thy sight are as an evening gone."

(Tss-1, p. 9) The fabricated exchange was no doubt an unnecessary restatement of Winnie's need, following closely, as it does, the actual exchange of the Cymbeline quote, "Fear no more the heat o' the sun." The exchange also reveals that Winnie understands her needs more than Beckett would like. The section was cut and with it is lost a concrete example of how Winnie would readjust to a significant disturbance in her world, Willie's absence.

Third, the passage also conveys heavy sexual overtones: "do you remember, when once a month was enough for me," and "that is what you should bear in mind when you refuse to satisfy me." Both statements may have seemed inappropriate to Winnie's final prudish characterization where she is revolted at the sight of Willie's pornographic postcard (although she examines it thoroughly) and is a little uncomfortable about having laughed at what she thought was Willie's reference to fornication. The casual sexual attitude of both the early Johnston and tally-stick episodes may have been particularly inappropriate to Winnie's traumatic response to retelling the autobiographical story of Mildred's rape. Although these last two major excisions brought the play closer
to the final tone and thematic emphases, they have also
decreased the development of Winnie's character and her
condition, information which in a naturalistic play,
for instance, would be the epiphany toward which the
dramatist works.

The pattern of dramatic composition and revision
described here reveals a struggle with development
congruous with Beckett's distrust of language and realis-
tic detail. As such, the method of composition of Happy
Days appears consistent with the significant excisions
Ruby Cohn describes in the Endgame manuscripts and
Richard Admussen observed in the manuscripts of "Play."15
While the earlier one-act version of Happy Days is not
dramatically better than the final version, quite the
contrary, it is in places more concrete and reveals more
clearly the sort of images with which Beckett began,
then grew away from, not toward a naturalistic, precisely-
defined physical world, but toward an abstract clarity,
an image free of cluttering detail. Beckett's thematic
commitment is to the fundamental questions of reality,
being and knowing, and not with their social manifestations.
The composition of Happy Days reveals Beckett's own
"contempt for the literature that 'describes,' for the
realists' and naturalists' worshiping the offal of
experience, prostrate before the epidermis and the swift
epilepsy, and content to describe the surface, the façade,
behind which the Idea is prisoner." (Proust, p. 59)
The distaste for realistic detail is also present in
Beckett's production Regiebuch. Beckett's description
of the props reveals a desire to make them incongruous
and unreal. The toothbrush, parasol, magnifying glass,
and nail file all have disproportionately long handles.
The revolver has a "disproportion between short butt
& long muzzle." (Regiebuch, p. 81) The props are
certainly incongruously funny, but the incongruity lifts
them out of our familiar world. The revisions of Happy
Days remind one of Beckett's attack on the painter,
Tal Coat, who, he says, remains on the "plane of the
feasible." Beckett's own revisions demonstrate his
"vagueness" of the play, transcending the "plane of the
feasible" to the unencumbered and abstracted view of
man's irrationality, a view as unencumbered with social
details as the mathematical symbol of irrationality, $\sqrt{2}$. 
Notes: Chapter IV


6. Duckworth, p. 94.
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Happy Days has all the potential for pathetic dreariness. Its components presage melodrama -- innocent female imprisoned, victim of injustice, attempts at freedom abandoned. A sentimental novelist could have written 900 pages on the heroine's exploits and her refusal to abandon hope. But Happy Days never degenerates into the exploitation of sentiment despite its sentimental heroine. The play was written by a comedian, one suckled on the Swiftian view of man and weaned on the travesties of two world wars and Irish politics. Beckett is a comedian, we must occasionally remind ourselves, funny as well as somber. He is at once clown, satirist, farceur, and nihilistic humorist like Lear's fool. The tradition on which his drama is nurtured is popular, vulgar, and comic, the underbelly of art: the circus, burlesque, vaudeville, music-hall, and silent film. Its staple is low comedy: slapstick routines, vulgar gestures, pratfalls, figures of speech literalized. "A man came up to me on the
street and told me he hadn't had a bite all day, so I bit him." Beckett's theater is not quite the anti-art of Dada, but the comi-tragedy of Chaplin, Keaton, Laurel and Hardy, and the Marx Brothers. An early title Beckett contemplated for *Happy Days* was "A Low Comedy." ([ETE 56, p. 40]

Beckett, however, like the dramatist to whom he is most often compared, Ionesco, claims to dislike the theater. "I'm not interested in the theatre. I very rarely go to see other people's plays ...." But Beckett was attracted to the theater long before *Godot*. He acted in a number of student plays in Dublin and one of his earliest artistic attempts was probably a play, "Le Kid," 1931. 2 And curiously, in a sort of mild rebellion against their author, his characters are intrigued with performing. They are often conspicuously acting, putting on a play and creating effects on a gathering of people. In the major plays, *Godot*, *Endgame*, and *Happy Days*, the characters' consciousness of playing before an audience emerges as an important dramatic device. At one point, Vladimir refers to the audience as "that bog." Looking directly out toward the audience, Vladimir throws a pointed barb at them: "Not a soul in sight." (A remark perhaps prompted by
the sparse houses Beckett observed at the small Paris theaters struggling to survive, or foresaw for the production of *Godot.*) Hamm, like Pozzo, is a model ham actor, euphuistic and histrionic. And one reason Hamm and Clov must go on, grey after grey, is that they are caught in a play, a tightly controlled game like existence itself. Clov asks, "What is there to keep me here?" Hamm's simple response, "The dialogue." (*Endgame,* p. 58) He even speaks of the agony of perpetuation in theatrical terms. As Hamm is warming up for his last soliloquy, Clov spies a young boy outside. Hamm: "More complications! ... Not an underplot, I trust." (*Endgame,* p. 78) And Winnie, going blind, has a fuzzy sense of being watched. In Act II of *Happy Days,* not only has Winnie returned to play her part for the audience, the audience has returned from the lobby to play its part for Winnie: "Someone is looking at me still .... Caring for me still .... That is what I find so wonderful .... Eyes on my eyes." (49-50) Those are our eyes!³

The turn (or return) to playwrighting seems to have been a fortunate relief for Beckett. It forced a bifurcation of the single consciousness of the French fiction which was virtually at a cul-de-sac (though
since has pushed on through the mud and into a cylinder). The stage demands duality for conflict and dialogue, and the repetitive public performance provides a visual metaphor for Beckett's cyclical view of existence. For Beckett, theme and form in the drama work together as neatly and rhythmically as rutting hounds. Dramatic performance is itself a symbol of almost identical recurrence. Night after night, the same events occur on stage. The same absurd agonies are inflicted on the same characters; they never seem to learn. Oedipus will return again tomorrow, sight restored, and blunder into the same dramatic ironies, the same hubris. Winnie-Willie, Clov-Hamm, Didi-Gogo will reappear tomorrow as they did today, as they did yesterday. Waiting again. And the characters' consciousness of their medium is itself a carefully calculated anti-realistic device, an attack on the artificial theater of illusion, on the suspension of disbelief. The realistic improbabilities of trees sprouting leaves overnight, of night falling as abruptly as a guillotine blade, of consumed parasols reappearing are not only incongruously comic, but Beckett's means of freeing himself from theatrical realism and its concomitant obligation to explain and make plausible. As Beckett has argued, "art has nothing
to do with clarity, does not dabble in the clear and does not make clear ...." The unnatural events of the plays stand in defiance of the naturalistic tradition, but in sympathy with the madness of the Marx Brothers' world.

Beckett's denial of interest in the theater is probably directed at the legitimate theater; Beckett's preference seems to be for the bastard. His plays testify to the author's thorough familiarity with the techniques of the dramatic substratum. They are nearly composites of fragments from popular entertainments, including especially the overt theatricality of vaudeville and the music-hall.

A storyline swollen with sentimental potential and a sprinkling of dance-hall theatricality, of such stuff is Happy Days made. The balance of the two, of comedy and pathos, then, is of utmost importance. Comedy is Beckett's necessary counterweight to suffering; it is precisely from that balance that Beckett's picture of man existing derives. At least part of the structural problem with Fin de Partie was the difficulty of balancing the tone of the play. Beckett struggled to shape the play to his preconceived structural plan. In a note preceding the first typescript of Fin de Partie, Beckett
writes, "Act 1. Hilare, Act 2. Mortellement triste." But the play would not conform; it found its own shape. The two-act version reveals very little tonal difference between the two acts, and consequently Beckett abandoned the two-act structure. Shaping the relationship of comedy and pathos to produce the play's final tone is a structural problem as crucial as shaping the pattern of dramatic action or the number of acts a play will have. Shaping Krapp's Last Tape, Beckett added much of the comic material after the central situation of the play was formed. As Professor Knowlson notes of the "Krapp" section of the ETE 56 notebook, "There is no mention at all at this stage of the by-play with the bananas that was to open the printed text .... On the other hand, most of the incidents that are referred to by Krapp and his reflections upon them are already present in this first draft." Much of the comic counterweight is added in the second typescript: "The second typescript sheet includes the lengthy description of Krapp's actions with bananas and keys which figures in the printed text." In the Happy Days manuscripts, the pattern of composition, of tonal adjustment is similar. Throughout the composition of Happy Days, Beckett carefully manipulates the balance of comedy and
pathos, and most of the comic counterweight is added after the play's central action is set. The following discussion traces the play's developing tone as Beckett adjusts and manipulates the physical comedy of the play.

Beckett's initial problem was to balance the tone of the opening scene. His first impulse was to make the opening tableau more obviously comic than it is in its final form, an attempt no doubt to counter the austerity of the setting and the seriousness of Winnie's entombment. In the first draft (ETE 56) Willie appears at the rise of the curtain asleep and dressed like a circus clown; as Beckett described him: "his back to the audience, a man, in striped pyjamas. (He is also?) sleeping, hanging so far forward that only his buttocks and foreshortened back are visible, his arms on his knees and his head on his arms. Bare flesh between trousers and coat of pyjamas." (ETE 56, pp. 36-37) In the first full holograph version (H-1), Beckett added that the stripes of Willie's pyjamas and Winnie's parasol match. The tableau, Winnie buried up to her waist and beside her the buttocks and legs of Willie, was to be held for 30 seconds (an assault on the audience's patience and shortened in revision to the final "Long pause"). Presenting the audience with half of
each character, Beckett would certainly have reinforced visually a familiar theme, a world where "Nothing is ontologically whole ... objects and persons are pre-determined to be partial ...."? The tableau would also have dramatized the complementary nature of the two characters, a pattern of Cartesian characterization of which Beckett is fond in the drama (e.g., Lucky-Pozzo, Gogo-Didi, Clov-Hamm), but the visual joke, virtually an indecent exposure, would have drawn attention away from Winnie and her opening monologue; and evidently Beckett felt her opening speech was crucial. The dominant pattern of most of the play is not the relationship between Willie and Winnie (for the play is almost a total monologue, and designed as such from its early stages), but the disjunction between Winnie's plight and her attitude (her understanding, or its lack), reinforced by the physical contrast between the starkness of the set and Winnie's physical vanity. In the third stage (Tss-1) Willie (then Bee) is eliminated from the opening, hidden from view, and the audience's attention remains limited to the incongruities surrounding Winnie's inexplicable burial. With the removal of the potentially distracting scene featuring Willie's semi-exposed buttocks, Winnie's ironic praise of the changelessness of
heaven is finally balanced between our initial shock at Winnie and the beginning of her morning ritual (modestly spitting out the remains of brushing her teeth). The final effect remains comic, serious predicament undercut with vulgar gesture, without being burlesque, a pattern close to some of the revisions Beckett made in the *Endgame* manuscripts. In an early version Hamm at one point decided, perhaps like Noah repopulating the world after the flood, that he needed to engender a large family. Clov appears in disguise "wearing a blonde wig, false breasts, and a skirt over his trousers." In the final versions of both plays, ostentatious dress is reserved for the end when character focus shifts. In *Endgame* attention shifts from Hamm to Clov at the end as Clov prepares to leave. He enters outlandishly dressed. In *Happy Days*, Willie becomes the focus of the play as he enters, "dressed to kill."

The scene with Willie dressed in ill-fitting pyjamas was never restored to the play, and consequently Beckett was left with the problem of introducing him. With his original appearance cut, he made his initial entrance when Winnie woke him with her ominous-looking parasol. He was then a direct victim of Winnie's careless cruelty. Unlike his earlier introduction as a sleepy
clown, his appearance with a physical injury would certainly not be burlesque, but it also had the potential to force an unwanted shift in focus. Had he been in pain or agony after the beating, had he complained about the injury, the scene might have degenerated into early pathos as our sympathies became aroused for him; but the injury is ignored; no attention is called to it. (Ten years later, however, Beckett changed his mind. Directing the German production, Beckett had Willie respond with three cries: two when he is struck by Winnie's parasol, the third when he is hit with the medicine bottle.) In the first holograph, Beckett had entertained the possibility that Winnie might understand the damage she had done to Willie's skull: "Poor Tom I have opened your skull?" (H-1, p. 9) But the realization was immediately cut. As the scene stood in the first holograph, Winnie bangs Willie over the head with her weapon, the bloody head pops up -- propinquity of events suggests cause and effect. But Beckett was troubled by the incident from the first; it was written out three times in the first holograph without substantive change, as if he started out to change the scene twice, but the same words returned. The following is the version Beckett let stand in the
first holograph. "She strikes down with beak of parasol. Pause. She strikes again, the back of a bald head, trickling blood, rises into view above slope. Pause. She strikes again." (H-1, p. 10) The overkill of the third blow, after Willie's head was visible, helped create the impression that Winnie was unaware of the effects of her action, and this lack of awareness is a crucial reflection of her character, but the scene as originally presented contained two major problems in addition to the potential shift in focus: first, it revealed a cruel streak in Winnie early in the play, and second, Willie was the direct victim of Winnie's cruelty, that is, a cruelty for which we can see a rational, albeit accidental, cause. As noted in Chapter IV, however, Beckett is revising away from such precisely defined conflict. As Ihab Hassan notes, "The comedy of Beckett is clownish, cruel, and absurd,"10 but his central characters are seldom malicious. Professor Cohn notes a similar problem with tone in the Endgame revisions. As some of the comic scenes were eliminated, so were the "cruelst scenes."11 In one, for instance, on the day of Nell's death, Hamm orders Clov to put Nagg's head in a pillory to prevent his withdrawing into the ash can. In the Happy Days
revisers, Winnie still strikes down at Willie with her parasol, but we are never certain that the blows bloody his head; the early suggestion of direct cruelty is eliminated. Beckett did not, however, want to scrap the image of Willie's bloody head altogether. The difficulty was solved by having Willie's head appear after Winnie haphazardly discards her medicine bottle, "in WILLIE's direction."

To weaken Winnie's culpability further and keep the conflict moving toward the vague, Willie does not appear immediately after the crash. His appearance is delayed momentarily until Winnie is preoccupied with trying to remember a literary quotation. The incident then fulfills the additional purpose of undercutting Winnie's contemplation. When Willie finally appears, Beckett adds comic touches; Willie spreads his handkerchief on his head, then his boater, complete with club ribbon, over the handkerchief. The actions could belong to a vaudeville song and dance man. These two revisions are completed by the first typescript (Tss-1) with the result that the first time we see much of Willie is after the bottle-throwing episode. His hand appears earlier to return the parasol which slipped from Winnie's hand (a fine chivalrous touch), but we do not
see the bulk of him until Winnie smashes the medicine bottle over his head.

The revisions of Willie's initial appearance demonstrate Beckett's ability to solve a multitude of problems with a minimum of alteration. Willie is still comic without being a distraction; Winnie has still created some havoc, but the suggestion of malice in her nature has been removed; and as Willie becomes the victim of Winnie's haphazard toss of the bottle, both he and she appear to be victims of some ill-defined cosmic plot, a direction crucial to the vagnuening of the play. We are, finally, never really certain how Willie's head was injured. Winnie may have hit him with the parasol or with the medicine bottle, or as a curious variation on the Cartesian split, Winnie's action may have had nothing to do with Willie's injured head. The only relationship between Winnie's action and Willie's appearance may be a temporal propinquity, the connection our own post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy. These changes are characteristic of the shaping and tightening of material in the early version, and through them we see Beckett not only balancing comic and pathetic incidents, we have a glimpse of his dramatic art, his ability to shape and compress his material.
The medicine bottle figures prominently in another set of early revisions in *Happy Days* as an example of Beckett's manipulation of comic technique and his tendency to move toward physical comedy in the drama, a pattern, incidentally, in contrast to the pattern Professor Cohn observes in *Endgame*, where "the center of non-gravity shifts from the visual to the verbal." Early in the play Winnie seeks some relief from a bottle of medicine (as if somehow medicine for the body can relieve the angst of modern existence). In the earliest versions much of the humor is verbal, reminiscent of some of Joyce's verbal tongue twisters, as Winnie reads the poetic and solcistic direction on the bottle: "Two double dessert spoonfuls five or six times daily before and ... (bends closer, moistens fingers, rubs label, reads) ... after food." (H-l, p. 12) As the scene is revised, the joke gradually becomes more visual and the irony increases. The earliest revision, on the verso of the first holograph, heightens the irony by adding the hyperbolic promise of relief: "Relief ... (bends closer) ... instantaneous." (H-l, p. 11) The relief is then sharply undercut as the amount of medicine in the bottle decreases from "partly empty" to "3/4 empty" in the first draft, to the "almost empty"
of the final version; even if the medicine did work, adequate dosage is unavailable. By the final version, the linguistic banter is played down: the hope is heightened by specifically enumerating the benefits of the potion: "Loss of spirits ... lack of keenness ... want of appetite ... infants ... children ... adults ... six level ... tablespoonfuls daily ... before and after ... meals." The undercutting is accomplished with physical action: "(Takes off spectacles, lays them down, holds up bottle at arm's length to see level ...."

(13) Hopefully, if the eyes of the audience are not as bad as Winnie's, they can see that she is holding an "almost empty bottle of red medicine ...." This type of change demonstrates not only Beckett's movement away from linguistic humor, but also his craftsmanship as he turns a relatively minor irony into a major one as hope is introduced only to be instantly shattered. The physical joke reinforces Winnie's hopeful nature and also reinforces the impossibility of the relief Winnie hopes for throughout the play.

Beckett's shaping of the scene in which Winnie discovers the emmet reveals another example of his exploiting a scene's comic possibilities. After Winnie discovers the emmet carrying eggs, an indication that
despite the hellish environment life will go on, and Willie makes his one and only sensory observation, that the mention of the ant makes him feel as though insects are crawling over his skin, Winnie mistakes the comment, formication, for a sexual reference (as no doubt most of the audience does). This is the one part of the play when the couple seems to enjoy themselves (a temporary union in the pineal gland); ironically, the enjoyment stems from misunderstanding. The earliest versions do not exploit the full comic possibilities of the scene: "Edward laughs quietly. After a moment she joins in. They laugh quietly together. Edward stops laughing. She laughs on alone. She stops laughing." (H-1, p. 40) In the final version Beckett develops the scene’s comic potential: "(Pause. WILLIE laughs quietly. After a moment she joins in. They laugh quietly together. WILLIE stops. She laughs on a moment alone. WILLIE joins in. They laugh together. She stops. WILLIE laughs on a moment alone." (30) In addition to exploiting the slapstick potential of the scene, the revision creates a more symmetrically balanced episode as it ends where it began, Willie laughing solo. And finally, the scene helps to undercut the following partial realization that Winnie has, "Or
were we perhaps diverted by two quite different things?"
(31) As Ruby Cohn notes, "In turning to the theater ... Beckett uses action to help him undermine language ...."

The revisions of the medicine bottle routine and the emmet misunderstanding are vivid examples of Beckett's development of comic action as a tonic, an elixir against the infection of pathos. For Beckett's plays are susceptible. His characters are in desperate circumstances, victims whose failures are outside the self; they have been programmed to fail. We must cry or laugh, and laughter is at once more therapeutic and more bitter, for we are laughing at disaster. Beckett himself has described Willie's laugh as rire jaune, a bitter laugh. Comic physical action is used throughout the play's first act to undermine and subvert the impact of the desperation of Winnie's plight. In addition, pathos is attacked surgically, by excising material which builds sympathy for Winnie. The tally-stick episode and the sexual assault of the early Johnston-Cooker episode discussed in Chapter IV were scenes which increased audience sympathy for Winnie and created a fuller human being, one who, at least to some extent, was aware of her own desperate plight. But sympathy and full characterization are anti-comic. As Ruby Cohn suggests,
quoting Bergson on comedy (although the following comments were directed at More Pricks Than Kicks, they serve equally well as a comment on the compositional direction of Happy Days): "Beckett's main intention seems to be to establish comic detachment from person and event. 'Laughter,' Bergson insisted in Le Rire, 'is incompatible with emotion.' In More Pricks, Beckett eliminates emotion by sharpening those surgical instruments that Bergson grouped under comic techniques of language: misplaced literalism, hyperbole, litotes, irony, jargon, incongruity, parody and paradox."¹⁵ As we have seen with the incongruities of the opening tableau, the literalism of the Phoenix parasol, and the ironies surrounding the medicine bottle episode, Beckett has adapted many of these linguistic techniques to the physical demands of the drama. By eliminating and undercutting highly emotional scenes, or scenes which help develop Winnie's character and audience sympathy for her, the irony, incongruity, parody, and paradox of the early scenes dominate.

Another scene in which Beckett's revisions help shift the tonal pattern of the play toward the comic is in one of the few extended bits of dialogue between
the two characters, the repetition of the *Cymbeline*
quotation. The exchange is another dramatization of
Winnie's need to have someone testify to her existence.
The earlier versions of the scene tend to be more
sentimental than the later, and differ from the final
in two significant ways, both of which would have en-
gaged our sympathies and plunged us into the emotion
of the encounter. In the earliest versions, Winnie's
voice actually falters during the episode; her physical
deterioration obvious at this point in the play. Her
voice grows softer and softer to the final "very soft."
In a verso note, Beckett entertained the possibility
that Winnie recognizes her growing desperation: "even
were it [the voice] to fail as just now for (some
reason?) or other to little more than a murmur ...."
(H-1, p. 31) Second, Willie followed her faltering
and one could sense some affection in his reduction
of voice to follow hers. There was a tenderness in
this episode as it was presented in the first holograph
and typescript. We almost realize that once, in the
old days when things were done in the "old style,"
love existed. And out of Winnie's selfish need to
have someone testify to her existence, bred "a relation-
ship which might -- almost -- give a reality to friendship
and make something other than a clownish farce of love ...."16

But that is emotion, and emotion is the staple of melodrama and tragedy, not nihilistic humor noir. In revision, tenderness is excised, Winnie's faltering voice and Willie's understanding expunged, replaced with hostility. Willie's response to Winnie's requests for repetition are violent, irritated, and finally, "more irritated."

But Beckett's most frequently wielded weapon against pathos is the comic gesture, the illiberal jest. To Winnie's pompous moral indignation over Willie's pornographic postcard Beckett adds, "takes nose between left forefinger and thumb." (19) And the precision of the directions suggests a stylized action which would increase the comic. Shortly thereafter, Winnie is threatened by involuntary memory and forced to look within, "What is the alternative? ... What is the al-" (20). Beckett decimates the seriousness of Winnie's plight by adding, "WILLIE blows nose loud and long ...." Willie then spreads his handkerchief on his head to dry, with, no doubt, stylized mannerisms. Both comic incidents were added late in the play's composition, Tss-3 and H-3 respectively, after the two act structure was established.
Many of the comic activities Beckett includes in his drama reflect the theatrical tradition in which he works, music-hall and vaudeville, those modern vestiges of low comedy and improvisation epitomized in the Commedia dell’Arte in which stock characters improvised around a set routine, the lazio. Beckett’s drama is not, of course, improvised, quite the contrary, but it makes extensive use of the lazio.

The lazio finds its way into the modern drama chiefly through the early comic film. Duck Soup, the 1933 Marx Brothers classic, for example, incorporates a number of such set pieces brought over from vaudeville. Pinkie (Harpo) finds what he believes to be the combination to Mrs. Teasedale’s (Margaret Dumont) safe. He tries the combination on what looks like a safe. Loud brass band blares from the radio. Pinkie turns the dial to silence it; it comes off in his hand. He tries to muffle the sound with a cushion then with a curtain. He sprays it with seltzer, throws it inside the closet; it shatters, but keeps playing. He retrieves it and smashes it to bits with a huge ash tray. Music continues. Only after the pieces are thrown out the windown and the window closed, does the music cease. In Happy Days, Beckett’s persistent parasol, mirror,
and even day are variations on Harpo's indestructible radio. In *Duck Soup*, the radio incident leads directly to another *lazzo*. Rufus T. Firefly (Groucho) comes down to investigate the noise, which leads to the famous mirror routine. Pinkie, disguised as Rufus, is on one side of the mirror frame, Rufus on the other. Pinkie follows Rufus's minutest actions to create the illusion that Rufus is indeed looking in a mirror.

Of Beckett's theater, Michael Robinson notes:

> Beckett's sympathy with the pure, non-literary theater is evident in the particular and the general structure of his plays. Lucky's famous speech with its confusion of garbled knowledge recalls the Doctor in ancient farce while the improvisation of the two tramps suggests the endless semantic speculations and misunderstandings of the *Commedia dell'Arte* .... In the plays the ceaseless linguistic permutations of the novels are replaced by equally pedantic and mechanical physical permutations. If language does threaten to assert itself, its pretensions are burst by the pratfall. 17

The exchange of bowlers in Godot, Clov's antics with step ladder and telescope, Krapp's slipping on his banana peel, the cat and dog routine in *Film*, are all stock routines. In *Happy Days* Beckett relies on the arrested or suspended gesture, where a character is interrupted in mid-action, and holds an awkward position for a brief tableau. Beckett uses the technique three
separate times in *Happy Days*. All three instances appear in the first draft and during potentially emotional scenes: 1. Winnie tries to don her hat as Willie reads from the newspaper; each time she begins, Willie's reading interrupts her; 2. immediately after the hat routine, the lazzo is reversed; Winnie interrupts Willie's fanning as she reads from the toothbrush handle; and finally, 3. after spotting the emmet, Winnie tries to put down her glasses and is interrupted by Willie's comments, first about the eggs, then about formication. The last two routines remain unchanged in the play's eight versions, but the first undergoes significant alteration. In the first sequence of suspended gestures, Willie is reading about a variety of aberrant rockets striking various cities (see Chapter IV). The awkwardness of Winnie's action serves to undercut the seriousness of what was probably a nuclear world war. When reference to the holocaust was cut in the second holograph, the suspended gesture was retained and distributed through Winnie's two reminiscences, the first about Charlie Hunter, the second about Mr. Johnston. The purpose of the lazzo, however, remains; the suspended gesture serves as a counterpoint to her reminiscences, further undercutting their seriousness.
What is obvious about the bulk of Beckett's revisions is that he consciously worked to develop the comic and undercut the pathetic, but the major revisions are made in Act I. Act II is another matter. The clown has been injured; he struggles through his routine, but it is no longer funny. His pain is obvious. Winnie's plight is intensified by the absence of Willie and the further restriction of her habits, her protection. Yet, pathetically, she clings to her hope. Her ritual is altered, but not because of a loss of faith. She may omit prayer, for instance, not because she has lost faith in a benign supreme being, but because she can no longer fold her hands, an integral part of her ritual. She struggles to salvage what portions of her habit she can; she distends her cheeks, pouts, but her determination grows pathetic as the audience is painfully aware of her desperation. Her physical action is limited and she is forced to rely more on words, especially her autobiography.

Willie is absent, Winnie's physical mobility severely restricted. The comic possibilities decrease since much of the earlier comedy relied on the interplay of two characters and physical action. In Act II, Winnie restates her memories and fears, but they are
fragmented, virtually incoherent as the disintegration of her personality is reflected syntactically. We are confronted with her physical deterioration. Additional memories intrude. An idyllic day on the lake, reminiscent of Krapp's sexual encounter: "that day ... the lake ... the reeds." (53) But her praise of the day continues, and as it does the ironies intensify. The pathetic potential of Act I, carefully restrained by the manipulation of physical comedy, is released in the second act. The ironies remain, but now they intensify the pathetic. As Ruby Cohn observes, "Irony serves finally to intensify the pathetic as well as the comic."18

It is difficult to assess Beckett's exact thinking in structuring the play's final tone. Many of the comic revisions occur in the first typescript and the second holograph, the point evidently when Beckett was deciding on a second act. But we are finally caught in the chicken-egg cycle. Was the decision to include a second act necessitated by the decision to cut some of the concrete characterization of Winnie, or did the decision to write a second act force the excisions and development of the comedy of the first? Beckett's manuscript revisions will not answer the question. But
one point is obvious: the major tonal alterations of *Happy Days* occur at a point when the play begins moving toward the two-act structure. And at that point, Beckett labored to maintain the focus of the play on Winnie and develop the comic potential of Act I by exploiting the techniques of popular entertainments. The result is a tonal pattern close to the one Beckett had planned for the two-act *Fin de Partie*: "Act 1. Hilare, Act 2. Mortellement triste."
Notes: Chapter V


5. Manuscript on deposit at the Ohio State University Library.


12. Ibid., p. 323.
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Chapter VI
A New Mythological Reality: The Literary Allusions in *Happy Days*

Discussing *Godot* with Beckett, Colin Duckworth asked, "Is the Christian interpretation of the play justified?" Beckett responded, "Yes, Christianity is a mythology with which I am perfectly familiar. So naturally, I use it." The response is something of an understatement, for Beckett's corpus is saturated with Christian mythology and variations on its ideology. He is as tied to Christian thought as Lucky is to Pozzo, as obsessed with Christian dogma and its implications as was Joyce. Maria Jolas suggests, "Like Joyce he is also a Christ-haunted man ...." And little wonder.

Born 13 April 1906. Friday the thirteenth. Good Friday the thirteenth. On the 606th anniversary of Dante's descent into Hell. A persistent theme of Beckett's is divine caprice, the arbitrary nature of salvation, a theme which haunts his plays like the ghost of King Hamlet. In *Godot*, one of Estragon's feet is comfortable, one in pain; one of his feet is
saved, one damned. Beckett is fond of quoting a sentence from Augustine (ostensibly for its shape): "Do not despair: one of the thieves was saved; do not presume: one of the thieves was damned." The sentence indeed has a fine shape and balance, but it imposes shape on chaos. The symmetrical order of the sentence veils the horror of arbitrary salvation, a frequent torment for Beckett's characters. What are the reasons that one thief was saved, one damned? What had they done or said? Why is the story treated in only one of the four gospels? What is the reason for God's refusal of Cain's gift, his acceptance of Abel's? Was Cain somehow forewarned that God expected his chosen to remain nomadic shepherds and not farm the land? Had He something against sod-busters? The questions suggest the failure of a covenant of benevolence, the failure of love and order. Beckett's characters are hounded by the inconsistencies of a system, of systems, which have dominated the western world at least since Christ. Moran, and hence the Unnamable, may be speaking directly for Beckett as he ponders: "Certain questions of a theological nature preoccupied me strangely." (Molloy, p. 166)
Beckett is, of course, preoccupied with mythologies other than Christian, and their promise, their pretense to order haunts him as well. His works exude the mythos and ethos of western civilization. In his first important essay, "Dante... Bruno. Vico. Joyce," a defense of Joyce's *Work in Progress*, Beckett placed Joyce in a developing western, intellectual tradition by comparing him to the three Italian writers. Beckett's characters often appear to exist in isolation, but they play their roles against a backdrop made from the shattered traditions of western man. In *Molloy*, for instance, he continues the variegated development of the epic form, most recently manipulated by Joyce. *Molloy*, however, is still another development, a contrapuntal epic, played fugally -- two epic journeys. It is also a parody of the novel itself, a middle-class form which developed with Richardson and Defoe, and which, under the guise of verisimilitude, has carried on an orgy with things, objects, portable possessions, the very stuff of middle-class minds. As Hugh Kenner observes, "The trilogy is among other things, a compendious abstract of all the novels that have ever been written, reduced to their most general terms." And philosophical systems are not spared. Beckett's oeuvre echoes and
re-echoes western philosophical traditions from Zeno and Pythagoras to Wittgenstein and Sartre. His characters are invariably either committed to systems which fail, which must fail, or haunted by the failure of systems. They are fascinated and befuddled by the problems of Eleatic paradoxes, the Pythagorean incommensurability of side and diagonal, Cartesian bifurcation, Phenomenology, Logical Positivism, and Existentialism. In response, indeed almost in defense, Beckett's literary critics have often been forced (at times unfortunately) to deal more with philosophy than art in their groping to understand.

The tradition with which Beckett works, however, is not only intellectual, not only western man's literary forms and philosophical systems; it includes the popular culture. Not only does Happy Days, and the drama as a whole, echo the popular entertainments outlined in Chapter V, but the title itself was chosen to reflect a cheery toast and the popular song, "Happy Days are Here Again."

The mythological reality with which Beckett works is then a complicated pastiche, a patch quilt worth careful scrutiny. The mythic peregrinations of Odysseus provided Joyce with a framework for Ulysses. The single
myth was for Joyce both skeleton and foil, and was
used virtually allegorically. As Eliot saw in 1923,
Joyce manipulated "a continuous parallel between con-
temporaneity and antiquity." The Odyssean myth was for
Joyce a "way of controlling, of ordering, of giving
shape."6 In his most allegorical works, Beckett too
wove his tale around a single myth, not so much to
order and control as to universalize and ironize. Myth
is never for Beckett a skeleton on which to hang his
contemporary flesh. During the thirty odd seconds of
"Breath," Beckett has hardly time for one allusion:
the Biblical version of creation: "And the Lord God
formed man .... and breathed into his nostrils the
breath of life." (Genesis, 2:7) Naturally, twentieth-
century philosophers were not the first to contemplate
the paradoxical nature and absurdity of existence;
neither were they the first to devise images of per-
petual agony. Beckett draws freely on Greek and early
Christian images of torment. From Dante, Beckett bor-
rows the image of the indolent Belacqua. And without
being direct allegories, "Act Without Words, I" calls
to mind the frustrations of Tantalus; "Act Without Words,
II," Sisyphus (divaricated). The myths are not a
framework, but the mythic echoes help equate the daily
frustrations of modern man with those torments devised by our fathers, the Greeks and early Christians, to punish the sinners, the defiant, the vain, and the slothful. In Beckett's vision, of course, the justice of punishment is removed, and everyman suffers. And the mythic echoes emphasize the repetitive nature of experience, for Beckett a convenient means of illustrating his cyclical view of history.

Beckett's use of a single myth is, however, rare. Even Joyce realized that too close an allegorical pattern may be restrictive ultimately. "I may have oversystematized Ulysses," he confessed. The Verticalist manifesto, "Poetry is Vertical," 1932 (and Verticalism is the one literary movement to which Beckett has allowed his name to be linked, albeit loosely), contains a rejection of Eliot's appeal for a return to classicism. The manifesto proclaims, "We are against the renewal of the classical ideal." But again, Beckett's ties with the Verticalists were slight, and as he himself had warned in 1929, "The danger is in the neatness of identifications." The manifesto, however, goes on to proclaim an interest in a new mythic reality, as opposed, evidently, to a classically mythic reality: "The synthesis of a true collectivism is made possible by a community of
spirits who aim at the construction of a new mythological reality." While Beckett has evidently not been much interested in "a community of spirits," his composition of *Happy Days* reveals a continuing interest in "a new mythological reality," formed from fragments of great western traditions shattered or decaying. The mythic reality is not an allegorical rendering. We see instead, the backdrop of western thought in jagged fragments, like a collage of found objects, the draft of Winnie's education. The fragmented mythic pattern parallels the way in which Beckett presents the background of his characters, through their minced and quasi-objectified autobiographies. Each of Beckett's works, in a Miltonic echo, is a rendering of paradise lost, or more precisely, of paradise denied. And the pervasive myth is a composite, a montage of western culture, which, like the *Bible* specifically, is a hope unbloomed. It is painfully obvious, for instance, that the Lord does not uphold "all that fall." The particular literary allusions in *Happy Days* take on a mythic quality as they reverberate throughout the play as Eliot's Fisher King myth echoes through *The Waste Land*. Beckett's mythic pattern is not as classical and structural as Eliot's though. He provides no footnotes, no single key like Eliot's
reference to Weston's *From Ritual to Romance*. The mythic pattern of *Happy Days* is closer to the way in which the spirit of America permeates Hart Crane's *The Bridge*. But Beckett's backdrop is vaster and more fragmented than Crane's, and without a central, single unifying symbol.

The creation of the cultural montage is an integral part of the making, the shaping of *Happy Days*. The collection of literary allusions Winnie tries to recall are part of her old style, part of her attempt to maintain order. The tendency of Winnie to reach back into her school-days-literature was part of Beckett's design as early as the first full holograph. (H-1) As she realizes that her lipstick is running out, Beckett notes: "Lips. First words of famous line -- transitoriness of all things -- Bible possibly ..." (Tss-1, p. 3) After the Cymbeline exchange, Winnie's sense of estrangement is reflected in her quoting Cordelia after her disinheritance (see Chapter III). The earliest use of allusion appears local, however, a parallel to Winnie's immediate condition. As the play grows, a more complicated pattern of allusions develops. Fragments of literary quotations are added throughout the play's composition, allusions in which themes and a pattern of imagery are surprisingly consistent. And literary references only obliquely
suggested in early drafts are emphasized, clarified, and restated as the play develops. Throughout, Winnie recalls fragments of the old culture without fully understanding the ironies in the contrast with her present condition. And the growing number of allusions is not only part of Beckett's attempt to universalize Winnie's struggle, but an ironic commentary on a schoolboy's (rather girl's) intellectual tradition -- her references are not, after all, as esoteric as Watt's or Murphy's. Winnie's allusions are interwoven with her other habits and add to her ability to go on. Allusions are used, notes Lawrence Harvey, "in a closely integrated fabric in his later writings -- in Happy Days, for example."9

Most critics, however, have paid only passing attention to the pattern of literary allusions in Happy Days, often assuming that identifying the quotations is sufficient, an indication that the speaker is another avatar of Beckett's scholar-tramps. But even the identification has been incomplete and occasionally misleading. Professor Cohn's identification of the phrase "the old style" with Dante is a significant contribution to the complexity of Beckett's literary allusions in Happy Days: "Winnie's 'old style' is implicitly contrasted with Dante's dolce stil nuovo; she even utters the
phrase 'sweet old style.' Dante's dolce stil nuovo ushered in the vigorous literature of the Renaissance, but by the time of Happy Days that Renaissance has become a weary decadence." And she identifies most, but not all, of Winnie's quotations, arguing that they have a function in the immediate situation, to "emphasize the unhappiness of the human condition," and a more general purpose: the "literary echoes" along with Winnie's other ritualized activities ("the inventory of her possessions, the repetitive refrains, the constant doubts and denials") are part of her "attempts to fill the void of existence." And so they are. Yet, they are more. The quotations do not all point to human woe. One quotation Professor Cohn fails to identify evokes a nineteenth-century, romantic, hedonistic ideal. Winnie's "paradise enow" is an allusion to Edward FitzGerald's translation of "The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám." Another, "damask" cheek is a reference to Shakespeare's Twelfth Night, a comedy of mistaken identities firmly rooted in the Commedia dell'Arte. And certainly the duet from The Merry Widow reflects more joy than despair. Ihab Hassan complicates matters by suggesting that the play contains a reference to the Song of Songs, but Hassan does not specify the
allusion, and to date it has defied precise identification. We may guess that perhaps Hassan considers Winnie's song to be a parody of the wedding song, but such an association is tenuous and has no support from the play.

The allusions, then, function on a broader level than additional aids to Winnie's adaptation or as a means of establishing a somber mood. They are also a crucial adjunct of the play's central irony. The snippets of quotations are designed to function most effectively when they call to mind the broader context of the work alluded to. As Winnie recites her classroom exercises to fill time and check her own physical deterioration, the cumulative weight of the quotations, as they reverberate and are orchestrated throughout the play, form Beckett's mythic pattern. As John Fletcher suggests (but unfortunately, never elaborates), Beckett's examination of man's contemporary predicament "is structured in the form of myth."¹² The examples of Beckett's use of Dante's dolce stil nuovo, the endlessness of Winnie's Eleatic burial, the addition of the fragment from the Lesser Doxology, "World without end, Amen," and the pervasiveness of images of fundamental changelessness under the sun and human vanity echoing Ecclesiastes
(the last two discussed in Chapter III), demonstrate the ways in which fragments of Christian mythology and western intellectual tradition help provide the mythic structure of the play.

Fortunately for the critic who has access to the Happy Days manuscripts, Beckett has taken the trouble to note in the margin of the final typescript (Tss-4), the exact references to most of the specific literary fragments Winnie recalls. Clearly Beckett intended these references to be an integral part of the play since, in his pre-production correspondence with Alan Schneider, he carefully prepared a list of Winnie's literary references for the director, a list which, incidentally, includes one more quotation than Beckett's notes in the fourth typescript (see Appendix B for a complete listing). He also suggested to Schneider that as Winnie's personality deteriorates, the quality of the literature to which she alludes also declines, a point which Professor Cohn echoes: In Act II, "She actually quotes from such sentimental versifiers as Charles Wolfe, rather than from the greater poets of the English language." The judgment is at least open to question, since in Act II Winnie also quotes from Milton, Keats, Shakespeare, and Yeats, as well as Wolfe, but Beckett's
literary judgments may be less in question here than the importance he seems to attach to the quotations.

* * *

The first direct literary allusion Winnie makes is to *Hamlet*: "woe woe is me . . . to see what I see." (10) It is a reference to Ophelia's recognition of Hamlet's madness, his deterioration: "O, what a noble mind is here o'ermthrown! . . . O, woe is me, to have seen what I have seen, see what I see!" (*Hamlet*, III, i)

This reference to *Hamlet* was added late in the play's development, in a verso note to the fifth full version of the play. (H-3, p. 161) The allusion provides the core of a curious and parodic comparison. Hamlet was virtually immobilized by his problems. He would have preferred not to act, to crawl into a cave and enjoy Willie's "Belacqua bliss." Winnie buried in her problem, Time, and Willie immobilized are versions of a contemporary Hamlet, who himself might have uttered Winnie's line, "What a curse, mobility!" (46) And Willie, like Hamlet, has also been unable to take his own life; as Winnie recalls: "Remember Brownie, Willie? . . . Remember how you used to keep on at me to take it away from you? Take it away, Winnie, take it away, before I put myself
out of my misery." (33) This reference to Willie's suicide temptation is also added very late in the play's composition to provide a balance and foreshadowing for Willie's final struggle toward the revolver. The reference to Willie's suicidal tendency appears as the final note in the ETE 56 notebook and is not included in the text until the third typescript, and then as an autograph revision.

For Hamlet, order and stability have collapsed, but the collapse is temporary. In Hamlet's world, human action still mattered; it affected the events of men. Willie and Winnie's chaos is permanent, and Beckett's two immobilized characters yearn for oblivion, but their actions are inconsequential. Winnie admires Willie's ability to sleep: "sleep for ever ... marvellous gift ... wish I had it." (10) The phrase echoes Hamlet's "To die: to sleep; / No more; and by a sleep to say we end/ The heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks/ That flesh is heir to." (Hamlet, III,1) Ironically, Winnie makes certain that Willie's sleep is only temporary: she wakes him at the opening of the play and keeps Brownie from him.

Moreover, Hamlet's "Oh that this too, too solid flesh would melt," is echoed twice by Winnie: "and
wait for the day to come ... the happy day to come when flesh melts at so many degrees" (18); and again, "Shall I myself not melt perhaps in the end, or burn, oh I do not mean necessarily burst into flames, no, just little by little be charred to a black cinder, all this ... visible flesh." (38) And in another allusion to *Hamlet*, Winnie's inability to act is dramatized through the impossibility of singing when one desires: "How often I have said ... Sing now, Winnie, sing your song ... and did not. Could not .... No, like the thrush, or the bird of dawning ...." (40) The allusion was included in the first full holograph, and Beckett identifies it specifically in his marginalia to Tss-4: "Some say that ever 'gainst that season comes/ Wherein our Savior's birth is celebrated,/ The bird of dawning singeth all night long." (*Hamlet*, I,1) But in Winnie's world there are no seasons, no night in which the bird might sing. And Marcellus's remark suggests that the bird's song is a signal of the celebration of the birth, the coming of the savior and the withdrawal of the restless shades. It is perhaps appropriate then that Winnie cannot sing. The savior is not coming; in fact, the reference to the bird of dawning is followed by Winnie's strange feeling that
someone is watching her, i.e., the ghosts are abroad. When she finally does sing, at the end of the play, Willie is struggling toward the revolver, in a parody, a travesty of salvation, which itself fails. If Willie is in any way a savior, he is like Mr. Rooney in "All That Fall," who saved the little boy from life by pushing him from a moving train. Mr. Rooney, however, seems to have succeeded in his role as savior. Willie not. And finally, Winnie's "I call to the eye of the mind," suggests Hamlet's vision of his father, "In my mind's eye, Horatio." While the last quotation does call to mind Hamlet, Beckett identifies it as a reference to the opening song of Yeats's "At the Hawk's Well."

Winnie then, at the very beginning of the play, echoing Ophelia, calls our attention to the deterioration of a man, of men, once noble. Vestiges persist. Willie defines hog, clears up a grammatical point about hair, identifies the emmet's eggs. These are chivalrous touches like returning the parasol which slipped from Winnie's grasp early in the play. Willie was evidently once a great admirer of Winnie, and, if we use the admittedly slight evidence of his moustache as a link, Willie is Mr. Johnson, or Johnston, or Johnstone, who,
as Winnie described him, had a "very bushy moustache."
In Beckett's revision of the Johnson episode, moreover, he was careful to retain the reference to the moustache (see Chapter IV), but others were cut, again perhaps to vaguen the relationship. In the early version of the episode, Winnie reveals that Johnson's moustache "vanquished my scruples." (H-1) In the same version Winnie complains about being tired of the sight of the revolver, Willie mistakenly thinks Winnie is referring to him. She allays his fears as follows: "Oh not you, Edward, not you, who could ever weary of the sight of you ... your moustache alone ...." (Tss-1, p. 11) And at one time Beckett contemplated making Willie's moustache much more conspicuous than it finally is: "B moustache visible on both sides of head." (ETE 56, p. 40) At the end of the play, when we finally see Willie full-face, we note he wears a "Very long bushy white Battle of Britain moustache" which he then proceeds to smooth like a villain of melodrama threatening the innocent, defenseless heroine. (61)

Happy Days, in short, abounds with echoes of Hamlet. We see perhaps that the Prince's struggle against state and self has, in the long run, been futile; the forces of chaos and disorder have been winning, have indeed
won. The ideals of the Renaissance, the hopes for art and science, the faith in man himself, ideals ushered in with Dante's *dolce stil nuovo* and developed by Shakespeare, have for modern man "become a weary decadence," useless and futile, as ineffective an aid to man as the Christianity suggested by Winnie's early prayers.

Winnie's next two quotations focus on her vanity. As she is concerned with her lips, she quotes Milton: "O fleeting joys/ Of Paradise, dear bought with lasting woes." (*Paradise Lost*, X, 741-742). The allusion to the misery of existence is obvious, and Beckett used the quote as a replacement for his earlier thought to represent "the transitoriness of all things" with a Biblical allusion. Shortly thereafter, Winnie quotes Romeo as he discovered the drugged Juliet: "Ensign crimson .... Pale flag." (15) During the rehearsals of *Glückliche Tage*, Beckett told his actors that "Ensign crimson" is life, and "Pale flag," death. Of course Juliet too is entombed at this point, and like Winnie, buried alive, in a state between life and death. And as Romeo reminds us in this speech, "How oft when men are at the point of death/ Have they been merry!" (V,iii) *Romeo and Juliet* details a frustrated
love, a love destroyed, at least in part, by forces beyond man, by something innocently called circumstance. As Shakespeare informs us in the prologue, these are "A pair of star-cross'd lovers." The failure of love is evident throughout *Happy Days*, but especially in Winnie's unconscious parody of the marriage vows as she omits all reference to love: "I would obey you instantly, as I have always done, honoured and obeyed." (36) As the echoes of Shakespeare's tragedy reverberate through *Happy Days*, we are reminded that a consistent pattern of disaster runs through the affairs of men. Winnie's next quotation provides a variation on the love theme; it is from Shakespeare's romance, *Cymbeline*, part of a funeral dirge sung by Imogen's lost brothers when they believe Imogen is dead. She, like Juliet, is also drugged. While the end for Imogen and her husband, Posthumus Leonatus, is happier than Romeo and Juliet's, the bulk of *Cymbeline* recounts a love frustrated by sinister forces.

Thomas Gray's use of landscape to set the mood of a poem, his brooding on death and sorrow make him a particularly apt poet for Beckett (and Winnie) to quote, and her "laughing wild amid severest woe" (31) is an allusion to Gray's "Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton
College": "And moody Madness laughing wild/ Amid severest woe." Gray's longing is for the innocence and ignorance of youth: "Alas, regardless of their doom,/ The little victims play!/ No sense have they of ills to come,/ Nor care beyond today." The lines approach Beckett's description of Winnie's conception of Time, her existence only in the present: "Her time experience incomprehensible transport from one inextricable present to the next, those past unremembered, those to come inconceivable." (Regiebuch, p. 62) It is a child's sense of time. The present moment was and will be. "And should one day the earth cover my breasts, then I shall never have seen my breasts ...." (38)

The entire mood of Gray's "Ode" reflects Beckett's view of tragedy, virtually a synonym for human existence, life: "To each his suffering: all are men,/ Condemned alike to groan." And Gray's solution to the oppression of knowing, understanding, seeing, is also Winnie's: "Thought would destroy their paradise./ No more; where ignorance is bliss/ 'Tis folly to be wise." It is Ecclesiastes again: "For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." (1:18)
The mood suggested by Winnie's allusions then abruptly shifts as she evokes another vision of paradise, this time from Edward FitzGerald's translation of "The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám." Though virtually unnoticed at the time of its publication, FitzGerald's translation of the Persian mathematician and astronomer's epigrammatic collection of poems gained a tremendous popularity among the late Victorians. It appealed to a growing Epicurean revival, a reaction from the dour Victorian gospel of work. The poem suggests, as an alternative to the oppression of social striving, a decadent hedonism. It is also another echo of the theme Beckett suggested in an earlier version of Happy Days, "the transitoriness of all things." "The Worldly Hope men set their Hearts upon/ Turns Ashes -- or it prospers; and anon,/ Like Snow upon the Desert's dusty Face,/ Lighting a little hour or two -- is gone." ("Rubáiyát," 16) The theme is again close to Ecclesiastes: "How dieth the wise man? as the fool."

The Rubáiyát suggests that given man's transitory state, given the fact of deterioration, the most he can hope for is a temporary pleasure of the senses: "A Book of Verses underneath the Bough,/ A Jug of Wine, a Loaf of Bread -- and Thou/ Beside me singing in
the Wilderness --/ Oh, Wilderness were Paradise enow!" 
("Rubáiyát," 12) Through the seven full versions of
Happy Days, Beckett had used, either mistakenly or as
an intentional misquotation, the line, "Happiness enow"
(altered from "enough for my happiness" in the first
holograph) changing it only in an autograph emendation
in the fourth typescript to "Paradise enow." Evidently
(and unfortunately) the typesetter missed the correction,
as did Beckett reading proof, and the allusion was
printed incorrectly in the first edition. It has sub-
sequently been corrected and the allusion to the "Rubáiyát"
clarified, the parody of Khayyám's idyllic vision shar-
pened. For Winnie is denied even this brief interlude
of pleasure, She has no shade under a bough. The
wilderness is within, and frightening -- the lover's
song, Willie's harsh, guttural response to the musicbox,
a parody. If Winnie's plight had earlier served as a
parody of Christian idealism and Renaissance humanism,
it now parodies the Epicurean alternative -- worldly
pleasure.

The allusion to the Rubáiyát is followed quickly
by Winnie's reference to Browning's "Paracelsus":
"I say confusedly what comes uppermost." ("Paracelsus,"
3,372) The reference was evidently important to Beckett
for he noted the quotation early in the ETE 56 notebook, and, as with the FitzGerald quotation, Beckett's manuscript revisions tend to clarify the reference. The earliest version of the Browning allusion made no specific reference to the poet. Browning's name was first included in the H-2 version to help the reader identify the allusion and establish the ironies surrounding the confusion of the poet with what is perhaps the brand name of the revolver and even, perhaps, the benevolent, elfin spirits. The quotation suggests not only the possible failure of gravity (an occurrence as unnatural as Paracelsus's rejection of love), a theme which Winnie develops shortly thereafter, but also the failure of human love. Paracelsus not only rejected authority and the traditional means of learning, but also human love in his pursuit of knowledge. He had none of Aprile's sensitivity toward people, art, and nature.

An additional irony, whether intentional or not, results from the coupling of FitzGerald and Browning so closely, especially when one of the themes connecting the allusions is the failure of love. On the death of Mrs. Browning, FitzGerald had written a friend, "Mrs. Browning's death is rather a relief to me, I must say: no more Aurora Leigh, thank God!" Needless to
say, Browning's response in "To Edward FitzGerald" was bitter.15

Act II opens with a reference to Milton: "Hail, holy light." (Paradise Lost, III,1) The quotation continues the light-shade imagery, as Milton reminds us, "God is light," and light is eternal: "never but in the unapproachable light/ Dwelt from eternity." But the celebration of the eternity of light is a sharp contrast to the reality of Winnie's condition. What Winnie needs, in point of fact, is not a rhapsody on the divinity of light, but shade, a relief from oppressive reality. The disjunction between the ideal and real is further developed in the next allusion to Keats's "Ode to a Nightingale," "beechen green." The song of the nightingale is an intoxicant which draws Keats's narrator from the woe of reality to the ideal of the imagination, but within the poem the narrator himself recognizes the disjunction, and the portion of the poem Winnie quotes refers to the idyllic abode of the bird which contrasts sharply to her own environment. The bird sings in the shade; Winnie is forced to suffer in the sun.

The Keats quotation re-sounds earlier images and themes also. As with other allusions, Beckett clarified
the Keats reference in revision. The earliest appearance (H-2, p. 137) was simply a reference to "Shade." The revision to "beechen green" not only sharpened the allusion to Keats, but strengthened the connection to Winnie's earlier amorous encounter, the Charlie Hunter episode, which also occurred "in the back garden at Borough Green, under the horse-beech." (15-16) And the horse-beech itself was revised from horse-chestnut. Also, the Johnson episode takes place in "The shadows deepening among the rafters." (16) Moreover, the nightingale is a thrush, the bird Winnie earlier coupled with "the bird of dawning." They would both signal the arrival of the savior, or at very least, salvation. The alternative to harsh reality is the idyllic grove of beechen green and the song of a bird reflecting a cosmic order, a celestial harmony, and perhaps an amorous interlude. But Winnie's world has only a parody of celestial music, Willie's spontaneous outburst. Nature is dead. She lives in the harsh light of day, and intimates that "tender is the night." Finally, Keats's poem echoes the ignorance is bliss theme: "Where but to think is to be full of sorrow." Winnie picks up the theme soon after the Keats allusion: "not to know, not to know for sure, great mercy, all I ask." (51)
The Keats reference is followed shortly thereafter by an allusion to the Shakespearean comedy, *Twelfth Night*, an allusion added in an autograph revision to Tss-2. The title of Shakespeare's play alone resounds with ironies for Winnie. Twelfth night is the night of the epiphany, Christ's manifestation to the Magi. Winnie's quotation is from Viola's, yet disguised as Cesario, hinting of the strength of her love for the Duke: "She never told her love, / But let concealment like a worm i'th'bud / Feed on her damask cheek."

(II, iv 110-112) Viola's stoic restraint stands in sharp contrast to Winnie's ignorance, but Winnie too withholds her overt protestation of love until the very end of the play when she sings The Waltz Duet from *The Merry Widow*. The reunion of the lovers at the end of *Happy Days*, however, is a travesty of love. And Viola's image of grief is also appropriate for Winnie: "She sat like Patience on a monument, / Smiling at grief."

(II, iv 114-115)

Winnie's reference to *Twelfth Night* contains another interesting dimension. Throughout Shakespeare's play runs an undercurrent of nostalgia for the good old days, for that merry old England represented by Sir Toby Belch, and in other Shakespearean plays by Falstaff.
They are vestiges of medieval castle life now out of place, a nuisance in a Tudor country house. Winnie follows her Twelfth Night allusion with a glimpse of her old style, an idyllic, romantic interlude: "The sunshade you gave me ... that day ... that day ... the lake ... the reeds." (53) The memory is for Winnie an ideal, a recollection of a time when retreat from the sun was possible. The word "sunshade" itself is a composite of the play's conflicting images, sun and shade. Part of Winnie's old style was the ability, the freedom, to withdraw from the oppressive sun: "I speak of when I was not yet caught -- in this way -- and had my legs ... and could seek out a shady place, like you, when I was tired of the sun ...." (38) Beckett took special pains in his production to remove all shadows on the stage.16

The theme of love frustrated, the images of sun, song, shade, change are reflected in Winnie's allusion to a rather obscure Irish poet, Charles Wolfe. The allusion is the only concrete suggestion we have of Winnie's ancestry: the poem is a minor, sentimental piece, one perhaps an Irish schoolgirl might read as a student, "Go! Forget me." Winnie (mis)quotes the opening stanza:
Go! forget me, why should sorrow
O'er that brow a shadow flying?
Go! Forget me -- and to-morrow
Brightly smile, and sweetly sing,
Smile -- though I shall not be near thee;
Sing -- though I shall never hear thee,
May thy soul with pleasure shine,
Lasting as the gloom of mine.

Hardly a classic. But her citing it as such reinforces our skepticism about Winnie's sensitivity and awareness. Willie is apparently gone. The quotation is Winnie's sentimental, self-pitying farewell to Willie, who now will never hear her sing. Ironically, the departure of the lover in Wolfe's poem brings on the night, but even this consequence of the failure of love is denied Winnie.

Almost immediately after the Wolfe quotation, Winnie begins a play, a play within a play, complete with dialogue: the Shower-Cooker story again. Winnie opens the play in the manner of another Irishman, Yeats. The allusion is to the opening of "At the Hawk's Well" and is sung: "I call to the eye of the mind." It is another attempt to escape reality via the imagination. Yeats invites the audience's imagination to supply the props and scenery for the play. The allusion to Yeats re-emphasizes the disjunction between the ideal and the real, which is the core of Hamlet's problem as well as
that of Keats's narrator. Yeats's life-long pursuit of universal order, of harmony between the imagination and reality, a harmony which he epitomized in the image of the dancer in whom artist and work of art fuse, serves as an ironic contrast to the disjunction, the permanent irreparable disjunction, between Winnie and Willie.

Winnie's final direct literary allusion is to Robert Herrick's "To the Virgins, to Make Much of Time." As Willie reappears Winnie asks, "Where are the flowers?" The pattern of Beckett's revisions of the Herrick quotation differs from the others. The earlier version was closer to Herrick's "Gather ye rosebuds while ye may." Earlier Winnie said, "All you need now is the rose in your button-hole." (H-2, p. 154) The final allusion to flowers is vaguer and would have been difficult to identify, if not impossible, had Beckett himself not done so in Tss-4. With the allusion clear, however, the image of Willie coming to gather his rosebud is grotesquely comic, as well as another example of Winnie's incorrect assessment of Willie's quest.

Other of Herrick's images parallel the pattern Beckett established in Happy Days. Herrick's time "a-flying" and "The glorious lamp of heaven, the sun"
again serve as an ironic contrast to Winnie's plight, where youth is lost and time has virtually ceased. Herrick could, after all, take "Delight in Disorder." His solution to the transitoriness of youth is similar to that in "Rubáiyát," a hedonistic solution impossible for Winnie, who "having lost but once her prime, ... may forever tarry." Forever!

* * *

As the literary allusions build over the course of the play, as they echo each other, as images are repeated and gain an accumulated weight, we realize that the imaginative treatment of life, the province traditionally of literature, the glory of the power and beauty of the sun, the idyllic withdrawal from human woe and the transitory nature of existence into the pleasures of nature and the sense, have, finally and essentially, nothing to do with the human condition, at least the human condition as Beckett perceives it, within the harsh, hellish light of reality. The order and hopes of literature are as mythologically unreal, as irrelevant to the human condition as the elaborate structure of divine, cosmic order devised by the Greeks. The hope provided by literature, the imagination, is no hope
at all, a hope irreconcilable with reality. Literary and humanistic failure is a parallel to the failure of religion to meet the needs of man. And although the Biblical allusions in Happy Days are not identified by Beckett or signaled by Winnie, they nonetheless saturate the play. In addition to the echoes of the book of Ecclesiastes, the parody of Christ's "When two are gathered in my name," the ridicule of Genesis around which Beckett built the slight "Breath" and also used in Happy Days (i.e., "the nostrils ... breath of life," 52), Psalm 40 provides Beckett with additional images for Happy Days. The opening of the Psalm, in fact, provided the central situation for Godot some twelve years earlier:

I waited patiently for the Lord; and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings. And He hath put a new song in my mouth ....

Withhold not thou thy tender mercies from me, O Lord: let thy lovingkindness and thy truth continually preserve me.

(Psalms, 40:1-3, 11)

And again, from the same Psalm which provided Beckett with the title for "All That Fall": "The Lord is good to all: and his tender mercies are over all his works."

(Psalms, 145:9). And from Isaiah, the hope that the failure of mercy is only temporary:
For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou was refused, saith thy God,
For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer.
(ISAIAH, 54:6-8)

Of Beckett's early working titles, three, Great Mercies, Tender Mercies, Many Mercies, would have signaled the direct literary allusions; perhaps the signal would have been too strong for Beckett. Unlike Mr. and Mrs. Rooney who can laugh at the promise of the Psalms, Winnie continues to hope and believe as she sinks into her pit. While many of the literary works from which Winnie quotes focus on the failure of human love, the disjunction between the promise of the Psalms and Winnie's plight suggests something of the failure of divine love. Each quotation marches past Winnie as the Unnamable's characters, his lies, march before him, and each quotation is ridiculed by the desperation of Winnie's plight. But the audience sees the ridicule, not Winnie. The dramatic irony is intense in Happy Days precisely because Winnie retains her optimism, her faith, and is unaware of the contrast between the way in which she thinks things are and the way in which they are.
The pattern of literary allusions and echoes in *Happy Days* is then complex. The themes of the failure of love, the misery of the human condition, the transitoriness of all things, the disjunction between the real and ideal, the misery of awareness, have been carefully reinforced in Winnie's literary allusion and reverberate throughout the play like a constant drumbeat. The word mercy itself becomes a refrain, like happy. And in Beckett's selection of quotations and oblique references virtually every historical epoch is represented: pre-Christian Greek philosophies, the blind religiosity and Christian Idealism of the Middle Ages, Renaissance Humanism, eighteenth century Rationalism, and nineteenth century Romanticism. The philosophies, literature, and religion of western man comprise the fragmented mythology against which Winnie fails and suffers, and like a jeweler's foil, mythology highlights the suffering.
Notes: Chapter VI


11. Hassan, p. 196.


Chapter VII
Nearly Finished: Approaching an End

The emphasis in the preceding discussion has been on process, the artist's shaping. Beckett's initial image, vision, inspiration, what have you, has been present from the first, in the ETE 56 notebook. The artistic struggle has been to shape the initial image, to translate it into an acceptable work of art. The critic, poring over successive stages of the play's composition, has that rare opportunity to simulate a look over the artist's shoulder as he is composing; he is virtually present at creation. Examining the nine stages of Beckett's composition of Happy Days, the critic can watch the artist work: sharpening his focus, reducing Willie's role, increasing the desperation of Winnie's circumstances, steeling her resolve, her determination that this will be a happy day, intensifying the religious ironies, undermining the play's potential for pathos with music-hall comedy, supporting themes and patterns of imagery with literary allusions, adding a second act, which, like Godot's,
dramatizes the essential changelessness of the human dilemma.

The central situation of Happy Days is familiar to readers of Beckett's work. Man (woman in this case) trapped in space and time, deteriorating in a combination of biological cachexia and physical entropy, a deterioration which seems endless. And the human deterioration serves as a corollary to the broader, cultural disintegration represented by Winnie's literary fragments. At its abstracted core, Happy Days represents another treatment of the Unnamable's paradox. What is different about Happy Days is the protagonist's response: a self-administered anesthesia which deadens awareness and makes possible "happiness." Beckett carefully shapes Winnie's struggles against knowledge of the void without and the void within, and that therapeutic ignorance is supported with a pastiche of literary allusions which further develop the themes of the blissful potential of ignorance and the protagonist's longing for its shade as a haven from bright reality.

It is through manuscript analysis that the critic is privy to the author's chaff, and scrutiny of the Happy Days debris is often more revealing of Beckett's
method and purpose than analysis of the printed product. Beckett's anti-realism and comedy are, for instance, evident in the printed text, but in the manuscripts we can see the how, the process, the ways in which the final effects are achieved. The excision of scenes which help explain the central situation, the elimination of incidents which develop character, these revisions reveal the extent of Beckett's movement toward an unadorned, abstracted image of the human dilemma, toward the simplicity of geometric design. Manuscript analysis, in short, provides the critic with the opportunity to examine the what and the what-not.

Finally, two points need to be kept in mind if we are not to oversimplify and distort Beckett's composition of Happy Days. First, the division of Beckett's complicated creative process into four separate categories is a critical convenience, nothing more. Beckett did not, naturally, approach the process so categorically. The refinements in theme, tone, dramatic style, and the developing pattern of literary allusions occur simultaneously.

Second, notable textual problems still surround the play, since the process of shaping may not be entirely
This analysis of the composition of *Happy Days* ends with one version of the play, the English printed text. But Beckett has not, in fact, stopped working with the *Happy Days* material, and as he works, the material changes. Beckett's artistic interests are diverse; he is a translator and director as well as an author, and neither as translator nor director is he reverential toward his original text. As Beckett brings his creative energies to bear afresh on one of his pieces, it changes. In translation, of course, differences in language, in sound and idiom, force alterations. And as a director, Beckett alters his text freely. Staging *Glückliche Tage*, Beckett made some forty changes in dialogue alone; some were necessitated by the German translation (the Erika and Elmar Tophoven translation), but others apparently because the artist's personality is not static. In 1971 Beckett, quite simply, was not the same man he was ten years earlier; for the German production, the text of *Glückliche Tage* was filtered through a new personality. Beckett no longer wanted Winnie in the exact center of the mound. The set was made more realistic with the addition of sand dunes. He decided to alter the waking scenes early in the play; in the German production
Willie responds to being thrashed by Winnie's parasol.² The changes might simply be dismissed as a director's prerogative, or a temporary experiment since they were never included in the standard German text (nor any other text for that matter). Every director alters his script to one degree or another. But the fact remains that the changes in Glüchliche Tage were made by the author, and as such they take on critical significance. The German audience, in fact, saw a different play from English audiences, a play reshaped by the author. Beckett's shaping of the Happy Days material then may not be finished. It's nearly finished, but Happy Days is evidently still changing.
Notes: Chapter VII


Appendix A

Character Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETE 56: text:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>notes:</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Not Edward Willie&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Not Mildred Winnie&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H-1:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom pp. 1-11</td>
<td>W pp. 1-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B pp. 12-25</td>
<td>M pp. 40-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed pp. 25-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hubert pp. 28-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward pp. 34-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ts-1, Act I:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bee pp. 1-3</td>
<td>W pp. 1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B pp. 3-7</td>
<td>Mildred pp. 15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward pp. 8-18</td>
<td>Winnie p. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willie pp. 11, 18</td>
<td>(autograph)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H-2, Act I:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom p. 74</td>
<td>Winnie pp. 74-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willie pp. 74-132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ts-1, Act II:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willie throughout</td>
<td>Winnie throughout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Literary Allusions Identified by Beckett

### Happy Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation</th>
<th>Stage added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>what are those wonderful lines ... woe</strong> woe is me ... to see what I see**</td>
<td>H-3, p. 163; verso revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>What is that wonderful line? ... Oh fleeting joys ... oh something lasting</strong> woe.</td>
<td>H-2, p. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Ensign crimson .... Pale flag.</strong> (15)</td>
<td>H-2, p. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Fear no more the heat o'the sun.</strong> (26)</td>
<td>H-1, p. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>what is that wonderful line ... laughing wild ... something laughing wild amid severest woe.</strong> (31)</td>
<td>Tss-2, p. 10, autograph revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quotation

- "O, woe is me, to have seen what I have seen, see what I see!" (Ophelia, *Hamlet*, III, 1)
- "O fleeting joys of Paradise, dear bought with such lasting woes." (*Paradise Lost*, II, 741-742)
- "beauty's ensign yet Is crimson in thy lips and written out, in thy cheeks, And death's pale flag is not advanced there." (*Romeo, Romeo and Juliet*, V, iii)
- "Fear no more the heat o'the sun," (Guiderius, *Cymbeline*, IV, i)
- "And moody Madness laughing wild Amid severest woe." ("Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College")
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. paradise enow.</strong></td>
<td>A Book of Verses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>underneath the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>enow in H-1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Bough, a Jug of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>p. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Wine, a Loaf of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Bread -- and Thou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Beside me singing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>in the Wilderness --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Oh, Wilderness were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Paradise enow! (&quot;The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Ever uppermost,</strong></td>
<td>I say confusedly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>like Browning.</strong></td>
<td>H-1, p. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>what comes uppermost!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>But there are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>times when patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>proves a fault As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>now: This morning's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>strange encounter --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>you Beside me once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>again! (Paracelsus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>III, 372-373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. No, like the</strong></td>
<td>Some say that ever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>thrush or the</strong></td>
<td>H-1, p. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bird of dawning,</strong></td>
<td>'gainst that season comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>with no thought</strong></td>
<td>Wherein our Savior's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of benefit, to</strong></td>
<td>birth is celebrated,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oneself or anyone</strong></td>
<td>The bird of dawning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>else.</strong></td>
<td>singeth all night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(40)</strong></td>
<td>long. (Marcellus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(40)</strong></td>
<td>Hamlet, I,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Hail, holy light.</strong></td>
<td>Hail, holy light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(49)</strong></td>
<td>(Paradise Lost,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(49)</strong></td>
<td>III, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(49)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10. Ah yes ... then ... now ... beechen green (51)

That thou, light-winged Dryad of the trees, In some melodious plot Of beechen green, and shad­ows numberless, Singest of sum­mer in full-throated ease. ("Ode to a Nightingale," 7-10)

11. (eyes left, dis­tends cheeks again) ... no ... no damask. (53)

She never told her love, But let con­cealment like a worm i'th'bud Feed on her damask cheek. (Viola, Twelfth Night, II,iv)

12. Go forget me why should something o'er that some­thing shadow fling ... go for­get me ... why should sorrow ... brightly smile ... go forget me ... never hear me ... sweetly smile ... brightly sing ... (57)

Go! forget me, why should sorrow O'er that brow a shadow fling? Go! Forget me -- and to-morrow Brightly smile, and sweetly sing. Smile -- though I shall not be near thee; Sing -- though I shall never hear thee. May thy soul with pleasure shine, Lasting as the gloom of mine. ("Go! Forget me")
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*13. I call to the eye of the mind ... (58)

14. Where are the flowers? (61)

I call to the eye of the mind ("At the Hawk's Well," 1)

Gather ye rosebuds while ye may ("To the Virgins, to Make Much of Time")

H-2, p. 148

Not included among Beckett's notes in Tss-4, but listed among the allusions Beckett sent to Alan Schneider and included in the list of allusions in the Regiebuch.
Appendix C

Collation: Typescript IV and First Edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act I</th>
<th>Typescript IV</th>
<th>First edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>brush) -- it</td>
<td>brush -- it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>strikes</td>
<td>strikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>... hog's ... (</td>
<td>... hog's (</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>puts them on</td>
<td>puts them on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>No but this is just</td>
<td>No but this is just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>the alternative.</td>
<td>the alternative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>Brush and comb it?</td>
<td>Brush and comb it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>Long pause.</td>
<td>Long pause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>paradise enow.</td>
<td>happiness enow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>punctuates following.</td>
<td>punctuates following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>Curtain</td>
<td>CURTAIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Collation of *Happy Days*, Printed Versions:
1st and 10th Printings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>First Printing</th>
<th>Tenth Printing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>strikes</td>
<td>strikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>happiness enow.</td>
<td>paradise enow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.24-39.25</td>
<td>The Merry Widow</td>
<td>The Merry Widow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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