TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

POSTGRADUATE REVIEW 2017

Published by the Graduate Students' Union
of the University of Dublin, Trinity College.

Printed in Ireland by the Thesis Centre.

ISSN: 2009-9185

The following article may be cited as:

McGee, Kurt. "*Beckett on Film* and the Commodification of an 'Irish Writer.'" *Trinity Postgraduate Review* 16, (2017): 116-128.

Beckett on Film and the Commodification of an 'Irish Writer'

By
Kurt McGee[1]

Abstract: This essay begins with an observational question: how is it that Samuel Beckett, an avant-garde, Paris-based writer who wrote nearly all of his work away from Ireland, has been so strongly assimilated into the Irish literary canon as to be memorialized in the form of a harp-shaped bridge symbolic of Irish antiquity? I argue that the cultural reappropriation of Beckett as a distinctly Irish writer, exemplified by the Beckett Bridge in Dublin, can be seen in parallel to the nationalist-driven economic revival of the 1990s. The *Beckett on Stage* (1991) and *Beckett on Film* (2001) projects, each supported by Celtic Tiger industry and led by a director who saw his work as a "sort of reclamation" of Beckett's Irishness, were instrumental in recapturing the cultural essence of a writer who had explicitly rejected cultural signification. Through an examination of Ireland's tenuous but evolving relationship with Beckett during the late twentieth century, and a close analysis of the stylistic choices behind the *Beckett on Film* version of "What Where," I argue that the triangulated effort between Irish industry, Celtic Tiger ideology, and contemporary Irish theater helped produce the discourse of Beckett as a product of Ireland.

Keywords: Beckett, Celtic Tiger, Beckett on Film, commodification

Walking across the expensive and grandiloquent harp-shaped Beckett Bridge in Dublin, it is easy to forget the awkward relationship between Beckett and his homeland, and the curious decision to represent an avant-garde writer who identified strongly with France with a symbol of Irish antiquity. Beckett was critical of the parochial values of his home country and made his feelings known most clearly by

[1]. M.Phil. in Irish Writing, Department of English, Trinity College Dublin
E-mail: kmcgee@tcd.ie

immigrating to Paris, where he would remain for the rest of his life.[2] The feeling was, in many ways, mutual. His work and persona were often treated with indifference or as scandalous by the deeply-conservative De Valera Ireland that stood in direct contrast to his liberal and deconstructive aesthetic.[3] Many Irish were slow to accept him as one of their own: as late as 1991 the influential Field Day Anthology excluded him from acceptance into its Irish canon, and while the Irish public eagerly consumed the premiere of *Waiting for Godot* in 1955, recent work in the *Stage Beckett* project suggests that Beckett productions in Ireland between 1960 and 1990 were relegated to smaller, experimental theaters.[4] Curiously, it took an American scholar, John P. Harrington, to produce the first monograph highlighting Beckett's Irishness, called simply *The Irish Beckett* (1991), and it was only with the burgeoning of Irish Studies as a discipline and the onset of the Celtic Tiger that Ireland decided to exhibit the author fully as a product of its nation.

It is not coincidental that Beckett's reintroduction into Irish society developed concurrently with the economic revival of the late 1990s. This remarkable period, which at its peak saw an astonishing

---

[2] James Knowlson, *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett* (London: Bloomsbury, 1996). Knowlson says of Beckett that "his remarks about Ireland became more and more vituperative after his return to Paris as he lambasted its censorship, its bigotry and its narrow-minded attitudes to both sex and religion from which he felt he had suffered," 280.

[3] Seán Kennedy, "Samuel Beckett's Reception in Ireland," *The International Reception of Samuel Beckett*, edited by Marx Nixon and Matthew Feldman (London: Continuum, 2009). Kennedy argues that "we should not be surprised if Ireland was slow to take Beckett to its heart, given that he had made it his business to offend almost every aspect of the country's Catholic nationalist sensibility at a time of considerable adjustment and national insecurity," 64.

[4] Ibid., 64. Anna McMullan, Trish McTighe, David Pattie, and David Tucker, "Staging Beckett: Constructing Histories of Performance," *Journal of Beckett Studies* 23, no 1. (2014): 24. In a separate article, McMullan notes that "Beckett's work was largely ignored by the dominant Irish cultural institutions, though he had a number of individual admirers and supporters in Ireland." McMullan, Anna, "Irish/Postcolonial Beckett," in *Palgrave Advances in Samuel Beckett Studies*, edited by Lois Oppenheim (London: Palgrave, 2004), 90.

ten-percent GDP growth per year,[5] brought a renewed confidence to the national psyche of Ireland, who could now safely admit bleak writers such as Beckett into its ranks. Irish capitalism also saw an opportunity to exploit one of its greatest cultural commodities—its writers—both to rally confidence in itself and to export to admiring literary consumers around the world. Today in Ireland, Beckett is more than just an Irish author; he is a bridge, an offshore patrol vessel, and a limited-edition euro coin. The commodification of its writers was perhaps inevitable given the international recognition of Joyce and Beckett, and it was an easy sell for a country that had whole-heartedly embraced global capitalism. In the cosmopolitan, but somehow distinctly-Irish Beckett, the country had a perfect symbol of a society open to globalization and eager to ship its profitable culture to hibernophilic nations around the world.

Selling the plays of a writer whose opaque aesthetic defies commercialization demanded careful attention to local and global markets. The first step was to remove the great dramatist from the theater, where a specialized audience and limited seats would obviously decrease potential profit. The second step was more challenging: to make Beckett more appealing to both Irish and international mainstream audiences. The rather ingenious result was *Beckett on Film*, an ambitious project backed by RTÉ and Channel 4, which filmed all nineteen of Beckett's plays for television and to be sold in DVD format. *Beckett on Film* purposefully overplays its Irishness in order to appeal to an Irish audience still learning to accept the writer amongst its own. To appeal to its global consumer base, the project assembled world-renowned actors, changed settings to mirror Hollywood hits of the time, and, of course, converted the great dramatist to the medium of film, irrevocably altering whatever theatrical qualities Beckett saw as nonnegotiable in regard to his drama. In this way, *Beckett on Film*, itself a production and symbol of the strong new Irish tech industry, was able to offer a diluted version of the once avant-garde dramatist to the average film-watcher in Ireland and

[5] Seán Ó Riain, *The Rise and Fall of Ireland's Celtic Tiger: Liberalism, Boom and Bust* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014), 54.

abroad, where its digital format and attractive reinterpretation would ensure its legacy as the most accessible version of the author's work.

This essay will attempt to lay out the material conditions in which *Beckett on Film* came about and will examine how its position as a product of Celtic Tiger ideology encouraged its producers to create their own version of Beckett for the public. To develop this argument, I will examine the *Beckett on Film* version of "What Where," which embodies Celtic Tiger ideology with its trendy mass-appeal science fiction setting, use of popular Irish actors, and cinematic flair.

Terry Eagleton explains in *Criticism and Ideology* that the "literary text bears the impress of its historical mode of production as surely as any product secretes in its forms and materials the fashion of its making."[6] *Beckett on Film* was, to its core, a product of Irish industry. It was supported by RTÉ, the Irish Film Board, and Irish film companies Blue Angel and Tyrone Productions, the latter being responsible for *Riverdance*, an early attempt to exploit an attractive Irishness for easy and palatable global consumption. The total cost was around 4.5 million pounds,[7] and it would also be shown on television in several countries around the world and later sold in an attractive DVD boxed set. The production was directed by Michael Colgan of the Gate Theatre, who had already put together the highly-successful Beckett Festival of 1991, which emphasized Beckett's Irishness and who, as Séan Kennedy points out, "made no bones about the fact that the purpose of his productions were 'to give back some of the fundamental Irishness to Beckett's work."[8] Colgan called his work on Beckett a "sort of reclamation" that was "redressing some imbalance" about Beckett as an Irish writer,[9] a point with which many of his Irish actors agreed.[10]

---

[6] Terry Eagleton, *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (London: Verso, 1976), 48.

[7] "Beckett Goes to Hollywood," *The Guardian*, Nov. 19, 2000, https://www.theguardian.com/film/2000/nov/19/beckettat100.theatre.

[8] Kennedy, "Reception," 68.

[9] Alan Riding, "Samuel Beckett Gets an Irish Embrace" in *The New York Times*, July 28, 1996, http://www.nytimes.com/1996/07/28/theater/samuel-beckett-gets-an-irish-embrace.html

[10] David Kelly, for instance, staunchly defended the Beckett Festival's presentation of a distinctly Irish Beckett, saying of *Godot* that "The whole fabric of the language is Dublin . .

And yet, Colgan was also aware of his commercial obligations outside of Ireland, and often sought to temper his nationalist statements by simultaneously praising Beckett's international qualities and suitability for the big screen. Anna McMullan remarks that "Colgan makes no secret of the fact that he is financially minded,"[11] and Alan Riding describes Colgan as a "ready apostle [who] decided to take his proselytizing a step further by carrying Beckett from stage to screen."[12] Colgan was walking a fine line, at once reinforcing the Irishness of Beckett to appeal to an Irish demographic while also opening up Beckett for consumption by a mainstream global audience. Global reception was ensured considering his selection of producers, "a who's-who list of contemporary cinema and theatre" including renowned directors and actors Neil Jordan, David Mamet, Julianne Moore, and Jeremey Irons, among others.[13]

Colgan, of course, was a product of his time, and his ideology behind presenting and marketing the *Beckett on Film* project can be seen working parallel to the larger Celtic Tiger socio-economic movement. As Ireland advanced from its mid-century economic stagnation, a new group of political leaders attempted to reinvigorate Irish industry to stand on its own. As Terence Brown argues, the Irish Film Board was established in 1981 to help Irish film-makers "escape the constraints of international stereotyping imposed by Hollywood."[14] Film making, which previously relied on assistance from American infrastructure, could now have a measure of independence and bring in revenue for its own economy. Years later, in 1988, Taoiseach Charles Haughey helped fund the Arts Council by offering eight million pounds "available from lottery funds," and explaining that "the arts were an integral part of future government policy."[15] Here we can see the synchronous and reinforcing progression of a developing national confidence alongside

---

. In English, it has to be performed with an Irish accent, a Protestant Dublin accent." See Riding, "Irish Embrace."

[11] McMullan, "Irish/Postcolonial," 25.

[12] Riding, "Irish Embrace."

[13] Kelly, "Beckett on Film."

[14] Terence Brown, *Ireland: A Social and Cultural History 1922-2002* (London: Harper, 2004), 346.

[15] Ibid., 345-346.

the requisite industrial forces to produce and evince such confidence, and this relation between national pride and economy should not be underestimated. Ireland had, only decades earlier in the century, finally achieved a forceful separation with Britain to gain self-rule, and the struggling economy post-separation was undoubtedly a sore spot for the Republic's pride. Therefore, when Ireland embraced capitalism and entered its period of growth, it also saw an opportunity to assert its autonomy by producing its own self-claimed Nobel laureate using its own film industry and making its own decisions about how he would be presented.

The transplantation of Beckett's plays to film in an attempt to reach a mainstream audience had immediate aesthetic ramifications for the dramatist's work. Critics had varying complaints in response to *Beckett on Film* including: deviation from Beckett's minimal sets by adding clutter in the background (*Krapp's*), a preference for individual faces as opposed to broad shots (*Godot*), situating an insular play within a larger environmental context (*Happy Days* and *Play*)and changing tempo from what Beckett preferred (*Rockaby*).[16] One critic took issue with *Not I* for its use of the "glamorous and perfect mouth [of Julianne Moore] instead of the scatological mouth" Beckett intended,[17] a comment that shows, in addition to the substantive and diverse changes made in the production, the boundless optimism that Beckett scholars bring to their studies. Finally, some people were troubled by the way *Beckett on Film* was delivered. RTÉ and Channel 4 played the filmed plays in marathon fashion and this left a disagreeable taste in people's mouths. Suddenly, the imprisoning experience of watching a Beckett play could be recorded and postponed for later to be watched between reruns of *EastEnders* and *Fair City*: or not. One can only guess how long the average Irish family—or any family for that matter—might have lasted when faced with eleven straight hours of Beckett to work through.[18]

---

[16] Jonathan Bignell, *Beckett on Screen: The Television Plays* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009), 32.

[17] Gabriella Borges, "Beckett on Film: A Dialogue Amongst Cinema, Television and Theatre," in *Cinema Europeu Contemporaneo* (2005), 5.

[18] Bignell notes, "It is telling in this respect that the life of the plays in the *Beckett on Film* series is now as a DVD commodity for solitary home viewing, primarily in the

Perhaps the most incisive critique of *Beckett on Film* comes from a person who, surprisingly, is allotted space on the official development documentary available with the DVD collection. Tom McGurk, labeled only as "Journalist" on screen, says:

> In the theater, there is a subjective relationship with a member of the audience. You are your own director... When you put a film camera between the audience and the play, it is the director who is deciding the meaning, who is deciding what is most important... It is an imposition on the Beckett performance.[19]

McGurk's concerns are introduced only to be summarily dismissed; he is silenced quickly by *Not I* director Neil Jordan in the next scene, who, after audibly sighing, brushes off McGurk by saying that "the only bad thing about Beckett is the commentators on him. They can be such tiresome bores."[20] McGurk is not seen again, the self-introduced criticism has been quashed, and the documentary ambles on unimpeded. What the immediate criticism of *Beckett on Film* shows is that its overt position as a product designed for mainstream consumption not only drastically altered the content and form of Beckett's plays, but the way in which it was experienced by viewers.

A Materialist Critique of "What Where"

"What Where" is Beckett's final play, and concerns an artist-figure named Bam who is directed by his own voice, an omnipresent megaphone given the separate name of "v." Responding to v, Bam asks doppelgangers Bem, Bim, and Bom about their success in interrogating an unnamed person regarding the simple questions of "What?" and "Where?" but, after assuming they are hiding the results from him, Bam has them interrogated each in their turn. The play engages with Beckett's theme of the trauma of habit, a theme even more

---

educational market, rather than as television broadcast for collective audiences or in cinema exhibition," *Beckett on Screen*, 87.

[19] All references labeled as "*Beckett on Film*" come specifically from the documentary found on the first disk of the boxed set. *Beckett on Film*, directed by Michael Colgan (Dublin: Blue Angel Films and Tyrone Productions, 2001, DVD). For this quotation, see 5:00 and 14:30 minutes.

[20] See documentary, 15:00 minutes.

incisive when one considers it has pervaded all the way to his final play: it is Beckett's own habit.

As with many of Beckett's later plays, "What Where" offers minimal set instructions, insisting only on a "playing area" that is "dimly lit" and "surrounded by shadow."[21] The *Beckett on Film* production, having taken creative license into its own hands, interpreted this minimalism as an opportunity for experimentation or, to be more specific, to produce the ideology of Beckett as fit for popular culture. It is worth noting, for example, that the play features Sean McGinley, a prominent Irish actor well-known among Irish audiences, and is directed by Damien O'Donnell, an Irish producer recently famous in Britain for his BAFTA-winning and commercially successful film *East is East* (1999). O'Donnell changes the setting of "What Where" to what appears to be a futuristic library complete with *Star Wars*-inspired sound effects for opening doors and neon lighting that immediately sets the play apart from the traditional nondescript Beckettian universe and into the realm of a distinct genre of popular film. O'Donnell's decision becomes clearer in the context of its production. "What Where" was filmed in December of 1999, a year that would also see a fluorishing of the science fiction genre in popular film. *The Matrix* and *Star Wars: The Phantom Menace*, for example, both came out in 1999 and together accumulated nearly two billion dollars in box office earnings, to say nothing of the profound effect their releases had on popular culture.

Introducing a particular and obviously recognizable setting to Beckett's minimally-designed sets has serious consequences for the interpretation of his work. Critics immediately began comparing this version of "What Where" to other films about "oppressive future societies," a long-standing genre with myriad political and cultural connotations.[22] These new interpretations were not harmful per se, but are unlikely what Beckett intended. Indeed, the science fiction or dystopian genre purposefully sets its time and place far from the here and now. This palliative distance, as well as the intricate specificity of

---

[21] Samuel Beckett, "What Where," 1984, in *Samuel Beckett: The Complete Dramatic Works* (London: Faber, 2006), 471.
[22] Bignell, *Beckett on Screen*, 74.

world creation, offers some level of comfort that the events occurring exist in a distinct and separate sphere from our own lives. By contrast, Beckett's version of his play purposefully avoids specificity to focus on the universal. They move inwardly, commenting on the internal struggle of existence, the pain and necessity of habit and repetition, the dullness of familiarity, and the agonizing cyclical nature of our lives. We see in the minimalist and nondescript setting of *Beckett's* "What Where" our own room, our own mind, and in it are able to feel the torturous twelve minutes with our own particularity. To go blatantly against Beckett's aesthetic philosophy by framing his work within the science fiction genre shows a desire to have it enter mainstream commercial culture.

O'Donnell defended his use of a futuristic library by claiming that Beckett had left the setting open for interpretation and that he saw "What Where" as "about power, and how information is power. So we used the library as a metaphor for someone who has control over all the power and information."[23] O'Donnell's library also adds props, another feature absent in Beckett's version of his play, with particular interest given to a large book that is zoomed in on several times throughout the film. The book, we might assume, is the artist-protagonist Bam's oeuvre—itself symbolic of Beckett's body of work—and therefore whoever has power over this book has power over the author. O'Donnell's insertion of this book into the film when the text does not ask for it is thus both a symbol and a production of his own power over the interpretation of Beckett. This idea resonates even more loudly when taking into consideration the executive mantras that were thrown around by the directors during production. O'Donnell said in regard to the controversy of putting Beckett on film that "If it works on film, you should film it,"[24] and with similar authoritarian gusto, Colgan said that "If this project turns more people on to Beckett, then it can't be heresy."[25] O'Donnell and Colgan have superseded Beckett and produced a version of "What Where," with distinctly-Irish characters

[23] See documentary at 9:20 minutes.
[24] See documentary at 10:20 minutes.
[25] See documentary at 42:10 minutes.

and a global science fiction setting, which is their own; they have, in essence, taken control of the interpretation of his oeuvre.
However, there are ways in which Beckett's transition to film can be helpful to our understanding of his philosophy. In his early aesthetic treatise *Proust*, Beckett explains his idea of a discontinuous self and the trauma involved with such a notion: "We are not merely more weary because of yesterday, we are other, no longer what we were before the calamity of yesterday . . . the world of our own latent consciousness, and its cosmography has suffered a dislocation."[26] Our present consciousness is the only thing we can lay claim to, because any past recollections are different conscious experiences and have no definitive connection to our present self. This, understandably, is traumatic for Beckett, and he suggests that only through the palliative practice of habit are we able to give ourselves a modicum of peace about the illusion of consistency and wholeness. This idea resonates with the production of film and the experience of film-making. In his essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility" (1936), Marxist critic Walter Benjamin makes frequent reference to film, suggesting that "*The stage actor identifies himself with a role. The film actor very often is denied this opportunity.* His performance is by no means a unified whole, but is assembled from many individual performances."[Original emphasis][27] Film-making is the process of producing hundreds, even thousands of different recordings, each time recording a different version of the actor and set. The completed film contrasts starkly with the single "take" of a theater production; it is a montage of carefully selected yet unmistakably different moments that give the illusion of continuity.[28] When we watch "What Where," it

---

[26] Samuel Beckett, *Proust and Three Dialogues with Georges Duthuit*, 1931 (London: Calder, 1976), 13.

[27] Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility," in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings: Volume 3: 1935-1938*, edited by Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings, translated by Edmund Jephcott, Howard Eiland, et al (Cambridge: Belknap, 2002), 112.

[28] Beckett produced a handful of plays for film on BBC in the 1960s and 1970s and, as Bignell notes, audiences and film critics avoided them because they were often recorded with a single camera and in a single take. This uncertain middle ground of being both unlike a normal film in its lack of an agile camera and unlike a theatrical experience in

becomes clear that each camera switch and each slightly different intonation for successive lines is the product of attempting to squeeze together discontinuous moments to imitate a continuous whole. Unacceptable shots, which inexplicably show a lack of similarity with an already dissimilar experience, are rejected and discarded. In this way, the production of film has many similarities to Beckett's idea of the self, and one wonders why Beckett never worked more with a medium that may have allowed him to experiment more deeply with this idea.

Seán Kennedy argues that "any account of the reception of Samuel Beckett's work in Ireland over the last 70 years or so might also serve as an account of Ireland's changing sense of itself in that period, revealing much about its ongoing processes of self-definition and revision."[29] Beckett's popularity as an "Irish writer" occurred at a time in which Ireland needed the confidence to push forward into global capitalism. Celtic Tiger ideology, which professed a self-confident Ireland open to global capitalism and the commodification of its culture, produced *Beckett on Film*, which in turn helped produce the idea that the great international writer Beckett was comfortably Irish. The *Beckett on Film* project has also opened up a considerable problem in Beckett Studies. Filmed versions of his plays directly contradict his theatrical insistence; Beckett was unflinchingly rigid about how and by whom his plays would be produced and, though he admired film throughout his life, he never approved of a film version of his works. It is surprising then that the Beckett Estate, though infamously as resistant to reinterpretation as Beckett, not only approved the *Beckett on Film* rendition, but also commended its results. According to Colgan, Edward Beckett praised the production of "What Where," saying that "it had more of an impact than it ever had on stage."[30] If Edward is willing to approve of film versions that fundamentally alter his uncle's work, he would surely be more open to flexible interpretations of Beckett in the future. Or perhaps his use of the word "impact" suggests

---

that it appears on screen shows the beginning of critical discourse about filming Beckett. See Bignell, *Beckett on Screen*, 31.

[29] Kennedy, "Reception," 55.

[30] "Beckett Goes."

not a commendation but a recognition that in contemporary society film is more widely consumed than theater.

Perhaps the greatest consequence of his transition to film is that the *Beckett on Film* versions have become, in a commercial sense, the definitive versions of Beckett. Theaters, of course, rarely, if ever, film their productions, and thus *Beckett on Film* has a monopoly on that market. Typing in "Beckett" on Amazon, for example, yields *Beckett on Film* as the only watchable version. And if one types in *Waiting for Godot* on YouTube, the first two results are different uploads of the same *Beckett on Film* version, which features the overtly Irish Barry McGovern and Johnny Murphy, and the elements of film—camera zooming, for instance—that articulate a vastly different vision of Beckett's work. *Beckett on Film* has become the definitive way to consume Beckett around the world and has produced a new ideology of Beckett as Irish, mainstream, and film-friendly.

References

Beckett, Samuel. "What Where." 1984. In *Samuel Beckett: The Complete Dramatic Works*. London: Faber, 2006.

---. *Proust and Three Dialogues with Georges Duthuit*. 1931. London: Calder, 1976.

"Beckett Goes to Hollywood." *The Guardian*, Nov. 19, 2000. Https://www.the guardian.com/film/2000/nov/19/beckettat100.theatre.

Beckett on Film. Directed by Michael Colgan. Dublin: Blue Angel Films and Tyrone Productions, 2001. DVD.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility." In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings: Volume 3: 1935-1938*. Edited by Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Translated by Edmund Jephcott, Howard Eiland, et al. Cambridge: Belknap, 2002.

Bignell, Jonathan. *Beckett on Screen: The Television Plays*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2009.

Borges, Gabriela. "*Beckett on Film*: A Dialogue Amongst Cinema, Television and Theatre." In *Cinema Europeu Contemporaneo*, 2005.

Brown, Terence. *Ireland: A Social and Cultural History 1922-2002*. London: Harper, 2004.

Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory*. London: Verso, 1976.

Harrington, John P. *The Irish Beckett*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1991.

Kennedy, Seán. "Samuel Beckett's Reception in Ireland." In *The International Reception of Samuel Beckett*. Edited by Marx Nixon and Matthew Feldman. London: Continuum, 2009.

Kelly, Nicholas. "Beckett on Film." Review of *Beckett on Film*, by Michael Colgan. RTÉ, Feb. 1, 1997. Https://www.rte.ie/entertainment/2001/0201/392948-beckett/.

Knowlson, James. *Damned to Fame: The Life of Samuel Beckett*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996.

McMullan, Anna. "Irish/Postcolonial Beckett." In *Palgrave Advances in Samuel Beckett Studies*. Edited by Lois Oppenheim. London: Palgrave, 2004.

McMullan, Anna, Trish McTighe, David Pattie, and David Tucker. "Staging Beckett: Constructing Histories of Performance." In *Journal of Beckett Studies* 23, no. 1 (2014): 11-33.

Ó Riain, Seán. *The Rise and Fall of Ireland's Celtic Tiger: Liberalism, Boom and Bust*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014.

Riding, Alan. "Samuel Beckett Gets an Irish Embrace." In *The New York Times*, July 28, 1996. http://www.nytimes.com/1996/07/28/theater/samuel-beckett-gets-an-irish-embrace.html