

**This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:**

There are differences : variants and errors in the texts of Beckett's radio plays

**Reference:**

Verhulst Pim.- There are differences : variants and errors in the texts of Beckett's radio plays  
Journal of Beckett studies - ISSN 0309-5207 - 24:1(2015), p. 57-74  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.3366/jobs.2015.0120>  
Handle: <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1253790151162165141>

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

### **'There are differences'**

#### **Variants and Errors in the Texts of Beckett's Radio Plays**

Pim Verhulst

As opposed to Beckett's drama and, to a lesser degree, his television plays, the six scripts he wrote for radio are generally considered to be a textually stable category in his body of work. The only well-known exception is *Cascando*, whose American and British first editions were distinguished by more than fifty variants. When Everett Frost confronted the author with the Grove and Faber versions of the text in 1987, to make a re-recording of it for an American Festival of his radio plays, Beckett admitted 'there are differences' and advised the producer to follow the Faber example (qtd. in Brater, 1994, 37). Three years earlier, Beckett's English-language publishers made the same choice for their joint publication of the *Collected Shorter Plays* (1984), when Grove discarded their own texts of the radio plays for the Faber versions. Not only were the American texts generally more reliable, they sometimes contained unique variants as well. Unproofed by the author, *CSP* added several new mistakes to the ones still surviving from the British first editions and their later reprints. This is problematic as *CSP* continued to serve as the model for Grove's Centenary Edition (2006) and Faber's *All That Fall and Other Plays for Radio and Screen* (2009). While the latter has 'made every effort silently to correct minor flaws appearing in earlier editions, no attempt has been made to impose a rigorous consistency upon such diverse materials', Everett Frost explains in his 'Notes on the Text' (qtd. in Beckett, 2009, xxv). For the present article I have compared all editions of the texts with the typescripts from which they were set, to reveal that *Cascando* is not the only one with differences, and that a study of the existing drafts is necessary to fully understand the textual history of the radio plays. My survey is limited to the English versions because the French texts are generally less problematic. I will discuss the radio plays in their order of publication, focusing primarily on the first editions and their relationship to the most recent texts, instead of providing full publication histories for all.

#### ***All That Fall***

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

From an editorial point of view, *All That Fall* is not generally considered to be a controversial text. However, a comparison of the first editions published separately by Faber and Grove in late 1957 reveal a number of variants. The reason is twofold: the texts were set from different typescripts, distinguished by minor variants, and Beckett corrected the British and American proofs at different times, without collating them.<sup>1</sup> This is a list of the substantial variants, not taking different spellings or house styles into account:

	<b>Faber (1957a)</b>	<b>Grove (1957b)</b>
1.	What news of your <b>poor</b> daughter? (9)	What news of your daughter? (6)
2.	<i>Dragging steps.</i> (10)	<i>Dragging feet.</i> (8)
3.	Are we very late, Mr. <b>Tyler?</b> I have not the courage to look at my watch. (10)	Are we very late, Mr. <b>Tyler,</b> I have not the courage to look at my watch. (8)
4.	Let us halt a moment and <b>let</b> this vile dust fall back upon the viler worms. (11)	Let us halt a moment and this vile dust fall back upon the viler worms. (8)
5.	<b>Heavens</b> you're not going to ride her flat! (12)	<b>Heavens,</b> you're not going to ride her flat! (11)
6.	<b>Well</b> if it isn't my old <b>admirer</b> the Clerk of the Course, in his limousine. (12)	<b>Well,</b> if it isn't my old <b>admirer,</b> the Clerk of the Course, in his limousine. (12)
7.	<b>Oh,</b> mother, you have squashed her (14)	<b>Oh</b> mother, you have squashed her (15)
8.	<b>Pity!</b> (15)	<b>Merde!</b> (17)
9.	You wouldn't have something for the Ladies Plate, <b>sir.</b> I was given (16)	You wouldn't have something for the Ladies Plate, <b>Sir,</b> I was given (18)
10.	<b>Ah</b> God forgive me, it's a hard life. (16)	<b>Ah,</b> God forgive me, it's a hard life. (19)
11.	just wasting <b>slowly, painlessly</b> away (16)	just wasting <b>slowly painlessly</b> away (19)
12.	<b>...What</b> did I do with that handkerchief? (17)	<b>...what</b> did I do with that handkerchief? (19-20)
13.	But according to my <b>watch</b> which is more or less right—or was—by the eight o'clock <b>news</b> the time is now (17)	But according to my <b>watch,</b> which is more or less right—or was—by the eight o'clock <b>news,</b> the time is now (20)
14.	<b>Why</b> even the sexton himself (18)	<b>Why,</b> even the sexton himself (23)
15.	And they are very <b>kind</b> I must admit (18)	And they are very <b>kind,</b> I must admit (23)
16.	<b>Now, now,</b> Mrs. Rooney, don't put your teeth in me. (19)	<b>Now now,</b> Mrs. Rooney, don't put your teeth in me. (24)
17.	<b>Christ</b> what a planet! (19)	<b>Christ,</b> what a planet! (19)
18.	the encircling <b>gloo-oom...</b> ( <i>Miss Fitt stops</i>	the encircling <b>gloo-oom</b> ( <i>Miss Fitt stops</i>

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

	<i>humming</i> ) (20)	<i>humming</i> ) (26)
19.	<b>oh</b> if you had my eyes (22)	<b>oh</b> , if you had my eyes (22)
20.	Poor Dan! (23)	<b>(sadly)</b> Poor Dan! (31)
21.	Put your arm <b>around</b> me. (26)	Put your arm <b>round</b> me. (37)
22.	<b>Then</b> instead of having saved sixpence (26)	<b>Then</b> , instead of having saved sixpence (37)
23.	One of the few satisfactions in <b>life!</b> (27)	One of the few satisfactions in <b>life?</b> (39)
24.	Hush! <b>Do</b> not speak as you go along (27)	Hush! <b>do</b> not speak as you go along (40)
25.	<b>Whatever</b> happened? (27)	<b>What ever</b> happened? (41)
26.	Mrs. <b>Tully</b> I fancy. (30)	Mrs. <b>Tully</b> , I fancy. (46)
27.	the happy little <b>healthy</b> little howling neighbours' brats. (31)	the happy little <b>hearty</b> little howling neighbours' brats. (47)
28.	<b>Oh</b> the pretty little woolly lamb (32)	<b>Oh</b> , the pretty little woolly lamb (49)
29.	No no, just the troubled <b>mind. I</b> was hoping he might shed a little light (33)	No no, just the troubled <b>mind, I</b> was hoping he might shed a little light (51)
30.	<b>Yes</b> , dear, from last year (34)	<b>Yes</b> dear, from last year (53)
31.	<i>They halt.</i> (34)	<i>They halt, on Mr. Rooney's initiative.</i> (53)
32.	You know, hinnies, or jinnies (34)	You know, hinnies, or <b>is it</b> jinnies (54)
33.	Than many of <b>which!</b> ... (35)	Than many of <b>which</b> ... (54)
34.	<i>(Pause. Gratefully.) Ah</i> , Dan! (35)	<i>(Pause. Gratefully.) Ah</i> Dan! (55)

Some variants are the result of differences between the Faber and Grove typescripts (#2, 12, 23, 27, 32), whereas #4, 20, 21 and 31 are typesetting mistakes by Faber that Beckett failed to spot on the proofs. While they have not yet been discovered for either edition, discrepancies between the Grove and Faber texts that do not occur on the typescripts reveal that Beckett made different last minute changes to the two sets of proofs. Examples #5, 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 26 and 28 show that Grove has many added commas, but some cases are unique to the British text: #7, 11, 16, 30 and 34. The editions also deal with other kinds of punctuation differently (#3, 9, 18, 24, 29 and 33). Example #8 shows that Beckett even changed words on the British proofs. As Maddy is pulled from of Mr. Slocum's car she cries 'Merde!' in all typescripts and Grove, but Faber has 'Pity!'. A rare example of a late addition is #1, which further heightens the sense of suffering in *All That Fall*.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

It seems that Beckett continued to expand this leitmotif in the English text of the radio play in Suhrkamp's *Dramatische Dichtungen in drei Sprachen* (1964). Having asked Christy how his 'poor wife' is doing, Maddy enquires about his 'poor daughter' (1964a, 8), a variant found nowhere else. Three other differences are unique to the Suhrkamp text: 'Come, Dolly darling', 'Retire! And live at home?', and 'Why won't you tell me!' change to 'Come, Dolly, darling' (42), 'Retire! And live at home!' (56) and 'Why won't you tell me?' (60). Since this is the last edition that Beckett supervised – as his letters to Barbara Bray reveal – these are important variants.<sup>2</sup> Not only should the Suhrkamp edition be taken into account for a critical edition, the Faber and Grove texts have different mistakes, in addition to unique variants, so reverting to either one of the two would result in a flawed text and partially neglect Beckett's layered revision of the radio play.

This is what happened when Grove adopted the Faber text for their *Collected Shorter Plays* (1984). While this version of *All That Fall* corrected some errors introduced in Faber's reset 1965 'paper covered edition', it also created new mistakes. Because later editions were based on *CSP*, most of these transmissional errors have persisted, with additional ones being added to the tally. Here is a survey of the remaining textual issues and their origin, with the Grove first edition as a cross-reference because it is the most reliable text:

	Origin	Grove (1957b)	Faber (2009)
1.	(1957)	<i>Mrs. Rooney murmurs melody.</i> (1)	<i>MRS ROONEY murmurs, melody.</i> (3)
2.	(1984)	MR. TYLER (6)	MR TYLOR (5)
3.	(1965)	It approaches, passes with thunderous <b>rattle</b> , recedes. (7)	<i>It approaches, passes with thunderous rattles, recedes.</i> (6)
4.	(2009)	Nothing, Mrs. Rooney, <b>nothing</b> , I was merely cursing (7)	Nothing, Mrs. Rooney, <b>nothing</b> I was merely cursing, under my breath (6)
5.	(1984)	Your poor wife, <b>she</b> told me to tell (9)	Your poor wife, <b>She</b> told me to tell (7)
6.	(2009)	But would I ever get <b>in, you</b> look very high off (12)	But would I ever get <b>in? You</b> look very high off the ground today (9)
7.	(1984)	The misery I have <b>endured</b> , to get here (34)	The misery I have <b>endured</b> to get here (19)
8.	(1984)	A Friday! (47)	A Friday? (26)
9.	(1984)	<b>No</b> no, I am agog (48)	<b>No</b> , no, I am agog (26)
10.	(1965)	Say <b>something</b> , Maddy. (50)	Say <b>something</b> . Maddy. (27)

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

11.	(1965)	a lecture by one of these new mind <b>doctors, I</b> forget what (50)	a lecture by one of these new mind <b>doctors. I</b> forget what (27)
-----	--------	---	---

Example #2, 4, 5 and 6 do not appear in Grove (2006), but the *Centenary Edition* text has two errors, inherited from *CSP*, which Faber (2009) corrects. The exclamation 'Ramdam!' (2006, 172) is assigned to Miss Fitt instead of Mr Tyler, and the word 'are' is dropped from the line 'when I remember there are five there three' (2006, 177).

### *Embers*

Beckett supervised the publication of *Embers* more scrupulously. He supplied his British and American publishers with the same typescript and made sure the changes to their proofs were identical.<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, he did not proofread the texts with the same care, so that the Grove and Faber versions of the radio play, in *Evergreen Review* 3.10 (Nov-Dec 1959) and *Krapp's Last Tape and Embers* (1959), were still distinguished by transmissional variants. All of the errors occurred in Faber, the *Evergreen* text being an almost flawless rendition. Some of the most obvious British mistakes were remedied in the next reprint of *Embers*, in the 'paper covered edition' series (1965), but not all, and additional ones crept into the reset *CSP* edition of 1984. Some of these were corrected in the most recent Faber (2009) version, but two new errors extended the list of surviving ones. Here is an overview of variants and their origin, with Grove (1959) serving as a reference again:

	Origin	Grove (1959)	Faber (2009)
1.	(1984)	cedar boughs bending under <b>load</b> , and then as the arm goes up (29)	cedar boughs bending under <b>load</b> and then as the arm goes up (36)
2.	(1984)	Bolton at the <b>window</b> , his back (30)	Bolton at the <b>window</b> his back (37)
3.	(1984)	a little apart with his <b>hand</b> , looking out, white world (30)	a little apart with his <b>hand</b> looking out, white world (37)
4.	(1984)	white <b>world</b> , great trouble (30)	white <b>world</b> great trouble (37)
5.	(1959)	"Please! <b>PLEASE!</b> ", Holloway (31)	'Please! <b>PLEASE!</b> ' Holloway (38)
6.	(1959)	Go on with you <b>now</b> when you're told (31)	Go on with you when you're told (38)

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

7.	(1959)	Laugh, <b>Henry</b> , do that for me (33)	Laugh, <b>Henry</b> do that for me. (40)
8.	(1959)	<b>Well</b> why don't you? (35)	<b>Well</b> , why don't you? (42)
9.	(2009)	watching you a <b>moment</b> , then on (40)	watching you a <b>moment</b> then on (46)
10.	(1984)	draws it <b>back</b> , no, kind of gathers (40)	draws it <b>back</b> no, kind of gathers (46)
11.	(1984)	old arm <b>tired</b> , takes it in the other (41)	old arm <b>tired</b> takes it in the other (47)
12.	(2009)	Sunday... <b>nothing</b> all day. (41)	Sunday... <b>Nothing</b> all day. (47)

Of all these examples, only #9 does not occur in the *GCE* (2006) text of *Embers*. Still, it is not a better version than Faber (2009) because it repeats five errors from *CSP* (1984) that the most recent British edition corrects:

	Origin	Grove (1959)	Grove (2006)
1.	(1984)	tramp the world down! ( <i>Pause.</i> ) Listen to it! (28)	tramp the world down! Listen to it! (198)
2.	(1984)	no <b>explanation</b> , no heat (31)	no <b>explanation</b> no heat (200)
3.	(1959)	I <b>used</b> to walk with her (31)	I <b>use</b> to walk with her (201)
4.	(1984)	<b>better off dead</b> , better off dead. (32)	better off dead. (201)
5.	(1984)	<i>Sea.</i> (41)	* (211)

Also, *CSP* (1984) rendered ellipses inconsistently as three or four dots. This is a mistake that *GCE* (2006) copies but Faber (2009) restores, and it occurs in the other radio plays as well. Finally, the English text of *Embers* in Suhrkamp's trilingual edition has a variant which could be a proof emendation: 'Let us get up and go' becomes 'Let us rise and go' (1964a, 126).

More intriguing than this single Suhrkamp variant are additions Beckett made in blue ink on his final typescript to prepare the BBC recording, after copies had been distributed to his British and American publishers. This set of more than fifty annotations is the result of a discussion with Donald McWhinnie from mid-June 1959 and has never been incorporated into any edition of the radio play. Generally, Beckett supplies more detailed stage directions for the sound effects and the voices of the characters, but he also expands the contractions in Ada's lines to their full forms, which makes her sound more lifeless.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

### *Words and Music*

The textual history of Beckett's last radio play originally written in English is more similar to that of *All That Fall*. The Grove and Faber first editions of *Words and Music*, in *Evergreen Review* 6.27 (Nov-Dec 1962) and *Play and Two Short Pieces for Radio* (1964), were again based on two different typescripts, distinguished by minor variants. Since the British version was published two years after the American text, the proofs were corrected at different times, causing more deviation.<sup>9</sup> The following list gives an overview of differences between the first editions:

	<b>Grove (1962)</b>	<b>Faber (1964)</b>
1.	a movement of the <b>soul</b> pursuing (35)	a movement of the <b>mind</b> pursuing (28)
2.	"No!" "Please" etc. (36)	"No!" "Please!" etc. (29)
3.	... <b>to</b> wit this love (36)	— <b>to</b> wit this love (29)
4.	"Please" "Peace" (37)	"Please!" "Peace!" (30)
5.	But how often <b>has it not</b> (40)	But how often <b>it has</b> (33)
6.	been <b>seen</b> , I mean (40)	been <b>seen</b> I mean (33)
7.	<b>Pause.</b> (41)	* (34)
8.	... <b>the lips part</b> , a little colour comes back into the cheeks and the eyes (41)	...a little colour comes back into the cheeks and the eyes (34)
9.	<b>END</b> (43)	<b>Curtain</b> (36)

Variants #1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 are due to differences between the typescripts. Beckett made the changes when he retyped the text. Example #5 can be traced to a holograph emendation, a marginal correction in red on the typescript used for the *Evergreen Review*. The last variant (#9) is clearly a blunder, as 'Curtain' makes no sense for a radio play. All drafts of *Words and Music* have 'END', so it is a Faber alteration passed on to *CSP* (1984) and even *GCE* (2006). Beckett himself corrected the error, in shocking pink ink, on a previously unknown proof copy of Faber's *Play and Two Short Pieces for Radio* gifted to the Irish-English book

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.



This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

collector Alan Clodd on 28 April 1964, weeks after the book appeared.<sup>10</sup> Beckett told Clodd his corrections mirrored the Faber proofs, but somehow they were ignored for the edition.

Most of the other annotations Beckett made on this proof copy correct obvious typos, avoided in later Faber reissues, but one holograph emendation creates a unique variant. The first occurrence of 'so' is crossed out in the sentence 'Seen from above at such close quarters in that radiance so cold and faint with eyes so dimmed' (1964b, 33), avoiding its repetition. The Suhrkamp edition (1964) has two additional variants that occur in no other version of the text. The phrase 'cooped up here in the dark', spoken by Words at the beginning, becomes 'pent up here in the dark' (1964a, 272) and 'under all angles' is rephrased as 'from all angles' (284). Since Beckett read proofs for the German edition, he is probably responsible for these differences.

In addition to these genetic variants, the latest Faber text (2009) of *Words and Music* has accrued some transmissional errors from its predecessors, in addition to a pair of its own:

	Origin	Grove (1962)	Faber (2009)
1.	(2009)	Bob! (36)	Bob. (75)
2.	(1964)	(Pause. Do.) (36)	[Pause. <b>Pause.</b> Do.] (75)
3.	(1964)	<b>Pause.</b> (37)	* (75)
4.	(2009)	(Pause.) <b>Age.</b> (Pause.) Joe. (37)	[Pause.] Joe. (75)
5.	(1984)	<b>pan...</b> in the bed... (38)	<b>pan</b> in the bed... (76)
6.	(1984)	the pan in the <b>bed...</b> (38)	the pan in the <b>bed.</b> (76)
7.	(1984)	on this particular night <b>and</b> shining coldly down (41)	on this particular night shining coldly down (79)

They affect all aspects of the radio play, from punctuation and content to the stage directions, as the omitted word in example #4 and the pause in example #3 illustrate.

### *Cascando*

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

Surely, the most puzzling editorial problem is presented by *Cascando*. Attention has already been drawn to the many substantial variants between the first editions by Grove and Faber, in *Evergreen Review* 7.30 (May-June 1963) and *Play and Two Short Pieces for Radio* (1964).<sup>11</sup> Because the British version has a marked tendency towards greater verbal economy, among other traits that confirm it as a substantial revision, it represents a more advanced state of the radio play.<sup>12</sup> Yet the BBC production of 6 October 1964 subverts the authority of the British edition because it seems to use a text still different from both Grove and Faber.

Critics have struggled to explain the relationship between these different versions of *Cascando*. John Fletcher first believed that the BBC broadcast was based on the *Evergreen* edition (1970, 86), but later he concluded that it 'followed a text intermediate between that printed in *Evergreen Review* and that published by Faber and Faber' (1978, 161). Enoch Brater accepted this view and tried to reconstruct the revision process: 'Beckett made textual changes in [the *Evergreen* text of] *Cascando* first for the BBC production, and then, after he had heard what the production sounded like, for the "final" (Faber) version' (1994, 37-38). This chronology cannot be correct, however, since the BBC Written Archives in Caversham reveal that Beckett's radio script was not recorded until September 1964, six months after Faber's edition had appeared on 27 March.<sup>13</sup> D. K. Alsop's most recent attempt to describe the relationship between the various published versions of *Cascando* shows just how difficult it is to resolve the matter from a textual point of view: 'the BBC broadcast follows the Faber text, correcting obvious errors (and so seeming to follow the *Evergreen* which lacked these errors) and showing knowledge of the *Evergreen* text in two brief variations' (2013, 6).

While he does not quite solve problem, Clas Zilliacus already suggested in his genetic study of the radio plays that the answer lies partly in the draft versions (1976, 123). Beckett's English translation of *Cascando* has survived in five typescripts.<sup>14</sup> The version in *Evergreen Review* corresponds to the second typescript, while the BBC version is identical to the fifth and last typescript in the series. The Faber edition, however, is still different from typescripts three and four, the two intermediate states, and so does not correspond to any of the surviving drafts. It is possible that the British edition was set from one of these remaining typescripts and that Beckett changed it further on the proofs, but this hypothesis is impossible to verify without access to the closed off Faber records. Yet the previously mentioned proof copy of Faber's *Play and Two Short Pieces for Radio* (1964), in the Alan Clodd-Beckett Collection at

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

the NLI, provides the answer indirectly. Beckett remedied the many mistakes in Faber's first edition in pink ink on the proof copy. Since all these emendations align the text with the last typescript in the draft sequence of the radio play – the one also used for the BBC production – it seems that Beckett intended this to be the final version of *Cascando* and probably gave a copy of this typescript to his British publisher as well.

As the annotations on the NLI proof copy reveal, Faber not only committed obvious typos – like 'I open the door' (1964b, 40), 'follow him him' (40), 'a of cave' (41), 'I've see him' (45) and 'a more' (48) – corrected in later reprints, but also dropped words and even an entire line. These errors were impossible to notice without the aid of the typescript underlying the edition, and they still exist in the most recent versions of the radio play by Grove (2006) and Faber (2009). Alsop suspects that another mistake may have survived. In the *Evergreen* text, Opener exclaims 'Good God' and 'Good God good God' (1963, 55) upon hearing Music alone near the end, which reads 'God' and 'God God' (1964b, 47) in the Faber edition and its successors. Alsop argues that 'God God' is 'distinctly un-Beckettian', suggesting 'a trance of revelation', and for that reason is 'almost certainly an error' (2013, 7). Brater, referring to a telephone conversation he had with Everett Frost, explains the change as follows:

Barbara Bray provided a crucial link here; her frequent telexes to Paris pinpoint the line items in the script that might be worth the author's reconsideration. One of the more important changes, the original 'Good God' crossed out and rendered in the BBC typescript as Opener's simple 'God,' was determined by no less prosaic a force than the Postal Service. Because radio broadcast fell under this domain in Britain, a domain that banned blasphemy, 'Good God' sounded risky. Beckett's producers at the BBC were reluctant to test the case (and thereby delay broadcast) so soon after the controversy surrounding *Endgame* at the Royal Court Theatre. (1994, 38)

Unfortunately, no evidence of these exchanges survives in either the Bray letters or the BBC WAC. What is more, Beckett already crossed out 'Good' and 'good' on his fourth typescript, and adopted 'God' and 'God God' in his fifth and final version, finished more than a year before the BBC production. Therefore, the shortened phrases do not seem to be mistakes or changes due to censorship, but belong to a larger revision campaign towards a tighter script

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

and a more economical style, reflecting the general evolution of the drafts. Beckett does not restore the phrase on the NLI proof copy of *Play and Two Short Pieces for Radio* either.<sup>15</sup> As a result, the best text of *Cascando* is, ironically, an immaterial one, broadcast by the BBC.

### ***Rough for Radio I***

Beckett's English translation of *Esquisse radiophonique* first appeared as 'Sketch for Radio' in the magazine *Stereo Headphones* 7 (Spring 1976), before it was collected with *Radio II* in *Ends and Odds* (1976/1977), under the label 'Rough' in the 'Odds' section. While *Ends and Odds* was a parallel publication by Faber and Grove, their editions are not identical twins and a few differences occur in the texts of *Radio I*.

Two of these variants have had repercussions extending to the Faber (2009) edition. In the stage directions of the telephone conversations Grove normalized Beckett's spelling of 'dialling' (1977, 90) in the British version to the American 'dialing' (1976, 110). This created confusion in the most recent Faber edition, where 'dialing' and 'dialling' (2009, 54) co-occur – as opposed to *GCE*'s consistent use of 'dialling' (2006, 314). The second error going back to the Faber *Ends and Odds* is a missing ellipsis between 'what? I tell you they're ending' (2009, 55), which does appear in the Grove variation of *Ends and Odds* but not in *GCE*, for which Grove adopted the Faber text. Two other mistakes in Faber (2009) and Grove (2006) were inherited through *CSP* (1984). A pause was dropped before the woman asks the man if voice and music are in the same situation (2009, 53), and an ellipsis was added after 'most urgent!...' (54), which is not present in either first edition of the script. On the same page, at the bottom, the role indication for 'VOICE' was dropped as it speaks together with 'MUSIC', an oversight that only occurs in Faber (2009). Yet Grove's *Centenary Edition* text also has two unique defects. A dotted line for VOICE is lacking (2006, 315), in addition to an ellipsis between 'what? breech?' (316).

### ***Rough for Radio II***

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

The textual history of *Radio II* shows more variants than that of its counterpart, especially if we compare the later versions to Grove's first edition in *Ends and Odds* (1976):

	<b>Origin</b>	<b>Grove (1976)</b>	<b>Faber (2009)</b>
1.	(1984)	You see, same old team. (116)	You see, <b>the</b> same old team. (59)
2.	(1977)	Unbelievable. (118)	Unbelievable! (61)
3.	(1984)	<b>Before</b> that, Miss (120)	<b>Before,</b> that, Miss (62)
4.	(1984)	little lichens of my <b>little</b> span (121)	little lichens of my <b>own</b> span (63)
5.	(1977)	I drew <b>near</b> , down the tunnels (121)	I drew <b>near</b> down the tunnels (63)
6.	(1977)	I seem to remember... <b>Admittedly</b> (122)	I seem to remember... <b>admittedly</b> (64)
7.	(1984)	" <b>No</b> no." (124)	' <b>No</b> , no.' (65)
8.	(1984)	but try, at least <b>try</b> (125)	but try, at least (67)
9.	(1984)	Who got her <b>into</b> that condition (127)	Who got her <b>in</b> that condition (68)
10.	(1984)	Maud would say, opened <b>up</b> – (128)	Maud would say, opened– (68)

The majority (examples #1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10) dates back to *CSP* (1984). The variant phrase in #4 is remarkable, but because *CSP* is essentially a reprint of older texts, Beckett did not read proofs for this edition and is probably not responsible for the change. But we cannot be so certain for variants #2, 5 and 6, the only three dating back to the Faber first edition of *Ends and Odds* (1977). This collection was entirely made up of new material, so Beckett is likely to have vetted proofs, but they have not yet come to light. While #5 seems to be a slip, #2 and #6 might well be proof corrections, not Faber normalizations. If the collection was proofed, it did not happen very meticulously, as Faber's *Ends and Odds* has a mistake not present in the first Grove edition but which was passed on to the most recent American edition of the script through *CSP*: 'Why on his stinker of a mouth, What do you suppose?' (2006, 327) is wrongly capitalized. Since Faber (2009) does not have this error, Grove's commemorative Centenary Edition sadly offers the roughest text of *Radio II*.

In a way, every text of the radio play is relegated to the status of a rough, incomplete version by a set of annotations on Beckett's latest typescript.<sup>19</sup> He must have made them after the radio play was published by Grove and Faber, as the notes have never found their way

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

into any publication. They may be linked to Beckett's comparison of the French and English versions of *Radio II* for Suhrkamp's trilingual *Stücke und Bruchstücke* (1978), because the grey pencil marginalia restore lines, phrases, ellipses and stage directions omitted from the French text, bringing the two language versions more in line with each other. Yet the English text in Suhrkamp's edition faithfully reproduces the Faber version of *Ends and Odds* (1977), so Beckett may not have noticed his mistakes until it was too late to do anything about them. Instead, he recorded his intentions, leaving the decision to posterity by preserving his drafts.

### Notes

**The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n° 31360911.**

1. Faber used a typescript preserved at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center (TXRC00-A1, Box 1, Folder 4), while Grove is based on a typescript held at the Olin Library, Washington University (MSS008, Box 1, Folder 24).
2. Beckett's correspondence with Barbara Bray is preserved at Trinity College Dublin. He mentions proofs for Suhrkamp on 12 and 18 September 1964 (TCD-10948-1-299 and TCD-10948-1-301).
3. The Grove and Faber editions of *Embers* were set from a typescript preserved at the University of Reading (UoR-MS-1396-4-6). No page proofs have surfaced for the publication in *Evergreen Review*, but a corrected proof copy of Faber's *Krapp's Last Tape and Embers* is at the HRC (TXRC00-A1, Box 4, Folder 2).
4. The *Evergreen Review* text of *Words and Music* is based on a typescript held the Olin Library, Washington University (MSS008, Box 3, Folder 75). The Faber edition goes back to a typescript copy preserved in the papers of Barbara Bray (TCD-10948-2-77). Corrected galleys for the first Grove edition are also at the HRC (uncatalogued). The original Faber proofs are missing, but Beckett reproduced his corrections on a copy of the edition preserved in the Alan Clodd-Beckett Collection at the National Library of Ireland in Dublin (LO-10276-255495).
5. Beckett's letter to Alan Clodd included with the gift is at the NLI (MS 35, 293/2).

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the *Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

6. See Fletcher (1970), Zilliacus (1976), Fletcher (1978), Brater (1994), Verhulst (2012) and Alsop (2013), Van Hulle (2014).
7. D. K. Alsop gave a detailed overview and discussion of variants in a previous issue of the *Journal of Beckett Studies* (22.1), so I will not provide a survey for *Cascando* as I did for the other radio plays. See also (Verhulst 2012) for additional information on differences between the various Grove and Faber editions of this text and the genesis of Beckett's English translation.
8. See Martin Esslin's letter to Samuel Beckett of 30 September 1964 (BBCWAC-Rcont 12-Samuel Beckett-Scriptwriter-File 2-1963-76).
9. The Harvard Theatre Collection has the first two typescripts (MS ThR 70, items 6 and 7). The other three are at Washington University (MSS008, Box 1, Folder 30).
10. For the sake of comparison, Winnie also uses 'God' in *Happy Days* when she spots an emmet (Beckett, 2010, 18). Beckett explained to Alan Schneider, who was confused by the word, that it simply meant "'good God!" as the implication of swarming ants dawns on her' (Beckett, 1998, 103).
11. This typescript is held at the University of Reading (MS-UoR-1555-2).

### Works Cited

Alsop, D. K. (2013), 'Textual Variants in *Cascando*: An Argument for a Scholarly Edition',  
*Journal of Beckett Studies*, 22:1, pp. 1–34.

Beckett, Samuel (1957a), *All That Fall: A Play for Radio*, London: Faber and Faber.

Beckett, Samuel (1957b), *All That Fall*, New York: Grove Press.

Beckett, Samuel (1959), 'Embers: A Play for Radio', *Evergreen Review*, 3:10, pp. 28-41.

Beckett, Samuel (1962), 'Words and Music', *Evergreen Review*, 6:27, pp. 34-43.

Beckett, Samuel (1963), 'Cascando', *Evergreen Review*, 7:30, pp. 47-57.

Beckett, Samuel (1964a), *Dramatische Dichtungen in drei Sprachen, Band II*, Frankfurt am  
Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Beckett, Samuel (1964b), *Play and Two Short Pieces for Radio*, London: Faber and Faber.

Beckett, Samuel (1965), *All That Fall: A Play for Radio*, London: Faber and Faber.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.

- Beckett, Samuel (1976), *Ends and Odds: Eight New Dramatic Pieces*, New York: Grove Press.
- Beckett, Samuel (1977), *Ends and Odds*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Beckett, Samuel (1978), *Stücke und Bruchstücke*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Beckett, Samuel (1998), *No Author Better Served: The Correspondence of Samuel Beckett & Alan Schneider*, ed. Maurice Harmon, Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Beckett, Samuel (2006), *The Grove Centenary Edition, Volume III, Dramatic Works*, ed. Paul Auster, New York: Grove Press.
- Beckett, Samuel (2009), *All That Fall and Other Plays for Radio and Screen*, ed. Everett Frost, London: Faber and Faber.
- Beckett, Samuel (2010), *Happy Days*, ed. James Knowlson, London: Faber and Faber.
- Brater, Enoch (1994), *The Drama in the Text: Beckett's Late Fiction*, Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Federman, Raymond and John Fletcher (1970), *Samuel Beckett: His Works and His Critics*, Berkeley: U of California P.
- Fletcher, John and Beryl S. Fletcher (1978), *A Student's Guide to the Plays of Samuel Beckett*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Van Hulle, Dirk (2014), 'Textual Scars: Beckett, Genetic Criticism and Textual Scholarship', in S. E. Gontarski (ed.), *The Edinburgh Companion to Samuel Beckett and the Arts*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, pp. 306-19.
- Verhulst, Pim (2012), 'Editing Multilingual Beckett: The Case of *Cascando*', in W. Dillen, C. Macé and Dirk Van Hulle (eds.), *Texts Beyond Borders: Multilingualism and Textual Scholarship*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 211-27.
- Zilliacus, Clas (1976), *Beckett and Broadcasting: A Study of the Works of Samuel Beckett for and in Radio and Television*, Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

This is the author's version of an article published by Edinburgh University Press in the  
*Journal of Beckett Studies* 24.1 (2015): 57-74.

Please refer to the published version for correct citation and content.