

Edinburgh Critical Studies in Modernism, Drama and Performance

Beckett's *Breath*

Anti-theatricality and the Visual Arts

Sozita Goudouna



BECKETT'S *BREATH*

Edinburgh Critical Studies in Modernism, Drama and Performance

Published

The Speech-Gesture Complex: Modernism, Theatre, Cinema

Anthony Paraskeva

Irish Drama and the Other Revolutions: Playwrights, Sexual Politics and the International Left, 1892–1964

Susan Cannon Harris

Modernism and the Theatre of the Baroque

Kate Armond

Beckett's Breath: Anti-theatricality and the Visual Arts

Sozita Goudouna

Forthcoming

Russian Futurist Theatre: Theory and Practice

Robert Leach

Greek Tragedy and Modernist Performance

Olga Taxidou

www.edinburghuniversitypress.com/series/ecsmddp

BECKETT'S *BREATH*
Anti-theatricality and the Visual Arts

Sozita Goudouna

EDINBURGH
University Press

Edinburgh University Press is one of the leading university presses in the UK. We publish academic books and journals in our selected subject areas across the humanities and social sciences, combining cutting-edge scholarship with high editorial and production values to produce academic works of lasting importance. For more information visit our website: edinburghuniversitypress.com

© Sozita Goudouna, 2018
Preface © David Cunningham, 2018

Edinburgh University Press Ltd
The Tun – Holyrood Road
12(2f) Jackson's Entry
Edinburgh EH8 8PJ

Typeset in Sabon and Gill Sans by
Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire,
and printed and bound in Great Britain.

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 1 4744 2164 5 (hardback)
ISBN 978 1 4744 2165 2 (webready PDF)
ISBN 978 1 4744 2166 9 (epub)

The right of Sozita Goudouna to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, and the Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 2003 (SI No. 2498).

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vi
Preface <i>David Cunningham</i>	vii
Introduction: In the Same Breath – From the Black Box to the White Cube and Beyond	1
PART I: RESPIRATION, DISCOURSE AND THE QUESTION OF MEDIUM SPECIFICITY	
1 Deeptime: <i>Breath</i> and the Look of Non-Art	45
2 The Durational Turn: Absorption and the Specificity of Temporality	79
PART II: (RE)PRESENTING BREATH	
3 Shortness of Breath: Beckett's <i>Breath</i> in Context	105
4 Emptied of Theatre: Breath and the Phenomenology of Disembodiment	120
PART III: THE EXHALED FIELD	
5 Waste of Breath: The Readymade as a Stage Set	141
6 Intermedial Breath: Defying the Boundaries between Displaying and Staging	148
7 Investigating the Materiality of Respiration in Different Media	161
Conclusion: The Afterlives of Breath: Breathe – Breathe Again . . . Breathe Better	182
Bibliography	196
Index	216

even when the body is absent, as it is in the "recorded vagitus" of Beckett's *Breath*.³⁶ We might have expected from Beckett the last syllable of recorded time, but what appears in the vagitus is more like the last minimal mediation of the birth cry of ancient drama. As Blau notes,

With dim light and synchronized breath, there is nothing to this play but the brief repetition of a faint, brief cry, but it is sufficient to remind us that what can never be represented (or can only be represented) is no less moving in thought: that the body in performance is dying in front of our eyes. Unceasing process is out there in the flesh. Or hangs, perceptually, on the audience's breath. No one sees the motion but the motion, but it is thus that performance remains – through the appearance of the invisible or the ghost of a rigor mortis ontological model of an encounter with the unforeseen.³⁷

The playlet evades human and corporeal representation; the body is missing both as an object and as an image, and human agency is made present through its absence while, as Blau concludes, the privilege of the dramatic stage is 'its very corporeality being the basis of its most powerful illusion, that something is substantially there, the thing itself, even as it vanishes'.³⁸

PRODUCTION HISTORY. THE LEGACY OF *BREATH*'S STAGINGS:
S. E. GONTARSKI, BARBARA KNEZEVIC, FERNANDO AND ADRIANO
GUIMARÃES, DAMIEN HIRST

The legacies of *Breath*'s 'stagings' by prominent and emerging visual artists, performance practitioners and theatre directors from different cultural and national backgrounds illustrate the controversial reception of the text. In particular, Kenneth Tynan's production reveals the tension regarding the interpretation and the 'readings' of the playlet. In 1969, *Breath* made its debut in Kenneth Tynan's bawdy revue *Oh! Calcutta!* Infuriated by this staging, which ignored a typically specific set of stage instructions, Beckett removed the work and the play became a shadowy chapter in his back catalogue. This incident with Tynan's addition forms the crux of Barbara Knezevic's exhibition at the Joinery, 'Breath and Other Shorts', in which a framed programme of *Oh! Calcutta!* is set beside an old library copy of *Breath* and a red-bound book, entitled *Beckett: An Exercise in Omission*. This last piece contains Knezevic's account of *Breath*'s ill-fated debut. Inside, the text is repeated hundreds of times, each page a copy of the one before, until its image fades and becomes skewed. A metaphor for the changes that occur when a work is restaged, 'this piece establishes a thread for the rest of an exhibition which abounds with duplicates'.³⁹

Theorists draw attention to the necessity of periodic reinvention of Beckett's *oeuvre*, in particular the theorist and director Stanley Gontarski points out the

significance of the play's avant-garde potential and its unconventional context, and attempts to direct and present *Breath* in a framework that he considers is more appropriate to the writer's initial objectives. The director tries to negotiate the complexity of the interface between a theatrical performance and a purely visual representation by directing and 'presenting' the work in a visual art context, and attempts to resolve the problems involved in the staging of *Breath* that are essentially related to its 'anti-theatrical structure'.

Gontarski argues that it was the clamour over Tynan's excesses that kept him thinking about how a director could solve the problems of staging *Breath*, thus he decided to resolve the problem by not 'staging' the playlet. The director aspired to present a performance closer to Beckett's rather than Tynan's; as an autonomous entity and not as part of an evening's theatrical sequence. He attempted to foreground what he considers as the play's avant-garde potential, the play of memory, its power to subvert or defy conventions and expectations and to shock its audience into thinking, at very least, about performance itself; thus he realised that the sort of performance he envisioned⁴⁰ did not require a theatrical venue.

In 1992 Gontarski was invited to participate in an evening of visual art and performance at Florida State University Gallery and Museum. It was in such a "fragile" and "ephemeral" artistic environment that he decided to present *Breath*. The project's curatorial approach was to use the gallery as a de-centred theatre space with events performed in several spaces of the gallery and the audience would wander or drift from one to the other with only the slightest prompting. Instead of adopting the structure of an outdoor fair, where simultaneous performances are offered to a roaming audience, the gallery evening features sequential performances without overlap. The evening as Gontarski describes, would comprise readings and other theatrical performances and environments among the gallery's various nooks and rooms and 'his offering was, then, in keeping with the hypertext theme, or rather to present versions of digital or telereality'.⁴¹

Breath, similarly to the majority of Beckett's later plays, requires a different frame, beyond the traditional proscenium arch, that was unavailable in the theatre, and Gontarski realised this fact, acknowledging that the playlet raises issues concerning the space of its production, reception, presentation, venue (gallery or theatre), but also of viewing and audience response. Consequently he decided to present it in an ambiguous context by highlighting its hybrid and technological implications. Gontarski calls the performance 'A Simulated Television Production' and rather than constructing a proscenium, he built an oversized prop television, through the absent screen of which *Breath* was performed 'live', thus this version was framed by an almost clownish simulated television screen. This was the continued development of the hybrid art that he considered to be Beckett's late theatre and as he describes it, it was 'an art of

icons, images and afterimages, ghosts of memories – as closely related to sculpture as to what we have traditionally called theatre'.⁴² The pile of 'miscellaneous rubbish' was physically present with the other installations in the gallery and he intended to show that Beckett's 'play' should be indistinguishable from the other art objects on display or from the gallery's refuse outside the service entrance.⁴³

The director intended to stress the different features of *Breath*, namely its 'hybridity' and theatricality, in contrast to the other exhibits. Gontarski's production focuses on the primary articulation of the *mise en scène* that is based on the lighting design as well as on the presence of the rubbish, so as to differentiate the subtext of *Breath* in relation to the other gallery artworks. The 'performance' of *Breath*, as opposed to the gallery's other sculptures, is 'announced' by the light's fading up on the set, that is, on the heap of rubbish some ten feet behind the television screen, as the gallery lights simultaneously (but only slightly) dimmed. The brief cry (*vagitus*) and amplified inspiration would sound for some ten seconds and after the prescribed five-second pause, the expiration and identical cry for some ten seconds. Fade down the stage; fade up the gallery. The playlet was repeated several times during the evening, interspersed amid other performances, and the director hoped that such repetition might suggest the regenerative element he saw as implicit in the play.

As he mentions, he couldn't foresee the audience's response. The context of the gallery and the fact that the viewers were not manipulated into seeing *Breath* as an ordinary theatrical piece, with the rise and fall of the curtain, led to an 'open response' that blurred the distinction among artistic forms. This reception pleased Gontarski, who felt that the production was like an invisible theatre that took place in a gallery; he deliberately chose to associate Beckett's 'play' with the visual arts, and that was the reason that he 'staged' this performance in an art gallery context.

He was not surprised that the viewers never seemed to understand that they were watching what he considered live theatre, since the performance lacks what had heretofore been deemed an essential ingredient of theatre, namely, actors. The audience, deprived of its standard ambience and cultural cues, failed to applaud at the fade down, but neither did they applaud the viewing of other sculptures as they departed, even when the gallery lights dimmed as they did to announce another *Breath*.

Counter to Beckett's stage directions, the production includes no curtain and no curtain call. Gontarski considers that the lack of audience response is a measure of the success of this production, since the project blurs the distinction among artistic forms and becomes, almost, invisible theatre. But, 'while I may have saved the play from being lost amid a sequence of other plays as planned, I may also have lost it to a neo-Dadaist revival of found sculpture'.⁴⁴ This statement reveals that the director intended to reinvent and experiment

with *Breath*, only to the extent that the piece would not approximate a ready-made structure that shares structural affinities with anti-artistic approaches. Therefore, the piece's complex relationship between a visual art piece (found sculpture, readymade piece) and the theatre challenged the director.

Fernando and Adriano Guimarães' staging of *Respiração +* (2002–7) involves the staging of Beckett's playlet along with the installation entitled *Breathó*. The artists are interested in the different representations of respiration and often work with the notion of respiration and on Beckett's plays. Adriano Guimarães sees in *Breath* a 'life in 35 seconds, and what you have is rubbish, organic material, what the human being is made of'.⁴⁵ The artists, however, consider as vital the presence of the human figure in this work (like Tynan). *Breath* is the centrepiece of the exhibition, one version of which features a live, naked actor in an embryonic sac. The performance takes place in two transparent tanks filled with water, where the fully-clothed performers dive, as they hold their breath. The installation consists of living people, who are forced to stay under the water, where they are unable to breathe. Their work focuses on the human body and according to the art critic, Vitoria Daniela Bousso, they engage directly 'the cultural games of regulation and control that are played upon it. The body is less ancillary in the artists' work, as Bousso argues, than it might generally be in Beckett and instead becomes the seat of the struggle of power relationships – if not overtly expressed, certainly a subtext of Beckett's work as well'.⁴⁶

The Guimarães' brothers reinvent the context in which *Breath* is presented by offering a new poetic interpretation of the Beckettian *oeuvre*, on the threshold between the visual and the theatrical. According to Gontarski, who reviewed the piece, the artists create something like their own Beckett archive: 'Beckett in or as a cabinet of curiosities, a Beckett made up of cultural shards. Their antiphonal use of Beckett's works and words is a case in point'.⁴⁷ According to the director and theorist, their performances are less critiques of Beckett's work, than reinventions of it:

these works are Beckett's afterimages and hence in no need of serious revision or renovation, since they are already preceded and followed, as they are, by images of the Guimarães brothers' re-imagining of Beckett afterimages, of Beckett's texts.⁴⁸

This version of the playlet disregards *Breath*'s anti-theatrical features as well as its minimal context and the writer's intention to expose the components of the medium in skeletal form. According to Gontarski, the rubbish is seen as a metaphor for the human body, which is finite and disposable, a similar approach to Damien Hirst's allusion to medicine as a reflection of the human organism. However, the decision to present the human body in these works disregards the writer's central premise that eradicates the body/subject from

the stage. Consequently, the installation fails to convey the existential and ontological importance of Beckett's decision to present the 'absence' of the human subject.

RESPIRATION AS VANITAS: DAMIEN HIRST, MARC QUINN, TRACEY EMIN,
MAT COLLISHAW

Damien Hirst,⁴⁹ the director of *Breath* for the Beckett on Film project, mentions that when he was asked to direct the film, he read the text and thought it was incredibly precise and strict. As he was preparing to shoot, he read the text over and over, and what really impressed him was Beckett's direction 'hold for about five seconds'. That was when he realised that the writer had 'this massive sense of humour'.⁵⁰

Hirst attempted to direct his version of the playlet based on this enormous and idiosyncratic sense of humour, alongside Beckett's meticulous and rigorous artistic practice and the visual artist's own saturated aesthetics. In his attempt to negotiate the complex interface between the theatre and the visual arts, Hirst designs a 'controversial' scenery that consists of an installation of medical waste. This additional component does not necessarily contribute to a critical conceptual framework or enhance and develop the playlet's meaning and humour. Hirst's staging is a version of the playlet seen as a 'Vanitas', that doesn't discover new aspects or place the playlet in a new context; one that relates to the original and current context. The visual artist reproduces his own preoccupations with the saturation of culture with commercial imagery.⁵¹ As Claire Lozier argues, there is in Beckett a desire to write a 'Vanitas' and she attempts to explore Beckett's debt to the genre of painting known as the 'Vanitas', and more specifically to its reworking in *Breath*. Lozier argues that 'the pictorial tradition of the baroque genre debt (the seventeenth-century Dutch genre of painting known as the "Vanitas") informs the play's aesthetic, to the point where *Breath* can be described as a transcription of the older genre'. The play inflicts a postmodern ironical twist upon the moral of the *contemptus mundi* and *memento mori* expressed by the 'Vanitas' tradition, and Lozier examines this contradictory use of the 'Vanitas' in the stylistic features of the writing, while she draws her argument from a comment made by Beckett in a 1973 interview with Charles Juliet. The writer mentions that he would like to be able to say death and life in an extremely reduced space, and Juliet reports that Beckett 'refers to the seventeenth-century Dutch paintings which serve as memento mori and that, like those painters, il aimerait pouvoir dire la vie et la mort en un espace extrêmement réduit'.⁵²

By and large, the YBA interest in respiration lies in their involvement with the themes of life and death, 'Vanitas' and the brevity of life. Marc Quinn's *You Take My Breath Away* (1992) is a thin skin bearing the imprint of his body that is exhibited hanging like a discarded condom, while Tracey Emin's

You Left Me Breathing (1992)⁵³ includes a series of early drawings and mono-prints, from diminutive stitched texts to monumental and hand-embroidered textile assemblages. *You Left Me Breathing* has diverse undertones, as the artist argues 'the obvious is half-dead, but also, when someone leaves you standing – crying – as you sob and inhale the air you realise how important breath is. The same as when making love with uncontrollable passion, when there are no thoughts but just breath and the sound of a beating heart'.⁵⁴

The ideological guise of the YBAs is revealed when compared to Beckett's *oeuvre*, since these works are immersed in the culture they criticise. On the contrary, Beckett's *Breath* resists recuperation and can be seen as a critique of the conditions of art making, display, marketing and interpretation, in contrast to the YBA movement that became dependent on these processes. The analysis of *Breath*'s stagings by visual artists such as Damien Hirst, Nikos Navridis, Adriano and Fernando Guimarães and by theatre directors including Stanley E. Gontarski, Kenneth Tynan and Amanda Coogan shows the impact of Beckett's work on contemporary art practice and the ways in which the interface between staging performance and displaying art can create a new intermedial 'genre' that can suit the purposes and approaches of both Beckett's *Breath* and contemporary art. The artists decide to transform and reinvent the context in which *Breath* was written by opening the work in a spatially expanded situation. Chapter 6 examines, in particular, Navridis' version of the piece that offers an experiential and intermedial context by projecting an image of waste above ground, so that the spectators can walk on the surface and become immersed in this environment.

The artist challenges the solid and fixed context and ascribes intermedial qualities to the work, thus activating the viewers in a bodily manner. Nevertheless, the majority of the above-mentioned versions disregard Beckett's intention to reveal the fundamental ontological emptiness on *Breath*'s disembodied stage. The following chapter examines in detail the existential, as well as the aesthetic ramifications of Beckett's ultimate decision to present the 'empty figure' on this shattered scenery.

NOTES

1. Bruno Latour. 'Air'. In Caroline Jones (ed.), *Sensorium*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006: 104.
2. Samuel Beckett. *Murphy*. London: Calder, 1993: 5.
3. Ibid. Connor, Steven. 'Beckett's Atmospheres'. In S. E. Gontarski and Anthony Uhlmann (eds), *Beckett after Beckett*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2006: 52.
4. Beckett wrote to agent Jenny Sheridan on 27 April 1972. See S. E. Gontarski, 'Reinventing Beckett', *Modern Drama*, 49. 4 (Winter 2006): 428.
5. Quoted in Kalb, Jonathan. *Beckett and Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 235.
6. Ruby Cohn remarks that,

although a fair copy of *Breath* has been widely reproduced, no holograph is extant. In the summer of 1966 Beckett recited to me in response to my question about what he had written and had sent to Kenneth Tynan for his revue of *Oh! Calcutta*. The staging became the most notorious deviation of Beckett's text first published as the prologue of *Oh! Calcutta*, New York Grove, 1969. It was printed correctly in the second impression (1970) and then by Calder in *Gambit* 1970. It is found in CDW and in Beckett's French in *Comédie et Actes Divers* 1972. Cohn, Ruby. *A Beckett Canon*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001: 298

7. This collection of short plays by a variety of authors included a prologue by Samuel Beckett, which he had originally written under the title of *Breath*, was finally staged after thirty-nine preview performances, on the 16 June (17 according to Gontarski), 1969 at the Eden Theatre in New York City.
8. See Stanley Gontarski. 'Reinventing Beckett', *Modern Drama*, 49.4 (Winter 2006): 439.
9. According to Gontarski,

Breath's most memorable performance was its first, as the opener, called *Prelude*, to the Jacques Levy-directed and Kenneth Tynan-conceived sextravaganza, *Oh! Calcutta!*, *Calcutta!*, the image and title adapted from the painting of Camille Clovis Trouille's posterior odalisque, with its pun on the French 'O quel cul t'as [O what a lovely ass you have], said 'cul' being prominently displayed. As an opener to an evening of shorts, by Beckett or a variety of artists, as was the case with the Tynan-Levy production and as it is most frequently performed, the play is inevitably lost. Tynan drew attention to the playlet by adding three words to the opening tableau. To Beckett's 'Faint light on stage littered with miscellaneous rubbish,' Tynan added, 'including naked people' [. . .] Leading off with Beckett. Bruce Williamson, who introduced the work for a 'pictorial essay' in *Playboy* billed as 'A Front – Row – Centre Look at Oh! Calcutta!' *Calcutta!* (known by some wags [so to speak] as *Jingle Balls*), was as he wrote the only show in town that has customers piling into front row-centre seats armed, by God, with opera glasses. But Tynan was called a literary pimp, and his stable of authors, Beckett included, 'a pack of whores' [. . .] As the *Playboy* feature suggests, the musical spawned something of an industry, reflecting the era's sexual revolution and its commodification of sex. A book version of the play was issued by Beckett's American publisher, Barney Rosset of Grove Press, who published the play as performed in an illustrated edition in 1969, attributing to Beckett alone the playlet – with Tynan's erotic alterations. While only the earliest playbills identified authors, Rosset's volume listed them under a traditional Table of Contents. The musical was subsequently issued as an LP, was made into a Hollywood film, and is still currently available in CD, VHS, and DVD formats. The enterprise may have been Beckett's sole entry into the Age of Aquarius, certainly his only appearance in *Playboy*. Despite such phenomenal success and unprecedented exposure, drama reduced to its bare necessities, one might say, most respectable critics have generally joined Beckett in the condemnation of at least his contribution to the production.

Gontarski, Stanley. 'Reinventing Beckett': 439.

10. *Gambit*, 4.16 (1969): 5–9.
11. A chronological scope of the late plays: *Act Without Words I* and *II* (1959), *Embers* (1959), *Words and Music* (1962), *Cascando* (1963), *Play* (1963), *The Old Tune* (adaptation of *La Minivelle*, by Robert Pinget) (1963), *Come and Go*

- (1966), *Eh Joe* (1967), *Breath* (1969), *Not I* (1973), *Footfalls* (1976), *Ghost Trio* (1976), *Rough for Radio I and II* (1976), *Rough for Theatre I and II* (1976), *That Time* (1976), . . . *but the clouds . . .* (1977), *Ohio Impromptu* (1982), *A Piece of Monologue* (1982), *Rockaby* (1982), *Catastrophe* (1984), *Nacht und Träume* (1984), *Quad* (1984), *What Where* (1984).
12. Brater, Enoch. 'Fragment and Beckett's Form in *That Time* and *Footfalls*', *Journal of Beckett Studies*, 2 (Summer 1977): 70; and Beckett, Samuel. *Proust*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1931: 64.
 13. See Brater, Enoch. 'Fragment and Beckett's Form': who mentions that Beckett used the phrase 'savage economy of hieroglyphics' to describe Joyce's work. In <http://www.english.fsu.edu/jobs/num02/Num2EnochBrater.htm>
 14. Keller, Paul. 'Feature – Londoners gasp at Beckett's 30-second play' London: Reuters, 11 Feb. 1999.
 15. See Harmon, Maurice (ed.). *No Author Better Served: The Correspondence of Samuel Beckett and Alan Schneider*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1998: 24.
 16. Brater, Enoch. *Beyond Minimalism: Beckett's Late Style in the Theatre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987: 177.
 17. Harmon, Maurice (ed.). *No Author Better Served*: 24.
 18. The mimes *Kilcool* and *J. M. Mime* were described by Beckett as 'fragments of theatre' and they were contained in a notebook given by Beckett to the Trinity College, Dublin.
 19. In <https://www.badnewdays.com/beckett-s-dramaticules> and <http://www.english.fsu.edu/jobs/num02/Num2EnochBrater.htm> See also Beckett, Samuel. *Ends and Odds*. New York: Grove Press, 1976:
 20. In <https://www.badnewdays.com/beckett-s-dramaticules> and <http://www.english.fsu.edu/jobs/num02/Num2EnochBrater.htm>
 21. See Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006; and *Cinema 2: The Movement-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
 22. Jeffers, Jennifer M. 'The Image of Thought: Achromatics in O'Keefe and Beckett', *Mosaic*, 29.4 (December 1996): 74.
 23. Brater adds, 'in his earlier plays there is more attention on representational detail, and these details are constantly and eloquently subjected to correction, revision, based on the shifting ambiguities of audience perception, especially in Beckett's *Fizzles*'. Brater, Enoch. 'Fragment and Beckett's Form in *That Time* and *Footfalls*': 71.
 24. Brater, Enoch. 'Fragment and Beckett's Form in *That Time* and *Footfalls*', *Journal of Beckett Studies* (Summer 1977): 70–81. In <http://www.english.fsu.edu/jobs/num02/Num2EnochBrater.htm> [accessed 1/11/16].
 25. *Ibid.*
 26. Beckett, Samuel. *Breath and the Complete Dramatic Works*. London: Faber and Faber, 1986: 209.
 27. In Puchner, Martin. *Stage Fright: Modernism, Anti-Theatricality and Drama*. Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002: 26.
 28. Cohn, Ruby. *Just Play Beckett's Theatre*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980: 4.
 29. *Ibid.*
 30. Pountney, Rosemary. *Theatre of Shadows: Samuel Beckett's Drama: 1956–76*. Gerrard's Cross: Colin Smythe Ltd, 1988: 42. However, the idea of the 'death rattle' is often disputed, see Hutchings, William. 'Abated Drama: Samuel Beckett's Unabated Breath', *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature*, 17.1 (1986): 88.
-

31. See Hutchings, William, 'Abated Drama': 88.
32. Cohn, Ruby. *Just Play Beckett's Theatre*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980: 4.
33. See Hutchings, William, 'Abated Drama': 88.
34. *Ibid.*
35. See Kalb, Jonathan. *Beckett and Performance*.
36. Blau, Herbert. *The Audience*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990: 365 and 366.
37. *Ibid.*
38. Blau, Herbert. *Blooded Thought: Occasions of Theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982: 132.
39. See <http://www.barbaraknezevic.com/> [accessed 1/11/2016].
40. According to Gontarski, Deborah Warner shared the same intentions, as she wanted with the staging of *Footfalls* to provoke the Beckett estate. Gontarski, S. E. 'Reinventing Beckett', *Modern Drama*, 49. 4 (Winter 2006): 441.
41. Gontarski, S. E. 'Reinventing Beckett'. *Modern Drama*, 49.4, University of Toronto Press, (Winter 2006): 441.
42. *Ibid.*
43. *Ibid.*
44. *Ibid.*: 442.
45. *Ibid.*: 441.
46. Bousso, Vitória Daniela. 'Interstice Zone in Adriano and Fernando Guimarães'. 'Todos Os Que Caem / All That Fall' catalogue. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Cultural Banco do Brasil, 2004: 97–9.
47. Gontarski, S. E. 'Reinventing Beckett': 451.
48. *Ibid.*
49. Hirst is a representative artist of the new British art of the 1990s, 'Young British Art' (YBA): Damien Hirst, Tracey Emin, Jake and Dinos Chapman, Marcus Harvey and Sarah Lucas, among others. YBA obsessed with commerce, mass media and the cult of personality, a movement that proved to have 'avant-garde pretensions'. Julian Stallabrass analyses all aspects of this young generation of British artists and their environment from a critical perspective, and places it in the broader context of contemporary art. Stallabrass, Julian. *High Art Lite: British Art in the 1990s*. London: Verso, 1996.
50. See <http://www.beckettonfilm.com/plays/breath/synopsis.html> [accessed 1/11/2016].
51. See Derval Turbity's extended criticism of Hirst's version of the playlet. Turbity, Derval. 'Beckett's Spectral Silence: *Breath* and the Sublime', *Limit(e) Beckett*, 1 (2010): 102–22.
52. Lozier, Claire. 'Breath as Vanitas: Beckett's Debt to a Baroque Genre'. In Erik Tønning, Matthew Feldman, Matthijs Engelberts and Dirk Van Hulle (eds), *Samuel Beckett: Debts and Legacies*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010: 241. Charles Juliet's translation into English of the phrase 'évoque ces tableaux hollandais du XVII^e siècle faisant fonction de memento mori'. 'Breath as Vanitas: Beckett's Debt to a Baroque Genre'. In Erik Tønning, Matthew Feldman, Matthijs Engelberts and Dirk van Hulle (eds), *Samuel Beckett: Debts and Legacies*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2010: 41.
53. Gagosian Gallery in Los Angeles in 2007.
54. Emin, Tracey. 'My Life in a Column', *The Independent*, Friday, 3 August 2007.