Notes

Chapter 1: Media


3. Most of the extant critical studies of Pinter contain practices of this nature. His work is rarely approached from a phenomenological perspective and is, instead, interpreted through the apparatus biographical data, allegorical readings, Pinter folklore, extraneous comparison, and various analytic conceits. Katherine Burkman’s study, The Dramatic World of Harold Pinter: Its Basis in Ritual (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1971), includes in its chapter on “Pinter in Production” an excellent argument for a purely phenomenological exegesis of the plays. She, however, diverges from the sensibilities of such a study by imposing a myth-ritual index on the contours of the individual scripts. Occasionally, this artifice produces absurd claims, such as her contention that Accident resolves in a “celebration of life” (p. 117). In a recent article on “Pinter’s Progress” in Modern Drama 23 (1980): 246-57, Noel King notes similar fallacies in studies of Pinter’s work, disparaging applications of linguistic and psychoanalytic theories to the plays and proposing his own reading of Pinter according to the “overall body” of Pinter’s career. Although this study, like Burkman’s, includes fine insights into certain aspects of Pinter’s work, it also proceeds by contamination of individual pieces through importation of extrinsic ideas. It seems to me that such approaches violate the prevailing theme of Pinter’s writing: that, however mystifying, the slice of life is a complete, unified entity that must be addressed in its own terms.


5. Ibid.
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15. Ibid.
17. I have adopted this attitude despite general confusion over the states of the various scripts (see Times Literary Supplement, “From Page to Screen,” 18 June 1971, p. 695). Indeed, possible and indeterminable degrees of script revision through film production exigencies necessitate the convenience of such a stance. Whatever the production-related status of the published scripts (and, judging by their frequent discrepancies with the finished films, they would seem to represent early, and hence relatively pure, versions of Pinter’s work—especially with respect to The Proust Screenplay, which has not been subjected to the actual process of filming, and to The French Lieutenant’s Woman, which Pinter has labeled a preshooting script), I have necessarily accepted these texts as definitive.

Chapter 2: The Servant

5. Ibid., pp. 92-93.

Chapter 3: The Pumpkin Eater


5. Pinter began his career in the theatre as an actor with Anew McMaster’s touring company in Ireland (see Harold Pinter, *Mac* [London: Emanuel Wax for Pendragon Press, 1968]), and he has continued to perform occasionally, including roles in both his screenplays and stage plays.


Chapter 4: *The Quiller Memorandum*


Chapter 5: *Accident*


3. Harold Pinter, quoted in John Russell Taylor, p. 183.


5. See Houston and Kinder, p. 27, for a discussion of the significance of this remark.


8. For a discussion of this point, see Houston and Kinder, p. 27.


13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.


Notes


Chapter 6: The Go-Between


Chapter 7: The Proust Screenplay

2. Menick interview.
3. Pinter, The Proust Screenplay, pp. ix-x.
10. Gussow, p. 32.
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Chapter 8: The Last Tycoon


Chapter 9: The French Lieutenant's Woman

4. Ibid.
9. Gussow, p. 43.

Chapter 10: Patterns

1. Houston and Kinder, p. 25.
2. For a more complete discussion of Pinter's plays in terms of these phases, see my "Pinterviews: Problems of Observation from the Modern Disposition" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1979).
5. In his subsequent one-act play, A Kind of Alaska, Pinter continues his study of time, memory, and the past through the conceit of sleeping sickness. Here, a hiatus of twenty-nine years operates ironically to bind and to sever the links between past and present, and the disease itself becomes an emblem of petrified time.
8. Kennedy, p. 28.