

BOOK REVIEWS AND INTERVIEWS

Terrifying Memory: An Interview with Carey Perloff

David Y. Chack DePaul University

We are condemned to remember even when we can't, to paraphrase Santayana's famous statement. Pinter and Stoppard commit that original sin, according to Carey Perloff, in her new book *Pinter and Stoppard: A Director's View*.

In this interview with Carey Perloff that I conducted for *The Harold Pinter Review*, we discussed how in her book the terror of memory in Pinter's and Stoppard's works created a point of comparison between the playwrights.

In her book, which is also a primer on directing these two playwrights, Perloff discusses how she became familiar with their work by directing it. By bringing Pinter and Stoppard together in her analysis, she makes the case that their Jewish identity connects them. For Pinter and Stoppard, their heritage and identity is a resource (even as Stoppard says he only later in his life realized his Jewishness), an ongoing theme, and even an aesthetic. Having directed them many times as artistic director of the American Conservatory Theater in San Francisco for twenty-five years, Perloff maintains that when their Jewishness is overlooked, the meaning of their work is occasionally diminished.

The Harold Pinter Review, Vol. 7, 2023
Copyright © 2023 The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa

“I wrestled with putting them (Pinter and Stoppard) together, and that’s why the chapter on their Jewish legacy became the first long chapter I wrote, because what I realized is that, that is one thing they have in common.”

She continues about Pinter: “All of the subterfuges in that play *The Birthday Party*, about changing your name and the knock on the door, and the terror of being exposed? And Stanley? What is Stanley guilty of? Is he Jewish? Isn’t he Jewish? He feels that sense of terror when people come after each other for no reason than someone’s sort of secret name. This makes sense coming from the pen of someone who’s lived through that kind of experience.”

She also referred to the Pinteresque style, which is not only on display in *The Birthday Party*, but also in other works of his: “To say nothing of the fact that all of the comedy, you know, the comedy of the play, is sort of Jewish vaudeville.”

She acknowledged that his works were Jewish, but not in a religious way. Instead, she elaborates that “when I directed *The Homecoming*, it felt like a profoundly Jewish play about a family reckoning with one of their members who has married out and has to be reintegrated into the clan. They say, ‘When you find the right girl Sam, let your family know, don’t forget, we’ll give you a number one send-off, I promise you. You can bring her to live here, she can keep us all happy.’”

Perloff continued about the ways that Jews in British culture were viewed as the outsider, including their portrayal as demonic, such as in Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* or in Dickens’s *Oliver Twist*.

“Whether or not you think it’s Jewish in any kind of religious way, and neither [Pinter nor Stoppard] were practicing Jews, even though Pinter had a bar mitzvah. But the fact is, to be in Britain during and after the war as a Jew, you were a total outsider.

“Pinter’s family came from Central Europe. But strangely he pretended at first that the Pinter name came from Da Pinto, a kind of Spanish-Portuguese Jew. But his grandparents came speaking no English from Central Europe. They worked in the fabric business, and you know his father was a tailor.

“Pinter went to a school in Hackney that was 40 percent Jewish. The school was very rigorous in terms of literature, English literature. As Pinter himself described it, the school was full of word-obsessed and culturally voracious Jewish boys who used words and language in an almost Talmudic way, full of games and argument.”

We then talked about biblical narratives and how Jews naturally question them, oppose them, try to reconcile them, and continue to interpret in the Jewish paradigm of midrash.

“Abraham spends his life arguing with God, negotiating with God. This is what [the late Israeli writer] Amos Oz, does in his brilliant book, *Dear Zealot*, when he’s trying to write to his grandchildren about the nature of Jewish argumentation, the roots of Jewish language,” Perloff said. “It is a culture that, in their

exiles, carries language and learning with them because they can't carry anything else. It is really germane, I think, to understanding Pinter and Stoppard.

"I think when you've lived through trauma like Jews did, coming out of the Second World War, whether your family escaped like my family did, and didn't end up being gassed, or whether your family pretty much entirely was destroyed in the camps, as with Stoppard's, memory is both seductive and terrifying. In Pinter and Stoppard memory is the thing that they are constantly going after, and yet can never entrap.

"Think about a play like *No Man's Land* and how heartbreaking it is that the men constantly ask questions like "Did you have a good war?," questions which cannot be answered, because as Pinter himself said, memory is distorted at the moment of its conception. Any moment is distorted and sucked away at the moment that it happens and when you try to go back and remember it, everybody has a different interpretation of what happened. So, memory is extremely elusive and hidden, and yet necessary to unveil and frightening to remember.

"And so, the action of both Stoppard and Pinter is how their characters try to reclaim memory, even when it doesn't seem to be about history, like in *Betrayal*, when Jerry says, 'Yes, everyone was there that day, standing around, your husband, my wife, all the kids, I remember. *Emma*—What day? *Jerry*—When I threw her up. It was in your kitchen. *Emma*—It was in your kitchen. *Silence*.' You know they don't even get that memory straight.

"We are a people of memory, of memory and of carrying memory with us, and then wanting to bury our memories and realizing how incredibly painful they are. And how do you carry that memory generation to generation? We say that over and over again, and we keep our own history. Our identity in the present is how we navigate our relation to the past. So, as we change our current identity, we reframe what we remember, or we remember it differently."

Perloff reflected on the question of whether Stoppard truly was unaware of his Jewish heritage until his later adult years: "I don't believe that Stoppard didn't know he was Jewish; after all he knew why his family had been exiled.

"As to his representation of himself at the end of *Leopoldstadt*, I'm not sure anyone is actually as naive as that character, but maybe they are. A young man comes in named Leonard Chamberlain who seems to know nothing about his past. Rosa says: 'No one is born eight years old. Leonard Chamberlain's life is Leo Rosenbaum's life continued. His family is your family. But you live as if without history, as if you throw no shadow behind you.'

"In this way, I think some intuitive knowledge of Pinter and Stoppard's Jewish past influences and informs our understanding of their plays. It's what makes the work feel (and I know this is a fraught word) authentic."

Perloff then differentiates Stoppard from Pinter: "Stoppard is a different kind of theater artist because he isn't an actor or a director, as Pinter was; thus he's

very much a writer who depends upon actors and directors to bring the internal life of his plays to the fore.

“However, he’s a trickster and a gamesman. So, every play is highly structured. For example, *The Real Thing* starts with a scene about the breakup of a marriage. And then you realize that’s a scene in a play, written by the guy in the second scene who is a playwright, writing about a man about to be cuckolded by the actress the playwright’s having an affair with.

“So Tom loves games, as he demonstrates even in *Leopoldstadt*, which is full of mathematics and games of cat’s cradle. I think in general, the English as a culture love games. Pinter and Stoppard played cricket together; that’s another link between them. Games like charades and blind man’s buff are key.”

Perloff and I then discussed how both Pinter and Stoppard loved the ability of language to both convey and distort meaning.

“In both of their works we see the ways that language can function both as knowledge and as a total lie. It’s what we’re wrestling with today, how language is being weaponized, and conspiracy theories are being developed through language in order to promote an agenda. This is related to Eastern European drama during the Cold War; I think one reason Stoppard loves absurdist language is that there’s such a deep tradition of that kind of writing in Czechoslovakia and Poland.

“Victor Shklovsky [Russian literary critic] said that literary language exists to defamiliarize political speech and give language its muscle back. That’s why Pinter is so meticulous about his choice of words. The way Pinter cracks open language so that it exposes the clichés of political speech—he’s absolutely masterful.

“For Pinter it is not only what is said, but also what is not said. I wrote about that a lot in the book because if you’re going to write on Pinter, you have to write about the famous pause. But what I learned is, language to Pinter is a stratagem, as he said, to cover nakedness.

“You know he’s not a confessional playwright. Neither is Stoppard. Language for them is a smokescreen. So, what happens to a character who runs out of language?

“When Goldberg is giving that famous speech in Act 3 of *The Birthday Party*, he says, ‘because I believe that the world . . .’ And then there’s a silence, and then he repeats, ‘because I believe that the world . . .’ Silence. And then he said the third time, ‘because I believe that the world . . . BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT THE WORLD . . .’ And then he has no more words, and that silence is utterly terrifying, because the audience realizes that this man is bankrupt, that he doesn’t believe anything, and that he’s run out of excuses. So, Pinter is particularly genius at creating the negative space around a torrent of words.

“It’s also the case in Pinter that stage movement is like language, and stillness is like silence. So it’s very important in a moment of silence that nobody moves.

It's also a useful rule of thumb in Pinter that you don't move and talk at the same time. It's not always true, but is often useful. The language is the action, and you don't want to dilute it by moving and talking at the same time."

Going back to Stoppard one more time, Perloff and I discuss whether he truly knew about his Jewishness even all the way back in his early career. "His biographer Hermione Lee had all those letters in a carrier bag between him and his mother. And yet, when Kenneth Tynan interviewed him, during *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern*, and said, 'How is it possible that you know so little about your Jewish past?' Stoppard's mother was furious, and said, 'We weren't really Jewish. It was just what the Germans made of us when they arrived in Czechoslovakia.'

"What's so moving is the episode in which he met someone in Czechoslovakia who had a scar from a wound his father [a physician] had treated, and Stoppard touched the scar and realized it was the first thing connected to his father that he'd touched since his death.

"My mother, Marjorie Perloff, is a famous literary critic. She wrote an amazing book called *The Vienna Paradox*, which is about her escape from Vienna and becoming an American, and becoming not only an American, but an Americanist, writing on Frank O'Hara and John Cage and Robert Lowell, and American poetry. Only much later in her life has she written about Wittgenstein and Joseph Roth and Viennese work, and I think Tom was immensely fascinated by her. They had had similar wartime experiences and they are similar ages."

At that point in our interview, Perloff made a revelation and told me that the family in *Leopoldstadt*, which takes place in Vienna rather than in Stoppard's Czechoslovakia, was in part inspired by Perloff's own family history. As Jews, they escaped from Vienna (Stoppard's family escaped from Czechoslovakia) after living a life that embraced Viennese culture.

Perloff and I finished our conversation there. What I take away is not only how Pinter and Stoppard use memory as a device, but also how memory closes in on them. So, they must create some distance in order to then get to the nakedness they portray in their plays and they both cloak their Jewish memories in the multiple dynamics of remembering and distancing; revealing and living in hiddenness, just as Pinter once facetiously took the name of Da Pinto, the crypto Jew.

A Jewish festival occurs in the spring, about the hiding of one's face in order to play (shpiel) and perform plays. It is Purim and centers around Queen Esther, whose name is synonymous with the Hebrew term for hiddenness: *h'estair*. She is a Jewish-born queen in ancient Persia, who is hidden behind the guise of being a queen to escape persecution and hatred toward Jews. But in her hiding, she also lives with the memory of being a Jew and the terror that can occur as a result of being a Jew. It is this memory of terror and hiddenness that haunt Pinter and Stoppard's works.

DAVID Y. CHACK is adjunct professor in The Theatre School at DePaul University in Jewish and Holocaust Theatre/Performance. He is also producing artistic director of ShPIeL Identity Theatre and a theater consultant for Taube Center in Warsaw and at the Illinois Holocaust Museum and Education Center. His BFA is from Tisch School of the Arts NYU/Circle-in-the-Square Theatre. He has an MA in Dramatic Criticism from Tufts University and did PhD work (a.b.d.) with Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Elie Wiesel at Boston University. He is vice president of the Alliance for Jewish Theater, an international umbrella for Jewish theater worldwide.

Pinter and Stoppard: A Director's View

by Carey Perloff. (New York: Methuen/Drama, 2022). Pp. x + 229.
ISBN 978-1-350-24339-2. Softcover, \$25.95.

Grace Epstein University of Cincinnati

Carey Perloff's examination of Harold Pinter and Tom Stoppard in her book, *Pinter and Stoppard: A Director's View*, reflects upon her personal as well as professional collaborations with the dramatists, spanning more than three decades. Grounded in the production process of several of their plays, which she directed in the United States on opposite coasts over the course of her career, she adds a unique perspective to the already large body of criticism on both men. Mediated by the collaborative nature of their works, she draws upon the production-specific encounters and some of the political dynamics shaping their careers as well as her own: the birth of her children, the events of 9/11, and the 2008 Recession. Particularly interesting and well explored here is the focus on the Jewish-European heritage of both men, a heritage the author shares with them. She emphasizes how she has "come to believe that being Jewish defined the gestalt of Pinter's and Stoppard's plays in specific ways that provide access and insight into the rehearsal room" (20). Part memoir of her extensive work with Pinter and Stoppard, she identifies many of the specific coordinates of that gestalt as the theatrical experience evolves for American audiences.

The focus on Jewish heritage during and following the Second World War is interesting, not simply as biographical information but as recognition about how Jewishness consciously, in the case of Pinter, or unconsciously, in Stoppard's case, has framed each man's vision of human life. Speaking specifically of Stoppard, she identifies the "almost Talmudic belief in the power of

HAROLD PINTER REVIEW

110 language to impart knowledge” but then notes that this flavor is also true of Pinter. “Jews,” she says, “after all, are the people of the word” (43). In exhuming the influences of Jewish identity, before, during, and shortly after the World War II, Perloff reveals an engine that drives the plays as they move from one context, geographically and culturally, to another around the world. The “word” she reminds her readers is what diaspora Jews were able to carry with them when they were dispossessed of all else.

Pinter was a third-generation Jewish immigrant surrounded by “a toxic antisemitism that had characterized British culture for decades” and that “continued well after the war from both sides of the political spectrum,” even into the present day (22–23). Contrary to what Americans generally believe about the British, who fought the Nazis from 1939 until 1945, and for a brief time almost single-handedly, there was an undercurrent of violence and resentment, in Pinter’s early life. Jews of Pinter’s generation, in the working-class neighborhood of London’s East End, fended off aggression with a thick-skinned repartee, confronted their burdens with dark humor, and supported one another with a fierce tribalism that was reinforced by religious practice. As Perloff describes this environment, I was reminded of living for a time during the 1970s in Israel amidst a conclave of British Jews, who had, following the Second World War, emigrated from cities such as London, Manchester, Birmingham, or Glasgow. Most were Pinter’s age or slightly older, many were from working-class families and almost excessively verbal, in Hebrew as well as English. Fond of parody and farce, they powerfully attuned themselves to the nuances of antisemitism, whether vocal or physical. They utilized the handed-down skills of the Jewish diaspora: word, wit, gesture, and yes, at times, silence. Like Pinter, they could be unsparing in their critique of power using parody and farce to illustrate their ideas. Their resistance to the everyday violence was also served by an insistent solidarity with other Jews.

One of the most interesting aspects in the book concerns Pinter’s insight into that tribal ideal from which, Perloff claims, he creates flawed Jewish characters, like Goldberg. I first encountered *The Birthday Party* as a student in a midwestern Lutheran college. Goldberg’s rhetoric made me uncomfortable as I wondered what my classmates, already largely antisemitic, might make of him. In her text, Perloff suggests that the family relations in *The Homecoming*, in particular, show the conflict at the center of these characters’ lives—that is, surviving as the unwanted or unwashed within a larger national context—and how that struggle complicates familial love and intimacy. The demand for family solidarity and support underlies each individual’s existence in Pinter’s families,

including the animosity that Lenny's father and brothers show him, not only founded upon bringing home a non-Jewish wife but, more significantly, resulting from Lenny's initial abandonment of his family. Immigrant Jews, and perhaps most minority communities, endure the hostile environment surrounding them by cleaving to one another, particularly within family arrangements. For better or for worse, that bond helps them shoulder the burden of existing as perennial outsiders.

While Stoppard was for a time less likely to "embrace" his Jewish identity, his childhood included displacement from his native Czechoslovakia, first, to Singapore, then two years later, with his mother and brother to India. From India on, Stoppard's father disappeared from his life, and eventually was recorded as deceased. Echoing Stoppard's interviews about how word of his father's death affected him, Perloff points to Guildenstern's comment in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* that death, as the living experience of it, is simply the momentary and final disintegration of a person (38).

As the child of European Jewish refugees also, Perloff takes up the question of why for much of Stoppard's career, his Jewishness remained largely invisible, not only in his work but also in his identity. Stoppard's mother deflected much of her Jewish experience after marrying her second husband who was English, but not Jewish. Perloff relates to the experience by recounting her own "refugee relatives who refused to acknowledge that being Jewish had been the cause of their persecution" (46). Considering whether the denial represents "survivor's guilt, . . . a desire to 'fit in' . . . or self-loathing on his mother's part," she finally decides: "Probably all three things pertained" (47). In the light of contemporary trauma theory, there might be a fourth prospect added, that of the trauma of the displacement itself. Revisiting any single factor of one's persecution without unearthing another more painful one might be motivation enough to steer clear of any memory of the trauma. That Stoppard eventually delves into that Jewish legacy is explored in later plays, such as *India Ink* and *The Hard Problem*. Perloff is able to explore with the playwright themes as he attempts to uncover, even to excavate, his buried past.

The book then memorializes the collaborations, making an account of what happens when European Jewish streams commingle and play out in the theatrical experience.

GRACE EPSTEIN is an emeritus professor of English and film studies at the University of Cincinnati. She has published scholarly and creative works in a variety of journals and continues to write plays and short fiction.

Transdisciplinary Beckett: Visual Arts, Music, and the Creative Process

by Lucy Jeffery. (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2021). Pp. 338.
ISBN 978-3-8382-1584-6. Softcover, \$70.

Ann C. Hall University of Louisville

Lucy Jeffery's *Transdisciplinary Beckett* offers an original, refreshing, well-researched and well-written analysis of Beckett's use of visual and musical arts in his nondramatic works. According to Jeffery, Beckett turned to these nonliterary arts because he was frustrated by the limitations of language. Jeffery herself faces a similar challenge when trying to define transdisciplinarity in a coherent way to audiences unaccustomed to the concept. In the end, she succeeds brilliantly, and the book can serve as a model of transdisciplinary research as well as a significant contribution to Beckett scholarship.

The book's introduction and first chapter are two of the best. Jeffery makes it clear that transdisciplinarity is not inter- or multidisciplinary. Instead, the interaction between and among disciplines creates a new work. Quoting Peter Osborne on Beckett, Jeffery notes the new "transdisciplinary actuality . . . reconstitutes" the disciplines in general and in Beckett's work in particular (21). In this chapter and throughout the book, Jeffery, often using archival material, then documents Beckett's study of, experiences with, and interest in the visual, musical, radio, and television arts. With the disciplinary acuity established, Jeffery shows how Beckett uses the various disciplines in his nondramatic works. She separates the various disciplines into separate chapters to afford focused analysis in the specific disciplines and how they are used in the texts. This approach may seem counterproductive to a transdisciplinary approach, but Jeffery manages to bring the various disciplines and Beckett's texts together in a way that is best illustrated by a comment Beckett himself made about Joyce in a 1929 essay: his writing is "not *about* something; *it is that something itself*" (23). While Jeffery does not discuss any of Beckett's stage plays because "Beckett's specific and complex use of the visual and aural in this live medium would require a different critical framework" (42), there is a theatrical element to her theorizing about Beckett's work and the transdisciplinary process and approach. With disciplines and texts in conflict, in conversation, in motion, it is very difficult to offer a single interpretation, and this is precisely Beckett's goal.

Chapter 2 offers an example for both the desire to define a work of art and its resistance through a close reading of the Erskine painting passages in Beckett's novel *Watt* (1953). After establishing his understanding of abstract expressionism, even before the term was coined, Jeffery shows how Watt's difficulties with

the painting reflect the reader's difficulties with the novel. Enforcing meaning misses the point in both cases. Jeffery notes the blue color in the painting, which exists for no reason, and concludes "Instead of providing meaning it entrances Watt" (64). Watt is forced to "relinquish knowledge in favor of experience" (98). But Jeffery's use of the word "entrances" may also be the best way to discuss transdisciplinary approaches to art and texts: it provides entrances to artworks and entrances our hearts and imaginations.

In order to describe the experience, however, language must be employed that more often than not truncates the aesthetic experience; so, Beckett and Jeffery turn to the radio waves. Arguing that Beckett adapted Leibniz's "Monadology" to make music a structural device "in order to stretch the boundaries of expression and probe the limitations of language" (102), the chapter includes discussions of the following radio plays that Jeffery argues best illustrate Beckett's decision to "prioritize radio as his creative medium" (103): *Embers* (1959), *Words and Music* (1962), and *Cascando* (1963). Here, she shows how Beckett "formulated a new circuit of communication between voice, sound, music, silence, and radio waves" (102). The next chapter focuses the auditory ironically by examining two television plays: the discussion of Beckett's use of music in *Ghost Trio* (1977) and *Nacht and Träume* (1983). The teleplays lack "text-based narrative," so viewers see how images are constructed and music moves the narrative along. Jeffery demonstrates Beckett's repudiation of Schopenhauer's "belief that music directly connects the listener to one's emotions without the intermediation of thought" (167). Instead, and not surprisingly, Beckett uses music to disturb, thereby dismantling the realistic perspectives of the new medium.

Jeffery's final chapter, "Paint it Blue," complicates Beckett further by introducing an optimistic strain, which she claims is evidenced through Beckett's use of the color blue throughout his work, but especially in the following later short prose works: *Imagination Dead Imagine* (1965), "Ping" (1966), *Lessness* (1969), and *Company* (1979). Beckett's relationship with Geneviève Asse furthered his visual, painterly methods, and both authors struggled against the limits of their media. In the blue references in the short stories, Jeffery defines a tension between the Romantic and the modern, the optimistic and the pessimistic, concluding that neither component in the dialectical conflict won: "To suggest that Beckett's creative process becomes darker, more desperate, and less hopeful, then, is to ignore the subtle highlights beneath the surface of his text" (242). Jeffery concludes the book by noting that Beckett's transdisciplinarity does not present the visual, radio, musical, and television arts as a solution to the linguistic challenges or limits he faced, but they are an integral part of his creations.

Jeffery succeeds in presenting not only Beckett's transdisciplinarity but also offers a method for future transdisciplinary work, one which I hope will include more discussions about Beckett's dramatic works by Jeffery herself.

HAROLD PINTER REVIEW

114

ANN C. HALL is a professor at the University of Louisville in the Comparative Humanities Department. Her publications include *A Kind of Alaska: Women in the Plays of O'Neill, Pinter, and Shepard* and *Phantom Variations: The Adaptations of Gaston Leroux's Phantom of the Opera*. She edited *Delights, Desires, and Dilemmas: Essays on Women and the Media* and *Making the Stage: Essays on the Changing Concept of Theatre, Drama, and Performance*. She co-edited *Pop-Porn: Pornography in American Culture* and *Mommy Angst: Motherhood in American Popular Culture*. She is currently a theater series editor for Palgrave-Macmillan, and her co-edited collection, *Dramatic Apparitions and Theatrical Ghosts*, was just accepted by Bloomsbury Press. She has written fifty scholarly articles on theater, film performance, and pop culture, most recently on the John Wick series and another on Alfred Hitchcock's favorite film, *Shadow of a Doubt*.

Harold Pinter: Stages, Networks, Collaborations

edited by Basil Chiasson and Catriona Fallow. (London: Bloomsbury, 2021).

Pp. 240. ISBN 978-1-350-13362-4. Hardcover, \$103.50. Paperback, \$35.95.

Ebook (PDF), \$ 28.76.

Matthew Roberts University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

It is no secret that during Harold Pinter's lifetime, critics, scholars, and audience members alike confronted the peculiar qualities of his writing; qualities that would lead Martin Esslin to affiliate Pinter with the Theatre of the Absurd and its representative playwrights: Adamov, Beckett, Genet, and Ionesco. Esslin's characterization of Pinter as an absurdist sparked debates and discussions that continue even now. Nevertheless, Esslin's *The Theatre of the Absurd* galvanized the attention that Pinter received in Britain and mainland Europe and situated his plays within the broader theatrical avant-garde that developed in the wake of the Second World War.

But more recently, scholars have turned their attention to Pinter's artistic output beyond his work as a playwright. Jonathan Bignell and William Davies's edited issue of the *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, entitled "Harold Pinter's Transmedial Histories," examines Pinter's contributions to a variety of different media. And Basil Chiasson's recent study, *The Late Harold Pinter: Political Dramatist, Poet and Activist*, is one of the few scholarly works to analyze Pinter's poetic output. Such examples make for a diverse and varied discussion of Pinter's artistic accomplishments.

With this context in mind, *Harold Pinter: Stages, Networks, Collaborations* is particularly notable. The volume not only provides a forum for scholars to reexamine Pinter's plays, but it also underscores Pinter's influence on late twentieth- and twenty-first-century British theater. The text's editors, Basil Chiasson and Catriona Fallow, observe that the publication is as much a "process of reassessment of what is known or held to be true as it is an attempt to showcase and generate new knowledge" (2). Responding to the "renewed interest in Pinter's writing for contemporary audiences and a wave of fresh approaches to staging Pinter," Fallow and Chiasson neatly organize the volume into three distinct sections that, when read together, represent the "various stages, networks and collaborations that were endemic to Pinter's career and that continue to define his legacy" (2). In the end, the volume presents an interdisciplinary approach to Pinter studies that will be of interest to scholars, students, and theater artists alike.

The book's first section, aptly named "(Re)situating Pinter, Critical Orientations," straddles that line between reassessing Pinter's work and producing new knowledge about it. Though it contains chapters that represent well-worn topics in Pinter scholarship (e.g., Chiasson's chapter on Pinter and modernism; Eckart Voigts's study of Pinter and Judaism; and Harry Derbyshire's analysis of Pinter and the Theatre of the Absurd), these contributions bring new perspectives to how readers understand Pinter's creativity and identity. On the other hand, the remaining chapters depict more critical interventions. James Hudson's "The Elite Pinter and the Pinter Elite" makes the rather compelling observation that "Pinter's stock rose through his being associated with particular aesthetic movements thought to be elite, though the perception of him as an elite artist acquired unusual contours as his political activism increased and his artistic output changed in scope and form" (54). On a related topic, Ibrahim Yerebakan's "Pinter's Connections with the Middle East" not only discusses Pinter's extended criticism of British and American foreign policy during the 2003 invasion of Iraq, but it also elaborates the numerous complexities that resulted from Pinter's visit to Turkey with Arthur Miller in 1985. Having visited the British Library to work with Pinter's papers, I believe that there may be more to be said about this topic, and Yerebakan's article demonstrates why Pinter's engagement with the Middle East warrants further examination.

The volume makes a natural progression to the second section, entitled "Pinter as Playwright, Playwrights and Pinter," which explicitly details Pinter's creative practice and his impact on British theater. Whereas Steve Waters examines the unique circumstances that informed Pinter's singular vision as a playwright, Alex Watson attends to Pinter's "dark matter," those ways that Pinter's plays haunt us with their representation of systemic violence but are also haunted by what they cannot, or do not, make visible. Catriona Fallow takes a different approach, illustrating the fruitful collaboration between

Pinter, Peter Hall, and the Royal Shakespeare Company. Finally, David Pattie and Maria Elena Capitani attend to Pinter's relation to more contemporary British playwrights, including Jez Butterworth, Dennis Kelly, and Martin Crimp. Capitani's article, "The Crimpesque: Pinter's Legacy in the Theatre of Martin Crimp," is particularly interesting. While Capitani goes to great lengths to illustrate Pinter's importance to Crimp, the chapter also shows—perhaps unconsciously—Crimp's reticence to identify Pinter as an explicit influence on his work. Viewed comprehensively, the section presents a more dynamic and complicated narrative than one might anticipate.

The third and final part provides readers with the opportunity to learn from those who worked directly with Pinter. The section, "Conversations and Collaborators," contains interviews with Chinonyerem Odimba, Nancy Meckler, Douglas Hodge, Jamie Lloyd, and Soutra Gilmour. These discussions provide insight into Pinter's creative process and the rigor required to produce his work. Examining these interviews, one is immediately struck by Pinter's generosity and by the immense respect that each of these artists has for him. While these interviews will reward any reader, they may be particularly appealing to students learning how to stage Pinter's plays.

In sum, *Harold Pinter: Stages, Networks, Collaborations* is a worthwhile read. While many of the chapters do tread familiar ground, they are not derivative. Instead, they attempt to bring nuance to conversations that may otherwise feel repetitive. The interviews are particularly valuable. In fact, I would have appreciated reading even more of them. Nevertheless, they provide a welcome change of pace to the scholarship that precedes them, and the editors were wise to produce a volume that could address Pinter's artistic output through a variety of different perspectives. *Harold Pinter: Stages, Networks, Collaborations* is a worthy addition to any academic library or Pinter scholar's bookshelf.

MATTHEW ROBERTS is assistant professor and librarian for English, Comparative and World Literature, and Drama at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His scholarship appears in *Comparative Drama*, *Modern Drama*, and *New Theatre Quarterly*. He is editor of the special issue of *Modern Drama*, "New Approaches to Harold Pinter," and currently guest editor of *The Harold Pinter Review*.