

**Contemporary Literature**  
**Prof. Aysha**  
**Department of Humanities and Social Sciences**  
**Indian Institute of Technology, Madras**

**Lecture No. # 02**  
**Harold Pinter**

So, I am... Today we will be talking about Harold Pinter, who is the British playwright, a Jewish British, born in Hackney part of London; and he was born on 10<sup>th</sup> October 1930; he died quite recently, we will be talking about that. He is of Jewish origin, and the salient features of his plays are the use of understatement, small-talk; Pinter's small-talk is a very famous attribute of all his plays; reticence and silence, there are lots of silences in Pinter. So, these devices are employed to convey the substance of characters, thoughts; how he does that? We will see. This is Harold Pinter; Pinter's father was a tailor; as a child, Pinter loved his mother, but he did not get on well with his father, because his father was a strict disciplinarian.

On the outbreak of the second world war, Pinter was evacuated from the city of Cornville, to be arranged from his parents was a traumatic event for printer, because those were the days of the times of bombing and Jewish persecution, so he, all Jewish children had to be evacuated. Pinter lived with 26 other boys in a castle on the coast, and at the age of fourteen he returned to London. He remembers the condition of being bombed has never left me, and this feature of, you know, the terror of the unknown is a persistent feature in all his place.

At school, one of Pinter's main intellectual interests was English literature, particularly poetry; but at the same time he also read works of Franz Kafka and Ernest Hemingway. And he started poetry, writing poetry for little magazines in his teens; the seeds of rebellion in Pinter could be sported early on when he refuse to do the national service; you know, all young people were expected to be a part of the army, of the armed forces, during the second world war, but he refuse to participate. As a young man, he studied acting at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art, the famous RADA and the central school of a speech and drama, but he soon left that place to undertaken acting career, and he

acted in a number of plays under the stage name David Baron; he travelled around island in a Shakespeare in company, and he spent years working in a provincial repertory, before deciding to turn his attention to play writing.

So, Pinter began his career then, as an actor; more about Pinter's life; Pinter was married from 1956 onwards to the actress Vivien Merchant; for a time they lived in a Notting Hill Gate in a slum; they could not afford better accommodation. So, therefore, eventually Pinter manages to borrow some money and they moved away from that... From the slum to a better place, and although Pinter said in an interview in 1966 that he never has written any play for any actor, his wife, the actress Vivien Merchant frequently appeared in his place; his marriage to the actress dissolved in 1980; and then Pinter married the biographer, lady Antonia Fraser, whose first, whose former husband was the conservative MP, Hugu Fraser.

So, the divorce with Vivien Merchant separated Pinter from his son Daniel, who later went on to become a writer and a musician; Vivien Merchant died in 1982, Antonia Fraser account of a married life with Pinter, it is title must you go, it came out in 2010. Pinter's works some of his early plays were *The Room*, in 1957; and *The Dumb Waiter* 1957, both one act plays; his first full length play was *The Birthday Party* in 1958. He also wrote a number of radio plays, one of such prominent place is a, *A Slight Ache* in 1959, which was subsequently adopted for the stage, and his reputation was secured by his second full length play *The Care Taker*, which is...Which can be categorized as a realistic play. At this point, I would also like to make a mention of *Anchored Journal*, it was the foremost radical theatre journal of the time; the contributors to *Anchor* studied Pinter plays with interest as soon as they arrived on the scene, and meet powerful senses and comments of them.

*Anchor* believed that theatre is a social art. So, remember *Anchor* was a radical theatre journal, and it was of one the foremost journals, which paid attention to Pinter during his initial days. So, most of Pinter's works were seriously interpreted and created in *Anchor*; the first edition of *The Birthday Party* was also published by the *Anchor* publishing company; the magazine encourage discussion on a variety of works and included every point of view. So it was not as if they subscribed only to the popular points of view; it could be a radically different point of view from **from** the once that would exist popularly; for instance the Irish writer Shan Okashi, attacked *Waiting for Godot*, *Waiting*

for Godot by Samuel Beckett, this is what Shan Okashi says about Waiting for Godot. Then Beckett is a clever writer, and that he has written a rotting and remarkable play, but his philosophy is not my philosophy; for within him, there is no hazard of hope, no desire for it, nothing in it, but a lust for despair and a crying of woe.

Although, Samuel Beckett by men he is recognizes one of the greatest playwrights of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; however Shan Okashi back to differ, but the anchor magazine people they were not afraid of publishing, such you know, radical point of view; so, that was their characteristic. Now, Pinter on the 20<sup>th</sup> century drama; so, when we are talking about radical journals, **journals** like the anchor magazine; this was that back drop **of the** or the times when Pinter was writing; at the same time in the US during the early 1950s, the plays of author Millar and Tennessee Williams, they were being staged, and these plays also registered at departure from the constructive self censorship of the British plays; the British **the British** plays during that time, they were extremely conservative, extremely conformist; however, when the British playwrights observed or discovered the American theatre, especially the theatre of... We have been talking about these playwrights Sugino Neela author Millar and Tennessee Williams, who were a radical in terms of themes as well as techniques.

So, Pinter was inspired by this particular group of American playwrights. So, British **play** plays were at that time dominated by virtual terror of the, so called vulgar and working class. So, you would now find any reference to the working class people in the British plays of that time; they were the... It was... They was an... And not a absence of the working class people the so called people, who **who** are not elitist; however, along with the changing post were social conditions; the seeming freedom signal by the Americans provided an emptiest for the rise of the angry young men, predominantly John Osborne and John Wesker. So, we have been talking about The Angry Young Men group of playwrights and we remember these names John Osborne and John Wesker; the period that you know, these people belong to was the mid 1950s avoid about the angry young men; so, the angry young men were a group of young British writers, whose works expressed the bitterness of the lower classes towards the established socio political system, and towards the Mediocracy and Hypocrisy of the middle and upper classes.

The trend was evident in john **(( ))** novel hurry on down 1953, and in lucky gimp 1954 by a Kingsley Amis; and this trend, which was evident in the novels of these writers, this

was crystallized in 1956, where the most representative work was written by John Osborne, and the title of the play was *Look back in Anger*, the label angry young men was extended to all his contemporaries, who expressed anger at the persistence of a class distinctions upbraided in the lower class mannerisms, and dislike for anything high brow or phoning. Anam Whisker and Alims Neethu are also other dominant figures of this moment; and other high light of that fear, of that particular era was the translation of the French absurd is literature, most famously Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and Youngin Oniscus with his success by the early 1960s Pinter was frequently associated with the social realism of the angry young men and with the absurdism of Beckett and Ionesco.

Ionesco's *(Le Rhinocéros)* is often compared with Pinter's *The Caretaker*; likewise, Pinter's *The Birthday Party* bears resemblance to *Rhinoceros*; *Rhinoceros* by Ionesco in terms of themes and ideas. Just have a small introduction to it; that this is a small, this is a life in a small provincial town where all, but one turn into rhinoceroses; the allegory, this is an allegory, this is nothing but an allegory of conformist fascism, and this can be highlighted in the famous lines such as good men make good rhinoceroses unfortunately, is because they are so good that they get taken in; Pinter's works have all also been categorized under the term *The Theatre of the Absurd*. So *The Theatre of the Absurd* is a term coined by Martin Esslin, in his book *The Theatre of the Absurd*. *Waiting for Godot* published in 1957, in many ways heralded the age of the absurd theatre; the term applies to a number of works in drama and post fiction, which have in common the idea that human condition is essentially absurd, and that this condition can be represented by those works, which are absurd.

So, why absurd, because you... Why absurd is literature, because human condition itself is absurd, and that cannot be any other way to represent it; that was the idea. Absurdism has its roots in the moments of expressionism and surrealism; in fiction *(Le Rhinocéros)* during the 1920s, they are also more or less, they can be categorized as absurdist literature, for example the trial and metamorphosis; after the 1940s, you must remember that there was a tendency, especially prominent in the existent field, existential philosophy of *(Le Rhinocéros)* to view human beings as an isolated existent, who is cast in an alien universe; this universe according to the existentialist writers has no inherent truth value or meaning Ionesco adds to the entire definition or to the body of *The Theatre of the Absurd* that cut off from

his religious metaphysical and transcendental routes man is lost; all these actions become senseless, absurd and useless.

Likewise Samuel Beckett's plays, they also project the irrationalism, helplessness and absurdity of human life. His dramatic forms reject realistic settings, logical reasoning is a coherently evolving plot; *Waiting for Godot* is a supreme example of this. Like most works in this mood, the play is absurd; in the double sense, that it is grotesquely common comic, and also irrational and non consequential. So, these are the terms perhaps that you should pay attention to grotesquely comic, irrational and non consequential, because all these attributes would be, would recur even in the works of Harold Pinter; much of the works written in the Theatre of the Absurd kind of tradition, is a parody of the traditional assumptions of western culture.

And at the same, it is also a parody of the conventions and a Janedic distinctions in traditional drama, for example, if you read a play, you can perhaps you would like to remember a play like *The Crucible*, even *Oedipus*; consider the dramatic structure, consider the themes that you find in those plays, and then take a look at the works by Samuel Beckett and Pinter, Ionesco, and then you will feel that it is indeed, a kind of parody of the conventional assumptions of western literature. So, the absurdity of characters and dialogues are used to project alienation, estrangement and tragic anguish of the characters.

The famous lines from Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and encapsulates perhaps the entire philosophy of the absurdist theatre, nothing happens, nobody comes, nobody goes; it is awful. So, some of the major names associated with The Theatre of Absurd are John **sorry** John Garry, Edward Albee; Edward Albee, who wrote *The American Dream* and who is afraid of Virginia Woolf, then Tom **(( ))** Pinter of course, and writers of absurdist fiction, for example, Joseph Heller catches 22, Thomas Pynchon, who wrote *We in the Night*, warning it, *Slattern Housewife*, John Garry **(( ))**. So, these names are associated forever with the absurdist literature both plays both dramas as well as fiction. So, just to recap the characteristics of absurdist writings, you have one fine for example, **(( ))** even inapt characters, inarticulate characters, characters dramatic persona, who are unable to express themselves, fantastic or nightmarish world, the setting itself is absolutely irrational, illogical; and often we find characters playing out tragic fars; I am sure you understand what the fars. So, that in absurdist literature you find tragic fars being

played out, even such simultaneously comic, horrifying and absurdist; you consider the mix of Johns; so many Johns collapsing together horrifying, comical as well as absurdist.

The influence of Samuel Beckett on Pinter's works is can be easily identified, in 1970 Pinter declared Beckett to be the greatest writer of our time, you just saw what Shan Okashi have to say about Waiting for Godot; and look at the contradiction for Pinter Samuel Beckett was the best, was the greatest; in a letter, Pinter writes I do not want philosophies, tracts, dogmas, creeds, way outs, truths answers, nothing from the (( )) basement, Beckett is the most courageous, remorseless writer going.

Can anyone tell me, what so courageous about Beckett? Are you aware? Are you familiar with waiting for Godot?

(No audio from 21:31 to 21:39)

That is the good response, one was the experimenting with the structure, but what was more important was the use of a peculiar kind of language, which so far was just not used. So, the... So, Beckett revolutionized the theatre in more ways than one, it were not just the structure which was radical, but that it was also the language, and if you read Waiting for Godot again, perhaps you know, you go back revisit the play, and you will understand, what is so special about it? Especially, you know during those days when it was first return. Pinter's theatre can also be called The Comedy of Menace, we are just talking that Pinter's theatres plays are comic, horrifying, absurdist all at the same time.

So, the term Comedy of Menace is associated with Pinter. So, Pinter's plays focus on triangulated relationships, you triangulated relationships means most of the time you find three people or two people having some kind of a conversation. So, basically all the plays of Pinter are conversational plays, but what kind of dialogue, what kind of speech, what kind of conversation that is what sets them apart from the plays by other writers. I am (( )), the critic Christopher (( )) who is a noted theatre critic, he says Pinter's typical cast is three; he usually develops his plays around the cast of three people, three dramatist persona; the smallest unstable relationship in we changing alliances can be formed and individuals isolated; if I ask you to interpret this particular comment, what... How... What would your response be triangulated relationships?

Look at the choice of language, triangulated relationships, unstable relationship changing alliances, isolation. There is say something; I will give you a moment just think about it will come back to it later. In further notes that Pinter's plays are variations on the subjects of dominance, control, exploitation, subjugation and victimization. So, what is generally happens in a typical Pinter play is that it begins with three characters, as we have seen triangulated relationships, and then gradually alliances start changing, for example, to, you know, people is start pleasing their friendship to somebody else, and what happens then, the third person is invariably left isolated, and this is the feature that you find in most of his plays: isolation, estrangement alienation.

So, in his plays, Pinter adds an element of comedy provided mostly through the brilliant small-talk behind which characters hide their growing anxiety, and you will find plenty of small-talk the characters do not do anything, but they just talk, just make a small-talk talking for the sake of initiating a conversation, but nothing much happens conversation you have, you know what communication is all about? So, that talk, but they do not communicate many of Pinter's plays involve processes of physical and mental torture, which can be seen in a play, like *The Dumb Waiter*, and this is the play which we are going to read in detail, do in detail.

Pinter suggests that is earlier plays can be read as political metaphors, implicitly interrogative of the abuse of authority; this is quite interesting, because none of his plays are overtly political, but they can be read as political metaphors; therefore, when we are talking about triangulations, changing alliances, which invariably would lead to isolation of one character. So that was not just a common domestic situation that Pinter was trying to portray, but however, it was the commentary on the politics of that times, and it is they are all very universal. They are not just restricted to the western world; Pinter's plays are quite universalize, we read along you know, during the cause of a *Dump waiter*, we are going to understand that the kind of power struggle that he portrays, can be found in any society.

So, in his plays, the terror only culminates, the man is only conformed, when observation is put to an end, we will understand this more when we read *The Dump Waiter*. So, Pinter's plays generate new kinds of ambiguity in relations between dramatic situations, and the abstract framing of the political facts. So, you have to understand that politics is always implicit, it is always covert in and always used metaphorically rather than

explicitly in Pinter's plays. I will give you an example, from the open from the Dump waiter; the dump waiter has only two characters and the third character is mentioned, we know that the third character is looking somewhere in the background, but he never... He makes his presence felt, but we never see him, we never see that character, most of the time or all the time rather we see only two characters Ben and Gus.

So this is how, and this is the typical and a very good representation of the Pinter's language; Sailery, Ben, Cock; he picks up the paper, what about this? Listen to this; he refers to the paper, a man of 87 wanted to cross the road, but there was a lot of traffic seem, he could not see, how he was going to squeeze through, so, he crawled under a lorry;

Gus: He what? Then he crawled under a lorry - a stationery lorry.

Gus: No.

Ben: The lorry started, and run over him.

Gus: Go on.

Ben: That is what it is says here.

Gus: Get away.

Ben: It is enough to make you want to puke, is it not?

Gus: Who advised him to do a thing like that?

Ben: A man of 87 crawling under a lorry.

Gus: It is unbelievable.

Ben: It is down here in black and white.

Gus: Incredible silence, remember silence is in a Pinter.

Gus: Shakes his head and exists, when lies back and reads, the lavatory chain is pool ones of left, but the elevator does not flush.



Ben: Vessels at an item in the paper.

Gus: Reenters, I want you ask you something.

Ben: What are doing out there?

Gus: Well, I was just.

Ben: What about the tea?

Gus: I am just going to make it.

Ben: Well, go on make it.

Gus: Yes I will.

So, can you see the power relations? These two people are sharing, who is the more dominant of the two. The man who is reading the news paper, so Ben is the more powerful. So, the dialogue establishes that, and also the reading of a very banal kind of a newspaper item, an 87 man... An 87 year old man is a scrolled under a lorry, he wanted to cross the road, the traffic was very thick, and the lorry started and he got run over by the lorry. So, that is the way conversation develops in a typical Pinter play.

(No audio from 31:10 to 31:21)

I will also read you the famous interrogation scene from the Birthday Party, which is another play by Pinter; it has three characters again. So, Stanley **sorry** I will begin with Goldberg.

Goldberg: Take off his glasses;

McCann: he snatches his glasses, and as a Stanley rises, reaching for them, takes his chair down center, below the table, Stanley stumbling as he follows, Stanley clutches the chair and stage bent over it; Weber, you are a fake the stand on each side of the chair, when did you last wash up a cup?

Stanley, the Christmas before last.

Goldberg, where?

Stanley: Lines corner house.

Goldberg: Which one?

Stanley: Marble arch.

Goldberg: Where was your wife?

Stanley, in... Goldberg answer.

Stanley: What wife?

Goldberg: What have you done with your wife?

McCann: He is killed his wife.

Goldberg: Why did you kill your wife?

Stanley, what wife?

McCann: How did you kill her?

Goldberg: How did you kill her?

McCann: You throttled her.

Goldberg: With arsenic.

McCann: There is your man.

Goldberg: Where is your old mum?

Stanley: In the sanatorium.

McCann: Yes.

Goldberg: Why did you never get married?

McCann: She was waiting at the poach.

Goldberg: You scaddled from the wedding.

McCann: He left her in the lurch.

Goldberg: You left her in the pudding club.

McCann: She was waiting at the church.

Goldberg: Weber why did you change your name?

Stanley: I forgot the other one.

Goldberg: What is your name now?

Stanley: Joseph.

Goldberg: You stink of sin.

McCann: I can smell it.

Goldberg: Do you recognize an external force?

Stanley: What?

Goldberg do you recognize an external force?

McCann: That is the question.

Goldberg: Do you recognize an external force responsible for you, suffering for you?

Stanley: It is late.

Goldberg: Late, late enough, when did you last pray?

McCann: He is sweating?

Goldberg: When did you last pray?

McCann: He is sweating?

Goldberg: Is the number 846 possible or necessary.

Stanley: Neither.

Goldberger, wrong, is the number 846 possible or necessary?

Stanley: Both.

Goldberg: Wrong it is necessary, but not possible?

Stanley: Both.

Goldberg: Wrong, why do you think the number 846 is necessarily possible?

Stanley: Must be.

Goldberg: Wrong; it is only necessarily, necessary.

So, this is a Pinter's language and you find plenty of a reputation plenty of banal conversation, plenty of (()), and all his conversations are full of farce, and also he also makes use of plenty of aggressive joke telling, which you will find a lot in the dumb waiter. His very recent play, not very recent, but quite a recent play is a mountain language, in which he focuses on a prison for political dissidents, in an unnamed country, in an unspecified time. So, a very contemporary kind of play commenting on the contemporary current political situations in many countries which are you know run by the so called dictators. So, the play was advertised as a parabolic about the torture and fate of the Kurdish people, you know, the situation of the Kurdish people, where are the Kurds. So, this is a depiction of a hostile landscape with communication is absolutely impossible, and the only language that is allowed, is a language of the appraiser, the aggressor; otherwise, there is a systematic killing, you know, language death. So, the systematic killing of the language of the minorities, here the Kurdish people; by the end the mountain people are so terrify that they have almost forgotten their language. So, when the appraisers when the dictator dictators tell them to start using they are allowed to use or they are permitted to use their language, they do not know what to say, because the fear has been so much. They are so much in a terrorized, they are so much persecuted

that by the end, they do not remember what their actual language was. So, they are unable to use their language and this is stripping away of once language, that is what Pinter says, could be the, you know the worst kind of torture to a human being, because you have deprived a human being of their voice, a freedom of speech is just taken away.

Coming back to his earlier place, the fifties in particular, when a Pinter was getting established; so, the fifties was a period of a sexual modes, when sexuality would be hinted at rather than expressed blatantly; the decade also witnessed an obsessive interest in the subject, and the survey list of sexual behavior became a more; and Foco, the French critic in the history of sexuality states, that western culture has long been fixated on sexuality; we call it a repression rather the social convention not to mention sexuality has created a discourse around it; therefore making sexuality ubiquitous, this would not have been the case, had it been thought of a something quite natural; this is a Foco's position, and this particular position is reflected in most of Pinter's plays of. So, there was also an element of social control in this; according to Foco, a power relationship was created between the preacher and the confessant between the psycho analyst and his patient.

So, power relations are to Foco central to any analysis of society, and this is especially true for sexuality power relations are formed in all relations where it differences exist. So, in the same way in sex for Pinter is a power struggle, and a mind game, in which there is no certain victor, but an endless struggle for dominance. So, both *The Birthday Party* and *The Home Coming* that is another play by Pinter, they can be read as dramatization of violent and authoritarian forces, especially in a sexual kind of a relationship; a Pinter was also well known a theater critic; and he has written a this is a taken from a speech called a writing for the theater; and at the beginning of this class, I told you that in Pinter, silence is a very important entity.

So, he talks about silence, he Pinter says in writing for the theater, there are two silences: one when no word is spoken, silent; you just remain silent; and no word is spoken that is a silence; the other when perhaps say torrent of languages being employed. When true silence falls, we are left with echo, but a nearer nakedness, one way of looking at speeches to say that it is a constant, a stratagem to cover nakedness; I believe, we communicate well in our **in our** silence. Would you like to comment on this particular observation? Well you know there is silence; on the other hand, you can also have a

torrent of words, what is that? You can bombard a person with words and speech and have plenty of conversation, according to Pinter silence makes us understand people better as compared to speech, because languages just not sufficient.

Now, whatever we have learnt in our theories of communication, this is a complete antithesis **right** of those particular theories of communication, where languages used to connect people with one another, but according to Pinter language is not just enough, sometimes, silence communicates better. In this respect Pinter has often being compared with the Russian writer Anton Chekhov; in Chekhov characters often talk across each other as if encapsulated in private worlds; in contrast avoidance of communication characterizes Pinter's dialogues. However in the works of both playwrights, the most profound expression of feeling is through silence, and to make his point clearer, Pinter in 1970, wrote a play called silence.

So, critics have found silence the play as one of his most lyrical, most Beckettian and also the most mysterious and difficult plays. So, in silence, the characters are also, except in flashback dialogues, physically separated; the stage direction is extremely **(( ))** and this is what the stage direction is three areas, a chair in each area. So, also do the three characters seem to leave a part, each in his room; so there are three rooms, three areas; a chair in each area, and then silence. So, the characters find it very pleasant to be alone, in fact, some of them show their dismay, an anger, at leaving next door to young people who make noisy music and noisy love.

Silence is an attempt to tell a story by a technique, which breaks the chronological sequence more decisively than is usually done in intricately woven patterns of flashback. Now, I am a Pinter is also understood as a political activist. So, most people who read a Pinter's plays they have realized that a political reading is always implicit as I was just telling you in his place. So, Pinter as a political activist in 1985, this is what he says in 1985, author Miller and I that is Pinter visited Turkey on behalf of International PEN, you know, what is PEN? They as organization PEN, what it stands for poets essayists novelists. Poet's playwright's essayist's novelists, PEN.

We met writers artists academics, many of these people had it spends some time in military prisons and had been tortured. They had been imprisoned for their ideas. They had committed no concrete act against the state. We met people whose lives had been

ruined both those who had been tortured and their families. Author Miller and I were invited to the American embassy to meet the ambassador. We discussed American support for the military regime in Turkey and conditions in military prisons. The ambassador said to me, Mr. Pinter I do not think you understand the realities of the situation here; you have to take into account the strategic reality, the military reality, the political reality. The reality to which I am referring, I replied is that of the electric current attached to your genitals. Sir, he said, you are a guest in my house and turned on his heel. He had found mention of that reality offensive. Thus my point, we take refuge in finding offense in a strong language, when it is the reality which is obnoxious, brutal and disgusting.

You understand this point, the diplomatic language that is what Pinter says, the diplomatic language - the ambassador was employing has been used to justify the gullets in Russia and the torture chambers in El Salvador, Chile, Guatemala, etcetera which last regimes are supported by the United States. I remind of you that simply, because the USA is the head of the democratic world, and considers itself to be the defender of Christian civilization.

In June 1989, a Harold Pinter and Antonia Fraser his wife they visited Vaclav Havel in his farm house in Bohemian over look by a 24 police guard. Vaclav Havel later went on to become, do you know anything about Vaclav Havel. He was a playwright. He later went on to become the president of the Czech Republic. So, this what he Pinter feel the US is really beyond reason now. There is only one comparison Nazi Germany. Nazi Germany wanted total domination of Europe and they nearly did it. The US wants total domination of the world and is about to consolidate that. That is what Harold Pinter said in June 2003, a little before his death.

So, Pinter is the language, so peculiar, so unique is a Pinter's language that it has come to form an adjective of its own, because it is a **it is a** very distinctive kind of an idiom. So, the term has come to suggest the irrationality of every day conversation is bad syntax, repetitions, non-secateurs and self contradictions. Pinter's language suggests that real life conversations do not proceed smoothly and logically from point to point. Is not this an antithesis of whatever we have learned about language? Language is **mean** meant to connect **right**, but in Pinter, language there is something opposite, it creates a wage, **it creates** it drives a wage between people.

So, language cannot necessarily be a force of connection. Pinter is decidedly an innovator where language is concerned. In his works, we find a fusion of the minimal language in naturalism as in the works of Anton Chekhov, and the esthetic expressiveness of the symbolist. Most importantly, Pinter's plays can only be experienced through listening to the way. Everyday language gets deflected by and the way it alienate they speak us from one another. So, the language as an alienating forces. Speech for Pinter is evocative and disturbing an accurate reflection of colloquial.

In Pinter characters, internal fears and longings, they guilt and difficult sexual drives as set against then neat lives, they have constructed in order to survive. I will read you a particular, I mean, I just wanted to expand this particular point, that people generally it is believe that they **they** create neat and very well ordered lives for themselves. But such is the human predicament and that is the way Pinter cease it that is you know, that the way they will use the language it exposes the Fars of their existence. This is a scene; this is a slight except from a play called a slight ache. This is conversation between a husband and a wife. Wife is flora, husband is Edward.

Flora: Is the height of summer today.

Edward: Cover the **(( ))**.

Flora: What?

Edward: Cover the pot, there is a wasp; he puts the paper down on the table. Do not move, keep still, what are you doing?

Flora: Covering the pot.

Edward: Do not move, leave it, keep still, give me the telegraph.

Flora: Do not heat it, it will bite.

Edward: Bite, what do you mean? Bite keep still it is landing.

Flora: It is moving in the pot.

Edward: Give me the lid.



Flora: It is in.

Edward: Give me the lid.

Flora: I will do it.

Edward: Give it to me now slowly.

Flora: What are you doing?

Edward: Be quite; slowly, carefully on the pot, ha ha ha ha very good, he sits on a chair to the right of the table.

Flora: Now, he is in the (( )).

Edward: Precisely, she sits on a chair to the left of the table and reads the telegraph.

Flora: Can you hear him?

Edward: Hear him.

Flora: Buzzing.

Edward: Nonsense, How can you hear him? It is in an earthen where lid.

Flora: He is becoming frantic.

Edward: Rubbish, take it away from the table.

Flora: What is shall I do with it?

Edward: Put it in the sink and drown it.

Flora: It will fly out and bite me.

Edward: It will not bite you; wasps do not bite. Anyway it would not fly out, it stuck, it will drown where it is in the (( )).

Flora: What a horrible death.

Edward: On the contrary.

What do you understand by this exchange? We were talking about a Pinter often constructs a neat well ordered, very structured kind of often arrangement; **between** it could be between brothers, it could be between husband and wife, it could be between friends; but the language says a lot of things about the character without giving away too much; any comments on this particular exchange?

Rehan.

Well, I thought it was very **very** normal, something that... That happens in an every day to day basis, and at the same time, the last line takes it turns the whole thing on its head when he says on the contrary.

Yes, you know, you find such the wasp, and the allowing a wasp to enter jar of mamma lid, covering the lid, and then watching it die, and being very you know plus it about it, then nothing special that is how wasp should die although, it would not bite. If you remember we were also talking about the political metaphors perhaps, you may like to you know connect the metaphor here, I could do some kind of reading political reading into this. A Pinter is also an acclaimed motion picture screen writer not many know about this, but he has been credited with writing screen plays for many well known films.

So, the first one of this was the Servant in 1963; Accident 1967, The Go Between in 1971, The Last Tycoon, this is an based on a novel by **(( ))** in 1974, the French lieutenants woman by John Fowles, the novel is by John Fowles 1981 and Betrayal; his later play plays include mountain languages in 1988, Party Time 1991 and Moonlight in 1993; Pinter has a lot to say about a writers responsibility, he said The Theater is a large energetic public activity, but writing is a private activity; the professional theater is a world of false climaxes calculated tensions, some hysteria and a good deal of inefficiency. What I write has no obligation to anything other than itself; well, this goes against the grain of play writing according to many critics that what I write has no obligation to anything other than itself; however, what he says is that my responsibility is not to audiences, critics, producers, directors, actors or to my fellowmen, but to the play inherent.

So, absolutely denying the response, the writer's response... A writer's responsibility a writers has no responsibility towards anyone except towards the play very interesting thesis. Again Pinter on characters and plot, he says that the context should be concrete and not abstract, I never start a play from any kind of abstract idea or theory I do not make any allegorical representation. So, he says I never envisage my characters as messengers of death doom heaven or the Milky Way. So, I do not my characters are not representatives of all these; characters should be defined, a symbolic character on the other hand puts up a smoke screen against recognition, against an active and willing participation; on real and unreal, Pinter says there can be no hard distinction between what is real and what is unreal, I think can be both real and false both true and false.

A character on stage may or may not give a comprehensive analysis of his motives, the more acute the experious, the less articulate it is expression. So, now you understand what we have been taking about the in adequacy of the language, insufficiency of language; the more acute **acute** the experience, the less articulate the expression; because language can never be enough to articulate to represent emotions; on verifying the past, Pinter says a moment is distorted often even at the time of its birth, what is happening now? We would not know until tomorrow or in six months time, it will be forgotten or are in imagination will have attributed quite false characteristics today **today**.

We all interpret a common experience quite different; there is no fix reality shared reality, but a quick sent. Pinter is against the playwright indulging in moral issues. So, in his plays, you will never find an overt, a very explicit discussion of moral issues; he also warns against words, the bulk of which according to Pinter is nothing but dead terminology, and his most important theory on language, language is highly ambiguous business for all words is spoken there are things known and unspoken. A language is where under what is said, another thing is being said; most of us are in expressive, unreliable, elusive, invasive, obstructive, unwilling it is out of these attributes that a language arises.

So, language is a mix of all these things, it is inexpressive, unreliable, elusive, evasive, obstructive. So, language is everything that what **what** believe it to be we believe that language can be relied on, according to Pinter we cannot rely on language. Now, all these ideas of you know, very radical ideas of theater very radical ideas about language and a Pinter has lots of admirers, but at the same time directors as well.

So, Allardyce Nicoll one of the most prominent theater critics who wrote definitive book called British drama; he criticizes Pinter's assertion **assertion** that he does not write with my audience in mind; that is what if you remember a Pinter says that he does not feel obliged or responsible towards any audience towards producers or directors or actors; Allardyce Nicoll for on the other hand, he criticizes this assertion; he says that the this kind of attitude best destructively down on the very essence of drama, because the drama is something which by its basic nature must be designed to appeal to an audience.

You look at all those classic plays that, you know, the plays written by the masters of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and even the earlier playwrights. So, they talk to an audience **right**, where the playwrights do be tray some kind of a responsibility towards the audience, but when Pinter completely denies, completely he wants to struggle, all kind every all responsibility towards the audience, then there is something wrong with his plays according to Nickoll. So, we are looking at the other side of Pinter plays; and critics have also felt that in Pinter we have the lowest common denominator of human speech, all this criticism notwithstanding, Pinter was awarded the noble in 2005 for literature, it is a high highest award of course, you know a highest kind of honor available to any writer in the world.

So, in announcing the award the chairman of the Swedish committee, he said that Pinter was an artist who his plays uncovers the precipices, under everyday prattle and fosses entry into operations closed rooms. In his noble lecture, which focuses more on politics than literature Pinter launched, Pinter launched a ferocious steroid against bush and blare saying they were responsible for tens of thousands of deaths in the Iraq war. So, again the same political activist; Pinter accuse the united states of supporting every right wing military dictatorship in the world, after the second world war from chili to the Philippines; the crimes of the united states have been very systematic, constant wishes remorseless, but very few people have actually talked about them that is what Pinter says.

It has exercised a quite clinical manipulation of power worldwide, while masquerading as a force for universal good. It is a brilliant, even witty, highly successful act of hypnosis. Pinter said the US also has its own bleating little lamp, tagging behind annelid the pathetic **(( ))**, Great Britain; any questions at this point?

Because Beckett has influenced Pinter in many ways; looking at two plays, which is the The Homecoming and by Harold Pinter, and End Game by Beckett, both these plays utilize silence to great degree within the difference between **between** Beckett and Pinter; is that Pinter's mode in that in that play, looking at comparing these two plays rather than the playwrights; end game you has a lot of dialogues, which are which are more absurdist than Homecoming, than the dialogues in Homecoming.

It is a total negation of the dearly held Bourgeoisie values of the British middle class; **yes** of course, so there are lots of and this is the constant in all Pinter plays, where you know, he strikes a blow, against all kinds of establishment particularly the domestic situation. The **he** language as well as a themes they are given they are a way of integrating the establish ideas the conserve the conventional ideas about family life and middle class situation, because what Pinter tells us is that very often things are not what they appear to be. How many is superficial is just on the surface, whether it is political harmony or whether it is friendship between two friends or even you know situation between husband and wife, brothers and brothers, but everything is suspect.

So, precautions taking against taking things at their face value is the there is a play called the Lover, a very shot play; are you familiar with that? No, perhaps when we discuss The Dumb Waiter, I will bring that along and will discuss it in detail. So, thank you so much.