

**UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE
FAKULTA HUMANITNÍCH STUDIÍ
KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY**

**JAZYK JAKO NÁSTROJ MOCI
V DRAMATECH HAROLDA PINTERA**

DIPLOMOVÁ PRÁCE

AUTOR PRÁCE: Věra Švachová

VEDOUCÍ PRÁCE: Libora Oates-Indruchová, PhD.

2005

**UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN STUDIES

**LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF POWER
IN HAROLD PINTER'S DRAMA**

THESIS

AUTHOR: Věra Švachová

SUPERVISOR: Libora Oates-Indruchová, Ph.D.

2005

Souhrn

Foucault definuje pojem moci, strukturu jejích pravidel a vysvětluje systém mocenských vztahů, vyjádřených jazykem. Jeho tvrzení o jazyku, který slouží jako nástroj moci je klíčovým pro teoretický základ téhle práce. Moc existuje v každém vztahu a její destabilizace v mluvě je dynamická. Na základě hierarchického uspořádání společnosti jsou vytvořeny nerovné vztahy, které dávají prostor pro efektivní fungování mocenských vztahů. Ty se projevují v každém konverzačním aktu a způsobují, že jeho účastníci používají různé způsoby vyjadřování pro dosažení svých cílů.

Diplomová práce analyzuje vztah moci, jazyka a instituce, taktéž se zabývá rozdíly v používání jazyka obou pohlaví a do značné části i vlivem instituce na jedince a jeho mluvu. Práce dále definuje různé lingvistické strategie, které účastníci konverzace používají pro dosažení různých cílů. Harold Pinter je významný autor absurdního dramatu, v jehož hrách je klíčovým prvkem právě jazyk použit za účelem získání moci nad druhými. Tato práce stručně představuje využití jazyka v absurdním dramatu, stejně tak jako Pinterovo osobité zpracování všední konverzace dle filozofických myšlenek o moci a jazyku. Diplomová práce podrobně analyzuje tři Pinterovy hry: *The Birthday Party*, *The Homecoming*, a *The Mountain Language*, ve kterých je jazyk užit jako mocenský nástroj. Části hry jsou rozebírány v průběhu celé práce dle konkrétních teoretických aspektů.

Cílem téhle práce je dokázat, jak důležité jsou poznatky o moci v jazyce a názorně předvést principy moci a mocenských vztahů v oblasti lingvistiky na třech významných hrách Harolda Pintera.

Abstract

Foucault defines the term power, structure of its rules and explains the system of power relations, expressed through language. Theoretical part of this thesis is based on his argument about language serving as a means of power. Power is present in all relationships and its destabilization in a discourse is dynamic. Based on a hierarchical structure of society there are unequal relationships which give rise to effective function of power relations. These are present in all conversational acts and cause that the participants use different kinds of language for reaching their aims.

In this thesis, the relationship between power, language and institution is analysed and the differences in language use based on gender are stated, as well as the influence of an institution over the individuals and their language use is described. As follows, various linguistic strategies that conversational participants use for reaching their goals are defined.

Harold Pinter is a significant writer of the absurd drama and it is just the language used as a means of power over others that is of a great importance in his plays. This paper briefly introduces use of language in the absurd drama and Pinter's individual use of a day-to-day conversation in the light of the philosophical ideas about power and language. The thesis analyses three of Pinter's plays in detail: namely *The Birthday Party*, *The Homecoming*, and *The Mountain Language*, where language is used as a means of power and gender represents an important part as well. Extracts of the plays are analysed throughout the paper according to the specific theoretical aspects.

The purpose of this thesis is to prove how important the statements about discursive power are and to clearly demonstrate the principles of power and power relations in the field of linguistics in the three sample plays by Harold Pinter.

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Power and Power Relations.....	4
3. Language.....	11
4. Absurd Drama and Harold Pinter's Language.....	30
5. Linguistic Strategies.....	41
5.1 Indirectness.....	42
5.2 Interruption.....	44
5.3 Silence Versus Volubility.....	45
5.4 Topic Raising and Changing.....	50
5.5 Verbal Aggression.....	53
5.6 Questions.....	54
5.7 Repetition.....	57
6. Conclusion.....	59
7. Resume.....	61
8. Bibliography.....	65

1. Introduction

Power is an issue of a high importance in this world. The term “power” is used in various situations, social, political or cultural contexts. Every single person uses this term differently and with various purposes. Naturally, “power” is perceived as belonging to strong humans, or to a mighty state. But in this paper, “power” is analysed as something that reaches far more, and represents much more complex topic than it is generally acknowledged.

Michel Foucault, the French philosopher, is an author of revolutionary ideas about “power”. The theoretical background of this thesis is based on these highly developed philosophical ideas about power and its functions. Foucault explains the term “power” itself, the structure of its rules and the system of power relations. According to Foucault, there are various kinds of power: political, statal, male, or female. All relationships emerging in different settings and institutions among humans are called power relations. Because there are always hierarchical divisions present, it is very easy for power to be present and the power relations can thus function effectively.

Certainly, major part of all the human encounters is based on conversation. It is language through which messages are communicated and people understand each other. However, it is Foucault again, who defines how power can be expressed through language. When talking about language, power goes hand in hand with it, and it is omnipresent in all conversational encounters. Consequently, when power is interwoven into language, then one can use such language for his or her own purposes. Individuals, that are aware of such a powerful potential of language, can even abuse it in order to overpower others and reach their own goals.

Therefore, this paper describes the basic Foucauldian power theory but examines other influencing theories as well, in order to summarize and analyse the system of power and power relations. After acknowledging these, one can better understand how does power work in the field of discourse and how, and to what extent, do the power relations appear in the linguistic exchanges.

The term “institutional talk” is also explained in this paper, where an institution represents any group of human beings. Because of the hierarchy based on unequal social positions of individuals that always exist in any institution and because of the rules and laws that are to keep in an institution, it is also the institutional talk that is asymmetrical and so allows power to work through power relations. Following, the explanation of relationship between language, society and power gives a deeper overall understanding of the workings of power in language.

Last but not least, the term gender plays an important part while analysing language in the context of power. In this paper, the importance of relationship between gender and language is stressed and explained because the use of language of the two genders is different and the effects and results can vary significantly depending on male or female use of language.

Social environment always determines not only language a speaker chooses to use but a hearer's perception of the utterance as well. Thus the hearer can perceive and understand the speaker's message and intentions differently not being aware how dangerous they can be. Because the less one is aware of power in a discourse, the better power works. Such threatening language with possibilities of power games and all the communication misunderstandings are crucial in the plays by Harold Pinter. For this paper, three of his plays are analysed in order to explain the workings of power in discourse and analyse how Pinter uses language to serve as a means of power. The main Pinter's plays where language is used in order to get power over others and where language is abused to manipulate others are *The Birthday Party*, *The Homecoming* and *The Mountain Language*.

Harold Pinter is a typical representative of a controversial theatrical movement called the absurd drama. In this paper, the basic theoretical points and main ideas of this movement are explained and Pinter is presented in its light. The most important and influencing field of the absurd drama is an unusual use of language that is based on a day-to-day conversation that lacks cohesion and coherence and it is full of bad syntax, verbal misunderstandings, and mishearings.

Pinter's characters usually use language that due to such miscommunication contain hidden cruel intentions. "Pinteresque" language is full of cunning strategies, pauses and silences, voice-overs and continual irrelevant small talks. All of these linguistic elements serve to achieve advantageous position and to win the floor over the other participants of the conversation. It is the precisely planned language that Pinter uses in order to show how language can be used as a tormenting weapon in a discourse, sometimes with destructive results over others.

But how can certain language be powerful? What are the strategies that one can use in discourse to manipulate and overpower others? What is it that makes language serve as a means of power? The aim of this paper is to answer such questions by initial theoretical explanations of the workings of power, especially in the level of discourse. In the initial chapter, language and discourse is analysed in the relationship with power and society. This theoretical background gives to a reader general comprehension of power in a discourse and

powerful language. Consequently, the language of the absurd drama and Pinter's language use itself is introduced in order to give a more profound view into the philosophy of absurd theatrical language and its connection with language use in the real world. Towards the end of the thesis, the specific linguistic strategies are summarized. These are the strategies based on various researches serving in discourse to win the floor and make others respond and behave in a wanted way.

As mentioned above, *The Mountain Language*, *The Homecoming* and *The Birthday Party* are the crucial plays by Harold Pinter being analysed throughout this paper. *The Mountain Language* and *The Birthday Party* are plays based on cruel interrogations where language used by the interrogators is full of linguistic strategies based on power serving the goal of a complete destruction of an individual. Whereas *The Homecoming* represents a play where gender plays a major part. It is the female skilful use of language that helps the main character to overpower and dominate others completely.

All of these plays are being analysed throughout the paper giving clear examples of the theoretical explanations. From the initial chapter about power till the last one describing the linguistic strategies, relevant pieces of Pinter's sample plays are used in order to prove the validity of the philosophical discourse theories. Moreover, the extracts from Pinter's plays help to acknowledge the theoretical base and show how and to what extent are the theoretical ideas used in Pinter's plays.

The extracts have been carefully chosen in order to analyse the outstanding plays profoundly, and the purpose of this paper is to show to readers how does Pinter use manipulative and tormenting language that is based on the most significant philosophical thoughts about power and discourse.

2. Power and power relations

One is always “inside” power, there is no “escaping” it. (Foucault, 95)

For better understanding of the relationship between language and power and to see how such language can serve as a means of power, one must start with an analysis of the term “power”, the structure of its rules and one must try to understand how power and power relationships emerge and work in the interplay between humans. To see the power all through and from various points of view can be helpful in the further analysis of drama and dramatic language used in the plays of Harold Pinter.

Power can be viewed in various ways and for each human individual it can mean something different. The term “power” can be found in various academic disciplines but this paper examines “power” in a broader abstract sense.

An endless number of definitions of power can be found in dictionaries. The basic understanding of power is as a state or quality of being physically strong, but power is also defined as having an ability or official capacity to exercise control and authority or possession of control or capacity to influence others. More politically or socially, power is perceived as the right to command, decide, rule or judge, or simply as the political control or influence, or as the might of a nation, political organization, or similar group. More specifically, power is represented in a person, group, or nation having great influence, or control over others. The term “power” is then connected with nouns like forcefulness, effectiveness, ability, control, dominance, influence, regime, rule, inferiority, or powerlessness (www.answer.com).

Basically, power means all of the above and much more. Power must be examined from a much larger point of view. It must be discussed as a broad issue, as something that is interwoven in all the actions we do, in all the encounters people have in their day-to-day lives. Power is a complex, immensely large and problematic task to analyse; it is a topic that has been vividly and constantly discussed among various theorists and specialists throughout history.

For example, Weber sees power as “the possibility of imposing one's will upon the behaviour of other persons” and according to Galbraith, Weber also says of power that it is the ability of one or more persons „to realize their own will in a communal act against the will of others who are participating in the same act” (www.ausis.com). Habermas then

translates Weber as saying that "power means every chance within a social relationship to assert one's will even against opposition" (ibid.).

These were just some of the themes by which the 20th century theorists discuss, analyse, formulate and explain the concept of power. However, this paper takes as a fundamental theory the one of the French philosopher and social critic Michel Foucault that "has provided a guiding theoretical light behind a range of work in the poststructuralist tradition in many areas of sociology, social psychology and particularly in discourse analysis" (Thornborrow, 7).

His theoretical accounts and new views about power have created the base for many other poststructuralist philosophers and theorists whose thoughts and opinions on power have been used as a theoretical base for this paper as well. Foucault's studies and essays about power have stood in opposition to foregone theorists who viewed power for example from the behavioural perspective, or who built a structural model of power, all of which "have been pervasive in many accounts of the relationship between power, ideology and social discourses" (Thornborrow, 6).

Simple questions must be laid before the discussion about the poststructuralist view on power in the relation to language and discourse. The questions are not just "what is power, what does it mean and what does it do?" And not even "where is it located and what forms can it have?" Many more and more profound questions one needs to ask about such a complex and highly theorised phenomenon as power is. If one is able to answer what the basic concepts of power are and how this multi-faceted phenomenon can be analysed in or as discourse, then one can better understand the complexity of power relations, especially in the field of discourse, concretely in the institutional talk, which will be described later on in this paper. One can then also better understand the relationship between language, society and power.

To add to or, better, to cover all the definitions of power listed at the beginning, one must understand the "power" in its real essence. Power is everywhere. It is present all around humans; it is interwoven in all their actions and can be born everywhere. Power is internal; it comes from inside every single being. Foucault defines power as "something that is not acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations" (Foucault, 94).

In society, there is a hierarchy and basic hierarchical divisions that are different in various cultures. In such divisions, it is easy for power to be present, and it occurs in every single relationship. But “power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with, it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategic situation in a particular society” (Foucault, 93).

Therefore Foucault sees power as being a complex and constantly developing web of social relationships. He understands it as a net that keeps on evolving, growing from itself and being present in the whole social body. Thus, there are many kinds of power, as political, statal, male or female. According to Foucault, power is a productive process, rather than simply a repressive phenomenon, and this is why one can experience and feel it at every level of social activity. Moreover:

Power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies. (Foucault, 93)

All the above stated represents the basic concept of power, which since being published has completely changed the view over the whole issue. All the dictionary definitions mentioned at the beginning are suddenly insufficient and must be further developed in the light of the far-reaching theories of Michel Foucault. The nouns accompanying the general perception of power as forcefulness, effectiveness, control, or dominance must definitely be extended to a larger range of not only nouns, as power

involves everything that is immanent in the whole society, because “it comes from everywhere” (Foucault, 93).

Another influential philosopher from the poststructuralist era is Pierre Bourdieu who talks about symbolic power. He is concerned with social practices and questions why some of them are more valuable and persuasive than others and how the knowledge of such practices makes some individuals more powerful over others. He, of course, goes further than perceiving power as a physical force; moreover, according to him, power is “transmuted into a symbolic form, and thereby endowed with a kind of *legitimacy* that it would not otherwise have. [...] Symbolic power is an ‘invisible’ power which is ‘misrecognized’ as such and thereby ‘recognized’ as legitimate” (Bourdieu, 23).

In every institution, in every group, in all various societies, there are some rules that are thoughtlessly kept. The rules and practices applied in these groups are based on power. Parts of these rules are represented in the system of law of a state and thus being silently recognized as codified rules to be kept. Also these law systems that are accompanied by certain habits, social practices and strategies are entangled with power and effective power relations. The less one is aware of the presence of power in such rules and practices and the less one thinks about them, the more effectively power and power relations work. Then, the participants of such institutions and societies are ruled by those power structures and act in a way that the practices make them behave. Moreover, there is a certain language used while applying the practices and there is a large number of linguistic strategies that are used among the members of the institutions in order to increase efficiency of the rules.

Pinter’s play *The Mountain Language* represents a clear example of principles on which power works. The whole play, even if set in an abstract world, depicts an institution known from a real world where power is violently and linguistically exercised. This aggressive piece of work describes the social practices and the application of the rules in an unnamed country at an unspecified time. This imaginary institution is a hierarchical one and its rules and laws are thoughtlessly kept. Pinter stresses the whole structure of such society and thus the power relations are visible and presented in an absurd way. The Pinter’s whole play describes the system of power and shows how dangerously power can be practiced.

The Mountain Language is a political one-act play set in a prison for political dissidents. In this hostile surrounding, communication is forbidden, and language has

become a tool of the oppressors, whose utterances infect the atmosphere. The owners of the language in this institution use words to gain power over those whose language is not “the language of the capital” (*The Mountain*, 10) or who had showed some kind of disagreement. What is more, the linguistic strategies of the oppressors are completely arbitrary giving thus evidence how absurd the social rules and practices sometimes are.

In this play, Pinter shows totally absurd situations, conversations and social practices and it is this absurdity that helps him to prove the omnipresence of power in every institution:

Officer: Look at this woman’s hand. I think the thumb is going to come off. (*To elderly woman*) Who did this?

She stares at him.

Who did this?

Young woman: A big dog.

Officer: What was his name?

Pause.

What was his *name*?

Pause.

Every dog has a *name*! They answer to their name. They are given a name by their parents and that is their name, that is their *name*! Before they bite, they *state* their name.

It’s a formal procedure. They state their name and then they bite... (*The Mountain*, 7-8)

Through the words of the guards, the plays stresses and explains the system of rules and laws in a state and shows how the insistency on keeping those rules can easily serve as a means of power.

Hand in hand with the term “power” goes the term “force relations”, sometimes called “power relations” that were mentioned previously. They represent a basic relationship between all the participants in the whole society; they are an interactional phenomena and the “power relations emerge in the interplay between participants’ locally constructed, discursive identities and their institutional status” (Thornborrow, 1).

Just as power, also these power relations are unstable, constantly moving and emerging from one another. They can be the basis of all the interactional problems, language misunderstandings, relations of dominance and submissiveness constantly appearing in society. Pinter’s play *The Mountain Language* is an apposite example. Foucault describes the power relations as “the manifold relationships of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups, and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole” (Foucault, 94).

Bourdieu, through his definition of institution, claims that “an institution is not necessarily a particular organization” (8). It can be every community from a family, recognized group of people, state or factory, for instance. What is more, he perceives an institution as being “any relatively durable set of social relations which *endows* individuals with power, status and resources of various kinds. It is the institution [...] that endows the speaker with the authority to carry out the act which his or her utterance claims to perform” (8-9).

As well as *The Mountain Language*, Pinter’s play *The Birthday Party* describes an institution that gives certain force to some members thus making them more powerful than others. Specific powerful language that they use and linguistic strategies which they choose to support their utterance with makes them even more forceful. The effect of such linguistic behaviour is sometimes invisible dominance. Such rhetorically skilled individuals can easily influence others to make them behave and respond in their sense.

To sum up, institutions place some individuals in a more powerful position. The rules that are applied in such institution strengthen that certain position. In case a person is a clever language strategist, he or she can reinforce his or her position by using linguistic strategies. These strategies that will be explained later in this paper being applied effectively can have tremendous, sometimes destructive effects over others, who are in lower social positions. Speakers make hearers behave and react in the way they want them

to. The subordinate, powerless position and situation of the hearers is thus stressed in a painful way. Pinter's play *The Birthday Party* is an example of these statements. This very successful full-length play describes such linguistic destruction of a person while using powerful linguistic strategies that strengthen an evidently powerful position in a certain society.

Goldberg and McCann from *The Birthday Party* are representatives of a mysterious organization who arrive in a boarding house where Stanley, presumably a former member of the same organization, lives. Goldberg suggests that they should hold him a birthday party. But the initial warmth turns into a step-by-step ritualistic destruction of Stanley by the two pursuers. Goldberg, being full of false bonhomie and worldly wise and McCann being brutal and silent, echoing Goldberg's words and obeying his orders, is behind all the actions in the play. He has made detailed plans as to what he, or the institution, wants to happen and how it is going to happen. He is a mysterious, evil creature representing the rules, laws and social practices of an institution with a strong determination to achieve his chosen ends:

Goldberg: What does he do, your husband?

Meg: He's a deck-chair attendant.

Goldberg: Oh, very nice!

Meg: Yes, he's out in all weathers.

She begins to take her purchases from her bag.

Goldberg: Of course. And your guest? Is he a man?

Meg: A man?

Goldberg: Or a woman?

Meg: No. A man.

Goldberg: Been here long?

Meg: He's been here about a year now.

Goldberg: Oh yes. A resident. What's his name?

Meg: Stanley Webber.

Goldberg: Oh yes? Does he work here?

Meg: He used to work. He used to be a pianist. In a concert party on the pier.

Goldberg: Oh yes? On the pier, eh? Does he play a nice piano?

Meg: Oh, lovely. (*The Birthday Party*, 31)

The extract above clearly shows how Goldberg is able to rule and control the conversation in order to achieve his goals. He forces the others tell him what he needs to know and manipulates them to serve his aims.

Goldberg is successful in what he has planned to achieve – or in what the organization that he represents wants him to do. He manages to take Stanley away from his shelter to an unknown place. The power of the institution that he represents is terrifying throughout the entire play and again, as in *The Mountain Language*, Pinter skilfully proves, how power and power relations are interwoven in every social body, in every single interaction of its members and how these interactions can represent effective power games.

Discourse, being a verbal exchange, a conversation, or an institutional talk is then supposed to be a strategic discourse that is power-laden, goal, or task-oriented and equipped with inequality. Institutional discourse is characteristically asymmetrical; asymmetry being “much less a question of turn distribution between participants and much more one of unequal distribution of social power and status” (as quoted in Thornborrow, 3).

Being aware of the existence of various “hierarchies and inequalities that exist in gender, class, ethnic and other social relationships between the participants” (Thornborrow, 3), also every single utterance or conversation must be taken as unequal. Always, there is one participant being situated in a lower position than the other, no matter whether from gender, class, ethnic or other point of view.

To follow, in any talk, relationships of power emerge and therefore the institutional talk represent a discourse “in which the discursive resources and identities available to participants to accomplish specific actions are either weakened or strengthened in relation to their current institutional identities” (Thornborrow, 4).

Taking notice of Bourdieu’s understanding of an institution, the following chapter deals with an institutional talk that is based on the power theories mentioned in this chapter. Such talk is described theoretically, as well as practically, and analysed in the chosen Pinter’s plays.

3. Language

One of the most important forms of human communication is language. Speaking a language makes human beings social, literate individuals. Through uttering words, in every speech act, one can recognize gender, social class, or culture. The language we use influences the way we think as well. Language means freedom for the human beings as it offers to express through discourses various thoughts and opinions but, paradoxically, it allows the individuals to create a world, as they want to have it by using certain discursive techniques and devices. Dale Spender suggests that “given that language is such an influential force in shaping our world, it is obvious that those who have the power to make the symbols and their meanings are in a privileged and highly advantageous position. They have the potential to order the world to suit their own ends” (as quoted in Cameron, 97).

Social environment is very important while using language. It always determines not only the language a speaker chooses to use, but it also determines a hearer’s perception of the speaker’s utterance and the final understanding of the meaning. Fairclough claims that “the language we use is always shaped by the material and social conditions in which it is produced” (as quoted in Thornborrow, 15).

How can language be powerful? Or, more precisely: How can a discourse be powerful? As it clearly comes out from Chapter 2, language is an inseparable part of power relations because a discourse is always present in the interaction between individuals and power is present in every kind of discourse. In this light, discourse can be seen as a manipulative language-game, a dynamic process by which meaning is given to linguistic interaction and in which a certain subject is communicated and where thus power relations are revealed.

Moreover, when analysing a discourse in relation to power, one cannot omit the importance of “the relationship between discourse and social, institutional organisations” (as quoted in Thornborrow, 7). Fairclough stresses the relationship and defines power “as already accruing to some participants and not to others, and this power is determined by their institutional role and their socio-economic status, gender or ethnic identity” (as quoted in Thornborrow, 7).

Foucault’s resistance must also be mentioned at this point. Because “where there is power, there is resistance” (Foucault, 95). Resistance is always present and so giving rise to power. Both these elements stand in a close relationship, they are mutually non-expellable and the existence of power relations “depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance” (Foucault, 95).

As a consequence, to answer the question stated above about how some kind of language can be powerful, one must consider not only the power – discourse – institution relationship, but one must also deeply consider how power is applied in a discourse and how it is resisted. In other words, “what discursive resources do speakers use for doing power in talk, and what resources do others use in response” (Thornborrow, 7).

Following Foucault’s argument about power that is omnipresent at all levels of social interaction, then power must be present and visible also in every single interplay between participants of all speeches, discourses and talks. So, consequently, some speakers occupy more or less powerful positions. Some of the verbal strategies that can be applied in discourse in order to make the speech more powerful will be examined later in this paper including paralinguistic and non-verbal interactive acts.

The relationship between power and resistance is a crucial one when examining language as a means of power. Power of a speaker’s language always depends on the amount of resistance that the hearer shows. In case the resistance is not hard enough or it is not present at all, then it is very easy for the language to serve as a means of not only power over the other person but also as a means of the linguistic teasing and even torment.

Subjugation of the other person is a common topic in Pinter’s dramatic work. The way to get complete control over the other through a use of a specific type of language is a problematic that is of Pinter’s interest since his early plays. He describes a step-by-step subjugation of a character leading to a complete destruction of an individual for example in *The Birthday Party*.

Pinter’s *The Mountain Language* gives another example of linguistic coercion in an abstract institutional surrounding. Both the officer and sergeant voice a language representing the one and only language allowed in the capital in order to torment the oppressed. The officials are in such a powerful institutional position endowing them with power over others. The language they use thus helps them to break the resistance of the oppressed and they are allowed so to torment them not only linguistically:

Elderly woman: I have bread –

The guard jabs her with a stick.

Guard: Forbidden. Language forbidden.

She looks at him. He jabs her. It’s forbidden. (To prisoner) Tell her to speak the language of the capital.

Prisoner: She can’t speak it. (*The Mountain*, 13-14)

Now, the resistance of the elderly woman has been broken. The guard has played with her, showing his powerful position and letting her know how subordinate she is. This situation depicts the hierarchy that exists in every society and proves how a certain language use can serve to not only stress somebody's powerful position but also his or her ability and opportunity to torment others. In *The Mountain Language*, this elderly woman is not strong enough to bear the officials' torment. Firstly, she is not allowed to speak her language, the only language she can speak. Secondly, the officials torture her physically in order to keep her silent and make her do and say what they want.

Towards the end of the play, the rules about the forbidden mountain language suddenly change and the elderly woman is allowed to speak her own tongue. But after such torment and linguistic oppression and coercion, she is not able to speak at all. The effects of such powerful tormenting behaviour are tremendous in this play:

Prisoner: She can speak?

Guard: Yes. Until further notice. New rules.

Pause.

Prisoner: Mother, you can speak.

Pause.

Mother, I'm speaking to you. You see? We can speak. You can speak to me in our own language.

She is still.

You can speak.

Pause.

Mother. Can you hear me? I am speaking to you in our own language.

Pause.

Do you hear me?

Pause.

It's our language.

Pause.

Can't you hear me? Do you hear me?

She does not respond.

Mother?

Guard: Tell her she can speak in her own language. New rules. Until further notice.

Prisoner: Mother?

She does not respond. She sits still.

The prisoner's trembling grows. He falls from the chair on to his knees, begins to gasp and shake violently.

The sergeant walks into the room and studies the prisoner shaking on the floor.

Sergeant: *(To guard)* Look at this. You go out of your way to give them a helping hand and they fuck it up.

Blackout. (The Mountain, 20–22)

In this extract, Pinter skilfully describes the menacing danger of such oppressive conditions and the effects it can have on the individual when power breaks resistance. The final scene of *The Mountain Language* represents an explicit deterrent example of linguistic torture leading to a complete destruction of an individual.

Pinter's *The Birthday Party* is also helpful when analysing the problematic of powerful language more profoundly. Goldberg, achieving his goals and making the other characters behave and respond in a way he wants them to, is the most powerful character of the play. But how does he manage this? There is no violence in the play, there are not even any threats expressed in the conversations. The answer lies in Goldberg's superb technique of verbal manipulation. He is able to lead the conversation where he chooses and he knows how to persuade the other characters to behave according to his desires. He is personified menace, skilful and determined to fulfil his mysterious duty. He can beat the others' resistance and so manipulate them.

The most important part of the play, the cross-examination of Stanley, shows Goldberg's using of several conversational devices with such skill that he gains complete control over Stanley and breaks his resistance. He chooses the conversational topic; he accuses him of several made-up things, insists on using his own phraseology, he makes the elicitation and repeats them several times and never lets Stanley respond. Such repetition together with a rapid pace of the interrogation functions to show the interrogee that he cannot answer although the question is again repeated. Many such pressures make the interrogee be convinced of his own inability to answer the questions, and finally of being guilty of the accusations. Thus Stanley is subjected to both mental and conversational pressure. The flow of the conversation, which Goldberg has chosen, serves a clear purpose. The cooperation between him and McCann runs perfectly smooth. His powers of persuasion are unique: Stanley is made to believe that he should share Goldberg's opinion.

The whole cross-examination is the first step in the play of Stanley's destruction; the main purpose of it is to crush Stanley verbally.

The structure of the cross-examination consists mainly of Wh-questions, which gives a deeper impression of pressure, dominance and verbal manipulation leading to a clearly stated goal. The phrases are constructed as being merely accusations, there is no tie between them and being put separately they make no sense:

Goldberg: Why do you treat that young lady like a leper? She's not the leper, Webber.

Stanley: What the –

Goldberg: What did you wear last week, Webber? Where do you keep your suits?

McCann: Why did you leave the organization?

Goldberg: What would your old mum say, Webber?

McCann: Why did you betray us? (*The Birthday*, 47-48)

At the end of the cross-examination the ties almost do not exist and the pace of the conversation is very rapid. Goldberg and McCann take turns in destroying Stanley in a brainwashing manner and it fits well with the general effect of a careful planning made in advance that is apparent in the successful manipulation. In this phase, Stanley is caught up and is made almost speechless:

Goldberg: Where's your lechery leading you?

McCann: You'll pay for this.

Goldberg: You stuff yourself with dry toast.

McCann: You contaminate womankind.

Goldberg: Why don't you pay the rent?

McCann: Mother defiler!

Goldberg: Why do you pick your nose?

McCann: I demand justice!

Goldberg: What's your trade?

McCann: What about Ireland?

Goldberg: What's your trade?

Stanley: I play the piano. (*The Birthday*, 51)

Both Goldberg and McCann want to persuade Stanley of his unquestionable guilt. A repetition of words or phrases serves to achieve such purpose. The change of personal pronouns during the following extracts also helps to accuse Stanley and show him exactly the direction of such conversation:

Goldberg: What have you done with your wife!

McCann: He's killed his wife!

Goldberg: Why did you kill your wife?

Stanley: (*sitting, his back to the audience*). What wife?

McCann: How did he kill her?

Goldberg: How did you kill her?

McCann: You throttled her!

Goldberg: With arsenic.

McCann: There's your man! (*The Birthday, 49*)

Shortly after this, Goldberg and McCann ask Stanley why he never got married. Thus it is obvious that they accused and tortured him just for the sake of it in order to demonstrate him their power, dominance and superiority.

Following example is going to prove how successful Goldberg and McCann are in achieving their purpose and so manipulating and destroying Stanley and winning the power over him. For a short time, Stanley manages to reply but as the pace increases, Stanley is no longer able to keep up. McCann then comments on Stanley's ignorance as if announcing it to everyone (He doesn't know!), which is repeated by Goldberg to give the phrase more importance:

Goldberg: When did you come to this place?

Stanley: Last year.

Goldberg: Where did you come from?

Stanley: Somewhere else.

Goldberg: Why did you come here?

Stanley: My feet hurt!

Goldberg: Why did you stay?

Stanley: I had a headache!

Goldberg: Did you take anything for it?

Stanley: Yes.

Goldberg: What?

Stanley: Fruit salts!

Goldberg: Enos or Andrews?

Stanley: En – An –

Goldberg: Did you stir properly? Did they fizz?

Stanley: Now, now, wait, you –

Goldberg: Did they fizz? Did they fizz or didn't they fizz?

McCann: He doesn't know!

Goldberg: You don't know. (*The Birthday*, 48)

Another example of Goldberg's excellent verbal manipulation and total control over Stanley is when Goldberg interrupts Stanley's reply and judges it wrong before he has even said it:

Goldberg: When did you last have a bath?

Stanley: I have one every –

Goldberg: Don't lie. (*The Birthday*, 48)

The extract below shows a powerful climax to the interrogation: the familiar and nonsensical – and most irrelevant – question is uttered and repeated with pressing intensity and verve. The result is extremely effective. Stanley is completely confused and does not understand at all what is happening:

Goldberg: Speak up, Webber. Why did the chicken cross the road?

Stanley: He wanted to – he wanted to – he wanted to. ...

McCann: He doesn't know!

Goldberg: Why did the chicken cross the road?

Stanley: He wanted to – he wanted to. ...

Goldberg: Why did the chicken cross the road?

Stanley: He wanted. ...

McCann: He doesn't know. He doesn't know which came first!

Goldberg: Which came first?

McCann: Chicken? Egg? Which came first?

Goldberg and McCann: Which came first? Which came first? Which came first?

Goldberg: He doesn't know. Do you know your own face? Wake him up. Stick a needle in his eye. (*The Birthday*, 51-52)

Finally it is no wonder that Stanley does not respond or try to challenge any accusations. Below is the last phase of the cross-examination proving that Stanley has been made unable to answer even accusations like *You're dead*:

McCann: Who are you, Webber?

Goldberg: What makes you think you exist?

McCann: You're dead.

Goldberg: You're dead. You can't live, you can't think, you can't love. You're dead. You're a plague gone bad. There's no juice in you. You're nothing but an odour!

(*The Birthday*, 52)

The final part of the interrogation starts with McCann's questions *Who are you, Webber?* And finishes with Goldberg's announcement *You're nothing but an odour!* Between these two phrases there is a rapid burst of accusations made by both McCann and Goldberg. The accusations are tied together and come in rapid sequence and some of them are repeated several times. Thus, after all the different stages of torturing Stanley verbally, Goldberg and McCann have managed to reduce Stanley into a speechless creature; they won over him completely.

At the end, the last stage of the verbal destruction of Stanley is to make sure that Stanley is incapable of saying anything no matter how hard he might try. Again, Goldberg takes the leading role in the scene. The scene is a ruthless interrogation in its intensity, resulting in the fact that Stanley is only able to pronounce nonsensical sounds:

Goldberg: You'll be able to make or break, Stan. By my life. (*Silence. Stanley is still.*) Well? What do you say?

Stanley's head lifts very slowly and turns in Goldberg's direction.

Goldberg: What do you think? Eh, boy?

Stanley begins to clench and unclench his eyes.

McCann: What's your opinion, sir? Of this prospect, sir?

Goldberg: Prospect. Sure. Sure it's a prospect.

Stanley's hands clutching his glasses begin to tremble.

What's your opinion of such a prospect? Eh, Stanley?

Stanley concentrates, his mouth opens, he attempts to speak, fails and emits sounds from his throat.

Stanley: Uh-gug ... uh-gug ... eeehhh-gag ... (*On the breath.*) Caahh....
(*The Birthday*, 84)

Nearly all the plays by Harold Pinter show the language used to overpower others. Such language serves to reach certain goals, to apply various social rules and to gain or stress one's position in society. In every institution there is a group of members who are stronger than other members. There are inequalities in every single society and thus the power relations can be born and function. Language, being a unique tool for the members to communicate among them, is chosen according to the certain social position of the participants of the utterances. As Dale Spender puts it:

One group literally has power over the other. This is a simplistic analysis of the workings of power [...]. The group which has the power to ordain the structure of language [...] have the potential to construct a language, a reality, a body of knowledge in which they are central figures, the potential to legitimate their own primacy [...] the potential to create a world in which they are the central figure. (as quoted in Cameron, 97)

Such language is used in certain kinds of institutions, in various political regimes or during various interactions between the conversationalists in different occasions. Language thus becomes an instrument of torture, a medium through which power is exerted between the individuals. Moreover, it can serve to extract confessions from possible traitors, to make people do or say what one wants or such language can be used to a complete destruction of an individual. Pinter's plays are perfect examples of torturing language serving various purposes in the hands of the more powerful participants of linguistic interactions. Pinter's language will be examined more profoundly in the following chapters in order to show some other examples of such threatening use of language serving as a means of power.

Torment is thus the most visible exercise of power by one human being over another and all verbal confrontations; all dialogues in fact, contain an element of a power struggle. Martin Esslin describes such situations as ones where "one of the interlocutors will dominate, the other will have difficulty in getting a word in edgewise; one will have the wider vocabulary, a quicker response reaction than the other" (as quoted in Burkman, 32).

In other words, hardly ever in an encounter there are two participants of the same level of intelligence. There is always “one leaping ahead in the exchange while another stumbles confusedly along behind” (Taylor, *Anger and After*, 294). Consequently, verbal cruelty is hidden in any dialogic situation and thus all the social interactions offer a possibility to grab an opportunity to linguistically overpower the other participant. The more articulate confuses the less articulate with, for example, questions he cannot understand, to which he cannot respond and so terrifies and threatens him. Examples of such practices and division of linguistic strategies that are used to overpower other participants verbally are described later on in this paper.

As mentioned before, verbal torture is the basic topic in the plays *The Mountain Language* and *The Birthday Party*. Pinter has skilfully written these plays in order to show how language is used as a means of power, what linguistic techniques are used to struggle for dominance and what forms of resistances the other participants use in order to protect themselves against such language and power.

Different degrees of power in language are reached when gender is taken into a consideration. The relationship between language and gender has always been of a great interest to various theorists and feminist researchers working on issues of dominance. The differences “between women and men in terms of amount of talk and access to the ‘floor’ as indicators of asymmetrical distribution of social power” (Thornborrow, 27) have been widely discussed among specialists. According to Tannen, there are various studies which examine linguistic strategies that women use differently than men in order to gain domination or, sometimes unwillingly, to stay inferior because “in a society structured along a series of unequal divisions, there are clearly a number of groups who have power in relation to other groups: men, whites, managers... The form of domination and subordination are by no means always identical” (as quoted in Cameron, 103).

Inevitably, there is the issue of power highly involved. Power is manifest in current conversational rules, cultural values, possession of resources, or social norms. Moreover, “there is institutional power owned only by men” (as quoted in Cameron, 301).

By the language the members of these two groups of gender use, one can easily recognize the various social positions and power relationships. When speaking about the power – language – gender relationship, one must be aware of the social position of the two genders. When groups of speakers have particular position in society, their language and use of linguistic strategies correspond to, or reflect, their social situation and status. According to McConnell-Ginet, “women’s favored styles of language use are often negatively evaluated by

the larger community, for example, and women are frequently victims of male oppression in discourse, suffering interruptions and inattention to their conversational contributions” (as quoted in Cameron, 198).

But, despite such typical features which female use of language is characterized by, it must not be omitted that women have other linguistic advantages than men, for example “woman is linguistically quicker than man; quicker to learn, quicker to hear, and quicker to answer [...] the lowest degree of linguistic imbecility is rarely found among women” (as quoted in Cameron, 236).

In other words, women are able to use their language as a means of power in a slightly different way than men can do. Women use their feminine tools to get what they want and to regulate the game they will play with the men around them. They also dominate by the speed of their reaction. Taylor claims that “men who act will always dominate men who stop to think; women think and act simultaneously, as though with some deep unquestioning instinct, and therefore dominate both” (22).

When talking about woman – power – language relationship, the non-verbal means of communication are of a high importance. Women use non-verbal language more often and in a more advanced way in order to give their utterance a bigger significance. Moreover, women have the advantage of sexuality at their disposal, representing a much-demanded commodity. Woman’s sexuality can serve as an aggressive weapon of seduction, which a woman can use, in conjunction with her linguistic skills, to torture her opponent. Then one can speak about the “assault of linguistic and sexual power” (Almansi, 65).

Pinter’s play *The Homecoming* is a clear example of the gender – power – language game. The main theme of this play is a battle for domination in a sexual context. It depicts a family struggle for power over each other and at the same time the strategic and sexual power game of Ruth. She is the wife of Teddy, together with whom she has come from America to visit Teddy’s family living in London. Teddy is the oldest son of Max who shares the household with other two sons and his brother Sam. Ruth, after realizing her proprietary and territorial possibilities, uses her female potentiality to lead a cruel fight for a powerful position in such a male family. She coolly uses her sexuality and female language as the major weapon to win over the others. Pinter’s *The Homecoming* is thus about skilful verbal and non-verbal techniques that are used by a woman to get a profitable, advantageous position in an institution.

On the first night of Teddy and Ruth's arrival, a surprise meeting with Lenny, Ruth's brother-in-law happens. In a show-off manner Lenny talks about himself and about brutal acts he committed against women. Ruth's reaction is surprising in that she not only accepts these weird tales as completely natural but also starts provoking Lenny erotically. When Lenny decides that Ruth's unfinished glass of water should be removed, she decides it shouldn't:

Ruth: If you take the glass...I'll take you.

Pause.

Lenny: How about me taking the glass without you taking me?

Ruth: Why don't I just take you?

Pause.

Lenny: You're joking.

Pause.

You're in love, anyway, with another man. You've had a secret liaison with another man. His family didn't even know. Then you come here without a word of warning and start to make trouble.

She picks up the glass and lifts it towards him.

Ruth: Have a sip. Go on. Have a sip from my glass.

He is still.

Sit on my lap. Take a long cool sip.

She pats her lap. Pause.

She stands, moves to him with the glass.

Put your head back and open your mouth.

Lenny: Take that glass away from me.

Ruth: Lie on the floor. Go on. I'll pour it down your throat.

Lenny: What are you doing, making me some kind of proposal?

She laughs shortly, drains the glass.

Ruth: Oh, I was thirsty.

She smiles at him, puts the glass down, goes into the hall and up the stairs.
(*The Homecoming*, 34-35)

In this scene, Lenny did all the talking but when Ruth speaks she cuts everything straight through. That indicates that she is very much in control of the situation woman versus man. It is the power of sexuality together with the skilful use of linguistic strategies that help women to reach their goals. This scene shows Ruth's strength and Lenny's weakness. She perceives his vulnerability and disarms him very skilfully. She is aware of his erotic fantasies that make him inferior to her as they make him weak and dependent on her. "She is the powerful erotic lover-to-be who might possess him" (as quoted in Lahr, 55). Ruth says little but governs the conversational pace and she always controls Lenny. She even calls him Leonard, as his dead mother used to do.

Ruth is the pivot of the play cancelling her bonds with her husband in order to rule this strange family and get the best piece of property and territory. The homecoming is hers, not of

her husband. She knows intuitively the rules of this institution and its power games and she knows how to manipulate its members. All her actions represent a straight struggle for power. The dirt and aggression of the London house provide the environment that Ruth needs. It's summed up in a speech of Max, Teddy's father: "I've never had a whore under this roof before. Ever since your mother died" (42). Ruth does not see anything inappropriate in it and takes it as a compliment. Moreover, she uses her body language and sexuality so skilfully whilst talking that her power over all the male members of the institution is very clearly visible. Taylor stresses that "in the battle for power, naturally the body wins out over the mind" (as quoted in Lahr, 63).

When the males are talking about philosophical matters, struggling for power among themselves, not even noticing Ruth, she suddenly jumps into the conversation and attracts everybody's attention to herself, using her sexuality and seductive manners, showing them openly her powerful position:

Ruth: Don't be too sure though. You've forgotten something. Look at me. I...move my leg. That's all it is. But I wear...underwear...which moves with me...it...captures your attention. Perhaps you misinterpret. The action is simple. It's a leg...moving. My lips move. Why don't you restrict...your observation to that? Perhaps the fact that they move is more significant...than the words which come through them. You must bear that...possibility...in mind.

Silence. (The Homecoming, 52-53)

The power of her speech is thus stressed by her sexuality. The importance of such non-verbal signals must not be underestimated when analysing language as a means of power. Particularly with reference to gender, such signals of sexuality must be considered because woman's talk can be a powerful and relatively effective means of gaining a favourable position or even superiority over men in a cross-sex verbal interaction. The final degree of power gained depends on context and social status as well. Women can then easily, and Ruth does so in *The Homecoming*, control the situation rather than be controlled by it.

After Ruth has been sexually initiated into the new family, she realizes her new powerful position and cunningly continues in getting what she wants. After rolling on the floor with Joey, another brother-in-law, while Lenny, the older one, stands above observing the rite, she gets up. In a new deliciously authoritative tone, she demands a drink. When receiving it, she just sternly states:

Ruth: What's this glass? I can't drink out of this. Haven't you got a tumbler?

Lenny: Yes. (*The Homecoming*, 60-61)

The game continues and Ruth's desire for powerful dominance over the others strengthens. She uses her sensuality, seductive gestures and ambiguous, double sensual language to create even more dominant position among the males. The whisky scene continues:

Lenny: On the rocks? Or as it comes?

Ruth: Rocks? What do you know about rocks?

Lenny: We've got rocks. But they're frozen stiff in the fridge. (*The Homecoming*, 61)

Ruth's strategic intentions are clearly visible throughout every interaction with the family members. She has been given some kind of legitimacy, a role, and she begins to act it. Now she becomes alive and open to her own possibilities, to complication, to life in its intensity. Again, female linguistic tactics and tone of voice help her to achieve her goals step-by-step:

Lenny: Well, the evenings are drawing in.

Ruth: Yes, it's getting dark.

Pause.

Lenny: Winter'll soon be upon us. Time to renew one's wardrobe.

Pause.

Ruth: That's a good thing to do.

Lenny: What? (*The Homecoming*, 56)

Lustfully she plays a game with the others, being self secure about the new position she is gaining and realizing that she can go even further. Ruth wants the maximum in that given situation and she is willing to do everything for it by using her sexuality, cunning language and skilful linguistic strategies as main tools. The male members of the family, being surprised at first, accept such game and play it hard as well. But they do not realize the cruelty of Ruth's rules and keep on thinking that they are winning over her and manipulating her into a position favourable for them. In fact, it is Ruth who wins because, as mentioned in Chapter 2, when the power is unrealised and unacknowledged, power relations work better and are much more effective.

Towards the end of the play, Ruth takes in the situation – a houseful of males who have not had a woman living on the premises since the mother died – and moves straight towards her target. She is willing to exchange her great material life in America for a shabby surrounding in dirty London. But to put it in other words, she wants to exchange her inferior position with her boring husband for a dominant powerful role in her new family:

Teddy: Ruth...the family have invited you to stay, for a little while longer. As a...as a kind of guest. If you like the idea I don't mind. We can manage very easily at home...until you come back.

Ruth: How very nice of them. (*The Homecoming*, 75)

And after a little bit of hesitation, Ruth's relations with the family start to consist of extended bargaining: she has sex to offer, they have territory, and in the end they strike a deal:

Max: No, you'd just have to bring in a little, that's all. A few pennies. Nothing much. It's just that we're waiting for Joey to hit the top as a boxer. When Joey hits the top...well...

Pause.

Teddy: Or you can come home with me.

Lenny: We'd get you a flat.

Pause. (*The Homecoming*, 76)

She wants to translate sexual power into real estate, and she does so by specifying precisely the property she desires – the number of rooms, services, domestic assistance, wardrobe –and putting the whole thing in contractual terms. She does not want sex so much as sex power; she is more interested in the power. She does not trust these men; she wants her rights clearly defined. In the end, Ruth is only too aware of her power; she frivolously bargains to claim the spoils:

Ruth: A flat?

Lenny: Yes.

Ruth: Where?

Lenny: In town.

Pause.

But you'd live here, with us. (*The Homecoming*, 76)

After a discussion about number of rooms, bathrooms and a personal maid, Ruth cold-bloodedly continues. Her tactics are cruel, lusty but precise and cunning:

Lenny: We'd supply everything. Everything you need.

Ruth: I'd need an awful lot. Otherwise I wouldn't be content.

Lenny: You'd have everything.

Ruth: I would naturally want to draw up an inventory of everything I would need, which would require your signatures in the presence of witnesses.

Lenny: Naturally.

Ruth: All aspects of the agreement and conditions of employment would have to be clarified to our mutual satisfaction before we finalized the contract.

Lenny: Of course.

Pause.

Ruth: Well, it might prove a workable arrangement. (*The Homecoming*, 77-78)

The female is the sexual specialist, and the exercise of that function robs her of nothing. Sexually, she retains the whip hand – a point that Pinter emphasises in the last scene when the apparently victorious Max and the other men lie or kneel around her, beseeching her favour. She is the queen bee, not the captive. All the men’s attempts to dominate her, Ruth turns to her own advantage, and she emerges as the most powerful figure in the play. Her own tactics are absolutely clear. Her husband is returning to America alone:

Ruth: Eddie.

Teddy turns.

Pause.

Don’t become a stranger.

Teddy goes, shuts the front door.

Silence. (The Homecoming, 80)

Ruth turns from business-like talk about prostitution to call her husband by a name not used before: “Eddie”, and then: “Don’t become a stranger” – a phrase which seems to express a concern but does not change anything about the present situation. She is not to be defined wholly by her obvious talents and her manner of half-mocking speech. Ruth, a significant “pinteresque” character, is important for her powerful words through which she expresses much more than can be said with words. Esslin describes Ruth’s powerful behaviour in *The Peopled Wound*:

Then Ruth speaks: she calls him – “Eddie”.

Throughout the play Ruth has never addressed Teddy by his name. Talking to the others she has referred to him, as they have, as Teddy. The fact that she now calls him by a different name, the name which no doubt was the one she used when they were alone, thus acquires a particular force.

Teddy turns. (241)

... Only five words, only eight syllables are actually spoken in that whole passage: “Eddie. ... Don’t become a stranger”. But through the surprise use of a name, through a pregnant pause and an utterly final silence, and through the subtle ambiguity of a phrase which is both a cliché and yet carries a literal meaning of deep, tragic, impact, Pinter has put a wealth of drama, psychological profundity, suspense, irony and pathos into those eight syllables. (242)

The scene continues in a heavy, bloody atmosphere when almost no words are spoken. The deafening silence, for Pinter typical, is more expressive than a torrent of words would be.

The three men stand.

Ruth sits relaxed in her chair.

...

Joey walks slowly across the room.

He kneels at her chair.

She touches his head, lightly.

He puts his head in her lap.

Max begins to move above them, backwards and forwards.

Lenny stands still.

...

He [Max] falls to his knees, whimpers, begins to moan and sob.

He stops sobbing, crawls past Sam's body round her chair, to the other side of her.

I'm not an old man.

He looks up at her.

Do you hear me?

He raises his face to her.

Kiss me.

She continues to touch Joey's head, lightly.

Lenny stands, watching.

Curtain. (The Homecoming, 80–82)

Ruth is at the centre of the final tableau. She finally gets her position, clearly emphasizing her central dominance. Pinter himself has commented that there is “no certainty that her future lies in prostitution and usage by this family” (as quoted in Lahr, 56). But certain is that whatever decision will have to be taken, it will be hers, without reference to the male members of the household. In any case, Ruth is a complete, mature character. Her refusal of masculine control shows how strong her character is and how deeply it is enforced by her sexuality. She, a woman, is the winner in such a male society and her powerful female linguistic skills supported by her taking advantage of her sexuality stay in contrast to the male characters and their male habits. These males are unable to think beyond the stereotypes of a patriarchal society and behave according to their animal instincts. She cunningly uses this advantage to reach her goals.

Another example of a woman, linguistically gaining a powerful position in a totally absurd, oppressive surrounding can be found in *The Mountain Language*. One of the few characters in the Pinter's play is a *young woman*. Pinter deliberately does not give his characters' names in this play in order to show how insignificant they are in that given situation. The *young woman* comes to a prison to visit her husband who has been captured

without any reason. She is supposed to belong to the mountain people, who do not speak the language of the capital. Thus her social position among the officials in that absurd world is insignificant and purposeless. Despite being in such situation, the *young woman* is able not only to show that although coming from the mountains, she can speak the language of the capital but she can linguistically fight with the officials as well, responding skilfully to their offences. Moreover, this woman is able to clearly state her name and so step out of the facelessness.

Already in the first scene, when all women are waiting to visit their imprisoned men, the young woman, holding the elderly one, is the only one who replies to strict orders of the officials. She is the strong character, not being afraid to show her female power by demanding her rights. Her strength proved by brisk and clever comments make the officials stop the absurd questioning.

Sergeant: Name!

Young woman: We've given our names.

Sergeant: Name?

Young woman: We've given our names.

Sergeant: Name?

Officer: (*To sergeant*) Stop this shit. (*To young woman*) Any complaints?

(*The Mountain, 5*)

This short piece of conversation represents a linguistic power game. The sergeant has a powerful social position that allows him to use certain language and makes him more important than the young woman. But this woman, by using only two sentences puts herself linguistically in a more powerful position. Thus officer, having a higher hierarchical post starts to speak with this woman. Few sentences later, the sergeant, by repeating the same question, tries to overpower her again, but the officer's comment towards him: "Shut up." (6) represents acceptance and respect of the woman's personality.

But the verbal torment and complete oppression continues in this scene. The elderly woman has been bitten by a dog and the young woman tries to help her by using her female personality and verbal skills.

Officer: What was the name of this dog?

She looks at him.

Young woman: I don't know his name.

Sergeant: With permission sir?

Officer: Go ahead.

Sergeant: Your husbands, your sons, your fathers, these men you have been waiting to see, are shithouses. They are enemies of the State. They are shithouses.

The officer steps towards the women. (The Mountain, 9)

The officials have quickly realized that he is losing the control over this young woman. Thus he starts to offend the women's relatives. He uses his social status, which places him in a powerful position as a weapon over the women. Then the officer starts a monologue in which he defines who the mountain people are, how inferior they are and that their language is forbidden. The young lady coolly and powerfully replies: "I do not speak the mountain language" (10). She verbally showed her equivalence with the officials and her single sentence, together with her female personality helped her to become a winner in that absurd situation. But the officials, being men, are not able to accept this. Firstly, they are officials and she is a visitor in the prison. Thus she has a lower social position and almost no rights. Secondly, she comes from the mountains, probably speaks the mountain language, which places her on an even lower hierarchical position in this society. Moreover, she is a woman and these officials do not respect a female like they do a male. So the scenes continues:

Silence. The officer and sergeant slowly circle her. The sergeant puts his hand on her bottom.

Sergeant: What language do you speak? What language do you speak with your arse?

Officer: These women, Sergeant, have as yet committed no crime. Remember that.

Sergeant: Sir! But you're not saying they're without sin?

Officer: Oh, no. Oh, no, I'm not saying that.

Sergeant: This one's full of it. She bounces with it. (*The Mountain, 10-11*)

This is a clear example, how these two males use the power of their social position and their gender to show their strength to this young woman. Her gender makes her position weak, together with her "mountain" origin and the officials' commonsense assumptions about the mountain people and women in general make her weak and inferior to them. Linguistically and physically as well, they oppress and torment her, putting her in a very unpleasant situation. But the woman's response is surprisingly powerful. She is a very strong female

character, knowing her rights and being aware about the social equality between the two genders:

Young woman: My name is Sara Johnson. I have come to see my husband. It is my right. Where is he? (*The Mountain*, 11)

By stating her name, her anonymity is broken; she suddenly appears in front of the two male officials as a human being having her name. The officials have nothing else to do but respect this, because even their dogs have a name and “they clearly state it before they bite” (8). She wins her rights for herself with her language serving as a main weapon. The officials’ institutional power is beaten. But still they use their apparent male power towards her:

Sergeant: So is she. She looks like a fucking intellectual to me.

Officer: But you said her arse wobbled.

Sergeant: Intellectual arses wobble the best. (*The Mountain*, 11-12)

But even if offending her female characteristics, they respect her rights and let her visit her husband. This woman has been placed in a very unpleasant position. It is a situation where she can do nothing else except fight for her rights by all means and so she does. Her main weapon is thus her language and linguistic skills, which supported by her strong female personality help her to gain the powerful position she needs.

To sum up, the omnipresence of power in discourse must not be underestimated when analysing language. Power makes every single utterance a powerful weapon. To what extent this potentiality is used depends on the speakers. In this chapter, the examples from the Pinter’s plays serve as demonstrations of powerful language. In all the cases, such language is used in a conversation with others serving as a means of power. The specific linguistic strategies that can be used in discourse in order to make it powerful will be examined in the fifth chapter. The following chapter deals with a specific use of language in a theatrical

movement called the Absurd drama and in this light the Pinter's personal language use is described.

4. Absurd Drama and Harold Pinter's Language

At the time when the British theatre was looking for new possibilities, another trend of development of the contemporary theatre was flourishing both outside Britain and inside it. That was the type of drama called the Theatre of the Absurd. The dramatists like Harold Pinter; generally regarded as representatives of the absurd drama, do not form any self-proclaimed school or movement. They are individuals with their own personal approach both to subject matter and form, but they happen to have a great deal in common. Their work expresses the anguish of people and the absurdity of the present-day conditions; problems of life and death, isolation and communication. Language is employed in order to show the essential loneliness of the human condition where there is a constant preoccupation with failure, dread and death.

The world displayed in the plays of the dramatists of the absurd is mad, distorted and grotesque, the characters are mysterious, their actions incomprehensible. A significant characteristic of the absurd play is that it is a poetic image rather than a sequential narrating of events and "therefore it uses a language based on patterns of specific images rather than argument and discursive speech" (Esslin, *The Absurd*, 393).

While the traditional plays with linear plots develop gradually, event by event, in time, an absurd play does not tell a story but communicates a pattern of poetic images making "in the spectator's mind a total, complex impression of a basic, and static, situation" (Esslin, *The Absurd*, 393). A poetic image combines visual elements, movements, light, and language.

Despite the playwrights of the absurd tradition have a different attitude to language itself; generally, the lack of cohesion and coherence in the absurd drama symbolizes the failures of human beings to communicate and to understand each other. The dialogue is full of verbal misunderstandings, mishearings and anticipations which are proved to be wrong. But the problem of communication is seldom a failure or inability to communicate; rather it is an unwillingness to converse. As Pinter himself has put it:

I think that we communicate only too well, in our silence, in what is unsaid, and that what takes place is continual evasion, desperate rearguard attempts to keep ourselves to ourselves. Communication is too alarming. To enter into someone else's life is too frightening. To disclose to others the poverty within us is too fearsome a possibility. (as quoted in Taylor, 25)

There is a radical devaluation of language that goes toward a poetry that is to emerge from specific images of the stage itself becoming disintegrated and being unfolded in a meaningless pattern. It is a language that “conceals rather than reveals” (Esslin, *The Absurd*, 399). What happens on the stage is often in a contradiction with the words spoken by the characters. In other words, it is “drama which says more in mumbles, mutters and broken phrases than has been said in generations of literary articulateness” (as quoted in Kennedy, 25).

The following example taken from Pinter’s play *The Birthday Party* represents a typical, absurd conversation. There are two members of the same organization but just one of them seems to know why they are there and what their task is. Goldberg is evidently quicker, manages to keep the pace, meanwhile McCann is stumbling behind him, not sufficiently catching Goldberg’s hints and jokes. Yet this dialogue is an example of a power struggle, typical for Pinter’s absurd drama:

McCann: Is this it?

Goldberg: This is it.

McCann: Are you sure?

Goldberg: Sure I’m sure.

Pause.

McCann: What now?

Goldberg: Don’t worry yourself, McCann. Take a seat.

McCann: What about you?

Goldberg: What about me?

McCann: Are you going to take a seat?

Goldberg: We’ll both take a seat. (*The Birthday Party*, 27)

Goldberg always has the last word; this conversation underlines his overall dominance. Nevertheless, McCann also manages to hold the floor and get his message heard and answered. He keeps on making elicitation, which seem to be the only way to dominate in a conversation with Goldberg. The conversation is almost funny and ironical in its essence. Such communication serves more to misunderstand the other participant than to understand. However this is the method the authors of the absurd tradition use to show the purposeless and useless world.

Better understanding of the basic principles that the authors of the absurd tradition have in common can help to apprehend the plays of this movement in a proper way. No matter what objections modern critiques have about the pigeonholing of Harold Pinter into this movement, the fact is, that the plays of Pinter have the typical signs of this tradition. The way he uses and manipulates language is thus the crucial absurd feature. Pinter's skilful use of language in order to dominate the others is crucial for this paper. Linguistic strategies that are used for the purpose of manipulation and overpowering of others will be examined in detail in the following chapter.

Martin Esslin sums up the absurd tradition and its basic characteristics and provides a revealing perspective on Pinter's use of language in this light. His comparison with traditional forms of theatre allows one to comprehend this issue completely:

If a good play must have a cleverly constructed story, these have no story or plot to speak of; if a good play is judged by subtlety of characterization and motivation, these are often without recognizable characters and present the audience with almost mechanical puppets; if a good play has to have a fully explained theme, which is neatly exposed and finally solved, these often have neither a beginning nor an end; if a good play is to hold the mirror up to nature and portray the manners and mannerisms of the age in finely observed sketches, these seem often to be reflections of dreams and nightmares; if a good play relies on witty repartee and pointed dialogue, these often consist of incoherent babblings. (as quoted in Hinchliffe, *Pinter*, 10–11)

Absurd drama is a tradition that has highly influenced many dramatists throughout the world. It is a kind of drama that is based on real life and its essence. Even if the theatre of the absurd finds life meaningless, purposeless and completely useless, the conversation style it uses to describe these „nauseous“ feelings is very vivid and real. It depicts real life situations, sometimes even making fun of serious matters and thus it creates a stream in drama and theatrical language that is far from being meaningless. Kennedy's statement that “what is needed is a critical awareness of the power of the inarticulate, its intensity and immediacy” (25) describes how important that kind of language is. It does not have a proper form, it does not keep the traditional theatrical rules but still it reveals more than a traditional theatre play. A dialogue of the absurd lacks continuity and the participants often do not understand or do not want to understand each other, but it precisely depicts how people think and how they communicate in the contemporary world. Conversation in the absurd gives clear evidence about the day-to-day conversation.

Harold Pinter is widely regarded as one whose oeuvre carries the typical signs of the absurd drama. Beside this, he is one of the most important British dramatists of the second half of the 20th century, whose idiom is extremely English; indeed it is much based on London East End, cockney Jewish language. His plays are rooted in English life and phraseology but at the same time all the plays deal with universal topics and are widely understandable. Martin Esslin, being one of the most important critics of Pinter summarises his oeuvre as follows: "Pinter's plays contain much that is immediately fascinating, entertaining, and amusing: the brilliance of the dialogue, the precision of the nuances and overtones of language" (as quoted in Lahr, 8).

Moreover, Pinter's plots are slight, and can be resumed in few words. He neither explains where his characters come from, nor the causes of their attitudes and actions. Their social background is suggested only by hints and remarks. For Pinter, the major characteristics of his characters are their sex and age. All of the remaining information is to be revealed as the plays proceed through their dialogues.

As mentioned above, Harold Pinter's oeuvre has signs of the absurd tradition. Despite the typical features the dramatists of the absurd have in common, Pinter's style is highly personal. Throughout his work, certain basic themes can be detected creating his very personal style and idiom. Typical Pinter's themes are nameless menace, verbal torment, power struggles for domination, erotic fantasy, obsession and jealousy, family hatred, relationship between male and female or mental disturbance. Esslin describes Pinter's characteristics as "the uncannily cruel accuracy of his reproduction of the inflections and rambling irrelevancy of everyday speech; the commonplace situation that is gradually invested with menace, dread, and mystery; the deliberate omission of an explanation or a motivation for the action" (Esslin, *The Absurd*, 265).

The most appreciated, developed and for this paper the most important aspect of Pinter's work that distinguishes him, is his use of language. Despite his use of very short sentences and an extreme economy, it is the language that is crucial for the plays and through which everything is revealed. What is more, Pinter's language has become such a famous phenomenon that his name has been adopted as descriptive of a type of theatre under the term "pinteresque" or "pinterish". Despite Pinter's own refusal of this "pinteresque" label, Hayman describes the "pinteresque" drama as based on "the irrationality of everyday conversation, its bad syntax, tautologies, pleonasms, repetitions, *non sequiturs* and self-contradictions. The characters are not only uninterested in listening; they're hardly interested in what they're saying themselves" (2).

Pinter is famous for possessing an ear for everyday speech. Taylor claims that Pinter has depicted "the constant tugs-of-war in normal speech" (24). But instead of merely reproducing such speech, however, Pinter cuts it to minimum, shapes it and makes poetry out of it. As he does so, he gives this language a deep meaning. Martin Esslin describes Pinter's artistic manipulation of an everyday speech as following:

Pinter's dialogue is as tightly - perhaps more tightly - controlled than verse. Every syllable, every inflection, the succession of long and short sounds, words and sentences, is calculated to nicety. And precisely the repetitiousness, the discontinuity, the circularity of ordinary vernacular speech are here used as formal elements with which the poet can compose his linguistic ballet. (Esslin, *The Wound*, 217-218)

Naturally, Pinter's dialogue is familiar and realistic on one side but not at all familiar on the other side. Immediately familiar is the use of clauses and the use of everyday phrases,

repetitions and hesitations. What makes it unfamiliar is that Pinter then orchestrates this and uses it to create something artificial. But all of these serve to show absurd situations and conversations; his plays reflect real life without scruples and his characters reflect ordinary people in ordinary lives.

Pinter's language is also expanded by its rhythms. All of his plays have a rhythm that makes them proceed quickly, regularly and the message they carry is very clearly transmitted. Pinter artistically plays with the rhythm throughout his plays creating passages of tension or relieve. The overall pattern of his plays is musical and rhythmic. Esslin wrote about Pinter: "He is a fine craftsman and makes superb use of rhythms and silences" (Esslin, *Encyclopaedia*, 214). Not only are tempo and rhythm important but also stress is the point that matters in Pinter's play. Sometimes the main point comes just in a long-awaited key word and the stress can tell where the meaning is. Pinter himself said: "I'm very conscious of rhythm. It's got to happen 'snap, snap' – just like that or it's wrong. I'm also interested in pitch" (as quoted in Lahr, 129).

Pinter is able to reproduce everyday conversations in all their repetitiveness, incoherence and lack of logic and grammar. His original perfect ear for such spoken language helps him to reproduce all the repetitions, tautologies and nonsense of actual speech. He records the misunderstandings that arise from an inability to listen, mishearings, the deliberate use of grand words to impress less articulate characters, the continuing small-talk:

As a dramatist Pinter explores such inadequacies of words, the presuppositions of speech and the barriers to comprehension. But he is not a destructive investigator; he also delights in words, teases them, appears to wait for them, and purposely avoids them. Interplay between confidence in words and fear of them and between what is meant and what is betrayed, is a constant source of excitement in Pinter's stage dialogue, as if it were the lifeblood and the nerves of all his writing. (Brown, *Theatre Language*, 17)

Pinter says that "communication is so frightening that rather than do that there is continual cross talk about other things" (as quoted in Tynan, A13). This idea is highly developed in Pinter's plays. His characters usually talk about non-relevant things in order to avoid certain topics, or to fill empty moments and unpleasant encounters. Such small talks can be also strategically used to find out some details about the other and so start a

power struggle game. The linguistic strategy of questioning will be further discussed in the following chapter.

Such irrelevant conversations with cruel intentions can be found in *The Birthday Party*. When Goldberg and McCann arrive, the former one tries to find out as much as possible about his future victim Stanley while using this strategic small talk. Meg, the owner of a boarding house represents an easy victim for Goldberg's superior linguistic techniques as well. Goldberg's use of manipulative techniques makes Meg answer all the queries without realizing possible danger:

Goldberg: What does he do, your husband?

Meg: He's a deck-chair attendant.

Goldberg: Oh, very nice!

Meg: Yes, he's out in all weathers.

She begins to take her purchases from her bag.

Goldberg: Of course. And your guest? Is he a man?

Meg: A man?

Goldberg: Or a woman?

Meg: No. A man.

Goldberg: Been here long?

Meg: He's been here about a year now.

Goldberg: Oh yes. A resident. What's his name?

Meg: Stanley Webber.

Goldberg: Oh yes? Does he work here?

Meg: He used to work. He used to be a pianist. In a concert party on the pier.

Goldberg: Oh yes? On the pier, eh? Does he play a nice piano?

Meg: Oh, lovely. (*The Birthday*, 31)

Such small talk seems to be an unimportant social conversation with no special reason in it. But if analysed deeply, it represents Goldberg's strategic questioning in order to prepare himself for the taking over of Stanley. Goldberg is a dominant character in *The Birthday Party* and Pinter artistically depicts in this play Goldberg's linguistic strategies used for his manipulative purposes.

Consequently, another typical feature of Pinter's drama is a struggle for dominance. It is one of the most important and significant themes in several of Pinter's plays. It is the

language in his plays that serves as a powerful weapon used for blistering tactics in a series of encounters in order to get the floor, and overpower others. In Pinter's plays, language not only serves to hide true feelings or to confuse others, but also to manipulate and dominate them. In order to do so, Pinter's characters use all possible weapons – cunning, potency, intelligence, and also the authority he or she possesses. Such tricky language represents a “language where under what is said another thing is being said” (Kennedy, 174). Brown describes the linguistic struggle for dominance in Pinter's plays as follows:

It doesn't particularly matter who comes off best; for life, ultimately, still has to be got on with. Hence, although the struggle for dominance may, as Pinter has conceded, be a “repeated theme in my plays”, at its most expressive it is not an abstract, chessboard struggle, or a staking of territorial claims in an emotional jungle, but an exploration of the consequences of interaction between people engaged in usually insignificant endeavours that may not seem particularly civilised but are always, for better or worse, the products of civilisation (*Theatre Language*, 185)

A struggle for linguistic dominance, in other words a power struggle, is a topic of all the three sample plays by Pinter being analysed throughout this paper. The linguistic struggles are elaborate and the cunning attempts to dominate and use other people in these plays are very cruel and calculating. Such dialogues always represent life-and-death battles under a constant sense of threat. The following example is taken from *The Homecoming*:

Max. On the back seat? What about the armrest, was it up or down?

Sam: I've never done that kind of thing in my car.

Max: Above all that kind of thing, are you, Sam?

Sam: Too true.

Max? Above having a good bang on the back seat, are you?

Sam: Yes, I leave that to others.

Max: You leave it to others? What others? You paralysed prat!

Sam: I don't mess up my car! Or my...boss's car! Like other people.

Max: Other people? What other people?

Pause.

What other people?

Pause.

Sam: Other people.” (*The Homecoming*, 15)

Similar dialogues appear constantly in this play. They depict the power struggles and the constant fights among the characters. During conversations like in the extract above, shifts in power happen and Pinter's plays like *The Homecoming* or *The Birthday Party* show verbal battles for dominance and control of the other characters. In *The Homecoming*, all the

members of that strange family fight for dominance in a different way: “They [family relatives] walk over him [Teddy], as they have always done, and then his wife, cool, feline, imperturbably in control of the situation, proceeds to walk over them” (Taylor, 21).

Pinter has created many dialogues that are almost ironically absurd showing various possibilities of domination in *The Homecoming*. The verbal duels are of a deadly nature and the connection between cruelty and sexuality becomes very strongly apparent to the surface. But there is no physical violence; all the battles are fought linguistically:

Max: Not that paper. I haven't even read that paper. I'm talking about last Sunday's paper. I was just having a look at it in the kitchen.

Pause.

Do you hear what I'm saying? I'm talking to you! Where's the scissors?

Lenny: (*looking up, quietly*). Why don't you shut up, you daft prat?

Max lifts his stick and points it at him.

Max: Don't you talk to me like that. I'm warning you. (*The Homecoming, 7*)

There is a life-and-death struggle going on in the dialogues between Lenny and Max, his father and between Max and his brother, Sam. No matter whether they quarrel, discuss something or ask questions. In every single word they utter, the tension appears and the verbal fight for dominance becomes visible. Pinter's main tactic in this play is the usage of dialogues based on principles in which words that the characters actually say are divorced from what they mean.

In the three sample plays, a dialogue in which a torturer, or an oppressor, always lurks behind all the verbal exchanges occurs very often. They contain a typical Pinter's feature: menace. A combination of this menacing atmosphere, verbal assault and physical threatening appears in *The Mountain Language*. What is more, the torturers are speaking in the presence of their victims, talking about them as if they were not there, giving so to their utterance even deeper importance and significance:

Sergeant: Your husbands, your sons, your fathers, these men you have been waiting to see, are shithouses. They are enemies of the State. They are shithouses. (*The Mountain, 9*)

The officials keep on telling to the mountain people that their language is forbidden. They deprive them so of the only language they have. By doing so, the torturers have an immense power and influence over the oppressed. Such strong powerful combination of tools used for getting dominance is threateningly effective. Moreover, the torturers are helped by the power of institution they are members of; by their hierarchical status in that institution and by the language they speak:

Silence. The officer and sergeant slowly circle her. The sergeant puts his hand on her bottom.

Sergeant: What language do you speak? What language do you speak with your arse?

Officer: These women, Sergeant, have as yet committed no crime. Remember that.

Sergeant: Sir! But you're not saying they're without sin?

Officer: Oh, no. Oh, no. I'm not saying that.

Sergeant: This one's full of it. She bounces with it. (*The Mountain*, 10-11)

This extract is a clear evidence of how Pinter's characters fight for domination through verbal fencing. Such dialogues represent a cruel strive for dominance, power and authority over others by all means; they use their social status, verbal possibilities and physical strength as well. Pinter's plays are full of life-and-death power struggles, linguistic and also crudely physical in the shadow of mysterious organizations, or institutions creating thus menacing atmosphere full of verbal torture and indications of physical execution.

Personal violence rather than public politics is a theme that runs through Pinter's early plays. Typically, these power struggles take place in enclosed spaces, detached from the real world. Pinter's most characteristic stage represents shabby houses with threatening atmosphere. There is the menacing possibility of a stranger entering. His is the theatre of sad boarding houses and inhabited rooms. The power struggles and seedy interiors are main topics in *The Birthday party* or *The Homecoming*.

There is a boarding house in *The Birthday party* in which the atmosphere alone is menacing. After the arrival of two strangers whose reasons and motivations are never explained, a brutal power struggle and verbal torture starts. The proceeding of this game is stunning. Goldberg and McCann's interrogation of Stanley demonstrates how verbal power can intimidate and eventually oppress the individual entirely. Whereas in *The Homecoming*, two members of a strange family are coming to visit, changing the family rituals completely, initiating a bloody game for dominance, a variety of typical "pinteresque" power struggles. The gender topic is raised in *The Homecoming* representing a social play of high importance as well.

In Pinter's later plays, which become more political, more clues are given, as the source of the violence that lurks in most of his plays is transferred from the interior lumber-rooms to the exterior world of totalitarian politics. In these plays, the threat that the powerful one can exercise the torment over the less powerful becomes to have much greater occurrence and significance. The oppressors in *The Mountain Language* both "are and are not the Turkish Government, and their victims both are and are not the Kurds" (as quoted in Lahr, 35). The play is situated in a military prison but there are no uniforms so it can be any kind of regime.

The play represents a powerful image of oppression and suffering imposed by authoritarian regimes. This intensely powerful short play depicts terrors of political oppression using verbal torture and physical violence.

A prisoner sitting. The elderly woman sitting, with basket. A guard standing behind her. The prisoner and the woman speak in a strong rural accent.

Silence.

Elderly woman: I have bread —

The guard jabs her with a stick.

Guard: Forbidden. Language forbidden.

She looks at him. He jabs her.

It's forbidden. *(To prisoner)* Tell her to speak the language of the capital.

Prisoner: She can't speak it.

Silence.

She doesn't speak it.

Silence.

Elderly woman: I have apples —

The guard jabs her and shouts.

Guard: Forbidden! Forbidden forbidden forbidden! Jesus Christ! *(To prisoner)* Does she understand what I'm saying?

Prisoner: No.

Guard: Doesn't she?

He bends over her.

Don't you?

She stares up at him. (The Mountain, 13-14)

This extract is an example of the language use in this political play. The play describes how the language can be manipulated and distorted to inflict violence to another person. But, as Pinter once said, "the violence is really only an expression of the question of dominance and subservience" (Bensky, *Interview*, 29). However, *The Mountain Language* represents a clear example of how people can destroy each other through language and describes an unspeakable horror when one human being has unrestrained power over another. The play focuses on the violence and verbal torture of the individuals that just happen to be in power.

To sum up, Pinter is one of the most important dramatists in modern history. His masterly use of language proves his linguistic art and a sensitive ear for everyday conversation. Language itself is a tool of domination, power and authority throughout his oeuvre. Pinter makes his characters play with the language that is always part of the mechanism of power and serves to manipulate others cunningly, showing how much can be done or reached by language. But how does such language work? How is it possible that some words or phrases uttered in a certain way have such power that can influence others? These

are the questions that the following chapter is going to answer, describing some of the linguistic strategies.

5. Linguistic strategies

I am pretty well obsessed with words when they get going. (Pinter, as quoted in Kennedy, 165)

For discourse, in order to proceed smoothly, some basic rules must be followed. Fairclough suggests that “turns have to be evenly distributed, topics established, questions answered, etc.” (as quoted in Thornborrow, 18). But, to stress, the order, or symmetry in a discourse is something that is accomplished between the participants of the interaction. Discourse in this view is thus “the construction of interpersonal social relationships through features such as interactional control, turn-taking, exchange structure, topic control, agenda setting, formulating, modality and politeness” (Thornborrow, 16).

Moreover, meaning should be expressed and transmitted carefully and the attention on its proper understanding must be paid. The participants should divide the control over topics, question raising and turn taking evenly in order to keep the equality between them as much as possible. But such ideal discourses are very rare, even impossible according to some theoreticians (for example Thornborrow, 16). Together with the Foucauldian concepts of power and with taking into account the principles on which power relations work, one can come to a conclusion that there are mostly asymmetrical interactions and that power is present in all discourses. “All interaction is subject to the social and institutional constraints of the context in which it is produced, constraints that lead to the reproduction of existing relations of power and status” (as quoted in Thornborrow, 21).

As a consequence to this statement, the examination of various linguistic strategies used deliberately or unconsciously in order to get into a more powerful position during an interaction follows.

There are resources and strategies available to all the speakers who can use those in their utterances and conversations. The effect that such strategies can have depends not only on who uses them but also how skilfully the speakers can operate such strategies. What is more, the social context and the situation these strategies are used in are very important. In other words, the speakers’ success in getting the floor depends upon their skilful use of various linguistic devices and strategies influencing the whole discourse and thus helping individuals to gain the floor and get the desired influence over the other participants. The power relations, as explained previously, are present in all verbal interactions between the participants of a discourse. And as Bourdieu claims, one must be “aware of the many ways in which

linguistic exchanges can express relations of power” (1). And he continues with a description of the linguistic strategies as “the innumerable and subtle strategies by which words can be used as instruments of coercion and constraint, as tools of intimidation and abuse, as signs of politeness, condescension and contempt” (1).

The basic theoretical division of the linguistic strategies in this paper is based on the work of a feminist researcher Deborah Tannen (as quoted in Cameron, 268). Such strategies are: indirectness, interruption, silence versus volubility, topic raising, and verbal aggression. This listing is then broadened by a strategy of questions based on a research by Joanna Thornborrow (24) and a repetition strategy that Martin Esslin suggests (*The Wound*, 214). These are “practical strategies which have numerous functions and which are tacitly adjusted to the relations of power between speakers and hearers” (Bourdieu, 7). All these strategies can be effectively used to create dominance or subordination over others and their effect will be proved on example extracts from the sample plays by Harold Pinter, namely *The Mountain Language*, *The Homecoming* and *The Birthday Party*.

5.1. Indirectness

Not to express a message directly can be a sign of power. Indirectness represents a skilful method of getting one’s will in practice. It is a method of having demands met without expressing them directly. The power benefit of such method can be immense when a hearer fulfils the speakers demand even when not being told directly. Thus indirectness represents a prerogative of the powerful participants of a discourse.

A specific example of this strategy can be found in *The Homecoming*. Teddy, a Doctor of Philosophy in United States, comes home to a dirty part of London to visit his family. Just according to his social status he is in a more powerful position but starts to be questioned by his younger brother whose job is not so socially acceptable about philosophical theories:

Pause.

Lenny: Eh, Teddy, you haven’t told us much about your Doctorship of Philosophy. What do you teach?

Teddy: Philosophy.

Lenny: Well, I want to ask you something. Do you detect a certain logical incoherence in the central affirmations of Christian theism?

Teddy: That question doesn’t fall within my province. (*The Homecoming*, 51)

By starting a conversation about philosophy, Lenny tries to place himself on the same social position of Teddy. Indirectly, this short conversation represents Lenny’s message to Teddy that philosophy is really not that socially high and that as a Doctor of Philosophy, he is not

able to answer such theoretical questions. Then, Lenny keeps on asking Teddy philosophical questions that Teddy obviously does not want to respond to: “Teddy: I’m afraid I’m the wrong person to ask.” (*The Homecoming*, 52).

The language that Lenny uses in this discourse is visibly different from the one he uses throughout the rest of the play. Lenny’s jargon and swear words do not appear in this piece of conversation. Such sudden change of the language use immediately gives him an apparent identical social position of Teddy. This is a clear, indirectly transmitted message of Lenny for Teddy letting him know who is the dominant in the home place. At the same time, this is an indirect message for the other present inhabitants that Lenny is not going to give up his dominant position.

In *The Mountain Language*, a political play about an institutional oppression, another example of the indirect strategy used to get into the powerful position can be found. In the second scene, a guard watches a prisoner trying to converse with his mother. She comes from the mountains and she is not allowed to use her mountain language. Whenever she tries to speak with her imprisoned son, she does use it anyway, as it is the only one she can speak. The guard always screams at her that her language is forbidden. The scene continues:

Prisoner: She’s old. She doesn’t understand.

Guard: Whose fault is that? He laughs. Not mine, I can tell you. And I’ll tell you another thing. I’ve got a wife and three kids. And you’re all a pile of shit.

Silence.

Prisoner: I’ve got a wife and three kids.

Guard: You’ve got what?

Silence.

You’ve got what?

Silence. (The Mountain, 14-15)

The sentence “I’ve got a wife and three kids.” is a crucial one in this dialogue. Both the guard and the prisoner indirectly express a certain message to the other one. By the guard’s use of this sentence, he speaks about his dominant position over the prisoner. Such position is strengthened by the fact that he is an official, speaking the language of the capital. The powerful effect is then emphasized by the whole oppressive situation in which he expresses this statement.

But the prisoner replies by using the same phrase. When he tells to the guard about having three kids as well, he indirectly speaks about the equality. The prisoner dares to use the same phrase like the guard in the language of the capital. He utters it in the same oppressive situation and thus the effect of the prisoner’s sentence is immensely powerful.

Indirectly, the prisoner shows his equality with the guard and stresses that there is no difference between them. Such answer disarms the guard completely at that moment and the prisoner wins the situation.

Both the examples above prove how powerful can the linguistic strategy of indirectness be. No matter whether this technique is used in the hands of the powerful and attacking participants or in order to protect oneself against the oppressing ones, it has very potential effects and plays an important role when analysing discourse power.

5.2 Interruption

When an interruption of the other participant of a conversation is made, it is a clear sign of dominance. An interruption can be made in order to contradict the other, change the topic, make the other one stop speaking or for other purposes with the goal of gaining power. According to Tannen, an interruption represents “an attempt to wrest the floor; a power play” (as quoted in Cameron, 270). Thus, the interruption-making participant must be a skilful conversationalist. His or her interruptions must be carefully planned and thought through. Such conversation is not equal, and power is highly involved. Tannen puts it as follows: “If one speaker repeatedly overlaps and another repeatedly gives way, the resulting communication is unbalanced, or asymmetrical, and the effect [...] is domination” (as quoted in Cameron, 270-271).

The use of interruption in order to gain dominance is another common feature appearing in Pinter’s plays. His characters use this strategy during their cunning power games. In the following example taken from *The Birthday Party*, the constant interruptions appear in the conversations between Goldberg, McCann and Stanley. The two strangers come to a boarding house to interrogate, torment and verbally destroy Stanley. During the long interrogation scene, the interruptions made by the two strangers dominate the conversation. Moreover, the effect of such interruptions is that Stanley is completely under their control without having a chance to reply and protect himself. The ground is completely taken by the two interrogators:

Goldberg: Enos or Andrews?

Stanley: En- An-

Goldberg: Did you stir properly? Did they fizz?

Stanley: Now, now, wait, you-

Goldberg: Did they fizz? Did they fizz or didn’t they fizz?

McCann: He doesn’t know!

Goldberg: You don’t know. When did you last have a bath?

Stanley: I have one every-
Goldberg: Don't lie. (*The Birthday*, 48)

The effect of such conversation is destructive. Stanley does not have any chance to react. He is not allowed to respond to any of the questions. Whenever he tries to tell something, he is interrupted. The strict interrogators do not give him time to think and the pace of this cross-examination is very quick which stresses the whole oppressive atmosphere. Moreover, there are two interrogators, both of them interrupting Stanley constantly. Thus interruptions made by both of them at this pace, completely break Stanley's resistance and towards the end of this cross-examination he is not able to speak properly.

Interruptions with similar destroying effect appear in another Pinter's play; *The Mountain Language*. In this play, there is a guard in a prison watching a meeting of an elderly woman, visiting her imprisoned son. She comes from the mountains and her own language is not allowed in the capital. The guard blindly keeps this absurd rule and constantly interrupts the elderly woman whenever she tries to speak:

Elderly woman: I have bread –
The guard jabs her with a stick.
Guard: Forbidden. Language forbidden. (*The Mountain*, 13)

The absurd fact that she is not allowed to speak her mountain language is stressing and oppressive on its own. Together with the guard's insisting on keeping this rule, the woman is in an even more tormenting situation. The interruptions that the guard makes are used as a tool in order to keep this rule. It is a tool serving to dominance, to overpower the elderly woman. Together with the physical violence the guard uses, such tool has destructive effects. Towards the end of the play, the woman is not able to utter a single word, despite a new decree, which makes the mountain language official as well.

Interruption as a tool of power and dominance is a very stressing way of making others behave in a wanted way. The constant interrupting can make others feel tired, stressed and completely confused. When the interruptions are being repeated over and over, their effects can be even destructive. The immense powerful possibilities of such strategy should not be underestimated.

5.3 Silence Versus Volubility

To shout [...] is a weakness. You have to contain everything (though to be silent is a different form of weakness). (as quoted in Lahr, 22)

Silence is a complex linguistic problematic. Often, it is difficult to decode the message being transmitted through it. Every single silence is unique. Silences have multiple sources, various durations, different topics and messages to tell and different effects. Thus through silence, important information can be revealed. By understanding the differences in use of silence and volubility, one can better understand the strategies characters use over others and what power games do they play. Silence can be thus easily used as a weapon to influence others and to get control over them.

Pinter is a skilful silence user in his plays. He uses these for various purposes without giving hints for revealing their meanings. Usually, Pinter's silences are used to increase tension and verbal torment. If a silence is used in his plays, a question of power always comes into mind. Thus silence represents a strategy, which can be used as an effective tool for manipulation. Cameron states that "meaning of silence is more complicated than the simple equation of it with powerlessness [...] sometimes silence is a strategy of resistance to oppressive power. Conversely, it can be a weapon of the powerful" (4).

Moreover, silence makes the other participants of a discourse wait for the words of the speaker. This not only stresses the potency of the word, but dramatically illustrates its power to capture the intensity of a present moment and its possibilities over the others. The here and now situation is very important for silence to have the desired effects. It is not just who are the participants of a conversation but also where does it happen and under what conditions. For silence, to be understood properly, the words around it must be analysed. For Pinter, what is happening during the silence and what comes with the silence is extremely popular. A director of some of his plays, Peter Hall, explains it as follows: "Pinter's ambiguity in technical terms is that he makes silence speak by defining silence by the noise around it. He equally well makes movements and action unbearably meaningful by the stillness on either side of them" (as quoted in Lahr, 11).

Consequently, a participant of a conversation who is aware of silence and its power in a specific situation has an advantage in winning the floor over others. Whoever can use this linguistic strategy skilfully enough can always manipulate the others and play a "pinteresque" power game with them. Despite the general opinion about silence, that it is a result or a symbol of passivity and powerlessness, often it can serve as a tool of the more powerful participants. It represents a display of power; a way to disconcert the opponent.

On the contrary, silence can also be used and taken as a form of resistance and protest against an exercise of power, so becoming a conversed form of power. But one must be thus aware that silence is a powerful weapon used for various reasons in different settings. As said

before, the silence can be ambiguous. It can be used for various purposes, with different effects and it can also be interpreted subjectively and according to the situation.

Therefore, Pinter's silences do not represent just the absence of speech. They have their true, raw and usually brutal self. For Pinter, there is not just silence. He uses pauses and these pauses and silences have different duration. He skilfully and artistically operates with these being therefore able to create such moving situations on a stage that clearly explain the motives of the characters. Pauses represent the struggle of a character to open himself to others. They are an indication that a mental process of the character is continuing. The pauses are used as markers of interpersonal and social relationships. Because there seem to be information *not* stated, the characters thus show that they have something to say. Hall reports that "if there is a pause in the proceedings, for a small pause he [Pinter] puts three dots; for a large pause he puts 'Pause'; for a very, very long pause he puts 'Silence'" (as quoted in Lahr, 16).

During a silence, the characters regroup their mental forces, plan their next moves, control or hide their aggressions, think about the strategies to be used upon the opponents, and prepare themselves or the others for a new situation. Silence usually represents the end of a movement. When a pause is taken into consideration, it frequently evokes a crooked, black humour, it also gives more importance to the words already uttered and it stresses and gives more opportunity to feel the atmosphere of a situation.

In a culture of total repression such as that in *The Mountain Language*, real communication never happens except through silence. It is the silence, during which all the thoughts are shared. In order to explain such thoughts, Pinter has created so called voice-overs. They are very carefully chosen and they occur at moments of utmost brutality when spoken communication is impossible. The voice-overs serve as a contrast to the absurd oppressive situation and they are the only weapon of the oppressed people to face the powerful practices. And as according to the Yeats's statement that "the human voice can only become louder by becoming less articulate" (as quoted in Kennedy, 24), as the play proceeds, the voice-overs serve as the only tool of the oppressed to win over the tormentors. As language has become the tool of the oppressor, the only real communication is possible through silence. As Pinter himself has put it:

There are two silences. One when no word is spoken. The other when perhaps a torrent of language is employed. This speech is speaking a language locked beneath it. That is its continual reference. The speech we hear is an indication of that we don't hear. It is a necessary avoidance, a violent, sly, anguished or mocking smokescreen which keeps

the other in his place. When true silence falls we are still left with an echo but are nearer nakedness. One way of looking at speech is to say it is a constant strategem to cover nakedness. (as quoted in Lahr, 124)

In the voice-overs, no words are being spoken. When the beaten hooded young man representing the oppressed prisoner is held up by the guards and his wife is at a distance from them, the two lovers are still, staring at each other. The guards hear nothing and they think that by silencing the “mountain people” they have conquered them. But this is just apparent:

Lights to half. The figures are still.

Voice over:

Man's voice: I watch you sleep. And then your eyes open. You look up at me above you and smile.

Young woman's voice: You smile. When my eyes open I see you above me and smile.

Man's voice: We are out on a lake.

Young woman's voice: It is spring.

Man's voice: I hold you. I warm you.

Young woman's voice: When my eyes open I see you above me and smile.

Lights up. The hooded man collapses. The young woman screams. (The Mountain, 18)

Simply, the power of the victims lies in the power of their silence through which their love is expressed. Silence here is a powerful tool in which everything is communicated. The oppressed have won over the brutal, tormenting power by using silence, the only linguistic strategy available to them in such absurd situation.

The Homecoming is a play where pauses and silences take over an important role as well. All the characters use these during their power-games, often with various effects. The two brothers Lenny and Teddy meet after many years when Teddy is visiting his family. As said at the beginning of this chapter, silence can reveal a lot when analysed properly. During the first conversation of these brothers, pauses instantly reveal the past hostility of the brothers:

Teddy: Hullo, Lenny.

Lenny: Hullo, Teddy.

Pause.

Teddy: I didn't hear you come down the stairs.

Lenny: I didn't.

Pause. (The Homecoming, 25)

Both of them try to conceal their mutual hatred, responses become irrelevant, even comical. With the first and second pause, the brothers reveal their isolation but the third one shows Lenny's cat-prowling habits – a comical moment but revealing his inner chaos:

Teddy: Oh, Did I...wake you up?

Lenny: No. I just had an early night tonight. You know how it is. Can't sleep. Keep waking up.

Pause. (The Homecoming, 25)

After still another silence, Teddy tries to communicate with Lenny once again, but the latter, out of context, tells about his "tick" – not only a funny point, but also another expression of his discomfort. Pauses are extremely repetitive now, as the brothers desperately try to control ill will and bitterness:

Pause.

Lenny: Well, if it's the clock I'd better do something about it. Stifle it in some way, or something.

Pause.

Teddy: I've...just come back for a few days.

Lenny: Oh yes? Have you?

Pause.

Teddy: How's the old man?

Lenny: He's in the pink.

Pause.

Teddy: I've been keeping well.

Lenny: Oh, have you?

Pause. (The Homecoming, 25-26)

Both of them try very hard to avoid a conversation about their feelings towards the other and perhaps towards the past. The language they use is absurd, indirect and devious; it functions as a means of hiding rather than expressing their feelings. This proves Pinter's skilful usage of pauses and silences. His silences are so powerful and moving that in his plays they have become as important as verbal language itself. One can say, that Pinter is even obsessed with pauses in his plays, as a result of which the pauses have acquired a great significance.

Another pause with great effect also occurs in *The Homecoming*. It is a typical "pinteresque" pause revealing more than a possible use of words. This pause not only stresses the previous sentence but also suggests much more because of the context and the given situation. Max, the father of Teddy, probably has a sinister past relationship with his sons. It came out when his eldest son Lenny says:

Lenny: You used to tuck me up in bed every night. He tucked you up, too, didn't he, Joey?

Pause.

He used to like tucking up his sons. (*The Homecoming*, 17)

This pause is one of the most powerful ones in Pinter's oeuvre. It heightens the ambiguity and importance of Lenny's last line, suggesting Max's possible sexual abuse of his sons. But it is

the son, not the father, who evokes this ambiguous past, and in doing so, Lenny's menacing posture becomes clearly visible.

The following instance is taken from *The Mountain Language*. This extract proves the generalized assumption that powerful people do the talking and the powerless ones are silenced. When the oppressors in this absurd world of *The Mountain Language* have outlawed the mountain people's language, they robbed them so of their ability to speak and of their humanity as well. The oppressed and tyrannized people only have silence, as a weapon of resistance. But they take this weapon and use it towards the officials in order to face the brutal oppression:

Guard: ... I've got a wife and three kids. And you're all a pile of shit.

Silence.

Prisoner: I've got a wife and three kids.

Guard: You've what?

Silence.

You've got what?

Silence.

What did you say to me? You've got what?

Silence.

You've got *what?* (*The Mountain*, 15)

The prisoner has decided not to respond. This is the way to show the guard how absurd his behaviour is and how powerless he is by behaving so. The prisoner uses silence as a protective shield against the torment. But the effect of being silent is much more significant in this situation. Even if it has made the guard angry and more violent, the fact is that the prisoner is the winner in this situation. He used the strategy of silence, representing an important linguistic strategy in order to gain power over the tormenting guard.

To sum up, silence can be as powerful weapon as a stream of words uttered. The effect of power of silence depends on context of given situation and the linguistic ability of the silence users. If silence is used just in the right time, its powerful potential can be enormous.

5.4. Topic raising and changing

To raise or reject a topic successfully is a powerful discursive strategy. Participants from various social groups use this strategy differently. Social status of a speaker or hearer is particularly important when effectiveness of this linguistic technique is considered. All the participants use this strategy for different purposes. Not to omit when using topic changing, a hearer can understand the overall message conversely to the speakers' intentions. Effective

raising, changing and rejecting of a topic is a powerful, potential and threatening weapon to be used over other participants of a discourse. Thornborrow suggests that “if higher-ranking speakers use different kinds of strategies to get topics raised or rejected than lower-rank speakers, then this may be a way of maintaining existing power relations, while masking those relations through ‘solidarity’ politeness strategies” (31).

Generally, a speaker who raises topics more frequently and succeeds in maintaining these dominates a conversation as he or she is consequently able to choose the kind of conversation they want, to select its pace and thus gain the floor and more convenient position over other participants.

This assumption is demonstrated in the conversation between Goldberg and Meg from *The Birthday Party*. Goldberg represents the oppressive power, using various linguistic strategies over Meg in order to manipulate her. Meg, the kind owner of a boarding house is completely unaware of the cunning strategies Goldberg uses over her. Goldberg knows how to maintain his dominance. Not only he is a successful topic raiser, he also knows the secret of turn taking, and succeeds in taking the active role. The first part of the following conversation shows how Meg makes awkward elicitation, and how Goldberg first gains time to think. The time he has thus gained gives him the chance to plan his avoidance of the topic. He then changes the topic, and, to be on the safe side, gives the reply himself. Meg does not answer so she has no other way but to change the topic. But Goldberg avoids responding to Meg’s topic by addressing Petey, Meg’s husband, and again changes the topic slightly. Thus he makes a new start according to the altered topic:

Meg: Is he coming down?

Goldberg: Down? Of course he’s coming down. On a lovely sunny day like this he shouldn’t come down? He’ll be up and about in next to no time.

He sits at the table.

And what a breakfast he’s going to get.

Meg: Mr Goldberg.

Goldberg: Yes.

Meg: I didn’t know it was your car outside.

Goldberg: You like it?

Meg: Are you going to go for a ride?

Goldberg: *(to Petey)* A smart car, eh?

Petey: Nice shine on it all right.

Goldberg: What is old is good, take my tip. There's room there. Room in the front and room in the back.

He strokes the teapot.

The pot's hot. More tea, Mr. Boles?

Petey: No thanks. (*The Birthday*, 70)

From this extract it is clearly visible, how Goldberg manipulates the others. He is able to control and dominate the whole conversation by an effective use of linguistic techniques, especially topic raising and changing. By such a skilful use of this strategy, one can become the complete and unique controller of a situation. This linguistic strategy helps to gain the floor very rapidly and entirely and under the circumstance that the other participants are not such skilful conversationalists; they do not have a chance to react properly.

In *The Homecoming*, Ruth is an experienced conversationalist. She is the wife of Teddy, whom she has come to visit his family with. She not only succeeds in being accepted by the family despite the initial problems but towards the end of the play she dominates and manipulates everybody. During a philosophical conversation of her husband with his brother, she suddenly interrupts it by attracting everybody's attention to her sexuality. All the other participants of the discourse stop, watch her, listen to her and thus are completely influenced and taken by her:

Ruth: Don't be too sure though. You've forgotten something. Look at me. I...move my leg. That's all it is. But I wear...underwear...which moves with me...it...captures your attention. Perhaps you misinterpret. The action is simple. It's a leg...moving. My lips move. Why don't you restrict...your observation to that? Perhaps the fact that they move is more significant...than the words which come through them. You must bear that...possibility...in mind.

Silence. (The Homecoming, 52-53)

Then, she skilfully uses everybody's surprise, realizes what influencing power she has gained and how strong control she has over the situation and decides to use it for her own purposes. She quickly chooses a new topic in order to direct the whole situation towards her needs and starts to develop the new subject:

Ruth: *Teddy stands.* I was born quite near here.

Pause.

Then...six years ago, I went to America.

Pause.

It's all rock. And sand. It stretches...so far...everywhere you look. And there's lots of insects there.

Pause.

And there's lots of insects there.

Silence.

She is still. (The Homecoming, 53)

Ruth managed to silence everybody. She not only interrupted a vivid male conversation, she managed to attract everybody's attention to her and she even changed the topic. The change was so influencing, that the rest of the participants have no other choice, except to listen to her and join in the conversation later on. The topic of such new talk was hers.

All the examples above prove how effective the linguistic strategy of topic changing can be. Speakers can raise, change or reject a topic subconsciously without any hidden reason and purpose. But some speakers do so with malicious intents, they plan every step very carefully and their tactics are cold and cunning. The effects of such skilful manipulation can be tremendous and can have a destructive effect on the others. With the use of this strategy, one can reach different degrees of power and use it for various purposes in order to influence and manipulate others.

5.5. Verbal aggression

There has always been a tendency to connect a verbal aggression with power. The fact supporting this statement is that the result of a verbal aggression is usually oppression or dominance over the others. An oppressive person with a skilful use of this linguistic technique is able to get complete power over the oppressed. Verbal aggression can not only lead to gaining the floor, or achieving domination in the specific situation but using such language can serve to a total destruction of a person as well. The oppressed whose verbal techniques are not so developed can easily succumb and surrender, and let the more powerful ones control him or her. According to Almansi, "the overall effect of a great verbal assault is to reduce the opponent to a state of catatonia" (45).

Harold Pinter is a dramatist who depicts the situations of verbal aggression and torment in many of his plays. Most significant are *The Birthday Party* and *The Mountain language*. A main topic in both of these plays is the use and misuse of the verbal aggression technique. The plays describe verbal torture and verbal overpowering and a follow-up destruction of the others. In *The Birthday Party*, two strangers coming to take Stanley away are the ones who often use a technique of verbal aggression. Goldberg and McCann are evil characters who have only one goal: linguistically destroy Stanley and make him leave with them. They succeed in destructing Stanley in the cross-examination scene described previously in this paper. A clear example of tremendous verbal aggression appears towards the end of the scene when Stanley is in shock, broken and not able to speak properly:

McCann: Who are you, Webber?

Goldberg: What makes you think you exist?

McCann: You're dead.

Goldberg: You're dead. You can't live, you can't think, you can't love. You're dead. You're a plague gone bad. There's no juice in you. You're nothing but an odour! (*The Birthday*, 52)

Goldberg and McCann accuse Stanley by naming him dead, meaningless and incapable. This kind of verbal aggression expressed by two torturers disarms Stanley completely and deprives him of his resistance. The effect of this linguistic technique in *The Birthday Party* is thus the complete destruction of Stanley.

Following example is taken from *The Homecoming* where some characters use verbal torment over others as well. In a dreadful household, Lenny, a pimp, constantly tortures his father, Max, throughout the play. Lenny is an aggressive person, using not only the verbal aggression over the others but also not hesitating to use the physical one as well. Here are some examples of the aggressive and menacing expressions he uses when talking to his father:

(*looking up, quietly*) Why don't you shut up, you daft prat? (7)

Plug it, will you, you stupid sod, I'm trying to read the paper. (9)

You know what, you're getting demented. (9)

You'll go before me, Dad, if you talk to me in that tone of voice. (11)

Didn't you hear what I said, Dad? I said I was thinking aloud. (35)

Look, why don't you just ... pop off, eh? (35)

Lenny's choice of vocabulary, together with the aggressive tone of his voice and the general atmosphere in that household, make such phrases extremely effective. He uses the verbal aggression technique as a tool to dominate. By his words he shows his powerful position and his dominance over the other members of Max's family.

Verbal aggression is the most simplest and clearest linguistic strategy that can be used in order to manipulate others. Usually, its interpretation is easy but the effects of this strategy can be as tremendous as of others. Very often, verbal aggression is connected with physical violence, giving the powerful participants even higher power over others.

5.6. Questions

Questions and answers in a symmetrical conversation should be evenly distributed. One participant asks a question, the other one answers and can put another question. But usually there are discourses in which the question/answer relationship is not regular. The distribution of questions is not equal and there are no answers. When one participant asks too many questions, raises certain kinds of questions or does not give the other participant time and possibility to answer, then it is a sign of dominance. In such relationship, power plays an important role and the relationship between the participants thus becomes a relation of dominance and submissiveness.

A function and effect of particular types of questions can be help to the speaker to get control over the others. Questions thus represent a powerful means of discursive control. Yes/no questions, disjunctive questions or what, how much and how many questions, as well as tag questions produce minimal response from the participants.

The effect of such queries can even be accusation of the others, forcing the others to respond in a way the speaker wants, or can be used just to let the others complete a suggested proposition. By moving on to another question, the speaker or questioner can also show what an inadequate question is. Such conductive questioning serves as a powerful means of control over the interaction and thus creates or reinforces the power and status of the speaker. Almansi says, that "this is the game of questioning to gain ascendancy [...] The aim is for one or more persons to address a series of absurd questions

and commands to an opponent, the loser being the partner who is eventually most flummoxed” (43).

Almansi’s statement proves the fact that effective question asking can represent a linguistic strategy with the goal of gaining power. To know the art of questioning means to know the art of manipulation as well. Questions are a powerful device of the oppressors and manipulators serving their purposes of domination.

In the oeuvre of Harold Pinter, to ask a question and demand an answer is a common situation. The most typical, absurd “pinteresque” situations happen just during questioning. Almansi analyses the questions in Pinter’s plays and comes up with the following statement about two forms of questioning: “Either you ask a series of irrelevant questions, just to keep the language game going; or you ask an awkward question so that the other is unable to answer” (34).

In all three of Pinter’s plays being analysed in this paper, both of these two kinds of questioning appear very often. Usually, the irrelevant questions are asked just for the sake of questioning. To ask a question out of a context of the situation, can serve to maintain a conversation in order to hide topics that should be discussed. Irrelevant questions serve also for hiding true feelings and emotions in given situations. In *The Homecoming*, during an unpleasant meeting of two brothers, such questioning happens:

Teddy: I’ve...just come back for a few days.

Lenny: Oh yes? Have you?

Pause.

Teddy: How’s the old man?

Lenny: He’s in the pink.

Pause.

Teddy: I’ve been keeping well.

Lenny: Oh, have you?

Pause. (The Homecoming, 25-26)

The questions used in this short extract give a clear clue to how unwanted the encounter after six years is. They serve the purpose of avoiding an unpleasant topic. Sometimes, this kind of avoiding questioning can serve for manipulating purposes in order to get dominance over the other.

The second type of questioning stated by Almansi is to ask a question that is difficult for the other one to be answered. That is a linguistic strategy used for the manipulation of others. Following example from *The Birthday Party* proves how successful Goldberg and McCann are in achieving their purpose and so manipulating and destroying Stanley, winning so the power over him just by a skilful questioning:

Goldberg: Why did you come here?

Stanley: My feet hurt!

Goldberg: Why did you stay?

Stanley: I had a headache!

Goldberg: Did you take anything for it?

Stanley: Yes.

Goldberg: What?

Stanley: Fruit salts!

Goldberg: Enos or Andrews?

Stanley: En – An – (*The Birthday*, 48)

For a short time, Stanley manages to reply but when the pace speeds up, the questions become awkward and irrelevant and Stanley is no longer able to keep up. The whole cross-examination scene in this Pinter's play represents a game of questions. Goldberg and McCann raise many queries, sometimes irrelevant; they change the speed of the interrogation and often do not give Stanley a chance to answer. The result of the scene, as described earlier in this thesis, is Stanley's complete breakdown.

Questioning is a powerful tool of interrogations and verbal torments. By asking certain kinds of questions that are very carefully planned, one can get to know specific information, make others tell or suggest what was wanted or can manipulate others completely. Pinter skilfully uses the art of questions and makes his characters play tremendous and dangerous power games where questioning is the main weapon helping language to be a means of power.

5.7. Repetition

When a word, phrase, or a whole sentence is repeated, it can turn the others' attention, and make them reply. Added to this, when a repeated utterance is carefully placed and timed, it gives the utterance the specific meaning and supports the whole message that is thus transmitted. The repetition of some parts of a discourse helps to stress and speed up the pace and direction of the conversation. It can create a menacing tension that puts the other participant in an uncomfortable position. In such created atmosphere, it is much easier for the oppressor or the more powerful one to reach his or her goal.

Throughout all the three sample plays by Pinter, the repetition is used quite often in order to reach the above stated power-gaining aim. Following extract comes from the interrogation scene in the third act of *The Birthday Party*. The final result of gaining power linguistically is reached by an effective repetition of some phrases.

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's the question!

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

Stanley: It's late.

Goldberg: Late! Late enough! When did you last pray?

MCCann: He's sweating!

Goldberg: When did you last pray?

MCCann: He's sweating! (*The Birthday Party*, 50)

The tension is strong, because the pace of elicitation and accusations created by the two interrogators is rapid and Stanley hardly ever gets the chance to respond. The phrase like "Do you recognize an external force?" is irrelevant and very difficult to be answered. Stanley is not a skilful conversationalist so he is not able to react properly. But this absurd question is repeated three times. The two interrogators show its importance and confuse Stanley completely. His answer "It's late." seems to be irrelevant as well but it is

immediately turned into another question, repeated again: “When did you last pray?” This time, Stanley does not answer. The effect of the repetition was reached. Stanley is silenced, Goldberg and McCann reached their goal; they overpowered Stanley completely.

The extract from *the Birthday Party* thus proves how destructive effects can be reached by repeating of sentences and phrases that do not seem so powerful when not repeated. When the repetition linguistic tool is used correctly and in the right moment, its powerful potential can be very dangerous.

All the linguistic strategies described in this chapter serve to achieve the same goal – dominance and control over others. Because of the asymmetry that appears in all discourses, it is easier for these strategies to function in linguistic interactions. There is always a participant, that is verbally more skilled and so he or she can manipulate others by interweaving the linguistic strategies into his or her utterance. One must be aware of such strategies in order to protect him or herself and such strategies can be also used in order not only defend oneself but to counter-attack as well.

All the strategies were based on the theoretical researches mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Their validity and powerful effects over others were proved on extracts from Pinter’s plays but the general descriptions of their functions are valid also in the world outside his plays. As described previously, such strategies can have menacing and destroying effects over less powerful individuals or the oppressed humans, so one must be highly aware of such powerful potential of all the linguistic strategies.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, the term “power” is a crucial one. The issue of its rules and a structure of power relations is interwoven in the whole paper. More profoundly, the thesis presents and summarises the most important philosophical power theories and examines the topic of power expressed in language in particular. The theoretical scope of this paper is clearly divided allowing thus readers to acknowledge the main theoretical points correctly.

The purpose of this thesis is to find out to what extent are the main philosophical ideas based on Foucault’s power theories valid and how does Harold Pinter use them in the three sample plays. Consequently, the paper examines carefully the topic of discursive power, trying thus to find out what are the main principles of power that is expressed in language. Further on, the thesis analyses the main verbal and nonverbal tools that are used in language making it powerful and used as a means of power while summarizing and describing various linguistic strategies. Moreover, Pinter’s language is analysed profoundly in order to examine his very personal use of language that is based on the most significant power theories and serves as a means of power.

After analysis of the highly developed power theories, this thesis comes to conclusions that they are of a high importance and valid since they were stated. The detailed look at the discourse power helps to understand how the power works in language. The findings that come from such analysis are very interesting. Thanks to the detailed explanations of power and discourse power, readers can get to know exactly what is power and on what principles does it work and can realize the omnipresence of power, especially in all conversational acts. It comes out, that the impacts of power expressed through language are immense and how dangerous such power can be.

Further on, it is understood how does Pinter use his language that is based on the principles of the absurd drama. The author of this thesis explains not only the main characteristics of Pinter’s highly personal style but describes also how Pinter’s characters use their language in order to win the floor over others, and what power battles they lead. Moreover, on extracts from Pinter’s plays, the author shows specific sentences and phrases through which power is expressed, allowing thus readers to understand the workings of discursive power deeply.

In this paper, as mentioned above, the linguistic strategies that are used in language to make it serve as a means of power are presented and analysed very carefully. Such

theoretical summary is also explanative, giving clear examples from Pinter's plays, helping readers to understand the real meaning and system of rules of such linguistic strategies. The author stresses the terrifying potential of those, providing that their users are fully aware of the principles of power in these strategies.

As the issue of power expressed through language is very complex, the author of this thesis suggests a further research in this field. More power theories by various theoreticians should be analysed as they are appearing constantly nowadays. Consequently, a validity of those theories should be proven as was done with the power theory by Foucault, Bourdier, Thornborrow and Fairclough in this paper. The author also suggests a follow-up discussion about the given linguistic strategies. Their use is very potential and their effect can vary depending on who uses them and under what conditions. More strategies can be proposed and further analysed, as their list in this paper is not final.

The author came also to surprising conclusions about power. After deep understanding of the main principles of power and power relations, one becomes aware of the workings of power. It is stunning that power is everywhere; it is born from itself and it is omnipresent in every setting and in all encounters between humans. Also the findings about tormenting use of powerful language are surprising and one must be very careful about such language use by strong and linguistically skilful individuals. Thus the most surprising and significant conclusion that the author has made is that the theoretical base of this thesis is not just a simple theory that cannot be applied behind the theatre stage but this paper proves that the power rules and system of power relations is a very important topic to be discussed in the real world.

7. Resumé

V současné době se téma moci často užívá při různých příležitostech ve společenských, politických i kulturních souvislostech. Pro každého jedince znamená moc něco jiného a každý člověk ji využívá různými způsoby a za jiným účelem. Přirozeně se moc přiřazuje výrazným jedincům nebo silnému státu, nicméně tato diplomová práce vysvětluje a analyzuje moc v daleko širších souvislostech a podrobněji popisuje moc vyjádřenou jazykem při konverzačních aktech mezi lidskými jedinci.

Francouzský filozof Michel Foucault je autorem převratných teorií o moci, jejím fungování a mocenských vztazích. Teoretický základ této diplomové práce je založen na jeho vysoce rozvinutých tvrzeních, která změnila pohled na problematiku v dějinách lidstva. Základní myšlenkou této diplomové práce je Foucaultova definice pojmu moci, mocenských pravidel a systému mocenských vztahů. Foucault tvrdí, a tato práce jeho tvrzení prakticky podporuje, že existují různé druhy moci, například politická, státní, mužská, či ženská. Všechny vztahy, které se vyskytují mezi jedinci v různých prostředích, se na základě zmíněné teorie moci nazývají mocenské vztahy. Vzhledem k hierarchickému rozdělení každé společnosti se moc rodí, vzrůstá a působí ve všech jejích sférách. Mocenské vztahy pak pracují velmi efektivně.

Základním prostředkem lidské komunikace je rozhovor. Je to právě jazyk, díky němuž lze vše potřebné sdělit ostatním. Na základě společného jazyka se lidé dorozumívají. A je to opět Foucault, kdo definuje teorii moci, která se právě v řeči vyskytuje. Tudíž s problematikou jazyka jde ruku v ruce i moc, která je vždy přítomná v mezilidské komunikaci. Tato práce problematiku takzvané diskursní moci představuje, nastiňuje její základní koncepce a vysvětluje její důležitost. Neboť když je moc obsažena v jazyce, pak člověk, který si je tohoto faktu vědom a účinně jej umí využít ve svůj prospěch, může svou mluvu velmi efektivně užít pro dosažení svých cílů. Potenciál diskursní moci je nesmírný a lingvisticky obratní jedinci mohou dokonce jazyk zneužít k ovládnutí druhých. Jazyk tedy slouží jako nástroj moci, jehož rozbor je ústředním tématem této diplomové práce.

Druhá kapitola této práce se zabývá Foucaultovou teorií moci. Spolu s popisem dalších významných mocenských teorií shrnuje a analyzuje systém fungování moci a mocenských vztahů. Až po pochopení základních mocenských teorií, může dojít k plnému pochopení problematiky fungování moci v jazyce s následným porozuměním principu mocenských vztahů, které jsou přítomny v konverzačních aktech.

Tato kapitola se taktéž zabývá pojmy instituce a institucionální rozhovor. Instituce je zde chápána jako kterékoliv těleso či skupina tvořená lidskými jedinci, rodinou počínaje, jakýmkoliv státním zřízením konče. Každá instituce je založena na hierarchickém rozvrstvení svých členů. Jakákoliv rovnost je téměř nemožná. Instituce má rovněž pravidla a řády, které její členové musí dodržovat. Totéž platí i pro jazyk, který se v té které instituci používá a preferuje. Právě v důsledku hierarchické nerovnosti podporované pravidly a řády je i institucionální rozhovor téměř vždy nerovný. Je chápán jako kterýkoliv formální či neformální rozhovor mezi jedinci v dané instituci. Nerovnost pozic pak poskytuje široké pole působnosti mocenským vztahům fungujícím prostřednictvím jazyka. Klíčovým prvkem druhé kapitoly je vztah mezi jazykem, společností, tedy institucí a mocí. Tento vztah je zde podrobně vysvětlen, což napomáhá čtenáři hlubšímu pochopení problematiky diskursní moci.

Úvodní část třetí kapitoly se zabývá skutečností, do jaké míry ovlivňuje sociální prostředí lingvistické vyjadřování každého jedince. Prostředí, v němž je rozhovor veden a sociální zázemí, odkud účastníci pocházejí, ovlivňuje nejen volbu jazyka a způsob konverzace, ale také posluchačovo celkové vnímání a chápání sdělení mluvčího. Jednou z hlavních charakteristik moci v jazyce totiž je, že čím méně si je člověk vědom přítomnosti diskursní moci, tím účinněji a lépe moc a mocenské vztahy fungují. Posluchač tedy může pochopit případné mocenské záměry řečníka zcela jinak, což může mít někdy destruktivní dopady. Třetí kapitola práce celkově rozebírá moc vyjádřenou jazykem a analyzuje jazyk jako dynamický proces, v němž moc je nestabilní a neustále se mění. V této souvislosti následuje vysvětlení pojmu odpor. Všude, kde je moc, je totiž i odpor. Tento vztah poskytuje prostor účinnému fungování moci prostřednictvím jazyka.

V neposlední řadě je při analýze jazyka v kontextu moci zmíněna teorie vztahu moci a pohlaví. Vysvětlení tohoto vztahu je obzvláště důležité s ohledem na rozdílné používání jazyka a způsobu vyjadřování příslušníků obou pohlaví. Takové rozdíly mohou způsobit odlišné vnímání vyřčeného sdělení a efekt konverzace tak může být různý. Obě pohlaví různým způsobem používají jazyk jako nástroj moci pro dosažení svých cílů. Dále je ve třetí kapitole analyzována ženská mluva a verbální i neverbální prostředky, které žena ve svém vyjadřování používá k uskutečnění svých záměrů.

Cílem třetí kapitoly je napomoci čtenáři pochopit, jakým způsobem může být jazyk „mocný“, jaké nástroje se v jazyce vyskytují, a činí ho tak silným a manipulativním. Protože právě takový jazyk dává prostor pro komunikační rozepře a mnohdy i mocenské hry.

Jazyk jako nástroj nedorozumění, jazykové hry, lingvistické strategie moci, to všechno jsou charakteristiky užití jazyka Haroldem Pinterem. Čtvrtá kapitola se zabývá jeho jazykem, který je vysvětlen na pozadí avantgardního divadelního hnutí Absurdní drama.

Pro tuto práci autorka vybrala tři Pinterovy hry, v nichž jazyk slouží jako mocenský nástroj. Jeho hry práce analyzuje za účelem názorného vysvětlení principů fungování moci v jazyce podle Foucaultových teorií. Pro tuto práci byly vybrány hry *The Birthday Party*, *The Homecoming* a *The Mountain Language*. Užití jazyka jako manipulačního prostředku v těchto hrách je velmi výrazné, tudíž rozbor těchto her napomůže čtenáři lepšímu pochopení problematiky diskursní moci. Taktéž rozdílnost pohlaví při užití manipulačních lingvistických technik, kterou se zabývá kapitola třetí, je v těchto hrách výrazná a je podrobně analyzována.

Harold Pinter je dramatikem, jehož tvorba nese typické znaky absurdního dramatu. Kapitola čtvrtá čtenáři stručně toto hnutí představuje a nastiňuje jeho základní divadelní koncepce a charakteristiky. Nejvýznamnějším, a pro tuto práci nejdůležitějším aspektem hnutí je specifické užití jazyka. V absurdním dramatu je jazyk postaven na reprodukci každodenních, běžných rozhovorů a jeho autoři zaznamenávají a zdůrazňují nedostatky a nedorozumění v takové konverzaci. Té chybí soudržnost a koheze, je plná verbální přeslechů, vyhýbavých odpovědí, špatné syntaxe a nerelevantního užití slov.

Pinterovy postavy užívají jazyk, který vzhledem k takové diskomunikaci, spíše než komunikaci, obsahuje skryté, někdy až zákeřné úmysly. Jazyk v jeho hrách je plný prohnanych lingvistických strategií, pauz a odmlčení, hlasů z podvědomí postav a neustálých irrelevantních poznámek. Všechny zmíněné verbální či neverbální prostředky slouží Pinterovým postavám pro získání výhodnější pozice v dané situaci nebo přímo za účelem verbálního vítězství nad druhými. Je to právě Pinterům precizně naplánovaný a rozvrstvený jazyk, který jeho postavy používají jako nástroj trýznění druhých, k jejich manipulaci a zneužívání pro své vlastní cíle. Někdy takové užití jazyka má v jeho hrách ničivé následky. Tato práce se snaží díky rozboru mocenského jazyka v kontextu divadelních her jít dále a nastínit spojitost filozofických teorií moci, prostřednictvím limitovaného divadelní užití diskursní moci až po její propojení s reálným světem.

Ale co konkrétně činí jazyk mocným? Co jsou to lingvistické strategie a jak se mohou použít a zneužít při konverzaci proti druhým? Jak může mít jazyk tak destruktivní dopady, jak popisují Pinterovy hry? Cílem páté kapitoly této diplomové práce je podat čtenáři ucelený obraz o lingvistických strategiích a prostředcích, které slouží k užití jazyka jako nástroje moci.

Úvod páté kapitoly rozebírá problematiku rovnováhy v rozhovoru. Dále jsou rozebrána kritéria, která činí konverzaci asymetrickou, a problematika přenosu sdělení z jednoho účastníka rozhovoru na druhého. Velký důraz je v této kapitole kladen nejen na samotné lingvistické strategie a jejich užití v hovoru, ale rovněž na širší souvislosti. Při analýze mocenského efektu jazyka je totiž nutné vzít v úvahu, kde se rozhovor uskutečňuje, za jakých podmínek, z jakého sociálního prostředí účastníci pocházejí, tudíž jaké celkové lingvistické znalosti mají. Širší pojetí této oblasti napomůže čtenáři lépe pochopit užití strategií v mluveném projevu. Tyto strategie jsou tak rozebrány z různých úhlů pohledu na teoretické bázi a prakticky rozebrány a znázorněny na relevantních částech Pinterových her.

Jak již bylo zmíněno, tři hlavní Pinterovy hry, jimiž se zabývá tato diplomová práce jsou *The Mountain Language*, *The Homecoming* a *The Birthday Party*. *The Mountain Language* a *The Birthday Party* jsou hry o rolích institucí a pozicích jejich členů uvnitř a nebezpečném užití specifického jazyka za účelem úplného ovládnutí druhých. Tyto hry jsou založeny na mučivých výsleších, při nichž tazatelé používají jazyk plný prohnanych strategií, založených na moci. Cílem těchto výslechů a celkového užití jazyka je získat moc, ponížit či podrobit druhé, případně i jejich zničení. *The Homecoming* představuje hru, kde pohlaví a s tím související pohlavní rozdílnost v užívání jazyka a lingvistických strategií, hraje nejdůležitější roli. V této hře je to žena, která díky své lingvistické zdatnosti a schopnosti pohybovat se v daném sociálním prostředí dokáže obratně vyhrávat lingvistické rozepře, až do naprostého zneškodnění a kompletního ovládnutí druhých postav.

Všechny tyto hry postupně rozebírá celá diplomová práce. Výběr konkrétních úryvků souvisí s právě řešenou problematikou od teorií moci až po lingvistické strategie. Cílem těchto praktických vsuvek je názorné vysvětlení teoretických bodů s cílem napomoci čtenáři teoretické záležitosti lépe pochopit. Relevantní ukázky také slouží pro podání důkazu o platnosti teoretického základu této práce a jeho propojení nejenom se světem Pinterových postav, ale i se světem reálným. Rozbory jeho her rovněž slouží pro velmi podrobný rozbor samotné Pinterovy tvorby a dobré pochopení specifického užití jeho jazyka ve světle absurdního dramatu.

Účelem této práce je představit základních filozofické teorie o moci a mocenských vztazích, vyjádřených jazykem ve vztahu k instituci a pohlaví. Tento teoretický rámec je dále aplikován na hrách Harolda Pintera za účelem podání důkazu, že zmíněné diskursní teorie mají širokou validitu. Pinter zpracovává jazyk ve svých hrách takovým způsobem, že jeho postavy jej užívají jako nástroj moci s cílem manipulovat druhými a dosáhnout svého. Rozbor

těchto her podává čtenáři ucelené propojení mocenské teorie s konkrétním užitím v různých situacích, při využívání rozličných lingvistických strategií.

8. Bibliography

Almansi Guido, Simon Henderson. *Harold Pinter*. London: Methuen, 1983

Bensky, Lawrence, M. "The Art of the Theatre III: Harold Pinter: An Interview," in Paris Review 10 (Fall 1966). 12-37

---. "Harold Pinter: An Interview," in Writers at Work: Paris Review Interviews, Third Series. Ed. George Plimpton 1967. 19-33

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003

Brody, Leslie. *Gender, Emotion and the Family*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP, 1999

Brown, John, Russell. *Modern British Dramatists: New perspectives*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984

---. *Theatre Language*. London: The Penguin Press, 1972

Brown, John Russel, H. Bernard. *Contemporary Theatre*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1962. 24-31

Burkman, K.H., and J.L. Kundert-Gibbs. *Pinter At Sixty: Drama And Performance Studies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1993

Cameron, Deborah. *The Feminist Critique of Language*. Ed. Deborah Cameron, 2.ed. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis group, 2003

Dukore, Bernard, F. *Where Laughter Stops – Pinter's Tragicomedy*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri press, 1976

Esslin, Martin. *An Anatomy Of Drama*. London: Abacus, 1978

- . *Brief Chronicles: Essays On Modern Theatre*. London: Temple Smith, 1970
- . *Illustrated Encyclopaedia of World Theatre*. Ed. Martin Esslin. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977. 214, 266, 267
- . ***The Field of Drama – How the Signs of Drama Create Meaning on Stage and Screen*. London: Methuen, 1970**
- . ***The Peopled Wound: The Work Of Harold Pinter*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970**
- . "Pinter Translated," in Encounter (Mar. 1968)
- . ***The Theatre of the Absurd*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1961**
- . ***The Theatre of the Absurd (revised and enlarged edition)*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1977**
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage Books, 1990, 92-102
- Ganz, Arthur. *Pinter: A Collection of Critical Essays*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972
- Gross, Miriam. "Pinter on Pinter," in The Observer (4 Oct. 1980)
- Hayman, Ronald. *Harold Pinter*. London: Heinemann, 1968
- Hinchliffe, Arnold, P. *The Critical Idiom: The Absurd*. London: Methuen, 1972
- . *Harold Pinter*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1967
- Kennedy, Andrew. *Six Dramatists in Search of a Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975**
- Kerr, Walter. *Harold Pinter*. London: Longmans, Green, 1975
- Kirkpatrick, Melanie. "Rev. of Mountain Language, by Harold Pinter," in The Wall Street Journal (29 Nov. 1989). A14
- Lahr, John. *A Casebook on Harold Pinter's The Homecoming*. London: Davis-Poynter, 1973**
- Pinter, Harold. *The Birthday Party*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1960
- . *The Mountain Language and Ashes To Ashes*. London: Methuen, 1971
- . *The Homecoming*. London: Methuen, 1966

---. "Between the Lines," in Sunday Times (4 Mar. 1962)

Poynton, Cate. *Language and Gender: Making the Difference*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990

Rich, Frank. "Rev. of *Mountain Language*, by Harold Pinter," in New York Times (15 Dec. 1988): B14

Risman, J. Barbara. *Gender Vertigo: American Families in Transition*. New Heaven and London: Yale UP, 1998

Taylor, John, Russell. *Anger and After: A guide to the New British Drama*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1966. 285-316

---. *Harold Pinter*. London: Longmans, Green, 1969

Thornborrow, Joanna. *Power Talk – language and interaction in institutional discourse*. London: Longman, 2002

Tynan, Kenneth. "Interview with Harold Pinter, BBC Home Service, 19 August 1960," in The Observer (27 Mar. 1980): A13

Internet sources

Linser, Roni. Power: Doing Political Analysis. 2000, updated 2 February 2004 [viewed 7 February 2005]: www.ausis.com.au/polsim/power

Amazon Books Prime. Harold Pinter. 2003, updated January 2005 [viewed 7 February]:
<http://www.kirjasto.scifi/hpinter.htm>

Wyllie, Andrew. Pinter, Harold. 2002, updated 20 June [viewed 15 November 2004]:
<http://litencyc.com/php/speople.php>

Billington, Michael. Questions and Answers: Language, Kenneth Tynan's interview with Harold Pinter 1960, updated December 2003 [viewed 17 January 2005]:
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcfour/pinter/language>

Graham, W.S. Harold Pinter. 2000-2003, updated 23 November 2003 [viewed 7 February 2005]: <http://www.haroldpinter.org>

Attias, Bernardo. World of Michel Foucault, updated May 2002 [viewed 1 February 2005]:
<http://www.csun.edu/~hfspc002/foucault.home.html>

Power definitions, updated 2005 [viewed 3 March 2005]:
<http://www.answers.com/topic/power>

Mackean, Ian. Harold Pinter: Winners and Losers in the Plays of Harold Pinter, updated January 2001 [viewed 28 May 2005]:
<http://www.englishliterature.org/essays/pinter.html>

Pinter, Harold, updated 26 February 2004 [viewed 28 May 2005]:
http://www.dmoz.org/Arts/Literature/Authors/P/Pinter,_Harold/