T.C.
SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI BİLİM DALI

THE STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF HAROLD PINTER'S PLAYS: *THE BIRTHDAY PARTY, THE HOMECOMING, THE CARETAKER, ASHES TO ASHES, BETRAYAL*

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nazan TUTAŞ

Hazırlayan
Nurdem Elif AYGÜN

KONYA – 2007

ÖZET

Bu çalışma Harold Pinter'ın *The Birthday Party, The Homecoming, Ashes to Ashes*, *The Caretaker* ve *Betrayal* adlı oyunlarında kullandığı dili analiz etmeyi amaçlar. Bu beş oyun, insanoğlunun yaşadığı hayatın anlamsızlığını ve yararsızlığını net bir şekilde okuyucuya anlatmaktadır. Her bir oyun *Biçembilimsel Yaklaşım*'ın önderliğinde Odd Talk, Turn-Taking, Repetition ve Speech Acts başlıkları altında incelenir.

Bu incelemeler Absurd Tiyatro'nun öncülerinden biri olan Harold Pinter'ın oyunlarında kullandığı dilin özelliklerini, bu dilin günlük konuşma diliyle ne kadar benzer olduğunu ve karakterlerin iç dünyalarında neler olup bittiğini dil aracılığıyla okuyucusuna nasıl ilettiğini ortaya çıkaracaktır.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation aims at analysing the language of Harold Pinter's five plays *The Birthday Party, The Homecoming, Ashes to Ashes, The Caretaker* and *Betrayal* in a stylistic manner. These five plays have the common characteristics of absurdity and futility of mankind.

Each play is examined under the headings of Odd Talk, Turn-taking, Repetition and Speech Acts in the light of Stylistic Approach. All these headings are exemplified by the quotations taken from Pinter's five plays.

This study tries to reveal the main characteristics of Pinter's language, its similarity with the daily verbal interaction and how Pinter represents what happens within characters' inner world and their battle with each other through language.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who gave me the possibility to complete this dissertation. I want to thank my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Nazan Tutaş whose help and stimulating suggestions helped me to complete this study.

I have further to thank my fianceé Salih Çolak and my dearest colleague Eda Köklü for their long-lasting patience and supports while writing this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Dramatists found themselves in a different chaos in such a cosmic world in the 1950s and 1960s when they began to discover the absurdity of humanity, and this led them to write plays with absurd themes related to realism. The changes of playwrights' attitudes came about as a reaction to the World War II and thus a new style of theatre arose, "The Theatre of The Absurd". Two seminal figures in this theatre that became known as The Theatre of the Absurd, a term coined by Martin Esslin in 1961, were Albert Camus (1930-1960) and Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980) (Dukore, 1982, p. 65). Together they pioneered the rise of absurdist drama, a movement with its roots in Greek Theatre. According to Peacock (1997),The Theatre of the Absurd "was strongly influenced by the traumatic experience of the horrors of the Second World War, which showed the total impermanence of any values, shook the validity of any conventions and emphasized the meaningless and arbitrariness of human life"(p. 38). Harold Pinter, Arthur Adamov, Eugene Ionesco, Samuel Beckett, Jean Genet created dramas with ambiguous background facts and character motivations; with dialogue marked by pauses and silences used as weapons of attack and defence against perceived threats (Esslin,1969, p. 82). Language became a vehicle of conventionalized, stereotyped, meaningless tool for people. All these writers share the same vision that human being is inhabiting a universe with which he is out of key. According to these writers, its meaning is indecipherable and his place within it is without purpose. He is bewildered, troubled and obscurely threatened (Pinter, 1977, p.11). His incongruity with people and the society makes his situation "absurd." The "absurd" as it is applied to the Theatre of the Absurd conveys a sense of inadequacy in the face of life which appears to have lost all meaning, producing an anxiety and despair in human futile attempt to come to terms with an inescapable condition. This condition is characterized by Martin Esslin (1969) as "a fundamental uncertainty that life has any true or valid meaning, and we are overwhelmed by horror at the mechanical senselessness of existence, of man's inhumanity" (p. 43).

The Theatre of the Absurd does not propose a solution. Rather, it is an attempt to inspire humans' awareness of their meaninglessness so that a universal consciousness and truth may fill it and restore their humanity, dignity and worth. Martin Esslin(1969) states in detail that to penetrate the deadened state of human kind, absurd writers use " the fantastical and nonsensical, the illogical and the irrational, the untraditional and the unconventional, the

wordless and the purposeless, the grotesque and the frivolous to force a confrontation with ultimate reality" (p. 52).

Harold Pinter has become one of the most famous product of a post war generation that has attempted to reject the evils of the twentieth century and present a new look on society on behalf of The Theatre of the Absurd (Dukore, 1982, p. 61). Pinter composed his own theatre with his own techniques and style in the face of Absurdism. He used everyday conversational language as a tool of action in his plays. The language of Pinter appears unfamiliar because it completely acts contrary to the language of traditional drama. However, Pinter's dialogues with their contradictions, repetitions, pauses and silences added a highly different and selective type of speech to his plays and British Theatre. According to Esslin (1982), Pinter's dialogues are the most superficial aspects of his artistry (quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 139). Language became a means of interpersonal communication, but it revealed the characters' current aims and fears in his plays. Esslin (1982) also states that "Pinter has added a new band of colours to the spectrum of English stage dialogue" (quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 140). Frequent use of terms like 'Pinterese' or 'Pinteresque language' demonstrates his great contribution to the British Drama. Moreover, Pinter is concerned with the human condition as it is today. He expresses man in his every condition; joy, fear, humour, stupidity. The center is human, and Pinter reflects it by his bitter dramas of dehumanisation that he actually implies the importance of humanity. According to Cohn (1962) "Most crucial to an understanding of Pinter's theatre is the symbolism of his characters" (quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 152). For all their initially realistic appearance, their total impact embraces and symbolizes the whole humanity.

Harold Pinter's use of language in his dramas is also an important point. He used some linguistic and stylistic devices as a verbal element to show the situations of the characters in a brilliant way. However, the linguistic interactions between characters in Pinter's plays reflect everyday conversational speech. Pinter's plays depict power struggles in which characters use conflicts to create ambiguity, perpetuate hierarchical relationships and suffocate in the realism of life.

In everyday conversation, participants collaborate to organize their talk to embody utterances to make meaning clearly. In situations where there is struggle for power, participants use different attitudes for dominance or self-protection (Geis, 1995, p. 68). As the text is formed by dialogues in drama, characters converse with each other; someone speaks,

the other takes a turn and it follows the other. This turn-taking helps the reader interpret the speech of characters. Odd Talk is one of the features of Absurd Theatre. In Absurd plays, characters use abnormal speech as they are in absurd situation; because life is meaningless for them and they are far away from personal relationships. Repetition is a central feature in The Theatre of the Absurd. Repetition in dialogue imitates the nature of ordinary talk; it gives both harmony and disharmony and shows the superiority of the characters and what they try to emphasize to the reader. Speech Act is an act which the speaker performs when making an utterance. As in drama, characters use different utterances in their conversation to make the reader perceive what is going on throughout the play.

Stylistic has been concerned with literary language. It can be simply defined as 'the linguistic study of different styles' (Chapman, 1973, p.11). Literary stylistics is concerned with explaining the relation between style and literary or aesthetic function (Leech & Short, 1982, p.13). Stylistics of drama analyses the meaning behind the words or fictional dialogue. To do this, specialists have used many different ways as some mentioned above to explore the language of drama.

Throughout this study, Absurd Theatre, Pinter as Absurdist and The Language of The Absurd are highlighted as a background information. In the following, Pinter's Language and Style are presented by giving some specific examples from his plays as it is necessary to have information about the author to understand his text better. Furthermore, the importance of Stylistic Approach in Dramatic Text and its subject headings 'Odd Talk', 'Turn-Taking', 'Repetition' and 'Speech Acts' are explained in detail. As a major section, Pinter's five plays *The Birthday Party, The Homecoming, Ashes to Ashes, The Caretaker* and *Betrayal* are examined under the headings of Stylistic Approach mentioned above. As a conclusion, the results obtained through this study are represented and discussed by emphasizing the messages the playwright wants to convey to his reader via his language.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. The Theatre of the Absurd

Absurdism has a long tradition beyond the post World War I and II. The term "The Theatre of the Absurd" is coined by the critic Martin Esslin for the works of a number of playwrights, written in the 1950s and 1960s. The term "absurd" is derived from an essay by the French philosopher Albert Camus (Peacock, 1997, p. 45). In one of his works "Myth of Sisyphus" he defined the human situation totally absurd and meaningless. Indeed, the roots of the Absurd theatre are based on the Greek Philosophy "existentialism" (Esslin, 1982, p. 102). The philosophers diverted human interest from nature and centre of the world and directed it at man and his thinking. This interest in a subject, individual human thinking and the individual's situation corresponds with the philosophy of existentialism which focuses on the subjective, individual's experience in a concrete fatal situation. In the relation with the philosophy, Absurd Theatre expresses human existence and its absurdity in a concrete dramatic picture. The Absurd plays written by Samuel Beckett, Arthur Adamov, Eugene Ionesco, Jean Genet, Harold Pinter and others all share the same opinion that human existence has no meaning or purpose, therefore all communication breaks down. The playwrights grouped under the name of the absurd attempt to convey their sense of bewilderment, anxiety, and wonder in an inexplicable universe. Moreover, Absurd Theatre rebels the conventional theatre form. It is illogical, conflictless and plotless. There is no dramatic conflict in Absurd plays. It is a theatre of situation, as against the more conventional theatre of sequential events. It presents a pattern of poetic images (Esslin, 1969, p. 38). To do so, it uses visual elements, movement and light. Unlike conventional theatre, where language rules are supreme, the language of Absurd Theatre is only one of its main features of its dimensional poetic image.

The Theatre of the Absurd makes man aware of his position in the Universe, which although precarious and mysterious, expresses the absence of cosmic system values. While the previous theatres attempt to confront man in the world which reflected a coherent and familiar version of truth, the Absurd Theatre communicates and shows the writer's most intimate vision of human situation, the meaning of existence and his own vision of the world (Esslin, 1969, p. 63). This is the proper subject of Absurd Theatre. Instead of talking about the feelings of alienation and hopelessness covering the world after the World War I and II,

absurd plays illustrate the confusion and desperate situation of man in real world (Esslin, 1982, p.25).

Absurd Theatre does not show man in a historical, social or cultural context; it does not communicate any general views of human life. It does not deal with conveying with representation of events or adventures of characters. Instead, it is interested in human's basic situation. The absurd character is in an absolutely different position. He is not formed by his surroundings; he does not exist in the flood of life events and processes. On the contrary, he is deserted and motionless, and thus he appears and illustrates himself from inside; he is seen through his own picture of the world he is in. The stage in the Theatre of the Absurd displays the mental world of the characters. The reality of the situation absurd character appears in is a psychological reality expressed in images which is a total reflection of the states of his mind. He stays in the centre of the world he creates on his own. The world exists according to man; his existence is not determined by any external forces; he is alone with his own behaviours and decision. The following quotation can be an exact explanation of why Absurd Theatre is considered an image of human being's inner world.

> If a good play must have clearly 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 recognisable 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 a neither beginning or an end; if a good play is to hold up a 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 reportee and pointed dialogue, these often consist in coherent babblings (Esslin, 1982, p. 40).

Although Esslin marks plays which are oppositions to the absurd one' s "good", he does not express their artistic value, but points by the truthful and essential comparisons of the plays of absurdity.

One of the most important features of the Theatre of The Absurd is its language. In general, language is defined as a means of communication. However, in Absurd Theatre language serves a purpose as non-verbal communication. Absurd Drama uses conventionalised speech, meaningless dialogues and clichés which break down communication. The language they use is meaningless and stereotyped. It focuses on a mistrust of language to convey the desperate human situation. The characters' interactions

between each other show how unaware they are from the ongoing world. They are unable to communicate.

The Theatre of the Absurd has brought a very different perspective and style to the theatre world. The playwrights such as Harold Pinter, Samuel Beckett, Eugene Ionesco, Arthur Adamov and Jean Genet have spread it with their absurd plays which evaluate the human basic situation under the name and feeling of absurdity.

2.1.1. Pinter as the Absurdist

Harold Pinter is known as one of the best playwrights in British Drama and The Theatre of the Absurd. He is also known as one of the most complex post-World War II dramatists. In deed, the importance of his life's work was declared in letters nominating the writer for the Nobel Prize in literature in 2005. The academic institutions and art organizations devoted Pinter the Nobel Prize due to his achievements and regarded as the latest representative of British Drama in the 20th century.

Like most of the greatest dramatists of the past and the present, Pinter has found a new language and a new form of theatre. As a major figure in contemporary drama, Pinter is best known for his mysterious plays which blend Absurdism and realism to illustrate the isolation and violence in modern society. Such topics as the ambiguity and subjectiveness of reality, the failure of interpersonal communication, and the primacy of power in human relationships figure noticeably in Pinter's works. In his plays, themes arise from the action, rather than an action created to convey ideas. Pinter claimed that ”What goes on in my plays is realistic but what I am doing is not realism” (quoted in Peacock, 1997, p.43). The dislocation of realism in Pinter’s work in order to create plays which the audience is in demonstrates that audience is at the same time involved in the action and distanced from it subjectively. Pinter assessed that it was his habit to start a play by placing his characters in real situations and allow them to speak; he did not write his plays for a specific purpose or a particular need. Pinter insisted that there was no conflict between writing realistic drama and writing about absurd situations as he believed that absurdity of life was farcical when the horror of human situation in real world was thought.

In a broad sense, the early life of Harold Pinter may provide sufficient element to understand the substances of his plays. Pinter's personal history reflects an age versus the artist lived in an isolated labour. Harold Pinter was born in Hackney, in England in 1930. He grew up in a working-class neighbourhood. At that time, like all the children in England, he witnessed the World War II, thus he learned living with inevitable terror, a theme which appears in much of his work. At the outbreak of War in 1939, Pinter and a group of children were evacuated to a castle in Cornwall and then returned home after a year.

From 1941 to 1947 Pinter attended the Hackney Downs Grammar School, acting in school plays, writing poetry and essays where he took the first step to the theatre. It was during this period that Pinter directly experienced the war which was threatening England. In the following years, he applied to attend the royal Academy of Dramatic Art. In 1948, Pinter faced with the military draft; declared that he was a conscientious objector because he had witnessed war and saw it as a great evil.

After a short time Pinter wrote his first play, *The Room.* Set in a room of a large house that was turned into a large apartment building, *The Room* opens with a sixty-year-old woman, Rose, serving a hot meal to Bert who is going out to drive a truck for delivery on an icy winter day (Thomson, 1985, p. 92). While serving the food, Rose continuously compares the cold, dark and dangerous world outside with the warm and safe atmosphere of their residence. At this point, Pinter's basic dramatic setting appears: a room with a door leading to a hostile and intrusive world. The first intruder is an old man, Mr. Kidd, who seems to be the landlord. Kidd makes several somewhat obscure references to the basement, and after a while he leaves; so does the silent Bert. Now alone, Rose opens the door to empty the garbage can and discovers a young couple looking for a room to rent. The husband tells her that "the man in the basement" said number seven was available. Rose, whose room is number seven, denies that it is going to become vacant, and the visitors leave. Then a blind black man enters. He calls himself Riley, and, in spite of being blind, he "looks about the room," notes that it is large and claims he wants to "see" Rose. Suddenly he calls her by a different name, Sal. At this point Bert comes back from his trip and, for the first time, begins to speak. Without warning, Bert turns to Riley, throws him out of the armchair in which he has been sitting, and kicks his head against the gas stove until he lies still, presumably dead. Rose clutches her eyes and repeatedly screams "I can't see." There is a blackout and the curtain comes down (Thomson, 1985, p. 94). *The Room* is a remarkable play in many ways. Its plot is very simple;

the dialogue is realistic and poetic; the characters are mysterious and allusive. In the following of this play, two further plays had come: *The Birthday Party* and *The Dumb Waiter.*

The Birthday Party begins with breakfast at a boarding house of Meg and Petey Boles, who have only one guest at the moment, a neurotic middle-aged man named Stanley, who seems to be a concert pianist on the run. Later, while Stanley is out, two strangers arrive and it is obvious from their conversation that they have been looking for him all over town. When Meg joins them in the living room, she lets slip that it is his birthday. One of the strangers, Goldberg, insists they have a party in Stanley's honour (Dukore, 1982, p. 110). Throughout the play, fear of guilt in Stanley's situation, the suppress of two strangers on Stanley, fear of women's sexuality on Meg can all be interpreted as the reflection of Pinter's socio-political view in his society: the desire of autonomy for people may be perceived as the absurdity of human existence in Pinter's work.

Harold Pinter's third play *The Dumb Waiter* concerns two working-class Cockneys who spend a morning in a basement bedroom in Birmingham waiting for instructions. To pass the time they talk about football, read newspapers, and argue about the various idioms related to lighting a gas stove. As can be seen in his other works, Pinter makes his characters chat rather than giving clues about what is going on in the play. The two men, Gus and Ben know very little about the organization they are in, but Pinter lets the audience learn incidentally that they are in the business of murdering people (Thomson, 1985, p. 93). All these plays have the common features of absurdity. The incongruity in their personal relationships, the irrelevant topics they talk about and the defectiveness in their personalities reflect how absurd and futile the human beings are. Even the extraordinary setting Pinter draws indicates the loneliness the characters experience in their inner worlds.

In most of his works, what Pinter shows is the struggle of conformity of human beings in the society they live, the struggle of power, the lack of communication and the disharmony in their personal relationships. By penetrating all these conflicts and dilemmas in characters, Pinter tries to show the absurdity of human's effort of living in his society.

2.2. The Language of the Absurd

Language plays an important part in the roots of Absurd Theatre. Absurdist plays demonstrate the failed communication among people. Living in a world in which so much language is used to give double messages, through advertising and political content, we are all aware that language can be used both to reveal and conceal the ongoing things that happen around us (Esslin, The Theatre of The Absurd, p. 403). As Martin Esslin explains, the failure of communication in The Absurd Theatre is a kind of a mirror of our mass communication era.

When critics comment on the language of the Absurd Theatre, most of them refer to the individual dramatists rather than taking them as a group. Moreover, their comments suggest that the language of absurd is very close to the daily conversation we use. It reflects the small talk of our daily lives.

Innes (1992) points out that the characters in the Absurd Drama use speech acts that occur in our everyday interactions. When characters talk to each other in Absurd plays, their conversation follows the rules of normal conversation; they use commands, declarations, short questions and answers, repetitions, requests and commands. Also, in ordinary conversation, the words we use to send a message may give only a part of the intended meaning; however in the dialogues of the Absurd Drama the uttered words and the messages conveyed are used in a greater extent.

The dramatists of the Absurd use ordinary conversation skilfully in their plays in order to send their messages about the danger of communication and its breakdown. They do not use the language to express knowledge or define normal human's situations. According to the dramatists of the Absurd, language is irrelevant to existing problems and meaningless.

Absurd Theatre exploits conventionalised speech, clichés and jargon to show the breakdowns of communication. Its main aim is to ridicule with conventionalised and stereotype speech to try to make people aware of the possibility of going beyond everyday speech conventions and communicating more authentically.

2.2.1. Pinter's Language

Harold Pinter is known as the product of a post-war generation that has attempted to reject the evil things of the twentieth century and present a new and different outlook to the society. He expresses man in his fear, loneliness, joy, humour, stupidity and absurdity. To present this to his reader and audience, Pinter does not use the traditional drama speech; on the contrary, he makes his characters communicate in a daily language to go against the experiences and emotions he wishes to communicate. Fear, menace, the row of daily living, the concentration on trivial possessions, the focus on the banality of language are all introduced to the reader with a simple daily language by Harold Pinter.

Pinter's use of language has brought a new colour to the British Drama. When it is examined much more closely, it can be better understood that personal insufficiency expresses itself in an inadequacy in overcoming and using the language. Pinter's characters are unable to communicate and also they are unable to use the correct terms in their dialogues and this can be perceived as a sign of inferiority for them. For instance; Mick in '*The Caretaker'* on his first encounter with Davies, speaks of someone of whom the tramp reminds him, who had a *penchant* for nuts:

> Had a penchant for nuts. That's what it was. Nothing else but a penchant. Couldn't eat enough of them. Peanuts, walnuts, brazil nuts, monkey nuts, wouldn't touch a piece of fruit cake (Pinter, 1991, p. 42).

Here, the false situational detailed contained in the associative use of the names of different kinds of nuts is used by Mick repeatedly. According to Esslin (1985) the introduction of the term "penchant" emphasizes Mick's claim to superior education, intelligence and ingenuity. (quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 151) This is called as *an act of aggression* for characters in Pinter's plays.

Pinter's characters are most of the time in the struggle of power. His use of technical terms and jargon establishes the characters' own superiority in their own fields and the feeling of togetherness; helps the characters to exclude intruders, and to defend themselves against outsiders.

The characters inability to communicate and inability to express themselves can be understood from Davies's utterances as the reason for his loss of favour with Mick:

> Honest. I can take nothing you say at face value. Every word you speak is open to any number of different interpretations. Most of what you say is lies. You're violent, you're erratic, you're just completely unpredictable. You're nothing else but a wild animal, when you come down to it. You're a barbarian (Pinter, 1991, p. 52).

In Davies utterances, Thompson (1985) asserts that" the ability to communicate is equated with civilization and the possession of a claim to being a human" (p. 75). The weak use of words and their meaning lose his claim to live.

Pinter (1961) abstains that "Language is incapable of establishing true communication among people" (p. 18). He only wants his reader to understand from his plays that human beings do not use the language for the purpose of communication, especially for spoken language; they do not use language logically rather than using it in an emotional context. The violence of the emotion behind the words is much more important than their content.

In Pinter's dialogues, one can see the desperate situation of a character in which he tries to find the correct expression for what he wants to say (Bloom, 1987, p.149). In *The Dumb Waiter* Gus recalls the time when they killed a girl:

> It was a mess though, wasn't it? What a mess. Honest, I can't remember a mess like that one. They don't seem to hold together like men, women. A looser texture, like. Didn't she spread, eh? She didn't half spread. Kaw! (Pinter, 1991, p.98).

Gus seems to feel a great pleasure while focusing on the words "mess" and "spread", not because of killing the girl, but finding an effective phrase for what they did as he is an inarticulate person, indeed.

One of the mere uses of expression of characters in Pinter's plays is repetition. Most of the time, Pinter's characters repeat themselves or each other's words or phrases. Dukore (1982) points out that the playwright emphasizes the device of repetition "to fulfil the definite function in the action" (p. 21). For instance; at the beginning of *The Birthday Party,* Meg asks Petey just after she has served his cornflakes:

> ***Meg:*** Are they nice?
> ***Petey:*** Very nice.
> ***Meg:*** I thought they'd be nice (Pinter, 1991, p. 123).

What Pinter wants to indicate by the repetition of the word "nice" by Meg is the emptiness of the characters relationship and the lack of communication with each other.

Esslin (1982) implies that Pinter use repetition to show "how a character gradually learns to accept a fact which at first he had difficulty in taking it" (quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 145). In *The Caretaker,* having been terrorized by Mick, Davies asks Aston:

> ***Davies:*** Who was that feller?
> ***Aston:*** He's my brother.
> ***Davies:*** Is he? He is a bit of a joker, en' he?
> ***Aston:*** Uh.
> ***Davies:*** Yes… he is a real joker.
> ***Aston:*** He's got a sense of humour.
> ***Davies:*** Yes, I noticed.
> *Pause.*
> He is a real joker, that, lad, you can see that.
> *Pause.*
> ***Aston:*** Yes, he tends… he tends to see the funny side of things.
> ***Davies:*** Well, he's got a sense of humour, en' he?
> ***Aston:*** Yes.
> ***Davies:*** Yes, you could tell that.
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1991, p. 62).

In this dialogue, the manner Davies takes up against Aston's phrase about the " sense of humour", the way in which he punctuates his realization of Mick's character with "I noticed" show Davies's evaluation of the man he met. This logical realism in language can be perceived as a characteristic of Pinter's language as well.

In addition, spoken language is used not so much for the purpose of communication, but as a means of evading communication in Harold Pinter's plays. Communication itself among characters diverges from its meaning; there is talking about other things than what is at the root of their relationship. They do not communicate as how it is supposed to be. One factor contributing to the phenomenon of evasion of communication is the unreliability of language itself, which Pinter describes it in "Writing for Myself". Pinter (1961) emphasizes that "Language is a highly ambiguous business; so often, below the word spoken, is the thing known and unspoken" (p. 12). This means that the speech that is heard is simply an indication of which is not heard.

Pointing to Pinter's concept of language as the chief irony in his plays, Martin Esslin (1982) describes this phenomenon as "the discrepancy between the implicit claim in any 'patois' (language) that it is the currency accepted and understood by all its users, and the dramatic fact that such language in actual usage reveals not complete communication between man and man but their essential apartness" (quoted in Bloom, 1987. p. 149). According to Esslin, this irony, in turn, leads to one of the central themes in Pinter's works, "insecurity and fearful loneliness." Pinter's characters have a fear against the outside world and they feel insecure. All the time they are on alert to the possible coming dangers from outside. Thence, they retire into themselves and they are abstracted from the real world and they prefer to live their own loneliness. The discontinuity and incongruity of Pinter's language can be a great evidence of these concepts in his plays.

2.3. Stylistic Approach in Dramatic Text

The term *stylistics* is employed in a variety of senses by different linguists. Stylistics can be considered as the study of literary texts with a sharp concern for how the language element works in a text. The term is generally called as "the linguistic study of different styles" (Chapman, 1973, p. 11). This definition shows that styles are the product of social situation; in other words, it is a common relationship between language users. Leech and Short (1981) explain it as "simply as an exercise in describing what use is made of language" (p.13). In general aspect, stylistics helps examine the relationship between the language and meaning.

The rise of stylistic is in some ways related to the practical criticism method in literary criticism. Some linguists questioned the widespread reference to influences and biographical details when criticising literary works, because they felt that focusing on influences and biographical details allowed the critic to almost ignore the text itself (Chapman, 1973, p. 19). The critical movement defended a formalist approach. A strong distinction was made between what was textual and what was extra-textual. Extra-textual matters include biographical details, the author's intention and cultural influences. What was textual was what was found on the page itself.

Style in language is not just a surface appearance; rather, it is an essential part of meaning, part of the author's communication to the reader. Understanding a text requires

more than just understanding the concepts it includes. To understand what the author tries to express and explain to his reader, his style should be taken into consideration at first. Stylistic Analysis in literary studies is usually made for the purpose of commenting on quality and meaning in a text. However, when a literary text is examined, it should be considered that literary language is used as an artistic medium.

There are so many examples of prose and poetry appreciations examined through stylistic approach. However, not so much attention has been paid to the stylistic analysis of a dramatic text in the twentieth-century. Culperer, Short and Verdonk (1998) suggested one of the reason of it as "the spoken conversation has for many centuries been commonly seen as a debased and unstable form of language, and thus with all their affinities with speech, were liable to be undervalued" (p.3). The language of drama is mostly an example of daily language; it reflects the everyday conversation in a natural way. It may be the reason why the critics haven't paid much attention to the stylistic analysis of drama. On the other hand, most of the drama texts are produced to be performed on the stage. When one deals with dramatic texts, he has to bear in mind that drama differs considerably from poetry or narrative that it is usually written for the purpose of being performed on stage. According to many critics and playwrights, plays can be merely perceived when they are performed in the theatre.

However, a play text can also be understood through accurate reading and by the help of linguistic analysis (Culperer et al., 1998, p. 7). Although the atmosphere of the stage, the scenic effects, lighting, the gestures and behaviours of the actors convey the message of the author more accurately, one can also understand what is implied between lines through a detailed stylistic analysis. In the Stylistic Analysis of Drama, different methods such as turn taking, odd talk, speech acts and repetition are used to reach the meaning between lines. In the following parts, some important methods; Speech Acts, Odd Talk, Turn-Taking and Repetition will be explained in the light of Stylistic Analysis of Drama.

2.3.1. Odd Talk

As this study deals with the plays of an absurdist Harold Pinter, the concept 'odd talk' is commonly encountered in the plays of Absurd Theatre. Simpson describes odd talk as a talk" which is in some way marked, aberrant or anomalous" (quoted in Culperer et al., 1998, p. 34). In dramatic texts, discourse structure and in what kind of a context the verbal

interaction takes part bear a great importance. Simpson divides this context into three parts: physical context which is the actual setting or environment where the interaction takes place, personal context which refers to the social and personal relationships of the participant, and the cognitive context that refers to the background information of the participants in interaction (quoted in Culperer et al., 1998, p. 37). In this respect, what is important is to consider the congruity of where the discourse structure is organized. In other words, the relationship between the language used and context is a primary consideration. However, the incongruity and meaninglessness of language characters use shape one of the most significant features of the Absurd Drama, and indeed these concepts conduct the message which the absurd playwright tries to give to his reader.

2.3.2. Turn Taking

Turn organization is an important aspect of how conversation is used to complete actions. Turn-taking considers how and when, in a conversation, a speaker gets turn, the transitions between turns, and possible phenomena existing in those transitions such as silences and overlapping of the dialogue. In an ordinary talk, speaking turns are usually managed by the participants engaged in the conversation and arranged sequentially or alternately. Nonetheless, according to Culperer et al.(1998), turn-taking is allocated in three ways: the current speaker can select the next; it means that one person can ask another a direct question, a person can self select; for instance; a person decides to speak when the current speaker has not selected someone else to speak, and there can be a speaker continuation which is also called a Transition Relevance Place (TRP hereafter) TRP may occur whenever a transition from one speaker to another becomes relevant.

Speakers usually align themselves to these rules in everyday speech to communicate. As in real life, whenever the rules are broken in dramatic language, interesting assumptions can be made. Dramatists skilfully use turn-taking method to display the aspect of a character and his or her intention. For example, a character who insists on carrying his or her turns may be someone who loves to be the central attention or to control the ongoing situation. Different contexts may provide circumstances for various interpretations of the character's intention.

During a conversation, there is a competition for turns or moments of silence. Competition can result in overlapping a conversation or interruptions. Overlapping dialogue

may also indicate someone trying to be dominant in the conversation. Silences also have meaning depending on when they occur.

2.3.3. Repetition

Repetition is one of the most common features in conversation. People in a wide variety of work and social situations use repetition in their daily conversation. For instance; teachers repeat their comments to students to reiterate the main points of the topic. Elderly adults repeat accounts of their past to remind themselves of its importance, but they also repeat a story or a question over and over because their minds no longer remember that they have just asked the same question or told the same story. As it is commonly used in daily conversation, repetition in discourse analysis comes in many guises. It is examined in two folds by Tannen (1989): forms of repetition and functions of repetition. First, repetition can be placed in an integral way from exact repetition of words to repetition with a slight variation to a paraphrase (Tannen, 1989, p. 54). Second, as many conversational linguists have emphasized that both individual repetition and repetition by another speaker are common in ordinary discourse (Norrick, 1987, pp. 245-246). Third, repetition varies from repetition of words, phrases, sentences or longer units of discourse. Repetition functions in two primary ways in conversation: it helps speakers and listeners create meaning by conserving energy spent in the process of receiving and producing speech and it promotes interaction between them by "managing the business of conversation" (Tannen, 1989, p. 51). Repetition allows us to set up a verbal formula and then add new information to it, producing conversation more easily. It also serves to link words, phrases and sentences to each other in discourse (Leech & Short, 1981, p. 244). Speakers connect ideas by repeating words, synonyms for them, or words related to them. Furthermore, speakers use repetition as a conversational source to stall for more time to formulate an answer (Norrick, 1987, p. 247). By this way, repetition in conversation varies in many forms and it functions both to create meaning and encourage interaction.

When it refers to drama, repetition in the plays under consideration here takes the same forms as repetition in conversation. It ranges along a scale from exact repetition, to repetition with slight variations, to paraphrase. Especially in the Theatre of the Absurd specific playwrights like Harold Pinter and Samuel Beckett use repetitions in most of their works. Repetition in Pinter's plays functions on two board levels. At the micro level, the

dialogue among the characters, it functions just as the repetition in daily talk function: creating meaning and promoting interaction (Tannen, 1989, p. 51). At the macro level, the "dialogue" between the play and the audience or the reader, the function of repetition changes. Because the repetition in dramatic conversation is meant for its audience, repetition in the absurdist plays is part of the playwright's design or his message about communication (Short, 1981, p.188). In other words, on one level a character sends a message to another character; at the same time on a parallel level, the playwright sends a message to the reader or audience. Repetition in the Absurd plays also mirrors how conversationalists in everyday speech interact with each other. In fact, characters in the plays appear to be working to create harmony in their interpersonal relationships. In addition, repetition of key words, phrases or themes in the conversation makes messages easier to process. On the other hand, repetition in the plays gives the signal of the desperation of the characters. Their repetition of words and phrases again and again indicates the terror and despair of the characters in most of Pinter's plays. To sum up, repetition takes an important part in the plays of Absurd Theatre as its dialogue reflects the daily language in a realistic manner.

2.3.4. Speech Acts

We perform speech acts when we offer an apology, greeting, request, complaint, invitation, compliment, or refusal. A speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. A speech act might contain just one word, as in "Sorry!" to perform an apology, or several words or sentences: "I'm sorry I forgot your birthday. I just let it slip my mind." Speech acts include real-life interactions and require not only knowledge of the language but also appropriate use of that language within a given culture. In general, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses regret. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed. In drama, a character's actions are his or her attempts to achieve objectives. The characters use the language as the primary means to pursue objectives. Discourse analysis is useful because the dramatic dialogue especially in The Theatre of the Absurd so closely resembles the daily verbal interaction.

Michael Toolan manipulates speech act theory according to the "amount of giving or seeking of information or goods and services" (quoted in Culperer et al., 1998, p. 144). He groups them as Offers and Requests, and Informs and Questions. As Offers and Requests are taken as a future proposed action by one participant to another, they are called Proposal, and as Informs and Questions look for information, they are called Prepositions (Culperer et al., 1998, pp. 145-146). The Proposals both consist of verbal and non- verbal communication. The Preposition is normal in general, but a remark to a Preposition can be non-verbal such as using gestures. For instance; threat may be included within Offer as they promise to give service to the addressee, although sometimes they are concerned to be damaging. In general, all of these types include variety of utterances.

According to John Searle (1969) Speech Acts are subject to conformity conditions: propositional content, preparatory conditions (situational contents) sincerity conditions and an essential condition (pp. 33-42). To achieve meaningful communication, the propositional content indicates either past, present or future behaviour by the speaker or hearer. Situational rules point to the aspects of a given situation that must hold before and act is accomplished. The sincerity rule implies that the speaker genuinely means the speech act. Finally, conversational action accounts for the basic function of an act, creating an essential condition. For instance; a request is a speech act having the propositional content indicating the possible future behaviour of the hearer. The situational rules hold that the hearer is able to perform the request; the speaker believes the hearer is able to perform the action; and the requested action would not be routine or automatic for the hearer. The speaker wants the hearer to perform the action. The essential condition created by the action is an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer carry out the future behaviour.

Almost any speech act is really the performance of several acts at once, distinguished by different aspects of the speaker's intention: there is the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, such as requesting or promising, and how one is trying to affect one's audience.

CHAPTER III

STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF PINTER'S PLAYS

Regarded as one of the most influential English playwrights of the twentieth century, Pinter is esteemed as a privileged author in the Theatre of the Absurd since he pioneered a new era in English theatre. The distinct, innovative blending of Absurdism and neo-realism has increased the reputation of Pinter among the scholars wisely.

Among the absurd playwrights such as Samuel Beckett, Eugene Ionesco, Albert Camus, Jean Genet, Arthur Adamov, Harold Pinter introduced his works in a more distinguishing way. The language he uses, the situation characters are in and the setting make him different than the others. Pinter takes the tragic hero through all the stages of temptation, hesitation, concentration and damnation. He reflects the conflicts of characters in their inner and mental world. With a minimum of plot, drama emerges the power struggle and hides and seeks conversation. In a typical Pinter play, we meet people defending themselves against intrusion or their own impulses by entrenching themselves in a reduced and controlled existence.

Pinter has written 29 plays with some in the absurdist style. What makes him different from other absurd playwrights is his own use of style with pauses and silences with non-sequiters which are also called "Pinteresque" or "Pinterese" for their expression of modern alienation and lack of genuine connection between human beings.

The adjective "Pinteresque" takes its place in English dictionaries. The Chambers Dictionary has defined "Pinteresque" in the style of the characters, situations, etc., of the plays of Harold Pinter, 20th century English dramatist, marked especially by halting dialogue, uncertainty of identity, and air of menace" (p. 510). The Oxford English Dictionary defines it as "'of or relating to the British playwright, Harold Pinter, or his works" (p.512).

Probably more than any other dramatist writing in English this century, Pinter has challenged and changed expectations of what dramatic language, action, and character should be. His unique blending of absurdist and realist techniques continues to fascinate and inform audiences in a way seldom witnessed in the history of the theatre.

3.1. Pinter's Style

Unlike other absurd dramatists, Harold Pinter creates a very different style on his own with an extraordinary point of view. When we think of traditional drama, we are given all the information about the characters; the dialogues are in a logical order, and the language consists of grammatically meaningful statements. However, all these features disappear in Pinter's plays. We are deprived of almost all information about the characters; all we know is what they say and do, and this is mysterious and evasive. As a clear example, the dialogue about the absent Stanley comes in *The Birthday Party*:

> ***Meg:*** Is Stanley down yet?
> ***Petey:*** No…he's…
> ***Meg:*** Is he still in bed?
> ***Petey:*** Yes, he's…still asleep.
> ***Meg:*** Still? He'll be late for his breakfast.
> ***Petey:*** Let him… sleep.
> *Pause.*

The rhythm hints at the darker recesses of the language games that people play. Language always means something different beyond its apparent meaning in his plays.

There are three different kinds of pauses in Pinter's plays. Three dots are the shortest: a pressure point, a search for the right word, a moment of incoherence. A pause is a longer interruption of action during which the lack of speech and presence of non-verbal tension becomes something almost like speech itself. A silence is the longest. It may be a crisis point from which the character emerges completely changed (Sack et al., 1974, p. 698). In the *Homecoming*, Lenny is telling Ruth his stories about prostitutes at their first meeting; and in the following he makes Ruth an erotic proposal and puts Ruth into the same position of a prostitute:

> ***Ruth:*** How did you know she was diseased?
> ***Lenny:*** How did I know?
> *Pause.*
> I decided she was.
> *Silence.*
> You and my brothers are newly-weds, are you?

As Lenny feels himself sure about his power over his girls, he changes the subject after the silence.

Pinter's pauses and long silences are often regarded as the climaxes of his plays. The end of *The Caretaker* can be a good example to this climactic point:

> ***Aston:*** You make too much noise.
> ***Davies:*** But…but…look…listen…listen here…I mean…
> *ASTON turns back to the window.*
> What am I going to do?
> *Pause.*
> What shall I do?
> *Pause.*
> Where am I going to go?
> *Pause.*
> If you want me to go…I'll go. You just say the word.
> *Pause.*
> I'll tell you what though… them shoes…them shoes…
> You give me…they're working out all right… they're all right.
> Maybe I could… get down…
> *ASTON remains still, his back to him, at the window.*
> Listen… if I… got down… if I was to… get my papers…
> would you… would you let… would you… if I got down
> … and got my…
> *Long silence.*

Long silence is identified by Esslin (1986) as "the death of hope for the old man, Aston's refusal to forgive him, his expulsion from the warmth of a home and death"(quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 160). Davies is begging for permission to stay in Aston's room but he gets no answer. Pinter ends the curtain with the desperate situation of Davies with the long silence.

As the frequent use of silences and pauses are standing out, Esslin (1985) calls it as the "economy of writing" in Pinter's plays. The characters' use of silence and pause reflect their threats and fears without giving them a name, and this style makes Pinter's plays really effective and surprising at the same time. What Pinter does by using pauses and silences is to give the exact realism of communication breakdown among the characters. Such economy in the use of language and the intense meanings beyond this tenuity in the text indicate the mastership of Pinter and he creates his own place as unique.

3.2. *The Birthday Party*

The Birthday Party is the first full-length play of Harold Pinter written in 1957. *The Birthday Party* is an accomplished example of the new *genre* (Esslin, 1982, p. 93). It is a skull-beneath play, exposing the horrors and fears that lurk under the calm, dull surface of our everyday existence.

The play is set in the sea-side boarding house kept by a childless couple, Petey and Meg. Petey is a kindly old man, employed as a desk-chair attendant. Meg is a slovenly but motherly old woman who keeps a seaside-boarding house in a British seaside town. Stanley is an indolent and indifferent man in his late thirties; he is the tenant of Meg and whose past is unclear and only known of being an old piano-player. Lulu is described at the beginning of the play simply; 'a woman in her twenties'. Although a small part, she fulfils a few essential roles in the play. Much of the plot revolves around the fact that Meg is planning to celebrate Stanley's birthday; a fact that he denies several times throughout the play. Meg claims he doesn't know that it's his birthday because she is keeping it as a secret. However, a supposedly innocent birthday party quickly becomes a nightmare as Stanley is psychologically tortured by the visit of two strangers, Goldberg and McCann.

Odd Talk

When the play is read in detail, most of the readers can realize the breakdowns and incongruity in the language the characters use, because there is a huge gulf in the relationship of the characters. To understand these breakdowns and incongruities much better, it will be helpful to analyze the language of the play with one of the most obvious features of Absurd Drama "Odd Talk". It is very obvious to see such anomalous conversation and the mismatch between context and utterances in *The Birthday Party*.

Stanley is a strange man; the relation between Meg and Stan is awkward somehow. A clear example can be seen in a dialogue between these two after the breakfast:

> ***Meg***: Is the sun shining? What are you smoking?
> ***Stanley***: A cigarette.
> ***Meg***: Are you going to give me one?
> ***Stanley:*** No.
> ***Meg:*** I like cigarettes.
> ***Stanley*** *(pushing her)*: Get away from me.
> ***Meg:*** Are you going out?

Stanley: Not with you.
Meg: But I'm going shopping in a minute.
Stanley: Go.
Meg: You'll be lonely, all by yourself.
Stanley: Will I?
Meg: Without your old Meg. I've got to get things in for the two gentlemen. (Pinter, 1957, p. 19)

The attitude of Meg towards Stan is conservative and soft; however Stan's answers to her are rude and irritating. The question Meg asks is changing immediately and Stan replies in a reckless manner. The context and the utterances go on in an inharmonious way between Meg and Stanley. In the following of this conversation, when Meg tells him about the two strangers coming to the boarding-house, Stanley suddenly changes his manner and doesn't want to believe to what Meg says; he asks questions one by one ' What are you talking about?',' Who are they?', ' Didn't he tell you their names?', 'Why are they coming here?'. Nevertheless, suddenly the dialogue breaks down:

Stanley: They won't come. Someone's taking the Michael. Forget all about it. It is a false alarm. A false alarm. *(he sits on the table)* Where is my tea? (Pinter, 1957, p. 21).

Stanley seems to be terrified in an inane manner and changes the subject and suddenly starts to argue with Meg about his tea. The breakdown comes here by the changing behaviour of Stanley as he is so disturbed by the news.

Another example appears in the dialogue between Goldberg and McCann:

McCann: Hey, Nat…
Goldberg *(reflectively):* Yes. One of the old school.
McCann: Nat. How do we know this is the right house?
Goldberg: What?
McCann: How do we know this is the right house?
Goldberg: What makes you think it's the wrong house?
McCann: I didn't see a number on the gate.
Goldberg: I wasn't looking for a number.
McCann: No? (Pinter, 1957, p. 28).

Goldberg is telling McCann about his old days with Uncle Barney, but McCann can not concentrate on it as he is so nervous about the situation they are in; this is where fraction comes out in the dialogue.

In *The Birthday Party*, the characters are ignorant of each other; there are lots of disjointed dialogues which cause the incongruity of context and language. For instance; when Petey and McCann go out together, Goldberg and Stanley are left alone; Goldberg starts chit chat to try to make Stanley speak, but the reaction of him is somehow fierce:

> ***Goldberg:*** A warm night.
> ***Stanley*** *(turning):* Don't mess me about!
> ***Goldberg***: I beg your pardon?
> ***Stanley*** *(moving downstage):* I'm afraid there's been a mistake.
> We're booked out. Your room is taken. Mrs. Boles forgot to tell you.
> You'll have to find somewhere else.
> ***Goldberg***: Are you the manager here? (Pinter, 1957, p. 44).

Goldberg goes on in a polite manner with Stan, but he insistently wants them to go as he is afraid of something. What Pinter does by giving a fraction in this dialogue in Goldberg's manner can be the use of politeness strategy to mitigate Goldberg's behaviour towards Stan to make him speak. As the below lines indicate, the tension between Stan and two strangers is rising; Goldberg and McCann are forcing Stan, they ask several meaningless and odd questions one by one with a fretful manner:

> ***Goldberg***: Webber, what were you doing yesterday?
> ***Stanley:*** Yesterday?
> ***Goldberg***: And the day before. What did you do the day before?
> ***Stanley:*** What do you mean?
> ***Goldberg:*** Why are you wasting everybody's time, Webber? Why are you getting in everybody's way?
> ***Stanley:*** Me? What are you-
> …
> ***Goldberg***: What did you wear last week, Webber? Where do you keep your suits?
> ***McCann:*** When did you leave the organization?
> ***Goldberg:*** What would your old mum say, Webber?
> ***McCann:*** When did you betray us?
> …
> ***Goldberg***: Webber, you are a fake. When did you last wash up a cup?
> ***Stanley***: The Christmas before last.
> ***Goldberg:*** Where?
> ***Stanley:*** Lyons Corner house.
> ***Goldberg:*** Which one?
> ***Stanley:*** Marble Arch.
> ***Goldberg:*** Where was your wife?
> ***Stanley:*** In-
> ***Goldberg***: Answer.
> ***Stanley*** *(turning, crouched):* What wife?
> …

Goldberg: When did you last pray?
McCann: He's sweating!
Goldberg: Is the number 846 possible or necessary?
…
Goldberg: What do you use for pyjamas?
Stanley: Nothing.
Goldberg: You verminate the sheet of your birth?
McCann: What about the Albigensenist heresy?
Goldberg: Who watered the wicket in Melbourne? (Pinter, 1957, pp. 47-51).

Goldberg and McCann go on asking several questions like those above. Simpson calls it as "a cross- examination" (quoted in Culperer et al., 1998, p. 44). The cross-examination here is created by Pinter that a series of questions are directed to addressee Stanley by Goldberg and McCann to trap him. The reader can realize the power and pressure of two men on Stanley. The function of the questions can be perceived as a mode of social control in the interactive roles of participants (Culperer, 1998, p. 45). Indeed, inharmonious dialogues and illogical actions of the characters make the reader or audience laugh at out of the dramatic realism. All these irrelevant and disjointed dialogues indicate the communication gaps among the characters.

Turn-Taking

Turn-taking is a method by which people organize actions in conversation. Effective verbal communication depends on this organization. Pinter creates a unique kind of structure additionally by using pauses and silences in his plays. He tends to organize turns by removing competition for speaking opportunities. In *The Birthday Party*, the characters tend to allow others to have their say. From the perspective of a Stylistic Analysis, there are moments when the characters choose not to speak when they are expected to do so, or when character select others to speak, and when they allow pauses and silences. These moments indicate the characters' refusal to collaborate to make meaningful communication. In the opening lines of *The Birthday Party*, Meg calls Petey for his breakfast:

Meg: Is that you Petey?
Pause.
Petey, is that you?
Pause.
Petey?
Petey: What?
Meg: Is that you?
Petey: Yes, it's me (Pinter, 1957, p. 9).

Meg forces Petey to answer her question; but Petey ignores her at first. Petey's refusal to reply at the Transition Relevance Place (TRP) forces Meg to repeat her questions again and again. Pinter's use of pauses and silences is highly clear in his plays. James Hollis (1970) notes that "a pause occurs when the character is waiting for a response from the other side, or it occurs when he cannot find the words to say what he wants" (pp. 14-15). However, Pinter (1985), who sees a little difference between silence and pause, maintains that:

> The pause is a pause because of what has just happened in the minds and guts of the characters…. And a silence is equally means that something has happened to create the impossibility of anyone speaking for a certain amount of time – until they recover whatever happened before the silence. (quoted in Bloom, 1987, p. 38).

Meg's questions for Petey are coming one by one and she pauses sometimes to have a turn from Petey, but Meg can not get the answers she expects.

> ***Meg***: What time did you go out this morning, Petey?
> ***Petey:*** Same time as usual.
> ***Meg:*** Was it dark?
> ***Petey:*** No, it was light.
> ***Meg*** (*beginning to darn):* But sometimes you go out in the morning and it's dark.
> ***Petey:*** That's in winter.
> ***Meg:*** Oh, in winter.
> ***Petey:*** Yes, it gets light in winter.
> ***Meg:*** Oh.
> *Pause.*
> …
> ***Meg:*** What a shame. I'd be sorry. I'd much rather have a little boy.
> ***Petey:*** A little girl is much better.
> ***Meg:*** I'd much rather have a little boy. (Pinter, 1957,p. 10)
> *Pause.*

In Act III, Goldberg and McCann decide to take Stan with them and their decisiveness is clear from the answer they give to Petey:

> ***Goldberg***: Still the same old Stan. Come with us. Come on, boy.
> ***McCann:*** Come along with us.
> ***Petey***: Where are you taking him?
> *They turn. Silence.*
> ***Goldberg***: We're taking him to Monty (Pinter, 1957, p. 85).

After the silence, Goldberg gives the expected answer. Pinter uses the silence here to rise the tension and may give the climax of the play. Mainly, characters allow other

speakers to have their say in *The Birthday Party*. However, the power struggle of Goldberg on Stanley can be seen in their dialogues clearly:

> ***Goldberg:*** Mr. Webber, sit down.
> ***Stanley:*** It's no good starting any kind of trouble.
> ***Goldberg:*** Sit down.
> ***Stanley:*** Why should I?
> ***Goldberg:*** If you want to know the truth, Webber,
> you're beginning to get on my breasts.
> ***Stanley:*** Really? Well, that's-
> ***Goldberg:*** Sit down (p. 47).

Pinter demonstrates how a character uses language to establish hierarchical position and define perceptions. In the lines above, Goldberg is forcing Stanley to sit down by using his power on Stan. Moreover, characters rush past transition relevance (TRP) places so as not to allow the selected speaker a chance to disagree. By doing so, a character can define his own reality and impose that reality on another. For instance, Goldberg and McCann ask questions to Stanley consecutively just like an inquiry:

> ***Goldberg:*** Why did you never get married? [TRP]
> ***McCann:*** She was waiting at the porch. [TRP]
> ***Goldberg:*** You skedaddled from the wedding. [TRP]
> ***McCann:*** He left her in the lurch. [TRP]
> ***Goldberg:*** You left her in the pudding club. [TRP]
> …
> ***Goldberg***: Do you recognize an external force? [TRP]
> ***Stanley:*** What?
> ***Goldberg***: Do you recognize an external force?
> ***McCann:*** That's the question! [TRP] (Pinter, 1957, p. 49).

Goldberg and McCann do not allow Stanley to reply or agree or disagree with what they say. They try to impose a subjective perspective by their attempts to control TRPs and Stanley can not even say anything to what they claim. Again, the same situation can be caught in the following lines to see how Goldberg ignores Stan to say even a word to what he tells and keeps Stanley to control the situation. Stanley's refusal to TRPs forces Goldberg to re-initiate:

> ***Goldberg:*** How are you Stan?
> *Pause.*
> Are you feeling any better?
> *Pause.*
> What's the matter with your glasses?
> *Goldberg bends to look.*

They are broken. A pity (Pinter, 1957, p. 81).
Stanley stares blankly at the floor.

Stanley rejects Goldberg and attempts to be silent or prepares for a battle. Whenever a TRP occurs, characters must make a calculated decision; to speak or not to speak (Hollis, 1970, 76). Such an order designs the realistic daily communication skilfully by giving the intention of the characters and the meaning beyond their messages.

Repetition

The language Pinter presents is full of challenges for the reader or audience. Part of that challenge exists because the dialogue moves so close to our everyday conversation that it can relax us yet, at the same time, disturbs us because the lines go on and on, and they say less and less on the surface. It is through repetition that Pinter sends his message about the difficulty of communicating. In Pinter's plays the repetition that normally provides enough redundancy in conversation to process information is increased such a level that the message becomes unclear and ambiguous. Repetition in Pinter moves in two directions. When characters repeat, they are usually either trying to evade responding to the questions of other characters, or they are trying to dominate verbally other characters themselves and keep more control. In *The Birthday Party*, repetition varies. Sometimes just one word is changed; sometimes the order of words is changed; sometimes a statement is changed into question.

At the beginning of *The Birthday Party*, Meg wants Petey to approve her about the taste of cornflakes she prepares for him and Petey is willing to repeat Meg's "nice" in order to show that he is paying attention:

Meg: I've got your cornflakes ready. Here's your cornflakes.
Are they *nice*?
Petey: *Very nice.*
Meg: I thought They'd be *nice* (Pinter, 1957, p. 9).

When it is considered in a deeper sense, the emptiness of the dialogue may indicate the emptiness of the characters' relationship with each other, the boredom of their lives and their determination to go on making friendly dialogue. Meg works at communicating with Goldberg, by repeating what he has just said in the greeting to her:

Goldberg: … How are you keeping Mrs. Boles?
Meg: Oh, very well, thank you.
Goldberg: Yes? *Really* ?

Meg: Oh, yes *really* (Pinter, 1957, p. 30).

Sometimes a character can repeat his or her own words to emphasize a request, as when Lulu is frightened and says "Hold me. Hold me." Characters can also repeat exact words to greet other characters or to wish them happy birthday, as Lulu and McCann do in the following sequence:

Goldberg: Lift your glasses. Stanley—
happy birthday.
McCann: *Happy birthday*.
Lulu: *Happy birthday* (Pinter, 1957, p. 57).

Characters in *The Birthday Party* repeat their own words and the words of the previous speakers. Goldberg and McCann repeat their own questions and each other's questions subsequently while questioning Stanley:

Goldberg: *Why did the chicken cross the road?*
Stanley: He wanted to- 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?* (Pinter, 1957, pp. 51-52).

Or it can be the repetition of a question with expansion as in this interrogation of Stanley by Goldberg:

Goldberg: *Is the number 846 possible or necessary?*
Stanley: Neither.
Goldberg: *Wrong! Is the number 846 possible or necessary?*
Stanley: Both.
Goldberg: *Wrong. It's necessary but not possible.*
Stanley: Both.
Goldberg: *Wrong.* Why do you think *the number 846 is necessarily possible?*
Stanley: Must be.
Goldberg: *Wrong. It's only necessarily necessary*. We admit *possibility* only after we grant *necessity. It is possible because necessary but by no means necessary through possibility*. *The possibility* can only be assumed after the proof of *necessity.* (Pinter, 1957, p. 50).

When characters repeat the words of the previous speaker in Pinter's plays, the repetition can serve as a signal of rhythm, as it often does in daily conversation. Repetition in Pinter also functions just like in everyday conversation. When critics comment on how close Pinter's

dialogue to our everyday speech, part of what they are responding is the repetition patterns. As Martin Esslin (1969) says, "Pinter's clinically accurate ear for the absurdity of ordinary speech enables him to transcribe everyday conversation in all its repetitiveness, incoherence, and lack of logic or grammar" (p.243).The repetitious dialogues can sometimes cause disharmony for the reader or audience in Pinter's plays. In Act II, the bombing of the questions, which lasts seven pages in the play text by Goldberg and McCann to Stanley, can also make the reader to feel the force as well as Stanley:

> ***Goldberg:*** Webber, what were you doing yesterday?
> ***Stanley:*** Yesterday?
> ***Goldberg:*** And the day before. What did you do the day before?
> ***Stanley:*** What do you mean?
> ***Goldberg:*** Why are you wasting everybody's time, Webber? Why are you getting in everybody's way?
> ***Stanley:*** Me? What are you-
> …
> ***Goldberg:*** Where was your wife?
> ***Stanley***: In-
> ***Goldberg***: Answer.
> ***Stanley*** *(turning crouched)*: What wife?
> ***Goldberg:*** What have you done to your wife?
> ***McCann:*** He's killed his wife.
> ***Goldberg:*** Why did you kill your wife?
> …
> ***Goldberg***: What is your trade?
> ***McCann:*** What about Ireland?
> ***Goldberg***: What is your trade? (Pinter, 1957, pp. 50-52).

Much of the discomfort Pinter creates with repetitious dialogues in his plays can be the reason to show the total collapse of communication among characters. It is given skilfully by Pinter how the characters are willing to avoid real communication and escape from the realities in their lives, and actually the message Pinter sends to his reader/ audience is to indicate how we also evade communication in our lives by avoiding answering someone directly or indirectly; often giving more information than required and never answering exactly what is asked.

Speech Acts

Speech Acts in *The Birthday Party* are formed by different structures. An obvious example can be taken as the insults of Stanley to Meg by criticizing her to be a bad wife:

> ***Stanley***: You're a bad wife.
> ***Meg:*** I'm not. Who said I am?

Stanley: Not to make your husband a cup of tea. Terrible.
Meg: He knows I'm not a bad wife.
Stanley: Giving him sour milk instead.
Meg: It wasn't sour.
Stanley: Disgraceful. (Pinter, 1957, p. 16).

In the final scene of *The Birthday Party*, the loss of the hope of love suffered by Meg can be seen obviously. Meg knows for sure that Stanley has gone, but she can not admit it to herself; and Petey is too inarticulate to offer a speech of consolation according to this situation:

Meg: I was the belle of the ball.
Petey: Were you?
Meg: Oh yes. They all said I was.
Petey: I bet you were, too.
Meg: Oh, it's true. I was.
Pause.
I know I was. (Pinter, 1957, p. 87).

The specific thing Meg wants to hear is the approval of Petey towards Meg's words, however what the hearer expects to get from the speaker is not corresponded and this may break the sincerity rule.

A threat is a strategic introduction of conflict, or heightening of interpersonal conflict, aimed at coercing another into undertaking an undesired situation. (Searle, 1969, p. 33) McCann and Goldberg want Stanley insistently to sit down, however as Stanley is stubborn about this situation and does not sit down, McCann starts threatening him:

McCann*:* Nat.
Goldberg: What?
McCann: He won't sit down.
Goldberg: Well, ask him.
McCann: I've asked him.
Goldberg: Ask him again.
McCann: (to *Stanley):* Sit down.
Stanley: Why?
McCann: You'd be more comfortable.
Stanley: So would you.
Pause.
McCann: All right. If you will I will.
Stanley: You first.
McCann slowly sits at the table, left.
McCann: Well?
Stanley: Right. Now you've both had a rest you can get out.
McCann *(rising):* That's a dirty trick! I'll kick the shite out of him! (Pinter, 1957, pp. 45-46).

As the tension rises, McCann can't stand the stubbornness of Stanley, however at the beginning of the talk, McCann and Goldberg try to persuade him softly and gently to sit down. The threat effectively places Stanley imposing the threat in a position of power. In other words, the objective of the threat here is to coerce the character to do what they want.

In Act III, Goldberg and Lulu meet again and Lulu faces a strange request by Goldberg:

> ***Goldberg:*** Come over here.
> ***Lulu:*** What's going to happen?
> ***Goldberg***: Come over here.
> ***Lulu:*** No, thank you. (Pinter, 1957, p. 79).

In the request of Goldberg, which may be perceived as a threat as well, Lulu tries to avoid this undesirable situation, so she withdraws herself. In another sense, Goldberg does not threat her directly, he suggests his threat, thereby undermining the essential condition which would oblige him to act if Lulu does not behave as he desires. In the following of the dialogue, Goldberg carries on his request for Lulu and Lulu prevents his action by refusing him:

> ***Goldberg***: Have a game of pantoon first, for old time's sake.
> ***Lulu***: I've had enough games.
> ***Goldberg:*** A girl like you, at your age, at your time of health, and you don't take to games?
> ***Lulu:*** You're very smart.
> …
> ***Lulu***: I wouldn't touch you.
> ***Goldberg:*** And I'm leaving today.
> ***Lulu:*** You're leaving?
> ***Goldberg:*** Today.
> ***Lulu*** *(with growing anger)*: You used me for a night. A passing fancy. (Pinter, 1957, p. 80).

Goldberg tries to deceive and seduce her, however Lulu seems to be aware of the situation and Goldberg's unsuccessful action foreshadows the ensuing power struggle between two, but it goes on with McCann's sudden participation to them by insulting Lulu in an indirect way:

> ***McCann***: That's fair enough. *(Advancing).* You had a long sleep, Miss.
> ***Lulu*** *(backing upstage left):* Me?
> ***McCann:*** Your sort, you spend too much time in bed.
> ***Lulu:*** What do you mean?
> ***McCann***: Have you got anything to confess?
> ***Lulu:*** What?
> ***McCann*** *(savagely):* Confess!
> ***Lulu:*** Confess what?
> ***McCann:*** Down your knees and confess! (Pinter, 1957, p. 80).

As Goldberg does not seem to suppress Lulu, McCann tries to regain power on Lulu by turning his request into a command and insulting her directly. Characters via power, struggle to define realities, cover their true intentions and attempt to dominate situations through speech acts and conversational actions. Most obviously, Goldberg's and McCann's manipulation of conversational action is similar to everyday use of indirect speech acts to achieve a dominant position throughout the play.

In *The Birthday Party*, Harold Pinter introduces his main objective about the essence of humankind via his language. Meg and Petey's dull conversations, Stanley's unawareness and escape from the outside world, Goldberg and McCann's meaningless desire to dominate over Stanley and captivate him present the reader the true intention of the author by the effect of language. Because, in Pinter's plays the intentions of the characters are not given as background information; the key is the language itself.

3.3. *The Homecoming*

The Homecoming written in 1965 is perhaps Harold Pinter's most enigmatic and mysterious play of all his works. The play consists of six characters, five men and a woman. The plot of the play involves the eldest son of the all male-household Teddy who brings his wife home to meet his family for the first time from the United States and who experienced the working class London Background as he grew up with it. Teddy is a lecturer who teaches philosophy at university. Teddy and Max's chauffeur brother Sam are calm and passive male figures in the family. The father figure Max is a nagging and aggressive ex-butcher. Teddy's wife Ruth who is one of the most important characters in the play is known to be an old prostitute and her coming affects the family members both as a mother portrait and a whore in an incomprehensible manner. Lenny is perhaps the mostly affected person by the coming of Ruth as he spends a lot of time thinking of his mother in a sexual context, hence the questions about his conception, and maybe that's why he has become a pimp in Soho. Joey has a position as a boxer in the play.

Throughout the play, position and struggle of power among characters are presented by Pinter, because everyone thinks they have the power in *The Homecoming*. For instance; Ruth is not an intelligent woman but she is so cunning to realize that she can use her position and power both as a mother figure and a prostitute to control the male members of the family. All the characters try to dominate each other by either mocking, or insulting. According to

Dukore (1982), "the play disorients" (p. 75). That is, a butcher cooks what one of his sons' calls dog foods, a young fighter is knocked down by his old father, a philosopher refuses to philosophe, a chauffer is unable to drive, a pimp takes orders from his whore and the whore does not go all the way with a man. All these disorientations can be perceived as the words disorient in the play.

Odd Talk

The signs of Odd Talk which is one of the most frequent figures used in Absurd Theatre can be rarely seen in *The Homecoming*. After six years Teddy comes home without calling anyone; but the first meet of Lenny and Teddy is somehow bizarre:

> ***Teddy****:* Hullo, Lenny.
> ***Lenny****:* Hullo, Teddy.
> *Pause.*
> ***Teddy:*** I didn't hear you come down the stairs.
> ***Lenny:*** I didn't.
> *Pause.*
> I sleep down here now. Next door. I've got a kind of study,
> workroom cum bedroom next door now, you see.
> ***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* (Pinter, 1965, p. 33).

In spite of several years of absence, Lenny and Teddy behave as if they were all together as usual. There is no sign of happiness or surprise by the coming of Teddy for Lenny. This conversation can be an evidence for the communication gap between two brothers and Pinter creates odd conversations to reflect it in a brilliant way. In the following, the dialogue goes on in the same manner:

> ***Teddy:*** How are you?
> **Lenny:** Well, just sleeping a bit restlessly, that's all. Tonight, anyway.
> ***Teddy:*** Bad dreams?
> ***Lenny:*** No, I wouldn't say I was dreaming. It's not exactly a dream.
> It's just something keeps waking me up. Some kind of tick.
> ***Teddy:*** A tick?
> ***Lenny:*** Yes.
> ***Teddy:*** Well, what is it?
> ***Lenny:*** I don't know.
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1965, p. 33).

The conversation between Teddy and Lenny goes on in the same irrelevancy, and Pinter tries to emphasize the incongruity and oddness of the relationship of the characters in a strange way, because most of the time Harold Pinter uses concrete examples to attract the attention of his audience or reader to demonstrate the disjointed relationship of people in real life as well. Even the people who are the same family members are not aware of the presence of each other as they retire into themselves.

Another example of Odd Talk can be given in the dialogue of Ruth and Lenny's first encounter. When they meet, they introduce themselves. At first sight, it seems to be a normal conversation, but in the continuation of the conversation the oddness starts when Lenny asks Ruth about the relationship between his brother and her:

> ***Lenny:*** You must be connected with my brother in some way.
> The one who's been abroad.
> ***Ruth:*** I'm his wife.
> ***Lenny:*** Eh listen, I wonder if you can advise me. I've been having a bit of a rough time with this clock. The tick's been having keeping me up. The trouble is I'm not all that convinced it was the clock. I mean there are lots of things which tick in the night, do you find that? (Pinter, 1965, p. 36).
> …
> ***Ruth:*** We're on a visit to Europe.
> ***Lenny:*** What, both of you?
> ***Ruth:*** Yes.
> ***Lenny:*** What, you sort of live with him over there, do you?
> ***Ruth:*** We're married.
> ***Lenny:*** On a visit to Europe, eh? Seen much of it? (Pinter, 1965, p. 37).

The curiosity of Lenny to learn about the relationship between Ruth and his brother contrasts with the answers he gives, because he asks the same question twice and Ruth says that they're married or she's his wife. However, Lenny persistently ignores the answers to his questions and talks about indifferent things with Ruth. This behaviour of Lenny which creates an odd atmosphere may show that he does not care or he does not want to accept this fact.

Turn-Taking

Turn-taking method is given as a competition in *The Homecoming*. When an author wants to create a vigorous spoken dialogue, this depends on turn-taking method. In *The Homecoming* characters purposely pervert from normal conversational turn-taking procedures to accomplish personal objectives. The reader or the audience can presumably recognize these departures, many of which are no doubt habitualized because of regular usage. Pinter tends to

organize turns in his dramas by removing competition for speaking opportunities. As in most of his plays, Pinter uses moments like silence and pause to demonstrate the characters' refusal to create a meaningful dialogue in *The Homecoming*. The dialogues in *The Homecoming* never overlap and characters rarely interrupt others. Rather, the characters tend to allow others to have their say.

In *The Homecoming*, speakers select others who choose not to respond. The refusal to speak is regarded as a form of protection or a means to ignore the tactics of the current speaker. The opening lines of the play indicate this point when Max is addressing Lenny:

> ***Max***: What have you done with the scissors?
> *Pause*.
> I said I'm looking for the scissors. What have you done with them?
> *Pause.*
> Did you hear me? I want to cut something out of the paper(Pinter, 1965, p. 23).

Lenny ignores Max to protect his dominance and to keep Max from controlling the situation. Lenny's refusal to respond at the TRPS forces Max to restart. Lenny rejects Max and attempts to silence him or to prepare for a battle. Later, after Max has gone on about his exploits as a younger man and his power over horses, Lenny changes the conversation:

> ***Lenny:*** Dad, do you mind if I change the subject?
> *Pause.*
> I want to ask you something. The dinner we had before, what was the name of it? What do you call it?
> *Pause.*
> Why don't you buy a dog? You are a dog cook.
> (Pinter, 1965, pp. 26- 27).

Max refusal to Lenny is a form of protection. He knows Lenny is insulting him and dismissing his prior boasting. Max uses silence to try to stop Lenny from speaking. Lenny, on the other hand, attempts to force Max to speak so as to seem to collaborate in the impending insult. Pinter shows contentious character relationships and their power struggles by emphasizing refusals to speak when selected.

Moreover, the speaker includes the selected respondent in the conversation, usually as a target of an attack, while at the same time denying that character a defence. During his first meet with Ruth, Lenny describes a noise that will not let him sleep:

> ***Lenny:*** The tick's been keeping me up. The trouble is I am not all that convinced it was the clock. I mean there are lots of things which tick in the night, don't you find that? All sorts of objects, which, in the day, you wouldn't call anything else but commonplace. (Pinter, 1965, p. 44).

Lenny has no intention of letting Ruth respond until he has made his absurd point and tested her reactions. He is creating a perception of himself, suggesting he has the power to propose the absurd and the irrational and that she would endanger herself by disagreeing. Further, Lenny communicates his ability to see beneath surface appearances. He also wants to establish his control over the relationship by rushing through a TRP which he originates. Later, after Ruth has gone upstairs, Max demands Lenny explain all the noise. Lenny, frustrated by his inability to intimidate Ruth, lashes out at Max:

> ***Lenny:*** That night… you know… the night you got me… that night with Mum, what was it like? Eh? When I was just a glint in your eye. What was it like? What was the background to it? I mean, I want to know the real facts about my background? (Pinter, 1965, p. 52).

A Transition Relevance Place (TRP) which is rushed past by a speaker who selects another after asking a question is particularly noticeable because the speaker is viewed as violating conversational rules. Inferences are made about selecting speaker and the selected person. Lenny has no intention of allowing Max to cut in to the conversation until after he has made his point, which is to bring up the ambiguous subject of Lenny's real fatherhood. Lenny knows Max to be vulnerable and he takes advantage of it. Lenny is able to weaken Max by disallowing a speaking opportunity when Max is challenged to speak about a vastly important matter. Max is further weakened by his inability to silence Lenny. Max also chooses not to answer the question of Lenny, displaying his inability to compete with Lenny's attack.

TRPs do not allow the selected speaker an opportunity to disagree. For example; when Teddy and Ruth first arrive, Teddy says to Ruth:

> ***Teddy:*** What do you think of the room? (TRP) Big, isn't it? (TRP) It is a big house. (TRP) I mean, it is a fine room, (TRP) don't you Think? (TRP) Actually, there was a wall (TRP), across there (TRP)… with a door (TRP) (Pinter, 1965, p. 37).

Teddy does not allow Ruth to disagree with him, nor does she deign to respond to his comments and questions. He is intent on proving his point while appearing to include her in

the conversation and implying her agreement. He is intent on ignoring his utterances, perhaps to express her feeling about the room in baffling silence.

As it is known, silences and pauses are the most common features of Pinter's plays. The "silences" and "pauses" Pinter writes into *The Homecoming* are not altogether different from the ones we experience in everyday conversation. They are as significant as the words in the text. As in most dramas, they demonstrate the tension in a situation and Pinter uses silence and pause to create a high tension where nothing can be further said. An obvious example is seen between Max and Lenny. After Max's boasting and Lenny's subsequent insult of Max, Max grabs his cane. Lenny responds with:

> ***Lenny:*** Oh, Daddy, you are not going to use your stick on me, are you? Eh? Don't use your stick on me, Daddy. No, please. It wasn't my fault. It was one of the others. I haven't done anything wrong, Dad, honest. Don't clout me with that stick, Dad (Pinter, 1965, p. 27).

This is followed by a silence. Lenny has prevailed, successfully disallowing Max's boasting and idle threats to affect him. Max realizes that to go further would only provide Lenny more opportunities to confute Max's power. When Max chooses not to continue, he concedes to Lenny's verbal dominance. Lenny mocks Max in a childish manner, reminding him that he is not a little and weak boy. Another example can be indicated after Lenny tells Ruth about the prostitute he beats:

> ***Ruth***: How did you know she was diseased?
> ***Lenny***: How did I know?
> *Pause.*
> I decided she was.
> *Silence* (Pinter, 1965, p. 39).

This silence is followed by a new subject introduced by Lenny:

> ***Lenny:*** You and my brother are newly weds, are you? (Pinter, 1965, p. 47).

Ruth has successfully challenged Lenny's perspective and Lenny has adequately responded. He is aware that if he continued, it would expose a weakness since Ruth refuses to express any sense of his intended warnings. Ruth's decision not to answer shows her small victory. Because she has achieved her goal of calling his power into question, there is no

further need to challenge Lenny. A strong example of pause is also given in the dialogue between Lenny and Ruth on a nonsense talk about the glass which Ruth is drinking water:

> ***Ruth:*** I haven't quite finished.
> ***Lenny***: You've consumed quite enough, in my opinion.
> ***Ruth***: No, I haven't.
> ***Lenny***: Quite sufficient, in my opinion.
> ***Ruth:*** Not in mine, Leonard.
> *Pause.*
> ***Lenny:*** Don't call me that, please.
> ***Ruth:*** Why not?
> ***Lenny***: That's the name my mother gave me.
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1965, p. 41).

The suppress Lenny is trying to apply on Ruth seems not to work as Ruth cleverly catches the weak side of Lenny by calling him with the name his mother used to call. After she pronounces the name "Leonard", she waits for his reaction to it; and she goes on using this weakness against him.

Repetition

Harold Pinter uses a different way to make the reader recognize the difficulty in conversation by using several repetitions in his plays. Since most of the battle is based on the power of struggle in *The Homecoming*, repetition also serves for this purpose. As the characters want to surpass on each other, they use their verbal power. Joey has a shy personality, he even abstains while talking about something, and Lenny tries to be dominant on the other members of the family and he chooses Joey about a very simple subject:

> ***Lenny*** *(to Joey):* How'd you get on?
> ***Joey:*** Er… not bad.
> ***Lenny***: *What do you mean?*
> *Pause.*
> *What do you mean?*
> ***Joey:*** Not bad (Pinter, 1965, p. 73).

Lenny's harsh attitude towards Joey seems to be repressive in a sense. In Act I, Lenny emphasizes the word 'tuck up' and repeats it several times while talking to Max in order to irritate and mocks with him:

> ***Lenny:*** What the boys want *Dad,* is your own special brand of cooking, *Dad.* That's what the boys look forward to. The special understanding of food, you know, that you've got.
> ***Max***: Stop calling me *Dad.* Just all that calling me *Dad,* do you understand?

Lenny: But I'm your son. 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 (Pinter, 1965, p. 25).

Lenny repeats the word "tuck up" to criticize Max about his paternity, or reminds him something from the past which makes Max annoy. Repetition in Pinter's plays reflects the daily conversations and it sometimes gives a harmony to the conversation. The sequence of words in the dialogue between Max and Sam can be considered as a good example:

Sam: I don't mess up my car! Or my… my boss's car! Like other people.
Max: *Other people? What other people?*
Pause.
What other people?
Pause.
Sam: *Other people* (Pinter, 1965, p. 23).

There can also be the repetition of question to indicate the complete collapse in the relationship of the characters as seen in the example of Max:

Sam: You know what he said to me? He told me I was the best chauffer he'd ever had. The best one.
Max: *From what point of view?*
Lenny: Eh?
Max: *From what point of view?* (Pinter, 1965, p. P. 21).

The reaction Max shows towards Sam's comments is somehow strange and incomprehensible. He can not understand whether Sam's words are true or not. He does not want to believe what he says. Pinter does not focus on repetition in *The Homecoming* as he does in *The Birthday Party*; however the function is the same; it is a simple indication of how people avoid communication in their lives and how much they are aware of it.

Speech Acts

Speech Acts in *The Homecoming* are dominated by threats and insults as the characters compete for power. Threats are considered to be commissives in the Stylistic Analysis; their purpose is to commit the speaker to a future course of action. It effectively places the character imposing the threat in a position of power over the recipient of the threat. In the first scene, the reader recognizes Max threatening Lenny unsuccessfully:

Max: Listen! I'll chop your spine off, you talk to me like that!

Lenny: You know what, you are getting demented (Pinter, 1965, p. 25).

Lenny rejects Max's attempt with an insulting response, because Lenny does not believe Max is capable of carrying out the threat and the threat fails. Lenny's insult, on the other hand, succeeds. Lenny proposes the reality of Max's situation. Max recognizes the negative assertion at the end of the conversation. Max does not pursue Lenny or respond to the insult, thereby conceding to the essential condition of Lenny's attack on Max's character. Pinter reveals subversion in the traditional father/son relationship. Lenny is not under the control of Max and, actually, he dominates the relationship.

When Lenny meets Ruth, he tests her strength through indirect attacks. After a long story in which he recalls physical abuse of women, he informs Ruth of a woman (a prostitute) he once beat because she was "diseased". The message of Lenny is indirect; if Ruth causes a problem for Lenny, he will do the necessary thing to punish her, since the threat does not follow a direct structure, its function as an intended action is emphasized. He does not directly communicate the threat but suggests it, thus undermining the essential condition which will oblige him to act if Ruth should not behave as he desires. Ruth rejects his threat by questioning his logic:

Ruth: How did you know she was diseased?
Lenny: I decided she was (Pinter, 1965, p. 45).

Lenny attempts to regain his position against Ruth and Ruth prevents his action by refusing to acknowledge his threat, and instead inserting a question for further information. Ruth wins the point because Lenny responds her request rather than reinforce his threat. His unsuccessful action foreshadows the ensuing power between them. Lenny's threat and Ruth's indirect parry demonstrate how both employ masking through indirect speech acts to hide their true intention.

A different contest of insult occurs between Max and Sam:

Sam: I can only drive one car. They can't have me at the same time.
Max: Anyone could have you at the same time. You'd bend over for half a dollar on Blackfriars Bridge.
Sam: Me!
Max: For two bob and a toffy apple (Pinter, 1965, p. 56).

There is a strange competition between two brothers and Max insistently goes on insulting Sam directly. Sam tries to defend himself, nevertheless; he can not escape from writhining under Max's insult.

As a means of power, Ruth follows a different perspective. She uses her sexual power to make the male members of the family to do what she wants:

> ***Ruth:*** I'd like something to eat. (To Lenny) I'd like a drink.
> Did you get any drink?
> ***Lenny:*** We've got drink.
> ***Ruth:*** I'd like one, please.
> ***Lenny:*** What drink?
> ***Ruth:*** Whisky.
> ***Lenny:*** I've got it.
> *Pause.*
> ***Ruth:*** Well, get it.
> *Lenny goes to the sideboard, takes out bottle and glasses.*
> *Joey moves towards her.*
> Put the record off.
> *He looks at her, turns, puts the record off.*
> I want something to eat.
> …
> What's this glass? I can't drink out of this. Haven't you got a tumbler?
> ***Lenny:*** Yes.
> ***Ruth:*** Well, put it in a tumbler. (Pinter, 1965, p. 69).

When Ruth realizes their weakness about women, she begins to use her physical power; it is like hypnosis. Even the most dominant character of the play Lenny seems to be affected by her deeply as he does whatever she wants immediately. Characters in *The Homecoming* accomplish their aims through conversational actions. What make these characters identifiable are not so much their positions; but their use of conversational actions to define realities and realize their objectives. Most of the readers/audiences would not relate Lenny because he is a pimp; but his manipulation of conversational action is similar to everyday use of indirect speech acts to achieve a dominant position. Ruth, on the other hand, bests Lenny's implied threats by her subtle intimidations.

Throughout the play, the disturbing power of dominance, the communication gap among characters and their disjointed relationships highly symbolize the absurdity of the characters' inner worlds.

3.4. *Ashes to Ashes*

Ashes to Ashes is a short-length play written by Harold Pinter in 1996. The play consists of only two characters, Rebecca and Devlin. Rebecca is a beautiful woman tormented by her painful past. She is indeed accepted to be a lost figure in a drowning landscape. Devlin is the husband who insistently rummages around her psyche without ever listening what Rebecca says.

In the play, Rebecca tells a story from her past to Devlin. In the story of Rebecca, the signs of atrocity are highly emphasized by Pinter. According to Peacock (1997), Rebecca is completely affected by "Nazi Holocaust" (p. 307). The great destruction and pain can be simply felt by her story.

Loss of power and responsibility are one of the most obvious images in *Ashes to Ashes*. The power in the play comes from the conflict between mystery and menace in Rebecca's story (Almansi& Henderson, 1983, p. 85). Rebecca is so desperate that she remembers being brutalized during a holocaust by a man she claims was a lover and then uses that memory to rouse Devlin's jealousy. Rebecca is accepted to be too young to have experienced Nazi Holocaust as a grown woman. Unlike Rebecca, Devlin is mostly focused on his jealousy of her barbaric lover whom Rebecca first describes as a tour guide, then as someone who tears babies from their screaming mothers on a train platform. The play's mystery comes from the questions that give more insight into responsibility which is the central question of the play.

Ashes to Ashes has the power to lead a nameless fear and a primal terror of a past holocaust and atrocity, and Rebecca's story becomes a reality in the present, joining that past to a multitude of more recent and current holocaust victims.

All the effects of Holocaust, atrocity, responsibility and fear are given in a realistic dialogue by Pinter. He even uses simple topics with the added tension of the questions. Harold Pinter focuses mostly on the memories of Rebecca to arise the attention of his reader/audience by using a realistic speech.

Odd Talk

When the play is read in detail, two examples of Odd Talk can be seen in the dialogue between Rebecca and Devlin. While Rebecca is talking about her lover to Devlin, she hears a police siren:

> ***Rebecca***: By the way, I'm terribly upset.
> ***Devlin***: Are you? Why?
> ***Rebecca:*** Well, it's about that police siren we heard a couple of minutes ago.
> ***Devlin***: What police siren?
> ***Rebecca:*** Didn't you hear it? You must have heard it. Just a couple of minutes ago.
> ***Devlin:*** What about it?
> ***Rebecca***: I'm terribly upset.
> *Pause*.
> I'm just incredibly upset. (Pinter, 1996, p. 29).

At first, Rebecca seems to be badly affected by the police siren; she remembers the Holocaust. However; in the following she changes:

> ***Rebecca:*** Don't you want to know why? Well, I'm going to tell you anyway. If I can't tell you who can I tell? Well, I'll tell you anyway. It just hit me so hard. You see … as the siren faded away in my ears I knew it was becoming louder and louder for somebody else.
> ***Devlin:*** You mean that it's always being heard by somebody, somewhere? Is that what you are saying? (Pinter, 1996, p. 29)
> …
> ***Rebecca:*** It makes me feel insecure. Terribly insecure.
> ***Devlin:*** Why?
> ***Rebecca:*** I hate it fading away. I hate it echoing away. I hate it leaving me away.
> I hate losing it. I hate somebody else possessing it. I want it to be mine, all the time. It is such a beautiful sound. Don't you think? (Pinter, 1996, 31).

What is odd in this dialogue is the changing attitude of Rebecca towards the police siren. Her unexpected swerving veers off. Her odd conjunction of beauty with pain really shows her lost psychology in the dark. Rebecca's bizarre reaction warrants only Devlin's dismissal:

> ***Devlin***: Don't worry; there'll always be another one. There's one on its way to you now. Believe me. You'll hear it soon (Pinter, 1996, p. 31).

That form of change begins with a normal position and followed by a swerve to an odd position that leads the reader into a greater mystery. Another odd dialogue between Rebecca and Devlin is really obvious. Devlin changes the topic and goes on questioning about Rebecca's lover; he seems to be very willing to learn something about that man:

> ***Devlin:*** Listen. This chap you were just talking about… I mean this chap you and I have been talking about… in a manner of speaking… when exactly did you meet him? I mean when did all this happen exactly? I haven't… how can I put this… quite got into focus. Was it before you knew me or after you knew me? That's a question of some importance. I'm sure you'll appreciate that (Pinter, 1996, p. 33).

Devlin never gives up talking about that man, but rather than address that question or answer Devlin's question, Rebecca attempts to evasion and makes a strange transition:

> ***Rebecca***: By the way, there's something I've been dying to tell you (Pinter, 1996, p. 33).

Then, she shifts into an unrelated topic, her inexplicable observation when she set her pen down on the table, it rolled off:

> ***Rebecca:*** It was when I was writing a note, a few notes for the laundry. Well… to put it bluntly… a laundry list. Well, I put my pen on that little coffee table and it rolled off.
> ***Devlin:*** No?
> ***Rebecca***: It rolled right off, onto the carpet. In front of my eyes.
> ***Devlin***: Good God.
> ***Rebecca:*** This pen, this perfectly innocent pen (Pinter, 1996, p. 35).

Devlin, instead of returning to his unanswered question, starts to talk about her new topic and he objects to her assertion:

> ***Devlin:*** You can't know it is innocent (Pinter, 1996, p. 35).

The escape of Rebecca from answering Devlin's question is given in an odd way. Pinter may show the evasion of Rebecca from her realities or responsibilities towards herself and Devlin. This is a typical absurd feature used by Pinter to attract the attention of his reader.

Turn-Taking

Turn-taking method in *Ashes to Ashes* is introduced by Pinter by the signs of power or powerlessness and fears of the characters especially with the help of pauses and silences. TRPs are more obvious in Devlin's talk as he asks several questions to try to learn about Rebecca's past:

> ***Rebecca:*** Oh yes. I kissed his fist. The knuckles. And then he'd open his hand and give me the palm of his hand… to kiss… which I kissed.
> *Pause.*
> And then I would speak.

Devlin: What did you say? (TRP) You said what? (TRP) What did you say? (TRP).
Pause.
Rebecca: I said, 'Put your hand round my throat.' I murmured it through his hand, as I was kissing it, but he heard my voice, he heard it through his hand, he felt my voice in his hand, he heard it there.
Silence
Devlin: And did he? (TRP) Did he put his hand round your throat? (TRP) (Pinter, 1996, p. 5)

Devlin seems to be in terror since he juxtaposes his questions; however Rebecca goes on telling her story in a very calm position. Actually, the use of silence indicates how Rebecca relives her memories. Also Rebecca's invitation to violate her becomes her defense towards Devlin and the way she expresses her story sets an erotic tone with a promise of sex. Devlin continues asking his questions in a shocked manner:

Rebecca: Oh yes. He did. He did. And he held it there, very gently, so gently. He adored me, you see.
Devlin: He adored you? (TRP)
Pause.
What do you mean, he adored you? What do you mean? (TRP)
Pause.
Are you saying he put no pressure on your throat? (TRP) Is that what you're saying? (TRP) (Pinter, 1996, p. 5).

Devlin does not allow Ruth to approve or disapprove his questions, as he knows the actual answers. What is strange is that after this conversation Rebecca's answer becomes shorter:

Rebecca: No.
Devlin: What then? What are you saying?
Rebecca: He put a little… pressure… on my throat, yes. So that my head started to go back, gently but truly.
Devlin: And your body? Where did your body go?
Rebecca: My body went back, slowly but truly.
Devlin: So your legs were opening?
Rebecca: Yes.
Pause.
Devlin: Your legs were opening?
Rebecca: Yes.
Silence (Pinter, 1996, p. 7).

Each question answered by Rebecca reveals another opening to a larger mystery for Devlin. She gives up explaining and gives short answers without thinking Devlin's position.

Perhaps, if she put herself into his position, she'd understand his right to ask such kind of questions.

The use of silence and pause is an indispensable characteristic of Pinter's plays. One of the aims is to create the daily conversation atmosphere and raise the tension of the play. When Devlin asks Rebecca about her lover's job, she gives elusive answers:

> ***Rebecca:*** I think it had something to do with a travel agency, I think he was some kind of courier. No. No, he wasn't. That was only a part-time job. I mean that was only part of the job in the agency. He was quite high up, you see. He had a lot of responsibilities.
>
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1996, p. 19).

Rebecca is not aware of what she is saying and when she realizes the strangeness in her answers she stops talking. One of the climactic situations in the play may be accepted as Rebecca's recalling something from the past when Devlin uses the word "sweetheart".

> ***Rebecca:*** That's funny, somewhere in a dream… a long time ago… I heard someone calling me sweetheart.
> *Pause.*
> I looked up. I'd been dreaming. I don't know whether I looked up in the dream or as I opened my eyes. But in this dream a voice calling me. It was calling me sweetheart.
> *Pause.*
> Yes.
> *Pause*.
> …
> And my best friend, the man I had given my heart to, the man I knew was the man for me the moment we met, my dear, my most precious companion, I watched him walk down the platform and tear all the babies from the arms of their screaming mothers.
> *Silence* (Pinter, 1996, pp. 53-54).

Rebecca remembers her lover with a word; she starts telling it in an unconcerned manner. The way she tells is very pure at first, but then she suddenly recalls the atrocity in her lover's behavior and silence comes. The following of silence is broken by Devlin's changing of the subject. *Ashes to Ashes* is full of Harold Pinter's own style of language, pauses and silences; in other words the sign of Pinteresque can be realized in the play.

Repetition and Speech Acts

Unlike other plays, the reader does not encounter with repetitions and types of speech acts in *Ashes to Ashes.*

3.5. *The Caretaker*

The Caretaker is Harold Pinter's second full-length play written in 1960. The play consists of three characters. Aston, who lives in an old house in a slummy suburb of London, invites a tramp called Davies who quickly asserts command of the home, and Aston's brother Mick who is the owner of the house offers the job of caretaker to Davies.

All three characters in the play struggle for power and dominance. According to Innes (1992), "*The Caretaker* contains the most subtle and complex portrayal of Pinter's power struggle to that date" (p. 88). At first, Aston appears to have power over Davies, who at first appears to be grateful because Aston rescues him, but later becomes diffident and tries to pull rank over Aston by taking his room. Realizing that he is being pushed out, Aston regains his room. Mick on the other hand, with an indecisive mix of dominance and subservience, is at first wholly dominant over Davies, terrorizing the man until he screams.

As mostly affected by the Second World War, *The Caretaker* is assumed to be a play about human connection, friendship, loneliness and isolation (Innes, 1992, p. 96). Some critics claim that Pinter's own experience reflects the complex relationship between the tramp and the two brothers in the play. Actually, what Pinter tries to emphasize in *The Caretaker* is human connection (Bloom, 1987, p. 28). As in all other plays, human connection seems to form the focus of Pinter's ethical concern. Throughout the play, the big gulf of communication and the identity problems in Davies's situation in which he has a nick name can be simply seen.

Odd Talk

To understand all these complexities, it is essential to examine the language and the style Pinter uses in the play. One of the most obvious stylistic features 'Odd Talk' is encountered in *The Caretaker* as in other plays examined so far. Davies himself is an odd character and the word he uses to explain a saucepan is really strange. Pinter may try to indicate the uneducated man by making the character to use the wrong word and strangeness of the character:

> ***Davies:*** All them toe-rags, mate, got the manners of pigs. I might have been on the road a few years but you can take it from me I'm clean. I keep myself up. That's why I left my wife. Fortnight after I married her, no, not so much that, no more than a week, I took the lid off a saucepan, you know what was in it? A pile of her underclothing, unwashed. The pan for vegetables, it was. *The vegetable pan* (Pinter, 1960, p. 143).

In Pinter's dialogue, it can always be clear to witness the desperate struggles of the characters to find the correct expression; so it is easy to see them in the act of struggling for communication, sometimes succeeding but often failing. In the following of the play, Davies asks Aston about the people living their next door and Davies feels disturbed when he learns that the neighbours are Indian:

> ***Aston:*** Family of Indians lives there.
> ***Davies:*** Blacks?
> ***Aston:*** I don't see much of them.
> ***Davies:*** Blacks, eh? *(Davies stands and moves about.)* Well, you've got some knick-knacks here all right, I'll say that. I don't like a bare room. (Aston joins Davies upstage centre.) I'll tell you what, mate; you haven't got a spare pair of shoes?
> ***Aston:*** Shoes? (Pinter, 1960, p. 147).

But the flow of the dialogue is changed in a bizarre way by Davies about the room he wants to stay and later about shoes. Aston is puzzled by the changing of the subject. Then, Davies jumps over from one subject to another and starts to talk about something else:

> ***Davies:*** Them bastards at the monastery let me down again.
> ***Aston*** *(going to his bed*): Where?
> ***Davies:*** Down in Luton. Monastery down in Luton. … I got a mate at Shepherd's Bush, you see…
> ***Aston*** *(looking under his bed):* I might have a pair. (Pinter, 1960, p. 147).

Both Aston and Davies at the same time talk about different things. It demonstrates that the characters are disjointed from each other; in other words they have no real communication. In Act Two, Davies meets Mick; he seems to be so friendly against Davies and talks to him about his brother Aston:

> ***Mick:*** Like a sandwich?
> ***Davies:*** What?
> ***Mick*** *(taking a sandwich from his pocket.)* Have one of these.
> ***Davies:*** Don't you pull anything.

> ***Mick:*** No, you are still not understanding me. I can't help being interested in any friend of my brother's friend, aren't you?
> ***Davies:*** Well, I … I wouldn't put it as far as that.
> ***Mick:*** don't you find him friendly, then?
> ***Davies:*** Well, I wouldn't say we was all that friends. I mean, he done me no harm, but I wouldn't say he was any particular friend of mine. What's in that sandwich, then? (Pinter, 1960, p. 181).

Mick offers him a sandwich but Davies is not interested in at first. However, when Mick forces Davies with his questions about his brothers Davies finds the way out by changing the subject. Another example of Odd Talk emerges in the dialogue between Mick and Davies again; Mick asks Davies whether he can give him references or not .While Davies is telling about it he suddenly asks Mick for a pair of shoes:

> ***Mick:*** Can you give me any references?
> ***Davies:*** Eh?
> ***Mick:*** Just to satisfy my solicitor.
> ***Davies:*** I got plenty of references. All I got to do is to go down to Sidcup tomorrow. I got all the references I want down there.
> ***Mick:*** Where's that?
> ***Davies:*** Sidcup: He ain't only got my references down there; he got all my papers down there. I know that place like the back of my hand. I'm going down there anyway; see what I mean, I got to get down there, or I'm done.
> ***Mick:*** So we can always get hold of these references if we want them.
> ***Davies:*** I'll be down there any day, I tell you. I was going down today, but I'm … I'm waiting for the weather to break.
> ***Mick:*** Ah.
> ***Davies:*** Listen. You can't pick me up a pair of shoes, can you? (Pinter, 1960, p. 185).

What is odd in this dialogue is the obsession of Davies about a pair of shoes. Pinter seems to give the absurd atmosphere by Davies in most of the play. Another incongruity in the play occurs again in the talk of Davies; in Act Three Davies starts to complain about Aston to Mick, but he suddenly starts to talk about the time and bitches that he has no clock:

> ***Davies:*** He's got no feelings!
> *Pause.*
> See, what I need is a clock! I need a clock to tell the time! How can I tell the time without a clock? I can't do it! I said to him, I said, look here, what about getting in a clock, so's I can tell what time it is? I mean, if I can't tell what time you're at you don't know where you are, you understand my meaning? See, what I got to do now, If I'm walking about outside, I got to get my eye on a clock, and keep the time in my head for when I come in. But that's no good, I mean I'm not here in five minutes and I forgotten it. I forgotten what time it was! (Pinter, 1960, p. 196).

Davies loses himself and talks nonsense. The way he talks puzzles the reader or the audience. As Simpson (1998) explains odd talk according to context, it is understood that there is an incongruity in the personal context which refers to the social and personal relationships of the participant; Davies complains one brother to another and he exaggerates so much that he can not realize where he stays. Even the wrong use of words such as 'forgotten' indicates the anomalous situation of the character. In every aspect, Pinter underlines the futility and absurdity of human being with great professionalism.

Turn-Taking

In The Caretaker, turn-taking method is given as a competition as in *The Homecoming*. Also Transition Relevance Place (TRPs) is often used in the play when there is a continuation of the speaker. The dialogue between Mick and Davies can be a good example of TRP. After a long talk of Mick, he asks to Davies:

> ***Mick:*** Did you sleep here last night? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** Yes.
> ***Mick:*** Sleep well? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** Yes!
> ***Mick:*** Did you have to get up in the night? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** No.
> *Pause*.
> ***Mick:*** What's your name? (TRP)
> Davies *(shifting, about to rise)*: Now look here!
> ***Mick:*** What?
> ***Davies:*** Jenkins!
> ***Mick:*** Jen ... kins.
> *Davies makes a sudden move to rise. A violent bellow from MICK sends him back.*
> *(A shout.)* Sleep here last night? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** Yes...
> ***Mick*** (*continuing at great pace).* How'd you sleep? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** I slept-
> ***Mick:*** Sleep well? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** Now look-
> ***Mick:*** What bed? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** That-
> ***Mick:*** Not the other? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** No!
> ***Mick:*** Choosy. (TRP)
> *Pause.*
> *(Quietly.)* Choosy.
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1960, pp. 166-167).

Mick tries to be dominant in the conversation without getting the answers to his questions. When a TRP occurs the characters should decide to speak or not to speak, but Mick seems to be playing a game with Davies. The current speaker (Mick) seems not to let Davies answer his questions. Mick effort to be dominant can be seen in most of the play especially over Davies:

> ***Mick:*** You a foreigner? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** No.
> ***Mick:*** Born and bred in the British Isles? (TRP)
> ***Davies:*** I was!
> ***Mick:*** What did they teach you? (TRP)
> *Pause*.
> How did you like my bed? (TRP)
> *Pause.*
> That's my bed. You want to mind you don't catch a draught (TRP)
> (Pinter, 1960, p. 167).

In Mick's every inch of word, there is a sign of dominance over Davies; he never gives up and asks irrelevant questions one by one and thus the beat of the play rises. In *The Caretaker*, the pauses and silences are used very often to demonstrate the intention of the characters or their preparation for a competition or, they are used to emphasize an interruption of an action, lack of speech and non-verbal speech. In the situation of Davies, one can see his desperate moments with the help of pauses and silences:

> ***Davies*** *(muttering)*: What's this? *(He switches on and off.)*What's the matter with this damn light? (*He switches on and off.)* Ahh. Don't tell me the damn light's gone now.
> *Pause.*
> What'll I do? Damn light's gone now. Can't see a thing.
> *Pause.*
> What'll I do now? *(He moves stumbles.)* Ah. God, what's that? Give me a light. Wait a minute.
> *He feels for matches in his pocket, takes out a box and lights one. The match goes out. The box falls.*
> Ahh! Where is it? *(Stooping.)* Where is the bloody box?
> *The box is kicked.*
> What's that? What? Who's that? What's that?
> *Pause. He moves*.
> Where is my box? It was down here. Who's this? Who's moving?
> *Silence* (Pinter, 1960, pp. 178-179).

The fear and panic of Davies is highlighted by the pauses and silences by Pinter. Although one does not watch the play, he or she even can form a picture of Davies's position and feel

the fear. As *The Caretaker* underlines the lack of human connection and difficulty in having a proper communication among characters, pauses explain them clearly in the play. As a new encounter with Aston, Davies tries to communicate with him:

> ***Davies:*** Anyway, I'm obliged to you, letting me ...letting me have a bit of a rest, like ... for a few minutes. *(He looks about.)* This your room?
> ***Aston:*** Yes.
> ***Davies:*** You got a good bit of stuff here.
> ***Aston:*** Yes.
> ***Davies:*** Must be worth a few bob, this ... put it all together.
> *Pause.*
> There's enough of it.
> ***Aston:*** There's a good bit of it, all right.
> ***Davies:*** You sleep here, do you?
> ***Aston:*** Yes.
> ***Davies:*** What, in that?
> ***Aston:*** Yes.
> ***Davies:*** Yes, well, you'd be well out of the draught there.
> ***Aston:*** You don't get much wind.
> ***Davies:*** You'd be well out of it. It's different when you're kipping out.
> ***Aston:*** Would be.
> ***Davies:*** Nothing but wind then.
> *Pause.*
> ***Aston:*** Yes, when the wind gets up it...
> *Pause*.
> ***Davies:*** Yes.
> ***Aston:*** Mmm...
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1960, pp. 144-145).

As Pinter points out, Aston makes an effort to form a human connection (quoted in Thomson, 1985, p. 92). The use of short sentences and the pauses indeed explain the effort of the characters to communicate with each other and at the same time the difficulty to shape a suitable dialogue.

In Act Three, one can realize that the balance changes. Davies abuses Aston's kindness and fails to ingratiate himself into family; but at that moment Davies tries to be dominant over Aston when he feels that:

> ***Aston:*** I ... I think it's about time you found somewhere else. I don't think we're hitting it off.
> ***Davies:*** Find somewhere else?
> ***Aston:*** Yes.
> ***Davies:*** Me? You talking to me? Not me, man. You! (TRP)
> ***Aston:*** What?
> ***Davies:*** You! You better find somewhere else! (TRP)
> ***Aston:*** I live here. You don't.
> ***Davies:*** Don't I? Well, I live here. I been offered a job here.

> ***Aston:*** Yes ... well, I don't think you're really suitable.
> ***Davies:*** Not suitable? Well, I can tell you, there's someone here thinks I'm suitable. And I'll tell you. I'm staying on here as caretaker! (TRP) Get it! Your brother, he's told me, see, he's told me the job is mine (TRP) Mine! So that's where I am. (TRP) I'm going to be his caretaker (TRP) (Pinter, 1960, p. 202).

The fear of losing tends Davies to compete with Aston because Davies feels that he is coming to a dead end. It can also be interpreted as a self-protection of Davies against Aston as he does not want to lose the job. At the end of the play, when Davies understands that he is going to be expelled from house, he changes his entire manner against Aston and offers to help him; however Aston refuses him all the time:

> ***Davies:*** I'll give you a hand to put up your shed, that's what I'll do.
> *Pause.*
> I'll give you a hand! We'll both put up that shed together! See? Get it done in next to no time! Do you see what I'm saying?
> *Pause.*
> ***Aston:*** No. I can get it up myself.
> ***Davies:*** But listen. I'm with you, I'll be here, I'll do it for you.
> *Pause.*
> We'll do it together.
> *Pause*.
> Christ, we'll change the beds.
> *Aston moves to the window and stands with his back to Davies.*
> You mean you're throwing me out? You can't do that. Listen man, listen man, I don't mind, you see, I don't mind, I'll stay, I don't mind, I'll tell you what, if you don't want to change beds, we'll keep it as it is, I'll stay in the same bed, maybe if I can get a stronger piece of sacking, like, to go over window, keep out the draught, that'll do it, what do you say, we'll keep it as it is?
> *Pause* (Pinter, 1960, pp. 210-211).

Davies is perplexed what to say and what to do. He is in panic, in other words he is begging Aston; however in the following of the dialogue Davies seems to feel that he is coming to an end:

> ***Aston:*** No.
> ***Davies:*** Why ... not?
> *Aston turns to look at him.*
> ***Aston:*** You make too much noises.
> ***Davies:*** But ... but ... look ... listen here ... I mean...
> *Aston turns back to the window.*
> What am I going to do?
> *Pause*.
> What shall I do?
> *Pause.*
> Where am I going to go?
> *Pause.*

> If you want me to go ... I'll go. You just say the word.
> *Pause*.
> I'll tell you what though ... them shoes ... them shoes you give me ... they're working out all right ... they're all right. Maybe I could ... get down...
> *Aston remains still, his back to him, at the window.*
> Listen ... if I ... got down ... if I was to ... get my papers ... would you let ... would you ... if I got down ... and got my ...
> *Long silence* (Pinter, 1960, p. 212).

Davies is so desperate that he does not know what to say. He understands that his ingratitude is a mistake; however his last effort to remain goes unheard by Aston. The long silence can be accepted to be the climax of the play, because some critics interpret the inevitable situation as the death of the old man. The changing attitude of the two brothers destroys Davies, however at the same time Davies exploits the kind and friendly approach of Mick and Aston. As a result, Davies prepares his inescapable end. But most important, each fails to form a human communication.

Repetition

In Pinter's plays repetition is highly used as reflection of daily language. Each time Pinter's characters repeat themselves or their phrases, or sometimes it occurs in longer sentences. The reason of repetition may show the vain attempt at conversation or the desire to be friendly. Davies in *The Caretaker*, talking about his ex-wife's stupidity, mentions the saucepan in which he found some of her underclothing, repeats himself saying:

> ***Davies:*** *The pan for vegetables*, it was. *The vegetable pan* (Pinter, 1960, p. 143).

The repetition serves a different purpose here; it indicates the inarticulate man's struggle to find the correct word.

In the first act of *The Caretaker*, for instance; Aston tells Davies that there is an Indian family living next door. Davies immediately reacts with:

> ***Davies:*** *Blacks?*
> ***Aston:*** I don't see much of them.
> ***Davies:*** *Blacks,* eh? (Pinter, 1960, p. 147).

Davies's repetition of the word 'black' simply shows his reaction and hatred against them. Another example of repetition is encountered in the debate between Aston and Davies. Aston is disturbed by Davies's making noise while sleeping:

Aston: Hey, stop it, will you? I can't sleep.
Davies: What? What? What's going on?
Aston: *You're making noises.*
Davies: I'm an old man, *what do you expect me to do, stop breathing?*
Aston: *You're making noises.*
Davies: *What do you expect me to do, stop breathing?* (Pinter, 1960, p. 200).

Both Davies and Aston say the same sentences again and again to show their reaction to each other. Indeed, this may show the frailty of communication and their weak relationship. A similar example occurs at the very beginning of the play when Aston and Davies first enter house:

Aston: Sit down.
Davies: Thanks. *(Looking about.)* Uhhh...
Aston: Just a minute.
Aston looks around for a chair, sees one lying on its side by the rolled carpet at the fireplace, and starts to get it out.
Davies: *Sit down?* Huh ... I haven't had a good *sit down* ... I haven't had a proper *sit down* ... well, I couldn't tell you ... (Pinter, 1960, p. 141).

In daily life, when people meet someone for the first time, they can not find many things to speak so they can repeat what they say several times. In Davies's situation, the same thing happens; he seems to be friendly and tries to be sympathetic. Sometimes repetition arises when one speaker repeats another speaker's word:

Mick: I'm awfully glad. It's awfully nice to meet you.
Pause.
What did you say your name was?
Davies: *Jenkins.*
Mick: I beg your pardon?
Davies: *Jenkins!*
Pause.
Mick: *Jen ... kins* (Pinter, 1960, p. 164).

Tension among the characters automatically rises when the first speaker has to repeat the same information twice. Mick takes control of the conversation in Act II by asking questions to Davies as in the same inquisition form Davies uses with Aston in Act I. Mick continues implying that Davies reminds him 'of a bloke' until Davies explodes, then he acts as if he did not hear Davies's answer:

Mick: You know, you remind me of a bloke I bumped into once, just the other side of the Guildgord by-pass—
Davies: *I was brought here!*
Pause.
Mick: Pardon?
Davies: *I was brought here! I was brought here!*
Mick: *Brought here? Who brought you here?* (Pinter, 1960, p. 168).

One of the most common forms of second speaker repetition is a question answering a previous question. Aston is asking Davies to leave and, Davies answers with a question to gain more time to think:

Aston: I ... I think it's about time *you find somewhere else*.
I don't think we're hitting off.
Davies: *Find somewhere else? (*Pinter, 1960, p. 202).

Instead of talking directly to Aston about why they are not getting alone well, Davies turns Aston's question back to him. In the continuation of the same dialogue, Davies uses repetition to challenge Aston's claim:

Aston: I live *here*. You don't.
Davies: Don't I? Well, I live *here.* I been offered a job *here* (Pinter, 1960, p. 202).

In the following, Aston uses repetition to keep Davies on the subject; he wants to know Davies nationality and insists on learning, but also he is already aware that Davies will not directly answer his question if he does not have to:

Aston: *Welsh,* are you?
Davies: Eh?
Aston: You, *Welsh?* (Pinter, 1960, 159).

When Davies replies as 'eh' Aston repeats his question again to get the answer. Moreover, characters use repetition to evade answering questions or to avoid dealing with problems and, the best way to do this is to provide too much information. For instance; Davies uses repetition especially when he is asked so much personal information and wants to talk more to be away from embarrassing situations. When Davies announces that he is worried about who might come to the front door, he utters his idea in a repetitive and long way:

Aston: Why, someone *after you?*

> **Davies:** *After me?* Well, I could have that Scotch git coming *looking after me,* couldn't I? All I'd do, I'd hear the bell, I'd go down there, open the door, who *might be there*, any Harry *might be there*. I could be buggered as easy as that, man. They *might be there* after my card, I mean look at it, here I am, I only *got four stamps, on this card*, here it is, look, *four stamps, on this card, that's all I got*, I ain't got anymore, *that's all I got* (Pinter, 1960, pp. 177-178).

Sometimes characters reiterate their own sentences to be approved by other characters just like in Davies's position:

> ***Davies*** *(handing the tin):* When he come at me tonight *I told him. Didn't I?* You heard me *tell him, didn't you?*
> ***Aston:*** *I saw him have a go at you.*
> ***Davies:*** *Go at me?* You wouldn't grumble. The filthy skate, an old man like me, I've had dinner with the best.
> *Pause.*
> ***Aston:*** Yes, *I saw him have a go at you* (Pinter, 1960, pp. 142-143).

A similar situation appears in Davies's persistence behavior about the case they experienced with Aston:

> ***Davies:*** Did you see what happened with that one?
> ***Aston:*** I only got the end of it.
> ***Davies:*** Comes up to me, parks a bucket of rubbish at me tells me to take it out the back. It's not my job to *take out the bucket*! They got a boy there for *taking out the bucket*. I wasn't engaged to *take out the buckets*. My job's cleaning the floor, claring up the tables, doing a bit of washing-up, nothing to do with *taking out the buckets!* (Pinter, 1960, p. 143).

Davies feels so indisposed by the situation he is in that he again and again underlines the same phrase to show his disturbance.

Repetition is one of the most common features in Pinter's plays, because Harold Pinter unlike most dramatists has no intention to apply certain conventional rules to his plays. His only objective is to indicate the desperate situation of humankind, their inability to communicate with each other and the disharmony among them. While doing this, Pinter stresses on the daily use of language to create a realistic atmosphere.

Speech Acts

Speech Acts in *The Caretaker* dominate in several forms. At the beginning of the play, Aston and Davies seem to be very kind to each other. Aston often asks Davies kindly if he

needs something and Davies replies in an ashamed manner. According to Searl's (1969) conformity conditions in speech acts, the reader encounters with sincerity conditions in Aston's behaviors:

> ***Aston:*** Take a seat.
> ***Davies:*** Yes, but what I got to do first, you see, what I got to do, I got to loosen myself up, you see what I mean? I could have got done it down there (Pinter, 1960, p. 142)

Davies is aware of the condition but at first he seems to be shy. A similar situation is seen in Mick's behavior. Actually Mick plays a sort of a game with Davies. First, he cross-examines with Davies by asking him harsh questions, and then suddenly he changes the subject and offers Davies a sandwich in a friendly manner:

> ***Mick:*** Like a sandwich?
> ***Davies:*** What?
> ***Mick*** (taking a sandwich from his pocket): Have one of these (Pinter, 1960, p. 181).

The friendly manner of Mick makes Davies feel surprised. He rejects his offer at first but then he accepts the sandwich. In the following of the play, the conversational action between Mick and Davies turns into a propositional content that creates a situational rule. The situational rules hold that the hearer is able to perform the request; the speaker believes the hearer is able to perform the action; and the requested action. Mick offers Davies the job of a caretaker:

> ***Mick:*** Look! I got a proposition to make to you. I'm thinking of taking over the running of this place, you see? I think it could be run a bit more efficiently. I got a lot of ideas, a lot of plans. *(He eyes Davies).* How would you like to stay on here, as caretaker?
> ***Davies:*** What?
> ***Mick:*** I'll be quite open with you. I could rely on a man like you around the place, keeping an eye on things.
> ***Davies:*** Well now… wait a minute … I … I ain't never done no caretaking before, you know …
> ***Mick:*** Doesn't matter about that. It's just that you look a capable sort of man to me.
> ***Davies:*** I am a capable sort of man. I mean to say, I've had plenty offers in my time, you know, there's no getting away from that. (Pinter, 1960, p. 184).

Mick's request surprises Davies but immediately he jumps into offer by praising himself to be capable. Because he feels what Mick would say beforehand although he seems to be surprised.

Another example of Speech Acts can be seen in the long talk of Davies as a show of power. All the three characters are in the struggle of power and although Davies seems to be a weak character he sometimes tries to show that he is a powerful man and nobody can oppress him:

> ***Davies***: I told him what to do with his bucket, didn't I? You heard. Look here., I said, I'm an old man, I said, where I was brought up we had some idea how to talk to old people with the proper respect, we was brought up with the right ideas, if I had a few years off me I'd … I'd break you in half. That was after the owner give me the bullet. Making too much commotion, he says. Commotion, me! Look here, I said to him, I got my rights. I told him that. I might have been on the road but nobody's got more rights than I have. Let's have a bit of fair play, I said. Anyway, he give me the bullet. (He sits in the chair). That's the sort of place (Pinter, 1960, p. 144).

Davies's effort to seem powerful although he is an old man is simply realized in his sentences. This type of behavior is often seen in the characters of Pinter. In the first encounter of Mick and Davies, Mick's sarcastic behaviors towards Davies continue with insults. Insults are another form of speech acts. Their argument about Mick's mother's bed in the room concludes with Mick's insults:

> ***Mick:*** Stop telling me all these fibs.
> ***Davies:*** Now listen to me, I never seen you before, have I?
> ***Mick:*** Never seen my mother before either, I suppose?
> *Pause.*
> I think I'm coming to the conclusion that you're an old rogue.
> You're nothing but an old scoundrel.
> ***Davies:*** Now wait-
> ***Mick:*** Listen, son. Listen, sonny. You stink.
> ***Davies:*** You ain't got no right to-
> ***Mick:*** You're stinking the place out. You're an old robber, there's no getting away from it. You're an old skate. You don't belong in a nice place like this. You're an old barbarian. Honest. You got no business wandering about in an unfurnished flat. (Pinter, 1960, p. 167).

Through the end of the play, Mick's insult to Davies as a show of power disappoints Davies:

> ***Mick:*** What a strange man you are. Aren't you? You're really strange. Ever since you come into this house there's been nothing but trouble. Honest. I can take nothing you say at face value. Every word you speak is open to any number of different interpretations. Most of what you say is lies. You're violent, you're erratic, you're just completely unpredictable. You're nothing else but a wild animal, when you come down to it. You're a barbarian. And to put the old tin lid on it, you stink.

…

Davies *(slowly)*: All right then … you do that … you do it … if that's what you want …
Mick: THAT'S WHAT I WANT. (Pinter, 1960, pp. 207-208).

Mick's show of strength and humiliation by using insults really affects Davies. He tries to indicate his power and pressure over Davies and puts him in a helpless position.

In Act three, this time Aston insults Davies as he finds him 'stink' just like Mick did. Insults are also accepted to be a way to show of power in Pinter's play. When Aston completely changes his attitude towards Davies and explains that he does not want him, Davies gets shocked and he panics:

Aston: You've no reason to call that shed stinking.
Davies points the knife.
You stink.
Davies: What!
Aston: You've been stinking the place out.
Davies: Christ, you say that to me! (Pinter, 1960, p. 203).

The following of this dialogue continues with a threat. Threats are also a type of speech acts and they make the reader realize that there will be a possible future action after the threat:

Aston: Four days. That's one reason I can't sleep.
Davies: You call me that! You call me stinking!
Aston: You better go.
Davies: I'LL STINK YOU!
He thrusts his arm out, the arm trembling, the knife pointing at Aston's stomach.
Aston does not move. Silence. Davies's arm moves no further. They stand.
I'll stink you…
Pause. (Pinter, 1960, p. 203).

One can see the fierce reaction of Davies against Aston and his struggle of power as Pinter also highlights the utterance of Davies with capital letters. As it is realized, as soon as Davies threatens Aston, he performs the action. The reader knows that Davies's proposed action will harm Aston; because the game the two brothers plays on an old man really annihilates the balance of Davies and he loses his control in the end.

Harold Pinter skillfully demonstrates his reader every possible position the characters are in. As a basic feature of his language, Pinter creates a daily language atmosphere for his characters in order to display the man's natural condition in this world. People are in need of everlasting struggle of power. They have no real communication although it seems so. However, Pinter shows how desperate people are in their relationships. The discrepancy in their behaviors towards each other and incongruity in their relationships are successfully reflected by Harold Pinter with his effective use of language. Characters express themselves by the use of power, they hide their true intentions and they dominate situations via conversational actions in Pinter's plays.

3.6. *Betrayal*

Betrayal is one of Pinter's recent plays written in 1978. In *Betrayal*, the reader encounters with a different but wholly common concept of human relations 'betrayal'. The play begins after the end of an affair between Emma and her husband's best friend Jerry and concludes with the seduction which brought them together at Emma's and Robert's anniversary party nine years earlier.

Emma is Robert's wife. She is really not satisfied with her marriage and ready to break up with her husband. Her marriage comes to an end because of an affair she had with his husband's best friend Jerry. Emma is disturbed and angry as she believes that also Robert has been unfaithful to her; however she misses the detail that she both betrayed Robert and Jerry. Jerry is a forty-year-old writer who is the best friend of Robert. Jerry is inherently romantic and perhaps it is the impulse that makes him betray Robert. Robert is a publisher and at the same age of Jerry. He is a realist and he seems to be the cleverest character in the play. He realizes Emma's betrayal beforehand, yet Jerry does not discover it until 1977. There are also some other characters; Roger Casey who is a writer, Jerry's wife Judith and the two kids of Robert and Emma. However, the reader can only hear their names, they do not appear physically.

The main theme of the play, as the title highlights, betrayal, infidelity and deception in human relationships. Pinter attracts the attention of his reader to a very common problem among spouses, lovers and friends. Betrayal is perhaps one of the most dramatic situations in human's life which presents us adulterous love affairs that is also encountered today. According to some critics, *Betrayal* is not only a simple story of love affair; it is accepted to

be “an examination of the ease and frequency with which fundamental loyalties fall victim to duplicity” (quoted in Thomson, 1985, p. 142). All the characters are betrayed and all betray.

Unlike Pinter’s other plays, *Betrayal* has an unusual dramatic structure. The play opens with what should conventionally be the play’s closing scene and moves back through the characters’ lives during a nine year period. Harold Pinter affects his reader by taking the story from the end to the beginning. *Betrayal* is simply a decipherable play as its subject is highly familiar for the reader or the audience.

Odd Talk

In *Betrayal* it is not difficult to encounter with odd speeches of the characters. As *Betrayal* tries to indicate the distortation and infidelity among characters, clear examples are easy to find in the play.

Betrayal opens with an awkward meeting over drinks long after the close of the affair between Jerry and Emma. Emma and Jerry meet after a long time and they ask to each other how good they are. However, after Emma’s question which seems to be innocent, Jerry suddenly turns back to a private moment they had experienced:

> ***Jerry:*** How’s everything?
> ***Emma:*** Oh, not too bad.
> *Pause.*
> Do you know how long it is since we met?
> ***Jerry:*** Well, I came to the private view, when was it -?
> ***Emma:*** No, I don’t mean that. (Pinter, 1978, p. 13).

Although Emma and Jerry had a relationship for a long time, it is apparent that they forgot each other. The example below demonstrates how disjointed they are:

> ***Jerry:*** How is Robert?
> ***Emma:*** When did you last see him?
> ***Jerry:*** I haven’t seen him for months. Don’t know why. Why?
> ***Emma:*** Why what?
> ***Jerry:*** Why did you ask when I last saw him?
> ***Emma:*** I just wondered. How’s Sam?
> ***Jerry:*** You mean Judith.
> ***Emma:*** Do I?
> ***Jerry:*** You remember the form. I ask about your husband, you ask about my wife (Pinter, 1978, p. 15).

What is strange is the way Jerry asks questions and the way he directs Emma while asking. In the following, Jerry explains Emma that he has heard something about the relationship between Roger Casey and her, but the things he says and the way he reacts seem to be really bizarre:

> ***Jerry:*** The funny thing was that the only thing I really felt was irritation. I mean irritation that nobody gossiped about us like that, in the old days. I nearly said, now look, she may be having the occasional drink with Casey, who cares, but she and I had an affair for seven years and none of you bastards had the faintest idea it was happening (Pinter, 1978, p. 23).

Jerry's irritation about why people did not gossip about their long-lasting relationship but Casey creates an awkward atmosphere, he does not want to accept the jealousy he feels and he only claims his irritation. Indeed, the utmost oddity in the play can be the awareness of Robert about the relationship between Emma and his best friend Jerry. In the long talk of Emma and Robert, he tries to explain Emma that he already knows about the relationship and as a result, Emma announces her ex-relationship with Jerry; however at the end of the conversation Robert's reaction is really surprising and at the same time strange:

> ***Emma:*** We're lovers.
> ***Robert:*** Ah. Yes. I thought it might be something like that, something along those lines.
> ***Emma:*** When?
> ***Robert:*** What?
> ***Emma:*** When did you think?
> ***Robert:*** Yesterday. Only yesterday. When I saw his handwriting on the letter. Before yesterday I was quite ignorant.
> ***Emma:*** Ah.
> *Pause*.
> I'm sorry.
> ***Robert:*** Sorry?
> *Silence.*
> Where does it … take place? Must be a bit awkward. I mean we've got two kids; he's got two kids, not to mention a wife…
> ***Emma:*** We have a flat. (Pinter, 1978, p. 84).

Robert asks his questions consecutively and Emma replies easily without any disturbance. Following of the dialogue continues in the same way. Robert nearly learns everything about what Emma and Jerry had experienced. However; at the end of the dialogue there occurs an unexpected thing:

Robert: Did he write to you from America?
Emma: Of course. And I wrote to him.
Robert: Did you tell him that Ned had been conceived?
Emma: Not by letter.
Robert: But when you did tell him, was he happy to know I was to be a father?
Pause.
I've always likes Jerry. To be honest, I've always liked him rather more than I have liked you. Maybe I should have an affair with him myself.
Silence.
Tell me, are you looking forward to our trip to Torcello? (Pinter, 1978, pp. 86-87).

This conversation may indicate the abnormality of the married couple and what they have experienced. In the end, Robert is changing such an important subject; he seems to ignore the situation or accept it as normal. Furthermore; Robert's comment on Jerry and his love for him appear to be completely strange and thought-provoking. Normally, in such a situation, a man reacts harshly against his wife when he learns that his wife had an affair with someone else. Perhaps, Harold Pinter makes us show the degenerated relationships among couples, how ignorant they are and how such values lose their importance more and more in today's world. A similar example emerges in the dialogue between Emma and Jerry. In scene Eight, they are talking about unfaithfulness and Emma firstly asks about herself and then Judith:

Emma: Do you think she is being unfaithful to you?
Robert: No. I don't know.
Emma: When you were in America, just now, for instance?
Jerry: No.
Emma: Have you ever been unfaithful?
Jerry: To whom?
Emma: To me, of course.
Robert: No.
Pause.
Have you to me?
Emma: No.
Pause.
If she was, what would you do?
Jerry: She isn't. She's busy. She's got lots to do. She's a very good doctor. She likes her life. She loves the kids.
Emma: Ah.
Jerry: She loves me.
Pause.
Emma: Ah.
Silence.
Jerry: All that means something.
Emma: It certainly does.
Jerry: But I adore you.

Pause (Pinter, 1978, pp. 128-129).

In the view of Emma's liability about unfaithfulness of Judith, Jerry gives no possibility for Judith. On the contrary, Jerry compliments Judith on her work, his family and her love for himself. The most amazing thing is that Jerry says that he loves her. Emma's response towards Jerry's words is really strange. It seems impossible to perceive the easy side of their relationship. Finally, at the end of the play, the reader encounters with the first signs of Emma and Robert's relationship. Jerry seduces Emma, he pursues her and she resists. Jerry follows Emma into the bedroom and reeling from drink and desire opens his suit with a memory of Emma in white at her wedding dress:

> ***Emma:*** Are you enjoying the party?
> ***Jerry:*** You're beautiful.
> *He goes to her.*
> Listen. I've been watching you all night. I must tell you, I want to tell you,
> I have to tell you-
> ***Emma:*** Please-
> ***Jerry:*** You're incredible.
> ***Emma:*** You're drunk.
> ***Jerry:*** Nevertheless.
> *He holds her.*
> ***Emma:*** Jerry.
> ***Jerry:*** I was the best man at your wedding. I saw you in white.
> I watched you glide by in white.
> ***Emma:*** I wasn't in white.
> ***Jerry:*** I know what should have happened?
> ***Emma:*** What?
> ***Jerry:*** I should have had you, in your white, before the wedding. I should have blackened you, in your white wedding dress, blackened you in your bridal dress, before ushering you into your wedding, as your best man. (Pinter, 1978, pp. 134-135).

In such an atmosphere, Jerry's passion and persistence can be interpreted as an odd situation. It seems to be something different; his desire and ambition to have Emma "in her white wedding dress" (p. 135) is like an obsession. The form that Harold Pinter tries to create to demonstrate the odd and inextricable situation of the characters is easy to understand. As Odd Talk considers mostly the relationship between the language used and the context, *Betrayal* provides so many clear examples.

Turn -Taking

Turn-taking is another method which helps the readers to understand the intentions of the characters and the flow of the conversation. In conversational actions, characters allow others to speak, or take a turn to speak and they can choose others not to speak. They create TRPs or they permit pause and silences in Pinter's plays; and all of them have different intentions. It is not difficult to be able to perceive the characters' intentions as Pinter's language is very close to daily language.

In *Betrayal*, the language is very simple; the utterances are generally short and it is in the form of daily conversation. In the play, Pinter's characters do not interrupt each other to speak in general. At the beginning of the play, Emma and Jerry seem to abstain from each other while talking as it has been a long time since they met; so their questions and answers are shortcut:

Jerry: Cheers.
Pause.
How are you?
Emma: I'm fine.
She looks round the bar, back at him.
Just like all times.
Jerry: Mmm. It's been a long time.
Emma: Yes.
Pause.
I thought of you other day.
Jerry: Good God. Why?
She laughs.
Why?
Emma: Well, it's nice, to think back. Isn't it?
Jerry: Absolutely.
Pause.
How is everything?
Emma: Oh, not too bad.
Pause (Pinter, 1978, pp. 12-13).

The conversation is stagnant; the characters allow each other to speak in turns and do not interrupt. The stagnancy in the dialogue demonstrates the timeout in their relationship and intimacy. When Emma tells Jerry that she had explained their former relationship to her husband Robert, Jerry feels panic and decides to elucidate, however Robert's approach to Jerry seems to be machiavellian:

Jerry: I must speak to you. It's important.
Robert: Speak.

Jerry: Yes.
Pause.
Robert: You look quite rough. (TRP)
Pause.
What is the trouble? (TRP)
Pause.
It's not about you and Emma is it? (TRP)
Pause.
I know all about that. (TRP) (Pinter, 1978, pp. 34-35)

TRP occurs when there is a speaker continuation (Culperer et al., 1998, p. 20). In these lines, Robert is totally aware of the situation and he seems not to allow Jerry to say his words immediately. Another TRP emerges from Robert's speech while talking to Emma:

Robert: Any other news?
Emma: No.
Silence.
Robert: How many times have we been to Torcello? (TRP) Twice.
I remember how you loved it, the first time I took
you there. You fell in love with it. That was about
ten years ago, wasn't it? (TRP) About … six months after
we were married. Yes. Do you remember? I wonder
if you'll like it as much tomorrow? (TRP)
Pause.
What do you think of Jerry as a letter writer? (TRP)
She laughs shortly.
You're trembling. Are you cold? (TRP) (Pinter, 1978, pp. 81-82).

In such kind of a situation, Robert is seen to violate the normal conversational rules as he does not allow Emma to speak or answer his questions. Actually, all the sharp words and sentences indicate Robert's awareness about Emma and Jerry's relationship. Robert has no intention of allowing Emma to confess the truth he knows. The following example strengthens Robert's determination:

Robert: How odd.
Pause.
He wasn't best man at our wedding, was he? (TRP)
Emma: You know he was.
Robert: Ah yes. Well, that's probably when I introduced him to you. (TRP)
Pause.
Was there any message for me, in his letter? (TRP)
Pause.
I mean in the line of business, to do with the world of publishing.
Has he discovered any new and original talent? (TRP) He's quite
talented

at uncovering talent, old Jerry (Pinter, 1978, pp. 84-85).

Robert does not allow Emma to agree or disagree with what he says. However; at the same time Emma does not seem to condescend Robert's sayings or comments about Jerry.

Pinter's most distinguishing characteristic should be his use of pauses and silences in his plays. Unlike conventional theatre, Harold Pinter adds a very different perspective to his plays; the reader is far away from the information about the characters. The key point is mostly hidden under the pauses and silences and in *Betrayal* there are a lot of examples Pinter presents to his readers to understand the meaning beyond the words and the sentences of the characters, and also the breakdown in the communication as it happens in daily speech.

In their first meeting of Jerry and Emma after a long time, it is clear to identify their surprise and confusion:

Emma: Well, it's nice, sometimes, to think back. Isn't it?
Jerry: Absolutely.
Pause.
How's everything?
Emma: Oh, not too bad.
Pause.
Do you know how long it is since we met? (Pinter, 1978, p. 13).

They seem to be careful while choosing the words they use towards each other while remembering the old days:

Jerry: What a memory.
Pause.
She doesn't know … about us, does she?
Emma: Of course not. She just remembers you, as an old friend.
Jerry: That's right.
Pause.
Yes, everyone was there that day, standing around, your husband, my wife, all the kids, I remember.
Emma: What day?
Jerry: When I threw her up. It was in your kitchen.
Emma: It was in your kitchen.
Silence.
Jerry: Darling.
Emma: Don't say that.
Pause.
It all … (Pinter, 1978, pp. 20-21).

Jerry's hesitation seems to still exist about being known by others, even by Emma's daughter. When they remember the party time, they go back to old times when they were together and at that point it is broken by Emma's silence. Jerry's use of the word 'darling' disturbs Emma and she feels the need to remind Jerry that it has been such a long time since they broke up. The most conspicuous hesitancy is seen in the comments of Jerry on Casey when Emma asks him whether he is jealous of Casey or not because of their relationship:

> ***Emma:*** I've changed. Or his work has changed. Are you jealous?
> ***Jerry:*** Of what?
> *Pause.*
> I couldn't be jealous of Casey. I'm his agent. I advised him about his divorce. I read all his first drafts. I persuaded your husband to publish his first novel. I escort him to Oxford to speak at the Union. He's my … he's my boy. I discovered him when he was a poet, and that's a bloody long time ago now.
> *Pause.*
> He's even taken me down to Southampton to meet his Mum and Dad. I couldn't be jealous of Casey. Anyway it's not as if We're having an affair now, is it? We haven't seen each other for years. Really, I'm very happy if you are happy.
> *Pause.*
> What about Robert?
> *Pause*. (Pinter, 1978, pp. 24-25).

Jerry becomes panic towards such a question. He hesitates what to say about Casey and at the same time he does not want to show his jealousy of Casey to Emma. For this reason, he tries to convince Emma by telling his intimacy with Casey. The same thing happens while Jerry is trying to talk to Robert about the same issue:

> ***Jerry:*** This evening. Just now. Wondering whether to phone you. I had to phone you. It took me … two hours to phone you. And then you were with the kids … I thought I wasn't going To be able to see you … I thought I'd go mad. I'm very grateful to you … for coming.
> ***Robert:*** Oh for God's sake! Look, what exactly do you want to say?
> Pause.
> Jerry sits.
> ***Jerry:*** I don't know why she told you. I don't know how she could tell you. I just don't understand. Listen, I know you have … look , I saw her today … we had a drink … I haven't seen her for … she told me, you know, that you're in trouble, both of you … and so on. I know that. I mean I'm sorry.

Robert: Don't be sorry.
Jerry: Why not?
Pause.
The fact is I can't understand … why she thought it necessary … after all these years … to tell you … so suddenly … last night … (Pinter, 1978, pp. 36-37).

Pinter uses his unique style to indicate the desperate situation of Jerry. To explain in the best way, Jerry feels the need to choose the right words and it is easy to see it from the three dots in Jerry's sentences. Or it can be accepted as the pressure point in Jerry's position.

One of the climactic points in the play comes out when Robert announces that he has known their relationship beforehand:

Robert: Last night?
Jerry: Without consulting me. Without even warning me. After all, you and me …
Robert: She didn't tell me last night.
Jerry: What do you mean?
Pause.
I know about last night. She told me about it. You were up all night, weren't you?
Robert: That's correct.
Jerry: And she told you … last night … about her and me. Did she not?
Robert: No, she didn't. She didn't tell me about you and her last night. She told me about you and her four years ago.
Pause.
So she didn't have to tell me again last night. Because I knew. And she knew because she told me herself four years ago.
Silence. (Pinter, 1978, pp. 37-38).

When Robert explains the reality, the crisis point emerges and there occurs a silence. When there is nothing left to say in such a situation, silence means more than the characters want to convey themselves. The same thing happens when Emma and Jerry realize that they can not maintain this relationship anymore. They seem to be totally aware of their desperate situation:

Emma: It's a waste. Nobody comes here. I just can't bear to think about it, actually. Just … empty. All day and night. Day after day and night after night. I mean the crockery and the curtains and the bedspread and everything. And the tablecloth I brought from Venice. (*She laughs.)* It's ridiculous.
Pause.
It's just… an empty home.

Jerry: It's not a home.
Pause.
I know … I know what you wanted … but it could never… actually be a home. You have a home. I have a home. With curtains, etcetera. And the children. Two children in two homes. There are no children here, so it's not the same kind of home.
Emma: It was never intended to be the same kind of home. Was it?
Pause.
You didn't ever see it as home, in any sense, did you?
Jerry: No, I saw it as a flat … you know.
Emma: For fucking.
Jerry: No, for loving.
Emma: Well, there's not much of that left, is there?
Silence (Pinter, 1978, pp. 54-55).

After Emma reveals the truth verbally, there occurs a silence. It can be one of the climactic points in the play, and the silence is broken by the final comment of Jerry which contradicts with Emma's words:

Jerry: I don't think we don't love each other.
Pause (Pinter, 1978, p. 56).

Pause and silences are also indication of communication gap among characters. Emma and Jerry seem to be disconnected as they have not seen each other for a long time. They try to talk about daily things; sometimes they even have difficulty to choose the right words:

Jerry: Yes, I thought it must be. Mmm.
Pause.
Emma: Long time.
Jerry: Yes. It is.
Pause.
How is it going? The Gallery? (Pinter, 1978, p. 14).
…
Jerry: Funny lots, painters, aren't they?
Emma: They're not at all funny.
Jerry: Aren't they? What a pity?
Pause.
How is Robert? (Pinter, 1978, p. 15).
…
Emma: Yes, of course. How is your wife?
Jerry: All right.
Pause. (Pinter, 1978, pp. 15-16).

They talk about old days; however they are like strangers, they are trying to find topics to talk to each other, but all these efforts are not enough to go back. Pauses and silences have great

significance in Harold Pinter's plays; he creates a unique conversational atmosphere as it is very close the daily language. In every speech, people also use pauses and silences when they have nothing to say, or when they can not find the right words to say in several situations like Pinter's characters.

Repetition

Repetition is commonly used in *Betrayal* as it is in Pinter's other plays. Characters repeat themselves when they want to emphasize their words; or they repeat other characters' sentences or phrase to show that they pay attention. Normally, it is used to create a meaningful conversation among characters, but sometimes the reader can see the characters repeating either their own words or other speaker's sentences; and this is a sign of how characters make effort to communicate but fail in the end.

Especially in *Betrayal,* when relationships fail or have already failed, repetition becomes an inevitable aspect in the characters' dialogue. In the play, husbands and wives, and also their lovers keep on talking or recycling subjects they have discussed in the past: children, the weather and vacations. The characters in *Betrayal* repeat the very same conversations over and over again during a period of nine years.

In the dialogue of Emma and Jerry, they continuously ask each other about their children, wife and husband:

> ***Jerry:*** How's Robert?
> ***Emma:*** When did you last see him?
> ***Jerry:*** I haven't seen him for months. Don't know *why. Why?*
> ***Emma:*** *Why* what?
> ***Jerry:*** *Why* did you ask when I last saw him?
> ***Emma:*** How is Sam?
> ***Jerry:*** You mean Judith. (Pinter, 1978, p. 15).

In Scene One, the reader immediately meets the key point of the play by the repeated verb 'betray'. Emma and Jerry talk about their own betrayal and Emma claims that Robert also betrayed her:

> ***Emma:*** You know what I found out ... last night? He's *betrayed* me for years. He's had ... other women for years.
> ***Jerry:*** No? Good Lord.
> *Pause.*
> But we *betrayed* him for years.

Emma: And he *betrayed* me for years (Pinter, 1978, p. 25).

In the following of the dialogue they remember the old days they shared together and by repeating the verb 'remember' they emphasize that they still can not forget their relationship:

Jerry: Well, look, I'm happy to see you. I am. I'm sorry...
about...
Emma: Do you *remember?* I mean you do *remember?*
Jerry: I *remember* (Pinter, 1978, p. 28).

When Emma tells Jerry that she talked to Robert about their affair, Jerry does not want to believe it. As he feels himself very bad, he repeats his sentence again and again and Emma also repeats her own phrase to convince Jerry:

Jerry: *You told him everything?*
Emma: *I had to.*
Jerry: *You told him everything* ... about us?
Emma: *I had to.*
Pause (Pinter, 1978, p. 29).

Throughout the play, there is a strange repetition of an event by the characters when Jerry picked up Emma's daughter Sarah and threw her up and caught her. In Scene One, Emma reminds Jerry:

Emma: Yes. She's very ... She's smashing. She's thirteen.
Pause.
Do you remember that time ... oh god it was...
when you picked her up and caught her? (Pinter, 1978, p. 19).

Or Jerry emphasizes the same event when he learns that Emma tells Robert about their relationship. He makes a different connection with that event, because Robert is his oldest friend:

Jerry: But he's my oldest friend. I mean, I picked his own daughter
up in my own arms and threw her up and caught her, in my kitchen.
He watched me do it (Pinter, 1978, p. 29).

The same memory is repeated in Scene Six in the dialogue between Emma and Jerry:

Jerry: Listen. Do you remember, when was it, a few years ago, we were all in your kitchen, must have been Christmas or something, do you remember, all

the kids were running about and suddenly I picked Charlotte up and lifted her high up, high up, and then down and up. Do you remember how she laughed?
Emma: Everyone laughed (Pinter, 1978, p. 101).

When Jerry talks to Robert about his affair with Emma, the verb 'know' is repeated by the characters many times, because everything is hidden under this word:

Robert: She didn't have to tell me again last night. Because I *knew.*
And she *knew* I *knew* because she told me herself four years ago.
Silence.
Jerry: What?
Robert: I think I will sit down.
He sits.
I thought you *knew.*
Jerry: *Knew* what?
Robert: That I *knew.* That I've *known* for years.
I thought you *knew* that.
Jerry: You thought *I knew?* (Pinter, 1978, p. 38).

However, Jerry totally seems to be disturbed by the situation. He feels shocked when he learns that he is the only one who does not know that Robert knows and asks Robert why anybody told him:

Jerry: *Why didn't she tell me?*
Robert: Well, I'm not her, old boy.
Jerry: *Why didn't you tell me?*
Pause.
Robert: I thought you might know.
Jerry: But you didn't know for certain, did you? You didn't know!
Robert: No.
Jerry: Then *why didn't you tell me?* (Pinter, 1978, p. 40).

Throughout the play, all the characters repeat the things they know, the things they shared or experienced. It seems that their relationship turns into a vicious circle. Robert and Jerry talk about the old days:

Robert: Have you read any good books lately?
Jerry: I've been reading *Yeats.*
Robert: Ah. *Yeats.* Yes.
Pause.
Jerry: You *read Yeats* on *Torcello* once.
Robert: On *Torcello?*
Jerry: Don't you remember? Years ago. You went over to *Torcello* in the dawn, alone. And *read Yeats* (Pinter, 1978, p. 45).

Moreover, Robert and Jerry repeat their activity of playing squash from time to time in the play:

> ***Jerry:*** But we've seen each other ... a great deal...
> Over the last four years. We've had lunch.
> ***Robert:*** *Never played squash though.* (Pinter, 1978, p. 39).
> ...
> ***Jerry:*** Very well.
> *Pause.*
> ***Robert:*** When are we going to *play squash?* (Pinter, 1978, p. 67).
> ...
> ***Jerry:*** I haven't *play squash* for years.
> *Pause.*
> ***Robert:*** Well, let's play next week (Pinter, 1978, p. 70).

The repetition of this play may indicate how an important activity it is for Robert and Jerry. Sometimes the characters repeat the previous speaker's words or phrases to demonstrate that they pay attention to what the other character says just like in daily language:

> ***Jerry:*** I think *it's the best thing he's written.*
> ***Emma:*** It may be *the best thing he's written* but it's still bloody *dishonest.*
> ***Jerry:*** *Dishonest?* In what way *dishonest?*
> ***Emma:*** I've told you, actually (Pinter, 1978, pp. 66-67).

In Scene Seven, Robert and Jerry are talking about what kind of a publisher Robert is and he repeats the same words to know whether Jerry is agree or disagree with him:

> ***Robert:*** Tell me, do you think that makes me a publisher of
> unique critical judgment or *a foolish publisher?*
> ***Jerry:*** *A foolish publisher.*
> ***Robert:*** I agree with you. I am a very *foolish publisher* (Pinter, 1978, p. 115).

In Scene Eight, Jerry announces his admiration to Emma by repeating the word 'adore':

> ***Jerry:*** All that means something.
> ***Emma:*** It certainly does.
> ***Jerry:*** But *I adore you.*
> *Pause.*
> *I adore you* (Pinter, 1978, pp. 130-131).

In Harold Pinter's plays, characters attempt to talk to each other and the repetitions in their dialogues indicate that. However, in Betrayal characters all the time repeat their old memories; repeatedly ask about their children, husbands and wives or their vacations. These repetitions can be a great indication that characters fail when they want to communicate to

each other. This is a sign of incongruity and disharmony in their relationships. They repeat the same dialogues again and again, but the meaning of the conversations changes with time in *Betrayal.*

Speech Acts

Speech Acts are not seemed to be used in *Betrayal.* There is not any example of threat or insult as the characters do not seem to attempt to dominate each other and they do not struggle for power.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Analysing the five plays of Harold Pinter in the light of Stylistic Analysis, this study demonstrates how language can become a powerful tool to indicate the intentions of the characters as well as the intention of the author in his plays.

Harold Pinter is as an absurd dramatist focuses on the absurd situation of human beings, their struggle of power, struggle of conformity in the society they live, the lack of communication and the incongruity in their personal relationships. Effected by the terror of World War II, Pinter's characters are withdrawn in their private lives; they are away from communication and they are lost in their own world. What make their situation absurd is their inability to communicate and the inability to express themselves in such a contemporary world. Harold Pinter's aim is to explain his reader how desperate the human beings are in real world. Because according to Pinter, people do not use the language as a purpose of communication. To do so, Harold Pinter creates his own style and adds a different atmosphere to The Theatre of The Absurd. The language the characters use in Pinter's plays is a reflection of daily language. Therefore, this study concentrates on a different point of view to understand Pinter's five plays ' *The Birthday Party', 'The Homecoming', ' Ashes to Ashes'*, *'The Caretaker'*, and ' *The Betrayal'* by the help of Stylistic Approach under the headings of Odd Talk, Turn-Taking, Repetition and Speech Acts.

Stylistic Approach is beneficial to examine the language of drama, because it is concerned with literary language, the style and the meaning in a literary text. Stylistics of Drama uncovers the language and its meaning beyond words and sentences. The main motive of this dissertation is to enlighten the language of Pinter and the message he wants to conduct to his reader or audience by using some headings of Stylistic Approach such as Odd Talk, Turn-taking, Repetition and Speech Acts.

Odd Talk is often encountered in the plays of Harold Pinter. Odd Talk occurs when there is a discrepancy between the context and where the conversation takes place. Odd Talk emerges mostly in *The Birthday Party, The Caretaker* and *Betrayal*, because one of the most common features of these plays is that characters are really ignorant of each other. There is a

great communication gap among them. The relationship of Stanley with Meg; the disharmonious dialogues between Goldberg and Stanley demonstrate their odd situations and also communication breakdowns among characters in *The Birthday Party*. The Odd Talk in *The Caretaker* is encountered by the anomalous behaviours of Davies throughout the play. Davies is in a desperate situation and his main effort is to take the job as a caretaker. However, he is so helpless that this drags him into an absurd position. *Betrayal* is presented to his reader with one of the most common problems in human relationships; and the communication breakdowns, the incongruity and distortation in their relations can not prevent them from talking about irrelevant things which causes Odd Talk.

Turn-taking is a method which helps to analyse how conversation is used to complete actions by the characters. It deals with how and when a speaker gets a turn to speak and the transitions between turns. By this way, the reader can understand the aspect and intention of characters easily. Turn-taking system is used by the characters in four of the plays examined in this study as a means of control and struggle of power.

In *The Birthday Party*, Goldberg's cross-examination towards Stanley may indicate that the speaker does not allow the other speaker to agree or disagree. Or characters' use of silences and pauses demonstrates that they do not intend to have a meaningful conversation as it happens between Meg and Stanley during the breakfast.

The characters in *The Homecoming* manipulate the turn-taking method by refusing to compete for turns or they select the other speakers who choose not to respond as a sign of power or competition. The attack of Lenny against Max about fatherhood and Max's silence towards Lenny shows his own protection. Or Ruth refusal to acknowledge Max's insults can be seen as a form of protection. As a means of power, especially the struggle between Lenny and Ruth occurs in the battle of words, but all the characters in *The Homecoming* compete for power.

In *Ashes to Ashes*, turn-taking method is used by Pinter as a sign of power, powerlessness and fear of the characters especially by the use of pauses and silences. The dialogues between Rebecca and Devlin consist of circulation of Rebecca's memories from past and thence; Devlin asks several questions to Rebecca to solve her mystery.

In *The Caretaker*, turn-taking method is used as a competition as in *The Homecoming*. The two brothers, Mick and Aston play with the poor man Davies at every turn and they try to control and defeat him.

Repetition is perhaps one of the most common figures Pinter is seen to use in his plays, because the language of Pinter is a reflection of daily language. Characters repeat their own words and phrases to highlighten what they say, or repeat other speakers to show their involvement in relationships. Repetition in the absurd plays demonstrates how conversationalists in everyday speech interact with each other. In all the five plays, characters make repetitions whether to have a meaningful conversation or it is a sign of failed communication. Or repetition is used by Pinter's characters as an excuse; they avoid communicating constant information or limit the amount of information they provide.

Speech Acts are known to be an act of communication in daily verbal interaction. In drama, it serves the same function. Speech Acts indicate the intention of the characters and their attempt to achieve a certain goal. Speech Acts are mostly dominated by threats and insults in *The Homecoming*, in *The Birthday Party* and in *The Caretaker*. The characters pursue relational power positions through direct and indirect insults. The characters battle each other while hiding their masks; they cover their true motivations. Speech Acts can help uncover the true intentions of the characters, and how threats and insults are masked by another type of speech acts.

Language is the salient element in Harold Pinter's plays and the Stylistic Analysis of a dramatic text demonstrates the power of language and its similarity with everyday interaction. The language the characters use reflect their true intentions, it is also the weapon the characters use in their struggles for power and the Stylistic Analysis help the reader discover the hidden masks beyond the words. When the reader restricts a drama text only between lines, it is not easy to perceive the true purpose of the author and also the message he wants to give; however a detailed stylistic analysis provides a true understanding for assessing how language is penetrated by dramatists to concentrate on the human relationships and how those relationships are shaped via conversation. Stylistic Analysis of Pinter's five plays can help determine that the characters use the everyday verbal interaction not to develop an excellent and qualified relationship; they use it to battle and dominate each other. To provide a broader understanding of Pinter's plays, Odd Talk, Turn-taking, Repetition and Speech Acts are used in the light of

Stylistic Analysis in this dissertation. Furthermore, several examples taken from the plays are used to illustrate different points and how different techniques are used to create daily verbal interaction by the author. The repetitions characters use again and again, their struggle to dominate and the turns they take while trying to create a possible dialogue, their discrepancies between the contexts and the conversational actions such as insult and threats can be explored easily by the help Stylistic Analysis of Drama.

Harold Pinter presents his mastership by using distinguished techniques. He draws an excellent portrait of human being who is suffocated in the depth of communication and conveys it by the help of language itself. This dissertation may illuminate the power of language and its similarity with real life interaction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almansi, G., & Henderson, S. (1983).*Harold Pinter*. USA: Methuan Co Ltd.

Baker, W., & Tabachnick, S. (1973). *Harold Pinter.* New York: Harper and Row.

Billington, M. (1996). *The Life and Work of Harold Pinter*. London: Faber and Faber.

Bloom, H. (1987).Harold Pinter: *Modern Critical Review*. USA: Chelsa House Publisher.

Chapman, R. (1973). *Linguistic and Literature: An Introduction to Literary Stylistic* London: Biddles Ltd.

Culperer, J., Short, M. & Verdonk. (1999)(Eds): *Exploring the Language of Drama.* London: Routledge.

Dukore, B. (1982).*Harold Pinter: Macmillan Modern Dramatists*. London: The Macmillan Press.

Esslin, M. (1969). *The Theatre of the Absurd.* New York: Anchor Books.

Esslin, M. (1982). *Pinter the Playwright.* London: Methuen.

Innes, C. (1992). *Modern British Drama. The Twentieth Century*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Gale, S. (1978). *Harold Pinter: An Annotated Bibliography*. Boston: G.k. Hall and Co.

Geis, M. (1995). *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Up.

Hollis, James, R. (1970). *Harold Pinter: The Poetics of Silence*. Carbondale: S. Illinois Up.

Leech, G. N. &Short, H.M. (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman

Norrick, Neal R (1987). *Functions of Repetition in Conversation*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ozunlu, U. (2001).*Edebiyatta Dil Kullanımları*.Istanbul: Multilingual.

Page, M. (1994). *File on Pinter*. London: Methuen.

Peacock, K, D. (1997).*Harold Pinter and The New British Theatre*.London: Greenwood.

Pinter, H. (1977).*Writing For Myself. In Complete Works: Two*. New York: Grove

Pinter, H. (1978). *Complete Works: Three*. New York: Grove.

Pinter, H. (1981). *Complete Works: Four*. New York: Grove.

Pinter. (1991).*Plays:Three*.London: Faber and Faber Ltd.

Sacks, H., E. A. Schegloff, & G. Jefferson. (1974) *A Simplest Systematic For The Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation*. London: Language 50.

Searle, John. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Novels*. London: Longman.

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery In Conversational Discourse.* London: Cambridge.

Taylor, J. R. (1969). *Harold Pinter*. London: Longmans Green.

Thomson, T, D. (1985).*Pinter The Player's Playwright*. London: Schocken Books.

Toolen, M. (1992*). Language, Text and Context: Essays in Stylistics*. London: Routledge.

Trussler, S. (1973). *The Plays of Harold Pinter*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Trussler, S. (2000). *The Cambridge Illustrated History of British Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.