AUDIENCE CONTROL, BRITISH POLITICAL THEATRE AND THE PINTER METHOD

Elizabeth Sakellaridou

Recent research on theatre and film spectatorhip has proved how complex a task it is to define the audience and predetermine its response. Still, playwrights, especially political ones, try to anticipate their audience and find ways of control of audience reception. Harold Pinter's political plays are a special case for study because, while on the surface they follow his old stylistic tactics of openness and ambiguity, underneath they give a strong feeling of tightness, closure and design. Visual and verbal strategies of cognitive and emotive nature employed in those texts are explored and discussed in association with Pinter's increasing eagerness to direct his own work or give model readings of it.

Asking whether Pinter's recent political plays belong to a Leftist or Marxist type of theatre, as much Pinter criticism has wondered in the last few years, is the wrong kind of question at the present historical moment. The British socialist theatre, which established a firm political tradition in the late 60s and early 70s, has made important shifts and has undergone major transformations since the mid-70s. What started as an anti-bourgeois fringe theatre with aspirations for an alternative culture and an alternative society was gradually absorbed, after about ten years' practice, by the mainstream theatre and this entailed a series of changes in writer-audience relationships as well as in the ideology and aesthetics of theatrical production.

The phenomena of discontent and instability in both ideology and the methods of political theatre, the breaking of former leagues and the ensuing bitter debates among socialist playwrights, when observed in retrospect, come to justify Pinter's long-standing scepticism about political theatre and his much discussed abstention from overt political involvement in his dramatic work. His sudden change of mind with the writing of the one-act play *One For the Road* in 1983 took the critics by surprise and it created

Γράμμα / Gramma: Journal of Theory and Criticism 2 (1994)
© 1994 by Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

further bewilderment when the sketch *Precisely* in 1984 and another one acter *Mountain Language* in 1988 joined forces with the previous play, forming a distinct group of works of direct political statement. The new body of his ideologically specific dramatic work grew larger with two more later short additions, the sketch *The New World Order* and the one-act play *Party Time*, both of which received their world première in 1991.

Since the appearance of *One for the Road* a great controversy has arisen around Pinter's theatrical political activism between critics who seriously questioned the possibility of his placement among the ranks of Leftist or Marxist writers and others who despised, with a lot of acid irony, his newly emerged "champagne socialism."[1] However, Pinter's recent political drama must be seen and understood not in isolation but within the historical and ideological context of the political theatre of Thatcherite Britain and its new tactics of "subversion from within" the system. The new function of political theatre is, as Howard Brenton argued, to hurl "petrol bombs through the proscenium arch" of bourgeois theatre venues (Brenton 4) or — as differently expressed by Trevor Griffiths — to make "strategic penetrations" into the audience's set ideology. Francis Gillen suggests a similar function for Pinter's political discourse in his review of the New York production of *Mountain Language* and *The Birthday Party* in 1989.

The assimilation of British socialist theatre by the mainstream culture is a fact and the recent collapse of existing socialisms in Europe has inspired further ideological repositioning and thematic reorientations in what still passes as British ideological theatre. In some respects political theatre is returning to general questions about the misuse of power and authority, reminiscent of the issues of anarchy and authority raised by Edward Bond and John Arden about thirty years ago. This return to old patterns of political thought in recent British political drama seems to validate some critics' earlier verdict that "the truly subversive dramatist is relativistic and anarchistic rather than programmatic" (Melmoth 954) — a view that does justice to many new plays of the London stage of the 90s (like David Edgar's *The Shape of the Table*, Caryl Churchill's *Mad Forest* and David Hare's *Racing Demon*) but also finds appropriate room for Pinter's new political face of a dramatist.

Within the present spectrum of theatrical ethics and modality the pertinent question to ask is not whether Pinter's theatre is Leftist or Marxist but what it is in his theatre that qualifies it for political thinking (in its new form), provided that very little has actually changed in Pinter's writing style over the years. To put the question more specifically — how does Pinter hope to exercise audience control so as to ensure the transmission of his intended message inscribed in the theatrical text? This has been the perennial concern of all ideological theatre and it would find insurmountable problems with the open, avant-garde forms that Pinter's theatre has been known to be using all along his theatrical career.

Among all the parameters of the theatrical practice audience response is the least tractable area. According to Herbert Blau "the audience is the major problematic of the theatre" (Blau 1983: 450). Other theorists of the theatre like Patrice Pavis and Marvin Carlson stress the difficulty of application of borrowed theories such as reader response and reception theory to the complexities of the theatrical praxis.[2] In a recent penetrating study on theatre audiences Blau returns, quite notably, to the same pessimistic remark about the "indeterminacy" of the audience (Blau 1990). Another contemporary study in the field, Susan Bennett's *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* (1990), focuses more on culturally specific para-theatrical determinants of audience reception than on actual spectatorial strategies of viewing. A more systematic psychosemiotic investigation of spectatorial reception has been undertaken by film theorists, especially by recent feminist film theory, and has partly illuminated the questions posed by theatre practitioners. However, many of the problems referring to theatre audiences still persist. The main complexity (also shared with cinematic processes) arises from the fact that the dramatic text in its course from authorial production to audience reception is subjected roughly to two major readings, the first by the director and his production team and the second by the audience, both as individual spectator and as "community reader."[3] There are also lateral readings influencing audience reception — those practised via the mechanisms of theatre publicity and commodification and the body of theatre reviewers. Theatre venues are also an important reception determinant. Besides, a performance is an ephemeral activity and consequently there cannot exist a definitive (therefore controllable) performance text in the sense that a cinematic one can be recorded on celluloid. As a result, theatre audience response remains a fluid, enigmatic and highly unpredictable activity.

Given the intricate theatre machinery of our times and Pinter's involvement in it not only as playwright but also in his capacity as actor and director, his posture of "innocence" in his writing practice sounds false. How true is it that writing is for him a private activity, disregarding audiences altogether? As cultural materialist studies of artistic production have shown, "works produced always have forms of social appropriation already behind them; they have been selected for reception."[4] In terms of theatrical practice Blau suggests that although audiences remain largely unknowable "this doesn't mean that skillful directors and actors can't make a particular audience feel at any moment pretty much what it wants or ... thinks it wants" (Blau 1990: 355). Taking up Pinter as an example he acutely observes that Pinter "seems to know what [the audience] wants, which is the musication of an anxiety that deepens the untruth. Or to put it another way: on the commodified evidence of his plays, it wants the reduplicated terror of uncertain signs and, *in its own image*, the self-annuling rhythms of a metonymic or hypothetical existence" (355). Placing Pinter within the

"commodified" context of his produced work Blau pinpoints a very pragmatic interest of the practising playwright in the methods of audience manipulation. Furthermore, is Pinter as far from theories and ideological formations as he has time and again pretended to be? In his Hamburg speech of 1970 Pinter expressed great admiration for a director who "has never been known to complete a sentence. He has such instinctive surety and almost subliminal powers of communication" (Pinter 1981: x). My contention is that however craftily Pinter has camouflaged his own designs of theatrical writing as deriving from "instinctive surety" and "subliminal" knowledge, *surety* and *knowledge* they have always been.

In an article published in 1983 Herbert Blau made the bold but intriguing proposition that Pinter's repudiation of theory is in fact "an ideological posture," like Beckett's, which "cover[s] up the theory," which "teases us out of thought" (443). Blau's article appeared some time before the first stage production of *One For the Road* and it obviously referred to Pinter's previous, so-called apolitical work. The argument it poses is more relevant and illuminating now, after Pinter's turn to political theatrical discourse, as it can offer an important clue to the understanding of the internal mechanism of his method and its continuity throughout his work. Blau contends that Pinter's method "is a process designed to cover up the theory or to make any signs of the process, which is an ideological process, seem spontaneous, innocent, invisible, or blank" (443). Pinter's plays have never been mere entertainment but always thought-provoking in an insidious way, through their false pose of naturalness, innocence, non-knowledge and spontaneity. This strategy of disguising ideology is inevitably associated with a hidden desire for ideological closure. Perhaps Pinter's own most obvious confirmation of his function as controller of the theatrical discourse has been when he described his relationship with his characters as a "highly respectful one" but then hastened to add: "I'd like to make quite clear at the same time that I don't regard my own characters as uncontrolled, or anarchic. They are not. The function of selection and arrangement is mine" (Pinter 1976: 14). The use of such precise and emphatic terms as "uncontrolled" and "anarchic" indicates that Pinter is fully aware of his power of control as the author of the dramatic text. His meticulous use of language with the absolute care for pause and the minutest segment of writing also suggests the exercise of conscious control over dramatic discourse.

However, Pinter's authority tends to extend beyond the boundaries of the written text. His double experience as an actor and director helps him to mentally stage his plays (probably more than the average playwright) while in the process of writing the text. A critic has argued that Shakespeare "in writing plays for performance was partly writing with an eye to the potential responses of the audience; that is as he orchestrated the play, he was indirectly orchestrating the theatrical experience of the viewer" (Howard 6). This parallel activity of invoking a stage representation of the text when

actually giving it verbal shape alone suggests an almost automatic, even though unconscious, identification of written and performance text in the mind of the writer. In Pinter's case this is not only a transitory mental state bound to disappear with the completion of the writing but it has often surfaced during actual productions as an active resistance on his part to even minor linguistic changes of the original script or to bold readings of it. The notorious Visconti case, in which Pinter fiercely opposed (even legally) the Italian director's "unorthodox" interpretation of *Old Times* as a play about a lesbian relationship, is a startlingly naked example of his desire to extend his authority over the performance text. Occasions of his participation as an actor in his own plays or of personal direction of his work are also instances of partial control over the intermediary stage of the theatrical praxis.

Such sporadic instances of desire for ideological control, however, have remained rather invisible and inconsequential and it is only after the writing of his recent political pieces that they have emerged as symptoms of an old tendency towards a certain subtle kind of ideological closure, which has only lately surfaced itself. Pinter shows an undisguised eagerness lately to direct his own work, to "make sure it was done right" (Merritt 19) — a justification that sounds completely incongruous with his previous stance of perpetual self-doubt. Furthermore, not only has he offered personal readings of *Precisely* and *The New World Order*, which, as fairly simple dramatic sketches involving two indistinguishable characters in a short dialogue, would lend themselves more readily to this type of oral representation, but also one-man performances of *One For the Road* and *Mountain Language*, which are both plays with multiple characters shown in a variety of dialogue situations. It appears that Pinter as a political dramatist is heading towards a monosemic theatre practice, a pattern not unfamiliar in the history of political theatre as Edward Bond's recent example comes to remind us.

Similar authoritarian tendencies can be detected in the texture of his political plays. Indeed, a close reading of the script of *One For the Road* suggests an austere, tight text, terribly minimalistic not only as a fictional piece and a discursive practice but also in terms of its visual and acoustic concretization. The laconic but distinct stage directions imply great reductions over and fixity of all elements of stage representation, visual and acoustic alike (set, stage props, costume, make-up, movement, gesture, posture, tone of voice, laugh, murmur), as if to minimize the possibilities of multiple interpretations opening up to intermediate creators and carriers of meaning (mainly director and actors) in the course of the theatrical praxis. *One For the Road* is indeed a model case of a highly regulated dramatic text which reduces the creative potentialities of theatrical production and refers back to the initial authority of discourse, in which lies the power of the written text. By attempting to bypass the risks of alternative meanings of the performance text Pinter establishes a more direct author-audience communication, carried mainly through discourse. Although *Mountain*

Language is the play which overtly deals with the theme of oppression through language, it is its predecessor *One For the Road*, a play inadequately described as being about "power and powerlessness," that is actually a real triumph of the power of discourse. The play revels in the infinite pleasures of discourse as a practice of dominance and control especially in its fictional context, where Nicolas manifests his full authority over his victims by exhibiting a triumphant mastery of speech rather than a brutal exercise of real on-stage violence. Indeed the iconic representation relies on simple, though memorable images (only suggestive of off-stage violence), whose limited kinetic and other components of iconic signification (like the gestic move of Nicolas's finger) are easily preconditioned by the writer's brief but precise directorial score embedded in the dramatic text. Thus the play's iconicity is subordinated to a double logocentric dominance, both intra-dramatic (Nicolas's domineering verbosity) and extra-dramatic (the author's direction notes).

Mountain Language is another striking example of a play which, ironically, contradicts its own ideological endictment of the power in and behind discourse, by adopting (like *One For the Road* but less exclusively) strategies which assume this same power it endicts, and foregrounds discourse's priority in theatrical representation.[5]

The primacy of discourse as controller of theatrical communication is a principle underlying all Pinter's theatre. There is a whole series of specific ploys through which this general principle is put into action. The selection of material (which implies ideological preference) and the mental, narrative and linguistic processes of its presentation (which disguise ideology) are all related strategies of prearrangement and control. Pinter's statement in his Hamburg speech that he presents "not intellectual concepts but facts" in the straight form of simple images and characters — "That is what happened. That is what they said. That is what they did" (1981: xiii) — is in reality, as earlier suggested, a very effective strategy of feigning innocence, simplicity and naturalness and thus disarming the audience of its resistance to design and ideological imposition. Theorists have warned us against the innocence of facts in discourse (Blau 1983, Trew 95). Pinter himself reveals the traps of his methods when he talks, at another point of his Hamburg speech, about finding "the *legitimate* and therefore *compulsory* facts" (1981: x, emphasis mine), which implies that he is surely not referring to random happenings but to facts already validated and charged with meaning in his mind. This method of *feigning* naturalism differentiates Pinter's work from the social realist and the documentary play, which are two of the most popular forms of contemporary British political drama. Pinter's "facts" undergo, before their dramatic representation, a peculiar kind of dehistoricization operating on certain levels alone so that, while they retain elements of immediate realistic recognition, they also create a distance from historical specificity. Thus, Pinter's political play (as much as any Pinter play) lies somewhere between

the realistic approach of the agitprop and the documentary play on the one hand and the parabolic/mythical method of epic theatre on the other. It therefore avoids many of the risks of both kinds of political drama: the specificity and/or oversimplification of the former and the distantiation and generality of the latter. Part of the success of *One For the Road* as political theatre lies in the fact that, while it is absolutely credible as a realistic event, it is, simultaneously, dehistoricized enough to permit its direct association with any number of similar cases of torture of different spatiotemporal specificity. A political piece like *One For the Road*,which operates between realistic documentation and ambiguity, simplicity and sophistication, has an appeal to all kinds of audiences because it leaves it to them to receive the play on their own level and degree of mental capacity and cultural experience. This is an advantage that not many political plays can boast of enjoying. Normally a political play deliberately creates a nexus of boundaries by which to predefine its audience and preclude specific social or ideological groups. This has been the great anxiety of political playwrights of all times; the constant necessity for negotiation between their own intellect and that of their presumed audience.

Pinter's answer to this problem is his refusal to separate cognitive from emotive modes of perception. The fact that he invites some kind of emotional response (though not complete emotional identification) seems to place him at the antipodes of Brechtian theatre — though of course Brecht never meant to exclude emotion altogether from his theatre. At the same time he is not that anti-Brechtian at all because he creates his own distance from the emotional world of the play (through vagueness, strangeness and ambiguity) and so differentiates his work from realistic psychological drama (of the type mostly practised in Britain today by David Hare). Pinter's idea of emotional response looks fairly close to Aristotle's concept of "pity" and "fear", an appeal to lower, elemental emotional stir than to higher, specified feelings. This strategy on the one hand makes the play accessible even to audiences of lesser cultural sensibility and on the other it avoids the pitfalls of in-depth psychological character investigation by directing the audience from global emotional response to general cognitive associations beyond character specificity and identification. This is precisely the point where Pinter's theatrical techniques seem to converge with Artaudian theatre which J. L. Styan encapsulates as "a subject of global importance with simple, concentrated imagery" (Styan 116). Just like Artaud, Pinter uses sensory stimulants or rather clues (perhaps more acoustic than visual), highly assisted by imagination, to evoke "the terror, the cruelty and the eroticism appropriate to 'the agitation and unrest characteristic of our age'" (Styan 110). Exactly what the role of emotions is in the process of human perception is still unknown. It is much to the point though that both Artaud, great supporter of an acute emotional stimulation of the audience, and Brecht, supporter of the arousal of the audience's rational capacities, failed in their prejudgment of

their audience's response in their experiments with *The Cenci* and *Mother Courage* respectively. Artaud has been accused for "dull[ing] the perception of the spectator" (Styan 110) while Brecht has had to revise *Mother Courage* to prevent further unwelcome readings of his leading character.

Recent studies in psychology and psychotherapy show that there can be no separation between intellectual and emotional processes of perception. Freud's pioneer work in the field first distinguished between primary process thought (which he linked with dreams, the irrational, the iconic mode) and secondary process thought (which he associated with consciousness, the rational, the verbal mode). Later psychoanalysts, developing further Freud's theory, called primary process thought "intuition" and argued that "instead of being repressed forever in the healthily developing person by his[/her] secondary process thought, intuition continues to operate alongside secondary process thought throughout our lives" (Hornby 107). Another related theory, the "Emotional-Cognitive Structure Theory," also maintains that "thoughts are conceived as emotional-cognitive structures, i.e. structured assemblies of cognitive fragments fused together by their emotional coding elements" (Gray 3). All these recent psychoanalytic studies of human perception illuminate and justify Pinter's use of a mixed method for effective communication with his audience. Peter Brook's memorable production of Weiss's *Marat/Sade* is a good example of mixed Artaudian and Brechtian techniques to look back to. The most successful productions of recent feminist plays also make extensive use of mixed rational and emotive techniques to reach their audiences.

Pinter has explored ways of conditioning emotion and turning it into a controlled communicative method. One tactic is the moulding down of emotion into crudely recognized binary categories of the type of good/evil, pleasure/pain etc., below any complicated nuance of feeling, on a level where channelling the audience's sympathies is an easier task (Pavis 85). Commenting on the primary process thought Hornby writes: "A characteristic of intuitive thought is that it is wholistic ... when we think about a face in primary process terms, intuiting its emotional state, we do so as a whole — the face looks angry or happy or sad. This total, overall impression is our first impression, which we can then secondarily analyze by isolating individual elements" (Hornby 109). Emotional stimulation can be achieved either on the visual level through exposition to crude or violent images or on the linguistic level through the thrusting of verbal crudities to the audience — both fairly familiar methods to political theatre for the achievement of "aggro-effects." British socialist theatre has greatly depended on such techniques of violent and shocking confrontation of the audience in its agitprop phase. Both Howard Brenton and David Hare greatly enjoyed the horrifying effects on their audiences of their Portable Theatre years, while Edward Bond has always considered the presentation of violence a "must" in his art. For him "it would be immoral not to write about violence" (Bond 3).

This strategy of violence has found vast application in Pinter's *One For the Road* and *Mountain Language*, though of course it has never been absent from his earlier work.

But there is another finer method of emotional control through language, of which Pinter has always been a superb master and which, wisely, he has not abandoned completely in his nakedly political works for the sake of cruder methods of immediate confrontation and assault. Pinter's emotional manipulation of his audience through discourse is mainly carried out by means of linguistic modality, which works in imperceptible, lateral ways of conveying meaning and is therefore ideal for evading the audience's resistance to enforced ideology. The modality of discourse is expressed through a variety of minor linguistic tactics already explored by Pinter's critics; elusiveness, inversion, inference, silence, non-sequitur, false politeness, repetition, interruption, verb tense, rhetorical questions. *The Birthday Party* is a classic example of Pinter's linguistic idiom — all the more so because in many respects it is an extremely realistic play. More examples can be called up from *The Dwarfs*, a play of a very different calibre from that of *The Birthday Party*. Pinter's recent screenplay *The Trial* (1989), based on Kafka's homonymous novel, also bears his unmistakeable stamp of verbal manipulation and control in its very first pages:

SECOND MAN

We're not authorised to tell you. Go to your room and wait. Proceedings have been started. You'll be told everything in due course. Eh, wait a minute, let's have a look at this. That's a very nice nightshirt you're wearing. (*To First Man*) Isn't it?

FIRST MAN

It's beautiful.

SECOND MAN

Listen. We're going to take care of this nightshirt for you. You don't mind that, do you? We're going to look after all your underwear, in fact. But don't worry. If your case turns out allright, you'll get it all back.

FIRST MAN

You see, it's much better to give it to us than leave it in the depot. If you leave it in the depot it'll either be pinched or they'll sell it. In any case you'll never see your underwear again.

SECOND MAN

If you leave it in the depot.

(Pinter 1989: 4)

Pinter's major deviation from the original passage of the novel is the change of Kafka's complex narrative form (combined with direct and reported speech) into a sharp, staccato dialogue, which, in its sudden profusion of disarming concern and civility on the part of the two warders,

breathes unspeakable terrors and unuttered threats into K.'s unguarded consciousness.

Even *Mountain Language*, which by comparison to *One For the Road* is lavish in crude aggro-effects of the visual and verbal types, has nothing, for instance, of the on-stage physical brutality in Edward Bond's *Saved* (where a baby is stoned to death in its pram) or in Howard Barker's *A Bite of the Night* (where a man's tongue is torn from his mouth in a horrible mess of blood). Quite indicatively blood in Pinter's play is only a red splash decorating the cover of the Faber edition of the published text. It does not invade his stage. As all Pinter's work *Mountain Language* gains its most powerful, truly climactic moment, not through its often problematic stage iconicity but in the extreme tension created on the linguistic level between the old woman's deliberate silence (an act of political resistance) and the sergeant's authoritarian discourse, which falsifies through irony and inversion the real relations of power between oppressor and oppressed: "Look at this. You go out of your way to give them a helping hand and they fuck it up" (Pinter 1988: 47). At this point Pinter proves wrong Artaud's "distrust [of] language as a satisfactory medium of expression for profound emotion" (Styan 108). Pinter's language mentally stages for the audience all the physical suffering that is underplayed or curtailed on his stage. The young man's touching monologue at the end of *Party Time* is the latest example of a stirring verbal report of the physical torments that are not given visual substantiation on Pinter's stage. Likewise, it is the last verbal conflict of utmost dramaticality, a real linguistic tour de force, that saves *Mountain Language* from the risks of an agitprop play, by far outdated in its methods in the present theatrical sociohistorical context. As another British socialist playwright, David Edgar, has remarked while looking back at his earlier agitprop years, "I was fed up with seeing agitprop shows that were messy, and also I was increasingly thinking that the politics you could get across were very crude, whereas the world around us was getting more complicated" (Edgar 13). Pinter's very cautious use of blunt agitprop tactics suggests that he must be sharing Edgar's misgivings for this theatrical medium of political thought.

The audience does not exist before the play, but it "happens" during the performance, argues Herbert Blau (1990: 25). Its power and judgment are illusions. There is an internalized authority figure at the controls of perception. This authority concealed in the text breathes its ideological codings to the audience (42-3). Pinter's plays belong to this treacherous category of theatrical texts that seem to confer authority to the audience while, actually, they are snatching its power away. The real controller, as is teasingly but also alarmingly suggested in Pinter's own short *Victoria Station*, is not the officially named one but the unnamed other, not the audience but the hidden phantasmatic authority behind the text.

Aristotle University

Notes

1. In a recent Pinter profile Steve Grant comments quite bluntly: "The working-class Jew is now satirised for so-called 'champagne socialism,' which is at least preferable to being a champagne cynic," (*Time Out*, Nov. 14-21, 1990: 23).
2. See Patrice Pavis, *Languages of the Stage* especially chapter "The Aesthetics of Theatrical Reception: Variations on a Few Relationships" 67-94. Also: Marvin Carlson, "Theatre Audiences and the Reading of Performance" in *Interpreting the Theatrical Past*, ed. Thomas Postlewait and Bruce A. McConachie (1989) 82-98.
3. Stanley Fish's view about "a 'community of readers,' socially defined, which shares common values and determines collectively the norms and conventions according which individual reading stake place" in Postlewait and McConachie 84-5.
4. Manfred Naumann as quoted by Susan Bennett, in Bennett 114.
5. For an analysis of power in and behind discourse see especially Chapter 3, "Discourse and Power," in Norman Fairclough, *Language and Power* (1989) 43 -76.

Works Cited

Bennett, Susan. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception.* London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Blau, Herbert. *The Audience.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.

——. "Ideology and Performance." *Theatre Journal* 35 (1983): 441-60.

Bond, Edward. *Plays: Two.* London: Methuen, 1978.

Brenton, Howard. "Petrol Bombs Through the Proscenium Arch." *Theatre Quarterly* 5 (1975): 4-20.

Carlson, Marvin. "Theatre Audiences and the Reading of Performance." *Interpreting the Theatrical Past.* Ed. Thomas Postlewait and Bruce A. McConachie. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1989. 82-98.

Edgar, David. "Towards a Theatre of Dynamic Ambiguities." *Theatre Quarterly* 9.33 (1979): 3-23.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power.* London and New York: Longman, 1989.

Gillen, Francis. "*Mountain Language* and *The Birthday Party.*" *The Pinter Review* 3 (1989): 93-7.

Grant, Steve. "Preview: Harold Pinter Revivals." *Time Out* 14-21 Nov. 1990: 23.

Gray, William. "Understanding Creative Thought Processes: An Early Formulation of the Emotional-Cognitive Structure Theory." *Man-Environment Systems* 9.1 (1979): 3-14.

Griffiths, Trevor. "Interview with Pat Silburn." *Gambit* 8.29 (1976).

Howard, Jean E. *Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration: Stage Technique and Audience Response*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1984.

Hornby, Richard. *Drama, Metadrama and Perception.* London and Toronto: Associated

U Presses, 1986.

Melmoth, John. "Theatre Subversives and Hooligans." *TLS* 30 (Aug.1985): 953-54.

Merritt, H. Susan. *Pinter in Play: Critical Strategies and the Plays of Harold Pinter.* Durham and London: Duke UP, 1990.

Pavis, Patrice. *Languages of the Stage.* New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982.

Pinter, Harold. *Mountain Language.* London and Boston: Faber, 1988.

——. *One for the Road.* London: Methuen, 1984.

——. *Plays: Four.* London: Methuen, 1981.

——. *Plays: One.* London: Methuen, 1976.

——. *The Trial* (screenplay). Typescript held by the author, 1989.

Styan, J. L. *Modern Drama in Theory and Practice Vol.* 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

Trew, Tony. "Theory and Ideology at Work." *Language and Control.* Ed. Roger Fowler et al. London, Boston and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979: 94-116.

Η σύγχρονη έρευνα σχετικά με τους θεατές θεάτρου και κινηματογράφου έχει αποδείξει πόσο πολύπλοκο εγχείρημα είναι ο ορισμός του ακροατηρίου και η πρόβλεψη της αντίδρασής του. Παρ' όλα αυτά οι θεατρικοί συγγραφείς, ιδίως οι πολιτικοποιημένοι, προσπαθούν να μαντέψουν το ακροατήριό τους και να βρουν τρόπους ελέγχου της πρόσληψης του θεάματος. Τα πολιτικά έργα του Harold Pinter είναι μια ιδιάζουσα περίπτωση για μελέτη διότι, ενώ στην επιφάνεια ακολουθούν τις παλιές του ανοιχτές υφολογικές τακτικές, στην ουσία δίνουν ένα δυνατό αίσθημα κλειστού, σφιχτοδεμένου κειμένου και σχεδιασμού. Το άρθρο διερευνά διάφορες οπτικές και φατικές στρατηγικές γνωστικού και συγκινησιακού χαρακτήρα που χρησιμοποιούνται μέσα σ' αυτά τα κείμενα και τις συζητά σε συσχετισμό με την τελευταία έντονη επιμονή του Pinter να κάνει υποδειγματικές αναγνώσεις και / ή να σκηνοθετεί ο ίδιος τα έργα του.