Ewa Byczkowska-Page

WROCŁAW 1983

The Structure of Time-Space in Harold Pinter's Drama: 1957—1975

WYDAWNICTWA UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO
SERIE

WYDZIAŁ FILOLOGICZNY

Anglica Wratislaviensia
Bibliotekoznawstwo
Classica Wratislaviensia
Germanica Wratislaviensia
Onomastica Slavogermanica
Prace Literackie
Romanica Wratislaviensia
Slavica Wratislaviensia
Studia Linguistica

WYDZIAŁ FILOZOFICZNO—HISTORYCZNY

Antiquitas
Historia
Prace Filozoficzne
Prace Pedagogiczne
Prace Psychologiczne
Studia Archeologiczne

WYDZIAŁ PRAWA I ADMINISTRACJI

Prawo
Przegląd Prawa i Administracji
Studia nad Faszyzmem i Zbrodniami

WYDZIAŁ MATEMATYKI, FIZYKI I CHEMII

Dielektryczne i Optyczne Aspekty Oddziaływań Międzycząsteczkowych
Matematyka, Fizyka, Astronomia
Probability and Mathematical Statistics
Winter School of Theoretical Physics

WYDZIAŁ NAUK PRZYRODNICZYCH

Biuletyn Meteorologiczny
Prace Botaniczne
Prace Geologiczno-Mineralogiczne
Prace Instytutu Geograficznego. Seria A. Geografia Fizyczna
Prace Instytutu Geograficznego. Seria B. Geografia Społeczna i Ekonomiczna
Prace Obserwatorium Meteorologii i Klimatologii Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego
Prace Zoologiczne
Results of Investigations of the Polish Scientific Spitsbergen Expeditions
Studia Geograficzne

INSTYTUT NAUK POLITYCZNYCH

Nauki Polityczne

ACTA
UNIVERSITATIS
WRATISLAVIENSIS
No 636

ANGLICA
WRATISLAVIENSIA
XI

Ewa Byczkowska-Page

The Structure of Time-Space in Harold Pinter's Drama: 1957—1975

WROCŁAW 1983

WYDAWNICTWO UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO

WYDAWNICTWO UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO

Wydanie 1. Nakład 350 + 70 egz., ark. wyd. 5,55, ark. druk. 4,0. Papier offsetowy kl. V, g. 70, form. B-1. Oddano do produkcji we wrześniu 1981 r. Podpisano do druku w marcu 1983 r. Druk ukończono w kwietniu 1983 r. Z. 1454 (B-5), cena zł 83.—

ZAKŁAD GRAFICZNY UNIWERSYTETU WROCŁAWSKIEGO
Pl. Solny 12, 50-061 Wrocław

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

On May 20, 1958 in a popular London newspaper the *Evening Standard* the title of the theatre review read "Sorry, Mr. Pinter You're Just Not Funny Enough". (Schulman 1958: 6). What Milton Schulman, the theatre critic of the paper, condemned so authoritatively turned out to be the production of Harold Pinter's second[1] play *The Birthday Party*. Other reviewers rejected the play in an equally irrevocable way and this practically unanimous[2] critical scorn drove *The Birthday Party* from the stage within a week. The only significant voice of defence and unreserved praise came from Harold Hobson of *The Times*. This critic not only pronounced Pinter a first rate playwright, placed him in "the very best company" (Hobson 1958: 11) of Shaw, Ibsen, Beckett and Osborne who had all received poor or sometimes even scandalous notices, but prophetically predicted „Mr Pinter and *The Birthday Party*, despite their experience last week, will be heard of again. Make a note of their names" (Hobson 1958: 11).

Today, more than twenty years after this first commercial production Harold Pinter has an established, although still controversial[3], position in English language drama which is also reflected in the long and still growing bibliography of critical works written about him[4].

For several years now, Pinter's reputation has been well recognized on both sides of the Atlantic. In America he was quite early pronounced "the most important

---

[1] His first play *The Room* was not commercially produced until January 21, 1960 at the Hampstead Theatre Club.

[2] Bad notices came from such critics as Barber — *Daily Express* (1958: 12), Boothroyd — *Punch* (1958: 721), Brien — *Spectator* (1958: 687), Darlington — *Daily Telegraph* (1958: 10), Myson — *Daily Worker* (1958: 2), Tynan, Kenneth — *Observer* (1958: 15), Wilson — *Daily Mail* (1958: 3). Apart from Hobson, Frank Jackson of the *Sunday Citizen* (1958: 7) was also in favour of the play and a few months later Irving Wardle praised it in *Encore* (1958: 39, 40 and 1958a: 28—33).

[3] Milton Schulman, for example, has not departed from his early views and in 1975 he concluded his review of *No Man's Land* stiking a similar note: appreciation for the playwright's language and accusation of obscurity and elusiveness (Schulman 1975: 19).

[4] There are even a few bibliographies of Pinter criticism. See: Gale (1972: 46—56), Gordon (1968: 3—20), Imhof (1975) Palmer and Dyson (1968: 314—317), Schroll (1971). Biographical material on Harold Pinter can be found in: "Caretaker's Caretaker" Anon. (1961: 76), Moritz, ed. (1963: 326—329), Marowitz (1967: 36), "People Are Talking About..." Anon. (1962: 38—39).

contemporary playwright for the English speaking stage" (Gottfried 1967: 288); in England he is seen as an established figure "of almost unquestioned pre-eminence" (Taylor 1971a: 11).

Harold Pinter is a prolific writer whose work, apart from stage plays, includes television and radio plays[5], poems[6], essays[7], short stories[8], revue sketches[9] and screenplays[10]. His work was classified, categorized, furnished with the labels of Theatre of the Absurd, Comedy of Menace, Theatre of Cruelty, Theatre of

[5] Pinter's stage, television and radio plays are very often treated together in critical literature. Trussler observes: "It is, I think, signigicant that Pinter's plays for radio and television are formally very much closer to his original work for the theatre (than his screenplays. E. B.). Indeed, almost every broadcast play has eventually been adapted for stage performance — and it's notable that, *Tea Party* and *The Basement* excepted, Pinter has chosen to publish the texts of these adaptations rather than the radio or television scripts" (Trussler 1974: 187). In 1958 Pinter wrote *Something in Common*, a radio play that was never performed.

[6] Pinter's earliest efforts as a writer were his essays and poems published in *Hackney Downs School Magazine* between Christmas 1946 and spring 1948 and an unpublished manuscript "A Note on Shakespeare", a fragment of which is quoted by Esslin (1973: 54—55). *Hackney Downs School Magazine* contains the following essays, speeches and poems by Pinter: "James Joyce" Essay, Christmas 1946 (No 160): 32—33. Speech. School Literary and Debating Society. Opposed the notion "That a United States of Europe would be the only means of preventing war", Spring 1947 (No 161): 14. "Dawn" Poem, Spring 1947 (No 161): 27. Speech. Supported the notion "That war is inevitable", Summer 1947 (No 162): 9. "O beloved maiden". Poem, Summer 1947 (No 162): 14. Speech. "Realism and Post-Realism in the French Cinema", Autumn 1947 (No 163): 13. "Blood Sports". Essay, Autumn 1947 (No 163): 23—24. Speech. Supported the notion: "In view of its progress in the last decade, the Film is more Promising in its future as an art form than the Theatre" Spring 1948 (No 164): 12. In August 1950 two of his poems were published in *Poetry London* with a printer's error and in November 1950 there appeared two other poems signed "Harold Pinta". He also wrote a novel based on his young years in Hackney but he has never agreed to have it published. Pinter's poems selected by Alan Clodd were published in 1968. For a more detailed discussion of Pinter's early writings see: Byczkowska "Recurrent Motifs in Harold Pinter's Early Poetry Prose and Drama" (1981).

[7] He was highly praised by Kenneth Tynan (1968: 30) for his essay *Mac* (1968) in which he recollects the time he spent acting in English classical repertoire in veteran actor-manager Anew McMaster's touring company. According to Tynan: "On this evidence we've lost a fine critic of acting when Pinter turned playwright". He also wrote an essay on Beckett for *Beckett at 60. A Festschrift* (1967) and on his favourite sport, cricket "Memories of Cricket" (1969).

[8] Pinter wrote two short stories, both closely connected with his plays: *The Examination* was completed according to Esslin (1973: 162) by January 1958 and according to Hinchliffe (1967: 71) in 1953, first published in the summer 1959 issue of *Prospect* and first broadcast on September 7, 1962 (read by Pinter) on the BBC Third Programme. *Tea Party* was published in *Playboy* in January 1965.

[9] See the review after the programme of a revue at the Lyric Hammersmith with John Mortimer, N. F. Simpson and Harold Pinter: "Mr. Harold Pinter — Avant-Garde Playwright..." (1959: 4). See also a humorous account of Pinter's revue sketches by Peter Crook who wrote for the same programme as Pinter: "Pieces of Eight" (Tynan, Kathleen 1968: 7, part I).

[10] See the review of Pinter's *Five Screenplays*: "From Page to Screen" (Anon. 1971: 695). Appart from the five scripts therein, Pinter also adapted some other works for the screen: in 1971 — Aidan Higgins's novel *Langrishe, Go-Down* (and he is interested in directing it, see: Pinter-Gussow 1971: 132), in 1972 Marcel Proust's *A La Recherche du Temps Perdu*, in 1973 directed the film of *Butley* — and adaptation from Simon Gray's *Butley*, in 1974 completed F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Last Tycoon* which was filmed in 1975 by Elia Kazan.

Situation etc. Is was discussed in terms of realism, supra-realism, naturalism, existentialism, impressionism, symbolism and compressionism. Equally often he was pronounced to be *sui generis*; very few writers can boast of having so many nouns and adjectives derived from their names as Pinter has: Pinterism, Pinteresque, Pintercourse or Pinterotic (e.g. States 1972: 150). There are fourteen monographic studies published in book form (listed in Bibliography), a collection of critical essays in Twentieth Century Views, a casebook on *The Homecoming*, a booklet in the series of Columbia Essays on Modern Writers in the United States and in the Writers and Their Work series in Britain, a study of the playwright's reputation, separate chapters in more general accounts of modern drama as well as hundreds of articles in periodicals and reviews of performances in daily papers and magazines.

Yet, in spite of this abundance of critical literature, or possibly just because of it, there exists the need for reconsidering some concepts of Pinter scholarship, including the basic ones. On the occasion of the second revival of *The Birthday Party*, seventeen years after its first disastrous run in London, J. W. Lambert (1975: 45), a well known theatre critic observed: "In 1958 the year after *The Entertainer*, Harold Pinter's *The Birthday Party* came before an unready world" (emphasis added, E. B.). Even nowadays, the critics seem in many ways unready for Pinter's plays, still baffled by the apparent lack of information, motivation and clues to understanding[11] (e.g. Barker 1975: 8, Thirkell 1975: 16). It seems that the problem is not in the professed absence of the expository information or of motivation in characters' behaviour in Pinter's plays but rather in the notorious lack of suitable tools of analysis in critical studies.

The present work is an attempt to employ some of the, so far, unexploited methods of literary analysis to examine the basic structural element of drama — the category of time-space in Harold Pinter's works. The fundamental importance of the notions of time and space in dramatic literature has been generally recognized. It is, therefore, hoped that the ensuing study will reveal and provide a commentary on the most significant features of Harold Pinter's poetics. The discussion covers all of his plays which appeared by 1975, yet, unfortunately it has to be limited to their written form only. The analysis of the actual performances, although extremely valuable, could not be attempted by this author. Only occasionally are references made to Pinter's plays on the stage and in some cases the viewpoint of the audience is introduced.

Because of the specific situation resulting from writing about a British author in Poland an attempt is also made at employing the research methods developed in this country. The interesting achievements of Polish scholarship practically unknown in English speaking countries may aid the reconsideration of some of the oft-repeated cliché statements on Harold Pinter's work.

[11] *A propos* of the critics' attempts to find one and only one interpretation, Alan Schneider who directed: *The Birthday Party* wittily observed "I think there are at least 249 meanings. You get the meaning you deserve, just as you get the wife you deserve" (Barthel 1967: 1).

INTRODUCTION

"In order to observe what happens to people he [Pinter] usually chooses as his central image a room — any ordinary room where people live — to serve as a microcosm of the world. In the room people feel safe. Outside are only alien forces; inside there is warmth and light. It is a womb in which people can feel secure. The conflict in Pinter's plays occurs when one of the outside forces penetrates into the room and disrupts the security of its occupants" (Wellwarth 1965: 198).

This is what George Wellwarth wrote about Pinter in 1964 in his *The Theatre of Protest and Paradox*[1]. In the chapter "Harold Pinter. The Comedy of Allusiveness" (1965: 197—211) from which the above fragment is cited the critic summarized the current views upon the spatial aspects of Pinter's drama. It was by this time customary to discuss the playwright's presentation of space in terms of the continuing opposition between the safe inside — the room — and the threatening and dark outside. The safety of the enclosed space was proven illusory in the course of the plays as the external malice penetrated the room. "A four-walled setting serves a strongly protective purpose although the shelter of a room proves inadequate as a refuge from the world outside" (Trussler 1974: 25). Several authors observed that the destruction of the characters' belief in the safety of their private territory sprung from the characters themselves and was rooted in their fear of the outside.

This treatment of space also implied the approach to Pinter's characters; the usual view was to divide his people into the inhabitants of the room — the defenders of their private *locus* and the intruders — the visitors from the dangerous external world.

In scholarly writing about Pinter and in the reviews of his plays the question of space attracted the critics from the very beginning. Already in the early sixties the first studies devoted to the newly emerged dramatist concentrated on Pinter's spatial vision which even at this early stage was interpreted in terms of a "room--womb"[2]. The image of the intrusion of the protected space was first pointed out

[1] The book was first published in 1964 in New York. The edition used by the present author is the 1965 London edition.

[2] Cf. for example:
Hinchliffe (1967: 43): "protective envelope or womb that the room appear to form around the characters"; Hayman (1975: 7) (first edition was of 1968): "He's obsessed with the subject of the safety of the womb or room and the dangers of dispossession"; Fjelde (1971: 91): "Stanley's

by Irving Wardle who in a July-August 1958 *Encore* article on *The Birthday Party*[3] described the play in these terms (Wardle 1958) and in the September-October issue wrote about "the womb" — the dominating image of the play (Wardle 1958a). Also A. Alvarez writing for *New Statesman* observed that the play showed a "classic paranoiac set-up"[4] (Alvarez 1959: 836), the view that was later echoed in Lumley's statement about the "claustrophobic power of the closed setting" (Lumley 1972: 270).

In the second (1962) edition of *Mid-Century Drama*, Lawrence Kitchin devoted more space to Pinter (Kitchin 1969: 119—122)[5] and labelled his plays compressionist on the basis of the dramatists treatment of space, "We think of his people as enclosed. This ties up with the notion of Kedrov about Chekhov's characters and their essence squeezed out under pressure" (Kitchin 1969: 121). This view is further developed in *Drama of the Sixties* where *The Caretaker* is even used as a representative example of the form "Drama in the nineteensixties ranges between two dominant forms, epic and compressionism, *War and Peace* and *The Caretaker*" (Kitchin 1966: 21). Kitchin conceives enclosure as both spatial and mental: "Aston and the tramp in *The Caretaker* are psychologically trapped by their personalities and visually by the set, but the third man remains a visitor from outside" (Kitchin 1966: 52) and thus the play fits the critic's definition of a compressionist work which he views as "one in which the characters are insulated from society in such a way as to encourage the maximum conflict of attitudes" (Kitchin 1966: 46). Kitchin's term, although occasionally referred to (e.g. Trussler 1974: 191), did not prove particularly useful as a tool of literary analysis and remained just one of the innumerable labels which the critics tried to attach to the drama of this period[6].

Ruby Cohn discussing the world of Harold Pinter (Cohn 1972: 78—93)[7] again stressed the sense of enclosure in Pinter's loci and equated his room with cells and coffins attributing to them symbolic significance; "Pinter's rooms, parts of a mysterious and infinite series, are like cells without a vista. At the opening curtain, these rooms look naturalistic, meaning no more than the eye can contain. But by the end of each play, they become sealed containers, virtual coffins" (Cohn 1972: 79).

snug, protected, womb-like hideaway presided over by his surrogate parents, Meg and Petey"; Pesta (1972: 124): "The womblike security of the room"; Trussler (1974: 70): *A Night Out* "is Pinter's first attempt to set his own living-womb world within a relatively 'normal' outside context"; Tinker (1975: 24) — about *No Man's Land*: "As a playwright, Pinter has returned to the iron-locked, womb-like ambiguities of his earliest work in this, his latest"; Taylor, on the other hand, observes (1974: 326): "it is tempting but not really necessary, to see it in terms of Freudian symbolism as womb-substitute".

[3] Wardle was one of the few critics who praised the play which was first performed at Oxford and Cambridge (The Arts Theatre). It was fairly well received by try-out audiences (cf. Marowitz 1967: 36) and was then moved to Lyric Theatre, Hammersmith on May 19, 1958.

[4] He was referring to the Ealing production of *The Birthday Party* of December 1959.

[5] The author of the present work is using the reprint of the 1962 edition published in 1969.

[6] Similarly Wardle, the author of the well known term "comedy of menace" (1958a) which was coined to describe Pinter's first plays realized a few years later that it was just a "comforting label" (Wardle 1971: 37—38): "I, for one, came up with the phrase 'comedy of menace' which explained nothing but at least supplied a comforting label".

[7] Ruby Cohn's article originally appeared in *Tulane Drama Review*, vol. 6, no. 3 (March 1962).

In 1968 Lahr made a very perceptive remark that „Pinter's world (...) is hermetically sealed off from nature. His plays are urban fables in which no poplars sway against the distant orchard, no wind underscores human loneliness" (Lahr 1972: 62)[8]. Yet, this view cannot be generalized to embody all plays since for example *A Slight Ache* represents a departure from this pattern.

In the second, revised edition of John Russel Taylor's *Anger and After* of 1969[9] more attention is given to Harold Pinter (1974: 323—359). The title of the chapter "A Room and Some Views" suggests a more profound treatment of Pinter's famous "central image" yet the view (at least the view upon space) is only one and not particularly original. Yet, writing already from a certain perspective Taylor makes an attempt at periodization of Pinter's drama and sees the first four plays as a group linked by the same spatial situation and the theme of intrusion into the seemingly safe shelter of a room.

Esslin's statements relating to the problem of space in Pinter's works and presented in his classical *The Theatre of the Absurd*[10] nowadays ring the hackneyed note of Existentialism: "The room becomes an image of the small area of light and warmth that our consciousness, the fact that we exist, opens up in the vast ocean of nothingness from which we gradually emerge after birth and into which we sink again when we die" (Esslin 1974: 266)[11].

Similarly, Walter Kerr writing about Pinter in a series of Columbia Essays on Modern Writers (1967) considers "Harold Pinter (...) the only man working in the theater today who writes existentialist plays existentially" (Kerr 1967: 3) and accordingly finds the playwright's treatment of space realizing the premises of this philosophical trend: „Existentialism imagines man living in a void. At the same time it asks that we refrain from conceptualizing this void. How shall it be defined when it has not been fully explored? In short we are asked to enter a void that is not an abstract void" (Kerr 1967: 10). Thus in Pinter's room everything is "entirely tangible, concrete, present not as idea but as actuality" (1967: 10). Objects are important because they exist and "Whatever exists in the room is made to exist at its maximum intensity (...) At the same time that the tangible is insisted upon, literally thrust into our faces, the surrounding void is implied (...) The real is real.

[8] Lahr's "Pinter and Chekhov: The Bond of Naturalism" was first published in *The Drama Review*, vol. 13, no. 2 (Winter 1968).

[9] The 1974 reprint of this revised edition is being used here. The central section of this survey of Pinter's work is also included, under the same title in *Pinter. A Collection of Critical Essays* (Ganz ed. 1972a: 105—122).

[10] The same enlarged edition is being referred to in this work in its 1974 reprint.

[11] Cf. also Esslin's statement in "Godot and His Children. The Theatre of Samuel Beckett and Harold Pinter" (1963: 142) about the theme of *The Caretaker* of "a man seeking a place for himself, fighting for that little patch of light and warmth in the vast menacing darkness". Esslin even equates the room with Paradise and Davies's expulsion with man's original sin and his expulsion from Paradise (1963: 142, 143). Cf. again Esslin (1973: 35) for the Existentialist approach to the theme of the room versus the outside world and of the characters' fear. Cf. also Hagberg "In Pinter's plays the room as a shelter against the threatening unknown outside is an essential theme" (1972: 18), "The room then becomes the ego, which is the only knowable reality" (1972: 16).

The void envelops it" (1976: 12). "Though the immediate room, the direct experience of life, is entirely dimensional, the universe in which it exists is unstructured" (1967: 13). Thus, apart from the oft-repeated opposition of dark and light, cold and warm, safe and frightening, known and unknown (c.f. for example Taylor 1969), Kerr introduces the dychotomy of the tangible and the dimensional versus the unstructured and void[12].

Pinter's *loci* are very often seen as areas to be defended and this is the view represented by Katherine Burkman in her study of *A Slight Ache* (1968: 326, 335) and in her book on *The Dramatic World of Harold Pinter*. Yet, viewing the transfer of power as ritual she compares the way in which Pinter's characters battle for possession of place to the priest of Nemi who "guards the tree and the Golden Bough knowing that his life is at stake" (Burkman 1971: 66). According to her, Pinter's plays dramatize the "territorial imperative" and the setting, although realistic, reveals poetic undertones and arises from the ritual base and thus the reality presented acquires mythical and symbolic aspect. "Whether the living space in a Pinter drama is a place to hide (*The Room* and *The Birthday Party*) or a place to cling to with all the identification of self with room (*A Slight Ache*), it has all the ritual importance in Pinter's world of Frazer's Oak bearing the Golden Bough. The importance of Pinter's settings to the characters who dwell in them, the way in which these rooms become battle grounds for possession, and their key place in the cyclic transfers of power that are often at the plays' centers is but further indication of the archetypal and ritual patterning of Pinter's dramatic world"[13] (Burkman 1971: 67).

An exhaustive treatment of the problem of space can be found in Arlene Sykes's monographic study of Pinter's plays, yet the approach is not particularly original. The notable contribution, stressed more clearly than in the previous studies, is the relationship of contrast which Sykes detects as existing between the space and events in this space, "The banality of the surroundings makes a sharp contrast with the melodramatic bizarre happenings within the room. A great deal is made of the ordinariness, the homely familiarity of the room" (Sykes 1972: 14). In the conclusion of her discussion of space Sykes writes "For all the subtlety with which he may exploit them, Pinter's rooms are still basically a background to what happens to the people in them: that is, destruction at the hands of menace" (Sykes 1972: 7). It is clear that the author views the spatial dimensions as auxiliary to dramatic events and dramatic characters. She does not consider space, a structural element, is its own standing which, to a high degree, determines all other dimensions of a dramatic work.

[12] Apparently Pinter's own beliefs are different as he said when discussing the film version of *The Caretaker* (Cavander 1963: 23): "these characters move in the context of a real world — as I believe they do. In the play, when people were confronted with just a set, a room and a door, they often assumed it was all taking place in limbo, in a vacuum, and the world outside hardly existed, or had existed at some point but was only half remembered. Now one thing which I think is triumphantly expressed in the film is Clive's (Clive Donnor, the director. E. B.) concentration on the characters when they are outside the room, outside the house".

[13] The term is taken from Robert Ardrey's book under the same title. See Burkman (1971: 67).

The everyday quality of the objects which exist in the scenic universe of Pinter's plays, has been stressed by several authors. The view of Simon Trussler on *The Room* is representative in this respect, "The room itself is replete with the common-or--kitchen props on which Pinter so often depends — a gas-fire, sink, stove, rocking chair. At once snug, stuffy and a bit down-at-heel. A double-bed protruding from an alcove, completes the self-containment of the place" (Trussler 1974: 31). Still, the play in which objects have received the most detailed treatment is *The Caretaker*. Aston's collection of junk was "made to accord with Aston's psychological conditions: a room filled with a haphazard jumble of tools, appliances, goods in storage, connoting disconnected rudiments for living, repairing, building. As the furnishings imply, this is a play about sorting oneself out..." (Fjelde 1971: 94)[14].

Several critics approached the problem of space in terms of change and evolution of Pinter's concept[15]. This change is sometimes seen in its social aspect, e.g. by Kathleen Tynan (1968a: 8) who writes that "In the later plays, the seedy rooms of his first works became offices and upper-middle class appartments..." Some other authors are of the opinion that the space which Pinter presents is becoming gradually more open: "*A Slight Ache* and *A Night Out* venture for the first time over the domestic theresholds..." (Trussler 1974: 56) and in *A Slight Ache* Pinter moved even "out of town" (Trussler 1974: 58). Fjelds sees the change in *The Homecoming* since "a traditional confined environment has been transformed, somewhat violently, into an 'open living area', suggesting the old claustrophobic pattern of life partially broken out of, first here and then by Teddy still more extensivelly in America" (Fjelde 1971: 100). Arlene Sykes associates the change of *locus* with the medium for which the play was originally written and thus "In his radio plays, Pinter abandoned the single room setting. He has returned to the room setting in all later stage plays but invariably in his radio and television dramas, the characters have been allowed to wander... *A Night Out* allows characters complete freedom of movement..." (Sykes 1972: 39). An interesting pattern is observed by Trussler who remarks that the plays as if move downwards, "each successive play descends one storey lower in what could well be — atmospherically though not architecturally — a single house" (Trussler 1974: 27). "And so Pinter's storey-by--storey exploration finally descends from that upperfloor *Room* by way of the ground-floor lounge of *The Birthday Party*, into the windowless and no doubt damp basement so feared by Rose Hudd" (Trussler 1974: 51). Obviously, almost every critic writing in the seventies commented upon the open space in *Landscape* and *Silence* and the lack of objects in the latter play. *No Man's Land* is seen as a return to the room (e.g. Tinker 1975: 24).

Pinter's vision of space, the "shabby and sick" (Leech 1962: 16) interiors that

[14] It is the opinion of the present author that the exaggerated ordinariliness of the *locus* and the continuous insistence of the characters upon the security of the room in itself constitutes a nucleus of danger.

[15] The spatial theme is traced back to Pinter's first attempts as a writer — to his early poems — by Byczkowska in "Recurrent Motifs in Harold Pinter's Early Poetry, Prose and Drama" (1981).

he most often presents, the oppressive atmosphere that he evokes in his rooms[16] are supposed to have grown out of his own personal experience. This is what he, at one time, knew best: "Anyone who knows the life of a rep actor in the English provinces moving from one set of sordid digs to another, tangling with neurotic landladies and that gray drifting population that makes up the bed-sitter world of England instinctively understands Pinter's preoccupation with grubby rooms and gritty people" (Marowitz 1967: 89). It is also significant that there was a period in the playwright's life when he was living in "near-destitution as the caretaker of a Notting Hill basement" ("Playwright on His Own" Anon. 1963: 13). To these may be added a possible feeling of confinement that any Jew[17] may have experienced during the War and in the time that shortly preceded it. One should also recall a sober statement of Adamov made during a conference at Edinburgh in 1963: "The reason why Absurdist plays take place in *No Man's Land* with only two characters is primarily financial." (quoted after Tynan, Kenneth 1967: 76).

Pinter apparently attributes a great importance to the question of space and has been often quoted saying that there is a spacial image at the basis of his work. "The germ of my plays? I'll be as accurate as I can about that. I went into one room and saw one person standing up and one person sitting down, and a few weeks later I wrote *The Room*. I went into another room, and saw two people sitting down, and a few years later I wrote *The Birthday Party*. I looked through a door into a third room, and saw two people standing up and I wrote *The Caretaker*" (Pinter--Findlater 1961: 174)[18].

It seems legitimate to point out Pinter's immediate fascination with the art of Francis Bacon. In 1968 he has remarked to Kathleen Tynan "I got this book on Francis Bacon — a big bloody book with a lot of paintings — and since I don't know where to look for the originals, and couldn't afford them I've cut out and framed about 16 reproductions. I'm going to stick them all over the house" (Tynan, Kathleen 1968a: 8). Significantly Kitchin opens his chapter on the form of Compressionism (1966; 45, 46) with references to Bacon's portraits of Pope Innocent X who is presented as "caged in a rectangle within the outer rectangle formed by the picture frame" (Kitchin 1966: 45). According to Kitchin, Bacon renders the sense

[16] Trussler observes that the places do not have to be dirty in order to be oppressive. In *A Night Out* "her home is not sluttish like Meg's — yet the more suffocating in that it is clean and tidy, its meals regular, its chairs comfortable" (Trussler 1974: 68).

[17] Pinter comes from a Jewish family. His father was an East End tailor.

[18] Hinchliffe warns that: "This article was not written by Pinter but compiled by Findlater from the tape of an interview. Pinter regards it as unsatisfactory" (Hinchliffe 1967: 171: footnote 32). Yet, other critics and other interviews confirm these spatial images:
Bosworth (1968: 3): "The image of that one room has been with him since 1956, when he witnessed an inexplicable scene that seems to have triggered his imagination. At a party he came upon two people in a small room. One was a barefooted little man talking animately to a huge truckdriver who wore a cap on his head. The truckdriver never spoke, he remained silent. This didn't seem to bother the barefooted little man, who just kept on talking and feeding the truckdriver as if he were a baby". Bakewell (Pinter-Bakewell 1969: 630) reports a similar story about *The Room* and *The Birthday Party*.

of confinement and terror better than any other painter. Actually it is not only the motif of enclosure but also the basic approach to life[19] which Pinter seems to share with Bacon and which might have caused his excitement about the painter's work.

Bacon's vision brings in mind an imaginative statement made by Irving Wardle: "A large area of modern drama is reducible to the Act V situation of Elizabethan tragic kings immured in their cells, and terrified equally of being left alone to rot and of the arrival of their only possible visitor, the assassin. The dominant theme of such plays is man's fight against time — a theme that confronts the playwright with the forbidding task of creating drama from a conflict that in itself is unheroic and undramatic" (Wardle 1962: 23). Wardle beautifully relates the theme of space to that of time, yet, unfortunately this is not a common case in Pinter scholarship.

The spatial theme and the temporal issues of Pinter's drama have been habitually treated separately in critical literature on the subject and such plays as *Landscape*, *Silence*, and *Old Times* have even gained themselves the label of "memory plays"[20]. The playwright himself is, to a high degree, responsible for this state of affairs since having worded his fatigue with the room theme (Pinter—Dean 1969: 312) he then added "The whole question of time and its reverberations and possible meanings really does seem to absorb me more and more" (Pinter-Gussow 1971: 133).

Pinter's experiments with the time structure can yet be dated back to earlier years. *Accident*, Joseph Losey's film made in 1966 for which Pinter wrote the scenario (Pinter 1977) is "based on strange time-shifts (...) the whole action is seen as refracted through my (Steven's, i.e. Bogarde's. E.B.) mind (...) and so one memory sets off another, and scenes that take place in widely different times and places actually appear on the screen simultaneously" (Taylor 1966: 176). This interest in the theme of time is reflected in Pinter's other works for the films: *The Go Between* released in 1971 and the scenerio for Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* which he completed in 1972. This last work is particularly significant since the Proustian theme[21] is often seen by the critics as the one that predominates his later plays (cf. for example Barker and Tabachnick 1973: 141—143).

[19] Francis Bacon was fairly explicit about his views and attitudes in an interview given in the winter of 1975 for the BBC Television. He talked about his concept of violence as natural in life and about his belief in the simplicity of his work. These are the views that Pinter also shares. It is, however, impossible to refer to this interview since, to the knowledge of this writer who was fortunate enough to have seen this television programme, the transcript was never published.

[20] See for example Esslin 1973: 183 according to whom *Old Times* "develops the style of reminiscence which distinguished *Landscape* and *Silence* from Pinter's earlier works" or Martineau (1973—4: 291) who sees Pinter's concern with spatial issues as pertaining to his earlier period while in the later ones "he very consciously abandoned the room as his dramatic domain" and "discovered new dimensions of time" (emphasis added. E. B.). It will be one of the arguments of the present work to show that the temporal dimension is put to dramatic use also in his earlier plays.

[21] Cf. the discussion of the Proustian theme in Frank (1963: 20, 21), particularly the following observation: "the physical sensation of the past came flooding back to fuse with the present and Proust believed that in these moments he grasped a reality 'real without being of the present moment'".

A radically different viewpoint in this respect is represented by William Spanos who in his exhaustive essay "Modern Drama and the Aristotelian Tradition" subtitled "The Formal Imperatives of the Absurd Time" (1971: 345—372) draws a border line between the absurdists and the literary followers of Bergson. The author includes Pinter among the dramatists of the absurd together with Ionesco, Genet and Beckett (1971: 371) and expresses the opinion that "the ultimate purpose of the drama of the absurd is unlike that of both the drama of the Aristotelian tradition and of the anti-Aristotelian literature of 'Bergsonism' modernism" (1971: 370) (i.e. also Proust). Spanos views the absurdists as post-modern anti-Aristotelians who do not follow Bergson's concept of creative memory (or what Mayerhoff aptly called 'creative recall' (Spanos 1971: 355) and unlike the Bergsonian Proust do not flee into a solipsistic form which spatializes time into the eternal subjective moment[22]. Under the influence of Existentialism the dramatists of the Absurd break down the "detective" frame of reference (Spanos 1971: 371), frustrate positivistic expectation of logical conclusion and generate anxiety in order to force the individual to face the temporal motion of the absurd time and to orient him "toward the absurd world" (Spanos 1971: 371). In his highly interesting and enlightening discussion Spanos, however, ignores completely the motif of creative recall which, by that time (1971)[23], became quite prominent in Pinter's works. Hence, this reason for his classification of the playwright as anti-Bergsonism raises many doubts[24].

When turning to the temporal aspect of Pinter's drama a large portion of criticism follows the lines that the playwright himself has indicated. In 1969 he confessed to Joan Bakewell (1969: 630) "I'm quite interested in the fact that a good deal of the past is really a mist — my past anyway. Quite often I can't remember what happened... I think you forget more than you remember" and in 1971 he stated the same attitude once more in his interview with Mel Gussow (Gussow--Pinter 1971: 43). Pinter's statement is reflected both in more general surveys such as for example Lumley's *New Trends in 20th Century Drama* who writes: "The only

[22] "The anti-Aristotelianism of the drama of the absurd is not ideally (though it sometimes becomes in practice...) the formal agency of a solipsism that captures or ... arrests duration in the external subjective moment that transcendes time. The variously 'de-composed' plot or 'time shape', the discontinuities of character ... and the dislocated and often irrational language (imagery, syntax and rhythm) of the drama of the absurd constitute, not a spatialized subjective world, but rather an inclusive figure of the external world, of the not-at home, the existence which is prior to essence, where all things are superfluous and thus dreadful, yet replete with possibility" (Spanos 1971: 366). Although this lengthy quotation exceeds the immediate needs of the present discussion yet it is useful as the analysis in the following part of this work is meant to present Pinter as creating "the spatialized subjective world" and thus once more not fitting into Spanos's frame of the Absurd.

[23] It is true that the motif of "Creative recall" appears in its most obvious form in *Old Times* first performed in 1971 (so Spanos could not have taken it into account in his essay) yet it can be traced back to as early a play as *The Birthday Party*.

[24] This is not to say that the present author sees Pinter as a faithful follower of Proust. The two authors seem to differ considerably in their approach to memory, particularly because of their individual rendering of the interrelation between the past and the present. (This question will be given some attention in the following chapter).

facts we have are within, the time and the address; outside everything is vague, uncertain, it belongs to the past which has slipped our memory and to which we can never return" (Lumley 1972: 270) and in the studies dealing specifically with Pinter, e.g. in Esslin's *Harold Pinter*: "The landscape of memory, the landscape of the soul, is dark, inaccessible and shrouded in the mists of eternal uncertainties" (Esslin 1973: 175) (also to Ganz 1972: 168, 169 "past is a misty wasteland"). As suggested in the above statement of Martin Esslin, Pinter sees the past not only as misty but also totally unreliable and impossible to verify: "Apart from any other consideration, we are faced with the immense difficulty, if not the impossibility of verifying the past" (Pinter 1964: 81). Accordingly Gale (1977: 20) sees Pinter as an author who considers "memory and verification as functions of each other" and Lahr describes Pinter's characters as "continually reconstructing the past from memory, unable to verify it or to be certain of any origins except the present (Lahr 1971: 189). The emerging conclusion is that the past is often unreal and "can be created to suit the individual" (Gale 1977: 202). At the same time it is viewed as exerting tremendous influence upon the present. Characters escape into the past, into their recollections (Barker and Tabachnick 1973: 136, Ganz 1972: 164, 168) yet, at the same time, memories are impossible (Lahr 1971: 186). Ganz in his discussion of *Silence* concentrates upon this problem which he associates with the Ibsenite theme: Ellen's life is dominated by the memory of a past which, however elusive and uncertain, has had a sinister power in shaping the present. The speeches which seem to be the key pronouncements upon the question of time and memory in *Landscape* ("I remember always, in drawing..." etc. [27, 28])[25], *Silence* ("And then often it is only half things I remember..." etc. [46]) and *Old Times* ("There are some things one remembers..." etc. [31, 32]) are often quoted by the critics but were actually discussed only in a few studies (Trussler 1974: 163, Byczkowska 1977: 77). Trussler writes perceptively that "in *Landscape* it is surely the past, intercepting the present, that casts its shadow over the action. The 'shape of the shadow' may perhaps be determined by the actual remembered forms of the past: or it may be that 'the cause of the shadow cannot be found' except in deep-felt longings and unrealised desires" (Trussler 1974: 163). Trussler is, on the other hand, highly critical of the key speech in *Old Times*: "Unfortunately this remark (...) seems philosophically pivotal to what the play 'means'" (Trussler 1974: 177) and he views the merging of time-scales as "merely a means of avoiding anything so old--fashioned as flashbacks" (Trussler 1974: 174) while motifs of memory, according to him, recur "either tricksily or for blatantly comic effect, or both" (Trussler 1974: 177). This seems to be a very narrow view of *Old Times* greatly reducing the implications of Pinter's treatment of time in this work which Hobson pronounced "one of the finest plays, one of the most mind-starting, one of the most immaculately written", of its generation and he also warned that "it is not as simple as Beatrix Potter" (Hobson 1971: 29).

[25] Pages in square brackets are keyed to the Methuen editions of Pinter's plays as listed in the Bibliography.

Still all these critics speak about the specific interdependence of the past and the present and/or about the actual fusion of both. Again this view can be referred to Pinter's statement in which he claims to feel "more and more that the past is not past, that it never was past. It's present" (Pinter-Gussow 1971: 43). The bearing of the memory (or fantasy) of the past upon the present is so strong that the past really turns into the present. Probably the most interesting discussion of this problem is contained in John Lahr's excellent essay "Pinter the Spaceman" (1971: 175—195). In his analysis of Max's speech about his father in *The Homecoming* the critic writes: "The graphic language flushes the past into the present — or tries to. Pinter is able to create this rare sleight of hand which conjures a sense of the past without having to bow to history's chronology. Bombarded by stimuli, faced with stalemate between man and the world, the present moment is the only dramatic situation which is justified by the philosophic implications of Pinter's vision". Similarly, Robbe-Grillet, in discussing his film *Last Year at Marienbad*, maintained significantly that: "The Universe in which the entire film occurs is, characteristically, in a perpetual present which makes all recourse to memory impossible. This is a world without a past, a world which is self-sufficient at every moment and which obliterates itself as it proceeds. The same seems true of Pinter, except that on the stage even this intended immediacy comes closer to an audience's response... Pinter's drama attests to Natalie Sarraute's esthetic, which seeks 'some precise dramatic action shown in slow motion', where 'time was no longer the time of real life but of a hugely amplified present'" (Lahr 1971: 186)[26]. The view that in Pinter everything is actually centered upon the present is shared by Dukore (1976: 110) while Eigo (1973: 181) argues that the past not only constantly "blends with the present, but that there is more than one past, whose incidents merge". Aylwin, on the other hand, declares that "the moments of the past are of a time that is dead" (Aylwin 1973: 99), the statement which stands in opposition to Martineau's view of the past as essentially dramatic and stimulating a competitive spirit (Martineau 1973: 4). Alexander in his essay on "Past, Present and Pinter" considers also the technical implications of this coexistence of different time planes and states that "A Pinter plot is created not by intricate intrigue but by the manipulation of past and present" (Alexander 1974: 1).

While the problems arising from intermeshing past and present have been dealt with in several articles the question of the future received only very scarce and modest treatment. It can be justified to some degree by the fact that this issue seems to be of lesser importance and is certainly less striking for the reader or member of the audience. Again, Pinter himself disclosed his personal opinion on the subject: "What's future. — Well, it ought to be fanciful really. I know the future is simply going to be the same thing. It'll never end" (Pinter-Gussow 1971: 132). Lumley (1972: 270) views the future of Pinter's characters as an "unrelated *mañana*" and repeats once more that only the present matters. Alexander (1974: 1) goes even further denying the characters any future at all, "There is no future for the

[26] Curiously enough Pinter seems truly interested in *Marienbad* and had even his own idea of another way of doing it. See a short interview in Taylor (1966: 176—185).

characters created by Harold Pinter... The future characters imagine is clearly beyong their grasp".

Several studies relate the question of time to that of identity (MacAuley 1975: 51—65, Byczkowska 1977: 71—80, Amend 1967: 172, Hagberg 1972: 12—16). Gay MacAuley (1975: 56) in her analysis of *Old Times* states that "Pinter is showing that the question of establishing one's identity is enormously complicated by the fact of the passage of time (...) We are left asking whether the passage of time can kill parts of our self, whether we can supress parts of our self, whether the idea other people have of us can affect the reality, and what this reality is, if it is constantly changing in time". Hagberg who is also concerned with this problem (yet he limits his analysis only to *The Dwarfs* and *The Collection*) assumes the viewpoint represented by Esslin in *The Theatre of the Absurd*. "The flow of time confronts us with the basic problem of being, the problem of the nature of the self, which, being subject to constant change in time, is in constant flux and therefore ever outside our grasp".

As it appears from the above review of critical attitudes to the problem of time in Pinter's works almost all of the studies concerning or touching upon this issue limit their discussion to *Silence, Landscape* and *Old Times*. Very few critics notice the importance of the theme of the past in earlier works. Ganz, Alexander and Boulton are notable exceptions and although Ganz argues that in the early plays "the past *per se* is not emphasised thematically" (Ganz 1972: 169) yet he still feels that the "great Ibsenite theme — of the weight of the past — begins to appear significantly in Pinter's work with *The Homecoming*" (Ganz 1972: 169). Alexander refers back to *The Birthday Party* where "At the party all speak in glowing terms of the past — especially Goldberg" (1974: 7). Boulton's treatment is the most exhaustive and interesting. He argues that *The Room* and *The Birthday Party* "exploit the nostalgia for the security of childhood (...) 'The terror of the loneliness of the human situation' is insisted upon time and again by Pinter. One means of demonstrating this fact is to show how he makes his dramatic material out of the nostalgia for the supposed security to be found in the past, especially a childhood past, which appears to be endemic in our society" (Boulton 1972: 95).

Still the above studies are exceptional in their references to the temporal theme in Pinter's first plays. This is the problem which is generally neglected and this drawback is analogous to the weakness in the research on space which, in turn, concentrates on the early works.

The objective of the present work is not only to fill out this gap in the study of Pinter's plays but, above all, to relate the question of time to that of space. The attempts in this field were so sporadic and unsystematic that there is practically no treatment of this subject which would approach the notion of time-space as a whole[27].

[27] These two categories were shown as parallel in Ganz (1972: 169); human notion of time is presented as equally illusory as that of space in Byczkowska (1977: 79) but, by far the most interesting treatment is that of Lahr 1971) who sees the world of nature as related to the past while the present represents an urban landscape. See also the already quoted reflection of Wardle (1962: 23).

The problems to be discussed here in connection with the questions of time and space belong to the realm of semiology. The object of the following study is the ontology of Pinter's literary space, the coexistence of different types of space and the interrelations between them. It seems impossible to discuss space irrespective of the category of time and in this work space will be viewed from the vantage point of its temporal dimensions.

The research on artistic space which became so widespread in recent years[28] has provided excellent tools for describing the model of the world in any work of literature in terms that are both clear and precise (Lotman 1976: 213—226). The most fundamental in this new approach are the works of Lotman to whom "artistic space is not an indifferent setting for characters and the episodes of the plot. Its connections with the characters and the general model of the world as formulated by the artistic text indicate that the language of the artistic space is not insignificant but it constitutes one of the components of the general language used by a work of art" (Lotman 1977: 221)[29]. It is space that shapes multiple relationships within the world represented: temporal, social, ethical etc. Sławiński considers space the centre of the semantics of the work and the basis for other orders which are presented in it (Sławiński 1978: 10).

Also theatre space is seen as occupying a unique position among theatrical sign systems[30]. "Space in theatre undergoes valuation, acquires special status thus becoming the basic constituting element of theatrical work" (Skuczyński 1978: 175). The guidelines for the study of dramatic space have been formulated by Jan Błoński (1978: 197—211). According to him "dramatic space can be viewed as a unity composed of the space that is given to be seen, destined to be presented *ad oculos*, and the other one, larger and less directly defined" (Błoński 1978). The space in drama is enlarged, among others, by characters' utterances (and so is time) (Sławińska 1960: 156—190). Of major significance becomes the relationship between the space represented and co-presented. This is the terminology introduced by Błoński while Sławińska speaks about scenic space and off-stage space (Sławińska 1967: 298 and 1971: 210—228)[31], the distinction which is derived from Souriau's scenic microcosm and theatrical macrocosm (cf. also Skwarczyńska 1958 and Scholes 1974). Souriau's scenic microcosm can be related to Bachelard's category of "le dedans" while "le dehors" is the reality evoked in performance yet absent on the stage (Bachelard 1974: 284—305).

Following this basic division into the space presented on the stage and the space created by means of other sign systems, the present work is, nonetheless, primarily

[28] Actually Genette (1976: 231) speaks about the preference for the category of space over that of time in the modern world.

[29] Quotations from Polish, unless otherwise indicated, have been translated by the present author.

[30] See also Mukarovsky (1970: 359, 360) who views the dramatic space as larger than scenic space because it involves the stage of imagination, stage and audience.

[31] See also the more detailed review and discussion of the problem in Sławińska (1979). The works of Sławińska, Miodońska-Brookes and the recent volume *Przestrzeń w literaturze* form the main body of research on dramatic space which inspired the present work.

concerned with a different problem. "In the artistic time-space of literature the spatial and temporal indications become united into one coherent and concrete whole. Time is condensed and thickened and it becomes artistically visible; space is intensified and drawn into the movement of time, action and history. The stamp of time makes itself present in space and space gains its sense and is measured in time" (Bachtin 1974: 274). Bachtin also emphasises the fact that all attributes that pertain to time-space (to follow Bachtin's term "chronotopos") are always tinted with emotion and contain an element of valuation.

Thus the present study introduces the temporal classification of space in drama. The space presented on the stage is treated here as the space of the present while three different types of space can be distinguished in the theatrical macrocosm: The outside (in relation to the scenic space) space of the present, contemporary to that presented to be seen, the space of the past appearing in characters' recollections, and finally the future space referred to in their plans, hopes and dreams. The relations between all these types of space will be studied and the signs by which external space is evoked will be considered. It is important which characters refer to the past and how they are related to the space which they recreate in their words (cf. Sławińska 1960: 131—154). The aim is to disclose the most significant features of the model of the world presented in Pinter's works in order to reveal some regularity, patterns and specific elements of his spatio-temporal conceptions.

It is impossible not to relate the above discussed categories to that of characters. Niekludow in his remarkable work *"Sujet" and the Spatio-Temporal Relationships in Russian Epic Folk Song* (1977: 358—361) notices "strict subordination of specific situations and events to specific places. In relation to the hero these 'places' form the functional zones: his presence in such a zone equals entering the situation of conflict characteristic for this *locus*" (Niekludow 1977: 358). Lotman develops this idea and states that "since the artistic space becomes a formal system of constructing various models — among them ethical — there arises a possibility to characterize the heroes morally through their respective types of artistic space" (Lotman 1977: 218). It, therefore, seems fully justified to treat the categories of time, space and characters together since the interferences (cf. Martuszewska 1979: 49—66) among these elements of presented reality, make it virtually impossible to discuss one disregarding the other. Although Lotman is concerned only with the interrelation between space and character (with space being ascribed the more important status and the function of modelling characters) Pinter's drama opens also a possibility of discussing the interdependences between time and characters or, more precisely, between the characters and time-space understood as a whole.

Still, the main concern of the first chapter is the mode of existence of time-space and particularly the relationship between the space of the present and the space of the past.

TIME—SPACE

The past is a foreign country.
They do things differently there.
L. P. Hartley[1]

SPACE: ON-STAGE AND OFF

In Harold Pinter's dramatic works[2] the scenic space outlined in the stage directions and in the main text is shaped by the convention of a picture frame stage. The playwright himself is well aware of this fact and has even declared that he actually thinks in terms of proscenium theatre when writing his plays[3]. The limitations enforced on the play by this box shape are used to the utmost and can be detected in the spatial image presented on the stage, in the themes that appear and reappear in characters' utterances and in the conspicuous lack of signals from the outside world. Pinter's stage tends to be centrally furnished with the figures often centrally grouped too[4]. It becomes particularly striking in the closing scenes which most often are arranged in a picture-like fashion. The final tableau in *The Homecoming* is most interesting in this respect. With almost all characters centrally and frontally

---

[1] This memorable line from L. P. Hartley's novel *The Go Between* (Hartley 1965: 7) also opens Pinter's adaptation for the screen implying the theme of merging of past and present: Colston's voice (speaking at present when he is already an elderly man) is heard over the view of 1900 (Pinter 1977: 286).

[2] This study concentrates upon Pinter's plays written specifically for the stage, but his television and radio plays are also referred to when the discussion touches the problems which are common to all these media.

[3] In "Harold Pinter Replies" (Pinter-Thompson 1961: 10) the playwright said: "I have worked in various types of theatre — in theatre-in-the-round, with arena staging, but mainly of course with the proscenium theatre. I am not terribly bothered about new forms. I always think of the proscenium stage when I'm writing". For similar statement see also Pinter-Findlater (1961: 173).

[4] For example the scene of the party in *The Birthday Party* is obviously arranged "spatially": Stanley occupies the central position yet he is silent and does not communicate with anybody (his position of alienation is thus revealed), Lulu and Goldberg form one group, to the left of the table, Meg and McCann, the other, to the right, downstage. There arises a symmetrical pattern of the two couples and Stanely — outside. Normington commented on the central arrangement in *The Homecoming* (Normington-Lahr 1971: 144): "in the center of the stage are the established figures and the honored guest is in the best chair".

placed and with Ruth occupying the most important position in the middle, the ironic reference to a happy and conventional (*sic!*) family photograph is only too obvious. And use is also made of the frame of this Italian stage which serves as a frame of Pinter's final pictures and photographs.

The shape of the stage so strongly implying the theme of enclosure emphasizes the importance of the notion of the border in Pinter's theatre (Lotman 1976: 225). Border can be most basically defined as a demarcation line which cannot be crossed if one is not entitled to (Głowiński 1978: 93). In the universe of the present the border separates the scenic microcosm (the space presented on the stage) from its contemporary off-stage macrocosm (the off-stage space of the present time). These two territories are divided by means of walls which, whether concrete or only mentally conceived, are always acutely experienced by the characters.

While not elaborating upon the well-known features of the inside and its relationship to the outside in the majority of Pinter's plays it seems worthwhile to stress that the existence of the border separating these two worlds immediately implies the idea of crossing this border. The line cutting through the presented and co-presented space returns like an obtrusive refrain in the characters' statements. It may be the result of the characters' monosubjective spatial orientation (*The Room, The Birthday Party*) or it can be forced upon them in the process of interaction (Aston in *The Caretaker* who in the past was willing to cross the spatial spheres). According to Płachecki (1978: 73) tension is a function of crossing the border and in Pinter's plays the very thought that anyone might transgress it is enough to cause the characters' uneasiness. The presence of the channels connecting the two types of space constitutes a dramatic promise. If there is a door somebody should enter through it. The door is the most active sign of this space as the equilibrium of the room may be destroyed as the result of an intrusion through the door. It may be opened letting somebody in and bringing this person into the immediate universe of the play. It may be opened to let somebody out or, more likely, to force somebody out. Even if it is closed it implies a possibility (inevitability) of intrusion.

On the other hand, the window does not perform its traditional function of enlarging the space. The characters hardly ever look out through it to report what is going on outside. If they do look out it is just to convey the idea that the external space is furnished with negative values in their eyes. When the outside is described by a character looking through the window the view is that of neglect and lifelessness (a pond without fish and an overgrown garden in *The Caretaker*). They also approach the window in order to close the curtains (*No Man's Land, The Lover*) and thus the idea of separation between these two types of space is pointed out once more[5]. In a Pinter play there are no busy streets, no people walking by, no voices and no noise of a big town heard from behind the window. The present off-stage space does not make its appearance through the acoustic signs, nor is it visually

[5] Lambert wrote in his review of *No Man's Land*: "Beyond the curtains lie space and air, darkness and light, within are all the signs of a cultivated household, arranged in elegance and order" (Lambert 1975a: 37).

suggested in a perspective view through the window. The only notable exception among the stage plays (the situation is different in the case of radio and television plays) is *The Dumb Waiter* where in spite of the lack of a window the messages from the outside world are received through the two existing channels: the speaking tube and the dumb waiter itself. Here the nature of these signs constituting the theatrical macrocosm throws certain light upon the off-stage territory itself. The messages come from above and are experienced by the characters as coming from some kind of authority, therefore fulfilled with due fear and eagerness. Thus the vertical geometry of this space follows the archetypal pattern of power and authority residing in the upper spheres and man on the lower levels is unable to penetrate the above and understand its motives. The incomprehensible messages frequently referring to concepts that are distant and exotic signify the impossibility of comprehending the high authority while the written note complaining of neglect in fulfilling the previous demands reflects the more general ire of the powerful "above" at the doubts and reluctance arising in Gus's mind. The omniscence of the outside forces is also implied through the act of sending matches which the characters need. This again is an expected quality of the mysterious authority from which nothing can hide. Finally, this is where the death sentence comes from (at least it seems most probable to be the death sentence). In this way the spatial vision makes it possible (although not necessary) to see the play as a commentary on the fate of man who, unable to grasp the logic of the unpredictable (the characters never know what their job is going to be), mysterious and hostile authority that governs their universe have yet to fulfil its orders, await for anything that it may bring, and in the end receive death from its hands.

Still, as it was already observed *The Dumb Waiter* is exceptional in its abundance of signs conveying the outside space. In other stage plays it is evoked in verbal sign systems and through the appearance of the characters functioning as the signs of the off-stage. These characters are habitually permeated with the same qualities as the outside from which they come: unknown, unpredictable, incomprehensible and strange (the Matchseller, Mr. Kidd). Most often they represent some kind of authority (Mr. Kidd — the landlord, Goldberg and McCann — the emissaries of Monty[6]), which is connected with the characters' feeling that the outside space can, at any moment, make its demands. The characters joining the two antithetical types of space and capable of moving freely from one to the other are, significantly, associated with the idea of motion by their possession of cars, vans and lorries (Bert, Mick, Sam). By contrast, the characters of the enclosed space very often abhor leaving their *loci*, do not go out at all, and in the later plays are as if frozen in their chairs.

The border cutting through the universe of Pinter's plays can be also seen as separating one's own space from somebody else's territory. "One's own space is

[6] Although this may be a much too far association, the name "Monty" brings to mind Royal Canadian Mounted Police known as "Mounties". Thus, again the association would be with some kind of authority (although this time famous for their courtesy).

understood as the type of space which together with the character constitutes a certain closed and homogeneous universe. The relationship between the character and the delimited space is based upon the principle of homologous alikeness or dialectical opposition. The relevance of the type of interior for the type of people that inhabit it is delineated, among others, by the nature and features of the objects which furnish a given interior" (Popiel 1979: 99). Also Michel Butor's statement about the novel can be very well applied to dramatic space: "To describe furniture, objects, is a necessary way of describing a character: there are things that cannot be experienced and understood unless the reader is shown the scenery and the accessories of actions" (Butor 1971: 43). Hence the signs constituting the space can also function as signs in relation to characters. In Pinter's plays one's own space is most often a homologous extension of the character[7]. The signs of the space serve not only as the first indications of characters' social position and financial standing (from the poor and ugly interiors of the first plays to the middle class and some fairly refined ones in his later plays) but also act as the signals of their mental state (Aston's collection of junk), their needs (the removed wall in *The Homecoming* as the need of a more open space or, possibly, Max's attempt not to let anything pass unnoticed in this house[8]), the roles they perform (e.g. housewife's role associated with the kitchen and kitchen accessories — Max, role of a child and identity of an artist combined in Stanley's toy drum) and their taste. The character's taste is particularly well rendered in *The Collection* (although a television play yet highly successful on the stage) where several sign systems are employed to outline the difference between the two *loci* presented, and consequently the difference between their inhabitants. The modern furniture of the Hornes' flat is contrasted with the period furnishing of Harry's house. Equally telling is the geographic location: the well-established respectability of Belgravia and the territory of successful Bohemia-Chelsea. The implication is that Harry Kane needs the external sign of tradition and establishment to counterbalance the risky situation of his homosexual relationship (on the other hand this deviation often blamed upon the English public school system may be seen as properly belonging to his universe). Another thing which constitutes the two *loci* is sound. Bill listens to Vivaldi while in the Chelsea flat Stella puts on a Charlie Parker record (classical jazz). Apart form the mere suitability of the respective musical pieces for both interiors, the music of Vivaldi "who composed largely for young women" (Sykes 1972: 105) may perhaps be treated as yet another sign of Bill's homosexuality.

[7] Homespace in *A Night Out* becomes, in Walter's eyes, a homologous extension of his demanding mother. In the majority of Pinter's plays it usually exhibits alikeness to the main character.

[8] John Bury, the designer was concerned with the technical aspect of this problem and argued that Pinter avoided a composite set which does not work well on the stage "by writing into the text that line about knocking the wall down to make an open living area" (Bury-Lahr 1971: 28). The present author is of the opinion that apart form Max's desire to know everything that is going on, it is also essential to see the hall, the front door, and the staircase because the very act of entering this specific homespace is so essential.

Yet, even without going so far it can certainly be seen as a means of creating the space as an extension of character. Similarly in *No Man's Land*, Hirst and his *locus* make one entity: the space hermetically insulated from the outside, ignoring even the natural cycle of day and night (curtains, light) and Hirst refusing access to any outside influence. One's own space is also strongly indicated in *Silence* and *Landscape*. In all these plays somebody else's space is invariably experienced as alien and hostile.

Not in all plays does the opposition of one's own and somebody else's space follow this basic pattern. In *The Basement* and *Tea Party*[9] one's private space changes with the entrance of characters from the outside. In *The Basement* the change is indicated by the objects (the refurnishing of the place each time exhibits its connection with the character who at that time can call the space his own) and the possession of a female.

Yet, while in *The Basement* the spatial changes assume the form of cyclic repetitiveness without a beginning and without an end, in *Tea Party* the change is a subjective one. The main character, Disson experiences his space as different, unreliable, unstable with the shapes changing, and distances and dimensions fluctuating. With Diana and Willy becoming well-established in his territory, Disson feels that he loses control over his space until he cannot even perceive it correctly. But there are no indications that his own *locus* is actually turning hostile against him. Thus this time the change in the spatial vision corresponds to the disturbances that the character undergoes. In the majority of Pinter's plays, however, the rhythm of one's own space is marked by everyday activities, rituals of tea and coffee drinking, breakfasts, lunches etc. This monotonous movement is frightening in its regularity and thus inviting its own disruption.

In Pinter's later plays, however, the spatial image of the border changes its function. In *Silence* and *Landscape* the border cuts across the scenic space (apart from the verbally conveyed border separating the characters' own *loci* from the outside) and becomes the sign of the disintegration of the presented space into isolated micro-worlds of identical construction. Thus the border does not separate anything; the spaces presented are merely psychological spaces. Still this mental border is almost uncrossable in *Silence* and completely so in *Landscape*[10].

The existence of the spatial opposition: one's own, somebody else's introduces the problem of homespace. Pinter presents his characters most often on their own territory; therefore, it seems possible to analyse their *loci* in relation to the traditional

[9] Both plays are television plays, yet, they are included in this discussion just because the medium offerred a possibility of having the change in one's space visually presented.

[10] In both plays the sets of the original stage productions were designed to stress the existence of the borders: In *Silence*, "The set, a stunning piece of gleaming tinfoil created by John Bury, highlights the desolation and isolation of the characters" (Marowitz 1973: 164). In *Landscape*, "On one side is a kitchen interior which suggests the servant's pantry of a large country house. A man puffs a pipe. (...) Opposite him, on a cutaway section of stage a woman..." (Marowitz 1973: 165). See also Hobson (1969: 52).

topos of homespace. A room as "the most elementary of man's existential spaces" (Ratajczak 1978: 90) and especially a room as a home is charged with strong emotional values on the basis of the function which it is supposed to perform. It would be a place of personal freedom, a quiet retreat, a place of return, family feelings, personal happiness and safety[11]. Yet, Pinter's plays, one after another, dispel all these idealized notions about homespace. Enclosure turns out not to be homogeneous with safety[12]. The interior reveals the same features as the outside (above all violence and danger). The pseudo-protection of the walls becomes prison-like (especially in *The Birthday Party* and in *No Man's Land*). The idea of family reunion and of return to the old home is ironically reversed (*The Homecoming*), family feelings and values have no access to these *loci*.

Yet, while the visual signs representing the scenic space and the characters' interactions taking place in these rooms are the negation of the traditional *topos*, the statements of Pinter's people claim positive values for these *loci* attributing to them all the convential features habitually associated with the idea of home[13]. This bitter discrepancy allows the conclusion that the scenic space of Pinter's plays implies the debasement or even the utter distortion of the traditional *topos* of homespace.

Pinter's homes do not exist in a geographic vacuum. He uses factual and empirical data in evoking the theatrical space. The geographic references, names of towns and cities, the street names and the bus routes can be confronted with the places that exist in reality (e.g. a variety of places in *The Birthday Party*, Birmingham etc. in *The Dumb Waiter*, Leeds in *The Collection*, London Airport in *The Homecoming*, London districts, streets and bus routes in *The Caretaker*, Hampstead Heath and Bolsover street area in *No Man's Land*, the latter actually providing inaccurate information). Yet, in spite of the existing analogy between real geographic space and the space conveyed in the plays the aim of Pinter's space is far from representing the actual *loci* in London or elsewhere. The information implied by topographical references is only seemingly relevant since it does not really matter at all whether the characters speak, for example, of Amsterdam or of any other city. The characters' goals in introducing the names of geographically realistic places are diverse[14] and often mischievous, yet never connected with providing referential information about the mentioned *loci*, never meant for confrontation with reality but rather for revealing the characters that evoke them.

[11] "It is a matter of doubt whether the generic idea of shelter was at first associated with protection from elements or concealment from one's enemies" (Pei 1964: 188). In Pinter's plays these two original functions are of great importance.

[12] Dukore (1976: 9) observes in connection with *The Room* that in Pinter the home is "not inviolable".

[13] Only in *The Dwarfs* homespace is experienced as unreliable and unstable. In *The Homecoming* the idea of home is occasionally ridiculed by the characters yet in other fragments of the play it is highly praised.

[14] The characters' goals in introducing topographical references range from sheer pleasure derived from pronouncing the name of a distant and exotic place and the wish to impress the interlocutor, to the desire of confusing and frightening him.

The theatrical space of the present is, therefore, composed of two spheres. There is the more distant space, presented as *locus spatiosus* made up of several *loci particulari* (cf. Michałowska 1978: 110), topographically pseudo-realistic yet, in fact, not meant to reflect the definite spatial situation. And there is also the immediate surrounding of the room: the house, the garden, the staircase — all these places which should be friendly and familiar and which, in Pinter, appear as *locus horridus* impossible to explore, incomprehensible, mysterious and terrifying. This more immediate sphere, conveyed predominantly in verbal sign systems cannot be confronted with any point of reference hence it cannot be verified. This type of presentation allows the mythologization of the immediate outside which starts to appear as a power bearing upon the characters' fate.

In Pinter's plays the antithetic opposition between the interior *locus* and the outside world is reflected in the opposition between the characters of the inside versus those coming from the outside. The encounter of these two worlds invariably leads to the situation of conflict between the proprietor of the enclosed *locus* and the newcomer. Yet, the presence of characters in a certain space is not only associated with a specific conflict (Niekludow 1977: 358) but the conflict concerns the space itself. Space is a value over which the characters are ready to struggle. This relationship between spatial and nonspatial values may be elucidated by a sociologial viewpoint as it was already observed by an outstanding Polish (and American) sociologist Florian Znaniecki. Aleksander Wallis in his discussion of Znaniecki's work concerning the sociological bases of human ecology (Znaniecki 1938) expresses the opinion that the discovery of close interdependence between those two groups of values and the postulate of translating one type into the other "is probably the most interesting idea of the whole study" (Wallis 1975: 130).

In order to be able to enter a certain space and stay in it a human being must have a right to do so which is connected with the social role and the status of this person since this individual's presence within the area of spatial value belonging to a given group is experienced as a sort of participation in this value (Znaniecki 1938: 93, 94). Znaniecki suggests the term ecological position for the right to be present in a certain space. This right is granted to a human being on the basis of a social role that this being represents (Znaniecki 1938: 94).

The space belonging to a group can be opened to the representatives of other groups under the condition that they appear in the socially acceptable roles and once the outsiders accept their roles they can be granted a specific ecological position on the group's territory. In the case of homespace Znaniecki distinguishes three types of roles which "make it possible for persons from the outside to gain an ecological position in the family. These are the roles of adopted members, servants and guests" (1938: 97). The outsider can cease to be a stranger permanently or temporarily.

It is also essential to realize what is meant by the term "stranger". Znaniecki defines it in his work on the reasons of antagonism towards strangers (Znaniecki 1931) in a way that seems particularly relevant for the situation in Pinter's plays. To the existing at the time sociological definitions of strangers Znaniecki introduces

"humanistic factor" and concludes that "strangers in relation to a given individual or a group are those and only those whom this individual or group experiences as strangers" (Znaniecki 1931: 118). This definition is fully confirmed in Pinter's drama where the feeling of the owner of the room about the newcomer is clearly the primary reason for viewing this person as an intruder.

The case of Ruth in *The Homecoming* is an exemplification of a possibility of admitting an outsider to the group in the role of an adopted member. The function that the newcomer is then to perform is that of an "ancestor" (a woman is to become a mother). In the play the role is literally treated and Ruth is not to become a mother to the next generation but to the already existing one. Znaniecki observes that the act of marriage to one of the members of the group is not in itself sufficient for admitting the individual to the family. Of common occurence is an act of adoption, the wife is pronounced a stepdaughter of the husband's parents (Znaniecki 1938: 98). In *The Homecoming* Ruth is adopted as a mother and she is accepted not when Max finds out about the marriage that took place years before but only after a ridiculous scene of blessing and pronouncing her "kith and kin".

In the other plays the situation is different since the outsiders are not, in any way, connected with the inhabitants of the room. When the status of an adopted member is being granted, the ecological position that the newcomer occupied in his original group is taken into account. Yet, once the individual enters the new group his group role becomes the only essential one. In *The Homecoming* the family examins and discusses Ruth's previous roles and having found out that she represents what they desire, they admit and adopt her.

A guest is a member of a different group in which he plays his main social role. Entering the territory of the new group he has to prove his role in his original environment, since this is what determines his higher or lower status as a guest.

In *The Caretaker, A Slight Ache* and *No Man's Land* the characters arriving from the outside do not represent any social group (at least they are all unable to prove their relationships with any outside group), therefore, according to Znaniecki (1938: 108) they can be classified as vagabonds. Without support from their original territory they can be forced to perform the functions that the new group requires.

In *No Man's Land* Spooner enters Hirst's territory and claims his involvement in an outside group (artist) so that he can assume the role of a guest. Characteristically, Foster and Briggs, concerned about their own positions try to disclose Spooner's unsuitability for the role of a guest by undermining his links with any respectable outside group. Finally, Spooner agrees on performing the roles that might be of use for Hirst, thus he resigns himself to the vagabond status but is nevertheless rejected because he transgresses Foster's territory.

The contrary situation occurs in *A Slight Ache*. The Matchseller does not seem to belong to any group and has all the attributes of a vagabond but Edward tries to impose the role of a guest upon him, by implying his high status elsewhere: "You must be a stranger here. Unless you lived here once, went on a long voyage and have lately returned" and "I get the impression that you've been around a bit" [23].

The ecological position of a guest in which Edward would like to see the Matchseller is less dangerous for him than the one which is associated with the role of an adopted member (the role of child and husband), which Flora intends for the stranger. Finally the Matchseller takes over the ecological position of an adopted member and Edward, deprived of it, is turned out.

In *The Caretaker* Davies is treated by Aston as a guest without having to prove his role in an outside group. Mick, however, pretends to believe in Davies's social status outside their group (e.g. he asks Davies: "Who do you bank with?") and accordingly offers him certain roles within their group that Davies — a vagabond — is unable to perform: experienced professional (interior decorator), tenant, cultured companion sharing interest in classical music. Davies, on the other hand, cannot understand that he can be treated as a guest and he expects to be assigned the worst jobs in return for the ecological position that he is granted which is what the vagabonds are usually forced to do: "You want me to do all the dirty work all up and down them stairs so I can sleep in this lousy filthy hole every night?" [61]. Davies tries an outrageous maneuver of usurping a role which would deprive a member of the group — Aston of his role. "If the vagabonds start to perform other roles than the ones they were assigned the local group tires to force them back into their roles or exile them" (Znaniecki 1938: 110). Znaniecki also notices that when the vagabonds enter the space belonging to the group this space becomes infected with their presence. Both in *The Caretaker* and in *A Slight Ache* this infection of the territory is commented upon. Edward says "I smelt him when he came under my window. Can't you smell the house now" [21] and in *The Caretaker* both Aston [69] and Mick [75] accuse Davies: "You've been stinking the place out".

It seems that this attempt to apply Znaniecki's categories (ecological position and correspondences between spatial and non-spatial values) revealed Pinter's interesting, and certainly unconventional, treatment of the situations known to sociology, especially in relation to the problem of assuming certain roles in order to enter the space belonging to a group.

SPACE: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Extremely significant and yet almost totally neglected in critical literature is the relationship between the space of the present — scenic space presented *ad oculos* (and in some cases the off-stage present space) and the space of the past, i.e. that part of theatrical space which is conveyed in the characters' recollections and statements pertaining to the past. Usually direct signals from the past space cannot be received and in the theatre it is habitually evoked by means of verbal sign systems. In Pinter's presentation of the space of the past versus that of the present one can trace several patterns.

In *The Room* a certain fragment of theatrical present space — the basement of the house (conveyed solely in linguistic signs) gradually emerges as Rose's space of the past. It is from the basement that Mr. and Mrs. Sands have just returned; it is from the basement that a blind Negro, Riley arrives at the end of the play.

From the very beginning Rose displays anxiety and curiosity about this territory. In her utterances relating to the basement repulsion is mixed with a strange attraction and her attitude to this place, although basically negative, is surprisingly emotional. She derives a sense of superiority from not living there, superiority in which the evaluation "the room is better than the basement" finds its reflection in the spatial arrangement — the room is upstairs, above the basement and the movement upwards is traditionally charged with positive values. Thus Rose is also literally superior (above) relative to the basement and the vertical geometry of her space follows the convention of associating the movement upwards with aspirations and ambitions (cf. Michałowska 1978: 107).

The first indication that the basement can be linked with Rose's past appears in her conversation with the Sandses. Asked by Mr. Sands if she had ever been in the basement of the house Rose replies:

> Oh yes, once, a long time ago.

and the conversation proceeds as follows:

Mr. Sands: Well, you know what it's like then, don't you?
Rose: It was a long time ago [21].

In this way the basement is for the first time implied to be the *locus* belonging to Rose's past. In Mrs. Sands's description [23] the basement takes on the characteristics of *locus horridus* and *locus angustus* (cf. Michałowska 1978: 110) with a variety of numerous details hostile to a human being. It is a confined area, smelling of dampness, subdivided into small sections (cells? cages?) and getting darker behind every partition. It is essential that in the horizontal architecture of the basement its mysterious parts appear as unknown or even impossible to penetrate. At the same time in the vertical order of the world, darkness is a common attribute of the lower spheres and movement downwards is symbolic of degradation — the association which is present in Rose's mind. The image presented recalls the descent into lower and lower regions of hell where every area, darker than the one before brings one nearer to the heart of darkness where nobody can be seen but an ominous voice is heard warning that soon the heroine's living space will be vacant. The man whose voice comes from this blackness truly belongs in the space of the basement; he is as black as every thing around him. There may be also an implied moral valuation in introducing a black character (racial issues are nor present therefore it seems legitimate to interpret this character as metaphorically black) coming from a black, hell-like netherworld. The suggestion that Rose herself comes from the moral underworld finds confirmation in an indication that she may have been a prostitute "Oh, these customers. They come in and stink the place out" [29]. Again the moral aspect can be viewed as implied also in spatial terms: lower moral values of the underworld and the higher morality of those who have managed to climb up.

Yet the space of the past is bound to return and make its claims upon those who have abandoned it. In her wish to bury it for ever Rose denies possessing any knowledge of the basement or anybody who might be connected with it. She tells Mr. Kidd "But I don't know anybody. We're quiet here. We've just moved into this district" [27] which is in contradiction to her earlier statement that she had been in the basement a long time before. Similarly, she claims never having met Riley before: "They say I know you. That's an insult, for a start. Because I can tell you, I wouldn't know you to spit on, not from a mile off" [29] although a few minutes earlier she was positive that Riley was not the man's real name [28].

The attempts to forget the basement and all that it stands for prove futile. The messenger from that space will arrive to reclaim Rose to her past life and *locus*. Confronted with Riley, Rose significantly stresses "You've got a grown-up woman in this room, do you hear?" [28] and later says "What do you know about this room? You know nothing about it" [29]. In this way she points out the effects of the passing of time, she is now a different woman than the one to whom the message was addressed, she is grown-up and Riley does not know anything about her as she is now and about her present space. In spite of these remarks Riley makes his demand: "Your father wants you to come home" [30]. Although it is not clear whether the basement actually is Rose's past home yet some kind of connection between the place of her childhood or youth and the dark basement certainly exists. Apart from the already discussed correspondences in spatial terms and moral valuation it is also implied in Riley's changing his demand "Your father wants you..." into "*I* want you to come home" [30] (emphasis added E. B.). Rose's refusal can be seen as a refusal to descend with all its moral overtones (movement downwards). Yet, as it becomes apparent at the end of the play the space of the past cannot be ignored. Rose has to pay her price for having rejected its claim[15].

In *The Room* the past space is conveyed not only by verbal signs. The character of black Riley is also a sign of the past *locus* with which he is associated through his blackness and an element of mystery that surrounds him. In Rose's mind the space of the past and that of the present are polar opposites. She consistently and stubbornly refuses to acknowledge the reality about the space that surrounds her and reinforces herself in her belief that her room is virtually heaven on earth. The idealized space of the present impressed in the character's imagination with strong positive valuation is contrasted with the negative *locus* of the past. In this situation there is nothing surprising in her attempt to forget that she ever knew it and in her wish to break any connection with the feared space of the past.

Yet, infinitely more common in Pinter's works is a pattern in which the past space is charged with positive values to the point of becoming glorified while the present *locus* evokes negative feelings.

The motif of the idealized, arcadian space of the past appears in the *Birthday Party* as a clear opposition to the dirty shabbiness of the boarding house living room presented on the stage. Meg, the landlady refers to her past space, that of her childhood "There was a night-light in my room, when I was a little girl (...) My little room was pink. I had a pink carpet and pink curtains, and I had musical boxes all over the room. And they played me to sleep (...) I was cared for, and I had

---

[15] Gale (1977: 7) represents a different point of view arguing that "Rose goes blind because of her exposure to the world outside her room".

little sisters and brother in other rooms, all different colours" [60]. The bright, happy colours of the past *locus amoenus*, cosiness of the little room, intimacy of the night-light, pleasant sounds of music lulling little Meg to sleep are very far from the grayish destitution of her present space (which she nevertheless desperately tries to ignore)[16].

The furnishings of the past space are thus fundamentally different from those existing in the present space. The present *locus* is filled with objects associated with elementary needs, symptomatically food appears very often. By contrast, the objects of the past space are not basic necessities. Meg's attempt to revive some aspect of this fantasmagoric past in her present space is her gift of a drum bestowed upon Stanley. It is the only object of the present space that is not of everyday use and it recalls Meg's musical boxes. Her childhood home appears also as inhabited by her brothers and sisters — dear companions and a nanny who took care of her. Her present life lacks all those emotional attributes.

Equally idealized past space is evoked by both Goldberg and McCann. A cliché image of happiness equivalent to Meg's pink room is that of a sunset which appears in both men's speeches[17]. McCann recollects the sun falling behind the town hall in Carrikmacross [43]. It is essential that this postcard view is that of Ireland, his motherland. He also returns in his words to the times and places where he was joyful and relaxed — the pubs in which he would sing and drink all night with the boys [60]. The past space thus presented appears as serene, friendly and beautiful and having revived it in memories McCann asks the crucial question "Now where am I?" [60]. Now he brings danger, unrest and hostility into the *locus* that he enters. He finds no peace of mind, no joy. The case of Goldberg is almost identical. The space which he recollects is not only meant to be conventionally beautiful (again the references to sunset) but is also associated with permanent values: respectability, family love, stability, safety and the idea of giving help to others — thus generally with goodness. These features are clearly contrary to those which characterize his *loci* of today[18].

Also Stanley's past is connected with a different type of universe than the one he inhabits at present. He recollects Fuller's tea shop, Boots' Library [39] and in these spatial references the trajectory of his life crosses that of Goldberg who also mentions these places [56]. Since the point of convergence is in the past it allows the assumption that the roots of present events are also there. Still, the most important territory of Stanley's past was a concert hall at Lower Edmonton. It was the place of his triumph where he was the central figure which was reflected in the spacial arrangement: "They came up to me" [22]. In the present space Meg recognizes his position as central — a sad compensation fort the one that he had lost. Yet,

[16] The archetype of the home of childhood as arcadian space is here deprived of a garden which traditionally surrounds the childhood house — "Paradise lost of house and garden" (cf. Czerminska 1978: 231).

[17] John Lahr finds this speech a mockery of the traditional view of nature and observes that nature is only a memory in the claustrophobic urban world (Lahr 1971: 177, 178).

[18] Boulton's opinion is very similar: "Their childhood is important because it represents a kind of cosy emotionalism within which they try vainly to shelter in escape from a present world of brutality" (Boulton 1972: 97).

Stanley's case in respect to space is different from those of Meg, Goldberg and McCann. Stanley describes his loss of the desired space, his expulsion "...when I got there the hall was closed, the place was shuttered up, not even a caretaker. They'd locked it up" [23]. He was locked out, never to regain his space of the past, the only space charged with positive values for him. The loss of space implies the loss of opportunities and talent (he says that he had a unique touch — in the past tense). Now even this once happy space, that can be also seen as his *locus* of potential achievement that was ever since denied to him, brings bitter memories. It did not prove lasting and finally turned against him. Therefore nowadays Stanley cannot associate himself with any *locus*. His present territory is viewed as temporary and he despises it while the past proved to be hostile. Only the future is left and Stanley makes reference to various cities which he claims he is going to visit during his around the world artistic tour: he will perform in night clubs in Berlin, Athens, Constantinople, Zagreb and Vladivostock. The places although topographically realistic are obviously chosen at random more for the sound of the word, association with high life and exotic connotations that at least some of them, bring to an Englishman. Clearly the future tour has nothing to do with reality, it may be Stanley's dream, but the kind of dream he does not even believe can ever come true. Thus, the future *loci* mentioned may to some extent represent Stanley's dream space, he must have once hoped to be a world famous pianist travelling all over the world. But the space of the future is also used here to dazzle Meg who probably does not even know where half of these cities are located. It is revealing that Stanley presents his future in terms of travel which adds to our sense of its improbable quality since Stanley is an opposite of a voluntarily travelling character, he does not even leave the house. Thus Stanley's situation in space was and still is tragic and there does not seem to exist any hope for change. In fact, he has no place which he could call his own and he has nowhere to go. Although he would like to leave the *locus horridus* in which he dwells at present and although the world appears to him in the tempting colours of *locus spatiosus*, yet he cannot make the decision to leave; the present space is negative, yet he does not know any positive one either:

Stanley (*abruptly*): How would you like to go away with me?
Lulu: Where?
Stanley: Nowhere. Still, we could go.
Lulu: But where could we go?
Stanley: Nowhere. There's nowhere to go. So we could just go. It wouldn't matter.
Lulu: We might as well stay here.
Stanley: No. It's no good here.
Lulu: Well, where else is there?
Stanley: Nowhere [26][19].

[19] Apparently the memorable words "There's nowhere to go" were Pinter's important inspiration in writing the play:

I was on tour with a farce... I found digs in which a man had to share a room with a man in a kind of attic, sleeping on a bed which had a sofa above it. The sofa was upside down, almost against the ceiling, and I was under the sofa, and he was in the other bed. There was a terrible landlady, and it was all quite incredibly dirty. And at the end of the week I said to this fellow, who turned out to have been a concert pianist on the pier: "Why do you stay here?" And he said: "There is nowhere else to go". I left with that ringing in my ears. Then about a year later or so I started to write *The Birthday Party*" (Pinter-Bakewell 1969: 630).

Eventually he will not leave his present space, he will be taken away and it is very doubtful if this "somewhere" where he is driven is the *locus* he, or anybody, might desire. Petey is terrified of the place to which the two men take Stanley and senses threat in Goldberg's invitation to join them.

Petey: Leave him alone! *They stop. Goldberg studies him.*
Goldberg (*insidiously*): Why don't you come with us, Mr Boles?
McCann: Yes, why don't you come with us?
Goldberg: Come with us to Monty. There's plenty of room in the car. *Petey makes no move. They pass him and reach the door.*
McCann opens the door and picks up the suitcases.
Petey (*broken*): Stan, don't let them tell you what to do. [86]

Petey realizes that the *locus* which is now their destination will not be the space of freedom for Stanley. Thus Stanley is a character who does not belong to any *locus*, who, in fact, does not possess a place that he could feel positive about. Yet at the same time he is not a homeless character by his own choice, he is not a character of the road, he avoids any movement in space and his final change of living space at the end of the play is forced upon him and has tragic overtones.

Davies in *The Caretaker*, a true character of the road, lacking any permanent *locus* with which he could identify himself, has lost track of the past and does not even recall (or does not want to remember) where he was born. He claims that he can reestablish the missing links with the past by recovering his papers yet these, significantly, cannot be reached, they seem to exist in a different space which assumes a tale-like quality by piling up obstacles that one encounters on the way to it. His space of the road is shaped according to the pattern of *locus horridus* (cf. Abramowska 1978: 138). Bad road, unsuitable shoes, rain are Davies's snakes and dragons that wait for the knight errant who has set out to free a princess from her castle-prison behind seven mountains and seven rivers. Davies's princess takes the form of his papers while the castle possesses even a realistic name "Sidcup". Yet the journey will not be undertaken and the reward will remain an unattainable illusion. We are confronted with a tragic situation of a character of the road unable to undertake a journey[20], and Sidcup, in spite of its geographic realism, will remain Davies's dream space.

The *loci* of the past which appear in Aston's reminiscences in the same play are invariably the places of contact with other people — the places of work and entertainment. Both the café which he frequented and the factory in which he was employed suggested a possibility of encounters with the group. The mental hospital is presented by Aston as a turning point in his life. It was there that he was deprived of his urge to communicate with others[21]. The change in his life dating from this traumatic experience involved also the change in his space. Now as he puts it: "I steer

[20] The opinions of the critics on this matter are diverse: Hinchliffe (1967: 175: footnote 32) sees Davies as a static character and warns against the use of the word "tramp"; Knight (1963: 48—54) presents him as dynamic in opposition to the peculiarly static brothers; Boulton (1972: 100, 101) detects the archetypal symbol of life as a journey by selecting a tramp as the main character, yet the journey is terrifying and along an uncertain road.

[21] In this work, however, the hospital is viewed as Aston's invention but even then it can be

clear of places like that café" [57]. He chose the space of isolation — his lonely room and instead of working with other people, he performs his small jobs alone and for himself.

Also the visions of the future *loci* unfold in the speeches of both Aston and his brother Mick in *The Caretaker*. This time the references to the spatial constructions of tomorrow sound more like the projects that theoretically could be even carried into effect — the building of a shed or the conversion of the derelict house into modern flats are not dreams that cannot be accomplished. Yet the furnishings, particularly of Mick's *locus* of the future are strikingly incompatible with those of the present space (although he does not live there permanently yet it apparently belongs to him and he has a bed there). Also in view of the present situation, of Aston's inability to sort out his room and Mick's lack of initiative in organizing the work about which he is talking, the only possible conclusion is that the future spaces which the characters are conceiving will always remain an unattainable dream.

A certain element of the same concept of past space associated with contact and present space with loneliness was present in Meg's vision (other rooms of her childhood house were the rooms of her brothers and sisters, and she had a nanny taking care of her in her room, while nowadays her house is almost empty), in Goldberg's description (his past space is filled up with his relatives with whom he was apparently very close — now he has to share his space with his work companion with whom his relationship is rather strained) and in Stanley's account (in his past space he had a large audience, now his audience consists of one person — Meg). This motif which was only additional in the before discussed plays becomes the primary one in *The Collection, Silence* and *Old Times*.

In *The Collection*, the past space, a hotel room in Leeds although only temporary in opposition to the permanent home spaces of the characters' present was the *locus* (or gave a possibility) of close relationship while in the present spaces the relationships do not work. Although the love affair, if it occured at all, was as temporary as the space in which it took place yet in the permanent space there exists permanent emotional isolation.

The dominant features of the space in which Kate and Deeley in *Old Times* now live is the isolation and remote distance which separates it from other people's homes. They rarely go to London [18] unwilling to enter the space of busy life and human encounters. Where they live there are "not many people" [20], while nature makes its appearance through the mention of the sea and boundless horizon. Thus their present home is a point in quiet *locus spatiosus* while their past space displayed contrary features, it was a lively city in which the mentioned *loci particulari* are cafés, pubs, art galleries, cinemas, that is, the places which indicate active involvement in life. Again the majority of *loci* of the past which the characters recall are

treated as Aston's dream space which he has conceived out of his present necessity for self-excuse. Yet, even if totally imaginary it is, according to his vision, the space in which he was "cured" of his wish to communicate.

traditionally places of encounters, the territories where people make friends, talk to others and go in order not to be alone (especially the traditional function of the pub in the English society).

Yet both in *The Caretaker* and in *Old Times* the easy valuation according to which the space of communication should be charged with positive qualities and that of withdrawal with the negative ones is not offered. The *locus* destined for sharing it with others did not necessarily prove happy for the characters. In the case of Aston it taught him (through his hospital treatment or the self-awareness of his inefficiency) to become weary of peopled spaces. At the same time he is not satisfied with his present space of isolation and tries to introduce a partner into it. His attempt proves to be a failure and he has to remain in his *locus* of separation. Neither the past nor the present space provide Aston with what he desires. Also in *Old Times* Kate renounces the city of her past, i.e. the space of communication and claims to prefer the country:

The water's very soft here. Much softer than in London. I always find the water very hard in London. That's one reason I like living in the country. Everything's softer. The water, the light, the shapes, the sounds. There aren't such edges here. And living close to the sea too. You can't say where it begins or ends. That appeals to me... I don't care for harsh lines. I deplore that kind of urgency. (...) The only nice thing about a big city is that when it rains it blurs everything, and it blurs the lights from the cars, doesn't it, and your eyes, and you have rain on your lashes. That's the only nice thing about a big city [59].

In this and several other utterances Kate cuts herself off from her past and from her past space — London. Anna, on the other hand, insists on returning to their past and defends the space with which it is associated:

That's not the only nice thing. You can have a nice room and a nice gas fire and a warm dressing gown and a nice hot drink all waiting for you when you come in.

In her words the past space appears accompanied by the attributes of friendship and care. In all of Anna's statements pertaining to the past spaces, events from the past, people from the past appear as more vivid, more real, more tangible than all that she describes as contemporaneous. It is as if her true life belonged to the past which becomes even more striking since her present life, her present space displays the qualities of a dream, seems to be only an illusion.

Thus it does not seem ungrounded to view Anna as a character from the past and even as Kate's identity from the old times in London. Anna is present on the stage when the play opens yet her figure — dim and remote in the unlit area at the back of the stage occupies the same position in the scenic space as she does in Kate's mind — just a trace of memory, a faint recollection or being different once, a vague sense of the almost forgotten part of the self. Still, this old identity is always there suppressed, yet just like Anna, ready to wake up at a suitable moment. As the dialogue between Kate and Deeley turns to things from twenty years earlier Anna comes back to life, or more specifically, Kate's old personality reappears from beneath her present guise. Actively entering the scenic space Anna also enters the present[22]. Throughout the play the two women are constantly identified and

[22] Katharine J. Worth (1973: 93) attributes a cinematic quality to this "spectacularily sudden appearance of Anna".

numerous indications suggest that Anna represents Kate from the past[23]. This interpretation is also implied by spatial references. Anna claims to have been present in the cinema when Kate and Deeley first met. According to Deeley's report Kate and himself were the only two people there, "there was only one person in the cinema, one other person in the whole of the whole cinema, and there she is. And there she was" [29]. Anna contradicts him and seems to suggest that she was always present in Kate,

I remember one Sunday she said to me, looking up from the paper, come quick, quick, come with me quickly, and we seized our handbags and went, on a bus, to some totally unfamiliar district and almost alone, saw a wonderful film called Odd Man Out [38].

Also Deeley's first talk with Kate in a café soon reemerges in his account of having coffee with Anna,

On the way to the party I took her into a café, bought her a cup of coffee, beards with faces. She thought she was you, said little, so little. Maybe she was you. Maybe it was you having coffee with me, saying little, so little" [69].

Anna's symbolic death, that is the death of Kate's old passionate, active self occurred when a man entered her private space, when she brought him (most probably Deeley) into her room. Thus the change of personality corresponded to the change in space, significantly the man suggested not only a wedding but "a change of environment" [73]. Thus in *Old Times* personality is related to space to such an extent that Kate's past vivacious and open ego has to die with the change of *locus*. In quiet and isolated space of the present there emerges the new Kate — withdrawn and fond of solitary walks. But unlike in the case of Aston when the process was still rendered in terms of one character going through major personality change and adequately entering a different type of *locus*, here the change is seen as so profound that it is presented symbolically through two different characters and the images of death and rebirth.

Kate's attempt to forget about her old identity appears, among others, in her final denial of Anna's existence in her past *locus*: "He asked me once, at about that time, who had slept in that bed (Anna's bed, E. B.) before him. I told him no one. No one at all" [73]. Yet the past exists, it can never be rejected completely and it returns incarnate in the character of Anna, it is present even if the characters are not aware of it. As the character from the past enters the present also the past space enters, or is superimposed upon the present space.

In view of the above it is legitimate to consider Anna's present *locus* (her permanent off-stage space, significantly conveyed only in verbal sign systems, thus impossible to verify) as the young Kate's dream of her territory of the future. Since Anna represents the suppressed passionate aspect of Kate the *locus* in which she lives should display the features that a young, emotional, poor girl (their lack of money in London is commented upon) would dream about. And this actually

[23] E.g. Anna's insistence on using old fashioned words, Deeley's decision to find out about Anna through Kate by watching her and several others are discussed in Byczkowska (1977: 71—80). See also MacAuley for a similar interpretation (1973) and Ganz (1972: 175) who views Anna as "at once an independent character, an aspect of Kate's inner self and an embodiment of a whole tendency toward luxurious corruption and sophistication that Deeley fears".

is the case. The description of Anna's world contains all these qualities: it is distant and foreign (young girls' dream of far-off foreign countries), slightly exotic, luxurious and sensuous (bare feet on marble floors, yachts, speedboats, beautiful Mediterranean people and a rich husband). Anna's "rather fine villa... very high up on the cliffs" [40] seems to be a modern version of a teenage dream of a beautiful castle on a high mountain while the volcanic island which is even furnished with geographic reality (Sicily) provides the necessary element of danger and implies the part of Kate capable of passionate outbursts. To sum up: the nature of the signs which are used to convey Anna's permanent *locus* make it possible to identify it as Kate's old dream of her future space.

On the technical level *Old Times* relies once more upon the manipulation of past and present. There exist three planes in the play: present, past (memories — past tense used), and the re-enactment of the past in the present (present tense used). There are no clear distinctions between these planes which is well seen at the beginning of the play when in the scene set in the present the past reemerges without any warning or explanation in Anna's memories of the girls' life in London. So far, the past is merely recollected, memories are introduced into dialogue concerning the present. Later in the play the past is brought onto the stage, the farmhouse becomes the flat in London yet there is nothing in the dialogue to indicate the passage of time. Also the stage set (which remained the same even in the television version of the play where instantaneous change was technically possible) does not reflect the fact that the women are, at least mentally, in a different space. The past space is created in words yet not by means of descriptions (as it happens in recollections) but it naturally emerges from dialogue. The movements, backward and foreward, in time without any preparation, the coexistence of the different time planes, the lack of any clear distinctions and boundaries between these planes (e.g. an action mentioned as if in the past is performed in the present) and the verbal imposition of the past space upon the present space correspond to the fusion of past and present on the thematic level.

Hence, the question of charging the space with certain values also appears in a different light. It becomes obvious why Anna is strongly positive in her attitude to the peopled past space while Kate seems satisfied in her present *locus* of loneliness. At the same time Kate appears somehow attached to the places she used to know in London and Anna recognizes the advantages of the remote farmhouse. Although the two different aspects of her self: the passionate and the dreamy one are torn between two different types of space and two different life concepts yet, being the same person she is bound to feel some attraction for the *locus* associated with the other part of her personality.

The idea of the same scenic space representing at once the *locus* of the past, and that of the present is further developed in *Silence*. Here the setting is so unspecific that it can stand for any *locus*. The emptiness of the space becomes a sign which can change its *signifié*. Therefore, when the characters move into the past, the same empty space, due to its universality, becomes the territory of the past. The past

is significantly associated with movement in space — movement towards another human being (it is the only time when movement occurs on the stage). A chance to approach another person, a chance for emotional involvement represented here by a series of simple changes in spatial positions existed only in the past. The present space indicates isolation, the characters are enclosed in their areas and when the present scenes are acted out they never leave their chairs. This time the past space is strongly impressed with positive qualities; it appears as the space of happiness, and love (or, at least, possibility of love). It is also associated with the country while the present *locus* is that of the city. It is only when the time moves backwards that the spatial boundaries can be crossed and the areas become open. The present space encloses the unhappy immobile characters unwilling to leave their cells and confront life and other people.

The opposition of open space and enclosed interiors or countryside and city space is a recurrent motif in Pinter's drama and although the past is usually associated with open spaces and the present with the city yet, as it was already visible in *Old Times*, this pattern can be reversed. The opposition as such is, nevertheless, always retained. Nor does Pinter fall into the formula that the city space should be associated with communication while that of the country indicates isolation or vice versa. Any *locus* can appear as a peopled territory and rural space may offer more chances of human contacts than the busy space of the city.

In *The Homecoming* Max reminisces about the open spaces of his youth, his life on the course at Epsom: "What a marvellous open-air life" [9]. And, even though London appears in his memories, it has the positive attributes of *locus spatiosus*: he speaks of the West End of London [8], the places he used to frequent with his friend Mac and of the family butcher shop. Nowadays Max is ascribed to his home space and he is most happy in the kitchen "I hate this room. *Pause*. It's the kitchen I like. It's nice in there. It's cosy. *Pause*" [37, 38]. The change of life space was, according to Max, the result of his family duties and was also connected with the change of his interests from horses and fights to children and cooking. Apart from the opposition: open — enclosed, Max's change of *locus* may be seen as a transition from male space (butcher shop, paddock) to female space (kitchen). Similarly, from the dominating position in the past space "We'd walk into a place, the whole room'd stand up, they'd make way to let us pass" [8] he descended into the situation in which he is scorned and humiliated by his sons and in the final tableau of the play he is on his knees on the floor begging Ruth for a kiss [81, 82] — the spatial position of degradation.

It is revealing that Sam who never fitted in a male space (he was a failure at their butcher shop) was also unsuccessful in his relationships with women. Mac, on the other hand, who is presented as a lustful lover proved his efficiency in the male space of the butcher shop, too.

It therefore seems fully justified to look for significant connections between the character and his *locus* and to view the change of *locus* also as a change in the character.

The new type of opposition can be detected between Ruth's space of the past versus that of the present. The *locus* of her youth, definitely positive, is her homeland — England.

Once or twice we went to a place in the country, by train. Oh, six or seven times. We used to pass a... a large white water tower. This place... this house... was very big... the trees... there was a lake, you see... we used to change and walk down towards the lake... we went down a path... on stones... there were... on this path. Oh, just... wait... yes... when we changed in the house we had a drink. There was a cold buffet. *Pause*. Sometimes we stayed in the house but... most often... we walked down to the lake... and did our modelling there. *Pause*. Just before I went to America I went down there. I walked from the station to the gate and then I walked up the drive. There were lights on... I stood in the drive... the house was very light [57, 58].

Thus her past space is associated with lakes and trees, drinks and food and a big house which was all lit up. This was the place which allowed her to fulfill her desires and follow her impulses, she could quench her thirst and satisfy her hunger. In this space she was "a model for the body" [57] while in her permanent present space (Ruth's present space — an American university campus — is also created only in words) she is forced to behave like a respectable housewife married to a proper university professor.

Ruth's past space can be associated with natural impulses, with following natural drives and living according to her true self (*locus naturalis*). Her permanent present space — *locus artificialis* is that of pretence and disguise; she is unnatural there, she has to wear a mask while her needs and appetites remain unsatiated.

The American space is "all rock. And sand. It stretches so far... everywhere you look. And there's lots of insects there" [53]. Thus the spatial and temporal opposition appears in the case of Ruth in terms approaching life and death. The natural and life giving space of her past is juxtaposed with the sterile, hostile and barren space of the present[24]. Accordingly she appears as a different woman in these two different types of space: one — giving herself to many men as her nature prompts her, the other — suppressing her wants and limiting herself to one man. Thus her decision to leave the space which she experiences as so utterly negative is only too obvious. She returns to the *locus* which is similar to that of her past, she even says, "I was born quite near her" [53] indicating that her roots are in this territory. Her new space, the *locus* given on the stage which, at the beginning of the

[24] Here is a handful of critical views connected with this problem:
Warner (1970: 340—353) and Ganz (1972: 162) interpret Ruth's decision as a reflection of her effort to escape the aridity of her life in America and her departure from conventional morality as her attempt to achieve authentic being. Burkman (1971: 110) considers spatial imagery and writes: "Perhaps the action of the play may be described as Ruth's escape from the desert (America and Teddy) to the jungle (London and Teddy's family)". Hewes (1967: 51) discussing the set also refers to the "jungle" image: "The curtain rises on John Bury's inspired setting, an enormous living room in which a few pieces of rundown furniture slightly larger than life-size are tilted at us to intensify the play's strange atmosphere, and free us from normal expectancies. It is a jungle cave in which an all-male family of four fight to preserve their virility". The image of the jungle, "...the life in the human jungle" (Hall-Wardle 1971: 9) reportedly occured to Peter Hall, the director, immediately after reading the play. Yet Wardle, himself 1971: 38, 39) is quite emphatic stating that Pinter's stage "does not present the conventional image of a jungle".

play seems to constitute only a temporary present territory for Ruth, is inhabited by people living according to their impulses and full of men. Ruth also refers to her future space which is, above all, destined to meet her needs: "I would want at least three rooms and a bathroom... I'd want a dressing-room, a rest-room, and a bedroom, (...) You'd supply my wardrobe, of course?... I'd need an awful lot. Otherwise I wouldn't be content" [76, 77]. Far from following the conventional rules of moral valuation Ruth judges the space according to the degree of satisfaction she receives in it. She desires and regards as positive the *locus* in which she can be herself and in which she can get "an awful lot". Thus the play traces the process in which Ruth's temporary present space becomes her permanent *locus*. It is also possible to view Ruth as a character of the road, the only character of the road in Pinter's plays whose life considered in terms of a journey follows a closed pattern (Abramowska 1978: 130). Ruth finds a new version of a home which she had once left (return to homespace in Eneas' version — building of the new Troy).

The *locus* to which Teddy return and which is the present space presented *ad oculos* in *The Homecoming* is, at the same tome his space of the past, the one which he left years before. *The Homecoming* is, therefore, a play about one's visit to one's past space. The territory to which Teddy belongs now, this very same American space which Ruth views with such aversion is for him furnished with positive features (it is interesting that he associates the American space with water while Ruth stressed dryness as one of its most essential qualities). To Teddy his permanent present space appears clean and fresh while his past home and consequently his temporary present *locus* is first of all dirty. "Clean" and "dirty" may be seen as metaphorical terms implying moral judgement. To Teddy who takes pride in being able to view everything objectively and unemotionally the world of his family must appear impure while his American life is sterile in a different sense than for Ruth. What she sees is its emotional bareness while Teddy associates cleanliness with moral purity, physical and mental health. Hence, he cannot fit in his original past space and is bound to leave his temporary present *locus*.

Sterility is also one of the features of Disson's present space in *Tea Party*. The most striking thing about the interior of his office is "a selection of individually designed wash basins, water closets and bidets, all lit by hooded spotlights" and set "along the walls in alcoves... at various intervals" [9]. The cool indifference of this *locus* can only intensify Disson's mental problems. This is not the type of space in which a frustrated man can relax and recover.

Another very significant quality of the present space in this play is its ostentatious luxury, the glitter and polish of money that shows up everywhere. The space comprises multiple *loci* (*Tea Party* as a television play is not limited in presenting numerous places): Disson's house (breakfast room, sitting room, bedroom, dining room, workroom and games room!) Disson's office suite (his and Willy's offices), Disley's surgery, "exclusive" [14] restaurant and a "sumptuous" [16] hotel room in Italy[25].

[25] Pinter's use of the words "exclusive" and "sumptuous" in the stage directions (in which he is always very brief) indicates that he wants to stress this quality of the presented space.

On the one hand this space represents Disson's success in life. He is comfortable at home, has an elegant office, is able to afford expensive trips abroad. He is rich. Yet, this is a view from the side because Disson himself is not free from doubts about his success.

His choice of his present *nouveau riche* living space with his office walls "papered with Japanese silk" [9], the mirror in his sitting room which, he must add, is "a few hundred years old" and "must have cost a few bob" [44] represent his frantic attempt to live up to the new standards which he himself and the companions he chose have imposed upon him. Yet, the feeling builds up in him that he is unsuitable for this space. The distorted vision of reality will be the price he will have to pay for his fears that the space in which he lives is really foreign to him. He develops a complex that he does not fit in his present space which he himself has created and finds satisfaction in reminiscing about his past visits to the pubs where he could drink "eleven or nine pints" every night "with the boys" [40] and was ready to fight with anybody, i.e. the space in which his position was domineering. In his present space he feels overwhelmed by his aristocratic wife and her self confident brother, who, in turn, present their past space — radically different than that of Disson. Diana's and her brother's past *locus* is painted in delicate colours indicating the high social standing of its inhabitants. They speak about the lawn in front of the terrace, the great long windows through which one could hear Diana play Brahms [14] and about other typical attributes of a high class country estate: the lake with the wild swans, the "withdrawing room" in the house [14]. In short "Sunderley was beautiful" [40] and its quiet subdued traditional wealth stands in opposition to the showy glitter of Disson's present space which they, too, now inhabit.

The past space of the siblings is now "gone for ever" [40] and Disson "never got there" [40], it was closed for him.

The past space of Diana and Willy in *Tea Party* again appears idealized, charged with high and subtle values and although the present space is by no means presented in a pejorative way yet it is cleary inferior to their past *locus*. It is but an imitation of the externals while tradition, quiet beauty and class are missing. It is important, however, that Diana and Willy never reveal any dissatisfaction with their present space. It is Disson who fears that they do since he sees them as the representatives of their past space to which he had no entry. The fact that he had never crossed this spatial boundary implies to him that he can never penetrate the social barriers that he sees between himself and his wife. His insecurity does not allow him to take his present space for what it is, for his success nad achievement. In his eyes it appears distorted, things and people change shapes and behaviour and turn against him. Thus, although the way in which different *loci* are presented in *Tea Party* allows consideration of them as, in a certain sense, oppositional yet it is only in Disson's mind that the present space becomes insufficient through the implied superiority of Diana's past *locus* and symbolic of his inability to equal his spouse.

The arcadian view of the past appears once more in *Landscape*. In this play

the opposition between the past space and the present *locus* reaches its peak. Beth's past space is impressed with nothing but positive qualities

> On the beach. Well... it was very fresh. But it was hot, in the dunes. But it was so fresh on the shore. I loved it very much. *Pause* Lots of people... *Pause* People move so easily. Men. Men move (...) My man slept in the dune (...) Snoozing how lovely [9].

Her positive emotional attitude makes her see only the peaceful beauty of the past. These features become even more conspicuous when compared to her present *locus*. She is in the kitchen of a country house where "the dust is bad" [23], "there's moths" [23], where the windows in the drawing room are never opened any more. Beth talks to herself and does not respond to her husband's remarks, she does not even seem to hear him. The enclosed and isolated character of Beth's present *locus* is in contrast with the open spaces that she recollects. Even when interior *locus* appears in her memories it is a hotel bar — the peopled space of human contacts. In the past space there was movement: she walked on the beach, drove in a car with her lover, "caught a bus to the crossroads and then walked down the lane" [27], people moved, men moved. By opposition the present space stands out by its complete immobility. Beth not only does not go outside any more but she even does not move from her chair throughout the entire play.

Thus the past space in *Landscape* is associated with life among people, with active attitudes and with concern about the things of life. It is, above all, the space of love, of communication and fulfilment, of happiness and a possibility of creating new life, of pleasures sensuous yet gentile. It is the space in which Beth herself is young and beautiful. The present *locus* with its radically different features is ignored by the character. Beth actually seems to believe that she is still living in her past and it allows her to divorce herself from her coarse and gloomy present. Her attempt is to confine herself to her space of the past[26]. But, apart from the fact that the present space is given on the stage, even its part merely outlined by Duff appears more realistic than the *loci* evoked by Beth. Her past space creates the impression of dream space, e.g. "So sweetly the sand over me. Tiny the sand on my skin. *Pause* So silent the sky in my eyes. Gently the sound of the tide" [30].

Landscape is one of these few Pinter plays which contains references to the space of the future. When Duff talks of any future *locus* he invariably sees Beth in it. And no matter whether he refers to the outside territory or to the room (drawing room) in the house it is the idea of them together, of Beth and himself involved in common activities that permeates the future space. He also longs for communication that he does not find in the space which he now shares with his wife, but his wishes, unlike hers, are directed towards the future.

The opposition of country space and city space as well as of open *loci* and enclosed interiors returns once more in *No Man's Land's* present and past territories. "A memory of the bucolic life" [28] of the past, tea on the lawn, cottages [28, 44] are the attributes of the world that both Hirst and Spooner evoke in their utterances

[26] Similarly, Eigo (1973: 182) concludes: "She will never be able to escape her landscape, that of yesterday grafted on to the present and projected into the future".

relating to the past[27]. These *loci* appear as peopled by friends, companions, mistresses and wives — the past emerges in their words as the time of friendship, love affairs and family feelings, and as such it is contrasted with the present space — Hirst's permanent *locus* — of isolation and withdrawal from life. In the past the windows were open, the border with the outside world could be easily crossed, the present *locus* is isolated from its surrounding by the blinds which cover the windows even during the daytime. The old friends are gone, the present space is inhabited by two sinister guards (servants?). This is the *locus* that Spooner enters as the play opens and, although it turns out to become only a temporary space for him yet, he immediately experiences its laws and regulations. Hirst's permanent imprisonment is paralleled by Spooner's being locked in the living room overnight. He gets a taste of what Hirst suffers all the time in his no man's land[28].

In this space of the present nothing changes, nothing happens, it is the *locus* of utter stagnation[29] while constant mutability[30], above all the ever changing relationships among people, characterized the *loci* of the past. These changes were not necessarily viewed as positive by the characters but at least they signified that people were alive then. In the present space they are just preserved in alcohol like the specimens of an extinct species — the abundance of bottles with various spirits on an antique cabinet is "the central feature of the room" [9]. This central spacial position points to the importance of drinking for Hirst; this is the only way in which he can endure the universe in which he lives now (Both men recollect tea cups, not whiskey glasses in their past *loci*.). In Peter Hall's original production the room was semi-circular which gave the cabinet, actually a large table in this performance, an altar-like position. Hirst also believes that one can preserve one's past by symbolically enclosing it in a photograph album. Like Beth, he tries to retain the illusion that his space of the past has not vanished:

> My true friends look out at me from my album. I had my world. I have it. Don't think now that it's gone. I'll choose to sneer at it, to cast doubt on it, to wonder if it properly existed. No. We're talking of my youth, which can never leave me. No. It existed. It was solid, the people in it were solid, while... transformed by light, while being sensitive... to all the changing light [45].

[27] Billington (1975: 10) observes that the contrast between the space presented and that which was created in words was very obvious in the performance of the play yet he failed to notice that an important part of the outside space belonged to the past: "Peter Hall's metronomically precise production also brings out the extraordinary contrast of images that is part of the key to the play — outside a world of country cottages, sunlit lawns, bucolic gaiety, inside hothouse order, ostentatious wealth, endless booze".

[28] According to Robert Cushman (1975: 32) the title "*No Man's Land* may denote the area of ground — Hirst's house — in which the characters are struggling to gain or retain a footing... But when the phrase actually occurs in the dialogue it is used of a state of mind: a sense of time having ceased and all memories having jelled into a single immovable instant".

[29] Billington (1975: 10) compares the characters to the figures in Keats's "Ode On a Grecian Urn" and to Barber (1975: 15): the situation "is so static as to verge on dramatic inertia".

[30] E.g. travels are mentioned as undertaken in the past: Spooner's trip to Amsterdam, Foster's enjoyable exotic journey to Siam and Bali.

To him the present space is hazy, the shapes are blurred by alcohol while the past and its inhabitants are still solid[31]. Yet, at times he starts to doubt and question the validity of his memories and the existence of the space that he reminisces about "It's gone. Did it exist? It's gone. It never existed. It remains. I am sitting here forever" [46]. Hirst is torn between his desire to escape into the past world and the awareness, which sometimes becomes clear to him, that the past is gone and that it could actually be different than what he now remembers.

For Spooner, the present space which he has entered as a guest constitutes a value to be gained. The features that appeal to him are its comfort and luxury. The reconstruction of Spooner's past space is an impossible task; he himself creates the already discussed images of pastoral country space and refers to his sophisticated and immoral days at Oxford (these are the *loci* which he is supposed to have shared with Hirst) but Briggs and Foster associate him with a public house where they knew him as a beer mug collector. This difficulty in associating Spooner permanently with any particular *locus*, and the fact that he, in some way, fits in all these spaces and in some way, does not belong to any of them allows the viewing of him as a character of the road, especially that he mentions Jack Straw Castle as one of his *loci* — a public house frequented in the past by highway men [23]. Spooner's attempt to win himself a living space fails. Hirst states his reluctance to share his space and his life with anybody and he does it in terms that are clearly spatial: "There are places in my heart... where no living soul... has... or can ever... trespass" [84]. Yet, at the end it seems that Spooner becomes conscious of the negative values of the *locus* for which he was fighting. He will resume his journey through time and space.

The most striking feature of Pinter's presentation of space in his dramas is the ever-repeating series of oppositions. They exist in the spaces which are contemporary in relation to each other, they make their appearance in the space of the past versus that of the present and in the space of the future considered in reference to the present *locus*.

Ptachecki (1978: 55—79) is of the opinion that the result of locating certain spatial spheres in the pre-action and thus attributing to them the *plus-quam-perfect* time feature is that these spheres become included in the time sequence which is different than the time of the events. Consequently, these past territories, even if objectively homogeneous with the spatial spheres of the story itself, belong in fact to a space different than the one which accompanies the proper action.

In Pinter's works the case is far more pronounced since the *loci* of the present are invariably oppositional to the territories of other time sequences. The opposition may be expressed in various terms and the list is long beginning with open—closed, up—down, dark—light and dry—damp. These classical pairs do not exhaust the theme which is also restated in terms of shabby—elegant, dirty—clean, sumptuous—

[31] A similar concept appears in *A Slight Ache* where Edward's past space was clear, well defined and well arranged [35] while today he can no longer define the space and the objects in it. Alienated from his *locus* he is also disposed of.

—modest, beautiful—ugly, safe—dangerous, respectable—immoral, peopled—
—empty, busy—quiet, moving—immobile, urban—rustic, familiar—unknown, male—female, blurred—solid, domestic—foreign, modern—traditional, old—new (also stated as England—America). These habitual contrasts imply the emotional attitudes involving such feelings as friendship and hostility, love and indifference, involvement and loneliness which develop in the appropriate *loci*. The moral valuation is also implied in displaying the space of stagnation versus that of change or the *locus* of natural behaviour versus that of artificiality.

The values associated with the present and past spaces are not constant, i.e. the space of the past is not always charged with highly positive attributes although this is most often the case. The emotional attitude can be invariably detected in the approach of the character to the space that he evokes, even if his attitude to this *locus* is negative.

While the present *locus* is very frequently sullied with an excess of objects the space of the past can be completely unfurnished. The objects which belong to the present space serve as the signs of the monotonous and repetitive everyday life while the past objects, interesting and unusual, signify the life that has not yet fallen into drudgery and routine. Similarly human relationships are usually reported to have flourished in the past *loci* which were very often destined for this specific purpose. In the present space of confinement human beings are habitually isolated from one another.

All these features indicate the existence of an impassable boundary between the spaces of the past and those of the present. Any links which could possibly indicate the transformation of one into the other, or the character's transition from his past territory into the present one are non-existent. No tangible sign of the past space can be found in the present (with the exception of visitors from the past). The characters do not grow from their past *loci*, what they are at present makes it obvious that they are not the creations of the space which they claim as their past territory. The present space never appears as a continuation or a possible development of the places which they evoke in their recollections. Therefore, it becomes very significant that the space of the future, if referred to by the characters (which does not occur frequently), is, as a rule, isomorphic to the space of the past and does not show any correspondence to the present. Hence, the conclusion may be drawn that the past spaces are mythologized and not presented as realistic pre-spaces of the present while the future is not viewed as any possible development of what exists now. Both, the *loci* of the past and those of the future are related to characters' fantasmagoric aspirations and are the extension of their inner world. Unable to transform the present space to match their dreams they create *espace oniric* in retrospection or, infrequently, they orient it into the future[12].

[12] Although the comparison of Pinter's and Proust's treatment of time does not belong in the present discussion it is tempting to give it at least some attention at this point. In Proust, the episode liberated by a digression about the past, the awakened memory in human consciousness is not connected with the present external episode which freed these memories (see Auerbach 1968: 403 v. II). In Pinter, on the other hand, the past is subordinated to the present and when it is exploited it is most often shaped by the needs of a present moment. According to Auerbach's argument, Pinter's handling of time is typical of monosubjective attitude while in Proust memories viewed in a perspective way and confronted with one another acquire a more general meaning and therefore cannot be treated as merely subjective and individual (Auerbach 1968: 405, v. II). The philosophy of time which Pinter's works seem to reflect (at least to some degree) can be traced back to Kant according to whom "Space and time are subjective, they are part of our apparatus of perception" (Russell 1969: 680). Following Augustynek's analysis of past, present and future (1979: 164—172) it seems legitimate to relate Pinter's approach to relational and subjectivistic theories of time both psychological (ancient) and linguistic (Russell). The events occur when they are expected, perceived and recalled (in its psychological version) or when the statement is uttered that the event occured in the past, present or future (linguistic). "Consequently, if these relations do not hold, i.e. there is no activity of perceivers or language users, then the corresponding events do not occur in past, present and future" (Augustynek 1979: 196). The question of philosophy of time is not the concern of the present author yet "it should be remembered that the writer's philosophy of time determines to some degree the time structure of his work" (Bartoszyński 1967: 41).

It might seem that the opposition of microcosm versus macrocosm both in parallel and in different time sequences with its habitual antithesis of open and enclosed follows the basic model of the archetypal space (Lotman 1976: 225). Yet, in the space of the present the opposition is the result of a highly subjective viewpoint and the positive features commonly associated with the enclosed *locus* tend to be only an illusion. Similarly, in the relationship of the space of the past versus that of the present, the positive values attributed to the past territories do not reflect the objective superiority of the old *loci* but rather the characters' determination to view them as such.

As it follows, both types of space: the enclosed *locus* of the present and the, most often, open territory of the past can constitute the centre of the characters' world and thus may seem parallel to Eliade's (1973: 50) *sacrum*. Yet, the value of this *sacrum* for the characters is very doubtful and unsure although they refuse to face this fact. The characters' decision to rely upon this mentally conceived *sacrum* (in spite of the obvious lack of confirmation in objective reality) elucidates the fact that the life of Pinter's people rests upon illusory foundations. The home space of the present does not confirm the hopes and trust with which it is furnished by its inhabitants and the space of the past cannot be relied upon by definition since it does not exist any more.

The spatial structure of Pinter's drama fulfils the general semiotic model of space (Lotman 1976: 224, 225) in a way which is far from automatic. The open space may acquire positive qualities being associated with aspirations, possibilities and fulfilment. Still, it is even possible to argue that the general spatial system is only superficially relevant since in several cases the enclosed space is only seemingly enclosed and safe while it is, in fact, as violent and unpredictable as the outside (*The Dumb Waiter, The Room* and *The Birthday Party*), or its protectiveness reveals the features of a prison (*No Man's Land*). A Pinter individual is surrounded by the space which, more often than not, is hostile and alien to him, and although he desperately tries to believe that his immediate universe can offer him stability and shelter, yet even this fragment of his world fails him.

In respect to time-space Pinter's characters fall into certain categories: those who have managed to delude themselves about their present *locus* and those who live in their past space. The first attempt to forget and deny the existence of their past territories but find out that it is impossible since the past returns and claims them back (Rose), deprives them of some part of their life (Teddy) or, finally, if seemingly buried together with some aspect of the character's old identity, it can still spring into the present introducing unrest into the supposed stability of the present *locus* (Kate).

Yet, infinitely more common is the pattern according to which the characters, unsatisfied with their present space, return into the past and try to live in their past *loci*. Their lives become a dream-like existence based on utter deception since the qualities of the recalled space cast doubts on whether it had ever existed at all. The debasement of the conventional *topos* of homespace and the necessity of a journey paralleled by the impossibility of life as a journey only add to this tragic situation.

Thus, in either case Pinter's characters cannot come to terms with their position in time and space. The time-space continuum in which they live, whether past, present, or future is their own invention, their subjective spatialized dream, the reflection of their desperate wish to believe that they can totally ignore that or another sphere of the time-space of which they are part.

CONCLUSION

A consistent underlying structure of tragic paradox can be detected in the temporal-spatial dimensions of a Pinter play.

The universe of the plays is intrinsically self-contradictory. Home and the protection it offers are the highest values constantly insisted upon and longed for and, at the same time, the spatial vision again and again ridicules and slanders the possibility of the existence of homespace as a place of safety and peace. There is tragic irony in the desperate desire for home and in the belief in the values of homespace, on the one hand, and in the actual presentation of this homespace as deprived of its traditional meaning, on the other. When the model of existence pursued is that of life as a journey, the outside world, i.e. the proper universe of pilgrims/vagabonds turns out to be charged in their eyes with negative values, avoided and often feared. The status of an inhabitant is unattainable for them and they are imprisoned in the negative space of exile. The journey is shown as their existential necessity — a fate that they bring upon themselves, a hopeless pilgrimage without a goal or with a goal which is but an illusion.

The space viewed in its temporal dimension lacks continuity and harmony. The space of the present and the space of the past (isomorphic to that of the future) are distant islands, with different landscapes, ruled by contrasting laws and inhabited by diametrically different people. The past is a true "foreign country" where things are done "differently". The *locus* of the past is an invented paradise to which the characters flee in order to avoid the present. Yet, again there is tragic irony of human fate in this concept of life as centred and relying upon something that does not exist and, probably, had never existed while the present space, although rejected, ignored and forgotten, is all the time holding the characters in its tight grip. The attempt to reject the memory of one's past space and to live in the present is equally futile; the past *loci* or the emissaries of the past will make their claims. Whichever model is chosen — what results is self-delusion, either about the beauty of the past or the safety and value of the present space.

Thus, there emerges one more aspect of modus of existence of Pinter's people: the motif of self-deception and of tragic entanglement in time and space. The impossibility of facing the reality, whether past or present, results in double falseness: rejection of one and self-delusions about the other. An attempt to deny the existence of one's present or past *locus* is only a temporary solution since, eventually, one is bound to be forced to confront one's own connections with the rejected sphere.

Yet, even the universe in which the characters live (again whether past or present) is not faced as it really is but distorted by self-delusions. In this way the vision of temporal-spatial reality of Pinter's major characters appears as utterly divorced from the existing situation.

Time-space constitutes a value which is desired by the characters but the way in which it is presented in the universe of the plays proves it to be only a deplorable substitute of the longed for ideal. Also the very choice of the means by which the pursued value is to be gained makes the attainment of this ideal *a priori* impossible. It is hoped that the analysis presented in this study and the methods applied have proven the existence of the tragic triangual paradox: the incompatibility between the desire, what is desired, and the means of fulfilling this desire which is at the heart of a Pinter play.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY OF HAROLD PINTER'S CAREER

1930 — Born Hackney, East London, 10 October.

1944-1947 — Attended Hackney Downs Grammar School. Played Romeo and Macbeth in school performances.

1948 — Attended Royal Academy of Dramatic Art for a short time.

1948-1949 — Liable for National Service, declared himself a conscientious objector. Two tribunals refused his application.

1950 — First poems published. First professional engagement as an actor in radio features.

1951 — First professional engagement in Shakespeare (Recording of *Henry VIII*). Attended Central School of Speech and Drama. Began work on the unpublished novel *The Dwarfs*.

1951-1952 — Toured Ireland with Anew McMasters.

1953 — Appeared in classical repertoire at King's Theatre, Hammersmith.

1954-1957 — Acted in provincial repertory theatres.

1956 — Married the actress Vivian Merchant who then played all his leading female roles.

1957 — Wrote *The Room*. *The Room* performed by the Drama Department of Bristol University and by the Drama School attached to the Bristol Old Vic (for *The Sunday Times* student drama competition). Wrote *The Birthday Party* and *The Dumb Waiter*.

1958 — *The Birthday Party* performed at the Arts Theatre, Cambridge (director: Peter Wood) and at the Lyric Theatre, Hammersmith, London. Wrote a radio play *Something in Common* (unperformed and unpublished). Wrote a play *The Hothouse* (discarded).

1959 — *The Dumb Waiter* performed in Germany (Frankfurt am Main). Revue Sketches: *Trouble in the Works* and *The Black and White* performed at the Lyric, Hammersmith in the revue *One to Another*. *A Slight Ache* broadcast on the BBC Third Programme (director: Donald McWhinnie). *A Night Out* written.

1960 — *The Room* (director: Harold Pinter) and *The Dumb Waiter* (director: James Roose-Evans) performed at the Hampstead Theatre Club. *A Night Out* broadcast (BBC Third Programme, director: Donald McWhinnie) and televised (ABC — TV, director: Philip Saville). *The Caretaker* opened at the Arts Theatre Club, London (director: D. McWhinnie). *Night School* televised (Associated Rediffusion, director: Joan Kemp-Welch). *The Dwarfs* broadcast (BBC Third Programme, director: Barbara Bray).

1961 — *A Slight Ache* staged at the Arts Theatre Club, London (director: D. McWhinnie). *The*

Collection televised (Associated Rediffusion, director: Joan Kemp-Welch), *A Night Out* staged in Dublin (Gate Theatre, director: Leila Blake) and in London (Comedy Theatre) *The Caretaker* received the Page One Award of the Newspaper Guild of New York.

1962 — *The Collection* staged at the Aldwych (director: Peter Hall and Harold Pinter, beginning of Pinter's association with the Royal Shakespeare Company). *The Examination* read by Pinter in the BBC Third Programme. *The Servant* directed by Joseph Losey released in London.

1963 — *The Lover* televised (Associated Rediffusion, director: Joan Kemp-Welch). *The Lover* wins the Prix Italia for Television Drama at Naples and several awards from the Guild of British Television Producers and Directors. The film version of *The Caretaker* (director: Clive Donner) awarded a Silver Bear at the Berlin Film Festival. *The Lover* (director: Harold Pinter) and *The Dwarfs* (director: Harold Pinter and Guy Vaesen) staged at the Arts Theatre Club, London.

1964 — Broadcast of nine revue sketches: *Last to Go, Applicant, Request Stop, That's Your Trouble, That's All, Interview, Trouble in the Works, The Black and White, Dialogue for Three* (director: Michael Bakewell). *The Servant* awarded by the British Screenwriters' Guild (for the screenplay). *Tea Party* (short story) read by Pinter on the BBC Third Programme.

1965 — British Film Academy Award for the adaptation of *The Pumpkin Eater* (director: Jack Clayton). *Tea Party* televised by BBC1 (The Largest Theatre in the World series, director: Charles Jarrott). *The Homecoming* opened at the Aldwych, London (director: Peter Hall).

1966 — Awarded Commander of the Order of the British Empire in the Birthday Honours List. *The Quiller Memorandum* released (director: Michael Anderson).

1967 — *The Basement* televised (BBC TV, director: Charles Jarrott). (*The Basement* was written as a film script titled *The Compartment*). *Accident* released (director: Joseph Losey). *The Homecoming* won the Tony and the Whitbread Anglo-American award on Broadway and was voted best play by the New York Drama Critics' Circle. Robert Shaw's *The Man in the Glass Booth* directed by Pinter opened at St. Martin's Theatre, London.

1968 — *Landscape* broadcast on the BBC Third Programme (director: Guy Veasen). The film version of *The Birthday Party* released (director: William Friedkin).

1969 — The adaptation of *The Go-Between* completed. *Night* performed at the Comedy Theatre, London. *Landscape* and *Silence* opened at the Aldwych Theatre, London (director: Peter Hall).

1970 — Adwarded Hamburg University Shakespeare Prize and Hon. D. Litt., Reading University; same degrees subsequently from universities of Birmingham (1971), Glasgow and East Anglia (1974). Directed James Joyce's *Exiles* at the Mermaid Theatre.

1971 — *Old Times* opened at the Aldwych, London (director: Peter Hall). *The Go-Between* awarded at Cannes Film Festival. Directed Simon Gray's *Butley* at the Criterion Theatre.

1972 — Completed the adaptation of Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past.*

1973 — *Monologue* televised (BBC TV, director: Christopher Morahn). Directed the film of *Butley.*

1974 — Completed the screenplay of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Last Tycoon.* Wrote *No Man's Land.* Directed *Next of Kin* by John Hopkins at the National Theatre, London.

1975 — *No Man's Land* opened at the National Theatre, London (director: Peter Hall).

HAROLD PINTER'S WORKS: FIRST PERFORMANCES AND FIRST PRINTINGS

PLAYS		First performance		First published
The Room	stage	20 December	1957	1960
	(public perf.	21 January	1960)	
The Birthday Party	stage	28 April	1958	1959
A Slight Ache	radio	29 July	1959	1961
The Dumb Waiter	stage	21 January	1960	1960
A Night Out	radio	1 March	1960	1961
The Caretaker	stage	27 April	1960	1960
Night School	television	21 July	1960	1967
The Dwarfs	radio	2 December	1960	1961
The Collection	television	11 May	1961	1963
The Lover	television	28 March	1963	1963
Tea Party	television	25 March	1965	1967
The Homecoming	stage	3 June	1965	1965
The Basement	television	20 February	1967	1967
Landscape	radio	25 April	1968	1968
Night	stage	9 April	1969	1969
Silence	stage	2 July	1969	1969
Old Times	stage	1 June	1971	1971
Monologue	radio	April	1973	1973
No Man's Land	stage	23 April	1975	1975
REVUE SKETCHES				
Trouble in the Works	stage	15 July	1959	1961
The Black and White	stage	15 July	1959	1961
Getting Acquainted	stage	3 September	1959	manuscr. lost
Request Stop	stage	3 September	1959	1961
Special Offer	stage	3 September	1959	1967
Last to Go	stage	3 September	1959	1961
That's All	radio	Feb/March	1964	undated
That's Your Trouble	radio	Feb/March	1964	undated
Applicant	radio	Feb/March	1964	1961
Interview	radio	Feb/March	1964	undated
Dialogue for Three	radio	Feb/March	1964	1963
SHORT STORIES, ESSAYS, SPEECHES				
The Examination	radio	7 September	1962	1958
Tea Party	radio	2 June	1964	1965
Beckett at 60				1967
Mac				1968
Memories of Cricket				1969
Pinter Between the Lines				1962
	(reprinted later as: *Writing for the Theatre*)			
Speech: Hamburg 1970				1971

FILMS

The Servant	14 November	1963	1971
The Pumpkin Eater	15 July	1964	1971
The Quiller Memorandum	10 November	1966	1971
Accident	9 February	1967	1971
The Go-Between		1971	1971
Butley		1973	—

POEMS

as listed in Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES — WORKS BY HAROLD PINTER

Plays:

The room (1968). In *The room and the dumb waiter*. London: Methuen.
The birthday party (1968). London: Methuen.
A slight ache (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The dumb waiter (1968). In *The room and the dumb waiter*. London: Methuen.
A night out (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The caretaker (1968). London: Methuen.
Night school (1974). In *Tea party and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The dwarfs (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The collection (1968). In *The collection and the lover*. London: Methuen.
The lover (1968). In *The collection and the lover*. London: Methuen.
Tea party (1974). In *Tea party and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The homecoming (1968). London: Methuen.
The basement (1974). In *Tea party and other plays*. London: Methuen.
Landscape (1975). In *Landscape and silence*. London: Methuen.
Night (1975). In *Landscape and silence*. London: Methuen.
Silence (1975). In *Landscape and silence*. London: Methuen.
Old times (1973). London: Methuen.
Monologue (1973). London: Covent Garden Press.
No Man's land (1975). London: Methuen.

Revue sketches:

Trouble in the works (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The black and white (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
Request stop (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
Special offer (1967). In Hinchliffe, A. (1967): *Harold Pinter*. New York: Twayne.
Last to go (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
That's all (undated). In *The dwarfs and eight revue sketches*. New York: Dramatists Plays Service.
That's your trouble (undated). In *The dwarfs and eight revue sketches*. New York: Dramatists Plays Service.
Applicant (1968). In *A slight ache and other plays*. London: Methuen.
Interview (undated). In *The dwarfs and eight revue sketches*. New York: Dramatists Plays Service.
Dialogue for three (1963). In *Stand*, VI, 3.

Short stories, essays and speeches:

Tea party (1974). In *Tea party and other plays*. London: Methuen.
The examination (1968). In *The collection and the lover*. London: Methuen.

Beckett (1967). In Calder, J. (ed.): *Beckett at 60. A festschrift*. London: Calder and Boyards.
Mac (1968). Emmanuel Wax for Pendragon Press.
"Memories of cricket" (1969). *Daily Telegraph Magazine* 16 May.
"Writing for the theatre" (1964). *Evergreen Review* 33, 80—82.
"Speech: Hamburg 1970" (1971). *Theatre Quarterly* 1/3, 3—5.

Film scripts:

Five screenplays (1977). London: Methuen.

Poems:

"Rural idyll" (1950). *Poetry London* 20.
"One a story, two a death" (1951). *Poetry London* 22.
Poems (1971). Clodd, A. (ed.). London: Emitharmon Press.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abramowska, J. (1978): "Peregrynacja" In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 125—159.
Alvarez, A. (1959): "Death in the morning". *New Statesman* LVIII, Dec. 12, 836.
Alexander, N. (1974): "Past, present and Pinter". *Essays and Studies*, London: English Association, 1—17.
Amend, V. (1967): "Harold Pinter some credits and some debits". *Modern Drama* 10/2, 167—174.
Auerbach, E. (1968): *Mimesis. Rzeczywistość przedstawiona w literaturze Zachodu*. Trans. Z. Żabicki; vol. I—II, Warszawa: PIW.
Augustynek, Z. (1979): *Przeszłość, teraźniejszość i przyszłość. Studium filozoficzne*. Warszawa: PWN.
Aylwin, T. (1973): "The memory of all that: Pinter's Old times" *English* 22/114, 99—103.
Bachelard, G. (1974): "Dialektyka zewnętrza i wnętrza". Trans. J. Skoczylas. In Karpiński, W. (ed.), 1974, 283—306.
Bachtin, M. (1974): "Czas i przestrzeń w powieści". Trans. J. Faryno. *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXV/4, 173—311.
Barber, J. (1958): "A warning perhaps, but a bore!". *Daily Express* May 20, 12.
Barber, J. (1975): "Richardson and Gielgud in fine partnership". *The Daily Telegraph* April 24, 15.
Barker, F. (1975): "Pinter rubbish so masterly". *Evening News* April 24, 8.
Baker, W. & S. E. Tabachnick (1973): *Harold Pinter*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
Barthel, J. (1967): "If you didn't know it was by Pinter...". *The New York Times* Oct 10, sec. 2, 1—3.
Bartoszyński, K. (1967): "Z problematyki czasu w utworach epickich". In Sławiński, J. (ed.), 1967, 31—77.
Billington, M. (1975): "Old Vic. No man's land". *The Guardian* April 24, 10.
Błoński, J. (1978): "Dramat i przestrzeń". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 197—211.
Boothroyd, J. (1958): "At the play". *Punch* CCXXXIV, May 25, 721.
Bosworth, P. (1968): "Why doesn't he write more". *New York Times* Oct. 27, sec. 2, 3.
Boulton, J. (1972): "Harold Pinter: The caretaker and other plays". In Ganz, A. (ed.), 1972a, 93—105.
Brien, A. (1958): "Communications". *Spectator* CC, May 25, 67.
Brown, J. R. & B. Harris (eds) (1962): *Contemporary theatre*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
Burkman, K. (1968): "Pinter's A slight ache as ritual". *Modern Drama* XI, 326—335.
Burkman, K. (1971): *The dramatic world of Harold Pinter: its basis in ritual*. Athens, Ohio.
Bury, J. — Lahr, J. (1971): "A designer's approach: an interview with John Bury". In Lahr, J. (ed.), 1971a, 27—37.

Butor, M. (1971): *Powieść jako poszukiwanie*. Trans. J. Guze. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Byczkowska, E. (1977): "Pinter's treatment of time in Old times". *Anglica Wratislaviensia* 6, 71—81.
Byczkowska, E. (1981): Recurrent motifs in Harold Pinter's early poetry, prose and drama". *Anglica Wratislaviensia* 8, 63—75.
"Caretaker's caretaker". Anon. (1961). Time LXXVIII, 19 Nov. 10, 76.
Cavander, K. (1963): "Filming The Caretaker. Harold Pinter and Clive Donner interviewed by Kenneth Cavander". *Transatlantic Review* 13, 17—26.
Cohn, R. (1972): "The world of Harold Pinter". In Ganz, A. (ed.), 1972a, 78—93.
Cushman, R. (1975): "Mr. Pinter's spoonerism". *The Observer* April 27, 32.
Czermińska, M. (1978): "Dom w autobiografii i powieści o dzieciństwie". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 229—253.
Darlington, W. (1958): "Mad Meg and lodger". *Daily Telegraph* May 20, 10.
Dukore, B. (1976): *Where laughter stops, Pinter's tragicomedy*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Eigo, J. (1973): "Pinter's Landscape". *Modern Drama* 16, 179—183.
Eliade, M. (1973): *Sacrum, mit, historia*. Trans. A. Tatarkiewicz. Warszawa: PWN.
Esslin, M. (1963): "Godot and his children: the theatre of Samuel Beckett and Harold Pinter". In Armstrong, W. (ed.), 1963, 128—146.
Esslin, M. (1973): *Pinter. A study of his plays*. London: Methuen.
Esslin, M. (1974): *The theatre of the absurd*. London: Pelican Books.
Fjelde, R. (1971): "Plotting Pinter's progress". In Lahr, J. (ed), 1971a, 87—107.
Frank, J. (1963): *Spatial form in modern literature. The widening gyre: crisis and mastery in modern literature*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Indiana U.P.
"From page to screen". Anon. (1971). *The Times Literary Supplement* June 18, 695.
Gabbard, L. P. (1977): *The dream structure of Pinter's plays. A psychoanalytic approach*. N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson U.P.
Gale, S. (1972): "Harold Pinter: an annotated bibliography 1957—1971". *Bulletin of Biography and Magazine Notes* Faxon, Westwood, Mass., 29/2, 46—56.
Gale, S. (1977): *Butter's going up: a critical analysis of Harold Pinter's work*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke U.P.
Ganz, A. (1972): "Mixing memory and desire: Pinter's vision in Landscape, Silence and Old times". In Ganz, A. (ed.), 1972a, 161—179.
Ganz, A. (ed.) (1972a): *Pinter. A collection of critical essays*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
Genette, G. (1976): "Przestrzeń i język". Trans. by A. W. Labuda. *Pamiętnik literacki* LXVII/1, 227—233.
Głowiński, M. (1978): "Przestrzenne tematy i wariacje". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds.), 1978a, 79—97.
Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds) (1978a): *Przestrzeń i literatura*. In *Z dziejów form artystycznych w literaturze polskiej*, vol. II, Wrocław: Ossolineum.
Gordon, L. (1968): "Pigeonholing Pinter: a bibliography". *Theatre Documentation* I/1, 3—20.
Gordon, L. (1969): *Stratagems to uncover nakedness: the dramas of Harold Pinter*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Gottfried, M. (1967): *A theater divided. The postwar American stage*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
Hagberg, P. O. (1972): *The dramatic works of Samuel Beckett and Harold Pinter. A comparative analysis of main themes and dramatic technique*. University of Gothenburg.
Hall, P. — Wardle, I. (1971): "A director's approach. An interview with Peter Hall". In Lahr, J. (ed.), 1971a, 9—25.
Hartley, L. P. (1965): *The go-between*. Penguin.
Hayman, R. (1975): *Harold Pinter*. London: Heinemann.
Hewes, H. (1967): "Pinter's hilarious depth charge". *Saturday Review* Jan. 21, 51.
Hinchliffe, A. (1967): *Harold Pinter*. New York: Twayne.
Hobson, H. (1958): "The screw turns again". *The Sunday Times* May 25, 11.
Hobson, H. (1969): "Paradise lost". *The Sunday Times*, July 6, 52.
Hobson, H. (1971): "Remembrance of things past". *The Sunday Times* June 6, 29.

Hollis, J. (1970): *Harold Pinter: the poetics of silence*. U.P. London: Feffler & Simons.
Imhof, R. (1975): *Pinter. A bibliography*. London: TQ Publications Ltd.
Jackson, F. (1958): "The new shows". *Sunday Citizen* May 25, 7.
Janus, E. & M. R. Mayenowa (eds) (1977): *Semiotyka kultury*. Warszawa: PIW.
Karpiński, W. (1974): *Antologia współczesnej krytyki literackiej we Francji*. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
Kerr, W. (1967): *Harold Pinter*. New York: Columbia U.P.
Kitchin, L. (1969): *Mid-century drama*. London: Faber.
Kitchin, L. (1966): *Drama in the sixties, form and interpretation*. London: Faber.
Knight, W. (1963): "The Kitchen sink". *Encounter* XXI/6 Dec., 48—54.
Kwilecki, A. (ed.) (1975): *Florian Znaniecki i jego rola w socjologii*. Poznań: UAM.
Lahr, J. (1971): "Pinter the spaceman". In Lahr, J. (ed.), 1971b, 175—195.
Lahr, J. (ed.) (1971a): *A casebook on Harold Pinter's The homecoming*. New York: Grove Press.
Lahr, J. (1972): "Pinter and Chekhov: the bond of naturalism". In Ganz, A. (ed.), 1972a, 60—72.
Lambert, J. W. (1975): "The birthday party". *Drama* Spring, 47—49.
Lambert, J. W. (1975a): "No man's land". *Drama* Summer, 37—39.
Leech, C. (1962): "Two romantics: Arnold Wesker and Harold Pinter". In Brown, J. R. & B. Harris (eds), 1962, 11—31.
Lotman, J. (1976): "Problem przestrzeni artystycznej". Trans. J. Faryno. *Pamiętnik literacki* LXVII/1, 213—227.
Lotman, J. (1977): "Zagadnienia przestrzeni artystycznej w prozie Gogola". Trans. J. Faryno. In Janus, E. & M. R. Mayenowa (eds), 1977, 213—266.
Lumley, F. (1972): *New trends in 20th century drama. A survey since Ibsen and Shaw*. London: Barrie and Jenkins.
MacAuley, G. (1975): "The problem of identity, form and theatrical method in Les Nègres, Kaspar and Old times". *Southern Review* VIII/1, 51—65.
Markiewicz, H. (ed.) (1967): *Problemy teorii literatury*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
Marowitz, C. & T. Milne (eds) (1965): *The Encore reader*. London: Methuen.
Marowitz, C. (1967): "Pinterism is maximum tension through minimum information". *The New York Times Magazine* Oct 1, sec. 6, 36, 89, 92, 94—96.
Martinau, S. (1973): "Pinter's Old times: the memory game". *Modern Drama* 16, 287—295.
Martuszewska, A. (1979): "Problem tzw. interferencji elementów rzeczywistości przedstawionej dzieła literackiego". In Niedzielski, C. & J. Sławiński (eds), 1979.
Michałowska, T. (1978): "Wizja przestrzeni w liryce staropolskiej". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 97—123.
Miodońska-Brookes, E. (1972): *Studia o kompozycji dramatów Stanisława Wyspiańskiego*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
Moritz, C. (ed.) (1963): *Current bibliography*. New York.
Mukarovsky, J. (1970): *Wśród znaków i struktur*. Trans. J. Baluch, M. R. Mayenowa, J. Mayen, L. Pszczółkowska. Warszawa: PIW.
Myson, M. (1958): "Horror comic". *Daily Worker* May 26, 2.
Niedzielski, C. & J. Sławiński (eds) (1979): *Tekst i fabuła*. In *Z dziejów form artystycznych w literaturze polskiej*, Wrocław: Ossolineum.
Nickludow, S. (1977): "'Sujet'-a relacje przestrzenno-czasowe w rosyjskiej bylinie. Tezy". Trans. A. Jędrzejkiewicz. In Janus, E. & M. R. Mayenowa (eds), 1977, 358—363.
Normington, J. — Lahr, J. (1971): "An actor's approach: an interview with John Normington". In Lahr, J. (ed.), 1971a, 137—150.
Palmer, H. & A. Dyson (1968): "Harold Pinter". In *European drama criticism*. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 314—317.
Pei, M. (1964): *The story of language*. New York: Mentor Books. "People are talking about..." Anon. (1962). *Vogue* 139, Jan 15, 38—39.
Pesta, J. (1972): "Pinter's usurpers". In Ganz, A. (ed.), 1972a, 123—136.
Pinter, H. (1960): "Letter". *Sunday Times* August 14.

Pinter—Avant Garde... "Mr. Harold Pinter — avant-garde playwright an intimate revue". Anon. (1959). *The Times* Nov. 16, 4.
Pinter, H. — Bakewell, J. (1969): "In an empty bandstand — Harold Pinter in conversation with Joan Bakewell". *The Listener* 82/2119 Nov. 6, 630—631.
Pinter, H. — Dean, M. (1969): "Harold Pinter talks to Michael Dean". *The Listener* 81/2084 March 6, 312.
Pinter, H. — Findlater, R. (1961): "Writing for myself. Pinter in conversation with Richard Findlater". *Twentieth Century* 169 Feb., 172—175.
Pinter, H. — Gussow, M. (1971): "A conversation (Pause) with Harold Pinter". *The New York Times Magazine* Dec. 5, 42—43, 126—136.
Pinter, H. — Thompson, H. (1961): "Harold Pinter replies". *New Theatre Magazine* II/2 Jan., 8—10.
Pinter, H. — Bensky, L. (1966): "The art of the theatre III. Harold Pinter: an interview". *The Paris Review* 39 Fall, 13—37.
Płachecki, M. (1978): "Przestrzenny kontekst fabuły". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 55—79.
"Playwright on his own". Anon. (1963): *The Observer* Sept. 14, 13.
Popiel, M. (1979): "Od topografii do przestrzeni mitycznej. Analiza przestrzeni w *Ziemi obiecanej* Reymonta". *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXX/4, 89—133.
Quigley, A. (1975): *The Pinter problem*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton U.P.
Ratajczak, D. (1978): "Przestrzeń domu w dramacie i teatrze". *Pamiętnik Literacki* LXIX/2, 86—110.
Russel, B. (1969): *History of western philosophy and its connection with political and social circumstances from the earliest times to the present day*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
Scholes, R. (1974): *Structuralism in literature*. New Haven: Yale U.P.
Schroll, H. (1971): *Harold Pinter. A study of his reputation (1958—1969) and a checklist*. N. J.: Scarecrow Press.
Schulman, M. (1958): "Sorry Mr. Pinter, you're just not funny enough". *Evening Standard* May 20, 6.
Schulman, M. (1975): "Word game made for two..." *Evening Standard* April 24, 19.
Skuczyński, J. (1978): "Przestrzeń w Lilli Wenedzie Juliusza Słowackiego". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 173—194.
Skwarczyńska, S. (1958): "Koncepcja sztuki teatralnej Etienne Souriau". *Dialog* 6, 106—110.
Sławińska, I. (1960): *Sceniczny gest poety*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Sławińska, I. (1967): "Struktura dzieła teatralnego. Propozycje badawcze". In Markiewicz, H. (ed.), 1967, 290—310.
Sławińska, I. (1971): *Reżyserska ręka Norwida*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Sławińska, I. (1979): *Współczesna refleksja o teatrze*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
Sławiński, J. (ed.) (1967): *W kręgu zagadnień teorii powieści*. In *Z dziejów form artystycznych w literaturze polskiej*, vol. 7, Wrocław: Ossolineum.
Sławiński, J. (1978): "Przestrzeń w literaturze: elementarne rozróżnienia i wstępne oczywistości". In Głowiński, M. & A. Okopień-Sławińska (eds), 1978a, 9—23.
Spanos, W. (1971): "Modern drama and the Aristotelian tradition: the formal imperatives of absurd time". *Contemporary Literature* 12, 345—372.
States, B. (1972): "Pinter's Homecoming: the shock of nonrecognition". In Ganz, A. (ed.), 1972a, 147—161.
Sykes, A. (1972): *Harold Pinter*. St. Lucia: Queensland U.P.
Taylor, J. R. (1966): "Accident". *Sight and Sound* 35/4, 176—185.
Taylor, J. R. (1969): *Harold Pinter*. London: Longmans.
Taylor, J. R. (1971a): *The second wave. British drama for the seventies*. London: Methuen.
Taylor, J. R. (1974): *Anger and after: guide to the new British drama*. London: Methuen.
Thirkell, A. (1975): "Fanny, peculiar..." *Daily Mirror* April 24, 16.
Tinker, J. (1975): "Maybe not his most profound — but riveting". *Daily Mail* April 24, 24.
Trussler, S. (1974): *The plays of Harold Pinter. An assesment*. London: Victor Gollancz.
Tynan, K. (1968): Part I. "In search of Harold Pinter: is he the mystery his critics allege?". *Evening Standard* April 25, 7.

Tynan, K. (1968a): Part II. "In search of Harold Pinter. We're pretty tight as a family..." *Evening Standard* April 26, 8.
Tynan, K. (1958): "At the theatre. Eastern approaches". *The Observer* May 25, 15.
Tynan, K. (1967): *Tynan right and left*. London: Longmans.
Tynan, K. (1968): "Shouts and murmurs". *The Observer* May 26, 30.
Wallis, A. (1975): "Znanieckiego socjologiczne podstawy ekologii ludzkiej". In Kwilecki, A. (ed.), 127—133.
Wardle, I. (1958): "The birthday party". *Encore* V July-August, 39—40.
Wardle, I. (1958a): "Comedy of menace" *Encore* V Sept-Oct., 28—33.
Wardle, I. (1962): "Laughter in the wilderness". *The Observer* June 24, 23.
Wardle, I. (1971): "The territorial struggle". In Lahr, J. (ed.), 1971a, 37—45.
Warner, J. (1970): "The epistemological quest in Pinter's *The Homecoming*". *Contemporary Literature* 11, 340—353.
Wellwarth, G. (1965): *The theatre of protest and paradox*. London: Macgibbon & Kee.
Wilson, C. (1958): "Cheers for the mad guests". *Daily Mail* May 20, 3.
Worth, K. (1972): *Revolutions in modern drama*. London: G. Bell & Sons.
Znaniecki, F. (1931): *Studia nad antagonizmem do obcych*. Poznań: Rolnicza Drukarnia i Księgarnia Nakład.
Znaniecki, F. (1938): "Socjologiczne podstawy ekologii ludzkiej". *Ruch Prawniczy i Ekonomiczny* 18/1, 89—110.

STRUKTURA CZASO-PRZESTRZENI W DRAMATACH HAROLDA PINTERA 1957—1975

Streszczenie

Celem pracy jest zbadanie kategorii czaso-przestrzeni, podstawowego elementu struktury dramatu w dużym stopniu determinującego inne elementy jego struktury, w sztukach wybitnego współczesnego dramaturga angielskiego Harolda Pintera. Analiza czaso-przestrzeni, ujawnienie istniejących w tej kategorii prawidłowości, regularności i cech charakterystycznych daje możliwość określenia znaczących cech poetyki dramaturga i służy poznaniu specyfiki dzieła autora. W pracy posłużono się pluralizmem metodologicznym. Zastosowano metody badawcze analizy literackiej zaczerpnięte z semiologii i socjologii, nie używane dotychczas w literaturze przedmiotu. Rozważana jest ontologia czaso-przestrzeni jako całości i sposób jej funkcjonowania w teatrze oraz współzależności między czaso-przestrzenią a postaciami dramatów.

W pracy zaproponowano sposób badania czaso-przestrzeni jako całości poprzez zestawianie ze sobą przestrzeni różnych sekwencji czasowych. Mówi się tu o przestrzeniach sobie współczesnych, przestrzeni teraźniejszości wobec przeszłości, teraźniejszości wobec przyszłości oraz przeszłości wobec przyszłości.

Przestrzeń sceniczna w dramatach Pintera zarysowana w didaskaliach oraz tekście głównym jest ukształtowana poprzez konwencję sceny pudełkowej. Ten ograniczający typ sceny, uwypuklający motyw zamknięcia wykorzystany jest do maksimum i podkreśla ważną rolę kategorii granicy i kanałów łączących przestrzeń sceniczną z przestrzenią pozasceniczną. Przestrzeń pozasceniczna nie jest zwykle kreowana za pomocą znaków akustycznych, ale przy użyciu znaków werbalnych i postaci, które funkcjonują jako znaki tej przestrzeni. Postaci łączące te dwa antytetyczne typy przestrzeni związane są z ideą ruchu. Postaci locusów zamkniętych są ograniczone w przemieszczaniu się w przestrzeni aż zamierają w bezruchu w późniejszych sztukach.

Granica dzieli też świat przedstawiony Pintera na przestrzeń własną i cudzą. Przestrzeń własna jest najczęściej homologicznym przedłużeniem postaci, ale może stać się przestrzenią cudzą wraz z nadejściem postaci z zewnątrz. Przestrzeń cudza postrzegana jest przez postaci jako obca i wroga. Granica może też przecinać samą przestrzeń sceniczną na odizolowane mikroświaty o identycznej konstrukcji. Granica nie oddziela już niczego a przestrzenie przedstawione są przestrzeniami psychicznymi.

Opozycja przestrzenna własna-cudza sugeruje problem przestrzeni domu. Tradycyjny *topos* przestrzeni domu jest w dramatach Pintera konsekwentnie wyszydzany. Gdy zaś modelem egzystencji jest życie jako wędrówka, wędrowiec pozbawiony statusu mieszkańca uwięziony jest w negatywnie przez niego odczuwanej przestrzeni zewnętrznej, przestrzeni wygnania. Podróż jest koniecznością egzystencjalną, ale jest to beznadziejna podróż bez celu.

Przestrzeń pozasceniczna czasu teraźniejszego składa się z dwóch sfer. Dalsza przestrzeń to topograficznie pseudo-realistyczny *locus spatiosus*, złożony z wielu *loci particulari*. Autor wprowadza sporo danych empirycznych i faktograficznych, ale nie chodzi tu o odzwierciedlenie konkretnej sytuacji przestrzennej. Sposób przywoływania przestrzeni mówi o postaci, która ją ewokuje. Natomiast sfera bezpośrednio sąsiadująca z przestrzenią sceniczną ukazuje się jako *locus horridus*. Stworzony

jedynie za pomocą werbalnych systemów znakowych nie może być zweryfikowany, co prowadzi do mitologizacji tej warstwy przestrzennej.

Przestrzeń jest wartością, o którą się walczy. Wyraźna jest współzależność między wartościami przestrzennymi i nieprzestrzennymi. Zastosowanie kategorii pozycji ekologicznej pozwoliło wykryć, że Pinter posługuje się specyficznymi przypadkami przyjęcia outsidera na teren należący do grupy jako przybranego członka, gościa i przybłędy.

Jeżeli idzie o współistnienie przestrzeni różnych sekwencji czasowych, locusy teraźniejszości jawią się jako niezmiennie opozycyjne w stosunku do terytoriów innych planów. Przestrzeń teraźniejszości może być, wbrew jej realiom, odczuwana jako zdecydowanie pozytywna i skontrastowana z negatywnie odbieranym locusem przeszłości, o którym pamięć postaci usiłują pogrzebać. Jednak o wiele częściej przestrzeń przeszłości ukazuje się jako wyidealizowana arkadia, przestronny *locus amoenus* zabudowany przedmiotami przeznaczonymi do zaspokajania potrzeb duchowych, podczas gdy negatywna przestrzeń teraźniejszości zabrudzona jest nadmiarem przedmiotów służących jedynie potrzebom podstawowym.

Przejście z jednego typu przestrzeni w inny związane jest z radykalnymi zmianami, jakie zachodzą w postaci. Cechy te wskazują na istnienie nieprzekraczalnej granicy między przestrzenią teraźniejszą a przeszłą. Brak jest śladów transformacji jednej w drugą, znaki przestrzeni przeszłej nie istnieją w teraźniejszości. Postaci nie są tworami przestrzeni, na którą się powołują. Przestrzeń przyszłości, rzadko ewokowana, jest zawsze izomorficzna do przestrzeni przeszłości i nie odpowiada przestrzeni obecnej. Stąd wniosek, że przestrzenie przeszłe są mitologizowane, a nie istnieją jako realistyczne pra-przestrzenie teraźniejszości, podczas gdy przyszłość nie ukazuje się jako jej logiczny rozwój. Lokusy przeszłości i przyszłości są wynikiem fantasmagorycznych aspiracji postaci i przedłużeniem ich świata wewnętrznego. Nie będąc w stanie przetworzyć przestrzeni teraźniejszej tak, by odpowiadała ich marzeniom, tworzą retrospektywną przestrzeń oniryczną albo, z rzadka, orientują ją ku przyszłości.

Analiza czaso-przestrzeni w dramatach Pintera ujawnia istnienie tragicznego paradoksu. Paradoks ten ma formę trójkąta, który konstytuują trzy elementy: pragnienie, realnie istniejący obiekt pragnienia i sposób realizacji tego pragnienia. Pragnieniem jest czaso-przestrzeń — marzenie, wizja czaso-przestrzeni. Cel, realnie istniejący w rzeczywistości przedstawionych dramatów, to żałosny substytut wymarzonej wartości a sposób realizacji tego celu *a priori* uniemożliwia jego osiągnięcie.