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ABSTRACT

This is a study concerned with the translation of formulaic expressions (FEs) and modifications (MODs) from English into Swedish in the following plays by Harold Pinter: The Birthday Party (1958), The Caretaker (1960), The Homecoming (1965), No Man's Land (1975) and Moonlight (1993).

Chapter I outlines the characteristics of the language of Pinter's plays. The findings of linguistic and biographical research related to Pinter are presented in order for a satisfactory understanding of the language of Pinter's plays to be obtained.

Chapter II investigates the critical reception of Pinter's plays in the UK, the USA, France and Sweden. Research findings obtained are presented in order to establish the problems presented by the source texts (STs) with respect to their comprehension and the difficulty of identifying FEs and MODs in five plays by Pinter.

In Chapter III, the terms cultural and linguistic FEs are defined and a framework for different types of FEs and MODs is introduced. In addition, proposed guidelines, options and strategies for the translation of FEs and MODs are presented. These are then applied to actual translation examples in Chapter IV, which is a comparative analysis of the English STs and the Swedish target texts (TTs). The emphasis is on assessing the translation of FEs and MODs in the five plays by Pinter mentioned above, illustrating the conclusions drawn with the help of examples.

Chapter V presents the findings of a questionnaire that was carried out in order to obtain qualitative data, which would indicate whether a group of native speakers of English would have difficulties identifying a selection of FEs and MODs in five plays by Pinter.

The summing up of the findings is presented in the Conclusion.
INTRODUCTION

The focus of this thesis is on the translation of cultural and linguistic formulaic expressions (FEs), particularly the translation of culture-based, here "cultural" FEs in the plays by Harold Pinter. The term cultural FEs is used in preference to the word "allusion" in order to ensure that the new term will not be confused with different meanings and associations that the word "allusion" brings to mind. A different term from "allusion" was also chosen in order to make clear beyond doubt the nature of the subject under study.

A small-scale survey carried out for my MA dissertation in 1998 suggested that native speakers of English did not understand a selection of allusions in *Moonlight*. The conclusion was drawn that allusions in Harold Pinter's play *Moonlight* (1993) were not successfully translated into Swedish because Kristina Lugn, the Swedish translator of the play, similarly did not fully understand Pinter's use of allusions. Little research seems to have been focussed on the translation of allusions, but Ritva Leppihalme's empirical study of the translation and understanding of allusions (1997) suggests that Finnish university students of English found it difficult to recognise and understand allusions in English texts. Leppihalme's study also indicates that Finnish translators tended to opt for a close or literal translation of allusions and that a close or literal translation of allusions resulted in the Finnish students in her study often failing to recognise or understand English allusions in translation into Finnish.

As Leppihalme's study suggests that non-native speakers of English find it difficult to understand allusions in English texts as well as in translation and since my survey in 1998 indicated that native speakers of English failed to identify allusions in Pinter's play *Moonlight*, I concluded that a non-native speaker of English such as Kristina Lugn is likely to have encountered difficulties in identifying and translating allusions in Pinter's play *Moonlight* into Swedish (Bergfeldt 1998). Also, Leppihalme's finding that translators often opt for a close
translation of allusions and the discovery that the Swedish translator of Moonlight had applied the same strategy suggests that either some of the allusions in the ST were not identified or that a close translation was chosen, because the translators did not engage in sufficient research. Either way, close translations cannot always be considered a satisfactory translation option for allusions since it often leaves the readers nonplussed.

Having established that a selection of allusions in Moonlight by Pinter were not successfully translated into Swedish, some of Pinter's other plays were studied. It was discovered that allusions or cultural FEs in several of his plays failed to be transferred correctly into Swedish. As a result, further research was carried out into a selection of Harold Pinter's plays. The plays chosen were The Birthday Party, The Caretaker, The Homecoming, No Man's Land and Moonlight. The Birthday Party, No Man's Land and Moonlight were chosen because they seemed, at a first glance, to contain many cultural FEs. The purpose of including The Caretaker, which did not appear to contain many cultural FEs, was to compare and contrast it with The Birthday Party. Could the seeming lack of allusions in The Caretaker have contributed to its success in 1960, and could the many allusions in The Birthday Party and the problems they presented in terms of easy comprehension have contributed to its failure in 1958? The Homecoming (1965) was included in order to widen the scope for the study of the early critical reception of Pinter's plays. The reception of Pinter's plays was not limited to Britain and the USA, but was extended to France and Sweden in order to pinpoint differences between English-speaking countries and countries where his plays by necessity had to be performed in translation. I also wanted to investigate if there were comments on the language of Pinter's plays, especially with regard to FEs.

Prior to researching the initial critical reception of Pinter's plays, I consulted scholarly works on Pinter's language and his plays in order to gain an insight into the way Pinter writes and to obtain a better understanding of his plays. I also carried out further research on Pinter as a man and as a writer, since additional knowledge about the writer may help interpret his work.
Although Leppihalme's empirical study on the translation of allusions (1997), including the translation guidelines and the translation options put forward in her study, was my prime source, Peter Newmark's translation strategies (1995) for the translation of metaphors also proved to be helpful. Leppihalme (1997) and Moon (1998) were also useful in my attempt to define what has been termed a formulaic expression (FE).

In order to be able to assess whether or not an FE has been successfully translated into another language, the terms cultural and linguistic FEs are first discussed and defined and a framework for different modifications (MODs) that may be carried out on these FEs are then outlined. For the same purpose, a set of translation guidelines and translation options are discussed and outlined. Next, the translation guidelines and options are applied to FEs from five of Pinter's plays and their translations into Swedish with the aim of trying to illustrate different ways of translating FEs successfully into another language, in particular, to illustrate why a close or literal translation may not always be the best solution.

In addition, to support the suggestion put forward that FEs in Pinter's plays are difficult to identify and understand, the findings of a questionnaire carried out in order to test this hypothesis are presented.

A presentation of the findings and the conclusions drawn with regard to the translation of FEs in five plays by Pinter from English into Swedish concludes this study.
CHAPTER I

The Language of Pinter's Plays

Introduction

Pinter is a playwright who is not inclined to discuss his work. Since 1960 when his fourth play *The Caretaker* was produced - his first success - there has been much discussion of his plays. The one facet, which has attracted most critical comment, is his language. This is not surprising since the complexity and originality of his writing is quite unique.

The fact that Pinter is very reluctant to discuss his work may be one contributing factor to the abundance of comments: without much assistance from the playwright, it is only through individual analyses that critics and scholars might arrive at an understanding of his work.

In order to illustrate characteristic features of Pinter's language, excerpts from some of his plays will be discussed. Views on the actual meaning and interpretation of Pinter's plays vary among scholars, and as a result, the presented outline here constitutes only one suggestion as regards plot and interpretation.

In addition, since previous research (Bergfeldt 1998) suggests that Pinter's play *Moonlight* contains a number of allusions such as literary references and slogans, particular emphasis will be directed to scholars' discussions of allusions in Pinter's plays.

The plays to be discussed in this chapter are *The Birthday Party* (completed in 1957; published in 1960) which is a play about what happens to the only lodger in a quiet boarding house when two intruders suddenly appear; *The Caretaker* (1959, 1960), a play about the effects an intruder has on two brothers as he is taken to
their home: The Collection (1961; 1963), a play rife with people contradicting each other and themselves resulting in neither audience nor characters knowing the actual truth; The Homecoming (1964; 1965), a play about the effects a female intruder has on an all-male household; Landscape (1967; 1969) which is a lyrical play conducted in monologues. It has no conventional plot; similarly Silence (1968; 1969) is a lyrical play which does not have a traditional plot, also conducted primarily in monologues; No Man's Land (1974; 1975) is a play about two old men who while drinking a great deal talk about philosophy, the past and their memories; Moonlight (1993; 1993) which is a play about death and loss. In this play it is not possible to be certain who is alive and if people are dying or just depressed. Absurd humour abounds.

The first time a reader studies a Pinter play s/he might have the impression that there is nothing unusual about the language. It seems to conjure up everyday speech since the characters are semi-articulate, stumble over words and leave questions only partially answered, the way people speak in real life (Evans 1977: 166). However, as Evans rightly points out it is possible that we might have met people speaking in this fashion on some occasions, but it is unlikely that people speak the way these characters do all the time (Evans 1977: 168-171). A case in point is the opening scene of The Birthday Party (1960) where phatic communion, that is polite social conversation, first gives the impression that the scene consists of everyday speech, but when phatic communion is used in excess as it is in this case, the dialogue sounds slightly stilted. First an outline of the play, followed by the opening scene.

The Birthday Party (1957) is a play about Petey and Meg a married couple who run an old boarding house. They have one lodger, Stanley, who has stayed with them for about a year. There has been no other lodger during this time. We do not know much about any of these people. They appear to lead a quiet life. One day two men, Goldberg and McCann appear. Initially they are polite but soon it becomes clear that they constitute a threat to Stanley. During a party, perhaps a birthday party, victimisation of Stanley begins and after an extended interrogation scene Goldberg and McCann interrogating Stanley - the play ends with a
physically and mentally broken Stanley being taken away from the boarding house by Goldberg and McCann.

*The Birthday Party* (Pinter 1960: 9):

PETEY enters from the door on the left with a paper and sits at the table. He begins to read. MEG's voice comes through the kitchen hatch.

MEG: Is that you, Petey?

*Pause*

Petey, is that you?

*Pause*

Petey?

PETEY: What?

MEG: Is that you?

PETEY: Yes, it's me.

MEG: What? [Her face appears at the hatch.]

Are you back?

PETEY: Yes.

MEG: I've got your cornflakes ready. (She disappears and reappears.) Here's your cornflakes. [...] Are they nice?

PETEY: Very nice.

MEG: I thought they'd be nice.

[...] 

MEG: Is it nice out?

PETEY: Very nice.

MEG: Is Stanley up yet?

PETEY: I don't know, is he?

MEG: I don't know. I haven't seen him down yet.

PETEY: Well then, he can't be up.

MEG: Haven't you seen him down?

PETEY: I've only just come in.

MEG: He must still be asleep.
Following closer examination of Pinter's work it becomes clear that there is something different about these plays because, as critics such as Martin Esslin, Mel Gussow and G. L. Evans have noted, they appear strange, mysterious, opaque and subliminal. What exactly then is unique about the plays? It would seem that the answer at least partly rests in the language.

The complexity of Pinter's language is in part what makes it difficult to understand his plays. However, it is important to point out that the sense of mystery audiences and readers experience when watching or reading one of his plays is also partly due to the fact that it is difficult to establish almost any facts with conviction. This is so because Pinter, in his plays, seems to withhold vital facts and truths about characters and events. Moreover, Pinter characters lie blatantly. They contradict themselves and each other. If this is not the case they have forgotten the actual facts or they talk as if they were uncertain of what was said or what they did or even when something is supposed to have happened. The kind of narration and dialogue referred to in this paragraph have been labelled "unreliable narration" and "unreliable dialogue" (Törnqvist 1999). The problems that unreliable dialogue cause the audience has been discussed by Törnqvist with regard to plays by the Swedish playwright August Strindberg, and the term "unreliable" is also applicable to the dialogue of Pinter's plays.

In addition, characterisation in Pinter is fragmentary. The motives behind the characters' actions are ambiguous or unexplained or both. Interpretation has to be guessed at since there is no omniscient narrator in charge of the play intent on clarifying uncertainties. Pinter does not believe that a playwright should know everything about actions and events as nobody knows about these things in real life. As a result, he rejects the notion of an omniscient author. Furthermore, Pinter does not structure his plays for a specific conclusion, nor to make a point. He has no particular message in mind. In fact, very little can be said about the plays with certainty, which explains why there is such a variety of interpretations of the meaning of his plays.

Having explained that very little can be established with certainty in Pinter's work it seems appropriate to proceed by describing and illustrating how different
aspects of his plays function. in order to illustrate how Pinter writes. The most important aspect to stress about his language is the diversity of styles. However, a fact perhaps equally important is that Pinter’s style shares many of the characteristics of postmodernist literature. In the following sections specific characteristics of Pinter’s language will be considered in greater detail.

1.1 Playwright as Poet

Pinter started writing poetry in his early teens. Features such as alliteration and repetition common in Pinter’s plays are in evidence in his early poetry (http://shop.barnesandnoble.com/booksearch-authorInfo.asp?authorCode=haroldpinter). In his teens Pinter read extensively. authors such as Dostoyevsky, T. S. Eliot, Hemingway, Joyce, Kafka, Dylan Thomas and Woolf being among his favourites (Billington 1996: 10). There is evidence to suggest that these writers have influenced Pinter. Scholars have pointed to Eliot and Joyce for Pinter’s use of repetition and to Thomas for Pinter’s use of alliteration and imagery and to Kafka for an atmosphere of unknown menace. These suggestions are not unfounded. At a later stage Beckett, Keats, Proust, Shakespeare and Yeats and other authors were included in Pinter’s repertoire. These authors have also influenced Pinter. Scholars refer to similarities between Pinter and Beckett with regard to aspects such as repetition and pauses and to Proust with regard to Pinter’s preoccupation with memories. Pinter has had poems published since 1950.

Hall regards Pinter as a poetic dramatist. First because Pinter is fastidious in his choice of words. second because rhythm is vital to the performance of his work and third because his plays are lyrical. In fact. Hall compares the language of Pinter’s plays to that of a musical score. Cuts are not possible. Hall claims. because it would disturb the entire rhythm of the piece. Pauses and silences which Hall stresses are not the same could be compared to the pauses of various lengths in musical scores (Itzin and Trussler 1975: 4-17; Hall 1993: 189-193).
The view that Pinter is a poetic dramatist is not uncommon among literary scholars and critics. The British theatre critic, translator and author Martin Esslin who is an authority on Pinter, the French literary scholars Margaret Tormachio as well as Lucina Paquet Gabbard all subscribe to the notion that Pinter is a poetic dramatist but point to different aspects of his plays to support their view. Esslin points to Pinter’s use of poetic language in the form of metaphor, repetition, rhythm, assonance, alliteration and rhyme (Esslin 1977: 244, 245, 248). Tormachio indirectly implies that Pinter is a poet by pointing to the ambiguity, the allusive aspects as well as the rhythm of the language (Tormachio 1990: 83-85). Gabbard is convinced Pinter’s language is poetic since she claims that Pinter describes external reality through ambiguous dream language in order to convey the inner life of the unconscious (Gabbard 1976: 185, 274-5). Evans is another case in point. His summing up of Pinter as “a deceptive poet” and “a verbal magician” would seem to encapsulate the notion that Pinter is a versatile poet (Evans 1977: 171-175).

Most literary scholars or critics like Esslin, Gussow and Evans hold that a dramatist by definition must also be a poet. In the case of Pinter, however, some critics do not consider him to be a poetic dramatist. Among these is Indian literary scholar Surendra Sahai. Sahai suggests that Pinter may not be a poetic dramatist after all because, claims Sahai, he is only considered to be a poet due to the complexity of his language. In other words, the complexity of Pinter’s language may have lead some critics to draw the conclusion that Pinter is a poet, whereas Sahai seems to suggest that Pinter’s originality as a playwright simply makes understanding difficult. To put it differently, complexity is not the same as poetry (Sahai 1981: 105).

When leafing through one of Pinter’s plays it will become evident that Pinter frequently uses poetic devices. These constitute an important feature of his plays. This use of poetic devices is more common in some plays than in others, resulting in some plays being more poetic than others. Silence and Landscape, in particular, are very poetic. In fact, they could be considered to be extended, poetic images depicting and evoking mood changes rather than plays developing dramatic plots.
Silence (1969) may be Pinter's most lyrical play. There are three characters: Rumsey, Ellen and Bates. As in Landscape, the monologue is the major mode of expression in this play. However, unlike Landscape, there are a few dialogues, especially in flashbacks to the past. Rumsey's language is very poetical. Ellen's is as well whereas Bates's language resembles that of Duff in Landscape, it is to the point and very rarely lyrical. The play does not have a conventional plot, instead the characters seem to give their own perspectives on their internal relationships with the exception of Rumsey and Bates, the two men. As is the case of Landscape, Silence resembles long extended poetic images rather than what people would conventionally consider a play.

In Silence and Landscape repetition of words, sounds and images abound. Silence in particular is very much like a musical score. The characters do not often speak to one another but take turns speaking in different motifs and rhythms. In this sense it reminds us of different movements in a musical score. Furthermore, extended key lines expressed early on in the play recur at later stages with minor or major variations, the way in which variations on themes are presented in a musical score.

The extract from Silence below is a typical example of Pinter's use of poetic language. Rumsey seems to be daydreaming. He is remembering what life, love was like in the past. His lines are very lyrical. The lyrical touch to Silence is established already in the first line of the play: in this passage rhythm is achieved through the repetitive use of the same or similar words, alliteration, assonance, consonance or rhyme (Pinter Plays 3 1978: 201):

RUMSEY: I walk with my girl who wears a grey blouse when she walks and grey shoes and walks with me readily wearing her clothes considered for me. Her grey clothes.

[...]

I tell her my thoughts, clouds racing. She looks up at me or listens down. She stops in midsentence [sic], my sentence, to look up at me. Sometimes her hand has
slipped from mine, her arm loosened, she walks slightly apart, dog barks.

In this extract we note the following features:

(a) *The same or similar words*:

Clothes, grey, look/s/, walk/s/ etc.

(b) *Alliteration*:

her hand, has
clothes, considered, clouds
looks, listens, loosened
stops, sentence, sometimes, slipped, slightly
walk with, wears, when

(c) *Assonance*:

apart - bark
cloud - down

(d) *Consonance*:

looks - listens - stops - midsentence [sic]
sometimes - walks - barks

(c) *Rhyme*:

walk - talk
The hypnotic or trance-like effect, which is achieved through the use of poetic devices is further heightened through the use of monosyllabic, staccato words interspersed with the odd longer word towards the end of the sentence. Lack of standard punctuation reinforces the effect. As a result, the effect of the passage is lyrical and romantic.

The excerpt above clearly illustrates that Pinter's language can be very poetic. In the case of Silence it sometimes appears poetic in the extreme. Extreme in the sense that when poetic devices are used to this extent throughout a play, the language becomes very stylised, it does not reflect real speech. As a result, it is not the language of contemporary drama. However, this method of using poetic devices is more sparsely used by Pinter in other plays.

Characters in Pinter's plays sometimes indulge in long digressions of poetic language reminiscent of the poetic example from Silence above. Bridget in Moonlight (Pinter 1993: 1) constitutes one such example (see excerpt below). First an outline of the play.

In Moonlight (1993) it appears that a former civil servant, Andy, is dying. He is married to Bel and they have three children Jack, Fred and Bridget. It seems the parents do not have any contact with their children. However, before he dies Andy would like to see his children. Bel tries to locate them, but she does not succeed. In the course of the play we go back in time, we meet some of their friends, listen to their sons playing word games and realise that we do not know what is going on. Is Bridget alive? Is Andy in fact dying? These are some of the questions we ask ourselves.

Moonlight (Pinter 1993:1):

BRIDGET in faint light.

BRIDGET: I can't sleep. There's no moon. It's so dark. I think I'll go downstairs and walk about. I won't make a noise. I'll be very quiet. Nobody will hear me. It's so dark
and I know everything is more silent when it's dark. But I don't want anyone to know I'm moving about in the night. I don't want to wake my father and mother. They're so tired. They have given so much of their life for me and for my brothers. All their life, in fact. All their energies and all their love. [...] 

Apart from these extended images there is also an abundance of poetic language in the odd phrase or line. Here are two examples from *Moonlight* (my italics):

*Moonlight* (Pinter 1993: 60):

FRED: Precisely. And so let me say this. He was a man, take him for all in all, I shall not look upon his like again.

JAKIE: *You move me much.*

"You move me much." seems to be too poetic for everyday speech. Similarly, alliteration is rather too frequent for it to reflect actual speech.

*Moonlight* (Pinter 1993: 41-42):

JAKIE: Why, did Hawkeye tangle with Rausch at Bromley?

No, I didn't mention Bigsby.

FRED: They were *daggers drawn at Eastbourne*.

In this instance "daggers drawn at Eastbourne." include both alliteration and assonance. In addition, the selection of the lexical items "daggers drawn" results in an impression of stilted language, the word "dagger" being archaic. Once again it seems that Pinter deviates from everyday speech in dialogue.

In order to better understand the context in which the first line below occurs an outline of the play is first presented:
No Man's Land (1975): Hirst lives in a comfortable home in north London. Two young men look after him. One day he brings a stranger home. This stranger called Spooner is not very well off. Spooner and Hirst drink a great deal. They talk about life, philosophy and the past in polite fashion. Gradually, it is suggested that perhaps Spooner and Hirst are not strangers after all because they start quarrelling and disagree about facts related to past love affairs, places, memories and people. They talk about missed opportunities and the fact that now nothing can be done to alter their situation. Life is at an impasse (No Man's Land Pinter 1975: 26):

SPOONER: What he said ... all those years ago ... is neither here nor there. It was not what he said but possibly the way he sat which has remained with me all my life and has, I am quite sure, made me what I am.

Pause.

And I met you at the same pub tonight, although at a different table.

Pause.

I wonder at you, now, as once I wondered at him. But will I wonder at you tomorrow, I wonder, as I still wonder at him today?

Repetition, as shown above, and language developed through association rather than logic is common in Pinter. Below is an excerpt from Landscape illustrating these aspects. Once again there is an abundance of poetic devices such as assonance, consonance, alliteration, rhyme etc. Moreover, there is a sense of legato, that is the rhythm is smooth and even as in music when notes are connected without a break (Microsoft Encarta 2000). This means that sentences are strung together by one sound in order to avoid the break which otherwise would occur through a full stop. The sentence ending and starting with the same
letter "m" adds a sense of flowing. Shorter phrases, monosyllabic ones with a staccato rhythm, and commas representing short pauses together contribute to heightening the emotional and lyrical impact of the writing.

A few words about the play: In *Landscape* (1968) there are two characters - *Beth* and *Duff*. They are married. They sit in a kitchen where they take turns talking in monologues during the entire play, by-passing each other, only referring to each other by name. Hence they are not actually talking to one another, there is no conventional dialogue, although it sometimes seems as if *Duff* tries to talk to *Beth*. The play seems to be a perfect example of non-communication. *Beth* talks about the past, describing memories in lyrical language whereas *Duff* is letting *Beth* know about what he has been doing during the last few days. His language is more matter of fact, real and much less lyrical. We seem to be dealing with two extended poetic images rather than two characters in a conventional play (*Pinter Plays 3* 1978: 180-1):

**BETH:** When I watered the flowers he stood, watching me, and watched me arrange them. My gravity, he said, I was so grave, attending to the flowers. I'm going to water and arrange the flowers, I said. He followed me and watched, standing at a distance from me. When the arrangement was done I stayed still. I heard him moving. He didn't touch me. I listened. I looked at the flowers, blue and white, in the bowl.

*Pause*

Then he touched me.

*Pause*
He touched the back of my neck. His fingers lightly, touching, lightly, touching the back of my neck.

This extract becomes lyrical through the already mentioned use of poetic devices as well as through short phrases, poetic punctuation and pauses.

1.2 Pinter and Postmodernism

Apart from precision and poetic devices, aspects of Pinter's style discussed above, there are other features of his language such as poetic and stylised language, parody, the mixing of style and register as well as different linguistic idiosyncrasies that may be classified as postmodernist writing.

Modernism and postmodernism both highlight the importance of impressionism and subjectivity as opposed to realism and objectivity. Consequently, it is not what we see but how we see that matters. The concept of the omniscient author, very much important to realist writing, is abandoned. Furthermore, fixed narrative points and the author's moral responsibility are ignored. The mixing of genres, fragmentation of form, random-seeming collages and metatext are other features characteristic of these two art movements. Both are eclectic movements that favour poetic features such as parody, pastiche and allusions. The hallmarks of this type of writing can be summed up as experimentation and innovation (Barry 1995: 82-85; Thornborrow and Wareing 1998: 170-179).

It seems that most if not all of the characteristic features of modernism and postmodernism mentioned above are directly applicable to Pinter's style and his approach to writing. The reasons why his writing can be considered to be postmodernist rather than modernist are discussed below with regard to the differences between these two movements.
The features that Barry and Thornborrow and Wareing put forward as representative of modernism and postmodernism indicate that, although modernism and postmodernism seem to be based on similar ideas with regard to how literature is viewed, there are differences between these movements as regards the application of these characteristic features, the differences being basically of mood and attitude or tone.

Modernist writers regard language as a substance in its own right and challenge the relationship between the signifier (word) and the signified (concept). Conventions with regard to rhyme and meter are broken. Juxtaposition of formal, rhetorical registers and informal ones are common, carried out in order to illustrate the values of what Thornborrow and Wareing labels “high” as opposed to “popular” literature (Thornborrow and Wareing 1998: 170-179). Modernists revere classical conventions.

Postmodernists have developed modernist ideas even further, viewing language as a free entity to be played with. Language is the world and consequently it is not uncommon that the author draws attention to the actual process of writing in his or her texts. As a result, form takes precedence over content. Furthermore, postmodernists break poetic conventions owing to their anarchic disrespect of tradition and status, resulting in texts that juxtapose high and popular culture without implying superior value to either of these. Moreover, original texts are mocked, or modified for comic effect. Playfulness is central to postmodernism and authors belonging to this movement enjoy breaking conventions.

1.2.1 Stylised Language

Another important feature of Pinter’s way of writing is stylised language. In a sense poetic devices could be construed as stylised features of language. The dividing line between poetic and stylised language is fine. However, in this thesis, poetic language refers to poetic devices used in a conventional way in order to create a particular mood, whereas stylised language is considered to be an
unconventional, postmodernist, creative device where language is manipulated or played with, for many reasons including mood.

In the excerpt below, Pinter manipulates language by use of poetic devices. The poetic devices in this context appear to constitute typical postmodernist creative writing. The aspects which make it postmodernist are the unconventional context in which they are used (a sudden extreme excess of poetic devices in a dialogue otherwise characterised by everyday language) as well as the motives (seduction and dominance) for using them. It is all to do with hidden meaning and dramatic effect. Due to the fact that the poetic devices used are not primarily employed to create mood through language they are regarded as instances of stylised language as in the excerpt below from The Homecoming.

In The Homecoming, (1965) Teddy, who has a doctorate in philosophy, brings his wife Ruth home to meet the family. Teddy and Ruth have been married for six years. they have three children and live in the USA. Teddy’s family does not know he is married. Teddy’s father Max is a butcher, his uncle Sam is a chauffeur and his brothers Joey and Lenny are a boxer and a pimp. Life in this household seems animalistic, there is a constant struggle for supremacy through language and action. At the beginning of the play when Ruth arrives, an all male household receives a female intruder. Lenny tries to dominate her by trying to scare her. Max initially rejects her through abusive language and Joey is fascinated by her. She is undaunted, and eventually, all the men except Lenny are dominated by Ruth. At the very end it is implied that Ruth has accepted Lenny’s proposal to remain with the family, working as a prostitute for Lenny as well as being the family’s lover and mother as Teddy returns to the USA alone (The Homecoming in Pinter Plays 3 1987: 68-9).

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

Silence

In this passage, Ruth deliberately tries to draw attention to herself. This attempt which may be interpreted as seduction is achieved partly through the manipulation of language. If she is not trying to seduce the men she at least tries to gain the upper hand. Below I will explain how Pinter uses poetic devices to dramatic effect.

First the phrases "I ... move my leg. That's all it is." In this case the pause after "I", indicated by three dots, gives emphasis to the phrase following the pause. Furthermore, the connotations evoked through the phrase are sexual, an interpretation which is emphasised through the use of alliteration of the letter "m" which can evoke the image of the movements of Ruth's lips pronouncing "m" which may be considered to be a sensual image. The second utterance is concise and effective because the phrase probably means the opposite to what is stated, or at least it has several possible deeper meanings, and the one stated is not the only intended one. The line continues: "But I wear ... underwear ... which moves with me ... it ... captures your attention." The pauses in this line draw attention to what Ruth says, to what she wants to underline, the word which raises sexual connotations: "underwear". The rhyme "wear ... underwear" further helps to give emphasis to the same word and alliteration "m" once again has the same effect as mentioned above. The excess of poetic devices used in Ruth's line above does not reflect language used in everyday speech. It is far too stilted and manipulating. The hypnotic and dramatic effect, which is experienced by the audience is achieved through excessive use of poetic devices such as alliteration, assonance, pauses, rhyme, rhythm as well as through connotations, the associations the words evoke.
Allusions constitute another kind of stylised language in Pinter. An allusion can be defined as "an expression designed to call something to mind without mentioning it explicitly: an indirect or passing reference: an allusion to Shakespeare a classical allusion." (The New Oxford Dictionary of English 1998). However, since my interpretation of the term "allusion" including jokes, advertisements, slogans, citations and quotations etc. seems wider than the definition in the dictionary above as well as compared with Leppihalme's interpretation of the concept, another term is used: formulaic expressions (FE) (for a detailed discussion of FE see Chapter III, pages 140-146). In Pinter's plays these FEs or allusions are of various origins; Shakespeare's plays and the Bible seem to be the most common sources but in addition references to lines used in popular radio shows and advertisements occur. It seems that in the latter instance "Chinese laundry" (as used in the Goon Show) has become a catch phrase, at least to Pinter, and as such it conjures up a particular context. However, often it is not easy to recognise the reference because of Pinter's "collage" of styles. Moonlight is dense with literary references, and there are quite a few in No Man's Land and The Hothouse as well. Indeed, references seem to constitute a common feature in most of Pinter's plays.

An earlier excerpt from Moonlight above contains a quotation - which can be viewed as a type of FE. It is from Hamlet (Shakespeare Act 1, scene 2). Here is part of the extract once again, emboldening letters indicating the FE:

FRED: Precisely. And so let me say this. He was a man, take him for all in all. I shall not look upon his like again.

Another stylised feature in evidence in Pinter is pastiche-like passages where the playwright uses the format of another writer's speech, or rhetorical devices taken from another source. It is not infrequently difficult to establish the origin of the format but it stands out in its context suggesting that it has been taken from another source. The passage below certainly does not resemble everyday speech. The example of pastiche below is from Moonlight (Pinter 1993: 10)

FRED: Precisely. And so let me say this. He was a man, take him for all in all. I shall not look upon his like again.
FRED: He was a truly critical force?

JAKE: He was not in it for pleasure or glory. Let me make that quite clear. Applause came not his way. Nor did he seek it. Gratitude came not his way. Nor did he seek it. Masturbation came not his way. Nor did he seek it. I'm sorry - I meant approbation came not his way -

FRED: Oh, didn't it really?

JAKE: Nor did he seek it.

Pause.

Jake's first line in this excerpt appears to have the format of oratory or public speech. It is structured through rhetorical devices - poetic inversion and reiteration of one phrase. These are techniques practised in orators. Thus the format and the language deviate from speech used in everyday conversation.

Another feature of Pinter's writing is long, unprovoked monologues where the characters elaborate on their past: Aston, Davies and Mick in The Caretaker, Stanley and Goldberg in The Birthday Party, and Maria and Andy in Moonlight are furnished with such monologues. Of course, monologues of this kind are not a feature of everyday language, but an old conventional feature of the medium of drama. Often it is difficult to believe the stories that the characters describe in these monologues. These monologues then constitute an instance of "unreliable dialogue" mentioned earlier in this chapter. Below is a monologue from The Caretaker, but first a few comments on the plot of the play:

In The Caretaker (1960), Aston who seems to be slightly retarded brings Davies, a tramp, home. Aston invites Davies to stay the night, then to become the caretaker of his home without telling Davies that he has a brother who lives with him. The tramp is evasive and unappreciative. Davies stays the night and when he is alone in the flat the morning after Mick, Aston's brother, turns up and threatens him. The tramp tries to ingratiate himself with Mick by ridiculing Aston. Later, Davies is also very rude to Aston and Davies's fate is sealed. He has to leave.
**The Caretaker** (Pinter 1960: 32-3):

Act Two

*A few seconds later.*

MICK is seated. DAVIES on the floor, half seated, crouched

*Silence.*

MICK: Well?


*A drip sounds in the bucket overhead. They look up. MICK looks back at DAVIES.*

MICK: What is your name?

DAVIES: I don't know you. I don't know who you are.

*Pause.*

MICK: Hh?

DAVIES: Jenkins.

MICK: Jenkins?

DAVIES: Yes.

MICK: Jen ... kins.

*Pause.*

You sleep here last night?

DAVIES: Yes.

MICK: Sleep well?

DAVIES: Yes.

MICK: I'm awfully glad. It's awfully nice to meet you.

*Pause.*

What did you say your name was?

DAVIES: Jenkins.

MICK: I beg your pardon?

DAVIES: Jenkins!

*Pause.*
MICK: Jen ... kins.

A drip sounds in the bucket. DAVIE'S looks up.

You remind me of my uncle's brother. He was always on the move, that man. Never without his passport. Had an eye for the girls. Very much your build. Bit of an athlete. Longjump specialist. He had a habit of demonstrating different run-ups in the drawing-room round about Christmas time. Had a penchant for nuts. That's what it was. Nothing else but a penchant. Couldn't eat enough of them. Peanuts, walnuts, brazil nuts, monkey nuts. wouldn't touch a piece of fruit cake. Had a marvellous stop-watch. Picked it up in Hong Kong. The day after they chucked him out of the Salvation Army. Used to go in number four for the Beckenham Reserves. That was before he got his Gold Medal. Had a funny habit of carrying his fiddle on his back. Like a papoose. I think there was a bit of the Red Indian in him. To be honest. I've never made out how he came to be my uncle's brother. I've often thought that maybe it was the other way round. I mean that my uncle was his brother and he was my uncle. But I never called him uncle. As a matter of fact I called him Sid. My mother called him Sid too. It was a funny business. Your spitting image he was. Married a Chinaman and went to Jamaica.

Pause.

I hope you slept well last night.

An important aspect of Pinter's writing is rhythm, which he achieves through the sometimes excessive use of poetic devices. One of these devices is repetition. Through the use of frequent repetitions, pauses as well as slight variations in the phrases and words repeated. Pinter seems to create what I shall refer to as ritualistic language. It is ritualistic in the sense that when these words and phrases
Phatic communion or polite conversation, used to uphold superficial, social relationships with strangers or acquaintances, is one such ritualistic feature very common to Pinter. It is perhaps particularly relevant to Meg in The Birthday Party, but there are many other instances of this feature in Pinter's writing. In order to illustrate what may be viewed as ritualistic language, below is an example of excessive use of phatic communion in everyday language. The passage is from the opening scene of The Birthday Party (Pinter 1960: 9)

[...] PETEY enters from the door on the left with a paper and sits at the table. He begins to read. MEG's voice comes through the kitchen hatch.

MEG: Is that you, Petey?

*Pause*

Petey? Is that you?

*Pause*

PETEY: What?

MEG: Is that you?

PETEY: Yes, it's me.

MEG: What? [Her face appears at the hatch.]

Are you back?

PETEY: Yes.

MEG: I've got your cornflakes ready. (She disappears and reappears.) Here's your cornflakes. [...] Are they nice?

PETEY: Very nice.

MEG: I thought they'd be nice.

[...]

- including slightly modified variations of phrases - occur at the beginning, middle and end of lines and exchanges. A language pattern seems to be forming. A formulaic shape or rhythm is created and these give the impression of constituting a linguistic ritual.
MEG: Is it nice out?
PETEY: Very nice.
MEG: Is Stanley up yet?
PETEY: I don't know. Is he?
MEG: I don't know. I haven't seen him down yet.
PETEY: Well then, he can't be up.
MEG: Haven't you seen him down?
PETEY: I've only just come in.
MEG: He must still be asleep.

The dialogue above is characteristic of the kind of conversation that may be found throughout the play. Phatic communion used in excess, as in the case of *The Birthday Party*, has an overall comic effect. Read aloud, this becomes apparent. Strangers may well talk in this way to one another in brief, polite exchanges as do Goldberg and McCunn when they first meet Petey, Meg and Stanley. However, when husband and wife talk in this fashion most of the time, the use of phatic communion sounds stilted and the language seems to deviate from everyday language because it seems unlikely that people can speak in this way for any length of time. As a result, excessive use of phatic communion might be viewed as constituting a key to the characterisation of Meg and Petey's relationship.

1.3 Linguistic Idiosyncrasies

One linguistic idiosyncrasy of Pinter's is juxtaposition; he juxtaposes different styles and registers and the popular with the conventional—characteristic of postmodernist writing—which result in the reader forming the impression that Pinter creates "collages" in writing. He does not seem to adhere to any one style of writing. In his use of collages Pinter's works resemble—and were perhaps influenced by—writers such as James Joyce and T. S. Eliot in whose works the type of collage mentioned abound. As a playwright, Pinter deviates from everyday speech patterns in several ways. Among these, Thornborrow and Wareing as well as Fowler draw attention to the fact that Pinter's characters tend to disregard the socially expected patterns applied to speech acts in normal speech. When
characters X and Y are talking. X either does not respond to Y's exclamations, or X gives no direct answer to Y's questions. Not infrequently X even ignores serious questions made by Y, or Y receives, it appears, an incongruous question in reply (Thornborrow and Wareing 1998: 131-2; Fowler 1986: 177-8). This can be labelled "language of dominance" because disrupting socially accepted speech norms tends to unbalance the person exposed to it. It gives the person who manipulates the norm the upper hand. Breaking with convention in this way sometimes comes across as strange. However, man's natural instinct is to try to make sense of what s/he has heard, no matter how bizarre the comment. This is what the characters try to do, as does the audience.

Paul Simpson has pointed out that "odd talk" or linguistic idiosyncrasy is a difficult concept to define (1998: 36). However, in order to be able to describe linguistic idiosyncrasy it seems that a model specifying "normal" or ideal conversation needs to be established, a model against which possible deviance may be compared and contrasted. J. L. Austin, H. P. Grice and J. R. Searle have discussed such models for speech acts. Below I apply Grice's basic rules to speech acts theory in order to describe linguistic idiosyncrasies in Pinter. With regard to "odd talk" Thornborrow and Wareing state (1998: 131) that Pinter's dialogue is famous for appearing strange. It is strange partly because he flouts maxims. Maxims are rules that can be applied to speech acts in order to describe the rules according to which interlocutors interact and if and how they flout these rules. An important principle in speech act theory is Grice's co-operation principle (Grice 1975: 47-8). This principle can be described as a model of conversation, basically one of a contract between co-operating equals whose intention it is to transmit information in the most clear and efficient fashion possible. The implication is that if any of the maxims are flouted it is carried out for a reason. The maxims governing the co-operation principle are as follows (Grice 1975: 45):

1. Quantity: be informative, but do not say too little or too much.
2. Quality: do not lie, do not say anything you do not have evidence of.
3. Relation: be relevant.
4. Manner: avoid obscurity and ambiguity, be brief and orderly.
Generally speaking, Pinter and his characters are always less informative than we would like them to be (maxim 1 flouted). This is especially the case with regard to characterisation. In addition, sometimes too much information is revealed (maxims 1, 4). Instances in which too much information is given occur in what seems to be sudden, unprovoked and extended monologues where characters relate stories that the audience tends to regard as strange, irrelevant or difficult to believe. Moreover, it is not uncommon that Pinter characters lie (maxim 2 flouted). Sometimes they seem to invent stories (maxims 2, 3). On other occasions they contradict themselves (maxims 2, 4); a fact expressed with conviction at an early stage in the play may with equal conviction be refuted at a later stage. In actual fact, much of what is said is impossible to verify. An extreme example of the flouting of maxims is found in Pinter’s play The Collection (1962). The characters in this play are Stella and James - they are husband and wife - and Harry and Bill who are lovers. The plot begins with Stella divulging to her husband that she has been unfaithful to him with Bill Lloyd, a business acquaintance, in Leeds. The entirety of the play, including Stella’s initial statement just mentioned, is a collection of lies and stories. The characters keep contradicting themselves and each other. The audience and reader never find out the truth. In greater detail this is what happens:

Stella tells her husband James that she has been unfaithful to him. We have no reason to doubt her statement. Her husband is told that she was unfaithful with a man called Bill Lloyd in a hotel in Leeds during the weekend. When confronted by the husband, Bill seems genuinely surprised and, quite truthfully it seems, denies that he even was in Leeds during the weekend. However, moments later he changes his mind and says that he did see Stella in Leeds, but they only kissed, nothing else happened. At a later stage in this conversation Bill again fervently denies even knowing Stella. Next Stella’s husband lies to his wife, telling her that Bill confirmed her story. She now seems genuinely surprised. The next complication in this story is that in conversation with Harry, an acquaintance, Stella firmly denies that she knows anyone called Bill Lloyd. She tells Harry that her husband has dreamed the whole thing up, that she has never been unfaithful. She says she has no reason to be unfaithful because they are happy together. Next, Stella once again contradicts herself. This time she tells Harry that she and Mr
Lloyd were in Leeds but that she hardly saw him. Harry then tells James that Stella was not unfaithful and says that she confessed to having made the whole thing up. However, Stella did not say that she made the whole thing up. There are further complications. Suffice it to say that the end is characteristic of the theme of the play. At the very end, the husband is desperate to know the truth. He keeps asking his wife whether anything happened and she neither denies nor confirms anything. At the end, nobody knows what really happened.

There are still further idiosyncrasies in Pinter. In true postmodernist fashion, and perhaps absurdist fashion as well, Pinter shocks and surprises his reader or audience through manipulating the audience's expectations. A few examples below:

*No Man's Land* (Pinter 1975: 31)

SPOONER: [...] You will not say. I will tell you then ... that my wife ... had everything. Eyes, a mouth, hair, teeth, buttocks, breasts, absolutely everything. And legs.

The enumeration of what a wife possesses, according to Spooner, is not what the audience expects to hear. It is not generally what we expect to associate with the expression "my wife had everything". It is possible that a person would think along the lines "She had everything. Money, a nice car, a lovely home and three beautiful children.". Moreover, what follows the phrase "my wife had everything" in this passage is self-evident since any wife is likely to have those characteristics. As a result, my conclusion is that Pinter intentionally manipulates the audience's expectations in order to surprise us, perhaps in order to achieve comic effect. In *Moonlight* there is the following speech: my italics (Pinter 1993: 10):

FRID: He was a truly critical force?

JAKE: He was not in it for pleasure or glory. Let me make that quite clear. Applause came not his way. Nor did he seek it. Gratitude came not his way. Nor did he
In this exchange Jake makes use of rhetorical devices used in oratory. The mistake of substituting approbation with masturbation is of course intentional. It has the expected effect of making people react since a completely acceptable word is replaced by a taboo word.

A third example is an extract from The Homecoming. Teddy has just arrived home after a few years’ absence. He wants to introduce his wife Ruth to his family. It is late at night. Teddy has just gone to his room after having spoken to his younger brother Lenny downstairs. He has not told Lenny about his visit. Ruth has gone for a walk in order to get some fresh air. Ruth comes in and meets Lenny. They talk. After a while there is the following exchange (Pinter Plays 3 1978: 44-5):

LENNY: [...] You must be connected to my brother in some way. The one who’s been abroad.

RUTH: I’m his wife.

LENNY: Eh, listen, I wonder if you could advise me. I’ve been having a bit of a rough time with this clock. The tick’s been keeping me up. The trouble is I’m not convinced it’s the clock. I mean there are lots of things that tick in the night, don’t you find that? [...] 

RUTH: We’re on a visit to Europe.

LENNY: What, both of you?

RUTH: Yes.

LENNY: What, you sort of live with him over there, do you?

RUTH: We’re married.

LENNY: On a visit to Europe, eh? Seen much of it?
In this dialogue Lenny either responds in an evasive and unexpected manner when confronted with the news that Ruth is Teddy's wife or he changes the subject. It is as if he did not believe what Ruth is saying. Even after having been informed by Ruth that she is married to Teddy he asks her "you sort of like with him or there. eh?" At first Lenny's reaction to Ruth's statements seems odd. He behaves as if he did not understand. The audience's or reader's interpretation here is not surprising since this episode occurs early in the play which means that we have very little to go on in our judgement of Lenny. However, later on Max, Teddy and Lenny's father, behaves in a similar fashion at his first meeting with Ruth. What both Lenny and Max are doing, in a way, is flouting the co-operation principle. Maxim 2. This is done probably in order to indicate that they know "her kind" better that the audience does. They see through her mask straight away and this is indicated through the flouting of Maxim 2. She may be married to Teddy, but to Max and Lenny she is something other than she purports to be. A prostitute? Be that as it may, there never seems to be one answer in Pinter. Once again this is a case of implying something through the flouting of a maxim.

A further characteristic feature of Pinter's writing is "new" collocations. What he does is make you think of a certain collocation, changing it slightly, making the reader or audience stand back and ask themselves what Pinter really intended. A not uncommon reaction to this type of creative use of language is: "You don't say that in English, do you? Isn't it supposed to be ... ?!" A case in point is Andy's remark to Bel in Moonlight: "What a wonderful woman you were. You had such a great heart. You still have, of course. I can hear it from here. Banging away." (Moonlight 1993: 3). There the collocation is usually "big heart" or "good hearted" rather than "great heart". Still, the choice of words make you wonder. Why change the collocation? Knowing Pinter, there is probably a perfectly good reason for the change. It may be that the phrase is ironic or sarcastic, the meaning being the opposite of what is stated.

French translator Eric Kahane describes a similar problem. In Betrayal (Pinter 1978: 68) there is the line "He was a brutally honest squash player [my italics]." In translation into French Kahane retained the phrase (Il était un joueur de squash brutalment honnête), but critics have stated that they think that this sounds
too English, claiming that the word *brutalement* in *brutalement honnête* (*brutally honest*) does not sound natural in French – the indication seems to be that these words do not collocate. Kahane agrees, but adds that he discussed the collocation with Pinter before deciding to retain it. The fact of the matter is, Pinter had said, that comments in England had indicated that the line did not sound natural in English either (Kahane 1987: 142). Whether it sounds natural in English or not may be disputed, however. the fact that during rehearsals actors and director alike had considered this line to be un-English seems to be an indication that Pinter's language is considered unconventional or strange even by English speakers. Pinter simply uses language in his own very particular way.

1.4 Subtext and Undercurrents

Owing to the abundance of commentary on the ambiguity, depth and complexity of the subtext in Pinter it seems fair to suggest that what lies beneath the words is of unusual importance in the work of this playwright. As Peter Hall aptly puts it: "You can never trust what is said to be literally true [...] They [the actors] should assume it's a ploy, unless you can establish that it's true." (Itzin and Trussler 1975: 4-17). Before discussing subtext further, the term should be defined. *Literary subtext* (referring mainly to novels and short stories) as defined in *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (1998) is "what is not said or done [...] what may be implied, suggested or hinted, what is ambiguous, [...] ambivalent, evasive [...]" and so on. When interpreting such texts, the reader is exercising "insight into the 'unconscious' elements in the work itself and thus elicits additional meanings." (ibid.) In drama, *subtext* "denotes the unspoken in a play; what is implied by pause and by silence. And perhaps also what Harold Pinter means by 'the pressure behind words'." (ibid.) As subtext is important to any play it should be pointed out that the critics do not only seem to discuss what is generally thought of as subtext in the theatre, that is *implied meaning*. They also discuss the *unconscious elements or meanings* of Pinter's writing, and these are the aspects of Pinter's writing which seem to intrigue them most. In this thesis,
*subtext* equals implied meaning, whereas the unconscious meanings are referred to as *undercurrents*.

Pinter’s plays are rife with layers of meanings beneath the words expressed. First in the sense that words and phrases are ambiguous. Second in that what is said is generally not what is meant. Third in that what is said may not make sense unless one has access to the character’s or the writer’s unconscious. Fourth because words subliminally awake the audience’s unconscious interpretation. This means that spectators respond emotionally to what lies beneath the spoken words. The spoken words and their unspoken meanings elicit a variety of interpretations, and reason or logic cannot always establish the actual “true” meaning of what has been expressed. As a result, spectators cannot always account for their responses to the plays.

Pinter is very sensitive to language. He is aware of how difficult it is to state exactly what we mean. He is aware that there is always something happening behind the words expressed in any conversation. The actual meaning depends on which word is stressed, tone of voice, glances, gestures, intonation and so on. Social context and degree of intimacy also play a part. There are still other factors that affect interpretation, suffice it to say that conversation is more complex than it might seem. The following illustration might facilitate the understanding of the degree to which Pinter is sensitive to language and its subtext: When one person (X) is talking to the person with whom s/he is in love (Y), without knowing whether or not the affections are reciprocated, X is probably able to come up with any number of interpretations to what Y means by a look, a phrase, or a word. This is the case because X reads meaning into everything that Y says or does which means that X is very sensitive to language. In his plays, Pinter exploits this sensitivity or uncertainty. Characters respond to one another as if they always suspect that there is some other meaning to what is said. Or they deliberately use evasive replies to questions in order to shield themselves against, and their ego against potential harm. In addition, Pinter is consciously often using ambiguity to complicate matters even further.
Daniel Salem (1983), a French Pinter scholar, argues that the importance of the subtext in Pinter is a Jewish legacy. This seems a fair supposition bearing in mind the reasons for which Jewish people are trained in interpreting the Torah (see pages 64-65 for details). Sahai, on the other hand, claims that the importance of the subtext to Pinter’s plays is a legacy from Ibsen and Chekhov (Sahai 1983:123). The subtext does not have to be a legacy from either Ibsen or Chekhov. “Legacy”, it seems, here implies influence and it would seem more likely for Pinter to have been influenced by writers he has read and admired since his adolescence, writers such as Joyce, Beckett, Kafka and Proust rather than Ibsen or Chekhov who Pinter does not mention. Ibsen and Chekhov rarely feature in interviews with Pinter or in other research conducted on the playwright’s work. Therefore, it would seem unfounded to imply any influence from Ibsen and Chekhov. Indeed, Pinter himself has refuted any literary influence on his work at all, stating that “Of course what I have read has influenced me personally, but not professionally.”. As a result, my conclusion is that these writers seem to have had little or no influence on Pinter. What one could say, however, as Esslin does, is that the subtext in Pinter resembles that of Ibsen or Chekhov (Esslin 1977: 20).

Esslin, Hall and Sahai – the list could go on and on – all stress the importance of the subtext in Pinter’s work. By subtext it would seem that they are referring to what I earlier called undercurrents, that is they feel that Pinter draws on the unconscious. Gabbard agrees with Esslin et.al. and alleges that the meaning of Pinter’s language originates in his unconscious. Esslin tends to be of the same opinion as are Hall, Salem and others. The implication is that the language on the surface seems to be speech concerned with everyday trivialities of life when on a deeper level, it is in fact an expression of Pinter’s unconscious.

Approaches to the interpretation of Pinter’s use of the unconscious differ in some details. Gabbard analyses Pinter’s language and the meanings of his plays through the language of dreams as suggested by Freud (Gabbard 1976). Salem uses the methodology of a disciple of Freud’s (Salem 1983). Esslin views the unconscious as undercurrents expressing the metaphysics of Pinter’s world (Esslin 1977: 245) and Hall mainly considers Pinter a poet (Hall 1993: 193), seemingly inferring that
poets partly draw on their unconscious in order to be able to create a commonly shared view.

No matter which methodology or approach is chosen, the consensus seems to be that on the surface Pinter’s language appears to concern events in the real world, while the undercurrents conceal deeper meanings. Indeed, Esslin rightly claims that unless the audience penetrates the surface of the text and discovers its depth, Pinter’s plays will inevitably be viewed as obscure (Esslin 1977: 250). As a result, it is not surprising that the majority of scholars and critics stress the fact that the subtext is particularly important in plays by Pinter, and that it seems to be viewed as an expression of Pinter’s unconscious.

As mentioned above the majority of critics have suggested that the language of Pinter’s plays seems to imitate everyday speech. Is this the case or is it an illusion? Views tend to differ here. Some Pinter scholars such as Martin Esslin and translator Eric Kahane, although stating that Pinter’s language is many-layered and dense with “suggestiveness”, still hold that Pinter’s language reflects everyday speech. Esslin even states that Pinter imitates everyday language “with the objectivity of a tape recorder” (Esslin 1977: 245). However, Esslin also suggests that Pinter has developed “his own very personal style” (Esslin 1977: 242). Sahai talks about Pinter’s “predetermined style” as well as the fact that his language resembles everyday speech (Sahai 1981: 106, 122). The literary scholar Brian Stone refers to Pinter’s stylised language (Stone 1976: 22). Yet another view is put forward by British literary scholar J. L. Styan who claims that it is symbolist language (Styan 1981: 160). In using symbols and images it can be said that Pinter is a surrealist playwright. He can be described as a surrealist because his words and expressions stem from his unconscious and he, like the surrealists, tries to evoke images and emotions through an exact and detailed description of language and reality.

The diversity of views outlined above seems to suggest that scholars and critics contradict not only one another, but sometimes even themselves. This is not the case. The fact of the matter is that Pinter’s language both reflects ordinary speech and is highly stylised and it is this diversity of his mastery of language that gives
rise to different views and interpretations. It is Pinter's creative genius, which complicates interpretation, not merely with regard to the language, but also with regard to many other aspects of Pinter's writing.

*The Homecoming* is a play so dense with undercurrents on so many levels that it has resulted in as many interpretations of the play as there are critics or scholars who have studied it. Below is an excerpt from the plays illustrating the presence of undercurrents (*Pinter Plays 3* 1978: 43-50):

LENNY: Good evening.
RUTH: Morning, I think.
LENNY: You're right there.

*Pause*

[...]

LENNY: [...] You must be connected with my brother in some way. The one who's been abroad.
RUTH: I'm his wife.
LENNY: Eh listen, I wonder if you can advise me. I've been having a bit of a rough time with this clock. The ticks been keeping me up. The trouble is I'm not at all convinced it's the clock. [...] So ... all things being equal ... this question of me saying it was a clock that woke me up, well, that could very easily prove something of a false hypothesis.

*He goes to the sideboard, pours from a jug into a glass, takes the glass to RUTH.*

Here you are. I bet you could do with this.
RUTH: What is it?
LENNY: Water.

*She takes it, sips, places the glass on a small table by her chair. LENNY watches her.*

Isn't it funny? I've got my pyjamas on and you're fully dressed.
He goes to the sideboard and pours another glass of water.

Mind if I have one? Yes, it's funny seeing my old brother again after all these years. [...] I was surprised myself when I saw Teddy, you know. Old Ted. I thought he was in America.

RUTH: We're on a visit to Europe.
LENNY: What, both of you?
RUTH: Yes.
LENNY: What, you sort of live with him over there, do you?
RUTH: We're married.
LENNY: On a visit to Europe, eh? Seen much of it?

[...]
LENNY: [...] Do you mind if I hold your hand?
RUTH: Why?
LENNY: Just a touch.

*He stands and goes to her.*

Just a tickle.

RUTH: Why?

*He looks down at her.*

LENNY: I'll tell you why.

*Sligh pause.*

One night, not too long ago, one night down by the docks. I was standing alone under an arch, watching all the men jibbing the boom, out in the harbour, and playing about with a yardarm, when a certain lady came up to me, and made me a certain proposal. This lady had been searching for me for days. [...] Well, this proposal wasn't entirely out of order and normally I would have subscribed to it. I mean I would have subscribed to it in the normal course of events. The only trouble was she was falling apart with the pox. So I turned it down. Well, this lady was very insistent [...] so I clumped her one. It was on my mind at the
time to kill her. and the fact is, that as far as killings go, it would have been a simple matter, nothing to it. [... and there she was up against the wall - well, just sliding down the wall, following the blow I'd given her. [...]]

RUTH: How did you know she was diseased?
LENNY: How did I know?

Pause.
I decided she was.

Silence.

[...]

LENNY: [...] Excuse me, shall I take this ashtray out of your way.
RUTH: It's not in my way.

[...]

LENNY: [...] And now perhaps I'll relieve you of your glass.
RUTH: I haven't quite finished.
LENNY: You've consumed quite enough, in my opinion.
RUTH: No, I haven't.
LENNY: Quite sufficient, in my own opinion.
RUTH: Not in mine, Leonard.

[...]

LENNY: [...] Just give me the glass.
RUTH: No.

Pause.
LENNY: I'll take it then.
RUTH: If you take the glass ... I'll take you.

Pause.
LENNY: How about me taking the glass without you taking me?
RUTH: Why don't I just take you?

Pause.
LENNY: You're joking.

Pause.
She picks up the glass and lifts it towards him.

RUTH: Have a sip. Go on. Take a long cool sip.

He is still.

Sit on my lap. Take a long cool sip.

She pats her lap. Pause.

She stands, moves to him with the glass.

Put your head back and open your mouth.

LENNY: Take the glass away from me.

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

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

She laughs shortly. drains the glass.

First of all it is important to recognise the context in which this conversation takes place. It has its own undercurrents. What woman would go for a walk in the middle of the night in a strange neighbourhood all by herself? Most women would not but Ruth does. Ruth then enters the house where she meets Lenny. Immediately there is a power struggle. Lenny says good evening, and Ruth corrects him. It is morning. Lenny agrees that she is right. Very quickly it is established that Ruth is Teddy's wife. However, Lenny does neither comment nor confirm that he has registered this fact. Instead he changes the subject. Lenny talks as if he has not understood, or as if he does not believe Ruth - so moments later he asks Ruth if she lives with Teddy "over there". This time Ruth says "We're married". Once again Lenny makes no comment and turns to another topic for conversation. The evasion and lack of confirmation imply a subtext and possesses undercurrents. The implied meaning may be that Lenny unconsciously thinks that he recognises what kind of woman Ruth is, that is a woman with a past rather than the ideal wife.

Hints about Ruth's past are implied through a few factors: first it would seem that Ruth recognises Lenny's kind and puts up a fight already at the start of the conversation by correcting him: it is morning not evening. Second Lenny tries to intimidate Ruth with his talk about "killing a lady" in a shady area of London. This has no effect on Ruth. Most people would feel uneasy round a person who
chooses such an unpleasant topic for conversation, especially at their first meeting. One would at least show some signs of surprise. Not Ruth. She remains cool, calm and collected during the entire conversation. Third Ruth’s response to Lenny’s story about the happenings in the harbour shows that she is familiar with what Lenny has talked about. She understands perfectly the meaning of the phrase “fallen apart with the pox” and what kind of lady he is talking about, that is a prostitute. The fact that she does not waver after his speech and instead tests him by asking him how he knew “she was diseased?” indicates that she does not intend to relinquish power to Lenny. Ruth is very much in control of the situation. Fourth when Lenny asks whether he can hold Ruth’s hand and she asks why his reply is an extended story about a prostitute – he talks about a woman who in fact is a prostitute. Consequently he is implying that Ruth is such a woman and he should therefore be allowed to hold her hand. The power struggle between Ruth and Lenny has sexual overtones. This is illustrated in the passage involving the glass. Ruth does not waver but matches Lenny on every level and the glass together with a language imbued with deeper meanings becomes a potent sexual image with which she defeats him.

1.5 Style and Register


The language of Pinter’s characters displays great variety in style and register. Due to the fact that the terms style and register are often used interchangeably (Aitchison 1995: 104-5; Durant and Fabb 1990: 196) I would like to define exactly what I regard to constitute style and register, respectively, in order that it will be made clear what I am referring to in my discussion of these aspects of the plays below.
Definitions in dictionaries seem to suggest that the terms are vague. *Style* seems to be more vague a concept than register and the former appears to constitute a super-ordinate term to the latter. A typical definition of style found in dictionaries is “the characteristic manner in which a writer expresses him- or herself, or a particular manner of an individual’s literary work” including “favourite or distinctive vocabulary, kinds of imagery, attitude to subject matter, kind of subject matter and so on” (*A Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1992). Register tends to be regarded as “[…] kinds [my italics] of language being used; especially the kind of language appropriate to a particular *situation* [my italics].” (*A Dictionary of Literary Terms* 1992). I should like to point out that my division between style and register might seem arbitrary since the dividing line between them seems fluid. However, a definition of the terms will be useful in describing Pinter’s work.

The term style will here be used when discussing the *overall* characteristic features of Pinter’s way of writing, including register, as defined below. As regards my interpretation of the term register I base it on Durant and Fabb’s outline on registers (1990: 196). However, I use three labels rather than two, adding *social register* to their discussion on *regional* and *situational register*. The definitions of *regional, situational and social registers* are as follows: *Regional register* is dialect, that is the use of different vocabulary and grammar from standard English. Cockney is one such dialect. *Situational register* is different situations requiring different degrees of formality or technicality – different types of language are viewed as appropriate to for instance written and spoken language. *Social register* is language reflecting social class or social standing. These terms are by no means absolute, but may aid in the discussion of various registers used by Pinter in his plays.

Characteristic features of Pinter’s style are on the one hand the linguistic characteristics already discussed and on the other hand those discussed below. An aspect of Pinter’s style not mentioned is an over-elaboration through extensive use of adjectives, predominantly of Latin origin. Moreover, on other occasions it is as if Pinter’s language “expresses nothing but itself as if a computer had become half-demented in a staccato way.” (Evans 1977: 171). On both occasions the
language differs from that of ordinary speech. Pinter's own comment on his style is "I'm stuck neither to a style, in the limiting, self-conscious sense, to a room, or a prophesy [...] Of course I recognise forms and employ them" when appropriate and "they [either] expand or snap." (Esslin 1977: 245). In italics below, an example from Moonlight which illustrates the over-use of adjectives as well as language expressing nothing but itself (Pinter 1993: 12):

JAKE: The vicar stood up. He said that it was a very unusual thing.
a truly rare and unusual thing, for a man in the prime of his life to leave [...] his personal fortune to his newborn son the very day of that baby's birth - before the boy had had a chance to say a few words or aspire to the unknowable or cut for partners or cajole the japonica or tickle his arse with a feather -

FRED: Whose are?

JAKE: It was an act, went on the vicar, which, for sheer undaunted farsightedness, unflinching moral resolve, stern intellectual vision, classic philosophical detachment, passionate religious fervour, profound moral intensity, bloodtingling spiritual ardour, spellbinding metaphysical chutzpah - stood alone.

On a first reading of Pinter it is possible that an astute reader may be struck by the diversity of register displayed there. S/he will come across slang and regional registers such as Cockney. The latter fact is not surprising since Pinter is a Londoner and knows Cockney well. Moreover, situational register in the form of professional jargon or specialist terminology as I prefer to call it - which constitute a sub-culture language - is common. Specialist terminology used by professional cellarmen (people working with wines) occurs for example (see pages 46-47 of this Chapter for examples of Specialist Terminology). Landscape is a case in point. Gussow has noticed specialist language or "jargon" (Gussow 1994: 125) as has Sahai (Sahai 1983: 112-114) and others. Social register is common. Davies's language, the tramp in The Caretaker, implies an uneducated.
working class origin whereas Hirst’s language in No Man’s Land rings of a much higher social standing, the language of a man of some education. The register varies between very informal language, through the use of spoken words written in their spoken form into the text, and formal, even official language (see any passage in Moonlight). A closer study makes it clear that Pinter juxtaposes informal and formal language, which may account for the impression of idiosyncrasy and “unnaturalness” that a reader may experience when reading one of the plays. Pinter does not seem to conform to one form or one particular convention of writing.

In his plays Pinter tends not infrequently to mix styles and registers. In some plays it would seem that he constantly varies them, always reinventing himself. This is the case in Moonlight. These often sudden changes in style and register tend to surprise the reader. This form of juxtapositioning and sometimes constant change of style and register, typical of postmodernist writing (Thornborrow and Wareing 1998: 171-3), leaves the reader or audience with the impression that she never quite knows what to expect to hear from a character. It could be argued that the juxtapositioning of different styles and registers do not facilitate the spectator’s attempt at establishing characterisation in his or her mind. As a result, the interpretation of the play is likely to be made more difficult. According to Thornborrow and Wareing, this Postmodernist, “anarchic” way of writing is often carried out in order to create comic effects and is an author’s way of breaking with conventions (Thornborrow and Wareing 1998: 173). There may be other reasons for this deviation such as borrowing a reference from another source and these aspects of deviation will be discussed in Chapter III (See “Functions of FEs” pages 156-161). What can be stated at this point, however, is that the deviation in style and register, as Hall points out, always seems to be carried out for a reason (Itzin and Trussler 1975: 4-17). Below are a few examples of different registers used by Pinter in his plays (examples underlined so as not to confuse with italics present in the excerpt):

The Caretaker (Pinter 1962: 8):
DAVIES: [...] All them Blacks had it. Greeks. Poles. the lot of them, that's what, doing me out of a seat, treating me like dirt. When he come at me tonight I told him.

ASTON: Take a seat.

DAVIES: Yes, but what I got to do first, you see, what I got to do, I got to loosen myself up, you see what I mean? I could have got done in down there.

ASTON: You want to roll yourself one of these?

DAVIES: (turning). What? No, no, I never smoke a cigarette. I'll have a bit of that tobacco there for my pipe, if you like.

ASTON: (handing him the tin). Yes. Go on. Take some out of that.

DAVIES: That's kind of you, mister. Just enough to fill my pipe, that's all. [...] I had a tin, only ... only a while ago. But it was knocked off. It was knocked off on the Great West Road. (He holds out the tin). Where shall I put it?

*No Man's Land* (Pinter 1975:15-6):

[...] *HIRST* is pouring a whisky at the cabinet. [...]
HIRST: Please help yourself.
SPOONER: Terribly kind of you.
SPOONER goes to cabinet and pours. He turns.
SPOONER: Your good health.
He drinks.
SPOONER: What was it I was saying, as we arrived at your door?
HIRST: Ah … let me see.
SPOONER: Yes! I was talking about strength. Do you recall?
HIRST: Strength. Yes.
SPOONER: Yes. I was about to say, you see, that there are some people who appear to be strong, whose idea of what strength consists of is persuasive, but who inhabit the idea and not the fact. What they possess is not strength but expertise. They have nurtured and maintain what is in fact a calculated posture. Half the time it works. It takes a man of intelligence and perception to stick a needle through that posture and discern the essential flabbiness of the stance. I am such a man.

HIRST: You mean one of the latter?

SPOONER: One of the latter, yes. a man of intelligence and perception. Not one of the former, oh no, not at all. By no means.

Pause

In the first extract, Davies speaks in a regional register or dialect which departs from standard English: "All them Blacks"; "When he come at me tonight.". He says: got done in rather than been killed, was knocked off rather than was stolen. In order to indicate that it is spoken language Pinter uses contractions, that's and I'll, and discourse markers: "you see" and "you see what I mean." The sentences:
are not very complex and there are a great deal of what seems to be unnecessary repetitions. Furthermore, Davies and Aston are talking about trivial, everyday problems of life. These aspects of the passage from The Caretaker give the impression that Davies is not well educated and that he is working class. When comparing the excerpt from The Caretaker with that of No Man’s Land it becomes clear that Spooner in No Man’s Land, as opposed to Davies in The Caretaker, does adhere to the rules of standard English. Hirst does as well, although in the particular extract above this is not made clear since Hirst’s lines are short. Spooner in this piece expresses himself in rather complex sentences. In fact the language used resembles written rather than spoken English, particularly towards the end. He uses abstract words, there are no contractions and ideas are expressed clearly and concisely. Evidence of Spooner’s use of more sophisticated or educated words and phrases are: arrive rather than come, recall rather than remember, appear rather than seem. Other evidence of elevated speech is the italicised words in the phrases “inhabit the idea”, “discern the essential flabbiness of the stance” and so on. Furthermore, there are few hesitations or repetitions. An expression echoing an upper class register is: “Terribly kind of you”. Lastly, the subject matter is of an intellectual nature, that is more elevated than the one in the first excerpt.

With regard to situational register, Pinter sometimes has one and the same character speak informal as well as formal English. Lenny in The Homecoming is one such character. He speaks in one way as a private person and in another as the businessman, the pimp. Sometimes he mixes the two. However, sometimes Lenny, it seems, uncharacteristically also speaks very formal, academic English, the language of scholars. On such occasions the language resembles written rather than spoken English. It is quite complex. Observe in particular Lenny’s second but also his last line in the following extract from The Homecoming (Pinter Plays 3 1978: 67-8), my italics:

LENNY: [...] Pause

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

TEDDY: Philosophy.
LENNY: Well, I want to ask something. Do you detect a certain logical incoherence in the central affirmation of Christian theism?

TEDDY: That question doesn’t fall within my province.

LENNY: Well, look at it this way ... you don’t mind my asking you some questions, do you?

TEDDY: If they’re within my province.

LENNY: Well, look at it this way. How can the unknown merit reverence? In other words, how can you revere that of which you’re ignorant? At the same time, it would be ridiculous to propose that what we know merits reverence. What we know merits any number of things, but it stands to reason reverence isn’t one of them. In other words, what else is there?

Pause

Lenny usually speaks in quite an informal register with family and friends. As the pimp his language becomes more business like, it is a sub-culture language with undercurrents, and in this case it is rather formal.

1.6 Specialist Terminology

Scholars such as Elin Diamond has pointed out that there is often specialist terminology in Pinter’s plays. She mentions “gangster’s language” and “decorator’s jargon” (Diamond 1985: 52; 75) for example. Pinter is an avid cricket fan. This becomes clear to anyone who studies his plays, and as a result, there are many cricketing terms and references or allusions to cricket in them. No Man’s Land is a case in point. In this play even names such as Briggs and Foster allude to cricket because the characters are named after two famous cricketers. Place names to do with cricket such as the Oval, one of the most famous cricket grounds in England, are not uncommon in his plays. This is what a passage might look like (Pinter 1975: 30):
SPOONER: Tell me then about your wife.

HIRST: What wife?

SPOONER: How beautiful she was, how tender and how true. I tell me with what speed she swung in the air, with what velocity she came off the wicket, whether she was responsive to finger spin, whether you could bowl a shooter with her, or an offbreak with a legbreak action. In other words, did she google?

Silence

This passage is dense with cricket terminology, but the subtext is sex. At the same time Pinter is just playing with language as postmodernists often do. The language does not reflect the way people speak.

There are other examples of Pinter using specialist terminology. In Landscape Pinter employs the language of cellarmen (Pinter Plays 3 1978: 193-5) for example and in The Homecoming he employs the language of seamen (Pinter Plays 3 1978: 46-7). In both cases, the understanding of the text is made more difficult because the language is specialised. In The Homecoming, understanding is made even more difficult because the types of sub-culture language used constitute codes dense with subtext and undercurrents.

1.7 Functions of Pinter's Language

Pinter uses language to many different ends. Through poetic language he creates moods, atmosphere. Through linguistic departures from the norm of various kinds he creates comic effect, surprise, perhaps even shock. Characterisation through register has already been mentioned. Below, a few of these uses will be described.

First, Pinter uses language to comic effect: characters play games through puns, and they speak in local speech patterns in a witty, ironic and often inventive way Meg's preoccupation with the word succulent in conversation with Stanley in The
Birthday Party makes us laugh. However, the ambiguity of the meaning of the word in this context results in it having sexual undertones making interpretation somewhat uncertain. Is the word only used for comic effect? Secondly, language is used as a weapon of aggression or defence in order to subjugate the adversary or enable a character to hide through evasion. Peter Hall's view of Pinter's language is that it can be labelled a device used for dominance since "words are weapons that the characters use to discomfort or destroy; and in defence, to conceal feelings." (Hall 1993: 190). An obvious example of the language of dominance or aggression would be Goldberg and McCann's subjugation of Stanley through language in The Birthday Party resulting in Stanley's total collapse. Pinter achieves this collapse solely through the use of accusatory, interrogation-like and oppressive language. An example of a character using the language of defence is Davy, the tramp in The Caretaker. Davis keeps talking about what appears to be irrelevant matters, avoiding the real issue. Instead of replying to or dealing with direct questions put to him, he uses the language of evasion or non-communication in order to hide his real problems. This type of language is as Sahai suggests probably a legacy from the "Theatre of the Absurd" (Sahai 1981: 105). Third, language is action in Pinter's plays, as Hall (Itzin and Trussler: 4-17) and Sahai (1981: 105) rightly state. Events do not really progress through plot, change in characters or through dramatic events, which is usually the case in drama, but through language. Suspense and menace seem innate in the language holding the audience's attention. Fourth, language is used for characterisation, as an indicator of social class, geographical origin etc. For instance, Esslin points out that Pinter uses hollow idioms to reveal the trivial solecisms of working class people (Esslin 1977: 47). Social class, regional origin and "mental identification" with the characters on the stage are partly consciously recognised and partly subliminally achieved through the use of ritualistic language patterns, clichés, everyday idioms and slang as well as highly stylised language of various kinds. The implication is that people have heard these lines - references, clichés, registers etc. - somewhere at some stage in their lives, although they might sometimes find it perfectly impossible to indicate when or where. As a result, lines "ring a bell". It is the abundance of these that seem to elicit identification. Furthermore, allusive names and place names, and register are indicators of a character's geographical origin. In addition, professional jargon or specialist
terminology as a type of code is a key to implicit understanding between characters from the same sub-culture. These implicit codes or messages can be observed between Ruth and Lenny in The Homecoming (see pages 35-39 of this chapter for illustration and discussion). Fifth, the language indicates how "healthy" a social relationship is. Through silences, constant chatter or ramblings, presence or lack of communication between interlocutors, and repetitions Pinter hints at how close, isolated or alienated characters are.

No doubt Pinter's language may have many more functions than those outlined above. The examples put forward here are only supposed to illustrate the complexity of the language. Below there are a few more examples. These are chosen in order to illustrate the different functions of language in Pinter.

1.7.1 Humour and Evasion

In Moonlight the character called Andy is dying - at least that is what we are led to believe. Andy and his wife Bel have not seen their sons Jake and Fred for a very long time, it seems. As Andy is dying he wants to see and talk to his children. Bel tries to find their children, or so she says, but she does not seem to be able to locate them. However, towards the end of the play she phones her sons. This would seem to refute her earlier claim that she was not able to find them. It seems she must have had the phone number all along. Be that as it may, the phone call is an indication that she has in fact known where their children have been for some time. Perhaps she has phoned them before and they have refused to see or talk to their father? It would seem that, in order to protect her husband, she says that she has not found them. Below is the conversation that takes place (Pinter 1993: 73-5)

*Lights up in Fred’s room.*

*The phone rings. JAKE picks it up.*

JAKE: Chinese laundry?

BEL: Your father is ill.
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*Lights up in Fred's room.*

_The phone rings. Jake picks it up._

**Jake:** Chinese laundry?

**Bel:** Your father is ill.
JAKE: Chinese laundry?

Silence.

BEL: Your father is ill.

JAKE: Can I pass you to my colleague?

FRED takes the phone.

FRED: Chinese laundry?

Pause.

BEL: It doesn't matter.

FRED: Oh my dear madam, absolutely everything matters when it comes down to laundry.

BEL: No it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter.

Silence.

[...]

FRED: If you have any serious complaint can we refer you to our head office?

[...]

JAKE: Hullo. Can I help you?

BEL: Do you do dry cleaning?

JAKE is still.

BEL puts the phone down.

JAKE replaces phone.

JAKE: Of course we do dry cleaning! Of course we do dry cleaning!

What kind of fucking laundry are you if you don't do dry cleaning?

First it seems that the couple's sons have decided to play a trick on whoever phones next, the way children may do. The reply "Chinese laundry?" therefore seems like a harmless joke. However, when Jake answers the phone and realises that it is his mother phoning to tell him and his brother that their father is dying, and the joke continues, it does not seem as harmless any more. Why do the brothers behave in this businesslike fashion pretending to be people working in a laundrette? Why does the mother, after she has given up, still continue the charade by saying "Do you do dry cleaning?" No matter what his motives are, after she
hangs up Jake replaces the phone and then furiously comments: “Of course we do dry cleaning. What fucking laundry doesn’t do dry cleaning?” Why does he? The whole episode seems absurd. A case of slapstick humour perhaps? It is clear that it is not natural conversation. It seems something else is going on beneath the surface conversation. The brothers and their parents may have fallen out and in order to avoid having an awkward conversation with their mother Jake and Fred evade a potentially sensitive situation by pretending to be other people. The anger displayed by Jake as he has just replaced the phone seems to indicate that the brothers do care, that we are dealing with a delicate and emotional situation, a situation he and his brother simply cannot handle. In actual fact, the phrase “Chinese Laundry” is taken from a radio show called The Goon Show which was popular in the 1950s, (Bergfeldt 1998: 35). In The Goon Show this type of conversation and situation was quite common. Borrowing from another source and placing it in a different context, a play, is not uncommon in Pinter, and it is a mark of postmodernist writing. Humour used in order to defuse a delicate situation is not uncommon in life, and seems very common in British society. The paradox i.e. the seriousness of the issue (death) and the context from which the catch phrase is taken (comedy or farce) seems to add to the gloom of the situation.

7.2 Dominance and Subjugation

There are many instances in Pinter where language is used in order to dominate or subjugate another interlocutor. A scholar such as Elin Diamond has described how Pinter does this (1985: 64-65). In these instances Pinter affords one character with language used as a weapon and the other with language used as a defence. The “attacker” interrogates the victim with constant questions without letting the victim think before s/he responds, if s/he is even allowed to respond. There is also often an apparent lack of logic in the development of questioning and the questions themselves appear to have no relevance to the elusive topic under discussion. The effect that this kind of language has on the victim is often quite telling. S/he is usually completely confused and does not know what to say and as a result silence is the only option. However, on other occasions, both interlocutors use language in order to subjugate the other and then there is a struggle for power.
by use of language and the one most adept will defeat the opponent and gain power. The kind of language described above occurs in plays such as The Caretaker and The Hothouse, but perhaps the most compelling instance is the following excerpt from the second act of The Birthday Party (Pinter 1960: 47-52):

MCCANN: Get in that seat.
GOLDBERG: McCann.
MCCANN: Get down in that seat!
GOLDBERG: (crossing to him). Webber. (Quietly.) SIT DOWN.

(Silence. STANLEY begins to whistle "The Mountains in the Morne". He strolls casually to the chair at the table. They watch him. He stops whistling.

Silence. He sits.)

STANLEY: You'd better be careful.
GOLDBERG: What were you doing yesterday?
STANLEY: Yesterday?
GOLDBERG: And the day before. What did you do the day before that?
STANLEY: What do you mean?
GOLDBERG: Why are you wasting everybody's time, Webber? Why are you getting in everybody's way?
STANLEY: Me? What are you –
GOLDBERG: I'm telling you, Webber. You're a washout. Why are you getting on everybody's wick? Why are you driving the old lady off her conk?
MCCANN: He likes to do it.
GOLDBERG: Why do you behave so badly, Webber? Why do you force the old man out to play chess?
STANLEY: Me?
GOLDBERG: Why do you treat that young lady like a leper?

She's not a leper. Webber!
STANLEY: What the –
GOLDBERG: What did you do last week, Webber? Where do you keep your suits?
MCCANN: Why did you leave the organisation?
GOLDBERG: What would your old mum say, Webber?
MCCANN: Why did you betray us?
GOLDBERG: You hurt me, Webber. You're playing a dirty game.
MCCANN: That's a Black and Tan fact.
GOLDBERG: Who does he think he is?
MCCANN: Who do you think you are?
STANLEY: You're on the wrong horse.
GOLDBERG: When did you come to this place?
STANLEY: Last year.
GOLDBERG: Where did you come from?
STANLEY: Somewhere else.
GOLDBERG: Why did you come here?
STANLEY: My feet hurt!
GOLDBERG: Why did you stay?
STANLEY: I had a headache!
GOLDBERG: Did you take anything for it?
STANLEY: Yes.
GOLDBERG: What?
STANLEY: Fruit salts!
GOLDBERG: Enos or Andrews?
STANLEY: En - An –
GOLDBERG: Did you stir properly? Did they fizz?
STANLEY: Now, now, wait, you –
GOLDBERG: Did they fizz? Did they fizz or didn't they fizz?
MCCANN: He doesn't know!
GOLDBERG: You don't know. When did you last have a bath?
STANLEY: I have one every
GOLDBERG: Don't lie.
MCCANN: You betrayed the organisation. I know him!
STANLEY: You don't!
GOLDBERG: What can you see without glasses?
STANLEY: Anything.
GOLDBERG: Take his glasses off.
MCCANN snatches his glasses and as STANLEY rises, reaching for them, takes his chair downstage centre, below the table. STANLEY stumbling as he follows. STANLEY clutches the chair and stays bent over it.

Webber, you're a fake. (They stand on each side of the chair.) When did you last wash up a cup?

STANLEY: The Christmas before last.

GOLDBERG: Where?

STANLEY: Lyons Corner House.

GOLDBERG: Which one.

STANLEY: Marble Arch.

GOLDBERG: Where was your wife?

STANLEY: In –

GOLDBERG: Answer.

STANLEY: (turning, crouched) What wife?

GOLDBERG: What have you done with your wife?

MCCANN: He's killed his wife!

GOLDBERG: Why did you kill your wife?

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

GOLDBERG: How did he kill her?

MCCANN: You throttled her.

GOLDBERG: With arsenic.

[...]

GOLDBERG: Webber! When did you change your name?

STANLEY: I forgot the other one.

GOLDBERG: What's your name now?

STANLEY: Joe Soap.

GOLDBERG: You stink of sin.

MCCANN: I can smell it.

GOLDBERG: Do you recognise an external force?

STANLEY: What?

GOLDBERG: Do you recognise an external force?

MCCANN: That's the question.
GOLDBERG: Do you recognise an external force?

[...]

GOLDBERG: Is the number 846 possible or necessary?
STANLEY: Neither.
GOLDBERG: Wrong! Is the number possible or necessary?
STANLEY: Both.
GOLDBERG: Wrong! It's necessary but not possible.
STANLEY: Both.
GOLDBERG: Wrong! Why do you think the number 846 is necessarily possible?
STANLEY: Must be.

[...]

GOLDBERG: What's your trade?
MCCANN: What about Ireland?
GOLDBERG: What's your trade?
STANLEY: I play the piano.
GOLDBERG: How many fingers do you use?
STANLEY: No hands!
GOLDBERG: No society would touch you. Not even a building society.

[...]

GOLDBERG: But we've got the answer to you. We can sterilise you.
MCCANN: What about Drogheda?
GOLDBERG: You're bite is dead. Only your pong is left.
MCCANN: You betrayed our land.
GOLDBERG: You betray our breed.
MCCANN: Who are you, Webber?
GOLDBERG: What makes you think you exist?
MCCANN: You're dead.
GOLDBERG: You're dead. You can't live. You can't think. You can't love. You're dead. You're a plague gone bad. There's no juice in you. You're nothing but an odour!

Silence. They stand over him. He is crouched in the chair. He looks up slowly and kicks GOLDBERG in
In this passage Pinter uses the formula of cross-examination which is found in detective stories. Only the two “investigating officers” do not follow common investigation practice, it seems, but harass the victim into silence, throwing questions and accusations at him, refusing to let him reply or think even. As a result, the victim becomes quite confused and, in the end, is totally subjugated. McCann and Goldberg do not talk like policemen in that their language does not always make sense. There seems to be no logic to the constant change of topics. Logical coherence is replaced by the development of dialogue through association. Moreover, the language does not seem to be leading anywhere, although its purpose is clear: the destruction of Stanley.

1.8 The Jewish Influence

1.8.1 Jewish Background

Billington (1996), Salem (1983) and Wesker (1965) have pointed out that there are traces of Jewish influence in Pinter’s work. Billington emphasises anti-Semitic incidents that Pinter experienced during and after the Second World War as having had some influence. Salem discusses primarily Pinter’s Talmudic obsession with language and Wesker, who is also Jewish, writes that Pinter’s play The Birthday Party depicts Jewish people in a Gentile setting (The Encore Reader 1965: 129-130). However, unlike other Jewish British playwrights such as Arnold
Wesker. the Jewish influence on Pinter's plays is not obvious. Wesker's characters comment upon their Jewishness in his plays. the playwright himself discusses the Jewish influence on his writing and his plays. and in Wesker's plays Hebrew and Jewish words occur. There are some Hebrew. Yiddish or German words in some of Pinter's plays, particularly in The Birthday Party, but in other plays such as The Caretaker and The Homecoming they are non-existent. The Jewish influence in Pinter's plays is implied rather than obvious.

Even limited knowledge of Judaism would support the impression that Jews, as an ethnic minority group, seem to be very much aware of their heritage, their past, especially past sufferings and persecutions going back thousands of years. Holding on to legends and traditions is, therefore, very important. Moreover, the past seems to be very much part of the present in the sense that Jews are encouraged to remember those who have suffered and made sacrifices for coming generations since the past has shaped who they are as a people today. It would seem that Jewish parents, elders and rabbis make sure that the Jewish heritage is kept alive for their children, and instil their children with the idea that to be Jewish is to be different. The Jewish community seems to be close-knit and very well organised - the Jewish network on the internet is an excellent example of this - and the impression is formed that the community is important as a "safe-haven" as members may be subjected to persecutions outside the community. It has happened before, and with the fairly recent atrocities of the Second World War in mind, it is perhaps not surprising that Jews are very protective of their kind.

Pinter was brought up in the Jewish community of Hackney in the East End of London. His father's family was very religious, his mother's was not. As the result of his parents being Jewish, Pinter was understandably steeped in Jewish traditions: he went to the Synagogue, studied the Torah and was round Jewish people, always being immersed in Jewish ways and ideals. Even though he rejected the Jewish faith as a teenager and does not believe in organised religion or authority of any kind, he is very much aware of his Jewish heritage as well as Jewish traditions. Evidence of Pinter's awareness of his Jewish heritage may be illustrated through one incident that happened some time after the war. In the 1950s Pinter went into a bar. He overheard a stranger saying that Hitler had not
gone far enough in his treatment of the Jews. There was a dispute. In the end, Pinter hit the man hard in the face. Police arrived. Later the man said that he could understand that Pinter had hit him since Pinter was a Jew, but he did not understand why Pinter had hit him so hard. Pinter's response was that he had hit him hard because the stranger had offended so many people by his comment (Billington 1996: 80-1). This would seem to constitute a good example of Pinter being aware of his heritage although he is not religious.

Pinter seems to be a man of a singular mind. He does things his own way, goes his own way, even writes his own way. One explanation of his individualistic approach may be that, like most artists, he considers himself to be an outsider and needs to mark out his very own territory, one distinct from his community, traditions and family. However, he might also view himself as different because Jews have tended to be viewed as different and a target for persecution through the ages. Furthermore, they themselves seem to consider themselves as different. In addition, Billington, Baker and Tabachnik have suggested that anti-Semitic experiences during and after the war have influenced Pinter's writing (Baker and Tabachnik 1973: 108; Billington 1996: 17-18) and these experiences may have made Pinter see himself as different. Billington draws attention to one incident that occurred after the war might illustrate this point. Pinter and his friends Jewish and Gentile - were intellectuals. Sometimes they and other people were attacked for looking Jewish and on other occasions because they were carrying books which led some people to draw the conclusion that they were Communists (1996: 17-18). Pinter handled these attackers in two ways, one of which has crept into his plays. Either he started talking nonsense - the phrases resembling phatic communion - in order to defuse the potentially violent situation saying things like "How are you? All right? That's all right then. isn't it?" (1996:17-18) or he stayed and fought. What Pinter did when avoiding confrontation was using what critics later have labelled "language of evasion", the type of language often found in his plays. In this respect it would seem that Billington is right that Pinter's anti-Semitic experiences have influenced his plays.

There appear to be a few factors that may, if not explain, then at least contribute to why Pinter writes the way he does and why his characters sometimes behave and
speak in the particular way that they do. First, being Jewish meant that Pinter was brought up feeling “chosen” as well as a potential target for persecution. Second, having renounced his faith he was an outsider in his own community. Third, being suspicious of organised authority such as the army – Pinter was a conscientious objector – made him a suspect person in many people’s eyes. Moreover, being an artist, he probably viewed himself as different. In addition, marrying out of his faith, an act not looked kindly upon in the Jewish community in the 1950s, isolated him even further. All in all, it is not surprising if Pinter as an outsider often felt under “threat” – people questioning his choices – and, as a result, felt slightly isolated and considered everybody to be an enemy. It is not unlikely that even Pinter’s defensive and slightly menacing voice and way of speaking betray that he is always on his guard, and it is not unlikely that this is a result of him feeling as an outsider. After all, he has always had to fight “everybody” in order “not to let people tell him what to do” – a slight variation on Petey’s “Stan, don’t let them tell you what to do.” in The Birthday Party, the line that Pinter claims to live by (Billington 1996: 79). Bearing these facts in mind, it is no wonder his characters are very defensive and evasive – masking their true intentions – in order to protect themselves from whatever or whoever they think may be against them. His plays, including their atmosphere, would in this way seem to be depicting his reality as a Jew, an outsider and an artist.

Another aspect which is likely to have influenced Pinter or made his awareness of the vulnerability of being Jewish more poignant, was the revelations of the atrocities committed against Jews in the concentration camps during the war. Pinter’s play Ashes to Ashes (1996) covertly deals with this issue. Perhaps Pinter changed his name to David Baron in order to conceal his Jewish heritage when he started acting? It was not uncommon among Jews to change their name after the war. In his plays many of Pinter’s characters have more than one name. Is this a cover-up employed in order to protect one’s past or protect oneself from prejudice or persecution?

Yet another way in which Pinter’s Jewish heritage has influenced his writing is what Pinter refers to as “the Gestapo knock”. It refers to the Gestapo who during the war without explanation or warning knocked on people’s doors in order to
take people away - Jewish people primarily. The Gestapo knock inspired Pinter to conceive of two people - Goldberg and McCann in *The Birthday Party* - who, like the Gestapo, knocked on someone's door in order to take somebody away, in this case Stanley, and subject him to interrogation. Moreover, it would seem that in some of the plays the characters' professions seem to originate in a Jewish heritage: *Max*, the butcher in *The Homecoming*, may be an example of this since Jewish people require butchers of their own due to the strict rules of Jewish food laws: Kosher. The poets in *No Man's Land* could be viewed as another such instance since many Jewish people seem to be artistically gifted. *Andy*, the civil servant in *Moonlight* perhaps? Jews are often well-educated and seem to be ambitious and successful - the Tory politicians Nigel Lawson, Malcolm Rifkind and Michael Howard constitute examples of people tied to the world of politics, including civil servants. Furthermore, by and large Jewish people tend to choose a profession where they can be "their own boss" perhaps because it is in accordance with the Jewish mentality: Jews are eager to control rather than be controlled (Brook 1996: 303). This mentality is present in most characters in Pinter's plays.

Critics and audiences have observed that Pinter's plays have an eerie atmosphere. It is often described as Kafkaesque which usually means that it is depicting "man's fear, isolation and bewilderment in a dehumanised world" (Collins English Dictionary 1979). Billington has pointed out that this eerie atmosphere can be the result of Pinter having lived through the bombing of London and the subsequent evacuation to the countryside during the Second World War (Billington 1996: 18-19). This would seem to be a fair assumption. Billington also emphasises anti-Semitic experiences during and after the war as having influenced Pinter's writing, by which I assume he means not only the language of evasion as mentioned above but the underlying menace of Pinter's plays - in dialogue as well as atmosphere.

The characters of Pinter's plays seem to live in isolation. This may be the case not only because of the events of the Second World War but also due to their Jewish heritage: research undertaken (Brown 1983, Clare 1980, Lichtenstein 1999 et al.) seem to indicate that Jewish people have a tendency not to trust anybody and be inclined to suspect people of having an ulterior motive. *Davies* in *The Caretaker* is
a case in point. He seems to live in constant fear. Or rather, as the Jewish playwright Arthur Schnitzler puts it in his book *The Road to Freedom*, it is perhaps not so much fear of persecution but "security mania" which results in Jewish people behaving in this way, i.e. Davies' way. What Schnitzler probably means, Clare suggests, is that if confronted with persecution Jews rise to their defence, but when a person constantly thinks that people are after him, he self-destructs since he does not let anybody in and consequently lives in isolation (Clare 1980: 90). Perhaps the characters in Pinter's plays behave like the survivors of the holocaust as described by Elie Wiesel (Brown 1983: 67): they seem to choose to exist alone in the sense that they keep their own worlds barred against invasion by others, and "live a life of pretence, employing deceptions as a means of survival" (1983: 67). If this is the case, it is no wonder fear and isolation seem to constitute recurrent themes in Pinter's plays.

Pinter's plays have been said to be surreal and realistic. Indeed there are qualities of both these aspects in his plays. Just how realistic Pinter's plays are is difficult to determine without intimate knowledge of where Pinter grew up. However, *Rodinsky's Room* (Lichtenstein 1999) - a young Jewess's account of the detective work she carried out in order to try to establish the truth about David Rodinsky, a "mysterious" Jew who in 1967 had disappeared from his room never to be seen again gives some suggestions as to what being Jewish might entail. The Jewish community of the East End in the first part of the 20th century, as depicted in the book, constituted a world of its own. Many Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe had settled there. It was a very close-knit community. The Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe changed little by way of habits, traditions, even clothing when settling in the new country. Indeed, it seems that the Rodinskys had changed very little indeed. Lichtenstein who is in her early twenties considers David Rodinsky's behaviour and actions, as described by other people in the book, bizarre. However, when the author speaks to the few still living members of the older generation of Jews who actually lived in the East End when it was a "time-warp" she discovers that they did not find Rodinsky odd at all. In their opinion, Rodinsky was merely an archetypal Eastern European Jew, a very religious and intelligent man who kept to himself as did very religious people of his community in Eastern Europe.
American critics of Pinter's plays _The Caretaker_ and _The Homecoming_, in their reviews of these plays, have pointed out that the setting of these plays, the lodgings, and the garb the characters were wearing were seedy, a bit odd. The same impression was created by _The Homecoming_ at the National Theatre in 1998. With this in mind I was, at a later stage, reminded of Lichtenstein's book where she mentions that non-Eastern European Jews thought the lodgings and even the place of worship, the synagogue, of Eastern European Jews to be seedy-looking. Not up to their usual British standard. These views have been supported by Brook (1996: 25-6) and seem to point to the fact that the setting of at least some of Pinter's plays reflect the Jewish community of the East End prior to the 1970s. This is particularly the case in _The Homecoming_. In view of what is stated above, so-called "odd" or erratic characters in Pinter's plays seem to be realistic. They seem to originate as human beings that Pinter met either when he was roaming the streets of London when he should have been at Drama School, or when he was on tour as an actor or indeed they are people from his past, mostly Jewish friends and relatives, but Gentiles as well. The characters or the atmosphere may seem strange to a Gentile, but to a Hackney Jew of Pinter's generation? Perhaps not. What is true is that many Jews brought up in the East End of London combined Jewish traditions with "indigenous traditions, resulting in a new hybrid culture" (Baker and Tabachnik 1973). As a result, Pinter's plays may depict life partly influenced by his Jewish heritage as well as Gentile traditions. This could explain the universality of his plays, since both Jew and Gentile can relate to his characters, but also experience the alienation.

1.8.2 The Jewish Influence on Language

Diamond states that in _The Birthday Party_ "the Jewish inflection is unmistakeable" (1985: 52). In particular, she is referring to Goldberg and his employment of "Jewish turn of speech" (1985: 53; 61), but she also mentions Max's inflection in _The Homecoming_. Baker and Tabachnik and others have also discussed the Jewish influence on Pinter's use of English (1973: 7; 56).
Peter Hall stresses the care with which Pinter selects words (Hall 1993: 189-143). This is an aspect often commented upon. Among those who agree with Hall are the French director and translator of all of Pinter’s plays into French, Eric Kahane. Moreover, Kahane confirms Hall’s view that cuts or changes should not be made in Pinter’s plays because it would disrupt the rhythm of the dialogue which, Kahane states, is very important to the performance of Pinter’s plays (Kahane 1987: 141-3, 150). In addition, Salem has emphasised the precision and concision of Pinter’s language. Salem argues that one of the reasons why Pinter is fastidious in his choice of words has to do with the fact that Pinter is Jewish. He sees Pinter’s obsession with exact meaning as a Jewish heritage. This claim is not unreasonable since, as Salem and Lillian Mermin Feinsilver point out, one of the principles of the teaching of the Torah (the Jewish Divine Law) is to train the intellect. Jews are taught to develop their thinking in a very precise way in order that they may learn to elucidate different possible connotative and denotative interpretations of the language and meaning of the Torah. This is done in order to provide the tools with which they may discover the secrets of the Torah. Furthermore, the Jewish heritage is, according to Salem, the reason for Pinter’s constant search for the meaning behind the words, the subtext, which constitutes such an important aspect of his work (Feinsilver 1980: 38; Salem 1983: 89-90).

Kahane like Hall and Esslin and other interpreters of Pinter’s plays comment on the concision and economy of Pinter’s choice of words. Pinter achieves concision through selecting words with many layered meanings, words which have allusive or connotative meanings apart from the denotative ones. As a result, what is not said but merely implied is as important or even more important than what is actually said. These aspects of Pinter’s language seem to reinforce the claim that Pinter is a poet since economy as well as implied or allusive meanings are vital aspects to poetry. In an interview with American literary critic Mel Gussow Pinter reveals his approach to language: “It [language] must be absolutely specific. If it’s at all generalized then it’s nothing else but indulgence and it’s illegitimate.[…] (Gussow 1994: 29)”. “Every sentence is a nugget.” (1994: 59).
Irving Howe has pointed out that in Yiddish and Hebrew there is greater freedom of “verbal improvisation” than there is in English (1970: 138-141). As a result, these languages are more verbally inventive than is English and this may have influenced Pinter’s language if not directly then indirectly through phrases used by older generations of immigrant Jews who surrounded him in Hackney. This view seems supported when Baker and Tabachnik state that people growing up in the East End developed a hybrid language “apparent in the development of unique idioms, inflections and speech rhythms” (1973: 1-2).

With respect to the studying of the Torah a few interesting facts may be noted (Lancaster 1993: 18-21, 59, 100-111): word play is encouraged in order to arrive at additional meanings of words and phrases. Moreover, Hebrew has no vowels which means that ambiguity is inherent in the language and different meanings arise depending on what vowel sound is inserted. The Torah is rife with symbolism, it is like a cipher, and even numbers are given symbolic meanings. In addition, both logical reasoning and free associations are explored in order to arrive at additional interpretations of meaning. Of course, the “right” interpretation is to be found in the Talmud, the spoken tradition of Jewish learning, but this encouragement of studying language and meaning may have influenced Pinter as his plays are known for word play, ambiguity, free association and several layers of meaning.

Moreover, it seems not unlikely that many Jews of the old immigrant generation in the East End spoke their native language amongst themselves, holding on to Jewish traditions and language. Furthermore, the second generation of immigrants possibly knew a Slavonic language and Yiddish as well as English. This may have resulted in Jews of Slavonic origins speaking English in a particular fashion. Language interference in these two groups is not unlikely to have occurred. Pinter’s language, his idiolect, having grown up in this type of community may, as a result, have been influenced. Hearing particular Jewish variants of pronunciations and turns of phrases might also have penetrated into the language of his work, natural to him and slightly less so to other people. Moreover, it might have made him more open to irregularities resulting in him being more inventive with language. This Jewish and Slavonic influence on the language might
contribute to the fact that audiences and critics sometimes regard his language as odd because they do not recognise its patterns. One particular telephone conversation in Rodinsky's Room very much resembles the dialogue of Pinter's plays, seeming to confirm the fact that Pinter's dialogue is realistic even when sometimes construed as idiosyncratic or "odd" by critics and audiences (Lichtenstein and Sinclair 1999: 144-47):

LITVINOFF: You're very reserved.
GOLDING: It's all right if you meet the right company.
LITVINOFF: Do you get to the moving cinema a lot?
GOLDING: I've worn the tails, top hat, white gloves ... I've worn better garb than you see me in.
LITVINOFF: Your attitude on philosophy is very ... very breathtaking. Very abstract.
GOLDING: Well, I have been a big reader in my days of solitude and melancholy.

[...]

GOLDING: Don't they know the difference between a bona fide citizen and an undesirable?
LITVINOFF: You're a man of splendid bearing.
GOLDING: I know the weakness of equity and utility. Whatever the qualm or equivocation.
LITVINOFF: I saw the light burning in your eye after closing time in Victoria.
GOLDING: I could have been a licensed surrogate. At Llanelli in Carmarthen. It could have made a difference in the mollycoddling of Mick [Jagger].
LITVINOFF: There's a Victorian light in your eyes after closing time ... Midst all the people hiryng and scurrying around Victoria, you alone had the dignity of the Third Eye. Your eyes were a magnificent sight, even
allowing for the bloodshot bits in various parts of them.

GOLDING: You understand me, don’t you?

LITVINOFF: You looked in extremely good health and fairly expectorative and splenetic when I saw you. You don’t have any infectious diseases – like anthrax – do you?

GOLDING: I can assure you ... I use the highest order of discretion. As no doubt you would observe.

LITVINOFF: You can keep a confidence? You won’t tell anyone, will you. I’m trusting you like a brother. I can rely on you implicitly?

GOLDING: Better than these walls.

LITVINOFF: I’m afraid I’m rather keen on the grape. I’ve drunk four bottles.

[...]

GOLDING: I have done work for a scriptwriter.

LITVINOFF: I know about that. The Caretaker play.

GOLDING: I did that with complete philanthropy, but I don’t worry about that.

[...]

GOLDING: You read The Caretaker. didn’t you? You understand me. I’m very precarious. I know what I’m talking about.

LITVINOFF: Do you accept sterling?

GOLDING: I have an amnesia for it.

The aspects that remind one of the dialogue in Pinter’s plays are declaratives used as interrogatives (You can keep a confidence?) which is probably based on Yiddish grammar (Feinsilver 1980: 304) and is more commonly used by Jewish
speakers of English than others, evading to reply to a question or give what seems to be a peculiar reply, a predilection for nominalisation which is characteristic of formal language, odd digressions on subjects whose importance seem trivial, and the tone suggesting indifference or lack of emotional involvement.

Here are two passages from No Man's Land and Moonlight to illustrate the similarities in the dialogue with the extract above (Pinter 1975: 16-19):

SPOONER: Yes I was talking about strength. Do you recall?
HIRST: Strength. Yes.
SPOONER: Yes. I was about to say, you see, that there are people who appear to be strong, whose idea of what strength consists of is persuasive, but who inhabit the idea and not the fact. What they possess is strength not expertise. [...] 
SPOONER: Do you often hang about Hampstead Heath?
HIRST: No.

[...]

SPOONER: I often hang about Hampstead Heath myself, expecting nothing. I'm too old for any kind of expectations. Don't you agree?
HIRST: Yes.

[...]

SPOONER: You're a quiet one. It's a great relief. Can you imagine two of us gabbling away like me? It would be intolerable.

Pause

By the way, with reference to peeping. I do feel it incumbent upon myself to make one thing clear. I don't peep on sex. That's gone forever. You follow me? When my twigs happen to shall I say rest their peeps on sexual conjugations.
however periphrastic, I can only see white of
eyes, so close, they glut me, no distancepossible, and when you can’t keep the proper
distance between yourself and others [...] the
game’s not worth the candle [...] what is
obligatory to keep in your vision is space. space
in moonlight particularly, and lots of it.

and *Moonlight* (1993: 7):

JAKE: I would think a man of your calibre needs a bit of both.
FRED: Or nothing of either.
JAKE: It’s very important to keep your pecker up.
FRED: How far up?
JAKE: Well ... for example ... how high is a Chinaman?
FRED: Quite.
JAKE: Exactly.

Pause.

One feature of Pinter’s writing, which might appear odd, is his characters’ replies
to questions through stories which seem out of context. Stories, which digress
rather extensively for no evident purpose, it seems. This feature is not often found
in plays by other playwrights, Jewish or Gentile. At least, they are not as frequent
as in Pinter. However odd these stories may seem, according to Feinsilver it is “in
good Jewish fashion” to begin an answer to a question with a story (1980: 23). As
a result, perhaps Pinter’s use of stories is in keeping with Jewish tradition,
although the content of the stories may not be. However, it seems that Jewish
people never forget their past and their forefathers, and since these issues usually
constitute the core of Pinter’s digressions perhaps even the content of the stories is
influenced by the fact that Pinter is Jewish?

Another feature common in Pinter’s works is repetition. Repetition in abundance
it seems sometimes. However, repetition and duplicitives (repeating a word twice)
are features observed as used more frequently by Jewish people speaking English than other speakers of English (Steinmetz 1986: 71). For instance, a question is often answered through the repetition of the same question - different uses of intonation imply underlying meaning such as irony, mockery, dismissal, indignation, scorn, anger or sarcasm and so on (Feinsilver 1980: 298; Rosten 1983: 102, 111, 268-270; Steinmetz 1986: 72). This practice of repetition Feinsilver attributes to having originated out of the discussions of The Talmud. Be that as it may, it is a feature often used by Jewish speakers. Repetition, therefore, may be viewed as a Jewish feature of Pinter's work.

Feinsilver's claims that Jewish humour is "shot through with mockery and paradox" (1983: 12), that logic is often used to celebrate illogic, that "a liberating lunacy dances through Jewish jokes" (1983: 12) and that inversion of reason is not uncommon. These are features which seem to apply to the humour of Pinter's plays. Here is an example from Moonlight (1993: 7-8):

FRED: You were writing poems when you were a mere child.

 isn't that right?

JAKE: I was writing poems before I could read.

FRED: Listen. I happen to know that you were writing poems
before you could speak.

JAKE: Listen! I was writing poems before I was born.

FRED: So you would say that you were the real thing?

JAKE: The authentic article.

FRED: Never knowingly undersold.

JAKE: Precisely.

Silence.

Feinsilver further claims that Yinglish (English with influences from Yiddish) sarcasm as practised by Jews is often used through what seems to be innocent interrogation. The aim, according to Feinsilver, is to demolish whatever validity a person's question may possess. Sarcasm used as ridicule, and irony are examples of this (1983: 49). The occasional line of this feature can be found in The
Homecoming. More extensive use of "innocent" interrogation can be found in The Caretaker, but "innocent" interrogation which is over the top is found in The Birthday Party. Could it be that Pinter is building upon Yinglish in these cases?

Analyses of Pinter's plays reveal many instances of "business lingo" or specialist terminology. Peter Wright claims that one of the main characteristics of Jewish people's way of speaking English is the "over-abundance of business expressions" (1981: 42). This seems to suggest that my analysis of the plays with regard to business expressions is not unfounded. Moreover, Howard Taubman reviewing The Caretaker observed that Mick in The Caretaker uses plenty of business jargon (New York Times Oct 15, 1961).

Here is an excerpt with examples of business language (my italics) from The Caretaker where Mick is talking to Davies (Pinter 1976: 35-6):

MICK: You're stinking the place out. You're an old robber. there's no getting away from it. You're an old skate. You don't belong in a nice place like this. You're an old barbarian. Honest. You got no business wandering about in an unfurnished flat. I could charge you seven quid a week for this if I wanted to. Get a taker tomorrow. Three hundred and fifty a year exclusive. No argument. [...] Say the word and I'll have my solicitors draft you out a contract. Otherwise I've got the van outside. I can run you to the police station in five minutes, have you in for trespassing, loitering with intent, daylight robbery, filching, thieving and stinking the place out. What do you say? Unless you're really keen on a straightforward purchase. [...] No strings attached. open and above board. untarnished record. twenty per cent interest. fifty per cent deposit. down payment. back payments. family allowances. bonus schemes. remission of term for good behaviour. six month lease. yearly examination of the relevant
In the extract above the use of business language is extreme, but there are many other instances of Pinter employing business expressions in his plays.

There are not too many instances of swearing in Pinter’s plays and this may initially have been due to censorship. However, after censorship was abandoned in the 1960s there are still few instances of this type of language. This may not be surprising since, as Feinsilver and Rosten claim, Jews prefer to vent their frustration and anger in obscene, vulgar and forceful language or through the invocation of calamities of various kind (1980: 92; 1980: 36) rather than actual swearing. There is evidence of this in plays such as The Birthday Party, The Homecoming and Moonlight.

The Homecoming (Pinter 1986: 52), my italics:

LENNY: I’ll tell you what, Dad, since you’re in the mood for a bit of a ... chat, I’ll ask you a question. [...] That night ... you know ... the night you got me ... that night with Mum, what was it like? [...] 

MAX: You’ll drown in your own blood.

and in Moonlight (1993: 5), my italics:
BEL: The term "taking the piss", however, was not known to us.

ANDY: It means mockery! It means to mock. It means mockery! Mockery! Mockery!

BEL: Really? How odd. Is there a rational explanation to this?

ANDY: Rationality went down the drain donkey’s years ago and hasn’t been seen since. All that famous rationality of yours is swimming about in waste disposal turdology. It’s burping and farting away in the cesspit for ever and ever. That’s destiny speaking, sweetheart! That was always the destiny of your famous rational intelligence, to choke to death in sour cream and pigswill.

BEL: Oh do calm down, for goodness sake.

Hall, Esslin and others have pointed out that rhythm is very important to Pinter’s plays. It has been claimed that his plays are written like musical scores, including pauses. Hall has said that if one word in Pinter is changed, the rhythm of the piece is altered and, as a result, the passage will not work. Pinter’s plays are indeed musical. Plays such as The Birthday Party and The Caretaker are excellent examples of this. The musicality of Pinter’s plays may also be a Jewish heritage since one of the most evident characteristics of Yiddish and the language of The Jewish Holy Writ is its musicality (Feinsilver 1980: 25).

Moreover, violence or threat conveyed through words, which is an aspect ever-present in Pinter’s work, may be viewed as originating in a Jewish tradition since, in this tradition, verbalised hostility is considered more effective than actual physical violence (Rosten 1983: 93).

Another feature that is striking about Pinter’s writing is the amount of exclamation marks he uses, not a common feature in British writing. The use of exclamation marks is different in the UK and Scandinavia and this often seems to lead British
people to misunderstand and misinterpret its use by Scandinavian playwrights, e.g. Strindberg. Nonetheless, Pinter frequently makes use of exclamation marks. Why? A possible answer presented itself while I was reading one of Wesker's plays; it was a remark that a character in *The Wedding Feast* made about another character (Wesker 1977: 122), my italics:

A. You're shouting.
B. That's Kate White.
C. *I'm Jewish. I shout!*

If this comment, written by a Jewish playwright in a play about Jewish people, is anything to go by then it is not strange that Pinter uses exclamation marks for characterization. The characters in Pinter's plays, with their origin in the Jewish East End, perhaps spoke in this way. Could it be a Jewish trait which occurs in some of the plays? A conscious characterisation on Pinter's part? Yet another possible Jewish feature of his writing is the use of declaratives as interrogatives such as *You drunk?* instead of *Are you drunk?* and this aspect may be based on Yiddish grammar (Feinsilver 1980: 304; Steinmetz 1986: 72). However, this feature of Pinter's language is present in everyday English, although perhaps not to the extent that it occurs in some of Pinter's plays. *Max* in *The Homecoming* (*Pinter Plays 3 1978: 51*) and *Mick* in *The Caretaker* (Pinter 1976: 33) are furnished with the feature of using declaratives as interrogatives (my italics below):

MAX: What's going on here? *You drunk?*

_He stares at Lenny._

What are you shouting about? *You gone mad?*

MICK: Jen ... kins.

Pause.

*You sleep here last night?*

DAVIES: Yes.
MICK: Sleep well!

DAVIES: Yes.

[...]

MICK: What bed you sleep in?

[...]

MICK: You a foreigner?

DAVIES: No.

If the aspects discussed above constitute Jewish features of Pinter's plays - whether or not employed intentionally by Pinter to imply Jewishness in his characters is not really important - the fact that they do occur is perhaps not strange since he probably heard language of this kind when he was growing up and, as a result, it has become natural characteristics of his writing.

1.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined some characteristics of Pinter's language such as precision, poetic and stylised language, allusions, subtext, undercurrents, style and register and other linguistic idiosyncrasies in order to try to illustrate what makes Pinter's use of language different, original and complex to native speakers of English as these aspects of his language may make the translation of his plays into other languages difficult. It has been suggested that Pinter's plays may be more realistic - as noted by Lumley (1967: 273) and others - than is generally assumed as a result of his Jewish heritage. As Pinter refuses to theorise over his works, his plays remain enigmatic, but perhaps the Jewish connection may be of some assistance in understanding why he writes the way that he does and why some critics and audiences tend to regard his language as idiosyncratic. However, the presence of allusions in Pinter's plays seems to have gone almost unnoticed by scholars, although the allusiveness of Pinter's writing has been discussed. As a result, the research in Chapter II (The Initial Critical Reception of Pinter's Plays) will be concerned with the critical reception of Pinter's plays in the UK and some other countries. It will focus not only on the language of Pinter's plays in general,
but also on comments made by critics with reference to Pinter's varied use of allusions.
CHAPTER II

Initial Critical Reception

Pinter’s first major play to be staged in London was *The Birthday Party* (1958). It was a fiasco. His next major play to be produced was *The Caretaker* (1960) which was successful. *The Homecoming* (1965) was Pinter’s third major drama to be staged in London. Since the staging of *The Homecoming* in 1965, many of Pinter’s plays have been staged in London, all over the UK and abroad. The focus of this chapter is the reception of *The Birthday Party*, *The Caretaker* and *The Homecoming* in the UK, the USA, France and Sweden, as it was these early plays that established Pinter’s reputation as a playwright in the UK. Another reason for limiting the analysis to Pinter’s first three plays to be staged in London is the likelihood that it was Pinter’s early reputation as a “surrealistic” and hard-to-understand playwright that influenced the approach to the translation of his plays.

In addition, in order to detect whether there were any major changes in the reception of Pinter’s early plays when compared to his later ones, research has also been carried out on *No Man’s Land* (1975) and *Moonlight* (1993). Although this thesis only deals with formulaic expressions (FEs) in Pinter in translation into Swedish, a discussion of Pinter’s reception in the USA has been included in order to compare the situation with respect to the critical reception of Pinter’s plays in an English-speaking culture other than the UK: particular emphasis will be directed to mentions of allusions or formulaic expressions (FEs). The reception of Pinter’s plays in France, on the other hand, is included in order to compare and contrast the critical reception of Pinter’s plays in translation into French with that in Sweden in order to pursue the questions whether different theatre traditions and language usage have a bearing on difficulties in translation and subsequent reception, particularly with regard to allusions. In order to assess the reception of *The Birthday Party*, *The Caretaker* and *The Homecoming* on the English stage there will first be an outline of the characteristic features of the British Theatre before and after “the revolution” on 6 May 1956 (Nicoll 1978: 231), the day John
Osborne's play *Look Back in Anger* opened at the *Royal Court Theatre*. Moreover, drawing on research undertaken with regard to events affecting the British Theatre, covering the period from the 1940s to 1965, the year *The Homecoming* opened, as well as reviews, I will also suggest some possible reasons for the rejection of *The Birthday Party* in 1958 and the success of *The Caretaker* in 1960. The reason for starting with an examination of the theatre in the 1940s is that it seems logical to begin describing the theatre a few years before the major changes were introduced that eventually resulted in the "new" British theatre. The account ends in 1965, the year *The Homecoming* was produced at the *Albery Theatre* in London; the period covered includes the revolution of the theatre in 1956 as well as the production of three major plays by Pinter, the last one in 1965. This chapter also outlines the history of the theatre in the USA, France and Sweden from the late 19th century until the late 1960s in order to provide a general picture of the theatrical climate prevailing at the time of the translation of Pinter's plays.

2.1 The British Theatre in the 20th Century

2.1.1 Changes in the Theatre

On 6 May 1956 *Look Back in Anger* opened at the *Royal Court Theatre* in London. It had a long and fairly successful first run. Most of the reviewers were critical of the play - Cecil Wilson and Milton Shulman in particular (Elsom 1981: 74-80) - as were many of the conventional theatregoers, but the young approved of it. Kenneth Tynan, although admitting that the play needed changes, was however positive maintaining that *Look Back in Anger* was "the best play of its decade." (*The Encore Reader* 1965: 79-80). *The Birthday Party* was produced in London at the Lyric Theatre, Hammersmith, in 1958. Although the play was very well received round the country before it came to London, it was taken off the Lyric Theatre within a few days (Benedict 2000: 9). In London, the reviews were appalling and few people went to see the play.

The inference drawn from the research undertaken on the British theatre in the twentieth century seems to be that if the plays by Pinter mentioned above had
been written before the 1950s it is unlikely that they would have been staged at all (Hinchcliffe 1974: 45-6 et al). The conclusion is based on the following facts: First, due to the prevailing theatre conventions at the time Look Back in Anger and The Birthday Party did not "fit the bill" and would therefore not have been staged. Second, due to the fact that the writing conditions for young writers were poor, few new playwrights would have appeared. Third, few theatres ventured to stage new playwrights. Fourth, as implied by Kenneth Tynan, it was private money or influence and not talent which made producers decide which plays or playwrights would be staged (Hinchcliffe 1974: 45).

A few events in the 1940s and 1950s as discussed by Hayman (1979) Hinchcliffe (1974), Nicoll (1978) and by critics in The Encore Reader (1965) seem to have altered the prerequisites for the staging of plays by new playwrights.

In 1945 Joan Littlewood started the Theatre Workshop, an experimental theatre dedicated to bringing the theatre back to the people. One of its aims was to promote new young talented playwrights. A year later, the Arts Council received the Royal Charter (subsidies). Among other things, the Council provided bursaries for new young playwrights. Moreover, in 1948, legislation was put through Parliament allowing local authorities to spend money on arts subsidies. This measure was undertaken in order that local theatres would constitute an alternative to the commercial theatres in the West End. In the 1940s the Arts Theatre and a few other small theatres in London began focussing on low-budget productions of experimental and poetic drama by unknown playwrights. Repertory became more widespread and there was a renaissance of the theatre at Stratford-upon-Avon. Furthermore, in 1957 the Royal Court Theatre in Sloane Square, the home of the English Stage Company, began productions of plays by new playwrights, including playwrights such as Osborne and Wesker.

The events mentioned above, resulted in greater opportunities for young talent to write and find a springboard for their work than had been the case before the Second World War. However, although there were more opportunities for the work by new playwrights to be staged in the 1950s than before, revivals dominated the scene, even at the Royal Court, the theatre which claimed to be and
was regarded as the centre for promoting new British drama. Furthermore, it would seem that despite the fact that critics such as Kenneth Tynan, Lindsay Anderson and George Coulouris (The Encore Reader 1965: 39-46) seemed to think that new talent was needed in an otherwise predictable and "dead" (1965: 47, 275) British theatre, some of these critics, such as Tynan, also expressed views which seemed to favour the old school of playwrights. Others such as James Bailey defended escapism in the theatre and regarded the theatre as a refuge from real life (Hinchcliffe 1974: 46).

2.1.2 The British Theatre before 1956

Until 1956, it was mainly the middle classes that went to the theatre, the commercial theatres in Shaftesbury Avenue or the West End constituting the area where plays were staged. Going to the theatre was regarded as a form of snobbery. The theatres in Shaftesbury Avenue catered for an audience who, in line with convention, expected the principal characters of a play to be from the upper classes, although principal characters from other classes were emerging in the 1930s. In addition, the social problems dealt with in these plays were those experienced by the upper classes whereas "real" problems were avoided. The Edwardian audience expected the theatre to set up a protective barrier of fantasy or illusion between the audience and real life. The plays were to be logically structured and motives, causes and feelings should be clear-cut and addressed with a stiff upper lip. Furthermore, the playwright was supposed to put over a message and the principal characters were supposed to have heroic qualities that the audience could admire, otherwise the theatre would be too gloomy and without beneficial use to society (Morgan 1965: 52-56). Before 1956, aesthetics was particularly important to the production of a play. As a result, make-up, lighting and clothes were given particular emphasis. The plays were meant to be historical re-constructions, and careful textual readings were the mode. Moreover, the characters resembled caricatures rather than real people, especially as regards the principal characters, since an ideal human being - rather than any one of a variety of people that exist in a given society - was depicted on the stage. Also, the plays were vehicles for star performances.
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The 1930s and 1940s were a period of superb acting (Nicoll 1978: 248). The typical actor of this era tried to charm or overpower his audience: cajoling or coaxing them in comedy and “thundering them into submission in tragedy” (Marowitz 1965: 282). The relationship between the audience and the actor was one of inequality and illusion. The word was important, and therefore it is not surprising to find that the “Voice Beautiful” (Hayman 1979: 129-35) was in vogue. Actors such as Noel Coward, Laurence Olivier and John Gielgud spring to mind as representative actors of this era. Revivals were the order of the day. Musicals and comedies were the kind of plays principally staged. Some critics at the time seemed to think that the theatre was too light-hearted in its choice of plays (Nicoll 1978: 244) and that there were too few new plays of quality written and produced in London: among these critics were Peter Brook and Kenneth Tynan (The Encore Reader 1965: 69, 275).

2.1.3 The British Theatre after 1956

The break-through for a new kind of young playwright took place in May 1956. The play was Look Back in Anger and was written by a new playwright called John Osborne. The play was a success with the audience, less so with the critics, and it had a fairly long first run at The Royal Court Theatre.

The “new” type of playwright that appeared in 1956 was working class. He had a different background, a different code of conduct, adhered to different conventions from the playwrights prior to the 1950s. As a result, a new type of drama appeared which, in turn, required a new school of play-acting. The new theatre was intimately bound up with the appearance of a new young audience: a small lower-middle class intelligentsia.

It was the English Stage Company and its theatre, The Royal Court, set up in 1955, in Sloane Square that provided opportunities for new playwrights to be staged. However, although professing to focus on new playwrights, records show that The English Stage Company primarily staged revivals (Hinchcliffe 1974: 45-6). The new working-class playwrights, whose backgrounds varied, portrayed
working-class life. This was in contrast to most of the plays staged before the "revolution" in 1956. Those had been plays about the people and the customs of the upper- or upper-middle classes. As a result, the setting of the new plays depicted a very different world. The hero of the new play was a working-class anti-hero, he was not a hero in the conventional sense: a character with admirable qualities and ambitions, but "a regular guy with regular problems". He was someone that the audience could identify with, unlike the hero of the conventional theatre who had been a character to emulate. The anti-hero was not meant to serve as an example to anybody. Jimmy Porter, the principal character of Look Back in Anger, is this kind of character. A further consequence of the change of setting and characters was the introduction of a new set of values being portrayed on the stage. In addition, due to these new playwrights' different backgrounds and styles of writing, the playwrights of the new theatre did not form a homogenous group. However, they all broke with established theatre conventions. One aspect they all shared was individuality. They approached the theatre in their own way, often in a very individual way. This idea of disregarding convention came to be regarded as inverted snobbery.

Another aspect of the new theatre that was different from the conventional theatre was what some critics labelled "lack of clarity" or "obscurity". What they referred to was the fact that most new plays did not adhere to the structure of the "well-made play". Unlike the well-made play, the new plays usually did not have a traditional plot, they had new themes and the language was more ordinary, and the playwrights did not always make clear the motives and causes for the characters feelings and actions. Moreover, the plays were personal in the sense that what was depicted was the writer's very private view of the world, that is the writers were not aiming for universality, and this was going against the grain. In addition, the plays were of a fragmentary nature, depicting situations rather than providing the audience with a sustained narrative or a plot (The Encore Reader 1965: 55. 261).

With the new theatre, the setting also changed. It was no longer the drawing-room theatre of the West End. Moreover, the stage was altered, becoming less realistic in the sense that the actors relied more on the audience's imagination than had previously been the case. Social realism, with regard to the new issues now dealt
The new type of writer, who appeared in the 1950s required a new school of acting. The acting became less conventional, less elegant or mannered, and more "real" in the sense that actors were encouraged to be themselves rather than adopt mannerisms. Elaborate speech had to be unlearnt. The stiff upper lip or bourgeois reserve was replaced by emotions and the relationship between actors and other members of a production became more equal as became the relationship between the audience and the actor (The Encore Reader 1965: 33-34, 52-53). The "old" style of acting with its fancy speech and manners did not suit the new working-class characters and did not appeal to the new audience (The Encore Reader 1965: 33-4, 39). As a result, the actor talked directly to the audience as if the actor and the audience were equals and this resulted in the spectator being able to identify with the actor rather than admiring him. Involvement rather than detachment was what the audience now wanted.

A significant facet of the new theatre that changed with the revolution in 1956 was the language. The language of the theatre was now contemporary and much closer to common speech than ever before. It was the language of working-class people and it was characterised by clichés, phatic communion, small talk and repetition. It was emotional and illogical, and was often considered to be obscure or unclear. The language was inventive in a spoken rather than in a written way (The Encore Reader 1965: 52, 86-87; Lumley 1967: 269).

2.2 Reviews of Pinter’s Plays

2.2.1 The Birthday Party

The reception of Pinter’s work has to be considered in the context of the existing theatrical climate in the 1950s and 1960s as described above. The Birthday Party was Pinter’s first play to be staged in London. It had its premiere at the Lyric
Theatre in Hammersmith in April 1958. The play lasted less than a week. As mentioned above, the reviews of The Birthday Party in 1958 were appalling. The critics' principal reaction to the play was incomprehension and bafflement. All the critics but one claimed that they were not able to discern what the play was about. However, they all agreed that the acting was brilliant. Below are some typical reviews:

W. A. Darlington's response, the then theatre critic of The Telegraph (20 May 1958), was one of complete rejection. He was of the opinion that Pinter 'wallowed in symbols' and 'revelled in obscurity'. Darlington complained that the playwright never 'got down to earth long enough to explain what the play was all about' and, as a result, Darlington claimed he could not tell his readers what the play was about. He went so far as to suggest that he would have preferred going to performances in Russian - which he had done the same day - rather than Pinter's Birthday Party because he would understand the Russian dialogue better than Pinter's even though he did not speak Russian. Every character in the play except Pete - was mad according to Darlington, but at least Pete would not have to sit through the play, he concluded. Milton Shulman writing for The Evening Standard (20 May. 1958) was as puzzled by the play as was Darlington. He compared the play to solving a puzzle where "every vertical clue puts you off the horizontal". The effort a spectator needed in order to understand the play, he remarked, involved too great a demand on the audience, if it was at all possible to make sense of it. Reading Shulman's review, it becomes clear that he agreed with Darlington in thinking that The Birthday Party was very obscure, adding that it was not funny enough as well as commenting that the language was banal. At the same time, however, he was of the opinion that the play's "appeal [was] based on some irreverent verbal anarchy". Shulman referred to Beckett and N.F. Simpson - as did other critics - with regard to playwrights who had influenced Pinter, and he considered Pinter to be their inferior. Shulman suggested Freud in order to help interpret the play, and remarked that a naïve colleague of his had "worked it all out". The colleague had said that "the play was an eerie allegory about messengers from death arriving to recruit the bestial lodger into their ranks." Shulman conceded that there was occasional comedy in the play in some non-sequiturs and
verbal invention, but he did not think the play was either original or clever, and he thought that it did not merit a review.

In The Manchester Guardian (21 May 1958) the signature M. W. W. supported Darlington and Shulman stating that "What all this means, only Mr Pinter knows". This critic attributed his puzzlement to Pinter's language, describing it as "half-gibberish, lunatic ravings" but he pointed to the characters as well who were "unable to explain their actions, thoughts or feelings." M. W. W.'s views were shared by many critics. The critic (not named) writing for The Times (20 May 1958) thought he had come across a surrealistic and/or symbolic drama and had the impression that it derived from the playwright Ionesco. This critic's views were summed up as follows: Act 1 sounded like madness, Act 2 like delirium and Act 3 gave no clues with regard to what Acts 1 and 2 had been about. Moreover, the critic stated that The Birthday Party could have worked if Pinter had been able to create theatrical effects, but according to this critic, the effects were neither terrifying nor comic, merely puzzling. The puzzlement expressed by this critic was shared by many other critics at the time such as Cecil Wilson (20 May 1958), J. C. Trewin (31 May, 1958) and Kenneth Tynan (25 May, 1958).

There was only one theatre critic who wrote a favourable review of The Birthday Party, the then influential critic of The Sunday Times, Harold Hobson. If Hobson had seen the play at its premiere the play might have survived since his review was very supportive. As it was, it had already been decided to take Pinter's play off the stage before Hobson's review could have any effect. In Hobson's review of 25 May 1958, he staked his reputation on his claim that The Birthday Party was first rate drama. The critic was of the opinion that Pinter was "the most original theatrical talent in London" at the time. He pointed out that bad reviews did not necessarily mean that the play was bad, reminding us that Pinter was in very good company: Ibsen, Shaw, Beckett and Osborne had all received bad reviews for their first plays. Theatrically speaking The Birthday Party was absorbing. Hobson claimed. Moreover, the play was witty, the characters fascinating and the plot superb. According to Hobson, one of the play's greatest merits was the very fact that nobody could say what exactly the play was about. It was the vagueness.
which accounted for the spine-chilling atmosphere of the drama, he stated, and it was this quality which made the play “delicious”.

In conclusion, a few observations: Apart from what has already been discussed, at the time, there were some cautious remarks made about the fact that Pinter had an instinct for what works in the theatre, that he seemed to be a natural dramatist, that uncertainty was the key to the power of the play, but none of the critics who made these remarks explained what they meant. The reason for the lack of explanation may have been due to the fact that the critics were not able to state the reasons for their impressions because of their own puzzlement – they had entered un-charted waters.

2.2.2 The Caretaker

The reviews of The Birthday Party had been catastrophic. The possible reasons for this I will discuss at a later stage in this chapter (pages 90-94). First a summary of some of the reviews of Pinter’s second major play, The Caretaker, as it was staged at The Arts Theatre in London in 1960.

It is often commented that The Caretaker was a roaring success with both critics and audiences. Reading The Life and Work of Harold Pinter (Billington 1996: 127-29) one has the same impression. However, there seems to have been two major types of reaction to The Caretaker in 1960. The reviews were, at the time, either rather tentative and cautious - the critics pointing to a sense of enigma or bewilderment, although quietly supporting the play - or they were very positive - every critic in this group agreeing that Pinter’s play was superb. The former view tended to be favoured by the critics of the broadsheet papers, and the latter by critics of the tabloids. A few reviews below:

The critic (again anonymous) writing for The Times on 28 April 1960 started his review by saying that there were certain aspects of The Caretaker which were unfathomable. Although puzzled, he was restrained in his critique, it appears, because the audience thought that the play worked. The sense of bafflement he
had experienced had nothing to do with what the characters actually said because that was very clear, he explained. However “it [was] the connection [my italics] [or lack of it] between what any two things one character says, or the connection between what one character says and the next says afterwards” which accounted for the baffling effect of the play. He also stated that much was kept from the audience with regard to the characters, how they communicated and the events taking place. However, this critic also remarked that the strangeness of the communication had oddly enough not been an issue for him as he had been watching the play. He commented that the play was a remarkable piece of theatre but he did not explain how or why. By and large this review seems neutral or cautiously positive. The cast was hailed, as it was by every critic at the time.

Patrick Gibbs of The Daily Telegraph (28 April 1960) was more negative than the critic writing for The Times. Mr Gibbs pointed to the fact that the bafflement critics had experienced in their reactions to The Birthday Party was also present with respect to The Caretaker, but this time the bafflement did not seem to matter, because the play was a success anyway – with the audience. The impression is that this fact somewhat surprised Gibbs. He further pointed out that there were many questions left unanswered by the play. As a result, it was up to every spectator to find the answers him- or herself. In his opinion, the play was also excessively derivative, almost a parody of Waiting for Godot by Beckett. Beckett’s influence was, as is often the case with Pinter’s plays, also mentioned by other critics. The tone of this review, the way Gibbs discusses the pessimism of the play, the extent to which he points out different possible pessimistic themes of the play, would seem to indicate that he was not very much in favour of it. However, Gibbs did concede that Pinter manipulated his characters with considerable theatrical craft and stated that the dialogue was amusing and absorbing. In fact, the fascination of the play rested in its odd topics of discussion according to Gibbs.

John Rosselli in The Guardian (29 April 1960) was more positive in his remarks than Gibbs. He considered The Caretaker to be a remarkable piece of theatre, but again, like the critic in The Times, he did not explain why, and one has the impression that he did not know why. Although conceding that the audience loved
the play, it seems Rosselli did not find the play to be his cup of tea. This impression is further enforced by Rosselli's statement that the play was "somewhere between farce and madness". That "must take a high place among anti-plays now in vogue" and his comment that "almost nothing" happens during the better part of the play. However, as was the case with the critics' view of The Birthday Party, Gibbs as well as other critics such as Anthony Carthew pointed to the comedy or "verbal flights of fancy" such as "Where were you born?" "What do you mean?" present in the play. The final impression is that Rosselli thought that the play was fascinating, that it was a hit, although he was not quite sure why.

Kenneth Tynan of The Observer was quietly positive, stating that Pinter was talented. However, although Tynan claimed that it was Pinter's bizarre technique, which was fascinating, he also asked whether it was an abuse of dramatic technique. What Tynan stressed outright, however, was Pinter's skill at evoking atmosphere and his consummate command of contemporary speech. One broadsheet critic was decidedly supportive of The Caretaker. T. C. Worsley of The Financial Times (29 April 1960). Worsley had only superlatives for Pinter. He acknowledged that Pinter had been influenced by Beckett, but as he put it "We're in Godot country, but not Beckett fog." The play was rich in observation, he continued, yet disturbing and moving. Furthermore, Worsley was of the opinion that the play was hilariously funny, and that it tried to catch something of "the underneath atmosphere". "This play is not to be missed", he concluded. Irving Wardle (1965: 129-132) did not think the play was either obscure or surrealistic. To him The Caretaker was "the work of a considerable artist" because it was very funny and original. He thought it was a thorough study of three characters, who were prisoners of their own private fantasy. In addition, he supported Pinter's decision to remove the social background, which was contrary to the contemporary trend, and stated that the language of the play created a world of its own. Wardle, like Tynan, pointed to the language of the play, its originality and the fact that it was based on working-class speech. Wardle compared Pinter to Chekhov: first because of the way that Pinter focused on trivia and how its significance expanded in a way reminiscent of Chekhov, and second because Wardle felt that the writing, like that of Chekhov, had the formal quality of music.
To sum up, it would seem that the majority of critics of the broadsheet papers tended to be restrained in their views, whereas those of the tabloids were extremely favourable. Among the latter were Anthony Carthew of The Daily Herald (28 April 1960) and Michael Gilderdale in The News Chronicle (28 April 1960). The former talked about the audience’s “tumultuous cheers”, calling the The Caretaker the best play in London, being overwhelmed rather than giving reasons as to why seeing the play was a must. The latter called the play “a spellbinder”. According to Gilderdale, Pinter was a writer of great gifts because he “trouble[d] and tried[ ] the imagination” and because he made his audience laugh and feel (fear, terror, compassion tenderness etc.) and, he continued, although Pinter made almost impossible demands on his audience – in what way, he does not really explain but the word “obscurity” seems implied – it did not matter because the play worked.

2.2.3 The Homecoming

On June 2nd 1965, Peter Hall produced The Homecoming at the Aldwych in London. The main reactions to the play among critics were that it could be interpreted in many ways, that the acting was brilliant and that it was a dark and disturbing play.

B. A. Young in The Financial Times (5 June 1965) labelled The Homecoming “dark and horrible”. He thought that the play had been slightly long-winded till Pinter had revealed his master strokes, the last of which had made everybody gasp: a woman preferring life as a prostitute to motherhood and married life. Young considered Pinter to be an important playwright because he had a great capacity for evoking tension among his characters, a tension, which the audience could not escape experiencing. Young claimed. However you interpret the play, this critic stated, “It’s monstrously effective theatre”. H. Kretzmer in The Daily Express June 4 1965 (Elsom 1981: 160) called The Homecoming “an intensely unattractive play” and was generally quite dismissive of it, mentioning Pinter’s “special tricks” and the “Pintermimes”: pauses and the violence beneath a trivial surface. In The Guardian on 4 June, 1965, P. Hope-Wallace claimed that Pinter
reversed what Hope-Wallace considered most pleasurable in the theatre. Instead of the audience either knowing or being curious about what was going to happen - and watching the actors trip up and be unaware of what was to happen - in Pinter’s work it was the audience who was in total ignorance and the actors who “exchange[d] nods and smiles of complicity”. The result of this was mystery and puzzlement. Moreover, Hope-Wallace stated, although the play was sometimes very funny it was steeped in non-sequiturs and masked innuendo. Once again it seems that a critic found the play puzzling and obscure.

A. Seymour writing for The Yorkshire Post 4 June 1965 (Elsom 1981: 159) reacted in a way similar to Hope-Wallace. He thought that Pinter had led his audience into a peculiar wasteland where it was soon lost in “a maze of dead ends, unmade roads and confusing signposts.” He continued by stating that the play was callous and empty, at least on the surface, and concluded: “what lies in its Freudian depths one only dreads to think.” N. de Jongh writing for The Evening Standard (24 Jan 1997) was not very impressed. He thought the play started as a comedy and drifted further and further into fantasyland. Anyone who asserts that this is a play about a woman acquiring freedom and power - as de Jongh asserts Billington did in 1965 and which in fact was the case in 1996 (Billington 1996: 168-9) - has a warped view of the world, de Jongh claimed. Finally, Bernhard Levin in The Daily Mail 4 June 1965 (Elsom 1981: 158) was of the opinion that the first act had been dazzling in dramatic effect and in Pinter’s ability to turn small talk into sinister dialogue using “half-caught meanings”. However, to Levin the second act had not depicted anything new and was, as a result, aimless and an imitation of Pinter’s own style. Levin called Pinter “[a] master of intangible menace”.

2.2.4 No Man’s Land and Moonlight

No Man’s Land, like most of Pinter’s plays, was received with puzzled incomprehension by the critics in 1975. The general impression can be summed up as follows: “the acting was brilliant, but what on earth was he [Pinter] on about?” This reaction, argues Billington (1996: 346, 251), is not surprising since
in order to understand Pinter’s plays a critic needs more than a few hours in which to assess and interpret the play. Critics usually do not have this luxury, and as a result, reviews tend to include a sense of puzzlement. As Pinter in 1975 was an established and popular playwright, No Man’s Land was not dismissed but received with a mixture of respect, admiration and bewilderment. The aspects critics pointed to in 1975 were the underlying menace of the play and the language, that is the play’s haunting atmosphere – haunting because it speaks to the unconscious one critic stated (Billington 1996: 245) – and the language: masterful, poetic with subtle rhythms, and repetition. Echoes of Beckett were noted (Billington 1996: 251).

Moonlight (1993), unlike Pinter’s previous plays, was not greeted with puzzlement by audiences and critics because, Billington claims, they felt that the play depicted authentic events that everybody has experienced (Billington 1996: 346). Moreover, in line with reviews of his earlier plays, critics remarked that Moonlight was enigmatic, difficult to understand and funny, but unlike Pinter’s earlier plays, it was also moving. The dialogue was claimed to be the “language of evasion”, that is a cover-up for true thoughts and emotions.

2.3 Discussion of the Reception of Pinter’s plays in the UK

2.3.1 The Birthday Party

When in 1958, The Birthday Party reached the Lyric, Hammersmith, hardly anyone came to see it, in spite of it having played to big audiences round the country. The London audience’s rejection of the play was probably partly due to the poor reviews that the critics gave the play. Hobson’s very favourable review did not help remedy the situation since it was published after the play had been taken off the stage. A study of the British theatre before and after Look Back in Anger in 1956 seems to indicate that the rejection of The Birthday Party was due to the play clashing with prevailing theatre conventions at the time. The clash was many-faceted. First of all, visually, the working-class setting was different to the rather lavish upper-middle class drawing room setting in customary use. Although
plays with a working class setting had been performed prior the production of The Birthday Party, the visual impact, which can be very powerful, was enhanced through the principal characters’ working-class dress code and manners, clashing considerably with the theatre tradition that had preceded it. As a result, the first reaction of the audience might have been a sense of defamiliarization or alienation. Second, aurally, the audience faced only working-class speech - words, rhythm and not least: accent. This might have caused another negative reaction as the theatre before 1956 had stressed what the audience probably considered to be beautiful upper-class English diction and enunciation. Another possible defamiliarisation effect, it would seem. Third, the principal character of the play was of a very different background than in earlier, traditional plays. Rather than the audience admiring the hero, which had been the case before, the new school play provided no conventionally admirable qualities in its anti-hero. It merely portrayed an ordinary man with a troubled life, as life might be for a man of the working classes. Perhaps this was something the audience found difficult to accept since it had been used to following the clear-cut actions and emotions of an exemplary specimen of the human species - learning from his actions - rather than the troubled and ordinary life of a regular worker. What could they learn from such a character, they might have asked themselves, if thinking along the lines of conventional approaches to drama. The audience’s framework for the evaluation of the play seemed to have been shaken. Moreover, the new principal characters required a new type of acting. Elegant mannerisms were substituted for actors whose behaviour was more natural. This type of acting was considered more common or down-to-earth - at least to the bourgeois middle class audience (The Encore Reader 1965: 33-34). Unfamiliarity on this account may have contributed to critics’ and audiences’ rejection of the play. Another aspect that may have affected the critics’ as well as the audience reception of The Birthday Party is the fact that Pinter was and is a playwright of instinct and intuition (Lumley 1967: 271-2). This means that Pinter does not believe in the concept of the omniscient narrator, that is he is against a theory of characterisation, plot and structure where the writer knows “everything” about characters’ motives, causes etc., aspects of the well-made play which were very important to the plays of the old school (Hinchcliffe 1974: 127). As a consequence, while writing and after the completion of a play, Pinter is not always aware of the causes, reasons or motives for his
characters' actions and feelings, nor does he want to be, because as he has claimed people do not know about these things in real life. As a result, these aspects are not clear to the audience. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find critics and spectators commenting on the lack of clarity, stating that Pinter's plays were alarming, negative and uninspiring (The Encore Reader 1965: 52-56). These comments seem to be a natural reaction to some aspects with which the audiences and the critics were unfamiliar, or had not expected.

In Pinter's plays then characterisation is fragmentary. As a result, the audience has very little actual knowledge of the characters. The plot does not usually seem very elaborate and the structure is not that of the well-made play. Instead it is through the language - undercurrents, puns, idiosyncrasy of various kinds, allusions, and silences etc. - rather than through action and plot that the play progresses. What the audience saw depicted before them in The Birthday Party was seemingly random images or situations, which appear to lack obvious logic of progression. The lack of logic often commented upon by critics in the 1950s and 1960s was not a feature unique to Pinter. His way of writing - like many other playwrights of the "new wave" - resulted in the audience having the impression that things just happened according to their own rules. Consequently, audiences and critics tended to see very little logic in the writing and failed to understand this new approach to writing. It is possible that because these factors clashed with the audience's expectations, they considered the play to be confusing or obscure. In fact, audiences and critics did not approve of Pinter's method, viewing it as inferior to the conventional method of playwriting (Nicoll 1978: 279; The Encore Reader 1965: 124).

It is clear then that Pinter's work is in stark contrast to the very careful development of plot, structure and characterisation - a legacy from the well-made play - which characterised the vast majority of plays written prior to the mid 1950s. With regard to structure for instance, the customary and very popular tradition of exposition, development, climax and denouement, characteristic of the well-made play, had been applied by many playwrights in order to aid the audience in understanding the playwright's message. Pinter rejects this notion. He
has no clear message because he believes it to be pretentious of a playwright to assume the mantle of moral guide. Accordingly, it would not be unlikely for the audience to experience confusion since Pinter so clearly evades contemporary conventions of structure and message.

Another feature adding to the confusion is the language itself. It was not primarily the fact that the accent, dialect and vocabulary were working class which was upsetting to the audience, but the fact that the dialogue seemed most illogical. It was often described as obscure, probably due to idiosyncratic features such as "cross talk", that is talk at cross purposes, development of dialogue through association rather than expected logic, collage of styles and genres as well as an abundance of pauses and silences, all of which added to a sense of mystery and puzzlement. However, the Cockney dialect and humour might also have impeded the audience's and critics' understanding of the play as social codes, culture, specialist language and conventions - including humour - seldom overlap between social classes and, as a consequence, in-jokes are invariably not understood (The Encore Reader 1965: 71). Moreover, in reviews of The Birthday Party in 1958, critics often commented that questions put forward in the play were never clearly answered, and issues raised were never satisfactorily resolved. The audience is likely to have got the same impression. This lack of finality or conclusion was new to the audience. It was a feature that they seem to have had great difficulty in accepting, probably because of its unfamiliarity. As a result they regarded the play as incomplete and rejected it. In addition, Pinter changed the relationship between the audience and the actors in the sense that - and this applies to The Birthday Party - the audience is often not sure whether or not a character is lying. Previously, playwrights had made it clear to the audience when this was the case. In Pinter's work facts cannot be confirmed, even the names of the characters cannot be taken for granted. The result was that the audience was left to interpret and find the answers to the puzzle or riddle, as some critics described it, for themselves without much guidance from the playwright. This fact may also have played a part in the rejection of the play.
Clearly, when watching *The Birthday Party*, it would not have been possible for an audience to sit back and be passively entertained as had been the case in the theatre of the past. There were too many differences between what an audience expected and what they were presented with which demanded their attention. Moreover, it appears that one of the prerequisites of the new type of play was the requirement of active involvement on the part of the audience in order for spectators to catch the hints and grasp the meaning of actions and events. As a result, Pinter's highly personal style and anti-establishment way of writing - his play did not fit the critics' framework for evaluation - may have been a contributing factor to the "eruption" amongst critics in 1958.

Finally, the bewilderment experienced by audiences may also have stemmed from their unawareness of the political implicatures (significance of references or meanings of FEs) embedded in the language of the play (Perloff 1993: 6-7).

2.3.2 *The Caretaker*

Only two years after the failure of *The Birthday Party* in 1958, *The Caretaker* was, on the whole, well received by critics and audiences alike in 1960. The question is why? What were the reasons for the change in reception within so short a period of time. The answers might be found with the new audience and/or with the critics. Pinter's reputation as a playwright probably influenced the translation of his plays into other languages but also the reception of his plays (see Bergfeldt 1998). With these factors in mind, audiences, critics and Pinter's evolving reputation as a playwright have been studied. *The Birthday Party* and *The Caretaker*, Pinter's first two plays on the London stage, were studied in order to ascertain whether there were any major differences between them, which might explain the differences in reception. Reviews were also studied for indications of why the reception in 1958 was different from that in 1960.

Having studied both plays there seem to be some significant differences between them with regard to the following aspects: message, structure, mystery and obscurity, although the critics at the time mentioned few significant differences
between the plays. On the one hand, Gilderdale (28 April, 1960) in his review of The Caretaker, seemed to assert that it was the realistic characterisation in The Caretaker - not present in The Birthday Party - which was the main reason why it had worked - although, he also perceived some surreal features present in the play. Wardle (1965: 129-132), however, thought that it was Pinter's removal of the realistic social setting and Pinter letting the language create its own reality that made The Caretaker successful. However, Wardle also pointed to realistic features in the same play. Thorough analyses of the two plays seem to suggest that characterisation in The Caretaker is more consistent and clearer in the sense that there are fewer question marks about the characters and the motives for what they do and say. This makes The Caretaker more realistic than The Birthday Party, a play dense with mystery. It would seem that according to critics there are elements of both realism and fantasy in both plays, but generally speaking, the majority of critics did not seem to perceive realism or fantasy or any other significant features as constituting factors that led to a change in critical reception.

Despite the similarities between the plays such as language being used as a power tool, characters lying and protecting their past by evading questions directly, the presence of odd stories, interrogations and subtext as well as undercurrents, there are a few distinct differences between the two plays. First, The Birthday Party is a play of extremes in a number of different ways whereas The Caretaker, in comparison, is a toned down version. A couple of examples may help illustrate what the differences are. In both plays interrogation occurs, however, the interrogation in The Caretaker is much shorter and the reason for the interrogation in this play seems to be more justified than it does in The Birthday Party. It is the language of the interrogation of The Birthday Party, which makes the dialogue appear totally nonsensical after a while. Moreover, the purpose of the length of the interrogation is difficult to grasp. These facets of the interrogation in The Birthday Party are not found in the interrogation in The Caretaker. Another feature that occurs in both plays, but in different ways, is repetition. In The Birthday Party the conversation is sometimes trite, and simple words are repeated as a form of phatic communion. Sometimes the same word is repeated as part of a phrase with minor changes four or five lines in succession. Initially this may be humorous, but the extent of the use of repetition of simple words such as "nice" in phatic
communion in this play is so frequent that it becomes ridiculous and finally, strange. The view put forward by Clive Barnes' (New York Times, 4 Oct, 1967) illustrates this point. Barnes felt that the effect of the repetition was that Meg and Petey came across as too eccentric to be funny. There is some phatic communion in The Caretaker but it is not extreme in any sense, and the repetition that occurs is found within the same line and it is the same character repeating himself. This gives a different impression. Here, it appears, repetition is used to imply aspects of the personality of the character.

Second, let us now examine the language of the two plays: The Caretaker is a play where the characters use colloquial English (Davies in particular) business language (Mick) and fairly standard language (Aston) and they speak the same way throughout the play. In sum, the language seems straightforward. In The Birthday Party, most of the characters keep to their way of speaking until suddenly, particularly during the interrogation scenes, the language of Goldberg and McCann becomes very difficult to grasp. Evidence that the dialogue is difficult is provided by Barnes, describing these passages in The Birthday Party as "music-hall patter" which reached "unrealistic heights", comments which seem to imply that Barnes considered the dialogue odd (New York Times, 4 Oct, 1967). It may be that the dialogue comes across as odd because it is difficult to grasp. It may make sense as music-hall patter, but it is also true that those passages Barnes are referring to are filled with allusions or formulaic expressions, allusions that the audience may or may not recognise and grasp depending on whether or not they are familiar with them. If the allusions are not recognised, the clues in them will not be grasped, and as a result, these passages become difficult to make sense of and appear odd, which may be why the audience loses the thread and some reviewers talk of non-sequiturs occurring in the play. Be that as it may, it is not necessarily a case of non-sequiturs or music-hall patter, but allusions, which are clues to the actual themes of the play: criticism of religion and society. It can be said that in The Birthday Party language is a code. In The Caretaker there are as far as can be established very few allusions, although the language is sometimes allusive. As a result, the language of The Caretaker is not as extreme, does not appear as strange and is therefore easier to understand.
Third, it is easier to justify and understand actions and events in *The Caretaker* because more is known about the characters in this play. In this context, Howard Taubman’s comments on *The Caretaker*, when it was staged in New York in October 1961, sums up some of the differences between *The Birthday Party* and *The Caretaker* rather aptly. He claimed that Pinter in *The Caretaker*, when compared to *The Birthday Party*, had concentrated his material and “given it sharper dramatic focus” (New York Times 15 Oct, 1961) by which can be inferred “easier to understand because the motives were clearer to the audience”, and he went on to say that Pinter “intensifies by condensing”, that is in *The Caretaker* the language was less elaborate or extreme. Indeed, *The Caretaker* is much more clear in purpose and more condensed in action than is *The Birthday Party*. In *The Birthday Party* there are more instances of mystery and uncertainty: Who is the character called *The Voice*? What is the purpose of the drum? Is it Stanley’s birthday or not? Who is Monty? and so on. Quite simply, the plot is more probable and more realistic in *The Caretaker* than in *The Birthday Party*.

There are other possible answers to the critics’ different approach to Pinter as a playwright in 1958 and 1960. These answers are not only to be found within the plays themselves.

First, critics and audiences may have become more used to the new theatre during the two years that had passed between *The Birthday Party* and *The Caretaker*, or rather between the revolution on 6 May 1956 and the production of *The Caretaker* in 1960. This might have been the case since, during this period, other "new and different" playwrights had been staged: Beckett, Ionesco, Simpson, Osborne and Wesker among others. Compared to Beckett and Ionesco, who audiences and critics considered outrageous in their approach to the theatre, Pinter did not seem as strange, only “derivative” (Gibbs 1960) or “parochial” (Hinchcliffe 1974: 127; *The Encore Reader* 1965: 55). Simpson had provided comedy and surrealism (Shulman, Tynan, Wardle 1958), and Osborne and Wesker and in addition Pinter, were other representatives of working class realism in the theatre. As a result, it could be suggested that people had become more accustomed to the new theatre. This view seems to be supported by Schroll (1971) when he states that the acceptance of *The Homecoming* in 1965 could be explained by the fact that
audiences and critics, at that time, had become more familiar with what he calls "implied theatre" (Schroll 1971: 55). Schroll's suggestion that familiarity with the new theatre was important to the reception of The Homecoming may, as a result, also be applied to The Caretaker since from 1956 onwards audiences were likely to have grown more and more accustomed to the new theatre. In addition, it seems that The Homecoming, which is much more disturbing a play than is The Caretaker, must surely have been more demanding and required even further open-mindedness and familiarisation in order to be accepted as excellent theatre in 1965 than did The Caretaker in 1960.

Another aspect that might have contributed to the difference in the reception between The Birthday Party and The Caretaker is the fact that Encore, an influential theatre periodical in the 1950s and 1960s, had championed Pinter after the failure of The Birthday Party (Billington 1996: 88). Wardle seems to support this suggestion when he mentions Encore's belated note on Pinter's "blighted career" in July 1960 (The Encore Reader 1965: 129). The implication is that the influence of this major and important theatre journal whose "big achievement of keeping continually alert to new developments in the drama, irrespective of aesthetic cliques and cabals" (The Encore Reader 1965: 11) had made a difference. In fact Encore even published some of Pinter's plays (The Encore Reader 1965: 11) and Encore might have been a contributing factor to the swing in the reception of Pinter's second major play produced in London, especially as the magazine was likely to have an influence on the audience; Billington refers to it as "the theatregoer's Bible" (1998: 106).

However, it seems that Encore was not the only magazine to write favourably about Pinter after the debacle of The Birthday Party. After the failure of The Birthday Party, a great deal appears to have been written about the play and its writer. This impression is corroborated by Schroll (1971) in his book Harold Pinter - A Study of His Reputation where he sums up the different critical and scholarly writings about Pinter and his plays during the period 1958-1969 in detail. The out-pouring of critical observations and views of this period can be summed up as ambivalent. Critics and scholars either did not understand Pinter's plays and rejected them and their writer outright or they read allegorical, deeper
meanings into the plays – the trend of the 1950s. Schroll claims (1971: 13) - and were very supportive of them.

The reason why critics write about particular playwrights at certain periods, Schroll claims, is due to the fact that among critics fashions tend to “blow up” (1971: 17). Schroll claims that the fairly positive reception of *The Caretaker* was due to the fact that Pinter had become fashionable with the critics after the failure of *The Birthday Party* (1971: 18). As a result of articles, reviews, counter-articles and other writings published in newspapers and periodicals such as Punch, Encore and The Spectator in support of or in opposition to Pinter, the change in the reception of Pinter’s play may well have been due to the fact that Pinter had become popular among critics. In fact, according to Schroll, the criticism of *The Birthday Party* is an interesting case study of the critics’ tendency to start fashions since the shift towards favourable criticism of the play gradually increased until the production of *The Caretaker* in 1960 (Schroll 1971: 17) and it increased even further later in the 1960s.

Despite the rather dismissive tone of Wardle’s review of July 1960 (The Encore Reader 1965: 129), Wardle’s description of how the critics’ views on Pinter had changed nonetheless confirms the fact that, after *The Birthday Party*, Pinter and his first play were indeed the subject of discussion in the world of theatre. As Wardle describes it, the play was first slaughtered, then it was “the buzz of salon conversation” (The Encore Reader 1965: 129); the buzz rapidly increased and with his second major play Pinter was hailed by the West End, and in addition, received prestigious offers to make films of his plays.

However, although a great deal was written about Pinter and his plays, the same subjects kept recurring in the discussions: “characterization, dialogue, similarities to European writers, and obscure plotting” and later “the creation of an atmosphere of horror” (Schroll 1971: 14). The critics’ writing at the time appears to have been rather uniform. It would seem that what Schroll refers to as the critics’ “older criteria for judging plays” (1971: 14) did not fit Pinter’s plays and, as a result, there was little the critics were able to say in order to clarify what the plays were about or help the audience understand them. The significance of
Pinter's art was debated and in doubt, perhaps because a new framework for judging plays had not been quite established. However, although almost all the critics were negative to start with there was a gradual trend towards an acceptance of Pinter's style. Then in 1960, with the production of *The Caretaker*, Pinter became the writer in vogue.

Once the Pinter canon had been established and labels such as Pinterism, Pinteresque and the Pinter Pause — labels such as these being signs of a writer being popular or fashionable according to Schroll (1971: 35) — were coined, these labels were invariably applied in order to describe Pinter's plays. It would seem that rather than discussing the actual play, labels were applied and little discussion was concerned with what these labels actually stood for. This might be interpreted as an indication that the critics did not really understand the playwright and used clichés to express action and plot. However, the very fact that labels were applied to Pinter's work seems to indicate that he was popular.

Another reason that may have made the success of *The Caretaker* possible was the fact that managers of the West End theatres as well as critics had to "acknowledge a change in public taste" in order for the theatre to survive — they had to cater for the new audience (*The Encore Reader* 1965: 45, 75). However, stiff competition from television and film may also have had an influence (Nicoll 1978: 262). It seems too that at the time managers and critics were not too enthusiastic about the play — there were indications of discontent among critics in some reviews of *The Caretaker* — but since the audience loved the play they restrained their criticism and the reviews were kept fairly neutral. In addition, before the production of *The Caretaker* in 1960, a couple of Pinter's plays had been broadcast on radio and television with great success and *The Room* and *The Dumb Waiter* had been staged in London.
2.4 The American Theatre in the 20th Century

An assessment of the initial reception of Pinter's plays in the United States requires some background knowledge about the American theatre at the time. Below is an outline of the American theatre of the 20th century.

In the 19th century and until 1914 there were no native playwrights of real distinction in the USA. One reason for this may be that in the 19th century the USA was still a young nation; the fact that the names of the American playwrights of the 19th century tend not to be remembered today can be viewed as an indication that there was a lack of talented playwrights. However, the new plays that were staged were often written by American citizens - some were adaptations - but most popular were British plays (The Oxford Illustrated History of the Theatre 1995: 312). The classics were also performed, but the majority of plays were melodramas, farces and sentimental comedies and the repertoire did not change until the early 1920s. However, naturalism became more and more important in the latter part of the 19th century.

By the inter-war years realism had become firmly established in the American theatre, although farce, commercial entertainment and historical drama were also produced. Musicals were popular and the American Broadway musical developed its characteristic form in the 1920s. In the 1930s, mainly due to ideological, spiritual and material upheavals in the aftermath of the First World War, but also as a result of the depression, radical impulses spread and the main purpose of the stage was to raise and debate social issues, particularly as a means to try to obtain political and economic justice. The radical Group Theatre was founded in 1931 by Strasberg, Crawford and Clurman, three former members of the Theatre Guild which was created in 1919 and was heavily influenced by naturalism (The Oxford Illustrated History of the Theatre 1995: 383). The Group Theatre, inspired by naturalism and Stanislavski, influenced the majority of the American theatres until the 1960s. The work of the well-known director Elia Kazan is based on naturalism. Besides non-political radical group theatres, extreme left theatres such as The New League Theatre Network (amateur groups) and the Labor Stage emerged (Nicoll 1949: 820-1). Many of these theatres often struggled financially.
and soon disappeared. In addition, the Federal Group (experimental theatre) was formed specifically to provide jobs for people active within the theatre as well as to finance productions and provide low-priced tickets for spectators. The work of Orson Welles was first staged as experimental theatre. Although continental art movements such as impressionism, expressionism, symbolism and surrealism and experimental as well as political theatre reached the American stage in the 1930s with Elmer Rice as one of the most prominent writers, realism - and naturalism to some degree - dominated. O'Neill is a case in point. He wrote many expressionistic full-length plays; however, in the States it was his realistic one-act plays, which paved the way and constituted his break-through as a playwright.

With the advent of the “talkies” in the 1930s, film became a serious threat to the theatre and by the 1940s the cinema was well established as the preferred means of entertainment of the American people. This fact influenced the development of the theatre as fewer and fewer people went to performances. Moreover, film conditioned the audience’s expectations, which led to the theatre adapting to film. With the appearance of television in the 1950s the theatre had to adapt even further in order to keep its audiences (The Oxford Illustrated History of the Theatre 1995: 395-6).

During the New York seasons of the 1940s, the great majority of plays staged on Broadway, and elsewhere, were revivals, mostly farces and comedies. The fact that light entertainment was popular at the time is not surprising since, after the war, the public sought and needed entertainment to lift their spirits - not only in America but in most of the Western world (Sjögren 1979: 25). However, realism was still popular and the new young American writers were almost universally realistic in the approach to their writing, however, they had little new to offer the theatre. In 1947 the Actor’s Studio was founded by Kazan, Crawford and R. Lewis with Strasberg as its director from 1951 to 1982. The influential directors and actors of the Actor’s Studio were the people who “shaped the plays by” Tennessee Williams, Arthur Miller and Eugene O’Neill in the 1950s and afterwards, and it was through the Actor’s Studio that a new distinctly American acting style was formed: the Method School with Marlon Brando as one of its most famous exponents (Actors on Acting 1970: 542).
The 1950s started the way the 1940s had ended, i.e. with light entertainment and realism. However, violence gradually entered the theatre and eventually it "took obsessive decadent forms" (Taubman 1967: 293). One reason for the gradually increasing occurrence of violence in the theatre was due to the fact that the playwrights, by shocking their audiences, tried to rouse the people from a general state of complacency and apathy. One writer who did this was Tennessee Williams, the well-known American playwright, whose plays in the 1950s were gradually becoming more sensational and violent. However, on the whole, the 1950s was a decade of little American distinction in playwriting, although there were two exceptions: Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams (Nicoll 1949: 900). Due to the fact that there were few new plays of distinction, the plays staged were symptomatically adaptations of works by European playwrights from primarily Great Britain and France. As a result, the plays from these countries constituted the major influence on the American theatre during this period which, without them would have been rather bland.

In the 1950s, the European playwright who made the biggest impact on the American stage was John Osborne with Look Back in Anger, but other playwrights performed were Sean O'Casey, Christopher Fry, Molière, Jean Anouilh and Samuel Beckett. Moreover, increasingly, complete theatre companies from abroad made visits to America, but they were not always successful. Different theatre traditions in France and America, and the fact that the play had been translated from French into English, may have been the reasons why Anouilh, the French playwright, was not a success in the States. Moreover, Beckett - probably the most influential playwright of the post-war era - was not very successful in America because his plays were too pessimistic, offering no hope for humanity (Taubman 1967: 308). What Taubman seemed to imply was that Beckett was too pessimistic for an American audience.

Despite the fact that American society from the 1950s onwards has been affluent, the standard of its theatre has declined (Actors on Acting 1970: 542). There are several reasons for this. First, America has neither a national theatre nor a genuine repertory company to set an example for the rest of the country; i.e. there is no long-standing acting tradition upheld by a national institution. Second, the actual
acting on Broadway was not of a high standard - not due to lack of talent, but because there were too few theatres of distinction where actors could be trained and grow. Moreover, as a consequence of the lack of competent actors and acting traditions, most actors were professionally unprepared to play the classics (Shakespeare and Molière) as well as ill-equipped for the style of Beckett, Ionesco and Brecht. However, actors wanted to do these plays. As a result of Broadway being unable to satisfy the needs of its actors and actresses in the 1950s and 1960s, an alternative theatre developed: Off-Broadway, and later Off-Off Broadway (1970: 542). These theatres were characterised by commitment, a political stance, audience participation as well as experimental theatre and they provided a variety of acting possibilities: gone were the neat dramatic construction of plays and the mellifluous voice of the actor; to this type of theatre box-office appeal was not a primary concern.

The commercially run Broadway has always tended to be late in acknowledging new talent because producers have been unwilling to stage risky new plays which might not be successful and, as a result, cost them money (Taubman 1967: 309). Therefore, producers chose to stage plays that would most easily make money. Compared with the European theatres, one reason why Broadway was reluctant to stage risky, new plays was partly due to the fact that unlike Europe, the United States did not subsidise its theatre to the degree that this was done in Europe. As a result, Broadway has had to rely on private funding, local benefactors and donations and it is understandable that these benefactors would rather support a “safe” revival than a play whose potential success is uncertain. In actual fact, the 20th century of American theatre has mainly been a fight against commercial entertainment and lack of finance. Also, Broadway often did not even acknowledge new talent which meant that new plays and playwrights had to be discovered by the Off-Broadway theatres. Moreover, most actors and directors preferred Hollywood to Broadway due to better salaries, prestige and because of Broadway’s neglect of the history of the theatre and its culture, and since the professional standard in acting had deteriorated due to few real opportunities for artistic growth and development. Musicals were often staged by composers such as Rogers and Hammerstein as well as Bernstein because unlike the theatre proper, Americans have always had performers of the highest standard in the
musical business. In the early 1950s, Brecht was hardly known on Broadway. With the professional standard in acting on Broadway declining, it was Off-Broadway which became – with their standard of acting and directing gradually increasing – an "indispensable complement" (1967: 319) to Broadway with regard to drama proper. Little by little, Off-Broadway started to become recognised and playwrights such as Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller had their new plays and Edward Albee his first play staged there in the 1960s.

In his chapter on the 1960s called "Be Thankful for Imports", Taubman describes the early 1960s as a period when there were still a few plays of distinction on Broadway by American playwrights. And amongst the plays staged there were many disasters. The few successes that did occur, Taubman states, such as Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf* ran for a very long time. But it was mainly the famous stars rather than the quality of the play that attracted theatre-goers and made a play a success. Actors such as Richard Burton, Albert Finney, Laurence Olivier and Anthony Quinn drew audiences to the theatre in the 1960s. Light comedy and musicals were still very popular, but very little seemed spectacular. In the 1960s, Off-Broadway increasingly became the stage for new American and foreign dramatists such as Albee, Pinter, Peter Shaffer, John Osborne and John Arden. As in the 1950s, international companies visited New York. Anthologies were popular and with the emerging civil rights' movement, American Black theatre became a potent force. In the latter part of the 1960s, some promising plays were staged by directors such as Peter Weiss and Peter Brook. Peter Brook, the British director, has claimed that Brecht more than any other playwright has influenced the American theatre of the 20th century through his theories on the theatre. However, due to dictatorship and exile, the influence of Brecht's writing did not start until the 1950s and did not really become apparent until the 1960s (Russell Brown 1995: 403).

In the 20th century, technical innovations have made the director more important in the theatre than used to be the case. Indeed, the American theatre is really the history of the dominance of a few directors: Elia Kazan, Tony Richardson and Tyrone Guthrie, but also a few authors such as Eugene O'Neill, Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams. And although the theatrical output of the American theatre in
the 1950s and 1960s was not to be compared with that of Europe. the late 1960s showed promising signs: a new school of directing with new ideas such as "the open stage" was appearing and changed the stage, making the theatre more flexible. In Taubman's opinion, directors, actors and playwrights of the 1970s needed to depart from the "naturalism which dominated and often confined the American theatre in the 1950s and 1960s" (1967: 366). However, the dominance of the directors would not diminish. Taubman concludes.

2.5 The Reception of Pinter in America

The Caretaker was the first play by Pinter to be staged in the USA. Its premiere was at the Lyceum Theater, New York, in October 1961. The following year The Dumb Waiter and The Collection were produced. 1967 saw stagings of both The Homecoming and The Birthday Party. A summary of the reviews of The Caretaker, The Dumb Waiter, The Collection, The Homecoming and The Birthday Party will provide an insight into the initial reception of Pinter's plays in the USA.

2.5.1 The Caretaker

Walter Kerr's (5 Oct. 1961) review of The Caretaker in 1961 was on the whole negative, describing the play as emotionally and intellectually barren, lacking "logic, texture and gesture" claiming that the characters talked about trivial matters as if they were incredibly important. Moreover, his characterisation of Davies as human and Aston and Mick as mechanical point to the critic's negative view of the play. In addition, Kerr pointed out that The Caretaker was a play for people with "special tastes", a comment that seems to imply that he was not one of its supporters. The comment further implies that the play was different from most plays and hard to grasp. It would appear that Kerr rejected the play because he did not understand it, perhaps because it did not fit the expected conventional patterns of playwriting, which he was used to.
In his review "Nothing Up the Sleeve" Henry Hewes (21 Oct, 1961) was more positive, although not enthusiastic. In fact he seemed a bit ambivalent. First, he stated that The Caretaker "was probably a masterpiece" (positive), although "sociology, psychology and dramaturgy" were not part of it (negative). Second, he appeared positive when he stated that he enjoyed the play because to him the characters' own private worlds were more important than analytical logic. It would seem that, unlike Kerr, Hewes was more open to a new kind of playwrighting - although his uncertainty about whether the play was a masterpiece or not indicates that he perhaps did not understand it - and he enjoyed The Caretaker and found it hilarious. Moreover, Hewes also acknowledged that because uncertainty and ambiguity were important facets of the play, it made it "an actor's delight" as this meant that Pinter left room for the actors' private interpretations, which were more likely to result in more passionate characterisation. In addition, Hewes felt that the play had been interpreted as an allegory by the London critics, but he disagreed with this interpretation. Finally, he remarked that the play had beautiful speech patterns. The conclusion seems to be that Hewes liked The Caretaker, although he could not explain why.

Howard Taubman (15 Oct, 1961) was the most positive critic of The Caretaker. In his opinion, the play was about a derelict and two unbalanced brothers: the first very glib, the other just barely articulate. Although it seems that Taubman - like Hewes - was not able to explain why he enjoyed the play, Taubman thought the play to be of "strangely compelling beauty and passion". Taubman further stated that Pinter was an important contemporary playwright, a writer who intensified by condensing, wrote a deceptively barren dialogue, and that subtext was important to Pinter's plays, although the playwright claimed that his dialogue had no subtext. Finally, Taubman held that Pinter had been influenced by Beckett and Joyce, however in his opinion, Pinter was "his own man". And unlike Beckett, Pinter had not resigned himself to the fact that "nothing can be done", and as a result, in Pinter's texts there was passion and protest beneath the surface dialogue.

2.5.2 The Collection and The Dumb Waiter
A double bill of Pinter's plays *The Collection* and *The Dumb Waiter* was produced at the *Cherry Lane Theater*, New York, on 26 November 1962. The great majority of theatre critics such as Richard Watts Jr, Walter Kerr, Richard P. Cooke and the theatre critic of *The New York Morning Telegraph* were of the opinion that Pinter was a talented playwright. Most critics also enjoyed the plays, although many admitted that they did not understand them. Typically, *Candide* of *The Villager Greenwich* described *The Dumb Waiter* as an "intriguing and elusive play" (6 Dec 1962). Also, the atmosphere of horror or menace was emphasised. Pinter's humour or "weird sense of comedy" (*Newark Evening News* 27 Nov. 1962) was commented on by for instance Alan Branigan. However, a few critics such as *Candide*, Richard P. Cooke and John McClain did not like the plays, and Howard Taubman seemed neutral, stating that Pinter "deals in [...] unresolved enigmas" (*New York Times*, 27 November, 1962) which are never boring but difficult to understand. On the whole, the reviews of the double bill were very favourable.

2.5.3 *The Homecoming*

*The Homecoming* was produced at the *Music Box Theater*, New York, in January 1967. What follows below is a summary of the American reviews of the play.

Spectator Charles Carshon (*New York Times* "Letters to the Editor" 15 Jan, 1967) summarised the American reception as "rather calm" but added that Pinter did not need champions, and further claimed that Pinter's writing was characterised by elegance. B.A. Young's (*New York Times* 6 June, 1965) review of the London production at the premiere of *The Homecoming* included the following remarks: The London critics had generally speaking been disappointing. To the London audience, the play had seemed bizarre and improbable, even disagreeable according to Young, however, despite these facts the play had made for very effective theatre.

Walter Kerr (15 Jan, 1967) was, as in his previous review of *The Caretaker*, sceptical of Pinter. Through the use of negative vocabulary, Kerr's description of
the play gives an impression of disapproval. According to Kerr then, there was too little action in the play, it had a seedy setting and Act I was "interminable". Kerr also described Pinter's writing as "numb fantasies" and in Kerr's opinion, Pinter was interested in what might happen if logic was suspended. However, he stated, although the audience was well aware that the situation depicted in *The Homecoming* was unconventional, they were not able to find logical responses to the play because human beings are steeped in logic. Consequently, they applied logic in order to interpret events, but found none, and as a result, *The Homecoming* did not work. However, Kerr also held that Pinter was "a gifted dramatist". Lastly, the critic pointed to the fact that *The Homecoming* was "bristling with overtones".

Richard P. Cooke (9 Jan. 1967) was another disheartened critic. He wondered what Pinter was up to. The audience was amused and bemused he said: amused by some incidental humour and bemused because they tried to solve a mystery, which was not worth trying to solve. Moreover, Cooke held that *The Homecoming* was a play about those family relationships, which usually remain unspoken of. He was further of the view that the characters talked *past* rather than *with* each other and, as a result, they lived in "communal isolation".

In the *New York Times* 'Letters to the Editor' (15 Jan. 1967) regarding *The Homecoming* there were the usual responses of admiration, dislike and incomprehension to Pinter's plays: one theatregoer admired the play and considered it to be an allegory on the subject of "Everyman and his Relationships to Women". Another one rejected the play on the grounds that it had no plot, the dialogue was "parrot-like", the characters were caricatures, as did another one because the play was "amoral, immoral, unmoral". Still another theatregoer thought *The Homecoming* a tedious play where the audience was bored rather than shocked, resigned rather than angry.

2.5.4 *The Birthday Party*
The Birthday Party was produced on Broadway in October 1967. Richard P. Cooke (5 Oct, 1967) was doubtful as to whether there was any depth to the dialogue. He remarked that the play had some interesting non-sequiturs, that the characters Pete and Lulu – who incidentally have minor parts in the play – were the only normal human beings in it, and also claimed that the meaning was irrelevant to the enjoyment of The Birthday Party since it was a play of non-meaning. Clive Barnes was much more positive (4 Oct, 1967) and thought that The Birthday Party was the most interesting play to have reached Broadway for seasons. He claimed that it must appeal to those theatregoers who want something new. The theme was fear, but fear of what he could not tell. Perhaps fear of God as in Greek and Elizabethan drama, he suggested. He drew attention to the fact that the play had appeared strange to the London audience ten year ago, but now in the States that was not the case. Like the London critics, Barnes glimpsed an influence from Beckett and Kafka. In this play, Barnes claimed, the nonsense makes sense and he referred to Goldberg and McCann’s dialogue as "comically sinister, music hall patter".

2.5.5 Summary

The Caretaker, which was the first play by Pinter to be staged in the USA, received good reviews, even though the American critics, like the critics in Britain in 1960, did not seem to understand what the play was about. As in the UK, the subtext was discussed and the presence of non-sequiturs was mentioned. Most of the American critics, like most British critics (bar the first staging of The Birthday Party in London), seemed to find Pinter’s plays intriguing because they were elusive. One aspect of Pinter’s play The Caretaker to which Americans critics drew particular attention was that the humour of the play. The Homecoming and The Birthday Party (both staged in 1967) were not very well received in the USA, although they were considered interesting because they were different from the type of play traditionally appearing on American stages. Unlike the British critics, the Americans thought that The Birthday Party lacked depth.
In the mid 19th century, the most talented French writers of the time had been writing for the theatre. As a result, France had a good many skilful playwrights: the vast majority of plays performed were entertaining social comedies. Scribe was the most frequently staged playwright. Some young new playwrights objected to the theatre's obsession with entertainment and "pictorial realism" which lead them to write so called thesis plays, i.e. plays which dealt with ethical and social problems. In the 1890s realism and naturalism dominated the theatre, although farce and comedy were still very common. At the beginning of the 20th century, talented writers were discouraged from writing for the theatre and encouraged to write on projects related to history. The theatre, according to some critics, was not deemed appropriate for serious issues because frivolous farces, comedy, entertainment and sex were the overwhelming focus of the majority of plays which were staged. Fashion was a prominent feature of the theatre with both actors and audiences. Indeed, plays were written with parts for characters wearing clothes in the latest fashion. After the First World War, film started competing with the theatre.

At the beginning of the 20th century commercial boulevard theatres dominated the Paris scene, which meant that plays produced were expected to make money. In France, this meant farce and comedy. After the First World War, film was gaining more and more audiences to the detriment of the theatre. In 1921 for the first time film made more money than the theatre. In 1926 the Cartel was formed. The Cartel was made up of Charles Dullin, Louis Jouvet, Georges Pitoëff and Gaston Baty, four directors who agreed that the theatre should be for the people - not an élite or the bourgeoisie – and they shared a dislike for the commercial theatre. The Cartel was to have a great influence in France (O'Connor 1975: 82).

The theatre in the inter-war period in France was characterised by comedies and historical revivals, but some experimental writing, mostly surrealistic in nature, and impressionist and expressionist works were also staged at "Art Theatres". The war and the depression made people question old ideals and values and this was reflected in the theatre. Avant-garde theatres appeared. Despite experiments,
audiences still preferred the conventional farces and comedies, plays written in the fashion of the well-made play. Realism also held firm. The most popular playwrights of the 1930s were Giraudoux, Verneuil and Guitry.

In 1930 Salacrou wrote Patchouli, an avant-garde play that foreshadowed what was to appear in the 1950s with Ionesco and Beckett. Salacrou's play was generally speaking original, but primarily he rejected the narrative form and a neatly constructed plot (Hobson 1978: 148-9). This new approach met with disapproval and incomprehension amongst audiences and critics, since to their way of thinking, the play was not realistic. Salacrou's technique seemed shocking because people were presented with something that they did not expect. During the Second World War, the theatre was still alive; revivals of classical works and comedies were popular (Nicoll 1949: 855, 897-9). Important writers were above all Claudel, Anouilh, de Montherlaut, and Giraudoux. Barrault was the most influential director, in fact the director was gaining more and more influence in France. Barrault's influence as director and actor was to remain important for at least the next forty years. After the war, comedies were staged but soon existential writers such as Sartre and Camus started to write plays which questioned old traditions and values. Artaud's theatre of cruelty also influenced playwrights.

In the 1940s, film had taken over as the prime source of entertainment in France. Because the theatre was regarded as a form of social and cultural education and the French Government aimed to create a people's theatre, steps were taken by the Government to support the theatre. The idea was that the theatre would unite the people of France through a common heritage. The main measures implemented were substantial subsidies for *La Comédie Française* and plans for the building of partly subsidised regional theatres round the country were also implemented. The first regional theatre was completed in 1947 and the same year financial aid for young directors to help in the production of new plays were implemented by the Government. Over the years, the number of regional or municipal theatres have grown steadily.

In the 1950s Sartre, Camus and Anouilh were still popular, as were farces and comedies by writers such as Feydeau, but plays were becoming increasingly
"absurd". Beckett, Adamov and Ionesco wrote absurdist plays, which depicted life as complex, meaningless and without hope. Genet was popular, depicting society as evil and man corrupted by society. In the late 1950s there was an increasing displeasure with absurdist plays among critics and directors because of their lack of a political message. As a result, Brecht's theatre came into focus and influenced writers and directors alike. Sartre's influence was also important. Hence, the French theatre in the 1960s was dominated by political plays, plays of denunciation, plays whose aim was to involve its audiences with the problems of their own ordinary lives. It was theatre as social and cultural education. Brecht and Artaud were the writers for this kind of theatre. And in 1968 the cultural revolution occurred. However, the impact of this event will not be discussed here since the plays to do with the initial reception of Pinter in France were produced before 1968. Important directors of the 1950s and 1960s were Meyer, Vilar, Roger Blin and Roger Planchon.

When television started to compete with the theatre in the 1960s, the Heads of some theatres in Paris resorted to staging new plays and encouraging new playwrights in order to attract a different audience. This was done successfully by Jean-Paul Escande at La Comédie Française between 1960-70 (Chevally 1979: 63-4).

Ever since Racine, the French theatre has been the theatre of the word. The authority of the text still stands firm. Some further characteristics of the French theatre are grace of expression, clarity of thought, the importance of rhetoric and an inclination to mime. Typical exponents of plays in which the word is primary and expressions marked by grace were written by Claudel, Giraudoux and de Montherlaut. Moreover, "the voice beautiful" - Barrault is a case in point - is still the dominating acting tradition in France whereas in Britain the actors of "the voice beautiful" such as Gielgud and Olivier went out of fashion in the 1950s. In addition, the French actor avoids "total exposure" (O'Connor 1975: 93) and prefers to preserve some mystery unlike the British actor who likes to make everything clear. Also, Anglo-Saxon critics tend to remark that French writers such as Sartre and Anouilh are neither skillful in drawing full character portraits nor clear in their focus of plot and action. This may be an indication that French
and Anglo-Saxon writers have different views on how plays should be written: the French expecting mystery, the Anglo-Saxon expecting clarity. Today the insights of Sartre and the theories of Brecht tend to influence both French actors and directors.

2.7 Pinter's Reception in France

2.7.1 The Caretaker

The Caretaker (Le Gardien) was the first play by Pinter to be staged in France. It premiered in Paris on January 27th, 1961. The play was not a success with French audiences and critics. Below is a summary of the reviews of the theatre critics of Le Monde, Le Figaro, L'Art and Paris-Presse, which were the most influential newspapers in France in 1961.

Like critics in Britain and America, the French critics also thought that The Caretaker was strange. However, unlike critics in Britain and America, the reviews of the play were unfavourable in France. Most critics, including Poirot-Delpch of Le Monde (28 Jan, 1961) considered Pinter to be a typical post-war writer. The Caretaker was classified as written by a post-war writer because it consisted of silences, was incoherent, and because it imposed symbolism and terror. Poirot-Delpch gave the play the thumbs down partly because of its "tape recorder style" of playwriting, a style of writing that had been dismissed by the French theatre in the early 1950s. Moreover, Poirot-Delpch thought that the symbolism in the play did not work. In addition, he was of the opinion that nothing happened in the play; he thought that everything was exaggerated and claimed that the character traits were unclear. Furthermore, he described the dialogue as "ravings" and claimed that the play inflicted vertigo because it was too absurd. He concluded by saying that audiences had to be extremely interested in the happenings of the play in order to enjoy it, by which he seems to mean that it was difficult to make sense of the play.
In *Le Figaro* (27 Jan. 1961) Gautier began his review by stating that although *The Caretaker* was “the play of the year in the UK last year” it was not going to be the play of the year in France. Gautier described the action as simple and he was not sure that the play had a theme. In his opinion, the play glorified misery to the point that the spectator was bored. He agreed with Poirot-Delpech that Pinter had used a tape recorder technique for writing dialogue, and further described the dialogue as “small talk gone insane” stating that “everything [was] repeated three or four times”. In Gautier’s opinion, Pinter had not edited his play. He had the impression that Pinter had sometimes run out of ideas and resolved the problem by starting from the beginning, adding minor changes. Put differently, Gautier was of the opinion that there was little development in the play. The dialogue of *The Caretaker* was not theatre but reproduction, stated Gautier. Moreover, it was a play for those who preferred mirrors to “the filter of art” and mediocrity to insight. Gautier also stated that there were some funny moments in the play, and added that the atmosphere was nightmarish, but in conclusion he simply did not think that Pinter was interesting.

*The Caretaker* was to Max Favalelli of *Paris-Presse*—*l'Intrasigeani* (26 Jan 1961) so boring that it made him “want to cut his own throat with a razor”. Moreover, he thought that the play was made up of platitudes and regretted that he had made the trip to the theatre when he could have stayed at home and read a book.

Pierre Marcabru of *l'Art* (28 Jan. 1961) thought that *The Caretaker* did not work in translation, or as he put it “the play does not acclimatise”. The play reminded him of Beckett and Ionesco, but he wondered where Pinter “had gone”. Marcabru thought that the language of the original was eloquent and that the dialogue was the force of the play. In the translation into French, Marcabru claimed that that force and eloquence had gone, and as a result, he thought that it was very difficult to give a fair opinion of the play. However, Marcabru thought that the play relied on symbolism, he detected menace, and described the play as being about lonely people who were incapable of communicating with one another, and they seemed intent on following their own private quests. According to this critic, the problem was not that the play lacked ideas, but the fact that it had no message. Moreover, Marcabru did not recognise the form, he did not detect a structure, and he did not
find anything that could hold the play together. Everything seemed a jumble to him. Marcabru described the play as being "a poison that did not work" and "a car without an engine", that is he implied that the engine or force of the play had been lost in the translation. Moreover, *The Caretaker* was monotonous, the spectator had to keep searching for meaning and Marcabru suspected that the play needed a lighter touch and more irony, because as it stood it was too heavy. He concluded that the play had been distorted in translation, and as a result, Pinter was yet to be discovered in France.

2.7.2 *The Collection and The Lover*

*The Collection and The Lover* were staged in France in 1965. An outline of the reviews of these plays will help illustrate the French critics’ views of the first few plays by Pinter staged in France. *The Collection and The Lover* (a double bill) were staged at Théâtre Hébertot in Paris, France, for the first time on 27 September, 1965. Below is a summary of the reviews.

Overall, the reviews were very favourable indeed, although the critics stated that they did not fully understand the plays. However, it seems that the lack of structure and clarity found in *The Caretaker* – as well as in this double bill - which led to incomprehension in 1961, was no longer a problem. The reviewer of "Un dramaturge anglais de 35 ans fait courir tout Paris au théâtre" (a 35 year-old English dramatist makes all of Paris run to the theatre) in *L'Aurore* on 3 November, 1965 mentioned Pinter’s “immense comic talent” as a playwright, and also emphasised Pinter’s “rich vocabulary”. Jean Paget of *Combat* (29 September, 1965) called the play “Perfection!” and stated that he had experienced one of the best nights at the theatre for years, and advised people to “run to the theatre” to see the double bill. Pierre Marcabru of *Combat* (27 September, 1965) was also delighted, particularly emphasising the mystery and humour of Pinter’s writing. In addition, Gilles Sandier (*Arts* 6 November, 1965) was of the view that Pinter’s plays were filled with references, and further stated that Pinter’s way of writing reminded him of Proust, Hitchcock, Kafka and Wilde. However, Colette Godard (*Nouvelles litteraires*, 23 Sept 1965) was disappointed with the double bill.
because she wanted to have answers to questions that the plays raised: answers that Pinter did not provide. Finally, although the ambiguity and mystery—hallmarks of Pinter’s way of writing—were also present in *The Collection* and *The Lover*, the critics seemed to like the double bill because of the originality of Pinter’s way of writing.

2.7.3 *The Homecoming*

In October 1966 *The Homecoming* was staged in Paris. Jacques Lemarchand, writing for *Le Littéraire Figaro* (20 Oct. 1966) began his review by stating that Pinter’s strong point was not conventions. Lemarchand further stated that the productions of *The Collection* and *The Lover* in 1965 had been successful, because the French thought they had discovered a new and different Pinter. *The Homecoming*, however, was difficult because “this new object [play] invented by Pinter” demanded a great deal of the spectator in order for him or her to understand it. *The Homecoming* was strange, many aspects of the play, including words and moments, were exaggerated, and if one chose to enter into this Pinter world, which Lemarchand labelled “a game”, one would be fascinated. Lemarchand also claimed that it was impossible to tell what any Pinter play was about, this one included, and he described the process of analysis as “trying to retell a dream in logical terms”. Moreover, this critic stated that the play offended beyond just the ugly words. Finding Pinter’s theatre intelligent Lemarchand felt that it did not really reveal anything. Pinter used all the resources of the theatre to show us only what was necessary and nothing more. The Pinter atmosphere was successfully carried over into the translation by Kahane, the acting was superb and despite Lemarchand’s reservations he ended his review by saying that *The Homecoming* “[was] a drama of seductive originality”.

The French critic Nicole Zand of *Le Monde* (12 Oct. 1966) started her review of *The Homecoming* by pointing out that since foreign plays were more important to the Paris season of 1966 than they had been in previous seasons, the adaptors, in this case Eric Kahane, were also more important. Kahane was highly praised for his adaptations in the French press at the time. According to Zand, Kahane thought that French audiences would find Pinter’s plays strange simply because...
they were unfamiliar with Pinter’s theatre. All of Pinter’s plays that had been staged in France had been very different, and at the previews of *The Homecoming* people left the theatre in a state of shock. Zand also thought that the play had an evil atmosphere, that it was realistic-naturalistic, and at first people were amused at the goings-on until they realised that something else was going on beneath the spoken words. The idea that one thing can mean something else was very disconcerting to the French audience, who were used to set ideas, frames and structures, Zand claimed. However, despite all these reservations, Zand thought the play “delicious”. The primitive characters in the play had their own morals. Silences were important and there was miscommunication, and Pinter was unlike any other playwright due to his conciseness with words. In this play you experience everything, Zand claimed: tragedy, comedy and an almost musical rhythm. Kahane had predicted, Zand stated, that Pinter would be regarded as one of the great playwrights in the future, and Kahane hoped that the French would, in the future, realise this.

Gilles Sandier of *l’Art* (Oct 1966) claimed that *The Homecoming* was a more ambitious play than *The Collection* and that it was more cruel, erotic and artificial than *The Caretaker*. It was a play, which sometime fascinated its audiences because of how Pinter had set up the deception. Furthermore, Sandier stated that in *The Homecoming* Pinter had depicted a mysterious world in great detail, a world inhabited by people who were amoral - at least according to the bourgeoisie - cruel and above the law. In his morality, Pinter reminded the critic of the French playwright Genet. Pinter’s characters were ordinary poor people instead of the noblemen of Ancient Greece, and the setting was the slums instead of palaces. Moreover, Sandier pointed out that, as was always the case with Pinter, nothing was explained or made clear and he was doubtful as to whether events explain themselves in the play. Sandier further thought that the play contained both symbolism and surrealism, and words, gestures and actions seemed mysterious to him, but perhaps the strangeness was a good thing since it made the audience look and listen, he argued. Sandier also commented that some actors seemed unsure of the text and texture of the play, but *Lenny* was superb, his smile was like “an open, unsettling abyss”.
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2.7.4 *The Birthday Party*

*The Birthday Party* was staged in Paris for the first time on 14 January 1967. Poirot-Delpech of *Le Monde* (15 Jan. 1967) stated that once again an inexplicable menace was part of a play by Pinter, and he also held that the play had some absurd, symbolic and burlesque moments. Sometimes the accusations that McCann and Goldberg directed at Stanley were funny (slapstick), he continued, but they seemed improvised and led nowhere, and he could see no reasons for them, except perhaps that the accusations were supposed to scare the spectator simply *because* they were inexplicable. He wondered if the interrogation was just a game. However, the critic's overall impression seemed to be that *The Birthday Party* was influenced by *Josef K* in *The Trial* by Kafka. Moreover, Poirot-Delpech found the characterisation improbable, he thought that the systematic repetitions could only be translated by a virtuoso, and he was of the opinion that there was no actual conclusion to the play. Moreover, there was a great deal of typical English nonsense and "slowness" in the play – by which I infer the critic was referring to the many repetitions - which made the translation laborious and insistent. At the end, the critic said, one regrets having taken an interest in the play because of all its nonsense. All the same, Poirot-Delpech thought that the play was a success because of the actors, but the play lacked depth and its author could do better.

Claude Baignères of *Le Figaro* (13 Dec. 1967) wrote that *The Birthday Party* was in the same style as *The Homecoming, The Lover and The Collection*. He also described the play as an epilogue in three acts, and said that he recognised hardly anything in it. Baignères further stated that the characters' indifference, their arguments, their trivial conversation as well as their banal behaviour were somehow seductive. At the same time, he found the characters annoying, arrogant and dull. Their fates were sealed from the start, they could do nothing to change them. The characters had to accept their lots in life. According to Baignères, each of the characters was also living a secret life, which the audience could only guess at. And plenty was going on beneath the surface, and it was precisely this fact, which moved people. Moreover, Baignères had many questions which the playwright left unanswered. Why did Stanley not fight back for example? What motivated the characters? Perhaps the answers were not very important. Baignères
stated. he seemed content with the fact that the actors somehow evoked mysterious feelings in the audience. However, when the third act began, Baignères confessed that he was totally bored because of all the platitudes, and because there was no progress or development between the characters in the play. Although he thought that the acting was superb, he was of the opinion that the play did not hold the audience's interest to the end. "What a shame", Baignères concluded.

2.7.5 Summary

The Caretaker was the first play by Pinter to be staged in France (1961). It was not a success. The French critics felt that there was nothing new or interesting about Pinter's writing. One critic, however, was of the opinion that the force and elegance of the language had been lost in translation, and as a result, he thought that Pinter was yet to be discovered by French audiences. The Collection and The Lover received more positive reviews by the French critics in 1965. This time the critics felt that Pinter's way of writing was original, and were supportive of the play even though they did not understand what it was about. Some critics also stated that the plays were packed with references. The Homecoming was produced in Paris in 1966 and this time the reviews were rather negative, but at the same time many critics also considered the play fascinating although strange. The translation and adaptation by Eric Kahane was hailed. When The Birthday Party was staged in 1967, the reviews were poor again. The critics stated that they were bored, that they found the dialogue trivial and that the characters' behaviour was banal, but once again some critics found the play seductive. One critic dismissed the dialogue as "English nonsense" and the play was said to lack depth. Another reviewer pointed out that it was difficult to translate Pinter into French.

2.8 The Swedish Theatre in the 20th Century

The Swedish theatre of the late 19th century was characterised by light entertainment. Plays by Strindberg were staged, but realism and naturalism had neither been accepted in the theatre nor by its audiences (Anderman 1992: 9). A
case in point is Dramaten. The Royal National Theatre of Sweden, where escapism was preferred to the new trend of realism due to the fact that by tradition it is a theatre, which is conservative in its choice of plays. In the early 20th century, however, there were some cases of experimental theatre at Intiman, a small privately run theatre in Stockholm, but realism still had not made its mark. In the rest of Europe "the airing of social issues on stage" (Anderman 1992: 9) was already established as the main form of theatre and in a sense it could thus be argued that Swedish theatre was old-fashioned and not of the same standard as its European counterparts (Anderman 1992: 10). As a result, some young Swedish directors such as Per Lindberg, an influential director and modernist in Swedish 20th century theatre, studied theatre abroad. Another important Swedish director who made his debut in 1919 was Olof Molander and in the 1920s he started an era of directors, making the visual side of theatre more prominent.

After the end of the First World War, theatre became increasingly important in Sweden. In response to this development, subsidised city theatres were built in Helsingborg (1921) and Göteborg (1934). Smaller studio stages were built by some theatres, where experimental plays were staged, in addition to the major stages. Cinema also became more and more popular. Radioteatern (the Radio Theatre) also contributed to the growth of Swedish drama with its influential Head, Per Lindberg, who, at the time, broadcast the Swedish writing elite such as Hjalmar Bergman and Hjalmar Söderberg on a regular basis. By 1925 the modern theatre had been established at Dramaten.

The most important Swedish playwrights of the 1920s and 30s were Hjalmar Bergman and Pär Lagerkvist. Hjalmar Bergman first tried his hand at serious playwriting, but in 1925 he had his breakthrough with Swedenhjelm. (The Swedenhjelm Family) a very popular comedy (Gustafson 1961: 389-391). In the first decade of the 20th century Pär Lagerkvist, an intense and imaginative dramatist, wrote modernist and expressionist plays. After the First World War he became a pessimist and the themes of his plays were primarily the problems of good and evil and the metaphysical as well as religious state of man's soul. Gradually, Lagerkvist's plays became more optimistic and in the 1930s a political dimension was included in his work. A case in point was the dramatised version
of Bödeln in 1933 (The Hangman), which he wrote in protest at Fascism. In the 1940s his plays dealt with universal moral problems and he was always a modernist prone to dramatic experimentation. Although Swedish playwrights were staged in the 1920s and 1930s, the playwrights most often produced were Ibsen, Strindberg and Shakespeare. However, in the 1920s and during the next few decades Sweden went through a theatrical renaissance. Influential directors of the period - primarily as directors of Strindberg’s plays - were Max Reinhardt, a German, and the Swedes Per Lindberg, Olof Molander and Alf Sjöberg. The productions by these directors were sometimes quite daring with regard to design and costume, the productions being characterised by simplification and abstraction; Lindberg, Molander and Sjöberg have been immensely influential in Swedish film and theatre in the 20th century (Marker and Marker 1975: 261). As the result of this theatrical renaissance, Sweden produced actors, actresses and designers of the highest standard: actor Lars Hanson, actress Greta Garbo and designer Isaac Grünwald just to mention a few.

Sweden was for a long time dominated by Dramaten, its national stage. Until 1944 there were only two other cities with permanent theatres: Helsingborg and Göteborg, the latter considered the more adventurous of the two. With the Social Democratic government beginning their period in office in the 1930s and continuing for the next forty years or so, government influence became increasingly important. The notion of equality and a theatre for all was important to the Government. As early as the mid-thirties, the Government had plans for building new theatres in order to make it possible for more people to go to the theatre; however, it was not until 1944 that the next permanent theatre, Malmö Stadsteater (the Malmö City Theatre) was completed. Another measure, which was implemented for the purpose of bringing theatre to the people was the highly successful Riksteatern (the National Touring Company). In the 1930s, it started touring the country bringing theatre of the highest calibre to communities which could not afford permanent theatres. In this decade political issues were debated on the stage. Lagerkvist’s plays as well as Vilhelm Moberg’s play *Rid i natt* (Ride This Night!) in 1941 are examples of this development in the theatre.
After the Second World War, there was a need for entertainment in Sweden just as in the rest of the world. As a result, there was a mix of committed plays or dramas as well as pure entertainment produced at Swedish theatres (Sjögren 1979: 25). Moreover, the theatre was increasingly influenced by film, and later - television. Plays using working class language appeared in the late 1940s. Because of its neutrality Sweden had been culturally isolated during the war and, as a result, the 1940s and 1950s were a period when the Swedish stage was invaded by the international repertoire: primarily British, French and American playwrights such as Christopher Fry, Sartre, Anouilh, O'Neill - the latter recognised as a major playwright very early in Sweden and awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1936 - Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller. The subject of the plays were private tragedies rather than how society influenced people. Few Swedish plays were produced, although Almqvist, Ingmar Bergman and Dagerman were staged. The 1940s was the period when director Alf Sjöberg made his mark on the Swedish theatre particularly through his staging of Strindberg's *Frogen Julie* (*Miss Julie*) at Dramaten; he also introduced Swedish theatre audiences to foreign playwrights such as Lorca and Sartre. It was also in the 1940s that Sweden's most famous director Ingmar Bergman began making his mark on Swedish theatre. He started out in Helsingborg, continued in Göteborg, then went on to Malmö (early 1950s) and in 1959 he was appointed Head of Dramaten (Gustafson 1961: 449). In addition to being a theatre director, Bergman established himself as a major film director in the 1950s. He has continued to do so until 1982.

In the 1950s realistically depicted psychological drama was the order of the day. The reasons for this are first the Ibsen and Strindberg tradition at Dramaten, second the fact that the theatre reflected the issues depicted in films since many Swedish actors and directors worked both in the theatre and in film, third because small studio stages which suited this kind of drama were being built, and last but not least due to the production of O'Neill's play *Long Day's Journey into Night*, which influenced Swedish theatres throughout the country (Anderman 1992: 15-16). By and large the plays staged at the National Theatre were not daring, although Bergman, now its artistic director, put on a different, stylized and ironic version of Molière's *Don Juan*, which was a success. O'Neill was often staged. The theatrical developments of the 1950s included the small studio stages soon
becoming the place where serious theatre was staged, that is art for an elite and not the people. In addition, experimental theatres started appearing. **Pistolteatern** is a case in point. On these experimental stages, avant-garde plays were staged, i.e. plays which were not about psychological realism, the subject of the bourgeois stage. These experimental theatres also addressed a new, younger audience.

Towards the end of the 1950s there was growing opposition to the psychological drama of the well-made play so popular with **Dramaten**, and as a result Ionesco and Beckett were staged more and more. Osborne, Sartre and T.S. Eliot were also produced. The invasion of foreign plays in the 1940s and 1950s decreased toward the end of the 1950s and Swedish revues (music-hall style entertainment) such as **Gula Hund** became increasingly important.

In 1966 Ingmar Bergman stepped down as Head of **Dramaten**. His leadership had not only meant that the standard of the Swedish theatre had been raised, but he had also been influential in reducing ticket prices and increasing actors' salaries. In this decade the Government had a planned policy for the arts, which meant that public funds were made available to individual writers and artists as well as institutions. Moreover, the policy involved increasing subsidies for the theatres and the establishment of three subsidised drama schools. The arts were, in the 1960s, considered a matter of public responsibility. These investments in the theatre resulted in plays by Swedish playwrights such as Erland Josephson and Verner Aspenström as well as Lars Forssell, the dominant Swedish playwright of the decade. Due to the Government’s measures, by the early 1970s two thirds of the plays staged were written by Swedish playwrights. New foreign influence of the 1960s came from England with Joan Littlewood’s Theatre workshop and plays by for instance Ann Jellicoe. Productions of plays by British playwrights such as Wesker, Lessing, Shaffer, Pinter, Arden and Stoppard were also very common. Swedish revues by Bengt Bratt and Kent Andersson were popular. Brecht did not really have an impact until 1963. The latter part of the 1960s saw the theatre becoming more politicised than ever before and democracy in the theatre was a hotly discussed subject. This was reflected in the productions that were staged all over the country.
2.9  Pinter’s Reception in Swedish

2.9.1  The Caretaker

In view of the fact that Pinter’s play *The Caretaker* (*Vicevarden*) was his first success in the UK it is not surprising that it was this play that was the first one to be staged in Sweden. *The Caretaker* had its premiere at *Kretsteatern*, which is part of *Stockholms Stadsteater*, one of the major theatres in Stockholm, in March 1961. In August the same year, the play was staged in *Göteborg*. Below is a summary of the Swedish critics’ reviews of *The Caretaker*.

Hans Ingvar Hanson, a Swedish theatre critic writing for *Stockholmstidningen* (10 August, 1961), claimed that atmosphere and tension were created in *The Caretaker* due to the fact that the dialogue consisted of poetic nonsense and exceptional monotony. In Hanson’s opinion, the one thing that the director had been able to get out of the play was atmosphere, and in spite of the fact that nothing really happened in the play the audience was captivated and curious to know what was going to happen. Moreover, Hanson found that the characters strange and the play, in parts, bizarre. In his opinion, Pinter had been influenced by Gorky, O'Neill and Beckett, however, unlike these playwrights Pinter had "no depth". Hanson further claimed that *The Caretaker* was without drama and that it had pretentious features (the Buddha), which encouraged symbolic interpretation. However, Pinter - Hanson reminded readers – rejected symbolic interpretations of his plays. Finally, Hanson doubted Pinter’s genius because there were no clear answers to the questions that the play raised. Another Swedish critic (name not known) compared Pinter to Chekhov because, as in Chekhov, the main experience to be gained from *The Caretaker* was atmosphere. This critic started his review by pointing out that, like Pinter’s other plays, *The Caretaker* was for an extremely exclusive audience, because, and here he agreed with Hanson, the play was odd and because there were too many uncertainties surrounding characters and events. The uncertainties and oddities of the play, he claimed, made interpretation subjective. Finally, he stated that the translation by C-O Lång was admirable.
Mario Grut, a theatre critic at *Aftonbladet*, a Swedish evening paper, had the following impressions of Pinter and his plays (10 March, 1961): First, like most English and Swedish critics, Grut was of the view that Pinter has been influenced by Kafka and Beckett. Kafka was the influence with regard to atmosphere and Beckett the influence with regard to dialogue, characterisation and setting, although Grut also emphasised the fact that influence from Joyce could be inferred in some of the "strange conversations" occurring in the play - these reminded the critic of passages from *Finnegan's Wake*. Second, although Grut stated that Pinter may not have been influenced by the novelists of *The Nouveau Roman* he pointed out that Pinter's writing resembled novels of the authors of that literary movement: depicted in both were man's "semi-conscious, semi-articulate and semi-comprehensible world", a world "where important images of the past triggered dialogue and where intuition and the subjective ruled. Moreover, Grut admired Pinter's dialogue and thought that the playwright had his own style. But, Grut was also of the opinion that too little happened in *The Caretaker*, finding the characters uninteresting, with no new interesting themes and he thought that Pinter's world was sad rather than absurd.

The most negative critic of *The Caretaker* was Urban Stenström, writing for *Svenska Dagbladet*, (10 August, 1961). In Stenström's opinion the intrigue was either too simple or too complex. But he also added that nobody could tell which. And Pinter did not give the audience enough clues to be sure. Stenström drew attention to the fact that after Mick had smashed Aston's most prized possession they both smile at each other. Why did Aston smile? "What does Pinter mean?" Stenström said and continued "The audience sighed heavily as they tried to make sense of what was going on. Many soon gave up, a few persevered" and whispered "My God, this is strange." According to this critic then the interpretation of *The Caretaker* could not be anything but subjective since the audience did not have enough clues to assist them in their understanding of the characters and their actions. All the same, Stenström suggested one possible interpretation of the play. He considered the entire play to be a therapy session in the social adjustment of Aston, where Aston's brother Mick was the quack therapist.
It would seem that most of the Swedish critics' reviews of *The Caretaker* were rather bland, Stenström's negative review being the exception. The reasons for the lack of enthusiasm might have been due to the fact that the critics did not understand the play, and rather than dismissing it they were careful in their judgements, much like the British critics. In spite of the fact that the critics did not like the play, the acting was praised by everybody. Other possible reasons for the non-committal reception of Pinter's first play to be staged in Sweden will be discussed later as critics of his later plays such as *No Man's Land* give reasons for the cool reception of his first plays. First, a summary of the reviews of Pinter's second play to be staged in Sweden, *The Birthday Party*. It was produced at Göteborgs stadsteater in 1964, then at Dramaten in 1966. Below is a summary of the critical reactions.

2.9.2 *The Birthday Party*

Håkan Tollet of *Hufvudstadsbladet* (10 December, 1966) stated that because critics and scholars had widely different views about "what is what" in Pinter's plays, he accepted Pinter's claim that there were no symbols in them - it simply made interpretation simpler, he thought. However, he also made the point that there were enigmatic contradictions in *The Birthday Party* (Födelsedagskalaset): the characters often seemed to lie and there were parts of the play that could not really be explained - "the witches' sabbath" i.e. the actual birthday celebrations was a case in point - which made interpretation difficult and, as a result, he was not able to grasp the meaning of the play, suggesting that perhaps the director was to blame. Second, Tollet mentioned the play's atmosphere, suggesting influence from Kafka. In addition, he objected to the fact that the sexual activities in the play were so overtly realistic and also stated, with reference to the difficulty of interpreting the play, that the audience was both amused and confused. They were perhaps even shocked, he said, but they would not admit to it as that was not the done thing, although he mentioned over-hearing a lady saying "From now on I will only go and see *Maria Stuart*", also playing at Dramaten at the time.
In *Människans otrygghet* (The Insecurity of Man), April 26, 1964, Sten Barthel suggested that the characters of *The Birthday Party* lied and told the truth capriciously. For the audience, this meant that it was impossible to tell which was which since, in the play, there were no answers to the questions raised by the play. Moreover, Pinter refused to help us by providing such answers. Barthel asked himself whether the play was symbolic, especially with regard to the two strangers Goldberg and McCann who appeared from nowhere, but once again he knew that people did not know, and never would. In addition, he mentioned that a constant threat seemed to be hanging over the characters, and stated that the interrogation scene was rife with serious, wild and ridiculous accusations, but Barthel also added that there were laughs in the play. According to this critic, Pinter had his very own style, although influenced by Kafka, Strindberg and the playwrights of The Theatre of the Absurd. In Barthel’s view, Pinter was the most interesting contemporary playwright in Great Britain. Lastly, he felt that the translation by C-O Lång was very good.

Per-Erik Wahlund, *Svenska Dagbladet* (24 April, 1964) stressed the fact that the dialogue of *The Birthday Party* was assured. He described it as fast and concise, at once recognisable and alien and consisting of everyday speech and bizarre language. This critic glimpsed the influence from Ionesco in Pinter’s writing but in line with the previous Swedish critics he emphasised that Pinter had a style of his own, pointing out that Pinter was more realistic than Ionesco. Uncertainty about facts was a characteristic of the play, he continued - everything was “up in the air”. The fast interrogation scene he called “sadism in jovial clothing” and he wondered how Pinter was able to achieve a sensation of secret undercurrents and creeping nervousness in his audience. Furthermore, he stated that it was possible to read symbols into the play.

In the article “Pinter – det är teater!” (Pinter – that’s theatre for you) in *Expressen*, an evening newspaper, of April 26, 1964, Clas Brunius claimed that *The Birthday Party* made such effective menacing theatre because everything in it was familiar and mysterious at the same time. On the surface, everything seemed normal but the audience sensed disaster “lurking round the corner”. Brunius went on to say that although many people probably did not understand the play, tension was there
from the beginning. He further stated that the play started with a trivial dialogue, continued with a witches' sabbath of seldom viewed proportions, and concluded the way it began – with a very trite dialogue – as if nothing has happened. Interpretation was subjective since there were no answers in the play and since Pinter would not provide the answers. The symbolism of the play could be as elaborate as one liked, Brunius claimed, at least if you based it on familiar stories. *The Birthday Party* was both horrible and funny. He recommended the play.

Per-Olov Enquist of *Expressen* (5 December, 1966) held that Pinter's work *The Birthday Party* was "a meeting place for contemporary aesthetic doctrines". In his view, there were plenty of themes in the play and the playwright was very skilled at writing dialogue, and he deplored the fact that the interrogation scene in this particular production did not work. However, this did not surprise him because in Enquist's opinion, it was a difficult scene to get right. Moreover, Enquist stated that Pinter was a person who enjoyed taking non-intellectual stances. As a result, Pinter claimed that his plays were very simple, and without symbolism. With regard to the interpretation of Pinter's plays, Enquist held that there were many possible interpretations because of the play's many digressions. He concluded that Pinter's world was one of cruelty and tenderness and posed the question if Pinter had perhaps influenced playwrights of other nationalities such as Hasse Alfredsson in Sweden.

The last review of *The Birthday Party* that will be discussed here is that of Bengt Johnson of *Dagens Nyheter* (DN), a leading newspaper in Sweden. First, Johnson pointed out that it was not until 1966 that a Pinter play had been staged at Dramaten (DN 5 December 1966). Second, Johnson claimed that the play raised many questions that remained unanswered, but he was convinced that the play was about the death of the soul. Moreover, in Johnson's opinion, the usual isolation and terror present in Pinter's plays were, unfortunately, not part of this production. Instead the characters were far too nice, making them un-pinteresque. Instead of Dante's *Inferno*, the audience were presented with what he called *The First Day of Spring* which he considered inappropriate. Johnson felt that this particular production of *The Birthday Party* might be a nightmare, but not one that Pinter intended. The negative tone of the review including the way Johnson
described the characters of the play – Meg was unstable. Stan mentally ill – gives one the impression that Johnson did not like it. However, Johnson considered the play to be amusing in parts, but again stressed that there was not much Pinter in it. In addition, the dialogue came in for criticism on the grounds that the lines were realistic, but the pauses were not. In summary, one has the impression that Johnson not only disapproved of this particular production of *The Birthday Party*, but also of the actual play.

2.9.3 *The Homecoming*

In addition to *The Caretaker* and *The Birthday Party*, Pinter’s play *The Homecoming* (*Hemkomsten*) was produced in Sweden in the 1960s. It was first staged at Göteborgs stadsteater on October 23rd, 1965. In order to give a more complete description of the initial reception of Pinter’s plays in Sweden, below is a summary of the reviews of *The Homecoming*.

In 1965, the great majority of critics were of the opinion that it was difficult to interpret *The Homecoming*, yet they also felt that it was intriguing, funny and worth seeing. Some critics disagreed. Hans Axel Holm writing for DN (25 October, 1965) was somewhat critical, finding that the characters "talk[ed] a load of rubbish". (Swedish: *tala[de] en väldigt massa strunt*). Holm was also of the opinion that it was impossible to know what the play was about, particularly since Pinter did not explain the reasons for his characters’ actions. However, like most critics, Holm also thought that the play was funny, but he summed up the production in Göteborg as a "completely hellish play" (Swedish: *fullkomligt jävlig pjus*).

Swedish critics such as Hans Ingvar Hanson writing for *Svenska Dagbladet* (*SvD*), a leading newspapers in Sweden (25 October, 1965), Alex Esser (*Kvällsposten* 24 October, 1965) and Tord Baeckström (*Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning "Utan Kommentar"*, 1965), suggested that *The Homecoming* could be interpreted in many ways. They also pointed out that Pinter would not divulge how the play should be interpreted. Indeed, their understanding was that Pinter did not know
himself. Even though Esser pointed out that few facts in the play could be verified, this uncertainty did not seem to be a problem, since he liked the play. Hanson and Baeckström and others also stated that The Homecoming had an eerie atmosphere, that it was intriguing, that its author was very talented and that the play was a success.

Immi Lundin of Aftonbladet (22 Sept. 1978) found the play boring because she did not understand the characters at all. In her opinion, they were simply incomprehensible. More to the point, she was not even curious to find answers to the questions that the play raised. Moreover, Lundin stated that the language of the original was cryptic, rife with innuendo and associations, and felt that "words did not mean what they usually mean". Lundin tried to dissuade people from going to see The Homecoming. Another negative critic, Brita Håkansson, recalled that the English middle class audience, at the first ever staging of The Homecoming in England, to her disbelief actually embraced the play. They understood, laughed and applauded. "Did they possibly identify with the characters' idle and meaningless chatter?" she asked (Expressen 20 May, 1965). But then again, she continued, Pinter was a revered idol of the English intelligentsia, and unlike most playwrights of today his plays were amusing so perhaps their reactions were not very surprising after all. However, as in Pinter's earlier plays, there was not much action in this play, Håkansson claimed. She further asked what Pinter wanted to say by The Homecoming, but she resigned herself to the fact that she knew that Pinter would not explain, because, as Pinter had said, life is not explained to us. In conclusion Brita Håkansson felt that The Homecoming was a play "about people who strive for trivialities and achieve nothing". It was realistic yet absurd, tragic and comic and most of what was said was said in silence.

Per-Arne Tjäder of Arbetet, a left-wing newspaper, (23 Sept. 1978), wrote a negative review entitled "Halvabsurdistisk efterklang i stället för banbrytande teater" (half-absurd aftertaste in place of epoch-making theatre). However he acknowledged that Pinter was a central figure in the British theatre, but he did not think Pinter was breaking new ground by his writing. Words and silences were central to his work and through them Pinter created atmosphere, but it was
impossible to know what he wanted to say since ambiguity was inherent in his work. The play was too funny in this production and there was only surface, no tension. In addition, The Homecoming was entertaining, but had that been Pinter's intention? Who knows?! With Pinter you just do not know, he claimed.

Bo Lundin in Göteborgstidningen (GT), one of the leading newspapers in Sweden (24 Jan, 1976), aptly contrasted Pinter with Ibsen, stating that Ibsen gave the audience some basic facts about characters and events in order to help them understand what was happening in his plays. Pinter did not. A Pinter play was like doing a puzzle with lines, connotations, attitudes, pauses, looks and so on and we were not given any answers. This play was a maze. You did not embrace it very easily, and in Lundin's opinion perhaps that was why this production focussed on humour. Rune Ellehammar (Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning 6 Oct, 1978) also thought that The Homecoming was a play which was difficult to digest and interpret. He considered it to be an eerie nightmare with a constant threat hanging over the characters. In his opinion, it was difficult to make sense of the play and, as a result, the audience soon gave up and did not even think that characters and events might be realistic. There was no way of knowing who these people were, he claimed. The animalistic and the primitive formed the basis of the play. Ellehammar called Pinter "a virtuoso with words" and despite its negative points he stated that The Homecoming was an enormously fascinating play which stayed with you long after you left the auditorium. He recommended the play.

A Finnish production in Swedish staged at Kansallissteatri in 1966 resulted in the following reviews. Greta Brotherus (Nya Pressen 1966) called the play "a disturbing piece of literature", a play of sexually primitive communication. She mentioned that Esslin applied Freud in order to arrive at an interpretation: a son subjugating his mother, then making her into a whore. It could be an allegory, she continued: lust triumphing over spirituality. Like most of Pinter's plays this was a horrid image of contemporary life - dominate or be dominated. It would seem that the woman by her mere presence was a threat. The dialogue was monotonous, the acting theatrical, the action a set of games and the effect of this play on a theatregoer she felt might be compared to the sensation one experiences on receiving a blow to one's stomach.
The initials H.K. (Nya Pressen, 21 April 1966), another Finnish critic, concurred with Brotherus: *The Homecoming* was not pleasant. H.K. called it "a black comedy" of terror. According to this critic then, it was an awful play about lechery and lust, but a masterpiece of "brilliantly horrid heartlessness*. *The Homecoming* was enigmatic, non-moralistic and not to be viewed by prudish people. The dialogue was accurately mirroring life, yet there were secret undercurrents of fear and terror underneath. Technically speaking Pinter was a virtuoso with regard to writing drama. In London the play was realistic with some terror and evil. In this production, however, the evil lurking underneath the surface in everyday life was lacking. H.K. warmly recommended the play for viewing.

2.9.4 *No Man’s Land*

*No Man’s Land* (*Ingen mans land*) was produced for the first time at Göteborgs Stadsteater in Sweden on 23 January 1976. Jarl W. Donner (29 February, 1976) fittingly entitled his review of *No Man’s Land* “Frigor utan svar” (Questions without Answers). It is a fitting summing up of his review but it is also fitting because, like many other critics, Donner considered all of Pinter’s plays, including *No Man’s Land*, to be on the theme “Who is what and what is true and why is it said?” The audience were not provided with the answers, and Pinter refused to give any assistance. Donner stated that part of the dialogue reminded him of the plays by Oscar Wilde and he was also of the opinion that Pinter’s plays were like surreal paintings: details were realistic, but the over-all impression was not. What he meant, he explained, was that certain lines were comprehensible, but on the whole the play seemed enigmatic and unreal. However, it was the enigma which enticed people and created tension. Interpretation was subjective, anything was possible, and in conclusion Donner gave the play the thumbs down because, as a critic, he found it unsatisfactory not to be able to explain what the play was about.

Ruth Halliden (29 February, 1976) disagreed with Donner. In her view, *No Man’s Land* was interesting because we were invited to take part in its creation—everything was not handed to us on a plate. However, she conceded that some lines seemed meaningless. Otherwise the dialogue was often menacing and the
audience did not know what was true and what was false. But that is life, she concluded. Life was a maze and sometimes like a dream – unclear and enigmatic. The play was a battle between the classes: Hirst (upper class) and Spooner (lower class). Halldén further thought the play had several layers of meaning and she considered the acting superb.

Bertil Jahnsson of DN (24 January, 1976) thought that it was more difficult to transpose No Man’s Land into a Swedish arena than it first had seemed. Jahnsson’s main reason for this view was that the play had been greatly influenced by T.S. Eliot’s poem The Waste Land (the title being a case in point) and how does one translate Eliot’s language – which had become part of the English idiom – into Swedish where Eliot’s idiolect had not been incorporated? How can the actors make associations, known only to poetry enthusiasts, understandable to a foreign audience? In this production, these issues had been overlooked according to Jahnsson. In addition, Pinter parodied Coward successfully in No Man’s Land. The plot was, as always with Pinter, very simple and complicated. However, the truth would never be known to the audience. The battle between the classes which was inherent in the English language and important to the drama of the play, had not been rendered successfully in the translation (by C-O and Sigbrit Lång). Jahnsson continued. Characterisation had been subtle in the London production of the play, here they were exaggerated. Moreover, Gielgud’s diction in English as Spooner was not matched by Kent Andersson’s Spooner in Swedish. Rhythm, so important to the production of Pinter’s plays, had not been successfully captured in Swedish.

Åke Perlström (24 January, 1976) called No Man’s Land a sparkling play and emphasised the fact that the language, just as in Shakespeare, was very allusive. The fact was, he said, that in Shakespeare’s day the audience had not understood the allusions whereas Pinter’s audience understood his. Perlström believed that Pinter’s language should be studied to the same extent as Shakespeare’s - Pinter being the only playwright to merit the comparison to Shakespeare according to Perlström. In this play, the conversation was very elegant, the characters a bit theatrical but that was as it should be, and there was plenty of comedy. There had probably always been comedy in Pinter’s plays, it was just that Pinter’s reputation
as a playwright, when he was first introduced to the Swedish audience in 1961, was that of "an unusually dark and sombre playwright" and this had influenced the interpretation.

Bo Lundin (GT 22 September, 1978) pointed to the fact that the play was full of contradictory facts which made the audience prick up their ears, and it also kept them asking themselves who the characters were. The play was like a puzzle. Other important features to which Lundin drew attention were the dialogue which had undercurrents and the characters who represented symbols of different human traits, even though as Lundin stated Pinter denied that his plays were in any way symbolic. In addition, ambiguity was rife and interpretation therefore subjective. In order to be able to enjoy this play patience was needed, he claimed, and if the audience could muster it, the play made very good theatre despite too many long pauses. Bertil Palmqvist (Arbetet 29 Feb. 1976) agreed with most of what Perström had to say, adding that Pinter's dramas were like music in the sense that you may not understand it all, but you still enjoy it.

Finally, Per Erik Wahlund (29 Feb, 1976) stated that No Man's Land resembled Pinter's earlier plays to a large extent. Wahlund entitled his review "Onödigt abstrakt" (Unnecessarily Abstract) which indicates that he was disappointed with the play. If you had seen one you had seen them all, he claimed, the implication being that Wahlund found little of interest in the play. One difference was that the dialogue in this play was more elegant than in Pinter's earlier plays. The action was deemed unimportant since there really was none, just as in Pinter's earlier plays. The dialogue was important and in English it was very enjoyable. In Swedish, however, it was not, due to too many English-sounding words. Wahlund further claimed that it was up to the audience to guess at the characters' motives for their actions, since Pinter did not reveal their motives, and he thought that the play was far too abstract. Gielgud and Richardson had been hailed in England for their performances, but Wahlund did not understand what message they had tried to put across. "Are there any relationships between people in the play?" Wahlund asked.
2.9.5 Moonlight

*Moonlight* has not as yet been staged in Sweden, but the play received a reading at *Dramaten* in 1996. Hence, there are no reviews available.

2.9.6 Summary

*The Caretaker* received a fairly muted reception in Sweden in 1961. The play was considered bizarre and monotonous, and as in the UK, the USA and France, the Swedish critics did not understand what the play was about. An atmosphere of menace was mentioned, but the critics wondered how Pinter managed to achieve this. As in the UK, the USA and France, the critics in Sweden also mentioned the influence from other writers such as Kafka, Beckett and Joyce. *The Birthday Party* (staged in 1964 and in 1966) received a mixed reception. However, most critics found the play enigmatic, amusing and bemusing. As in France, many critics in Sweden seemed to feel that the problem was that it was impossible to know when the characters were lying and when they were telling the truth. Pinter was, all the same, considered an assured writer of dialogue and his play was considered effective theatre. One critic stated that Carl-Olof Lång's translation was good. *The Homecoming* (1964, 1966 and 1978) was recommended by many critics, although their description of the play seemed to suggest that people should not see it: the language was described as cryptic, there was idle chatter, the play was a maze, it was boring and the atmosphere was awful and eerie. All the same, many critics were fascinated. It seems that like critics in other countries, critics in Sweden were fascinated without being able to explain why. *No Man's Land* (1976, 1978) also received a mixed reception. Some critics were positive, others negative. Those who were positive enjoyed the fact that Pinter left questions unanswered, whereas those who did not, did not like the play. Some critics stated that it was difficult to transpose the play into Swedish due to the fact that the allusive language of the play was drawn from other texts by playwrights such as T.S. Eliot and Noel Coward. As a result, it was asked whether Swedish audiences would recognise the influence of these writers. Finally, one critic pointed out that Carl-Olof Lång's translation was inadequate.
2.10 Conclusion

In the 1960s, the great majority of critics in Great Britain, America, France and Sweden were of the opinion that it was difficult to make sense of Pinter's plays. There were many comments on the language and the critics seemed bemused. The acting was, on the whole, considered superb. Although the critics in Great Britain, America and Sweden did not seem to understand Pinter's plays, few of his plays received poor reviews. In France, however, Pinter was initially not very successful.

Polysystem Theory as put forward by Even-Zohar (1990) may help explain the relative success and failure of Pinter's plays in America, France and Sweden in the 1960s as well as the poor reception of The Birthday Party in the UK in 1958. Even-Zohar suggests that different kinds of literature interact in a synchronic and a diachronic way in a global literary polysystem (1990: 11-14). The different polysystems (called polysystems since each system has sub-systems or genres) stand in a hierarchical relationship with one another. The status of a polysystem influences that country's view of translation. According to Even-Zohar, translation has a primary position in a hierarchical relationship with one another. The status of a polysystem influences that country's view of translation. According to Even-Zohar, translation has a primary position in cultures with a weak or "peripheral literature" in the Western hemisphere (1990: 48). Even-Zohar claims that the literature of smaller nations usually fits into this category. Sweden is such a nation. As a result, translation has a primary position in the Swedish literary polysystem while it occupies a secondary position in countries where the national literature has a traditional central position (1990: 50). In Europe, such strong literatures or polysystems are found in the UK and in France (1990: 66). In addition, the openness to change is different in different polysystems. Even Zohar suggests that young nations, the USA is a case in point, and countries with a weak literary tradition (drama has a weak literary tradition in the USA) are more open to change whereas rigid and established literary polysystems such as those in France and the UK are less open (1990: 47-49). As a result, such nations expect new plays or novels in translation to adhere to their literary canon making it difficult for new playwrights who do not adhere to the established canon to be accepted in these countries in translation.
The UK has had a fairly long traditional central position in drama and the country has an established literary canon. Also, the English language has had a high status globally since the end of the Second World War. As a result, it is perhaps not surprising that the critics rejected Pinter's play *The Birthday Party* in 1958 since it did not adhere to the British canon. It is possible that the critics in the UK had to become familiar with a playwright who broke with the established canon, before he could be accepted. The success of *The Caretaker* in 1960 may be an indication that Pinter's way of writing was being incorporated into the new British canon.

The fairly positive reception of Pinter's plays in the USA may have been due to the fact that since the USA had an under-developed sub-system (no canon in drama) they relied heavily on imports for the stage. Also, since the USA hardly had a canon in drama with which to compare new plays, the plays by Pinter may, as a result, have been more readily accepted than if the USA had had a strong theatre canon or tradition like the UK.

France has had a strong central literary canon (including drama) for a few hundred years, resulting in drama translation holding a secondary position. Moreover, absurdist plays by Beckett and Ionesco were staged in France before Pinter appeared. Bearing these facts in mind, it is not surprising that Pinter, who was initially regarded as an absurdist playwright, was initially rejected by French critics. Comments indicating that Pinter did not bring anything new to the French theatre may support the argument that Pinter plays were compared with the plays by indigenous playwrights (the French canon) and considered inferior. The fact that one critic stated that the French dismissed Pinter's type of theatre in the 1950s also seems to support this view. Other comments by French critics about Pinter's language as "English nonsense" may also support the argument that indigenous plays were preferred to translations.

Since Sweden is a small nation, translation has a primary position and its literary system has been receptive to translation and influence from other countries for some time. Sweden also has a weak drama canon (like the USA). As a result, in the 1960s, Sweden relied on imports for their theatres. It is therefore not surprising that Pinter's plays were not dismissed in the 1960s, even though few Swedish critics seemed to understand what his plays were about.
In addition, although research suggests that there are a number of allusions or FEs in three of the plays by Pinter selected for this study - FEs which might complicate the understanding of his plays - it is interesting to note that there was very little discussion of FEs in the reviews of Pinter's plays in all four countries. However, in the English speaking cultures non-sequiturs were mentioned, as was the influence from writers such as Coward, Kafka and Beckett. Also, even though Pinter's language was described as allusive and elusive in the four countries, examples and definitions of what the critics were referring to were often lacking. However, in Sweden a couple of critics reviewing No Man's Land did point out that the play contained literary references from poems by T.S Eliot and they also felt that it would be difficult to translate these into Swedish in such a way that the audience would understand them. It is the aim of this thesis to assess the extent to which the translation of these formulaic expressions have had a bearing on Pinter's plays in translation in particular into Swedish.

However, before an assessment can be made of the translation of the FEs in Pinter's plays into Swedish in Chapter IV, the term "FE" needs to be defined. In the following chapter, the term "FE" is discussed and defined, and guidelines and translation options for the translation of FEs are outlined.
CHAPTER III

Formulaic Expressions

One of the aspects of the language of Pinter’s plays discussed in Chapter I was the occurrence of allusions or formulaic expressions (henceforth referred to as FEs). In some of Pinter’s plays these formulaic expressions abound. If these FEs are not identified and understood they may present problems in translation. In this chapter, different types of formulaic expressions are outlined. In addition, the functions of FEs and their modifications are discussed as well as the problems linked to the identification of FEs. Also discussed are the importance of text type, targeted recipient and cultural differences which may influence the translator’s approach to the translation of a text, including the translation of FEs. Finally, translation strategies for the translation of FEs are also outlined.

3.1 Discussion of Formulaic Expressions

The study of formulaic language is not an unexplored field. Several scholars such as Rosamund Moon (1998), R. J. Alexander (1978, 1979), R. Carter (1987), Deborah Tannen (1989), Peter Newmark (1995) and R. Leppihalme (1997) have discussed the subject. However, there does not seem to be a uniform terminology for the study of FEs, nor a uniform definition of what constitutes FEs. Moon bases her choice of term “fixed expressions and idioms” (FEI) on Alexander, Carter and other scholars’ common use of the term “fixed expressions”. According to these scholars, fixed expressions cover a wide range of different types of phraseological unit, phrasal lexeme and multi-word lexical item. In applying L. Bauer’s (1983) definition of fixed expressions, Rosamund Moon’s definition of fixed expressions and idioms (FEI) can be described as institutionalised formulations, which are considered to be lexical items of a particular language (Moon 1998: 7). Examples of fixed expression or formulae based on Alexander, Carter and others and further
developed by Moon are similics such as "clear as day", sayings including quotations such as "to be or not to be", catchphrases such as Anne Robinson's "Good-bye" and truisms such as "look before you leap", proverbs or maxims such as "there's no fool like an old fool", frozen collocations such as "heavy heart", collocations that break the conventional rules of English grammar such as "of course", "by and large", and idioms such as "spill the beans" (1998: 2. 21). Moon also adds metaphors to her discussion of FEls or FEs (1998: 21-22). Moon divides metaphors into three types (her classification seems based on what is required to decode a particular metaphor). They are transparent, semi-transparent and opaque metaphors. In order to decode or understand transparent metaphors such as "behind my back" the recipient needs only real world knowledge, with regard to semi-transparent metaphors such as "the pecking order" some specialist knowledge is required, and finally, opaque metaphors like "kick the bucket", which are pure idioms, knowledge of the historical origin of the expression is needed (1998: 22). In Chapter Three of Talking Voices, Tannen (1989) outlines a whole array of terms for formulaic language used by different scholars such as "set expressions" by Fillmore 1982 (Tannen 1989: 38), "routine formulae" and "linguistic routines" (Coulmas 1981) and "situation formulas" (Zimmer 1958). Tannen herself seems to prefer the labels "idiomatic" or "formulaic" expressions (1989: 37). In Culture Bumps – an empirical approach to the translation of allusions, Leppihalme discusses the translation of allusions, a type of "prefomed language" (1997: 9). She points out that the definition of the term in dictionaries and as used by scholars is often vague, also stating that definers and users vary in their definitions of the term and that they seem to accept a wide latitude for what is generally referred to as "allusions" (1997: 6). Leppihalme divides allusions into three main groups, one of which is relevant to the discussion of FEs (Group I). Group I is labelled "allusions proper" (1997: 10) and is divided into two subdivisions: proper name (PN) allusions such as "Stop acting like Nancy Drew" and key phrase (KP) allusions (1997: 3. 10-11) such as "To be or not to be". Her division is based on the fact that PN allusions contain a proper name whereas KP allusions do not. The term allusion is, according to Leppihalme, closely related to references, citations, quotations, wordplay, borrowing and intertextuality (1997: 6). As a result, it is not surprising to find that her translation examples and her use of the term seem to encompass references, citations, wordplay and so on. In this
thesis, Leppihalme's guidelines to the translation of allusions is applied to the translation of FEs as her definition of PN and KP allusions may be viewed as near-synonyms to FEs. In addition, Newmark outlines metaphors, which may be regarded as synonyms to FEs. A metaphor, according to Newmark, is "any figurative expression" (1995: 104) such as

1. personification: "modesty forbids me"
2. polysemy: "heavy" heart
3. phrasal verbs: "carry something off" which means "to do something successfully or well"
4. "the transferred sense of a physical word" such as French naître for "to originate"
5. the application of a collocation or a word "to what it does not literally denote" such as "my love is like a red red rose".

Peter Newmark claims that metaphors can be anything from single lexical items to longer stretches of text such as allegories (1995: 104). Moreover, since Newmark primarily discusses the translation of metaphors, his division of metaphors into six different groups (see pages 147-148 for Newmark's division of metaphors) is based on different translation solutions required for different types of metaphors (see pages 181-184 for more information on the translation of metaphors). The scholars listed above do not have the same definition of formulaic language, but they seem to refer to more or less the same concept. However, very few scholars of translation seem to have studied FEs in the context of translation. As Newmark and Leppihalme have, their discussions will be important to the approach to the translation of FEs. Here, the subject of FEs is primarily based on Moon and Tannen's discussions of formulaic language, and with regard to the translation of FEs, Newmark and Leppihalme have proved valuable.

Collocations, which are very common in English, may also be viewed as FEs because, although they are of varying rigidity, many of them are viewed as set expressions (Moon 1998: 26, 73-4). Tannen seems to agree with Moon, stating that collocations are a "clear example of pre-patterning", and supports the claim
that collocations are common in English when stating that collocations abound in English (1989: 41). Other possible FEs are formulaic "greetings" and "social routines", also generally referred to as ritualistic language or phatic communion (1998: 29). Because the user of ritualistic language has a limited choice of phrases at his or her disposal for different "inter-social" situations such as greetings and salutations, it can be argued that ritualistic language adheres to the "idiom principle" (1998: 26) and therefore constitute FEs. Even rhetorical frames such as those used in order to parody the style of an author or a known passage of a book or a speech, Moon suggests can be viewed as FEs. Moreover. Chiaro considers joke formulae such as "Knock, knock ... Who's there?", "Did you hear about ..." and "What's the difference between an X and a Y?" as "semi-idioms" since they are based on fairly fixed frames (Chiaro 1992: 59, 62, 68). Therefore joke-formulae can be viewed as FEs. The question below is a joke formula which signals a joke: "Question: When is a walnut not a walnut? Answer: When it does not conform to the Euro regulation 175/2001." (Sunday Express March 18, 2001).

In relation to pre-patterned language Tannen stresses that all language is "more or less patterned" (1989: 38) and although she holds that proverbs are very fixed and that collocations constitute formulaic language. Tannen also points out that sometimes it is difficult to determine whether or not to classify an expression as formulaic (1989: 39, 54-55). Her claim is strengthened by Moon who states that the "boundaries of FEI are unclear" (1998: 116). In this thesis an FE constitutes the type of lexical items as defined and outlined by Moon et. al. above, including extended parody (see pages 145-147 for a more detailed discussion and classification of FE).

According to Moon then, formulaic expressions abound in English (1998: 73-4). Moreover, as studies have shown, these expressions are more common in spoken than in written language, although they are not as frequent in everyday conversation as people tend to think (1998: 69-72). In addition, FEs are governed either by syntax or situation, that is the syntactic or social context governs lexical choice. For example, collocations are governed by syntax and greetings adhere to specific social routines or rituals. As there are many FEs of various rigidity in a language, and since they are created through mixing patterned language with novelties of different types, it is perhaps not surprising that Tannen describes FEs
as an excellent tool of creativity (1989: 37). Wilss has drawn up a list based on creativity (from the least to the most creative language) in which Tannen’s claim may seem refuted since, here, FEs are considered to lean towards the least creative kind of language. Wilss’ list looks as follows (1996: 27):

1. phatic communion (greetings etc.)
2. casual conversation involving routine activities
3. idioms, phrases, etc
4. sentence fragments (I don’t know whether …)
5. short sentences (I couldn’t care less …)
6. unusual collocations of two or more words
7. deviance structure (OSV instead of SVO)
8. deviance-form classes (noun as verb)
9. violation of selectional rules (metaphor, personification)
10. violation of strict subcategorization (transitive for intransitive)

According to the list, FEs such as phatic communion, routine activities and idioms constitute uncreative language. However, when FEs are modified or “violated” in some way it is clear that FEs do not necessarily constitute uncreative language anymore. Another indication that FEs are not always uncreative is the fact that FEs are not fully frozen (Moon 1998: 7) which means that they are open to variation. Moreover, it is sometimes possible to modify FEs without altering the meaning of the lexicon. Truncation and transposition (1998: 112-114) constitute modifications which do not alter the lexicon (see pages 161-169 for a framework of different modifications, including examples) Moon further states that an original FE can have more than one modification, which in many cases is considered to be an FE in itself, and in Moon’s opinion personal preference seems to decide which FE is chosen, the original or its modification. A case in point, as suggested by Moon, is the original a wolf in sheep’s clothing, whose opposite a sheep in a wolf’s clothing also occurs and seems to have become an FE (1998: 171). Also, modifications can become established as FEs in themselves (1998: 72, 171) and they can change the meaning of an FE entirely. Moon’s (1998) and Tannen’s (1989) discussions of FEs seem to support Leppihalme’s claim that it is
impossible to establish precise syntactic rules for the creation of NP and KP allusions (or FEs) as well as for the possible modifications that these can take (1997: 31-32). As it seems that no precise rules for the creation of an FE can be drawn up, a summary of what types of modifications that occur can be listed in order to illustrate what is possible. However, before different modifications of FEs are outlined, a classification of the types of expression that encompass the term FE is put forward below, followed by a discussion of the functions of FEs.

According to Moon, who bases her definition on Bauer (1983), FEs are institutionalised formulations, which are considered to be lexical items of a particular language (1998: 7). In this thesis, the same definition has been adopted for FEs. As outlined on pages 140-145, FEs are of many different types: single words, collocations, set phrases, sentences, allegories, even extended parody, just to mention a few. I divide FEs into two major groups: cultural FEs and linguistic FEs. The division is based on the fact that cultural FEs such as “to be or not to be” and “all’s well that ends well, as they say” are context-specific as well as culture-specific, that is the use of a cultural FE conjures up a particular generally recognised context, a context particular to a society, a culture or a subgroup within a society. In other words, extra-linguistic knowledge is required to understand the FE fully. The identification and interpretation of such an FE require familiarity with the source of the cultural FE. Finally, these FEs can contain a proper name. Linguistic FEs such as “spill the beans” and “a red herring” are, however, usually not context-specific and do not usually contain a proper name. Cultural FEs may further be divided into two sub-groups: references such as “speech is silver, but silence is golden” and catchphrases such as “Didn’t she do well”. The division of cultural FEs into two sub-groups is based on the fact that many cultural FEs originate in written language (references), although some also originate in spoken language (catchphrases). This type of division does not seem applicable to linguistic FEs, since the same linguistic FEs are used in both written and spoken language. It should be pointed out that the division into groups and sub-groups is not watertight since it appears to be a matter of opinion if an FE is regarded as a cliche, an idiom, a cultural FE or a metaphor and so on — fetch any two monolingual dictionaries and compare the classification of an FE and this should
soon become obvious. Finally, below is a table illustrating the types of FE discussed above.

**FORMULAIC EXPRESSIONS (FEs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural FEs</th>
<th>Linguistic FEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(FE with or without proper names)</td>
<td>(FE without proper names)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catchphrases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(written)</td>
<td>(spoken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citations</td>
<td>catchphrases (fads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maxims</td>
<td>jingles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended parody</td>
<td>quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mottoes</td>
<td>slogans (ads, pol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quotations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>references</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proverbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**references**

To be or not to be. (Shakespeare)

Brazil, Brazil, Brazil, Brazil, Brazil. (Tommy Cooper)

The exception proves the rule. (proverb)

**catchphrases**

Just like that. (Tommy Cooper)

Because I'm worth it. (advertisement)

**idioms**

Put one's foot in it. (idiom)

Kick the bucket. (metaphor)
I came, I saw, I conquered. The lady's not for turning. To have one's cake and eat it.

(Julius Caesar) (Margaret Thatcher) (cliche)

There are other approaches to the classification of FEs. These constitute helpful complements to any basic classification of FEs, since no one classification is exhaustive. In the context of translation, one such helpful approach has been provided by Peter Newmark. His classification of metaphors is helpful since Newmark's definition of the term metaphor seems to be a near-equivalent to the term FE relevant to this thesis. Newmark divides types of metaphor into six groups as outlined below (1995: 106-112):

**Dead metaphors:** metaphors where the metaphorical image is hardly evident

e.g. the *field* of human knowledge (English)
    le *domaine* de savoir humain (French)
    la *sphere* de savoir humain (French)

**Clichés:** /often emotive/ metaphors used instead of clear thoughts: hackneyed phrases

e.g. basically
done and dusted
at the end of the day

**Stock metaphors:** established metaphors covering a physical or mental state referentially and pragmatically

e.g. He is the apple of her eye.
    I'm stumped.
    I'm bowled over.

**Adapted metaphors:** modified metaphors
Recent metaphors: a "new" metaphorical expression, which has spread rapidly in a language (examples in italics below)

e.g. What do you think of the car? Pretty wicked, eh?!
     (i.e. very nice)

     Just look at him, he's not with it at all. He's a total geek.
     (i.e. trendy, fashionable)

Original metaphors: metaphors created or quoted by a writer

e.g. Come, sleep. O sleep, the certain knot of peace.
     The baiting place of wit, the balm of woe.

     (Sir Philip Sidney)

     Though this be madness, yet there's method in't.
     (Shakespeare)

The usefulness of Newmark's division of metaphors above will become clear at a later stage of this chapter when it is applied to the translation of FEs. However, the translation of FEs should not be discussed until text-type, the functions of FEs and the context in which they occur have been established. As a result, these aspects will be discussed in the following sections, but first a few observations with regard to the translation of drama.
3.2 The Translation of Drama

Research suggests that the statements "There is practically no theoretical literature on the translation of drama as acted or produced." (Lefevere 1980:178) and "Only limited scholarly attention has [...] been devoted to the translation of drama." (Anderman 2001: 71) still hold true today, even though Heylen (1993:1) has pointed out that "literary scholars are beginning to turn their attention to" this translation problem (1993:1). Bassnett (1980/1985/1991), Snell-Hornby (1988) and Johnston (1996) have, in their work, discussed the translation of drama, but all in all the lack of scholarly work on the subject suggests that more attention should be given to the translation of drama.

The duality of drama (literary text and actual performance) requires the translator to view the ST either as text or performance (Anderman 2001: 71; Espasa 2000: 50). Johnston states that "It is now commonly accepted amongst those who translate drama that the translator" views the ST as performance (2000: 85). The translation of a play as performance involves both the "speakability" or fluency of the TT and "mise en scène" or the "performability" which involves for instance "cultural adaptation" (Bassnett 1985: 90-91; Espasa 2000: 49). Socio-cultural differences between two countries may for instance evoke undesired connotations; the interdisciplinary nature of translation has been discussed by scholars such as Snell-Hornby (1988) and Bassnett (1980/91). "Performability" is also partly shaped by the status of the literature or the status of translation in a particular country (see Polysystem Theory in Chapter II, pages 137-139 for a discussion). Theatre traditions in a society may also influence a play's performability (Anderman 2001: 72), as might the person or people in charge of a theatre production. In addition, unlike other types of literature, drama "interrupts the relationship between writer, text and reader" (Bassnett 1991: 104-105), since drama has to be interpreted for the audience by the director and the actors, which means that drama, in this sense, is more indirect communication than other literature. Also, in drama translation, the ST may have been interpreted by the translator before it reached the director and the actors as a TT and this may result in a change of the writer's intentions. Finally, readers of novels may take a break to reflect or they may consult a dictionary or an encyclopaedia for reference or
understanding, whereas a theatregoer does not have these options. In drama, understanding has to be immediate.

3.3 Text Type and Translation

Peter Newmark points out that before the translation of a text is begun, text type should be established, because the awareness of text type helps determine how a text should be translated. Newmark divides text into six categories according to its language function. They are aesthetic, expressive, informative, metalingual, phatic and vocative texts (1995: 39-44). Aesthetic texts are primarily supposed to please the senses - poetry is the typical example. In expressive texts, it is the speaker or writer, who is in focus - autobiographies, plays, novels, poetry, political speeches and short stories are examples of such texts. Informative texts are topic-oriented, factually impartial texts aimed at avoiding value statements: the academic style of writing is a case in point. Metalingual texts explain and criticise features of language itself - syntax or grammar for instance, whereas phatic texts are language used to maintain friendly contact with other people - formulaic expressions such as greetings. Finally, the vocative function of texts; here the readership is the focus and the function of vocative language is to persuade the audience of something. Advertisements constitute a typical example of vocative texts.

According to Newmark’s classification of text above, the function of drama is primarily expressive. By this Newmark seems to mean that the speaker’s or writer’s subjective view of life is the focus of the text. Aesthetics can also be important to such texts. However, texts are never purely one or the other but an amalgam of all or several text types. Translation should be adjusted accordingly. Since Pinter is a playwright, his texts are primarily expressive in function, and this function should therefore be kept in mind.

After the main function of text has been established, other aspects on both the “micro” (smaller strings of text) and “macro” (the text as a whole) levels of the text have to be considered (Leppihalme 1997: 2). First, an illustration of function
on the micro level: An Englishman, who has been talking casually to a stranger or an acquaintance, concludes the conversation by saying “You must come to visit some time”. The phrase is a linguistic FE and it is often used because it is a polite way of ending a conversation in English. The FE is not to be taken literally, that is the addressee has not been invited to come for a visit. However, if the same Englishman had been speaking to a foreigner, who does not know the function of the FE, the line may well have been interpreted literally and a miscommunication would have taken place. Accordingly, if a translator finds the same FE in a novel and translates it literally, the translation will be faulty. Linguistic FEs occur regularly in everyday language. A lack of knowledge or awareness of these FEs may lead to communication problems, also in translation, but they do not usually distort the interpretation of the text as a whole. The macro context of a text concerns the text as a whole. The interpretation of a phrase or indeed the translation of an expression is, in this case, based on an overall interpretation of the entire text. If a character in a novel speaks very colloquial English all through, in translation into another language s/he should also use colloquial language, since it must be part of the characterisation of that person. As a result, if the translator has a choice between a formal or a colloquial expression, the informal expression should be used when the translator has analysed the text as a whole and identified that distinctive of a particular character is his colloquial way of speaking.

FEs are particularly common in certain forms of literature: novels, short stories and journalism. Relevant to this thesis is the fact that some of Pinter’s plays contain many FEs. In order that misunderstandings of FEs do not occur and in order that FEs be satisfactorily translated, a text has to be studied semantically (meaning), stylistically (characteristics particular to a group, context, idiolect or genre etc.) and pragmatically (language in use), as well as analysed in the context of culture (Wilss 1996: 45). Furthermore, Wilss states that it is important to remember that surface features of text often encode shared underlying norms, tacit and intuitive knowledge which is “unobservable but inferable” (1996: 41, 58) from the situation, which means that shared knowledge is required for the complete understanding of a text. Moreover, this shared, intuitive knowledge is culture-bound since culture is a “human-made part of the environment” (1996: 84), and this means that FEs such as “That’s not cricket” are strings of text, which
often encode cultural knowledge based on norms and particular modes of thinking (1996: 71-2). In this case, the recipient needs to know that cricket is a symbol of English sportsmanship, that cricket is a gentleman’s sport where honesty and fair play are virtues. Since FEs are often culture specific, it is only with this knowledge in mind that a reader will fully understand the FE. Culture specific or culturally shared knowledge within one culture can be labelled “schemas” or “structures of expectations” (Tannen 1993: 59). Tannen also outlines other scholars’ terms for more or less the same concept: “scripts”, “modules” and “prototypes” etc. These schemas are prior knowledge structured in our brains, which leads us to have “expectations about people, objects, events and settings in the world” (Tannen 1993: 59-60). These culturally structured schemas of knowledge are constantly updated when we acquire new knowledge. In addition to schemas, we also store and process knowledge in another system: categories (1996: 61-66). People also make use of different interpretive frames or frameworks in order to make sense of text (Tannen 1989: 59). Through the processing of schemas, categories and frames members of a particular culture expect things to happen in a certain way (1996: 62-65).

In applying the aspects of textual analysis discussed above, translation in general and the translation of FEs in particular should become more successful. However, one or more of these aspects may make the analysis and translation of FEs difficult. A case in point would be Wilss’s claim that translation of style can be difficult because “individual style is an elusive phenomenon” that thwarts “all efforts of systematic description and operationalization” and moreover because it is largely unpredictable, often idiosyncratic and since it may be, if not impossible, then difficult to find an adequate TL equivalent for a stylistic feature in the SL (1996: 171). It is my view that Pinter’s style makes translation in general, but especially the translation of FEs difficult, partly due to the reasons stated by Wilss, but also because the success of a translation depends on the degree of idiomatic, lexical, socio-cultural and syntactic “contrast between SL and TL and the stylistic repertoire between SL and TL” (1996: 141). In the case of Pinter, idiomatic contrasts between English and Swedish make translation difficult, whereas socio-cultural differences between Britain and Sweden often make interpretation difficult.
3.4 Translator Behaviour: Experience and Skills

Wilss states that the translator's primary aim is to establish correspondence between source text (ST) and target text (TT), taking account of the intentions of the writer as well as trying to produce a translation, which meets with the TT recipient's expectations. As Wilss points out, this is not easy to achieve (1996: 41). Moreover, translators are intermediaries and mediators between two languages and two language communities, which means that they need to be both bilingual and bicultural in order to be able to decode the ST and encode the TT satisfactorily (1996: 43; Leppihalme 1997: 4). Leppihalme holds that allusions or FEs may become “culture bumps” in translation (1997: 4), that is expressions are not understood by the TL recipient, if translators are not bicultural, since the understanding and translation of FEs require a high degree of biculturalization (1997: 4). In addition, in order to produce a satisfactory translation, a translator is also required to have many interactive analytical skills: analysis, interpretation, comparison, inferencing, weighing of possibilities, planning, combining, routinization, that is acquired translation habits, problem-solving etc (1996: 43, 156). However, since Wilss points out that there is no such thing as an ideal translator, there are no homogenous solutions to problems among translators as skills vary from one translator to the next (1996: 141). Apart from encoding and decoding skills the outcome of a translation is further determined by aspects such as the translator’s mental state of mind, his or her personal history, attitude, intelligence, motivation, flexibility, patience, perceptive talent, breadth and depth of thought and these aspects may vary with age and the circumstances of the translation task (1996: 140-141). Furthermore, translation involves various levels, areas and “manifestations of creativity” (1996: 53). And depending on the type of the professional translator - technical or literary to mention two opposites different knowledge is required. A technical translator needs to be taught domain specific knowledge whereas a literary translator needs to learn how to apply interpretive methods and techniques (1996: 73-4). With regard to FEs, Wilss claims that experienced translators have usually picked up huge amounts of conventional and stereotypical knowledge of FEs such as stock phrases, collocations and formulaic expression (1996: 72, 111). Indeed, professional translators need to have a great store of “formulaic transfers”, that is standard or
equivalent formulaic utterances or prefabricated routines in the IT at their fingertips in order for the translation and the translation of FEs to be successful (Campbell 1998: 17). With experience comes economizing, which means that translators use habitual translation procedures in order to save time (Wilss 1996: 156).

Wilss further holds that translators experience problems when there is too much novelty (unfamiliar FEs could be a case in point) in the text since this leads to analysing problems, as the cognitive frame that the translator needs to apply is outside his or her range of competence, and so the novelties may become "unmanageable" (1996: 95). There may also be other knowledge deficits, and an author's individual style of writing may cause problems. Other reasons, which may cause translation mistakes are time pressure, an obscure or unclear message of the ST sender, and concepts or descriptions which are not fully, accurately, efficiently, plausibly and coherently encoded (1996: 95-101, 142, 144, 156; Leppihalme 1997). Wilss advises a translator to deal with problems in the following way (1996: 188):

1. Problem identification
2. Problem clarification
3. Research on, and collection of, background information
4. Deliberation of how to proceed (pre-choice behavior)
5. Moment of choice
6. Post-choice behavior (evaluation of translation results)

In addition, Wilss stresses that, if possible, author feedback would be invaluable, but he also states that it is not common (1996: 175).

3.5 The Audience

Familiarity with sources of FEs is important in order for a recipient to recognise and interpret them. Each country, but also each subculture within a country, is familiar with different sources (Leppihalme 1997: 31, 36). The French recognise
quotes from Racine, the British quotes from Shakespeare. The cultural elite of a
country would probably feel at home discussing what is conventionally viewed as
"serious subjects". that is world literature, opera and classical music, but it is
unlikely that the same group of people would know much about football, popular
music and literature. Moreover, Moon states that many FEIs (a near-synonym to
FEs) - "Didn't she do well", "The Weakest Link? Not O'Leary's Stars" and so on
- are culture-dependent, that is knowledge about the particular culture as well as
their connotations are required for the understanding and interpretation of the FE
or the FE. FEIs may also encode "ideological constructs" which involve
knowledge of "shared experiences and cultural givens" (Moon 1998: 165) as well
as norms which "appeal to culturally conditioned schemas" in our brains (1998:
259). In Britain, the proverb "speech is silver, but silence is golden" (The (hj6rd
Library of Words and Phrases - II Proverbs) is generally accepted as true or it
would not be a proverb, but is the proverb applicable to every country?
Furthermore, different countries often have different underlying "conceptual
systems", that is different cultures view the world differently, which further
complicates the decoding or production of FEIs (1998: 160, 165). Familiarity with
different sources and socio-cultural issues as discussed above make identification
and understanding of FEIs more difficult, since lack of prior knowledge of the FE,
or the sources of the FE, is likely to impede identification and understanding.
Furthermore, if the FE has been manipulated in some way, identification may be
even more difficult. For instance, foreigners are likely to miss at least some FEIs
and the reasons for their use because they are not bicultural enough to intuitively
or subconsciously recognise underlying patterns of FEIs as well as their sources
(Chiaro 1992: 13, 32). It could thus be argued that some FEIs are culture-specific,
that is they are not universal. Jokes based on formulae "I'm busier than (IBI) ...."
for example may constitute culture-specific FEIs, since they often are specific to a
language community (1992: 6-10, 78). Outsiders or non-native speakers may not
even recognise the author or speaker's intention to joke and, as a result, the
humour will be lost on them. Insufficient knowledge of linguistic rules will
complicate identification and understanding further since this will mean that the
recipient will not notice instances of manipulation of FEIs (1992: 13). In
translation it is important that FEIs are identified and then translated in such a way.
that the TL recipient understands the purpose for their use, otherwise the understanding of the text may be hampered.

3.6 Functions of FEs

In order to interpret or translate a word, a phrase, an expression, an FE or a paragraph satisfactorily, text type and context, as outlined above, need to be considered. Another aspect to be considered is function. This section focuses on the functions of FEs. FEs can operate on both micro and macro levels of text (Leppihalme 1997: 31). FEs that work on the micro level of text are items, which in translation need to be viewed in a smaller context where solutions have to be found to, for instance.

a proper name: "Jan" is a woman's name in English but a man's name in Swedish. Should the name be retained unaltered in the TL text or should another proper name be used?

a collocation: What is the equivalent TL collocation of the SL collocation "a heavy heart"?

prepositional phrase: What does "pull somebody up on something" mean and how should the phrase be translated into another language?

These FEs do not necessarily affect the overall meaning of a piece of writing but still the items need to be understood and translated appropriately in their smaller context in order for them to make sense to the TL reader. FEs operating on the macro level, however, often affect the overall interpretation of the entire text and this means that the interpretation or translation of such an FE needs to be viewed in its appropriate context, that is as part of the text as a whole. This type of FE can for instance constitute a thematic device and work as a clue to the meaning of a text or help in characterisation (1997: 37). Moreover, it should be pointed out that
an FE can, and often does, have more than one function, and furthermore, for various reasons the function of an FE is not always clear (Moon 1998: 239). Also, a function may be obvious to the reader able to recognise the context and possible associations related to a particular expression, but unclear or vague to readers who do not know either expression or context. Intentional or unintentional “insiderism”, that is a text which is understood by one group of people but not by another, can thus be viewed as one of the functions of FEs (1998: 269).

It is possible to classify FEs in different ways. My classification of FEs (see pages 144-146 for an outline) is based on two factors: whether or not the understanding of an FE requires extra-lingual knowledge, and whether the FE originates in spoken or written language. Peter Newmark’s classification of metaphors seems to be based on how metaphors should be translated. In order to give an overview of what types of FE exist, in the table below, Rosamund Moon’s classification of FEs is reproduced with many of her examples (1998: 217):

- **informational**: stating proposition, conveying info
  - rub shoulders with in the running
  - catch sight of for sale

- **evaluative**: conveying speaker’s evaluation and attitude
  - kid’s stuff
  - a fine kettle of fish
  - near the knuckle
  - it’s an ill wind …

- **situational**: relating to extra-linguistic context, responding to situation
  - excuse me!
  - long time no see
  - knock it off!
  - talk of the devil
· **modalizing**
  - conveying truth values.
  - advice, requests, etc.
  - I kid you not
  - you know what I mean
  - to all intents and purposes
  - if in doubt, do nowt (Yorkshire)

· **organizational**
  - organizing text.
  - signalling discourse
  - structure
  - by the way
  - for instance
  - talking of
  - be that as it may

Outlining the range of FEs that occur (Moon 1998) should serve as an illustration of what is meant by functions of FEs. However, it is also useful to further explain and illustrate what types of functions FEs can have, and why they are used, and add to the list of functions, in order to make the concept clearer. The aspects discussed below are labelled as follows:

**insiderism**: as discussed by Moon, FEs such as in-jokes which are understood by one group of people, but not by another (1998: 269).

**the aesthetic function**: texts aimed to please by sound or style as discussed by Peter Newmark (1995: 42-43, 104)

**foregrounding**: to draw attention to something in a text for a purpose (Fowler 86: 70-71)

**device of structure**: FEs used as “cohesive links” in text (Moon 1998: 243)
characterisation: FEs used to help develop character (Leppihalme 1997: 43; Moon 1998: 165)

thematic allusions: FEs that are potentially clues to the interpretation of an entire text (Leppihalme 1997: 37)

the writer’s message: the writer’s choice of FEs in a text may indicate what kind of message the writer wishes to give us or they may say something about his personality (Newmark 1995: 39-44)

In literary texts prior to the 1950s, references to earlier literary works of art were common either in order to enrich the writer’s own work or in order to call attention to the writer’s wider learning (Leppihalme 1997: 7). It was a type of insiderism in the sense that those who did recognise the reference were part of the literary elite whereas those who did not would feel like outsiders. The practice of referring to other writers’ works is less common today, but it is by no means completely outdated. The use of FEs can also have aesthetic purposes. Through the recipient’s recognition of an FE, the purpose of its occurrence may be to please, interest or surprise the reader (Newmark 1995: 104). In some cases, FEs are used as an “academic game” with the writer intending the recipient either to identify the reference since s/he is familiar with the expression, or baffle the recipient because the reference is unknown (Nash 1985: 11). This can also be viewed as a type of insiderism. Another reason for using FEs is foregrounding. Foregrounding can be used for many different reasons, some of which will be described below.

Foregrounding, as the term implies, is used to signal or draw attention to something (Fowler 1986: 152-154). Foregrounding can be achieved through the use of understatement, or overstatement as well as through change of register and other modifications of FEs discussed later in this chapter. With regard to foregrounding FEs, Raskin states that trademarks, clichés and formulaic language are used as signals (1985: 12). In addition, some joke formulae are used and commonly recognised as triggers indicating a joke. Specific formulae or wordings such as “Chelsea Rule OK”, and its variations “Elizabeth II Rules OK” and
“Dyslexia Rules KO” may therefore be viewed as FEs, since they indicate to the recipient that somebody intends to be funny (Chiaro 1992: 61, 63, 68). Moreover, in crosswords the collocation “or Luke” signals that an expression is “in a cryptic code”, which the reader has to unravel (1992: 30). Foregrounding FEs can also be used or viewed as cohesive links or devices of structure (Moon 1998: 243). A case in point would be original or modified references such as proverbs which are often used in newspaper headlines to sum up the drift of an article. Many of these FEs often carry tacit evaluations, that is they encode norms, views and judgments and so on. Other FEs signal prefacing or the beginning (In the first place, ...) and end (Finally, ...) of an argument, and some constitute closing turns (It’s getting late.) in dialogue. Furthermore, references tend to help the recipient bond with the writer or speaker through identification (1998: 69, 216, 296-7; Tannen 1989: 94; Leppihalme 1997: 39; Wilss 1996: 50). If the FE is not identified then these FEs have the opposite effect, distancing the recipient from writer or speaker.

FEs are often used for characterisation purposes because, by their very nature, they allude to cultural stereotypes as well as situations where images, connotations and evaluations are self-evident (Leppihalme 1997: 43; Moon 1998: 165). Consequently, in fiction ordinary people talk in clichés or use proverbs because it is the general stereotypical view of how ordinary people talk. Moreover, it is not unusual that this type of FE refers to culturally shared experiences, which encode “ideological constructs” (1998: 165) or attitudes. In literary texts FEs are often used to suggest unconscious attitudes and behaviour or thoughts, which will help categorise the people involved. In film, fiction and TV some FEs are very common since they, if understood by two parties, can describe interpersonal relationships based on solidarity, and they also further the development of the narrative (1998: 73). In addition, references can be used as a power tool, weapon or controlling device in struggles for dominance since the character using references can control the situation if his or her interlocutor does not understand the references being made (Leppihalme 1997: 44, 46, Nash 1985: 74, 78). The fact that the meaning of references tends to be indirect further means that they seem more polite, and therefore, can be used to reduce the effect of severe criticism (1985: 78). Using references can also be a way of sheltering behind acknowledged wisdom, or detracting from the importance of a situation or a statement (1998:
Indeed, the referential purpose of these FEs can be used to describe a mental state or process, a person or concept or they can be used to impress interlocutors (1997: 47). In short, FEs seem to constitute a short cut to characterisation. In addition to the functions already outlined, two more important functions of FEs should be mentioned: First, thematisation which is the organisation of texts in order to draw attention to the important sections of its themes (Moon 1998: 61). Potentially thematic devices are “attention-catching transformations of word-order […] any unexpected ruffling of the surface of the text by noticeable phonology, printing, syntax, or vocabulary” (Moon 1998: 61). In other words, they constitute a type of foregrounding. Leppihalme claims that allusions (here labelled references) can be used as a thematic device (1997: 37), since on the macro level “thematic allusions” (Leppihalme 1997: 37) may be keys or clues to the meaning or interpretation of the entire text or work. Lastly, metaphors or FEs may furthermore contain the writer’s core message, his comments on life and his personality (Newmark 1995: 39-44).

3.7 Modifications of FEs (MODs)

As described in Chapter 1, Pinter manipulates or plays with language in his plays in many ways. One of the ways in which he does this is through the modification of FEs. A modification (MOD) in the context of an FE is a manipulated or changed FE, that is an FE that differs in some way from its original. Leppihalme (1997) and Moon (1998) have discussed modifications of FEs. Leppihalme’s study focuses primarily on allusions, her use of the term encompasses a wide range of expressions and provides a very general overview of modifications, whereas Moon’s approach covers more broadly various kinds of FE. The term modification is borrowed from Leppihalme and it seems to be an equivalent to what Moon refers to by the term transformation.

Modifications can be of many different types. Leppihalme’s general listing of MODs include situational twists, transformations of an FE from the negative to the affirmative, lexical modifications, additions, substitutions and what Leppihalme refers to as “deviations” in style (1997: 59-65). The term “deviation”
as used by Leppihalme seems to refer to the same concept as discussed by Roger Fowler in *Linguistic Criticism* (1986: 108). According to Fowler, deviations are either motivated linguistic peculiarities or breaches of maxims, which produce implicatures and result in defamiliarization, that is "the use of some strategy to force us to look, to be critical." (1986: 42) and it is the reader's responsibility to find out the reason for the deviation (Fowler 1986: 108). Moreover, FEs often have more than two "refillable slots" (Moon 1998: 98), that is it is possible to make more than two modifications to any FE: subject, object, pronoun, possessive and locatives can be modified. Predicates can be added to the list. Deviations are of various kinds: situational, cultural, contextual and lexical (1997: 41; Nash 1985: 8; Newmark 1995: 106; Tannen 1989: 97). A proposed list of modifications based on Moon and Leppihalme -- with examples -- will illustrate the majority of modifications possible (my own list):

1. **Substitution** (replacement of lexical item in fixed FE).
   
   Lexical items can be replaced with more formal, literary, or euphemistic synonyms, even antonyms, quasi-homophones, homophones or near homophones. A single letter can also be replaced as is the case in punning.

   *e.g.* *quietly* (cautiously) optimistic

   short of a few *krugerrands* (bob)

   you've never had it so *uncertain* (good)

   the sweet allure of *kids'* (haute) couture

   to *pee* (be) or not to *pee* (be)

   "Have they gone *parking* (barking) mad"

   (an article in *the Daily Express* criticising parking attendants for giving people tickets when they should not)

   "*the Loch Ness* (Ness) monster"
("Devon Loch" was the Queen Mum's racehorse that was set to win the Grand National in the fifties when it suddenly and mysteriously collapsed just before the finishing line)

The Eskimos are God's frozen people
(The Jews are God's chosen people)

2. Ellipsis (leaving out part of the FE while still retaining its meaning)

  e.g.  *An apple a day...* (keeps the doctor away.)
        *All's well...* (that ends well.)
        *While there's life...* (there's hope).
        *A tough nut...* (to crack)

3. Truncation (a shortened expression; often used in its truncated form)

  e.g.  *faint praise* - to damn somebody with faint praise
        *Opportunity knocks!* - Opportunity never knocks twice at any man's door
        *still waters* - Still waters run *deep*
        *all thumbs* - all fingers and thumbs

4. Expansion also labelled addition or infixing: the addition of an extra noun, adjective, letter or morpheme:

  *push the city limits*
  (a headline to do with the foot-and-mouth disease and its consequences for the countryside)
sensational – sensational
(referring to Mr Sven Gőran Eriksson, the successful Swedish coach for England’s national football team)

Thanks a lotski – Thanks a lot
(refers to a Russian football team helping Arsenal qualify for the next round of a European tournament)

5. Deviation of style, content or imagery, which leads to saliency and defamiliarization. Deviation can be performed by alluding to facts, traditions, culture, literary works etc. through the use of irony, or parodies of style, social conventions and attitudes. It is interplay of form and context. Devices used to foreground deviation are among other things stylistic contrast, rhyme, rhythm, italics and tone.

frugal with the actualité (economical with the truth)
extract the michael (take the mickey)

The Iceman Cometh (the title of a play by American playwright Eugene O’Neill is used to refer to a Finnish football player coming to England to play the English national team, also alluding to the fact that it is cold in Finland)

Tiger burning bright again (the opening line of William Blake’s poem “Tyger, Tyger burning bright” has here been slightly manipulated and is used in a headline in the Daily Express referring to American golfer Tiger Woods playing well again after a period of minor setbacks)
Please keep to the right (drivers are used to such instructions, but here it is used as a reference to the fact that coaches put England's football player David Beckham on the right in midfield and not in centre field where they think he should be; May also be a modification of the F.F. "Keep to the middle").

Hammers hangover (alliteration used in a headline describing West Ham football club - nicknamed the Hammers - on their losing to Ipswich Town)

Waging War on the Welsh (alliteration used in a headline which refers to Anne Robinson's unfavourable comments about the Welsh)

Ole's Pole-axed after ace strike (rhyme and alliteration in a headline referring to Norwegian football star Ole-Gunnar Solskjær scoring a goal against Poland, but Norway were beaten all the same)

6. Transposition (change the order or position of 2 or more letters, words, phrases and so on)

  e.g.  
  stop the show = show-stopper
  a swallow does not make a summer
  a swallow does not a summer make

  "a sheep in wolf's clothing" and its institutionalised variation "a wolf in sheep's clothing"

  "a big fish in a small pond" and its variation
  "a small fish in a big pond"
Spoonerisms: quite complex expressions that, to be understood, often require prior knowledge to make the transposition. Non-native speakers sometimes have problems understanding spoonerisms, and are likely to remain nonplussed when they come across them. A few examples below:

Let us drink to the queer old Dean (W. A. Spooner)

Sir, you have rasted two whole worms; you have hissed all my mystery lectures and have been caught fighting a liar in the quad; you will leave Oxford by the town drain (W. A. Spooner)

"Radox fucks up the beat" is based on Radox bucks up the feet and describes Louis Frémaux as a conductor (Chiaro 1992: 31)

7. Polarity (affirmative to negative, or vice versa)

e.g. it's a laughing matter
(origin: it's no laughing matter)

*live duck: "a dead duck" is an FE which can be defined as "somebody or something with no chance of success or survival" whereas *live duck is not recognised as an FE, but it has been used as a modification.

Moderation is a fatal thing
Nothing succeeds like excess
In Oscar Wilde's hand the proverbs "Moderation in all things" and "Nothing succeeds like success" above have been modified. The MODs are quotes from *A Woman of No Importance* by Oscar Wilde: "Moderation is a fatal thing, Lady Hunstanton. Nothing succeeds like excess."

8. **Passivisation** (active-passive)

   e.g. Colin has *made up his mind* to stop smoking.
   Colin's *mind is made up*.

   X *nips something* in the bud.
   Something *is nipped* in the bud.

   X *gives priority to something*.
   Priority *is given* to something.

9. **Embedding** (FE becoming part of a relative clause or structure, also becoming cleft (split) or pseudo-cleft structures)

   e.g. *Euro or no Euro, that is the question.*

   *From a radio broadcast:*
   Yes, what's he doing about his words then? *Any actions that are speaking louder than his words?*  
   (Moon 1998: 111)

   *Cautious Ferguson warns United to beware of weary Greeks bearing gifts.* An expansion of the expression "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts" and the modification refers to Sir Alex Ferguson, the
coach of Manchester United, warning his players about the Greek team they were about to play.

10. **Pronominalization** of nominal groups (not always possible):

   e.g. put one's foot in it = put her foot in it
   
   get wind of something ≠ get wind of her

11. **Transformation**:

   a) into *adjectives*: hyphenation and truncation (shorten the phrase) often involved:

   e.g. Salming is the best ice-hockey player of all time. = He is an all-time great.

   b) into *predicates*:

   e.g. a drowning man will clutch at straws = to clutch at straws

   c) into *nouns*: (verb = verbal nouns or participles):

   e.g. come and go = coming and going
   
   lose face = loss of face

Modifications of FEs come in various forms. One or more combinations of the modifications outlined above may be performed on an FE. Combinations are not uncommon. In fact, combinations of more than two MODs often occur.
Furthermore, there are mixed or fused FEs. Tannen emphasises that all language production is a blend of remembered patterned language and inventions (Tannen 1989: 41) and this also applies to the production of FEs. Tannen claims that there are innumerable fused FEs, and unlike Aitchison (1992: 250) and Peters (1983: 106), Tannen also holds that fusions of different FEs are not necessarily mistakes or slips made by speakers, but inventions performed for a purpose (1989: 41). Moreover, Aitchison and Peters seem to regard fused FEs as flawed language, whereas Tannen does not. Tannen is supported by Espy who states that fused FEs are not necessarily “bad” (1971: 163). Below is an example of a “new” FE created from two different canonical FEs (1989: 41):

You can make a decision *on the snap of the moment.

The new set expression in italics above is a blend between the FE On the spur of the moment and A snap decision. Another fused FE *quietly optimistic is a “new” collocation created from cautiously optimistic and quietly confident. Whether these FEs were deliberate or slips of the tongue is not important in this context as the purpose of this section is only to outline different types of MODs which occur.

3.8 Function of Modifications of FEs

The two main functions of FE modification seem to be foregrounding and humour. However, infixing and insiderism also seem to play some part. Below is an outline of these four different functions of MODs.

As mentioned earlier, foregrounding is used in order to signal something to the recipient. A common way of foregrounding is through change of style and register. In journalism where the modification of FEs is very common, the foregrounding function of FEs may be performed in order to attract people’s attention to the article and its context as in headlines such as “You’ve never had it so uncertain” where a modified FE based on Harold Macmillan’s general election slogan in 1959 “You’ve never had it so good” indicates that the subject is “economy” and that the economic situation in the UK has changed since 1959.
Moreover, when an FE has been modified and the modification detected, it may force us to look more critically at something. in this case the article. Whatever the MOD. in translation it is important to remember that the “new FE” needs to be looked at — and any contrasts noted — on several levels apart from the purely lexical ones. Context, convention and underlying values are some of the levels just to mention a few. When FE s are used out of their canonical context or if FE s have been modified lexically, the reason for the MOD needs to be established before the new FE is translated. The modification may have been performed in order to help us identify the FE on the micro level, because it may be significant on the macro level for example. As a result, modified FE s such as “There’s method in his madness” just as its original FE s “Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t” (quote from Hamlet) may both constitute a thematic device in the text as a whole, and the modificaiton may be performed to foreground the FE. Consequently, the modified FE may help signal that the phrase requires a more significant analysis on the macro level in order to be fully understood (1997: 37). In addition, the manipulation of a formula or an FE is often performed for comic effect (1998: 170). However, the manipulation may also be done in order to trick the recipients into thinking that they are going to hear something funny when instead the “joke” takes a serious turn. In either case, the important thing to remember is that the MOD usually occurs for a reason.

In the UK, the practice of word play is prevalent. Creating witticisms seems to be an aim, a way of life. Punning is often heard on the radio or on TV, witticisms commonly occur in newspapers and magazines and people are inventive with language. In fact, British people seem to resort to wit or humour in order to better cope with difficult situations. “Ardley cause for celebration” is an example of word play where “Ardley” is a pun on “hardly”, the Cockney pronunciation of the word, and the line is a reference to Wimbledon’s footballer Neil Ardley scoring against Wolves, thus ending Wolves hopes for a hat-trick of league wins (The Daily Express, 6 April. 2001). Moreover, in the UK it is considered acceptable to be funny and play with words in any number of situations, which “in most other countries is considered inappropriate” (Chiaro 1992: 21, 100, 122). A case in point would be the television broadcast of BAFTA (British Academy of Film and Television Arts) honouring actress Judy Dench. In Sweden the occasion would
have been marked by solemnity although the odd joke might have been told. whereas the actual broadcast of the event in Britain came across as a competition in wit with Judy Dench as a sideshow. One type of word play, which seems very common in English is modifying FEs. Sometimes it seems an “intellectual game”. on other occasions it is a game of parody or irony. but some are generally speaking just mischievous comments where the speaker or writer manipulates or plays with rules of convention, stretching the norms for humorous effect (Ross 1998: 27; Nash 1985: 48). FEs are also modified through the infixing or insertion of a word in a phrase such as “not bloody likely”, and “the proverbial bad apple”. The infixing is usually done in order to intensify the literal meaning of the FF (Moon 1998: 174). Finally, both FEs and their MODs sometimes constitute insiderisms where MODs seem to be used in order to obscure the original FE. FEs and MODs as insiderisms are used to embrace some people (those familiar with the FE or MOD) and exclude others (people unfamiliar with either FE or MOD).

3.9 Identification of FEs

Having outlined text type, types of FE and their functions as well as different modifications of FEs and their functions, this part of the chapter will deal with different aspects of text, language and culture and MODs. These MODs either facilitate or impede the identification and interpretation of FEs and ensuing MODs. The following sections dealing with familiarity. intertextuality. deviations for humorous and parodic purposes, ideological constructs, culture and subculture outline different aspects which make it easier or more difficult to identify FEs and their MODs.

Scholars and researchers agree that familiarity is the key to the identification of FEs (Raskin 1985: 46; Leppihalme 1997: 31; Moon 1998: 185). Indeed. FEs presuppose familiarity. not just with sources but with lexical frames and underlying meanings as well. In addition. FEs usually conjure up colloquial connotations (Chiaro 1992: 32; Moon 1998: 133). Many jokes are based on presuppositions, for instance, and if these are too colloquial they become in-jokes, which are not understood by outsiders (Nash 1985: 4). Context is also very
important to the understanding and appreciation of FEs. If a frame or formula is identified – with or without MODs – the original FE and its context are recalled and a likely interpretation can be suggested (Leppihalme 1997: 42). However, if the frame is not recognised, it is likely that neither the FE nor its MOD will be understood and interpretation will become flawed. Another reason why an FE is not recognised is that some FEs only work synchronically: a catchphrase such as “Evening all” (the opening phrase of a TV programme called “Dixon of Dock Green” from the late 1950s) will only be recognised as a catchphrase by people who heard it at the time when it appeared, whereas it might seem strange or even unintelligible to people who were too young or not even born in the 1950s (Raskin 1985: 46; Chiaro 1992: 83). Moreover, non-native speakers of a language will have problems identifying as well as encoding even a fairly contemporary FE such as “Didn’t she do well” (Bruce Forsythe’s “Generation Game”) or “Nice to see you, to see you ... Nice” (also Bruce Forsythe) if the FE is culture specific. In addition, in order to identify an allusion, it is necessary to understand that an allusion is being made to an already existing style, text, convention or comic frame and so on, that is knowledge of “intertextuality” is vital to the decoding of references (Chiaro 1992: 89-90; Ross 1998: 37). In order for a reader to completely understand and appreciate the phrase “It is a truth universally acknowledged that Italian footballers never fall” is ironic, the reader must know that the original FE “It is a truth universally acknowledged that a single man in possession of a good fortune is in want of a wife” (the opening line of Jane Austen’s novel Pride and Prejudice) was ironic, and that Italian footballers have a reputation of failing very easily. Moreover, decoding is made even more difficult in translation since the encoding of schemas in the SL often are tacit and “unmapped”, by which Moon seems to mean that schemas are arbitrary, that is based on unconscious, intuitive knowledge rather than conscious, factual knowledge, and the translation of such schemas are therefore perhaps “unmappable”, that is not transferable into the TL, since they are based on intuition rather than fact (1998: 18, 168).

The modification of FEs seems almost mandatory in British English. It is most common in journalism (Moon 1998: 121, 160). Often the modification is used to defamiliarise the FE and draw people’s attention to the headline. There are many
types of modifications or deviations of FEs. As a result, syntactic knowledge of the language is important for the deviation to be identified (Chiaro 1992: 13). Moreover, a high standard of proficiency is required in order that ambiguities, word play and other hidden traps be detected. Only then will the recipient be able to recognise instances of broken or merely “bent” linguistic rules, or stylistic manipulation of lexis or semantics (1992: 13). With regard to translation, the phenomenon of variation increases the decoding and identification problems, which face especially non-native speakers of the SL.

Humour is, at least in English, often achieved through the manipulation of FEs. However it is not always easy to detect that humour or wit is intended, at least not to outsiders such as non-native speakers of a particular language. It is difficult to identify comic intent because of what the understanding of a manipulation of an FE involves. It involves three principal references: (1) a derivation or origin in attitudes, culture and institutions, (2) a formula and (3) a word or phrase. Put slightly differently, socio-cultural and linguistic knowledge (Chiaro 1992: 12-13) is involved as is knowledge of the different devices one may use in order to create humour. In most cases this knowledge is subconscious to a native speaker (1992: 13), whereas non-native speakers have to acquire the same knowledge. In order to make it more clear, the recipient of “You turn if you want to, the lady’s not for turning” and “I want to tell you a story” needs the following information in order to understand the intended humour and what is alluded to (1992: 13):

- know the linguistic ambiguities of English
- share the presupposed knowledge
- identify the subject matter
- know the subject
- be familiar with either the quote, or the matrix, formula or formulaic wording indicating the joke
- recognise somebody’s intention to joke
- recognise the deviation of the formula, if there is one
- link the deviation with the reason for its use
In order to fully understand as well as appreciate the intended humour of “You turn if you want to, the lady’s not for turning” above, among other things readers need to know that the person who delivered the statement as well as the woman referred to as “the lady” was in both cases Margaret Thatcher. Moreover, they need to know that the context was the Tory Party conference of 1980, and they also need to realise that the line contains word play. In this case, humour was achieved through homophony (you/U) and a MOD. Mrs Thatcher’s message to the press (“U-turn” was a media catchphrase with the press at the time) was that she was not going to make a U-turn, that is she was not going to change her mind. In addition, the phrase was also a modified reference to British dramatist Christopher Fry’s play “The Lady’s Not for Burning” (1948) and by using that reference, Thatcher stressed that she was not going to succumb to pressure. In order to understand the significance of the “I want to tell you a story” above, the reader needs to know that the phrase is closely linked to British singer and comedian Max Bygraves, and that it would very likely be followed by something humorous. If there is a lack of knowledge in any of the areas listed above the recipient may suspect that s/he has come across an FE because the language uncharacteristically suddenly seems strange or does not quite make sense (Newmark 1995: 106). However, s/he may well not be able to understand the FE, and if this happens to a translator, the translation of the FE will most likely be inaccurate.

Parody as described by Nash (1985: 80-100) is “organised recollection”, which often mocks familiar features of style. It may be viewed as a type of extended FE since as Nash claims parody uses a model, which is modified in some way. Moreover, Nash holds that in parody there are notable discrepancies between expression and content, and displacement of content is often involved. However, on occasion a parodic passage does not seem to imitate a model as such, that is no source can be detected, and this is according to Nash common in humour. Moreover, some texts seem to have “parodic auras” where the use of various rhetorical techniques is common. Such parodic texts appear to be an imitation of something indefinable, but they may just be instances of “pseudo-parody” and all the translator needs to acknowledge then is the parodic intent and transfer it to the TT (1985: 80-100).
Rosamund Moon claims that many FEs are based on shared experience and knowledge that encode "cultural constructs", by which it is inferred that Moon means that cultural constructs encode culture-specific connotations (Moon 1998: 165, 206). Two examples to illustrate this point: "He played as if to the manor born" and "The Bath lock packs down with the England captain for the first time against France at Twickenham on Saturday" (The Daily Express, 6 April, 2001).

"Play as if to the manor born" (italics for reference) means that somebody plays well, that is as if he was born to play for the team and belongs there. In the same way, children of noblemen are brought up to feel that they belong in a manor house. The problem then is how to translate the FE and its connotations into a language and culture where there is no nobility. In order to understand "The Bath lock packs down with the England captain ..." the reader needs to know that the subject is rugby, and that "a lock" is a player's position in rugby. Moreover, if the reader knows that Twickenham is a rugby pitch where international games are held, s/he would infer that the subject is rugby. If the reader is Swedish, however, s/he may not understand the two phrases above if they are translated literally as they are culture-specific, since rugby is neither a well known nor a popular sport in Sweden. As a result, it is suggested that the sentence should be translated with some guidance, a measure described by Leppihalme (1997: 79, 84, 108-109).

Moreover, conceptual systems and conventional use of FEs underlie the production, view and decoding of idioms and this means that extra-linguistic as well as intuitive knowledge is involved in the understanding of FEs (Wils 1996: 57, 71; Moon 1998: 206). In addition, converted schemas rely on knowledge of the canonical schema and context for interpretation. In order to understand a humorous FE the underlying, logical frame will first have to be identified but also the "illogical" or displaced schema, and intuitive, culture-specific evaluations, conceits and concepts must be understood (Moon 1998: 160-169). The decoding of unfamiliar passages requires knowledge of frames and lexis as well as analytical skills (1998: 186). Jokes rely on textual allusions, which are often culture-specific and this makes decoding difficult for non-native speakers.

Most FEs are "culture-dependent" (Moon 1998: 160), that is some knowledge of the culture where an FE originates is required in order for the FE to be understood. "Every man meets his Waterloo at last" (Wendell Phillips in 1859) is a case in
Many FEs may also be considered to be "culture-bound stereotypes" where socio-cultural knowledge is important (Moon 1998: 244). Indeed, some FEs, particularly proverbs such as "Don't cross the bridge till you come to it", "Divide and rule" and "Necessity knows no law" and metaphors such as "Every parting gives a foretaste of death; every coming together again a foretaste of the resurrection" are by their very nature cultural, depicting stereotyped situations where evaluations, images and connotations are self-evident, constrained by that culture's ideology (1998: 163-169). FEs may furthermore distinguish subcultures within a culture as they tend to belong to particular registers, dialects, ethnic groups and contexts where each subculture "will be familiar with different sources of allusions" (Leppihalme 1997: 36; 1998: 68). Once again, FEs may become insiderisms where jokes and FEs are lost on outsiders. Catchphrases constitute a typical example of insiderisms where the FEs divide people into "us" and "them" (1998: 269). The understanding of culture-specific FEs for instance rely on the recipients' social and educational background, age, expectations and nationality (Ruskin 1985: 16; Leppihalme 1997; Wilss 1996).

Leppihalme's study of the translation of allusions or FEs bore out more or less the following tendencies with regard to what facilitated and impeded the identification of FEs - some aspects have been added by me (1997: 185):

Aspects that may enhance the recognisability of FE:

- familiarity
- presence of proper name
- metaphorical statement

Aspects that may impede the recognisability of FEs:

- lack of familiarity (FEs can be highly noticeable without being detected due to no knowledge of source)
- unshared knowledge between sender and reader
- when comical FE are not signalled, the recipient does neither detect the FE nor get the joke
- culture specific nature of FEs
- absence of proper name
- obscure deviation: wordplay or slip?
- ordinary and common vocabulary
- ellipsis
- brevity

3.10 Translation Options

Leppihalme divides allusions into two groups: allusions containing a proper name (PN) and key phrase allusions (KP), that is allusions not containing a proper name (1997: 10-11). She proposes different ways of translating these allusions or FEs into the TL. Newmark (1995) discusses the translation of metaphors (near-equivalent to FEs), dividing them into six groups: dead, cliché, stock, adapted, recent, and original metaphors. Both scholars also suggest general guidelines for the translation of FEs. Below is an outline of the translation strategies for FEs, integrating Leppihalme and Newmark’s views.

Leppihalme’s (1997: 78-79) translation strategies for allusions containing a proper name (PN):

1. **Transference**: to keep the name unaltered; retention of name either unaltered or in its conventional target language (TL) form; three subcategories:

   a. **Use the name as such**: *Coca-Cola* and *Pepsi-Cola* are used in both English and Swedish, for example; *Pope John Paul II* (English) becomes *Påven Johannes Paulus II* in Swedish.

   b. **Use the name, adding some guidance**:

      *Gröna Lund*, an amusement park in the city of Stockholm, Sweden;

      *Victoria Wood*, a popular British comedian.
c. **Use the name, adding a detailed explanation**, for example a footnote:

---

*Gretna Green*: a footnote could be used describing the place name as "A village in Dumfries and Galloway, south-western Scotland. It used to be a popular place for eloping couples from England to be married without parental consent." (Microsoft Encarta 2000)

---

2. **Replacement**: to change one name by another (beyond the changes required by convention):

a. Replace the name by another source language (SL) name:

*Algernon* is an upper-class name in England. In order to keep the upper-class connotation in drama translation into Swedish another name may be preferred. The reason for changing the name is that the pronunciation of *Algernon* in Swedish does not sit well with a Swede. In fiction, the name may be changed in order to make it clear to the TI reader that the character called *Algernon* is a member of the upper classes. As a result, another upper-class-SL name such as *Hugo* might be used, since it is a name used in Sweden. Hence, there will be no problems with the pronunciation of the name. Moreover, since *Hugo* is a fairly uncommon name in Sweden it would not raise obvious connotations. *Hugo* is also a name predominantly given to children of well-to-do families in Sweden.

b. Replace the SL name by a TI name:

*Pippi* (Långstrump), that is *Pippi Longstocking*, becomes *Fifi* in French because if *Pippi* is retained it would be associated with the expression "faire le pipi" which means "go to the toilet" which raises unfortunate connotations.

3. **Omission**: to omit a name; two subcategories:
a. Omit name but transfer the sense by other means, for example by a common noun:

The Song Balladen om Cecilia Lind (The Ballad of Cecilia Lind) becomes “a /Swedish/ ballad” in translation into English.

b. Omit the name and the allusion altogether:

It is hard to tell where MCC ends and the Church of England begins. (J. B. Priestley)

As connotations are important to the translation of proper names (PNs), Newmark gives the following advice on the matter (1995: 214-215). When nationality is important names should be transferred (in line with option 1.a above). When connotations are important, Newmark suggests that the naturalised TL name should be based on the word underlying the SL name. A case in point would be Superman, which becomes Stålmannen (man of iron) in Swedish, which is a translation of sense, not a literal translation. Connotations can further be kept in the TL if an overlapping proper name is found. Finally, Newmark reminds the translator not to use a TL name that raises different connotations in SL and TL.

Potential strategies for the translation of key phrases (KP) as suggested by Leppihalme, with examples provided by me (1997: 84):

1. Extra-allusive guidance added in the text, where the translator follows his/her assessment of the needs of target text (TT) readers by adding information (on sources etc) which the author, with his/her SL viewpoint, did not think necessary including the use of typographical means to signal that the material is prefomed:

e.g. In order to help a TT reader identify where an FT such as Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t originates, inverted commas may
be used in the translation to indicate that the phrase has been borrowed.
An introductory phrase may also aid understanding: *as Polonius said
“Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t”.

2. **The use of footnotes, endnotes, translator’s prefaces and other explicit explanations** not slipped into the text but overtly given as additional information

e.g.  
   a. Well, why don’t you do a *Gretna Green* then?  
   b. He fell at the *Chair*.

Endnotes could explain that

a) *Gretna Green* is a village in Dumfries and Galloway in southwestern Scotland where eloping couples from England used to get married without parental consent, and

b) The *Chair* is one of the fences of the Grand National.

3. **Simulated familiarity or internal marking**, that is, the addition of intraallusive allusion-signalling features (marked wording or syntax) that depart from the style of the context, thus signalling the presence of borrowed words

e.g. The Red Queen, who is an imaginary character in *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There* may be translated with capital letters and inverted commas (“Röda Drottningen”) into Swedish in order to indicate reference.

4. **Replacement by a preformed TL item**

e.g. Ironic SL *klart som korvspad* in Swedish becomes ironic TL *clear as mud* when translated into English.
5. **Reduction** of the allusion to sense by re-phrasal, in other words, making its meaning over and dispensing with the allusive KP itself.

e.g. *He's a real Joe McCarthy* (anti-Communist). Few Swedes would associate McCarthy with communism, which means that in translation into Swedish the name may not be retained, but sense can be transferred resulting in for instance *Han avskyr kommunister* (He detests Communists).

6. **Re-creation**, using a fusion of techniques: creative construction of a passage which hints at the connotations of the allusion or other special effects by it.

e.g. "All over the land sermons of praise have been sung to these golden oldies who reneged on retirement plans, these fresh recruits to the pantheon of bus-pass heroes alongside the saintly Bobby Robson. Sorry, but I can’t join in the smug chorus of hosannas." (by Jim Holden of *The Sunday Express* Feb 10, 2002; page 96)

7. **Omission** of the allusion.

e.g. Thatcher’s *I'm Batting for Britain* alludes to sport, that is cricket and her doing what is best for Britain (possibly her defence of the arms trade with Iran). The allusion will probably disappear in translation into languages where cricket is not part of the culture, in Sweden for instance.

Generally speaking, with regard to the translation of stereotypic and formulaic FFs such as language markers – openings, closures, tags and so on – Newmark suggests that, if there is one, the standard TL equivalent should be used (1995: 55-57). In the case of phatic communion or polite conversation where British people...
speak of the weather, the translation should only be literal if the TL culture also
treats the weather as a subject for phatic communion, otherwise the TL standard
equivalent should be used (1995: 43). Moreover, with regard to other FE s such as
references, Newmark emphasises that connotations are often an integral part of the
expression. Connotations can be difficult to translate. As an example, Newmark
cites cricket, which infers middle class connotations, and stresses that the
connotations that cricket raises can be difficult to translate into the TL (1995:
109). Finally it should be pointed out that the strategies outlined below are neither
exhaustive nor “foolproof”, and as Wilss points out, when the text so requires
translation strategies sometimes have to be overlooked (1996: 37-38).

In Newmark’s view of metaphors, translation seems to take its point of departure
from what kind of metaphor or FE is to be translated. Outlined below is
Newmark’s division of metaphors, followed by a description of how each kind
might be most appropriately translated. Outlined also are considerations that need
to be kept in mind when translating metaphors (1995: 106-112):

1. Dead metaphors: we are hardly conscious of image any more

   Translation normally not difficult to translate, however, they often defy
   Strategy literal translation

2. Clichés: expressions used instead of clear thoughts; often emotive

   Translation clichés translated by their TL counterparts, however badly
   Strategy it reflects on the writer

3. Stock (standard) metaphors: established metaphors which informally are often a concise
   method of conveying a physical or mental situation both
   referentially and pragmatically
common metaphors: sometimes tricky to translate since their apparent equivalents may be out of date or affected or used by a different social class or age group: stock or standard metaphors are disliked by Newmark but he also acknowledges that they make the world go round:

Translation a. reproduce image (frequency the same? Appropriate register?)
Strategies b. symbols or metonyms transferable? (cultural overlap?)
               c. replace SL image with another established TL image (common? frequency? register?)
               d. reducing to sense or literal TL; more acceptable in non-literary texts (however, sense demystifies, clarity, harsher)
               e. keep FE + add explanation (keeping cultural and some emotive effect)

4. **Adapted metaphors**: modified metaphors

Translation a. translated equivalent, adapted metaphors
Strategies b. reduce to sense

5. **Recent metaphors**: a metaphorical neologism which has spread rapidly in a language

Translation if transparent through translate provided that the sense of the metaphor is clear to the readership

6. **Original metaphors**: metaphors created or quoted by a writer

Translation created or quoted by the SL writer. In authoritative and expressive texts these should be translated literally whether
they are universal, cultural or obscurely subjective. If FF is too obscure and not very important turn into descriptive metaphor or reduce to sense

According to Newmark (1995: 81-85) the rule for translating metaphors or FFs seems to be to 1) use a standard TL phrase, that is translate the proverb "Speech is silver, silence is golden" with its standard (authorised) expression Tala ar silver och tiga ar guld into Swedish for example; 2) use a trans-cultural TL expression, that is an expression which is understood in both the SL and TL culture or 3) use an equivalent TL phrase (see details below). However, it should be pointed out that when there is a lacuna, that is a gap in the TL, Newmark states that the SL word or phrase is usually transferred to the TL as a loan word. A case in point would be e.g. Schadenfreude, which means "gloating at somebody else's bad luck". It is a German noun, which has been transferred into English due to a gap in the English language. A calque is translated literally, that is through-translated. German Übermensch became "superman" in English for example. Newmark further states that when some time has passed these gaps are accepted as part of the TL and pronunciation and spelling are naturalised to suit the TL. The word juice came into the Swedish language via English (Nyd i svenska från 40-tal till 80-tal 1986) and was therefore initially only spelt j-u-i-c-e whereas the word is now also spelt j-o-s in order to suit Swedish spelling and pronunciation. Moreover, when an exact equivalent does not exist, Newmark suggests near-equivalents should be used. As regards equivalents, there are three different types of standard translation. Before they are listed it is important to emphasise that the boundaries of these equivalents do not appear to be completely clear, but overlapping (1995: 81-5):

1) Cultural equivalent: "an approximate translation where an SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word."

   e.g. Gymnasium (Swedish school for students 16-18 years old)
   A-levels (British exams that students of 16-18 years sit)
2) **Functional equivalent**: a culture-free equivalent that generalises or neutralises the SL word. This is a case of "cultural componential analysis".

   e.g. Riksdag (Swedish Parliament)
        Parliament (British Parliament)

3) **Descriptive equivalent**: describes the word

   descriptive - Japanese aristocrat
   samurai
   functions - provided officers and administration in 11\(^{th}\) – 12\(^{th}\) C Japan

Newmark also advises us to be careful not to alter the tone when translating metaphors (FEs). Furthermore, he suggests the amplification of cultural FEs where this is possible rather than replacing FEs with explanations, because FEs which are reduced to sense clarify, demystify and make harsher the expression (1995: 109-110, 173) in the TL compared with the original in the SL. In addition, Leppihalme advises against the strategy of minimum change (literal translations) – the one most common one amongst translators in her study – because connotative and contextual meaning is then disregarded which would mean that there would be no change specifically aimed at the transfer of connotations which is so important to the understanding and interpretation of FEs (1997: 84, 102-3).

3.11 Conclusion

In this chapter, the terms cultural and linguistic FEs have been defined. Different cultural and linguistic MODs have also been outlined and a framework for the translation of FEs and MODs has been set up (based on Leppihalme 1997). The functions of FEs and MODs have also been outlined and the difficulties in
identifying FEs and MODs have been discussed. It is important to have an understanding of what constitute cultural and linguistic FEs and MODs, to know their functions, to be aware of problems with identification and to be familiar with different translation solutions to the translation of FEs and MODs in order to find translation solutions to FEs and MODs that are going to work. Awareness of these aspects of the translation of FEs and MODs is also important for the understanding of future chapters dealing with the translation of FEs and MODs into Swedish (Chapter IV) and the testing of native speakers' comprehension of FEs and MODs (Chapter V).
CHAPTER IV

Pinter’s Formulaic Expressions in Translation into Swedish

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter II, the consensus among British, American, French and Swedish audiences and critics in the 1960s seemed to be that Pinter’s plays were difficult or “strange”. Aspects of Pinter’s play that seemed different were, among other things, the apparent failure of Pinter’s plays to have either a message or an evolving plot, that the motives for the characters’ actions were often unclear and that the plays ended without a resolution. As a result, audiences and critics often felt that they had to guess what Pinter had intended and what the plays were about. Also, the language or dialogue of Pinter’s plays was commented upon. In discussions of the language of his plays, the following aspects were mentioned: non-sequiturs, musical rhythm, poetry, the language of ordinary people, idiosyncrasies and creativity. In 1975, seventeen years after The Birthday Party was first staged in London, Pinter’s play No Man’s Land was performed in London. Again, audiences and critics debated what the play was about. In his autobiography, distinguished British actor John Gielgud remarked that audiences in both England and the USA loved No Man’s Land, but they also asked him what it was about (Gielgud 1981: 168). “Why should the play mean anything if the audience was held the whole time and was never bored?” he continued (Gielgud 1981: 168). When No Man’s Land was staged in Sweden in 1976, critics such as J.W. Donner also discussed the non-apparent “meaning” of the play (Svenska Dagbladet Snällposten Feb 29 1976) and others such as Åke Pehrström discussed Pinter’s use of language (Goteborgsposten Jan 24, 1976). In 1993, audiences and critics in Britain asked themselves what Moonlight, at the time Pinter’s latest play, was about.
Why do critics and audiences still find Pinter’s plays difficult? Logically, by 1975 (and by 1976 and 1993) critics and audiences should have become accustomed to Pinter’s way of writing, since many of his plays had frequently been staged in the UK and around the world. Furthermore, since the 1960’s, the theatre is likely to have changed sufficiently, having adapted to new circumstances and audiences, in order for a play by Pinter not to continue to appear mysterious or "strange". In addition, in 1975 as well as in 1993, Pinter was fashionable, and today he is as fashionable as ever - his plays are staged all over the world and Pinter is recognised as a major playwright everywhere.

Research into five of Pinter’s plays seems to point to one factor: the language of Pinter’s plays can make interpretation difficult (see Chapter I for a discussion of the characteristics of the language of Pinter’s plays). These language difficulties can be divided into two categories: idiosyncrasies (described below) and formulaic expressions (see Chapter III pages 140-147 for a discussion of FEs).

Language

Since Pinter’s use of language seems to make interpretation difficult, the following sections will discuss different aspects of the language of Pinter’s plays. The focus will initially be on problems, which native speakers of English may encounter when they go to see a Pinter play. As non-native speakers are likely to have the same problems, but also other, additional difficulties because they are likely to have less of a mastery of Pinter’s language and be less familiar with aspects of English culture than native speakers, there will also be a discussion of the ways in which Pinter’s language may be difficult for non-native speakers of English.

For native speakers of English, the dialogue of a Pinter play may come across as unfamiliar or strange because use of vocabulary, idiom and turn of phrase, reflecting both his origins and his knowledge of the world, may be different from their own. As a result, Pinter’s language may seem idiosyncratic. As some aspects of the language can be viewed as idiosyncratic, these language difficulties in
Pinter's plays are hence referred to as *idiosyncrasies*. His language may seem idiosyncratic for the following reasons: Pinter is a creative and poetic Jewish Londoner with interests in widely different fields. Due to his origin, Jewish words such as *mazeltov*, Jewish names and "nicknames" such as *Goldberg* and *Lulu schmulu* appear in his plays (see Chapter 1, pages 56-74 for details of the Jewish influence on Pinter's way of writing). Sometimes Pinter also uses word order that seems to be influenced by Hebrew or Yiddish. In addition, he seems to have a tendency to digress by telling stories, a practice common among Jews, rather than putting something quite succinctly in a few lines. Any one of these aspects of Pinter's writing may seem idiosyncratic to someone who is unfamiliar with them.

As Pinter's way of writing is poetic it is not surprising that rhythm is important to the language of his plays; poetic devices such as assonance, consonance, alliteration, repetition and rhyme abound. Repetition is particularly common. In abundance, these features may seem unnatural – critics have often complained about the endless repetition in his plays for instance – but it is also true that real dialogue is rife with repetition. Be that as it may, Pinter's use of poetic devices makes his language sound more like music than real speech, creating the impression that the language is unnatural. Evidence that Pinter is a Londoner becomes clear in his use of ordinary slang as well as Cockney rhyming slang such as *a butcher's* (an abbreviated version of "a butcher's hook", which means "a look") that to anybody not familiar with such a phrase may seem odd. Other words and phrases similarly reveal that Pinter is a Londoner. A case in point would be "He's off his conk" (Pinter 1963: 50), an expression which may exist in other parts of the UK but more commonly found would be the phrase *He's off his head*, which has the same meaning. Some expressions that Pinter uses may seem odd to those who are not familiar with the turn of phrase used in his neighbourhood of origin. Moreover, colloquial expressions, which are now out of date may seem odd to a younger person. Pinter's interests in cricket and literature may also cause problems for those who lack these interests. It is possible that Pinter's use of "*google*" (1975: 23), which seems to be a slant on the cricket term *a googly*, may be considered as odd to people disinterested in sports since they probably would not associate the word with cricket. As a result, it is possible that they take the view that Pinter is being creative. He *is* creative, but some of the instances where people consider him to be using non-sequiturs or where his language seems...
unfamiliar to them, may simply be phrases that reflect Pinter's origin, the vocabulary used in the neighbourhood where he grew up. As a result, Pinter's language is not really idiosyncratic, it simply reflects who he is. Non-native speakers are likely to be even less familiar with the type of language idiosyncrasies described than are native speakers of English, since they are likely to know formal English better than colloquial English. As a result, they may interpret colloquial English as creativity, especially when research has taught them that Pinter has a reputation for being a writer of "difficult" plays, and especially if they are aware of how much has been written about Pinter's use of language. Non-native speakers misinterpret expressions sometimes, either through "over-interpretation", that is they read more meaning into an expression than is actually there, or they simply misinterpret the expression and translate it incorrectly. If unfamiliar language does not belong to any of the categories discussed above, it is possible that some phrases or expressions may be formulaic expressions (FEs) or modified FEs (MODs), which may be clues to the understanding of Pinter's plays. Instances of over-interpretation, or misinterpretation will be exemplified later in this chapter with regard to the translation of linguistic FEs such as "carry the can" and "fit as a fiddle" and cultural FEs such as "to be or not to be" and "because I'm worth it" in five of Pinter's plays (see Chapter III pages 145-147 for definitions of linguistic and cultural FEs). In the case of FEs, previous research indicates that native speakers have difficulties in understanding allusions or cultural FEs (Perloff 1993; Leppihalme 1997; Bergfeldt 1998). It follows that non-native speakers will have even greater difficulties understanding these FEs, since they require familiarity with a wide array of subjects within another nation's culture.

4.1 Previous Research and the Translation of FEs

Previous research into the understanding of cultural FEs (also known as allusions) in Moonlight indicated that native speakers of English found it difficult to identify cultural FEs in the play (Bergfeldt 1998). A study of the translation of cultural FEs in Moonlight into Swedish further indicated that Kristina L ugn, the Swedish translator of the play, had not identified or at least not translated several
cultural FEs in English into Swedish correctly (Bergfeldt 1998). Research on Pinter's plays \textit{The Birthday Party} and \textit{No Man's Land} resulted in similar findings. In addition, Martin Esslin has pointed to a few mistranslations into German, stating that the first German translator of \textit{The Birthday Party} must have been baffled by Pinter's use of language since the German translator rendered "Who watered the wicket in Melbourne?" meaning "Who cheated at cricket?" as "Who urinated against the city gate of Melbourne?" (Esslin 1972). A study of the translation of allusions (a near-synonym to cultural FEs) from English into Finnish carried out by Leppihalme (1997) supported the findings just described in \textit{Moonlight}. Since there were very few cultural FEs in \textit{The Caretaker} and \textit{The Homecoming}, this translation problem did not occur. However, in these plays, linguistic FEs still caused difficulties for translators. Translating linguistic FEs also constituted a difficulty in \textit{The Birthday Party}, \textit{No Man's Land} and \textit{Moonlight}. The difficulty of understanding cultural FEs seems to be a problem for both native and non-native speakers of English. In some of Pinter's plays, allusive language in the form of cultural FEs such as \textit{The Caprice}, which is an exclusive restaurant in London (\textit{The Homecoming} 1965: 28) or \textit{Drogheda}, which refers to a massacre of Irish people by the English in the 17th century (\textit{The Birthday Party} 1963: 55) constitute clues to the understanding of the play. If these FEs are not understood they become obscure comments or non-sequiturs, which may lead to problems in the interpretation of the plays. Linguistic FEs such as \textit{to pull a fast one}, meaning "to deceive somebody", also cause problems, but mainly for non-native speakers of English. In translations of Pinter's plays into Swedish, it seems that in particular cultural FEs but also linguistic FEs have not always been understood. The study of five of Pinter's plays brought to light that some plays contained more obscure language in the form of cultural FEs than did other plays. \textit{The Birthday Party}, \textit{No Man's Land} and \textit{Moonlight} seemed to contain many such FEs, whereas \textit{The Caretaker} and \textit{The Homecoming} did not. As a result, it is suggested here that the presence of cultural FEs may have contributed to the failure of \textit{The Birthday Party} in 1958 whereas the absence of such FEs contributed to the success of \textit{The Caretaker} in 1960 (for a more detailed discussion of the reasons for the success of \textit{The Caretaker} and failure of \textit{The Birthday Party} see Chapter II, pages 90-100). In addition, if some FEs provide clues to the understanding of Pinter's plays, and they were not identified by translators, who are non-native speakers of English.
such FEs may also explain why some of Pinter's plays seem even more obscure or
difficult in translation into Swedish than they do in English. In order to ascertain
how linguistic and cultural FEs influence the understanding and interpretation of
Pinter's plays in translation, this chapter will focus on the translation of five of
Pinter's plays into Swedish. The emphasis will be on how linguistic FEs and
cultural FEs have been translated into Swedish, and if the translations work and
why. When the translation of an FE is considered not to work, an alternative
translation is suggested.

4.2 Micro and Macro Levels

Linguistic and cultural FEs can be studied on the micro level, that is the "lexico-
semantic or stylistic" level as well as on the macro level such as the level of theme
and poetic structure (Leppihalme 1997: 31-35). Applied to FEs, this means that
FEs may have one meaning in a small unit of text such as a sentence and another
in a larger unit of a text such as the novel as a whole. With regard to translation,
FEs with meaning on the micro level only do not influence the interpretation of
the entire text such as a play or a novel, whereas FEs that work on the macro level
often do. An illustration: the correct translation and understanding of the linguistic
FE cold turkey as "withdrawal symptoms" is of importance to the understanding
of the sentence or phrase in which this particular FE occurs, but it is unlikely that
it will influence the understanding and interpretation of the text as a whole,
although many translation mistakes on the micro level may render the text
incomprehensible. However, on occasion linguistic FEs can work on the macro
level. An example is characterisation; in order to reflect social origin and gender a
writer may for example let a character say "She's got a bun in the oven" or "I'm
going to see a man about a dog" rather than opt for "she's in a family way" and
"I'll go and powder my nose" respectively. The writer's choice may in this way
reflect his view of the character or the origin of the character. With regard to the
phrases above, it seems more likely that men would use the first two expressions
and women the latter two. The level of informality of the expressions may also
indicate which social class the characters belong to, that is FEs work as
characterisation on the macro level. In the case of cultural FEs, a name can be a
cultural FE. In the Western world older generations will recognize the name Greta Garbo. The connotations associated with the name are for example “film star” and “loneliness”, and the use of the name makes people familiar with Greta Garbo think of these connotations. However, younger people in the Western world and cultures not familiar with Western Cinema will probably not know who the actress was and they will not associate the name with anything in particular. As a result, it can be said that the name Greta Garbo is a cultural FE, since the name has specific connotations associated with it, associations known only to those familiar with the actress. When Jake uses the FE Greta Garbo in Moonlight, it seems to be used in order to tease Bridget – he is suggesting that she is a loner - and nothing more. This particular use of the FE is not a short cut to characterization since its meaning is spelt out in the play as “I want to be alone” (Pinter 1993: 31) and does not seem to have any significance on the macro level, but only readers familiar with Greta Garbo will fully understand that “I want to be alone” was a phrase used by Garbo in one of her films and that Garbo was a loner in real life. However, “Greta Garbo” could have been a macro FE if one of the themes of the play was loneliness, and the writer used the FE in order to underline that theme. A phrase such as Greeks and their gifts could be an FE working on the macro level if the underlying theme of the text in which this phrase occurs was racism or nationalism for example, provided that the phrase was meant to be a modified FE based on the expression “Beware of Greeks bearing gifts” which stems from the The Aeneid, which was written by the Roman poet Virgil: “Do not trust the horse, Trojans. Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even when they bring gifts.” (Microsoft Encarta 2000). As a result, if the modified FE “Greeks and their gifts” was included in order to work as a covert warning or a critical comment on Greek people it could be viewed as a cultural FE especially if there were several such references of dislike of other peoples in a play. It seems logical to assume that cultural references are included by leading writers for a reason. If one fails to understand the significance of several such FE’s, it is likely to result in a misinterpretation of aspects of the play and, in translation, failure to translate these FE’s could seriously hamper its understanding and interpretation. Research indicates that the failure to either identify and or translate cultural FE’s containing cultural connotations in three of Pinter’s plays, may have led to such problems of interpretation.
The odd mistranslation of linguistic FEs does not seriously hamper the interpretation of a play as a whole because they usually only work on the micro level. However, failure to identify and translate such FEs may indicate that a translator is not sufficiently bilingual, that is his or her linguistic knowledge of a language is insufficient, or it may be that s/he has not done his or her research properly. In the following sections are a number of examples of linguistic FEs and their translations into Swedish from five of Pinter’s plays: The Birthday Party (1958), The Caretaker (1960), The Homecoming (1965), No Man’s Land (1975) and Moonlight (1993). First there will be a summary and an analysis of each play. This will be followed by a discussion as well as an assessment of the translation of linguistic and cultural FEs.

4.3.1 The Birthday Party

The setting of The Birthday Party is an old boarding house. It is run by Meg and PeteY, a couple in their sixties. Stanley Webber is their only boarder. One day Goldberg and McCann, two strangers, unexpectedly show up. The strangers are polite, initially, but they also have a mission: they intend to abduct Stanley. Why they want to do so is not entirely clear. In the end, Goldberg and McCann are successful in their mission. With regard to the language, the most prominent features are repetition and the abundance of both linguistic and cultural FEs. By discussing how the translator has handled the translation of linguistic FEs in The Birthday Party, I will try to illustrate how a translator may go wrong when s/he is insufficiently familiar with colloquial or idiomatic English. In addition, an analysis of the translation of linguistic FEs from The Caretaker, The Homecoming, No Man’s Land and Moonlight will illustrate the same problem. Later in this chapter, there will be a similar discussion of the significance and translation of cultural FEs in Pinter’s work. However, first a discussion of linguistic FEs.
*The Birthday Party* was translated into Swedish in 1964 by Carl-Olof Lång and the play had its premiere at Göteborgs Stadsteater in April the same year. Lång's translation of *The Birthday Party* into Swedish has not been published (my italics below). My translation when not stated otherwise.

**Example 1**

STANLEY: They won't come. Someone's *taking the Michael*. [...]  

(Pinter 1963: 21)

STANLEY: De kommer inte. Det var säkert någon *som var på snussen*. [...]  

(Lång 1964: 35)

"Take the Michael" seems to be a modified FE. The original, or at least the most commonly used version of the FE, is "to take the mickey" (or possibly "to take the mick"), the meaning of which is to tease or ridicule somebody. In Swedish, the translation of this FE above is *som var på snussen*, which means "was tipsy" or "was slightly inebriated" which is incorrect. The FE or idiom cannot have been familiar to the translator or a Swedish idiom whose meaning is equivalent to the one in English such as "driva med någon" would have been used.

**Example 2**

STANLEY: [...] *A fast one. They pulled a fast one*. I'd like to know who was responsible for that.  

(Pinter 1963: 23)

The idiom "to pull a fast one" and its MOD (abbreviated) preceding it "a fast one" denotes cheating or tricking somebody. It is an informal idiom (Microsoft Encarta 2000). If the translator had been aware of the meaning of this linguistic FE, he is likely to have used an equivalent translation into Swedish. Even if an idiom denoting "cheating somebody" does not exist in Swedish, the meaning of the idiom could have been translated into Swedish as "Lurade mig. De lurade mig." that is "Deceived me. They deceived me". Instead, the translator seems to have over-interpreted the idiom, reading more into its meaning than was intended, perhaps because he drew its meaning from the context where it occurred. The translation thus reads "Knockout direkt. Dom slog till med en gång". It is difficult to know what exactly the translator thought that the FE meant, but it is likely that his translation means "They were fast. Very fast" which is incorrect. My interpretation of the Swedish translation rests on two facts: firstly, the word "knockout" chosen by the translator belongs to the world of boxing, and secondly, the Swedish verb phrase "slog till" seems ambiguous and can mean either "they acted quickly" or "hit" as in "hit somebody". As a result, it seems that Lång based his translation on the fact that he thought that somebody had "acted quickly" and possibly been violent too. Whatever the translator intended, the message of the original FE is not translated into Swedish and is, as a result, inaccurate.

Example 3

GOLDBERG: I’m telling you, Webber. You’re a washout. Why are you getting on everybody’s wick? Why are you driving that old lady off her conk?

(Pinter 1963: 50)


(Lång 1964: 41)
When this line appears in The Birthday Party, Stanley Webber has for some time endured an interrogation by Goldberg and McCann. Stanley is being put under extreme pressure. The interrogation does not end here. In this extract, Pinter uses the idiom “to get on somebody’s wick” in order to say that a person is very annoying or irritating. The use of this idiom and similar expressions such as “off her conk” may en masse work as clues to Goldberg’s background. The types of linguistic FE, which Goldberg employs such as “you’re beginning to get on my breasts” (Pinter 1963: 49) and “I’ll kick the shite out of him” (1963: 50) are often informal, vulgar or slightly offensive and some have sexual undertones. They are the kinds of FE which tend to be used to signal that people are of a working class background or that they are not very well educated. The expression “to drive somebody off their conk” (see below) is another such example. On the macro level, these linguistic FE or idioms seem to work as characterization and can, as a result, be considered to be thematic devices. With regard to the translation of the FE “get on somebody’s wick”, the translator cannot have been familiar with the idiom or an equivalent idiom in Swedish would have been chosen, or the correct sense would have been found in the translation. Neither is the case. In Lång’s translation into Swedish, Goldberg says “[...] Varför trasslar ni till det för alla människor? [...]” (Lång 1964: 111) which may be translated as either “why do you cause trouble for everybody” or “Why do you get everybody into a mess”. The translation does not reflect the original either in tone (much less forceful an expression) or meaning (incorrect). It is possible that the translator looked up the word in a dictionary and found the following definition for the noun “wick”: a piece of twisted thread in a candle” (Longman’s Dictionary of Contemporary English 1981) which could possibly explain how “twisted” became “trassla till det” and resulted in the translation above. Instead “Varför retar ni gallefer på alla?” could be used, since “reta gallefer på någon” is an equivalent idiom, which means “to annoy somebody intensely”. Both tone and meaning would thus reflect the original.

A synonymous idiom to “to drive somebody off their conk” is the more neutral expression “to drive somebody mad”. The former expression is informal and the
tone of “off their conk” appears slightly aggressive. In Swedish the idiom has been translated as “to scare the life out of somebody” resulting in “Varför skrämmer ni vettet ur den gamla damen?” (Lång 1964: 111). The original FE and its translation do not mean exactly the same thing. In the Swedish translation, the translator seems to have misinterpreted the FE, or he may have thought that his choice of FE was a close enough translation of the original. At any rate, the set expressions “dra någon till vansinne” (drive somebody insane), “göra mig galen” (make me go mad) or “förstora förståndet” (lose one’s mind) could also work even though these Swedish set expressions are more formal and neutral in tone than the original. “Varför driver ni den gamla damen till vansinne?” (Why are you driving the old lady insane?) or the rewrite “Vill ni att den gamla damen ska förstora förståndet, va?!” (You want the old lady to lose her mind, do you?) might consequently work since they appear closer in meaning to the original than the phrase used in Lång’s translation.

Example 4

MCCANN: He left her in the lurch.  
GOLDBERG: You left her in the pudding club.  

(Pinter 1963: 53)

MCCANN: Han lämnade henne i sticket.  
GOLDBERG: Ni lurade henne.  

(Lång 1964: 118-119)

The linguistic FE “To be in the pudding club” is a colloquial way of saying that somebody is pregnant. This FE or idiom might be viewed as offensive by some people (Microsoft Encarta 2000). The Swedish translation “Ni lurade henne” above means “You deceived her” which is a mistranslation and it probably occurred because the translator was unfamiliar with the meaning of the English idiom. The offensive tone of the original FE should be transferred in translation in
order to reflect the language used by the character since such an FE could be part of Pinter’s characterization of the characters. The informal “vara på smällen” or “vara på tjocken” seem equivalent since they mean “to be pregnant” and since they are also viewed as slightly offensive to some people in Swedish.

Example 5

GOLDBERG: Beautiful! A beautiful speech. ( [...] GOLDBERG comforts MEG.)

Buck up now. Come on, smile at the birdy. That’s better. [...] 

(Pinter 1963: 58)


(Lång 1964: 134)

“Watch the birdy” is a phrase that photographers use when they ask somebody to look into the camera, as they are about to take a photo. Therefore, “smile at the birdy” is another way of saying “Say cheese”. In this passage, Pinter has modified the expression by putting it into another context – that is nobody is about to take a photo when the phrase occurs in the play; it is a case of displacement of context. Pinter has also made another modification; he has replaced “watch” for “smile at”. Pinter lets Goldberg borrow an FE used in photography in order to help Meg feel better, that is the phrase is used in order to cheer Meg up, to make her smile. In Swedish Lång offers the translation “Titta på den lilla fågeln” (Lång 1964: 134). It means “Look at the little bird”. The translation is close to the ST but incorrect. It is likely that the translator was unfamiliar with the expression. If he did not know the meaning of the expression, it follows that he was not aware of its use in an unfamiliar context. If he had been, the translation could have read “look into the camera” for instance which would have made more sense, although it is not satisfactory, since no camera is present in the scene. In order to best decide how to translate this FE, a translator must arrive at a decision as to why Pinter uses the
FE. However, the reason why he uses “Come on. smile at the birdy” in order to make somebody smile is difficult to assess. Why not use “Come on. smile?” or “Give me a smile!” for instance? Since it is difficult to know why Pinter chose to use this particular FE, it does not seem advisable to be too inventive when translating the expression into Swedish. An equivalent phrase used by photographers in Sweden or the translation of the sense of the FE seems adequate. In other words. “säg omelett!” (say omelette) which is equivalent to “say cheese” or “och så ett leende” (give us a smile) might work since Swedish photographers use these expressions when working with clients. “Se så, le nu” (smile now please) may also work since the phrase translates the sense of the FE.

Example 6

GOLDBERG: What’s the matter? You got the needle to Uncle Natey?

(Pinter 1963: 83)

GOLDBERG: Vad är det? Har du skaffat nålen till farbror Natey?

(Lång 1964: 199)

The Swedish translation of “You got the needle to Uncle Natey?” is literal and incorrect. reading “Har du skaffat nålen till farbror Natey” that is “Have you found the needle for Uncle Natey”. The linguistic FE “get a needle to somebody” appears not to have been familiar to Lång, the translator. The FE means to have “a feeling of antagonism or hostility” to somebody and it is an informal expression (Microsoft Encarta 2000). “Hyser du agg mot farbror Natey?” (Lång 1964: 199) seems a more appropriate translation because it is a linguistic FE which means “Do you bear a grudge against Uncle Natey”. Also, the linguistic FE “hysa agg mot någon” is a near-synonym to “You got a needle to Uncle Natey”.

Example 7
GOLDBERG: You’re on the verge.

MCCANN: You are a dead duck.

GOLDBERG: But we can save you. (Pinter 1963: 86)

GOLDBERG: Du verkar aldeles färdig.

MCCANN: Du är trasig.

GOLDBERG: Men vi kan rädda dig.

(Lång 1964: 208)

If somebody is described as “a dead duck”, it means that s/he is “somebody [...] with no chance of success or survival” (Microsoft Encarta 2000). The expression is informal; it is colloquial English. In the passage from The Birthday Party above, both meanings of the FE are possible and both may be intended. However, it is the threat of no survival which seems to stand out in the context since the expression is used during the threatening and fierce interrogation of Stanley. As a result, Lång’s translation into Swedish “Du är trasig” (Lång 1964: 208) meaning “You’re a nervous wreck” seems inadequate since the threat of death is absent in that interpretation, but also because the translation does not have the same meaning as the FE in the source language (SL). Moreover, the Swedish word “trasig” seems unfortunate since its connotations are foremost associated with items that have broken into pieces and only rarely used figuratively. “Du ligger risigt till” that is “You’re in big trouble” might work since the idiom “ligga risigt till” implies danger to the person to whom it is addressed. However, the threat would neither be as clear nor as pregnant in the target language (TL) as the FE in the SL. It seems that in this case some translation loss has to be accepted.
4.3.2 The Caretaker

The second play to be discussed in this chapter is *The Caretaker*. There are three characters in this play: two brothers and a visitor called Davie. One of the most prominent aspects of the language of *The Caretaker* is that Davie speaks very colloquial English. There is some allusive language but very few (if any) cultural FEs, that is none of the possible cultural FEs seem to have concealed meanings. Due to the fact that the dialogue appears devoid of cultural FEs, the language seems straightforward. It is therefore not surprising that Carl-Olof Lång, who translated the play into Swedish in 1961 (unpublished), seems to have had few problems translating *The Caretaker*, except the problems related to the translation of colloquial language. The first production of the play was staged at Kretsteatern, Stockholm in March 1961. Below are a few translation examples from *The Caretaker*, illustrating some of the problems C-O Lång encountered in translating *The Caretaker*.

**Example 8**

DAVIES: [...] I could have got done in down there.  
(Pinter 1976: 8)

DAVIES: [...] Jag kunde ha åkt dit på det där stället.  
(Lång 1961: 6)

The translation of this line into Swedish reads “Jag kunde åkt dit på det där stället” and could mean “I could have got into trouble in that place”. “Got done in” is the past tense of the linguistic FE “to get done in” which means “to be killed”. Using colloquial Swedish, it is translated as “åkt dit” (Lång 1961: 6), which if translated literally into English means “got caught”. In this instance, the translator was either not familiar with the idiom “to get done in” or he was of the opinion that Pinter did not intend the idiom to be interpreted literally and translated it more freely as “got caught”. Either way, this does not seem to be an appropriate translation, particularly because it is more vague and less threatening than the original. In order to better reflect the original, the translator may have
chosen “Jag kunde ha blivit jordgubbe på det där stället” since “blivit jordgubbe” is colloquial Swedish for “have died” and the Swedish translation would have the same meaning as the idiom in the SL.

**Example 9**

DAVIES: [...] It was knocked off on the Great West Road. [...]  

(Pinter 1976: 8)

DAVIES: [...] Den tog slut på riksvägen västöver. [...]  

(Lång 1961: 6)

Referring to his tin of tobacco, Davies says “It was knocked off on the Great West Road”. The Swedish translation of “knocked off” reads “tog slut” (1961: 6) that is “ran out”. The entire line in Swedish back-translated into English reads “It ran out on the main road out west”. If something is “knocked off” and one does not have it any more, the meaning of the verb phrase is either that it “was stolen” or possibly “destroyed”, but it does not mean “that one has run out of something”. As a result, the translation appears to be a mistranslation. It seems that the translator did not know the meaning of this particular linguistic idiom. “Att sno”, a colloquial word for “to steal” could be used in Swedish as an equivalent to “knock off”.

**Example 10**

DAVIES: [...] When he came at me tonight I told him, didn’t I? You heard me tell him, didn’t you?  

(Pinter 1976: 8)

DAVIES: [...] När han kom fram till mig i kväll satte jag honom allt på plats, vä?  

Ni hörde ju att jag satte honom på plats.  

(Lång 1961: 6)
According to Microsoft Encarta 2000 the idiom “come at somebody” means “to set upon and attack somebody”. C-O Lång’s translation of the idiom in The Caretaker is “När han kom fram till mig ikväll ...” (1961: 6), that is “When he walked up to me tonight ...” which has a different meaning than the original, and is not as threatening. The idiom “ge sig på någon” could work since it is an informal way of saying “to attack somebody” in Swedish. The text would then read “När han gav sig på mig ikväll, så jag till honom på skarpen, visst gjorde jag!” or “When he come at me tonight ...” and thus the FE is correctly translated and the threat intact.

Example 11

DAVIES: You got any more rooms then, have you?
ASTON: Where?
DAVIES: I mean, along the landing here ... up the landing there.
ASTON: They’re out of commission
DAVIES: Get away.
ASTON: They need a lot of doing to.

(Pinter 1976: 11-12)

DAVIES: Ni har väl fler rum här?
ASTON: Var?
DAVIES: Jag menar, här utanför ... dörrarna utanför.
ASTON: Inget att räkna med.
DAVIES: Hur så?
ASTON: Måste repareras först.

(Lång 1961: 9)

In this passage an interjection seems to have been misunderstood. Get away is here translated into Swedish as Hur så? (1961: 9) which means “How come?” or “Why?”. In English the interjection “get away” expresses disbelief (Microsoft Encarta 2000). The passage may be improved by the use of a Swedish interjection or phrase equivalent to the one in the original. “Du skojar!” or “Äh, lägg av!” might work.
Example 12

DAVIES: Them bastards at the monastery let me down again.

(Pinter 1976: 13).

DAVIES: Dom jävla lösen i klostret lurade mig igen.

(Lång 1961: 11)

“Let somebody down” is a phrasal verb, which means “to disappoint somebody by not meeting expectations” (Microsoft Encarta 2000). However, in the translation into Swedish, it was rendered by Lång as “to deceive somebody”, which is incorrect. Lack of familiarity with the FE in the SL is the most likely reason for the mistranslation, because if Lång knew what “let somebody down” meant he would have used the correct translation “svek mig”.

Example 13

DAVIES: [...] I’d hear the bell, I’d go down there, open the door, who might be there, any Harry might be there. [...]

(Pinter 1976: 43-44)

DAVIES: [...] När klockan ringer går jag ner och öppnar dörren, och då kan ju vem som helst stå utanför, vilken djävla typ som helst [...]

(Lång 1961: 42)

“Any Harry” is a MOD (a truncated FE), that is a modified version of the full length linguistic FE “Any Tom, Dick and Harry” whose meaning is “anybody”. The MOD was over-translated into Swedish as “vilken djävla typ som helst” (1961: 42) or “Any bloody guy” when a simple “anybody” would have been enough. The word was probably added for effect. However, there is no need for it, since the original MOD is a truncated FE which does not contain any additions.
4.3.3 The Homecoming

The Homecoming is a play about a dysfunctional family of males. It consists of Max (the father), his brother Sam, and Max's sons Lenny and Joey. The ambience in the family household is one of hostility, and the language of the play is working class, often crude, and threatening. It is the language of an all-male household where people constantly compete for power. One day, Max's eldest son, Teddy, who has lived abroad for a few years, unexpectedly brings his wife Ruth home to meet the family. As it turns out, Max seems to have been a butcher and a crook and now acts as the mother of the family, since the death of his wife. Lenny is a pimp, Joey a brainless boxer, Sam a cowed taxi driver, Teddy a doctor of philosophy and Ruth a mother of three who previously may have worked as a prostitute. At the end of the play, Ruth seems to prefer to stay on with her husband's family working as a classy prostitute to returning to the USA with her husband. The translator is Olov Jonason (Unpublished manuscript from 1965).

Example 14

Pause.

(MAX) Mind you, she wasn't such a bad woman. Even though it made me sick just to look at her rotten stinking face, she wasn't such a bad bitch. I gave her the best bleeding years of my life, anyway.

LENNY: Plug it, will you, you stupid sod. I'm trying to read the paper.

MAX: Listen, I'll chop your spine off. you talk to me like that! [...]

(Pinter Plays 1978: 25)

Pause.


LENNY: Håll käften, din djävla torsk - jag försöker lasa tidningen.
The expression "to give somebody the best years of your life" is a linguistic FE. Here, Pinter has added "bleeding" to give the expression more force. In Swedish, the translator did the same thing: the mild invective *jävla* was added to *mina basta år* (my best years) resulting in *mina basta jävla år*.

The verb "to chop one's head off" is used in the context of beheading or decapitating somebody. Here Pinter replaced "head" with "spine", which makes the linguistic FE "to chop one's head off" into the MOD "to chop one's spine off". The expression is a threat. The question remains: is it possible to chop off somebody's spine? Why did Pinter replace "head" with "spine"? It has been suggested that the word "spine" is an anagram of "penis" (*The Sunday Express*, 3 February, 2002), a word that Pinter could not have included in 1965 due to the censorship laws. If spine is meant to be an anagram of penis, the linguistic MOD makes sense, since it is possible to chop off somebody's penis. In addition, should the MOD be an anagram, the threat made to Lenny is not a general one, but a threat to his masculinity and his status in the family. Jonason translated the MOD as *jag slår dig på kaften*, which means "I'll punch you in the face", a toned down version of the MOD in the ST. If "spine" is an anagram of penis, the anagram will be lost in translation into Swedish. As a result, some translation loss seems inevitable.

Example 15

TEDDY: Stop it! What are you talking about?

MAX: I haven't seen the bitch for six years, he comes home without a word, he brings a filthy scrubber off the street, he shacks up in my house!

TEDDY: She's my wife! We're married!
TEDDY: Sluta! Vad är det du säger?
MAX: Jag har inte sett den fan på sex år, och så kommer han hem utan ett ord och släpar in en sketen pyscha från gatan och slafar i mitt hus.
TEDDY: Det är min fru! Vi är gifta!

(Pinter Plays 1978: 58)

The linguistic FE or phrasal verb "to shack up" is an informal expression meaning that somebody is living with a lover (Microsoft Encarta 2000). By using the phrasal verb, Max also shows disapproval of the arrangement. The Swedish translator may have chosen the informal expression slafar in order to reflect the ST, only the translation does not mean the same thing. Slafar is slang for "sleeping" and has no connotations of "live with a lover" nor is it a word stating disapproval. As a result, the translation is less forceful than the original. It seems that some translation loss will have to be accepted, since it is difficult to find an exact equivalent in Swedish. Olov Jonason seems to remedy the lack of force to some degree by successfully transferring the tone of Max's way of speaking, and the context makes clear that Max disapproves of Teddy's actions.

4.3.4 No Man's Land

No Man's Land (NML) was written in 1975. The main characters are Hirst and Spooner, two old men who drink heavily. Hirst is successful and rich whereas Spooner is unsuccessful and poor. The play begins with Hirst arriving home together with Spooner whom he seems to have picked up in a pub. While at Hirst's, they reminisce. In fact, the entire play relies heavily on memories. The two men talk about women, sex, literature, philosophy and work. Both are very well spoken. The elegant and affected style of the language as well as its often parodic tone resemble the style of Oscar Wilde and Noel Coward. Hints and innuendoes, where they met (Hampstead Heath) and the way Hirst and Spooner speak, may indicate that they are homosexuals, but this need not be the case.
There are few linguistic FEs in *NML*. Cultural FEs and other allusive language, however, seem to abound. The abundance of allusive language makes the dialogue come across as obscure because memories in the form of cultural FEs seem to allude to people and events that the spectator cannot always identify. As a result, it can be difficult to make sense of the play. If the dialogue in *NML* is not understood, this may be due to the fact that the language seems obscure because of the many cultural FEs. Carl-Olof and Sigbrit Lång translated the play into Swedish in 1975, and *NML* had its premiere at Göteborg’s Stadsteater on January 23rd 1976 (text unpublished). Below are a few examples of Pinter’s use of linguistic FEs in *NML*. First a few more observations on the language of the play.

The dialogue in *NML* often comes across as prefabricated. An instance of prefabricated dialogue is language which has been borrowed from other texts. Cultural FEs constitute such prefabricated language. Linguistic FEs such as idioms or metaphors also constitute prefabricated language. The dialogue in *NML* does not resemble everyday conversation because too many passages seem prefabricated; they sound stilted or affected. The impression of prefabrication is often brought out by the parodic tone of the language of the play. As a result, defamiliarisation occurs, which means that some passages appear “odd” to those members in the audience unfamiliar with the origins of the prefabricated cultural FE. The impression is that these passages stand out because they seem out of context. Linguistic FEs may appear odd when modified. However, prefabricated phrases such as linguistic and cultural FEs may also seem familiar, they “ring a bell”, even though it may be difficult to identify the original FE s. Below are a couple of examples to illustrate the types of linguistic FEs found in *NML* (my italics):

**Example 16**

HIRST: [...] Her ardour was, in my experience, unparalleled.

*Pause*
You were always preoccupied with your physical condition, weren't you? Don't blame you. Damn fine figure of a chap. Natural athlete. Medals, scrolls, your name inscribed in gold. *Once a man has breasted the tape, alone, he is breasting the tape forever.* His golden moment can never be tarnished. […]

(Pinter 1975: 76)

HIRST: […] Hennes lidelse var, enligt min erfarenhet, utan motstycke. Ja ja.

*Paus.*


(Lång 1975: 64)

"Once a man has breasted the tape, alone, he is breasting the tape forever" seems to ring a bell. It may do so because it conjures up phrases of the format "seen one, seen them all" (Microsoft Encarta 2000). The repetition may also make the line seem familiar. Repetition is a rhetorical device often used by poets and orators in order to make a point, since the repetition tends to remain in people's minds. It is a device used in advertising as well. Repetition of some kind is also common in catchphrases, slogans and sayings of various kinds. In the passage above, the repetition is based on "breast the tape". Finally, the insertion of "alone" seems out of place because its position in the sentence resembles written rather than spoken language. "[A]lone" also becomes stressed since it breaks off the rhythm of the line. Having established that "Once a man has breasted the tape …" is an MOD, we now turn to the Swedish translation. It is close. The repetition is kept which results in the line sounding like an FE, which also resembles the original MOD. As a result, the translation works.
As described, repetition ("tender" in this case) may indicate that a line has been borrowed as it is common in for instance sayings and slogans. If the rhythm stands out, making the sentence sound poetic, there is yet another reason to suspect that the line has been borrowed. However, it may also be that the author is imitating another author's style or using a frame such as "seen one ... seen them all". Rhetorical devices are usually used for specific reasons. A case in point, rhythm is common in certain types of preformed material such as proverbs, verse and poetry. The advantage with familiar sounding phrases is that they may cause us to believe that we have heard them before simply because the format seems familiar. This may happen when the audience hear "tender the dead, as you would yourself be tendered" since the line has the same frame as "do unto others, as you would
have them do to you" (Microsoft Encarta 2000). Also, the language in the excerpt above seems a little too solemn for everyday speech, and this may be an indication that the line has been borrowed. The phrase "And so I say to you." seems to signal an FE, especially since there are instances of other such signals followed by an H in other plays by Pinter (see Moonlight page 60: "And so let me say this. He was a man. take him for all in all. I shall not look upon his like again."); a direct quote from Hamlet preceded by the signal underlined here). Despite the indications that the language has been borrowed from another source, it has not been possible to establish whether or not the italicised phrases are in fact FEs, because the sources of the phrases have not been located. If the two phrases discussed are not linguistic or cultural FEs, they may be imitations of styles or frames used by other writers before Pinter.

The Swedish translator opted for a close translation in both cases above. If the origin of an FE is unknown to the translator, a close translation seems to be the right option, provided that the tone and style of the piece is retained. Moreover, style seems to override content in NML. Therefore, it is particularly important to retain the style of the Sl. in the translation, in order that the TT reflects the original. The language style in NML is elegant and solemn. The translation of the first line does not retain the SL style, and although the second line better reflects the original, it seems that the translator has misunderstood the meaning of the verb "tender" slightly. The second example may be said to be a modification of "do to others as they do unto you" which comes from the Bible. As a result, in Swedish the translator could have chosen the equivalent phrase found in the Swedish Bible.

Example 18

SPOONER: I looked up once into my mother's face. What I saw there was nothing less than pure malevolence. I was fortunate to escape with my life. You will want to know what I had done to provoke such hatred in my own mother.

HIRST: You'd pissed yourself.
SPOONER: Quite right. How old do you think I was at the time?
HIRST: Twenty-eight.
SPOONER: Quite right. However, I left home soon after.

*Pause*

My mother remains. I have to say, a terribly attractive woman in many ways. Her buns are the best.

_**HIRST looks at him.**_

_**Her currant buns.**_ The best.

(Pinter 1975: 18-19)

SPOONER: En gång såg jag upp i min mors ansikte. Vad jag såg där var ingenting annat en ren illvilja. Jag var lycklig att komma undan med livet i behåll. Ni undrar förstås vad jag gjort för att våcka sådan avsky hos min egen mor.

HIRST: Ni hade kisset på er.

SPOONER: Just det. Hur gammal tror ni att jag var då?

HIRST: Tjugotalet.

SPOONER: Just det. Emellertid flyttade jag hemifrån strax efteråt.

*Paus.*

SPOONER: Min mor är fortfarande, det måste jag tillstå, en på många sätt oerhört attraktiv kvinna. Hennes bullar är bäst.

_**HIRST ser på honom.**_

_**Hennes korintbullar.**_ Bäst.

(Lång 1975: 16)
The above passage illustrates how Pinter uses his audience’s expectations in order to create comedy. *Spoon* er states that his mother once gave him a look of malevolence. The audience, on hearing that it was because he “pissed himself”, is likely to assume that *Spoon* er was a child when it happened. As a result, Hirst’s guess “twenty-eight” is somewhat surprising to the audience, since they thought a child had wet himself. However, it also tells them something about the characters and their experiences: *Spoon* er and Hirst seem to be on the same wavelength. They are heavy drinkers, which means that they probably have had similar experiences related to drinking (hangovers and dehydration). This may be why Hirst did not state that *Spoon* er was talking of a child wetting himself. Later in the passage, the sexual innuendo in the ambiguous phrase “her buns are the best” may seem inappropriate since it is assumed that children do not view their parents as sexual beings. However, when “currant” is added to the phrase, it seems to take on a different meaning. It is possible that the sexual innuendo was not only a pun, but also a foretaste for what was to come, namely “Her currant buns. The Best.” In Cockney rhyming slang, “currant bun” means “son” or “sun”. With this knowledge in mind, it is possible that *Spoon* er is talking about himself, saying that he and his brother/s are the best, or put differently, that his mother’s sons are the best. As a result, the expression may have nothing to do with buns at all. Langed’s translation of the phrase is literal. It is possible that he decided on a literal translation, because he was unfamiliar with the linguistic FE. If Pinter is referring to buns, the translation works, but since NML seems to be a very allusive play where the language has undercurrents (see Chapter 1, pages 31-39 for a discussion of subtext and undercurrents), it is unlikely that this is what Pinter intended. Equivalent rhyming slang to Cockney does not exist in Swedish. Therefore, the FE must be translated literally. However, a note explaining to the reader the meaning of “currant buns” in Cockney would be helpful.

Example 19

*SPOONER:* Tell me about your wife.

*HIRST:* What wife?

*SPOONER:* How beautiful she was, how tender and how true. Tell me with what
speed she swung in the air, with what velocity she came off the
wicket, whether she was responsive to finger spin, whether you could
bowl a shooter with her, or an offbreak with a legbreak action. In
other words, did she google?

Silence.

HIRST: You will not say. I will tell you then ... that my wife had
everything. Eyes, a mouth, hair, teeth, buttocks, breasts absolutely
everything. And legs.

(Pinter 1975: 23)

SPOONER: Berätta då om er fru.

HIRST: Vilken fru?

SPOONER: Hur vacker hon var, hur öm och hur sann. När ni spelade cricket?
Berätta om hur fort hon fick in schwungen, hur snabbt hon klarade
grinden, ifall hon kunde ta emor en skruv, ifall ni kunde kasta en
långboll på henne, eller en vänsterstuss med benstopprörelse. Med
andra ord, klarade hon en lyra?

Tystnad.

Ni vill inte säga det. Då skall jag tala om för er ... att min fru
hade allt. Ögon, mun, har, tänder, lår, bröst, allt. Och ben.

(Lång 1975: 20)

In the italicised line above, Pinter manipulates his audience’s expectations. The
use of the phrase “my wife ... had everything” is based on the assumption that the
audience expects a certain answer to it; in other words the phrase signals a
particular response. Such signals can be viewed as linguistic FIs. What the
audience expects to hear is “a beautiful house, two children and a car” or
something along those lines. Pinter, however, decides to thwart his audience’s
expectations by introducing the unexpected: he enumerates the obvious, which is superfluous. It is likely that he manipulated the audience for humorous effect. The translation is literal. It works because a Swedish audience has the same expectations as an English-speaking one, since a line such as “I had everything” carries similar expectations in both languages.

Example 20

FOSTER: [...] Who are you? I thought I’d never make it. What a hike. And not only that. I’m defenceless. I don’t carry a gun in London. But I’m not bothered. Once you’ve done the East you’ve done it all. [...] Who are you, by the way? What are you drinking?

(Foster 1975: 31)


(Lång 1975: 26)

Example 21

FOSTER: [...] I know what it is. There’s something about you fascinates me.
SPOONER: It’s my bearing.
FOSTER: That’s what it must be.
BRIGGS: I’ve seen Irishmen chop his balls off.
FOSTER: I suppose once you’ve had Irishmen you’ve had everything (to SPOONER) Listen. Keep it tidy. You follow? You’ve just laid your hands on a rich and powerful man. [...].

(Foster 1975: 50-51)
“Once you’ve done the East you’ve done it all” is in all likelihood based on the idiom frame or format “seen one, seen them all” (Microsoft Encarta 2000). In the first example, Pinter has replaced the verb “seen” for “done” and “one” is replaced by “the East”. Another modification of the same frame is “I suppose once you’ve had Irishmen you’ve had everything” (1975: 51). There are idioms like “seen one, seen them all” in Swedish and this means that the translation of these two FPs do not constitute a problem. Therefore, it is not surprising to discover that the translation of these lines into Swedish is literal. However, the verb in the SL may have been misinterpreted in the second example, perhaps because it is not entirely clear what Pinter means by the expression “have had Irishmen”. It may mean “have caught Irishmen”, “have bumped into Irishmen” or “have had sex with Irishmen”. The translation of “have had” in “I suppose once you’ve had Irishmen you’ve had everything” is råkat ut för (English synonym is “exposed to”, “exposed to something bad” in particular) in the TL. As a result, the Swedish means “If you’ve once been exposed to an Irishman you’ve been exposed to everything”. What supports such an interpretation? Do Englishmen hate the Irish, because of their shared history when the Irish and the English were enemies? Possibly, but anti-Irish sentiments do not to seem to be a theme in the play. However, the English often run down the Irish and tell jokes about them. This is what Pinter may be doing here. Homosexuality also does seem to be a possible theme. In view of this fact, the translation of “have Irishmen” could be a modification of “have a woman” which means “to have sex with a woman”. If homosexuality is a theme in the play, the intended meaning of the expression
could be "if you've had sex with Irishmen you've experienced everything". If this is the right interpretation, the Swedish translation is wrong and should be changed.

Another linguistic MOD is "gaining a march on the world" (1975: 42). It is a version of the more common military FE "stealing a march on the world". To steal a march on the world means "to be early", "to outdo", "to be cunning" or "to deceive" (Microsoft Encarta 2000). This is the context in which the MOD appears in the play:

**Example 23**

HIRST: The same night? I was dreaming of a waterfall. No, no, of a lake. I think it was ... just recently. Can you remember when I went to bed? Was it daylight? It's good to sleep in the late afternoon. After tea and toast. You hear the faint beginnings of the evening sounds, and then nothing. Everywhere else people are changing for dinner. You're tucked up, the shutters closed, *gaining a march on the world.*

(Pinter 1975: 42)


(Lång 1975: 35-36)

The meanings of the MOD enumerated above do not seem to fit the context. However, the MOD can also mean "to gain an advantage" (Svensk handordbok 1980), which seems the most likely interpretation in this instance. The Swedish translation of the MOD is *tiden har hejdat sitt lopp*, which is a Swedish phrase meaning "time has stopped". Although the TT phrase does not seem to mean the
same thing as the one in the ST, the translation works because it fits its context, and like the ST, it is an FE.

4.3.5 Moonlight

The main characters in Moonlight are Andy and Bel and their sons Jake and Fred. Andy and Bel also have a daughter, Bridget. Based on the fact that death and what happens after death are discussed in the play, but also because Andy says he is dying, and Fred is bedridden, one of the themes of Moonlight seems to be death or dying. As a result, it is not surprising that religion and existentialism seem to be undercurrents in Moonlight. Loneliness is possibly another theme, because although the play is about a family, they all seem cut off from one another, each living in their own world. The play contains many linguistic and cultural FEs. Below are a number of examples of linguistic FEs in Moonlight. Interspersed is a discussion of how these FEs have fared in translation into Swedish. Swedish poet and playwright Kristina Lugn is the translator and the play was read by her at Dramaten on 1 April, 1995. The translation has not been published (my italics in the passages below).

Example 24

ANDY: Well that's more like it. You are a proper target for a cat's derision. And how I loved you.

Pause.

What a wonderful woman you were. You had such a great heart. You still have, of course. I can hear it from here. Banging away.

Pause. (Pinter 1993: 3)
If somebody is described as having “a great heart” it means that she is courageous. If somebody is described as having “a good heart” she is kind-hearted. Why does Pinter use the phrase “You had such a great heart,” which seems to be mixing “a great heart” and “a good heart”? First, it is important to look at the context in which the phrase occurs. Andy is here talking to his wife, Bel. He is rude to her, not only here, but in the passages preceding this line and afterwards as well. The tone of the speaker stands out – Andy seems to be sarcastic. An indication of tone is supplied through Andy’s uncomplimentary claim that his wife is “a proper target for a cat’s derision” for instance. As a result, it is possible that Pinter’s MOD of the collocation “have a good heart” into “had such a great heart” is an indication that Andy’s being sarcastic, that is the MOD is an indication of tone. In translation into Swedish, the translator has decided to use ett så gott hjärta (Lugn 1995: 3), which is the equivalent of “such a good heart”. It is perfectly correct Swedish but the expression does not seem to convey the sarcasm, which seems intended in the ST. It is unlikely that Pinter has made a mistake by using “great” instead of “good”, since a playwright of his calibre must be assumed to be aware of what he is doing. It cannot be a coincidence that “good” was exchanged for “great”. As a result, the translator is advised to translate the MOD in order to show that Andy is being sarcastic. “Ditt hjärta var såâå stort” (your heart was sooo big) might work, since in Swedish it would suggest either irony or sarcasm, but also because it fits in with the lines following that expression.
Example 25

JAKE: It’s important to keep your _pecker_ up.
FRED: How far up?
JAKE: Well … for _example_ … _how high is a Chinaman_?
FRED: Quite.
JAKE: Exactly.

_Pause._

JAKE: Det är mycket viktigt att hålla _modet_ uppe.
FRED: Hur högt upp måste jag hålla det?
JAKE: Tja … Vad ska vi säga … _Hur hög kan en dvarg bli_?
FRED: Just det.
JAKE: Ja. _Precis_.

_Paus._

These lines represent an example of the word play that occurs in _Moonlight_. It resembles music-hall patter: nothing serious is being said or conveyed and there is possibly sexual _innuendo_ since one of the meanings of “_pecker_” may be “_penis_”. The idiom is a synonym to phrases such as “_keep your chin up_” and “_keep your spirits up_”, but unlike these idioms “_keep your pecker up_” can, by some people, be considered offensive since one meaning of “_pecker_” is “_penis_” (Microsoft Encarta 2000), whereas the others cannot. Pinter may be using this linguistic _tool_ in order to create comedy. In addition, “_Quite_” and “_Exactly_” which end the exchange (words which tend to be used as signals for ending comic exchanges in English) gives the impression that the brothers are clear as to what has been said when in fact _nothing_ is certain. It is difficult to translate “_keep your pecker up_” into Swedish because there is no equivalent phrase in Swedish with sexual _innuendo_. As a result, it seems that some translation _loss_ has to be accepted. The translator used “_hålla modet uppe_” (1995: 7) which means “_keep your chin up_” and so far all
is well. However, the translator then appears to have over-interpreted “how high is a Chinaman”, seemingly thinking that the phrase is connected to a music-hall passage later in the play, that is the “Chinese laundry Sequence” (Pinter 1995: 73-75) where “Chinese laundry” is translated into Swedish as “Djargarnas tvättinrättning” (Lugn 1995: 68-69) which means “The Dwarfs’ Laundry”. As a result, the translation of “how high is a Chinaman” reads “Hur hög kan en djarg bli?” that is “How tall can a dwarf get”. The over-translation has taken place, it seems, because the translator did not know that “how high is a Chinaman” (A Dictionary of Catchphrases 1977) is either an idiom such as “How long is a piece of string”, a common phrase meaning that something cannot be given a finite measurement, or a joke where “How Hi” is the name of a Chinese person. There are similar jokes in English where wordplay such as homophony or homonymy is used: “Keep fit with Jim Nastics” is a case in point (Chiaro 1992: 35). The 11 may also be a cricket term (Bergfeldt 1998: 33-34). Jake and Fred seem to be talking nonsense, and they do so within the music-hall set up. It may also be that they are competing, hiding the fact that they are not sure what the other person is actually saying. If that is the case, they keep up appearances in order to ensure that they do not lose face. In the Swedish translation, it seems that the translator has tried to translate sense, which has resulted in a loss of humour. A more flippant approach to such a passage would better transfer the humour of the passage, or a Swedish joke may have been used.

Example 26

FRED: The answer is that your father was just a little bit short of a few krugerrands.

JAKE: He’d run out of pesetas in a pretty spectacular fashion.

FRED: He had, only a few nights before, dropped a packet on the pier at Bognor Regis.

(Pinter 1995: 14)

FRED: Därför att din far hade lite dåligt med stalar
Example 26

FRED: The answer is that your father was just a little bit short of a few krugerrands.

JAKE: He'd run out of pesetas in a pretty spectacular fashion.

FRED: He had, only a few nights before, dropped a packet on the pier at Bognor Regis.

(Pinter 1993: 14)

FRED: Därför att din far hade lite dalkigt med stälar.
Fred and Jake are here talking about their father. Money seems to be the issue. As a result, the idiom “a little short of a few krugerrands” could be seen as a MOD (replacement) of “short of a few bob” which means having too little money. In addition, “run out of pesetas” could thus be a MOD (replacement) of “run out of money”. However, the impression created is also that “short of a few krugerrands” could be ambiguous. The phrase may also suggest that Fred thinks that his father, Andy, is “a card short of a deck” which would mean that he thinks that Andy is crazy. Having said that, the main focus is likely to be on money since the theme of this part of the play is money. If there is an idiom in Swedish that can convey the ambiguity just described it could be used, but since this does not seem to be the case, the translator can only translate one meaning and, in this context, Kristina Lugn’s translation of money is considered appropriate since money seems to be the main focus.

Example 27

BEL: I’m giving you a mushroom omelette today and a little green salad and an apple.

ANDY: How kind you are. I’d be lost without you. It’s true. […]

(Pinter 1993: 34)


(Lugn 1995: 32)
"And an apple" seems to be a linguistic MOD that works on both the micro and the macro level. On the micro level, the MOD could be an ellipsis of the proverb "an apple a day keeps the doctor away". And on the macro level, it could be reinforcing the interpretation that dying is one of the themes of the play. The translation of the FE could involve finding an equivalent phrase (if there is such a phrase in Swedish) and modify it through ellipsis, bearing in mind that the translated ellipsis must be recognisable to a Swede as referring to health. Finding such an equivalent FE in another language is very difficult. It may be especially difficult to find one in Swedish, partly because there are not as many idiomatic expressions in Swedish as in English, and partly because Swedes do not seem to use FEs as much as native speakers of English. In addition, MODs are not as common, probably because Swedes are not prone to witticisms in the way that the British seem to be. The reason why Swedes do not use witticisms very often is that Swedes arguably, at all times, try to be to the point. It is therefore possible that wit is considered to be superfluous by Swedes, because it may be considered elaborate and imprecise. When wit is used, it is used only in certain circumstances. The British, however, who seem to take delight in trying to outwit one another, come up with witty remarks at a much higher frequency than do Swedes. Lugn who translated the MOD "- and an apple" literally into Swedish as "- och ett äpple" must have failed to see any underlying meaning hidden within the MOD, because otherwise her translation would have been creative, particularly since in this particular case the translator is a poet.

Example 28

JAKE: I once lived the life or Riley myself.
FRED: What was he like?
JAKE: I never met him personally. But I became very very close friend of the woman he ran away with.
FRED: I bet she taught you a thing or two.
JAKE: She taught me nothing that she hadn't learnt herself at the feet of the master.
JAKE: En gång i tiden levde jag som Riley.
FRED: Hur var han.
JAKE: Jag träffade honom aldrig personligen. Men jag blev mycket mycket nära vän med kvinnan som han rymde med.
FRED: Jag kan slå vad om att hon lärde dig ett och annat.
JAKE: Bara sånt som hon själv lärt sig vid mässarens fötter.

"The life of Riley" (also spelt Reilly) is a linguistic FE meaning "living the good life" or "living a life of abundance". The origin of the FE is unknown. Who "Riley" is, is also unknown. In fact, it seems that the name does not refer to anybody in particular. Pinter's employment of the name as if it does refer to a particular person is, therefore, considered to have been carried out for comic purposes: it is an example of creative word play. In translation into Swedish, the name is retained and the first line above reads "En gång i tiden levde jag som Riley" (Lugn 1995: 46) which means "I once lived like Riley". It is understandable that the translator retained the name since it is exploited for comic effect later in the dialogue, but the translation in not satisfactory since there is no clarification what the FE actually means. As a result, Swedish audiences are not likely to grasp that Jake may be boasting about how he used to live, nor will they understand that Pinter is punning. A freer translation with an addition such as "En gång i tiden levde jag ett liv i överflöd .precis som Riley" that is "I once lived a life of abundance .just/ like Riley", would convey the meaning of the FE in the ST.

Example 29

JAKE: A great and deadly price
FRED: But strictly in accordance with the will of God.
JAKE: And the laws of nature.
FRED: And common or garden astrological logic.
JAKE: It's the first axiom.

FRED: And the last. (Pinter 1993: 58)

JAKE: Ett dödligt högt pris.

FRED: Men i enlighet med Guds vilja.

JAKE: Och naturlagarna.

FRED: Och vanlig astrologi och sunt bondförstånd.

JAKE: Det är det första axiomet.

FRED: Och det sista. (Lugn 1995: 53-54)

The collocation “common or garden” is informal and means “commonplace” or “ordinary”. The phrase “common or garden logic” has above been modified by the addition of an adjective: “astrological”. In Swedish the translation reads “Och vanlig astrologi och sunt bondförstånd” (Lugn 1995: 53) which glossed means “And common astrology and common peasant sense”, which is close enough a translation, but it sounds clumsy, and the rhyme (-log-) at the end is also lost. It is also possible that the Swedish expression sunt bondförstånd is inaccurate, because the normal collocation would be sunt bondförrnuft. Moreover, the translator has interpreted the FE for the audience, which was not necessary. It is possible to translate the line closely as “Och vanlig astrologisk logik”, and the rhyme would be intact in translation. In addition, the spectators could then decide for themselves what the FE means.

Example 30

JAKE: He knew his beer and possessed the classic formula for dealing with troublemakers.

FRED: What was that?

JAKE: A butcher’s hook.

Pause. (Pinter 1993:62)
JAKE: Han var en ölkännare och han kunde det klassiska receptet att hantera bråkstakar.

FRED: Vilket då?

JAKE: Slaktarkroken. (Lugn 1995: 57)

“A butcher’s hook” is Cockney rhyming slang for “Look”. Evidently, it took but a look from the Incumbent – “He” in the passage above – and people would behave. The translator was not familiar with the Cockney expression and failed to translate its sense. Instead, she opted for a literal translation Slaktarkroken (1995: 57), which is incorrect.

4.4 The Translation of Cultural FEs and their MODs

Previous research has shown that people become bilingual, that is “able to speak two languages easily and freely” (Microsoft Encarta 2000) and command the “semantic or syntactic” (Leppihalme 1997: 2) aspects of a language or a text before they become bi-cultural, that is have sufficient knowledge of “extra-linguistic” (1996: 2) features such as a country’s culture and its customs etc (Leppihalme 1997: 192; 196). Leppihalme, has shown that Finnish university students of English – who had studied the language since early Secondary School - understood English literally, but found allusive language including cultural FEs much more difficult to grasp. Instead, they seemed to use their imagination to make sense of FEs in a text. As a result, FEs were often misinterpreted. Thus, my personal experience of studying English in a similar manner to the Finnish students in Leppihalme’s study seems to have gained support: first the language is acquired then the culture. It seems that acquiring a language is one thing but understanding the allusions in that language is another matter altogether. Indeed, it seems that biculturalisation (acquiring a culture) takes many years and must include a deeper understanding of a people’s history and traditions. As a result, cultural FEs which, to complicate matters, sometimes work on the macro level and may indicate macro interpretations of a play, such as thematic interpretations, are usually more difficult to translate than are linguistic FEs. because the translation of cultural FEs not only requires linguistic and syntactic knowledge but also
cultural knowledge. Several incorrect translations of linguistic FEs by a translator may, as a result, be an indicator that s/he will be less successful in translating cultural FEs, because if a person is not sufficiently bilingual, it is doubtful that s/he is sufficiently bi-cultural in order to translate cultural FEs in a play successfully. However, because cultural FEs are generally speaking more difficult to translate than are linguistic FEs, it does not follow that linguistic FEs can always be translated into another language without problems. A translator may not be able to translate linguistic FEs successfully due to linguistic differences between two languages and cultural FEs due to cultural differences between the cultures of two languages. If a cultural FE, which works on the macro level, is either not identified or not translated appropriately, vital clues to the interpretation of the play may be lost. Linguistic FEs, however, usually only work on the micro level, and a few mistranslations of such FEs seldom seem to interfere with the interpretation of a play as a whole. Below is a selection of cultural FEs from *The Birthday Party*, *No Man's Land* and *Moonlight*. By discussing how a selection of FEs from these plays were translated into Swedish, and suggesting reasons for why the translator opted for a particular solution, I will try to illustrate if these translations work or not. Moreover, I will try to assess if the cultural FEs can be translated more successfully, and if so, how they may be translated in order to better reflect the original.

4.4.1 *The Birthday Party*

Example 31

GOLDBERG: [...] One of my sons used to come with me. He used to carry a few coppers. For a paper, perhaps, to see how the *MCC* was getting on overseas. Otherwise my name was good. [...]  

(Pinter 1963:30)

GOLDBERG: [...] En av mina söner brukade följa med mig, och han hade lite småpengar så att vi till exempel kunde köpa en tidning för att se
hur cricketlaget klarade sig utomlands. Annars så räckte det med mitt namn. [...] 

(Lång 1964: 58)

"The M.C.C." is an abbreviation of The Marylebone Cricket Club, the most prestigious cricket club in the world. It was considered the ruling body of cricket until 1969 when it was replaced by The International Cricket Conference. However, The M.C.C. is still responsible for the laws of cricket and revises rules when necessary (Microsoft Encarta 2000). The importance of The M.C.C. is here outlined in order to demonstrate that it is not just any cricket club. In the Swedish translation, the generalisation "cricketlaget" (Lång 1964: 58), that is "the cricket team", is used. Is the translator thus referring to the England national cricket team, and is it understood as such, or is he only using a general term, referring to no particular team at all? The original must surely be a reference to the England national cricket team, since The M.C.C. is a cricket club with no real cricket team as such. Could this FIn be better translated into Swedish?

Leppihalme's first translation guideline is to retain the proper name unchanged (1997: 78-79). This would not work in Swedish because few Swedes would recognise the abbreviation. Particularly in theatre dialogue, the abbreviation "the M.C.C." would not make sense since, in the theatre, instant understanding is the key and nobody could look up the abbreviation to find out what it means. Therefore, retaining the name is not an adequate solution. However, texts which are only meant to be read could retain the name provided that some guidance is added; a note at the bottom of the page may work (Leppihalme 1997: 113). If retaining the name unchanged is not a workable solution, Leppihalme's second suggestion, to replace the SL name with a TL name, may be an option. It is unlikely that such a procedure would work since hardly anybody plays cricket in Sweden and very little is known about the game, except perhaps that it is an English sport. As a result, the name of a Swedish cricket team would not be identified as a cricket team by Swedish spectators. The third translation option is to omit the name and transfer sense or meaning (Leppihalme 1997: 79) and this is what the Swedish translator has done, at least in part, by translating The M.C.C. as "cricketlaget" (the cricket team). However, The M.C.C. may not only allude to the
England cricket team: it refers to cricket, which is the most English of sports, and the club is the cricket club of the world. Moreover, the sport has many revered traditions and is the national sport of England. History is very much part of the game and so is prestige. The M.C.C. may, therefore, be viewed as a symbol of the English Empire, social class and so on. How can these different aspects be conveyed into Swedish? All of them cannot be conveyed into Swedish, but some might be. If some of these aspects were transferred into Swedish, the translation might be more satisfactory. As a result, the line "... för att se hur cricketlaget klarade sig utomlands" (to see how the cricket team fared abroad) may instead be translated as "... för att se hur vårt anrika cricketlag klarade sig utomlands" that is "to see how our prestigious cricket team fared abroad". This translation seems to better reflect the different meanings inherent in the FE in the SL. However, the addition may be considered superfluous in which case "cricketlandslaget" (the national cricket team) or "vårt cricketlandslag" would be synonymous to "the England cricket team" and interchangeable with the M.C.C. Another option would be to explain the importance of this particular cricket club in an endnote in order that at least the director and the actors understand what is being referred to.

Example 32

MCCANN: Why did you betray us?
GOLDBERG: You hurt me, Webber. You’re playing a dirty game.
MCCANN: That’s a Black and Tan fact.
GOLDBERG: Who does he think he is?
MCCANN: Who do you think you are?

(Minter 1963: 51)

MCCANN: Varför förändade ni oss?
MCCANN: Ti vet nog.
GOLDBERG: Vem tror han egentligen att han är?
MCCANN: Vem tror ni att ni är egentligen?
"That's a Black and Tan fact" was translated as "Vi vet nog" into Swedish (Lång 1964: 112). It means "We know all right" in English. An endnote at the back of the manuscript defines "The Black and Tans" as "English terrorists in the Irish war of independence". Such an endnote is appropriate in order to make clear the significance of "The Black and Tans" to the director and the actors. According to "The Microsoft Encarta 2000", however, A Black and Tan was a member of the British Militia in Ireland, which was sent to Ireland in 1920-1 to fight Sinn Fein. By these two definitions, it should be clear that Swedes and Brits have different views as to who the terrorists were: the English were the terrorists according to the Swedes, and Sinn Fein according to the British. A translator needs to be aware of this difference and should not put forward his own view of history. McCann is an Irishman who knows about the Black and Tans. As an Irishman, it is likely that he would consider the British Militia the terrorists and it is likely that he and the British militia differ in their views of what is "a fact", that is what is true. Since McCann is Irish, he is likely to think that what "a Black and Tan" claims to be the truth, he considers to be untrue. Does Pinter, therefore, intend the interpretation of this phrase to be ironic or sarcastic? It is possible. However, there is a twist to this play. In The Birthday Party Pinter has made Goldberg, a Jew, and McCann, an Irishman, represent "the organisation" (1963: 51), which extended may mean "organised society", the Establishment and so on. Pinter has given an Irishman and a Jew – who history tells us have been oppressed - the role of the oppressor. In a sense Goldberg and McCann have the role of the Englishman. In the past, England was the organisation, the Government, or the Empire, which suppressed the Irish (McCann). Is this twist only a coincidence or is Pinter suggesting that anyone could be the oppressor?

According to Goldberg and McCann, Stanley has betrayed "the organisation" (1963: 51). However, with their help Stanley is going to be a reformed and well-adjusted man fit for society. But Stanley does not want to change. Goldberg and McCann subject him to an intense interrogation, and although Stanley does his best to resist their pressure, ultimately he fails. Interpreting the cultural H in the excerpt above, the MOD seems to be an extension of the phrase "That's a fact".
"A Black and Tan fact" is likely to be "a fact" to a Brit whereas it is likely to be anything but a fact to an Irishman, as explained above. As a result, it could be that, on the micro level, Pinter is being ironic. What Goldberg and McCann say is a fact to them, but not to their enemies, including Stanley. It is all a matter of point of view. The irony should be transferred into Swedish because, on the macro level, Pinter’s use of irony in this instance may be a thematic FE, that is a critical remark on England’s treatment of the Irish, but perhaps more importantly, Pinter may be criticising authority, the Establishment or the Government of any country and how they treat their subjects when these refuse to conform. The thematic interpretation of the FE should be conveyed in the translation by an endnote as it helps the reader understand and interpret the play. The translator of The Birthday Party, Carl-Olof Lång, in his endnotes stated that, with regard to this FE, translation loss was inevitable, since incorporating the terrorists into the line would mean that somebody other than the actors would have to explain the comment as the play was being performed. Instead, he suggested, that the actor should convey McCann’s Catholic ardour and political fervour through his acting. Lång may be right. It seems very difficult to transfer the significance of the FE aurally in translation into Swedish. However, since research about Pinter suggests that he does not like to belong to organisations, the significance of the FE should not be ignored, especially since Pinter himself has said that one of Petey’s lines in The Birthday Party is his life motto, namely “Stan, don’t let them tell you what to do” (Pinter 1963: 90). As a result, it could be considered that the reference to the Black and Tans as oppressors may be covert criticism of how rulers treat their subjects. It may therefore be significant to point out that one of the themes of the play seems to be anti-Establishment feelings and explain this interpretation by, for example, an endnote in order that at least the director and the actors understand Pinter’s intentions. Since there are further cultural FE’s in this play on the same theme, it seems important to keep this observation in mind when translating cultural FE’s in The Birthday Party.

It is possible that “Det är ju solklart!” (That’s crystal clear, all right) could be a better translation than “Vi vet nog” (1964: 112) since it means that something is a fact, but at the same time, the over-confidence on the part of the speaker suggests that he is trying to convince somebody who is not of the same point of view. Or
"Det är ett politiskt faktum" (It's a political fact) might work since most people would interpret the phrase as ironic, as it is not generally believed that politicians tell the truth. In this way, politics would be part of the expression – as in the ST – and the translation would convey the ambiguity. However, it seems that the significance of the reference to the Militia, on the macro level, may only be explained through a note.

Example 33

GOLDBERG: Webber! Why did you change your name?
STANLEY: I forgot the other one.
GOLDBERG: What's your name now?
STANLEY: Joe Soap.
GOLDBERG: You stink of sin.
MCCANN: I can smell it.

(Pinter 1963: 53)

GOLDBERG: Webber! Varför bytte ni namn?
STANLEY: Jag glömde bort det andra.
GOLDBERG: Vad heter ni nu?
STANLEY: Joe Soap.
GOLDBERG: Ni stinker av synd.
MCCANN: Jag kan känna lukten.

(Lång 1964: 119)

As mentioned, Leppihalme suggests that proper names remain unchanged in translation when this is possible (1997: 79). The translator opted for this translation strategy above. However, it would seem that he did so without understanding the significance of the name, because transferring the name does not convey the meaning of the original to a Swede. Therefore, his translation does not work. According to the Microsoft Encarta 2000 "Joe Soap" is the name a person may use if s/he wants to refer to himself or herself in a humorous way.
particularly when he is being violently attacked. This is what Stanley does in *The Birthday Party*: he is being interrogated when he says the name. As a result, Stanley’s use of the name seems to be an act of defiance and this defiance should therefore be present in the translation in order to show that Stanley does his best to defy his accusers. If the name cannot be retained in translation, Leppihalme suggests replacing the SL name with a TL name. This would not work in this instance since there is, to my knowledge, no equivalent to “Joe Soap” in Swedish. If the name cannot be replaced by another name, Leppihalme suggests the omission of the name in order to translate the sense, that is to translate the meaning or function of the name. This strategy may be used in this instance. Hence “Vad tror du!?” (What do you think?) or “Gissa.” (Take a guess) might work as they convey defiance.

Example 34

MCCANN: You’re a traitor to the cloth.
GOLDBERG: What do you use for pyjamas?
STANLEY: Nothing.
GOLDBERG: You verminate the sheet of your birth.
MCCANN: What about the Albigensist heresy?
GOLDBERG: Who watered the wicket in Melbourne?
MCCANN: What about the blessed Oliver Plunkett?
GOLDBERG: Speak up, Webber. Why did the chicken cross the road?

(Pinter 1963: 54)

MCCANN: Ni har förrätt prästerskapet.
GOLDBERG: Använda ni pyjamas eller nattskjorta?
STANLEY: Ingenting alls.
GOLDBERG: Ni lusar ner era lakan.
MCCANN: Vad anser ni om albigenserväktärriet?
GOLDBERG: Vem sumpade grinden i Melbourne?
MCCANN: Vad anser ni om den helige Oliver Plunkett?
referring to, might help even though it means that the translation would be more
direct than the original. The first example: "Var står ni när det gäller korstaget
mot Albigenserkättarna?" meaning "What is your opinion on the crusade against
the Albigensenist heretics?" where "the crusade against" is added in order to make
it clearer to the audience that Pinter is questioning the actions of the religious
Establishment with regard to how they treated people of a different faith might
help. This translation procedure might work since, with added guidance, the line
would make more sense to Swedes and would not come across as an enigma that
they would need to solve. The second example might benefit from an addition:
"Var står ni när det gäller den irlandske martyren Oliver Plunkett?" meaning
"What is your opinion on the Irish martyr Oliver Plunkett?". The addition "the
Irish martyr" reveals Plunkett's nationality as well as what happened to him. With
this added information, a spectator is more likely to understand that Pinter is
bringing "the Irish question" as well as religion into the play. If the addition "den
irländske martyren" (the Irish martyr) is too clumsy a construction, it is possible to
focus on either "Irish" or "martyr". If the translator emphasizes the "martyr"
aspect of the FE, religion would be foremost in people's minds and the phrase
would not necessarily be associated with Ireland since England has had other
enemies. If the translator chooses to focus on "the Irish aspect" of the FE, many
Swedes would have sufficient knowledge about the historical disagreements
between Ireland and England (the UK) in order to associate religion as one such
problem. As a result, it may be more appropriate to focus on Ireland rather than
religion. The phrase "the Irish Oliver Plunkett" might thus suffice. It is possible to
argue that not even English-speaking audiences would be aware of the meaning of
these religious FEs, so why explain them in Swedish? Some Brits would recognize
them, though, and it seems appropriate that Swedish audiences should at least be
given a chance to partially understand the references rather than be left in the
dark. If the cultural FEs are not understood by native speakers of English, the
impression may be created that these have no actual meaning, perhaps the reason
why, in the 1960s, Pinter's plays came across as confusing to many audiences. In
order to find out whether or not native speakers of English actually understand the
FEs in Pinter's plays, this particular issue will be put to the test in Chapter V. My
reason for adding guidance is that the understanding of a line helps an audience to
understand the play and its themes, whereas allowing them to view a line as a non-
sequitur will not add to their enjoyment or understanding of the play. As a result, addition seems an adequate translation option. It should be added that Lång, the translator of *The Birthday Party* in his endnotes explains that Oliver Plunkett was a patriot, but he does not say anything more and he does not say anything about the Albigensenist heresy. The translator's information will help the director and the actors, but it will not help the audience and both need the information.

There is yet another cultural FE in the passage on page 234 (italics in the excerpt). It is an allusion to cricket, Pinter's favourite sport. The translator was aware of the cricket allusion in "Who watered the wicket in Melbourne" and translated "wicket" as "grind" into Swedish. A "wicket" can mean a "wicket gate" in English, but in this instance it does not. In this case a "wicket" refers to the pitch. Insufficient knowledge of cricket is likely to be the reason for the incorrect translation, or the FE would have been translated correctly. As mentioned, the word "wicket" can refer both to the wicket gate, that is the stumps, but it may also refer to the pitch onto which the bowler bowls the ball. If in cricket someone asks "who has watered the wicket?" anyone familiar with the game would know that the person is not referring to the wicket gate or the stumps but that s/he is referring to the pitch, because a wet pitch causes the ball to spin in unexpected ways whereas the stumps are not affected by water. As a result, a wet pitch would favour the bowlers and be disadvantageous to the batsmen. In this passage, Pinter seems to suggest that somebody had tampered with the pitch in Melbourne. Perhaps he is referring to an occasion when this actually happened in real life? In any case, the translation could read "Vem vattnade plan i Melbourne?" in which "the wicket" is translated as "the pitch".

Example 35

GOLDBERG: But we've got the answer to you. We can sterilise you.
MCCANN: What about Drogheda?
GOLDBERG: Your bite is dead. Only your pong is left.
MCCANN: You betrayed our land.
GOLDBERG: You betray our breed.
MCCANN: Who are you, Webber? (Pinter 1963: 55)
GOLDBERG: Men vi har ett svar på era problem. Vi kan steralisera er.
MCCANN: Vad tycker ni om Drogheda?
GOLDBERG: Ni har inget mer att saga. Går bara på tomgång.
MCCANN: Ni förrådde vårt land.
GOLDBERG: Ni förråder vår ras.
MCCANN: Vem är ni, Webber?

(Lång 1964: 125-126)

This is another passage from the interrogation scene in *The Birthday Party*. Once again there is a reference to Ireland, and England's treatment of the Irish. Once again, Pinter speaks through McCann. In order to understand the FE “What about Drogheda?” one needs to be familiar with Irish-English history. It is very likely that this FE is a reference to the Siege of Drogheda in Ireland in 1649 when, under the command of Oliver Cromwell, the English army stormed Drogheda, massacred Irish royalists as well as local townsmen, but in particular the Catholic clergy (Microsoft Encarta 2000). In the translation, the place name is retained and no guidance is added. Hardly anybody in Sweden knows that Drogheda is Irish. Moreover, it is likely that they do not even know that it is a town. As a result, a Swedish audience would have no idea what the line means or what is indirectly referred to in McCann’s comment. Is there a better solution than translating the passage literally? One suggestion might be to explain the significance of the FE in the endnotes in order that directors and actors understand the references. With regard to the actual translation, some added guidance might work. As a result of the tensions between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland, which have been and are often reported in the Swedish media, Swedes are aware of the tensions between Ireland and the UK. In addition, since Swedish students study the history of the world, in which England as an Empire has influenced world events, Swedes are aware that Ireland was once part of the British Empire, that Ireland wanted independence and that there was much poverty and blood shed in Ireland while England was its master. What might help the audience understand the significance of the place name would be some added guidance such as “the battle of Irish...” as in “What about the battle of Irish Drogheda?” which in
Swedish reads *Vad anser ni om slaget i irlandiska Drogheda.* Swedes would then understand that the war against the Irish is alluded to. However, since this FE is a line in a play, the additions just suggested may make the line too clumsy. If that is the case, perhaps either "the battle of " or "Irish" could be added in which case the reference would be to either war or Ireland. With either of these additions, a Swedish audience would guess that an issue is being addressed covertly, although they would probably not be aware of the exact event. It could be argued that few English-speaking people would know about Drogheda so why explain in Swedish? No doubt, some would identify the reference in English and it seems ill advised not to try to give some guidance in Swedish.

**Example 36**

GOLDBERG: Steady, McCann.

STANELY: *(circling)*. Uuuuuhhhhhhh!

MCCANN: *Right, Judas.*

*(Pinter 1963: 55)*

GOLDBERG: Försiktigt nu, McCann.

STANLEY: *(Som rör sig i cirkel)*: Uuuuuuhhhhh!

MCCANN: Just det, Judas.

*(Lång 1964: 127)*

Here, Goldberg and McCann’s interrogation of Stanley is just about to finish. Stanley is defeated and can only manage a gurgling sound. By saying "Right, Judas," McCann brings religion into the picture again. In the Bible, Judas betrayed Jesus for a handful of money. As a result, calling somebody "Judas" is synonymous to calling a person a traitor. Sweden and Britain are largely Christian countries and it seems fair to assume that people of both countries would be aware of the meaning of this cultural FE on the micro level. On the macro level,
however, the FE constitutes yet another religious comment by McCann, which may be an indication why it is being used. It may be a thematic FE. The translator retained the name and it works on both the micro and macro level since Swedes as well as Brits would understand the significance of the name.

Example 37

GOLDBERG: Were you a nice little girl?
LULU: I was.
[...]
GOLDBERG: Maybe I played piggy-back with you.
LULU: Maybe you did.
[...]
GOLDBERG: Or pop goes the weasel.
LULU: Is that a game?
GOLDBERG: Sure it’s a game.
[...]
LULU: You’re tickling me!
GOLDBERG: You should worry.
LULU: I’ve always liked older men. They can soothe you.

They embrace.

(Pinter 1963: 62-3)

GOLDBERG: Var du en trevlig liten flicka?
LULU: Det var jag.
[...]
GOLDBERG: Jag kanske lekte sistan med dig.
LULU: Det kanske du gjorde.
[...]
GOLDBERG: Eller en bicykel gjord för två.
LULU: Är det en lek?
GOLDBERG: Visst är det en lek.
[...]
Du krittas!

Du borde bli radd nu.


De omfamnar varandra.

(Lång 1964: 146-147)

"Pop goes the weasel" in the passage above is the title of a nursery rhyme. Its first and last verses are as follows:

A penny for a spool of thread,
A penny for a needle.
That's the way the money goes.
Pop goes the weasel.

Rufus has the whooping cough.
And Sally has the measles.
And that's the way the doctor goes,
Pop goes the weasel.

CHORUS
Pop goes the weasel

The meaning of "Pop Goes the Weasel" is "to pawn something". It is derived from "pop" which is slang for "pawn" and "weasel" which is a reference to the Cockney rhyming slang "weasel and stoat" meaning "coat". The meaning of "Pop goes the weasel" is therefore "to pawn one's coat". With this knowledge in mind, the nursery rhyme makes sense: if a person does not have money to pay for something, she may pawn her coat. In The Birthday Party "Pop goes the weasel" is said to be a game, although it is not. What is the significance of Pinter using the title of this nursery rhyme? The answer is not obvious. The context does not seem to warrant an interpretation using logic. However, it could be that Pinter, by using the title of the nursery rhyme, is simply referring to the word "pawn". If that is the case, the possibly out-of-context remark by Goldberg to Lulu "You should worry"
(1963: 63) makes sense provided it is a reference to the linguistic F1 "pawn in the
game". If this elaborate interpretation is possible, by giving Goldberg this F1,
Pinter may indirectly warn Lulu that she is like a "pawn in the game", that is a
puppet or an instrument in a larger "game" or context. Goldberg could simply be
toying with her. It could also be that Pinter by the line "You should worry"
intends the meaning "You have nothing to worry about. others are much worse
off" (Stanley or Goldberg himself, for instance) or something along these lines, in
which case no elaborate interpretation is necessary. It may be that Pinter is simply
referring to any nursery rhyme, and that he calls it a game. Such an interpretation
would fit the context. Therefore, a Swedish nursery rhyme seems appropriate in
translation. If Pinter intended anything other than simply referring to any nursery
rhyme, those meanings would be very difficult to translate into Swedish. As a
result, because it would be impossible to translate the elaborate interpretation of
the nursery rhyme described above, a solution to this translation problem is not
discussed further. Lång, the Swedish translator, seems to have been aware that the
FE "pop goes the weasel" was part of a verse and rightly stated, in his endnotes,
that it was not really a game as claimed in the extract above. He further rightly
claimed that it was a nursery rhyme with which Swedes would not be familiar,
which was why he substituted it with the line "En bicykel gjord för två" from
"Isabella" a song with Swedish lyrics based on an English song called "Daisy
Bell" by British songwriter Harry Dacre (Microsoft Encarta 2000). However, the
Swedish translation is not part of a nursery rhyme and does, therefore, not seem to
be a suitable translation. A Swedish nursery rhyme such as Imse vimse spinDEL
(Incy Wincy Spider) might work since it may be considered to be a nursery rhyme
equivalent to the one found in the ST.

Example 38

MCCANN: I know a place. Roscrua. Mother Nolan’s.

[...] MCCANN: Tullamore. where are you?

MEG (to MCCANN): Give us a drop more.

MCCANN: (filling her glass and singing). Gloria. Glorio. to the bold Fenian
men!'
MEG: Oh, what a lovely voice.

(Pinter 1963: 63)


[...]

MCCANN: Tullamore, var är du?

MEG (Till MCCANN): Får vi en droppe till?

MCCANN: (Fyller hans glas och sjunger): Ara, ara för djärva irlandska man!

MEG: Å, en sån underbar röst.

(Lång 1964: 147-149)

In this passage there are further references to Ireland: "Roscrea" (or "Rosecrea") and "Tullamore" are Irish towns. Roscrea is "an ancient monastery site", and Tullamore was a monastic centre during the Middle Ages. It is possible that these place names were chosen as religious references in order to emphasise the Irish as well as the religious theme of the play (Microsoft Encarta 2000). There are still other references to religion in The Birthday Party: McCann mentions "the Rock of Cashel" (1963: 85) which used to be the stronghold of the kings of Munster from the 4th century. It has many religious sites: St Patrick’s Cathedral, Cormac Chapel, the bishop’s castle and an ancient cross etc. Since 1784, it also has a Georgian cathedral, the seat of the Protestant bishop (Britannica 2000). In the Swedish translation, the cultural FE "the Rock of Cashel" reads "templet" (1964: 205) that is "the temple" which neatly sums up the meaning of the FE in the original. Clearly, either the translator recognised the place name and translated its meaning, or he researched the FE and came up with a satisfactory solution. "Glorio, glorio, to the bold Fenian men!" is a reference to the Irish people. In fact, Fenians is an "Irish nationalist revolutionary movement" (Microsoft Encarta 2000), which was founded in the 19th century, the IRA being its military division. Since McCann is Irish it is not surprising that he should commend the Fenians. The translator identified the FE and translated it closely as Ara, ara för djärva irlandska man (Honour, honour for bold Irish men!), substituting the lesser-known "Fenian" by "Irish" which makes more sense to a Swede.
Example 39

(referencing to STANLEY)

GOLDBERG: You need a long convalescence.
MCCANN: A change of air.
GOLDBERG: *Somewhere over the rainbow*.
MCCANN: *Where angels fear to tread*.
GOLDBERG: Exactly.

(Pinter 1963: 86)

GOLDBERG: Du skulle behöva en lång tids vila.
MCCANN: Luftombyte.
GOLDBERG: *Ovan regnbågen*.
MCCANN: *Där ånglarna fruktar att ta ett steg*.
GOLDBERG: Precis.

(Lång 1964: 207)

"Somewhere over the rainbow" is the title of a song. It was written by E.Y. Harburg for the fantasy musical "The Wizard of Oz", and the lyrics are:

Somewhere over the rainbow.
Way up high:
There's a land that I heard of
Once in a lullaby.

The expression "over the rainbow" is synonymous to "the Promised Land" or "El Dorado", which may allude to Heaven (Microsoft Encarta 2000). It is no doubt a reference to a wonderful place. According to Christianity, heaven is the "place or condition of supreme happiness and peace where good people are believed to go after death [...]", it is also where the angels and God dwell (Microsoft Encarta 2000). In this context, the FE "Somewhere over the rainbow" seems to indicate death indirectly, by alluding to Heaven. It may be an indirect threat to kill Stanley.
However, the second line italicized is a quote from a poem entitled “An Essay on Criticism” by Alexander Pope and it does not seem to refer to Heaven. The passage in which “Where angels fear to tread” occurs reads as follows:

No Place so Sacred from such Fops is barr’d, Nor is Paul’s Church more safe than Paul’s Church-yard: Nay, fly to Altars: there they’ll talk you dead; For Fools rush in where Angels fear to tread. (Alexander Pope 1711)

In this context, the quotation “where angels fear to tread” seems to suggest that nobody is safe. The FE is normally quoted as “Fools rush in where angels fear to tread”, but since it has been truncated above, the phrase is viewed as an MOD. Again an MOD or an FE can be viewed as a covert threat to Stanley and this time to his safety. In the actual dialogue, the FE above may allude to Heaven, where, supposedly, there are angels, whereas the MOD may allude to hell. Together they seem to constitute an indirect threat to Stanley. In addition, “You need a long convalescence” and “a change of air” seem to confirm that Goldberg and McCann are saying that Stanley cannot stay where he is. Both FE s are translated literally into Swedish. A literal translation works in the first case, because many Swedes have seen “The Wizard of Oz” or heard Judy Garland sing the song from the film on the radio. If people born in the late 1960s such as myself recognise it, older people are surely even more likely to recognise the song and to know its origin. If not, logic will tell people that “Heaven” or “something wonderful” is being referred to. The MOD is not as simple. If the literal translation works, it is because the spectator deduces that if angels fear a particular place, it is a nasty place. It is unlikely that the spectators would recognize the MOD as a quotation in Swedish, since they are unlikely to be sufficiently familiar with the literary works of Alexander Pope. Moreover, audiences would not view the phrase as a quote, because it does not seem as if the translator did. If he had, he would have used the authorized Swedish translation of the works by Alexander Pope. It is likely that the Swedish translation of Pope’s poem is not a quote
because the literal translation sounds clumsy. Even though one does not know the Swedish authorised translation of the MOD (if it exists), a translation of the line from An Essay on Criticism would have been more poetic or rhythmical than the one Lång suggests, because the original MOD was borrowed from a piece of work written in verse. If there is a recognized translation of the FEs in Swedish, the established one should be used to ensure that audiences may associate it with its ST. In this instance, Pinter’s use of language can be viewed as insiderism, because few people are likely to know the source or origin of the MOD in English, and even fewer in Swedish.

4.4.2 The Homecoming

There seems to be very few cultural FEs and MODS in The Homecoming. The ones that have been discovered are mainly place names. There is one exception, a title of a book. Some cultural FEs are discussed below (FEs in italics).

Example 40

LENNY: Oh, a Yankee, was it?

SAM: Yes, I’ve been with him all day. Picked him up at the Savoy at half past twelve, took him to the Caprice for his lunch. After lunch I picked him up again, took him down to a house in Eaton Square - he had to pay a visit to a friend there - […]

(Pinter Plays 1978: 28)

LENNY: Jaså, var det en järnare?

SAM: Ja, jag har kört omkring me’n hela dan. Hämtna’n på Savoy halv ett, skjussa’n till Caprice, han skulle äta lunch där. Efter lunchen hämta jag’n igen och skjussa’n till ett hus på Eaton Square, han skulle hälsa på en god vän där. […]

(Jonason 1965: 7-8)

The Savoy and The Caprice are places in London, which the rich and famous frequent. Eaton Square is an area of London inhabited by the well to do. In
Jonason's translation, these place names are transferred into Swedish without guidance. It is unlikely that transference will work in this instance, since few Swedes are likely to know the connotations associated with the place names. An actor may be able to hint at their significance (body language, tone of voice or mimicry) but it may be helpful to indicate what the Savoy, the Caprice and Eaton Square (and the Ritz Bar later in the play) are and what they stand for in order that actors and directors can make that clear to the audience. An endnote may be added to the manuscript, explaining the connotations of sophistication associated with the place names. Other place names in _The Homecoming_ such as "the Scrubs" (Pinter Plays 1978: 83) and "Greek Street" (ibid. 88) are also transferred into Swedish. Again, this seems unfortunate because it is unlikely that Swedes would know what The Scrubs is and where Greek Street is located. The Scrubs is the informal name for Wormwood Scrubs (a prison) whereas Greek Street is located in Soho, "the red light district" in London. In Swedish, the translator must make the significance of the Scrubs and Greek Street clear to the audience. _The Scrubs_ may be translated as _fängelset_ (prison) and _Greek Street_ may be translated as _vilken gata skall hon jobba på?_ (Which street should she work?) in the expression "Where are you going to put her in Greek Street", the latter translation alluding to the Swedish expression _gå på gatan_ meaning "walk the street".

**Example 41**

LENNY: [... ] Her chauffeur, who had located me for her, he'd popped round the corner to have a drink, which just left this lady and myself, you see, alone, standing underneath this arch, watching all the steamers steaming up, no one about, _all quiet on the Western Front_, and there she was up against the wall - well, just sliding down the wall, following the blow I had just given her. [...].

(Pinter Plays 1978: 47)
LENNY: [...] Hennes chaufför, som hade spårat opp mig åt’na, han hade stickit runt hörnen för att få sig ett glas, så vi var ensamma, damen och jag, där vi stod under valvet och såg hur alla ångbåtarna angade opp - inte enmanska i närheten, _allt lugnt på västfronten_, och hon stod där mot muren, ja, höll just på att glida ner ute efter muren efter smockan som hon hade fått. [...].

("All Quiet on the Western Front" (1929) is the title of a book by German-born, American novelist Erich Maria Remarque. It is novel about the First World War. In the TT above, the title was in this case translated into Swedish as _allt lugnt på västfronten_, a literal translation of the ST title. Since there is a Swedish title for Remarque’s novel, it should be used. Moreover, since the book is often read or discussed in Swedish schools, the Swedish title is likely to be recognised. As a result, the Swedish title _På västfronten intet nytt_ is the appropriate translation option.

4.4.3 _No Man’s Land_

_No Man’s Land_ (NML) seems to be a play containing many cultural FFs. The language is elegant and the tone of the dialogue is often parodic. Scholars who have pointed to the parodic tone of the play are Michael Billington (1996: 248-249) and Elin Diamond (1985: 159, 180, 185, 190-191). In _NML_, Pinter appears to be imitating styles, drawing on passages from earlier literature and English history. In support of this impression, Billington has claimed that _NML_ is full of echoes of T.S. Eliot (1996: 242) and he has also stated that _NML_’s obvious ancestor is _Endgame_ by Beckett (1996: 246). In addition, Diamond has called _NML_ a “writer-filled creation” (1985: 180) and pointed to influence from Beckett and Eliot as well as Emily Dickinson and Marlowe (1985: 191-192). Billington and Diamond also state that the first-night critics in 1975 commented on echoes of Becket and Eliot as well as Emily Dickinson, Shakespeare and Keats (1996: 251; 1985: 180). Both Billington and Diamond claim that many echoes from “The
Love Song of Alfred J. Prufrock" by T.S. Eliot can be found in NML. Billington also mentions a passage influenced by Coward (1996: 249) and Diamond observes a Wildean influence (1985: 184). With regard to history, some passages seem based on people and events from the Elizabethan, Victorian and Edwardian eras. Indeed, many passages in NML appear familiar, although research has proved it difficult to discover the origin of some of these passages. Diamond states that the extra-textual references in NML are more personal than in Pinter’s previous plays (1985: 180). This could be one reason why it seems more difficult to identify FE s in NML than in Pinter’s earlier plays. To clarify: the great majority of FE s of The Birthday Party indirectly refer to historical events, that is they are historical facts, which constitute general knowledge. The FE s in NML, however, are mainly references to different poems or plays, the knowledge of which depends on personal experience and taste, that is they are based on more personal knowledge. As a result, it may be more difficult to identify FE s in NML than in The Birthday Party. On the subject of familiarity, in 1975 John Peter of the Sunday Times stated the following about NML; the play is haunting because “it speaks of, and speaks to, the unconscious” (Billington 1996: 245). Peter’s statement could be interpreted to mean that NML appears familiar to audiences although they cannot always explain why. Diamond’s (personal references) and Peter’s (the unconscious) comments seem to support the impression that although there are many FE s in NML, it is not always possible to state their origins. However, the familiarity experienced seems to make audiences feel at home, or it speaks to the unconscious as Peter put it, and this may account for the fact that audiences have often left performances of NML pleased, although they feel that they have not understood what the play was about. In his autobiography An Actor and His Time, Sir John Gielgud commented that people who came and talked to him backstage about NML had said that they loved the play but they had also asked him what the play was all about (1981: 168).

Although Pinter seems to scatter cultural FE s, especially literary references, throughout NML (Diamond 1985: 182), it is not always possible to state, with certainty, that a phrase is an FE when a source has not been found. The decision to view phrases or lines in NML as FE s are based on the following facts:
- The subject matter is of an era other than Pinter's: maidens, virginity, purity etc.
- Pinter is unlikely to have experienced what he describes.
- Archaic or stilted language may indicate that a passage has been borrowed. It may be individual words such as "maiden" and "chevalier" or a parodic or flippant tone etc.
- The use of rhetorical or poetic devices which depart from everyday conversation are assumed to have been included for a reason. It seems that these devices often signal FEs. Repetition in the extreme is one such device.
- Lines and phrases that seem out of context suggest that a phrase could be an FE.

In the words of Elin Diamond, *NML* contains many references to "the works of other word artists" which makes "literary parody accessible to our ears" (1985: 180). If these literary references (or FEs) are not understood by the audience, the play is likely to become obscure. The audience's puzzlement in 1975, as described above, may partly have been caused by the unfamiliarity with the FEs in this play. However, although the audience did not understand the play they still enjoyed it. Could this be so not only because *NML* speaks to the unconscious but also because the obscurity or elusiveness fascinates people? Is the elusiveness of *NML* part of the attraction of the play? In other words, is *NML* meant to be elusive in order to fascinate or intrigue people in the way that enigmas do? Does the elusiveness make the audience think as well as make them puzzle? (FEs constitute one such puzzle) that Pinter has left in the language? It is possible. What seems clear, however, is that translators who are non-native speakers of English and who are not sufficiently bi-cultural to identify the FEs, may jeopardise the interpretation of *NML*, since the misinterpretation of cultural FEs will result in mistranslations, which in turn will obscure the writer's intent.

As mentioned, understanding depends on familiarity with the sources. And whether the audience consists of native or non-native speakers of English, unfamiliarity with the origins of the FEs will result in interpretation problems. A study carried out to assess whether British people (mainly students and lecturers at the University of Surrey) would identify FEs in *The Birthday Party*, *NML* and
Moonlight suggests that few of them knew the origin of the FEs in NML. (For details of the study see Chapter V). As university students and lecturers must be viewed as well-educated, and since these respondents recognised a low percentage of FEs, it can be argued that since NML is generally to be viewed as obscure, less well-educated and intelligent people would be likely to do less well than the respondents in my study. Below is a selection of verified and probable cultural FEs present in NML. The examples will be discussed in order to illustrate how the presence of cultural FEs may make interpretation difficult.

Example 42

*They drink.*

**HIRST:** Tell me ... do you often hang about Jack Straw’s Castle?

**SPOONER:** I knew it as a boy.

**HIRST:** Do you find it as beguiling a public house now as it was in the days of the highwaymen, when it was frequented by highwaymen?

Notably Jack Straw. *The great Jack Straw.* Do you find it much changed?

**SPOONER:** It changed my life.

**HIRST:** Good Lord did it really?

(Pinter 1975: 13)

*De dricker.*

**HIRST:** Såg mig ... håller ni ofta till på Jack Straw’s Castle, puben?

**SPOONER:** Jag kände till den redan som pojke.

**HIRST:** Tycker ni att den är lika lockande nu som på stråtrövarnas tid, då den frekventerades av stråtrövare? I synnerhet Jack Straw. *Den store Jack Straw.* Tycker ni den har förändrats mycket?

**SPOONER:** Den förändrade mitt liv.

**HIRST:** Gode gud. Det menar ni inte? (Lång 1975:12)
"Jack Straw's Castle" is the name of a pub. "[T]he great Jack Straw" is likely to be a reference to one of the leaders of the well known Peasant's Revolt of 1381 (Jack Straw was killed during the revolt). In other words the phrase is a cultural FF. As Pinter refers to the rebel "Jack Straw" as "great" it seems that Pinter sides with the underdog. It may therefore be argued that Pinter indirectly questions authority and supports the actions of the individual. If there are other anti-authoritarian FFs in the play, one of its themes may be "man against society". However, it may also be that Pinter makes a playful digression in the dialogue because of the dual reference to "Jack Straw"; and those who understand the reference may smile in recognition whereas those who are unfamiliar with the rebel may wonder what Pinter is referring to. If that is the case, the FF is another instance of insiderism. "The great Jack Straw" is translated literally into Swedish as Den store Jack Straw. It is doubtful whether anybody in Sweden would understand such a literal translation. Added guidance would probably give the audience a better chance to understand the significance of the reference. Therefore, Den store rebellen Jack Straw might work, the added guidance being "rebel".

Example 43

SPOONER: I have gone too far, you think?
HIRST: I'm expecting you to go very much further.
SPOONER: Really? That doesn't mean that I interest you, I hope?
HIRST: Not in the least.
SPOONER: Thank goodness for that. For a moment my heart sank. [...] But nevertheless you're right. Your instinct is sound. I could go further. in more ways than one. I could advance, reserve my defences, throw on a substitute, call up the cavalry, embody in essence Von Kleist's retreat from the Caucasus (the wittiest and most subtle systematic withdrawal known to man) or throw everything forward out of the knowledge that when joy overfloweth there can be no holding of joy. The point I'm trying to make, in case you've missed it, is that I am a free man. (Pinter 1975: 10)
SPOONER: Har jag gått för långt, tycker ni?

HIRST: Jag väntar mig att ni kommer att gå oerhört mycket längre.

SPOONER: Verkligen? Detta innebär väl inte att jag intresserar er, hoppas jag.

HIRST: Inte det minsta.


(Lång 1975: 8-9)

Poland was invaded by Germany in 1942. Von Kleist was in charge of the operation. However, the Germans soon had to retreat to the Caucasus where Von Kleist’s army narrowly escaped encirclement. Spooner may be comparing Von Kleist with himself, saying that although he (Spooner) is poor and unsuccessful, he will find a solution to his problems. The cultural FEs such as “call up the cavalry” (military reference) and the reference to sport (throw on a substitute) seem to constitute an indirect message to Hirst: “I may be poor but there are many options open to me and I decide what I want to do, nobody else”. In the translation the proper name Von Kleist has been kept. Retaining the name works because it does not seem to be of importance to the interpretation of the passage or to the play as a whole. However, the use of the name Von Kleist may be considered an insiderism and it may be that Pinter used it in order to convey his interest in the Second World War. The references to sport and the military are kept in translation since there are equivalent expressions in Swedish. The extract also includes “when joy overfloweth there can be no holding of joy”. Archaic language such as “overfloweth” is often an indication of an FE and may be in this instance. The line resembles the language of the Bible, for example, where phrases such as “A feast is made for laughter, and wine maketh merry: but money answereth all things.”
(King James Bible: Ecclesiastes 10:19) where the archaic ending -th is common. However, it may also be that Pinter is imitating the language of the Bible. Moreover, he may have borrowed the phrase from another literary work. It has been difficult to establish what exactly Pinter has done and what he intended, since it has not been possible to locate a source. Locating the source may be difficult because Pinter has modified the original text. A close translation must be considered adequate because it is difficult to know what Pinter intended. The Swedish translation is close. However, the archaic flair of the passage as a whole must be retained since style seems to be important to the play. This aspect of the original is not reflected in the translation.

Example 44

SPOONER: [...] "Pause.

Do forgive me my candour. It is not method but madness. So you won't, I hope, object if I take out my prayer beads and my prayer mat and salute what I take to be your impotence?"

He stands.

(Pinter 1975: 27)

SPOONER: [...] "Paus."

För låt min frispråkighet. Den är inte metod bara galenskap. Så ni kommer inte invända, hoppas jag, om jag tar fram mitt radband och min bönenmatta och hyllar vad jag antar är er impotens.

Han reser sig.

(Lång 1975: 25)
The language above seems formal in the extreme: who would say that he is going to "take out [his] prayer beads and [his] prayer mat and salute ... [somebody's] impotence" for example? Moreover, the tone seems overly solemn and flippant, making the line seem very different from everyday conversation. In particular, Spooner's way of speaking implies arrogance and indifference, much like characters in plays by Oscar Wilde. Since the language comes across as a pose, it is likely that defamiliarization occurs, that is the audience gets the impression that the language is affected. Audiences may also get the impression that they have heard some of the phrases before, although they may not be able to identify any sources. Is the passage a pastiche (an imitation) of the type of language found in plays by Oscar Wilde and Noel Coward as mentioned above? In addition, since many critics claim that NML is rife with literary references, the line may seem familiar because Pinter has included phrases from other sources. There is one clear example of an MOD (inversion): "it is not method but madness". The phrase is borrowed from Hamlet: it is a line of Polonius' "Though this be madness, yet there is method in't" (Hamlet Act II, Scene 2). However, it should also be pointed out that nowadays the phrase "there's method in one's madness" is also an expression with the meaning "there is a sensible foundation for what seems to be foolish or strange behaviour" (The Oxford Dictionary of English 1998). The translator must have been unaware that there is an MOD in this extract since he translated it literally. The literal translation sounds very clumsy in Swedish. A freer translation may be an option, because it would sound more natural. However, if the MOD in NML is meant to be a literary reference, it may be translated into Swedish through the use of a modified version of the line in the authorised translation of Shakespeare's works translated by Hagberg reading "Fastän detta är galenskap, så är det likväl metod deri". Whatever the translation option, it is doubtful whether Swedes would identify the phrase as a slant on the line from Hamlet, but nevertheless, they should be given the chance to make the connection. As a result, translation loss seems inevitable.

As pointed out, Pinter is an avid cricket fan and cricket vocabulary is common in his plays; a case in point is Spooner's second line below (in italics):

"..."
Example 45

SPOONER: Tell me about your wife.
HIRST: What wife?
SPOONER: How beautiful she was, how tender and how true. I tell you with what speed she swung in the air, with what velocity she came off the wicket, whether she was responsive to finger spin, whether you could bowl a shooter with her, or an offbreak with a legbreak action. In other words, did she google?

Silence.

You will not say. I will tell you then ... that my wife ... had everything. Eyes, a mouth, hair, teeth, buttocks, breasts, absolutely everything. And legs.

(Pinter 1975: 23)

SPOONER: Berätta då om er fru.
HIRST: Vilken fru?
SPOONER: Hur vacker hon var, hur öm och hur sann. När ni spelade cricket?

Berätta om hur fort hon fick in schvungen, hur snabbt hon klarade grinden, ifall hon kunde ta emor en skruv, ifall ni kunde kasta en långboll på henne, eller en vänsterstuss med benstoppning? Med andra ord, klarade hon en lyra?

Tystnad.

Ni vill inte säga det. Då skall jag tala om för er ... att min fru ... hade alltt. Ögon, mun, här, tänder, lår, bröstad, alltt. Och ben.

(Lång 1975: 20)
In the italicised line above, Spooner talks about a woman as if she were a cricket ball. The line also contains sexual innuendo. Some of the cricket terms are "wicket", "finger spin", "bowl", "offbreak" and "legbreak". The translator picked up on the cricket terminology, but the translation does not suggest any sexual innuendo. Instead, in Swedish, Spooner asks Hirst questions about how his wife coped with different aspects of playing cricket such as *kunde hon ta emot skruv* that is "could she cope with spin?" rather than "was she responsive to finger spin", which is ambiguous, meaning how she responded to his touch. Sigbrit and C-O Lång opted for a free translation, perhaps because the translator was not familiar enough with cricket. Evidence of unfamiliarity with cricket are evidenced by mistranslations of cricket terminology such as "wicket" and "google". If the translators had been familiar with cricket, or carried out enough research, the translation could have been closer and more accurate.

Example 46

BRIGGS: The financial adviser didn’t turn up. You can have his breakfast. He phoned his order through, then phoned again to cancel the appointment.

SPOONER: For what reason?

BRIGGS: Jack spoke to him, not me.

SPOONER: What reason did he give your friend?

BRIGGS: Jack said he found himself without warning in the centre of a vast aboriginal financial calamity.

*Pause.*

(Pinter 1975: 60)


SPOONER: Av vilken anledning?

BRIGGS: Jack talade med honom, inte jag.
SPOONER: Vilken anledning uppgav han för er vän?

BRIGGS: Jack sa att han sa att han utan förvarning hade hamnat med omfattande ekonomiska svårigheter av elementaraste slag.

Paus.

(Lång 1975: 50-51)

The phrase "in the centre of a vast aboriginal financial calamity" is, according to Michael Billington, "Pinter’s favourite Cardinal Newman phrase" (1996: 249).

Cardinal John Henry Newman was a British theologian who lived in the 19th century. He was also an Oxonian. Pinter’s line is not an exact quote, but a MOD (extension). The original line reads "And so I argue about the world:—if there be a God. since there is a God, the human race is implicated in some terrible aboriginal calamity. It is out of joint with the purposes of its Creator." (1885: 242)

and the line is from Apologia, which was written by Cardinal Newman in 1885. It is difficult to know why Pinter chose to include an MOD of a phrase by Cardinal Newman. It may be an instance of insiderism. Pinter may also admire the Cardinal and his works or he may simply like the expression. After all, it seems to be a favourite expression of Pinter’s. The MOD, with its additions, fits the context (finances) and it may be an example of Pinter having fun with language. Pinter may have gone for word play. Turning to translation, it is doubtful that Swedes would either identify the phrase as an MOD or know its source. As a result, a fairly close translation may be the best solution. The freer translation reading omfattade ekonomiska svårigheter av elementaraste slag above meaning "in vast economic difficulties of the most elementary nature" will alter the meaning as well as obscure the source. Neither seems advisable. However, some translation loss seems inevitable due to the fact that the vast majority of Swedes are unfamiliar with the source of the FE.

Example 47

SPOONER: [...] Let me live with you and be your secretary.
HIRST: Is there a big fly in here? I hear buzzing.
SPOONER: No.
HIRST: You say no.
SPOONER: Yes.

Pause.

(Pinter 1975: 101)

SPOONER: Låt mig få bo hos er och vara er sekreterare.
HIRST: År det en stor fluga här inne? Jag hör något som surrar.
SPOONER: Nej.
HIRST: Ni säger nej.
SPOONER: Ja.

Pause.

(Lång 1975: 84)

Elin Diamond is of the opinion that the italicised phrase above is a modification of Emily Dickinson’s poem “I heard a fly buzzing when I died” (1985: 192). Her interpretation is possible, partly because the line seems out of context, which can often signal MODs and FEs, and partly because Hirst, as an acclaimed poet, is likely to know a fair amount of poetry himself including the poetry of Dickinson. Moreover, the fact that the line is said indoors makes the comment about flies out of place, because it is unlikely that any fly would be present in this mausoleum of a house where Hirst lives. The MOD may also be intended as a slight insult (the 2002 production of A. Vl at the National Theatre with Pinter as its director seemed to suggest such an interpretation) where Hirst compares Spooner to a buzzing fly or put differently “a talkative irritation”. If the italicised phrase is a MOD, it is unlikely that many Swedes would recognise the reference in translation into Swedish whether translated literally or with the line from the authorised Swedish translation of Dickinson’s poems, because few people in Sweden are sufficiently familiar with her poetry. As a result, some translation loss seems inevitable. However, it is important to transfer the haughty tone of the passage in order to preserve the possible slight to Spooner.
Example 48

SPOONER: [...] My sword shall be ready to dissever all manifest embodiments of malign forces that conspire to your ruin. I shall regard [...] I will accept death’s challenge on your behalf. I shall meet it for your sake, boldly, whether it be in the field or in the bedchamber. I am your Chevalier. [...] by domestic enemy or foreign foe. I am yours to command.

Silence.

(Pinter 1975: 103)


Tystnad.

(Lång 1975: 86)

The solemn tone, the archaic words (shall, Chevalier) and the subject matter (chivalry) suggest that the origin of this piece is not from contemporary literature, nor is it an example of everyday speech. Instead the tone and the subject matter resemble literature written during periods such as the Middle Ages or the Elizabethan era, although the language would have been more archaic had it been written in those days. Indeed, it has been suggested that Pinter, in this passage, parodies “Marlowe’s passionate shepherd” (Diamond 1985: 191). If that is the case, it seems that the passage is an MOD, that is a pastiche or an imitation of Marlowe’s style. However, it is also possible that Pinter is doing a pseudo-parody on the knightly oath. In a solemn and possibly parodic tone, Spooner seems to be saying that, as Hirst’s secretary, he would be Hirst’s humble servant. The reason for Spooner’s solemn tone and poetic language might be explained by the fact that
he is a poet. After all, as Billington has put it, Spooner seems to have an aura of Fitzrovia - the London literary quarter in the 1940's and 1950's - about him (1996: 247). However, since the reader also knows that, earlier in the play, Spooner has admitted that he knew that Hirst once had an affair with his wife, it seems unlikely that Spooner would want to speak to Hirst in a respectful way. From this perspective, it seems unlikely that they are friends, or that Spooner would want to regard himself as Hirst's servant.

Another aspect of NML which may be relevant to the interpretation of the above excerpt is the fact that the characters seem to fabricate past memories when it suits them. As a result, it is difficult to know what is true and what is not. For example, Billington suggests that the scene where Hirst suddenly addresses Spooner as Charles and talks to him as if he was a long lost friend from their days at Oxford, is "cod-Coward banter" (1996: 249). Diamond refers to the passage as Pinter's parody of the "old-school reminiscence" (1985: 190). Swedish critics also commented on echoes of Coward in 1976. If much of NML is parodic banter, name-dropping and fabrication, then it is possible that facts are not always to be understood as true: Spooner may never have been married for instance and his speech above may simply be an exercise in a game called "Do you get the reference?"

The elaborate, lengthy line (of which only a fraction is quoted above) and its seemingly parodic tone, may also suggest that Pinter intends for the passage to have another meaning than the one expressed. Spooner's parodic and solemn tone above may be ironic, a mask to hide behind, should he receive an answer that he does not want. Spooner might also be mocking Hirst by using irony. In addition, it is possible that some lines from literature that Pinter has read come to mind as he is writing and that Pinter uses these phrases in order to illustrate what his interests are. However, Pinter's real intentions only he himself knows. The translation of this passage into Swedish is literal in meaning. A close translation seems appropriate, provided that the tone and style of the piece are retained. In Söhnri and C-O Lång's translation however, the tone has changed; the language is more ordinary. Moreover, in the translation, content has taken precedence over style and rhythm, making the rhythm less "smooth". Bearing in mind the clues embedded in
the passage, that is the tone, the archaic words and the subject matter, the translator should understand what Pinter is referring to. However, since the translators have disregarded tone and style, it is likely that they neither found the source of the FE nor considered it an imitation or a reference, that is they may not have understood the clues, and this could explain why the translators focused on content.

Example 49

HIRST grips the cabinet rigid.

SPOONER: [...] You have a long hike, my lad, up which, presently you slog unfriended. Let me perhaps be your boatman. For if and when we talk of a river we talk of a deep and dank architecture. In other words, never disdain a helping hand, especially one with such rare quality. [...] Think before you speak. For this proposition, after thought, will I assure you be seen as carte blanche, open sesame and worthy the tender. [...]  

(Pinter 1975: 28)

HIRST griper tag i skåpet, stel.

SPOONER: [...] Ni har en lång fjärd framför er, kamrat, snart strekar ni utan vänner. Låt mig kanske bli er roddare. För om och när vi talar om en flod talar vi om djup och fuktig byggnad. Med andra ord, förstma aldrig en hjälpare hand, särskilt inte en av så sällsynt talang. [...] Tank innan ni säger något. För vid eftertanke kommer detta förslag, det försäkrar jag er, att visa sig vara ett carte blanche, ett sesame öppna dig och vårdigt anbudsgivaren. [...]  

(Lang 1975: 23-24)
This passage seems to contain preformed or stylised language. Expressions such as “never disdain a helping hand” and “Think before you speak” sound like proverbs. The solemn, formal and perhaps parodic tone (Let me perhaps be your boatman) enhances the impression that this is no ordinary dialogue. Moreover, the excerpt resembles written rather than spoken language. There are unusual words (boatman) and the passage comes across as a collage of cliches or set expressions including “Carte blanche” and possibly “worthy the tender,” and a literary reference (open sesame), which first occurred in the story of “Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves”. Finally, the subject matter does not seem contemporary: What is a boatman and why is he needed? Prior to this line, no boatman has been mentioned in the play so the line seems out of context. Moreover, who would talk of a boatman in this manner? The boatman may be a classical reference to the Aeneid by Roman writer Virgil. In Greek mythology, Charon is a ferryman who transports people’s souls to Elysium, and Elysium is “the home of the blessed after death” (Microsoft Encarta 2000). Michael Billington is also of the opinion that “the boatman” is a reference to the Aeneid (1996: 247). Billington partly bases his interpretation on the fact that he thinks that Hirst picks up on Spooner’s reference to Charon by talking about “village maidens” (1996: 247), the type of deserving people that Charon would take to Elysium.

Pinter put much information into this passage by using few words. Rather than writing a long speech, information is accumulated through different FEs with very different associations. What are Pinter’s reasons for using FEs here? It is difficult to say. He may use FEs in order to exclude those who do not understand the FEs while embracing those who do identify them, thus creating insiderisms. It may also be a case of the underdog (Pinter) trying to outwit his peers (intellectuals and the Literary Establishment). In order to reflect the original, Mr and Mrs Lang’s translation is formal when it can be, and archaic language is used when appropriate. Furthermore, the translation is as close to the original as it can be, and some Swedish FEs are used. However, the rhythm, flair and tone of the passage seem lost in translation. Moreover, “my lad” is translated as “comrade” into Swedish, with unfortunate associations with Communism, unlikely to have been intended by Pinter. The choice of “comrade” also seems wrong because Spooner’s use of the expression seems ironic or parodic which it does not appear to be in the
translation. In addition, "the boatman" is translated as "an oarsman" which seems inappropriate because its connotations are unclear. However, since it seems as if the translators have translated content rather than style, and since they seem to have misunderstood or underestimated the importance of cultural FE's in *NMIL*, it may be that, on the micro level, Lång's translation was based on guesswork rather than fact. This is not an acceptable translation method, since the translation of a passage on the micro level should be based upon an understanding of the text as a whole. If the translator takes a stand with regard to the interpretation of *NMIL* on the macro level, the translation choices made on the micro level can be justified. However, if a translator does not take such a stand, the interpretation as well as the resulting translation will seem to be based on guesswork.

Example 50

HIRST: In the village church, the beams are hung with garlands, in honour of young women of the parish, reputed to have died virgin.

*Pause*

However, the garlands are not bestowed on maidens only, but all who die unmarried, wearing the white flower of a blameless life.

*Pause*

SPOONER: You mean that not only young women of the parish but also young men are so honoured?

HIRST: I do.

SPOONER: And that old men of the parish who also died maiden are so garlanded?

HIRST: Certainly.

SPOONER: I am enraptured. Tell me more. Tell me more about the quaint little perversions of your life and times. Tell me more [...] Tell me more.
Pause

(Pinter 1975: 22-23)

HIRST: I bykrykan behånger man takets tvåvärva med blomsterkransar till åra för unga kvinnor i församlingen, med rykte om sig att ha dött som jungfrur.

Paus.

Emellertid, blomsterkransarna tillägnas inte bara ungmör, utan alla som dör ogifta, som bär den oförbitliga levnadens vita blomma.

Paus.

SPOONER: Menar ni att inte bara unga kvinnor i församlingen utan också män i församlingen hedras så?

HIRST: Det gör jag.

SPOONER: Och att gamla män i församlingen som också dör som oskulder bekransas så?

HIRST: Visst.


Paus.

(Lång 1975: 19-20)

The reasons why this passage may be a cultural FE or contains one or several FEs are:

archaic custom.
2) The subject matter (virginity) is neither contemporary nor topical.

3) The subjects appear unexpectedly in the play.

4) The link with Charon as discussed (Example 47 above), suggests that this passage may be an FEs.

People do not refer to women as "maidens" any more. In the Victorian or the Elizabethan era, however, women were referred to as "maidens" and virginity was important. What is the significance of maidens or virginity in NML? The subject matter seems to have little or nothing to do with what Spooner and Hirst have been discussing up to this point in the play. As suggested by Billington, it may be that Hirst simply picked up on Spooner's reference to Charon, and by digressing further, Hirst may be indicating that he got the literary reference and that he has not been outsmarted by Spooner. It is difficult to know exactly how to translate this passage since its interpretation is uncertain because the playwright's intentions are not clear. If the translator identifies the link between Charon and maidens, s/he may first choose the relevant line to "Let me perhaps be your boatman" in the Swedish translation of the Aeneid in Example 47 above, and then continue with a close translation of Example 48. However, if the translator does not identify any FEs, a literal or close translation seems the only option, since a freer translation is likely to rule out the possible link to Charon. In conclusion, when translating the passage literally or closely, the translator needs to retain the tone and formality of the language as well as retaining the repetitions.

Prufrockian Echoes

As mentioned above, many scholars and theatre critics such as Billington, Esslin, Diamond, and a few Swedish theatre critics have pointed out that T.S. Eliot has influenced Pinter's writing. In NML, Eliot's influence seems particularly strong. Diamond claims that "Echoes of Prufrock" occurs four times in Spooner's speech" (1985: 182) and Billington states that "Spooner speaks in [...] consciously Prufrockian phrases" (1996: 247). In addition, Diamond holds that the "interplay between two texts" (1985: 182), that is NML and "The Love Song of Alfred J. Prufrock"), which occurs in NML is "an
explicitly literary-textual moment" (ibid.) which, if identified, makes the audience laugh. But the interplay is not only textual, because like Prufrock, Spooner "dons an ironic mask to hide his terror" (1985: 184) and Pinter's way of writing resembles Eliot's style (1985: 182). Diamond further states that the line "It's good to sleep in the afternoon" (NML 1975: 42) is a quote from "Prufrock" (1985: 195), but research has shown that it is not a quote but possibly a paraphrase (Eliot 1917: line 75). Diamond further claims that the line "I have known this before" in Pinter is a paraphrase of "For I have known them all already - known them all", borrowed from "Prufrock" (Eliot 1917: lines 49, 55, 62). Below is one such paraphrase (Example 49) from NML. The paraphrase occurs four times with minor changes (Pinter 1975: 61), and there is another passage (Example 50), which seems to be an Eliot pastiche (Diamond 1985: 187).

Example 51

The paraphrase:

SPOONER: I have known this before. The door unlocked. The entrance of a stranger. The offer of alms. The shark in the harbour.

Silence.

(Pinter 1975: 61)


Tystnad.

(Lång 1975: 51)

Example 52

SPOONER: Remember this. You've lost your wife of hazel hue, you've lost her a tillifola tillifola tillifoladi-foladi-foloo
Apart from the fact that Billington and Diamond have pointed to specific echoes of Eliot in *NML*, there are other aspects of the two examples which may indicate that the lines are FE: First, the two passages do not resemble everyday conversations. Second, the paraphrase seems odd when it occurs in the play because it seems out of context, whereas the pastiche seems odd because of its even rhythm, because it rhymes like a poem. Third, the impression that the paraphrase is odd is strengthened as the play continues because the paraphrase occurs another three times, each time without fitting into its context. As regards the pastiche, two features stand out: the rhythm and the poetic devices. These features suggest that this line is not to be considered as actual dialogue, particularly since the last line seems unnecessarily elaborate. After *NML* premiered in Sweden in 1976, one Swedish critic, Bengt Jahnson, *(DN, 24 Jan 1976)* pointed out that it would be difficult to transpose *NML* into Swedish because of T.S. Eliot’s influence on the play. This critic viewed *The Waste Land* by Eliot as the main influence. Unless discussed and emphasised in the performance programme, Bengt Jahnson did not think that Eliot’s language would work in Swedish because Swedes are not used to his way of writing, nor did he think that Swedes were sufficiently familiar with Eliot’s works in order to identify Eliot’s influence on *NML*. Both points are valid. It seems that some translation loss will therefore have to be accepted. However, a close translation would reflect Pinter’s style as well as his imitations of style, and may also evoke - through back translation (translating a phrase from the TL back into the SL) - Eliot for those members in the audience familiar with his works. A free translation would be less likely to achieve the same goal and should therefore be rejected as an option.
Possible cultural FEs

As discussed, the language of NML is elegant. It has also been mentioned that the language of the play seems flippant. The style may, as a result, remind the audience of characters in plays by Oscar Wilde or Noel Coward. Indeed, Swedish critics J. W. Donner of Svenska Dagbladet Snällposten (29 Feb. 1976) and Bengt Johansson of Dagens Nyheter (24 Jan. 1976) remarked that the characters spoke like characters from plays by Wilde and Coward when the play was performed in Sweden in 1976. Here is an example of “flippant” dialogue:

Example 53

SPOONER: What he said ... all those years ago ... is neither here nor there. It was not what he said but possibly the way he sat which has remained with me all my life and has, I am quite sure, made me what I am.

(Pinter 1975: 16)

SPOONER: Vad han sa ... för alla dessa år sedan ... spelar ingen roll. Det var inte vad han sa men kanske hans sätt att sitta som i hela mitt liv levtt kvar hos mig och, det är jag helt säker på, gjort mig till vad jag är.

(Lång 1975: 14-15)

In plays by Wilde and Coward, it is how a person speaks, not what s/he says that matters. Apart from the fact that Oscar Wilde’s plays include dandies, to whom style and appearance is everything, Wilde himself was a dandy and witticisms were his forte in real life. Coward’s plays also included such characters and he was a wit and something of a snob with camp overtones. In addition, both playwrights were homosexuals, and references to homosexual activities may suggest that NML is a play about homosexual people. Indeed, critics have suggested that Spooner and Hirst are homosexuals.
It appears to be difficult to transfer the wit, the tone and the elegant turn of phrase of *NML* into Swedish, because no well-known Swedish playwright really writes in this manner. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the flippant style is used in the same way in Swedish, since to Swedes content is more important than style. Moreover, in English, accent is often used for characterisation in order to evoke or imitate "the stiff upper lip", the upper classes, the language of the working classes or a camp way of speaking. In Swedish, there is no clear division of social accents in a similar way so it is more difficult to reflect class solely by use of language. Camp language may, however, be transferred into Swedish, but is it possible to evoke Wilde and Coward? Unless they were discussed in the performances programme, it seems so, since some Swedish critics identified influence from Wilde and Coward in 1976. However, few critics did. Moreover, there is no endnote in the translation into Swedish suggesting a possible influence from any other writers on *No Man's Land*. Even if translators did identify influence from Wilde or Coward and transferred these influences into Swedish, it is unlikely that Swedish audiences would recognise that influence because few Swedes are sufficiently familiar with the plays by Wilde and Coward in order to identify the similarities. Therefore, some translation loss seems unavoidable.

The Lång translation is literal, but the language is neither formal nor elegant, not even when it could have been (see Lång's translation on page 269 and the one suggested by me on page 271). It may be that the translators either ignored or misread the tone of this passage and translated content rather than style. However, it could also be argued that the translators did not understand the importance of the tone and the formality of the language, which might explain why the language is more ordinary than in the ST.

In order to make the passage above more formal, even elegant, some less formal expressions and words may be substituted for more formal ones. In addition, the rhythm can be made smoother in order to make the language flow more elegantly (italics indicate change):
Example 54

SPOONER: Vad han sa ... för alla dessa år sedan ... har ingen betydelse. Det var inte hans sätt att tala utan möjligens hans sätt att sitta som jag borit med mig i hela mitt liv och det har, det är jag övertygad om, gjort mig till den jag är.

SPOONER: What he said ... all those years ago ... is of no consequence. It was not the way he spoke, but possibly the way he sat which has stayed with me all of my life and it has, I am convinced, made me what I am.

First, my suggested translation above seems more natural than Lång’s (page 269), because it does not include any interference from the ST. Lång’s translation does. The word “what” in “… made me what I am.” at the end is interference from English - gjort mig till vad jag är - when the line should read gjort mig till den jag är (made me the person I am). Second, it is very difficult to translate the “language pose” or tone, which Pinter has given to the characters in the play. I have tried to make the tone more formal and dispassionate by substituting some not so formal phrases in Lång’s translation for more formal ones. Finally, it may be advisable for the translators to add an endnote in order to explain the function of the language style in order that anyone who reads the play may have a better understanding of it.

In the following passage Pinter seems to capture the Victorian or Edwardian era:

Example 55

SPOONER: […] But with windows open to the garden, my wife pouring long glasses of squash, with ice, on a summer evening, young voices occasionally lifted in unaccompanied ballad, young bodies lying in the dying light, my wife moving through the shadows in her long gown, what can ail? I mean who can gainsay us? What quarrel can be
found with what is. au fond, a gesture towards the sustenance and preservation of art, and through art to virtue?

(Pinter 1975: 20)

SPOONER: [...] Men med fönstren öppna mot trädgården. min fru som fyller höga glas med juice. med is, en sommarkväll. unga röster då och då höjda i en oackompanjerad ballad. unga kroppar som ligger i det sinande ljuset. min hustru som rör sig genom skuggorna i sin långa klänning, vad ont i det? Jag menar vem kan förmå oss? Vem kan motsätta sig vad som, djupast. är ett offer åt vidmakthållandet och bevarandet av konsten och därigenom sanningen.

(Lång 1975: 17)

This is not a depiction of contemporary life. Rather, it is likely to remind readers of life in England in the late 19th or early 20th century. The passage evokes the life of the carefree rich of that era. In support of this view, Diamond calls Pinter's depiction above "an Edwardian view of his [Spooner's] country house [...] complete with faded - rose diction (What can ail? I mean who can gainsay us?)" (1985: 186). Once again, Spooner's description of life in the past seems to suggest a longing to live in another era. Whether or not the extract is solely Pinter's creation, it is not possible to be sure of his intentions. If Pinter here tries to evoke the Victorian or the Edwardian era, how may Victorian or Edwardian England be evoked in Swedish? Does "Victorian" or "Edwardian" mean the same thing to an Englishman and a Swede? The translator decided on a literal translation. A literal or close translation seems the only option. unless a source is identified. Even if Pinter is imitating the writing of the Victorian or Edwardian era, a literal or close translation seems the only option. However, an added endnote to enlighten readers as to what Pinter might be doing seems advisable.

Example 56

SPOONER: [...] All we have left is the English language. Can it be salvaged?
Before this passage can be translated, a few aspects of the line need to be looked at. First, who are “we” in this passage? Second, why does “the English language” need to be salvaged? What does Spooner mean? Hirst and Spooner seem to prefer the past to the present. As a result, Spooner may be referring to a time when England was an empire, when the English ruled the world. Today, the USA is the country being emulated in the West. Spooner may be lamenting this fact, emphasising his sorrow by stating that the English language is not even theirs any more, suggesting that American English has taken over. The reason why the “nostalgia interpretation” is likely is the fact that there are many passages in NML, which appear to refer to the past. Apart from the Elizabethan, Victorian and Edwardian eras already mentioned, there are references to the Second World War as well as to the Middle Ages. However, the line may also be an FE, whose source I have not been able to identify. Would non-native speakers be aware of any inferences to be drawn from this line? Perhaps. However, the literal translation into Swedish above does not help the audience understand what the subtext might be. If Lång had added an endnote to his translation, it would have helped the actors and the director understand the subtext. Making the meaning of FEs clear to actors and directors is important since knowledge of their significance may help explain what the play is about, that is these FEs may help clarify the theme of the play. As a result, it is here suggested that interpretation and translation is aided by an endnote.

Example 57

In the following passage, Pinter lets Spooner talk about somebody that he refers to as “a Hungarian émigré, lately retired from Paris” (see italics below). Who is Spooner talking about?
SPOONER: I refer to midsummer night, when I shared a drink with a Hungarian émigré, lately retired from Paris.

HIRST: The same drink?

SPOONER: You’ve guessed, I would imagine, that he was an erstwhile member of the Hungarian aristocracy?

HIRST: I did guess, yes.

(Pinter 1975: 14)


HIRST: Samma glas?

SPOONER: Ingalunda. Ni har väl gissat, kan jag tänka mig, att han var en f.d. medlem av den ungerska aristokratin?

HIRST: Jag gissade faktiskt det, ja.

(Lång 1975: 12-13)

According to Diamond, NML is ripe with “elaborate gamesmanship” (1985: 161). Indeed, many scholars have commented on the fact that Pinter’s characters often play games in his plays – name dropping being one such game. Hirst and Spooner seem to be competing with each other throughout NML. They compete by fabricating facts. It is therefore possible that Spooner has invented an important friend (the Hungarian émigré) in order to impress Hirst, that is “the Hungarian émigré” is an instance of one-upmanship. If it is not one-upmanship, the person alluded to may be a reference to somebody. Pinter may be referring to a person with whom, or a piece of fiction with which, only a few people are familiar. If an FF (insiderism), the reference has not been identified, and can therefore not be explained. What does the translator do if s/he cannot locate the reference or if s/he cannot make sense of the passage? A literal or close translation seems the only option and is what Lång opted for. However, if the translator knows what Pinter is alluding to, s/he may explain the significance of the FF through a note or s/he may translate sense. By discussing the FF above, I have tried to illustrate why it is difficult to translate NML, especially since this type of passage where the reader
suspects the writer is making a reference but does not know its source, abound in
the play.

In addition to the FEs in NML already discussed in this chapter, there are other
phrases in the play which do not seem to make sense. Are they non-sequiturs?
What do the following examples in italics mean for instance?

Example 58

SPOONER: Do I detect a touch of the hostile? Do I detect – with respect – too
many glasses of ale followed by the great malt which wounds. Which wounds?

_Silence._

(Pinter 1975: 26)

SPOONER: Uppdagar jag ett spår av fientlighet? Uppdagar jag – med all
aktning – ett spår av för många glas öl följda av den förmåna malt
som smärtar? Som smärtar?

_Tystnad._

(Lång 1975: 22)

Example 59

FOSTER: Who are you? I thought I'd never make it. What a hike. And not
only that. I'm _defenceless_. _I don't carry a gun in London_. But I'm
not bothered. Once you've done the East you've done it all. [...] Who are you, by the way? What are you drinking?

SPOONER: I'm a friend of his.

FOSTER: You're not typical.

(Pinter 1975: 31)

SPOONER: En vän.

FOSTER: Ni ser inte ut som de brukar.

(Lång 1975: 26)

The contexts in which the italicised phrases above appear do not help explain how they are to be interpreted. The lines seem out of context, as if they were added without much thought. As a result, it is not clear what Pinter is trying to say. It may be that understanding depends on a knowledge of the sources that Pinter draws on. Familiarity with *something* seems vital. The fact is that the seemingly out-of-context remarks exemplified above often result in bewilderment as well as in curiosity as to what Pinter is saying. This type of bewilderment or defamiliarization may captivate audiences. It may lead them to want to solve the puzzle. The solutions to the difficulties in the passages above are not simple. If the translator does not identify an FE, s/he can only try to translate these passages closely or literally. If s/he regards the passages as FEAs since s/he can identify their origins, s/he should look them up, assess the context in which they appear, and then decide what his or her cause of action should be.

A few concluding remarks: the excerpts from *NML* were chosen in order to try to illustrate some of the interpretation and translation difficulties a reader or a translator may encounter in *NML*. As has been emphasised, it is the abundance of allusive language that makes interpretation difficult, especially for non-native speakers of English, since it is unlikely that they are familiar with what Pinter is alluding to, having less cultural knowledge about the UK than a native speaker. As a result, the interpretation would, at least in part, have to rely on guesswork, and the solutions to translation problems would be questionable. My advice to the translator would be to do as much research as possible on the macro level (theme, style, meaning) and then opt for an interpretation on the micro level, never the other way round.
In *Moonlight*, there are many cultural FFs. One of them is “All will be well. And all manner of things shall be well” (Pinter 1993: 6). The line appears in *Little Gidding* by T.S. Eliot, but Eliot is likely to have borrowed it from *Revelations of Divine Love* written by one of the greatest English mystics of all time, Mother Julian of Norwich (1342-1416). The phrase is a cultural FF with religious connotations. Mother Julian wrote the revelations while she was seriously ill (Microsoft Encarta 2000). On the micro level, a literal translation like the one found in the translation into Swedish may be justified since it is likely that most people would interpret the line as meaning “You will be all right”. However, since Andy is dying and Fred is bedridden in the play (they are ill as was Mother Julian) this FF may be a thematic FF. It may emphasise the fact that the play is about dying or death. It may also point to the fact that religion is a comfort. The cultural FF may, therefore, be of importance on the micro level. As a result, it is important to study this cultural FF further in order that the translation better reflects the original. If the FF is a quotation from “Little Gidding” by Eliot, the phrase would be an instance of insiderism, which means that few members in the audience would know the source, but the translation would still have to convey the fact that the phrase is prefabricated or borrowed. According to Lepitalme, one aspect which enhances the identification of an FF is familiarity (1997: 185). If one is not familiar with an FF, deviation in style such as archaic language might help a translator spot an FF. In this case, the use of “shall” instead of “will” might have helped the translator, Kristina Lugn, to identify the FF, but that does not seem to have been the case, because she uses everyday language in translation into Swedish. The deviation in style actually starts at the beginning of the scene when the two brothers greet each other very formally:

**JAKE:** Brother.

**FRED:** Brother

**JAKE:** Min bror.

**FRED:** Min bror.  

(Pinter 1993: 6)

(Lugn 1995: 6)
If Lugn had identified and researched the origin of the FE, Lugn could have set the tone for the scene and transferred the religious connotations by translating "Brother" as *Broder*, a formal, archaic and polysemous word which in Swedish means "brother" or "male sibling" as well as "religous brother" or "man of same faith". If *Revelations of Divine Love* has been translated into Swedish, Lugn could have used the recognised translation of the FE, and even if there is one, she could have added archaic flavour to the FE by using old-fashioned and formal language. Using archaic language, the FE might have been translated as "På det hela taget skola allt bli bra" where "skola bli" are archaic forms for "ska bli" or "kommer att bli" which mean "shall be" and "will be" respectively. The use of such archaic language would better reflect the language of the original. In addition, archaic forms such as "skola bli" in Swedish are likely to make an audience think of the language of the Bible where these archaic forms are common. As a result, on hearing the line, a Swedish audience may think of religion, which would be appropriate since this reference seems to be a religious FE. However, should the FE be a reference to "Little Gidding" by T.S. Eliot (one of Pinter's favourite writers), the translator would have to research the poem in order to find out if Pinter chose the quote for a reason. If the translator does see a connection s/he would have to transfer that connection into Swedish using archaic language and a formal tone in order to reflect the ST and if s/he does not see a connection, the archaic language and the formal tone should still be transferred in order to reflect the original. In addition, if "Little Gidding" has been translated into Swedish, ideally, the Swedish translation of that line could be used in order to make audiences think of Eliot.

**Example 60**

**FRED:** You were writing poems when you were a mere child, isn't that right?

**JAKE:** I was writing poems before I could read.

**FRED:** Listen. I happen to know that you were writing poems before you could speak.

**JAKE:** Listen! I was writing poems before I was born.

**FRED:** So you would say that you were *the real thing*?

**JAKE:** The authentic article.
FRED: Never knowingly undersold.
JAKE: Precisely.

Silence.

(Pinter 1993: 8)

FRED: Du skrev dikter redan som barn, eller hur?
JAKE: Jag skrev dikter innan jag kunde läsa.
JAKE: Vet du vad! Jag skrev dikter innan jag föddes!
FRED: Så man kan hävda att du har den sanna gaven?
JAKE: Jag är en sann poet.
FRED: Och du har aldrig salt ut dig själv?
JAKE: Nej. Aldrig.

Tystnad.

(Lugn 1995: 7-8)

Here, Jake and Fred are trying to outwit one another through the use of illogical nonsense. Pinter is also making use of FEs. “The real thing” conjures up the 1970s slogan for coca-cola “It’s the real thing”. However, “the real thing” is also a linguistic FE meaning “no joke”, “no imitation” and “true love”. In this context “no imitation” seems the most likely meaning. “No imitation” is synonymous to the linguistic FE “the genuine article”. As a result, “The authentic article” above could be considered a modification of that FE. In addition, “Never knowingly undersold” is a slogan, which was first used in 1920 by the John Lewis plc, that is the John Lewis retail stores in the UK. The first four lines of the excerpt were translated literally into Swedish. The literal translation works. When the FEs appear, the translator has opted for free translation. As a result, “you are the real thing?” becomes “you are truly gifted?” which works because there is no way of translating “the Coca-cola slogan” into Swedish. The reason why it is not possible to translate it as it stands is that the locations where it appeared in Sweden, in Swedish cinemas for example, audiences heard the slogan in English. There is no
Swedish translation. And translated, it is unlikely that Swedes would associate the slogan with Coca-cola. As a result, the play on words and possible associations with Coca-cola may have to be forgone. "The authentic article" becomes "I am a true poet" in Swedish, which is an affirmation of the line "... you are truly gifted?". It also works. However, Swedish slogans (FEs) such as aktu vara (genuine article) or its synonym till hundra procent (to a hundred percent), and Absolut (absolutely) could possibly have been used instead, although the connotations would be different. In Swedish, the meaning of aktu vara, till hundra procent and Absolut would be "Swedish" or "no imitation". "Absolut" would have yet another connotation: it would refer to Absolut vodka, a Swedish brand of vodka (see the Swedish FEs used in their context below). The third FE "Never knowingly undersold" which was originally used by the John Lewis plc stores, is used more widely now, and means "a good buy". In Swedish it reads "And you have never sold out yourself" which sounds odd and seems ungrammatical. The translator may have intended the meaning "sold yourself cheap" but that is not really what the FE means. In English, the passage is really a play on words and phrases. The last FE in this passage seems over-translated, probably because the translator was unfamiliar with the slogan, which means that she was unaware that she was dealing with an FE. Lugn could have used prisvard (worth its price), a term often used in the Swedish retail business. In the context of comedy, where word play, ambiguity and innuendo are common, it seems more appropriate to use FEs in Swedish, or the force and pace of the dialogue will be lost. As a result, the FEs in the dialogue could read as follows (the proposed translation into Swedish is followed by a translation of that passage into English):

FRED: Så du menar att du är aktu vara?

JAKE: Absolut.

FRED: Alltid prisvard?

JAKE: Ja. Alltid.

Tystnad.

FRFD: So you mean you're the authentic article?

JAKE: Absolutely.

FRED: Always worth your price?
JAKE: Yes. Always.

_Silence._

Example 61

FRED: The answer is that your father was just a little bit _short of a few krugerrands._

JAKE: He'd _run out of pesetas_ in a pretty spectacular fashion.

FRED: He had, only a few nights before, dropped a packet on the pier at Bognor Regis.

JAKE: Fishing for tiddlers.

FRED: His casino life had long been a lost horizon.

JAKE: The silver pail was empty.

FRED: As was the gold.

JAKE: Nary an emerald.

FRED: Nary a gem.

JAKE: _Gemless in Wall Street._

FRED: _To the bank with fuck-all._ (Pinter 1993: 14-15)

FRED: Därför att din far _hade lite dåligt med stålar._

JAKE: Han _hade blivit av med sina stålar_ på ett ganska uppskynande sätt.

FRED: Några kvällar tidigare hade han tappat en bunt från däcket på Bognor Regis.

JAKE: Där han fiskade småpigg.

FRED: Hans glansdagar på kasinot var ett minne blott.

JAKE: Slut på silvermynten.

FRED: Slut på guldmynten också.

JAKE: Icke en enda smaragd.

FRED: Icke en enda juvel.

JAKE: _Utan byxor på Wall Street._

FRED: _Banken hade tagit hela skiten._ (I ugn 1995: 13-14)
The FEs “short of a few krugerrands” and “run out of pesetas” were discussed earlier in this chapter (for details see Example 26, page 221) and the assessment of the translations were based on their functions on the micro level. On the macro level, it may be of importance to remember the particular currencies Pinter chose: krugerrands and pesetas. Why did Pinter not choose pounds, or dollars, for instance? The choice of foreign currencies may be of some importance because many foreign proper names appear in Moonlight. If the choice of currencies have some significance, Kristina Lugn’s translation (where no currencies appear) of the FEs may have to be re-evaluated and changes suggested to her translation.

Pinter has said that “Gemless in Wall Street – ” and “to the bank with fuck-all” above are slants on “Eyeless in Gaza, to the mill with slaves”, which is a reference from Samson Agonistes by John Milton (Gussow 1994: 124-125). Thus, these lines are MODs (replacement). They are also obtuse since few people are likely to recognize their source. Either, native speakers of English are not sufficiently familiar with the works by Milton in order to spot the MODs, or, the MODs are far-fetched. Perhaps it is a case of both. Therefore, the MODs constitute insiderisms - that is they are understood by only a few people. Pinter may have used such obtuse references because he wants his plays to be obtuse. With regard to translation, it is unlikely that the translator identified these lines as MODs. If she had done so, she would either have indicated their source in for example an endnote or she would have been more faithful to the original and not translated the second part of the reference freely. Moreover, since native speakers of English did not identify this reference (Bergfeldt 1998) it is unlikely that a non-native speaker such as Lugn would. At any rate, Kristina Lugn translated the first MOD literally, and the second one freely. The translations read (English gloss to the right):

(Swedish) (English)

FRED: Icke en enda smaragd. FRED: Nary a single gem.
JAKE: Utan byxor på Wall Street. JAKE: Without trousers in Wall Street.

The literal translation of the first line seems appropriate, although it is not a modified reference to Milton’s poem Samson Agonistes. The use of archaic or
formal language (icke instead of the much more common and contemporary inte) is justified and appropriate because the tone reflects the original. Moreover, the literal translation works because it is unlikely that any Swede would have recognised a reference to Milton had Lugn chosen to use the line as it is translated in the authorised translation of Milton’s work. The creative translation of the second MOD appears to be an over-translation in the sense that the translator has given herself too much freedom. Why did she not translate this line literally as well? What is the translator’s justification for choosing a free translation? Is she trying to be witty? It is possible. The exchange is based on wordplay: “gem” and “gemless”. Could wordplay have been used in Swedish? The answer is probably “no”. Sense could, however, have been translated. The lines would then have been transferred as juveler and utan juveler (“gems” and “without gems”) respectively. Ideally, the way to proceed would be to either find the original translation in Swedish, modify the translation in a similar way that Pinter has, or employ a literal translation. If the translator had spotted the MODs, a literal translation with an endnote explaining the MOD might have been another option.

Example 62

ANDY: [... ] Oh there’s something I forgot to tell you. I bumped into Maria the other day, the day before I was stricken. She invited me back to her flat for a slice of plumduff. I said to her, If you have thighs prepare to bare them now.

BEL: Yes, you always entertained a healthy lust for her.

ANDY: A healthy lust? Do you think so?

BEL: And she for you.

(Pinter 1993: 18)

ANDY: Du, det är en sak jag har glömt att berätta för dig. Jag stötte på Maria häromdagen, dagen innan jag blev sjuk. Hon frågade om jag ville fylla med till hennes lägenhet. Och åta en skiva russinpudding. Och jag sa till henne att om du har några lar så gör dig redo att visa upp dem nu -
"If you have thighs prepare to bare them now" is a MOD. The original FE appears in *Julius Caesar* by Shakespeare and reads "If you have tears prepare to shed them now". The FE is in fact the opening line of *Mark Anthony's* speech against the conspirators who have just assassinated *Julius Caesar*. It is a speech in defence of *Caesar*. Mark Anthony's speech is also an address to the people of Rome. He advises them to rise up against the conspirators. Only Pinter knows the reason why he included this MOD, but he may have done it for any of the following reasons:

- **Humour-wit**: the spectators who recognise the modification will probably smile at Pinter's witticism since the modifications are outrageous.

- **Insiderism-solidarity**: the spectators who recognise the reference to Shakespeare will feel that they are in on the plot, in collusion with the writer.

- **Learning**: Pinter cannot resist showing that he is well-read.

- **Personality**: the MOD may say something about Pinter's personality in the sense that his choice of MODs indicate what impression he would like to give his audience about himself.

- **Theme**: This MOD, together with other MODs in the play, may be clues to the understanding of *Moonlight*.

With regard to the points made above, it is possible that Pinter would like to appeal to part of the audience, to people who recognise the MOD, to establish a kind of solidarity. Moreover, those spectators that can identify the origin of the
MOD may smile at Pinter's disrespectful slant on the original FE, and the effect is emphasised because of the opposites: humour in Pinter's play and tragedy in Shakespeare's. The significance of this particular MOD may also be that, although Pinter, in this instance, is being witty, the context of the original FE is one of death, and death seems to be one of the themes of Moonlight. Also, the MOD may indicate that Andy is nervous, that he uses wit in order to deflect the attention from the real issue, his affair with Maria. The translator does not seem to have identified the line as an MOD, most probably because she was not sufficiently familiar with Shakespeare's play Julius Caesar. In addition, word play is not as widely used in Swedish as it is in English. As a result, it is likely that Kristina Lugn was not looking for witticisms of this kind when she was translating the play. However, it seems that Pinter, through a deviation in grammar, prepared the translator for a MOD: after the comma, the MOD begins with a capital letter rather than a small letter, which would be the correct punctuation (deviation underlined below):

I said to her, If you have thighs prepare to bare them now.

The best translation solution to this cultural MOD could be to obtain the authorised translation of Julius Caesar, find the particular line in question, namely "Om I nu haven tårar, varen redo att gjuta dem" by Hågberg and make the appropriate alterations to it in order that the translation better reflects the ST. It may be argued that very few people in Sweden would recognise the MOD anyway. True, but some would because Shakespeare and his plays are sufficiently well known to some strata of Swedish society and why should they not be given the opportunity to understand the play the way that Pinter might have intended?

Example 63

RALPH: Were you keen on the game of soccer when you were lads, you boys? Probably not. Probably thinking of other things. Kissing girls. Foreign literature. Snooker. [...] Well. There's a place in the world for thinking. I certainly wouldn't argue with that. The
trouble with so much thinking, though, or with that which calls itself thinking, is that it's like farting Annie Laurie down a keyhole. A waste of your time and mine. [...] I've always been a pretty vigorous man myself. I had a seafaring background. I was the captain of a lugger. The bosun's name was Ripper. [...] Mind you I preferred a fruity white wine but you couldn't actually say that in those days.

(Pinter 1993: 27-29)


(Lugn 1995 26-27)

There are a few cultural FEs in this speech by Ralph. Identification once again relies on familiarity. Different groups in society are familiar with different things. Every such group may be viewed as a sub-group. A generation may constitute such a sub-group. For instance, one generation may recognise FEs that another will not. Moreover, men may recognise FEs when women may not while women may identify FEs where men do not see any. In the mid 1950's, "foreign literature" was a euphemism for "adult magazines", probably because most such magazines were imported to Britain from abroad. People of Pinter's generation may pick up on this remark as meaning "adult mags" but would people in their thirties? The translation into Swedish is literal. Did the translator understand the euphemism and did "foreign literature" mean the same thing in Sweden? If the translation did work, the euphemism must have been used in Sweden and a certain
generation will therefore have understood it. If it did not work, another
euphemistic expression may be used.

As pointed out by Leppihalme, there is one aspect of allusions (near-synonym to
FEs) which makes it easier to spot them, namely the presence of proper names
(1997: 185). As a result, it is not surprising that Annie Laurie, above, was
identified as an Fl' by Kristina Lugn. Having identified the Fl, Lugn must have
carried out some research on the name and discovered that Annie Laurie is the title
of a song, and that it is a folk song. The translator then decided that few Swedes
would recognise the title and, therefore, she opted for a less specific translation,
but one that works. The translation reads “a folk song”. Lugn may have used a Fl
name, provided that it has similar connotations as the Fl in the Tl, but in general,
translation scholars seem to consider such a step undesirable, because it eradicates
the foreign flavour, which indicates that the play is a translation.

“I was the captain of a lugger. The bosun’s name was Ripper” is a quotation from
a rugby song called ‘Twas on the Good Ship Venus. It is a song with a great deal
of explicit references to sexual activities. the type of rugby song which men sing
when only men are present. Moreover, it is likely that only men interested in sport
would know it. Hence it is unlikely that any woman would be familiar with this
particular cultural FE or recognise its origin. Since among native speakers of
English, only a particular sub-group would be able to identify the FE, it is unlikely
that any Swede or a woman poet such as Kristina Lugn, would be familiar with it.
Therefore, it is not strange that she did not spot the FE. If it had been spotted by
the translator, she could either have tried to find this rugby song in translation into
Swedish and chosen the equivalent lines in Swedish, or, she could have found
another song of a similar type and chosen lines, which would make listeners
recognise the line as borrowed from a song with explicit references to sexual
activities.

In the past, many people took the view that a man was a homosexual if he had a
glass of fruity wine. This may be the reason why Ralph could not admit to liking
it. Nowadays, this perception has changed since many people enjoy drinking
fruity wine. All the same, the Fl “a fruity wine” seems to be an allusion to
homosexuality. In Swedish, the translation reads "ett fylligt vitt vin" (a full-bodied white wine). It is questionable whether drinking white wine was once considered to be something that only homosexual men did in Sweden. If Swedes used to be suspicious of people drinking white wine for the same reasons as in the UK, the translation works, but if drinking white wine did not have the same connotations, it obviously does not. As a result, some thought has to go into judging what might be used instead. A solution would be to research the language with which Swedes associate homosexuality. If nothing can be found, some translation loss has to be accepted due to cultural differences between Sweden and the UK. In France, however, it is a fact that people drink wine in similar contexts where people in the UK and Sweden drink beer. In France, the FE above can therefore not be translated literally. If possible, another drink associated with the homosexual community in France would have to be found.

The four cultural FEs discussed above illustrate some of the difficulties a translator may come across when translating plays by Pinter between English and Swedish. As was explained, age and gender divide people into different subgroups, which may make FEs into "insiderisms" where understanding depends on familiarity with the sources. Different customs in different countries also cause problems. In the case of Pinter, a translator has to be familiar with a wide range of sources to be able to interpret his plays, and then s/he can translate them into another language. However, it does not seem plausible that one person can be familiar with all the sources that Pinter uses in his plays, especially not a translator from another culture. As a result, with regard to the translation of Pinter's plays, some translation loss appears inevitable.

Example 64

FRED: Let me say this. I knew your father.

JAKE: You did indeed.

FRED: I was close to him.

JAKE: You were indeed.

FRED: Closer to him than you were yourself perhaps.
JAKE: It could be argued so. You were indeed his youngest and most favoured son.

FRED: Precisely. And so let me say this. He was a man, take him for all in all. I shall not look upon his like again.

JAKE: You move me much.

Pause. (Pinter 1993: 60-61)


JAKE: Det gjorde du sannerlig. 

FRED: Jag stod honom nära.

JAKE: Det gjorde du sannerlig. 

FRED: Jag stod honom kanske närmare än du gjorde.

JAKE: Det skulle man kunna hänvisa. Du var hans yngste son, hans älsklingsson.

FRED: Just det. Så låt mig säga detta. Han var på det hela tagen en man vars like jag aldrig kommer att möta.

JAKE: Nu gör du mig rörd.

Paus. (Lugn 1995: 55)

Andy and Bel do not have a good relationship with their sons. Parents and sons never meet in the play for instance. In addition, Andy says that he wants to see his sons before he dies, but he does little else but complain about them. When Bel talks to her sons over the phone, letting them know that their father is dying, they play a game with her, pretending to be strangers working in a launderette (1993: 72-75). Although Fred and Jake ignore their father, they also seem to admire him, love him even. Having such conflicting impressions of their relationship in the play, how is one to know how Fred and Jake really feel about their father? The answer may lie in the uncovering of the meaning of a cultural FF. The quotation in italics above has been borrowed from Hamlet. It is Hamlet’s own words about his dead father. In the scene from which this quotation has been borrowed, Hamlet expresses his love and admiration for his murdered father. By using this quotation, Pinter could be indicating that Jake and Fred feel the same way about their father. In result, the FF seems to underline the fact that Jake and Fred love their father.
The archaic "shall" facilitates the identification of the FF, since it is a deviation from contemporary speech. The translator, however, does not seem to have spotted the FE and translated the line literally. A literal translation does not work because it is unlikely that the line would remind Swedes of Hamlet. Instead, it would be more appropriate to find the authorised translation of Hamlet into Swedish and use the quote as translated by Carl August Hagberg (1814-1864). Hagberg was a professor in Modern Languages at Lund University, Sweden. He was also a writer and a translator, well known for his translations of Shakespeare’s plays into Swedish. Hagberg’s translation of the above passage reads “Det var en man, en man och det i allo. Mitt öga skådar ej hans lik mer” (proxy.www.lysator.liu.se/runeberg/hagberg; Hamlet: Act 3, Scene 2) because if Swedes are at all familiar with Shakespeare they would be familiar with Hagberg’s translation of Shakespeare’s plays. If the translator is of the opinion that the language of Hagberg’s translation is too archaic she may use Britt Hellqvist’s translation of Hamlet where the same line is translated as “Han var en man, en ojämförlig man, och aldrig mer får jag se hans like” (Hellqvist 1967).

Moonlight seems to be a play with religious undercurrents. That is to say, when Jake and Fred talk about their father for example, at times their lines also seem to have a hidden agenda: religion. Pinter cleverly creates a surface meaning as well as a deeper meaning, partly through word play. A case in point would be the following passage where Jake, the older brother, claims he has acquired some capital:

Example 65

FRED: Where did you find it?
JAKE: Divine right.
FRED: Christ.
JAKE: Exactly. (Pinter 1993: 9)

FRED: Var hittade du det?
JAKE: Gud visade mig.
FRED: Här. Gud
In *Moonlight* Jake and Fred appear to be half-brothers. They seem to be half-brothers rather than brothers because of lines such as (Fred talking to Jake) "Oh, your father? Was he the one who was sleeping with your mother?" (Pinter 1993: 9). In addition, Jake says (about their father) that Fred was "his youngest and most favoured son" (1993: 60). The latter line is reminiscent of passages in the Bible where there are sections about favoured sons. Is Pinter here alluding to events in the Bible? Are Jake and Fred loosely based on the biblical characters such as the brothers Jacob and Esau and Isaac and Ishmael? May Pinter be using semi-biblical characters in *Moonlight*?

Example 66

*Lights up in Fred’s room.*

*The phone rings.* JAKE picks it up.

JAKE: Chinese laundry?

BEL: Your father is very ill.

JAKE: Chinese laundry?

Silence.

BEL: Your father is ill.

JAKE: Can I pass you to my colleague?

FRED takes the phone.

FRED: Chinese laundry.

BEL: It doesn’t matter.

(Pinter 1993: 73)
Tvånd.

BEL: Er far är mycket sjuk.

JAKE: Ett ögonblick så ska ni få tala med min kollega –

FRED tar luren.

FRED: Dvärgarnas tvättinrättning.

Paus.

BEL: Det spelar ingen roll. (Lugn 1995: 68)

Research carried out in 1998 suggested that the line “Chinese laundry” was a reference to the radio programme “The Goon Show” starring Peter Sellers, Spike Milligan, Harry Secombe and others (Bergfeldt 1998). It seemed to be a line which these actors often used in their sketches for their radio programmes and may be viewed as a catchphrase. Other suggestions point to the use of the line by the Crazy Gang in the 1930’s. Whoever used the line originally, native speakers of English associate the line with humour. However, “Chinese laundry” is also the name of many launderettes in the UK. It seems next to impossible to translate this line into Swedish without some translation loss. The reference to the Goons will not remain, because few Swedes have ever heard of the Goons and are not familiar with their type of humour. Nor are they familiar with the Crazy Gang. The Swedish translator appears to have over-interpreted “Chinese” in “Chinese Laundry”, linking it with a previous phrase “How high is a Chinaman” (1993: 7) which was translated as “How high is a dwarf” (1995: 7) in the Swedish translation. As a result, the translation reads “Dvärgarnas tvättinrättning” (1995: 68), that is “The Dwarfs’ Laundry” which does not reflect the original. Using a TL name for the launderette might, however, be a solution. “Söders kemtvätt”, which means “Söder’s Launderette” (Söder is a district in Stockholm) could be used because the humour of this dialogue would then not have been distorted by misinterpretation. “Söders kemtvätt” might work provided that the rest of the exchange is translated literally.
4.5 Conclusion

There are many linguistic and cultural FFs and MODs in Pinter's plays *The Birthday Party*, *No Man's Land* and *Moonlight*. Some of the linguistic FFs and MODs have been mistranslated into Swedish, and many cultural FFs and MODs have become enigmas in translation into Swedish. It seems that these linguistic FFs and MODs were mistranslated because the translators were not familiar with the expressions. Cultural FFs and MODs became enigmas in translation either because the translators failed to identify the expressions as FFs or MODs or because they did not help the TT reader understand the expressions by adding guidance or clarifying the meaning of the FE or MOD in the ST. Leppihalme's (1997) suggestion that translators should be made aware that allusions may become enigmas in translations unless translation guidelines are applied is also applicable to cultural FFs and MODs. In this chapter, Leppihalme's (1997) guidelines were applied (although adapted) to the translation of FFs and MODs in five of Pinter's plays. By applying these guidelines, and carrying out research, I have tried to illustrate how cultural FFs and MODs in Pinter's plays do not always have to become enigmatic in translation into Swedish.

As there are many cultural and linguistic FFs in some of Pinter's plays and since Swedish translators have often failed to identify them, in the next chapter, a selection of FFs from Pinter's plays *The Birthday Party*, *The Caretaker*, *The Homecoming*, *No Man's Land* and *Moonlight* will be tested on native speakers of English in order to determine whether they will be able to identify and understand these FFs.
CHAPTER V

Findings of Questionnaire

Background

The research carried out for my MA in Translation suggested that there were many allusions in Moonlight (Bergfeldt 1998). Many of these allusions were formulaic expressions and modifications (jointly referred to as FEs in this chapter), which had been translated inaccurately into Swedish. Further research on the translation of FEs into Swedish in The Birthday Party and No Man's Land and Moonlight (presented in Chapter IV) produced similar results. As discussed in Chapter III, Leppihalme carried out empirical research on the translation of allusions in 1997. Her study showed that Finnish university students of English understood few of the allusions in English texts. In fact, the students seemed to guess their meaning. The translators, Leppihalme discovered, mainly opted for a close or a literal translation of key phrase (KP) allusions and proper name (PN) allusions were usually transferred from the ST to the TT (1997: 102, 197). A close or literal translation, with no guidance to help the TT reader understand the allusions, resulted in these allusions becoming in Leppihalme's terms "culture bumps" or enigmas in translation. With Leppihalme's study in mind, I decided to test whether native speakers of English would have difficulties in identifying and understanding FEs in Moonlight. As a result, a questionnaire was designed for this purpose (Bergfeldt 1998). The findings of the questionnaire indicated that few native speakers did understand and identify FEs. With these findings in mind, it was inferred that if native speakers do not identify and understand FEs, it is even less likely that non-native readers and translators from English will. As a result, a number of FEs in Moonlight may not have been satisfactorily translated into Swedish because they had not been identified or understood by the translators.
The critical reception of Pinter's plays in Britain, the USA, France and Sweden (discussed in Chapter II) was and is often characterised by reactions of bewilderment. Critics, scholars and audiences often find that Pinter's plays are "strange" or difficult to make sense of. They also comment on the language, stating that it is "creative" and that it contains non-sequiturs.

Bearing Leppihalme's (1997) and my research (1998: 2002) in mind, it is possible that the bewilderment that Pinter's plays has produced in critics, audiences and scholars in Britain, the USA, France and Sweden can partially be attributed to the fact that they were unfamiliar with some of the FEs used by Pinter in his plays. As a result, another questionnaire was designed in order to test whether native speakers of English identified and understood a selection of FEs in Pinter's plays *The Birthday Party*, *No Man's Land* and *Moonlight* (see Appendix II for details of the questionnaire).

5.1 The Questionnaire

First, research was carried out on how to design a questionnaire in order that the questionnaire would test for the identification and understanding of cultural and linguistic FEs. Further research was then carried out on the interpretation and presentation of the findings of questionnaires. I then used the 1998 questionnaire in my MA dissertation as a framework for the new questionnaire. The new pilot questionnaire was tested on two informants in order to find ways of improving it. Some alterations were made. Primarily, there was clarification of terminology and the questionnaire was made shorter.

The purpose of the questionnaire was not revealed to the informants because it might have influenced their approach. Also, in order to avoid a biased approach, Harold Pinter's name was not mentioned, nor was the fact that the examples had been taken from plays. However, there was one clue: the questionnaire was divided into three sections, the titles of Pinter's plays *The Birthday Party*, *No Man's Land* and *Moonlight* heading each section. The informants were asked not to spend too much time completing the questionnaire. They were specifically
asked to "go with their instincts" in order that their responses would reflect the situation in which members in the audience would find themselves when hearing FEs spoken on stage; theatre audiences cannot go and look things up or think for too long or they will miss what is happening on the stage. In order to ensure that the informants would not feel insecure if they did not identify a phrase, they were encouraged to indicate their personal interpretation. However, they were also asked to indicate if the phrase that they had recognised was a reference, an allusion, an idiom, a slogan or a set expression. In addition, the guidelines indicated that lines and phrases in the questionnaire could have been borrowed from different literary sources. Moreover, the informants were asked to state the source or origin of the phrases that they recognised, if known to them. Finally, they were asked to indicate if a phrase that they recognised had been changed (modified), and if it had been, how it had been changed. On receiving the questionnaire, the informants were asked to complete it in two weeks.

The questionnaire tested the informants on fifty-seven FEs (see Appendix I for a list of FEs tested). Forty of these were cultural FEs, whereas seventeen were linguistic FEs. The questionnaire was aimed at testing the informants' identification and understanding of cultural FEs (see pages 145-147 of Chapter III for a discussion of cultural FEs), whereas it only tested for the meaning of the linguistic FEs (see pages 145-147 of Chapter III for a discussion of linguistic FEs). In the questionnaire, a phrase, line or passage, was considered to be a cultural FE if

a) Pinter had pointed out that he had borrowed it from another text
b) If scholars and critics had made a good case for it being material borrowed from another author
c) If it was a reference, a quotation or an MOD which had clearly been borrowed from another literary work or from other sources such as slogans or advertisements.

Also, a few passages were viewed as cultural FEs even though they did not fit categories a), b) and c) described above. The reason for this is that a literal interpretation of these passages would not make sense. However, it should be
pointed out that since Pinter has not discussed the presence of allusions or cultural
FEs in his plays in any great detail, there may be some doubt as to whether a few
expressions in the questionnaire are cultural FEs. Only Pinter can state with
certainty whether a phrase is an FE, and he has declined to discuss the matter with
me. In the questionnaire, linguistic FEs are set expressions and phrases such as
idioms and metaphors which do not warrant a literal interpretation, and these
expressions can be found in different monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. It
should, however, be pointed out that the borderline between what constitutes a
cultural FE and what constitutes a linguistic FE is not always clear-cut. Therefore,
it might be argued that in some instances a cultural FE may also be a linguistic
FE. The opposite may also be the case. However, in the questionnaire, FEs which
required extra-linguistic knowledge for the identification of meaning constitute
cultural FEs, whereas FEs which did not require such knowledge constitute
linguistic FEs.

5.2 Population

The questionnaire was completed by twenty-eight native speakers of English. The
great majority of the informants (82%) were mainly selected from the School of
Language, Law and International Studies (SLLIS) at the University of Surrey,
UK. As a result, the population is viewed as a selected sample. Four informants
consenting to complete the questionnaire did not respond. In order to reflect the
different age groups in society, the sample was stratified into five age groups
(percentage of the total population in brackets below):

| Age group 1: 20-29 | 7  | 25% |
| Age group 2: 30-39 | 6  | 21% |
| Age group 3: 40-49 | 5  | 18% |
| Age group 4: 50-59 | 4  | 15% |
| Age group 5: 60+   | 6  | 21% |

Total: 28 Total: 100%
A division was also made between male (43%) and female (57%) respondents in order that the sample would not be gender-biased. Fifty percent of the population was made up of university lecturers (11), a college teacher and two postgraduate university students. Twenty-five percent consisted of second year undergraduate students and the remaining twenty-five percent was made up of university secretaries (5), a decorator and one informant whose profession is unknown. The focus on many highly educated informants in the selected sample was deliberate; it was based on the assumption that well-educated respondents would achieve a higher score than would the average English speaker. In order to find out if well-educated informants would obtain a higher score than less well-educated informants, a group of informants belonging to the last group described above (secretaries and the decorator) was included.

5.3 Summary of the Data

5.3.1 Cultural FEs

The distribution of the scores for cultural FEs was asymmetric: the respondents' scores did not adhere to the normal distribution curve where the scores accumulate in the middle. There were also a few outliers (untypical scores) which left the resulting distribution curve with a tail. The median is the best measure to describe the typical score when the distribution is asymmetric, since the median is robust to outliers (Swinscow 1996: 4). The median score in this selected sample was 8 out of a possible 40, or 20 percent of the total number of cultural FEs in the questionnaire. As a result, the typical informant in the selected sample failed to identify 80 percent of the total number of cultural FEs. In other words, 80 percent of the total number of cultural FEs went undetected by many informants. The inter-quartile range, which measures the dispersion, spread or variability of the scores was 5.5 marks. This measure is used because it omits twenty-five percent of the highest and lowest scores where outliers appear. A variability of 5.5 means that the spread between inter-quartile 1 (5 identified FEs) and inter-quartile 3 (10.5 identified FEs) is 5.5 identified FEs. In other words, 50 percent of the scores of the entire questionnaire ranged between 5 and 11 (10.5) - the median.
being 8, or 50 percent of the respondents identified between 12.5% to 25% of the cultural FEs. In other words, 75% of the native speakers of English identified 25% (or less) of the FEs in the questionnaire. Also, on the whole, men identified more FEs than women and the respondents in age group 4 (50-59 years) demonstrated the highest median and mean score.

5.3.2 Linguistic FEs

It was assumed that most of the respondents would understand the majority of the linguistic FEs in the questionnaire. The purpose of testing linguistic FEs was to discover if there were any FEs that the respondents did not know the meaning of. As hypothesised, the respondents did far better on detecting and defining the meaning of the linguistic FEs than the cultural ones. However, some FEs were not identified by any respondents at all, and a few of them were not understood by some informants.

5.4 Presentation of Data - Descriptive Statistics

5.4.1 Cultural FEs

As mentioned, the total number of cultural FEs tested in the questionnaire was 40. The number of identified cultural FEs (x) in the selected sample ranged between 2 ≤ x ≤ 22. Put differently, the minimum score was 2, or 5% of the total number of FEs, whereas the maximum score was 22, or 55% of the total score. This means that the identification range was 5% ≤ x ≤ 55% and consequently, the un-identification range was 45% ≤ x ≥ 95%. The dispersion within the selected population was as follows.
Figure 5.1 Blocked frequency distribution for cultural FEs.

As Figure 5.1 shows, the distribution of the cultural FEs was asymmetric. The asymmetric shape of the distribution is made clearer by a histogram (see Figure 5.2 below).

Figure 5.2 The grouped frequency distribution for cultural FEs.

Figure 5.2 illustrates that the majority of scores (20) occurred in the first two groups. There are also a few outliers which left the resulting distribution curve
with a tail. As mentioned, when the distribution is asymmetric, the median is the best measure to describe the typical score, since it is robust to outliers (Swinscow 1996: 4).

The Median

When all the scores in a questionnaire are put in rank order (see Table 5.1 below), the median is the middle score. In a sample of 28 informants, the median below is scores 14 and 15 divided by 2. Table 5.1 below gives the informants' individual scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>ID Score</th>
<th>ID in %</th>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>ID Score</th>
<th>ID in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Identified cultural FEs. The informants' actual scores and scores in percentage. ID: identified. Maximum score is 40.

In Table 5.1, score 14 is 8 and score 15 is 8. As a result, the median is 8 (8.5.2) or 20% identified cultural FEs in this selected sample. The median score for unidentified FEs was, as a result 32, or 80% of the total.
Variability

When, as in this study, the median is the appropriate measure to describe the typical score, the minimum and maximum scores (the range) are not advisably used in describing variability (the extent to which the observed values are scattered out from the median), because the extremes can be outliers. Therefore, the inter-quartile range is used, since it is a fairer measure of dispersion. The inter-quartile range is calculated by omitting 25% of the highest and lowest scores within a sample. In this way, the extreme scores are not taken into account. Inter-quartile two (Q₂) is always the median: 8 in this case. In a sample of 28 informants, 25% equals seven informants or scores, which means that seven of the highest and lowest scores are disregarded in order to calculate inter-quartiles one (Q₁) and three (Q₃). Q₁ is scores 7 and 8 divided by 2, or 5+5/2 = 5 (see Table 5.1 above), and inter-quartile three (Q₃) is scores 20 and 21 divided by two, or 10+11/2 = 10.5. As a result, Q₁=5, Q₂=8 and Q₃=10.5. The inter-quartile range is Q₃-Q₁= 5.5 marks. Thus, the variability is rather low, 3 marks lower than the median and 2.5 higher than the median.

Age Group

The selected sample was stratified into five age groups. The distribution curves for the highest and the lowest scores of each age group seem to adhere to the normal distribution curve (see graph in Figure 5.3 below). It turned out that age group 4 (ages 50-59) achieved the highest score as well as the highest lowest score in the sample (see next page). Age may be a factor influencing score "the older the better", it appears, until age group 5 (ages 60+) when the curve declines. However, since the variable age and score was not tested for in the questionnaire, the results of this variable will not be discussed further.
Figure 5.3 Cultural FE: highest and lowest score within each age group.

Gender

The variable gender and score was not tested for in the questionnaire. However, the mean score for men was about 11 (~11.3) whereas it was about 7 (~6.9) for the women (see Table 5.2 below).
5.4.2 Linguistic FEs

This thesis deals with the identification and understanding of cultural FEs, since
the failure to recognise these FEs may impact upon the interpretation of Pinter's
plays (For a discussion of the functions of cultural and linguistic FEs see Chapter
III, pages 155-160). Linguistic FEs do not affect the interpretation of a play in this
way. However, if native speakers do not know the meaning of some linguistic
FEs, it would not be surprising if non-native speakers, including translators, make
translation mistakes. This is the reason why linguistic FEs were tested. However,
because of their minor importance, there will not be a detailed presentation of the
data related to linguistic FEs here, only an outline.

As mentioned in the section "Summary of Data" in this chapter, the informants did
much better in identifying the meaning of linguistic FEs (see Table 5.3 below) than identifying and explaining the meaning of cultural FEs. The score range (x) was 0 ≤ x ≤ 13, or 0% ≤ x ≤ 76%, the mean identification (ID) score being 7 (±6.6) of
the total 17 linguistic FEs. This means that the mean ID score was around 41% compared with the median ID score of 20% for cultural FEs.

SCORE SHEET FOR LINGUISTIC FEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>ID Score</th>
<th>ID in %</th>
<th>US-ID Score</th>
<th>US-ID in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 The informants' scores for linguistic FEs, including score in percent

* The informant ticked off FEs without explaining their meaning

Maximum score is 17.

5.5 Errors, Approximations and Accuracy

By using descriptive statistics, the results of the questionnaire have been outlined above. The size of the selected sample (28) may seem too small, since in statistical inference most statisticians would claim that a much higher minimum
number of respondents should be used for a representative sample upon which hypotheses are to be tested. However, only descriptive statistics are used in this thesis, since a selected and not a representative sample was chosen. Also, statistical evidence is not to be drawn from the tables, charts and graphs outlined in this chapter, that is statistical inference is not to be used, which means that a specific sample size is not a requirement.

Having carried out research on descriptive statistics and discussed the results of my questionnaire with a statistician, a sample size of twenty-eight informants was considered a realistic proposition. The reasons for choosing twenty-eight respondents were motivated by two facts. First, since the distribution was asymmetric with outliers, the median was the appropriate measure to be used. Second, calculating the inter-quartile range for the median required the sample size to be dividable by four. As a result, the sum of twenty-eight was chosen since it is easily dividable into four groups with seven respondents in each group.

In order to avoid gender bias the sample was made up of 12 men (43%) and 16 women (57%). Also, the population was stratified into five age groups in order to avoid age bias. Although neither gender, nor age was an issue in this study, it was considered desirable that the selected sample reflect the structure of society to some degree in these respects as the inferences drawn from the results would better reflect the average well-educated person if both men and women of different ages were included in the sample than if, for instance, only women in their fifties had been selected.

Even though the respondents were only asked to indicate gender and age group, the questionnaire was not completed anonymously. In some instances, the informant's name was on the questionnaire, in others it was on the envelope containing the questionnaire, and some informants handed me the questionnaire themselves. The fact that the respondents' anonymity was not secured may have influenced their responses: some may have tried very hard to identify the FIs in order not to look badly informed, and others may have completed the questionnaire very casually in order to avoid feeling that they were badly informed. Indeed, several informants voiced concern that they may come across as
badly informed because they felt that they had not done very well in the questionnaire. However, none of the informants refused to give additional personal information (age or profession) when approached after the questionnaire had been completed. The question of anonymity and its probable causes have been taken into account when analysing the results. However, since the identification score was so low amongst so many informants, and since those who did “well” failed to identify at least 45% of the cultural FEs, it is considered unlikely that total anonymity would have changed the outcome significantly.

Despite written guidelines, oral advice (requested by about 1/3 of the informants) and other advice, there were indications that a few informants may not have fully understood what to do with the linguistic FEs. In Table 5.3 of this chapter, this uncertainty has been indicated by the use of an asterisk (*). Some respondents who did rather well in identifying cultural FEs did not do as well as expected on the linguistic FEs. The reason for this may be that they were mainly looking for cultural FEs and only spelled out the meaning of those linguistic FEs that they regarded as needing clarification. As a result, it was not assumed that respondents had failed to understand linguistic FEs if they had indicated that they understood the meaning of less common, informal and archaic linguistic FEs. Instead, it was assumed that they had not explained their meanings because they were obvious to these informants. However, other informants who had identified few cultural and linguistic FEs and who had not clarified the meaning of straightforward linguistic FEs were considered not to have understood these FEs.

The borderline between what constitutes a cultural FE and what constitutes a linguistic FE is not foolproof. As a result, some approximation may have occurred in the final numbering of cultural (40) and linguistic (17) FEs. However, the borderline cases were very few and are therefore not considered significant, particularly since the removal of these cultural FEs from the questionnaire would not have changed the outcome in any significant way: the identification rate was low with or without the borderline cases.

The small-scale questionnaire testing for the identification of allusions in Moonlight carried out for my MA dissertation in 1998 (Bergfeldt 1998), a pilot
study and an amended questionnaire testing for the identification and understanding of linguistic and cultural FEs carried out for this thesis all yielded similar results and the same findings, namely that many native speakers of English missed a number of cultural FEs and seem to find it difficult to identify and understand cultural FEs in texts written by Pinter. Therefore, it seems likely that if the questionnaire was carried out again, similar results and findings would occur.

In addition, the different circumstances of the informants completing the questionnaire and the theatregoers hearing the FEs on stage have also been taken into account. MAINLY, the informants had the possibility to look at expressions more than once since they had them in writing, whereas the theatregoers would not have had that luxury. This fact should make it more likely that the informants may achieve a higher score on the questionnaire than if the FEs had been read out to them only once or if they had heard them in the theatre.

5.6 Conclusion

The typical score in this selected sample of mainly well-educated native speakers of English was 20% of the total number of cultural FEs. This is a low identification rate. Twenty informants, or 75% of the population, failed to identify eleven or more cultural FEs, that is they failed to identify 75% of the cultural FEs in the questionnaire. This means that a high percentage of the informants failed to identify the great majority of cultural FEs. No one identified more than 55% of the cultural FEs. With these facts in mind, it is suggested that it is difficult to identify cultural FEs in Pinter's plays. Moreover, since it seems difficult for native speakers of English to identify cultural FEs in Pinter's plays, it must follow that it is even more difficult for non-native speakers of English to identify Pinter's cultural FEs, and as a result, it is understandable that Swedish translators of Pinter's plays have failed to translate a selection of these FEs satisfactorily into Swedish.
The research carried out for this thesis suggests that cultural FEs tend to complicate the understanding of plays by Harold Pinter. A questionnaire carried out in order to test whether a group of native speakers of English could identify and understand cultural FEs in Pinter's plays *The Birthday Party*, *No Man’s Land* and *Moonlight* supports this finding since 3-4 of the informants failed to identify 75% of the cultural FEs in the questionnaire.

The research also indicates that cultural FEs in *The Birthday Party*, *No Man’s Land* and *Moonlight* are often not transferred in translation into Swedish because the translators either failed to identify the cultural FEs and were therefore unable to make the writer’s intentions clear to the TL audience, or they translated them closely without any guidelines in the hope that the cultural FEs would be understood. Whether the translators failed to identify the cultural FEs or opted for a close translation, Leppihalme’s finding that allusions (labelled cultural FEs in this thesis) are often not captured in translation seems to have gained support.

Previous research (Bergfeldt 1998) indicated that Swedish translators of Pinter’s plays and native speakers of English have difficulties identifying allusions or cultural FEs in plays by Pinter because of the complexity of Pinter’s language. Further research was, therefore, undertaken in order to determine the reasons why it is difficult to identify cultural FEs in plays by Pinter. As Pinter is reluctant to discuss his work, my research was based by necessity on existing scholarship in the field as well as analyses of his plays. It was discovered that the critics in Britain, the USA, France and Sweden have found it difficult to determine, with certainty, what Pinter’s plays are about and it was interesting to find that the critics’ views of Pinter’s plays did not vary much from country to country. It was also interesting to note that much of the critical writings and the reviews focused on the language of Pinter’s plays.
Starting with the way Pinter writes, it seems that because Pinter does not have a resolution to his dramas, interpretation is made difficult and audiences and critics can only guess at the meaning of his plays. Moreover, since Pinter's characters do not seem to behave logically, and since their actions and statements often do not seem to make sense, that is they do not always conform to established norms, and because there is very little known about the characters' past, there is little on which a reader or an audience can base his or her interpretation. This uncertainty may make Pinter's plays interesting, but it also makes them bewildering. With regard to the language, many critics appear to have found it difficult to make sense of Pinter's dialogues because they develop through association rather than logic. Another problem is presented by the characters often appearing not to say what they mean, much seems to be happening beneath the surface of the words, but critics and scholars disagree on what is actually happening. In addition, Pinter's characters seem to be prone to lying and making up stories which complicate interpretation. The research further revealed that some of the critics in the UK, the USA, France and Sweden felt that Pinter's dialogues were allusive and contained non-sequiturs but few of them quoted examples or explained what they meant. The critics initially felt that the language of Pinter's plays was simple, but they later changed their minds and research suggests that his language is deceptively simple. It is complex because style and register can often change and there is specialist terminology of different types. Also, the language is poetic, it contains Jewish words and turn of phrases and Cockney expressions, and it contains cultural FEs from very different sources. Moreover, cultural and linguistic FEs are modified, the language is often laden with ambiguity, and Pinter's plays contain jokes with which some people are unfamiliar.

In order to translate a play successfully, a translator first needs to establish what the play is about. In the case of Pinter, the research undertaken suggests that this is not easy. In addition, as discussed above, the complexity and originality of the language does not facilitate understanding nor does it make translation easy, since the translator of Pinter's plays has to be familiar with widely different subject areas ranging from cricket to the Bible. The translator must know or identify specialist professional terminology employed by different sub-groups and terminology employed by other sub-groups such as the Jewish community and
Londoners as well as phrases employed by these sub-groups and find translation solutions to these difficulties. He or she must also be familiar with poetic devices and how they can be translated into Swedish. Dated vocabulary is also not uncommon. Much is also happening beneath the surface and ambiguity is an integral part of the language. With these facts in mind, it was not surprising to find that several cultural FEs in the five plays by Pinter researched in this thesis were not successfully translated into Swedish, since it is unlikely that one person would be familiar with all aspects of Pinter's writing.

Leppihalme (1997) has suggested that one of the reasons why allusions are not understood in translation into Finnish is that they are not considered to be a translation problem by translators. She has pointed out that translators should be made aware that allusions can constitute a translation problem and provided guidelines and options for their translation. The guidelines and options outlined by Leppihalme and the strategies for the translation of metaphors put forward by Newmark (1995) were successfully applied to a selection of FEs translated from English into Swedish in five plays by Pinter. A framework for different modifications of linguistic and cultural FEs, partly based on ideas outlined by Moon (1998) and Newmark (1995), was presented and knowledge of these might help a translator identify FEs, and successfully apply them to translation examples from Pinter's plays. Knowledge of different FEs and a framework for modifications of these FEs as well as knowledge of translation guidelines, options and strategies often helped provide successful solutions to the translation of FEs from English into Swedish. As a result, I agree with Leppihalme that translators should be made aware that FEs can constitute a translation problem and suggest that they should be made familiar with different ways in which FEs or allusions may be translated. The importance of carrying out often time-consuming research in order to identify and understand Pinter's FEs must also be emphasised.

In the questionnaire carried out for this thesis, 33% of the informants failed to identify 75% of the cultural FEs. The best score for identifying cultural FEs was 55%. As a result, it has been concluded that identifying and understanding cultural FEs in Pinter's work present translators with a problem. Moreover, since native speakers seem to have major difficulties in identifying cultural FEs in Pinter's
work, it is assumed that non-native speaker will have even greater difficulties since research indicates that it is easier to learn a language - grammar and vocabulary - than it is to understand implicit cultural messages such as allusive references ranging from politics to poetry in a foreign language. Therefore, it was not surprising to find that the informants obtained a much higher score on the linguistic FEs than they did on the cultural FEs, although a few of these linguistic FEs were not identified or understood by any informants and different informants identified and understood different linguistic FEs. It is, however, interesting to note that some linguistic FEs were not understood by native speakers of English.

With these facts in mind, it is not surprising to find that translators, who are non-native speakers of English, have had difficulties translating FEs in Pinter's plays, in particular cultural ones which are of crucial importance as they may constitute thematic devices or clues to the understanding of the plays.
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APPENDIX I

Below is a list of the cultural (C) and linguistic (L) FEs and MODs tested in the questionnaire (see Appendix II).

Cultural FEs:

1. **All will be well and all manner of things shall be well.**
   Source: *Revelations of Divine Love* written by one of the greatest English mystics of all time, Mother Julian of Norwich (1342-1416). The line also appears in *Little Gidding* by T.S. Eliot.

2. **So you would say that you were the real thing:** reference to the coca-cola slogan "It's the real thing".

3. **Never knowingly undersold:** slogan used by the John Lewis retail stores.

4. **Gemless in Wall Street. To the bank with fuck-all:** a modification of the original line "Eyeless in Gaza, to the mill with slaves" from *Samson Agonistes* by John Milton.

5. **If you have thighs prepare to bare them now.** Modification of the original line "If you have tears, prepare to shed them now." Borrowed from *Julius Caesar* by William Shakespeare.

6. **Foreign literature:** Dated reference to adult literature.

7. **Annie Laurie:** the title of a Scottish folk song.

8. **I was the captain of a lugger. The bosun's name was Ripper.** Lines borrowed from 'Twas on the Good Ship Venus, a rugby song with very offensive lyrics.

9. **Mind you, I preferred a fruity white wine but you couldn't say that in those days.** Reference to homosexuality.


11. **The Orient Express:** a luxury trans-European train.

12. **Ruritanian fantasy:** Ruritania is a fictional kingdom in novels by Anthony Hope. Ruritania has come to mean "a place of romance".

13. **You were indeed his youngest and most favoured son.** Biblical reference.

14. **He was a man, take him for all in all, I shall not look upon his like again.** Line borrowed from *Hamlet* by Shakespeare.
15. **The M.C.C.** Stands for the Marylebone Cricket Club.

16. **Black and Tan:** a Black and Tan was a member of the British Militia in Ireland, which was sent to Ireland in 1920-22 to fight Sinn Fein.

17. **The Albigensian heresy:** reference to Albigensians, heretics who lived in Southern France in the 13th century. The Roman Catholic Church went on a crusade against them.

18. **Who watered the wicket in Melbourne?** Reference to cricket.

19. **The blessed Oliver Plunkett:** an Irish saint and martyr.

20. **Drogheda:** Irish town. A reference to a massacre of Irish people in Drogheda (in 1649) under the command of Cromwell.

21. **Or pop goes the weasel:** a nursery rhyme.

22. **Roscrea:** an ancient monastery site in Ireland.

23. **Tullamore:** monastic centre in Ireland in the Middle Ages.

24. **Fenian men:** Irish revolutionaries or warriors.

25. **Honour thy father and thy mother:** one of the commandments.

26. **The Rock of Cashel:** a place in Ireland with many religious sites.

27. **Over the rainbow:** song sung by Judy Garland in The Wizard of Oz: Heaven.

28. **Where angels fear to tread.** A line borrowed from *An Essay on Criticism* by Alexander Pope.

29. **Throw on a substitute:** a reference to sport.

30. **Von Kleist:** Poland was invaded by Germany in 1942. Von Kleist was in charge of the operation.

31. **When joy overfloweth, there can be no holding of joy:** pseudo-biblical line.

32. **The great Jack Straw:** a reference to one of the leaders of the famous Peasant’s Revolt of 1381.

33. **What he said ... all those years ago ... is neither here nor there. It was not what he said but possibly the way he sat which has remained with me all my life and has, I am quite sure, made me what I am.** This line is possibly a pastiche on witticisms made by Oscar Wilde.
34. How beautiful she was, how tender and how true. Tell me with what speed she swung in the air, with what velocity she came off the wicket, whether she was responsive to finger spin, whether you could bowl a shooter with her, or an offbreak with a legbreak action. In other words, did she google?

A passage laden with cricket terminology.

35. It is not method but madness: A modification of the original line “Though this be madness, yet there is method in’t” from Hamlet by Shakespeare.

36-38. You have a long hike, my lad, up which, presently you slog unfriendled. Let me perhaps be your boatman. (C) […] In other words, never disdain a helping hand, especially one with such rare quality. […] I offer myself to you as a friend. Think before you speak. (C) For this proposition, after thought, will I assure you be seen as carte blanche, open sesame (C) and worthy the tender, […]

36) Let me perhaps be your boatman: a classical reference to the Aeneid by Greek writer Virgil. In Greek mythology, Charon is a ferryman who transports people’s souls to Elysium.

37) Think before you speak: a proverb.

38) Open sesame: a literary reference which first occurred in the story of “Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves”.

39. And so I say to you, tender the dead as you would yourself be tendered:

A possible modification of the proverb “Do unto others as you would be done by”.

40. My sword shall be ready to dissever all manifest embodiments of malign forces that conspire to your ruin. I shall regard […] I will accept death’s challenge on your behalf. I shall meet it for your sake, boldly, whether it be in the field or in the bedchamber […] by domestic enemy or foreign foe. I am your Chevalier. I am yours to command.

The passage comes across as mock parody of the knightly oath.

Linguistic FEs:

1-2. - It’s important to keep your pecker up.
- How high up?
- Well … for example … how high is a Chinaman?
1) to remain cheerful

2a) Joke formulae where How Hi is a Chinese name or
2b) Catchphrase meaning that something cannot be given a finite measurement.

3. Your father was short of a few krugerrands: a modification of either "one card short of a deck" or "short of a few bob", the first meaning "not rational" and the second meaning "broke".

4. The life of Riley: living an easy, good life.

5. Common or garden logic: ordinary logic.

6. A butcher's hook: Cockney rhyming slang meaning "a look"

7. Take the Michael: a modification of "take the mickey" meaning "to tease" or "to make fun of" somebody.

8. Pull a fast one: to trick or cheat somebody.

9. Get on somebody's wick: to annoy or irritate somebody greatly.

10. Drive somebody off their conk: drive somebody mad.

11. In the pudding club: i.e. pregnant

12. Come on, smile at the birdy: Photographer's patter meaning "Say cheese".

13. Get the needle to somebody: get angry with somebody.

14. One night does not make a harem: a modification of the format "one swallow does not make a summer".

15. Carte blanche: "freedom to act"

16. Once you've done the East you've done it all: a modification of the format "done once, done all".

17. Gaining a march on the world: meaning "to get ahead".
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

Read the phrases below. Do not spend too much time thinking. Go with your instincts. If you recognise any phrase, please state what you think it means. Does it refer or allude to anything? That is to say, do you think of anything in particular when you read a certain phrase? Please explain. It could come from a book, a poem or a play etcetera. It could also be an idiom, a set expression or a slogan for example. If you know the origin of the phrase, please name its source (where it comes from), or simply indicate that it does "ring a bell" but that you do not know its source. Has any idiom, reference or quote below been changed? If yes, please indicate when this is the case, and if you know how, explain how.

MOONLIGHT

(page)

(6) All will be well. And all manner of things shall be well.

(7) - It's important to keep your pecker up.
   - How high up?
   - Well ... for example ... how high is a Chinaman?

(8) - So you would say that you were the real thing.
   - The authentic article.
   - Never knowingly undersold.

(14) - The answer is that your father was short of a few krugerrands.
   [...] - The silver pail was empty.
   - Nary an emerald.
   - Nary a gem.
   - Gemless in Wall Street
   - To the bank with fuck-all.

(18) I said to her. If you have thighs prepare to show them now.

    Foreign literature. Snooker.
... it's like farting Annie Laurie down a keyhole.

I was the captain of a lugger. The bosun's name was Ripper.

Mind you, I preferred a fruity wine but you couldn't say that in those days.

From now on it's the Michelin Guide and the Orient Express for me - that kind of thing.

I once lived the life of Riley myself.

... in the lowest category of Ruritanian fantasy.

And common or garden astrological logic.

- It could be argued so. You were indeed his youngest and most favoured son.

- Precisely. And so let me say this. He was a man, take him for all in all, I shall not look upon his like again.

A butcher's hook.

THE BIRTHDAY PARTY

... take the Michael.

A fast one. Pull a fast one.

The M.C.C.

get on somebody's wick

drive somebody off their conk

That's a Black and Tan fact.

You left her in the pudding club.
(54) What about the Albigensenist heresy?

(54) Who watered the wicket in Melbourne?

(54) What about the blessed Oliver Plunkett?

(55) What about Drogheda?

(58) Come on, smile at the birdy.

(63) Or pop goes the weasel.

(63) Roscrea

(63) Tullamore, where are you?

(63) Glorio, glorio, to the bold Fenian men!

(80) Honour thy father and thy mother.

(83) You got the needle to Uncle Natey?

(84) One night does not make a harem.

(85) ... the Rock of Cashel ... 

(86) Over the rainbow.

(86) Where angels fear to tread.

**NO MAN'S LAND**

(7) All we have left is the English language. Can it be salvaged? That is my question.
(10) ... I could advance, reserve my defences, throw on a substitute, call up the cavalry, embody in essence Von Kleist's retreat from the Caucasus (the wittiest and most subtle systematic withdrawal known to man) or throw everything forward out of the knowledge that when joy overfloweth there can be no holding of joy.

(13) The great Jack Straw.

(16) What he said ... all those years ago ... is neither here nor there. It was not what he said but possibly the way he sat which has remained with me all my life and has, I am quite sure, made me what I am.

(18) Her buns are the best. Her currant buns. The best.

(23) How beautiful she was, how tender and how true. Tell me with what speed she swung in the air, with what velocity she came off the wicket, whether she was responsive to finger spin, whether you could bowl a shooter with her, or an offbreak with a legbreak action. In other words, did she google?

(27) It is not method but madness.

(28) You have a long hike, my lad, up which, presently you slog unfriended. Let me perhaps be your boatman. [...] In other words, never disdain a helping hand, especially one with such rare quality. [...] I offer myself to you as a friend. Think before you speak. For this proposition, after thought, will I assure you Be seen as carte blanche, open sesame and worthy the tender. [...].

(31) What a hike. And not only that. I'm defenceless. I don't carry a gun in London. But I'm not bothered. Once you've done the East you've done it all.

(42) Gaining a march on the world.

(61) The offer of alms. The shark in the harbour.

(88) And so I say to you, tender the dead as you would yourself be tendered.
My sword shall be ready to disperse all manifest embodiments of malign forces that conspire to your ruin. I shall regard [...] I will accept death's challenge on your behalf. I shall meet it for your sake, boldly, whether it be in the field or in the bedchamber [...] by domestic enemy of foreign foe. I am your Chevalier. I am yours to command.

MANY THANKS!