On Beckett's Legacy in Harold Pinter

This article addresses the influence of Beckett's writing on the work of Harold Pinter. Both playwrights have been awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature (Beckett in 1969 and Pinter in 2005) and the work of Beckett has been pointed out by a multitude of critics as one of the main influences on Pinter, especially as regards the core of the "Pinteresque" signature – the suspension points, pauses and silences.

In an interview given to Kirsty Wark, for the programme Newsnight on 23rd of June 2006, Pinter referred to his relationship with Beckett and reiterated that "There is no one like Beckett". He commented on a specific episode involving Beckett and Pinter's play Silence: Pinter had shown it to Beckett, as usual, and Beckett said that he had liked it very much, but he advised Pinter to review speech six, on page five. Pinter could not find anything wrong with it, until the moment they started rehearsing the play, under the direction of Peter Hall. After being away for a week, Pinter called up Hall who told him that everything had been going smoothly, apart from one speech that needed some revisions. Instantly, Pinter recalled "Speech 6, on page 5", leaving Hall amazed, asking: "How did you know?"

One of the reasons why Beckett is summoned whenever one tries to find Pinter's heritage concerns mostly his use of silence to convey meaning. In practical terms, Pinter is the dramatist of pauses and silences, whereas Beckett is, essentially, the dramatist of the almost purposeless wait – even

 $^{^1}$ Newsnight Interview is a programme of BBC 2 and this interview with Harold Pinter was broadcast on the $23^{\rm rd}$ June 2006.

when there would seem to be something beyond the scene (a Godot, a voice coming out of empty space), the primary aim in Beckett's texts is to entertain time.

Although Beckett and Pinter have almost the same starting point, the outcome is distinct: Beckett starts from almost nothing – a nameless road, a man in a room - and then begins to deepen that void; Pinter starts with a room, a kitchen or a restaurant but endows his characters with a credible identity, as regards their verisimilitude. (The exceptions are Pinter's plays Silence and Landscape, which can be said to take us to Beckett's texts immediately). If in Beckett every character is the equivalent to anyone, anywhere, at any time - which becomes evident in his recurrent option of introducing characters through numbers and letters -, Pinter is concerned rather with attributing a name and a plausible identity to his characters who, in most cases, are inscribed in London surroundings, sometimes with precise geographical details provided by references to bus numbers and street names. Thus, Beckett deals mainly with characters facing the mystery of life, whereas Pinter's people are much more dependent on the circumstances involved in facing daily experience. With regard to the actual making of plays, and its relationship to experience, though, Pinter, rather like Beckett, appears to have a problem in formulating opinions about the characters or the plots of his plays. According to Pinter:

The desire for verification on the part of all of us, with regard to our own experience and the experience of others, is understandable but cannot always be satisfied. (...) A thing is not necessarily true or false; it can be both true and false. (...) The more acute the experience the less articulate its expression. (...) A moment is sucked away and distorted, often even at the time of its birth. (Pinter 1991: ix-x)

From a broader perspective, this last sentence brings to mind Beckett's A Piece of Monologue: "Birth was the death of him. Again. Words are few. Dying too. Birth was the death of him" (Beckett 1982: 11). And it also reminds us of Pozzo's words in Waiting For Godot: "One day we were born, one day we shall die, the same day, the same second (...) They give birth astride of a grave, the light gleams an instant, then it's night once more" (Beckett 1965: 89).

Beckett, even more than Pinter, always refused to offer further explanations about plays, beyond what was already in the texts themselves. However, he played meticulous attention to the tiniest details involved in the actual staging of the text.

Another main feature that is common to both authors concerns the use of silence as a form of discourse. Deprivation of language creates the urge to communicate by different means. Again according to Pinter:

There are two silences. One when no word is spoken. The other when perhaps a torrent of language is being employed. (...) When true silence falls we are still left with an echo but are near nakedness. One way of looking at speech is to say that it is a constant stratagem to cover nakedness. (...) I think that we communicate only too well, in our silence, in what is unsaid (...). Communication is too alarming. To enter into someone else's life is too frightening. To disclose to others the poverty within us is too fearsome a possibility. (Pinter 1991: xiii)

It is relevant to note that this remark – which was part of a speech first delivered at a time when only nine of Pinter's plays had been published – is still up-to-date, if one bears in mind his last longer play,— Celebration (published in 1999), and his last sketch, Apart from That, written in 2006 and read live at the already mentioned Newsnight interview: the sketch consists of a reproduction of a mobile conversation in which two men (played by Pinter and Rupert Graves) have a pointless exchange, saying that everything is fine "apart from that", but what is meant by "that" is never explained.

In the speech cited above, Pinter used a quotation from Beckett's novel *The Unnamable* to conclude and emphasise his observations on the pointlessness of speaking without reason:

The fact would seem to be, if in my situation one may speak of facts, not only that I shall have to speak of things which I cannot speak, but also, which is even more interesting, but also that I, which is if possible even more interesting, that I shall have to, I forget, no matter. (*Ibidem*: xiv)

Through the interviews and the writings compiled in Various Voices, readers were given the opportunity to become acquainted with Pinter's literary preferences, namely Beckett. Pinter considered Endgame the most perfect of plays, and he mentioned that he visited Beckett regularly and used to show him the first draft of his plays or scripts, beginning with The Homecoming – the first play he submitted to Beckett, asking for an opinion. According to Pinter, at the time of his death Beckett was reading his adaptation of Kafka's Process. What struck Pinter the most was the simplicity of means used by Beckett to convey emotions. However, when asked by Mel Gussow about a possible pupil-master relation, Pinter dismissed it, declaring: "No, not as pupil to master... I think he is the

most remarkable writer in the world, that's what I feel. I don't feel pupil to master, for a start, because I don't see where I relate to him at all" (Pinter apud Gussow 1996: 30).

On the topic of Beckett and Kafka, Pinter also noted: "When I read them it rang a bell, that's all, within me. I thought: something is going on here which is going on in me too".²

For many years, critical consideration of Pinter focused on establishing parallels between the two authors. Katherine Burkman, in *The Dramatic World of Harold Pinter*, published in 1971, finds two types of rituals in Pinter's texts, and uses this insight to compare him with other writers, namely with Beckett:

As in the rest of Pinter's dramatic world, the rituals of daily life are seen at one and the same time as comic and ineffectual, and as tragic and pathetic. Their emptiness is exposed with all the intellectuality of Ionesco's kind of irony, but the effort to sustain them is explored with all the sympathy of Beckett for his two Godot clowns, desperately improvising their routines in a void. (Burkman 1971: 12)

Peter Hall, drawing on his experience of directing both Beckett's and Pinter's plays, also talks about the influences of Beckett in the "Pinteresque" text. Hall refers specifically to the staging of their plays, and he argues:

The mystery to me is that there is communication in the theatre which is beyond words, and which is actually concerned with direct feeling. (...) My vocabulary is all the time about hostility and battles and weaponry, but that's the way Pinter's characters operate, as if they were all stalking round a jungle, trying to kill each other, but trying to disguise from one another the fact that they are bent on murder. (...) Equally, Pinter deals in stillness, in confrontations which are unbroken, and I believe it mandatory to do as few moves in a Pinter play as possible. (Hall 1985: 21-22)

Moreover, Hall recognises the importance of the games that the characters initiate, and the way they develop in the course of the text a game that can be summed up in Pinter's case as "social intercourse". Ruby Cohn, in her article "The Economy of *Betrayal*", attempts to relate Beckett to Pinter with regard to issues of language and silence, and she ventures a few cogent definitions. As she points out:

² Pinter interviewed by John Sherwood, BBC European Service, 3rd March 1960.

More repetitive than any verbal technique in Pinter's plays are his units of silence – indicated in print by comma, period, three dots, pause, and silence, which can function like musical notation for the actor. (...) Where Pinter's shaping most resembles that of Beckett is the rhythm of verbal duels. (...) Beckett's duologues are valiant strategies against the void. For Pinter, in contrast, the short lined exchanges usually constitute an attack and defence. (Cohn 2001: 19)

The best way to search for Beckett's voice in Pinter is to read Landscape and Silence, the plays that present the absence of communication as their core theme. In Landscape, Beth and Duff maintain throughout the text two parallel monologues which would resemble a dialogue, if it were not for the fact that their topics are utterly distinct. Beth dwells on a fantasy of a life in common, washed by the sea and warmed by the sun, whereas Duff concentrates on trivial matters, but focuses mainly on Beth. There are moments when, by mere coincidence, their speeches coincide on the same theme. They both activate the power of memory with images of water - the sea, for Beth, a lake in Duff's case - that serve as a metaphor of the break-up between them: on the one hand, Beth is driven by a desire of infinitude, represented by the endlessness of the sea; on the other hand, Duff is circumscribed to the definite space of a lake. According to the stage directions, Beth never looks at Duff and appears not to listen to his voice; Duff talks to Beth, but is equally deaf to all the things she says. What appears to be relevant is that Beth's and Duff's memories are not about past dreams, they are centred on the anguishes and the regrets of having let the instants and the opportunities pass by, missing the moment for loving, the moment for starting a family, for risking happiness. The play transmits a cadence of intensities, of sun, shade and night, that convey the pauses and the silences brimming with unspeakable memories. The text in fact resembles Night, a sketch where a man and a woman deprived of name recreate past events from the moment they have met.

In Silence the minimalist structure, the inertia that characterises all movement, the figurations invested in particular images, and the play's general incantatory and cryptic tone are identical to Landscape. More than existing in a triangle, the characters experience the failure of the projects that never were; and, once again, as is the case with most of Beckett's plays, only silence can reproduce the uneasiness of having to live with a sense of unfulfilment. All the expressions of desire for change die the minute they are uttered. Bates questions: "If I changed my life, perhaps, and lived deliberately at night, and slept in the day. But what

exactly would I do? What can be meant by living in the dark?" (Pinter 1997: 194)

Throughout the text, he keeps on "singing" his refrain trying to undermine the importance of dreaming and loving: "Sleep? Tender love? It's of no importance" (*Ibidem*: 203, 209). Ellen ponders on her solitude and on the desire to find someone who listens and talks to her, repeating all through the text the first two of the following sentences: "Around me sits the night. Such a silence. I can hear myself. (...) Is it me? Am I silent or speaking? How can I know? Can I know such things? No-one has ever told me. I need to be told things" (*Ibidem*: 201).

The female character has lost all notion of things past, and recapitulates her incapacity of distinguishing between the simple past, the past perfect and past perfect continuous because the time line that connects her memories is definitely broken. For Ellen, as for Krapp, Hamm, Clov, Didi, Gogo, Winnie, Will and so many others, the past is a foreign place. Thus, the fragmentary architecture of the text is consistent with the expression of the discontinuous time of her memories and explains her urgency to talk, as someone who says a prayer, to eradicate the silence of those three interrupted lives.

In October 2006 – from the 10^{th} to the 21^{st} – Pinter performed Krapp in Beckett's play, for the centenary celebration, at the Royal Court. The run of ten performances sold out within about seventeen minutes and a £25 ticket was sold on eBay for £180. One of the reasons why this happened has been well put by the director of the play, Ian Rickson, when he acknowledged: "There's a moment of theatre history coming together here".

According to Beckett's stage directions, Krapp is a man of sixtynine, listening to his old self of thirty years before. Pinter was seventy-six, but the way he sat behind the desk in a motor wheelchair delivering Krapp's final speech – "Perhaps my best years are gone. But I wouldn't want them back" –, followed by a silent pause, brought back the memory of his Nobel speech on December 2005, when, due to health problems, he appeared on the screen also in a wheelchair and beginning his speech by quoting himself in 1958, the same year that, by coincidence, Beckett wrote Krapp.

³ Quoted in The Sydney Morning Herald, 24th October 2006.

Beckett's legacy in Harold Pinter amounts in particular to the latter's use of silent discourse, as well as an intrinsic vocation to mix menace with laughter and black humour. It can also be seen in the quest either for the perfect word, the one that best describes the emotion that is being conveyed, or a torrent of words, or a simple repetition of ideas. However, Beckett is perfectly at ease in giving away nothing, in reinstating on stage, from the very beginning, the awkwardness of the situation – characters buried alive, or in vases, or in "no man's land" – whereas Pinter tries to start from a daily situation and then moves onwards to take the audience by surprise with the introduction of menace and mystery behind the surface of a normal situation. The visual evidence of this difference is present in the Nobel Diplomas given to each by the Swedish Academy: in Beckett's case a disembodied head, alone, in the middle of the stage; in Pinter, the depiction of a room viewing another.

Universidade de Évora

References

BECKETT, Samuel (1965). Waiting for Godot. London: Faber and Faber.

-- (1982). Three Occasional Pieces. London: Faber and Faber.

HALL, Peter (1985). "Directing Pinter". Alan Bold (ed.), Harold Pinter: You Never Heard Such Silence. London and Totowa, NJ: Vision & Barnes and Noble.

BURKMAN, Katherine (1971). The Dramatic World of Harold Pinter: Its Basis in Ritual. Ohio UP.

COHN, Ruby (2001). "The Economy of Betrayal". Lois Gordon (ed.), *Pinter at 70: A Casebook*. New York and London: Routledge. 13-32.

GUSSOW, Mel (1996). Conversations with Harold Pinter. Grove/Atlantic.

PINTER, Harold (1991). Harold Pinter: Plays 1. London: Faber and Faber.

- - (1997). Harold Pinter: Plays Three. London: Faber and Faber.