



**Meaninglessness of Language and the Obscene of Communication in
Pinter's "the Silence and the Dumb Waiter"**

Inst. Alaa Sadoon Muhsen
Iraqiya university - College of Art

Abstract

This paper deals with Harold Pinter the concept of communication and absurdity of human existence which show us silences and pauses. Harold Pinter has incorporated strategies just like pauses and silences to enable his audience how human being influenced by some obstacles which make him keep silent and nothing to say . Silence not as meaning characters are mute and the reader doesn't get to listen to the words flying out of their mouths, but a moment which is so full of significations, that the reader fumbles to come to the final rhythmic of the written text. In other words, what might have been construed as silences in Pinter's works are in fact vocal in their way. Once its saturation to be silent as a result to violence and the impact of war II, one needs to reflect deeply in that moment. And when there is no characters left whose language one can listen, a person has to take an inventory of his reveries. This paper focuses on the manifestation of the fear, uncertainty, menace, or even death to which the characters' pauses or silence refer to in Pinter's Silence and The Dumb Waiter. In in other words, it is how those moments of silence define a state of tranquility and how this state led to that of chaos and death

Email:

almimar19831@yahoo.com

Published: 1- 3-2025

**Keywords: The Silence, Pauses,
Death and Deterioration**

هذه مقالة وصول مفتوح بموجب ترخيص
CC BY 4.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

المخلص

يتناول هذا البحث مفهوم التواصل وعبثية الوجود الإنساني عند هارولد بينتر، والذي يظهر لنا حالات الصمت والتوقف. لقد استخدم هارولد بينتر استراتيجيات مثل التوقف والصمت ليظهر لجمهوره كيف يتأثر الإنسان ببعض العوائق التي تجعله يلتزم الصمت ولا يجد ما يقوله. الصمت ليس بمعنى أن الشخصيات صامتة ولا يستمع القارئ إلى الكلمات التي تخرج من أفواههم، ولكنه لحظة مليئة بالدلالات، لدرجة أن القارئ يتخبط للوصول إلى الإيقاع النهائي للنص المكتوب. بعبارة أخرى، ما قد يُفسَّر على أنه حالات صمت في أعمال بينتر هو في الواقع صوتي بطريقته الخاصة. بمجرد أن يصبح الصمت مشبعًا نتيجة للعنف وتأثير الحرب العالمية الثانية، يحتاج المرء إلى التفكير بعمق في تلك اللحظة. وعندما لا يتبقى أي شخصيات يمكن الاستماع إلى لغتها، يتعين على الشخص أن يقوم بجرد أحلامه. يركز هذا البحث على مظاهر الخوف، وعدم اليقين، والتهديد، أو حتى الموت، التي تشير إليها فترات الصمت أو التوقف التي يقطعها الشخصيات في روايتي "الصمت" و"النادل الأبكم" لبينتر. بعبارة أخرى، إنها الطريقة التي تحدد بها لحظات الصمت حالة الهدوء وكيف أدت هذه الحالة إلى حالة الفوضى والموت.

Introduction

Harold Pinter is the Dramatist One of the greatest dramatists. he is well known for his wonderful style, experienced critic as 'Pinteresque'. For almost all twenty-nine of Pinter's mysterious plays, he provides his audience with an atmosphere that becomes repetitive. If fear calls horror and anxiety to a Pinter play, interest is also still needed to show how human being still silent without motion. their utterances seem to lack any import. His morbid action will go on silly to the point of absolute logical deformation, often mystifying its audience/reader, while that somber sense itself of doom mounts, to herald there a tragic bereavement impending the very absurdity of our existence human one still. Pinteresque context of other such, no meaning, local general, no reason, only power and only identity, showed obviously more matters of focus, in which language is said to sharp fade away from its known communicative function, identifies well the dramatist as a thinker who is, actually, into Lumumba. When Harold Pinter's plays are discussed in relation to the concept of silence, one immediately thinks of his short play which concerned with Silence, and more especially of Ellen's words as she expresses her fear, failure, and uncertainty. In a paradoxical way, Ellen is talking about her need for someone to speak to her and break her silence.

Such a silence. I can hear in myself..my heart Beats in my ear.

Such a pause. Is it me? Am I silent or speaking? How can I know!

(Pinter, 1976, p. 200)

The reader or audience may naturally become interested in asking additional questions in response to her inquiries: is it such a philosophical speculation as only Martin Heidegger could come up with It is. The woman appears to be in some kind of an ethical dilemma and the man is expected to comfort her. Would we be exposed to humanity in modernity and or, modernity

to humanity? (2012) noticed? Or a bare-dramatic chance to examine the internalizations of the human being? Paradoxically, asking those questions she cannot locate the answers and contemplate over life without coming up with any conclusion. The character is first depicted as being fearful, possibly unemployed, and definitely losing out to an external force that attacks the essence of the internal force. She seems to be so lonely due to the constant unawareness of time that passed, time present and all the time to come, that she is compared to "the surveyor of Kafka's *The Castle* and the librarian of Borges' *'The Library of Babel'* (Hollis 1970, 117) who appear to remain consistently out of touch with the desired contact. Undoubtedly, Pinter focused on the contradiction between the internal world—a warm and light room—and the external hostile world—a hostile world marked by darkness and coldness—in *The Room*, in addition to Rose's attempts to win over her husband Bert Hudd and his lack of interest. The portrayal of a hostile world encircling a warm room is comparable to Rose's total devotion to acting as sentimental and agreeable to her husband as possible, as well as Bert's total indifference. Hollis (1970, p. 22) accurately explains that "Bert's reticence is horrifying to Rose, but it is superficially humorous to the audience.". Her loquacity is the silence of someone who is trying desperately but is unable to express what she truly wants to say, whereas his silence is the silence of someone who has nothing to say. According to Babae, Babae, and Nesami (2012), "the elements coming from outside tend to destroy those living inside where the very idea of security tends to fade dramatically.". Similar to this, the kind of laughter that comes from the humorous scenes seems to wane and eventually vanish as one enters the hostile and terrifying interior world. Surprisingly, what the reader perceives as a comedy abruptly transforms into a hostile tragedy, what should provide security instead becomes fear, and what should enlighten tends to tragically darken. As the play comes to a close, we are aware that Rose loses her sight. Intriguingly, Hornby (2015) and Dukore (1976) have proposed that the moment humorous scenes enter a room, laughter becomes its opposite. Pinter has clearly done this by using language that considers the play's overall context, the mood, and the primary themes it explores.

The angry young man is absent in *The Caretaker*, the play which is seen as Pinter's masterpiece, a depiction of a world where people fail, lose and despair. All three of the characters Mick, Aston and Davies appear to be more or less the quintessential representation of loss. Mick starts the play, exploring the room and analyzing it – the objectification is ironic given that he is insecure and a failure. Sitting in a café, Mick's older brother Aston fearlessly stopped an old man – a tramp – from getting badly beaten. The elderly tramp, Davies, has been unsuccessfully try to penetrate into that café and is now in search of integration.

Of course, this is what Pinter has let his characters to develop more of the feeling of fear and danger. For while Mick and Davies tend to swear loudly – regarding their situation- Aston is so over- verbose that one is hardly surprised when he hallucinates in the midst of the criminal verbalization. Language plays a big role also because along with that suspense that is typical of Pinter it also shows the artistic side of Harold Pinter. Yuan (2013), p. [72] has well and briefly stated it and simply has brought out the fact that the knack of the dramas lies in.

Language plays a number of different roles in Pinter's plays, including functioning as a rather amorphous reference towards the past, as a way of categorizing jokes as being either 'offensive' or 'defensive', and as a device for characterization. As part and parcel of the whole, or even an absolute principle of Pinteresque language, Pinteresque discourse may be recognized as the most distinctive feature of Pinter's plays.

What both *Silence* (1968) and *The Dumb Waiter* (1957), two of Pinter's plays, try to introduce is unclear. When the dramatist employs his other famous gimmicks such as 'pauses,' 'moments of silence,' the audience or the reader is lost. As in other plays, Pinter has also shown an excellent mastery of this theatrically useful device through the rending of silences in these plays. This scene is saturated with meanings that the meaning is deliberately ambiguous or at least oblique; it is not simply a scene in which nothing is said and the characters inhale words and the audience barely speaks them. Notably, there no real silence in this book. When it comes, one has to be very much conscious of that very hour. Also, there are ideas which are logically predictions and/or interpretations of what characters would not say had they continued speaking. Both the play *Silence* and *The Dumb Waiter* are stylized by characters' pause or silence that calls for feelings of fear, uncertainty, loss, or death. The ideas within this paper are to investigate these concepts. In other words, this paper will try to show, through the plays aforementioned, how those instances of stillness represent the concept of the state of peace on the one hand, and how this state engulfs that of transition to chaos and death on the other.

Discussion and analysis:

That is clear and precisely how *Silence* is outlined in the first reading as a short play concerning love and mildly affected protagonists of Pinter's play. *Silence* is a drama performed by three people with one scene. Three people, namely Bates, a man aged between thirty-five and forty, Ellen, a girl of twenty-five and Rumsey, a man of forty. As Bates who looks like a lover pretends to be trying to convince Ellen to accept his kind invitation, we realize that Rumsey and Ellen are indeed in love. At the start of the play Rumsey expresses himself gracefully about his girl. On the other hand, Ellen informs us that she is with

two men and that she loves one of them believing that he is Rumsey while in actual sense she detests the other man Bates. Rumsey shows that the partnership is based on respect and balance. A dialogue is good example to show us stress

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. She holds my arm. On good evenings we walk through the hills to the top of the hill past the dogs the clouds racing just before dark or as dark is falling when the moon. (Pinter, 1976, p. 201)

Ellen's reply seems to clarify the same idea

Ellen: There are two. One who is with me sometimes, and another. He listens to me. I tell him what I know. We walk by the dogs. Sometimes the wind is so high he does not hear me. I lead him to a tree, clasp closely to him and whisper to him, wind going, dogs stop, and he hears me. But the other hears me. (Pinter, 1976, pp. 201-202)

It's worth stressing that the play presents more than Ellen and Rumsey's love affair. If Bates does not speak, his dark discontent with them, and perhaps they with him, speaks volumes; ATA, fear so powerfully conveyed by silence. The main cause of Bates' frustration mostly involves his inability to convince Ellen to go out with him, and her seeming deep affection to Rumsey. He is more afraid when he is alone and chatting with himself, questioning whether they are whispering or making love, he would tell his girlfriend that birds rest when they reach a tree that has strong branches if they have been flying around the state. And if we remember the first time we saw Bates, there was a feeling that everything was going fine between him and his girlfriend since "she's clutching me." Painter, 1976, p. 202). But that harmony is played side by side with a very fear-based environment that gradually shuts down all the other ones. "Caught a bus to the town." crowds. Rain is as important as smell, each cold light over the market, girders and black roads, pub doors thrown into the night. The lights and barking cars. Painter, 1976, p. 202).

Not surprisingly, Pinter has ingeniously concentrated on character study. Hollis, 1970, p. 114) believes that they "are always in the provisional, hypothetical, and fragmentary realm." This appears to be the fact in *Silence* than any other play of his works that I have read. They might have been on familiar terms in the past or they may turn into friendly terms in future but at this juncture and in this context, there appears to be no point, no utility, no possibility. In the first few scenes, three characters of this man appear to be voluble, but as the play comes to its close, they remain wholly reduced to silence. It should also be noted that Pinter has sometime used pauses and silences in this movement to enhance the qualities of feeling of insecurity terror

and death. An exploration of Pinter's ability to write pauses and silences tells us a lot about his writing; how dependent it is on a balanced and correct use of punctuation. These marks have been converted by this dramatist into a different form of language. I would like to say it as an additional language on another language. Thus, the punctuation by the dramatist, contrary to the words he uses tells more of the story than it has to. That indicates a neutrality, paradoxically teeming with meanings: the silence. The idea that silences are more complex than pauses, which are only a phase of transition, is emphasized by Gauthier (1996) in Harold Pinter: contributing to the Formation of the Fragmentation of Modernity: The Caretaker. The absence of communication means that there can never be any effort made to close, or even recognize, gaps. They are not silent.

The first time that the walk of the typography is silent, it is clear that many long dialogues have taken place between Ellen and Bates wherein he tries in his inept way to convince Ellen to go out with him. She cannot decide what she wants and does not want him to walk her around or buy her a drink., we can infer that Pinter is restless and scared, probably after rejecting. Her intimate description "I turn." I turn. I turn. I glide. Or rather, I turn. in breathtaking illumination. They change with sun and horizon from before. The light crushes me (Pinter, 1976, p. 208) The two preceding expression denotes inability to dump her frustrations which is followed by a pause. That, Bates said, is a 'funny moment'. "That quiet time," they write. (Pinter, 1976, p 209) However, he only forgets all of his troubles if he only puts his hand on his forehead. And only then, and for the shortest time, does he feel comfortable.

However, Ellen could be enjoying a healthy working relationship with Rumsey. As strange as it might sound, while her conversation with Bates has been characterized by a total dismissal of any form of rapport with him, she now seems fully prepared and willing to be in rapport with Rumsey. She is now ready to cook for him, loves music, good cook. Yet, despite the fact that Bates succeeded in pretense that she swayed Ellen, she does not bother to even attempt to attempt to persuade Rumsey otherwise. Bates seem to have something in common with Ellen. That they won't is unthinkable—to reach him Bates, who is supposedly sweet on Ellen, wants to marry her; to reach Rumsey, Ellen who is supposedly in love with him wants to return to him. It is in failure that Bates's dialogue is suddenly interrupted by silence.

As it stands, there is no doubt that we are offered with a mysterious triangle relationship. This is because the three characters are thinking nostalgically, and the past that is depicted is in form of short scenes. This disappears at the benefit of memory loss which is remarkable with Pinter's characters and specially at the end of the play. And Rumsey, Ellen and Bates remember only semi-thing, ap trapping of thing, introductory things (Pinter, 1976, p. 214). As Pinter

continues to add the signal for silence, they inexplicably continue to say the first line of their first words of the play. Fairly, what they both do is that he uses many silences as to create tension the more they reiterate “the beginnings of things. Consequently, the entire play has been described by Gauthier as being a Revenge Tragedy, this is in accord with the description as follows, (Gauthier, 1996, p ‘Culturally muted’, interspersed with reminiscing fragments of speech, or with calls to oblivion in a sea of utter silence that would be death.

Whenever I watched a Pinter’s play before, I do not feel astonished by the fact that the play ends at the last silence. In its conclusion, *The Caretaker* is quite long and the substance of both plays is akin as well. In the *Caretaker*, Aston ultimately says nothing while Davies has lost the room and the shelter at last. The curtain finally falls to the ground and having nothing else to say – Davies stands by the door staring, trying to say something but he cannot. His long speechless means that he can leave, which means he has no shield in that room any longer, and, of course, that life is over. From here until the end of the play, one simply wonders about friendship and family bond that is most important. There can be no doubt that World War Two contributed greatly to changes in interpersonal relationships: they are indicated by the setting in most of Pinter’s writing as well as the use of silence as a statement on such relationships. When humanity is reduced to mere animalism then love elicits only hatred within a blink of an eye. Intimacy disappears, and isolation becomes the main criterion that demonstrates the nature of the relations of the main characters. In the play, there is no togetherness, no romantic passion, no tenderness, little affection, and to some extent, no sense of acceptance. Uselessly, Pinter has made them try to understand the notions of harmonies and intimacies as goals that define relationship with an identifiable individual. Specifically, the fact that the end is prolonged by the music and words of Hannah and Abraham results in its meaning that the characters’ inability to understand, to say, to create, will now be underscored. In this culture, silence is actually the way people express anger and even violence.

The silent times reveal impending disasters to us as though they are conveying a message to their own selves. Lacking any clear concept of what stability means or what bonds demand, the characters roam. Suggesting some key points drawn from the work of Prentice (2000, p. 86) one has hailed it ‘, it is a play about people pertaining friendship, loneliness, isolation and love from a distance.

On the other hand, silence is truly a movie about silence and its nature. Ironically this play has left us without information from the society where language is expected to guide us. Its characters also do. Good news is their complexity has not gone unnoticed, even by the dramatist himself. McTeague, M. (1994, p. 82) ‘It’s evident,’ he proclaims, that character implications, for

instance, aren't limited to themselves. Nevertheless, it is not an allegory issue. Only men are present. Those bloody symbols do not reflect the versatility of men. 'He is a symbol' is what people utter at the moment a character should not be defined through the practicable. But not all of these characters are completely alien to us. We are all in the same boat here. I'm with them. Silence appears to articulate the unspeakable and transgress space. As for the concept of quiet, Gauthier notes that its purpose is to refer, to indicate, to signify (Gauthier 1996, p. 26) stated that "Either annihilation or the realization of impossibility are revealed by silence.". Speech is immediately reduced, narrowed down. We are at the stage where it is impossible to say any further. The "silence" indication of language constantly repeated thus underscores the unimaginable and marks off the distance.

Like many of Pinter's plays, *The Dumb Waiter* presents us with a stereotypical scenario: a room means, that the house is warm, and the people in it – an alien. Who is outside is unknown, and the residents are interested in this threat? In this play the two main characters Gus and Ben are planning a murder. They sometimes come to a specific room as planned, sit and watch their prey come in, do their job, and leave to go to the next room. The intruder Peacock 1997 p. As described by 69), "is not a human being but a familiar inanimate object, a dumb waiter that brings arbitrary orders from above". In the course of the play, one of these killers, Gus, will be a victim; Ben will be supposed to follow the order and kill him. The dramatist has concentrated all his effort on the concept that Gus and Ben are not only made to become killers but also victims and quite inadequately the victims of these killers are portrayed. This concept is expressed in the whole talk and the setting. And to these may be added the quiet scenes, which Pinter has suggested and which the climax has unveiled. Such brief scenes present Gus as a victim rather than anything else because the lack of speech is Pinter's tool to suggest that there has been much silence—and thus, death. The playwright, as notes Taylor 1969 p 25) mentioned, states that:

I think that we communicate only too well, in our silence, in what is unsaid, and that what takes place is continual evasion, desperate rear-guard attempts to keep ourselves to ourselves. Communication is too alarming. To enter into someone else's life is too frightening.

Throughout the play there are two unknown characters, Gus and Ben who produce a 'silent' setting at the start of the play. They do not speak, but they some sort of sound as they get up and walk and lead the way to the door; and shaking the paper and their foot. Noise that does not include speech, means silence in itself. Gus stumbles a bit trying to get comfortable, then tries to approach Ben in small talk and fails dismally. Its counterpart depicts Ben

leering at his victim and reads a paper unconsciously.” When they get eye contact with each other, they freeze and stop any form of movement or sound. Copeland (2001) has broken down the concept to show that ‘The fundamental concepts do not often change’, pointing out that while the basic building blocks of strategy may sound like an exhaustive list, in practice most of them remain fixed. 22. To take the reader or audience to a time of quietness which is pregnant with meanings a time which precedes a tragedy, the tragedy of Gus’s death — Pinter has evidently concentrated on how he could lead them to that brief period when they watch Gus’s inactivity and Ben’s omission. What is tragic and what is humorous seems to be most closely expressed in the contrast of the concepts of the agitation and nonchalance. The audience or the reader might laugh at what is read over or performed. However, if one is to read the scene or analyses it, it is as a reminder that is instructive: to laugh, but to do so, think twice about it; to have fun, but once done. Despite paying attention to the life story of an old man, the said, Pinter’s excessive word usage also indicates another tragedy, the unspoken, that is, Gus’s shooting at the end of the play. The dramatist’s cue of silence after the lovers ceases to speak underscores this point. This is the moment when the spoken and the unsaid are synonymous, and silence – is just as meaningful as what lies behind it. From reading the play, we realize that Gus as well as Ben go to an area at night, spend all their day sleeping, wait for their prey, do their work, and leave again at night.

Again, Pinter’s aim is to end the debate with Ben as the winner and Gus as a sickly and unwell man. Dully we listen to the two characters and it becomes clear that at some point their argument goes on endlessly and then there is silence which is a typical Pinter’s signal. The play often employs that verbal confrontation to state two differing opinions that lead into a scene that is the entire focus of the play. Despite the fact that Gus remains aware of his actions and type of work he performs, he appears most probably trapped and, therefore, split between fear inside and outer command. He will be “glad when it’s over” as we know (Pinter, 1978, p.153) but the silence which followed the moment when he stopped speaking drawn on the stage over and over again exhibits the prison in which he is. He cannot reject Ben’s order, he cannot reject the outsider’s xenophobe decision and he cannot speak when the dramatist wins the right to command silence, that is why it is a prison. He can hardly breathe for him and turns his silent gaze at Killer Ben and his friend. Moving from one state to another, Gus changes from defining the environment outside to the later where the environment defines the thoughts inside, translates his fear, ultimately resulting in his death. These are his hatred of the person who gave orders and his discontent with the work that he was doing - killing strangers in

different places at least for him—as main topics he addresses when he opens his mouth. From his speech, it is evident that fully he lives in an atheist society.

Ben: (savagely:

That's enough! I'm warning you! Silence. Ben hangs the tube. He goes to his bed and lies down. He picks up his paper and reads Silence The box goes up They turn quickly, their eyes meet. Ben turns to his paper Slowly ,Gus goes to his bed, and sits. The hatch falls back into place. (Pinter, 1987, pp. 163)

Ben talks roughly to Gus stating that he owns him and Gus remains quiet swept away to. his bed and sits. Ben acts like a killer without noticing it and Gus reacts as a killer without paying attention. victim. The first is the thought of crime, the second death. They meet in one point while about death and when they say nothing, they are not equal in purpose; the first one is to kill is the second and to be killed is the first. From here, 'the "ask" for Gus is that he not know and, in fact, could have never imagined that he is "the" be killed next. He ironically keeps asking about this person, but Ben does not answer, nor does the person who gives his orders. Ben only looks at her when they both sit at the end of chalk line staring at each other. unexpectedly finds his victim and he has to do his job.

Having said this, Pinter stops and they both look at each other for a long time before Pinter brings it to a halt. The first of the warnings that Pinter gives the reader of the fact that Gus will be the last victim is his indication of it by silence at the start. He fails to appreciate this until the end of the play to appreciate this. We can see and totally comprehend why silence is good. This is in fact a sign or a moment that masks the unstated, which is death and fear. 'The absence that occurs in the final moments of silence in the play between Ben and Gus,' (Grimes 2005, p. Notably, according to 60) "has always been present." A violence and coercion are innate in Ben and Gus's lives threatening other people and themselves at the request of their superior organizations. It seems the dramatist toyed with a sort of characters that end up being tragically involved in relationships in which their situations become even more nuanced no matter how much both parties try to get each other, hence the tragedy. They know how to speak but those words come out mixed up, and the interpersonal relationships that they portray are unrealistic. Despite living under the same Roof, they plan to murder each other; they discuss their problems as friends but stab each other in the back to stay alive. If the person who does not lead and control the other is to lose, he must be ready to follow and do as the winner pleases for the rest of the duration.

The atypical characters are depicted in isolation presumably because of their abnormal thinking and unusual behavior. They seem to be some ill-fated souls confined in a circular enclosure with no escape, no place for virtue due to the elemental paradox percolating their utterances. They can only be either bad or mad because they live a cycle of lying, being a contradiction, being lonely and desperate. They can only be negative or, in a few cases, mildly negative and are thus “bad” and almost invariably insane. In two plays there is an express presentation of the peculiarities and behaviors of the characters, thus it is stated the concept of truth which is supposed to be so, is rather very illusive and human relation which is supposed to be so humane is actually an essence of deceptive immoral gambling. What is more, in comparison with the above-mentioned empty attempts, which do not make any sense at all, futile activities are much more widespread. Thus, the Pinteresque style opposes the human essence putting forward a dystopian picture of a threat within the greater threatening world of a broken identity and a reality that is far from being rosy. Its bitter setting and absurdity with a grim and dark prospect are highlighted to the reader or the viewers. Vairavan, G. & Dhanave, A. (2014). The struggle for positions in human relationships. *Journal of Command, Control & Intelligence Studies*, 1(4), p. (38) have said it best when they said thus: “The source of dramatic action in *One for the Road* is the everyday occurrence which Pinter sees as the precursor of violence.” That is also absent in *The Dumb Waiter* and *Silence*. the ideas of dominance and superiority.

This is power in every sense; rutting as the external organization that in all its divisions, its events, all that it contains, its minute particulars as well as in linguistic and rhetorical and rhetorical techniques. Where Foucault (1978) most probably meant it is present in all “stages” of live, where people expect it to emerge and pierce every layer and barrier. It is ‘something that is grasped or slipped through one’s hands, not something that can be gotten, taken, gotten at or divided. (p. 95) That power may be a function of position or vice versa is possible and called agony. The three elements of Pinter’s play are closely and effectively interweaved in Pinter’s plays in general and in *Silence* and *The Dumb Waiter* in particular. The dramatist mainly employs them to expand on the relationship between the human and his world, as well as inner struggle. Indeed, whenever they are introduced acting and basically moving in a particular way, they seem to alter their behavior patterns.

Everyone from various societies is present through Pinter’s characters which are undoubtedly the place of man in the world where well to do totalitarian regimes systematically breach human rights and where there is no freedom or goodness. They have helped him a lot to throw enough light on the

nature of the relationships that existed between the oppressors and the oppressed the internal environment which is usually a warm and safe place, and the external environment which is a hostile and fearful space which is usually many other places around the twentieth century and many other places around the world. The political and the social system is corrupt and this threatens his people identify and existence even if they are willing to compromise. Pinter himself wants to learn how, according to Garner (2012, pp. For this reason, points 1-4 underscores the fact that “social relations involving authority and power reduce and marginalize the worth of persons... Persons are constructed by means of eradicating individual profiles that are formally effective name, race, or nationality”. He seems desirous of speaking for all of them in the process which means that it is time to reconsider interpersonal and family relations. Only one voice against the oppressor’s violence and outside world hostility. To them at least in Silence and The Dumb Waiter it is more like attempting to deny them speech seems to be ineffectively done.

Conclusion:

Harold Pinter is one of the most important playwrights in Britain, but at the same time he is one of the strangest writers who used the word silence in a strange way, which is that he depicts silence in a new way different from the rest of the writers and makes the readers feel bored and unable to communicate in the correct way. analysis reveals that silence in fact turns out to be another one of the tricks which employed to build the play’s dramatic tension. It is present in the play and encourages a further reflection on the matter by the reader. At that point, he will only be able to understand what cannot be put into words, what cannot be explained, so to say. Strikingly, silence is indeed ‘talkative’ the moment it violates a given perimeters. The right to speak further is gone again. a silence, which can never be a silence. And one of his plays is titled that way also. But as to the characters in his two plays, The Dumb Waiter and Silence, except for uttering words, they are dumb. The dramatist occasionally inserts fragments from Waiter time to time the use of the “silence;” technique the unimaginable. Scholars have the unenviable duty of explaining the way we relate with other people or organisms, physical world included. It seems that Harold Pinter belongs to the league of people who can reveal a certain type of interpersonal relationship in a likely given environment. He acts different part and as well as different characters have different angles which he portrays in a dramatic way.

Work cited:

- Babae, S., Babae R., & Nesami M. (2012). Modernism and Social Condition: A Study on Harold Pinter's the Homecoming. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 4(2), 40.
- Baldwin, V. M. (2009). Look for the Truth and Tell It: Politics and Harold Pinter. PhD. Thesis,

- Unpublished, University of Birmingham.
- Copeland, R. (2001). A Room of His Own. American Theatre, 18(8), 22.
- Dukore, B. F. (1976). Where Laughter Stops: Pinter's Tragicomedy. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). The History of Sexuality. Trans. Robert Hurley, Vol.1, Pantheon, New York.
- Garner, N. (2012). The Politics of Harold Pinter. Inquiries. 4(2), 1-4.
- Gauthier, B. (1996). Harold Pinter: The Caretaker of the Fragments of Modernity. Paris: ellipses.
- Grimes, C. (2005). Harold Pinter's Politics: A Silence beyond Echo. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Volume 1, Issue 3, 2019
- International Journal of Language and Literary Studies 125
- Hollis, J. R. (1970). Harold Pinter: The Poetics of Silence. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hornby, R. (2015). Theatre of the Absurd. The Hudson Review, 67(4), 640.
- McTeague, J. H. (1994). Playwrights and Acting: Acting Methodologies for Brecht, Ionesco, Pinter, and Shepard. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Morris, M. B. (1977). An Excursion into Creative Sociology. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Peacock, D. K. (1997). Harold Pinter and the New British Theatre. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Pinter, H. (1976). Harold Pinter, Plays: One. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Pinter, H. (1978). Plays Three. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Prentice, P. (2000). The Pinter Ethic: The Erotic Aesthetic. New York: Garland.
- Sesani, Samira, & Ghasemi P. (2014). Entrapment in Relationships in August Strindberg's the Father and Harold Pinter's the Collection. Kata. (16) 1, 37.
- Taylor, J. R. (1969). Harold Pinter. London: Longmans, Green.
- Vairavan, C., & Dhanavel, S. P. (2014). Power, Position and Agony in Harold Pinter's One for the Road. IUP Journal of English Studies. 9(3), 37.
- Yuan, Y. (2013). Power from Pinteresque Discourse in the Birthday Party. Studies in Literature and Language. 7(2), 2013, 72 |