

A Rethinking of Pinter's Language and Power from Deleuze's Affect Theory: *The Birthday Party* as a Case Study

Dr. Benadla Djamel^{*1}, Dr. Berrezoug Hanaa²

1- University of Saida

djamel.benadla@univ-saida.dz

²-University of Saida

hanaa.berrezoug@univ@saida.dz

Submission: 11/12/2020 **Acceptance:** 05/06/2021 **Pulication:** 30/09/2021.

Abstract: This article deals with Pinter's use of language through which he works out his plays, and by which he has become fortunate enough to be part of a school i.e. the Theatre of the Absurd. His true understanding of the realities of everyday language with its ambiguities, irrationalities, inconsistencies, and fragmentations by which he has featured his stage has spawned him the recurrent term "Pinteresque language" among notable critics. This paper draws on Gilles Deleuze's affect conceptual tool to investigate those strong mutual relations of language and extra-linguistic forces in *The Birthday Party*. To do so, the researchers entail looking to Pinter's myriad performances or/and a representation of power. Focus is put on how Pinter's scholarship of language in the play under study is grounded on the notion of affect as a useful means which engenders references of sensation of the "Pinteresque" i.e. the ability to join the words as they are spoken to the action and image of his characters.

* **Autore corrispondante.**

Key words: Affect, Deleuze, language, Pinter, Pinteresque, power, theatre

1. Introduction: Nobody ignores but rather all concur that we are living in a world of words. Whatever we may do when we meet each other—whether we joke, laugh, play, struggle, gossip, travel—we talk. We talk to their relatives, teachers, friends, enemies, neighbours; we talk to foreigners and strangers. We talk even when we have nothing to say. Talking then is an action which has always existed whether people talk face to face, use signs and symbols or just miming.

Considering this, everyone responds to us with words. Besides, our action of talking sometimes subverts the conventions and the logic of speaking. Sometimes we talk even when there is no-one to respond. We talk to ourselves. Perhaps that is language which sets us apart from other living species on earth, and makes us human, “a living, speaking being” to quote Heidegger (Campbell, 2012, p. xii). Hence, to understand humanity, we have to understand language and its effects on us. Thus, most often language is considered by some mythical and religious philosophies as the “source of human life and power” (Rodman, 1978, p.1). Since it is often difficult or may be even fascinating and still baffling to trace the question how language is originated, the researchers have deemed it vital to tackle its variant uses in the various fields, particularly when language is given freedom to dominate at times and submerge meaning at others. To do so, the researchers refer to the field of literature and more precisely British drama where the theatrical language is still claiming efforts to shore up and slake the quest for ground of certainty, knowledge and truth. Harold Pinter, as a matter of fact is one of the British playwrights, who has devoted pretty much concern to the different aspects of language notably as it manifests itself in the form of power.

Throughout Pinter's major plays, notably *The Birthday Party* (1957), one notices a drastic dramatization of characters giving pattern to and contesting and striving for control over their immediate circumstances. Struggling for power is inevitably the greatest descriptive phrase of the action in Pinter's work. It is therefore quite reasonable to refer to Pinter as a 'dramatist of power'. Since nearly all his plays are interrelated or rather share common characteristics, they advocate this notion of power and incessant struggles over it. His major plays represent a continuous battle for increasing control over another and/or a struggle to hedge one's self against oppression and control at the hands of others.

More often language has garnered the attention of many scholars, thinkers and philosophers who consider it as a human activity. Activity, on the one hand, concerns the individual's attempts to make himself understood by another; and activity, on the other hand, concerns that other to understand what was on the mind of the first. Yet, what is at stake here is that all the endeavours that were made to answer the different questions raised about language are about the essence of language if not about its nature. Since language is still determined just from the atmosphere of mutual intelligibility it creates, it is worth to note that the aim of language is not always to erect understandings between speaker and hearer. It is not always to communicate, but to impose one speaker's authority so as to impress the listener. Therefore, language is not a static or a neutral system to be used without creating changes. It is rather a social practice capable of potential change. For when we use language just to have the listener's agreements equated to ours, compelling him/her to accomplish what we like is by no means to inform but to impress and/or hypnotize the listener. The same utterances may be said but may be interpreted quite differently depending on

who makes them - and what variety they make them in. Bolinger Dwight seems to have a good remark on this point: "If people use language to get the corporation of their fellows, then little of anything that is ever said is entirely neutral; communication is more to influence than to inform" (Dwight 1968, p. 225).

By investigating these characteristics mentioned in some of his plays, scholarships wish to admit that Pinter's genuine claim is to make his readers aware that every speaker is capable or rather guilty of decorating his/her speeches. Every speaker can calculatingly choose the appropriate expressions and manners that will sway his/her audience in any direction he/she wishes. It may sound strange that language may be a form of seduction or instrument of domination; but this is in fact only one aspect of the various forms of language that Pinter is emphasizing much to feature his plays.

Various are the forms that language can take whether written or spoken; however, it is Pinter's dramatic language which is given pretty much concern. For this reason, perhaps, it is on the stage rather than anywhere else that spoken language is given more considerable attention. Moreover, it is that everyday language with its expressive function, irrationalities, silences, tautologies, self-contradictions, pauses, repetitions and ambiguities that fascinate Pinter and through which he worked out his plays (Esslin, 1968). Pinter keeps innovating his language on the stage constantly enhancing his followers among critics to grow apace. Yet to enter in the main stream of debate, it should be pointed out that every day-language is not left for itself. To elucidate this point—lest it may appear flippant or obtuse— one can go back to the term stage which, be it a concrete physical aspect, requires a direct communication and participation of both: the actors and spectators. It asks for a language that can be adequate in space as Antonin Artaud words

it: "...the question of the theatre ought to arose general attention the implication being that, through its physical aspect, since it requires expression in space (the only expression, in fact...)" (Artaud, 1976, p. 55).

To take this idea even further, the researchers attempt to refer to the melting space and its collapse between spectators and stage owing to Pinter's dramatic use of language and its apparent effects on the bodies of the characters on the stage. Pinter's concomitant transcendence of representation is devoted to violence language which it performs at the level of the audience experiences. Pinter's perpetually constant working of his strategic language has made of the latter a product and instrument to perform an intensive function which promptly invoices material repercussions on the onlookers body. This is quite evident in Pinter's subtended performative language in the form of an extra linguistic excess gendering dramatization of power relations and struggles. Simply said, there is no access to Pinter's plays except by way of language and other related orders of representation.

Pinter is the type of the modern playwrights who keeps innovating his creative writing putting much focus on characters' use of language, a feature which has influenced myriads of critics to the point of parody. This particular area has received immediate comment from Austin E. Quigley, who praises the specificities of Pinter's aspect of language claiming that Pinter's characters exceedingly use language as an instrument to negotiate relationship of power—that is what he calls the "interrelational" function of language (Quigley, 1975, p. 54). Thus, the power issue is strongly coalesced into the Pinteresque language with its linguistic variations and techniques such as the use of ordinary vocabulary, repetition, malapropisms, pauses, silences, and the familiar patterns of everyday conversations. Moreover, the

study of Pinteresque and the power issue has attracted many critics who have, in many occasions, applauded Pinter's craftsmanship and use of language. It is the common ground on which many of them have built their investigations.

Interestingly enough, Pinter's works have from the beginning been the subject of considerable interest and much dispute. Pinter's first plays, for example, with their psychological traits and attributes have enhanced Martin Esslin to initiate a Freudian approach as a possible tool of interpretation to be mapped onto Pinter's work in order to explain its meaning (*Esslin*, 1971). Few years later, Pinter's plays received thorough Freudian readings by L. P. Gabbard (1976); the American psychiatrist Dr. A. Franzblau (1967); the American scholar Thomas Adler (1981); and Katharine Burkman (1971).

Other critics, however, seem to consider much more the roots of Pinter's plays from different lenses. Being entirely philosophical, they based their criticisms exclusively on ideas and themes that are recurrent in human beings 'everyday life and deeply integrated and articulated in Pinter's plays. Steven Gale (1977), for example, approaches the theme of menace; W. Baker and S. E. Tabachnick (1973) focus on Pinter's Jewish identity; and Walter (1967) Kerr investigates Pinter's existential themes. Nevertheless, many other critics have escaped the psychological and philosophical theories and deliberately limited themselves to a much safest ground i.e. Pinter's language and its subtleties. Martin Esslin (1970), James Hollis (1970); Austin Quigley (1975); the post-structuralists Guido Almansi and Simon Henderson (1983) may be the doyens of this category of critics. However, in spite of these myriads of criticisms, the interplay between Pinter's works and Deleuze's body of thoughts still remains terra incognita and pristine field of

study. Few researchers have, in fact, conducted a pragmatic approach to study Pinter's conversations on the stage. Therefore, the purport of this article is to exploit this relationship by drawing on Deleuze's Affect theory in *The Birthday Party* to determine the characters' power relations and destruction of weaker character. It is in this optic then, that the researchers emphasize the performance of power as it takes us to the ultimate point where Pinter's writing and its staging together encounters with audiences in a shared act of creation. Consequently, this engenders different effects and production of material changes in both body and mind.

2. Pinter's Language as Power

It is premised that understanding Pinter's plays is strongly associated with his use of language. It is out of his plays that Pinter hopes to capture the mysterious contrasts and intense ambiguities of everyday language with its different purposes so as to widen his audience's experiences. Disciples of this mode of criticism have all concurred that the concept of power has been recurrent in Pinter's plays forming the center of everything the author has written and the staple of a series of long discussion. By language as power, the researcher deals with language as it takes the "form of power", when the purpose from language is not meant to establish true understandings between speaker and hearer, but to assert authority and manipulate the conversation i.e. language with special agenda in mind. Thus, the power issue is a fundamental aspect to approach Pinter's plays. In this respect, Esslin immediately concedes that "behind the highly private world of his plays, there also lurk what are, after all, the basic political problems: the use and abuse of power, the fight for living-space, cruelty, terror." (Esslin, 1976, p. 32)

More importantly, Pinter's characters' continuous struggle and desire for power, particularly in his earlier plays, has become a kind of everlasting disease. They are impulsively obsessed of domination and power that themselves lack and are unable to bring under control. These episodes of struggle-engaged-characters are most of the time episodes for survival, control, or domination. To this extent, power struggle is the bastion where all the characters are involved some would culminate in eminent loss whereas others would simply triumph toward the end of the play.

The consistent and ever transforming dramatization of characters in Pinter's *The Birthday Party* (1957), betokens their ambiguous and prolonged contest for control over their instantaneous circumstances. Thus, power struggle in Pinter's major plays has become one of the most prominent phrases necessary to investigate the action in all Pinter's work.

Interestingly, it is important to emphasize Pinter's ability to join the words as they are spoken to the action and image of his characters. This careful combination between speech and movement of the character will, on the one hand, help us figure out the key to Pinter's linguistics, and grant us the opportunity to see words as they become instruments of domination, on the other. The character who happens to have an over flow of expressions, or more calculated speech asserts his superiority, and erects influence and governance over his companion who becomes his rival in a battle of words that would end in a dichotomous linguistic power dynamic. This aspect is quite noticeable in *The Birthday Party*, Pinter's first full-length play, which was first performed at The Arts Theatre in Cambridge on 28, April, 1958. A three-act play in which the characters are complex, for we cannot recognize why Stanley Webber, a young man in his thirties is hiding from the world. His only refuge is Meg, an elderly woman, sixty-years old, who treats him as

a son and at the same time as a lover. Readers/spectators do not understand why the Jewish, Goldberg and the Irish McCann have taken him away from Meg. In the third act Pinter invites us over to witness that inarticulate speech of Stanley when McCann and Goldberg had determined to take him away. He remains motionless, impressed, unable to talk, to react and even to respond. He is subjected to a stream of language and governed by velocity of mysterious talks of the two terrorists. This torrent incomprehensible and nonsensical speech that drenches Stanley is apparent in the following lines:

McCann: That's it.

Goldberg: We will make a man of you

McCann: And a woman.

Goldberg: You'll be e-oriented

McCann: You'll be rich

Goldberg: You'll be adjusted.

McCann: You'll be our pride and joy.

Goldberg: You'll be a mensch

McCann: You'll be a success

Goldberg: You'll be integrated.

McCann: You'll give orders.

Goldberg: You'll make decisions (*The Birthday Party*)

In a comparable Kafkaesque scene, Goldberg and McCann in *The Birthday Party* went to Meg and Petey's seaside household to find their hapless victim Stanley, seemingly a broken pianist lodger, who they harshly tormented with an understandable torrent language. Like "K" Kafka's hero in *The Trial*, the routinely peaceful life of Stanley is abruptly muddled and his birthday disturbed by the appearance of this outlandish pair Goldberg and McCann. The reader or the spectator would easily hear/trace/touch the

two men's odd bureaucratic interrogation implying Stanley's escape from an organization which they represent.

Being conscious of a potential power of language, Goldberg and McCann use linguistic techniques making their utterances stronger and more effectively forceful. In fact, they are the ones who are giving orders and making decisions, distorting Stanley by their abusive language which is too fast and thick to be understood. It would easily be noticed that there is more effective rhythm in Goldberg and McCann's language in Act three, than in the previous Acts while Stanley remains impressed, motionless, unable to speak; only making inarticulate sounds. It is more fascinating to see that possession and power of language that overwhelms not only Stanley who appears to be the principle victim in the play, but also Petey, Meg's husband. He has tried to protect Stanley, but proves to be weak and easily influenced by accepting McCann and Goldberg's invitation to go with them:

Petey: Where are you taking him?

(They return in silence)

Goldberg: We're taking him to Monty.

Petey: He can stay here.

Goldberg: Don't be silly.

Petey: We can look after him here.

Goldberg: Why do you want to look after him?

Petey: He's my guest.

Goldberg: He needs special treatment.

Petey: We'll find someone.

Goldberg: No. Monty's the best there is. Bring him, McCann.

Petey: Leave him alone! (Then Goldberg and McCann reply): Come with us to Monty. There is a plenty room in the car.

(The Birthday Party Act III)

Petey really lacks words to comment upon the invitation he has been offered. Like Stanley he is unable to move and talk. And the play ends, as it starts, with Meg and Petey alone in the room.

It is therefore very legitimate and quite reasonable to refer to Pinter as a 'dramatist of power'. Pinter has used that technique whereby the characters use language as a weapon or instrument of domination so as to defeat over the partners. This task seems beyond the reach in this play because of the ambiguity and uncertainty that is maintained between the characters. Pinter's use of language, with its inflections, elaborated sentences and more precisely its repetitiveness and discontinuity in this play, though at first glance may seem odd, helps us to come up with a concise formula and trace where the notion of word's domination or domination proper takes place. This is *prima facie* evident in Stanley's speech rhythms when the two men came in. Right from their appearance, the readers may witness the eagerness of each of the two men to have the upper hand over Stanley. Pinter deliberately allows his readers to notice Stanley's intensified inarticulateness and dithering as opposed to the two men's firmness and assertiveness. He is overwhelmed above all by Goldberg. Stanley's manner of repeating the same rhythm, the same hesitation and his successive utterances suggests Stanley's invasion by the two men's terror.

Stanley's inability to endure Goldberg and McCann's oppression is expressed not only from the rhythmic dialogue but also from his great obstinate mutation of the same items and words: "Me?", "What the", "Yes", "En", "An", "Now", "now wait", "you", "He wanted to—he wanted to...." This repetition and obsessive change of the same words and phrases show the weakness of Stanley who seems to accept his weakness proclaimed over

him by the two men especially Goldberg. Thus Esslin wrote: “Conversely, Pinter uses repetition to show how a character gradually learns to accept a fact which at first he had difficulty in taking in.” (Esslin, 1978, p. 219) It is also worth witnessing Stanley’s broken words, when he met Goldberg and McCann, almost in total fusion and frantic rhythmic pattern. Stanley’s behavior and state of mind correspond to what L.S. Vygotsky says in his book *Thought and Language*: “The inner speech of the adult represents his thinking for himself rather than social adaptation, i.e. it has the same function that egocentric speech has in the child. It has the same structural characteristics: out of context it would be incomprehensible to others because it omits to ‘mention’ what is obvious to the speaker.” (Vygotsky, 1975, p. 18)

It is also important to single out that there is no direct connection between the sentences, only a mere mixture of intermingled thoughts wrapped in verbiage with no logical correlations. The reader is overtly left with the characters’ undecipherable speeches and associative thoughts. This demonstrates Pinter’s artistic talent in shaping real life on the stage. He seems to inaugurate a convention whereby thoughts and sentences do not cohere, the same as they are in real life. One can quote Esslin’s explanation of this regard: “...Pinter uses refrain-like recurrence of whole sentences to show that people in real life do not deliver well thought-outset speeches but tend to mix various logical stands of thought which intermingle without any permanent connection...” (Esslin, 1978, p. 220)

Strange enough Pinter’s perpetual refusal to provide detailed motivations for his characters stems from his belief in the dialectical relationship between language and society invoked in Fairclough expressions that language, which “is socially shaping and socially shaped” (Fairclough, 1995, p. 55), would

suffice to undertake this role. This fact is clearly noticeable and apparent in the way Pinter uses language. For Pinter sees language as an inevitable indicator feature beyond which lurks various and complex human relationships. He has really, some scholars believe, invented a drama of “human relations at the level of language itself” (Kennedy, 1975). Pinter admirably invites the readers to share in this enterprise by highlighting how language, in its everyday usage enables us to understand issues of social concern. (Dukore, 1962) Focus is put, especially on the structures and forces that substantially hamper our ways of communication and in frequent measure define our identities. Pinter’s objective is to investigate when and where language is used as an instrument not to communicate but to dissolve, veil and wrap meaning so as to impose domination on the part of the speaker. Thus, Stanley’s speech and thoughts are mixed together and it is hard to make a discrepancy between them.

Stanley’s speech is more indirect, more fragmented and almost entirely hidden. It is a frequently repeated feature in almost the entire play. This is to indicate that Pinter’s most ultimate characters’ purpose is to deceive each other and build up their supremacy. Sometimes the readers are faced with striking unexplained speech, and structurally functionless. Totally nonsensical and absurd that it prolongs suspense.

Goldberg: 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?

McCann. How did he kill her?

Goldberg. How did you kill her?

McCann. You throttled her.

Goldberg. With arsenic.

McCann. There's your man!

(The Birthday Party, ACT II)

3. Giles Deleuze's Affect Concept

It is deemed fundamental to offer an explicit account of the meaning of *affect* concept in Deleuze's philosophy before undertaking any possible analysis of the link between Deleuze and Pinter's works. It should also be acknowledged that Deleuze, though, has never written about Pinter specifically or only has done so *en passant*, their common vision of affect, nonetheless, makes them strong allies.

3.1.Affect Concept

It should be acknowledged that the concept of affect is derived from Deleuze's reading of Spinoza. However, while Spinoza has confined the use of affect in ethics, Deleuze attempts to push the notion of affect to further theorization in different fields as a paradigm attesting to myriad usages, especially in literature where language may be subsumed and subverted. (Cole, David R. 2011, p.549) It should be immediately acknowledged,

however, that the two terms “Affect” and “Affection” do not, by all means, refer to a personal feeling “*sentiment*” or emotions in Deleuze and Guattari. To Barush Spinoza “L’affect” or “*affectus*” is the capability to affect or be affected by other bodies. It is the move of the body, says Spinoza, from one experiential state to another naming the first state of the body “l’affection” and the second “affecting” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p.xvi). Adopting Spinoza’s affirmative idea of the body’s power to affect and be affected, Deleuze stresses the multicliplity of the body’s power to act within degrees in different situations (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: xvii). Thus, in any case, affects are the powers of the body.

Allegedly, however, what is unfathomable in Deleuze’s theory is that the concept affect is an independent thing. Described in terms of the expression of an emotion or physiological effect, affect is the variation, the change at the moment of encounters of bodies. Affect, for Deleuze is the scheme through which all transformations and configurations of bodies when they collide over a period of space and time can be understandable and comprehensible. If “affection” refers to the additive processes, powers and expressions of change, affect expresses or rather determines the conditions for a particular human expression of emotion (Massumi, 2002b, p. 227). Thus; affect as a whole is the virtual co-existence of prospects.

3.2Affective Dimensions on in Pinter's Birthday Party

The discussion of affect would be entirely fruitless if it did not bring us yet to coupling this concept of affect with other concepts such as power, language etc. The researchers, then, engage the characters' conversations and actions in *The Birthday Party* from the perspective of Deleuze's affect conceptual tool to show the procedures under which these characters, especially Stanley, who under the myriad of long pauses and questions exchange, is affected by the power of the indeterminate and non referential interactions. To do so, Pinter as a creator of affect in its multi-dimensionality stresses the direct, mutual involvement of language and extra-linguistic forces on his stage. This, in the case of Pinter's drama, can be achieved not through the figurative sense of words, phrases, slogans, and monologues, but rather through his infamous pauses and silences (Deleuze and Guattari, 1986, p. 22). What makes Pinter outstanding, however, is his genius in disengaging affects in such a way that readers/audiences are no longer capable of identifying. His plays oust affects from their recognized and expected origins such as the menace or terror of marriages and bourgeois life or the hostility and violence of acts of charity and hospitality (Colebrook, 2002).

Interestingly, Stanley's fear and menace in *The Birthday Party* is a mode of thought that is far from being representational, but an affect which is

autonomous from recognition or determined origins. Fear and menace are not named in the play, but are evoked between the images the readers/audiences have out of experience from what comes from outside in everyday life. Pinter, therefore, does not represent these affects, (fear, terror, menace) rather employs lots of aesthetics to provoke sensation within the bodies of readers/spectators. This is, *de facto*, one of Pinter's intentional dramatic strategies and theatrical skills to boost and stimulate uncertainty and dodging both on stage and in audience reaction. These mixed modes of the comic, the threatening, the naturalistic and the surreal would certainly prevent readers/audiences from having the same fixed response or common opinion (Knowles, 1998).

It is deemed fundamental to approach Pinter's affective dimension in *The Birthday Party* from the standpoint of the dramatic power of language which "by the reduction", Tompkins writes "in visibility of affects, effected by language which embeds, distorts or is irrelevant to affects and which thereby impoverishes the affective life of man" (Tomkins, 2008, p. 164).

It is worth noting that in *The Birthday Party*, Pinter minds his readers/spectators to consider a type of power that is not stringently grounded in representation, but which can easily be deduced from the images people encounter in their daily discourse. Readers/spectators can, therefore, recognize the relationship between language and power from deduction; a kind of power which is invoked in detailing dramatization of the concomitant abuse of power. Goldberg and McCann's interrogating Stanley and forcing him say what they want to hear from him is a vivid innuendo of power abuse. By the same token, affect in Pinter's works, some critics suggest, is an imageless phenomena, but is naturally related to experience reflected in the language of menace, anxiety, humour, inculcation and other

akin or comparable words; and in this manner it “constitutes a challenge to thought and therefore to verbal articulation” (Green, 1986, p. 174).

What is stressed throughout is that language is an overriding factor in the exercise of power. Goldberg and McCann’s inescapable threat, violence and menace are true representation of reality of power featured through different instances in the play. For example, Goldberg and McCann’s impoliteness, oppressive interrogation, mockery, sarcasm as illustrated in the following turns of the dialogue:

Goldberg: What would your old mum say, Webber?

McCann: Why did you betray us?

Goldberg: You hurt me weber. You’re playing a dirty game.

McCann: That’s Black and tan fact.

McCann: you betrayed the organization. I know him!

Stanley: you don’t.

Goldberg: What can you see without glasses? Stanley: anything Goldberg: Take of his glasses?

(The Birthday Party Act II)

It is clear then, that Goldberg and McCann assert their power over Stanley because as Pinter writes, “Goldberg and McCann are the hierarchy, the Establishment, the arbiters, the socio-religious monsters [who] arrive to affect alteration and censure upon a member of the club who has discarded responsibility . . . towards himself and others” (Knowles, 1988, p. 34). Consequently, Stanley’s social rights and apparently untouchable respectability have been affected due to this unequal relationship between the characters. The powerful Goldberg and McCann are imposing power, and control over Stanley. Being affected, Stanley has lost his identity as a result of excessive verbal attacks by the two intruders.

4. Conclusion

In this article the researchers have engaged Pinter's manipulative use of power in *The Birthday Party* through the lens of the Deleuzian concept "affect". Mindful the Deleuze's affect is considered not as a linguistic or semiotic representation but rather as a derivative concept from a desire to fathom and articulate the extraordinary, excruciating and damaging configurations of power mediated through language. Just as concepts for Deleuze—are not just names that are attached to things—so do words in Pinter's *The Birthday Party* they veil beneath the reality of things. The interval between words and the meaning they signify is what the researcher may refer to as affect in Pinter's respective play. So the readers/spectators are left to witness fear or terror from the image that pervades life as a whole. What preoccupies Stanley is not the house but the meaning it conveys in that specific context.

Finally, to illustrate the means by which Pinter's work is affective is far from being perfect or complete. However, this work is expected to push further researches and open discussions on new issues employing theories of affect by accommodating the violence language at the audience level and how it performs an actualization within the spectators.

Bibliography List :

1. Artaud, Antonin.(1976). *The theatre of Cruelty, in the Theory of Modern Stage*, edited by Eric Bentley, Penguin Books ltd, Middlesex, England
2. Baker, William and Stephen E. Tabachnick. (1973). *Harold Pinter*. London
3. Burkman, Katharine. (1971). *The Dramatic World of Harold Pinter: Its Basis in Ritual*, Columbus
4. Campbell, Scott M. (2012). *The Early Heidegger's Philosophy of Life Facticity, Being and Language*. New York, Fordham University Press

5. Cole, David R. (The Actions of Affect in Deleuze: Others using language and the language that we make *Journal Educational Philosophy and Theory* Volume 43, 2011 - Issue 6: The Power In/Of Language [David R. Cole](#) Pages: 549-561
6. Colebrook, Claire (2002). Gilles Deleuze. London and New York, Routledge
7. Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B. Massumi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
8. Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari Felix. (1986). *Kafka Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. by Dana Polan, foreword by Reda Bensmaï'a (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
9. Dukore, Bernard. "The Theatre of Harold Pinter." *TDR*, 6, no. 3 (March, 1962), 43-54
10. Dwight, Bolinger. (1968). *Aspects of Language*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc, New York
11. Esslin, M. (1968). *The theatre of the absurd*, revised and enlarged edition. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
12. Esslin, M. (1970). *The people wound*. London: Methuen & Co.
13. Esslin, M. (1982). *Pinter: the playwright*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Esslin, Martin. (1978). *Pinter a Study of his Plays*. 3rd. Ed. Eyre Mathuen, London
15. Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Media Discourse*. UK, London Arnold
16. Green, Andre. (1986). *On Private Madness*. London: Karnac
17. Hollis, James. (1970). *Harold Pinter: the Poetics of Silence*. 1st Edition. New York, Southern Illinois University Press
18. Kennedy, A. K. (1975). *Six dramatists in search of a language: studies in dramatic language*. New York: Cambridge Univ Press.
19. Kerr, Walter. (1967). *Harold Pinter*. New York, Columbia
20. Knowles, Ronald. (1988). *The Birthday Party and The Caretaker Text and Performance*. London, MacMillan Education LTD
21. Lucina P. Gabbard, *The Dream Structure of Pinter's Plays: A Psychoanalytic Approach* (Cranbury and London, 1976).
22. Massumi, Brian (2002b), *Parables for the Virtual: Affect, Movement, Sensation*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC
23. *Pinter, Harold. (1991). Harold Pinter : Plays 1 : The Birthday Party ; The Room ; The Dumb Waiter ; A Slight Ache ; The Hothouse ; A Night Out ; The Black and White ; The Examination*. London Bloomsbury House,, Faber and Faber Ltd

24. Quigley, Austin E. *The Pinter Problem*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975
25. Rodman, Fromkin. (1978). *An Introduction to Language*. 2nd. Edition, Holt, Richard and Winston, New York
26. Tomkins, Silvan S. (2008). *Affect Imagery Consciousness: The Complete Edition*. New York, Springer Publishing Company, LLC
27. Vygotsky, L. S. (1975). *Thought and Language*. Ed. Eugenia Hanfmann and Gertrude Vakar, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts