HAROLD PINTER'S AESTHETICS IN THE MAKING: FROM HANDWRITTEN MANUSCRIPTS TO DRAFTS *MOONLIGHT* AND *ASHES TO ASHES*

HAROLD PİNTER'İN ESTETİĞİNİN YARATILIŞI: EL YAZMALARINDAN MÜSVETTELERE AYIŞIĞI *VE* KÜLLER KÜLLERE *OYUNLARI*

Nesrin DEĞİRMENCİOĞLU

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Kuzey Kıbrıs Kampüsü, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümü, Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Ana Bilim Dalı, dnesrin@metu.edu.tr.

Makale Bilgisi
Türü: Araştırma makalesi
Gönderildiği tarih: 26 Nisan 2023
Kabul edildiği tarih: 23 Eylül 2023
Yayınlanma tarihi: 25 Aralık 2023

Article Info
Type: Research article
Date submitted: 26 April 2023
Date accepted: 23 September 2023
Date published: 25 December 2023

Anahtar Sözcükler
Harold Pinter; Absürt Tiyatro; Ayışığı; Küller Küllere; Pinter Arşivi; El Yazmaları

Keywords
Harold Pinter; Theatre of the Absurd; Moonlight; Ashes to Ashes; Pinter Archieve; Manuscripts

DOI
10.33171/dtcfjournal.2023.63.2.1

Abstract

Martin Esslin emphasizes that "instead of being in suspense as to what will happen next, the spectators are, in the Theatre of the Absurd, put into suspense as to what the play may mean. This suspense continues even after the curtain has come down" (1960, p. 14). In accordance with Bertolt Brecht's Verfremdung effects, alienating the audience from the characters and urging him/her to think, question and respond to the events or the dialogues taking place on stage, Pinter's plays — with all the obscurity and uncertainty the characters are caught in — endow their audiences with more than enough tools to become subjects in the meaning-making process of his plays. No matter whether Pinter's works are categorized as modernist through his transformation of the audience into subjects or just like more recently categorized as postmodernist in the works of Austin Quigley and Mireia Aragay (2009), what enables Pinter to be categorized as both is the obscurity of the language that he uses, and particularly in case of postmodernism, just like Fredric Jameson's assertion of the "breakdown in the signifying chain" (1984, p.71), the broken correlation between the signified and signifiers in the dialogues that Pinter uses, creates the effect of ambiguity in his works. Pinter, in parallel to these definitions, states that "If I'm being explicit, I'm failing" (qtd in Knowles, 2009, p. 75). Considering how important the creation of ambiguity and uncertainty in Pinter's plays is, this essay focuses on the creation process of the Theatre of the Absurd in Pinter's Moonlight and Ashes to Ashes by examining the handwritten and type scripted manuscripts available in the Harold Pinter Archive at the British Library (UK).

Öz

Martin Esslin Absürt Tiyatro'nun izleyicisinin, bir sonraki adımda ne olacağını merak etmek yerine, oyunun ne anlama gelebileceği konusunda bir merak içinde bırakıldıklarını vurgular (1960, p. 14). Bertolt Brecht Verfremdung etkisi tekniğini kullanarak tiyatro izleyicisini sahnedeki karakterlere yabancılaştırıp, izleyicinin düşünmesi, sorgulaması ve sahnedeki diyalog ve olaylara tepki vermesi konusunda onları cesaretlendirir. Harold Pinter de oyunlarında, Brecht'in tekniği ile uyum içinde, karakterin içinde bulunduğu bilinmezlik ve belirsizlikler aracılığı ile izleyicisini oyuna anlam verme süreçlerinde özne kılar. Pinter ister izleyicisini anlam vermede özneye dönüştüren bir modernist olarak görülsün, isterse de son yıllarda Austin Quigley ve Mireia Aragay'in (2009) eserlerinde olduğu gibi bir postmodernist olarak sınıflandırılsın, Pinter'in her iki sınıfa girmesini sağlayan esas faktör, kullandığı dilde bilinmezlik unsurunu öne çıkarmasıdır. Özellikle postmodernizm alanında, Fredric Jameson'ın ileri sürdüğü "işaret zincirinde yaşanan kırılma" (1984, p.71) ile paralel olarak, Pinter'in yarattığı diyaloglarda 'işaret eden' ile 'işaret edilen' arasındaki ilişkinin yıkılması, oyunlarındaki belirsizlik etkisini artırır. Pinter'in "Eğer açık bir şekilde anlatıyorsam, başarısızımdır" (Knowles'da alıntılandı, 2009, p. 75) ifadesi de bu belirsizlik unsurunun bilinçli şekilde yaratıldığını destekler. Belirsizlik ve bilinmezlik unsurlarının Pinter'in oyunlarındaki önemi göz önüne alınarak, bu makale Londra'daki İngiliz Kütüphanesi'nin Pinter Arşivi'ndeki Ayışığı ve Küller Küllere oyunlarının el yazması ve müsveddelerini inceleyip Pinter'in eserlerinin yaratılış süreçlerinde Absürt Tiyatro'yu nasil oluşturduğuna ışık tutmayı amaçlar.

Introduction

Martin Esslin claims that "*Brecht's famous* 'Verfremdung *effects' (alienation effect), the inhibition of any identification between spectator and actor, which Brecht could never successfully achieve in his own highly rational theatre, really comes into its own in the Theatre of the Absurd"* (1960, p. 5). Esslin grounds his argument mainly on how the Theatre of the Absurd makes it impossible for its audience "*to identify oneself with characters one does not understand or whose motives remain a closed book*" (1960, p. 5). As a result, Esslin emphasizes that "*instead of being in suspense as to what will happen next, the spectators are, in the Theatre of the Absurd, put into suspense as to* what the play may mean" (1960, p. 14).

In accordance with Bertolt Brecht's *Verfremdung* effects, alienating the audience from the characters and urging him/her to think, question and respond to the events or the dialogues taking place on stage, Pinter's plays — with all the obscurity and uncertainty the characters are caught in — endow their audiences with more than enough tools to become subjects in the meaning-making process of his plays. No matter whether Pinter's works are categorized as modernist through his transformation of the audience into subjects or just like more recently categorized as postmodernist in the works of Austin Quigley and Mireia Aragay (2009), what enables Pinter to be categorized as both is the obscurity of the language that he uses, and particularly in case of postmodernism, just like Fredric Jameson's assertion of the "*breakdown in the signifying chain*" (1984, p.71), the broken correlation between the signified and signifiers in the dialogues that Pinter uses, creates the effect of ambiguity in his works. Pinter, in parallel to these definitions, states that "*If I'm being explicit I'm failing"* (qtd in Knowles, 2009, p. 75). Considering how important the creation of ambiguity and uncertainty in Pinter's plays is, this essay focuses on the creation process of the Theatre of the Absurd in Pinter's *Moonlight* and *Ashes to Ashes* by examining the handwritten and type scripted manuscripts available in The Harold Pinter Archive at the British Library (UK).

The earliest publication on the archive is Susan Hollis Merritt's (1994) journal article entitled "The Harold Pinter Archive in the British Library" in which she provides an overview on the archive's significance for Pinter scholars. Almost three decades later, in "Our Beginnings Never Know Our Ends: Archiving Harold Pinter", Zoe Wilcox and Jamie Andrews "documents and assesses the growth of the Harold Pinter Archive at the British Library from the initial deposit on loan in 1993,

through the permanent acquisition in 2007" (1). The article provides invaluable information on how Pinter decided to start to deposit his archive in the British Library back in 1992, its growth till its permanent acquisition in 2007 and its ongoing expansion with "satellite collections" up until 2021 (104). As the titles of these two publications suggest, they mainly focus on the archive itself, and the usage of the archival documents to provide a more in-depth understanding of Pinter's literary works remains out of their scope.

Pinter's screenplays and their manuscripts in the archive have attracted attention of scholars and there has been a growing number of publications integrating the screenplays and their creation processes through archival research conducted in the British Library. Linda Rendon's *Pinter and the Object of Desire: An Approach Through the Screenplays* (2001) used unpublished material from the Harold Pinter Archive to examine the creation process of the characters in Pinter's screenplays from a Lacanian perspective. In *Sharp Cut: Harold Pinter's Screenplays and the Artistic Process* (2003), Steven H. Gale "compares the scripts with their sources and the resulting films, analyzes their stages of development, and shows how Pinter creates unique works of art by extracting the essence from his source and rendering it in cinematic terms". Gale's work has become an invaluable resource that thoroughly examines Pinter's screenplays and the creative artistic processes behind it. Matt Harle (2015) following the footsteps of Steven Gale, traces "The Proust Screenplay" in the Harold Pinter Archive and shifts the focus from the "incompletion of the film" to "the form of the work's incompletion" in explaining "the work's limited reception" and debates on the value of the archival research and so on (271).

Jamie Andrews's (2008) book chapter examining Harold Pinter and his significance in the 1960s as a playwright – focusing on the plays' reception and their legacies – was an important attempt to examine his plays in correlation with the archival material available in the British Library but at the same time highlights how limited the scholarship on Pinter's manuscripts is. In this essay, the choice of the plays is determined by the difference in their aesthetic creation processes: *Moonlight* (1993) is a play that gradually develops from the handwritten manuscript to the typescript final version showing a drastic transformation in the characterization and language use whereas in *Ashes to Ashes (1996)* Pinter seems to have a more clear vision about where the play would be leading to even in the first draft. Even though the creation processes of these two plays seem to be quite different from each other, the outcome with the elimination of the repetitive

sentences, creation of a sense of insecurity and uncertainty in the final versions provide an invaluable insight into Pinter's artistic creation processes.

Introduction to *Moonlight* and *Ashes to Ashes*

Moonlight is one of Harold Pinter's family plays which is written after his political plays such as *The Party Time* and is regarded as a return to his "*super-realistic mode of plays*" like *The Homecoming* (Esslin, 2000, p. 23). The two main characters of *Moonlight* are Andy and Bel, who are a married couple, one is in his fifties and the other is fifty, respectively. Andy's deathbed shows the last phase of their marriage which has lost its love and passion, and only the memories of their common past keep them together. They are isolated from their children and Bel tries to find them throughout the play. Three main areas are used by the characters: The first is Andy's bedroom, which is well furbished, and the most of Andy and Bel's dialogues take place there; the second is Fred's bedroom, which is shabby, and it is the space allocated to Fred and Jade (their sons), and the third is mainly related with Bridget (their daughter), who exists at the border of imagination and reality.

The parent, the boys and the daughter have their own free space in the play and they dominate them. Fred and Jade are detached from their parents and have their own way of life. Bridget is like a ghostly figure; her existence is isolated however appallingly connected with her family's. Ralph and Maria are Andy and Bel's old friends who appear like shades of the past, in between reality and imagination, similar to Bridget's dream-like existence. The play includes Andy and Bel's power struggle which is achieved by Pinter's genius for the use of language. Andy is the aggressive, "*loudmouth*" husband while Bel is the rational, self-controlled wife (Pinter, 2005, p. 347). Similar to Pinter's other plays, the characters are quite different from what they seem to be: Andy, who is the dominant power in appearance, tries to hide his flaws, insecurity and fear of death. On the other hand, Bel, who seems to be the submissive housewife, is donated by great power. Martin Esslin describes the play as "*a sardonic, anguished, and intensely felt imagist poem about the approach of old age and death*" (2000, p. 26). According to Francis Gillen, in *Moonlight*, Pinter puts "absence" on the stage: "*In the presence of death each [Bel and Andy] feels and brings movingly to the stage the absences in their lives which the other could not fill*" (1993, p. 32). The play is the plea of Andy and Bel who are longing for children, friends and days that are no more.

Ashes to Ashes is one of Pinter's extraordinarily powerful political plays. At the beginning of the play, Pinter leaves the audience ignorant of the relationship between Devlin and Rebecca. They seem to be an interrogator and a criminal, respectively. Rebecca is the wife narrating her memories about her 'lover' who resembles a torturer. He tries to suffocate her, tears the babies from the arms of their screaming mothers and so on (Pinter, 2005, p. 407). Devlin is the husband who is ignorant of his wife's past, and by his interrogation tries to take that obscure area under his control. Rebecca carries the burden of all political mistakes which have threatened the existence of mankind. Pinter describes Rebecca as follows:

> From my point of view the woman is simply haunted by the world she's been born into, by all the atrocities that have happened. In fact they seem to have become part of her own experience, although in my view she hasn't actually experienced them herself. That's the whole point of the play. I have myself been haunted by these images for many years, and I'm sure I'm not alone in that... (qtd. in Esslin, 1992, p. 54)

According to Billington, in *Ashes to Ashes*, the 'personal' and the 'political' operate together, "*both as a twisted, perverted, love story and as an evocation of the arbitrariness and cruelty of state power*" (1997, p. 375). Charles Grimes explains that Pinter shows "*how sustained empathy with the legacy of atrocity is made problematic by the circumstances of bourgeois comfort and by the social and temporal distances between the event of the genocide and his audience*" (2004, p. 72). *Ashes to Ashes* is an outstandingly powerful play on atrocity, insecurity and lives of the victims under threat.

Introduction to the Manuscripts

This essay aims at to research the creation process of *Moonlight* and *Ashes to Ashes,* which are quite different from each other, by using handwritten manuscripts, the first and second drafts of the plays, in the Harold Pinter Archive, at the British Library (UK). Most of the manuscripts are handwritten on ruled yellow refill pads. The drafts are type scripted and corrected by handwritten notes. Pinter usually writes with black ball-point and in the handwritten manuscripts crosses through and makes corrections usually with the same colour, probably during the writing process. For *Moonlight*, three handwritten manuscripts are used for this

essay: a yellow refill pad named *First Notes 1977/8*[1], another yellow refill pad, handwritten attached yellow manuscripts, and a small thin white paged pad. In the handwritten manuscripts, the names of the characters do not appear from the beginning: Pinter refers to them as 'A' and 'B' or 'C' and 'D'. Even though each of these characters seems to be different from each other at the beginning, as the play proceeds, 'A' and 'B' in the *First Notes,* and sometimes 'C' and 'D' in the remaining manuscripts transform into Andy and Bel.

In the manuscripts, it is obvious that Pinter has the idea of a couple from the beginning, however the other characters are created gradually during the writing process of A and B. Even though Pinter has the idea of including children, he has not yet decided on their gender and number. From the *First Notes* to the first and second drafts, the characters' use of language goes under a change by clarification of language, disappearance of emotional reactions, and the female characters gain power in the implicit power struggle. The change in the female characters', especially Bel's, use of language and, the female characters' increasing power and dominance in the play are analysed.

The small white paged pad includes Bridget's monologue and Ralph's speech. The first draft includes more correction than the second. In the first draft, Andy and Bel, Fred and Jade's dialogues exist; nevertheless Bridget, Maria and Ralph's monologues and speeches appear as short handwritten notes in the first draft. The play takes its final form more or less in the second draft. Bridget becomes an individual character and Pinter gives voice to her in the second draft: Her monologues and also the conversation between Bridget, Fred and Jade appears. Maria and Ralph's speeches to boys exist in the second draft. Also, the conversation between Andy, Bel, Maria and Ralph appears. From the first notes to the drafts Pinter gives more power to Bel and according to this change in the distribution of power, the tension between the two increases. Pinter rarefies his language by eliminating the repetitious words and sentences, and creates a more powerful language by using fewer words.

On the other hand, most of the handwritten manuscripts of *Ashes to Ashes* are found on a yellow refill pad. The first half of the pad is written by black ball point and corrected by green, and the second half is written by green and corrected by black on yellow ruled pages. This manuscript includes the most interesting notes

[1] The name is a later addition to the top of the page. There is also a question mark after the year, probably Pinter is not sure whether they are written in 1977/8.

on *Ashes to Ashes*; there are passages omitted either from the drafts or the final published version which are quite important to give insight to political stance of the play. The first and the second drafts are also researched but the changes on the play are minute. Even though the creation process of *Moonlight* is remarkable as a gradually developed play, the manuscript notes of *Ashes to Ashes* are remarkably similar to the published version.

In the manuscripts, the play reminds the reader of Pinter's early plays: A powerful husband and a passive wife talking the nostalgia about the past — like Meg and Petey in *The Birthday Party* or Kate and Deeley in *Old Times*. In the manuscripts, Andy sounds similar to Max in *Homecoming* who tries to be the dominant power as the head of the family but fails to be so. However, Pinter's *Moonlight* is distinguished from those early plays by its expansion into new territories throughout the creation process by the addition of the characters Bridget, Fred, Jade, Ralph and Maria.

To summarize, the documents that have been used for this essay are as follows:

Moonlight

1. **Handwritten Manuscripts**
   a. First Notes 1977/8
   b. Another yellow refill pad
   c. Handwritten attached yellow manuscripts
   d. A small thin white paged pad
2. **Type Scripted Manuscripts**
   a. First Draft
   b. Second Draft
   c. Final Version

Ashes to Ashes

1. **The Handwritten Manuscript:** a yellow refill pad
2. **Type Scripted Manuscripts:**
   d. First Draft
   e. Second Draft
   f. Final Version

Gender and the Balance of Power

Bel appears to be a passive housewife dominated by her husband in the first draft and especially in the manuscripts. The language used in the handwritten manuscripts is more repetitive than the drafts. The repetitions and the use of the

words are minimized as the play develops from the manuscripts to the first and the second drafts. Andy and Bel use shorter but more powerful sentences in the drafts.

The First Notes of *Moonlight* written in 1977/8[2] begins with the following dialogue which shows the change in the power relations and the use of language between male and female characters indicated by letters 'A' and 'B', and who become Andy and Bel respectively:

A: You're a wonderful woman.

B: Thank you.

A: You make everything worthwhile. It's your heart. A good heart I can hear it from here. Banging away. A lovely heart. One of the best. I met Maryann Marianne Maria the other day[3]. The day before I was stricken.

B: Oh, yes?

A: She invited me back to her flat. I said to her if you have thighs prepare to bear them now. What heaven.

B: Yes, you have always entertained a healthy lust for her.

A: A healthy lust?

Yes, yes you are right.

B: And she for you.

A: Has that been the whisper in ~~Fortnum and Masons~~?

The paddock?[4]

B: Poor Maryanne. Her tragedies. Terrible. Her husband lost. Two children lost.

A: Two?

B: All in one year.

All lost.

A: ~~Rubbish~~.

B: Did she know you were ill?

A: I wasn't ill.

Andy's compliment about Bel in the above dialogue appears intentionally in the past tense both in the drafts and in the final version. Andy says, "*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*" (2005, p. 321)[5] (Italics mine). The use of the past tense makes clear that Bel is no longer loved and appreciated by Andy. Even

[2] The First Notes of *Moonlight* written in 1977/8 will be indicated throughout the essay as the *First Notes*.

[3] Pinter works on Maria's name. All the crossed out part in the essay will be the same as the original manuscripts.

[4] Pinter crosses out "Fortnum and Masons" and replace it with "the paddock".

[5] The published version.

though Andy corrects his speech by saying "*You still have of course*", his insincerity is obvious. Furthermore, the sentences repeating the same idea such as "*A lovely heart. One of the best*" and those showing emotion such as "*What heaven*" in the manuscript are eliminated in the drafts. Thus, Pinter creates a more powerful dialogue by using fewer words. Moreover, the story that Bel narrates about Maria reflects her own destiny: Andy is in his deathbed and she is detached from her sons. This speech dedicated to Maria does not exist in the first draft. At the end of the dialogue, Andy reveals that he was not ill when he was talking with Maria. This indicates that Andy is revealing his old memories. In the above dialogue, Andy is a stronger source of power than Bel when compared to the drafts and the final version.

Pinter adds Andy's speech on being a civil servant to the second draft (2005, p. 333). In the *First Notes*, Andy declares that "*No, I was not loved. But love is not a feature any civil servant wanting his salt would want to give elbow room to*". In the second draft, Andy is not as blunt as he is in the first draft. He states that he is not loved in an indirect way: "*I do not say I was loved. I didn't want to be loved. Love is an attribute no civil servant worth his salt would give house room to*" (2005, p. 333). By rejecting love on behalf of himself, he eliminates the vulnerability of being not loved.

Andy is proud of himself as a source of inspiration to the others, by being an admired, respected and first-class civil servant (2005, p. 333). However, after his self-assertive speech, Bel's question "*But you never swore in the office*?" shifts the balance of power between the two towards Bel. Bel's question, which seems quite simple, unexpectedly reveals Andy's flaws and his self-assertive speech is no longer valid. The dialogue between the two continues as follows:

> Andy: I would never use obscene language in the office. Certainly not. I kept my obscene language for the home, where it belongs.
>
> *Pause*
>
> Oh there is 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.

Andy: Has that been the whisper along the white sands of the blue Caribbean? I'm dying. Am I dying? (2005, p. 334).

Andy realizes that Bel has defeated him by showing his flaws and in revenge, he reveals his betrayal of Bel with Maria. By hurting Bel's feelings, he calculates to gain his powerful position. However, Bel's cold-blooded indifference and acceptance of the betrayal once more distracts Andy's plan. Instead of "*The white sands of the blue Caribbean*" (2005, p. 334), Pinter uses "Fortnum and Mason" and then corrects it as "*The Paddock*" in the *First Notes*. Nevertheless, "*the blue Caribbean*", with its exotic and distant connotations reflects the difficult circumstances Andy encounters in the power struggle. The dominance is as far away as "*the blue Caribbean*" (2005, p. 334). Therefore, without waiting for Bel's response, Andy changes the subject to his health and by pretending to be dying, tries to hide his injured pride. From the first manuscripts to the second draft Andy gradually loses power while Bel gains more power in comparison.

Pinter uses the same tactic in Andy and Bel's battle to gain dominance over each other when Andy longs to see Maria in his deathbed:

B: She's probably forgotten you're dying. If she ever remembered.

A: What! What!

Pause

I had her in our bedroom by the way, once or twice, on our bed. I was a man at the time (2005, p. 352).

Bel hurts Andy by implying that he is not as important for Maria as he supposes himself to be. After the first shock, Andy calms down to prepare a counterattack. By revealing his betrayal of her with Maria, Andy tries to hurt Bel and gain dominance in their power struggle.

In the *First Notes*, the dialogue between Andy and Bel, concerning Andy's death, is under Andy's dominating power to lead the discussion:

A: Where are my sons?[6]

B: I am trying to find them.

A: They can't have disappeared from the face of earth. Two whole sons. Their father dying.

B: You are not dying.

[6] This dilogue is written for two sons and then corrected for one, however in the first draft it reappears as two sons. I prefered to use the first version for two sons as the corrected version will be analyzed later in the essay.

A: I know that. If I were dying … you know what I would be now? *If I were dying, I'd be dead.* [7]

B: Dead.

A: Right. But you say I'm dying.

B: Perhaps not.

A: Do I look dead?

B: No.

The dialogue above includes contradictory statements. Even though Bel declares that Andy is not dying, he changes his own statement and blames Bel for saying that he is dying. Although, Bel has not said that, she submissively accepts Andy's accusation. On the other hand, in the first draft, Bel gathered her power to say that "You'd have come to a dead halt ages ago, if you were ~~actually~~ dying". In the second draft, the dialogue takes its final form:

Andy: Has that been the whisper along the white sands of the blue Caribbean? I'm dying. Am I dying?

Bel: If you were dying, you'd be dead.

Andy: How do you work that out?

Bel: You'd be dead if you were dying (2005, p. 334).

From the passive, submissive woman in the *First Notes*, Bel transforms into a decisive, powerful character in the second draft. She becomes the ultimate source of knowledge when she repeats her claim without giving any explanation.

Andy is more kind towards Bel in the *First Notes*. As Bel is the passive character in the manuscripts, Andy does not need to struggle with her to protect his powerful position. Nevertheless, he develops into a rude character and becomes harsher in the first and second drafts as Bel gains supremacy in their power struggle. The following dialogue between the two appears in the *First Notes*:

A: Do I look dead?

B: No.

A: I suppose you'll tell next spring is coming.

~~B: Oh~~.

A: Spring in England. I've always been an optimist. The paraphernalia of flowers.

B: What a lovely phrase.

A: You have never heard it before?

B: Never.

[7] All the later additions to the manuscripts will be indicated by 'italics'.

A: I've never said that before?

B: No.

A: You mean its original?

B: Absolutely.

A: What an encouragement you are. What a solace you give me. […]

Andy is the leading figure in this dialogue. He conceptualizes Bel's ideas by leading her with questions in his favour. Bel is passive in the production of the ideas, she only supports Andy's point of view with short answers confirming his questions and satisfying his ego. However, in the first draft Pinter reshapes Bel as a more powerful figure. She is strong enough to express contradictory ideas which would be annoying for Andy:

B: You'd have come to a dead halt ages ago, if you were actually dying.

A: What you say makes absolutely no sense at all but I'm happy to take your word for it. You mean I'll see spring again? Is that what you're saying? I'll see another spring, all the paraphernalia of flowers.

B: What a lovely use of language. You know, you've never said such a thing before. [8]

A: Oh so what? I've said other things, haven't I? Plenty of other things. All my life. All my life I've been saying plenty of other things.

In the first draft, Bel is no longer a passive housewifely figure accepting the dominance of her husband. Therefore Andy finds himself in the middle of a power struggle to protect his dominance. In the first draft, Bel is courageous enough to show Andy that he is not dying by using offensive remarks. As a counter attack, Andy degrades her by indicating her use of language as meaningless, and tries to lead her in along a new pathway where he could control her ideas once more. However, Bel's response that he has never used such a beautiful phrase before is still an attack on his good opinion of himself. Thus, he emphasizes "many other things" that he has said to lessen the importance of the phrase in question.

In the second draft, Pinter recreates Bel as a self-confident woman and at the same time, puts harsher words in Andy's mouth. In the second draft, Andy calls Bel a "*raving lunatic*" (2005, p. 335). On the other hand, Bel becomes courageous enough to criticize Andy in her long speech (2005, p. 335). In the second draft,

[8] There is a handwritten addition: "Used language that way before".

Pinter still works on adjectives to create a fierce speech. The speech includes the adjectives "*coarse, crude, obscene, brutal*"; "*vacuous*" and "*puerile*" as a hand-written addition. The speech appears as follows in the final version:

> Yes, its true that all your life in all your personal and social attachments the language you employed was mainly coarse, crude, vacuous, puerile, obscene and brutal to a degree. Most people were ready to vomit after no more than ten minutes in your company [...] (2005, p. 335).

In the second draft, Andy's motives become more emotional while Bel is more rational. He loses his temper and the only way to destroy Bel's dominance is by calling her a "*raving lunatic*" (2005, p. 335). Bel, on the contrary, is quite self-controlled and in a rational and objective tone she mesmerizingly criticizes Andy, and the silence coming after her speech seems to mark a defeat in Andy's terms.

The dialogue on the phrase "*taking the piss out of*" undergoes changes that transform the language into a weapon (2005, p. 321). In the first draft, Andy says "*Nonplussed? You've never been nonplussed, in the whole of your voracious life*", and there are handwritten adjectives "*virulent*" and "libidinous" on the page. In the second draft, the sentence transforms into: "*Nonplussed! You've never been nonplussed in the whole of your voracious, lascivious, libidinous life*" (2005, p. 321). The exclamation mark after the word "nonplussed" gives more emphasis to the word and suggests a more emotional reaction, making fun of Bel's use of language. The handwritten adjective "*virulent*" is changed by "*lascivious*" in the second draft, which is in rhyme with the other adjectives. The "s" sounds give the impression that the words are exploding through Andy's angry mouth.

The contrast between emotion and reason, between Andy and Bel, reach a climax at the end of the dialogue on "*taking the piss*" (2005, p. 321). Bel questions the "*rational explanation*" behind the phrase "*taking the piss*" and Andy's response is remarkable:

> 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 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 (2005, p. 322-23).

Bel's cold-blooded questioning of Andy's use of language, and of the rationality behind it, clashes with Andy's explosive anger. The analogy of rationality with defecate reflects Andy's rising irritation and battle to eliminate Bel's rising position in the power struggle. Pinter worked on his words in the first draft: "Drainpipe" is crossed out in the first draft and "cesspit" is a handwritten addition; the consonants 'p', 't' in "*burping*" and "*farting*" are explosive and stress Andy's emotional outburst. Thus, the addition of the word "*cesspit*" makes a contribution to both the semantics and the pronunciation of the sentence. Furthermore, Pinter crossed out the words "*codswallop*" and "*baconing*", and finally decided on "*pigswill*", a handwritten correction to the first draft.

Pinter raised the tension between the two characters through the calm questions that Bel asks Andy. On the other hand, Andy, who has complete belief in himself, cannot tolerate to be interrogated by Bel, who is supposed to be a submissive housewife in his eyes. Andy's last questions in this scene -"Why? Why? (pause) What do you mean?"- appear in the first draft as a handwritten addition. It reveals Andy's growing insecurity in his relationship with Bel. Moreover, Pinter gives Bel more power in the second draft and Andy loses his dominance gradually during the creation process: Both characters turn out to be more complicated. The following speech is an addition to the second draft:

> Bel: You may be dying but that doesn't mean you have to be *totally* ridiculous.
>
> Andy: Why am I dying, anyway? I've never harmed a soul. You don't die if you're good. You die if you're bad (2005, p. 322).

Meanwhile, Andy's concentration on his death, rather than Bel's critique of him, opens up a new emotional dimension. His conception of death echoes like a child's insufficiency to explain death. As Hall states "All Pinter's characters have masks […] But the mask almost never slips" (Dukore, p. 59). Andy is a complex character and his obstinacy and aggression mask his underlying weakness and his fear of death. Therefore, what is said on the surface and what is meant underneath are quite different: "I was not jealous then. Nor am I jealous now" (2005, p. 336), is a handwritten addition to Andy's speech in the first draft, and it strongly suggests just the opposite of what Andy claims. Andy's new sentence tries to deny his jealousy but on the contrary reveals it. In the *First Notes* the dialogue is as follows:

> A: But please don't think I am or have ever been jealous.
>
> B: Why should you be?

She was your mistress.

A: Was. Was. Long long ago. Long long ago.

B: In the first years of our marriage in fact.

A: She must have reminded me of you.

Throughout the creation process, Pinter eliminates unnecessary sentences and increases the power of the words by using the less. In the first draft, Bel's speeches are combined to create one more effective response: "Why should you be jealous? She was your mistress. Throughout the early and lovely days of our marriage" (2005, p. 336). Andy's repetitive words "long long ago" are absent in the first draft. He replies, "Was she really? She must have reminded me of you", as a response to Bel's blunt reaction. In the second draft, Andy's question "Was she really?" is eliminated and his direct response gives him more power against Bel's sharp reaction. Furthermore, towards the end of the dialogue Andy recalls that once a woman walked towards him across a darkening room. The rest of the dialogue in the first draft is as follows:

Bel: That was me.

Andy: You?

Bel: ~~Or perhaps not.~~

However, Bel's last words are crossed out on the first draft and Pinter transforms her into a character sure of herself. In the final version, there are pauses between their speeches, and Pinter allows the reader to question the reliability of the memory of the two characters who are challenging each other. Pinter's use of pauses in the final version shows a shift from verbally and explicitly stimulating the reader or the audience to question the characters' reliability for a more implicit invocation through literary form.

The dialogue about Andy's food does not exist in the first draft but appears in the second. In the attached handwritten manuscripts, the attitude of the characters are completely different:

B in with food.

B: I've brought your food.

A: Just what the doctor ordered.

B: Mashed potatoes and a pear.

A: Have I no teeth?

Is that what you think?

I can't bite?

B: They are lovely mashed potatoes.

A: Stick them up your arse.

Overturns plate

She cries

In the manuscript, Andy is an aggressive husband while Bel appears as an emotionally weak wife submissive to Andy's rude behaviour. Andy, who demands a better food in fury in this manuscript, transforms into a naïve old man appreciating Bel's efforts in the second draft:

> 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. I'd flounder without you. I'd fall apart. Well, I'm falling apart as it is — but if I didn't have you, I'd stand no chance.
>
> Bel: You're not a bad man. You're just what we used to call a loudmouth.
>
> You can't help it. It's your nature. If you only kept your mouth shut more of the time life with you might just be tolerable.
>
> Andy: Allow me to kiss your hand. I owe you everything.
>
> *He watches her embroider.*
>
> Oh, I've been meaning to ask you, what are you making there? A winding sheet? Are you going to wrap me up in it when I conk out? You'd better get a move on. I'm going fast (2005, p. 348).

In the second draft, Bel's acceptance of Andy's compliment comes along with her critique of him as "a loudmouth" and she is capable of analysing his nature. Andy's last speech presents him as "a loudmouth" and it disguises his fear of death beneath his humour. In the first draft the dialogue above does not exist, therefore Andy and Bel's dialogue goes on as follows:

> Andy: Where's my lovely daughter? My sons. One daughter. Two sons. Absent. Indifferent. Their father dying.
>
> Bel: Do you remember how the boys used to help me with the washing-up?
>
> Andy: The washing-up?
>
> Bel: And the drying. The washing-up and the drying. And of course the cleaning of the table. They used to help their mother. Don't you remember?

> Andy: You mean in the twilight? The soft light falling through the kitchen window. Is that what you mean? The sound of pigs rutting in the piggery.
>
> Bel: My hopes in my children, I must say, have been fulfilled. I did have very high hopes, I confess. But they have all been fulfilled.

In the second draft, the daughter is not mentioned in that particular dialogue. Andy's repetitive question "The washing-up?" is also omitted in the second draft. Bel's fulfilment about her children does not exist in the second draft. Thus, the isolation between the children and the parent becomes stronger in the second draft. Andy is a man more capable of doing what he imagines in the *First Notes* and in the first draft; Pinter transformed him into a weaker figure in the second draft. In the *First Notes*, Andy's wish to go to the common appears as follows:

> A: **I'll be up soon and out.**
>
> P
>
> **I'll be up soon and out, striding across the common fierce as a fart.** I'll watch them playing football who was that old friend of mine? What was his name? Used to referee amateur matches, club matches (in the park). Lunacy! They treated him like dirt. A subject of scorn (2005, p. 349)[9]

Pinter uses the future tense in the first sentence and makes Andy's speech seem a fairly reliable plan to be achieved. "*Soon*" emphasizes an action that is going to be done in the near future. The choice of monosyllables such as "*up*", "*soon*", "*out*", "*fart*", gives momentum to the sentence and the possibility of reading the sentence in a rush, increases its potential to be actualized. Pinter indicates 'pauses' with the letter "P" in his handwritten manuscripts. This shows that 'pause' is a crucial and significant element in Pinter's dialogues. Although some long speeches are divided by pauses later in the drafts, Pinter frequently uses 'pauses' during his creation process. In the first draft, Andy's speech undergoes a few changes:

> **I need a good stretch of the legs. Any minute now I'll be up- and about- across the common- watch a game of football.** What was the name of old chum of mine? Used to referee amateur games every weekend rain or shine? On the common? [...][10].

[9] The page number given is for the final (published) version (2005, p. 349).

[10] The rest of the speech is the same as the final (published) version (2005, p. 349).

Now, going to the common is a physical necessity. The location of the speech in the near-present still reflects Andy's potential to actualize his will. The second sentence, which Pinter breaks into four fragments, could reflect the excitement of an elderly man. Even though there is a direct connection between going to the Common and his old memories, the first two sentences affirm Andy's capacity to realize what he says. However, Andy's speech takes its final form in the second draft:

> **I have got to stretch my legs. Go over the Common, watch a game of football, rain or shine.** What was the name of that old chum of mine? Used to referee amateur games every weekend? On the common? Charming bloke. They treated him like shit. A subject of scorn. No decision he ever made was adhered or respected. They shouted at him, they screamed at him, they called him every kind of prick. I used to watch in horror from the touchline. I'll always remember his impotent whistle. It blows down to me through ages, damp and forlorn. What was his name? And now I'm dying and he's probably dead (2005, p. 349)[11].

Although going to the common is still expressed as a physical necessity, it is now an emotional longing for the days of youth that are no more. Andy's description of going to the common - "Go over the Common, watch a game of football, rain or shine"- is locked in the past now. The rest of the speech about Andy's referee friend is the same as in the first draft; however, it is more in harmony with the beginning of the speech which reflects Andy's nostalgia. Pinter reshapes Andy by changing his use of language and from the manuscript to the second draft, he loses his physical power and transforms into a more passive elderly man.

Andy fears death and he is insecure of the potentiality of being assaulted by Bel: "*What do you mean? Are you threatening me? What do you have in mind? Assault*?" (352). His rising insecurity is reflected in his harshening language. In the first draft, Andy says, "[...][12]*May I remind you that I'm on my deathbed? What do you intend to do, kill me in the act? How much blood does a corpse retain and for how long, for Christ's sake?*" (Italics mine). In the second draft, "*blood*" is changed to "*sexual juice*". The direct reference to sexuality stresses Andy's masculinity, and his implied sexual dominance as a man is used to defeat Bel's calm response -"*Oh you.*

[11] The page number given is for the final (published) version.

[12] The beginning of the speech is the same as the final (published) version (2005, p. 352).

Oh yes. I can still have you" (2005, p. 352). Even though it seems contradictory, Andy tries to hide his increasing insecurity by the mask of his masculinity. Andy and Bel's dialogue continues as follows in the second draft and final version:

> Andy: The truth is I'm basically innocent. I know little of women. But I've heard dread tales. Mainly from my old mate, the referee. But they were probably all fantasy and fabrication, bearing no relation whatsoever to reality.
>
> Bel: Oh, do you think so? Do you really think so? (2005, p. 353).

In the first draft, Bel had said "*Oh, do you think not? Do you really think not?*". Although the questions she utters - "*Oh, do you think so? Do you really think so?*" (353) - seem to be the questions of an innocent wife, they imply just the opposite and reveal of women as capable of dreadful deeds. Although Bel is not as wordy as Andy throughout the play, her language is very powerful. Beneath her calm and rational responses - and even her passive appearance, in contrast with Andy's emotional outbursts - she hides a strong and complex character. Her powerful command of language and the implied meaning behind their innocent appearance, show the threatening glints of her complex character.

In the first draft, Andy is remarkably kind towards Bel and it is easier for him to appreciate her point of view. Andy ends their dialogue about death –in which Bel states the link between the newly born babies and death (358)- by saying, "You know, I never thought of it that way. Well, you live and learn, I'll say that". In the second draft, and also in the final version, Andy asks "Really?" and Bel replies "Of course" (2005, p. 359)[13]. On the one hand, Pinter gives complete authority to Bel to declare her point of view; on the other, he reshapes Andy as a more suspicious character questioning Bel's knowledge and therefore the power that comes to her along with it.

Maria and Ralph: Later Appearances

In the first draft, Maria and Ralph exist only as part of Andy and Bel's nostalgia for the old days. The conversation between Maria, Ralph, Andy and Bel does not exist. Moreover, there are handwritten notes on the first draft: "Maria and Ralph — we didn't live here anymore, of course", and "Old Andy? Not a chance" and these two sentences are the origin of the scene with the four characters. This scene appears in the second draft, nonetheless, Pinter prefers to use present tense, "We

[13] The page number is given according to the printed final version.

don't live up here anymore [...]"; instead of the past tense, "We *didn't* live here anymore [...]", used for the note (Italics mine). The use of the present tense creates a dilemma whether the scene is Andy's imagination or reality. The use of the present tense increases the possibility that Maria is uttering those words in the present, however, their ghostly appearance throughout the play, especially Maria and Ralph's monologues directed to boys, isolate them from the real life and imprison them in the characters' imagination whether they are dead or alive. The time span of "ten years ago" that Ralph mentions in the final version (2005, p. 377), is a handwritten addition on the second draft and it is also an attempt to locate their conversation into the present time.

In the second draft, there is a handwritten correction on Maria's speech which emphasizes her talents: "I mean physically. Mentally artistically they take after me"[14]. Conventionally, the woman represents physical beauty, lacking mental superiority, but Pinter now challenged gender stereotypes by emphasizing Maria's mental strength and artistic talent. This strengthens the women's status in the play.

In the *First Notes*, Andy narrates more stories about their past and he has longer speeches. The dialogue below did not survive into the drafts:

> A: What an encouragement you are. What a solace you give me. You mean you might still take me to dinner parties? That I might still be entertaining to others? Turn with a smile, bewitch with a word, be magnetic, still?
>
> P
>
> One meets wonderful people at *dinner* parties. People whose wives have left them, painters & diplomats & their wives who have left them, the delectable, *solid*, legitimate, *unfortunately* rift-raft, some, & accompanied by wives who have not left them.
>
> I have sometimes at larger gatherings, great balls for instance, observed wives who have left their husbands in earnest consultation with wives who have not left their husbands. Maryann & you for example.
>
> B: Not at a great ball.
>
> A: No.
>
> B: She's my oldest friend.

[14] The addition appears the same in the published vesion (377).

A: She ~~left~~ killed her husband for you.[15]

B: For me?

A: Between you you squashed him until he was ~~nothing~~ but a slain. Between you you crushed him to death.

B: Oh really, *how silly*.

A: I agree. It is ~~graceless~~ to discuss woman as murderer ~~when she has just made a pot of tea~~ at this time of night.

Andy's description of Maryann and Bel as wives "who have not left" their husbands and their "earnest consultation" with the divorced women imply their unhappy marriages. Furthermore, the story about Maria's husband did not survive into the drafts: It suggests Pinter's state of mind at the beginning of the process of creating the relations between the two couples. Their relationships, and their individual characteristics, especially Maria and Ralph's, were not immediately determined. Moreover, Pinter crossed out Andy's insult which would have diminished Bel into a stereotypical housewife.

Maria's long speech to the boys does not exist in the first draft (2005, p. 332). There is only a handwritten note, "*Maria (to boys) – Do you remember me?*". In the second draft, her monologue gives insight into Andy's youth as "*one of the great waltzers. An elegance and grace* […]"; though it contradicts our perception of Andy as a rude, old man. Similarly, Ralph's speech to the boys does not exist in the first draft (2005, p. 342), but there is a handwritten addition: "*Ralph- I myself have often wanted to have a few words with you boys ..... not I was a loving husband*". Ralph's monologue appears in the second draft and the same remains in the published version. Ralph describes Andy as a "thinker" and an intellectual interested in poetry and arts, which is in contrast with bedridden Andy, detached from arts and joy of reading poetry, and stuck in the old memories.

Maria and Ralph gain their individual identities in the second draft. It is indicated that both characters talk to Jade and Fred, however, they have no interaction with the boys. They appear as part of the boy's imagination. Moreover the scene between Maria, Ralph, Bel and Andy is located at the end of the play. Throughout the play Andy longs for old days and the location of the scene reminds of a dream which is fulfilled by Andy's imagination. Similar to their late appearance in the creation process of the play, their existence is a dilemma between reality and hallucination.

[15] Pinter changes the verb "left" with "killed". He prefers to use more powerful verbs.

Bridget: Creation of an Independent Character

In the first handwritten manuscripts, Pinter was not sure of the number or the gender of the children. The characters Fred, Jade and Bridget develop gradually throughout the creation process. In the *First Notes* written in 1977/8, the children appear as follows:

A: Where ~~are~~ my/sons?
B: I am trying to find ~~them~~ him.
A: He ~~They~~ can't have disappeared from the face of earth.
~~Two~~ One whole/sons. His ~~Their~~ father dying.[16]

Pinter, not unlike Andy, was trying to create sons. He was unsure if there should be one or two: First written as two sons, then corrected as one, and two sons reappear in the first draft. Meanwhile, the idea of a daughter existed in the handwritten manuscripts and the first draft. She gained her individual characteristics and grew into Bridget in the second draft; and again, Andy's confusion paralleled Pinter's own creative search:

A: Where is my daughter?
B: I am trying to find her.
A: Trying? Trying?
You're just sitting here by the damned bed. Is that trying?
B: I have been trying.
A: One daughter. ~~Two~~ One son~~s~~! Absent! Their father dying.
B: You are not dying.
A: I was. I am. I will be.
B: So will they.
A: You have not been trying to tell me with your famous subtlety that
both my children have been killed in a car crash, in one smash?
B: I don't know. I suspect not.
A: What a mother.
Pause

Though, Pinter alters the number of the children, the isolation of the parent from the children is obvious from the very first notes. Bel's trial to find the boys is in vain and they are so detached from each other that the parent is unsure whether they are alive or not.

[16] The dialogue is written down with original corrections.

Moreover, *First Notes* includes passages that did not survive in the first draft. The potential car accident that Andy suspects in the above dialogue disappears in the first draft. Also, the nostalgia of the happy childhood days of their daughter is exchanged between Andy (A) and Bel (B) in *First Notes* and her existence seems to be a part of old memories:

A: I've lost my darling daughter.
B: You haven't lost her.
A: I remember her when she wore socks!
Socks! Little white ones. She was so small I remember that.
B: So does she.
A: She used to sit upon my knee. Didn't she?
B: Yes. Both knees.
P
A: The bitch.

This dialogue is remarkable as it shows Andy's complex feelings towards his children. The daughter is loved and hated, longed and cursed simultaneously. His "darling daughter" is "the bitch". These contradictory feelings for the daughter are developed in the first draft:

Bel: And how we used to tuck little Bridget up in bed.
Andy: But that's my point. Who's tucking little Bridget up in bed tonight? ~~Who is tucking her up tonight?~~ Why isn't she tucking her old Dad up? ~~For a change?~~ Don't I deserve a bit of tucking up after all these years? Surely, I justify a dream of tenderness, of compassion, surely my action justifies such a thing, surely they warrant it?

Bel's nostalgia for the daughter clashes with Andy's rage against her, and his longing transforms into incest. The erotic undertone of his language is strongly felt. Furthermore, Andy's mind, like his feelings, works on several different levels. Andy's thoughts about daughter, wife and lover alter and intermingle throughout the play. For example, Andy's next speech, in the first draft appears as follows:

My daughter- of all the people in the world- would want to be with me now. Because she I know remembers. How I cuddled her and sang to her, how I kept nightmares from her, how she fell asleep in my arms. She is bringing my grandchildren to see me, isn't she, to catch their last look of me, to receive my blessing?

In the second draft (and the final version), his daughter is not mentioned. The meaning becomes ambiguous. It now also suggests Andy's betrayal of Bel with Maria, and Andy and Maria's potential grandchildren and whether the person suggested is the daughter or Maria, the crucial point is that the passage shows the diverse levels that Andy's mind works on, and the complex emotions he has for his mistress, his daughter, and his wife.

In the handwritten manuscripts and the first draft, the idea of a daughter appears as part of Andy and Bel's dialogues through their feelings of love, longing for the past, and rage: the daughter is not characterized as Bridget and she is not given a voice to express herself. Antonia Fraser, Pinter's wife, describes the creation process of Bridget as follows:

> What was unusual about Moonlight is that we were sitting in the same room as he wrote it and Harold was reading bits out as he went along. I did just say that I'd like to know more about Bridget and her brothers so he wrote that scene in. I don't really have any creative input. What I do is provide sounding-board. Once Harold has finished a play, you'd better believe it. It's just that when the egg yolk is forming I happen to be there…You see Bridget, for instance, grows all the time. In the first draft, she didn't exist. Then she became a voice and finally a person. I wrote in my diary about *Moonlight* that I was the midwife because I was saying to Harold, "Push, shove, because it's going to be a long one –eighty minutes." But the point about being a midwife is that the birth would have happened anyway (Billington, 1997, p. 132).

As Antonia Fraser points out, at the beginning of the first draft, Bridget's monologue does not exist. There is only a handwritten note added to the top of the first page:

> - Eliza,
> - I can't get to sleep. There's no moon. It's so dark.

Her name first appears as Charlotte or Eliza and is finally changed as Bridget. The most remarkable note about Bridget's monologue, found among the manuscripts, is written in a small notebook made up of blank white sheets. "C" speaks as follows:

> I can't get to sleep. Can I play the piano? I won't make a noise. I'll play quietly. You won't hear me. I know it's dark outside and I know its quieter everywhere when its dark. So perhaps my piano will

> sound[17] all across the fields. But I really don't want anyone to know I'm here. Or playing the piano. I don't want to wake my father or my mother up. They have given so much of their life for me and my brothers. All their life. And so when they look at me they see I'm all their life. They guided me towards the river. I walked towards the river. I walked towards the river. I walked towards the river. I walked towards the river. I walked towards the river and when I got there nobody else was there. (And I walked forward to seeing all the other people- but when I go to the river nobody else was there).

The speech above appears with some alterations in the second draft as Bridget's monologue at the beginning of the play. Furthermore, it hints at her monologues in the jungle (2005, p. 337), or during her final journey to the party (2005, p. 386); all three monologues were generated from this notebook text. Bridget's monologue in the second draft, and the final published version is as follows:

> 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 quite. Nobody will hear me. It's so dark and I know everything is more silent when it is 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. They need to sleep in peace and wake up rested. I must see that this happens. It is my task. Because I know that when they look at me they see that I am all they have left of their life (2005, p. 319).

Pinter gives Bridget a voice and she gains her character here in the second draft. Her short sentences give momentum to the play at the beginning. She appears to be concerned, decisive and strong; she is thoughtful, knows her "task" and tries to fulfil it. Her memories of a piano do not appear now. It could present her as a well-educated girl, according to the social expectations of a well-off British family; however, the omission of this part of the speech means that Bridget's concerns about the sound she makes, is focused on her family. It will not be heard across the fields but only by her parents.

[17] The word is illegible in the manuscript but it should be 'sound'.

As noted, Pinter gives Bridget voice and character in the second draft. Her three monologues -at the beginning, in the jungle and her final one- appear in the second draft, as does, the scene where Fred, Jade and Bridget are together. From the idea of a daughter, mentioned by Andy and Bel, to an independent character, Bridget gains a crucial role as a female figure throughout Pinter's creation process. She finds her own domain, separated yet appallingly related to her family's.

Space and Isolation

When Andy moves about in the dark in the third area, Bridget appears in the background under growing moonlight (2005, p. 360). Even though she does not say a word, her presence is felt or imagined in Andy's mind when he sighs, "*Ah darling. Ah my darling*" (2005, p. 360).In the jungle (2005, p. 337), Bridget is part of that thrilling environment and when she says that "*No one in the world can find me*" (338), her existence turns out to be an escape from the domain of her parents. Bridget is liberated by death and is "*a captive no longer*" in her own domain (2005, p. 337).

The idea of a parent detached from their children exists even in the *First Notes*. Pinter, while trying to create this isolation, works on a few different ideas. At first, the parents and the children were not so detached. There was a telephone conversation that "B" (Bel) seems to have with one of the children: "*Hello darling. Yes. No, no much better. Oh, yes? No, really, don't bother. No really! Of course you're welcome if...well that's the point exactly...no... I'll ring you tomorrow... Yes. I will. Goodbye darling*". Pinter crossed the speech over and it does not exist in any of the drafts. Among the other attached handwritten manuscripts, there is a conversation in which Bel addresses Fred and Jade. Bel is emotional here and declares that "*He (Andy) is dying for you", "He is dying so that you'll be born. So that you will grow and be young* [...]". The latter, showing Bel as a weak female figure, is crossed out in the manuscript and does not exist in the subsequent drafts. The telephone conversation between Bel and the boys transforms into the scene when the boys pretend to be running a Chinese Laundry. They are so isolated from each other that they are indifferent to their father's death.

The creation process of *Moonlight* is significant as the play develops gradually from the first manuscripts to the drafts. Both the boys and Bridget, and Ralph and Maria become significant throughout the drafts. Although the isolation between the parent and the children is determined in the *First Notes*, it becomes more dominant in the drafts. From the handwritten manuscripts to the final draft of *Moonlight*,

Andy loses his dominance over Bel, and the power struggle between the two characters become more complicated as Bel develops into a complex strong female figure. The power struggle between the couple intensifies as the characters develop into more complex figures through Pinter's omissions. In the final version, through the pauses inserted in between Any and Bel's dialogues, Pinter allows the reader to question the reliability of the memory of the two characters who continually challenge each other. Pinter's use of pauses in the final version shows a shift from verbally and explicitly stimulating the reader or the audience to question the characters' reliability for a more implicit invocation through literary form which could be seen as a proof of Pinter's deliberate attempt to create a more obscure dialogue, exemplifying the Theatre of the Absurd.

Ashes to Ashes

In contrast with *Moonlight*, Pinter – to a striking degree – knew what *Ashes to Ashes* was going to be like, even in his first handwritten manuscripts. In this play, Pinter was more concerned to use political references, and he is more descriptive at the first manuscript stage; therefore, the handwritten manuscript helps to comprehend the obscure meaning of the drafts. But, this research do not aim to understand the hidden meaning behind the plays through an examination of the play's drafts. On the contrary, it is research that is conducted to provide an insightful understanding and appreciation of Pinter's attempt at creating a modernist, postmodernist or even a metamodernist (post-1980s) language through his deliberate omissions and alterations to create ambiguity and uncertainty in meaning that transforms his play into a riddle awaiting to be solved by the audience.

In performance, Rebecca's 'lover', who sounds like her torturer and the murderer of the babies, is an appalling mystery to the audience who are left in darkness like Devlin (399). Yet, the manuscripts perhaps give some "*light*" to the reader (2005, p. 399). Most of the manuscripts of *Ashes to Ashes* are found in a yellow refill pad which begins as follows:

A- You felt adored?

B- I felt he adored me and was sorry for me and would protect me forever against all peril and that he would kill me in order to protect me.

….

B- I think you're a fuck pig.

A- So you don't feel you're being hypnotised?

B- I was hypnotised by the ~~monster~~ lover long before the pig who fucked. He hypnotised me.

Pinter first referred to Rebecca's lover as a "monster" and then replaced it with "lover": "Monster" was more attached to reality — in correspondence to his later description as a murderer — but Pinter chose to obscure the meaning by referring to him metaphorically a "lover". In the handwritten manuscript, Pinter explains that the lover wants to kill Rebecca in order to protect her; the reason is not explained in the drafts and the final version. The lover could symbolize a state whose soldiers are killed to preserve the welfare of the rest of the nation. If the nation is regarded as a whole, the death of a few for the protection of the rest is a foregone conclusion.

In the first draft — where the characters are still referred to as "A" and "B" — Pinter cuts unnecessary sentences and words, and creates straightforward sentences which are more effective. For example, 'B' begins by saying, "He'd gaze my mouth with his fist", then the sentence is crossed out and replaced by "His fist ... gazed my mouth". The minimal use of words, and the pause in the middle of the sentence, increases its power. The dialogue goes on as follows:

B: *Oh*, yes. He did. And he held it there, very gently, so gently, ~~I felt his compassion for me, I felt his adoration~~ *... he adored me you see.*

A: ~~You felt adored?~~ He adored you?

P

What do you mean, ~~you felt adored~~? *He adored you*? What do you mean?

Pinter crosses out the repetitious sentences. By omitting the sentence "You felt adored?", Pinter puts the lover at the centre of the discussion. The elimination of Rebecca's sensations excludes the intimate and subjective depiction of that moment and gives it a more objective appeal.

Devlin's justification of his interrogation of Rebecca (2005, p. 399), undergoes changes in the first draft:

~~I'm asking you questions, aren't I? I think you can~~ *You* understand why I'm asking you these questions, ~~can't~~ don't you? Put yourself in my place. I'm compelled to ask you questions. There are ~~hundreds of~~ *so many* things I don't know. I know ~~almost~~ nothing. ~~I know~~ nothing. I'm ~~sitting~~ in the dark. I need light. ~~Only you can give me light. Otherwise I will...rummage...in the dark...for the rest of my life. I~~

~~know you understand this. I also know you want to love me~~. Or do you think my questions are illegitimate?

Pinter crosses out the explanations and rarefies the language. The second draft, incorporating these corrections, is the same as the final published version.

Devlin and Rebecca's dialogue on the word "darling" develops throughout the creation process (2005, p. 401). It appears in the manuscripts as follows:

B: ~~Anyway~~ No, it's not funny.
A: Why not?
B: ~~Because it's~~ Only my ~~monster~~ lover ever called me darling.
A: ~~Perhaps, I'm your monster.~~ I thought I was your lover.
B: I can't even remember you")
A: Tell me about him.
~~Describe him to me~~.
B: ~~He died many years ago. He died so long ago~~.
Or he went away.

In the manuscript, Pinter works on the characters, firstly identifying Devlin with the monster and then differentiating the two. Devlin reveals himself as Rebecca's lover both in the manuscripts and in the first draft. Nonetheless, Devlin and Rebecca's relationship is not defined explicitly in the second draft and in the final version; thus, the audience are left to solve the riddle. Moreover, the lover is declared dead only in the manuscript.

Throughout the play, Rebecca is the source of knowledge and power. Her past is a territory of which Devlin is ignorant. Through an intense interrogation, he tries to gain knowledge and control over Rebecca; however, in the first draft, Pinter gives Rebecca the ability to hide or divulge her knowledge: "The thing is I can't tell you what he looked like. That's not the point. Anyway, he went away years ago". In the second draft, she sharply refuses to be Devlin's 'darling': "Well, how can you possibly call me darling? I'm not your darling. It's the last thing I want to be. I'm nobody's darling". In this second draft, she also rejects the song that Devlin recalls by saying "I didn't use the word baby". In the final published version, she even corrects Devlin: "*It's* you're *nobodies baby now. But anyway, I didn't use the word baby*" (2005, p. 402). Thus, Pinter stressed Rebecca's superiority throughout the dialogue's creation process.

Ashes to Ashes was written with a political purpose, just after Pinter read "Gitta Sereny's biography of Albert Speer who was Hitler's favourite architect, minister for Armaments and Munition's from 1942, and virtally the Führer's second-in-command" (Billington, 1997, p. 374). Pinter explained that "I've always been haunted by the image of the Nazis picking up babies on bayonet-spikes and throwing them out of windows" (qtd. in Billington, 1997, p. 375). Pinter avoided giving direct political references in the play; however, among the manuscripts there is a dialogue which was mostly omitted even from the drafts but gives a crucial insight into the political stance of the play.

B: ~~He died many years ago. He died so long ago.~~
Or he went away.
That was it. To points West. He joined some kind of caravanserai. So perhaps it was points East. Caravanserais don't go to points West, do they. They – do they? They – do – they? – If they go to points East. Actually, that's all crap. There's no East, there's no West.

A: And no caravanserais?

B: Of course, there are caravanserais.

A: Going in which direction?

B: Marking time. rec[18] woman and children, animals, marketing time, waiting for the route map, waiting for petrol. You know, waiting for the signal, waiting for the whistle.

A: So what happened to your ~~monster~~ lover?

B: Oh. He just got on the train and stole a few babies from the arms of their screaming mothers.

Pinter's choice of the word "*caravanserais*" is crucial as it reflects a clash of cultures and the impossibility of separating one from another. Rebecca declares the unity of the earth by denying geographic, economic and social differences between East and West; they are connected to each other and obliged to one another for their existence. Rebecca regards them as a whole.

Her reference to the time, and "*waiting for the signal*" and the "*whistle*" implies a command taking the "*route map*" and the "*petrol*" as targets. It echoes like the struggle for oil and power in the Middle East; however, such a direct reference does not exist in the later drafts and the published version. *Ashes to Ashes* was first published in 1996, and the time is indicated as "*now*" at the beginning of the play.

[18] Illegibile word in the manuscript.

This was after the first Gulf War, and the play is still valid. Whether the play concerns the Nazi Holocaust, an attempt to purify the nation, or the USA killing civilians in the Middle East, as long as the power struggles continue, the play will preserve its validity. In the first draft, Pinter changed the discussion of the East and the West as follows:

A: What sort of travel agency?

B: Mostly to do with ~~points West~~. No, ~~I don't mean that~~. I mean points East. Actually that's all crap. There's no East, there's no West. But he was a guide, you see. A guide.

A: A tourist guide?

B: Well in a way. ~~What he actually did was that he got on a train and tore a few babies from their screaming mothers~~.

The speech about caravanserais, signals, and petrol, with its political connotations, is omitted. It is limited to the East-West question. Moreover, the dialogue is completely omitted from the second draft.

In the handwritten manuscript, Devlin describes Rebecca's disease through a metaphor: "Can you imagine Wembley Stadium – England and Brazil – and not a soul in it? Not a soul in the stadium?". Rebecca is the only person witnessing the appalling murders and the Holocaust while the rest is ignorant of them. Even though nothing has happened to her and her friends (2005, p. 413), she carries the burden of the wrongdoings on behalf of mankind. However, in the final version, the metaphor is used to explain a world without a God (2005, p. 412). Moreover, there is a reference to Rebecca's sanity:

B: I know what you are doing.

A: What?

B: You're trying to save my sanity.

A: I often wonder who you think I am.

B: Oh you are probably my lover or something.
~~Or my husband or my father~~.

At first reading, one is appalled by Rebecca's memories, most of which seem incomprehensible. Mirroring Devlin's urge to learn more about her past, the reader questions the logic behind her narration. Rebecca's memories of a murderer, who is referred to as a lover, are at the border of sanity and the dialogue above is the only reference to her sanity in the manuscripts.

In the manuscripts of *Ashes to Ashes*, Pinter is more descriptive and the political references are more explicit, than in the published version. Rebecca carries the burden of on-going political catastrophes. She is not only the victim of the system but also, by being able to 'see' what has happened in the past, she gathers all the power in herself, as the source of knowledge to enlighten Devlin and the audience.

Conclusion

Pinter gives voice to the female characters, Bel, Maria, and Bridget throughout the creation process of *Moonlight*. Bel destroys Andy's dominance; Maria gains her own voice to give insight to the old days, and Bridget creates her own territory to issue drastic questions on death and life. From the passive, submissive woman in the *First Notes*, Bel transforms into a decisive, powerful character in the second draft. In contrast with Bel's rising power, Pinter reshapes Andy: by changing his use of language, he loses his physical power and transforms into an aggressive but weaker old man.

The creation process of *Moonlight* is significant as the play develops gradually from the first manuscripts to the drafts. Both the boys and Bridget, and Ralph and Maria become significant throughout the drafts. Although the isolation between the parent and the children is determined in the *First Notes*, it becomes more dominant in the drafts. From the handwritten manuscripts to the final draft of *Moonlight*, Andy loses his dominance over Bel, and the power struggle between the two characters becomes more complicated as Bel develops into a complex strong female figure. The power struggle between the couple, who continually challenge each other throughout the play, intensifies as the characters develop into more complex figures through Pinter's omissions. In the final version, through the pauses inserted in between Any and Bel's dialogues, Pinter allows the reader to question the reliability of the memory of the two characters who continually challenge each other. Pinter's use of pauses in the final version shows a shift from verbally and explicitly stimulating the reader or the audience to question the characters' reliability for a more implicit invocation through literary form which could be seen as a proof of Pinter's deliberate attempt to create a more obscure dialogue, exemplifying the Theatre of the Absurd.

In contrast with *Moonlight*, Pinter – to a striking degree – knew what *Ashes to Ashes* was going to be like, even in his first handwritten manuscripts. In *Ashes to Ashes*, the power struggle between Devlin and Rebecca exists even in the first

handwritten notes. Rebecca is the possessor of the knowledge that Devlin is ignorant of, and by his intense interrogation, he puts effort to gain control over that unknown past. In this play, Pinter was more concerned to use political references, and he is more descriptive at the first manuscript stage; therefore, the handwritten manuscript helps to comprehend the obscure meaning of the drafts. But, this research does not aim to understand the hidden meaning behind the plays through an examination of the play's drafts. On the contrary, it is research that is conducted to provide an insightful understanding and appreciation of Pinter's attempt at creating a modernist, postmodernist or even a metamodernist (post-1980s) language through his deliberate omissions and alterations to create ambiguity and uncertainty in meaning that transforms his play into a riddle awaiting to be solved by the audience.

In the first draft of *Ashes to Ashes* – where the characters are still referred to as "A" and "B" – Pinter cuts unnecessary sentences and words, and rarefies his dialogues by creating straightforward sentences. The second draft, incorporating these corrections, is the same as the final published version. In the manuscript, moreover, Pinter works on the characters, firstly identifying Devlin with the monster and then differentiating the two. Devlin reveals himself as Rebecca's lover both in the manuscripts and in the first draft. Nonetheless, Devlin and Rebecca's relationship is not defined explicitly in the second draft and in the final version; thus, the audience is left to solve the riddle. Moreover, the lover is declared dead only in the manuscript.

As this archival work proves, Pinter in the manuscripts of *Ashes to Ashes* and *Moonlight* uses a more elaborate language endowing the reader with a better understanding of the power relations and the political references behind the plays. Throughout the creation process of both plays, Pinter eliminates the repetitious words, emotional reactions and explanations. By use of the pauses and the omissions in the sentences, each of the plays transforms into a riddle which is hard to be solved by the audience. The plays gain their intentional ambiguity, and become evocative, suggestive and extraordinarily powerful. Pinter's handwritten manuscripts and the drafts involve precious information that enlightens the ambiguities. But, more important than that, the creation process of the plays highlights how Pinter from more explicit political or explanatory notes, through omissions, transforms his plays into more implicit modernist texts that encourages the audiences' collaboration in the meaning-making process and consolidates his

position as a continuation of Brecht's Epic Theatre tradition, and actualizes the *Verfremdung* effects even more powerfully than Brecht.

References

Andrews, J. (2012). Harold Pinter. In S. Nicholson (Ed.). *Modern British Playwriting: The 1960s*, (pp. 161-189). London: Methuen Drama.

Aragay, M. (2005). Pinter, politics and postmodernism (2). In Peter Raby (Ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter* (2nd ed.), (pp. 283-296). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billington, M. (1997). *The Life and Work of Harold Pinter*. London: Faber and Faber.

Dukore, B. F. (1982). *Harold Pinter*. London: The Macmillan Press (pp. 58-85).

Esslin, M. (1960). The Theatre of the Absurd. *The Tulane Drama Review*, 4(4), 3-15.

Esslin, M. (1992). *Pinter: The Playwright.* London: Methuen Drama.

Esslin, M. (2000). Harold Pinter: from *Moonlight* to *Celebration*. In F. Gillen and S. H. Gale (Eds). *The Pinter Review: Collected Essays 1999 and 2000* (pp. 23-30). Tampa: The University of Tampa Press.

Fredric, J. (1984). Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. *New Left Review,* 146, 53-92.

Gale, S.H. (2014). Sharp Cut: Harold Pinter's Screenplays and the Artistic Process. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

Gillen, F. (1993). Whatever Light is Left in the Dark?: Harold Pinter's *Moonlight I.* In F. Gillen, & S. H. Gale (Eds). *The Pinter Review: Collected Essays 1992 and 1993* (pp. 31-37). Tampa: The University of Tampa Press.

Grimes, C. (2004). Harold Pinter's *Ashes to Ashes*: The Criminality of Indifference and the Failure of Emphaty. In L. Kane (Ed.). *The Art of Crime: The Plays and Films of Harold Pinter and David Mamet* (pp. 71-84*).* London: Routhledge.

Pinter, H. Moonlight. Box 34, The Pinter Archive, The British Library, London.

Pinter, H. Moonlight. Box 35, The Pinter Archive, The British Library, London.

Pinter, H. *Ashes to Ashes*. Box 67, The Pinter Archive, The British Library, London.

Pinter, H. (2005). Moonlight. *Plays* 4, 315-387. London: Faber and Faber.

Pinter, H. (2005) Ashes to Ashes. *Plays* 4, 389-433). London: Faber and Faber.

Harle, M. (2015). “Cinema’s First Domestic Epic”: Tracing “The Proust Screenplay” in Harold Pinter’s Archive. *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 43(4), 263–275.

Merritt, S. H. (1994). The Harold Pinter Archive in the British Library. In F. Gillen, & S.H. Gale (Eds.), The Pinter Review Annual Essays 1994 (pp. 14–53). Tampa: University of Tampa Press.

Quigley, A. (2005). Pinter, politics and postmodernism (I). In P. Raby (Ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter* (2nd ed.) (pp. 283-296). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Renton, L. (2001). Pinter and the Object of Desire: An Approach Through the Screenplays. Oxford: Legenda Main.

Wilcox, Z., & Andrews, J. (2021). “Our Beginnings Never Know Our Ends”: Archiving Harold Pinter at the British Library. *The Harold Pinter Review*, 5(1), 88-106.

Summary

Martin Esslin emphasizes that “instead of being in suspense as to what will happen next, the spectators are, in the Theatre of the Absurd, put into suspense as to what the play may mean. This suspense continues even after the curtain has come down” (1960, p. 14). In accordance with Bertolt Brecht’s *Verfremdung* effects, alienating the audience from the characters and urging him/her to think, question and respond to the events or the dialogues taking place on stage, Pinter’s plays — with all the obscurity and uncertainty the characters are caught in — endow their audiences with more than enough tools to become subjects in the meaning-making process of his plays. No matter whether Pinter’s works are categorized as modernist through his transformation of the audience into subjects or just like more recently categorized as postmodernist in the works of Austin Quigley and Mireia Aragay (2009), what enables Pinter to be categorized as both is the obscurity of the language that he uses, and particularly in case of postmodernism, just like Fredric Jameson’s assertion of the “breakdown in the signifying chain” (1984, p.71), the broken correlation between the signified and signifiers in the dialogues that Pinter uses, creates the effect of ambiguity in his works. Pinter, in parallel to these definitions, states that “If I’m being explicit I’m failing” (qtd in Knowles, 2009, p. 75). Considering how important the creation of ambiguity and uncertainty in Pinter’s plays is, this essay focuses on the creation process of the Theatre of the Absurd in Pinter’s Moonlight and Ashes to Ashes by examining the handwritten and type scripted manuscripts available in the Harold Pinter Archive at the British Library (UK).

The creation process of *Moonlight* is significant as the play develops gradually from the first manuscripts to the drafts. Both the boys and Bridget, and Ralph and Maria become significant throughout the drafts. Although the isolation between the parent and the children is determined in the *First Notes*, it becomes more dominant in the drafts. From the handwritten manuscripts to the final draft of *Moonlight*, Andy loses his dominance over Bel, and the power struggle between the two characters become more complicated as Bel develops into a complex strong female figure. The power struggle between the couple intensifies as the characters develop into more complex figures through Pinter’s omissions. In the final version, through the pauses inserted in between Any and Bel’s dialogues, Pinter allows the reader to question the reliability of the memory of the two characters who continually challenge each other. Pinter’s use of pauses in the final version shows a shift from verbally and explicitly stimulating the reader or the audience to question the

characters' reliability for a more implicit invocation through literary form which could be seen as a proof of Pinter's deliberate attempt to create a more obscure dialogue, exemplifying the Theatre of the Absurd.

In contrast with *Moonlight*, Pinter – to a striking degree – knew what *Ashes to Ashes* was going to be like, even in his first handwritten manuscripts. In this play, Pinter was more concerned to use political references, and he is more descriptive at the first manuscript stage; therefore, the handwritten manuscript helps to comprehend the obscure meaning of the drafts. But, this research do not aim to understand the hidden meaning behind the plays through an examination of the play's drafts. On the contrary, it is research that is conducted to provide an insightful understanding and appreciation of Pinter's attempt at creating a modernist, postmodernist or even a metamodernist (post-1980s) language through his deliberate omissions and alterations to create ambiguity and uncertainty in meaning that transforms his play into a riddle awaiting to be solved by the audience.

In the first draft of *Ashes to Ashes* – where the characters are still referred to as "A" and "B" – Pinter cuts unnecessary sentences and words, and rarefies his dialogues by creating straightforward sentences. The second draft, incorporating these corrections, is the same as the final published version. In the manuscript, moreover, Pinter works on the characters, firstly identifying Devlin with the monster and then differentiating the two. Devlin reveals himself as Rebecca's lover both in the manuscripts and in the first draft. Nonetheless, Devlin and Rebecca's relationship is not defined explicitly in the second draft and in the final version; thus, the audience is left to solve the riddle. Moreover, the lover is declared dead only in the manuscript.

As this archival work proves, Pinter in the manuscripts of *Ashes to Ashes* and *Moonlight* uses a more elaborate language endowing the reader with a better understanding of the power relations and the political references behind the plays. Throughout the creation process of both plays, Pinter eliminates the repetitious words, emotional reactions and explanations. By use of the pauses and the omissions in the sentences, each of the plays transforms into a riddle which is hard to be solved by the audience. The plays gain their intentional ambiguity, and become evocative, suggestive, and extraordinarily powerful. Pinter's handwritten manuscripts and the drafts involve precious information that enlightens the ambiguities. But, more important than that, the creation process of the plays highlights how Pinter from more explicit political or explanatory notes, through omissions, transforms his plays into more implicit modernist texts that encourages the audiences' collaboration in the meaning-making process and consolidates his position as a continuation of Brecht's Epic Theatre tradition, and actualizes the *Verfremdung* effects even more powerfully than Brecht.