Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, Nejla Kalajdžisalihović

PERSUASIVE SPEECH AND THE POWER PLAY IN PINTER'S *MOUNTAIN LANGUAGE*: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY ANALYSIS[1]

Taking an interdisciplinary approach, this paper analyses power play, speech strategies, and speech impact in Harold Pinter's one-act play *Mountain Language* (1988), in which prison officials exercise power over inmates and their visitors through various tactics of control and subjugation. The paper's methodological framework of corpus analysis is founded upon the linguistic features of police speak in the English language (a hybrid genre of spoken language police officers use when interrogating suspects), which, we propose, permeates the discourse in *Mountain Language.* The paper first reflects on discourses on/of power as observed in literary theory, then examines discursive strategies in the play, to illustrate speech impact caused by "conduct-regulating persuasion" and linguistic features of verbal violence. It also reflects on the concept of the persuasive power of discourse, in terms of the impact it may have on the mindset and behaviour of the interlocutor(s).

 Key words: power; persuasion; speech impact; speech strategy; Harold Pinter; *Mountain Language*

---

1.   A shorter version of this paper was presented at the Language, Literature, Power conference at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš (May 6–7, 2022).

Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, Nejla Kalajdžisalihović *Persuasive Speech and the
Power Play in Pinter'*s Mountain Language: *An Interdisciplinary Analysis*
DHS 1 (22) (2023), 107-122

1. INTRODUCTION: A SURVEY OF
CONCEPTUALISATION(S) OF POWER

The concept of power has been the focus of Western philosophical, social and political theories for many centuries. According to Barry Hindess, power has in most cases been thought of either as a" generalized capacity to act ˝*or*˝ aright to act" (1997: 1). Further inspection reveals that power may also refer to the "possession of control, authority, or influence over others" (Merriam-Webster "power": 2); or to a person, community, and/or (state) institution(s)or "establishment" (ibid.) possessing power to control and influence others. In the latter case, power is understood as "an instrument of domination" (Hindess 1997: 2), which presupposes two issues. First, it implies that power relations are based on unequal positions between social groups participating in the relations; and second, that the group exercising this power to control or dominate others will intentionally disregard and exclude the wishes and interests of the group(s) acted upon.

In his comprehensive book *Discourses of Power: from Hobbes to Foucault* ([1]1996, [2]1997), Hindess presents a version of the modern history of discourses on the issue of power, starting with the anglophone founders of political theory, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, and their respective deliberations over social covenant(s), sovereignty, and the patterns and mechanisms of regulating conduct in a society. Hindess properly points out that while Hobbes views power relations as "characterized by an extreme asymmetry of power" (1997: 47), in which subjects are absolutely bound by the (one-sided) decisions of a centralized authority, Locke proposes a model of sovereignty "based on, and operated through the consent" (Hindess 1997: 57) of the people upon whom political power is exercised. In this model, the subjects retain their right to "withdraw [the] consent" at any time (ibid. 62). Hindess proceeds to discuss Steven Lukes' radical view of power, and "the more sinister cases in which the power to control the thoughts of others is used *against* the interests of its victims" (1997: 69, added emphasis). In this view, the subjects who are the majority in a civil society (such as women or the working class), are conditioned by/through various social institutions–which Hindess sees as "instruments of state power" (1997: 83) – and may therefore voluntarily consent to subordination, even if this breaches their true interests and desires (as, for example, occurs with the insidious workings of the patriarchy or capitalist system).

Focusing on contemporary political theory, Hindess fittingly connects Lukes' radical view with Herbert Marcuse's reflections on power relations, instruments of (state) domination, and repression (Hindess 1997: 87–89), and subsequently with Jürgen

Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, Nejla Kalajdžisalihović *Persuasive Speech and the*
*Power Play in Pinter'*s Mountain Language: *An Interdisciplinary Analysis*
DHS 1 (22) (2023), 107-122

Habermas' discussions of power's negative effect on "intersubjective relations" and communication/speech situations (Hindess 1997: 90–95). In this segment, Hindess foregrounds Marcuse's claim that liberty has been made "into a powerful instrument of domination" (Marcuse 1972: 21, as cited in Hindess 1997: 87), since the alleged 'free' choices made by individual members of [advanced industrial societies] serve to perpetuate a set of power relations that further the interests of those who dominate". This is viable because "the false needs [are] 'superimposed' on individuals by 'external powers' over which they have no control […], most obviously perhaps through propaganda and manipulation carried by the media" (ibid. 86–87). Essentially, in modern civil societies, power relations are asymmetrically arranged to the advantage of the minority in power, yet consent (which was precluded by Hobbes, and which Locke stipulated as the key factor in the legitimation of sovereignty) is achieved through social conditioning, indoctrination, and (media) manipulation of the majority upon whom the power is exercised. Habermas' theories readily append to this examination of inequity in power relations, because those in the possession of power intrude into mutual relations between subjects to "distort the original orientation [of language] towards understanding, thereby undermining the rationality of both the lifeworld and its individual inhabitants" (ibid. 92). Because of this imposition of power, the original mode of communication, which would have led to understanding and rational agreement among the autonomous individuals in relation of equality, is rearranged to undermine rationality, disrupt mutual understanding, and give rise to the "appearance of agreement, arising from fear, deference, insecurity and other such non-rational motivations" (ibid. 93).

This brief review of the history of discourses of/on power would not be complete without including Michel Foucault. Unlike the theorists previously discussed, Foucault disassociates his analysis of power and power relations from questions of legitimacy and sovereignty, and from the notion of repression. In the introductory chapter of his *History of Sexuality: Volume I* (1979), Foucault does not refer to power as "institutions and mechanisms that ensure […] subservience", or as "a mode of subjugation"; or even as "a general system of domination exerted by one group over another, […] whose effects […] pervade the entire social body" (Foucault in Natoli and Hutcheon 1993: 333), because for him these are manifestations of power. Instead, Foucault defines power as

> "… the **multiplicity of force relations** immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as **the process** which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as **the support** which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions

and contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as **the strategies** in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies." (Foucault in Natoli and Hutcheon 1993: added emphasis)

Power in a general sense is an enduring and stable process, intrinsic to complex force relations. As it comes from everywhere, it is ubiquitous; as it has a transformative function, it is dynamic and productive; and as it involves diverse forms of agency, it is heterogeneous. Examining the general concept of power only from the aspect of repression and domination implies considering it from a "purely juridical conception […]; identify[ing] power with law which says no; power […] carrying the force of prohibition" (Foucault in Rabinow 1984: 60–61).

Conversely, Foucault differentiates between three types of power relations: "strategic games between liberties"; "states of domination"; and "governmental technologies" (Foucault, as cited by Hindess 1997: 98), all of which are calculated with, and permeated by individual sets of "aims and objectives" (Foucault in Natoli and Hutcheon 1993: 335). The first refers to tactics employed in the context of deliberate attempts to establish the conduct of other free individuals, and may involve a plurality of resistance; the second[2] refers to asymmetrical relations, and implies subordination of those whose "margin of liberty is extremely limited" (Foucault, as cited in Hindess 1997: 102), but who, paradoxically, have the possibility to resist (through violent actions and reactions, such as taking their own lives). The third type of power sits between the first two. It refers to the arena of political power and the "regulation of conduct", whereby a government controls the behaviour of its subjects and itself, while simultaneously influencing the former in such a way that they control, adjust, and standardise their own actions (by way of self-government). Foucault's theory of power is more general, and does not rest only on asymmetric relations and the hierarchical distribution of power; further, he strongly advises against the modality of power whose key goal and instruments are domination and repression. Foucault does, however, examine what he calls the "power of the disciplinary type" (Foucault in Rabinow 1984: 380), although he does not endow it with entirely negative connotations. Such power is localised, and (mostly) experienced as insufferable. It can be effective and productive (in the sense that it moulds and transforms conduct), and its "formula [is] invented at a given moment" (ibid. 380). In this sense, discipline is a "procedure of power" (ibid.), a set of techniques employed for "education and training, military organization, the regulation of hospitals, prisons, and other institutions of confinement" (Hindess 1997: 113).

---

2.   This type is the one commonly thought of when the concept of power is being considered.

Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, Nejla Kalajdžisalihović *Persuasive Speech and the
Power Play in Pinter'*s Mountain Language: *An Interdisciplinary Analysis*
DHS 1 (22) (2023), 107-122

In order to inspect the knowledge of power's distribution, and of its relational conceptualizations, one has to first analyse the discourse of/on power. This discourse is as *instrumental to* power as it is an *effect of* power, while also being an *obstruction*, or "point of resistance" (Foucault in Natoli and Hutcheon 1993: 340). Foucault perceives discourse as a "multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies" (ibid.). Instead of focusing on which discourse is accepted and which excluded, or which is dominant and which subordinated, Foucault insists one should analyse and reconstruct the "distribution [of discourse] […] with the variants and different effects – according to who is speaking, his position of power, the institutional context in which he happens to be situated …" (ibid.). Likewise, silences sustain power relations as they "anchor its prohibitions" (ibid.). It is therefore only by studying and evaluating various elements and strategies of a discourse, including its silences or ruptures, that the play and distribution of power in force relations can be determined.

1.1. Mountain Language: *Pinter, Politics and Power Play*

Almost fifteen years after his death and over two decades since the publication and performance of his last original full-length play (*Celebration* 2000), Harold Pinter (1930–2008) is still considered unprecedented, and one of the most influential figures in post-war British theatre. Pinter's exceptionality is reflected in the multifaceted nature of his involvement with the theatre and film industry; the versatility and scope of his writing career[3]; his political activism and ardent advocacy of general human rights and freedom of expression[4]; his long list of awards, including the Nobel Prize for Literature[5]; and the multifariousness of theoretical and critical approaches by which his texts have been assessed. As Taylor-Batty (2014) explains, critical reception of Pinter's plays has invited diverse analytical positions and directions, including Esslin's (wrongful[6]) early-1960s approach to the interpretation of Pinter as an absurdist playwright; Lois Gordon's Freudian analysis; Katherine Burkman's late-1960s and early-1970s Myth Criticism; discourse analysis; theatre semiotics; and gender studies, to name a few. Many of these have led to the formation of (and extensive de-

3. Pinter bequeathed contemporary audiences with some 30 plays; a dozen dramatic sketches; quite a body of lyrical and (fictional and non-fictional) narrative literature; a line of screenplays; and a novel (see Raby 2009; Taylor-Batty 2014; Harold Pinter.org 2002–2012).

4. For more information, see Taylor-Batty (2014), Luckhurst in Raby (2009: 105–120), Chaisson (2017).

5. Pinter is among the few great dramatists to receive this prize.

6. See Čirić (2008), Čirić (2009), Raby (2009), and Taylor-Batty (2014).

bate on) the terms "comedy of menace" and "Pinteresque", which are nowadays commonly associated with the author. Countless other critics, including Guido Almansi and Simon Henderson (1983), Jeanette Malkin (1992), and Marc Silverstein (1993), made the playwright's idiosyncratic dramatisation of strategic use of language (as a vehicle of domination, repression and violence) the focus of their research. Jeanette Malkin aligned her analysis with this track in her investigation of the "theatre of language"[7.]. She claimed that Pinter's dramatic language should be examined within a "political, or power context" (Malkin 1992: 8), and that his innermost dramatic tool was "the extensive use of verbal violence" (ibid. 53). Although in the early days of Pinter studies, critics focused on the centrality of language in his oeuvre, they refrained from classifying him as a (British) political dramatist, and predominantly discussed his characteristic use of pauses and silences, beneath which "a torrent of language [wa]s […] locked" (Pinter 1990: 14–15).

On the other hand, as Aragay (in Raby 2009: 283–296), Taylor-Batty (2014: 151) and Ann C. Hall (in Taylor-Batty 2014: 232–248) properly point out, with the advent of *One for the Road*, *Mountain Language*, and *Party Time* (composed between 1984 and 1991), the critics began to wonder whether they had trusted the artist too much, and his "tales" too little.[8.] They consequently re-evaluated even his earlier dramas, previously categorised either as menace or memory plays, from a political perspective. Regardless of the approach taken, it has to be asserted that whereas Pinter's earlier dramas place their protagonists within an ambiguous and metaphoric web of force relations and power play, these three openly political plays, "written out of anger" (Pinter, as cited by Hall in Taylor-Batty 2014: 232), situate their respective protagonists in a different kind of tangible reality: one distinctively marked by political repression, persecution, and belligerence. *Mountain Language* (1988), the play in the focus of this paper, uses the setting of a prison ward as a backdrop to its exploration of asynchronous power relations, and the exercise of disciplinary power over the inmates and their visitors. The former, proclaimed enemies of the state, and the latter, their wives, daughters and mothers, are equally subjugated to various manifestations and instruments of political oppression and violence, starting with the suppression of free speech and the prohibition of (indigenous) language. The play's episodic structure persistently directs the audience's attention to the insidious workings of despotic power on the fragmentation of families and annihilation of a nation (and its individual

---

7.   This corresponds to those pieces that appeared in the post-war period, in which "the function of language is radically altered, […][and] becomes 'the very content of the drama itself'" (Malkin 1992: 3).

8.   In a parodic inversion of D. H. Lawrence's notorious axiom: "Never trust the artist. Trust the tale. The proper function of a critic is to save the tale from the artist who created it." (Lawrence 1923, as cited in Ratcliffe 2018).

members), through strategies of (violent) discourse. Simultaneously, it withholds a realistic and minute portrayal of physical violence, and instead offers images of the consequences and outcomes of violent acts. At the onset of the play the audience does not see an elderly woman being bitten by a police dog, but rather a woman whose hand is torn and bleeding, and who is systematically prevented from filing a complaint or seeking medical assistance. The readers and viewers are not shown the beating of the same woman's son for attempting to invoke a guard's empathy in Scene Two, but two scenes later, at the end of the play, they see a trembling man with blood on his face, and his perplexed mother, unresponsive to his pleas to talk. Finally, the audience is not presented with the actions that cause a hooded man to collapse while his wife watches from a distance; instead, it is witness to the insults and abuse hurled at the woman. Such profound organisation of the dramatic material and its fragmented plot additionally ensures that the sympathies of the audience are unmistakably aligned with the oppressed. This better facilitates the juxtaposition of the torturous, cold nature of those instrumental to disciplinary power, and the humane face of the people upon whom it is exercised, which is particularly enhanced by the voiceovers in Scenes Two and Three.

In most of Pinter's pieces, including *Mountain Language,* language is "actively domineering and dangerous, a force which controls and manipulates man, becoming the essence of his being and the limit of his world" (Malkin 1992: 5). Malkin contends that, like those by Ionesco and Havel, Pinter's playtexts revolve around the conceptualization of language as an aggressive means of coercion and assimilation, which has the "power to destroy personality, eradicate individuality, maim and even kill" (1992: 38). Moreover, the scenes that depict verbal abuse contain "ideological and political power structures", either directly or indirectly (ibid. 38). In *Mountain Language*, the state power's decision to prohibit an indigenous language and indiscriminately impose the "language of the capital" discloses the unwavering efforts of those in command to obliterate the identity of a social group (i.e., the people of the mountain).This is affirmed by the manipulative and violent discourse of the instruments of state power: the guards and officers. They insist, for example, that every police dog has a name given to it by its parents, which it must state before it attacks (Pinter 1988: 253–254), thereby anthropomorphising the animals. Simultaneously, the guards and officers verbally assault the prisoners' families, and repeatedly call the inmates "shithouses" (Pinter 1988: 255, 260), with the intent to humiliate and dehumanise their ethnic group.

Achieving full subordination through (violent) language demands the operation of certain discursive elements, primarily "verbal automatism; the ritualization of lan-

guage into magical formulae; and the use of extended clichés and jargon which control the meaning and preclude its development" (Malkin 1992: 8). In such a manner language is devalued, made nonsensical, and intervened in, so that intersubjective communication is prevented, and only the appearance of agreement, arising from insecurity and fear, is achieved. This idea is further assessed and explained in the next section.

2. THE LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF *MOUNTAIN LANGUAGE'S* DRAMATIC DIALOGUE: A METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK BASED ON EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES

This part of the paper contains a linguistic analysis of the dialogue between prison guards and detainees, from several vantage points that comprise the methodological framework of the paper based on qualitative content analysis. First, it examines whether the speech impact and speech strategies of prison guards in *Mountain Language* (i.e., corpus) are related to the linguistic features of *police speak* in the English language. It also observes the playtext as a "site of struggle" (Wodak, as cited in Wodak and Meyer 2001: 11), and relates it to Pinter's fascination with interrogation[9.]. The play's "institutionalized language" is delivered within "a room": a closed space, which, unlike in Pinter's earlier plays, does not represent a safe haven (not even at the onset). Within this confined space (the prison), the inmates and their visitors are not safe for even for a moment; the safe place is conceptually placed outside the play's locus, and represented only by the word "mountain". This word is used throughout, in the phrases "mountain language" and "from the mountains", which carry negative connotations in the discourse of those in power.

Second, it uses selected examples to analyse "Pinter's central dramatic device: the extensive use of verbal violence" (Malkin 2004: 53), which demonstrate the antagonistic forces that operate upon individuals, manifested in murderous language as a weapon of interrogation, persuasion, dominance, and finally, destruction (Mahmoodi-Bakhtiari and Mahavi 2014: 35). The paper also observes speech impact from the perspective the text or speech has on the listener/audience, and its potential outcomes in interaction (Miron and Douglas 1979). It proposes that *Mountain Language* is permeated with both the linguistic features of *policespeak* and the patterns in Malkin's theoretical framework on verbal violence, and illustrates this point with examples observed not only in the derivation of violence from language (or the latter's

---

9.   See Pitches and Shrubsall (1999).

oppression/persuasion through the fear of physical violence), but also in the disturbing nature of the contemporary human's relationship with language and its (persuasive) power.

2.1. Policespeak *and Power Play – Evaluative Categories*

Policespeak is an unusual hybrid genre, and a distinctive form of spoken language. Certain features and linguistic patterns can be extracted from the corpus of police language (which is abundant in formulaic institutionalized language) that encourage interaction (i.e., dialogue). Johnson, for example, "demonstrates how in police interviews officers may switch between acting as a *representative of the institution* (e.g., to exercise power) and adopting an almost *therapeutic role* (e.g., to show empathy) in order to create a more productive context for disclosure" (Johnson 2006, as cited in Coulthard and Johnson 2007: 57), in an attempt to build rapport. The term *police-speak* in this corpus is extended to the use of language by "oppressive soldiers and officials subjugating individuals" (Shammout 2018: 72).

Policespeak comprises particular phrases and formulaic language expected to occur in the course of police work, and observed in samples of police interviews and interrogations. The scripted questions and phrases in *policespeak* are not always understood by respondents, who may answer affirmatively without fully understanding what is being asked. This is a result of subjugation (see Eades 1994; Coutlthard and Johnson 2007), as illustrated in this example of "gratuitous concurrence"[10.]:

> (1) "Police: Has any threat, promise or offer of advantage been held out to you to take part in this interview?
> Suspect: Yes." (Hall 2008: 84)

Hall primarily emphasises that police language is oriented towards maintaining control of an interaction's direction (as in: (2) What made you do it?/And what made you do it? [Hall 2008: 68–69]), where the repetition of questions is "relentless". This is characteristic *policespeak*, employed when the suspect ignores the question because the answer might lead to a confession. In *policespeak*, there is a goal or an end-product (to "establish knowledge"), and the norms that govern the genre are based on interrogation and storytelling (Coulthard and Johnson 2007: 64).

---

10. This type of scripted question has been now removed from the NSW ERISP interview model.

Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, Nejla Kalajdžisalihović *Persuasive Speech and the
Power Play in Pinter'*s Mountain Language: *An Interdisciplinary Analysis*
DHS 1 (22) (2023), 107-122

In relation to the corpus presented in this paper, it is proposed that linguistic features of *policespeak* as a hybrid genre are also found in Pinter's earlier plays, such as *The Birthday Party*, which were more concerned with menace:

> "The oppressors approach the victim with a verbal trap designed as an interrogation model. This model is symbolic of the more sophisticated disciplinary techniques pervading the modern society. The way Goldberg and McCann interrogate Stanley simulate[s] the practice of information elicitation in a police station. The interviewers exercise full control over the accused and do not bother for the latter's psychological discomfort. The expected compliance from the accused to the questions asked in quick succession result in fear, confusion and disintegration of the mind. The inability to respond to all questions, the fumbling and hesitations and the pressure exhaust the accused to a state of desired submission. The end result is almost like corroborating the imagined and fictitious charges leveled against the accused." (Misra 2016: 4)

The end-product of these interrogation models may be silence, a concept that will be discussed using selected examples from *Mountain Language.*

3. CORPUS ANALYSIS AND QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS

The examples that follow have been extracted from the play (corpus) to illustrate the linguistic features of *policespeak* in *Mountain Language*, and are classified as: a) repetition; b) interrogation; and c) rapport building. Each feature of *policespeak* in *Mountain Language* is presented within the speech impact framework.

3.1. Linguistic Features of Policespeak: *Repetition, Interrogation, Rapport Building*

In terms of the categories analysed there is repetition in all types of questions in the corpus, the most frequent being *yes-no* and *wh*-questions. The former elicit a response to confirm known information, while the latter seek new information, and should elicit a narrative response (Hall 2008: 70). The following dialogues illustrate the use of repetition in the playtext:

(1) Sergeant: **Name**?

Young Woman: We've given our names.

Sergeant: **Name**?

Young Woman: We've given our names.

Sergeant: **Name**?

…
Sergeant: **What is your name**?" (Pinter 1988: 251–252, added emphasis)

(2) "Officer: […] **Who did this**?
She stares at him
Officer: **Who did this**?"
Young Woman: A big dog.
Officer: **What was his name**?
Pause
What was his *name*?
Pause" (Pinter 1988: 253, added emphasis)

As previously stated, one of the discursive functions of the police interview is to seek new information. *Wh*-questions often contain presuppositions (as in "What *else* did you hit her with?") (Hall 2008: 73), and may be used to direct the suspect towards particular responses. This is remotely related to persuasion. *Tagged* questions are also listed in the conduct-regulating "continuum of control" (Woodbury 1984), and are tentatively proposed to belong to the same category:

(3) "Guard (shouting): Forbidden! Forbidden forbidden forbidden! Jesus Christ! (*To the Prisoner)* Does she understand what I'm saying?
Prisoner: No.
Guard: **Doesn't she**?
He bends over her
Don't you?
She stares up at him" (Pinter 1988: 259, added emphasis)

In the corpus of *Mountain Language*, there are no instances of prison officials establishing rapport with respondents – e.g., using "son", "daughter" or "mate", or expressions of empathy like those generally found in police interviews. Rapport building is not always successful, and depends on the willingness of respondents to participate in co-operative questioning. There is only one example in the playtext that resembles rapport building, and it is initiated by the prisoner, who is ultimately bludgeoned:

(7) "Prisoner: She's old. She doesn't understand.
Guard: Whose fault is that?
He laughs

> Not mine, I can tell you. And I'll tell you another thing. **I've got a wife and three kids.** And you're all a pile of shit.
> *Silence*
> Prisoner: **I've got a wife and three kids."** (Pinter 1988: 259–260, added emphasis)

Hall (2008: 79) refers to another important feature of *policespeak* that features in different corpora: the presence of "subject + temporal adverb" occurring with 1st, 2nd and 3rd person subjects (e.g., *I then*, *you then*, *she then* as in: "…She then went outside./…I then handed the notice to John/… you then deleted all the files". These sequences are usually preceded by a request for confirmation, such as: "Do you agree/do you then agree/did you agree/did you then agree/would you agree/would you then agree/would you also agree?" In contrast, "Do you agree (that)" is considered a fixed phrase, to be used in combination with these stated variations.

3.2. The Speech Impact of **Policespeak**

In response to *policespeak*, the suspect may decide to echo the police officer's preferred terminology (i.e., adopt the term used by those in power).This is intriguing to observe and analyse from the perspectives of language production and comprehension. Hall (2008: 76) refers to a case in which an interviewed suspect initially uses the word "car", whereas the police officer uses the word "vehicle", as it is the official formulation in the rules and regulations. Suspects have also been known to invoke an incorrect or marked usage of a word or part of speech (e.g., the verb "to sustain") to accommodate the police language style (Hall 2008: 91). As police officers often use "to sustain" in relation to injuries, suspects may also adopt it, even if the usage is incorrect, or it is not part of their everyday vocabulary. In the example Hall (ibid.) cites, the suspect asks his wife "What did you sustain?" in reference to her injuries. He uses this term because the police officer had done so during his interrogation, in questions such as: "Did you sustain any injuries as a result of her having hit you?" (ibid. 91, example [49]).

Accordingly, in *Mountain Language*, the prisoners start using and adopting the expression "mountain language" without referring to the language's actual name:

> (6) "Officer: Now hear this. You are mountain people. You hear me? Your language is dead. It is forbidden. It is not permitted to speak **your mountain language** in this place. You cannot speak your language to your men. It is not permitted. Do you understand? You may not speak it. It is outlawed. You may only speak the language of the capital. That is the only language

permitted in this place. You will be badly punished if you attempt to speak **your mountain language** in this place. This is a military decree. It is the law. Your language is forbidden. It is dead. No-one is allowed to speak your language. Your language no longer exists. Any questions? Young Woman: I do not speak **the mountain language**." (Pinter 1988: 255–256, added emphasis).

As previously stated, non-fiction *policespeak* contains elements of empathy and therapeutic language, and can be analysed to examine the speech impact on the consciousness of the interlocutors, and more widely in the discourse as a whole (Avetisyan 2015). There is only one such example in *Mountain Language*, and it occurs in Scene Two, when the prisoner responds to the guard, for which he is cruelly punished. Any trace of successful rapport building in the play would, however, have been discordant with Pinter's political agenda, which was generally humanitarian, and promoted freedom of expression and thought (Tavassoli 2016; Luckhurst 2009)[11.].

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Pinter's playtexts often revolve around the conceptualisation of language as an instrument of power and a means of coercion and assimilation, which can destroy, annihilate and eradicate individuality and identity. This paper took an interdisciplinary approach to Pinter's *Mountain Language*, and examined it within a framework that combined literary-theoretical discourses on power and the linguistic features of *policespeak*.

Corpus analysis proved the language in the play that was instrumental to power was "actively domineering and dangerous" (Malkin 1992: 5), because the powerful and their instruments (guards, sergeants and officers) used violent discourse with the intent to obliterate and dehumanise the identity of the social group referred to as "people of the mountain". This violent discourse and power play was analysed through the extraction of particular features of verbal violence in the discourse: repetition (of noun phrases, declarative sentences and questions); repetition and the use of *yes-no*, *tagged*, and *wh*-questions, which resulted most frequently not in rapport building, but in silence and/or adoption of the jargon of the powerful, even if such language was not understood or previously used by the subjugated.

---

11. This is possibly why Pinter "as a dramatist never explicitly mention[ed] the exact political references in his plays, nor d[id] he intend at documenting [sic] the political events" (Misra 2009).

Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija, Nejla Kalajdžisalihović *Persuasive Speech and the
Power Play in Pinter'*s Mountain Language: *An Interdisciplinary Analysis*
DHS 1 (22) (2023), 107-122

The speech impact of power play, persuasion, attitude-changing and brainwashing has therefore been demonstrated through power play strategies that should be addressed in further interdisciplinary studies on the interplay between power and language comprehension and language production. Such studies should be applied not only to literary texts, but also to real-life contexts that pertain to the nature of legal language, legal translation, questioning in court, minority languages, and interpreting, and to power play and persuasive language in other interdisciplinary settings.

REFERENCES

1. Avetisyan, Zarine (2015), ″Persuasion and suggestion as priorities in psycholinguistic survey of political discourse″, *CLeAR 2015 Conference Proceedings*, 52–57, SlovakEdu, Nitra, https://7df6ec12f8.clvaw-cdnwnd.com /f11631 02c0d0e0a3aae255c61d630629/200001320-aa5f9ab550/ CLEaR2015 Conference Proceedings.pdf.
2. Chaisson, Basil (2017), *The Late Harold Pinter: Political Dramatist, Poet, Activist*, Palgrave Macmillan, London
3. Coulthard, Malcolm, Alison Johnson (2007), *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*, Routledge, London/New York
4. Čirić, Ifeta (2008), ″Govor tišine: dramske pauze u djelima Samuela Becketta i Harolda Pintera″, *Novi izraz*, 40, 84–94.
5. Čirić, Ifeta (2009), ″Pinterov 'teatar jezika'″, *Nasleđe,* 12, 107–119.
6. Eades, Diana (1994), ″Forensic Linguistics in Australia: An Overview″, *Forensic Linguistics* 1(2), 113–132.
7. *Films by Harold Pinter* (2002–2012), HaroldPinter.org
8. Foucault, Michel (1976), ″Introduction to the History of Sexuality: Volume 1″, in: Joseph Natoli, Linda Hutcheon (eds.) (1993), *A Postmodern Reader*, State University of New York Press, New York, 333–341.
9. Foucault, Michel (1983), ″Politics and Ethics: An interview″, in: Paul Rabinow (ed.) (1984), *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books, New York, 373–380.
10. Gibbons, John (2003), *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden/Oxford/Victoria
11. Hall, Phil (2008), ″Policespeak″, in: John Gibbons and M. Theresa Turell (eds.), *Dimensions of Forensic Linguistics*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 67–93.

12. Hindess, Barry (1996, 1997), *Discourses of Power: From Hobbes to Foucault,* Blackwell Publishers, Oxford/Malden.

13. Luckhurst, Mary (2009), ″Speaking Out: Harold Pinter and Freedom of Expression″, in: Peter Raby (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 105–121.

14. Mahmoodi-Bakhtiari, Behrooz, Mahsa Mahavi (2014), ″The Philosophy and Functions of Verbal Violence in Harold Pinter's *Mountain Language*: A CDA Approach″, *Kīmīyā-ye-Honar Quarterly*, 3(11), 36-47.

15. Malkin, Jeanette ([1]1992; [2]2004), *Verbal Violence in Contemporary Drama,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

16. Merriam-Webster Online n.d., "Power", https://www.merriam-web-ster.com/dictionary/power.

17. Miron, Murray S., John E. Douglas (1979), ″Threat Analysis: The Psycholinguistic Approach″, *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 5–9, 1-32.

18. Misra, Chittaranjan (2009), ″Silencing Rites in Pinter's Plays″, in: Brigitte Gauthier, *Viva Pinter: Harold Pinter's Spirit of Resistance*, Peter Lang, 183-192.

19. Pitches, Jonathan, Anthony Shrubsall (1999), ″Atmosphere, Space, Stasis: Staging Pinter's *Mountain Language* and *A Kind of Alaska* Using the Techniques of Michael Chekhov″, *Studies in Theatre Production*, 19(1), 36–66.

20. Pinter, Harold (1988), *Mountain Language and Ashes to Ashes,* Samuel French Ltd, London/New York.

21. *Plays by Harold Pinter* (2002–2012), HaroldPinter.org

22. Rabinow, Paul (1984), *The Foucault Reader*, Pantheon Books, New York

23. Raby, Peter (ed.) (2009), *Cambridge Companion to Harold Pinter*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

24. Ratcliffe, Susan (ed.) (2018), *Oxford Essential Quotations*, https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191866692.001.0001/q-oro-ed6-00006540.

25. Shammout, Hekmat (2018), *Politics, Oppression and Violence in Harold Pinter's Plays through the Lens of Arabic Plays from Egypt and Syria* [A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of Master of Arts by Research], University of Birmingham, Birmingham, http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8221.

26. Tavassoli, Sina (2016), ″Pinter's Political Theatre: A Quest for Socio-Political Spaces of Authority in *One for the Road* and *Party Time*″, *International Journal of English and Literature (IJEL)*, 6(3), 53–60.

27. Taylor-Batty, Mark (2014), *The Theatre of Harold Pinter*, Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, London/New York

28. Wodak, Ruth, Michael Meyer (eds.) (2001), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage Publications, London

29. Woodbury, Hanni (1984), ″The Strategic Use of Questions in Court″, *Semiotica*, 48(3/4), 197–228.

PERSUAZIJA I IGRA MOĆI U PINTEROVOJ DRAMI *GORŠTAČKI JEZIK* – INTERDISCIPLINARNI PRISTUP

Sažetak:

Ovaj rad, koristeći interdisciplinaran pristup, analizira igre moći, govorne strategije, te učinak govornog jezika u djelu *Gorštački jezik* (1988), jednočinki Harolda Pintera u kojoj zatvorski službenici, iz pozicije moći nad zatvorenicima i njihovim posjetiteljima, upotrebljavaju raznovrsne taktike kontrole i subjugacije. Metodološki okvir rada zasnovan je na ekstrakciji jezičkih odlika govornog jezika koji upotrebljavaju policijski službenici u engleskom jeziku prilikom ispitivanja osumnjičenih (engl. *police--speak*). U radu se kroz odabrane primjere nastoji dokazati da je ovakav jezik zastupljen u datom književnom tekstu. Analizom diskurzivnih strategija u drami, rad namjerava ilustrirati i učinak takvog govora koji karakteriziraju poticanje "kontrole ponašanja" i verbalno nasilje. Rad također daje pregled diskursa (o) moći iz ugla književne teorije i reflektira se na koncept persuazije putem analize učinka govora na svijest i ponašanje sagovornika.

Ključne riječi: moć; persuazija, učinak govornog jezika; govorne strategije; Harold Pinter; *Gorštački jezik*

Adrese autorica
Authors' address

Ifeta Čirić-Fazlija
University of Sarajevo
Faculty of Philosophy
ifeta.ciric@ff.unsa.ba

Nejla Kalajdžisalihović
University of Sarajevo
Faculty of Philosophy
nejla.kalajdzisalihovic@ff.unsa.ba