



Millar, M.R. (2012) “All’s fair in love and war.” Power and desire in Harold Pinter and Ovid’.

Rosetta 12: 101-119.

http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/Issue_12/millar.pdf

‘All’s fair in love and war.’ Power and desire in Harold Pinter and Ovid

Margaret Robinson Millar
Royal Holloway, University of London

Introduction

This paper aims to illustrate that there are surprisingly rich similarities in the way Pinter and Ovid each use a deep psychological attention to the darker sides of love to dramatize a politically subversive reading of human nature and behaviour. While the reception of Ovid has emerged as a major area of interest in recent scholarship,¹ my work does not assume any direct or indirect influence of Ovid on Pinter.² Rather, instead of the generally conservative and directional models of reception, it explores new comparative readings across the widely different cultures and periods. It attempts to suggest that the differences of genre and chronological distance between Pinter and Ovid paradoxically enable one to make fresh conclusions about each that could not be arrived at another way.

Both authors, while separated by thousands of years, are travelling on similar paths of protest. Each writer constructs characters who asphyxiate through the dictate of a society that narrows choices, predetermines roles, and casts the less privileged into the shadows of oblivion. They also throw light on those rather lost in their unease with society when that society does not provide moral and ethical

¹ See for instance Bate 1994, Brown 1999, Fantham 2004: 133-51, Hardie (ed.) 2002: 249-367, Taylor (ed.) 2000, Knox (ed.) 2009: 397-484, and Martindale 2006.

² This complex issue is the subject of a separate, ongoing study drawing on material from archives and correspondence.

compass. So individuals do not know, as Pinter observes in an interview, 'where to put their love.'³

I will focus on two of their women characters who could be sisters in their manipulative skills and power struggles to establish their identities, Pinter's Ruth in *The Homecoming*,⁴ and Ovid's Myrrha in the *Metamorphoses* (X: 298-502).⁵ Myrrha can be seen to be a precursor, a first expression, of an underdeveloped Ruth. Myrrha and Ruth are restrained, limited and at the same time powerful women. Both use the love triangle, and their ability to become a fantasy lover, to express their discomfort with their roles, and try to change their identities to gain liberation from life as it was and conquer the males.

The fantasy element and the power of image intrusion, where a figure outside the text (in the case of *The Homecoming* the dead mother) is part of a love triangle, is pertinent to certain triangles in both ancient and modern texts. It is the hidden third party which mobilizes the actions of a couple, in the Freudian unconscious which, according to Lacan,⁶ has a language structure. The hidden lover is a metonymy for a fantasy lover, the perfect lover who remains in the unconscious due to the prohibitions of the symbolic phallic society.

To summarize the stories: *The Homecoming* portrays a family, Max, a retired butcher, who shares his run-down old house in North London with his younger brother Sam, a chauffeur, and two of his three sons, Lenny, a pimp, and Joey, a demolition worker who is also an amateur boxer. The sons treat their father very badly. Max talks a great deal about his boys' dead mother, Jessie, about whom

³ Gross 1990: 41.

⁴ Pinter 1991.

⁵ Ovid 1999.

⁶ See Lacan 1977.

there is a great mystery. There are also hints that Lenny might be the son of an adulterous affair between Max's friend MacGregor and Jessie. Teddy, Max's third, and oldest son, who teaches philosophy at an American college, returns with his wife, Ruth, whom the family has not met. Ruth, also the mother of three boys, is recognized as the double of the deceased and revered Jessie (who, it transpires, appears to have been a prostitute). She moves to a position of power over the family and is invited to work for them as whore domestically and prostitute publicly. Teddy passively goes back to America, leaving Ruth not only as probable prostitute, but also matriarch and whore to the all-male family.

In the *Metamorphoses*, one of the furies infects Myrrha, King Cinyras's daughter with an incestuous desire for her father. Because of her unhealthy passion she rejects all the suitors who wish to marry her, telling her father that she wants a husband 'like' him. Although she knows it to be wrong, tormented Myrrha's desire for her father is so great that she attempts to kill herself rather than live with the anguish. Myrrha's old nurse discovers that her charge is on the point of hanging herself and persists in questioning her until she confesses her incestuous desire. Appalled as she is, the nurse agrees to help Myrrha. The opportunity arises when Cinyras' wife, Cenchreis, is away at Ceres' festival. The nurse finds drunken Cinyras and tells him about an attractive young girl, the same age as Myrrha, who is in love with him, falsifying her name. He agrees to have her brought to his bed. Cinyras sleeps with Myrrha night after night during the festival, ignorant of her identity. Calling for a lamp, he discovers his lover's true identity and, horror-struck, tries to kill Myrrha with his sword. However she flees, protected by the dark night. Myrrha wanders for nine months while pregnant with Cinyras' child. Exhausted, afraid of death and weary of life, she begs the gods to change her to a state in between. Her prayer granted, she is transformed into a myrrh tree. As she weeps silently,

the tears become myrrh dripping from the tree. Lucina, goddess of childbirth, touches the tree, speaking the words of childbirth. The tree cracks and delivers an extremely beautiful baby boy, Adonis. When Adonis reaches manhood, Cupid accidentally scratches his mother, Venus, with an arrow. She falls deeply in love with Adonis but he dies a tragic death.

Ruth and Myrrha: absent mothers, incest, and the fantasy lover

Ruth conquers the all-male family of her husband through her sexuality and intelligence, displacing and replacing the dead wife and mother. Fantasy lover of the all-male household, the sons see Ruth as the restoration to them of their late mother and object of desire, Jessie, and, in their father, Max's case, his wife, his object of desire. I want to suggest that Ruth comes as the double of the dead mother, which makes her position very strong in the mythical kingdom. As Irving Wardle puts it, '[Ruth] takes in the situation—a houseful of males who have not had a woman living on the premises since the mother died—and moves straight toward her target.'⁷

Myrrha also comes to the conclusion that her mother's position is actually vacant. She understands that the position can be occupied, and, like Ruth, has the power of the dangerous attraction of incest. Crucially, Ruth and Myrrha's ability to use the forbidden fruit of incest makes them more powerful and influential than their respective mother-in-law or mother.

To achieve her goal of an incestuous relationship with her father, Myrrha becomes his fantasy lover. Absence and lack, as Lacan⁸ suggests, fuels desire, and this is particularly pertinent in the case of Myrrha and Cinyras. Even a brief absence inspires a state of lack

⁷ Wardle 1973: 43.

⁸ Stavrakakis 1991: 51.

and desire, as in this case. Marked, and joined, by the absence of an important other in their lives, Myrrha and her father are emotionally vulnerable and open. For although she is one side of the love triangle, Myrrha's absent mother Cenchreis is almost out of the text, meriting only a brief mention. Myrrha as fantasy lover actively tries to fill the emotional space left by her missing mother and Cinyras is also willing to fill the empty space, but his desire primarily comes from his lust.

At that point Myrrha is motherless and hysterical through her obsession with her father and her '*furiosaque uota....*', '*...mad hopes....*' (X.370) Elizabeth Grosz argues that '*...hysteria...is a mode of defiance of patriarchy. In this sense the hysteric is a proto-feminist.*'⁹ So here there is the duality of a motherless daughter, who is powerless according to Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar,¹⁰ and the hysteric who is, according to Irigaray, defiant and a proto-feminist, conflicting identities in one. I want to suggest that these conflicting identities are portrayed in Myrrha's emotional struggle to contain her passion for her father. She reasons, '*tune eris et matris paelex et adultera patris?/tune eris soror nati genetrix uocabere fratris?*' 'Will you be called both the supplanter of your mother and an adulteress with your father/ Will you be called the sister of your son and mother of your brother?' (X: 347-348).

Myrrha can be seen as struggling to destroy her fantasy lover by showing to herself the deplorable consequences of giving way to that obsession for her father. This struggle seems to prefigure the emotional struggles of heroines who find themselves in similar situations in later literature.

⁹ Grosz in Henke 1994:104.

¹⁰ Gilbert and Gubar: 2000.

Within the *Metamorphoses* itself, the complexity of Myrrha's predicament traces over, as Victoria Rimell puts it, 'the ghosts of yet another marriage, that of Procne and Tereus (and Philomela/Itys in between)...Myrrha plays raped Philomela, calculating Procne and innocent doppelganger Itys all at once....'¹¹ Leonard Barkan also refers to the confusion of roles, '... [t]he familial roles of daughter, father, and nurse, along with the love that is meant to nurture those roles, are all submitted to agonizing tests of redefinition.'¹² It seems to me that this complexity and confusion of roles is heightened by the old nurse's leading Myrrha by the hand to her father's bed (X: 462), the nurse whom she followed and obeyed in childhood. For her presence gives a false sense of normality to the situation. The nurse takes little Myrrha's hand and leads her to paternal love, which, though disturbingly, doubles for erotic passion too. Myrrha's and her father's confusion and equal guilt in the episode is here signed with this double image which paints the innocence of a child over Myrrha's self-confessed desire for her own father.

For Ruth, the false sense of normality is present anyway because there is no indication that she has any qualms about being the wife of one brother while sleeping with another, and potentially sleeping with her father-in-law. Unlike Myrrha, she is not trying to destroy the role of the fantasy lover, but is actively using that role to achieve her goal of heading the family.

In a similar way to Myrrha, Ruth is also '...both supplanter of [her mother-in-law]' and potentially '...an adulteress with [her father-in-law]....' In contrast to Myrrha, however, whose conflicting identities bring her downfall, Ruth skilfully uses different identities as another of her instruments of power. For in this family situation, as Butler

¹¹ Rimell 2009: 118.

¹² Barkan 1986: 63.

writes, '...identity can become a site of contest and revision....'¹³ In order to stay safe and control the situation Ruth switches, or undergoes metamorphosis, from professor's wife to whore, from whore to mother and from mother to mistress, to respond to the fast-changing circumstances and stay in power.

Ruth increases her dominance by the power of her body language. She uses her entire body as a female organ, as Cixous propounds, a medium of communication through which she as a woman can speak.¹⁴ Rather than being oppressed through her body by the males of the family she uses it to her advantage in this situation to take control. For these reasons I have to disagree with Bernard Dukore who writes, 'Possibly Ruth will control the men rather than be controlled by them.'¹⁵ She is already in control as I hope to have shown. Addressing the family comprised totally of men she says:

Look at me. I....move my leg. That's all it is. But I wear underwear...which moves with me...it...captures your attention. Perhaps you misinterpret. The action is simple. It's a leg...moving. My lips move. Why don't you restrict...your observations to that? Perhaps the fact that they move is more significant...than the words which come through them....' (Act Two, page 85)

She cuts through the illusion of the mythic narrative and effectively wields the power of her feminine attraction.

After the family invites her to stay on as whore/prostitute and housekeeper, Max says to Ruth,

[I]isten, I'll tell you something. Since poor Jessie died.... we haven't had a woman in the house. Not one. Inside this

¹³ Butler 1993: 105.

¹⁴ In 'The Laugh of the Medusa' (1976) Cixous discusses how women have been repressed through their bodies throughout history. Here Ruth expresses her freedom by successfully using her body as a weapon against male oppression.

¹⁵ Dukore, B F. 1982: 195.

house. And I'll tell you why. Because their *mother's image* (italics added) was so dear that any other woman would have... tarnished it. But you...Ruth...you're not only lovely and beautiful, but you're kin. You're kith. You belong here.

Pause.

RUTH I'm very touched. (Act Two, pages 125-126)

Thus Max himself is manipulated into inviting Ruth to take Jessie's place. Ruth then makes her move to take his place through their subsequent conversation, 'MAX Of course you're touched. I'm touched.' (Act Two, pages 125-126) The distance necessary to be observed between king and subject and, in this case, a newcomer, is lost. Max cannot resist Ruth's power and, with one sentence, puts himself on the same level as Ruth, enabling her from that moment to use it as a platform to rise to the pinnacle of the family.

Ruth, by knowledge of the rules established by society in order to move upward on the axis of power,¹⁶ with her clinical question also nails down Max and his tall story about his mythical kingdom.¹⁷ As Silverstein observes, '[Ruth's] language ...inaugurates a shift that both transfers power from the specular object and locates agency on the side of the object and passivity on the side of the subject.'¹⁸ The kingdom promptly collapses and once again becomes Max's dilapidated house.

Ruth has become the power, the lawgiver and the lawmaker.

Ruth and the nurse: power brokers of transgression

¹⁶ This development can also be explained in the light of Butler's proposition (1990) that in society sex/gender is an axis not merely for differentiation but for domination, oppression and even discrimination. The role of the axis in positioning one as dominant or subservient in the social sphere is so pivotal that Butler calls it the 'differential axis of domination'. Butler argues that gender is performative and one can move into a position of dominance or submission by performing an act that affirms one's masculinity or femininity.

¹⁷ Appendix 1.

¹⁸ Silverstein 1993: 81.

Arch schemer behind Myrrha's successful love affair with her father, the nurse coolly manipulates Cinyras and the circumstances, enabling the incest to take place. Myrrha and the nurse act as one powerful unit, "*alumna;/ uicimus!*", "my child;/we have won!". (X: 442-443) I want to suggest that this is emphasised by the fact that, as the nurse leads Myrrha to the king's bed, Myrrha is joined to her by the hand (X: 462), as indeed, in the same sentence, the nurse joins the bodies of Cinyras and Myrrha (X: 464). Thus linked to both Myrrha and Cinyras she is part of the triangle and, I want to suggest, vicariously sleeps with Cinyras. The scale of Myrrha and the nurse's obtaining power by manipulation is such that the king has no will to resist it.

The nurse shows how calculating love can be, how invincible and ultimately ugly, when used in a power struggle. Through her success in facilitating Myrrha's conquest of her father, the nurse becomes much more than a slave, and is a dominant person, an individual with power. At that point she is more powerful than Cinyras himself. She shows that love as a weapon transcends even social strata and social class. Love, as a weapon, also transcends biological normalcy, in this case as a means to political power.

I want to argue that, in *The Homecoming*, the roles of Myrrha and the nurse, that undivided unit, are played by the calculating Ruth. She is both manipulator, as is the nurse, and mistress, as is Myrrha. It would seem that in the modern world people transcend boundaries with greater ease. While Ovid showed his characters transgressing boundaries with their acts and excessive behaviour there are still limits. In Myrrha's world, the boundaries still exist, for her incest is punished and presumably the mother returns. Pinter seems to take on the theme of transgression and gives it free rein. Ruth completely disregards all boundaries and takes on a whole range of identities. Pinter continuously remodels these identities, as does Ovid before

him. However the 20th century author goes even further in showing the transgression of his characters.

Entrapment and Collapse of the Phallic Order

The missing mother, turned fantasy lover, creates the gap, the lack, which is manipulated by Ruth in one case and Myrrha with the nurse in the other. The absence of the queen is the nurse and Myrrha's opportunity and they skilfully exploit that opportunity. The nurse manages to find the king when he is drunk. Knowing that his guard is down, she presents the case for Myrrha. It seems to me that the king is duped into thinking that he and the nurse are in league to betray his absent wife. The king has the wrong impression that the nurse brushed aside her female loyalty to the queen as she regards the bond between the king and herself as more important. He thinks his power is being enhanced when in fact he has been made to behave like a heady young man in love. He has been promised true love and given a description of beauty and youth (X: 439-441). The path of betrayal has all the snares laid to entrap the prey. The '*...ueros...amores....*' '*...true love....*' (X: 439) gradually fills the empty space, the Lacanian lack becomes something which begins for the king as a promise of a new relationship and potentially could be greater than the one he had before. Sexual love becomes the stimulus for a chain of events. It is a clear demonstration of the magnitude of the mesmeric pull of love which drags all the participants into a whirlpool of tragedy. Even the warning coming from the forces of nature, the ominous signs in the sky, the crying of the funereal owl (X: 448-453), cannot stop the characters from falling into the abyss of incest. The scale of Myrrha and the nurse's manipulatively won power is such that the king has no will to resist it. As well as the queen being betrayed by him, he himself is fooled

and becomes a pawn in the game.¹⁹ In this case Myrrha's powerful love is used to bring about a temporary collapse of the established phallic order. Both kings, Max and Cinyras, are those who end up victims of their own sense of power, their own arrogance. Their illusion that power brings entitlement leads to their undoing.

In comparison with the nurse and Myrrha, the entrapment in *The Homecoming* is created by Ruth herself. The hunters who tried to create it, Max, Lenny and Joey, are completely outwitted by Ruth, who refuses to be entangled in their snare. Instead she cleverly manipulates their need for a mother's love and sexual fulfilment. Ruth awakens their desires and brings them to the surface. For instance, she uses her body language in such a way that, while she is dancing, astonished and mesmerized brother-in-law Joey says, 'Christ, she's wide open....'(Act Two, p. 95)²⁰ Ruth skilfully delays gratification with no guarantee that it could actually come, thus ensuring her continuing dominance and power.

Thus love is used as a powerful stimulus for changes of monumental proportions in *The Homecoming*. Ruth uses the need for the love of a mother as well as sexual love to disarm each of the males. On the personal level they are forced to abandon their assigned roles in the family. The gravitational force of this love obscures and negates the needs of Ruth's husband and her three children in the USA. Max's family is starved for the love which Ruth is capable of giving them. The price of that love is a total collapse of the established phallic order and the establishment of a new order headed by Ruth as matriarch and modern goddess of love.

¹⁹ This brings reverberations with Pinter's *Betrayal* (1978), a classic love triangle, in which the lover who thought he had the upper hand, was in fact a gullible pawn.

²⁰ As Cixous writes, 'Listen to woman speak in a gathering...she doesn't "speak", she throws her trembling body in the air, she lets herself go....' Cixous & Clément 1975 : 92.

As Margaret Croyden puts it,

...she dances with Lenny, fornicates with Joey, and agrees to copulate with members of the family and to be their prostitute as well. Hence a major reversal: Ruth, passing the test of strength, dethrones the old king, as Queen, she orders food and drink....²¹

As for Cinyras, there is a conflict between power and desire when the 'other' in him emerges forcefully so that a father can become a fantasy lover of his daughter and the king's power is abused to break the taboo of incest. For both Ruth and Myrrha brilliantly exploit their intuitive knowledge about the 'other'²² in their partners, the 'other' which cannot be controlled by the partners.

Voices and the shifting balance of power

Ruth and Myrrha are linked by their desire to be heard, to use their voice to manipulate those around them to shift the balance of power to their advantage. While following their respective agendas, each woman is trying to break out from imposed identities and establish herself in accordance with her true desires.

Ruth manages to achieve what Myrrha was ultimately prevented from doing. When Ruth decides to bend all the rules against incest, she does it in daylight, but Myrrha and the old nurse operate in the dark, away from society. Ruth shows what happens if Myrrha was allowed to disclose her identity. The result is not punishment, but a strong sense of liberation, even at some cost.

For example Ruth rejects and completely disregards the father's symbolic order when openly discussing the business arrangements

²¹ Croyden 1971: 48.

²² Lacan posited that the 'other' is the unconscious which breaks into conscious thought and influences behaviour.

for prostitution with the males of the family. She takes away any possibility for them to level hypocritical allegations against her because they come as instigators of the new arrangement. Ruth does not leave any pretence of morality for Max and his sons. Therefore Max's stick of authority, previously used to threaten his son Lenny and strike Sam,²³ could not be wielded against her. She finds that ritual king Max's symbolic order is already fractured, coolly observes all the fault lines, openly takes over the kingdom as fantasy lover and establishes the new order. Paradoxically, choosing to give up her life as professor's wife in America for a life of probable prostitution in a less than appealing area of North London, Ruth gains a form of freedom. As Pinter himself says, 'At the end of the play she is in possession of a certain kind of freedom. She can do what she wants....'²⁴

Max, who initially called Ruth a 'stinking pox-ridden slut' (Act One, page 66), in the final scene, deposed, kneels by the side of her 'patriarchal' chair, and begs the new queen for a kiss of love, if not more, a kiss of life.

As Vera M. Jiji puts it,

[of] all the concrete metaphors in the play, perhaps the most effective is the last tableau, in which Ruth, the primal female figure, sits with Joey's head on her lap while Max, the defeated ritual king, crawls beneath.....²⁵

Max's brother, chauffeur Sam, is so shocked by this turn of events that he actually collapses. Lenny, the pimp, was previously trying to frighten Ruth by his stories of violence against women. However, after seeing how Ruth conquered boxer Joey, the most powerful in

²³ Appendix 2.

²⁴ Hewes 1967: 58.

²⁵ Jiji 1990:105

the family, driving Joey apart from him and making Max clutch his stick, his symbol of power, Lenny is awestruck. Ruth's triumph is complete, no pages left with questions that she did not manage to answer. Her husband meekly goes back to the USA without her.

Myrrha takes over the empty bed of the king and the expected obedience and life as a shadow wife are abandoned forever: *alea iacta est*. The mystery of this connection, the skills and the passion turn the king into a schoolboy with curiosity. He lights the lamp (X: 472-475): his lover was more than the same age as Myrrha, it is actually Myrrha - as everyone but the king has known all along. When he asks the nurse his would-be lover's age, and hears that it was the same as Myrrha's, the symbol of sleeping with his daughter is obvious. Like the waning Max who clutches his stick, that symbol of power (Act 2, page 138), Cinyras snatches down his symbol of power, his sword, not only to try to kill Myrrha, but to reassure himself (X: 475). Whether he manages to reassure his wife and the wider audience is open to question.

The fantasy lover's slipper is effortlessly put on by Ruth, and Myrrha manages to put it on with help from her scheming nurse, who has the last laugh at the king. The attraction of female promise, the unfulfilled desire, makes the king into an obedient slave and mesmerises him.

The brutal power of the established order, the macho, with fragile egos and the secret room of desires, the Freudian unconscious, the Lacanian 'he who wags me',²⁶ are uncovered, unlocked and manipulated. They are surrendered to the all-conquering beauty of feminine form and analytical thinking. With it comes the ability to read the life situation, to see the room for a fantasy lover, and

²⁶ See Lodge & Woods (eds.): 2008.

mercilessly establish a love triangle in which Ruth and Myrrha get their men.

Conclusion

As I hope to have illustrated, Pinter, through the minute details of his characters' behaviour, indicates their vulnerability and inadequacy, and the ugliness and forcefulness of love when used as a means of a struggle for power and supremacy. Ovid also shows the ugly side of love and his works address the violent side of love when used in a power struggle. Both authors demonstrate that love oppresses when it is used for domination and manipulation. Ruth conquers the power which seeks to annihilate her into a plaything and her predecessor Myrrha will never be a shadow wife. In Ruth and Myrrha's love triangles the desire for love is manipulated to shift the balance of power and the weaker side of the triangle empowered to become what seems to be a very unlikely winner.

Appendix

1.

MAX

'...Mind you, I was a generous man to [Jessie, his late wife]. I never left her short of a few bob. I remember one year I entered into negotiations with a top-class group of butchers with continental connections. I was going into association with them. I remember the night I came home, I kept quiet. First of all I gave Lenny a bath, then Teddy a bath, then Joey a bath. What fun we used to have in the bath, eh, boys? Then I came downstairs and I made Jessie put her feet up on a pouffe — what happened to that pouffe, I haven't seen it for years — she put her feet up on the pouffe and I said to her, Jessie, I think our ship is going to come home. I'm going to treat you to a couple of items, I'm going to buy you a dress in pale corded silk, heavily encrusted in pearls, and for casual wear, a pair of pantaloons in lilac flowered taffeta. Then I gave her a drop of cherry brandy. I remember the boys came down, in their pyjamas, all their hair shining, their faces pink, it was before they started shaving, and they knelt down at our feet, Jessie's and mine. I tell you, it was like Christmas.

Pause.

RUTH

What happened to the group of butchers?

MAX

The group? They turned out to be a bunch of criminals like everyone else.

Pause.

This is a lousy cigar.

He stubs it out.

*He turns to **SAM**.*

What time you going to work?'

Pinter, *The Homecoming*, Act Two pages 73-74.

2.

MAX *grips his stick.*

LENNY

Oh, Daddy, you're not going to use your stick on me, are you?....Don't clout me with that stick, Dad.

Pinter *The Homecoming* Act One, page 9.

MAX...*hits Joey in the stomach with all his might. JOEY contorts, staggers across the stage. MAX, with the exertion of the blow, begins to collapse. His knees buckle. He clutches his stick.*

SAM moves forward to help him.

MAX hits him across the head with his stick. Sam sits, head in hands.

The Homecoming, Act One, pages 67-68.

Bibliography

Bate, J. 1993. *Shakespeare and Ovid*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, New York, Oxford University Press.

Barkan, L., 1988. *The Gods Made Flesh*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Brown, S.A., 1999. *The Metamorphosis of Ovid: from Chaucer to Ted Hughes*, London, Duckworth.

Butler, J. 1993 - *Bodies That Matter*, Routledge, New York and London.

1990 - *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London.

Rosetta 12. http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue_12/millar.pdf

Cixous, H., & Clément, C., 1975. *La Jeune Née*, Paris, UGE.

Cixous, H., Cohen, K. and Cohen, C., 1976. 'The Laugh of the Medusa', *Signs* Vol.1, No. 4 (Summer, 1976), 875-893.

Croyden, M., 1971. 'Pinter's Hideous Comedy' in Lahr (ed.) 45-56.

Dukore, B.F., 1982. 'Different Viewpoints in the Play' in Scott (ed.) 189-196.

Gilbert, S.M., and Gubar, S., 2000. *The Madwoman in the Attic: the woman writer and the nineteenth century literary imagination*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Gross, M., 1990. 'Pinter on Pinter' in Gale (ed.) 37-44.

Grosz, E., in Henke, S., 1994. *Emerging Perspectives, Selected Papers from the Third Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf*, Hussey and Neverow (eds.), Jefferson City, MO, Lincoln University.

Hardie, P. (ed.), 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irigaray, L., 1985. *This Sex Which Is Not One*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Jiji, V., 1990. 'Pinter's Four Dimensional Homecoming' in Gale (ed.) 101-110.

Knox, P. (ed.), 2009. *A Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 397-484.

Rosetta 12. http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue_12/millar.pdf

Lacan, J., 1977. *Écrits, A Selection* (trans. A. Sheridan). London: Tavistock.

Lodge, D. & Wood, N., 2008. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, Harlow, England, New York: Pearson Longman.

Martindale, C. 2006. *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, Malden MA, Oxford. Blackwell.

Ovid, 1999. *Metamorphoses*, Hill (ed.), Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Pinter, H. - 1991. *The Homecoming*, London: Faber and Faber.

- 1978. *Betrayal*, London, Faber and Faber.

Rimell, V., 2009. *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference, and the Poetic Imagination*, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, M. 1993. *Harold Pinter and the Language of Cultural Power*, Lewisburg, Bucknell University Press, London and Toronto: Associated University Press.

Stavrakakis, Y., 1991. *Lacan and the Political*, London and New York: Routledge.

Taylor, A.B. (ed.), 2000. *Shakespeare's Ovid: the Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wardle, I., 1973. 'The Territorial Struggle' in Gale (ed.) 37-44.