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Abstract

This paper intends to interpret Martin Crimp’s theatrical territory whose characters consist of lonely and mysterious occupants trapped together in the British suburbs. Crimp has written innovative plays in which he explores a symbolic and absurdist landscape of cruel personal relationships and psychological disorders. He employs various theatrical possibilities where incidents are reflected and refracted through multiple perspectives. The diversity of form and styles he employs in his plays makes Crimp one of the most innovative and original playwrights of new writing in Britain. He has structured The Country (2000) in the form of the children’s game of rock-paper-scissors in order to highlight the power games among adults; hence empowering his innovative style once more. The play’s five scenes unfold the plot through a series of evasive stories that consist of shapeless dialogues, hesitations, interruptions and repetitions. The Country exemplifies domestic space in which modern marriages have become prisons. The contrasts in suburban life and the unknowability of the other are depicted through a game of question and negation, and tricks of language which will be evaluated by the vocabulary of Game Theory.
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Introduction

My paper initially argues that Crimp’s The Country has been a challenge for both spectators and critics alike in terms of its innovative writing style and portraying an intricate series of liaisons. What I further argue is that Game Theory provides invaluable insights into understanding and explaining what all the intricacy in the play represents, and that the characters’ fears and their
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efforts to exist are all veiled under the games they play by using civilized word games and complicated tactics.

Crimp’s theatre continues to be an enigma and a mystery for contemporary scholars and spectators. There is a growing interest in scholars’ attempts to explore the infinite potentialities of Crimp’s writing style, aesthetics and his “restless inventiveness with theatrical form.” Aleks Sierz defines him as “one of British theatre’s best-kept secrets” (Sierz, 2012). And in an interview Crimp admits that he constantly renovates his writing style: “you build habits when you work, and part of wanting to develop as any kind of artist is to break old habits, break old patterns of working” (Sierz, 2012). Describing himself as “text obsessive”; (Costa, 2007), Crimp has developed two diverse styles: on the one hand, he produces “conventional psychological dramas” such as Dealing With Claire, an alarming portrayal of the UK housing market that possibly ends with an estate agent's murder; on the other, there are the “texts that are really open”, such as Attempts on Her Life and Fewer Emergencies, where no stage directions are offered, action is described, and characters are mysterious. (Costa, 2007). Similarly Crimp explains his two distinct methods of dramatic writing where he makes scenes in which characters enact a story in the conventional way as in The Country, and the other method he employs is a form of narrated drama in which the act of story-telling is itself dramatised as in Attempts on Her Life and Fewer Emergencies (Ayache). He notes that in this second kind of writing, “the dramatic space is a mental space, not a physical one” (Ayache). In either style, however, Crimp investigates the violence of the modern world. Whether it is the shooting of schoolchildren in Fewer Emergencies, the rape in Attempts on Her Life, or the wife who unintentionally stabs her husband in the hand in The Country, Crimp implies that savagery is all around us, woven into the structure of life (Costa, 2007). One must not forget that drama, by dealing with human conflicts and tensions, is “political” by its very nature. However, while exploring the depth of the human condition and a sense of accompanying violence, Crimp is careful not to sermonize; he is rather more interested in aesthetics and form, and sees his plays as “a kind of filter: you pass life through it, and maybe the unpalatable things are what are left behind, but they have to make beautiful shapes” (Costa, 2007). At this point my essay is an attempt in understanding and explaining The Country, in which the characters enact a story in “conventional” ways. The general orientation of my essay will be as follows. On the one hand I will maintain that Crimp’s theatre is not restricted by stage principles and that he inventively schemes play structures; on

the other hand I will take the distinction of using Game Theory in order to demystify the intricacy in
the characters’ utterances and the moves they plan. In other words I want to show the fruitfulness of
using Game Theory in understanding and explaining the characters’ survival games.

In order to highlight a sense of inconsistency and ambiguity in people’s next act, Isaac Newton
rightly remarked that he could calculate the motions of heavenly bodies, but not the madness of people
(Spence, 1820: 462). Crimp’s characters, too, distort the anticipated flow of behaviour and they act
unpredictably as if playing in a competitive survival game. The strategic conversations that take place
between characters are sometimes collaborative but mostly conflicting.

Crimp’s ground-breaking plays, in which he employs “shapeless speech, overlapping lines,
simultaneous conversations, stacked thoughts, delayed replies, hesitations, interruptions and
repetitions” (Butler, 1993: 433) have been in opposition with the English naturalism. Crimp avoids the
strictures of the Western tradition of mimesis which confines drama as representation. As a playwright
he avoids the rules of the naturalistic drama and rather creates progressive, avant-garde, and inventive
plays that may be categorized under “postdramatic theatre” a term coined by Lehmann (Lehmann,
2006: 85). Crimp’s theatre signifies that he is not limited by stage conventions or the material
constraints of theatrical representation: he can throw around violent images with the speed of speech,
but he avoids the familiar problems of showing violence on stage (Sierz, 2007: 375-393). With his
ingeniously engineered play structure, and a concern for theatrical form and language, Crimp has been
a model for “new writing” in Britain. His spare and direct language creates powerful plays. His
Attempts on Her Life (1997) is indeed a model for Sarah Kane’s 4.48 Psychosis – an unconventional
disturbing play that has no specified characters, narrative, setting or stage directions. Similarly Play
with Repeats (1989) is an exceptional play with its fragmented narrative full of repetitions and echoes.

Verbal cruelty defines human relationships. While portraying a bleak view of human relationships,
Crimp’s characters play their language games in order to put each other at critical risks. Not alone do
they alarm each other but they also disturb the audiences alike. As Malkin argues a number of postwar
playwrights such as Pinter, Handke, Bond and Shepard have all explored how characters are
manipulated and defined through language and that how “man has become a prisoner of his speech”
(Malkin, 1992: 1). Similarly Crimp’s characters, too, are subjugated and victimized through verbal
structure. Crimp not only appropriates the postwar tradition of using language as a tyrannical weapon
of dominance and destruction but also adapts a European perception. Labeling Crimp as a truly
European writer, theatre director and critic Dominic Dromgoole argues that “Intellect and image rule
the theatre in Europe” (Dromgoole, 2000: 61). Dromgoole emphasizes the importance of perspective
as well as content in Crimp’s work where incidents occur and are then reflected in different mirrors,
refracted through different lenses.
Writing is a place of discomfort for Crimp. He has a fascination for investigating the unknowability and mystery of the other. His characters use particular tactics such as infantilisation, interrogation, evasion, and reiteration in order to subdue the other. He masterminds linguistic materials and juxtaposes fragments of scenarios. While his plays illustrate a similarity to the Pinteresque theme of language as evasion, he insists that his plays are always experimental (Aragay, 2007: 59). Like Pinter, though, Crimp has a unique ability to create dramatic poetry out of everyday speech. Aleks Sierz would rather define the revolutionary form and content in Crimp’s plays within Hans-Thies Lehmann’s “postdramatic theatre” and Frank Furedi’s “culture of fear” (Sierz, 2007). Especially Crimp’s *Attempts on Her Life* differs from the tradition of English naturalism or social realism and displays similarity to postdramatic theatre with its anonymous speakers. Due to its unspecified setting, its spoken narratives rather than a plot and its exceptional characters, *The Country* seems to fit in the model of postdramatic theatre. The play challenges readers and audiences by forcing them to create meaning for themselves. In the finale it is clear that Crimp resists a closure to this play which lacks a coherent story. The next section will outline Game Theory broadly in order to suggest that Game Theory may be helpful in elucidating and interpreting *The Country*, a challenging play full of intricacy.

**Game Theories**

At the basis of theatre lies the idea of mimesis; and role-playing is a useful way of simulating real-life situations. Jack Ehrmann wrote that any theory of communication - and hence of literature - must necessarily imply “a theory of play…and a game theory” (Yale French Studies). In this respect, many theorists have elaborated upon play with various approaches. For Bruner, Jolly and Sylva play is essential in both humans and animals to accomplish perfect instinctive skills (Bruner, Jolly, Sylva, 1976). According to motivational model the play is an activity that is realized for its own sake which provides immediate contentment such as pleasure, fun, and artlessness (Ellis, 1973: 17). On the other hand, Piaget obtains a more pragmatic stance and argues that play is a useful activity that enhances both the growth and development of an individual towards maturity (Piaget, 1963).

Similarly, game theorists have developed game concepts and distinguished its elements in order to highlight certain outcomes where someone wins and someone loses. Game Theory is characterized as a formal way to analyze interaction among a group of rational agents who behave strategically. (Temple University, Game Lectures). Game Theory, which has found its applications in numerous fields such as economics and political science, has just recently found its appliance in literature with Steven Brams’ seminal work *Game Theory and the Humanities*. In order to inspire a novel interpretation of literary texts, Brams demonstrates that Game Theory can illuminate the rational choices made by characters in texts. He has developed the theory of moves (TOM) in order to
explicate the connection between a character’s goals and the means he or she chooses to achieve them. TOM is especially useful in illuminating the *dynamics* of player choices, at least insofar as players think ahead when considering their moves. It also facilitates the analysis of misperceptions and deception by players, the exercise of different kinds of power, and the use of threats and related stratagems. Brams proves that Game Theory provides an economical framework and an important set of tools for the literary theorist (Brams, 2011: 1). As we shall see, Game Theory offers important new insights into understanding the intricate relationships among the characters. The above mentioned theories of play and game can be applicable to Crimp’s *The Country*, a play in which many strategic situations involve both chronological and immediate moves.

**Interpreting *The Country* through Game Theory**

In order to demystify the intricate language games and intriguing relationships in the play, the vocabulary provided by Game Theory proves to be helpful. As Brams emphasizes, Game Theory offers a structure for clarifying strategic issues in plot design and character development that literary theories often ignore. (Brams, 2011:4). A middle-aged married couple, Richard and Corinne, and a young American, Rebecca play their games in a love triangle. Crimp engineers the plot in every possible combination of dialogues in order to portray this middle-class adultery. In that sense the playwright is playing with new forms, plot structures and language games as well as experimenting ways of representing relationships and feelings.

In order to get away from the hectic city life, Richard, Corinne and their children have moved to the country, which is indeed symbolic. British countryside and suburban life bear solace, peace, happiness and simplicity. As Mark Perryman argues, “Suburbia has always been as something archetypically English” (Perryman, 2008: 50). Beyond the rambling metropolis, the suburbs provide a rich diversity of experience. However, the pastoral and the rural setting produce, in contrast, narratives of aggravation, chaos and discontent as Crimp rejects any tones and images of an ideal kind of bucolic life. The characters retreat into the country in order to avoid the materialistic life style, but encounter a life of disappointment, conspiracy, mystery, and betrayal. Here the country represents the sinister side of the human psyche in a world of power games where the characters fail to establish a social order in the middle of the natural order. Raymond Williams accounts that “In Britain there is a rural-intellectual radicalism, genuinely hostile to industrialism and capitalism, opposed to commercialism and to the exploitation of environment, attached to country ways and feelings, the literature and the lore” (Williams, 1975: 36). Indeed, it is at this point Crimp emphasizes that the characters in *The Country*, who are degenerated urbanites, ruin the organic society. The disoriented and displaced characters’ desire for stability and order is overcome by their own disturbance and disorder. The prospected rural bliss is wiped out when Richard brings home an unconscious woman in his arms, who
is Richard’s patient and lover. Richard is supposed to help Rebecca recover from drug addiction; however, Richard himself is also a drug addict.

Crimp structures the play with remarkable cleverness, building it as a series of encounters between two characters. The dialogues are vague, full of lies and intrigues so that the characters employ rationality, self-interest and equilibrium as much as they can. The dialogues are interrupted by the recurring telephone calls from Richard’s boss, Morris, who wants to know why Richard has failed to visit a seriously ill old patient who is now dead. Every repeated word suggests a hidden meaning in order to provide its interlocutor a strong position. Corinne repeatedly uses the word “job” in order to disturb and tease her husband in an ironic tone: “Your job? It’s your job to bring a strange woman into our house in the middle of the night?” (4). As Corinne interrogates her husband about his job and this woman that he has picked up on the side of the road, Richard prefers to elude his subjacent position and takes a maneuver in order to evade his wife’s naggings. To escape from the pressure, he inevitably asks her if she wants a drink. However, she is hooked at her previous utterance about this mysterious woman and continues her own tactic by ignoring her husband’s offer of a drink: “Lying there...Lying on the road” (5). “Lying” here has a double-meaning. On one hand she wants to imply that she believes her husband’s story that she was just lying on the side of the country track “sprawled”, but on the other her choice of the word “lying there” demonstrates that she knows that her husband is lying and that she does not believe him.

The plot develops through verbal duels, which consist of cruel and lyric word games. A sense of menace and dislocation constantly recurs in the dialogues. As Rebecca the rescued girl awakens, Corinne learns that she has been seduced and introduced to drugs by her doctor, Richard – a fact which may cause to ruin their lives. In order to protect her husband’s position and profession, she apologizes for Richard's behaviour.

Words are used more often to cover meaning than to express it. The characters hide information, which they use against each other later. They engage in a rational-emotional process of re-defining their positions. Although the utterances are not assigned to any particular characters, the interlocutors are obvious. The dialogues are either between the husband and wife, the mistress and the wife, or the husband and the mistress. They all plan to establish control over each other by playing word games. Upon seeing Corinne cutting out pictures to go round the cot, Richard sarcastically judges his wife, “You don’t normally cut. You don’t normally make things? What are you making?” (1). Then Corinne suspiciously interrogates Richard on whether or not the woman is alive, to which he reacts alarmingly: “Well of course she’s alive. What sort of question / is that?” (2). Again in the water scene, Corinne makes her husband drink the water which tastes of nothing in order to establish her authority. She reveals her suspicions unhurriedly, and now she talks about a bag which might unveil the secrecy
about the mysterious woman. She bombards her husband with skeptical statements which disorder his mind; she grills him even more when she asks him to kiss her. However, Richard refuses to kiss her and confesses that he is not clean. She makes another set of moves as to reveal the beauty of the land, hills and clouds, which she recognizes sitting under a tree. However, she admits that the tranquility is ruined by Morris’s arrival, his questions about whether they miss the city and his chanting to her in another language: “He said, ‘It’s Latin. It’s Virgil’” (14). Despite the various topics between husband and wife, Corinne never loses track and repeatedly diverts the matter to the strange woman and asks Richard if it had been a man instead of a young girl abandoned at the side of a road, would he have been “so...solicitous” – a word that makes Richard defensive and apologetic. All the refined tactics, civilized language, smiles and laughs bear a sense of mystery and insincerity. The first act finishes on “...scissors” as Corinne accidentally cuts her finger with scissors. The husband goes out to take a shower to get clean while the wife sucks her bleeding finger.

In the next scene, having found Rebecca’s watch, Corinne becomes more powerful and resourceful. Richard wants to take the watch back, however, Corinne snaps it in her fist and plays a dangerous game by asking her husband to kiss her. Their game of strength and wit is interrupted by Morris’s phone call which puts Richard at a more fragile and remorseful position as he is interrogated as to why he has failed to visit the old patient. While Richard struggles to find excuses for his neglect, Corinne brings a woman’s bag which demands an explanation from her husband. Here Corinne becomes superior to her husband. Indeed, according to “zero-sum” game theory one player wins what the other players lose (Howard, 1971). Richard finds himself messed up against his wife and his boss; and he loses the game. He is in trouble because his negligence is the cause of an old patient’s death, a fact which would ruin his career. He strives to convince Morris simply to “put the events in some kind of intelligible order” (20). He is also in trouble because his wife has found the bag in which there are needles and other materials which would reveal the fact that Richard is having an affair with this strange woman and that he is still on drugs. Corinne is good at making decisions under uncertainty. Feeling “lost”, she interrogates her husband about the girl and the needles in the bag.

The two women encounter in Scene III. Corinne again acts as the interrogator listening to Rebecca’s accounts. She talks about the stone which has arms like a chair. In a dreamy effect she tells Corinne about the remaining images in her mind before finding herself under a blanket in Corinne’s house. Indeed the trembling leaves that have different shades of green, the cold of the stone seeping into her slowly, the darkness and her feeling of death all correspond to the fact that she has been drugged by Richard. In sequential games one is either the sender or the receiver. Here Corinne is the receiver, and she has to wait for the sender’s decision. She collects new information in order to play the game strategically towards her new challenger. As both women feel confused and betrayed by Richard, the game takes on a dangerous turn. Rebecca accuses Richard of almost killing her. Corinne
supports her husband indicating that as a doctor his only concern has been her safety. Corinne does not let Rebecca leave before they talk. As Corinne tries to rationalize her husband’s acts, Rebecca speaks to her sharply “the more you talk, the less you say” (37). At this, Corinne protects her husband and accuses Rebecca of accepting his offer for a ride: “A girl – a woman – a young woman accepts a ride from a man she’s never met. And perhaps for her it’s…I don’t know what it is – it’s a game? Is it a game?” (38, italics are mine). Rebecca makes a counter attack furiously: “You patronize me. With your house, your land, your children. And accuse me of sententiousness” (39) and reveals that Richard has come to the country to continue their relationship. On account of this truth, Corinne leaves the house with her children.

Scene IV displays the encounter between Rebecca and Richard. He is anxious to know whether the two women have met. Rebecca conceals that she has seen his wife. When Richard intends to take Rebecca back, she insists on staying, claiming to be the owner of the house. Richard is helpless but Rebecca negotiates to stay as part of the game in order not to lose completely. She knows that once she is dismissed from the country house she will be outside of the game. She threatens Richard as to reveal the truth about their relationship and how he has broken rules and laws. As she has demeaned Corinne before, now she patronizes Richard and lectures him on integrity: “There’s not a limit to what can be said, only a limit to how honest we are be prepared to be” (45). Richard evades any discussion with Rebecca; he realizes that she will become a serious threat to his private and professional life and regrets not having left her on the track for dead. Raged, she discloses some hidden facts about Corinne’s deserting the house. Richard feels betrayed by the two women. As suggested by TOM (theory of moves), here Rebecca determines her dynamics profitably and having gotten rid of her competitor, Corinne, now she plots to defeat Richard by considering her moves carefully. She uses a series of threats, and language games in order to weaken Richard’s moves.

In the final scene, which takes place two months later, it appears that the husband and wife have gotten rid of Rebecca, the family union is established and they are celebrating Corinne’s birthday. Richard promises that he will keep himself clean. Corinne reminds Richard of his offence that he has left a man to die and that Morris has lied for him. She talks about her trip where she has discovered the track and visualizes in Rebecca’s terms how she has looked for something human in the area such as a needle or a piece of brick but could find nothing, “Not even a track now…Because the track stopped or it gave out” (53). She repeats Rebecca’s previous account about sitting in the stone which has arms. Then she remembers seeing Morris who has brought her a golden watch. She tells Morris that the stone devours her heart and how she dislikes the idea of simulating love for the rest of her life. The final image where the telephone rings and Corinne asks to be kissed is a message that there is no relationship, no intimacy between husband and wife. Corinne imagines acquiring Rebecca’s position, and to be Richard’s lover, but the spectators are left mystified whether this has been realized or not.
Conclusion

In this play of twisted meanings and deception, the readers are exposed to a series of constant tension between pairs of characters. Each individual word has been exploited as a means of power and a way of demeaning one another. The repeated expressions and scenes explore how power changes hands in this intricate series of relationships between a husband, wife and lover. In order to interpret and resolve verbal ambiguities and power games among characters, the vocabulary provided by Game Theory proves to be supportive. Indeed, Game Theory provides techniques for analyzing interactions between several speakers. The characters are forced to cooperate, coordinate, and change positions in order to play optimally. The readers/spectators detect scattered verbal clues such as track, needles, job, handbag, solicitous, clean - words that acquire a sinister resonance and operate towards deception and infidelity. Crimp portrays the power games of these unhappy adults by concluding the play in the married couple’s acceptance to simulate love. It is anticipated that the couple continues to play games as games include simulation.

Overall, this paper is a study that tries to shed more light on the controversial method and manner that Crimp has used in The Country. Most importantly, this paper can be taken as an example application for future researchers who intend to interpret contemporary play texts through Game Theory in order to make sense of postdramatic writing which employs innovative and creative writing styles and techniques.
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