

PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF DEVIATIONS OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN SAMUEL BECKETT'S *WAITING FOR GODOT*

¹Dr. Mazhar Hayat, ²Abdul Baseer, ³Saira Akhter

Abstract

There is no denying that for a meaningful communication to take place, the interlocutors ought to observe in the words of Paul Grice (1975) 'Four Maxims of Cooperative Principle'. However, for the communication to become meaningful and effective, utterances are interpreted and understood in context, not in isolation. Pragmatics, a relatively new branch of linguistics, deals with all the sociological and psychological phenomena which occur in the functioning of speech. It does not interpret a textual discourse at its surface level but goes to its meanings at deeper level. Samuel Beckett, the pioneer of 'The Theatre of the Absurd', affirms that we try to conceal reality behind words but we fail because language reveals more than is intended by the speaker. Beckett's master piece *Waiting for Godot* provides rich foregrounded material for pragmatic analysis as characters of the play frequently flout the maxims of Cooperative Principles. For a lay man, the utterances of the dramatis personae seem to communicate nothing because of repetitive sentence structures, unconventional dialogues and untraditional symbols. But, this research paper aims to establish that all these deviations/floutings of Cooperative Principles would yield a variety of meanings when analysed in context. A number of passages from the text are selected for analysis on the basis of their stylistic and thematic significance. Mick Short's (1997) model of description, interpretation and evaluation has been applied for the analysis of the selected texts.

Keywords: Pragmatics; Deviations; Cooperative Principles; The Theatre of the Absurd; tragi-comedy

Pragmatics is described as a study of "intended speaker's meaning" or of "invisible meaning" (Yule, 1997, p. 127) as the meaning has to be recognized in a context with deliberation because it is not conveyed simply and directly. Moreover, with the help of deixis, the speaker refers to something temporally, spatially and personally: either it is near to him or away from him. Yule (1997) propounds pragmatics as "the study of relationships between linguistic forms and the uses of these forms" (p. 4).

Whenever there is a conversation going on between two persons, it indicates that both of them are giving their share of information to each other. In other words, they are being cooperative. The theory of

¹ Assistant Professor of English, Government Postgraduate College, Samanabad, Faisalabad, Pakistan

² Lecturer in English Linguistics, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

³ Lecturer in English, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan

Cooperative Principles was presented by Paul Grice (1975). He states that the four Cooperative Principles of Quantity, Quality, Relevance and Manner are necessary for effective communication consisting of accurate, true, relevant and unambiguous interaction between the interlocutors. The four Cooperative Principles with their sub-maxims are the following:

Quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation

Be relevant

Manner

Be perspicuous

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

(Paul Grice, pp. 26-27, 1991)

These principles draw an ideal picture of human communication. The speaker may sometimes deviate, opt out, violate, breach or flout the maxims. In such situations, meanings are implicit not explicit. The most frequently applied tools of implied conversation (Implicatures) are irony, metaphor, metonymy, litotes, simile, and hyperbole etc. Irony is “the technique of implying the opposite of what is actually said”, (Russell, 2001, p. 206). Metaphor is a word derived from “Greek *meta* ‘change’ and *phero* ‘I bear’, and has come to mean a change or transfer of significance from one object to another” (p. 211). In this way, all these devices add more meanings to the utterance than are seemingly conveyed by speakers.

Beckett’s play *Waiting for Godot* represents “the predicament of man living in the age of science and industrialization” (Pickering, 1988, p. 3). Two men at a country road are waiting for a man named Godot

who does never come. They spend their time of waiting in idle talk but their discourse gives a variety of meanings. The absurdity and incongruity of the text of *Waiting for Godot* will give way to its meaningful and logical deciphering with the help of pragmatic analysis. In the drama, dialogue is an essential element and Beckett creates a new and negative myth by its failure which is “a source of creative energy, is comparable to the familiar power of certain negative emotions as motives to action, and to ‘the negative way’ as a source of spiritual life” (p. 135).

Samuel Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot* is a tragi-comedy. Beckett’s economy of expression in his plays causes ambiguity in his texts for the common readers. Drama stages action through dialogues. But most often, Beckett’s character does not understand other character’s talk which causes irrelevance of content in the situation; hence, it ends in apparent meaninglessness of the conversation but it provides a new horizon of heterogeneous meanings to the researchers with Pragmatic study of the text. The dramatis personae have multifaceted speeches which can be understood only with the help of the contextual study of Pragmatics.

Textual Analysis

The sequence of the analysis of the given passages is: 1) first, the conversation between the characters is described in terms of the context; 2) second, deviations of the maxims of cooperative principles are interpreted in terms of their implications; 3) finally, the implied meanings are evaluated in terms of communicability. To facilitate the readers, the researchers have numbered every dialogue of the characters in the play.

Text-1

Vladimir: (1)
I’m glad to see you back. I thought you were gone for ever.

Estragon:
Me too.

Vladimir: (2)
Together again at last! We’ll have to celebrate this. But how? (...) Get up till I embrace you.

Estragon:
(...)Not now, not now.

Vladimir: (3)
(...). May one enquire where His Highness spent the night?

Estragon:

In a ditch.

(p. 9)

Vladimir and Estragon are two friends who are waiting for Godot. In the night time, they depart from each other and in the morning, they meet again at the same place. In this scene Vladimir wants to embrace Estragon out of love to celebrate their reunion but Estragon refuses to do so. Consequently, Vladimir gets hurt emotionally and asks Estragon about the place where he spent his night.

It is interesting that Vladimir, in his utterance 3, does not ask Estragon about his night stay with a simple question as ‘Where did you spend the night?’ after departing from him yesterday. In spite of a short and simple interrogative, he uses a long sentence consisting of a modal auxiliary ‘may’, pronouns “One” and “His” in the place of “I” & “You” and the word “Highness” which is one of the ‘honorifics’- “the expressions which indicate higher status” (Yule, 1996, p. 10) for Estragon who is a tramp and equal in social status with Vladimir. The reader gets perplexed at the prolixity and ambiguity of this utterance, because Vladimir is flouting the maxims of Quantity, Quality and Manner.

Vladimir is talking to his friend but he is giving false personal deixes to the reader as “One” and “His” for himself and Estragon respectively where he should have used “I” and “You” respectively. He is using “may” a modal auxiliary, which shows the uncertainty on the part of the speaker as the listener can condescend to reply his query if he opts to; otherwise, he can refuse to answer because of his superior or powerful social status. Vladimir is not being brief; even then his information is not as informative for the reader as it should be. Actually, Vladimir has used here an implicature, an irony by giving an exaggerated treatment to Estragon when he refused to hug Vladimir at his arrival on the “Country road”, a place where they are supposed to wait for Godot. Hence, he is affronting him with “mock-politeness” (Leech, 1989, p. 176) in an indirect address by the sarcastic use of title like “His Highness” which is used for a person to whom it is “clearly inappropriate” (p. 176). We know that Estragon is neither a king nor a noble man to be interrogated in such a hyperbolic way of reverence. Hence, the humorous and ironical effect is created on the readers because more is conveyed than said.

Earlier on, Vladimir used first person singular and plural personal deictic pronouns as 'I' and 'we' to show intimacy between them, but now he uses (pronouns) 'one' and 'his'. He uses "one" to address himself as a common man or a stranger to Estragon because Estragon, being totally obsessed by his boot, does not pay attention to his friend Vladimir. The pronoun "His" shows distance from the speaker. This distance deixis is used for Estragon and past sentence "spent" also shows psychological distance of Vladimir from Estragon. Vladimir has used irony in his utterance and its ironical effect aggravates when Estragon tells his friend that he spent his night in a ditch. So, there is a deflation in the status of Estragon after his elevation. This contrast enhances the bitter situation of Estragon's life. It projects his extreme poverty because of which he is unable to live in a room or a home and this may be the cause of his indifferent behavior towards other human beings.

So, the gap between Vladimir and Estragon's utterances generates comedy as well as tragedy of human life which become the quintessence of the Theatre of the Absurd. "The absurdity arises from the largeness of the gap" (Hasan, 2002, p. 122).

Text-2

Vladimir: (1)
And now you turn him away? Such an old and faithful servant.

Estragon:
Swine!
Pozzo more and more agitated.

Vladimir: (2)
After having sucked all the good out of him you chuck him away like a . . . like a banana skin.
Really . . .

(p. 33-34)

Pozzo-Lucky or the master-slave relationship is discussed here. Pozzo recites a lyrical extract on man's happy and sad moods. After accomplishing his speech, he reveals that Lucky has taught him all these things and has given all his knowledge to Pozzo, his master. Now, Pozzo claims to be more intellectually rich and physically fit than Lucky. On the other side, Lucky's intellect is becoming faulty because of his old age. Pozzo's demands from Lucky are still very high which he cannot completely fulfill at this stage. Consequently, Pozzo decides to sell Lucky at a fair and earn some money. Vladimir and Estragon erupt and

object on his unjust conduct towards Lucky who is tied with a rope around his neck. Lucky should have been treated sympathetically.

Estragon's dialogue "Swine!" consists of just one lexeme "swine" which is a noun; the exclamatory sign after it expresses the extreme anger and hatred for Pozzo. Vladimir was not so severe in his indictment against Pozzo, but Estragon is very vociferous in his criticism on him. "Swine" is a greedy animal. Apparently, it has no resemblance with the human beings. So it is a breach of Quality maxims. This is a deanthropomorphic and dehumanizing metaphor in which a human being is reduced to the level of an animal. The implied meaning refers to Pozzo as a greedy man of a capitalist world. He looks only for his own benefit. He consumes all the energies of his slave which proves him an avaricious and covetous man.

Pozzo's nervousness is shown by Beckett in the drama. He is getting upset and disturbed on hearing the remarks of both the friends. He has been the object of his own praise and Lucky's obedience all the time. Now, he is the target of Vladimir's and Estragon's censure which is nerve-shattering to him.

Vladimir in his turn (in utterance 2) says that Pozzo wants to expel Lucky from his job after enjoying his services as someone throws banana skin after eating banana. Vladimir's utterance is creating a conceptual gap of understanding. How is this possible that a human being can be thrown away as a banana-skin? Vladimir is exploiting the maxim of Quality. He is not presenting true picture of events so it causes ambiguity of style and manner, as a result he is breaking the maxim of relation also. Vladimir is perhaps overcome by Pozzo's gestures and facial expressions. He is no more straight forward in his blame on Pozzo that is why he talks in a circumlocutory manner. Vladimir tries to elaborate his point of view about Lucky and Pozzo's relationship with the help of a simile. "Simile postulates the comparison: X is like Y" (Bradford, 1997, p. 26). By the comparison, the implied meanings become explicit. Plant analogy has been used to represent a human being; it is generating dehumanizing element. The value of human being is compared with the value of a fruit skin which is aggravating the valuelessness of Lucky for his master. Banana is tasty and nutritious fruit but its skin is just scrap. Fruit is utilized and eaten by us but its skin is distasteful and useless so it is thrown away. Same is the condition of workers, servants and masses

represented by Lucky for the capitalist sado-masochistic landlords and dictators in this world. Pozzo has sucked all the intellect and aesthetics from Lucky about beauty and grace but in spite of being grateful or affectionate towards him, he wants to get rid of him. Lyons (1983) writes that the poverty and richness of the characters in the drama symbolizes a “socioeconomic scheme” (p. 42). He compares and contrasts Pozzo and Lucky with lordship and bondage model of Hegel in which slave produces goods for his masters but slave cannot own them; the slave does perform all the duties assigned to him by his master. Lyons points out some differences between Hegel’s philosophy and Beckett’s viewpoint by informing the reader that Beckett’s slave who is Lucky in *Waiting for Godot* generates thoughts; he does not make objects. Through his intellect and contemplation he connects his master, Pozzo, to the modern world. “That world, however, has escaped them both; nothing of its remains but the words of his disturbing tirade that oppresses both servant and master” (pp. 42-43).

Vladimir gives a pause in his speech after “like a” and he repeats these lexemes also. This is creating redundant material which is in extra quantity which is not needed in his speech act. It leads to the breach of Quantity maxim. Vladimir may be searching for some appropriate words to evaluate Lucky’s condition but he may be facing difficulty because of his faulty memory. In addition to this, he may have realized his own situation in life which is below Pozzo’s rank and this reality has benumbed his senses, therefore he falters and hesitates to use some hostile and impolite expression for Pozzo. The pauses play a vital role in the drama; they add semantic richness in the text. Worton presents different types of pauses and their implications in Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*. He discusses “silences of inadequacy, when characters cannot find the words they need; silences of repression, when they are struck dumb by the attitude of their interlocutor or by their sense that they might be breaking a social taboo...” (qtd in Pilling, 2001, p.75). Beckett is a moralist. Through his drama, he presents the right and wrong deeds for the readers to appreciate or deprecate them. He tells us that Pozzo’s treatment of Lucky is a malevolent act. It is severely disliked by Vladimir and Estragon who are the spokesmen of Beckett.

Text-3

Pozzo:

(1)

Gentlemen, you have been . . . civil to me.

Estragon:

Not at all.

Vladimir:

What an idea!

Pozzo:

(2)

Yes yes, you have been correct. So that I ask myself is there anything I can do in my turn for these honest fellows who are having such a dull, dull time.

Estragon:

Even ten francs would be welcome.

Vladimir:

We are not beggars!

Pozzo:

(3)

Is there anything I can do, that's what I ask myself, to cheer them up? I have given them bones, I have talked to them about this and that, I have explained the twilight, admittedly. But is it enough, that's what tortures me, is it enough?

Estragon:

Even five.

Vladimir:

(*to Estragon, indignantly*). That's enough!

Estragon:

I couldn't accept less.

(p. 39)

Pozzo makes a remarkable speech on evening and approaching night. He asks for the comments from Estragon and Vladimir. Initially, they pass good remarks on it but after some time their latter comments show their dissatisfaction with his performance. On the whole, Pozzo gets encouragement from their pronouncements and expresses his intention to reward them at their patience with him in utterance 1.

In Pozzo's utterance 2, we find recurrence of "yes" and "dull" which is superfluous. In normal sentence, such repetitions as "yes yes" and "dull, dull" are not found. It is redundancy of lexeme which breaches the Quantity maxim. It shows that Pozzo prefers long conversation and exaggerated style. Moreover, he is a great hypocrite who pretends a lot thus Vladimir and Estragon do not credit his comment. Pozzo has to utter "yes" twice to make them believe on his observation. Pozzo says that he craves for paying them tribute for their nice conduct towards him.

Estragon values Pozzo as powerful and rich feudal who can grant them some money. He demands some money from Pozzo. Vladimir dislikes taking any help from Pozzo. Vladimir uses first person plural pronoun “we” which is a personal deictic including him and Estragon in his statement. He does this to save their respect before Pozzo. Vladimir admonishes Estragon that they are not beggars to beg for money or food from people.

Pozzo’s third dialogue has unnecessary prolixity. Instead of saying that he has been courteous with Estragon and Vladimir, he enumerates a long list of his small deeds of civility so he is flouting the maxim of manner. His first beneficent act is of granting chicken bones to Estragon but he has used pronoun “them” which includes both the friends. It is wrong usage of plural pronoun for a single person which provides erroneous information to the reader hence breaching the Quality maxim. While saying this he tries to present himself as a man who wants to extend his generosity to both of them. Pozzo’s utterance “I have given them bones” fails to create the required effect of inspiring the reader as well as Estragon and Vladimir because Pozzo gave the bones after eating flesh on them. This fact creates sarcasm and satire on Pozzo who threw the bones away when he did not need them and he allowed Estragon to take bones on the latter’s request. Pozzo’s next deed of helping them is passing their time with his conversation on miscellaneous topic. In one of the topics, he gives valuable information to the tramps who are strangers at this place. According to him, he painted a picture of evening with words to entertain them. In reality, he himself is in dire need to converse with someone to get rid to his boredom that is why he proposes to “to dally with” them snobbishly. Beckett’s portrayal of his character is ironical and satirical because his generosity is not worthy to be appreciated by anyone.

After making a catalogue of his so-called fine actions towards Estragon and Vladimir, he repeats a question. Apparently, it is breaching Quantity maxim, but it is not without its covert significance. He asks himself about the adequacy of his actions in the following interrogative “is it enough?”; he gets traumatic to know about its answer; he could possibly be feeling his “being overly generous” (Hasan, 2002, p. 150) with them. It is crystal clear from his verb “torture” which connotes intensive feeling of anguish. He is a man who grabs every possible thing

from others and if something drops from his lap by chance for others, it torments him a lot. Pozzo conveys more with his question than conveying it overtly to the reader. He wants the answer “yes” from Estragon and Vladimir to affirm that his efforts are sufficient and abundant in making them happy and he has paid them in the same coin by being civil to them as they were to him.

Text-4

- Vladimir:* (1)
At last! (...) #
What are you doing?
- Estragon:*
Pale for weariness.
- Vladimir:* (2)
Eh?
- Estragon:*
Of climbing heaven and gazing on the likes of us.
- Vladimir:* (3)
Your boots. What are you doing with your boots?
- Estragon:*
(...). I'm leaving them there. (...) Another will come,
just as . . . as . . . as me, but with smaller feet, and
they'll make him happy.
- Vladimir:* (4)
But you can't go barefoot!
- Estragon:*
Christ did.
- Vladimir:* (5)
Christ! What's Christ got to do with it? You're not
going to compare yourself to Christ!
- Estragon:*
All my life I've compared myself to him.
- Vladimir:* (6)
But where he lived it was warm, it was dry!
- Estragon:*
Yes. And they crucified quick
- (p. 52)

After the departure of Pozzo and lucky, a boy comes to give them Godot's message. Estragon gets huffy at the boy's late arrival to deliver the message. He is feeling unhappy on Godot's non-appearance and sits on the mound to take off his boot. The messenger says that Godot could not come today but he will surely come tomorrow. As soon as the boy leaves the stage, the evening modulates into night and moon rises on the sky.

The pale moonlight is scattered everywhere. Vladimir utters “At last!” which does not refer to anything in particular. It creates ambiguity of manner. It may refer to the night for which they were waiting so that they can take rest after a tedious waiting. Fletcher and Fletcher (1985) say that it means “night has come” (p. 68) and now they can depart from each other. It also points at receiving Godot’s message at last. If he fails to come here personally he sent a message to them in the evening. The emotion of relief and release from their tension of staying there is displayed with exclamatory sign at the end of his utterance. After putting off his boots, Estragon ponders over the presence of moon on the sky which is another part of nature along with tree. Ultimately, he gets his poetic inspiration back as he has told us earlier about his being a poet and utters half lines from Shelley’s poem “To the Moon” as response to Vladimir’s question.

Estragon’s utterance 1 is irrelevant to Vladimir’s interrogation. Hence he is flouting the maxim of Relevance. He tells about the condition of moon whereas Vladimir is interested in knowing about his boots. Vladimir seems to be unable to understand Estragon’s allusion to Shelly’s poem. Estragon puzzles him more by adding another line of the same poem but with some adaptation. What does Estragon want to convey with it? Obviously, he is utilizing his turn of speaking and he is also cooperating with Vladimir. He may be showing his own exhaustion by spending a lot of years of misery and by looking at the suffering humanity.

Estragon fails to recall the complete two lines of Shelley’s poem “To the Moon” which he has quoted in the play. The lines are:

Art thou pale for weariness
Of climbing heaven, and gazing on the earth, ... ?

He may have done it because of his lapse of memory as he suffers from forgetting things, places and people, or he may be doing it intentionally. Shelley’s question to the moon leaves it with an open choice to accept his reason for its paleness or to narrate its own cause. As a result of his openness of choice, Estragon does not give any option to the moon as he himself has no other option expect waiting for arrival of Godot. From Estragon’s perspective, the moon is pale because of being tired of its dull routine. It is not yellowish due to absorbing light from

sun but it is pallid and anaemic because of unhealthy atmosphere surrounding it. It is lonely and without any friend, so Estragon's statement has proved that the moon is tired; its energy is sapped and it seems to be on its end. It has been climbing on the heavens and hills for centuries and from that height it is used to look on earth. "The earth" is substituted by "the likes of us" in Estragon's statement. He delimits moon's range of sight to the human beings only. He excludes nature and animals from this category because the co-sufferer of moon is merely man. The moon is a non-living object; it does not possess animate quality of looking at others. Thus, this situation breaches Quality maxim. It indicates that more is conveyed than said. Anthropomorphism has been used to assign human qualities of watching others by the moon this is why its tie is more strengthened with human beings.

Estragon's irrelevant and ambiguous partaking in speech leads towards implicatures. This reference has its implied meaning. This foregrounded utterance compels the reader to find similarity between the moon and Estragon. On Vladimir's question "What are you doing?", his answer is "pale for weariness" which may infer that Estragon himself is getting unhealthy and old because of his tiresome shifting from place to place. In day time, he comes at this place and he has to spend night time in a ditch. He is also suffering from anguish of waiting for Godot who may be God. He may be looking for some spiritual guidance to lead his life from him but he remains a failure in getting it. His ineffectual exploration makes him disconsolate and dejected. The phrase of "climbing heaven" represents his different undertakings and engagements to accomplish on time with the hope of arriving at his destination. He has been engaged in different improvisations with Vladimir to ensure himself of his existence with some objective in life for half a century. His feet have swelled as a result of his wanderings. When he meets and looks at other human beings on earth, he does not get any satisfaction from them. They are also crushed by the tyranny of their fated journey. The vicious cycle of moving on and on in their lives for some destination does not let them rest and it begins again when they incline to stop it. Pozzo and Lucky are also victim of this process. They will also be degenerating continuously and in Act II of the drama Pozzo will become blind and Lucky dumb out of this drudgery. Vladimir who is Estragon's companion suffers from the same pathetic condition but his

anguish is twofold as he seems to forget less and he is afflicted by physical and mental torments.

After dragging himself on this routine, Estragon is feeling enervated. He cannot go on like this; he is unhappy with his routine; he seems to be uninterested in life any longer. Exhaustion is taking him to a stasis and to give up his will of living. Estragon's quoting infers pessimism in his mood which can also be traced in Shelley who was a revolutionary romantic poet of the nineteenth century. Estragon displays his knowledge of exemplary poet Shelley which shows that he has got formal education in the past happy days.

Vladimir tries to put Estragon on right track by adding noun phrase "your boots" in his dialogue so that he will not misinterpret Vladimir's utterance. Estragon has tugged off his boots, which indicates his intention to die or to end his wanderings; he has put them aside. Vladimir is worried about Estragon's catching cold and falling sick because of cold climate. Estragon is in a mood to get rid of his tight boots so that some other man with smaller size of feet can utilize them. In his utterance 3, he uses lexeme "as" three times which is its redundant use, hence exploiting Quantity maxim. There are also two pauses which display Estragon's moments of reflection. At the background of this utterance, we can allocate two emotions working simultaneously: one is feeling relaxed after abandoning problematic boots and the other is to sacrifice them for some other man to make him happy and comfortable with them. He discards them with a good intention; otherwise he is not rich to renounce his boots carelessly. Beckett implies here that there can be another couple who comes at night at this place to wait for someone most probably Godot that is why in the morning of Act II the boots are found changed in colour and size. Beckett presents a circularity of theme by presenting a couple loitering there in the morning and probability of another pair of friends in the night, in this way, inaction of action goes on.

When Vladimir forbids him from leaving his boots and walking bare foot, Estragon replies him with an irrelevant utterance "Christ did"; for this reason, we can say that he is flouting the maxim of Relevance. Vladimir's talk revolves around Estragon but he is thinking about what Christ did in the past. The question arises that what Christ has got to do here and why Estragon is taking interest in Christ's troubles. Beckett let

Vladimir ask about these points. Vladimir's first reaction is of surprise. He is baffled at mixing the suffering of existence of a common man with the biblical persona. Throughout the play, Beckett intermingles physical life of a common man with spiritual world of religion because they cannot be separated being entwined with each other.

Estragon proclaims that he has found his points of similarity with Christ throughout his life. Estragon provides the reader with fake information. He is breaching maxim of Quality. Estragon is attaching himself with Biblical sufferers. "Thus Estragon links himself both with the first sinner and with the redeemer of sins, the whole tragicomic pattern of the fall" (Dutton, 1986, p. 64). He fancies that the sacrifice of his boots is a sacrifice like Christ, but the thing which is sacrificed is not of a sublime level that results in a huge contrast of situation. This absurd situation generates laughter. Comparing oneself with Christ on the basis of a trivial issue is ironical and satirical. Christ's sacrifice was to redeem mankind. Contrastively, Estragon's sacrifice of boots which are hurting him is for any one man and in reward, he is seeking God's pity only for himself as it is mentioned in Act II. Graver (1989) comments briefly on the situation under-discussion in the following words:

Ludicrous in its extravagant inapplicability, excessive in its self-pity, Estragon's claim is also plaintively fitting for the plight of an itinerant longing for a connection with the spiritual hero who embodied the promise of salvation for all mankind through his suffering and theirs. (p. 57)

Vladimir tries to prove Estragon's comparison with Christ unequal and unfair in a circumlocutory manner. He argues that Christ lived in hot and dry atmosphere whereas Estragon belongs to cool and humid area. Estragon's reply is once again about Christ that he had been crucified quickly because of warm weather there. The people of hot places are normally very emotional so they might have crucified him immediately in their furious moods. Estragon's environment is cold; people are also less emotional. They torment him bit by bit. Accordingly, his life is equivalent to a process of slow crucifixion at a snail's pace. For years and years, he is present at the same place without any development in his condition. According to Berlin (1981), Beckett may be trying to present Christ luckier than modern man because his anguish and pain ended with

his death but modern man's misery increases with his hazy future and his uncertainty about life and death. Therefore, Estragon contemplates on committing suicide to end his life in a minute. He also sees the mirror reflection of his condition in the moon also who seems to him utterly exhausted by its long journey for centuries on heavens as if it were also being gradually crucified by the divinities.

Dutton (1986) observe that "Estragon's thoughts are focused very much on the practicalities of suffering rather than its spiritual dimension" (p. 64). This comment sharpens the irony. He is centralizing his thoughts on the physical condition of suffering rather than focusing on spiritual side of the event. It indicates that Estragon is a man related to physical needs and worries of life; he cannot be professed to take interest in the metaphysical and spiritual side of life. He utters his remark scathingly that ends the dialogue between friends for some time and only silence ensues it.

Text-5

Estragon: (1)

We might try him with other names.

Vladimir:

I'm afraid he's dying.

Estragon: (2)

It'd be amusing.

Vladimir:

What'd be amusing?

Estragon: (3)

To try him with other names, one after the other.
It'd pass the time. And we'd be bound to hit on the
right one sooner or later.

Vladimir:

I tell you his name is Pozzo.

Estragon: (4)

We'll soon see. (...) Abel! Abel!

Pozzo:

Help!

Estragon: (5)

Got it in one!

Vladimir:

I begin to weary of this motif.

Estragon: (6)

Perhaps the other is called Cain. Cain! Cain!

Pozzo:

Help!

Estragon:

(7)

He's all humanity.

(p. 83)

All the four characters have fallen down on the ground and they are unable to get up from it. Pozzo, who has gone blind, is continuously calling for help to get up. His cries disturb the sleep of Estragon and, on his suggestion, Vladimir kicks Pozzo who retreats from his place and then collapses. Both the friends get worried about him. Vladimir calls him but he does not answer. Estragon suggests a game of addressing him with other names to pass the time.

Estragon casts doubt on Pozzo's name when he does not show any reaction on his name (Pozzo) uttered by Vladimir. He presents a proposal to use other names for him. Vladimir is thinking about an unpleasant probability of Pozzo's death because of his inertia and inaction. His declarative is not relevant to Estragon's talk. He is flouting the maxim of Relation. By doing this, he conveys his guilty conscience at kicking a blind man who is in need of getting help from them.

Estragon's second utterance bewilders the readers. Has he become so heartless to see a dying man with pleasure? The habit of watching deaths of lots of people may have made him stone-hearted. Vladimir questions him about it and a new point comes to the surface that he was not listening to Vladimir at all as he was not attentive to him in his previous dialogue. Estragon was considering the act of calling Pozzo with different names fun-filled. Beckett's play presents this phenomenon which marks characters' self absorption and their obsessions with their train of thoughts which create misunderstanding or lack of understanding. "Beckett counterpoints resulting misunderstandings with comic subtlety" (Fletcher & Spurling, 1985, p. 61-62). The misconception about Estragon creates tragic feelings, but when it is resolved, it generates laughter on having thought low of Estragon's nature. Such situations make the play a tragi-comedy.

Estragon is quite sure that Pozzo would react on other names. The first name he chooses after reflection is "Abel". Pozzo utters "help!" and reacts on that name; Estragon feels happy to find out name in his maiden effort. Estragon's knowledge of religious myths presents him as a man learned in the field of religion. He breaches Quality maxim as he knows that the blind man is Pozzo not Abel. Perhaps he gives this name to

Pozzo to criticize his victimization of Lucky as Abel who was a murderer of his own brother Cain. Pozzo is also breaching Quality maxim by answering to a wrong name. His answer is also not relevant. He should have said that his name is not Abel but he responds to it by saying "help!". It means he is no more a powerful man who was moving "on" Lucky in the first act. In the second act, he is reduced to a figure that needs help and he has become dependent on Lucky and. He is a victim of fate which is blind, and it has made him blind as a punishment. He considers himself "Abel" because he was opted by fate to be a sinner: the first murderer and the wanderer on the earth afterwards. Pozzo is also destined to roam about here and there probably in search of salvation. Thus, sign of exclamation shows Pozzo's pain at his pitiable condition.

Vladimir loses his interest in this tactic which was meant to pass their time. He says that it cannot serve its purpose so he is tired of it. It could not entertain him. Vladimir may have not liked Estragon's successful turn of conversation that is why he may have suggested stopping this distraction.

In the enthusiasm of winning the game, Estragon carries on with it. This time he chooses another religious name "Cain" and repeats it twice like "Abel" which is an affair of redundancy; hence breaking the maxim of Quantity. This second effort has again given a favourable outcome by Pozzo's scream of help. Estragon breaks the maxim of Quality by uttering a wrong name for Pozzo. He does it on purpose to present him as a man (Cain) who was murdered by his own brother. Pozzo was kicked by Vladimir and he might be beaten by other fellowmen to death with whom he had behaved badly earlier.

Estragon's seventh dialogue is describing Pozzo as whole humanity. Pozzo is a single man and he cannot be considered as all the human beings of the world. Estragon is breaking the maxim of Quality through his statement about Pozzo. Estragon may be foregrounding the theme of universality with Pozzo's tendency to be identified with both the brothers, Abel and Cain. Beckett has mentioned earlier that the mankind is divided into two batches: one will be saved and the other will be damned; this binary division leaves them with fifty-fifty percent chance of getting salvation or damnation in the world hereafter. According to this conclusion, one person out of two mentioned in the dialogue would be saved. So, Pozzo answers and responds immediately on both the

names. It is “his frantic attempt to draw that fifty-fifty chance of salvation upon himself” (Esslin, 1980, p.55).

After losing his eye-sight, Pozzo is woe-begone and calling for help which is not granted to him. In the play, help of others is sought for many times but it is provided on a few occasions; it indicates man’s ineffectuality. The land owner, at an instant, may be exploiting others and at the next moment, he himself might be ill-treated by them. Consequently, the cycle of human life is completed. In the first Act, Beckett acquainted Pozzo with the reader as a man full of lust to suck all the good out of Lucky. Now, after tragic deterioration in his personality, he is still in the same element. He wants to represent all the men like Abel or Cain. As a result of his self absorption, he receives justifiably a sarcastic treatment from Estragon.

Conclusion

In the analysis, deviations of maxims are noted and marked greatly in the text of the play. The deviations from the maxims of cooperative principles are motivated and purposeful.

Estragon and Vladimir break these rules of communication, so that in correcting the wrong information, asking for more, finding relation of the topics under discussion and disambiguating the vague utterances their time can fly while waiting for the arrival of Godot. Both the characters contribute less amount of information but Pozzo talks a lot to hold the floor of conversation for a long period of time. Both the situations result in deviation of maxims which project their absurd condition in the play *Waiting for Godot*. Its deviated paradigms are exploited to justify the emptiness, meaninglessness of existence in the drama.

The researchers find that text, sometimes, dodges the reader because of its surface simplicity which has a web of complex ideas underneath. It is highly charged with symbols, metaphors, similes, irony, litotes and hyperboles etc which communicate their meanings from “context-driven factors...used as heuristics” (Katz, 1996, p. 21). The simple structure of the sentence from its contextual study generates deep structure in the language of the drama. The metaphors, which appear deviated and unrelated to the other lexemes, are interpreted meaningfully in their context because “we usually cannot depend on our interpretations of expressions ... apart from their contexts” (Hausman, 1989, p. 4). Beckett’s characters have no freedom of thought and movement; they

seem to exist in a vacuum. It is best presented by deixes in pragmatics which are “verbal pointers” (Carter & Goddard, 2003, p. 199); they mostly describe the condition of characters restricted in the present scenario which results in absurdity of their life.

References

- Beckett, S. (1985). *Waiting for Godot*. UK: Faber and Faber
- Berlin, N. (1981). *Samuel Beckett: The language of self*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Bradford, R. (1997). *Stylistics: The new critical idiom*. London: Routledge.
- Dutton, R. (1986). *Modern tragicomedy and the British tradition: Beckett, Pinter, Stoppard, Albee and Storey*. Great Britain: The Harvester Press Ltd.
- Esslin, M. (1980). *The Theatre of the Absurd*. Great Britain: Pelican Books.
- Fletcher, B. S. & Fletcher, J. (1985). *A Student's guide to the plays of Samuel Beckett*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Fletcher, J. & Spurling, J. (1985). *Beckett: The playwright*. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.
- Graver, L. (1989). *Samuel Beckett: Waiting for Godot*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics Volume 3: Speech Acts*. Academic Press.
- Grice, P. (1991). *Studies in the way of words*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Hasan, I. (2002). *Samuel Beckett: Wordmaster 'Waiting for Godot' (Text with Critical Commentary)*. Pakistan: Oxford University Press.
- Hausman, C. R. (1989). *Metaphor and art: Interactionism and reference in the verbal and nonverbal arts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Katz, A. N. (1996). On interpreting statements as Metaphor or Irony: Contextual Heuristics and Cognitive consequences. In J. S. Mio & A. N. Katz (Eds.), *Metaphor: Implications and applications*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

-
- Leech, G. N. (1989). *A Linguistics Guide to English Poetry*. England: Longman Group Ltd.
- Lyons, C. R. (1983). *Samuel Beckett: Macmillan Modern Dramatists*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Pickering, K. (1988). *How to Study Modern Drama*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Pilling, J. (2001). *The Cambridge Companion to Beckett*. England: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, S. (2001). *Grammar, Structure and Style: A Practical Guide to Advanced Level English Language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Short, M. (1997). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London and New York: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (1997). *The Study of Language* (2nd ed.). U.K.: Cambridge University Press.