

Decoding Catatonic Dialogues: A Pragmatic Analysis of Conversational Maxims in Samuel Beckett's Selected Plays

Mohammed A. Kareem and Hawzhin H. Azeez²

^{1,2}Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Koya University, Koya 44023,
Kurdistan Region – F.R. Iraq

ABSTRACT

This article explores the depiction of catatonic characters in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* by analyzing the flouting of Grice's conversational maxims. In particular, it considers the unique ways Beckett utilizes language, or the breakdown thereof, as a representational method for psychological states. The study investigates how the characters' frequent flouting of the maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and manner reveal their psychological inertia and existential stagnation. This violation of communicative norms not only disrupts the flow of dialogue but also serves as a reflection of their deeper inner turmoil and psychological paralysis. By systematically disrupting conversational norms, the characters reflect a deeper state of catatonia, where their dialogues mirror a paralysis of action and thought. These patterns of communication or lack thereof highlight the stagnation that pervades their existence. Through a detailed analysis of key dialogues, the research demonstrates that Beckett uses this linguistic flouting to highlight the characters' passive existence and immobility within an absurd and meaningless world. The findings suggest that the characters' resistance to conventional communication further emphasizes Beckett's themes of existential despair and absurdity. This study offers a new perspective on how linguistic dysfunction functions as a dramatic tool in Beckett's work, enhancing the portrayal of catatonic states and deepening the thematic exploration of inertia in his plays.

KEY WORDS: Catatonia, Flouting, Inertia, Maxims of Conversation, non-observance, *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame*.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

Patients with catatonia reveal a deep lack of communication similar to the characters of Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (1954) and *Endgame* (1958). The deep lack constitutes a common feature from where Grice's conversational maxims become relevant. However, catatonia is a neuropsychiatric condition caused by a disturbance in motor, emotional, and cognitive functions (Hirjak et al., 2022). These patients convey a type of speech disorder that is akin to the nonsense utterances of the characters of Beckett: nonsensical because it is too much or too little in terms of quantity, quality, relevance, or manner. Both catatonic speech and the dialogue of Beckett depict the disintegration in the conversation in a logical, coherent, and sensible manner. The same catatonic repetition of gestures and meaningless behaviors finds an almost exact

parallel in the absurd, often cyclical conversations in Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*. Further, Grice's maxims of conversation stress cooperation in pursuit of mutual understanding, while Beckett's dialogues systematically flout such cooperative principles in order to hew out a thematic analogy with the breakdown of catatonic communication. An attempt at flouting the principle of Gricean cooperation through either flouting the maxim of quantity, as is evident in the over- or under-informativeness of the speech of catatonics, or irrelevance and ambiguity points out the fragility of human interaction on both psychological and philosophical levels. As a result, the failure of language in catatonia and in Beckett's characters underlines wider themes of absurdity, existential paralysis, and the limits of communication, thereby suggesting a common pathology of communicative dysfunction in neuropsychiatric and existential domains.

¹. Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (KUJHSS) Volume 8, Issue 2, 2025.

Received 27 June 2025; Accepted 7 August 2025

Regular research paper: Published 19 November 2025



Corresponding author's e-mail: hawzheen.hamza@koyauniversity.org
Copyright ©2025 Mohammed A. Kareem and Hawzhin H. Azeez. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

Additionally, Catatonia is a multiform neuropsychiatric syndrome. The major features of its core symptoms are motor, emotional, and cognitive-behavioral in nature. Historically, the diagnosis and classification of catatonia have been substantially problematic because of its wide and often puzzling presentation. Individuals with catatonia may exhibit extreme withdrawal and mutism or bizarre, repetitive gestures and meaningless behaviors (Hirjak et al., 2022). Thus, the variability in symptomatology both confuses diagnosis and treatment, therefore underlining the need for an in-depth understanding of its clinical manifestations and mechanisms.

The key elements of [Karl Ludwig](#) Kahlbaum's original description of catatonia were the behavioral and psychic dimensions of the condition and the association between psychological traumatization and the disturbances in motor and behavioral functions that occurred in affected individuals. Thus, states of anxiety or psychological traumatization at a high level in catatonic patients may precipitate a state of immobility, stupor, or catalepsy finding that realizes an intimate interaction between mental and motor phenomena (Dawkins et al., 2022). These historical and recent findings suggest a critical interplay between affective, cognitive, and motor symptoms in the pathophysiology of catatonia, given the rapidity with which acute states can precipitate observable motor changes

Moreover, the motor disturbances of catatonia, such as stupor, posturing, waxy flexibility, and stereotypies, first received a systematic description by the German psychiatrist Karl Ludwig Kahlbaum in 1874. His writing outlined catatonia for the first time as an independent psychomotor illness and thus laid the groundwork for the modern concept. Beyond the motor disturbances, catatonic patients frequently show affective disturbances, such as anxiety and fear, and a flat affect, combined with cognitive-behavioral disturbances like mutism, echolalia, and echopraxia. This was further support for the suggestion that its motor symptoms interact with its psychiatric symptoms (Hirjak et al., 2022). The historical review underlines how the observations of Kahlbaum remain valid for contemporary diagnostic perspectives.

Consequently, in extreme conditions, catatonia diminishes the communication ability of the patient as patients can be mute, whereas there may be abnormal speech patterns such as agitation or changed intonation of voice given to utter words. These speech anomalies make interpersonal interactions of the particular person difficult, but even various diagnostic processes depend on such symptoms, especially as part of vital mood disorders like major depressive disorder or extreme anxiety (Zingela et al., 2022). Moreover, the subjective experience of catatonia often includes an overwhelming sense of dread and helplessness, exacerbating the

individual's psychological distress.

The communication deficits of catatonia include mutism and incoherent speech. The late British/American philosopher H. Paul Grice (1975, 1989) provided maxims of conversation, which outline the cooperative principles necessary in dialogue. These maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner are frequently contravened in catatonia, with speakers either failing to provide information, or speaking irrelevantly, or in a disordered manner. This breakdown in communication forms the equivalent of the pragmatic failures. Grice found when conversational norms are flouted, and it indicates a way in which catatonia can be interpreted through the framework of conversational pragmatics. People do not always or, indeed, usually say what they mean. Speakers often mean more than what their words say. For instance, I might say, "It's hot in here!" but mean "Please open the window!" or "Is it okay if I open the window?" or "You are wasting electricity!" What somebody says actually implies, and sometimes even means, the opposite of what the words say. When people speak, they sometimes mean something very different from what their words imply, or even the exact opposite (Thomas, 1995). Thus, a central feature of pragmatics is that not everything said directly expresses what the speaker actually means. In this regard, the beginning of Pragmatics as a field was pioneered by J.L. Austin, an Oxford University philosopher during the 1940-1950s, who elaborated on language. He sought to understand how humans communicate effectively. Austin, unlike other philosophers of the early 20th century, aimed to appreciate how humans communicate despite language defects. According to Thomas (1995), Austin's interest in the study of language was informed by his belief that language is used not just to describe but also to perform actions. He investigated how an utterance can cause an action. Grice's distinction between what is said and what is implicated in his theory of conversational implicature remains a subject of ongoing debate due to its conceptual complexity. The notion of "what is said" has proven particularly problematic, drawing considerable attention and differing interpretations from both philosophers of language and linguists. Within Grice's framework, this concept is further complicated by two overlapping distinctions: between what is said and what is implicated, and between what is said and what is meant (Othman & Salih, 2021).

Additionally, pragmatics is that aspect of linguistics that deals with the way speakers use language to accomplish their goals and the way listeners deduce the message which the speaker wants to convey. This, after Austin's death, was developed further by other scholars. During a conversation, a speaker and a hearer are both responsible for the inference, depending on the speech

context. Thus, pragmatics differs from syntax and semantics because whereas both the latter respectively focus on the linguistic aspect of structure and meaning, pragmatics shall always focus on human cooperation and knowledge in communicative situations. In Aitchison's view, semantics is to look to what lexical items mean and how they relate to one another because pragmatics look into meaning intended from contextually (Aitchison, 2003).

Grice introduced the notion of implicature in a series of lectures he gave at Harvard University in 1967 during William James' lectures. The notion is based on the empirical observation that speakers often imply more than what is literally conveyed by the words used. A speech may implicate some extra meaning, that is the implicature, which is then understood as the content the speaker intends to convey without stating it explicitly. Grice, in his work "Logic and Conversation," first proposed the idea of distinguishing between conventional and conversational implicatures. In the former case, the implicated meaning is determined by the usual definition of the words used, aside from providing the literal meaning. Grice thus gives the following example of implicature that depends on the word 'therefore' to provide a cause-and-effect relationship between two sentences (Grice, 1989). When someone says, "Dwight is an Englishman, and therefore he is brave," that speaker has asserted that Dwight is English and that he is brave. The second thing to note is that, in saying what he did, the speaker likely intended to suggest that Dwight's being English is the cause of his being brave.

Conversational implicature, on the other hand, is generated by the speaker with regard to the particular context. The implicature involved may or may not be grasped (Thomas, 1995). One conveyed message could have different meanings under different circumstances. To illustrate this, an example has been chosen from Cruse's *Meaning in Language* (Cruse, 2000):

A: Have you cleared the table and washed the dishes?

B: I've cleared the table.

A: Am I in time for supper?

The first example involves speaker B suggesting he has taken things off the table, but he has not washed or cleaned up the dishes. The second example, speaker B suggests that speaker A is late for the meal (Cruse, 2000).

It is important to note that Grice established the Cooperative Principle, henceforth CP, to explain how hearers perceive the implicature of an utterance. The CP works this way: "Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." The CP is defined as one where both speaker and listener cooperate in a conversation to achieve the conveyance and understanding of a message.

The speaker and hearer co-operate in communicative behavior that leads to an effective process of communication. According to Thomas, 1995, the criteria for significance in discourse differ both between and within different cultures, according to Finegan, 1994.

Further, the late British/American philosopher H. Paul Grice (1975, 1989) has bestowed on it an autonomous principle. He formulated the CP made up of four pragmatic subprinciples which are sometimes known as 'maxims'; they are:

The maxim of quantity:

1. Make your contribution as informative as required;
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than required.

The maxim of quality:

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

The maxim of relation:

Make your contribution relevant.

The maxim of manner:

Be perspicuous, and specifically:

1. avoid obscurity
2. avoid ambiguity
3. be brief
4. be orderly (Leech, 1983) & (Mey, 2001) & (Thomas, 1995)

Moreover, interlocutor might not follow that systemic way to convey the message; the result will break a maxim. Hence, the term "Breaking a maxim" can mean any action that does not follow a maxim. People who hear someone break a maxim look for what it means because they think the helpful principle is at process. Sometimes people break these maxims for the purpose of making people laugh or to avoid hurting others. Grice talked about five reasons why you should not follow a rule. It "is the prototypical way of conveying implicit meaning to break a rule (Grice, 1989). A speaker may flout, violate, opt out, infringe, and suspend a maxim.

First, there is flouting, where, in case someone breaks a rule, they are not trying to deceive the other; rather, they actually want the other to deduce the implicature what is meant, not by the words themselves, thus if someone flouts a rule on purpose, that may be his or her way of making his or her point more eloquently (Thomas, 1995). Therefore, if the listener is cooperative, they will know from which it is derived and fill in with information they need from the context. Similarly, as opposed to flouting, violation of a maxim does involve the speaker's intent to deceive the listener. In this case, the speaker speaks the truth but alludes to misleading information in a subtle way (Thomas, 1995). Moreover, when someone opts out of a maxim, it means they do not want to follow through and say more than they already have. The person indicates they do not want to follow the maxim and decides not to (Thomas, 1995). Further, when a person

breaks a maxim, they unintentionally or intentionally trick someone or do not follow it. Instead, this is something the speaker does without intending to implicate anything. A person infringes when they do not have sufficient knowledge about the culture or language such as those who cannot articulate well when drunk (Mooney, 2004); (Thomas, 1995). Also, the suspension of a maxim would entail that what has been uttered may not be the whole truth and that some terms, like taboo words, are better left unmentioned. Thomas (1995, p.77) says that a speaker may suspend a maxim owing to cultural variations or due to the nature of certain events or situations.

Studies dealing with Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (Beckett, 1954) and *Endgame* (Beckett, 1958) have principally been done through existential, philosophical, and absurdist discourses, where the prevailing emphases are on human futility, nihilism, religious eschatology, and religious salvation through its perpetual deferral, while other scholars investigate the existential dimensions of the plays. However, there is a gap in applying linguistic theory regarding Grice's conversational maxims to Beckett's catatonic characters. The infringement of these maxims' quantity, quality, relevance, and manner is habitual in Beckett's dialogues, a methodical procedure reflecting the psychic catatonia of his protagonists. Their speech is incoherent, irrelevant, and repetitive, revealing an impedance to communication parallel to their existential stasis. While silence and inaction are well-researched, linguistic breakdown in the characters' catatonia through the lens of Gricean maxims has gone into a blind alley. The relative neglect of this area constitutes a *fait accompli*, in that linguistically oriented discussion of Beckett's dysfunctional communication as thematic underpinning of apparently connected concepts such as paralysis and absurdity may most fruitfully be discussed regarding the limits of language in an ostensibly absurd world.

Recent studies on Beckett's works have increasingly focused on interpreting his plays through complex philosophical and existential frameworks. In her 2022 analysis, Fogarty examines *Waiting for Godot* within the context of Nietzsche's notion of eternal recurrence. This concept highlights a paradoxical reality where events are destined to endlessly repeat, serving as an allegory for the moral disintegration witnessed in post-Holocaust Europe. Beckett's alignment with Schopenhauer's philosophical pessimism is also evident, as his characters grapple with unavoidable suffering. Nonetheless, the play does not entirely succumb to despair; Beckett introduces a counterpoint in the form of Hegelian Enlightenment thought, generating a productive tension between existential desolation and the possibility of intellectual optimism. This exploration of humanity's perpetual struggle against despair reflects Beckett's

broader critique of the limitations of rationality and moral accountability in an ethically ambiguous universe, (Fogarty, 2022, P.532).

Xu (2022) explores *Endgame* through the lens of existential disillusionment, interpreting the play as a poignant reflection of postwar trauma and the cultural disintegration that followed World War II. The pervasive sense of emptiness and disillusionment in Beckett's characters symbolizes the psychological crises of a society struggling with the erosion of faith and the destructive consequences of advancing technology. Within *Endgame*, the trauma not only criticizes society's excessive reliance on machinery but also underscores the profound physical and psychological scars left by the war, emphasizing Beckett's anti-war message. This paralysis, born of trauma, aligns with the existential despair woven throughout the play, where the cyclical nature of suffering becomes a dominant force in the human experience.

In contrast, the work of Miyanrostaq & Mousavi, (2022, p.99) provides an alternative perspective by examining the role of humor in Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*. They propose that, while the humor may appear meaningless and repetitive, Beckett strategically uses it as a means of redemption. Rather than serving as mere comic relief, the laughter becomes a vehicle for revealing the fragile and vulnerable nature of the human condition. By merging existential suffering with moments of ironic and compassionate humor, Beckett emphasizes the paradoxical nature of existence, where pain and the possibility of redemption are closely intertwined. This approach allows for a deeper understanding of human endurance and adaptability in the midst of life's absurdities.

Dilworth & Langlois, (2007, p.169) offer a critical examination of *Endgame* through the lens of Nietzschean existential philosophy, highlighting the play's overt challenge to religious metaphysical optimism. In Beckett's work, the absence of a divine entity is not celebrated as a moment of emancipation, but rather, it intensifies the characters' existential suffering. The atheistic perspective presented within the play consequently confines the characters to a repetitive and absurd existence, where the monotony of their dialogue and actions becomes a strategy to endure the overwhelming sense of despair. As Dilworth and Langlois argue, the play criticizes the fallacy of clinging to optimistic metaphysical beliefs, revealing instead of the fundamental absurdity of human existence in the absence of transcendent certainty.

Finally, in her 2007 study, Begam, p.145 delves deeper into the intricacies of Samuel Beckett's language use, with a particular focus on *Waiting for Godot*. Drawing from the linguistic frameworks of J.L. Austin and Ludwig Wittgenstein, she approaches the play through the lens of

performativity. Begam explores how Beckett's deployment of what Austin terms "performative" utterances, statements that typically aim to enact or bring about an action fails to retain their intended illocutionary power when transferred to the stage. This breakdown of speech acts into intransitive, or ineffective, forms echoes Austin's idea of aesthetic intransitivity, where the division between life and art is emphasized. This concept is further connected to Kant's notion of aesthetic autonomy, suggesting a detachment of art from practical life. In *Waiting for Godot*, Beckett's dialogue does not seek to generate concrete outcomes but rather highlights the futility inherent in communication, as the characters' words lead to no tangible results. This failure of language within the play mirrors the existential themes of futility and meaninglessness that pervade the work.

The scholars offer an in-depth exploration of Beckett's existential themes, particularly focusing on how trauma, suffering, humor, and the constraints of language intertwine in his works. In both *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, Beckett's characters exhibit a deep confrontation with the absurd. Their experiences are marked by existential immobility, cyclical despair, and an ongoing quest for meaning, which are central to the structure of his plays. Despite the extensive studies on Beckett's dramatic oeuvre, this review reveals a gap in the analysis: the examination of his catatonic characters through the lens of conversational maxims remains untackled.

2. METHODOLOGY

The current section develops the methodological approach regarding the analysis of the catatonic character in Beckett's selected plays focusing on the issue of maxim flouting. Based on the previous sections that present a general outline regarding catatonia, pragmatics, the CP and implicature, this research will develop the linguistic expressions of catatonia by closely approaching Beckett's dramatic texts.

2.1 Data Collection

The primary data for this research will be selected plays by Beckett that have recognizable catatonic characters. These will be subjected to close textual analysis to ascertain the maxim flouting employed by the characters.

2.1.1 Framework for Analysis (Analytical Framework):

The theoretical framework of this analysis will be pragmatics, mainly flouting Grice's CP and its associated maxims. Closer scrutiny of the language of the catatonic characters and its evaluation in consideration of flouting the principles of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner will be made. We will be able to see how these catatonic

characters reveal their states through their use of language by investigation of their conversation. In other words, the following table analytically depicts the framework for our analysis:

Table 1

Analytical Framework.

Flouting	Quantity	Quality	Relation	Manner
Behavior	Excessive, insufficient, or vague information	False, misleading, or unverifiable information	Irrelevant or off-topic contributions	Unclear, disorganized, or ambiguous communication

2.1.2 Analytical Procedures:

Stage 1: Detection of flouting of the Maxim of Conversation

The first step involves a close examination of conversations in the selected Beckett plays. Each utterance will be surveyed to identify cases of conversational maxims flouting. Such cases will be cataloged according to the specific maxim flouted quality, quantity, relevance, or manner. The contextual details surrounding the flouting, who delivered the message, and the effect on communication achieved due to the flouting will also be recorded.

Stage 2: Investigating Catatonia through Maxim Flouting

This research, based on Stage 1, aims to explain the connection between maxim flouting and representation of catatonia. Careful examination of maxim flouting patterns of catatonic characters will help us to establish how such linguistic abnormalities contribute to representing their mental state. This analysis will, thus, focus on establishing precisely what strategies are employed in communicating catatonia symptoms through mutism, echolalia, stereotypy, and maxim flouting.

This study, through a proper, structured two-step process, hopes to delve deeply with great understanding into the linguistic signposts of catatonia in the dramatic writings of Beckett.

2.1.3 Limitation:

First and foremost, it has to be realized that this is limited research for a number of reasons: it may not be possible to understand the complex psychological and existential dimensions of catatonia only by linguistic analysis. There is always subjectivity when maxim flouting interpretation is concerned, and that may come to different conclusions by different analysts.

The purpose of the present study is to further our understanding both of the catatonic character in Beckett's drama and of the application of pragmatic analysis within literary studies. The core insight regarding the subject matter comes from the focus of the methodology which follows

2.2 Data Analysis

In the present subsection, a close look will be taken at *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*. The present research focuses on the conversational patterns of both plays, precisely that it surveys flouting of Grice's maxims of conversation by protagonists. Analyzing such cases of deliberate maxim flouting, we try to disclose the hidden meanings of the dialogues and interactions between characters. This kind of analysis, in the end, points out the connection of the maxims' flouting with the picture of characters as catatonic, stressing their disconnection, and existential inertia.

2.2.1 Analysis of Waiting for Godot

2.2.1.1 Analysis of the first dialogue:

The language has completely disintegrated in the play and moves erratically. The conversation happening amongst the characters has failed to develop any significant communication amongst them. The words are defunct and are nastily deteriorated. The pain of characters' attempt to comprehend the situation becomes evident. By using only language, characters parodically or obliterate all myths of meaning and rhetorical arguments, the language used against its own self so as not to masquerade any kind of nihilistic susceptibility (Shahid, 2018). (See appendix one).

Table 2
Analysis of first dialogue

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
Estragon (giving up again). <i>Nothing to be done.</i>	Maxim of Quantity & Relation	Estragon provides very limited information; no clue as to what 'nothing' is supposed to be, making his statement very vague and devoid of context.	It reflects resignation and passivity, which is indicative of the mental and physical standstill characteristic of catatonia.
Vladimir. <i>I'm beginning to come round to that opinion...</i>	Maxim of Quantity & Manner	Vladimir provides too much information in that he elaborates on the inner struggle in a meandering way: too much information and no direction is set.	It reveals his cyclical thinking, which is a signal of cognitive stasis, where the movement of thoughts cannot move forward, reflecting an act of mental paralysis.
Vladimir. <i>So there you are again.</i>	Maxim of Relation	Vladimir's statement is detached from his previous reflection concerning struggle, and as such, has no bearing on the flow of conversation.	Suggests disordered thinking, underlining their inability to stay focused on the present as a symptom of cognitive detachment.
Estragon. <i>Am I?</i>	Maxim of Quality	Estragon denies his own presence, defying the truth and creating ambiguity when it is quite blatant the opposite is true.	Suggests disorientation and uncertainty, showing mental disconnection with reality a classic feature of catatonia.
Vladimir. <i>I thought you were gone forever.</i>	Maxim of Quality	Vladimir exaggerates, as this is not true since Estragon has not left	Emphasizes emotional detachment and overreaction, which are common in states of confusion and withdrawal.
Estragon. <i>Me too.</i>	Maxim of Quality	Estragon's agreement to Vladimir's hyperbolic statement is just not true; it is ironic and thus constitutes a flouting of the maxim of truthfulness.	However, suggests mental disengagement and detachment from reality, thus reinforcing the cognitive paralysis of catatonia

Their conversational maxims are flouted, showing the cognitive and physical paralysis of the characters through symptoms of catatonia. For example, the quick shift by Vladimir from an internal struggle to a non-sequitur comment about Estragon's existence flouts the Maxim of Relation and is an example of disorganized thinking. When he says, "Nothing to be done," that appears to be a flouting of the Maxim of Quantity, as this statement reflects defeat and is paralleled by physical inactivity. Their detachment from reality becomes manifest when Estragon asks, "Am I?" and Vladimir responds, "I thought you were gone forever," flouting the Maxim of Quality with sarcasm and hyperbole, indicating cognitive withdrawal. Their emotional detachment is further enhanced by Vladimir's over-the-top reaction to Estragon's appearance and Estragon's dismissive response, "Me too." These scenes demonstrate their

mental stagnation and withdrawal, which are associated with catatonia.

2.2.1.2 Analysis of the second dialogue

The world which Beckett depicts for his characters has been termed as "an eternity of stagnation." Estragon and Vladimir continue waiting, putting on hats, removing shoes, and munching on carrots and turnips. Pozzo and Lucky resume their journey; from time to time, Pozzo stops to eat his chicken, smoke his pipe, check his timepiece, and sit on his folding stool as if this occurred within a world governed by relatively fixed behavioral patterns, (Menouer, 2023, p.24) (See appendix two).

Table 3
analysis of second dialogue

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
Vladimir: "Do you want a carrot?" (Rummages, takes out a turnip)	Quantity	Vladimir proffers a turnip to Estragon because he asks whether he wants a carrot; therefore, he is supplying inexpressible and incomplete information.	Shows lack of attention to detail and inconsistency in their actions, adding to confusion.
Estragon: "It's a turnip!"	Quality	Estragon corrects Vladimir, for which the mistake shows. It reflects a lack of veracity in Vladimir's first proposition about take-over.	Outlines Estragon's frustration and the discrepancy between what they had expected and what was actually experienced.
Vladimir: "Oh pardon! I could have sworn it was a carrot."	Quality	The apology and rectification by Vladimir are not sincere and practical, either, because it does not touch the root of the problem in miscommunication.	It underlines the absurdity and the superficiality of their interactions.
Vladimir: "There, dear fellow. Make it last, that's the end of them."	Quantity	Vladimir's statement about the food's limited quantity is somewhat irrelevant to the immediate confusion.	Contributes more to the feeling of triviality and lack of meaningful progress in their conversation.
Estragon (chewing). "I asked you a question."	Relation	Estragon's comment regarding having posed a question does not quite follow from the previous argument about the mix-up with the turnip and carrot.	Demonstrates how disconnected Estragon is and frustration, since it seems his question goes unnoticed amidst all the confusion. This reflects their inability to engage meaningfully in the conversation and serves to underline the absurdity of their condition.
Vladimir: "Ah."	Relation	As for Estragon's question, Vladimir's answer is only vague and far from answering the real question as usual, adding to irrelevance.	This reflects their inability to engage meaningfully in the conversation and serves to underline the absurdity of their condition.
Estragon: "Did you reply?"	Relation	Estragon's question further underscores the disconnection and incoherence of the conversation.	It enhances the feeling of confusion and disorientation between characters.
Vladimir: "How's the carrot?"	Relation	The question of Vladimir about the carrot does not relate to the general confusion and frustration.	Demonstrates the lack of meaningful interaction and the disconnection between their responses.
Estragon: "It's a carrot."	Quality	Estragon's confirmation that it's a carrot is somewhat redundant, given the earlier exchange.	Contributes to the absurdity, the circularity of their discussion.

Their flouting of conversational maxims and preoccupation with the trivial in this dialogue reveal the essence of the catatonic state of the characters. For instance, Vladimir's question "Do you want a carrot?" followed by offering a turnip, as a flouting of the Maxim of Quantity by giving a piece of information that is not right and depicts their inconsistency and confusion. Similarly, Estragon's irritated response, "It's a turnip!" and Vladimir's false pretension of an apology, "I could have sworn it was a carrot," flout the Maxim of Quality. This apparently cyclical argument over the status of the turnip as carrot suggests mental stasis that adds up to absurdity and confusion. First, the dislocated question by Estragon, "I asked you a question," is met irrelevantly by Vladimir's "How's the carrot?", which is again flouting of the Maxim of Relation, stressing their inability to engage meaningfully. It is just such trivial and circular dialogue that demonstrates their existential despair: that of stagnation in indecision and disorientation, and an inability to make any substantial progress.

2.2.1.3 Analysis of the third dialogue

The characters suffer and desperately struggle to find a meaning for themselves. They get more and more depressed. Vladimir thinks that he is not so bad, hoping that Godot will come and end all their worries. The worst possible event he imagines is that he will be waiting for Godot in vain. Beckett's ambiguous drama, *Waiting for Godot*, is a literary reaction to trauma and disillusionment, as post-war life appeared inconsequential and scattered to humankind. The piece features characters entrapped within suppressive and absurd circumstances, attempting to make sense of their lives, thus reverberating the existential crises of the modern world. Despite their efforts to overcome their circumstances, they end up entangled in what seems like an endless circle of despair and uncertainty. Vladimir and Estragon struggle to find meaning in their monotonous waiting. Falling on the spatiotemporal flux of two pairs of protagonist characters namely; Vladimir and Estragon, Pozzo and Lucky all over a vaguely similar place, setting,

actions, and things, the play manifests the uncertainty, absurdity, meaninglessness, and trauma of the modern world. Based on the paradoxicality of the absurd, everything in the play communicates the uncommunicable and speaks through the unspeakable. Repetition, meaningless acts, illogical dialogues, and

seemingly endless cycles of waiting are used to trivialize and martialize existential traumas, the hidden human abstracts plaguing humanity, and its struggle to find any purpose or meaning in the existence of man, (Abd Al hussein Hassan, 2024, P.106), (See appendix three).

Table 4
Analysis of the third dialogue

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
Estragon: "Why don't we hang ourselves?"	Quantity	Estragon makes a suggestion of a radical measure in round terms without deliberating on the practicalities which is an idea not fully fleshed out.	Gives a sense of the absurd and lack of practical planning.
Vladimir: "With what?"	Quantity	Vladimir's question is brief but unhelpful and thus part of the senselessness of Estragon's suggestion.	It reflects the absurdity of their situation and inefficiency in problem-solving.
Vladimir: "We'll hang ourselves tomorrow. (Pause.) Unless Godot comes."	Quality	Here, Vladimir bases his statement on an unconfirmed and insecure event; notably, Godot's arrival makes the whole plan of action highly improbable.	Focuses on their dependence upon an indeterminate future, about which they do nothing.
Estragon: "I can't go on like this."	Relation	This does not directly relate to the question about hanging themselves, adding even more to the feeling of disconnection.	Demonstrates existential despair in Estragon and his disconnection with the present discussion.
Vladimir: "Pull ON your trousers."	Manner	Vladimir gives an incomprehensible directive, and because of that, his directive is misunderstood. The confusion of Estragon again reveals the deficiency in the clarity of the instruction provided by Vladimir.	Draws out their confusion and miscommunication, which contributes to their general bewilderment.
Estragon: "You want me to pull off my trousers?"	Manner	Estragon's confusion shows that Vladimir's earlier instruction was ambiguous and poorly communicated.	This reflects their disconnection with reality, as the characters cannot even get the most mundane of actions right.
Vladimir: "Pull on your trousers."	Quantity	This repeated directive lacks elaborate explanation and, therefore, causes confusion.	Feeds into the sense of futility in addition to the ongoing inability of the characters to perform everyday actions.
Estragon: "True."	Quality	Estragon's delayed realization after Vladimir's correction underscores the lack of clarity and practicality in their actions.	Shows how disoriented they are, where persons cannot process well information given.
Vladimir: "Well? Shall we go?"	Quantity	The question assumes a decision to move, despite their evident inertia and lack of movement	Portrays their paralysis, where the characters cannot act upon what they have mutually agreed to do verbally.
Estragon: "Yes, let's go."	Quantity	Estragon agrees, but this agreement is superficial since they do not really move.	Demonstrates how different it is from what they intend to do and what they have done, resounding with the stale action of their situation.

This dialogue demonstrates several of the key features of a catatonic state: extreme immobility and indecision; the act of hanging oneself is discussed, but it would not be followed through let alone the precursory act of actually getting up and leaving and, after having determined to leave, they do nothing but remain stationary, which is the inability to act decisively, marking a true catatonic state. Their discussion is repetitive and circular, also, always about the same issues without developments in them. They talk of hanging themselves, find a broken rope, and postpone their actions until Godot arrives or the next day a proof of their intellectual stagnation. The absurdity and confusion in conversation are also lingering on, as in the misunderstanding of Estragon regarding Vladimir's directions about his trousers, which showed how

disoriented they were and their thinking was disorganized. Finally, the existential despair voiced by Estragon, coupled with Vladimir's dependence on an indefinite future incident In Godot emphasizes their deep hopelessness and resignation. On the whole, their conversation flouts conversational maxims because of a lack of clarity, relevance, and detail, which simulates their catatonic condition marked by inaction, repetition of activity, confusion, and above all, existential despair.

2.2.1.4 Analysis of the fourth dialogue

The central characters in *Waiting for Godot* are always wondering where they are, where they were yesterday, and where they will be tomorrow. Besides, they are continuously thinking about what happened the previous day and if there seems to be any memory about what this may have been, to whose memory this belongs, whether

their memory belongs to yesterday or to some other strange moment in time if there is any trustworthy memory at all. Vladimir and Estragon are, therefore,

conscious of their "going" that is nowhere in that they will continue to wait for Mr. Godot, but they are not aware of their past (Menouer, 2023, p.25).(See appendix four).

Table 5
analysis of fourth dialogue

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
Vladimir: "Help me!"	Maxim of Quantity	Vladimir provides no context for what kind of help he needs.	Creates confusion as Estragon does not know how to respond or what to do.
Estragon: "I'm trying."	Maxim of Quantity	Estragon does not clarify what he's doing or how he is trying to help.	Leaves the situation ambiguous, preventing any clear resolution.
Silence	Maxim of Relation	Silence interrupts the flow of the conversation, breaking relevance.	The gap heightens the sense of confusion and disconnection between them.
Estragon: "Well?"	Maxim of Quantity	"Well?" is vague and offers no elaboration or clear direction.	Further contributes to frustration and disorientation.
Vladimir: "What was I saying, we could go on from there."	Maxim of Quantity and Manner	Vague reference without specifying the content of the conversation.	Adds to Estragon's confusion, halting the dialogue and causing inertia.
Estragon: "What were you saying when?"	Maxim of Manner	The question lacks clarity as Estragon does not specify when.	Increases ambiguity, leading to more circular dialogue.
Vladimir: "At the very beginning."	Maxim of Quantity	"The very beginning" is too broad, failing to pinpoint any specific moment.	Frustrates Estragon, as it provides no useful information.
Estragon: "The very beginning of WHAT?"	Maxim of Relation	Estragon is seeking clarity but his response is dismissive rather than helpful.	Escalates confusion as they cannot get on the same page.
Vladimir: "I was saying... happy... go on waiting... now that we're happy..."	Maxim of Relation and Quantity	Irrelevant shifts between being happy and waiting, with no clear direction.	Estragon is left confused, unable to follow Vladimir's train of thought.
Estragon: "I'm not a historian."	Maxim of Relation	Estragon's comment is irrelevant to Vladimir's reflection on their past.	Deflects from the actual conversation, avoiding progress.
Vladimir: "The tree!"	Maxim of Relation	Introducing the tree does not seem relevant to the preceding topic.	Distracts from the issue at hand, causing further disconnection.
Estragon: "The tree?"	Maxim of Relation	Estragon is confused as the tree does not relate to the previous topic.	Highlights Estragon's disorientation and inability to follow Vladimir.
Vladimir: "Do you not remember?"	Maxim of Quantity	Asking Estragon to remember without providing specific details.	Creates frustration, as Estragon cannot recall vague moments.
Estragon: "I'm tired."	Maxim of Relation and Quantity	Estragon changes the subject by referring to his own exhaustion.	Signals disengagement and withdrawal from the conversation.
Vladimir: "Look at it."	Maxim of Relation	Vladimir abruptly shifts focus to the tree, which feels unrelated.	Adds to the disorientation and aimlessness of the dialogue.
Estragon: "I see nothing."	Maxim of Quality	"I see nothing" may not be literal, potentially an exaggeration.	Reinforces the sense of hopelessness and detachment between the characters.

This conversation illustrates a breakdown in meaningful dialogue, marked by vagueness, irrelevance, and insufficient communication, traits that parallel the cognitive and behavioral inertia of catatonia. Catatonia is characterized by immobility and withdrawal, where individuals can be unresponsive and rigid, mirroring the communicative "stuckness" of Vladimir and Estragon. Vladimir's repetitive, unclear statements such as referencing happiness, waiting, and the tree reflect a cyclical thought process that leads nowhere, much like the repetitive behaviors seen in catatonia. Similarly, Estragon's exhaustion and disengagement signal a withdrawal from the interaction, akin to the emotional and cognitive inertia observed in catatonic states. The characters' inability to progress in their conversation,

despite repeated attempts, underscores their paralysis and lack of purposeful engagement, which is a central feature of catatonia. The flouting of conversational maxims in this dialogue reflects an entrapment in static, ineffective communication, akin to the rigid mental and physical states characteristic of catatonic individuals.

2.2.2 Data Analysis of *Endgame*

2.2.2.1 Analysis of the first dialogue

During the play he repeats this several times and he postpones his wish again and again. The difficulties in managing the world cause a person to be weak at his/her struggle against the troubles. Even though Clov says and repeats he will go, Hamm is sure that he will not, as they are stuck in that house evoking a prison. They are both paralyzed they fairly know that neither of them can go anywhere. Here Beckett not only demonstrates how

desperate they are, but also emphasizes the emotional and psychological toll of their existential struggle. In fact, the emotionlessness is a sign of the characters' misery. In the play the characters ask interesting and unrelated questions and they answer them in such an absurd way. Hamm is a blind old man who is a wheelchair-bound as well. Clov is his servant who has been taken by him since he was a child. As Clov is as ill as Hamm, he is not happy with staying with his master. On the other hand, he still goes on serving him, even though he complains about being obliged to serve Hamm. Here in this dialogue Hamm by asking why he does not kill him, expresses Clov's being too unhappy to be with him and wonders

why he still continues serving him. Clov's answer as "I don't know the combination of the cupboard" is so strange and unexpected that he throws the reader/ audience a curve and gets a laugh. In addition, it also shows how he is desperate and in need of Hamm's order and guidance. Hamm's beginning the dialogue with a question which is the most serious moment of the play and continuing with an order that is neither more nor less unserious is a good example of the feature of the theatre of the absurd which is a fragmental dialogue. As it is seen above, the fragmental dialogue is constructed with unrelated questions and answers (Yasar, 2020, p.25). (See appendix five)

Table 6
analysis of first dialogue in *Endgame*

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
HAMM (violently): Then move!	Maxim of Manner	Hamm's command is unnecessarily forceful for a simple action, and his manner does not fit the context, adding ambiguity.	Hamm's forceful but irrational demand emphasizes his desperation and lack of coherence, showing emotional paralysis.
Where are you?	Maxim of Quantity	Hamm already knows where Clov is, yet asks the same question twice, unnecessarily repeating himself and wasting conversational effort.	Repetition without purpose suggests mental inertia and cyclical behavior, reflecting a breakdown in meaningful interaction.
CLOV: Here.	Maxim of Quantity	Clov provides a minimal and obvious response, giving no new information and simply repeating his previous answer.	Clov's mechanical reply highlights his lack of engagement, demonstrating a mental and emotional detachment.
HAMM: Why don't you kill me?	Maxim of Relevance & Quantity	Hamm's sudden leap from mundane actions to a request for death is jarring and irrelevant, flouting the flow of conversation and its expected purpose.	Hamm's dramatic shift reveals existential despair and a desire for an end, despite lacking clear motivation or rationale.
CLOV: I don't know the combination...	Maxim of Relevance & Quality	Clov's response is absurd, offering a nonsensical reason for not killing Hamm, which is irrelevant and implausible.	Clov's excuse reflects avoidance and a refusal to engage seriously, showing emotional paralysis and detachment.
HAMM: Go and get two bicycle-wheels.	Maxim of Relevance & Quantity	Hamm's command to fetch bicycle wheels is out of context and irrational, unrelated to anything in the immediate conversation.	Hamm's irrational request reflects his inability to connect with reality, mirroring mental stagnation.
CLOV: There are no more bicycle-wheels.	Maxim of Quality	Clov provides an illogical response, suggesting there were once bicycle wheels, even though he later reveals he never had a bicycle.	Clov's nonsensical reply adds to the sense of absurdity, emphasizing his disconnection from reason and logic.
HAMM: What have you done with your bicycle?	Maxim of Quality & Relation	Hamm assumes Clov had a bicycle, despite Clov's previous claim, and asks an irrelevant question that contradicts earlier information.	Hamm's irrational persistence shows confusion and detachment from reality, highlighting mental disintegration.
CLOV: I never had a bicycle.	Maxim of Relation	Clov's clarification contradicts the previous dialogue, further breaking the logical flow of conversation.	The breakdown of logic reflects a lack of coherence in both characters, mirroring their mental and emotional deadlock.
HAMM: The thing is impossible.	Maxim of Relevance	Hamm's final statement lacks clarity and fails to specify what is "impossible," making it disconnected from any logical conclusion.	This vague, ambiguous statement encapsulates the absurdity of their dialogue, reinforcing the paralysis and inaction.

The dialogue between Hamm and Clov in *Endgame* vividly illustrates their catatonic states through the continuous flouting of conversational maxims. Hamm's abrupt, unclear demands and Clov's minimal responses flouts the Maxims of Manner and Quantity, reflecting their intellectual and emotional paralysis. Hamm's irrelevant questions and Clov's unrelated replies, such as about the cupboard, flout the Maxim of Relation, showcasing their detachment and dysfunctional

communication. These flouting highlight their confusion, withdrawal, and inability to engage meaningfully, underscoring the play's themes of existential despair and the paralysis of the human condition.

2.2.2.2 Analysis of the second dialogue

The characters of *Endgame* are stuck in an infinitely repeatable routine Hamm is blind and paralyzed. Physical loss, uncertainty, the absence of a future, and the absence of meaning combine to create a nearly overriding

sense of inexpressible hopelessness. The world that the characters inhabit has been devastated by a tragedy that has left nothing but ashes. The characters do not cease to stress the fact that man's road of decay and suffering inevitably leads to death, understanding the truth of Clov's statement that death is inevitable. (Shastri, 2023, p.286). Hamm's parents Nell and Nagg, the "accursed progenitors" (Beckett 16), live in two dust bins at the side of the stage. Clov, with his "stiff, staggering walk" (Beckett 7), is the only character who can move about the stage. Hamm, struggling with his memory, plays the raconteur, shares a few stories, tells a few jokes, but mostly he bickers with Clov and expresses his contempt for everyone else. The characters end the play essentially

where they began and nothing much seems to have changed. The seeming lack of action and repetitious dialogue baffled critics when the play was first produced in New York in 1958. Clov and Hamm's disabilities serve as metaphor, and the characters' decreasing options for mobility become an allegory for an existential crisis in the face of the inexorable decline of humanity. . Physical disabilities in *Endgame* have been interpreted as "ciphers of the frailty of the human condition and [are] not to be read as disabilities". In this narrative prosthesis, critics have deduced that *Endgame's* disabled characters represent a fundamental breakdown of humanity (Cavanaugh, 2022). (See appendix seven).

Table 7
analysis of second dialogue in *Endgame*

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
HAMM: Outside of here it's death.	Maxim of Quantity & Relevance	Hamm provides a vague and dramatic statement about "death," offering no specifics or clear context about what he means.	Reflects existential despair and mental stagnation; Hamm's comment is disconnected from practical concerns or solutions.
(Pause.) All right, be off.	Maxim of Relevance	Hamm's sudden command for Clov to leave lacks logical progression, as there is no clear reason or buildup for this dismissal.	The abrupt change in tone reflects emotional instability and confusion, adding to the sense of paralysis in their actions.
NAGG: Me pap!	Maxim of Quantity & Relevance	Nagg repeats a simplistic, childlike demand, "Me pap!", with no regard for the ongoing conversation, making the request irrelevant and repetitive.	Nagg's insistence on a basic need emphasizes his regression into dependency and detachment from adult reasoning.
HAMM: Accursed progenitor!	Maxim of Quality & Relevance	Hamm insults Nagg with an exaggerated and irrelevant response, disconnected from Nagg's request for food.	Hamm's grand insult reflects frustration and existential anger, yet it's overblown, indicating a lack of meaningful communication.
NAGG: Me pap!	Maxim of Relevance & Quantity	Nagg repeats the same demand again, adding nothing new and ignoring the context of Hamm's insult, making the conversation circular and stagnant.	Nagg's repetitive plea shows fixation on basic needs, further highlighting the emotional paralysis and catatonic behavior.
HAMM: The old folks at home! No decency left!	Maxim of Relevance	Hamm's statement is disconnected from the immediate situation, with no logical reason for mentioning "old folks" or "decency."	Hamm's outburst reflects internal frustration with life's absurdity, exposing his inability to respond logically or practically.
CLOV: Oh not just yet, not just yet.	Maxim of Quantity	Clov provides an overly vague response, repeating "not just yet" with no further explanation, offering minimal information.	Clov's non-committal response reflects avoidance and detachment, typical of catatonic inaction.
NAGG: Me pap!	Maxim of Quantity & Relevance	Nagg repeats his simplistic request again, ignoring everything happening around him.	His fixation on food reflects a primitive, catatonic state, as he is unable to engage in any higher-level communication.

In this dialogue from *Endgame*, the characters' catatonic states are revealed through the consistent flouting of Grice's conversational maxims, emphasizing their mental paralysis and existential despair. Hamm's vague declaration, "outside of here it's death," flouts the Maxim of Quantity by offering insufficient information, highlighting his sense of entrapment in a lifeless environment. Nagg's repetitive plea, "Me pap!," further flouts Quantity, reflecting his helplessness and lack of meaningful communication. Hamm's unrelated remark about "the old folks at home" flouts the Maxim of Relation, illustrating his mental disorientation and

detachment from the conversation's context. Clov's ambiguous, evasive response, "Oh not just yet," compounds the flouting, reflecting his reluctance to confront their bleak reality. These flouting of relevance, clarity, and informativeness deepen the characters' disconnection from each other and their environment, embodying the paralysis typical of catatonia. The repetitiveness and vagueness of their dialogue reinforce their inability to engage meaningfully with the world, underscoring their trapped existence in a cycle of despair and confusion.

2.2.2.3 Analysis of the third dialogue

Clov walks with stiff and mechanical movements, which could be ascribed to the bad health condition of his legs which makes him incapable to sit. Clov provokes the absurd as he keeps moving back and forth with stiff strides between the right and left windows in a peculiarly repetitive manner for no apparent reason, as the stage directions tell us. Such mechanical and repetitive movements are unfamiliar and unreasonable to the audience, and thus, evocative of the absurd. The physical decline of the characters, as seen in the blind, paralyzed and crippled characters, gives a striking sense of entrapment. In addition to the physical decline of the characters, uncertainty stands as another manifestation of the absurd. Besides the aspects of physical deterioration,

alienation and uncertainty which manifest the absurd in the play. The relationship between Hamm and Clov is one of shocking violence and struggle. Hamm mistreats Clov, who is supposedly his servant. He is a demanding master who repeatedly asks for his painkiller, his toy dog, and escorting him around the room, etc. and he frequently whistles to Clov and asks him repeatedly the same questions about the surroundings and about his parents. Part of Clov's absurd suffering manifests in the linguistic violence that Hamm exercises against him. In response to this, Clov exercises linguistic resistance as seen in his repetition of phrases and his indirect vagueness, (Abdelhamid, 2023). (See appendix seven).

Table 8
analysis of third dialogue in *Endgame*

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
HAMM (after reflection): I don't.	Maxim of Quantity & Relevance	Hamm provides an overly minimal response, without explaining what he "doesn't" know, making his statement vague and disconnected from any specific context.	Hamm's vague reply reflects mental detachment and confusion, showing a lack of engagement with the conversation or reality.
CLOV (after reflection): Nor I.	Maxim of Quantity	Clov mirrors Hamm's vague response, offering no new information, which contributes to the sense of purposeless dialogue.	Clov's minimal reply reflects emotional withdrawal, as he avoids meaningful interaction, deepening his state of inaction.
CLOV: Zero... zero... and zero.	Maxim of Quantity & Quality	Clov repeatedly announces "zero" without providing further explanation, offering unnecessarily repetitive and uninformative statements.	The repeated and hollow observations highlight the emptiness of their world and Clov's inability to make sense of it, signifying emotional paralysis.
HAMM: Nothing stirs. All is —	Maxim of Quantity & Relevance	Hamm's statement trails off without completion, leaving his thought unfinished and his observation vague.	The unfinished sentence suggests his inability to articulate coherent thoughts, revealing mental and existential stagnation.
CLOV: Zer —	Maxim of Quantity	Clov tries to complete Hamm's sentence but stops abruptly, failing to provide any useful or new information.	Clov's truncated reply reflects his inability to break the cycle of meaningless repetition, indicating emotional paralysis.
HAMM (violently): Wait till you're spoken to!	Maxim of Manner	Hamm's sudden shift to aggression is unnecessary and abrupt, breaking the flow of conversation and causing further confusion.	Hamm's violent response reflects frustration and a breakdown in communication, showing emotional instability and confusion.
HAMM: All is... all is... all is what?	Maxim of Relevance & Quantity	Hamm repeats the question without specifying what he is referring to, offering no new information and deepening the ambiguity of the conversation.	The repetition of Hamm's question reflects his inability to complete thoughts, showing mental paralysis and circular thinking.

In Hamm and Clov's dialogue consistently, also, flouts Grice's conversational maxims, emphasizing their catatonic states. Hamm's vague statement, "I don't," followed by Clov's equally empty response, "Nor I," flouts the Maxim of Quantity, leaving their conversation devoid of substance. Clov's repetitive announcement of "zero" while looking through the telescope flouts the Maxim of Quality, providing meaningless observations that reflect the emptiness of their world. Hamm's incomplete thought, "All is —," and his repetitive questioning of "All is what?" flout the Maxim of Relation, highlighting his mental disorientation and inability to form coherent thoughts. This vague, repetitive, and uninformative dialogue captures their mental and

emotional paralysis, symbolizing their existential despair and entrapment in a cycle of futility, where meaningful communication and action are impossible. The flouting of these maxims reinforces the characters' disconnection from reality and their inability to escape their bleak, stagnant existence.

2.2.2.4 Analysis of the fourth dialogue

To further demonstrate how unfamiliar the present is, Hamm recollects memories of the past, a fact which shows his feeling of alienation as he recollects memories of a once familiar world that cannot be retrieved. The characters are strikingly nostalgic about the past. This sense of nostalgia indicates that the present is far worse than the past. Beckett instills this sense of nostalgia to

deepen the feeling of the absurd and to show the unbridgeable gap between both the past and the present. In addition to alienation, Hamm suffers from increasing physical decrepitude. He is paralyzed, blind, sitting on an armchair, and his eyes have "gone all white". Since health is what empowers man to forge ahead in life, Hamm's physical deterioration gives him a tormenting sense of helplessness in the face of life. Part of Clov's absurd suffering manifests in the linguistic violence that Hamm

exercises against him. In response to this, Clov exercises linguistic resistance as seen in his repetition of phrases and his indirect vagueness. Hamm acknowledges that he is the source of Clov's suffering and admits that has tormented him: "I've made you suffer too much". Clov has grown weary of the repetitive questions that Hamm asks him ad nauseam and that require him to give the same repetitive and, thus, mechanical answers in a vicious circle, (Abdelhamid, 2023). (See appendix eight).

Table 9
analysis of the fourth dialogue in *Endgame*

Dialogue	Maxim Flouted	Explanation	Effect on Characters
HAMM: Absent, always. It all happened without me. I don't know what's happened.	Maxim of Quantity & Quality	Hamm's statement is both vague and contradictory. He claims to be "absent" but speaks as though he should know what's happened, offering no clear explanation.	This highlights Hamm's detachment from reality and his inability to comprehend or process events, reflecting mental paralysis.
HAMM: Do you know what's happened?	Maxim of Relation	Hamm's question is repetitive and irrelevant, especially after stating that he does not know. He is stuck in a loop of meaningless questions.	Hamm's questioning shows his confusion and inability to move forward in conversation, mirroring his emotional stagnation.
CLOV: Do you want me to look at this muckheap, yes or no?	Maxim of Relation & Manner	Clov's response shifts the subject entirely, avoiding Hamm's question. His use of "muckheap" is also unnecessarily harsh, unrelated to the prior context.	Clov's frustration and avoidance of Hamm's questions indicate emotional distance and a breakdown in logical engagement.
HAMM: Answer me first.	Maxim of Relevance	Hamm's command disregards Clov's previous statement, insisting on continuing his own irrelevant line of questioning.	Hamm's need to dominate the conversation reflects his helplessness and inability to face the reality of his situation.
HAMM: Do you know what's happened?	Maxim of Quantity & Relation	Hamm asks the same question yet again without clarifying his intent or explaining what he means by "what's happened," adding nothing new to the conversation.	The repetition reflects Hamm's mental stagnation, as he is trapped in circular, meaningless dialogue.
CLOV: When? Where?	Maxim of Manner & Relation	Clov responds with further questions that show his confusion and inability to understand Hamm's vague inquiries.	Clov's questions add to the disconnection between the characters, reflecting his frustration and emotional paralysis.
HAMM (violently): When! What's happened? Use your head, can't you! What has happened?	Maxim of Manner & Relevance	Hamm's violent outburst does not clarify the situation; instead, it increases confusion, as he continues to demand answers without providing any clarity.	Hamm's aggression and lack of clarity reflect his internal turmoil and disconnection from coherent thought and action.
CLOV: What for Christ's sake does it matter?	Maxim of Quantity	Clov's retort, though relevant, minimizes the importance of Hamm's question, reflecting a refusal to engage meaningfully.	Clov's dismissal of the issue shows his emotional detachment and apathy, typical of catatonic behavior.
CLOV: You knew what was happening then, no?	Maxim of Relevance	Clov shifts the topic suddenly to Mother Pegg, which is unrelated to the previous discussion, further confusing the conversation.	The unrelated reference highlights Clov's emotional numbness and disconnect from the present situation.
HAMM: I hadn't any.	Maxim of Relation & Quantity	Hamm provides an incomplete and uninformative response, offering no further explanation about why he did not help Mother Pegg.	Hamm's feeble response reflects his powerlessness and unwillingness to confront his past, contributing to his emotional paralysis.

In this dialogue from *Endgame*, Hamm and Clov's consistent flouting of Grice's conversational maxims underscores their catatonic states, characterized by confusion, detachment, and an inability to engage meaningfully. Hamm's repeated question, "What's happened?" flouts the Maxim of Quantity, as it provides insufficient information and reflects his mental stagnation and detachment from reality. His failure to

clarify or progress the conversation further flouts the Maxim of Relevance, leaving him trapped in a loop of repetitive, meaningless inquiry. Clov's evasive and irrelevant responses, such as talking about the "muckheap" and Mother Pegg, flout the Maxim of Manner, showing his emotional detachment and frustration. His dismissive attitude reinforces their mutual disengagement and inability to connect. This

disjointed, circular dialogue reveals the characters' paralysis, as they are trapped in a cycle of ineffective communication, mirroring their existential despair. The breakdown in logical thought and meaningful action highlights their profound disconnection from the world, deepening the play's themes of futility and the paralysis of the human condition.

3 RESULTS OF DISCUSSION

1. Catatonic Paralysis through Maxim Flouting: Both *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame* demonstrate cognitive and emotional paralysis through the continuous flouting of Grice's conversational maxims. As seen in **Table 2** and **Table 6**, characters repeatedly flout the Maxims of Quantity and Relation, revealing their inability to engage in meaningful dialogue, a hallmark of catatonia.

2. Mental and Physical Stasis: The flouting of the Maxim of Quantity, as shown in **Table 2** and **Table 8**, where Vladimir and Hamm offer vague or insufficient information, symbolize their mental and emotional stagnation. Hamm's fragmented statements like "All is..." (**Table 8**) mirror his inability to articulate complete thoughts, reflecting cognitive paralysis.

3. Disconnection from Reality: In **Table 3, 5** and **Table 7**, flouting of the Maxim of Relation, such as irrelevant responses (e.g., Vladimir asking about a carrot but handing a turnip, and Clov talking about Mother Pegg instead of addressing Hamm's question), highlight the characters' detachment from reality, symptomatic of catatonia.

4. Emotional Detachment: As depicted in **Tables 2, 3** and **Table 9**, minimal responses, such as Clov's brief replies like "Here" or "Nor I," reflect emotional disengagement. These flouting of the Maxims of Quantity and Manner illustrate the characters' inability to connect meaningfully with each other, further deepening their psychological withdrawal.

5. Circular and Repetitive Dialogue: The repetitive and circular nature of dialogue is evident in **Tables 3** and **Table 9**, where Estragon and Hamm both engage in repetitive conversations about trivial matters (e.g., the carrot and the rope) without making any substantial progress. This reflects their mental inertia, trapping them in a cycle of indecision and inaction.

6. Absurdity and Confusion: **Table 3** and **Table 6** show absurd and disjointed exchanges that contribute to a sense of confusion. For example, the confusion between a carrot and a turnip in *Waiting for Godot* and Hamm's absurd requests for bicycle wheels in *Endgame* both flout the Maxim of Quality, emphasizing their disorganized thinking.

7. Existential Despair: Through these conversational breakdowns, Beckett depicts a profound sense of futility and existential despair, as illustrated in **Table 2** and **Table**

7. The inability of the characters to act decisively or make meaningful statements underscores their entrapment in a bleak, stagnant existence.

8. Irrelevant or Illogical Comments: As highlighted in **Table 6**, Hamm's and Clov's irrelevant and nonsensical responses, such as Hamm's irrational demands and Clov's unrelated responses, flout the Maxim of Relation and reflect disconnection from the logical flow of conversation, further emphasizing their mental disorientation.

9. Lack of Purposeful Action: **Table 4** illustrates how the characters, despite discussing decisive actions (like hanging themselves), fail to take any meaningful steps. Their decision to "go" but remaining stationary captures the paralysis of both mind and body, typical of catatonia.

10. Psychological Withdrawal: **Table 8** and **Table 9** show that fragmented, vague, and evasive responses (such as Clov's repetitive "zero" and Hamm's incomplete thoughts) represent symptoms of psychological withdrawal. These flouting of the Maxims of Quantity and Manner suggest the characters are mentally trapped in their own isolated worlds.

11. Power Struggles and Emotional Paralysis: In **Table 6**, Hamm's forceful demands and Clov's passive, evasive replies reflect a dysfunctional power dynamic where neither character engages meaningfully. This flouting of the Maxim of Manner demonstrates their emotional paralysis and inability to assert real control over their situation.

12. Thematic Reinforcement: The continuous breakdown in logical conversation and communication, as seen across **Tables 2-9**, reinforces Beckett's themes of existential despair and futility. The characters' persistent flouting of conversational maxims mirror their mental paralysis and inability to engage with the world, emphasizing their entrapment in a bleak and meaningless existence.

4 CONCLUSIONS

1. The breakdown of communication which is known as 'non observance of the maxims' is one of the remarkable elements to identify the cognitive and emotional paralysis. As in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*, it reflects the characters' cognitive and emotional paralysis, reinforcing their inability to engage meaningfully with the world.

2. The characters' flouting while speaking illustrates a detachment from reality, with irrelevant and illogical exchanges emphasizing their existential isolation and psychological disorientation.

3. The plays' use of repetitive and circular conversations highlights a lack of progress, symbolizing the futility and stagnation that define the characters' existence.

4. Minimal and evasive dialogue reveals emotional

detachment, illustrating the characters' withdrawal from both interpersonal connection and purposeful action.

5. The disruption of logical discourse contributes to an atmosphere of absurdity, underscoring the instability of meaning and the existential uncertainty central to Beckett's work.

6. The characters' fragmented speech and failure to communicate effectively serve as a linguistic representation of their broader existential entrapment, reinforcing the themes of futility, stagnation, and despair.

REFERENCES

- Abd Al hussein Hassan, S. (2024). Between the Existential Angst and the Absurdist Quest: Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and the Search for Meaning. *BATARA DIDI: English Language Journal*, 3(2), 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.56209/badi.v3i2.110>
- Abdelhamid, M. M. A. (2023). Samuel Beckett's Dramatic Dialectical Solution to the Contradictory Relationship between Hamm and Clov in *Endgame*. *Egyptian Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 12(1), 165–206. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ejels.2023.340745>
- Aitchison, J. (2003). *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon* (3rd Edition). blackwell.
- Beckett, S. (1954). *Waiting for Godot*. Faber and Faber.
- Beckett, S. (1958). *Endgame*. London.
- Begam, R. (2007). How to do Nothing with Words, or Waiting for Godot as Performativity. *Modern Drama*, 50(2), 138–167. <https://doi.org/10.3138/md.50.2.138>
- Cavanaugh, J. (2022). On the anguish of going: An actor's *Endgame*. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 42(1), 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10462937.2021.1969425>
- Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, E., Cruden-Smith, L., Carter, B., Amad, A., Zandi, M. S., Lewis, G., David, A. S., & Rogers, J. B. (2022). Catatonia Psychopathology and Phenomenology in a Large Dataset. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, 886662. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2022.886662>
- Dilworth, T., & Langlois, C. (2007). The Nietzschean Madman in Beckett's *Endgame*. *The Explicator*, 65(3), 167–171. <https://doi.org/10.3200/EXPL.65.3.167-171>
- Fogarty, M. (2022). A Positive Statement of a Negative Thing": Nietzschean Eternal Recurrence as Dramatic Form in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. *Modern Drama*, 65(4), 522–546. <https://doi.org/10.3138/md-65-4-1182>
- Finegan, E. 1994. *Language; its Structure and Use*. USA: Harcourt Brace College Publisher.
- Grice, P. (1989). Logic and Conversation. In P. Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words* (pp. 22–40). Harvard University Press.
- Hirjak, D., Wolf, R. C., Landwehrmeyer, G. B., & Northoff, G. (2022). Catatonia: Looking back and moving forward. *Brain*, 145(9), 2939–2942. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awac196>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group Limited.
- Menouer, B. (2023). Exploring the Self Through Habit and Memory. *English Language, Literature & Culture*, 8(2), 22–27.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell.
- Miyanrostaq, M. M., & Mousavi, S. M. (2022). Laughing with Beckett in *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 11(1), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.2478/pjes-2022-0005>
- Mooney, A. (2004). *Co-operation, violations and making sense*. 36(5), 899–920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.006>
- Othman, S. M., & Salih, S. M. (2021). Dimensions of Implication: A Review of the Saying-Meaning-Implying Trichotomy. *Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.14500/kujhss.v4n1y2021.pp151-162>
- Shastri, T. (2023). Outside of here, It's Death or Hope?": Exploring despair and Hope in TS Eliot's 'The Waste Land' and Samuel Beckett's 'End Game.' *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 286–300.
- Shahid, A. (2018). Towards a Deconstructive Text: Beyond Language and the Politics of Absences in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences*, 12(1), 108–113.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London.
- Xu, Y. (2022). Postwar Trauma and Neglected Culture in Samuel Beckett's *Endgame*. *Asian Journal of Social Science Studies*, 7(7), 47.
- Yasar, Y. (2020). Humour and Satire in the Plays *Endgame* by Samuel Beckett, *No Exit* by JP Sartre and *The Birthday Party* by Harold Pinter. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(3), 19–27.
- Zingela, Z., Stroud, L., Cronje, J., Fink, M., & van Wyk, S. (2022). The psychological and subjective experience of catatonia: A qualitative study. *BMC Psychology*, 10(173), 1–11.

APPENDIXES

1. Appendix one

"Estragon (giving up again). Nothing to be done. Vladimir (advancing with short, stiff strides, legs wide apart). I'm beginning to come round to that opinion. All my life I've tried to put it from me, saying Vladimir, be reasonable, you haven't yet tried everything. And I resumed the struggle. (He broods, musing on the struggle. Turning to Estragon.) So there you are again. Estragon. Am I? Vladimir. I'm glad to see you back. I thought you were gone forever. Estragon. Me too."

2. Appendix Two

Vladimir. Do you want a carrot? (Vladimir rummages in his pockets, takes out a turnip and gives it to Estragon who takes a bite out of it. Angrily.)

Estragon. It's a turnip!
Vladimir. Oh pardon! I could have sworn it was a carrot. (He brings out a carrot and gives it to Estragon.) There, dear fellow. (Estragon wipes the carrot on his sleeve and begins to eat it.) Make it last, that's the end of them.

Estragon (chewing). I asked you a question.
Vladimir. Ah.
Estragon. Did you reply? Vladimir. How's the carrot? Estragon. It's a carrot.

3. Appendix Three

Vladimir. With what?
Estragon. You haven't got a bit of rope?
Vladimir. No.
Estragon. Wait, there's my belt.
Vladimir. Show me (Estragon loosens the cord that holds up his trousers which, much too big for him, fall about his ankles. They look at the cord.) It might do in a pinch. But is it strong enough?
Estragon. We'll soon see. Here. They each take an end of the cord and pull. It breaks. They almost fall.
Silence.

Estragon. Didi?
 Vladimir. Yes.
 Estragon. I can't go on like this.
 Vladimir. We'll hang ourselves tomorrow. (Pause.) Unless Godot comes.
 Estragon. And if he comes?
 Vladimir. We'll be saved.
 Vladimir takes off his hat (Lucky's), peers inside it, feels about inside it, shakes it, knocks on the crown, puts it on again.
 Estragon. Well? Shall we go?
 Vladimir. Pull on your trousers.
 Estragon. What?
 Vladimir. Pull on your trousers.
 Estragon. You want me to pull off my trousers?
 Vladimir. Pull ON your trousers.
 Estragon (realizing his trousers are down). True.
 He pulls up his trousers.
 Vladimir. Well? Shall we go?
 Estragon. Yes, let's go.
 They do not move.

4. Appendix Four

Vladimir. Help me!
 Estragon. I'm trying.
 Silence.
 Estragon. Well?
 Vladimir. What was I saying, we could go on from there.
 Estragon. What were you saying when?
 Vladimir. At the very beginning.
 Estragon. The very beginning of WHAT?
 Vladimir. This evening... I was saying... I was saying..
 Estragon. I'm not a historian.
 Vladimir. Wait... we embraced... we were happy... happy... what do we do now that we're happy... go on waiting... waiting... let me think... it's coming... go on waiting... now that we're happy... let me see... ah! The tree!
 Estragon. The tree?
 Vladimir. Do you not remember?
 Estragon. I'm tired.
 Vladimir. Look at it.
 They look at the tree.
 Estragon. I see nothing.

5. Appendix five

HAMM (violently): Then move!
 (Clov goes to back wall, leans against it with his forehead and hands.)
 Where are you?
 CLOV:
 Here.
 HAMM:
 Come back!
 (Clov returns to his place beside the chair.) Where are you?
 CLOV:
 Here.
 HAMM:
 Why don't you kill me?
 CLOV:
 I don't know the combination of the cupboard. (Pause.)
 HAMM:
 Go and get two bicycle-wheels.
 CLOV:
 There are no more bicycle-wheels.
 HAMM:
 What have you done with your bicycle?
 CLOV:
 I never had a bicycle.
 HAMM:
 The thing is impossible.

6. Appendix six

HAMM:
 Outside of here it's death.
 (Pause.)
 All right, be off. (Exit Clov. Pause.) We're getting on.
 NAGG:
 Me pap!
 HAMM:
 Accursed progenitor!
 NAGG:
 Me pap!
 HAMM:
 The old folks at home! No decency left! Guzzle, guzzle, that's all they think of.
 (He whistles. Enter Clov. He halts beside the chair.) Well! I thought you were leaving me.
 CLOV:
 Oh not just yet, not just yet.
 NAGG:
 Me pap!

7. Appendix seven

HAMM (after reflection): I don't.
 CLOV (after reflection): Nor I.
 (He gets up on ladder, turns the telescope on the without.)
 Let's see.
 (He looks, moving the telescope.) Zero...
 (he looks)
 ...zero... (he looks)
 ...and zero.
 HAMM:
 Nothing stirs. All is — CLOV:
 Zer —
 HAMM (violently):
 Wait till you're spoken to! (Normal voice.)
 All is... all is... all is what? (Violently.)
 All is what?

8. Appendix Eight

HAMM:
 Absent, always. It all happened without me. I don't know what's happened.
 (Pause.)
 Do you know what's happened? (Pause.)
 Clov!
 CLOV (turning towards Hamm, exasperated):
 Do you want me to look at this muckheap, yes or no?
 HAMM:
 Answer me first.
 CLOV:
 What?
 HAMM:
 Do you know what's happened?
 CLOV:
 When? Where? HAMM (violently):
 When! What's happened? Use your head, can't you!
 What has happened?
 CLOV:
 What for Christ's sake does it matter? (He looks out of window.)
 HAMM:
 I don't know.
 (Pause. Clov turns towards Hamm.) CLOV (harshly):
 When old Mother Pegg asked you for oil for her lamp and you told her to get out to hell, you knew what was happening then, no?
 (Pause.)
 You know what she died of, Mother Pegg? Of darkness.
 HAMM (feebly): I hadn't any.