

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame"

تحليل الحديث في مسرحية ساموئيل بيكت "نهاية اللعبة"

Assist. Lect
Majid Mohammed Saadoon

Translator
Ali Kareem Falah

University of Kufa/ College of Arts

المخلص

ان المحادثة هي الطريقة المثلى للحديث لشخصين او اكثر بواسطة اتباع دورين للكلام والاساس في المحادثة هو التفاعل الطبيعي وهو ايضا تناقل للكلام . وتبادل الكلام يتم عن طريق تبادل المتحدثين للفرصة الحديث فيما بين المشتركين بالمحادثة. ويحدث هذا التبادل للدور بالكلام اما بتسمية المتحدث التالي او بأن يختار المتحدث التالي نفسه ذاتيا للحديث . ويعتبر هذين الدورين للكلام البنية الاساسية الفاعلة في تنظيم اي محادثة.

ان مسألة البحث التي يقصد الاجابة عنها هي البحث في دراسة كيفية تحديد الدور الكامل في اي حديث. ولتمييز هذا الدور نحتاج لفحص علامات انتهاء ذلك الدور وانتهاء ذلك الحديث. وتهدف هذه الدراسة الى تحليل المحادثة والتي هي وسيلة الحديث بين الناس (الجانب الاجتماعي) ، وتهدف هذه الدراسة ايضا الى تأييد وجهات نظر نقدية والمتعلقة بكتاب مسرح العبث واسلوب كتابتهم . بالإضافة لذلك تحديد الأسباب وراء حدوث حالات الصمت وأيضا دور وحدود الحوار في المحادثة (بداية ونهاية الحوار) .

أما فرضيات هذه الدراسة فهي أن هناك حالات صمت بالحديث والذي قد يحدث نتيجة تقريبا لعدم استخدام علامات امكانية انتهاء الحوار أو الموضوع (امكانية قبل الأغلاق ، وقبل الأغلاق) .

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(14)
وقد وجد بان الدور للحديث لا يمكن ان تحدد حدوده بسهولة في مادة البحث لعدم تمكن المتحدثين من تحديد تلك النهايات لغياب علامات انتهاء الدور لذلك فقد ايدت النتائج ما جاء بفرضية البحث الحالي.

ABSTRACT

Conversation is a way of speaking of two or more people by means of two turns, the first turn and the second turn. The basis of a conversation is normally interactional, although sometimes it has got a transactional element. Turn –taking is the process of alternating between speakers or participants in a conversation. Turn –taking occurs either through nomination or by self –selection by the new speaker. Adjacency pairs are considered as functional units in conversational organization .Such pairs are most frequent in plays which are the means of interaction between characters.

The problem of the research is related to how can a complete turn identified. To identify a turn you need to examine the points of possible completion of a turn at transition relevant places. It is difficult to identify a turn without it sings of possible completion.

This study aims at analyzing conversation as a means of interaction between people (social side). Also this study aims at supporting some critical points of view concerning the Absurd playwrights' way of writing (their techniques). In addition to that identifying the reasons behind the occurrence of silences and the role and boundaries of a turn in a conversation (the beginning and end of a turn).

It is hypothesized that silences occur as a result of rather absence of possible completion of a turn and topic –change devices (possible pre_ closing and pre –closing) . Also, it is the use of turn-by-turn allocation system waiting to speak.

1.Conversational Analysis and Rules for Interaction

Conversation is a general term that refers to a state of talk which generally proceeds so that one person talks at a time and all members in the particular group are attending 'the same conversation '. In this sense , these groups might be said to be 'a single focus ' that is

they do not involve a number of conversations proceeding at the same time (Schegloff, 1999 : 375-6) .

Conversational analysis, as defined by Crystal (1997:75) is

a term used in linguistics and associated discipline to refer to a method of studying the sequential and coherence of conversations (in their everyday sense) usually employing the techniques of ethnomethodology. The approach studies recordings of real conversations to establish what properties are used in a systematic way when people linguistically interact . Conversation analysis is basically an empirical, inductive study , and a contrast is often drawn with the deductive approach characteristic of discourse analysis .

In the social psychological sense ,conversation refers to the study of interaction between language and social behavior . Social psychologists concentrate on three main issues: the segmentation of speech into appropriate units, the classification of these units, and the formation of rules which generate the orderly behavioral sequences which can do and can occur. Such an approach can concentrate only on analyzing how conversation is constructed in terms of speech acts, thereby emphasizing the semantic cohesiveness (Robinson , 1969:123) .

To distinguish between conversation and transaction, consider the following:

(1) Conversation is a speech between two or more people in which thoughts, feelings ,and ideas are expressed ,questions are asked and answered, or news and information are exchanged. (2)Transaction interactions are those primarily involving the exchange of some form of good or service , or information ,while interactional interactions primarily involve the creation ,maintenance and extension of personal and social relations (Burns,2000 : 126, as cited in Mulcahy, 2000: 1) .

To ask what is conversation ? Perhaps it is easier to say what conversation is not . It is not as sometimes thought ,any spoken encounter or interaction between people . Conversations need at least two people , but the group must be small .Conversations are two-way-unlike a lecture , for example ,which is one-way .There is no audience

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(16)
, everyone is involved ,and there is no fixed schedule (Mulcahy ,2000 :1).

The basis of a conversation is normally interactional, although sometimes it has got a transactional element to it . Conversations can be used to exchange information; to create or maintain social relationships; to decide on something; and to carry out a joint task (ibid.).

Conversation is a general term that refers to a state of talk which generally proceeds so that one person talks at a time and all members in the particular group are attending 'the same conversation '. In this sense, these groups might be said to be 'a single focus ' that is they do not involve a number of conversations proceeding at the same time (Schegloff ,1999 : 375-6) .

There are certain rules or norms which are generally fixed by on a sub-conscious level during a conversation .These rules, however, subtle, shape the structure of most conversations that take place. They govern who speaks, for how long and when they speak .A long side these rules are set formulae and strategies for :

- a-Opening and closing a conversation.
- b- Changing the subject .
- c-Interrupting .
- d-Holding the floor and turn-taking .
- e-Repairing conversation (ibid. :2) .

It is an easy noticed fact about two-party conversations that their sequencing is alternating . That is to say , conversational sequence can be described by the formula ab ab ab , where "a" and "b" are the parties to the conversation . The ab ab formula is a specification , for two-party conversations , of the basic rule for conversation : one party at a time (Schegloff ,1999 :1076) .

2. Coulthard's Model

This model has been made by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson in 1974 but Coulthard changes somehow this model and makes it fit to the analysis of any text depending on the Sacks' model. He finds it is

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(17)
right to add some new components to the old model (as it is clear in the next pages). The components of this model are the following:

2.1. Turn-Taking :

One of the facts of conversation is that the roles of speaker and listener change and this occurs with remarkably little overlapping speech and few silences. Sacks suggests that there is an underlying rule in American English conversation – 'at least and no more than one party talk at a time '. This is not an empirical fact, because there are obviously many instances of short pauses and short overlaps .If more than or less than one party is 'noticeable ' and participants set out 'remedy ' the situation will return to a state of one and only one speaker. If the problem is more than speaker one of the participants usually yield the floor quickly . While if the problem is silence other speakers begin speaking or indicate their interaction to speak by noises like 'er' or 'mm' (Coulthard , 1985 :59-60) .

Overlapping is dealt with by one speaker ending his turn quickly , gaps between turns by another speaker beginning his turn or simply indicating that his turn has begun and incorporating the silence into it (ibid. :60) .

A second feature of conversation is that speaker change recurs, and this problem for the participants- how can they achieve change of speaker while maintaining a situation in which at least, but not more than, one speaker speaks at a time?(ibid.).

Sacks suggests that a current speaker can exercise three degree of control over the next turn. Firstly ,he can select which participant will speak next , either by naming him or by alluding to him with a descriptive phrase .If the current selects the next speaker ,he usually also selects the type of next utterance by producing the first part of adjacency pair (ibid).

The current speaker's second option is simply to constrain the next utterance , but not select the next speaker ,while the third option is to select neither and leave it to one of the other participants to continue the conversation by selecting himself (ibid.) .

Sacks(1974)(as cited in Coulthard ,1985:60-1) emphasizes that these options are in an ordered relationship – the first over – rides the second and the second over –rides the third .If the current speaker selects the next speaker he alone should talk next ; Sacks notes that when an unselected speaker talks a turn already assigned to a selected one , the right of the selected speaker to speak next is usually preserved .

Sacks(ibid.) suggests that, in fact, next speakers are not and can never be concerned with actually completed utterances ,because one can never be concerned with actually completed utterances , because one can never be sure that an utterance is complete .Therefore ,next speakers are concerned with points of possible completion .In developing this idea , Sacks observes that turns consist of one or more sentences ,with a sentence being defined as a unit which has :

Its completion recognized on its completion ,and that it is not complete recognizable by participants ; also it can be monitored , from its beginning ,to see from its beginning what it will take for its completion to be produced , in such a way that ,on its completion may be recognized (ibid. :61) .

Turns to speak are valued and thus the majority of turns in any conversation consist of only a single sentence, unless permission has been sought for a larger turn, perhaps to tell a story or a joke (ibid.).

Jefferson (1973) (as cited in Coulthard ,1985:62) argues that the recipient of an ongoing utterance ' has the technical capacity to select a precise spot to start his own talk " no later " than the exact appropriate moment ' .

2.2.Cases of Overlaps and Silences.

Much more impressive cases are instances of recipient coming in at just the right moment with their own proposed completion as yet an uncompleted sentence .A variant of this is when the recipient is able to predict the ending of the sentence and attempts to say the same thing at the same time (Coulthard, 1985: 62) .

If the current speaker has not selected a next speaker,a self selecting speaker, beginning at a possible completion may well

overlap with current speaker who has decided to continue ,or with a second self-selecting speaker .The problem is usually 'remedied ' quickly by one of speaker yielding the floor ; when the overlap is the result of two self –selecting speakers there appears to be a rule that the 'first starter ' has the right to continue (ibid.). On occasions when both speakers cease speaking simultaneously, there is the question of who has next turn; if one speaker was producing a completion of the other's utterance, the speaker whose turn was completed takes the next turn. If, in other circumstances, an overlap is ended by one speaker stopping first, if only one syllable, he takes the next turn (ibid. : 62-63) .

Silences between turns similarly create a problem and participants feel that a silence is attributable, usually to some intended next speaker (ibid : 63).

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) observe that silence is noted by the speaker as not his, but that he then transforms it into a pause by continuing his turn (as cited in Coulthard, 1985:63).

There is low tolerance of silence between turns and the intended next speaker does not begin almost at once the previous speaker is likely to produce a post completer, which is either a question ,noticing the silence such as ' Didn't you hear me ', or a marked repeat of his utterance . To avoid this, speakers who have not yet formulated what they want to say tend to indicate their intention to speak by 'erm','um','mm', or an audible intake of breath and thereby incorporate the silences into their turn (ibid.).

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson(1974) (as cited in Coulthard,1985: 64) distinguish different speech exchange systems according to the organization of turn taking . They suggest that different turn-taking system produced different structured turns .In a pre-allocated system there are no interruption pressures ,turns tend to be longer and for these reasons consist of a series of linked sentences .In a turn-by-turn allocation system there are strong pressures from other participants wanting to speak and the turn is typically only one sentence long .There are several techniques open to the speaker who wishes to continue speaking past a particular 'possible completion ' .

The simplest technique is to employ what Sacks calls an utterance incomplete – these are items such as 'but', 'and', 'however' and other clause connectors.

One technique is to begin with an incompletion marker, 'if', 'since' or any other subordinator, which informs the other participants that there will be at least two clauses before the first possible completion. A speaker can also pre-structure a fairly large unit of speech by devices as 'I'd like to make two points' or simply 'firstly', which explicitly indicate that there is more to come after what could otherwise have been regarded as a possible completion point (ibid.).

The evidence adduced so far to describe and explain a speaker change has been almost entirely grammatical and semantic. There is, however, evidence to suggest that a speaker signals Para-linguistically and kinesically to other participants at which possible completion they are actually willing to relinquish the floor (ibid :65-66) .

Kendon (1967)(as cited in Coulthard ,1985:66) suggests that one important factor enabling the smooth change-over of speaker is gaze. He notes that, while listening, A typically looks at B with fairly long gazes broken by very brief away gazes, but while speaking A looks at and away from B for more equal periods. Focusing on the end of utterances of more than five seconds, Kendon notes that 'usually the person who is bring along utterance to an end does so by assuming a characteristic head posture and by looking steadily at the auditor before he actually finishes speaking'. The auditor, who spends most of his time looking at the speaker, is able to pick up these signals and tends to respond looking away just before or just as he begins to talk.

Weisbord (1965) found the person whom the current to a speaker last look at before ending was most likely to speak next (as cited in Coulthard,1985:67).

Goodwin (1981:106) has interesting observations on how participants organize with draw from conversation. He notes that the 'boundary between full engagement and mutual disengagement is not

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(21)
structured as a sharp clear break '; rather, 'participants are afforded a space within which they can recognize their bodies .

Ferguson (1975) discovered that almost a third of interruptions occur following ' fillers' such as 'um', 'er' ,and 'y' know' (as cited in Coulthard, 1985:66) .

Duncan (1973 ,1974)(ibid.:68) suggests that the cues for a speaker change can be grammatical, paralinguistic or kinesics or any combination of all three . The cues are :

1-Intonation : the use of any pitch level / terminal juncture combination, other than 22 .

2-Paralanguage : drawl on the final syllable or on the stressed syllable of the phonemic clause .

3- Body motion : the termination of any hand gesticulation or the relation of a tensed hand position .

4- Sociocentric sequences : the appearance of one of several stereotype expressions ,such as 'but uh ' , 'or something ' , 'you know', labeled sociocentric by Bernstein (1962) .

5- Paralanguage : a drop in paralinguistic pitch and /or loudness in conjunction with a sociocentric sequence .

6- Syntax : the completion of a grammatical clause involving a subject – predicate combination (ibid.).

2.3. Conversational structure

Sacks(1967)(as cited in Coulthard,1985:69) observes that a conversation is a speech of at least two turns. Some turns are more closely related than others and he isolates a class of sequences of turns called ' adjacency pairs ' which have the following features: there are two utterances long; the utterances produced successively by different speakers; they are ordered the first must belong to the class of the first pair parts, the second to the class of second pair parts; the utterances are related, not any second pair can follow any first pair part ,but only an appropriate one; the first pair part often selects next speaker and always selects next action –it thus sets up transition relevance and expectation which the next speaker fulfils, in other words the first part

of a pair predicates the occurrence of the second: 'Given a question, regularly enough an answer will follow.

Adjacency pairs are the basic structural unit in conversation. They are used for opening and closing conversations , and are very important during conversations both for operating the turn –taking system by enabling a speaker to select next action and next speaker ,and also for enabling the next speaker to avoid both gap and overlap (ibid. :70).

Sacks(1967)(ibid.) argues that , whereas the absence of a particular item in conversation has initially no importance because there are number of things that are similarly absent, in the case of adjacency pair the first part provides specifically for the second and therefore the absence of the second is noticeable and noticed . He observed that people regularly complain ' you didn't answer my question', or ' I said hello , and she just walked past '.

2.4. Preference Organization

Pomerantz (1978 ,1984), Atkinson and Drew (1979) and Levinson(1983) as cited in Levinson 1983,p.307) have developed the notion of adjacency pair into a very powerful concept .As mentioned above ,some first pair part allowed for alternative seconds; however, some options are preferred and some dispreferred –a distinction which may have a psychological basis and explanation but also has linguistic realizations. Preferred seconds are unmarked – they occur as structurally simpler turns; in contrast dispreferred second are marked by various kinds of structural complexity (Couthard ,1985 :70).

Levinson(1983:334-5) observes that dispreferred seconds are distinguished by incorporating a 'substantial number of the following features ':

- (a) Delays : 1- by pause before delivery; 2- by the use of a preface; 3-by displacement over a number of via use of repair initiators or insertion sequences .
- (b) Prefaces: 1-the use of markers or announcers of dispreferred like 'uh' and 'well'; 2- the production of token agreements before disagreements; 3- the use of appreciations if relevant (for offers ,

invitations, suggestions, advice); 4- the use of apologies if relevant (for requests, invitation, etc.); 5- these of qualifiers (e.g. I don't know for sure but) ; 6- hesitation in various forms, including self-editing .

- (c) Accounts: carefully formulated explanations for why the dispreferred act is being done.
- (d) Declination component: of a form suited to the nature of the first part of the pair, but characteristically indirect or mitigated.

Schegloff et.al.(1977)(as cited in Coulthard 1985,71) argue that conversationalists prefer the speaker to correct his own mistakes rather than to have someone corrects them for him and that they therefore use a series of repair initiator devices ranging from pausing ,to return question ,to actual frequently mitigated, correction .

We can also now see a general explanation for pre-invitation, pre-requests and pre-arrangements –they are psychologically motivated structures to avoid loss of face for one or both participants resulting from a dispreferred second having to be preferred (ibid.).

The very recognizability of the first of a pre-sequence sometimes results in 'collapsing ',in which next speaker produces what is really an answer to the first part of an anticipated next sequence, e.g.

Pre-request 1- Can you fix this needle ?

2-Sure .

Request 3-Will you ?

4-I'm busy .

(ibid. :72) .

Levinson(1983:357) argues that to think in terms of indirect requests is misguided – he suggests that one of the advantages of a pre-request is that, being transparent ,it may save the speaker having

to risk his face by making the request at all. In some instances the addressee may respond with an offer, e.g.

A: Hi .Do you have uh size (flash light batteries ? (pre-request)

B : Yes Sir . (Go ahead)

A : I'll have four please . (request)

B: (Turns to get) . (Response)

(Merritt , 1976:324) .

(as cited in

Coulthard,1985:72).

2.5. Inserted Sequences

The structures described so far have been linear ,one pair followed by another; Schegloff (1972)(ibid.:73) calls these embedded pairs 'insertion sequences. Sometimes ,either because he doesn't understand ,or because he doesn't want to commit himself until he knows more, or because he's simply stalling ,a next speaker produces not a second pair but another first pair part . The suggestion is 'if you answer this I will answer yours '.

A: I don't know where the –wh-this address//is .

Q

Insertion { B: Well where do –which part of the town you live ?

Qi

Sequence { A: I live four ten East Lowden .

Ai

(side sequence)

B: well you don't live very far from me .

A

A question ,that immediately arises, is the pair 'Qi Ai' inserted into the pair' Q A' ; surely this is treating conversation as an accomplished product rather than a developing process ,because 'A' may never occur

. In the inserted sequence the original question retains its transition relevance ,and if the second speaker does not then produce an answer .It is noticeably absent in exactly the same way as it would if there were no intervening sequence ,and the questioner can ask about the lack of answer in exactly the same way. Adjacency pairs are normative structures, the second part ought to occur, and thus the other sequences are inserted between the first pair part that has occurred and the second pair part that is anticipated (ibid.).

Jefferson (1972)(ibid.:75) proposes an embedded sequence different from Schegloff's insertion sequence and labeled 'side sequence '. She observes that the general drift of a conversation is sometimes halted at an unpredictable point by a request for clarification and the conversation picks up again where it left off .

The side sequence begins with a questioning repeat –an interrogative item indicating there is a problem in what has just been said 'and its work is generated further talk directed to remedying the problem '. Questioning repeats occur typically after the questioned utterance has been completed, because only then one be sure that the speaker is not going to correct himself or explain the unclear item ; an interrupting questioning repeat is liable to attract not a clarification but a complaint ,e.g.,' if you'd let me finish ' (ibid.) .

Jefferson suggests initially that the misapprehension sequence has a three –part structure, consisting of a statement of sorts, a misapprehension of sorts ,and a clarification of sorts' .So far the side sequence looks rather like Schegloff's insertion sequence. There are, however, two major differences : Firstly ,the first item ,the statement ,is not a first pair part , the other items are in no sense inserted and there is no exception of who should speak at the end of the sequence or what type of utterance should follow; secondly, while the sequence misapprehension –clarification looks like a pair, there is actually a compulsory third element in the sequence, an indication by the

misapprehender that he now understands and that the sequence is now termed –'That's better ' or 'Yeah' .

Statement : If Percy goes with – Nixon I'd sure like that .

Misapprehension : Who?

Clarification : Percy .That young fella that uh – his daughter was murdered (1.0) .

Terminator : Oh yea:h .Yea .

However , it seems to be no reason why Schegloff's insertion sequence couldn't also have a termination.

A: I don't know where the – wh- this address //is . (Q)

B : Which part of town you live . (Qi)

A: I live four ten East Lowden . (Ai)

B: Ah yeah . (Termination)

Well you don't live very far from me . (A)

(ibid. :76-77) .

Statement : A: And a good looking girl comes to you and asks you,

. y' know .

Misapprehension : B: Gi (hh) rl asks you to

Clarification: C:Wella its happened alotta times . {side

Termination : B: Okay ,okay go ahead . sequence}

Continuation : B:So he says 'no'.....

(ibid. :76).

A:I don't know where the –wh –this address//is . Q

B: Which one ?

Misapprehension

A: The one you just gave me . Clarification

B: Oh yeah, yeah . Termination

B: Well you don't live very far from me . A

(ibid :77)

2.6. Topic Change and Topic Conflict

Sacks(1971)(as cited in Coulthard, 1985:80) observes that in a conversation which is progressing well talk drift imperceptibly from one topic to another, and suggests that relative frequency of marked topic introduction is a kind of measuring of the quality of a conversation .

However ,as Sacks (1968) stresses ,talking topically and talking about some topic chosen by another speaker is not the same thing at all .One can perfectly well have ‘Q’ sequence in which successive speakers talk in away topically coherent with the last utterance, but in which each speaker talks on a different topic (as cited in Coulthard,1985 :80-81).

The phenomenon of drift can be frustrating at times for conversationalists. Everyone has the experience of failing to get in at the right time with a good story or experience ,and then seeing it wasted because the opportunity never recurs. At times, within conversations, there is competitive talk when two speakers want to develop the topic in different ways; both fight because they know there will be no further opportunity to say what they want to say (ibid. :81) .

2.7. Story Telling.

For Sacks (as cited in Coulthard ,1985 :82) a story is any report of an event –it may be only one sentence long, but is usually longer, and therefore presents a problem for any intending telling because other speakers are likely to self –select at the first possible completion point . The intending story –telling therefore needs to seek a suspension of the usual turn-taking machinery and one way of achieving this by a floor –seeker or story –preface, ' Do you want hear a joke ? ' or 'I was at the hospital this morning ' .

The function of such utterances is to select not next speaker as is usual in the turn-taking system, but next speaker but one, and to guarantee this speaker a stretch of uninterrupted talk in which to accomplish the story (ibid.) .

Jefferson (1978) (ibid. :83) looks how stories are fitted into conversation . She notes that one problem facing story telling is ' to display a relationship between the story and prior talk' . There are two discrete devices ' ; there is a disjunct maker , 'oh' , which shows that what is to come is not directly related to what has just been said , and then an embedded repetition , which marks ' the element of prior talk which triggered the story ' , here they do , but ' the two devices need not occur in combination ' .

Once a story ends the normal turn –taking mechanism resumes normally. Jefferson (1978) focuses on an instance when no one appears to want to take over the speaker role , citing a speaker who produced five possible completions before solving the problem by producing half an idiom , while re-engagement of turn-by-turn talk may be the primary issue upon 'a story completion'. There are , as Jefferson points out, 'other matters to which a story –teller may be oriented ' –specially what other participants have made of the story , what its significance is taken to be. But as Ryave (1978) points out participants can disagree about what real significance of a story is (ibid. :83-84) .

Typically , second stories accept the first speaker's assessment of ,or significance statement about ,his story and show ' that and how they understand ,support , sympathize and agree with the preceding story ' with their own supportive one ; whereas first stories typically have an overt significance statement ,second stories typically do not and are rather seen as further supportive exemplifications of the first significance statement (ibid. :84) .

Also the 'Inserted Sequences'(see (2.4.5) above which is mentioned in Coulthard's model) will be added to this new model .

2.8.Pre-sequence System

Pre-sequences are conversation structures that invite collaboration in an upcoming turn sequence .By inviting collaboration, the pre-sequence ensures that the following turns will proceed without face –threatening refusals and disagreements .Pre-sequences are, thus, involved to minimize the occurrence dispreferred action (e.g., refusal

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(29)
and disagreement) and to maximize the occurrence of preferred
actions in the upcoming turns (Levinson ,1983 :89).

The first proper way of initiating a closing section that one kind of
(what will be called) "pre-closing .The kind of pre-closing we have in
mind takes one of the following forms "we-ell.....","ok...","so-oo",
etc.(with downward intonation contours), these forms constituting the
entire utterance .These pre-closings should properly be called 'possible
pre-closing' ,because providing the relevance of the initiation of a
closing section is only one of the uses they have. One feature of their
operation is that they occupy the floor for a speaker's turn without
using it to produce either a typically coherent utterance or the
initiation of new topic .With them a speaker takes a turn whose
business seems to be to "pass," i.e., to indicate that he has not now
anything more or new to say ,and also to give a 'free 'turn to a next ,
who ,because such an utterance can be treated as having broken with
any prior topic , can without violating topical coherence take the
occasion to introduce a new topic ,e.g., some heretofore unmentioned
mentionable .(Schegloff and Sacks, 1992:303-304)(as cited in
Sacks,1992 : 87).

After such a possible pre-closing specifically, there is a place for
a new topic begins . The use of possible pre-closings is not only to
initiate a closing section, but also, by inviting the insertion of
unmentioned mentionables ,to provide the reopening of topic talk. On
their occurrence, they are only possible pre-closing because of this
specific alternative they provide for . In brief, utterances of the form
"we-ell", "ok", e.t.c., operate as possible pre-closing when placed at
the analyzable (once again, to participants) end of a topic (ibid : 305
).

Heritage (1985 :4) states that pre-sequence objects are considered
ground-clearing devices directed at establishing the appropriateness or
relevance of projectedly subsequent actions such as making 'a news'
announcement ,requesting ,inviting and the like .In each of these cases
, the face-threatening rejection of some activity proposed by the
speaker is avoided by the recipient's indication ,in advance of the

proposed activity , that the activity is not appropriate, relevant, possible, desired or whatever.

The term pre-sequence is used ,with a systematic ambiguity to refer both to a certain kind of turn and a certain kind of sequence containing the type of turn. That is, one has to make a distinction between pre-sequence for the turn-type (pre-s) and pre-sequence for the sequence –type .Most pre-s are built to pre-figure the specific kind of action that they potentially precede. For example, pre-closings often realized as tokens of "okay", are recognizable as potential initiation of closing (Levinson,1983 :345-6).

The notion ,pre-sequence ,on the other hand, cannot be defined in terms of just the sequence of turns but in term of both the turn-location , (i.e., speaker sequential locus of a turn in a sequence by a count after some initial turn) and position , (i.e., the response to some prior but not necessarily adjacent turn).Thus, a second part of an adjacency pair, separated from its part by a two –turn insertion sequence, will be fourth turn but second position (ibid.) .

Pre-sequence for requests is called pre-request and pre sequence in closing system is called pre-closing .The former checks the conditions concerning an upcoming request . If the conditions for request-handling are favorable ,the speaker can proceed with the request. If on the other hand, the conditions for request handling are unfavorable, the speaker may avoid the probable refusal by aborting the request attempt (Jakobsen,1998) (as cited in Mulcahy, 2000:6). The latter, on the other hand, indicates that a speaker has nothing to add to the topic and he is willing to close the conversation . Such a pre-sequence also implies that the addresser may either require the addressee to introduce additional topics that have not been mentioned ,or he agrees to close the conversation (Hatch, 2000: 12)

Pre-sequence corresponds to Edmondson's(1981:100) pre-exchange . Edmondson distinguishes parts of exchange: pre-exchange, pre-responding and post-exchange. Pre-exchanges are directly parallel to 'pre-sequence'. They are defined such that the outcome of such an exchange directly leads to the initiation of a following 'head' (or other exchange) . This means that a pre-exchange is in part identified and

Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(31)
 defined by its consequences, and also that turn-taking is consistently determined by more sequence "after" a pre-exchange, i.e., the speaker who initiates a pre-exchange will initiate the following exchange. Post-exchange serves to firm the outcome of a preceding exchange which may lead to the re-opening of business which appeared before the close or the end of conversation. In a first 'firming' post-exchange is followed by a second concerning a detail of the outcome which has just been firmed, before a third post-exchange leads directly to the close of the encounter; therefore, more than one exchange may occur (ibid. :101-103).

'Misplacement marking ' are Classes of utterances or activities which have a proper place in a conversation but are to be done in some particular conversation in other of their proper place ,or an utterance (type) which has no particular proper place but is nonetheless 'out of place ' where it is to be done may have their occurrence misplacement marked (e.g. By the way, my name is) (Sacks ,1992 :319) .

3. Conversational Analysis of "Endgame" :-

Endgame is one of Beckett's famous early plays (1958). Its main theme is the hopeless conditions of man in this aggressive world and existence .

The play(short and one act play) is about a blind ,lame ,confined to a throne –like chair , Hamm exists in space out of time , measuring the minutes and the minutiae of his life as if they are a spiralling heap of sand. Hamm is himself ' a speaker in the void '. His servant [and son, Clov] moves mechanically. His parents, Nagg and Nell, are stumps of people entrapped in a shcans. However there is linear movement within the text as well as a density of poetic language (Gussow, 1996 : 151).

Hamm and Nagg make efforts to pass time by telling stories, continually interrupting themselves to comment on their performance, like actors at a rehearsal . But against this is set a counterpoint of reminiscence in which everyone joins. Nell reminds Nagg of their amorous youth when they rowed on Lake Como : 'It was deep, deep. And you could see down to the bottom. So white. So clean .' Nagg

reminds his son of how he used to cry for him in the night. Clov recalls live liar days when he used to plead with Hamm for bicycle (Alvarez, 1973: 91-2).

Nagg also tells along, much rehearsed story about a man who crawled to him once out the surrounding desolation, pleading for himself and his child. He tells it as if it were a fiction, like all the other stories, made up to pass the time but it sounds convincingly like a description of how Clov first arrived at his house (ibid :92).

When Hamm makes his speech about the mad painter who looked at the world and saw only ashes he is also describing his own present state , except that he is now blind and uses Clov to look for him on to a world from which all life has been eliminated. Clov, in turn, repeats the same message in his closing speech. Both Clov's speech and Hamm's represent Beckett's own situation as a writer (ibid :92-93).

The main components of the adopted model(eclectic model) are the following :-

- 1- Turn –Taking .
- 2- Adjacency Pair .
- 3- Preference Organization .
- 4- Insertion Sequences .
- 5- Pre –Closing and Closing Sequences .
- 6- Topic and Topic Change .
- 7- Story Telling .

These components are used for the analysis of a dialogue of a text or conversation of many settings . Conversation can be used to exchange information , to maintain social relationships , to decide on something , to carry out a joint task . There are certain rules which subtly shape the structure of most conversations that take place . They govern who speaks , for how long and when to speak .

3.1. Turn-Taking .

Turn –Taking is the process of alternating between speakers or participants in conversation . Turn –Taking in conversation occurs

either through nomination by the speaker or by self –selection by the new speaker . In this play there are always two characters or there are rarely more than two characters . For this , nomination is not needed although it may occur .

Text (1) :

Hamm : I feel a little queer (pause) Clov !

Clov :Yes . (Beckett, 1958:.13) .

Text (2) :

Hamm :Get me ready (Clov does not move) Go and get the sheet
(Clov does not move)

Clov !

Clov : Yes . (ibid.) .

Hamm, in nomination of the next speaker ,is to encourage Clov to obey him .But there is ,in ordinary cases, no need to nominating the next speaker, because there are just two characters on the stage . There should be turn-by-turn allocation technique .

Text (3) :

Hamm : Apart from that, how do you feel ?

Clov : I don't complain .

Hamm : You feel normal ?

Clov : (irritably .) I tell you I don't complain !

(ibid.) .

As it clear from the above examples, speaker –change recurs. Also one speaker talks at a time . Each character keeps his turn even by one word sentence .

Text (4) :

Hamm : You're a bit of all right , aren't you ?

Clov : A simthereen . (ibid:17) .

Each speaker keeps his turn even by one word .The turns are short.

Text (5) :

Clov : I see my light dying .

Hamm : Your light dying ! Listen to that ! Well , it can die just as well

here, your light.

Take a look at me and then come back and tell me what you

think of your light (ibid).

It is obvious here that the talk can be continuous or discontinuous. The turn may be one word more than three sentences .

Interruption may occur in certain cases because of the absence of sentence completion. Also this happens in turn –by –turn allocation technique, because there is a pressure from other participants waiting to speak this due to the short turns (may be one word –turns) .

Text (6) :

Nagg : Can you hear me ?

Nell : Yes . and you ?

Nagg : Yes .(pause .) Our hearing hasn't failed .

Nell : Our what ?

Nagg: Our hearing.

Nell : No.(Pause.) Have you anything else to say to me ?

Nagg: Do you remember-----

Nell: No. (ibid:18-9).

In text (6) the interruption happens after the verb ' remember' which is transitive and intransitive verb at the same time. So, Nell expected that the sentence is completed (intransitive verb)'Do you remember ' as yes / no question. Her answer was 'No'. It came immediately after this verb.

The dialogue used in this play is not a real dialogue but it is a quasi-dialogue. This is clear in the use of language above and in the style used by Beckett which is his own way of writing .Most of turns is of short turns which are turn-by-turn allocation system.

Table (1) Turn-Taking Elements and their Occurrences

Types	Frequency	Causes	Percentage
-------	-----------	--------	------------

Long turns (more than	73	To pass time	9.26%
One word turns	99	To keep the turn	12.56%
Short turns (less than 3	616	To exchange information	78.1%
Pauses after turns	80	Sometimes for changing topics	10.15%
Pauses inside turns	116	Either psychological or	14.72%
overlaps	9	Projectability of possible	1.14%
Total turns	788		100%

3.2. Adjacency Pairs:

A kind of paired utterances of which question –answer , greeting-greeting , offer-acceptance , apology –minimization, etc., are prototype . These are inter-related with the turn –taking system as techniques for selecting a next speaker .

Text (7)

Hamm : Have you looked ?

Clov : Yes .

Hamm : Well ?

Clov : Zero . (ibid:13) .

In the text (7) above , it is clear that the most common form of adjacency pairs is question –answer pairs . Participants can direct questions to others which derive their interactional power from the obligation they place upon a hearer to come with an answer , or as Sacks(1992) puts it , " appropriate question gets a proper answer . In such a manner , methods of putting the question and receiving an answer can develop into ' chain-structure' of turns . For this question –answer is the most common type of adjacency pairs in this play as in other conversational settings.

Text (8) :

Hamm : I'll give you nothing more to eat . (offer)

Clov : Then we'll die . (acceptance)

(ibid:14).

Text (9) :

Hamm : Get me ready .(Clove does not move) Go and get the sheet . (Clove does not move .) Clov ! (request)

Clov : Yes . (acceptance)
(ibid) .

Text (10) :

Hamm : Have you not had enough ? (question)

Clov : Yes ! (Pause.) Of what ? (question)

(ibid) Hamm : Of thisthisthing .
(repetition)

It is clear in the texts (8,9,10) there are different types of adjacency pairs in this play which are used by Beckett . One important feature for adjacency pairs is to select not just the second utterance but also the next speaker .In all the above texts the adjacency pairs have the following features :-

1-They are two utterances long .

2-They are produced by different speakers .

They are ordered as a first pair part and a second part . 3-

They are adjacent

4- They are related.

5- They are types, i.e., a particular first part requires a particular second (Schegloff, 1984: 32-33). But their structure is not the same ,for example, there may be one word or may be one clause or one sentence or more .

It is not always useful to use the adjacency pair as a basic unit for conversation because sometimes there are what is called insertion sequences and side sequences. As in the following text (11) :-

Text (11) :

Hamm :Why do you stay with me ? Q
 Clov : Why do you keep me ? Qi
 Hamm : There's no one else . Ai
 Clov : There's nowhere else A (ibid) .

Or misapprehension sequences as illustrated in the text (12) below :-

Text (12) :

Nagg : It's lower down .In the hollow . (Statement)
 Nell : What hollow ?
 (Misapprehension)
 Nagg : The hollow !(Pause.) Could you not ? (Pause.)
 Yesterday you scratched me there . (Clarification)

Nell : (Elegiac) Ah yesterday !
 (Termination)
 (ibid:15).

So the structure of these forms of conversation is different according to the type used in the certain setting .Form the table below , it is clear that the question –answer is the main type used here by Beckett in this play, and other types come as it is clear in the table(2).

Table (2) Adjacency Pairs

Types	Frequency	Causes	Percentage
1-Question – answer	588	To get information	74.6%
2-Request- accept or refuse	192	To make the listener do something	24.3%

3-Offer- accept or refuse	6	To encourage the hearer to do or say something	0.761%
Complain 4-	1	To correct behavior or etc.	0.126%
5- Goodbye	1	To leave	0.126
6- Total	788		100%

3.3Preference Organization.

Adjacency pairs system is considered to be a fundamental unit of conversational organization, but sometimes there are two alternatives for the first pair parts. Preference organization system is a structuring system wherein utterances can be classified into preferred and dispreferred categories on the basis of structural formal (Levinson ,1983 :333) .

The preferred seconds are unmarked, whereas, the dispreferred seconds are marked .When participants have to produce dispreferred seconds ,they indicate that they are doing something very marked by using delay, preface and stumbling repetition (this makes the preferred seconds have simpler structure than the dispreferred seconds) . Preferred seconds occur at the beginning of turns ,whereas, dispreferred seconds occur late in the turn and separated by different parts of the turns(ibid) .

In this play nothing occurs from that happens in the dispreferred seconds . The dispreferred seconds occur without delay and without using some preface like 'well' also without using some account of why the dispreferred seconds cannot be preferred.

Text (13)

(A)-

Hamm : Get me ready I'm going to bed . (request)

Clov : I've just got you up . (refusal) (dispreferred)

(Beckett, 1958:13) .

(B)-

Hamm : Go and get the gaff .

(request)

(Clov goes to the door , halts).

Clov : Do this ,do that ,and I do it .I never refuse . Why ? (refusal)

(Dispreferred)

(ibid:31-32) .

(C)-

Hamm : Kiss me (pause .) Will you not kiss me ? (Q)

Clov : No . (refusal) (dispreferred)

Hamm : On the forehead . (request)

Clov : I won't kiss you any where . (refusal)(dispreferred)

(ibid:44) .

(D)-

Hamm : Put me in my coffin . (request)

Clov :There are no coffins . (refusal)(dispreferred)

(ibid:49) .

(E)-

Hamm : Did your seeds come up ? (Q)

Clov : No . (refusal)(dispreferred)

Hamm :Did you scratch round them to see if
they had sprouted ? (Q)

Clov :They haven't sprouted. (refusal) (dispreferred)
(ibid:17).

In the texts(A to E) the dispreferred seconds occur immediately without delaying or using any of dispreferred devices (preface, account , e.t.c.) .

In other cases of dispreferred seconds, the refusal happens after a delay :-

Text (14) :

Hamm :I've made you suffer too much .(Pause) Haven't I ? (Q)

Clov : It's not that . (refusal)

(dispreferred)

(ibid:14) .

The 'pause' ,after the first sentence , is interpreted as a refusal which is one of dispreferred devices(as in the text(14) above). But Hamm wants to be sure about his interpretation (as rejection) .So , he makes a tag-question to assert this refusal .

Text (15) :

Hamm :.....That's what I call light ! (Pause .) Feels like a ray of Sunshine. (pause.) No? (Q)

(ibid) Clov : No . (A , refusal)

In the text (15) Hamm expects the refusal from Clov's delaying in answering . There is no device used here by the writer but delay .Beckett's usage of dispreferred devices is restricted to the use of pauses (or delay the second part of the adjacency pairs).This is clear also in this table(3) below .

Table (3) Preference Organization Elements and their Occurrences.

Type	Frequency	causes	percentage
Preferred second	16	Acceptance of the offer ,or order or question or	2.03%

		etc.	
Dispreferred second with pause as delay signal	159	Refuse to do or do not accept offer or request or etc.	20.17%
Total	175	causes	22.20%

3.4. Insertion Sequences .

Insertion sequences occur between two parts of an utterance pair , i.e., between two utterances, the second of which is conditionally relevant given the occurrence of the first (Schegloff, 1972 : 106) (as cited in Coulthard,1985:75).

Accordingly , the strict criterion of adjacency pairs must be replaced with the notion of 'conditional relevance ' , criterion for adjacency pairs that given the first part of pair ,a second part is immediately relevant and acceptable .If such a second fails to occur, it is noticeably absent (which can be interpreted as a refusal) (Levinson ,1983 : 306) .

There are three main types of insertion sequences :-

1- Schegloff's (1972) insertion sequences of the form {Q, Qi, Ai, A}.

2- Jefferson's (1972) side sequence . A conversation is sometimes halted at an unpredictable point by a request for clarification and then conversation picks up again where it left off . The side sequence begins with question repeat –an interrogative item indicating that is a problem in what has just been said , and its work is to generate further talk directed to remedying the problem (as cited in Coulthard ,1985 : 75-76).

3- Jefferson's Misapprehension sequence has a four –part structure , consisting of a statement ,misapprehension ,clarification , termination for the conversation (the last two are used to resume the turn taking mechanism.) (ibid. : 77).

Also there are suggestions of mixing the first and third types to get these forms:-

(Q, Misapprehension, Clarification, Termination, and A) .Or (Q, Qi, Ai, Termination, and A) .

Text (16) :

Hamm :.....Why do you stay with me ? Q

Clov :Why do you keep me ? Qi

insertion sequences[

Hamm : There is no one else . Ai

Clov : There's nowhere else .

A

(Beckett,1958:14)

It is clear this is Schegloff's insertion sequences . The suggestion here is ' if you answer my question I'll answer yours.

Text (17) :

Nagg : It's lower down . In the hollow . (statement)

Nell : What hollow ?

(Misapprehension)

Nagg : The hollow ! (pause .) cyou not ?

(pause.) Yesterday you scratch me there . (clarification)

Nell : Ah yesterday ! (Termination)

(ibid:20).

In text (17) above it is Jefferson's misapprehension sequences . This is happened when there is something unclear needs clarification ('hollow ' is the unclear word).

Text (18) :

Hamm : Go and get the oilcan . (Request)

Clov :What for ? (Misapprehension)

Hamm : To oil the castors . (Clarification)

Clov : I oiled them yesterday . (Termination)
(pibid:32).

In this example there is Jefferson's misapprehension sequences of oiling something that has been oiled before . So the action has been done and no need to do it again .

Text (19) :
Hamm : Is it working ?(Pause .Impatiently.)The alarm is working?
(Q)

Clov : Why wouldn't it be working ?
(Qi)

Hamm : Because it's working too much .
(A)

Clov : but it's hardly working at all.
(A)
(Pibid:34).

This type is Schegloff's form (Q, Qi, Ai, A) ,in that if you answer my question I will answer yours.

Text (20) :
Hamm : What ?
(Q)

Clov : Who do you mean ,he ? (Misapprehension)

Hamm : Who do you mean ! Yet another . (Clarification)

Clov : Ah him ! I wasn't sure . (Termination)

Hamm : Crawling on belly , whining for bread for his drat. He's offered a job as gardener (continuation).
(ibid:40).

It is noticed in the text (20) above the absence of the answer for the Hamm's question "What". The form is Q ,Misapprehension ,Clarification, Termination , and Continuation .

Text (21) :

Clov : Oh ,by the way your story ? (Q)

Hamm : (Surprised) .What story ?
(Misapprehension)

Clov : The one you've been telling yourself all your
.....days . (Clarification)

Hamm : Ah you mean Chronicle ? (Termination)

Clov : That's the one . (Continuation)
(ibid:40).

The form in the text (21) above is Jefferson's misapprehension sequence .But instead of statement the sequence begins with question but there is no answer for this question .

In addition to all that there are certain cases in which the turns are not fit to any of those types of sequences as in :

Text (22) :

Clov : What ? (Q)

Hamm : Do you know what happened ? (Qi)

Clov : When ? Where ? (Q)

Hamm : When ! What's happened ! use your head
can't you !What has happened ? (Qi)

Clov : What for Christ's sake does it matter ? (Q)

Hamm : I don't know . (A) (ibid:47).

In the text (22) there are five questions one follows the other without answering any one but the last question .In this case it does not fit to any type of the above mentioned types of insertion sequences .

Text (23) :

Hamm : And the horizon ? Nothing on the horizon ?
(Q)

Clov: What in the God's name could there be on the horizon?
(Qi)
(Pause.)

Hamm : The waves , how are the waves ? (Q)
(ibid:26) .

The ordinary form to the text(23) above is question followed by answer, but it is ordinary to see questions are not followed by answers.

In that you may find a question followed by another question , for if you answer my question I will answer yours.

Table (4) Insertion Sequences

Types	Frequency	Causes	Percentage
Schegloff's Insertion Sequences	2	If you answer my question I will answer yours	0.253%
Jefferson's Sequence	-----		0%
Jefferson's Misapprehension sequences	2	To clarify something unclear	0.253%

Mixed types	2	To clarify or knowing something	0.253
Total	6		0.761%

3.5. Pre –Closing and Closing Sequences

To close a conversation is not always easy to determine precisely where closing signals begin . Pre-closing signals such as "well" ,"so" and "okay " used with falling intonation are among the signals given by each participant ,when she or he is ready to close the communication channel . Possible pre-closings indicate that a speaker has nothing more to add to the topic and he is willing to close the conversation . They include expressions like 'alright' ,'okay' ,'so' ,'anyway'. Clark and Clark (1977:231) propose another explanation to use of such pre-closing expression .They imply that the addresser may either require the addressee to introduce additional thing that has not been mentioned or he agrees to close the conversation . Consequently , a possible reply for such pre-closing might be 'okay' .

It seems that closing a conversation is more complicated and more elaborated than opening . It is more complicated since bringing a conversation to an end must be done by coordinated activities of participants , thus , closing a conversation is the process where one speaker's talk and will be regarded as some speaker's silence (Schegloff and Sacks,1973 : 139) .

Text (24) :

Hamm : In your kitchen ?

Clov : Yes .

Hamm:Out side of here it's death .(Pause.) All right .Be off (Exit Clov.
Pause.) We're going on.

Nagg : Me pap !

Hamm : Accursed propenitor ! (ibid:15).

Beckett uses "all right" as possible pre-closing a conversation after a pause . But he never uses the pre-closing or closing devices .This makes the speakers do not know where the conversation will be closed . For this, the silences or pauses are the expected thing to find because the transition relevance places are unknown for the speakers.

Text (25) :

Hamm : Sit on him .

Clov : I can't sit .

Hamm : True . And I can't stand .

Clov : So it is .

Hamm : Every man has his speciality (pause .) No phone calls
?(Pause.) Don't we laugh ?

Clov : I don't feel like it . (ibid:16).

In text (25) Beckett uses 'So' as possible pre-closing without adding any of pre-closing and closing devices . 'Speaker change recurs' which provides for the recurrent relevance of transition to a next speaker at any possible utterance completion point . To know the point at which the next speaker can choose and speak is very difficult in the case of absence of pre-sequence devices (possible pre-closing , pre-closing and closing sequence devices) .At this point and in the presence of these devices one can choose to talk .Absence of these devices will cause confusion to the participants in a conversation . Also in the absence of these devices may cause gaps and overlaps .Gaps and overlaps are the reasons behind absence of where the conversation will end . The change of speakers' turns occur at

transition relevance places in the presence of pre-sequence devices . So these devices are of great help for participants to know when to take the turn without gaps and overlaps .In case of absence of these devices there will be uncertainty and hence silences periods.This is also a case not of a real dialogue but a quasi-dialogue . These cases are clear in the table 5 below :-

Table (5) Pre-closing Devices

Types	Frequency	Causes	Percentage
Pre-closing devices	3	To close a topic	0.38%
Closing devices	-----	Absence of closing devices	0%
Total	3		0.38%

3.6. Topic and Topic Change

Sacks (1992:319) describe other classes of utterances or activities which have a proper place in a conversation but are to be done in some particular conversation in other than their proper place or an utterance (type) which has no particular proper place but is nonetheless 'out of place ' where it is to be done , may have their occurrence misplacement marked (e.g., By the way, my name is).

Mulcahy (2000:7) says that if a speaker or listener wants to change the topic there are certain phrases that can be used ,such as : 'That reminds me', 'By the way' , I'm sorry but can we change the subject ' .

Text (26) :

Clov : What is there to keep me here ?

Hamm : The dialogue (pause . I've got on with my story (pause.) I've got

on with it well (pause . Irritably.) Ask me where I've got to
Clov : Oh , by the way ,your story?

Hamm :Surprised What story ?

Clov : The one you've telling yourself all your ...days .
(Beckett,1958:40) .

The use of 'by the way ' is a desire to change the topic to another one. A topic is the subject of a conversational exchange . Utterances are used to introduce a topic often consists of a two –part structure . The first part introduces the topic and informs the listener about what they are going to be talking about and the second part is known as the comment , which is what we want to say about the topic (ibid.) .

There is a technique for 'closing down a topic ' that seems to be a formal technique for a class of topic types . The signals for closing down a topic are : 'Well', 'Ok', 'alright'....etc.(Sacks ,1992 : 306-7) .

Van Dijk (1983:202) points out the devices for topic change:

- 1- After a pause .
- 2- After a specific boundary or linking signals (yeah) .
- 3- By first introducing the major referent of the episode .
- 4- The major predicate or other participant .

Text (27) :

(Pause .)

Hamm : Apart from that , how do you feel ?

Clov : I don't complain .

Hamm : You feel normal ?

Clov : (Irritably) I tell you I don't complain !

Hamm : I feel a little queer (pause .) Clov !

Clov : Yes .

Hamm : Have you not had enough ?

Clov : Yes ! (Pause .) Of what ? (Beckett,1958:13)

.

Beckett uses here " Apart from that " as a device for topic change and before it there is a pause as signal of delay .

Text (28) :

(pause.)

Hamm : You're leaving me all the same .

Clov : I'm trying .

Hamm : You don't love me .

Clov : No .

Hamm : You loved me once .

Clov : Once .

Hamm : I've made you suffer too much (pause .) Haven't I ?

Clov : It's not that .

Hamm : (Relieved) .Ah you gave me a fright ! (pause . Coldly .)
Forgive

me (pause. Louder .) I said , forgive me .

Clov : I heard you (pause .) Have you bled ?

Hamm : Less. (Pause.) is not time for my pain –killer!

Clov : No .

(Pause.)

Hamm : How are your eyes ?

Clov : Bad.

(ibid:14).

Beckett uses pauses as the only device for topic change (the underlying pauses in the text 28 above) . Participants do not know where the conversation will be closed . This will arouse confusion about where the topic will begin or end (pre-closing sequence devices) . The absence of these devices will be one of the reasons for those pauses periods .Also the length of the turn will be not clear for the participants, hence ,the presence of the silences .

Text (29) :

Nell : Why this farce ,day after day ?

(Pause.)

Nagg : I've lost me tooth .

Nell : When ?

Nagg : I had it yesterday .

Nell :(Elegiac) Ah yesterday !

(They turn painfully toward each other)

Nagg : Can you see me ?

Nell: Hardly . And you ?

Nagg : What ?

Nell : Can you see me ?

Nagg : Hardly .

Nell: So much the better , so much the better .

Nagg : Don't say that (pause.) our sight has failed .

Nell : yes .

(pause .They turn away from each other .)

Nagg : Can you see me ?

Nell : Yes .And you ?

(ibid:18).

Through all the play Beckett uses just one device for topic change which is 'pause' (for topic boundary) . Also the use of pauses are due to the absence of pre-closing sequences . This is also because of the short turns make the participants in confusion of where the turn will end or closing down a conversation . The silences are the proper result for the absence of pre-closing and closing devices .This is clear in the table below :

Table (6) Topic and Topic- change

Types	Frequency	Causes	Percentage
Pre –topic change devices	2	Ordinary closing of topic the presence of these devices	0.253%
Topic change devices(pauses signal)	203	There is just on device is used here ,delay.	25.76%
Total	205		26%

3.7. Story Telling

For Sacks(as cited in Coulthard, 1985: 82) a story is any report of an event –it may be only one sentence long , but is usually longer ,and therefore presents a problem for any intending teller because other speakers are likely to self select at the first possible completion point . The intending story –teller therefore needs to seek a suspension of the usual turn –taking machinery and one way of achieving this is by a floor seeker or story –preface "Wanna hear a joke?" or "I was at police station this morning

The function of such utterances is to select not next speaker as usual in the turn –taking system , but next speaker but one, and to guarantee this speaker a stretch of uninterrupted talk in which to accomplish the story (ibid. :83).

Jefferson (1978) notes that one problem facing story teller is 'to display a relationship between the story and prior talk ' . 'Two devices ' are used a disjunct maker ' oh ' which shows that what is to come isn't directly related to what has been said ; the second device is embedded repetition (ibid.) .

Text (30):

Nagg : Let me tell it again ((Raconteur's voice .) An Englishman , needing a pair of striped trousers in hurry for the new year festivities , goes to his tailor who takes his measurements .(Tailor's voice) "That's the lot , come back in four days , I'll have it ready ". "Good . Four days later" . (Tailor's voice)" So sorry ,come back in a week I've made a mess of the seat ." Good ,that's all right , a neat seat can be very ticklish. A week later (Tailor's voice .) "Frightfully sorry , come back in ten days I've made a hash of the crutch is always a teaser.Ten days later . (Tailor's voice .) "dreadfully sorry , come back in a fortnight , I've made a balls of the fly ." Good ,at a pinch a smart fly is proposition

(p.21) .

The unfruitful story is circular and hopeless condition of participants in this play , Endgame . This repeated story is told by Nagg to pass time . This is clear of repeating the same story from Nell's speech "It's not funny " and Nagg's speech "It always made you laugh ." This reflects the routine life of those people and the idea that human being are habit lovers . Also it is similar to the circular form of the play.

This story begins with a story preface in Nagg's speech "Will I tell you the story of the tailor ?". The function of such utterance is to select not next speaker, but next speaker but one , and to guarantee this speaker will continue uninterrupted talk in which to accomplish the story.

The second story is told by Hamm . There is also a story – preface as in : "It is time for my story " , and "Do you want to listen to my story". But Clov's answer was "no . Hamm asks Clov to ask Nagg , " Ask my father if he wants to listen to my story " .This is the longest story in the play . It begins when Hamm interrupts Nagg . The story is as following:

Text (31) :

Na : One for me and one for-----

H : One ! Silence ! (Pause .) Where was I ? (Pause . Gloomily) It's finished , we're finished (pause .) Nearly finished . (Pause.) There'll be no more speech .(Pause.) Something dripping in my head ,ever since the fontanelles .(stifled hilarity of Nagg) Splash ,splash always on the same spot . (Pause .) Perhaps it's a little vein (pause.) A little artery . (pause . More animated.) Enough of that , it's story time , where was I ? (Pause. Narrative tone.) The man came crawling towards me , on his belly.pale, wonderfully pale and thin , he seemed on the point of ----(pause . Normal tone .) No , I've done that bit .(Pause .Narrative tone .) I calmly filled my pipe –the meerschaum, lit it with Let us say a vesta ,drew a few puffs,

Aah! (pause.) Well what is it you want ? (Pause.) It was an extraordinarily bitter day , I remember , zero by the thermometer .But consider it wasTill he reaches : "I'll soon have finished with this story .(Pause.) Unless I bring in other characters . (Pause.) But where would I look for them ? (Pause. He whistles .Enter Clov .) Let us pray to God " . (p.35).

Before this story begins Beckett uses the device of story – preface and before it ends he uses story –closing when Hamm says "I'll soon have finished with this story ", and " Let us pray to God". These two sentences are used as a signal to the characters that the story will end to resume the turn –taking mechanism .

In this play, and most of Beckett's plays, Beckett chooses his characters psychologically sick people .There is a case of 'delirium'. "Delirium is a temporary state in which individuals experience a clouding of consciousness ,in which they are unaware of what is happening around them and are unable to focus or pay attention , they experience cognitive changes , which their memory is foggy and they are disoriented . A person in a state of delirium may forget what he or she had eaten for lunch"(Halgin and Whitburne, 2000:37).

The speech of individuals experience delirium may be rambling incoherent as they shift from one topic to another . These individuals may also experience delusion , illusions or hallucinations , as well as emotional disturbances such as anxiety, euphoria, or irritability (ibid : 371) .

Another problem appears, in this play, may be called 'Expressive language disorder (communication disorder) which is a developmental disorder characterized by obvious problems of verbal expression .This may be evident in language style that includes using limited and faulty vocabulary , speaking in short sentences with simplified grammatical

structures ,omitting critical words or phrases ,and putting words together in particular order (ibid. : 352-354) .

An example which is taken from this play on pages (30-31). In this example , as Barnard(1971 : 107) says ,
 "And he [Hamm] ends this speech (which is a good example of the disordered thought of a schizophrenic)with the metaphor of the millet grains which has been quoted : " And all life long you wait for to mount up to a life ".

People with schizophrenia have disorganized and dysfunctional cognitive process that their thinking may lack cohesiveness and logic . Their language can be grossly distorted to the point of incomprehensibility . Attempting to communicate with a person who has a thought disorder is extremely perplexing (Halgin and Whitbourne , 2000:310).

Table (7) Story- Telling

Types	Frequency	Causes	Percentage
Story preface	2	To begin a story	0.253%
Without story preface	3	To tell an event or to keep the floor for a long time	0.38%
Total	5	Causes	0.634%
Total Turns	788	To begin a story	Percentage

Through this play there are 788 turns . The short turns are (one word turn) 99 turns . The long turns (more than two sentences) are 73 turns . The rest are (two and one sentences) 616 . Stories and very long turn are (with audiences)five and three soliloquies , as shown in table (8). It is clear here that Beckett uses his special way of writing which is absurd way of writing(his style).

Table (8) A Breakdown of Turn-Taking Occurrences in *Endgame*

Component of model	Frequency	Types	Causes	Percentage
Adjacency Pairs	394	Mostly question – answer or request – acceptance/refusal	To get information or to pass turns in a conversation	50%
Preference organization	175	Preferred and dispreferred seconds	To expect acceptance or refusal of something	22.20 %
Inserted sequences	6	Schegloff's insertion sequences or Jefferson's misapprehension sequences	To clarify or answering under condition e.t.c.	0.761 %
Pre-closing and closing sequences	3 -----	Possible pre-closing and closing sequences	To close a topic or absence of closing sequences	0.380 %
Topic and Topic change	205	(2) pre-topic change (203) topic – change (pause – signal)	Ordinary closing (presence of some devices) or the use of pause as topic – change signal	26%
Story Telling	5	Long and short stories	To pass time	0.634 %
Turn-Taking	788	Different types	conversation	100%

4. Results :

In this play ,Endgame , Beckett mostly uses turn –by –turn allocation technique . He also uses short turns (sometimes one word turns) the pauses within turns are due to hesitation and psychological disorder of the characters. Many critics mention that silences in Beckett's plays are important as the dialogue has meaning .Beckett uses special language and intentional dialogue . Sometimes there is no verb in Beckett turns . The pauses after turns are mostly used as a signal for topic change . Beckett rarely uses (twice) such devices as : "Apart from that" , and "Oh, by the way " and pauses as only devices as pre-topic change. Mostly all pauses are due to the absence of possible pre-closing and pre-closing devices .In adjacency pairs, Beckett uses question –answer as main type and request –acceptance /refusal . Beckett uses the other types less than the two types mentioned above .The answers within question –answer are unpredictable . Beckett does not use dispreferred organization devices and if uses them , he just uses the pauses (or delay) as dispreferred signal . But he sometimes uses the pauses in the opposite way . He may use the pauses but after these pauses there is acceptance not refusal (as in the text, A,B,C,D,E).

It is worth noticing that many critics, as Barnard, see Beckett's characters as sick people (e.g. Hamm as a schizophrenic patient). The soliloquies in the play are signal for the inner –conflict and thinking disorder of the characters (Beckett, 1958:45).

There are not many cases of overlaps. It is clear that Hamm who is talking in vain . He wants to pass time and also keeps Clov with him. He tells stories (ibid: 35-37) and gives orders or asks questions to keep Clov moving . Hamm's can't see so he uses Clov's eyes to see the world . He can't move but he keeps Clov moving as his servant. Nagg and Nell are Hamm's parents They add more confusion to the play. The dialogue is quasi-dialogue which is clear through the split dialogue used by Beckett here .

Beckett cannot overlook all turn –taking rules but he has his special way of introducing these rules . The first play supports the hypothesis of the present study , Silences and overlaps occur for the absence of possible completion (i.e. the end of a turn). This happens in conversation of a turn –by turn allocation system, as it is clear in this play, Endgame.

5. Conclusions

The results of the analysis have come out the following conclusions:

1- Beckett uses turn-by-turn allocation system .He mostly uses question-answer type of adjacency pairs (Table-2), and then request-acceptance/refusal (Table-2) etc. This supports the both hypotheses of the present study (the use of the turn-by-turn allocation system which causes pressure on other participants waiting to speak. .

2-Most of Beckett's turns are of short turns (Table -1) . This is due to the Psychological case of Beckett's characters (Delirium and Schizophrenia). Sometimes these short turns are just one word turns (this comes from the interest Beckett has in brain disorder patients) .This also causes pressure on the participants which supports the both hypotheses of this study.

3- The only device used by Beckett for dispreferred second is delay (or pause) but sometimes he may use the pause signal in opposite way (in preferred not dispreferred) (Table -3) and dispreferred (the same table). This also supports the hypotheses of the present study .

4- Concerning the insertion sequences, Beckett uses Schegloff's insertion sequence Q, Qi, Ai, A (Table-4) and Jefferson's side sequences (the same table). And he uses less Jefferson's misapprehension sequences(the same table). So the main type used here is Schegloff's insertion sequences.

5- Beckett seldom uses possible pre-closing and pre-closing devices (the possible pre-closing (Table-5). But he does not use closing

devices. For this there is uncertainty about the turns and length of the turns and also the boundary of the turns. As a result of this, rather absence of pre-closing and closing devices, there are many cases of silences after turns at the possible transition places (Tables 1). This supports the first hypothesis of the present study.

6- Beckett rarely uses pre-topic change devices (Table -6) , but he uses pauses signals as topic-change device many times (the same table). This explains why there are many cases of pauses at the end of each topic. Also this supports the first hypothesis.

7- Stories are long turns for passing time in the selected Play. Beckett hardly ever uses story-preface devices (Table-7), and stories without story-preface (the same table).

Short turns are used by Beckett more than other types. So this proves the use of turn-by-turn allocation system in both plays. (see tables 1). The only device used in both plays for preference organization is the ' pause' or silence (see tables 3) .This supports the both hypotheses of the present study .

There are no possible pre-closing and pre-closing devices used in this play (Endgame) the writer uses these devices in a few cases (see table 5). So as a result of the rather absence of those devices is uncertainty and confusion which will lead to silence periods. This supports the hypothesis of this research.

Also the only device for topic-change signals is the ' pause' also. This also supports the first hypothesis of this study.

8- Most of those results support the both hypotheses of the present study concerning the reason behind the presence of many cases of silences in Beckett's play (Endgame) . The reason of uncertainty of turns is rather absence of possible completion devices at the transition relevance places at which turn-role changes between speaker and hearer and the use of only pause device as topic-change signal .

Bibliography

- Alvarez ,A. (1973) Beckett Glasgow : William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd., .
- Atckison, Maxwell and John heritage (1984) Structures of Social Action , Studies in Conversation Analysis Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- Barnard , G.C. (1971) Samuel Beckett A new Approach London : J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.,.
- Beckett, Samuel (1958) End game London : Longman.
- Clark, Herbert H. and Clark Eve V.(1977) Psychology and Language An Introduction to Psycholinguistics New York Harcourt B Race Jovanovich ,Inc.
- Coulthard ,Malcolm (1985) An Introduction to Discourse Analysis London : Longman Group Limited.
- Crystal, David (1997) A Dictionary of Linguistic and Phonetics Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Edminson ,W.(ed.) (1981) Spoken Discourse :A Model for Analysis . California: Longman Inc.
- Goodwin, Charles (1981) "The Interactive Construction of a Sentence in Natural Conversation " G.Pstathas (ed.) In Everyday Language : studies in Ethnomethodology New York : Irvington Publishers .
- Gussow, Mel (1996) Conversations with and about Beckett New York : Grove Press.
- Halgin, Richard and Susan Krass Whitebourne(2000) Abnormal Psychology Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies , Inc.
- Hatch , C. (2000) Discourse and Language Education .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J.(1985)"Recent Development in Conversation Analysis". In Sociolinguistics. Vol.6, No.1 .
- Levinson, Stephen (1983) Pragmatics Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- Mulcahy, Fiona (2000) "Helping Higher Level Students to Participate More Naturally In Conversation " Seville : Pilgrims Ltd., . London : Longman .

- Conversational Analysis in Beckett's "Endgame".....(62)**
- Robinson , Michael (1969) *The Long Sonata of Dead* London :Rupert Hart-Davis.
- Sacks, Harvey and E. Schegloff (1992) *Lectures on Conversation* (vol. II)Oxford :Black Well Publishers.
- and Emanuel Schegloff(1973) " Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons in Conversation and their Interaction " Oxford : Backwell.
- Schegloff, Emanuel (1999a) " Sequencing in Conversational Opening " Los Angeles : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. .
- (1999b) "Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation "Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- (1999c) " What Next?: Language and Social Interaction Study at the Century's Turn" Los Angeles :Lawrence Erlbaum Associates ,Inc .
- (1999d) *On Talk its Institutional Occasions* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .