4.1 Preliminaries

In this chapter, structural equivocation of absurd drama is analyzed through the use of the context. Thus, this chapter illustrates context in terms of definitions, types, and features. It states the general role of context in getting the meaning of the message across. This is because

Many statements are ambiguous in isolation but clear in context or are amenable to logical analysis . . . In conversation, ambiguity can usually be resolved by asking, 'What do you mean, X or Y?', but in reading there is no one to ask and, unless the term is marked so as to designate the meaning intended, it may be impossible to distinguish one meaning from another" (McArthur, 1992: 33).

In 'The Caretaker', Davies tells Aston about what had happened to him before they met on the road "I came all the way down here, look, I said, I showed him these" (P. 14). In such sentences, it is said that the context of the utterance plays a vital role in clarifying 'What is meant by 'him', 'here', and 'these', etc.? etc. Löbner (2002: 47) opines that when it comes to interpreting words and sentences in their contexts, i.e., when one proceeds from the level of expression meaning to the level of utterance meaning, the meanings of words and sentences may be modified. Thus, there are many questions that may come to mind concerning the benefit of the context to understand the message, such as 'How can the addressee(s) understand which meaning is intended in the addressee's message?', 'Was the message encoded in a certain context?', and 'Is it useful for the addressee(s) to know what the context is, and how?'
4.2 Context

Language has to be appropriate to the external circumstances in which it is used. These circumstances have been an important means of interpretation of speech. They are traditionally referred to as the 'context'. Hartmann and Stork (1972: 104) define context as:

Those features of the external world in relation to which an utterance or text has meaning. The notions of context and situation…account for the way that verbal and graphic symbols represent the world around the speaker….Alternative terms: environment, context of situation.

In this respect, Crystal (2003 a: 103-4) supports the above definition by indicating that context is a term referring to the features of the non-linguistic world in relation to which linguistic units are systematically used. The term 'situation' is also used in this sense, as in the compound term 'situational context', which is also an alternative term. Cresswell (1988: 66) states that a context is a situation. The term 'context of situation', as viewed by Crystal (2003 a: 104), is a specific term in Firthian linguistic theory, derived from the work of the anthropologist Malinowski, in which it refers to the whole set of external-world features considered to be relevant in the analysis of an utterance at these levels. The various alternative terms are used in this work, and the main reason for this is that there is no agreement upon a kind of terminology among the linguists, and it can be a way for embellishing or decorating the explanations. The researcher prefers 'context of situation' since it combines the two terms.
Brown and Yule (1983: 35) state that "Since the beginning of the 1970s, linguists have become increasingly aware of the importance of context in the interpretation of sentences." This importance has been stated clearly through different definitions of pragmatics. Levinson (1983: 9) writes "Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language."

Similarly, Hatim and Mason (1990: 59) define pragmatics as the study of relations between language and its context of utterance. Leech (1983: 6) defines it by using 'situation' as a term for context: "the study of meaning in relation to speech situations." Moreover, the kind of meaning that is formed as a result of "the relation between an utterance and the situation in which it is used is called CONTEXTUAL or SITUATIONAL MEANING" (Hartmann and Stork, 1972: 138).

4.3 Features of Context

In a communicative situation there are at least two persons: one is an actual agent, and another is a possible agent, i.e. an addressee and an addresser, respectively (Van Dijk, 1977: 191). According to Hymes [cited in Brown and Yule, 1983: 38], there are features of context which may be relevant to the identification of a type of speech event. Crystal (2003 a: 427) defines a 'speech event' as "a communicative exchange made meaningful by culturally-specific structures of participants, genres, CODES and other elements." Gumperz and Hymes (1972: 56) opine that the term 'speech event' is restricted to the activities which are directly conducted by rules or norms for the use of speech. They affirm that an event may consist of a single speech act or several ones, for example, when the word 'five', which is a single word,
is uttered in a proper context of situation it may be the whole of a speech event, because it is the only utterance.

However, the main features or components of context are the 'addresser', 'addressee' as well as the 'subject-matter'. The addresser is the speaker or writer who produces the utterance. The addressee is the hearer or reader who is the receiver of the utterance. The subject-matter is the topic that can be described as the essential vehicle that relates the addresser and addressee to each other in a mutual interaction.

As mentioned by Hymes (Ibid), other features of context can usefully be added as follows 'the audience' (over hearers), 'setting' (time and place), 'channel' (the message is carried out through speech, writing, singing, smoke signals), 'code' (what language, or dialect, or style of language is being used), 'message form' (what form is intended-chat, debate, sermon, fairy-tale, sonnet, love letter, etc.), 'key' (which involves evaluation, e.g. was it a good sermon), and finally 'purpose' (which involves the participants' intention of what should come about as a result of a communicative event).

There are many other features of context of situation that seem significant and indicative in the interpretation of a message. Gee (1999: 63) calls these features 'aspects' and adds other ones, such as 'activity aspect' (The specific social activity or activities the participants are engaging in), 'socio-cultural aspect' (The personal, social, and cultural knowledge, feelings, values, identities, and relationships relevant in the interaction), 'political aspect' (The distribution of 'social goods' in the interaction, such as, power, status and anything else deemed a 'social good' by the participants in terms of their cultural models, e.g. beauty, intelligence, strength, possessions, race, gender, etc.). Typically, all these features play an important and significant role in determining the
intended meaning of the message encoded by the addressee in any form.

4.4 The Role of Context

Generally speaking, the linguistic and physical contexts of situation are vital to understand the intended meaning of the expression regardless of its type. In this realm, Hymes [cited in Wootton, 1975: 44] states that:

The use of a linguistic form identifies a range of meanings. A context can support a range of meanings. When a form is used in a context it eliminates the meanings possible to that context other than those the form can signal: the context eliminates from consideration the meanings possible to the form other than those the context can support.

Hymes views the role of context in the interpretation of a text through two intimate ways: it limits the range of possible interpretations (i.e. meanings), and also supports the intended interpretation. This can clearly be seen in the above example of the homonymous word 'dyke', whose linguistic and physical contexts can limit the possible meanings and support the intended one. However, one can say that a text may not be interpreted without the knowledge of context of situation in which it is used. The following diagram demonstrates how the meanings of a message narrow from the wider range to the closer one. Each ring represents a particular interpretation that may come across the addressee's mind when deciphering the message encoded by an addressee.
O'Toole (1992: 14) states that context is the situation that comprises the characters who interact with each other and their physical, social, and cultural environment. Thus, context is an inevitable matter because of its importance in forming and interpreting of any message.

### 4.5 Types of Context

There are cases where the addressee has the opportunity to ask for further clarification or elaboration about the communication that is taking place if the speaker and listener are communicating face to face. There are many examples in the plays where the addressee asks the addresser for further explanation about their conversation.
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4.5.1 Stenning's Classification

In addition to the definition of the term 'word' in Chapter II which performs as a reminder here, Champers English Dictionary defines 'word' as "a unit of spoken language: written sign representing such an utterance." 'What does the written sign mean?' It apparently refers to the written letters that they are usually used by the speakers of a certain language to represent their language. The question that may come now to the mind of the reader is as follows 'Is a spoken language the same as a written one?' The answer for this question is simply 'no' because this requires two different contexts for the communication to take place. Stenning [cited in Brown and Yule, 1983: 42] distinguishes between 'normal context' and 'abnormal context'.

4.5.1.1 Normal Context

The 'normal context' refers to the situation where the hearer is part of the context and then experiences the text. This means that the addressee is physically present in the linguistic spot where the text is taking place and he/she can normally experience the text and understand what it is about. So, the spoken language usually occurs in a 'normal context'.

4.5.1.2 Abnormal Context

The 'abnormal context' refers to the situation where the analyst reads the text and then has to try to provide the characteristics of the context in which the text might have occurred. Thus, the written language exists in an 'abnormal context'. Such written language can be embodied in the different forms of a drama, novel, story, personal letter, etc.
4.5.2 Yule's Classification

On the other hand, Yule (1996 a: 129) indicates that there are different kinds of context to be considered. The first kind is best described as linguistic context. The second kind of context is called 'physical context'.

4.5.2.1 Linguistic Context

The linguistic context is also known as co-text, which refers to the set of other words used in the same phrase or sentence. This surrounding linguistic context has an indicative and vital effect on what the word actually means. The word 'dyke', for example, is homonymous. How does the addressee know which meaning is intended in a particular message? If the word 'dyke' is used in a sentence together with words like 'woman', 'excitement', etc., the addressee may not have a problem deciding which the meaning is intended.

4.5.2.2 Physical Context

The physical context refers to the place where communication is occurring. It refers to how the location, where language is used, perks up our understanding. If the addressee, for instance, encounters the same word 'dyke' on a wall, a building or a machine close an area of water, this physical position usually points to the addressee which sense is designated.

4.5.3 Cutting's Classification

Cutting (2008: 4-7) classifies context in a more detailed manner. It deals with the meaning of the language in context-the physical and
social world-and assumptions of knowledge that the speaker and the hearer share. He states that there are three types of contexts to be observed for the analysis of meaning:

- The situational context
What speakers know about what they can see around them;
- The background knowledge context
What they know about each other and the world;
- The co-textual context
What they know about what they have been saying.

The following is a conversation between DM, an English man, and AF, a Scottish woman. DM went to hill walking in Arran, an island off the west coast of Scotland. As far as this conversation is concerned, Cutting tries to exemplify how the speech can occur in the three types of contexts:

AF: So you went to Arran. A bit of a come-down isn't it!
DM: It was nice actually. Have you been to Arran?
AF: No I've not. I like to go.
DM: Did a lot of climbing.
AF: (heh)
DM: I went with Francesca and David.
AF: Uhuh?
DM: Francesca's room-mate. And Alice's, a friend of Alice's from London. There were six of us. Yeah we did a lot of hill walking. We got back er Michelle and I got home she looked at her knees. They were like this. Swollen up like this. Cos we did this enormous eight-hour stretch.
AF: Uhuh
4.5.3.1 Situational Context

The situational context is the immediate physical co-presence. That is, it is the situation where the interaction is taking place at the moment of speaking. If one examines the example above of the hill-walking in Arran, he/she will see that there is an example of words taking meaning in the situational context: "There were like this. Swollen up like this." The speaker (DM) must be holding his hands open and rounded to show what Michelle's knees looked like. That is, it is not by chance that DM uses the words 'like this' because it is a demonstrative pronoun, used to point to something that both the addressee and the addressee can see (Ibid). The same thing can be found in Beckett's play when Vladimir says "It's this bastard Pozzo at it again" (P. 94). He must be pointing to Pozzo while talking. If one examines the following conversation, he/she will find that Estragon is referring to what he sees around him. It is not by chance that he uses the demonstrative pronoun by saying "this bloody thing" (P. 3) because he must be pointing to his boot which hurts his feet:

VLADIMIR: (gloomily). It's too much for one man. (Pause. Cheerfully.) On the other hand what's the good of losing heart now, that's what I say. We should have thought of it a million years ago, in the nineties.

ESTRAGON: Ah stop blathering and help me off with this bloody thing. (P. 3)

In the following example, one can understand that Pozzo is pointing with his whip while he is speaking:
POZZO: A little attention, if you please. (Vladimir and Estragon continue their fiddling, Lucky is half asleep. Pozzo cracks his whip feebly.) What's the matter with this whip? (He gets up and cracks it more vigorously, finally with success. Lucky jumps. Vladimir's hat, Estragon's boot, Lucky's hat, fall to the ground. Pozzo throws down the whip.) Worn out, this whip. (He looks at Vladimir and Estragon.) What was I saying? (P. 37-8)

There are examples of situational context in 'The Caretaker', as when Davies talks about his meeting with the monk:

DAVIES: . . . I said to this monk, here, I said, look here, mister, he opened the door, big door, he opened it, look here, mister, I said, I come all the way down here, look, I said, I showed him these, I said, you haven't got a pair of shoes, have you, a pair of shoes, I said, enough to keep me on my way. Look at these, they're nearly out, I said, they're not good tome. I heard you got a stock of shoes here. Piss off, he said to me . . . (P. 14)

As is shown above, he uses "look here", "look", "I showed him these", and "Look at these". They refer either to his torn shoes or to his feet. Most probably they refer to his feet because if one looks back on the previous text, one can find that Davies uses the phrase "a pair of shoes" to refer to his shoes, and this means it is singular for him. He must be using his hands in this context to refer to his feet or extending his legs before the monk.

As there are many verbal assaults between the two brothers one side and the intruder 'Davies' on the other side, they use the word 'here'
to refer to the place where their conversation is taking place which is most probably the room where Aston and Davies live, for example:

ASTON: I think . . . think it's about time you found somewhere else. I don't think we're hitting it off.
DAVIES: Find somewhere else?
ASTON: Yes.
DAIVES: Me? You better find somewhere else!
DAVIES: Don't I? well, I live here. I been offered a job here.
ASTON: Yes . . . well, I don't think you're really suitable.
DAVIES: Not suitable? Well, I can tell you, there's someone here thinks I am suitable . . . (P. 68)

This conversation takes place between a number of pauses and silence. The word 'here' is mentioned four times, all of which refer to the room where both of them live. They may use their hands to denote their territory as if it were a conflict between two animals of different sorts for dominating some territory. This situational context shows the readers a kind of clash between two different generations. The young generation is represented by Aston and his brother Mick. On the other hand, Davies represents the old generation which cannot coexist with the young one and admit the changes of the modern society. He also hints at such a difference when he says many times says that he is an old man, "Waking an old man up in the middle of the night" (P. 66). This situational context gives the audience the idea that Davies is not the caretaker, but he is the person whom somebody else should take care of. Thus, the title, as it has been shown in another place in this
study, is ironic because it contrasts the reality of the characters in the course of the play.

On the other hand, if somebody looks at the following example, he/she may object to the above interpretation of the play:

DAVIES: This the bed here, is it?
ASOTN: (moving to the bed). We'll get rid of all that. The ladder'll fit under the bed. (They put the ladder under the bed.)
DAVIES: (indicating the sink). What about this?
ASTON: I think that'll fit in under here as well.
DAVIES: I'll give you a hand. (They lift it.) It's a ton weight, en't?
ASTON: Under here.
DAVIES: This in use at all, then?
ASONT: No. I'll be getting rid of it. Here.
*The place the sink under the bed.* . . . (P. 18)

The situational and linguistic contexts of the conversation discloses that the two characters Aston and Davies have a kind of cooperation at the beginning of the play when they help each other to re-arrange the 'here' that refers to Aston's room for the new guest Davies. They even talk to one another about their personal problems which are mainly about the female gender such as mother, wife or a prostitute of the café. But this situation does not last long in the play because it is expected by most of the audiences/readers that one of the trio would be killed by the end of the play because of the menace, misunderstanding, selfishness, and fraud of one character against the other. Davies cannot understand the needs, desires, and dreams of the new generation represented by Mick and Aston. After receiving him in his room and giving him many
things, Aston is surprised and disappointed by Davies' verbal and physical assault against him. Mick does not like outsiders such as Davies and tries his best to push him away by using all sorts of deceptions.

The situational context is used by the characters to refer to certain things around them on the stage (e.g. by using demonstratives or adverbs). It is also used to refer to something outside the stage, which the imagination of the audience/readers is drawn to, as in the following example:

ROS: We are sent for.
GUIL: Yes.
ROS: That's why we're here. (He looks round, seems doubtful, then the explanation.) Travelling.
ROS: (dramatically) : It was urgent—a matter of extreme urgency, a royal summons, his very words: official business and no questions asked . . . our guides outstripped in breakneck pursuit of our duty! Fearful lest we come too late!!

Small pause.
GUIL: Too late for what?
ROS: How do I know? We haven't got there yet.
GUIL: Then what are we doing here. I ask myself. (P. 19-20)

The word 'here' that is used by Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (once by each) refers to the place where both of them exist, i.e., it refers to the stage where the whole play is to be performed by the characters. The stage is a symbol of life and the characters performing on the stage are the people. It also refers to the road where they are travelling from
Germany to Denmark, "That's why we're here. (He looks round, seems doubtful, then the explanation.) Travelling" (P. 19). The word 'there' refers to the Danish court where the Tragedians want to perform different plays, and where the duo have to meet the royal family- Claudius says "To draw him on to pleasures, and to gather So much as from occasion you may glean . . . unknown afflicts him" (P. 36). Therefore, travelling on the road from 'here' to 'there' symbolizes the shift from innocence (where they are innocent and trustworthy friends to Hamlet) to guilt (where they spy and participate in a conspiracy of killing him). It is something that is even realized by Guildenstern himself when he tells the Player, "He doesn't give much away" (P. 67).

When Guildenstern asks him "what have you got?" (P.31) the Player simply uses non-verbal communication by silently bringing Alfred forward. Thus, the Player's movement indicates that 'Alfred is all what they have'. This movement is understood by Guildenstern who regards Alfred sadly and says "Was it for this?" (P. 31) and the Player answers "It's the best we've got" (P. 31). The situational context indicates that the pronoun 'it' that is used by the Player and then by Guildenstern most probably refers to the boy 'Alfred' and the demonstrative 'this' in Guildenstern's question refers to 'money' used for betting. The Player's movement of bringing the boy into the scene before Guildenstern confirms this interpretation.

When Gertrude meets the duo, she says "I beseech you instantly to visit My too much changed son. Go, some of you, And bring these gentlemen where Hamlet is" (P. 37). There must be a number of attendants entering the stage with her and Claudius to meet the duo. That is why she says "some of you". At the beginning of Act III, when the duo are on the boat Rosencrantz asks "In out here?" (P. 100). Parry (1984: 30) explains this question:
'somebody might come in' suggests the stage of an enclosed theatre (where the actors who play Rosencrantz and Guildenstern really are); 'out here' suggests the open air and the open sea (where Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are supposed to be). 'In out here?' combines both suggestions.

Although the absurd plays have been described by many critics for being pieces of nonsense or include non-sequiturs, they are full of symbols for man's social life. In their actions and speech, Beckett's duo, for example, try to address the people with whom they share the same background and cultural knowledge:

VLADIMIR: Let us not waste our time in idle discourse! (Pause. Vehemently.) Let us do something, while we have the chance! It is not every day that we are needed. Not indeed that we personally are needed. Others would meet the case equally well, if not better. To all mankind they were addressed, those cries for help still ringing in our ears! But at this place, at this moment of time, all mankind is us, whether we like it or not. Let us make the most of it, before it is too late! (P. 90)

Stoppard uses his characters to address the audience/readers and let them pay some attention to their future. For example, when the Player talks too excessively about death, Rosencrantz, while looking out over the audience, starts to address them, by saying "Rings a bell" and Guildenstern immediately replies, "They're waiting to see what we're going to do" (P.85), and "Never a moment's peace! In and out, on and off, they're coming to us from all sides" (P.73). In the following
quotation, the word 'bog' is given different interpretations in this research, one of which is that Beckett addresses the audience because he is "turning towards auditorium" while he is talking:

    ESTRAGON: In my opinion we were here.
    VLADIMIR: (looking round). You recognize the place?
    ESTRAGON: I didn't say that.
    VLADIMIR: Well?
    ESTRAGON: That makes no difference.
    VLADIMIR: All the same . . . that tree . . . (turning
towards auditorium) that bog . . .
    ESTRAGON: You're sure it was this evening? (P. 9)

Before that, Beckett's duo seem to do the same matter as when Estragon looks on the space around him. His "gesture towards the universe" while wondering "This one is enough for you?" can mean that he is addressing the audience watching the play on the stage:

    ESTRAGON: I dreamt that—
    VLADIMIR: DON'T TELL ME!
    ESTRAGON: (gesture toward the universe). This one is
    enough for you? (Silence.) It's not nice of you, Didi. Who
    am I to tell my private nightmares to if I can't tell them to
    you?
    VLADIMIR: Let them remain private. You know I can't
    bear that. (P. 10)

4.5.3.2 Background Knowledge Context

    Cutting (2008) states that this type of context is of the assumed
    background knowledge shared by the speaker and the hearer. This
knowledge is either cultural or interpersonal. Knowing this knowledge is an important factor for understanding the conversation conducted between the participants.

4.5.3.2.1 The Cultural Knowledge

The cultural knowledge is the general knowledge that is shared by most of the people of a particular location or interest. In the hill-walking-in Arran excerpt mentioned above, the two interlocutors 'AF and DM' share the same cultural background knowledge about the low mountains on the island. That is why AF does not appear surprised that DM and his friends went 'hill walking', that they could walk for eight hours there, or that the walk was strenuous enough to make somebody's knees swell. As long as the interlocutors establish that they are part of the same cultural group, they can assume the same cultural knowledge. In the case of the hill-walking in Arran, the community of people who could be assumed to know about these hills are the British people, or people who have visited or studied the British isles.

Let us now ask this question about 'Waiting for Godot': 'Who do those two thieves in the story refer to?' Before answering this question, one should remember that most of Beckett's spectators were Christians living mainly in Europe and America. This means that they share almost the same cultural background knowledge. The two thieves could be the two tramps Estragon and Vladimir because one of them 'Estragon' seems to be the damned one in the story. He lost his good memory while Vladimir seems to be physically more powerful in the whole play. Moreover, Estragon says "I'm accursed!" (P. 82) and consequently "I'm in hell" (P. 83). He even explains to Pozzo the essential difference between him and Vladimir by saying, "He has
stinking breath and I have stinking feet" (P. 50). Robinson (1969: 249) explains that

Vladimir's preoccupation, which is mental, and Estragon's, which is physical, are reflected in the distinct smells which disgust Pozzo. Of the two Vladimir thinks more and is therefore more eloquent: his anguish is intellectual. Consequently he appears to be the stronger . . . assures Estragon they are in the right place . . . dispenses the food . . more cultured than his companion: he quotes Latin and searches his memory for the correct word, who tries to make polite conversation with Pozzo.

So, Estragon could be the damned thief who was crucified with Jesus. His damnation is represented not only in his loss of memory but also in his problem of hearing. He forgets a lot of things and Vladimir is the one who is used to remind him of his conditions. This means that Vladimir's memory is well:

VLADIMIR: Because he wouldn't save them.
ESTRAGON: From hell?
VLADIMIR: Imbecile! From death.
ESTRAGON: I thought you said hell.
VLADIMIR: From death, from death. (P. 7).

The following is a simple picture of the real life of the disillusioned man who thinks

We've no rights any more? ESTRAGON said.
Laugh of Vladimir, stifled as before, less the smile.
VLADIMIR: You'd make me laugh if it wasn't prohibited.
ESTRAGON: We've lost our rights?
VLADIMIR: (distinctly). We got rid of them. (P. 17)

In Vladimir's last statement, one can see that he consciously tries to adopt an importance that he does not possess (Robinson, 1969: 257). The equivocation of this exchange of ideas signifies that the man's opinions and situations about the world in which he exists differ. It denotes a political reference to the situation of the world in the twentieth century. It may refer to the absurdity of the human beings who lost their lives, houses, properties during the World War I and II and thus they have started to think that they have no rights any more. It may also refer to the death of his father and his sweetheart. In 1933 when Hitler became powerful, Beckett was in Dublin and this was the beginning of very hard period of Beckett's mental breakdown because his great love Peggy died from tuberculoses that year, and soon Beckett's father had a massive heart attack, which totally overwhelmed him (See Navratilova, 1999). Vladimir's statement is also true if one remembers that the people in some European countries elected their governments, i.e., they gave their votes to the politicians who pushed their own people in wars and destruction. Subsequently, this makes many people think about committing suicide or wish to be killed like billions of the other people because "We have our reasons", Vladimir said. The pronoun 'We' refers to the human beings who become "All the dead voices", Estragon says. It can be indicated in their dialogue:

ESTRAGON: It'd be better if we parted.
VLADIMIR: You always say that and you always come crawling back.
ESTRAGON: The best thing would be to kill me, like the other.
VLADIMIR: What other? (Pause.) What other?
ESTRAGON: Like billions of others. (P. 68)

Beckett introduces many references about World War I and II when politicians were talking about horrible theories that led the entire world toward destruction for half a century:

VLADIMIR: (controlling himself). About what?
ESTRAGON: Oh . . . this and that I suppose, nothing in particular. (With assurance.) Yes, now I remember, yesterday evening we spent blathering about nothing in particular. That's been going on now for half a century. (P. 73)

The phrase "for half a century" is not randomly used by Beckett. It could be a symbol for the two world wars which occurred within the first half of the twentieth century. Beckett tries to differentiate between the present by using the word now and the past by using the word yesterday. The use of the commas to separate the two tenses is also important for he wants to substantiate the difference. The word yesterday refers to the past time when the wars took place and the word evening refers to the unfriendly atmosphere or the gloom of the people. The use of the pronoun 'we' not only refers to the speaker himself and his friends, it could also be used to refer to the people who underwent the outcomes of the wars.
One example of the general knowledge that is shared by Pinter's characters' Davies and Mick and it is of a particular interest is when they talk about services:

MICK: Well, I could see before, when you took our that knife, that you wouldn't let anyone mess you about.
DAVIES: No one messes me about, man.
MICK: I mean, you've been in the services. You can tell by your stance.
DAVIES: Oh . . . yes. Spent half my life there, man. Overseas . . . like . . . serving . . . I was.
MICK: In the colonies, weren't you?
DAVIES: I was over there. I was one of the first over there.
MICK: That's it. You're just the man I been looking for.

The services that they talk about are most probably the services in the British military during the World War II, when people of certain age were forced to join the army and get trained. They don't mention this matter clearly because they share the same cultural background knowledge. There are other words mentioned in the conversation that support this interpretation such as 'overseas' and 'colonies'. However, the conversation is very ironic because Mick tries to conceal his opinion about Davies' timid personality and equivocate his future plans to push him outside. What is more ironic is that Mick is a young man and this means that he is physically stronger than the old man, Davies. He even kicks Davies at the end of Act I and scares him in the middle of Act II but now in this situation he flatters Davies' ability to use the knife and pretends to be afraid of Davies.
4.5.3.2.2 The Interpersonal Knowledge

Interpersonal knowledge is the knowledge that is shared by the interlocutors. It is the specific and possibly private knowledge about the history of the speakers themselves. "Shared interpersonal knowledge is knowledge acquired through previous verbal interactions or joint activities and experience, and it includes privileged personal knowledge about the interlocutor" (Cutting, 2008: 6). In the hill-walking excerpt, one can see that AF and DM know who 'Michelle' is. This is an example of the interpersonal context. AF might have been told where 'home' is. She might also have actually been to DM's 'home' and learned quite a lot about Michelle (Ibid).

In the following example, the pronoun 'him' is a kind of an exophoric reference that is misguidedly introduced in this conversation by Estragon and it is not related to the noun 'Pozzo' that is introduced before by Vladimir. The impact of the interpersonal knowledge about the theme of waiting on Estragon makes him confused and hence he irrelevantly uses the pronoun 'him' to refer to Godot rather than Pozzo. He thinks about nothing but Godot and this is an example of violation of the CP maxims, which shows the confusion of man in modern society:

POZZO: Pity!
VLADIMIR: Poor Pozzo!
ESTRAGON: I knew it was him.
VLADIMIR: Who?
ESTRAGON: Godot.
VLADIMIR: But it's not Godot.
ESTRAGON: It's not Godot?
VLADIMIR: It's not Godot.
ESTRAGON: Then who is it?
VLADIMIR: It's Pozzo. (P. 88)

Similarly, in Pinter's 'The Caretaker' the pronoun 'him' is an exaophoric referent that Davies introduces in his conversation. It most probably refers to his boss in the café where he used to work:

DAVIES: All them Greek had it, Poles, Greeks, Blacks, the lot of them, all them aliens had it. And they had me working there . . . they had me working . . . All them Blacks had it, Blacks, Greeks, Poles, the lot of them, that's what, doing me out of a seat, treating me like dirt. When he came to me tonight I told him. (P. 8)

Although the word 'boss' and 'café' are not mentioned in the above conversation, the shared interpersonal knowledge that is acquired in the previous conversations gives Aston the ability to infer whom the pronoun 'him' refers to. It does not at all refer to Mick because at this point in the course of drama, Davies knows nothing about him and then he gets surprised and startled when he is taken down by Mick.

When Mick sees Davies in the room at the beginning of Act II, he tells Davies, "Watch your step, sonny! You're knocking at the door when no one's at home" (P. 38). Mick's statement is a reaction to Davies' action of looking into the bags in the room when he has been left alone. It shows Mick's resentment of Davies and "knocking at the door" in this interpersonal context means searching into the bags without permission from the owner of the house.

In Stoppard's play, there are examples of the shared interpersonal knowledge, e.g. when Gertrude (with Claudius) enters the stage and
immediately asks the duo about Hamlet, she uses the pronoun 'him' rather than the name because she relies on the interpersonal knowledge shared with the duo:

GERTRUDE: Did he receive you well?
ROS: Most like a gentleman.
GUIL (returning in time to take it up) : But with much forcing of his disposition.
ROS (a flat lie and he knows it and show it, perhaps catching Guil's eye) : Niggard of question, but of our demands most free his reply.
GERTRUDE: Did you assay him to any pastime? (P. 72-3).

Although the pronoun is sometimes confused with different people, the addressee can still figure it out depending on the previous speech situation, e.g.

ROS: He's coming.
GUIL: What's he doing?
ROS: Walking.
GUIL: Who's with him?
ROS: The old man. (P. 88-9)

The pronoun 'He' refers to Hamlet for whom the duo wait to capture and "The old man" is used to refer to Polonius' body.

4.5.3.3 Co-textual Context

According to Cutting (2008), the co-textual context is the context of the text itself. Yule (1996 a) calls such type of context as the 'co-text' or 'linguistic context'. It deals with the information mentioned in the
text itself that is required for its analysis and understanding. In the same example of the hill-walking in Arran, one can see that the interlocutors use certain personal pronouns, such as 'us' in "There were six of us", and the 'we' in "Yeah we did a lot of hill walking." These two pronouns refer back to Francesca, David, the room-mate, and the friend, who were already mentioned elsewhere in the text. So, the interlocutors have enough knowledge to infer who the pronouns 'us' and 'we' include.

If a referring expression is introduced for the first time in the conversation, it will be called 'exophoric'. In the above example of the hill-walking in Arran, DM introduces the names 'Francesca, David, Francesca's room-mate, Alice's friend, and Michelle, which are all exophoric references because they are introduced for the first time in the text. Later, the addressee DM uses the pronouns 'us' and 'we' to refer to these names. These two pronouns are called endophoric expressions because they are already introduced somewhere in the text.

When any addressee establishes a referent in his or her speech, as when Vladimir says "Did you ever read the Bible?", and subsequently refers to this referent, as when Estragon replies "I must have taken a look at it" (P. 5) there becomes a particular kind of referential relationship between 'The Bible' and 'it'. Yule (1996 a: 131) states that "The second (and any subsequent) referring expression is an example of anaphora and the first mention is called the antecedent." Thus, 'The Bible' is an antecedent and the pronoun 'it' is the anaphoric expression. According to Yule, anaphora is "defined as subsequent reference to an already introduced entity." Cutting (2008: 8) explains

When the referring expression is the first mention of the referent, in the sense that there is no previous mention of the reference in the preceding text, we call it exophoric
reference. Exophoria is dependent on the context outside the text, either in the situation or in the background knowledge.

The writer or speaker has to maintain the referent by using certain referring expressions. Otherwise, there will be no connection between the antecedent and anaphora, for example:

VLADIMIR: Thinking is not the worst.
ESTRAGON: Perhaps not. But at least there's that.
VLADIMIR: That what?
ESTRAGON: That's the idea, let's ask each other questions.
VLADIMIR: What do you mean, at least there's that?
ESTRAGON: That much less misery. (P. 71)

Vladimir starts his dialogue with the word 'Thinking' but Estragon's reply contains a new antecedent 'that', i.e., a new exophoric expression. The word 'that' is not the anaphoric (endophoric) expression of any reference mentioned in Vladimir's dialogue. The loss of the referent or the introduction of the new antecedent expressions immediately in the conversation stands for the lack of communication between the characters. It can also be seen in the following conversation when Vladimir equivocally uses the object pronoun 'them' to which Estragon replies inappropriately. They unexpectedly change the topic of conversation and this makes the speech irrelevant:

ESTRAGON: I'll go and get a carrot.
He does not move.
VLADIMIR: This is becoming really insignificant.
ESTRAGON: Not enough.
Silence.

VLADIMIR: What about trying them.

ESTRAGON: I've tried everything.

VLADIMIR: No, I mean the boots. (P. 77)

One can hit upon Vladimir's personality that seems to have different molds in the play. In Act I, he wants the Boy to transfer his message to Godot by saying "Tell him . . . (he hesitates) . . . tell him you saw us. (Pause.) You did see us, didn't you?" and he uses the endophoric pronoun 'us' instead of 'me'. This demonstrates that he is not the man who thinks of himself only. He is still faithful to his friend Estragon. But in act II, he wants the Boy to

Tell him . . . (he hesitates) . . . tell him you saw me and that . . . (he hesitates) . . . that you saw me. (Pause. Vladimir advances, the Boy recoils. Vladimir halts, the Boy halts. With sudden violence.) You're sure you saw me, you won't come and tell me tomorrow that you never saw me! (P. 56)

Towards the end of this act, Vladimir starts to think only of himself by using the pronoun me instead of us. He does not want to suffer any more and he looks for the salvation for himself first. Robinson (1969: 253) explains that "Pozzo and Lucky are representatives of the ordinary world from which the tramps are excluded." Robinson proves this matter through the role-exchange between Estragon's question, "We've lost our rights? and Vladimir's preferred answer "We got rid of them" (P. 15). Beckett's duo are confused with the mobile world where everything is in a state of instability.
There are some political interpretations that also abound. Some reviewers hold that the relationship between Pozzo and Lucky is that of a capitalist to his labour. This Marxist interpretation is understandable given that in the second act Pozzo is blind to what is happening around him and Lucky is mute to protest his treatment (See Pershinova, 2000: 6).

If one looks carefully on the words used by Davies, one can find that his speech style is more vulgar. For example, Aston uses the word 'lavatory' where Davies uses the word 'toilet':

ASTON: There's a lavatory down the landing. It's got a sink in there. We can put this stuff over there.

DAVIES: (stopping). You don't share it, do you?

ASTON: What?

DAVIES: I mean you don't share the toilet with them Blacks, do you?

ASTON: They live next door.

DAVIES: They don't come in? (P. 18)

From the sociolinguistic point of view, the latter (toilet) is a taboo word that was not really proper to use in the English of the twentieth century and nowadays. The former is a more euphemistic term that reflects Aston's cultured personality or social awareness of the language. Crystal and Davy (1975: 92) distinguish the main dimensions of the stylistic variation. They talk about the relatively temporary features of style, which include the 'status' of the participants' speech style (polite, colloquial, slang, etc., language). Thus, it seems that Pinter implicates a deeper meaning in the status of his characters' speech style, alluding to the differences of their ways of living and education. It also hints at
Davies's isolation and unawareness of the world outside his expectation.

This can also be seen in his description of the weather which he thinks is an impediment for him to go to Sidcup: "The weather's so blasted bloody awful, how can I get down to Sidcup in these shoes?" (P. 19). He uses the taboo word 'bloody' which is "a swear word that many people find offensive that is used to emphasize a comment or an angry statement" (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary). He also describes the monk in the Monastery as "bastard monk" (P. 14). Moreover, he uses the word 'nigs' (P. 20) which is a term of abuse for black people 'niggers'. Davies also says, "Give me my bloody trousers" (P. 34), "Where's the bloody box?" (P. 44), and at the end of Act III, he tells Aston, "Treating me like a bloody animal!" (P. 67). Davies is not the only character who uses such type of terminology, Mick also describes Davies, "You're a bloody impostor, mate" (P. 72). One can see that in the selected plays of this study, playwrights use slang and colloquial language to show the characters' background and that their language appears in its natural settings. Sokhanvar (1999: 202) states that the plays of the 1950s and 1960s written by Beckett, Pinter and others are more colloquial and slangy, in keeping with the setting and characters: tramps, gangsters, newspaper vendors, unemployed youths and their language is more naturalistic and shows gaps, repetitions, silences, and incoherence, modelled on normal conversation. Moreover, there are many situations in which Davies uses a lot of double negation, as when he says, "I never done you no harm" (P. 47), "How can I cut a loaf of bread without no knife" (P. 58), "I didn't tell you nothing!" (P. 73), and "you didn't ask me no questions" (P. 75).

The overall co-text of the play indicates the absurdity of life. For example, Davies wants the window closed because of the draught and
rain, and Aston on the contrary wants the window open because he likes fresh air. Everyone wants his own position to stand:

ASTON: I could not sleep in here without that window open.
DAVIES: Yes, but what about me? What . . . what you got to say about my position?
ASTON: Why don't you sleep the other way round?
DAVIES: No, I couldn't do that. I couldn't do that.

Pause.

I mean, I got used to sleeping this way. It isn't me has to change, it's that window. (P. 53)

Mick uses the same speech style as Davies at the beginning of Act II, he insults Davies by using many words, such as "choosy", "fibber","perky", "old rogue", "old scoundrel", "old robber", "barbarian", "old skate" (P. 31-35), etc. Mick abuses Davies by using all these offensive words to show him that he is not really welcomed in the house. That is why he says at the beginning of Act II "I'm awfully glad. It's awfully nice to meet you" (P. 30) then he tells him "You don't belong in a place like this . . . You got no business wandering about in an unfurnished flat" (P. 35). Moreover, to push him away from the flat, he tells him:

I could charge seven quid a week for this if I wanted to . . .
Three hundred and fifty a year exclusive . . . No argument.
I mean, if that sort of money's in your range don't be afraid to say so. Furniture and fittings, I'll take four hundred or the nearest offer. (P. 35)
If one examines Mick's speech carefully, one can see the contrast of his attitudes. He first says that the flat is "an unfurnished flat" but then he says that Davies can rent the flat with all "Furniture and fittings" in four hundred. It shows nothing but the stingy nature of his personality. He tries to find excuses for pushing away the guest of his brother. That is why he later tells Davies, "I think we understand one another . . . you know what it was? We just got off on the wrong foot. That's all it was" (P. 47).

Although Mick pretends to be complaining about Aston, Davies' description of Aston "he's a funny bloke, your brother", makes Mick upset and serious about his relations with his brother. He immediately expresses his disapproval of Davies' speech by wondering, "What's funny about that?" and consequently "You don't want to start getting hypercritical . . . Don't get too glib" (P. 49).

Certain matters in Stoppard's play are best to be analyzed by the co-text. Guildenstern and Rosencrantz are not Danish. It is a matter to be proved through the co-text of the play:

GUIL: (tensed up by this rambling) : Do you remember the first thing that happened today?
ROS (Promptly) : "I woke up, I suppose. (Triggered.)
Oh—I've got it now—that man, a foreigner, he woke us up—
GUIL: A messenger. (P. 19)

Thus, 'a foreigner' refers to the Danish messenger sent by the royal family. When Gertrude meets the duo, she says "Your visitation shall receive such thanks" (P. 36). It means that they come from another place which is most probably the same place where Hamlet was
studying with them. At the end of Act I when the duo practice the game of question-answer with Hamlet to draw some information about "Hamlet's transformation" (P. 35), they state that Hamlet was "In Germany" (P. 49). In Act II, Guildenstern says, "we came from roughly south according to a rough map" (P. 58). Germany is located south of Denmark. Thus, to put all the co-textual information together ("a foreigner", "a messenger", "Your visitation", "In Germany", and "south"), one can find out that Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are German men who were Hamlet's schoolmates. It is more evident in the meaning of the name Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, explained in Chapter II.

One can also find that Beckett's characters use the same technique of asking questions about the weakness of the body, e.g. Vladimir asks Pozzo, "it came on you all of a sudden?" (P. 99) where the pronoun 'it' refers to Pozzo's blindness. Robinson (1969: 256) states that "Pozzo's blindness does create a tragic image of his earlier refusal to see human existence as it really is." It is a reference to his cruel and inhuman treatment for Lucky. It can also be seen as a bad karma-punishment for his heartless deeds. Almost the same question is asked by Guildenstern to Rosencrantz,

Has it ever happened to you that all of a sudden and for no reason at all you haven't the faintest idea how to spell the word—"wife"—of "house"—because . . . you just can't remember ever having seen those letters in that order before . . .? (P. 39)

In the course of practicing the game question-answer with Rosencrantz, Guildenstern's says "Words, words. They're all we have to
go on." (P. 41). It becomes identical to Vladimir's in 'Waiting for Godot' when he talks to the boy, "Words, words. (Pause). Speak" (P. 55). It is also more interesting to find out that it is similar to Hamlet's statement to Polonius

Polonius: What do you read, my lord?
Hamlet: Words, words, words.
Polonius: What is the matter, my lord?
Hamlet: Between who?
Polonius: I mean the matter that you read, my lord.
(Hamlet, P.145)

This matter gives the audience/readers the concept that this reappearance of the shortened quotation is a matter of a circle: language continues regardless of what is going on around its' users. Although Shakespeare's English is different from the recent writers of the Twentieth century especially the Absurd playwrights, it seems that 'words' are still the representative of the language.

Although the Player is considered to be smart compared with Rosencrantz in equivocating the meaning of his communication, Guildenstern is found to be smarter than him. When they decide to bet by tossing the coin, Guildenstern suggests "Year of your birth. Double it. Even numbers I win, odd numbers I lose." The Player does not realise Guildenstern's meaning because any number double becomes even. But when the Tragedians realise the Player's mistake, "a terrible row as they object" (P. 31). The Tragedians' terrible row makes the Player aware of his mistake and that is why he declares "We have no money" (P. 31).
4.6 Context and Construction of Identity

4.6.1 Religious Identity

There are many religious references. Words such as 'prayer', 'supplication', the 'Saviour', 'God', etc. all reflect Beckett's consciousness of religion. Although the play has been considered by some critics for being non-sense, it contains many references to Christianity, as when the two tramps talk about the two thieves who were crucified at the same time with Jesus:

VLADIMIR: There's man all over for you, blaming on his boots the faults of his feet. (He takes off his hat again, peers inside it, feels about inside it, knocks on the crown, blows into it, puts it on again.) This is getting alarming. (Silence. Vladimir deep in thought, Estragon pulling at his toes.) One of the thieves was saved. (Pause.) It's a reasonable percentage. (Pause.) Gogo. (P. 4-5)

As if they were criminals they talk about repentance, a means that can save them from their current situation:

ESTRAGON: What?
VLADIMIR: Suppose we repented.
ESTRAGON: Repented what?
VLADIMIR: Oh . . . (He reflects.) We wouldn't have to go into the details.
ESTRAGON: Our being born? Vladimir breaks into a hearty laugh which he immediately stifles, his hand pressed to his pubis, his face contorted.
VLADIMIR: One daren't even laugh any more.
ESTRAGON: Dreadful privation. (P. 5)

Although their dialogue includes non-sequiturs, as it is obvious in Estragon's replies that make Vladimir laugh, it equivocates the meaning that they feel guilty and sorry of some wrong that they have done in the past and thus it is a reference to religion. It is even more evident when they overtly talk Bible, Gospels, and Holy Land:

VLADIMIR: Did you ever read the Bible?
ESTRAGON: The Bible . . . (He reflects.) I must have taken a look at it.
VLADIMIR: Do you remember the Gospels?
ESTRAGON: I remember the maps of the Holy Land. Coloured they were. Very pretty. The Dead Sea was pale blue. The very look of it made me thirsty. That's where we'll go, I used to say, that's where we'll go for our honeymoon. We'll swim. We'll be happy. (P. 5).

They even talk about the two thieves and Jesus Christ, who is described as the Saviour:

VLADIMIR: Ah yes, the two thieves. Do you remember the story?
ESTRAGON: No.
VLADIMIR: Shall I tell it to you?
ESTRAGON: No.
VLADIMIR: It'll pass the time. (Pause.) Two thieves, crucified at the same time as our Saviour. One—
ESTRAGON: Our what?
VLADIMIR: Our Saviour. Two thieves. One is supposed to have been saved and the other . . . *(he searches for the contrary of saved)* . . . damned.

ESTRAGON: Saved from what?

VLADIMIR: Hell. (P. 6)

So, the question that may come to the mind of the spectators or readers is, 'Who is 'the Saviour'?' One of the explicit interpretations is that *Jesus Christ* is apparently 'the Saviour', with whom the two thieves were crucified. One should also remember that for many Christians, Jesus Christ is considered to be the Son of God. Moreover, some even think that he is God himself. This may be evident when Vladimir says: "Christ have mercy on us!" (P. 106) or when Estragon says "God have pity on me!" (P. 87). Because of this similarity I conducted a statistical survey to see how often Beckett uses the words 'God' and 'Saviour' in the play. It is really interesting to know that the word 'God' is mentioned three times, and the word 'Saviour' is mentioned three times as well. Does this happen by chance? For a playwright like Beckett, it does not seem to be a matter of chance. Accordingly, 'the Saviour' could be 'God' whom the two tramps are waiting for. Vladimir confirms that what Godot offers is a spiritual matter:

ESTRAGON: What exactly did we ask him for?

VLADIMIR: Were you not there?

ESTRAGON: I can't have been listening.

VLADIMIR: Oh . . . Nothing very definite.

ESTRAGON: A kind of prayer.

VLADIMIR: Precisely.

ESTRAGON: A vague supplication.

VLADIMIR: Exactly. (P. 14)
Most importantly, Christians believe in the reappearance of Jesus Christ to accomplish their dreams, such as justice, equality, shelter, contentment, etc. Throughout the play, one can find many examples that show the suffering of two tramps; therefore, they look for comfort by waiting for the arrival of Godot. Godot may stand for Jesus Christ, the Saviour, or the hope for which they appeal. Godot may even stand for freedom and they have the free will to choose whatever he gives them, as Vladimir says "I'm curious to hear what he has to offer. Then we'll take it or leave it" (P. 13). This apparently means that he is not the one who forces them to do certain things in certain ways.

Davies also tries to abuse the monks at the monastery in Luton by describing them as "them bastards" (P. 13). Naismith (2000: 127) says that "there is much comedy in this sequence where Davies forcefully abuses monks, traditionally the mildest of men." This is an example of his verbal menace against other people. Later, he also says that one monk told him "Piss off" (P. 14) it is an example explained in Hyperbole Section. Thirdly, Pinter uses Davies in his play to mock the people who serve the religion, showing them as beneficiary people who eat too much and never mind about others. If one reads or listens carefully to Davies's long speech, one can clearly understand the implicated theme of religion being scorned by Pinter:

DAVIES: I heard you got a stock of shoes here. Piss off, he said to me. Now look here, I said, I'm an old man, you can't talk to me like that, I don't care who you are. If you don't piss off, he says, I'll kick you all the way to the gate. Now look here, I said, now wait a minute, all I'm asking for is a pair of shoes, you don't want to start taking liberties with me, it's taken me three days to get here, I said to him,
three days without a bite, I'm worth a bite to eat, en I? Get out round the corner to the kitchen, he says, get out round the corner, and where you've had your meal, piss off out of it. I went round to this kitchen, see? Meal they give me! A bird, I tell you, a little bird, a little tiny bird, he could have ate it in under two minutes. Right, they said to me, you've had your meal, get off out of it. (P. 18)

He disrespects the meal that was given to him by describing it as "a little tiny bird" (P. 14-5). He even makes fun of the amount of the food that the monk eats in the monastery. He may also overstate the speech of the people who work in the kitchen of the monastery by saying that they told him to get off the place when finished. The fourth example is when Davies claims that he wants to complain against the monk to the mother superior. Naismith (2000: 127) states that "A mother superior is in charge of a convent of nuns, not a monastery." Thus, Pinter implicates a joke in his play about mother superior. The fifth example is when he describes the monk as "a hooligan" (P. 15) which is defined in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary as "a young person who behaves in an extremely noisy and violent way in public, usually in a group."

Sternlicht (2005: 77-78) explains Stoppard was born as Tomas Strussler in Czechoslovakia and the last child of Eugen and Martha Beckova Straussler. Eugen was an assimilated Jew and Martha has both Gentile and Jewish grandparents. Because of the German invasion of the country, the family fled to the British colony of Singapore. When the Japanese attacked Singapore in 1942, the British evacuated Mrs. Straussler and her boys to India. Eugen chose to remain behind because he was badly needed for his job as a physician to take care of the
wounded. When he finally left, his ship was attacked and presumably he drowned. After all this suffering, his mother was married to a British military major Kenneth Stoppard and they eventually moved to live in UK. That is why Tomas became Tommy Stoppard in England.

Stoppard's previous life has undoubtedly been reflected in his writings including 'Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead'. That is why he gives hints at such an event in his play. Stoppard expresses his religious identity implicitly in his play. He tries to indicate the discrimination against his Jewish family in Czechoslovakia and the suffering that he faces when he was a kid, but later "divine intervention, that is to say, a good turn from above concerning him, cf. children of Israel, or retribution from above concerning me" (P.16).

There are many references that indicate the religious background of the writer. Such references can be represented by Stoppard's characters' saying prayers in their verbal exchanges with others. For example, when Guildenstern says "Heaven make our presence and our practices Pleasant and helpful to him", Gertrude immediately replies "Ah, amen!" (P. 37). Polonius says "I hold my duty as hold my soul, Both to my God and to my gracious King" (P. 37). It could be the influence of the original text of Shakespeare. Guildenstern also says "What in God's name is going on?" (P. 42).

At the end of the Act I, Guildenstern asks "Is there a God?" (P. 43). The way he wonders about the existence of God makes the audience/readers feel that he is not a true believer and he mocks God. He uses an indefinite article "a" with the word "God" to state that he is a kind of atheist. It is more evident in Guildenstern's statement, "Death is followed by eternity . . . the worse of both worlds. It is a terrible thought" (P. 72).
Religious identities are changed from one person to another and from one time to another, e.g. Rosencrantz says, "Saul of Tarsus yet!". According to Vickery (1980: 58) Saul of Tarsus is "The first (Jewish) name of the apostle Paul before his conversion to Christianity." Rosencrantz's description of a Christian, a Moslem, and a Jew implicates the confusion of religious identity. It is "Another Jewish joke about conversion which excites as little response as the previous one. Here the changing of names and identities operates on three levels – the Jew greets his friend Silversterin (who has become a Moslem) whose former friend Abdulla[h] has become a Christian" (Ibid). Parry (1984: 26) explains that "the Moslem is a Jew who has been converted to Islam. His Jewish questioner calls him by his pre-conversion name. The Moslem then refers to his friend, formerly a Moslem but now a convert to Christianity, by his pre-conversion name."

4.6.2 Personal Identity

Personal identity is a confusing matter for the characters of the absurd drama in the sense they have multiple personal identities. They either call themselves different names, or they are called by other people with different names. For example, Vladimir in 'Waiting for Godot' calls himself "Vladimir" (P. 2), while the Boy calls him "Mister Albert" (P. 53). Rabinovitz (1992: 201) states that "in many works Beckett tries to erode the sense of a fixed identity that accompanies the naming of characters."

In 'The Caretaker', Davies introduces himself differently. He says that his assumed name is 'Bernard Jenkins' and then he says that his real name before he changed it was 'Mac Davies' (P. 25). Gordon (1969: 42) interprets Davies' switching of the two names to his two-faced games, which in turn seems to reflect the different personalities of the two
brothers—he introduces himself as Davies to Aston, but as Jenkins to Mick, and he nevertheless becomes each brother's caretaker, while he takes no care of the games. He claims that his papers verifying this fact are with a friend in Sidcup and that he must return there to retrieve them just as soon as the weather gets better and he has a good pair of shoes.

There seems to be confusion in the personal identity of Stoppard's duo. Claudius and Gertrude are confused with their identities (P. 36-7). Hamlet who is supposed to be a friend of theirs switches between their names when he meets them (P. 53). They themselves even exchange their own names in a way that implicates that both of them are two faces of the same coin, for instance:

ROS: My name is Guildenstern, and this is Rosencrantz.
GUIL confers briefly with him.
WITHOUT embarrassment. I'm sorry—his name's Guildenstern, and I'm Rosencrantz. (P.22)

These examples show that things in our life are very confusing and things are mixed with each other that it is difficult to differentiate between them easily.

4.6.3 Gender Identity

The identities of Beckett's duo seem to be different "That's the idea, let's contradict each another" (P. 70) said Estragon. They behave as if they were a married couple, a husband and a wife, who sometimes do not have a stable relationship:
VLADIMIR: Together again at last! We'll have to celebrate this. But how? (He reflects.) Get up till I embrace you.

ESTRAGON: (irritably). Not now, not now.

VLADIMIR: (hurt, coldly). May one inquire where His Highness spent the night?

ESTRAGON: In a ditch.

VLADIMIR: (admiringly). A ditch! Where?

ESTRAGON: (without gesture). Over there. (P. 2)

Vladimir takes care of himself and Estragon at the same time. He has to look Estragon after every time he faces a problem like when Estragon gets kicked by Lucky and on one leg tells his man "I'll never walk again!" And Vladimir tenderly replies "I'll carry you. (Pause.) If necessary" (P. 32). Although Beckett does not use any female character in his play but the relationship between the two tramps looks as if they were a married couple. Estragon is so kind that he even cares about other people. He, while looking at his boots, says "I'm leaving them there. (Pause.) Another will come, just as . . . as . . . as me, but with smaller feet, and they'll make him happy" (P. 57).

If someone examines the way they behave, move, look at each other, gesticulate, etc. he/she will get a feeling that they are behaving as if they were a married couple who are used to have some problems but are obliged to stay together. One even can go further than that by saying that they represent the Christian Catholic marriage by which the husband and the wife cannot with ease part from each other by a divorce.

VLADIMIR: You again! (Estragon halts but does not raise his head. Vladimir goes towards him.) Come here till I embrace you.
ESTRAGON: Don't touch me!
Vladimir holds back, pained.
VLADIMIR: Do you want me to go away? (Pause.) Gogo!
(Pause. Vladimir observes him attentively.) Did they beat you? (Pause.) Gogo! (Estragon remains silent, head bowed.) Where did you spend the night?
ESTRAGON: Don't touch me! Don't question me! Don't speak to me! Stay with me!
VLADIMIR: Did I ever leave you?
ESTRAGON: You let me go.
VLADIMIR: Look at me. (Estragon does not raise his head. Violently.) Will you look at me!
Estragon raises his head. They look long at each other, then suddenly embrace, clapping each other on the back. End of the embrace. Estragon, no longer supported, almost falls. (P. 68-9)

When Estragon tries to sleep by resuming "his foetal posture, his head between his knees" (P. 78) and Vladimir tells him "Wait" and then "He goes over and sits down beside Estragon and begins to sing".

_Estragon sleeps. Vladimir gets up softly, takes off his coat and lays it across Estragon's shoulders, then starts walking up and down, swinging his arms to keep himself warm. Estragon wakes with a start, jumps up, casts about wildly. Vladimir runs to him, puts his arms around him._) There . . . there . . . Didi is here . . . don't be afraid . . . (P. 79)
Estragon's foetal posture, his desire to sleep, Vladimir's lullaby, his movement towards Estragon his taking off the coat, etc. all show that Vladimir takes care of his partner as if he were the husband of a little wife (or at least the mother of a child):

VLADIMIR: Come to my arms!
ESTRAGON: Yours arms?
VLADIMIR: My breast!
ESTRAGON: Off we go!

They embrace. They separate. Silence. (P. 85-6)

He sacrifices himself for the sake of Estragon. He says "I'm cold" (P. 58) because he takes off his coat. Estragon falls into the arms of Vladimir and this means that he is emotionally more dependent and needy:

VLADIMIR: ... (He writhes. Exit Estragon left, precipitately.) I can't! (He looks up, misses Estragon.) Gogo! (He moves wildly about the stage. Enter Estragon left, panting. He hastens towards Vladimir, falls into his arms.) There you are again at last! (P. 82)

There are five female references in Pinter's play. The first reference is when Davies claims that he wants to complain against the monk to the mother superior. The second one is mentioned by Aston when he talks about the woman who wanted to show her body to him in the café, "then suddenly she put her hand over to mine ... and she said, how would you like me to have a look at you body?" (P. 25). The third one is mentioned by Davies by saying "They've said the same thing to
me" (P. 25) referring to women. The fourth one is when Mick refers to his mother when he talks about her bed in the flat (P. 31-5). The fifth one is when Aston shows his reaction to his mother's confirmation and signature to operate him in the hospital (P. 54-7). Thus, Pinter does not ignore the existence of the woman by using some references. Through these references, the woman is portrayed differently. Three out of the five references are relatively negative. She is shown as bad as a prostitute and as good as a mother superior who is a kind of a religious leader and in charge of a convent of nuns.

Mick makes fun of Davies and taunts him verbally and physically and scorns Davies' gender identity. Mick finally destroys Davies' sexual identity when he asserts that this man, Davies' "spitting image he was. Married a Chainman" (P. 31). Comically, Davies' image of his manhood is totally destroyed by Mick.

**4.6.4 Racial Identity**

Beckett expresses his disapproval of the English people through his characters by mocking the way they speak and by telling a notorious story about an Englishman:

ESTRAGON: *(voluptuously.)* Calm . . . calm . . . The English say cawm. *(Pause.)* You know the story of the Englishman in the brothel?

VLADIMIR: Yes.

ESTRAGON: Tell it to me.

VLADIMIR: Ah stop it!

ESTRAGON: An Englishman having drunk a little more than usual proceeds to a brothel. The bawd asks him if he
wants a fair one, a dark one or a red-haired one. Go on. (P. 11)

Although this example implicates Beckett's racial tension or feeling of dislike for the English, this could also be a political reference to the occupation by the English of Ireland, which, as it is stated in the first chapter, is his country.

From the very beginning of 'The Caretaker', Davies expresses his racial prejudice about other people who live nearby. He thinks that he is better than everybody, i.e., he is an egoist:

DAVIES: All them Greek had it, Poles, Greeks, Blacks, the lot of them, all them aliens had it. And they had me working there . . . they had me working . . . All them Blacks had it, Blacks, Greeks, Poles, the lot of them, that's what, doing me out of a seat, treating me like dirt. When he came to me tonight I told him. (P. 8)

Davies shows his racial prejudice again when he describes the Indians who are living next door as 'Blacks':

ASTON: Family of Indians live there.
DAVIES: Blacks?
ASTON: I don't see much of them.
DAVIES: Blacks, eh? (Davies stands and moves about.) . . . (P. 13)

Davies has the sense of egoism as when he refuses to take out the bucket of rubbish, an event that causes him to be dismissed from his job and being beaten down. He does not really have the desire to work:
DAVIES: Comes up to me, parks a bucket of rubbish at me tells me to take it out the back. It's not my job to take out the bucket! They got a boy there for taking out the bucket. I wasn't engaged to take our buckets. My job's cleaning the floor, clearing up the tables, doing a bit of washing-up, nothing to do with taking out buckets! . . . Yes, well say I had! Even if I had! Even if I was supposed to take out the bucket, who was this git to come up and give me orders? We got the same standing. He's not my boss. He's nothing superior to me. (P. 9)

Davies always wants to blame others for his mistakes, as when Aston complains about Davies' groaning or making the noises at night. Davies accuses "Them Blacks" (P. 13, 14, 18, and 23) who live next door. He does not want to admit that the noises are his:

ASTON: You are making noises.
DAVIES: Who was?
ASTON: You were.

DAVIES gets out of bed. He wears long underpants.
DAVIES: Now, wait a minute. Wait a minute, what do you mean? What kind of noises?
ASTON: You are making groaning. You were jabbering. . .

DAVIES: I don't jabber, man. Nobody ever told me that before. . . . I tell you what may be it were them Blacks.
ASTON: What?
DAVIES: Them noises.
ASTON: What Blacks?
DAVIES: Them you got. Next door. Maybe it were them Blacks making noises, coming up through the walls. (P. 23)

Again in Act II, he blames the window for making noises in the room. It is explicitly a plea that indicates his racial personality against other people. He tries to shirk from all the problems that he causes to Aston:

DAVIES: I spelt terrible.

*Pause.*

ASTON: You were making . . .

DAVIES: Terrible. Had a bit of rain in the night, didn't it?

ASTON: Just a bit.

DAVIES: Thought so. Come in my head.

*Pause.*

Draught's blowing right in on my head, anyway.

*Pause.*

Can't you close that window behind that sack?

ASTON: You should.

DAVIES: Well then, what about it, then? The rain's coming right in on my head.

ASTON: Got to have a bit of air. (P. 52)

He is the man who feels superior to other people as if he were without mistakes and he does not make these noises at all and it were the poor black people living next door who are making these noises to disturb Aston. The situation is really ironic. It not only discloses his racial nature but it also reveals that he wants to distract Aston from his mistakes by accusing others of everything that he does.

There are other examples where he shows his pride and prejudice over other people, especially the foreigners:
But of course what it is, they can't find the right kind of people in these places. What they want to do, they're trying to do away with these foreigners, you see, in catering. They want an Englishman to pour their tea, that's what they want, that's what they want, that's what they're crying our for. (P. 27)

Although it seems to the addressees that he is of a Welsh origin, he ironically pretends that he is an Englishman who is highly wanted for his services. He is so lazy that he was fired from his job because of his refusal to take the bucket of trash outside the café. Although Mick tells him "Now don't get perky, son, don't get perky", he replies "I got respect, you won't find anyone with more respect" (P. 35). This reveals that Davies is not only egoist but he is obstinate at the same time.

**4.6.5 Political Identity**

In the following speech, for example, Beckett is trying to direct his political opinions to his addressees through Vladimir. His speech contains certain political references:

**VLADIMIR:** Let us not waste our time in idle discourse! *(Pause. Vehemently.)* Let us do something, while we have the chance! It is not every day that we are needed. Not indeed that we personally are needed. Others would meet the case equally well, if not better. To all mankind they were addressed, those cries for help still ringing in our ears! But at this place, at this moment of time, all mankind is us, whether we like it or not. Let us make the most of it, before it is too late!
Beckett attempts to indicate that all people, including himself, still have the chance to do something about the oppressed people. He tries to shed light on the grief and suffering of the Irish people who appeal for aid to save them out of the English occupation. If his speech is interpreted in this way, it could also be referring to the French during the World War II whose country was occupied by the Germans. He tries to say that all people in the world were addressed to support those people who had been suffering. People's pains and agonies were so cruel that their cries are still ringing in the ears of this generation. At the same time, he hints at the equality and similarity of the human beings. Thus, he uses the demonstrative pronoun 'this' to refer to France which is the place where people make no racial differences by saying "But at this place, at this moment of time, all mankind is us, whether we like it or not" (P. 90).

Pinter implicates political references in Davies' speech where he talks about his insurance card that was stamped out. Aston asks him "How long's he had them?" His answer is "Oh, must be . . . it was in the war . . . must be . . . about near on fifteen year ago" (P. 21). One should realise that the play was first published in 1960 and the Second World War ended in 1945. This means that the war Davies refers to is this war and "fifteen year ago" is the difference of time between the 1960 and 1945. Pinter tries to give the audience/readers the idea that these identification papers could be missing now and the man who holds them could be dead because "It was in the war", Davies says. Thus, it can be a delusion because he believes that his papers are still there, a matter that is rationally not acceptable. A period of fifteen years is a long time and it was during the war. Pinter also wants to show the audience how destructive could the wars be and what are the repercussions of them. People cannot be real people unless they have
papers which indicate who they are. Thus, it is Pinter's criticism of modernism where people become numbers and papers.

4.6.6 National Identity

Ireland is located north-west of Europe and this makes it a cold, muddy and wet place where there are swamps, bogs, etc. this is because "Rainfall is extremely common throughout Ireland . . . In many mountainous districts rainfall exceeds 2,000 mm (78.7 in) per year" (See Wikipedia Encyclopaedia). Thus, Beckett uses such words to describe its environment that he does not like:

ESTRAGON: In my opinion we were here.
VLADIMIR: (looking round). You recognize the place?
ESTRAGON: I didn't say that.
VLADIMIR: Well?
ESTRAGON: That makes no difference.
VLADIMIR: All the same . . . that tree . . . (turning towards auditorium) that bog . . .
ESTRAGON: You're sure it was this evening? (P. 9)

The questions that may come to the mind of the readers is, 'Why does Beckett not use other words?' To answer this question one has to remember something about Beckett's history. He lived for a long time in France and he even defended it against the German occupation. He loved it more than Ireland. He even said "France in war to Ireland in peace" (See Wikipedia Encyclopaedia). Thus, He uses certain cultural symbols to criticize the nature of his country. In the following example, Beckett again tries to express his disapproval of Ireland by using the
same type of words, such as "the mud", "scenery", "muckheap", etc., to depict the road, which could be a typical road in the Irish countryside:

VLADIMIR: Where else do you think? Do you not recognize the place?
ESTRAGON: (suddenly furious). Recognize! What is there to recognize? All my lousy life I've crawled about in the mud! And you talk to me about scenery! (Looking wildly about him.) Look at this muckheap! I've never stirred from it!
VLADIMIR: Calm yourself, calm yourself.
ESTRAGON: You and your landscapes! Tell me about the worms!
VLADIMIR: All the same, you can't tell me that this (gesture) bears any resemblance to . . . (he hesitates) . . . to the Macon country for example. You can't deny there's a big difference. (P. 67-8)

"It has been convincingly argued that the countryside through which Beckett's outcasts wander, and more particularly the weather conditions encountered during these wanderings (uniformly rainy) are Irish" (Astbury, 2001: 5).

Beckett, in the following speech, describes the country road where Pozzo meets the duo on "this bitch of an earth". One should remember that the play was first written in French and it was later translated into English by Beckett himself. It is not by coincidence that he uses the indefinite article 'an' with the noun 'earth'. Thus, he is not referring to the earth as a planet. It is the situational context that helps the readers to understand that Pozzo is referring to a specific place "an earth", which is the typical Irish countryside road:
POZZO: *(who hasn't listened).* Ah yes! The night. *(He raises his head.)* But be a little more attentive, for pity's sake, otherwise we'll never get anywhere. *(He looks at the sky.)* . . . But– *(hand raised in admonition)*– but behind this veil of gentleness and peace, night is charging *(vibrantly)* and will burst upon us *(snaps his fingers)* pop! like that! *(his inspiration leaves him)* just when we least expect it. *(Silence. Gloomily.)* That's how it is on this bitch of an earth.

*Long silence.* (P. 39)

To implicate the identities of the characters through language is one function of language in the absurd drama. It is through the different types of context that one can realise and interpret these identities.