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Abstract

This research article deals with the stylistic analysis of Samuel Beckett’s play ‘Waiting for Godot’ on the level of Grammatical Deviation. Samuel Beckett’s play is called as an absurd play which is known for disintegrated language. Beckett breaks the norms of English language to get the reader’s attention, to develop his interest and to create his indulgence in the play. He has touched upon modern man’s misery in existence, religion, cosmos, relationship and problem of time etc., with a long catalogue of other socio-political issues as sub-themes in this play. Hence, the language of the play ‘Waiting for Godot’ is ripe with material for stylistic analysis. Sometimes, prepositions or phrases are used in the place of complete sentences which become grammatical freak for the readers but for the researcher this irregularity creates specificity of
artistic meanings. Drama represents action through dialogues. Most often, a character does not understand other character’s talk which causes irrelevance of content in the situation and apparent meaninglessness. The common reader waives its message away with laughter, but it provides a new horizon of multiple meanings for the researchers.

Keeping in view the constraints of space and time, we have selected seven passages from the text. They are selected on the basis of stylistic and thematic significance. Leech’s model of irregularities of language has been applied on Beckett’s ‘Waiting for Godot’. For the analyses and descriptions of the texts, Berry’s systemic model has been applied to tackle with the grammatical deviations.

**Waiting for Godot**

Samuel Beckett’s drama ‘Waiting for Godot’ is difficult to perceive and comprehend because of lack of well-knit plot or story-line. The reader cannot locate chivalric or heroic characters in it who can deliver grandiloquent and mesmerizing speeches. On the contrary, “Dialogue seems to have degenerated into meaningless babble” (Esslin, 1982, p. 7) without well-constructed patterns and structures of language. However, these irregular dialogues can appear quite logical and meaningful in Stylistic analysis of the play.

**Unique Pattern of Language**

Brown (1968) opines that this play has a unique pattern of language which is quite different from conventional dramas. Kennedy (1975) remarks that Beckett has brought his language to a “still point – the world of perpetual solitude” (p. 130) or to its cyclic reiteration.
The language seems to belong to “limbo”. He adds an important point to it that “the total lack of interaction between the speakers is not stated but expressed through the fast-flowing fragments of speech that never interlock” (p. 132). According to him, Beckett’s plays present the language as the only reality in it “but words cannot be trusted – they can neither communicate nor express, they can only fail” (p. 134). In the drama, dialogue is an essential element and Beckett creates a new and negative myth by its failure which is “a source of creative energy, is comparable to the familiar power of certain negative emotions as motives to action, and to ‘the negative way’ as a source of spiritual life” (p. 135).

**Literary Criticism and Linguistic Framework**

Literary critics locate certain elements in ‘Waiting for Godot’ based on their intuition and imagination which is partially subjective, because they do not have proper system of analyzing literary discourse. In other words, literary criticism is not based on linguistic framework which is objective and systematic. A literary critic analyses, criticizes and evaluates an extract from the text based on his perception of a writer’s socio-political age, his life history and background. Hence, his judgment can be different from another critic’s verdict on the same text depending on his personal vibes or philosophy towards life. Quite contrary to this approach is the approach of a linguist and a stylistician.

An important component of linguistics for textual study is stylistics which consists of “less intuitive and less personal method of analysis – one which would depend instead on the observable facts” that is the diction of play in the present study (Thornborrow & Wareing, 1998, p. 3). A stylistician chooses an extract from a text, selects tools for its analysis and then
interprets it; here the analysis can diverge into different tracks of interpretation but overall it gives an objective treatment to the text. Simpson (1997) presents three key factors of stylistic analysis: “The first is to do with what’s in the language itself, the second with what’s in the context of communication, while the third is to do with what’s in your head” (p. 3) which is actually a stylistician’s erudition to explain text. He further says that stylistics is an off-shoot of both the disciplines – literary criticism and linguistics. Keeping all these things in mind, the researchers have selected Stylistics as an evaluative approach to understand objectively the enigmatic text of Beckett’s ‘Waiting for Godot’.

Deviations

‘Deviation’ is one of the two divisions of ‘foregrounding’ in ‘Stylistics’. ‘Foregrounding’ typically involves a defamiliarization, deautomatization or highlighting of some kind in the lexemes or syntax of some discourse. It occurs “either through an aspect of the text which deviates from a linguistic norm (called ‘deviation’) or, alternatively, where an aspect of text is brought to the fore through repetition or parallelism” (Simpson, 2004, p. 50) which is called ‘parallelism’. Leech (1989) has presented and discussed phonological, graphological, lexical, grammatical, semantic, dialectal deviations, deviations of register and of historical period. Neologism or nonce-formation and functional conversion (which is changing one category to other of the same item) are examples of lexical deviation. “The borrowing of features of socially or regionally defined dialects” (p. 49) is considered Dialectal Deviation. In this article only the deviated pattern of language of ‘Waiting for Godot’ on Grammatical level will be analysed and discussed.
An acute observation of mannerism, repetition and even nonsense of English language is often visible in English dramatists before Beckett which was given a pleasant turn by the naturalistic quality of the language. We found in Beckett a special flavor of one-sided dialogues with his peculiar economy and control of language and its precise use. Every syllable and succession of long and short sound, words and even sentences are calculated to give an impact stunning but lasting on the mind of the reader. Keeping in mind this impact, one finds alluring grammatical deviations at syntactical level in which most of the times the reader finds ellipses of verbs which represent inaction of the characters in ‘Waiting for Godot’. Grammatical deviation is a deviation from accepted norms of grammar. Incorrect or bad grammar, inversion of accepted word order in a sentence, violation of ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ structures, wrong use of verb or verb forms, ellipses and the usage of genitive structure to an unusual extent like “our heart’s charity’s heart’s fire” (Leech, 1989, p. 45) etc fall under the category of grammatical deviation.

TEXT 1

VLADIMIR:

Hand in hand from the top of the Eiffel Tower, among the first. We were presentable in those days. Now it's too late. They wouldn't even let us up.

(p. 10)

In the first selected text for analysis, Vladimir, at first, is depressed at the sorry state of affairs in his present life but the next moment he says that after bearing so much trouble they
should not lose their heart. They should have thought about committing suicide many years ago because now nobody can allow them to enter Eiffel Tower to end their lives.

Vladimir’s first utterance comprises ellipses of unusual nature which causes ambiguity. It does not convey clearly and comprehensively his thought. The following analysis can show the deviation of its structure.

Hand in hand from the top of the Eiffel tower, among the first.

We were presentable in those days.

Now it’s too late.

They wouldn’t even let us up.

The first sentence is not a simple sentence. It is a compound sentence which is compressed with Adverbials and a comma only in an irregular way, so it is grammatical and graphological deviation. Both the clauses are deprived of their subjects and predicates. The focus
is on the prepositional phrases. Wright and Hope (1996) say that “prepositional phrases usually function as adverbials” and “much of the scene-setting and atmosphere of a text can be conveyed by prepositional phrases” (p. 149). Beckett describes Vladimir’s recollections of past with the adverbials. This scene is set in Paris where both the friends went to visit Eiffel Tower. The past discloses their youth period spent in the company of each other in a populated and fashionable area of France.

The subject is ellipted from this clause probably because it is understood from the context and previous dialogue that he is talking about their past lives. The absence of predicate ambiguates their action that what did they do in their past on Eiffel Tower. There can be any one of the two possible verb phrases which is omitted by Vladimir in his speech: one is ‘should have ascended’ and second is ‘should have jumped’. First verb phrase ‘should have ascended’, does not go with the rest of the clause that is why second verb phrase ‘should have jumped’ is more appropriate in this slot. He is thinking about their suicide attempt which they should have attempted half a century ago to end their lives when Eiffel Tower was newly built and no one would have objected on their presence there because they were in better condition then, as they had to pay charges to go up the Tower. The tragedy of their present life is enhanced by mentioning their desolate past in the garb of pleasant mood of Vladimir while pondering over “a time when they still belonged to society” (Robinson, 1969, p.251).

The second clause is joined by comma which can be replaced by conjunction “and” or punctuation mark “;” (a semi-colon). This independent clause is without subject and predicate so it is a deviation from Standard grammatical rules. Subject ‘we’ is ellipted but the reader can guess it from the context. The predicate ‘would have been’ is also ellipted from the utterance.
implies Vladimir’s feeling of pride on this thought that they might have been the first and foremost suiciders who would have committed suicide from Eiffel Tower if they could have attempted it in the past. That unattempted action also indicates their same inactivity and inertia in the past as is in present; therefore, Vladimir did not use verbs in his dialogue to hide their inaction. The prepositional phrase “among the first” denotes that they would have been considered among the distinguished first suiciders. It is an obvious hint towards a wide range of unemployed, frustrated and poverty-stricken people even in the past which is displayed by the usage of Adverbial clause.

Beckett has written mostly the elliptical sentences in ‘Waiting for Godot’ which makes him “an obscurantist” for “projection of the obscurantist elements in our life” (Berlin, 1981, p. v). Beckett presents the impotency of their actions in clauses without verb phrases. Their planned suicides never attain fruition.

The next two sentences have normal order of SVCA (Subject, Verb, Complement, Adjunct) and ASVC (Adjunct, Subject, Verb, Complement). The placement of irregular pattern of grammatical sentence structure with a regular one intensifies the contrast between the two. They were in better state and shape; they were able to pay the fee to visit the monument. Now they do not have money so they cannot visit such places. Vladimir’s retrospection discloses that they suffered from the anguish of existence in the past and they could feel it now so the death would be their only recluse to avoid it, but it also might prove an abortive action for them.

TEXT 2

ESTRAGON:
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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.

**VLADIMIR:**

You should have been a poet.

**ESTRAGON:**

I was. *(Gesture towards his rags.)* Isn't that obvious.

(p. 12)

Estragon’s speech has grammatical deviations. Here, the lines are analyzed grammatically to find out deviations in them to be interpreted for the readers.

**I remember the maps of the Holy Land.**

I: S
V: V
O: O(NP – det, n)
A: A(PP – pc)

Coloured they were.

C: C
S: S
V: V

Very pretty

[S ellip] [V ellip] C

**The Dead Sea was pale blue.**

S: S(NP – mmh)
V: V
C: C

The very look of it made me thirsty.
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S(NP – mmhq)  V  Oi  Od

That’s where we’ll go, I used to say

(Ind.cl.) S(Pr,demon) V  A (Dep.cl) S V  (Ind.cl.) S V  to–infinitive

That’s where we’ll go for our honeymoon.

(Ind.cl.) S(Pr,demon) V  A (Dep.cl) S V  A(PP – pc)

We’ll swim.

S  V

We’ll be happy.

S  V  C

You should have been a poet.

S  V  C

I was.

S  V  (C ellip)

Is n’t that obvious

V(neg)  S  C

First line consists of SVOA (Subject, Verb, Object, Adjunct) structure and no irregularity of grammar is found in it, but the second sentence has C S V (Complement, Subject, Verb)
pattern which is a grammatical deviation. It is called inversion of order; the thematic position is given to the complement or attributive Adjective which is foregrounded syntactic structure. It shows Estragon’s attention to the colors of maps in the Bible and not to the sacred book. It may represent the dearth of colors of life for him. Next utterance has a complement as its ingredient. There is neither a subject nor a predicate which connect this utterance with the subject and predicate of the previous one. It is an elliptical sentence which is marked because Beckett has achieved here economy of expression by deleting subject and the predicate from this utterance. The focus is once again on a complement “very pretty” which makes it clear to the reader that Estragon has aesthetic sense and interest in the worldly affairs. The beauty attracts him as it attracts to a poet.

The next two sentences have normal order of SVC and SVO: in the first sentence the color of Dead Sea attracts Estragon, but the second utterance gives semantically odd meaning in which he feels thirsty to drink its water. Everyone knows that the taste of this sea is very salty because of high quantity of sodium mixed with its water. His thirst may symbolize the thirst for spirituality and purgation from sins.

The last sentence of the analysis is very strange in its syntactic pattern. Two subordinate clauses precede the super-ordinate clause, which complicates and puzzles the reader’s understanding. “That” is a demonstrative deictic pronoun used as a subject of the dependent clause; it is also an anaphoric reference to the Dead Sea. In his youth probably he wanted to go there to enjoy and to spend his time in the company of his wife but his wish remained unfulfilled. The spiritual element of purification is discarded here by his physical need of getting married and spending his time in merry-making. He craved to be happy once in his life. Robinson (1969)
asserts that “his suffering is physical… he still delights in the body” (p. 250). Estragon is just recalling his dream of a happy conjugal life which was perhaps thwarted and turned into a nightmare by time or his economic instability which leads him to wait for Godot for some tangible reward and bright future.

Estragon wished to swim in the Dead Sea because there would be no chance of drowning as he was nearly drowned in the Rhone and rescued by Vladimir. So this whole chunk establishes Estragon as a man who is deprived of the physical pleasures of life. Resultantly, he hankers after it more and more. This speech event begins at a holy juncture but it ends at the unfulfilled physical desire.

Vladimir’s utterance has a regular SVC structure. He suggests Estragon that he should be a poet. Estragon’s answer “I was” consist of SV but complement of copula (was) is missing. It is a deviant use of sentence which gives incomplete meaning. He does not utter a complete sentence but he refers to his old and worn out cloths which prove him a poet. The poet who writes in lyrics about his dreams of love and peace cannot earn bundles of money; nobody gives worth to dreams so he left his occupation which is described with past tense. Since then he could not materialize his dreams.

Estragon’s depression at his failure in life is projected by his utterance “Isn’t that obvious”. It has an interrogative and negative verb at the initial position; SC is used after it but it does not end with a sign of interrogation. It can be considered irregularity at syntactic and graphological levels. “That” is a pronoun used as a deictic which refers to his condition in
tattered clothes. His sordid mood at the dullness of his life is presented with such a sentence as has the pattern of a question but it is without its requisite question mark.

**TEXT 3**

**VLADIMIR:**

He said Saturday.

(p.15)

Estragon and Vladimir discuss the day on which Godot promised to come for employing them after consulting some friends. On Estragon’s question, Vladimir gives him an answer which is elliptical in its construction. If Vladimir is quoting here Godot’s word then “Saturday” should be written within inverted commas and before that and after verb “said” comma should be used.

“He” is subject, “said” is verb and “Saturday” is at adverbial position but it is without a preposition. According to grammatical rules, there should be a link between verb “said” and adverb “Saturday”. We know that “said” is a transitive verb which needs a direct object to convey its meaning. To make this sentence comprehensible, we can opt two ways: one is to add to-infinitive as the object of transitive verb, e.g. “He said to come on Saturday” and the second option is to add a relative/nominal that-clause “as direct object” (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1983, p. 316) e.g. “He said that he would come on Saturday”. Now if we analyse the sentence, the structural and semantic ambiguity would be made clear and we can understand the foregrounded structure.
He said Saturday.


The gap between verb and adverb represents the weakness of Vladimir’s memory because a gulf of a lot of days exists between Godot’s promise and the wait for his expected arrival. Therefore, the direct object of verb is missing. Whatever Godot has said, it would remain unfulfilled. Vladimir and Estragon both are not sure about the right place and right day of Godot’s arrival because they have no gadgets to measure the time. Resultantly, both are confused about day and date of their freedom from the act of waiting. The syntactic deviation refers to Beckett’s skill of extreme economy of expression. To understand it, the reader has to exert himself as Mauriac has said, “It seems that with Samuel Beckett, whether we like it or not, even more than Kafka or Joyce, we must exert ourselves” (qtd in Berlin, 1981, p. vi). Beckett’s comparison generates poetic rhythm in his dialogues. We notice that “said” and “Saturday” are written side by side and they begin with the same consonant sound so the alliteration is used by Beckett here.

The language of common men with ellipses is reduced to short but pithy dialogues. “Saturday” may refer to the day between “Crucifixion and Easter Sunday. In literary terms, this would signify man caught between despair and hope. One day (Friday) has ruined all man’s hopes and the day of Resurrection or new life is still to come” (Hasan, 2002, p.128). The human beings in their life show two feelings: one is joy and the other is sorrow. These two friends, Vladimir and Estragon, are unable to feel both of them but they are caught in between them.
Their long Saturday evening is without the next day of Resurrection. They are hanging there without any rescue from any one.

**TEXT 4**

**ESTRAGON:**

*(with effort).* Gogo light—bough not break—Gogo dead. Didi heavy—bough break—Didi alone.

(p. 17-18)

Estragon and Vladimir have exhausted their topics of conversation; therefore, the suggestion to hang themselves from a branch of tree crops up. Vladimir offers Estragon to hang himself because he is lighter in weight than him. Estragon refuses to do so because of the reason narrated in the given text for analysis which Vladimir cannot understand. Estragon explains it with a very unusual syntax which is analysed here.

Both the sentences have the same structure. A lot of syntactic complexity can be observed in these sentences. Each sentence can be divided into three sentences or it can be joined by conjunctions but Beckett has used dashes instead which is a syntactical and graphological deviation. The sentence becomes a compressed and complex phenomenon because of ellipsis of
verbs which has an irregular and a deviated structure. Wright and Hope (1996) define ellipsis as a device which involves “the absence of an item which the reader or listener has to supply... its use in writing treads a fine line between economy and incoherence (where too little information undermines understanding)” (p. 170). Without use of conjunction in a sentence and with the usage of dashes, Beckett tried to give some pause so that the clauses can be prominent and focus will be on them; in addition to that, Vladimir will get some time to reflect on them and he will be able to comprehend Estragon’s thought.

Beckett did not divide complex sentences, having one dependent and two independent clauses each, into short and simple sentences because full stop will break the tempo of thought whereas dashes infer linguistic continuity of the topic of the sentence. Vladimir is slow to understand the hints provided by Estragon on the topic of committing suicide. Therefore, Estragon has to utter his thoughts in a bit detail. The syntactic pattern which he uses to convey his thought-content to Vladimir is SC, SV and SC. In both the sentences, auxiliary verbs are missing which “carry information about tense, mood and aspect” (Thornborrow & Wareing, 1998, p. 55). This is a very unusual thing that the sentences consist of only subjects, lexical verbs and complements. The whole incident seems to happen at the same time because Beckett possesses the habit of conveying every action into present.

Without verbs, the action seems to convert into inaction. No chance of committing suicide will be availed. It is just discussed here but the characters would not be able to realize their scheme. Hence, it will be another futile activity added in their life as the sentences look lifeless and vain without the verbs. Their ellipses symbolize the absence of performance of any happy or tragic deed from their life.
TEXT 5

POZZO:

Nice business it'd be if he fell sick on me!

(p. 27)

After taking his meal, Pozzo throws away his chicken bones. Estragon is hungry. He wants to chew those bones so he asks Pozzo about them. According to Pozzo, Lucky has the right to use them. On Lucky’s refusal, Estragon takes the bones. Pozzo, in his anxiety, utters a sentence which has deviant syntax.

Nice business it’d be

Ind. cl. C S V

If he fell sick on me

Dep. cl. Conj (conditional) S V C A(PP – pc)

Pozzo’s sentence consists of one main clause and another subordinate clause this is why it is a complex sentence. Its syntactic pattern is CSV and SVCA. The CSV pattern of independent clause is deviant and irregular one. The thematic position is given to the complement of this clause which should be placed after the verb. So the inversion of order forms a foregrounding here. Lucky did not reject the bones ever in his life which may be his only meal. This unexpected event is presented by unusual syntax. In his disturbance, Pozzo disrupts the grammatical pattern of his sentence.
In complement “nice business”, which is also a noun phrase, an adjective “nice” is working as modifier to head word “business”. Third person singular “It” is subject which is also a deictic. This is a proximal deixis which refers to a possible ailment of Lucky if he does not eat anything. The deep structure of NP “nice business” tells us about its ironical use which “involves saying something which is not true” (Carter, 1996, p. 194). For Pozzo, it would be a bad thing if his carrier would be sick which is pointed out from Pozzo’s worried look at him. He is not concerned for his menial but he is irritated to think about the impediment in his work and journey because of Lucky’s possible sickness; hence, it would not be a ‘nice business’ for Pozzo.

The subordinate clause has normal sentence and it works here as adverbial clause which serves the purpose of “what” in the sentence. Law (2002) describes such clause as “open: the ‘if-event’ may or may not happen” (p. 11). It means that Lucky may or may not be ill in imminent future. Pozzo may be fretful at the prospect of hiring a new slave, therefore, exclamatory sign is used at the end of the sentence otherwise there is no need of it. Pozzo’s cruelty and atrocity is displayed by this sentence.

**TEXT 6**

**ESTRAGON:**

The Scapegoat's Agony.

**VLADIMIR:**

The Hard Stool.

**POZZO:**

The Net. He thinks he's entangled in a net.

(p. 40)
On the request of Estragon and Vladimir, Pozzo orders Lucky to dance. After frolicking, Lucky stops it. All the three persons give different names to his dance. Their three utterances have deviant structures.

**The Scapegoat’s Agony**

[S ellip] [V ellip] [Oi ellip] Od

**The Hard Stool.**

[S ellip] [V ellip] [Oi ellip] Od

**The Net**

[S ellip] [V ellip] [Oi ellip] Od

He thinks he's entangled in a net.

Ind. Cl. S V Dep. Cl/ Rel. Cl. S V A(PP)

Pozzo tells both the friends that Lucky has given a particular name to his dance. So we come to know that the three actors have taken subject, verb and indirect object “he calls it” from Lucky. The three utterances analysed above are examples of ellipsis and to understand them, the reader has to fill this gap. The obscurity of expression can be understood by Berry’s voice systems. Berry (1977) says that sometimes we have a choice to represent our processes in sentences with surface structure or deep structure, i.e., “to make something explicit or to leave it implicit.... the term major is used to refer to the making of a process explicit; the term minor is used to refer to the leaving of a process implicit” (p. 153). In the explicit structure, predicate will be there but in the implicit structure, predicator will be absent.
The grammatical analysis of the given text informs the reader that the three utterances have meaningful implicit structure but its surface structure is deviant and irregular. Merely Noun phrases have been used by Beckett for the sake of economy of expression. This economy of expression has a painful and deliberate effort of his writer at its back ground. A lot of knowledge is conveyed by these noun phrases. For the sake of emphasis on the noun phrases, they are used solely in a compressed manner which generates deviation from the Standard rules of English Grammar. The initial letters of these noun phrases are in capital, which imply certain latent meanings. This dance represents a man who is in anguish because he may be sacrificed for the sin of others. Dutton (1986) says “such figures, who carry the scorn and even the physical burden of a society, are called scapegoats, an idea alluded to Lucky’s pathetic, shambling dance is called ‘The scapegoat’s Agony’” (p. 61). Pozzo blames Lucky all the time as a cause of all his wrong doings and he does not say anything to make his position clear so, he has to shoulder responsibility of Pozzo’s deeds of failure.

Noun Phrase “The Hard Stool” has also a deviant syntax for getting prominence in the text. Lucky stands all the time to offer his services to Pozzo. Even after long journeys, he does not sit anywhere. It seems that he is devoid of human qualities; he has become an object on which Pozzo depends all the time for his things and actions. Two lexemes precede headword “stool” which enrich its meaning. Beckett has presented Lucky as a very strong man on whom Pozzo practises his relentless actions.

In Pozzo’s speech, we come across a deviant syntax and a normal complex sentence having one main clause and one subordinate clause. Resultantly, the distinction between the two utterances becomes more prominent. Determiner “the” is placed before headword / noun “Net”
as it has been used in earlier two noun phrases. With this definite article, the nouns become particular and they refer to some specific entity which is possessed by Pozzo. So, whatever Lucky does, it certainly has Pozzo’s will and order behind it. The correct name of Lucky’s dance is “The Net” which has its meaning at deep structure level. He feels himself entrapped by Pozzo in a snare from which he cannot some out. His dance does not mean his joy but it reflects his helplessness and powerlessness on his own life. Frye says that “Lucky... thinks he is entangled in a net: the image of being fished for by some omnipotent and malignant angler” (qtd in Bloom, 1985, p. 20) named Pozzo. So, a lot of meanings are conveyed with Beckett’s laboured elliptical utterances which are grammatically irregular to analyse and interpret them.

TEXT 7

POZZO:

... Let me go! (...) Up!

*Lucky gets up, gathers up his burdens.*

VLADIMIR:

Where do you go from here?

POZZO:

On.

In Act II, Pozzo wants to go from the stage after getting up from the earth. Vladimir questions him but he does not get satisfactory answers rather no answers from Pozzo. Soon, he leaves the stage with Lucky. Pozzo’s utterances are very brief which shows that Beckett has deviated from the established syntactic patterns.
Let me go!

[S] V- (C) -V

Up!

[S] [V ellip] e (preposition as extension of verb)

Where do you go from here?

Wh–interrog aux S V A(PP)

On!

[S] [V.ellip] e

The grammatical analysis shows that Pozzo’s first utterance and Vladimir’s interrogative are normal in their structures but Pozzo’s second and third utterances are deviant syntactically due to economy of expression. He orders Lucky with the help of prepositions only. It is extreme condensation of Beckett’s language. We know that these are imperatives in which subject is understood or implied. An imperative sentence presents “the mood of a verb expressing command” (Law, 2002, p. 48). Therefore, if verbs are ellipted from the utterances, it is a deviation from principles of grammar. Preposition is used as an extension of verb “which changes the meaning of the verb to which it is attached” (Berry, 1977, p. 67). The deep meaning of these clipped utterances reflects Pozzo’s dislike for Lucky; therefore, he uses prepositions to show Lucky’s direction of movement.

In the text of ‘Waiting for Godot’, Pozzo seems to be in a hurry all the time. He uses elliptical sentences a lot because he does not like to have long conversations with Lucky whom he does not respect as a human being. His favourite lexeme is “on” to start an action in both the acts of the play. Its deep structure represents his own journey to blindness and death ultimately.
Berlin (1981) writes: “the ‘on!’ leads to one place only, the grave, for the night of the play has come back to make even darker the night of Pozzo’s blindness” (p. 105).

Grammatical Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Deviations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellipses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversion of syntactic order</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Foregrounded Texts

From the seven foregrounded textual extracts for grammatical analysis, elliptical utterances are found in greater number as compared to utterances which have inverted syntactic order. Ellipsis at the level of verb is greater in number. Verb reflects the action in an utterance and its absence shows the inaction of the characters of the drama. The inactive and futile life of Estragon and Vladimir is presented with this type of grammatical deviation. Ellipsis of subject is also meaningful in the dialogues of Pozzo. He does not bother about the ‘doer of action’ or the person from whom he is taking benefit but he focuses on his object and work done by Lucky. By breaking the rules of placing parts of speech in an order to make a sentence, Becket sometimes
has given thematic position to the complement. This device is called inversion of syntactic order. It has been used in the selected extracts to focus the unfulfilled desire of physical happiness of Estragon at one place and at the other place it highlights the fear of Pozzo of Lucky’s sickness.

The disintegrated language of characters yields enough foregrounded content for the study of grammar mostly with incomplete sentences; the utterances written with incorrect punctuation marks and spellings of lexemes are experimented with in the play ‘Waiting for Godot’. Seven texts are analysed for describing grammatical deviations in the play. Grammatical deviation is breaking the rules of grammar in the selected textual discourses, elliptical constructions and inversion of syntax are obvious and prominent types of grammatical deviations. Elliptical constructions refer to Beckett’s habit of condensation. He does not repeat the words if there is parallel construction in the dialogues. For this purpose, either he excludes subjects or verbs from the sentences. The researchers have also found ellipses of conjunctions which display the eagerness of the characters to complete his turn before forgetting his content. Inversion of syntactic order is another type of grammatical deviation. It is used to highlight that particular lexeme which is written at the thematic position so that the reader will be acquainted with its significance in the text.

To Conclude

To conclude, through this stylistic analysis of grammatical deviation, a link between particular linguistic choices and their manifold literary effects present in the text of the play is established. This study will prove a seminal work on Beckett’s ‘Waiting for Godot’ from the
perspective of deviations in Stylistics whose style is marked for its brevity which may sometimes be difficult for a common reader to decipher.
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