

Violation of the Strategies of Conversation in Some English Selected Plays

خرق "سُتراتيجيات" المحادثة في بعض المسرحيات الانكليزية المختارة

Hamid Suleiman Khalaf Kadhim

حامد سليمان خلف كاظم

Abstract

The present study analyzes the violation of the strategies of conversation in two English plays namely *Richard II* and *King Lear*. The present study tries to achieve the following goals: 1. showing how the strategies of real conversation can be applied to conversation in plays. 2. analyzing how the characters communicate with each other to discover how Shakespeare violates the strategies of conversation in depicting his characters. The study has been conducted on the bases of the following hypotheses:

1. The strategies of conversation which are derived from the study of natural conversation can be applied to conversation in drama with some modification for dramatic purposes.
2. Shakespeare makes certain violations of the strategies of conversation especially in the state of insanity these strategies are discarded.

Analytical procedure is followed for the investigation of the two plays. The study depends basically on Sacks et al.'s model (1974) for conversation structure, Duncan and Fiske (1977) for turn size, Grice's Maxims (1975) and Brown and Levinson (1978) for conversation implicature.

1.1 Introduction:

English plays especially of Shakespeare's present the reader with a universe of dialogues, and the immense variety of dramatic dialogues in his works is indeed amazing. Within this universe, the tragic dialogue is but one form of different types of dialogue, though it represents some number of Shakespeare's plays, it provides some of his most memorable scenes. Müller (1999: 212) states that Shakespeare's time is frequently characterized as a dialogic period or, more specifically, as an age which

gives priority to dialogue over monologue. Since dialogue is a constitutive element of drama, and drama is “the outstanding literary genre of the age”, Shakespeare’s universe of dialogues might be seen as one indication of the priority which dialogue has over monologue in the Renaissance.

This study demonstrates a view of tragic dialogue which is defined by Stephen (1984: 42) as a play with unhappy ending. For him a tragic hero goes from happiness to misery and death. A tragic hero is highly born person and he is neither particularly evil nor particularly good, but merely normal.

The researcher has noted that, although Shakespeare’s dramatic art offers a remarkable variety of dialogic strategies and in recent years dialogue as a focus of study has received increasing attention, a development which is in part due to linguistic approaches subsumed under the terms ‘discourse analysis’, ‘conversation analysis’, or ‘dialogue analysis’, however, the analytical techniques developed and used in these fields have only rarely been applied to dramatic dialogue. So, the interactive character of Shakespeare’s dramatic texts is not sufficiently considered in analysis, despite the fact that dialogue is the basic element of drama. It is striking that Shakespeare’s studies have neglected the interactive features of Shakespeare’s language. Approaches to Shakespeare’s language are done according to two tendencies: First, they focus on the speech rather than the exchange as the unit of dramatic discourse. Second, they regard the speech as issuing from within the character rather than from interaction among characters (see Morris: 1966).

Shakespeare’s dialogue is organized as interaction, how words answer preceding words, how addresser and addressee are shaped as subject within these exchanges, the problem begins to change shape. The researcher tries to shed light on Shakespeare’s dialogue and how he deals with strategies of conversation in his plays. Since to the best of the researcher’s knowledge there has been no single investigation that has studied the violation of strategies of conversation in these two plays, the present study comes to fill such a gap.

1.2The Nature of Conversation:

The English word, conversation, is made up of a combination of two Latin roots ‘con’ and ‘vers’. ‘Con’ means with or together. ‘Vers’ means to turn about in a given direction. Thus, literally, conversation means to turn about with others. It is made of two elements; informational and phatic

.The latter is concerned with social relationship (see point 2.1.3), while the former is made for a purpose shared by the participants (Miller, 1999:1).

Speier (1972:398) maintains that conversation as a communicative act is made as a socially organized set of speech events¹ .Van Dijk (1985: 118, 5) explicates that there should be a semantic coherence in conversation both backwards and forwards i.e. speakers must monitor their contribution by keeping the semantic coherence with the previous T. He clarifies this point by saying that speakers in conversation plan their next turn in talk on the basis of their understanding of what has been said by the previous speaker and on the basis of their cognitive representation of the whole social situation. Brown and Yule (1983:84) state that participants should speak topically, they pick up elements from the previous speakers and make their contribution according to them i.e. they can derive a new element from the previous contribution and incorporate it in their contribution.

1.3 Turn –Taking System:

Researchers have studied the system of ‘turn –taking’ which has been independently suggested by Yngve and Goffman (1970) and the fact that participants in a conversation tend to take turns in speaking and listening has frequently been observed and discussed by other investigators such as Hymes(1972), Jaffe and Feldstein (1970), Kendon (1967), Schegloff (1968), Sullivan (1947). Great details are presented by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974).

The organization of taking turns to talk is fundamental to conversation as well as to other speech-exchange systems. Sacks et al. (1974:696) suggest that “at least, turn –taking in conversation will be characterized as locally managed, party- administered, and interactionally controlled and sensitive to recipient design”. Duncan (1972:283) demonstrates that many authors try to find out the universal features of conversation. One of these authors is Miller (1963), who suggests that ‘turn – taking system’ is one of the universal features in all conversations.

Coulthard (1985:59) maintains that one of the most fundamental facts about conversation is that the roles of the speaker and the listener change with remarkably little overlapping of speech and few silences. This can be achieved by applying the system of ‘turn –taking’ which is the basic form of conversation organization. Sacks et al. (1974: 700) state that the system can be applied to any number

of parties without changing. Levinson (1983:297) shows that the number of parties may vary from one to twenty or more. Persons may enter and exit the pool of participants. If there are more than two parties, then provision is made for all parties to speak without any specified order of speakers.

1.4Phases of Interaction:

Language users are sensitive to the location of a particular utterance in a whole discourse structure i.e. in day-to-day conversation, speakers are sensitive to whether an utterance occurs in the opening or closing phase of the conversation, for each utterance expresses certain intention in these phases e.g. greeting will be heard as a part of opening phase, but utterance such as “I just wanted to see how you were feeling” may be understood as indicating a closing phase in a conversation if it occurs subsequent to talk about that topic, but it will be considered an opener if the topic has not been discussed in conversation(Ochs ,1979:4 a).

Burton (1980:19), commenting on Laver’s work, indicates that Laver has divided conversation into three sections: opening, medial and closing. She notes that some writers concentrate more on the first and third phases, and this suggests that more analytical work needs to be done on the rather vague notion of ‘medial’. To use Burton’s words “Laver points here is that it is in the opening and closing phases of an interaction that most phatic communication is seen to be done; and that, note, these are points of psychological insecurity of differing kinds and degrees.”.

1.4.1 The Opening Phase:

Clark and Clark(1977:229-30) have aptly stated that in order to start up a conversation, one person must get other participants’ attention and signal the desire for a conversation and the other person must show willingness to the part. For this purpose, the first person should provide the first topic of conversation even if it is only simple “hello”. Clear and Schaefer (1989), cited in Ervin Tripp (1993:247), show that participants must collaborate in starting and grounding a topic to establish shared beliefs of mutual comprehension. If this grounding continuation on the topic does not occur, there will not be shared understanding.

1.4.2 The Medial Phase:

The medial phase comes after greeting and gaining attention of the other partners. Then, the conversation begins to develop. Sacks et al. (1974: 699) maintain that conversation can accommodate a wide range of situations, participants and changes of situation, but it should be sensitive to social reality in a local context. Van Dijk (1985:120) explains that people in their conversation establish a large number of strategies to connect between moves or between underlying propositions. They use apparent denials, displacements, attributions, denials of presupposition and so on.

Sacks (1971), cited in Cauthard (1985:80), observes that in order to progress conversation well, talk should shift from one topic to another.

1.4.3 Closing Phase:

At the end of conversation, Speakers do not just stop speaking but they have to do certain things. Schegloff and Sacks in Clark and Clark (1977:230) put two steps for closing conversation: first, A and B agree to close it. Second, they actually close it. The first step that includes the most difficult problem which can be solved by other conversation devices i.e. pre-closing statement and its response, a statement that initiates the closing section of the conversation. A could say “we-ell” ,“okay” or “so-oo” to signal to B that he thinks the topic is closed. Then, there is a possibility of ending the conversation with just- finishing the topic or bringing another one.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973:320)suggest that if a closing section has mutually pre-closing devices like ‘okay’, terminal elements like ‘Bye’ can be expected, but sometimes the closing is reopened by expressions like “oh, by the way,...”. Clark and Clark (1977: 232) comment on this point by saying that in spite of the fact that closing section can be elaborated but there should be explicit justification for such elaboration. If B wants to bring up a new topic he should give signal as “incidentally”or“I forgot to tell you” making an explicit justification that he is interrupting the closing section.

1.5Adjacency Pairs:

Adjacency pairs are described by Ervin-Tripp (1993:249) as a sequence of moves², when the first occurs, the second is awaited. The second is usually matched at several levels or it will be heard as incoherent. Mey (1993:243) points out that adjacency pairs are subsequent of utterances which consist conversational exchange. Pairs are characterized by their type which is given by a common illocutionary intention. Ferrara (1985:148) considers that adjacency pairs provide dialogue a typical relation by pairs of speech acts such as; request - grant, excuse-acceptance of excuse, congratulation-thanks, offer-acceptance/rejection, compliment –acceptance/ rejection,...etc.

1.6 Preference System:

Adjacency pairs are not simply contentless noises in sequence. Yule (1996:78-79) reports that adjacency pairs represent social actions and not all social actions are equal when they occur as second parts of some pairs. A first pair part that contains a request or an offer makes the expectation of the second part to be acceptance. An acceptance is structurally preferred and a refused one is a dispreferred second part. This structure is called *preference* which indicates socially determined structural pattern, not individual's mental or emotional desire.

Preference system, according to Ervin – Tripp (1993: 252-53), is represented by a quick and more spontaneous reply such as accepting an invitation, answering a question, complying with request, accepting an offer, agreeing with an assessment. It is agreeing with other's self-deprecation, thanking for compliment and denying blame (just as denial of guilt is preferred in the legal system).

1.7 Simultaneous Turns:

Simultaneous means at the same time. For Duncan and Fiske (1977:221) simultaneous turns means simultaneous claiming of the turn by two participants. This goes beyond the rule of taking turns which claims only a single turn to a single speaker (Sacks et al. 1974:706).

There are two reasons for *simultaneous turns*, according to Duncan (1972:288), first, the absence of a T. yielding signal by the speaker then the auditor may attempt to take the speaking turn. Second, if the speaker displays a yielding signal, and the auditor acts to take the turn and the original speaker keeps his speaking turn. There are two kinds of simultaneous turns: overlap and interruption.

1.8Silence:

Silence has a very close relation to the system of ‘turn- talking’. Goodwin (1981:18) defines gaps between turns as silence i.e. the absence of vocalization that occurs between the turns of two different speakers. Levinson (1983:299) classifies silence between turns into three kinds and differentiates among them according to ‘turn - taking’ rules and subrules proposed earlier by Sacks et al. (1974). By *gaps*, he refers to the silence that may occur before SS. by a conversational partner other than the current speaker. A *lapse* occurs when the current speaker does not select a next one and none of the participants claims a turn on his or her account. Finally, when a selected next speaker does not immediately continue at the first TRP. after the turn has been allocated to him or her, this silence is called *attributable silence*.

1.9 Pause:

A pause is a common feature that occurs in conversation. It occurs during the production of utterances. Pauses are of two kinds; *silent* and *filled* pauses. Clark and Clark (1977:567, 561) define the former as “a hesitation in the speech not filled with any speech sound” and the latter as “a hesitation in spontaneous speech or wholly taken up a speech sound like ah, er, uh ...ete”

Pauses have different significances on the basis of their structural locations. Levinson (1983:326) points out that some analysts have seen pauses as evidence of verbal planning i.e. ‘time out’ for psychological processing either in the routine preparation of the fluent phrases that often follow or in the production of complex syntax. Clark and Clark (1977:268) state that speakers may stop in midsentence as they want to search for the right word or they have forgotten something they want to refer to or to select several examples to be mentioned. They do so by applying certain devices by which the speakers signal the reason behind stopping such as interjection (oh!, ah!, or well).

1.10Repair Mechanisms:

Richards et al. (1985: 244) define 'repair' as a term for ways in which errors and unintended forms of misunderstanding are corrected by speakers or others during conversation.

Sacks et al. (1974: 723-24) explain that during the developmental course of conversation, errors, troubles and violations exist. Repair mechanisms are found to remedy them. They classify these mechanisms into three types:

The first type of repair mechanisms deals with problems of turn-taking. Examples of these are the following:

Question like 'who me?', practices of etiquette concerning interruptions and complaints about them, interruption markers e.g. Excuse me, false starts, the repetition of a turn overlapped by others, false recognition of possible completion and thus simultaneous talk is resulted.

The second type of repair mechanisms is related to the system of 'turn-taking' itself. In order to repair more than one speaker at a time one of the turns stops before its possible completion point. Another repair mechanism is designed by the rule-set. The cycles of rules (1) and (2) are a repair for the non-occurrence of turn-transfer at TRP. and thus is repaired by the current speaker's continuation.

The third kind of repair mechanisms is not related to the turn-taking system. Schegloff et al. (1977:377) illustrate that participants other than the current speaker are not allowed to repair until the turn is completed. These repairs occur within the turn where the repair occurs. They are mostly corrections of words which are done within the turn by the speaker as self repair, or other than the speaker initiates repair by other initiates a repair which Sacks et al. call repair sequences can take repair.

1.11 Grice's Maxims (1975):

Talk exchanges do not normally consist of a successive of disconnected remarks and would not be rational if they do. They are characteristically, to some degree, at least, cooperative efforts, and each participant recognizes in them, to some extent a common purpose or set of purposes or at least a mutually accepted direction. Grice formulates a rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe normally "make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which the speaker is engaged". One might label this cooperative principle as follows:

1.11.1 The Quantity Maxim:

It is related to the quantity of the information to be provided and under it falls the following maxims:

- A. Make contribution as required for the current purposes of the exchange.
- B. Do not make contribution more or less informative than required.

1.11.2 The Quality Maxim:

The Maxim of Qual. falls under a super maxim “Try to make contribution one that is true” and two more specific maxims:

- A. Do not say what is believed to be false.
- B. Do not say what lacks adequate evidence.

1.11.3 The Manner Maxim:

It is related to how ‘what is said to be said’. It includes the following super maxims:

- A. Avoid obscurity of expressions.
- B. Avoid ambiguity.
- C. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- D. Be orderly.

1.11.4 The Relation Maxim:

It is related to only one maxim namely ‘be relevant’. It deals with questions about what different kinds of relevance. There may be shifts in the course of talk exchange that allow change in the subject of conversation.

1.12 Drama and Dialogue:

Literature as a communicative act is described by Duncan in Pratt (1977:124) as an ideal form of communication because it has the most powerful example of verbal skill. Levin (1962:18) mentions that

literary language should seem to impose on the discourse some structure in addition to that which derives from ordinary language.

Schmidt (1976: 163) reviews Frege's description of literary texts which are characterized by two features which one may distinguish as semantic (1 and 2) and pragmatic (3).

- 1. Literary texts may contain expressions that do not designate correlates in the 'real world'.*
- 2. Literary texts may contain sentences which are neither true nor false. Any sentence which is neither true nor false belongs to literature.*
- 3. The reception of a text as an item of literature implies that its statements are to be read as non-asserting.*

Ejzenbaum (1926), cited in Pratt (1977:4) makes a number of relevant assumptions:

- 1. Language functions in literature are different from those elsewhere.*
- 2. The relation between the literary and non-literary functions of language is one of the opposition.*
- 3. This opposition is fully manifested in the observable properties of literary and non-literary. The former possesses properties that distinguish it from the latter.*

Drama texts are described by Coulthard (1985:182) as scripts for the performing of pseudo – conversation which can be successfully approached with techniques originally developed to analyse real conversation. For this purpose, Burton (1980:31) reviews Searle's description of conversation ,who states that the speaker and the hearer know how to speak the language, both are conscious of what they are doing, the speaker is not acting under pressure or threat, and they have no physical impediments to communicate with each other such as deafness or aphasia. Hence, they are not acting in a play

1.12.1Speech Acts Relevance to Theatre:

A speech act theory [henceforth SAT.] has been developed by the British theorists Austin, Searle, Strawson, Grice and others. SAT. offers a useful and interesting way of treating contextual information.

Van Dijk (1981:244) defines speech act [henceforth SA.] as the act accomplished when a speaker produces an utterance of a natural language in a specific kind of situations, which is called a context. This means that SA. is not just an act of ‘talking’ or ‘meaning’ but, also it is a social act by which members of a speech community interact with each other.

Having demonstrated that in fact utterances are performative, Coulthard (1985:18) reviews Austin’s reconsideration about the sense in which ‘to say something may be to do something’, this leads the speaker to perform three acts simultaneously: a *locutionary act* which is the act of saying something in the full sense of ‘say’, an *illocutionary act* which is an act performed in saying something, the act identified by the explicit performative and a *perlocutionary act*, the act performed by or as a result of saying.

1.13Analysis of Violation of Conversational Strategies

1.13.1 Preliminaries:

This chapter deals with the strategies of conversation in two of Shakespeare’s tragedies namely *Richard II* (1595) and *King Lear* (1616). In each play Shakespeare develops his characters by assigning them distinctive features of speaking and by giving each certain attitude towards language. Both dramatic texts include witty and sparkling dialogues which prove Shakespeare’s creativity and cleverness.

1.13.2Adjacency Pairs:

Adjacency pairs are fundamental units of conversational organization. In this play there are different types of these pairs that are employed by the characters who violate Grice’s Maxims of conversation namely Quality (Qual.), Quantity (Quan.), Manner (Mann.), and Relevance (Rel.).

1.13.3Question- Answer Sequences:

(a) Question- Answer:

The characters violate Grice's Maxims in different question – answer instances such as turn (1):

In T. (1) Richard, being a judge, violates Mann. and Quan. Maxims by giving a long speech in which he includes many details asking about the two quarrelling nobles, while Gaunt answers the question giving the required information only.

In T. (8) Richard directs a question to Bolingbroke asking him what he has against Mowbray. In the next T. Bolingbroke answers Richard's question by giving a very long speech which violates Mann. Maxim to confirm his speech starting with swearing, then using metaphors to compare life with sky and problems with clouds. By doing so, he violates both Qual. and Quan. Maxims.

In T. (13) Richard asks Bolingbroke what he has against Mowbray. In the next T. Bolingbroke violates Qual. Maxim in his answer by using metaphors to describe what he is going to do against Mowbray. He, also, violates Mann. Maxim by having a long T.

(b) Question- No Answer:

Questions are usually followed by answers, the first pair – part of an adjacency pair creates expectations of a reaction. If an answer does not occur, this does not happen randomly but has significance and meanings, these questions as follows:

In T. (118) the Queen asks Gaunt "How fares our noble uncle, Lancaster?" but she does not get the answer in the next turn.

In T. (188) York asks Servingman "He was? Why so?" but he does not get an answer in return.

In T. (208) Northumberland asks "Harry, how fares your uncle?" but Harry does not answer.

In Ts. (454), (456) and (458) the Duchess asks the same question "What is the matter" but she does not get an answer. She repeats her question in T. (461) Aumerle tells her to be content.

Aumerle: Good mother, be content; it is no more

Than my poor life must answer.

1.13.4Speech Acts:

Franck (1979: 461) states that every speech act in a conversation is a step in the process of interaction i.e. every speech act produces a new state of conversation in which a set of continuation options is established.

Order:

In T. (5) Richard gives order to Gaunt which is obeyed in the next T. In his order Richard violates Qual. Maxim by using figurative language and speaking ironically. He, also, violates Mann. Maxim by giving a long T.

Richard: Then call them to our presence: face to face,

And frowning brow to brow, ourselves will hear

The accuser and the accused freely speak:

High- stomachd are they both, and full of ire,

In rage deaf as the sea, hasty as fire.

Since solidarity affects language, Richard as a king rules over society brings Bolingbroke and Mowbray together in order to speak freely in his kingly presence. Richard's ironic speech points to the opposite direction when Bolingbroke and Mowbray start quarrelling and abandon the very bases of reciprocal communication leading Richard kingship to stop the freedom of communication. For this purpose, Brown and Keller (1973: 163) cite Lord Acton's speech "power tends to corrupt". It means that power affects conversation for authority makes person less sensitive to the feeling of others and affects the listening of people in position of authority.

1.13.5 Phases of Interaction:

(a) The Opening Phase:

The characters open their conversation to each other by using adjacency pairs such as question – answer, speech acts ...etc.(see point 4.1.1).

In this phase there is phatic communication especially with King Richard such as Bolingbroke's speech in T. (6) and Mowbary T. (7).

(b)The Closing Phase:

The characters end their conversation by using adjacency pairs; question – answer, speech acts...etc. (see point 4.1.1).

The character may use pre – closing expressions such as:

T. (202) Green: Farewell at once, for once, for all, and ever.

T. (203) Bushy: Well, we may meet again.

T. (204) Bagot: I fear me, never.

In this phase, there is no farewelling as in Ts. (29, 30) or the second part of it is lacking as in Ts. (51, 52).

(c)Silence and Pause:

In conversation, silence is generated as a result of a case when a speaker reaches a possible completion point and ends his turn while the next speaker is not ready to take it over.

In *Richard II*, silence does not occur because the characters are always prepared to take a turn. If the characters are not ready to talk, they produce certain fillers to avoid silence between the turns.

One of the techniques of filling a gap and avoiding silence is to repeat the last segment of the previous character.

T. (399) Bolingbroke: Name it, *fair cousin*.

T. (400) Richard: *Fair cousin...*

Gaps occur almost frequently within utterance and they are usually filled by certain fillers such as 'Ah'. Gaps occur for the reason of preparing an utterance or for selecting a lexical item.

T. (31) Duchess: *Ah! Gaunt, his blood was thine...*

Sometimes the characters stop in the middle of the sentence as they want to refer to something they forgot or to give more examples as in:

T. (37) Duchess: I shall remember more. Bid him... Ah! What

1.14Conclusions:

The application of the models to the two plays has shown the nature of the strategies of conversation in each play, the way by which Shakespeare achieves his purposes and what distinguishes him from other writers and makes him unique. Shakespeare has his own techniques which he applies in his plays. The analysis has shown certain conclusions:

1. Sacks et al.'s rules (1974) and Grice's Maxims (1975) are violated especially in the state of insanity where these rules are discarded.
2. The violation of Grice's Maxims (1975) comes to be norm in Shakespeare's plays especially Qual. and Mann. Maxims. The characters sometimes violate more than one Maxim at the same turn.
3. The conditions of relevance and adjacency in adjacency pairs are sometimes violated.
4. There are insertion sequences in *Richard II*, but *King Lear* lacks these sequences.
5. Three - part sequence is observed in both plays.
6. Sometimes there is no greeting in the opening phases and no farewelling in the closing ones. Sometimes the second part is lacking.
7. Topic initiation is restricted in *Richard II*, but it is free in *King Lear*. The characters (Lear and Edgar) self select themselves to talk about a topic which does not have connection to the previous turn. They do that act to reflect or pretend madness and show how it affects communication.
8. There are repair mechanisms in the two plays.
9. There are pauses, but lack of silences in the plays.
10. There is a positive correlation between solidarity and turn – size and turn numbers.

11. There is a positive correlation between rhetorical questions and turn – size. The number of these questions in *Richard II* is more than in *King Lear*, so the size of turn for the former is longer than that for the latter.
12. Few cases of simultaneous turns occur in the plays. This is obviously one of the differences between conversation in real life and conversation in drama.
13. The plays present another kind of conversation which is *Monologue*. It consists of two participants: active and passive. The active speaker does not receive immediate reaction from his/her addressee.

المُلخص

تتضمن هذه الدراسة تحليلاً لخرق ستراتيجيات المحادثة لبعض المسرحيات الانكليزية (ريشارد الثاني والملك لير). تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحقيق الأهداف الآتية: (1) بيان مدى الاستفادة الممكنة من تحليل ستراتيجيات المحادثة في المحادثات الحقيقة في دراسة الظاهرة نفسها في الكتابات المسرحية (2) تحليل المحادثات بين شخصيات المسرحيتين لتحديد الخروقات التي لجأ إليها شكسبير لستراتيجيات المحادثة لتصوير شخصياته.

ستُجرى الدراسة على أساس الفرضيات الآتية :

- (1) يمكن تطبيق قواعد تبادل الأدوار التي أخذت أصلاً من تحليل محادثات واقعية طبيعية على محادثات نصوص مسرحية مع بعض التحويلات لغراض مسرحية.
- (2) يخرق شكسبير ستراتيجيات المحادثة لتصوير شخصياته خصوصاً في حالة الجنون التي تلقى فيها تلك القواعد جانبًا .
- اتبع البحث الطرق التحليلية في البحث والتحليل لمسرحتي شكسبير . إن هذا التحليل مبني بشكل اساسي على نماذج كل من ساكس وآخرين (1974) لتركيب المحادثة ، دانكن وفايسبك (1977) لطول الدور ، قواعد غرايس (1975) وبراون ولوفنسن (1978 للمعنى الضمني للمحادثة.