

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 11 Volume: 79

Published: 30.11.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Feruzakhon Karimova

The Academy of the Republic of Uzbekistan
a researcher, the Institute of the Uzbek language,
literature and folklore. Uzbekistan
kshferuza@mail.ru

DIALOGUE AS THE MAIN FORM OF SPEECH

Abstract: The article analyzes the history of researching the dialogue and ideas about it. Relationship of addresser and addressee in the dialogue has been learned. The characteristics of situational dialogues are revealed.

Key words: speech communication, dialogue, speech situation, speaker, listener.

Language: English

Citation: Karimova, F. (2019). Dialogue as the main form of speech. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (79), 360-363.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-79-75> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.11.79.75>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Although the origin of the dialects dated back to the time when mankind was given speech, its usage as a term goes back to ancient time. The earliest public speeches by Greek philosophers were dialogical. Historically, special missionary rhetoric and public speaking events have been organized. In this process, a live question is achieved through the clever use of subtle and feigned dialogues in response. One used with the help of heated speeches – monologue and dialogue as a means to lead the rhetorical masses behind them. The use of the term like dialogue first is associated with the name of Zenon who was a spokesman of the school called Eley. He first described philosophical issues through the dialogue form. Inspired by him, Platon, Socrate and Aristotel also wrote philosophical dialogues. Later, Ciceron, the well-known spokesman, was renowned for his dialogues like “Orator”(Orator), “Republic” (Respublika)and contributed to the spread of the genre. [13] His dialogues were particularly valuable and had their place among Greek philosophers. In Russian linguistics, L.V.Sherba and L.N.Yakubinskiy are the authors of the first scientific conclusions about the dialogue and monologue. Sherba gave this conclusion “... the language finds its identity in dialogue and the monologue is essentially an artificial form of language.”

In her work on Russian speaking, N.Yu.Shvedova outlined her views on Sherba and the

structure of monologues, in addition, he summarized three main features of the dialogue; 1) specific complexity in the compositional structure; 2) the focus is on the direct and indirect conversation initiator. 3) a wide range of topics in compact replicas.

Basing on the ideas of Sherba and Yakubinskiy Shevedova considered that monologue is “made up”, “recycled”. [12: 280]

He concluded that the forward theses of A.B.Shapiro are also “conversational speech is dialogue by its nature”. G.O.Vinokur disagreed that there must be an insistent limit between monologue and dialogue [5:277 - 278] and indicated the following features; complexity in the sentence formation, The focus of speech on not “outside”, but “inside”, the lack of addressee’s reaction, being around a relatively broad subject and infecting another replica. He sees the life of the monologue mainly in the scenario, dramaturgy.

V.V.Vinogradov also argues that the basis for the monologue’s distinction from the dialogues is its processing. [4:18-28] He explains from the oral form in the evolution of the monologue to the image of writing and divides the monologue into agitated, lyrical and informer types. Gelgard commented on the views of Vinokur and Vinogradov on the monologue and agreed with the idea of Vinokur that a strict boundary must not be drawn between dialogue and monologue. [6:132] We cannot disagree with this view. Dialogue and monologue are transitional

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

phenomena. He tried to prove that there was existence of addressee in the monologue, agreeing with “monologue in the form of dialogue” by Yakubinskiy, recognizing that the addresser and addressee in the dialogue are the main characters that distinguish it from the monologue. Yakubinskiy explained his aspiration for “monologue in the form of dialogue” with small correspondence, notebook notes, marking on the edge of a text. The owner of the monologue also says that the inner speech is in motion (response to someone else). He emphasized that there were also the listener’s controversial views in the oral and written monologues.

The following ideas about dialogue and monologue in the monograph like “Incomplete sentences in the modern Uzbek literal language” by A. Boboeva in the Uzbek linguistics.” ... dialogue and monologue are two related and interchangeable form of the speech. The speech elements in monologue may be kept in dialogue and in contrary, dialogic speech ones can be met in monologue. Our linguists are keen not to put strict limits on dialogue and monologue, in addition, they emphasize dialogue, focus more on dialogue than monologue. Gelgard used the term “the inner communication in dialogue” basing on his views about monologue. We also interpret the internal dialogue as follow.

For example:

Hayot qanchalar shirin! Uni tashlab ketishga odamning qanday qo’zi qiyarkin? Siz qanday tashlab ketdingiz uni, Nozim aka?! Eh, hali sizga aytadigan gaplarim ko’p edi!... Eh, hayot, bevafo, bebaho hayot, iztirobihg ham shunchalar lazatliki, seni qanday tashlab ketib bo’ladi?! Siz qanday tashlab ketdihgiz uni, Nozim aka?! O’zing-chi, o’zing, endi qanday tashlab ketasan uni?!

H. Sulstonov. On a wonderful day.

In this example the speech is addressed to Nazim, but in the same speech he is not participating and the addresser (speaker) monologically expresses his attitude to the subject, reflecting the response to the addressee. In this example the communication between the speaker and the listener is optional or the speech of a particular interlocutor in the dialogue may be monologue-like.

Another example:

Bir borganman uyiga ketdik-ey! Biz ham umrimizda biror marta ko’nglimiz buyurgan ishni qilaylik!

“Rost aytadi, deya armon bilan dilidan o’tkazdi Sulton umr bo’yi o’zgalarning ko’ngliga qarab keldim, o’zimning ko’nglimga qarashga zarracha fursatim bo’lmadi”.

Mana, endi fursatim yetdi deganimda!

H. Sulstonov. On a wonderful day.

In this dialogue although the next speaker’s speech is in the form of monologue, the speech emerged in response to the first one. This can be also seen in the form of the expression “It is true”. That is

to say, the next sentence was made in the form of monologue only by the reaction of the addressees.

Consequently, dialogue and monologue are two types of speech that intersect with each-other.

Let us take a look at the general definitions for the dialogue.

“The direct speech of interlocutor in “the explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms” . This type of speech has a number of character traits. For instance, its syntactic formation is simple. Every person’s sentence is usually short and so on.” [11:33] H. Mahmudov expressed his opinion about this issue in his primary research. “... Dialogue is comprehended as a communication about the general topic between two or more people” [8:72] It was also written in the research of Boboeva “... a pair of two components that are usually interconnected constitutes a dialogue.” [3:39]

It is clear that the authors considered that the bases of the dialogue two or more people, the general topic, the features in the syntactic formation.

The description of O.C.Axmanova is also the same as the abovementioned ones.

“Dialogue. A form of the speech. Each sentence is addressed directly to the interviewer and is spoken within the context of the topic. Dialogue is characterized by a relatively short and simple syntactic structure.” [1:132]. Differentiating the usual dialogue she said that its inner type is “the figure of the speech”.

Basing on the ideas abovementioned about the dialogue, we discovered the following main marks.

1. A speaker and a listener or addressee and addresser
2. The process of the speech
3. The general topic

We have not discussed about the form of monologue again. So, in our opinion, dialogue is the primary one and monologue has to keep dialogue elements in all conditions because everything has two sides. In other words, the presence of the speaker indicates this of the listener. If it had not so the speech process would not have occurred either verbally or written without addressee and addresser. In the conversation a person’s speech refers to a certain listener and addresses to someone. In the last years the term “discuss” have been used together with dialogue. A number of ideas were expressed about the dialogue discuss in the research of Sh.Safarov, L.Raupov, G.Toirov, M.Kurbonova. As a first researcher Sh. Safarov conveyed discuss “as a process of the speech conversation”. [9:223] Raupova and our linguists may be said to use the viewpoints of Sh.Safarov as an example.

It is clear that the person who has a question must begin the speech in the dialogue. The addressee that forms the answer to the question in the conversation makes the subject of the conversation in most cases. The interviewer’s questionnaire gives the possible

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

answers that surround the subject and drives the conversation in a certain direction. Having observed this case Gelgard said that dialogue is in a certain form, in other words, responding to interest. What is said for benefit comes from the expression and evaluation of something. Relationship depends on how the speaker evaluates the situation. The content of the second interlocutor's response indicates that he is trying to understand the situation, trying to put himself in a more balanced position or feeling inclined to try. Dj. Serlning, the American linguist, called this case as a speech intensity in his theory about the speech statement. [10:151-169]

Let us the following example:

-Manaviniyam qoldirdi,-dedi qorovul chol qora muqovali qalin kitobni uzatib.

We can know what is the word "manavi" in the line of the sentence with the help of the speech situation in this case. The existence of a line of the sentence except for the speech situation, context is unlawful. It has no value beyond the situation, that is, outside the situation. Apparently, the meaning of the word is realized in a speechless manner and performs a specific communicative function. We get information about the book through a speech situation. In such cases it is impossible to have a dialogue without speech. N. Mahmudov used the term like "situational ellipsis" about it. By the nature of dialects it is a phenomenon that embodies compactness, sophistication and charm.

One of the characteristic features of the dialogues is formality and meaningful pressure and the observations show that the interlocutor's knowledge of each other can lead to a diminished vertical side of the general conversation. Kinetic expressions tend to go forward.

Example:

-Sulton aka?- do'rildoq tovush telefon trubkasini zirillatib yubordi.

"Abdulla! Qayerdan bildi? Obbo!"

-Salom,-dedi dovdirab.

-Sulton aka, o'zingizmisiz?- Bu safar jiyaning ovozi hiyla ishonchli eshitildi.

-O'zim, Abdullajon.

-E, yashang-e! Shunaqa bo'ladimi! Ayting, bizning gunohimiz ne?

H. Sultonov. On a wonderful day.

This conversation made the dialect like a brief overview according to participants' proximity, intimate and sighs of respect. A full verbal expression of the dialogue without the above characters would be as follows.

-Allo,

-Allo,

-Assalomu allaykum!

-Assalomu allaykum. Sulton aka kerak, sizmisiz?

-Menman. Siz kimsiz?

-Abdullaman.

-Qachon keldingiz?

-Kecha keldim.

-Nega xabar bermadingiz?

-O'zim.

-Xafa bo'ldim. Yashang-e, shunaqayam bo'ladimi! Ayting bizning gunohimiz ne?

In the example, we can see that the feelings of the cousin caused the process of the communication to become more compact. Sh.Balli said so about the role of the sense. "The role of the word in the sentence decreases proportionally to increased role of the sense." [2:351]

Another example:

Yuzi shishinqiragan, qo'zlari ich ichiga cho'kkan, ko'ylak shimi g'ijim bir kimsa, Ramazon!

-Ha?!- dedim hovliqib, tahlika bilan.

-Keldim.

-Qanday? Hali, hali... vaqt bor-ku?!

The first interlocutor's (a friend of Ramazon) line of the sentence consists of a word-sentence in the meaning of a question - astonishment like "Ha?!" The meaning of the word is the same the followings "What are you doing here? Were you in prison?!"

The question must not ask in this way. The questioner expresses his intention in a word-sentence "Ha" because there is the speech situation (the sighs which indicates the common spiritual-social situation of the interlocutors) in the abovementioned sentence. Such closed content was referred by G.P.Grays, the logicist and linguist with the term "implication". [7:219-220] Implicit expression (closed) is the opposite of exploitation (open) expression. The former ones add charm, eagerness and desire for meaning to the lines of dialogues. It makes the listener be attentive and vigilant. This causes the dialogue to be lively and real. The word "implication" means like "connection, communication" in English. This process refers to the meaning that comes through the common knowledge that is known to the participants in the dialogue. Such anonymous, gesture-based interviewing takes place in the same group, in general business, with inter-compulsive, voluntary interlocutors. They are united by common goals in a common "scenario". At the same time the togetherness in the dialogue, the speech steps of those who work for the common purpose remind us of travelers seeking a destination through the common road. Each "traveler" has a specific and common purpose that becomes clearer in the communication process. Obedience to the principle of commonality is a prerequisite for becoming a participant. It reminds us the wise expression of our Uzbek people like "We are in the same ship". The mental and spiritual unity of the participants brings a closer "address", opens the way for new "addresses" Otherwise, a failed communication occurs. People are moving away from each other.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHII (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Axmanova, O.S. (1966). *Slovar lingvisticheskix terminov*. Moscow: Sovetskaya ensiklopediya.
2. Balli, Sh. (1961). *Fransuzkaya stilistika*. Moscow.
3. Boboyeva, A. (1978). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilida to'liqsiz gaplar*. Tashkent.
4. Vinogradov, V.V. (1963). *Stilistika. Teoriya poeticheskoy rechi. Poetika*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akadem nauk.
5. Vinokur, G.O. (1959). *Izbranniye raboti po russkomu yaziku*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoye uchebno-pedagogicheskogo izdatelstvo.
6. Gelgard, R. R. (1971). *Rassujdeniye o dialogax i monologov. Sbornik dokladov i soobsheniy lingvisticheskogo obshchestvo. II. vip. I*. Moscow: Kalingrad.
7. Grays, G.P. (1985). *Logika i rechevoe obsheniye. NZL. Vip. XVI*. Moscow: Progress.
8. Mahmudov, N. (1975). Dialoglarda ellipsis. *O'ZBEK TILI VA ADABIYOTI, №5*.
9. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalingvistika*. - Toshkent, O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
10. Serl, Dj. R. (1986). *Chto takoye rechevoy akt. Novoye v zarubejnoy lingvistike Vip. 17*. Moscow: Progress.
11. Xojiyev, A. (1985). *Lingvistik terminlarning izohli lug'ati*. Tashkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
12. Shevodova, N.Yu. (1960). *Ocherki po sintaksisu russkoy razgovornoy rechi*. Moscow
13. (n.d.). Retrieved 2019, from [www.http.hrono.ru/biograf/bio_z/zenoneleat.php](http://www.hrono.ru/biograf/bio_z/zenoneleat.php)