

UDC 82

**DIALOGUE AS THE HETEROGENEOUS PHENOMENON  
IN THE TRAGEDIES OF SHAKESPEARE**B. Abdurazokov<sup>1</sup>, N.B. Nazarova<sup>2</sup>*Abstract*

The article discusses dialogue as a heterogeneous phenomenon in the tragedies of Shakespeare.

*Key words:* dialogue, Shakespeare, phraseological configuration, dramatic monologue, characters.

The interaction of phraseological configurations with its semantic correlates is investigated from the point of view of its role in the structural-semantic and stylistic organizations of dramatic dialogue. The text of dramatic context includes dialogues, monologues and author's marginal notes. So, here the object of the investigation is dialogical speech. The problem of differentiation of dialogues and monologues has a paramount importance in this research. In the capacity of general criteria during differentiation of dramatic dialogue and dramatic monologue in the work is accepted by a sign of communicativeness, i.e. the pronouncing of replica in the presence of one or another interlocutors (or listeners), originated by its expression and depending on their reaction. The replicas, pronounced on the stage, that are free from other characters, don't possess this sign and are added on monologic one. Dialogue in the tragedy of Shakespeare is heterogeneous phenomena. The dialogical replicas are distinguished by structural-syntactical composition and extent as well as communicative-semantic particularities and forms between them. The four main types of dramatic dialogue in the tragedies of Shakespeare are distinguished in the research.

1) *Proper dialogue* – bilateral interchange of short replicas, consisted of one or two simple sentences. It is realized in two varieties: a) genuine dialogue and b) dialogue – casuistry.

According to structural-syntactic composition of replicas and forms of connections between them, this type of the dialogue is a large extent close to everyday dialogue. Replicas of proper dialogue are characterized by simple syntactical composition, extreme conciseness, frequently usage of modal sentences, etc. Such replicas by virtue of its conciseness and interdependence are interlaced with each other by different ways. The “repetitions” and “question-answering connection” is widespread here. At the same time, proper dialogue is a part of drama as a work of fictional literature and should perform certain functions such as a development of plot, transmission of author's ideas, etc. In the plane of content of replicas of proper dialogue the action is expressed directly in the dynamic; replicas of dialogue – casuistry (play) of words don't gain ground the development of the action of drama. These plays on words are in its own way a verbal competition between heroes, the contest of wit [2, 14].

2) *Dialogue-monologue* is an exchange of expanded, syntactical complex replicas, which occupy minimum - the quatrain, maximum – 7-10 lines. Structural dependence between replicas is debilitated, formal connection is frequently absent and only semantic connection is realized. In the plane of content replicas of dialogue-monologue narrate about processing events. For example, message about a course of battle.

---

<sup>1</sup>Абдуразоков Бобур – магистрант, Самаркандский государственный институт иностранных языков, Узбекистан.

<sup>2</sup>Н.Б. Назарова – магистрант, Самаркандский государственный институт иностранных языков, Узбекистан.

3) *Monologue-dialogue* is an exchange of replicas, which are not equivalent in structural-syntactic relationship. The replicas of monologue character (10 or more lines) are interlaced with not widespread replicas, consisting of one or two simple sentences of questioning, declarative and imperative character. Depending on the content of monologue-dialogue acts in the role of two their variety:

a) *epic monologue-dialogue* – narration about facts and events, which was not shown to the reader in the stage version, but essential for understanding the development of the dramatic action;

b) *lyrical monologue-dialogue* explains or motivate the actions of personage, shows temper of characters. It is characterized by high degree of emotiveness, which becomes apparent in the widespread usage of modal types of sentences that express different emotions.

4) *Mixed dialogue* is a type of dialogue, in which replicas of different dialogic forms are united. This suggested classification is not exhaustive one. However, a delimitation of types of dialogic speech is useful because of its simplicity and answer to the purpose of the present research. Dialogue in its various forms is characterized by certain structure, units of which are replicas, supra-phrasal dialogic unity and dialogic wholeness. Replica is an expression, boarder of which is a change of speaker, connected with previous and following expression of lexica-structural means and without it doesn't exists.

Replica in the dramatic dialogue is interpreted in several planes: as expression of image of personage, as a mean of development of action in drama, etc. Replica is also an important mean of delimitation types of dialogic speech. In tragedies of Shakespeare the types of dialogues are differentiated from each other by extension and structural-semantic composition of replicas which compose it. Supra-phrasal dialogic unity is a binomial (rare ternary) formation, consisted of stimulating and reactive replicas that belong to two participants of conversation.

Replicas are united in supra-phrasal dialogue unity not only mutually causal lexical-stylistically as in proper dialogue, but also syntactically non-correlative as in dialogue-monologue and monologue-dialogue. Dialogical wholeness is a whole set of two or more supra-phrasal dialogic wholeness, connected by one general theme of conversation.

Not only structural indicators, but also communicative orientation of a dialogue, its pragmatic functions, i.e. realization of motif, which makes a speaker to begin the conversation are taken into account during the selection of this unit of dialogical structure. The upper boarder of dialogical wholeness is the first expression of one of the interlocutors on this theme. The whole set of two or several dialogical wholeness, in which several themes are developed, forms dialogical micro context. Such different types of interactions between themes as "interweaving", "alternation", "interpenetration" are observed [4, 17].

The setting up of the borders of dialogical micro context presents significant difficulties. A formal indicator is often changing of characters that participate in a dialogical communication. Thus, structural and semantical interconnected units of dialogical structure (replicas, supra-phrasal dialogical unities and dialogical wholeness) are united in single dialogical micro context, which is described in certain dramatic situation.

The widespread approach to a phenomenon of correlate on the phraseological level, in the base of which lies the extended notion of nomination, suggested by V.G. Gak and other researches, is realized in this work. Nomination is interpreted according to Pinskiy as "designation of the whole reflected and recognized by human consciousness, all things in existence and conceivable notions, objects, people, actions, quality, relationship, events" [1, 56].

Such understanding of nomination gives rise to extend the circle of means with nominative function and relate them to not only lexical units, but also sentence or a number of sentences as a mean of nomination of situation.

Firstly, not separate phraseological units are distinguished. But, correlates of phraseological configuration, within the scope of which phraseological units is actualized during the deep approach to the phenomenon of correlation, is realized in this work.

Secondly, accounting of specifics of phraseological nomination, the ability of phraseological units as signs of generalized semantics enter in the correlative relationship with nominative formation more than word or word combination, allows extending the notion of semantic correlate and not delimitating it only by the frame of lexical and phraseological nomination [3, 204].

Thirdly, wide understanding of correlative couple-phraseological configuration/ its semantic correlate stipulated the broad concept of correlative relationship due to structural-semantic varieties of correlates.

*Reference list:*

1. Пинский Л.Е. Шекспир. Основные начала драматургии.- М.: Наука, 2001.- 126 с.
2. Смирнов А.А. Творчество Шекспира.- Л.: Литература, 2004.- 298 с.
3. Строганова Ю. Что подсказал Шекспир.- М.: Литературная учеба, 2004.- №5. С.203-205.
4. Watson C. B. Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor Text. .- N.Y.: New York Press, 2005.- 69 p.

© В. Abdurazokov, N.B. Nazarova, 2019

---