

THE DIALOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE NOVEL - LIVING SPEECH, A LITERARY NORM AND A WORK OF ART

Diana Shimanskaya, researcher,

Samarkand Campus of ISFT Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract. *The study of dialogic speech is a relevant area of research in modern linguistics, within the framework of which research is conducted that differs in methodology, goals and objectives. It is obvious that the study of speech activity, and when we speak about speech activity, we mean primarily the situation of dialogical communication, contains many interesting and sometimes little-studied problems and questions. The purpose of the article is the linguistic analysis and classification of fiction dialogues according to their communicative-functional characteristics.*

Keywords: *word arrangement, division, utterance, component, colloquial speech, associative addition.*

ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ СТРУКТУРА РОМАНА – ЖИВАЯ РЕЧЬ, ЛИТЕРАТУРНАЯ НОРМА И ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОЕ ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЕ

Диана Шиманская, преподаватель,

Самаркандский филиал Института ISFT, Узбекистан

Аннотация. *Изучение диалогической речи является актуальным направлением исследований в современной лингвистике, в рамках которого проводятся исследования, различающиеся по методологии, целям и задачам. Очевидно, что изучение речевой деятельности, а когда мы говорим о речевой деятельности, мы имеем в виду прежде всего ситуацию диалогического общения, содержит в себе много интересных и порой малоизученных проблем и вопросов. Целью статьи является лингвистический анализ и классификация художественных диалогов по их коммуникативно-функциональным признакам.*

Ключевые слова: *словорасположение, членение, высказывание, компонент, разговорная речь, ассоциативное дополнение.*

Today, there are many works aimed at solving important theoretical and practical issues: description of types of dialogic reactions (Arutyunova), problems of modeling and functional-linguistic analysis of dialogue (Balayan), study of dialogic functions of individual types of statements (Tsurikova) and types of dialogic remarks (Shvedova), description of the structure of dialogue (Byrdina), studies of syntactic features of dialogic speech, description of communicative roles of participants in dialogic interaction (Vinokur), identification of the constituent parts of dialogue (Debrenne), analysis of the coherence of dialogic text (Fugeron, Breuillard). A number of works are devoted to the analysis of dialogic speech in works of art of different genres: this is the analysis of dialogue from the point of view of the theory of speech acts in drama, the description of the functions and semantic features of dialogic unity in poetic speech (Mukhametova).

The works of a number of scientists (I.V. Azarova, M.V. Yavorskaya, A.V. Antonov, M.V. Gubina, O.A. Kazakevich, I.N. Larchenkova, I.S. Nekrestyanova, B.V. Dobrov, I.V. Segalovich, V.I. Shabanova, etc.) form a separate section of research on computational linguistics. A noticeable feature of the latest research has become the popularity of the topic of conflict dialogue. Of interest here are the works of Anna A. Zaliznyak "Reconstruction of the "true meaning" of lines in a conflict dialogue: problem statement", B.S. Tretyakova "Conflict through the eyes of a linguist", A. Nikolova "Speech tactics and language markers of disagreement and conflict when motivating to action", etc.

The Dialogical Structure of the Novel as Living Speech, as a Literary Norm, and as a Work of Art Colloquial speech is a type of language that is realized primarily in oral form in a situation of unprepared, relaxed communication during direct interaction of communication partners. The main area of implementation of colloquial speech is everyday communication that takes place in an informal setting [1].

One of the main characteristic features of colloquial speech is ellipsis. The absence of verbalized expression of individual elements of an utterance is explained by the

fact that they are compensated for by the generality of the situation. In linguistics, the term "ellipsis" is most often used to denote three phenomena.

1. Significant absence of a member of a syntactic construction ("zero member" or "syntactic zero"): My brother - student.

2. Omission of one or another member of the syntactic construction, present in the context (contextual ellipsis): The boy was bought a scooter, and the girl - a doll. The missing member is understood unambiguously, since it is given in the context.

3. Absence of one or another member of the construction, clear from the consituation (consituational ellipsis): Show me the red ones. Constructions of this kind are understandable only under certain conditions [3].

E.A. Trofimova identifies the following types of elliptical constructions in English:

1) Sentences with a zero subject, expressed by a personal pronoun or introducing "it": Got some rope - have been told.

Had mashed potatoes and stuff like that.

2) Elliptic sentences with a zero predicate:

· with an unexpressed auxiliary verb: You're going to have all the girls and boys? Somebody at the door!

· with an unexpressed nominal part of the compound predicate: 'But there is no need to get angry.' - 'If I am it is your fault...'

· with an unexpressed full-valued verb: Odd man (goes) out.

3) Sentences with a zero subject and predicate: Dreadful!

4) Constructions with an unexpressed subject and part of the predicate:

This phenomenon is common both in interrogative sentences and in response replies: Go back? ... No good at all! Go sideways? Impossible! Go forward? Only thing to do! On we go!

Similarly, a similar phenomenon is possible in sentences that contain a connecting part of the question: Hot stuff, isn't she?

Sentences with an elliptical introductory phrase "there is" can also be included in this group: No public phones in this residential area.

Despite the fact that simple grammatical constructions predominate in colloquial speech, complex sentences are still used, with preference given to compound constructions. According to V.V. Buzarov, the phenomenon of ellipsis is usually observed in the second sentence of a compound sentence. In this case, for the sake of speech economy, the following elements can be omitted:

- predicate or part of it: Many a hand has scaled the grand old face of the plateau. Some belong to strangers, and some to the folks you know.
- modal verb and subject: Perhaps I could reach him at home after I got back to the house. On the other hand, why (should we) bother?
- object determined by an adjective or ordinal number: They dedicate their lives to running all of his.
- adverbial clause: Kelly was at Richard's, but Emmy wasn't.
- predicate phrase in full: Mike plays football but not Bob.

In a complex sentence, the following are omitted [5]:

- linking elements “that”, “who(m)”: You know you're right. Using the elements “who”, “that”, or “which” as the subject of a subordinate clause is the norm of the language, but in spoken language there is a tendency to omit them:

I reckon there ain't one boy in a thousand (who) can do this.

- subject and predicate in the second part of the sentence: He is a prisoner at Bag End now, I expect, and very frightened.
- one of the subordinate clauses that differ only in conjunctions: I'm ready to meet them where and when they like.
- infinitive: You can all go, if you want to. I mean to stay.
- particle "to": There was only one thing for me to do - accept his conditions.
- preposition: `Foreigner (With) Heavy accent.' [4].

As a result, semantically and grammatically related phrases often end up separated, with the most significant word being moved to the beginning: Have you seen where my hat is? Good job, this. Word order in Russian colloquial speech is connected with intonation. Colloquial speech has a specific type of connection

between two predicative constructions in one utterance - the connection of free connection.

As already noted in the above, striving to recreate the most truthful picture of people's lives, the writer, in most cases, achieves the effect of naturalness and ease in the characters' lines. Nevertheless, due to a number of factors, some discrepancies are inevitable, caused, first of all, by the difference between written and oral forms of communication. In colloquial statements, some grammatically and semantically necessary components are often un verbalized. Their absence is compensated for by the presence of a certain situation common to the participants in the discourse. Thus, verbal ellipsis does not hinder mutual understanding of the interlocutors.

References:

1. Nafisa, K., & Matluba, D. (2023). PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF RESEARCH INTO THE PROBLEM OF BILINGUAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING. Conferencea, 31-34.
2. Tasheva, D. S., & Kubaeva, N. A. (2022). Modern educational technologies in the aspect of a student-centered approach in teaching foreign languages. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching, 12, 35.
3. Nafisa, K., & Kamola, A. (2024). THE PROBLEM OF TEACHING STUDENTS LEXICAL AND PHRASEOLOGICAL FEATURES IN TRANSLATION STUDIES OF PHRASAL VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 4(10), 39-42.
4. Kholbaeva D.D., Tasheva D.S. Pedagogical techniques and methods of forming interest in the lessons of the Russian language. Web of scientist: international scientific research journal, ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 3, Mar., 2022. -p.238
5. Kholbaeva, D., & Tasheva, D. (2022). Theoretical And Practical Aspects Of Monitoring The Acquisition Of Knowledge, Skills And Abilities By

Students In The Russian Language In Universities. Евразийский журнал
социальных наук, философии и культуры, 2(11), 115-118.