

Suima I. P.

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

MAIN COMPONENTS OF THE DIALOGICAL ENTITY

Dialogue research is mainly related to the analysis and description of its varieties, the search for general patterns of formation and functioning of dialogical entity. A differentiated approach to each of them is characteristic of the study of this type of unities from the point of view of both functions in the texts of works and the interaction of speech-thinking tactics and communication strategies. Scientists are united in the fact that a productive analysis of dialogical speech is achievable only if the researcher studies it in close connection with the speech behavior of communicants. It is necessary to take into account factors and conditions associated with the individual qualities of the participants in communication, with their general knowledge, interactions and assumptions. In connection with the appeal of the science of language to the human factor, to a native speaker, the efforts of scientists began to be directed to the study of speech messages, taking into account their impact on the addressee. In the process of communication, it is important to take into account the correspondence factor of the dialogue form of communication of the speech situation and the principle of variability. Moreover, it is precisely the possibility of choosing the option of utterance that provides the functional-pragmatic flexibility of the dialogue. The choice of means of expression of dialogic speech allows the speaker to develop his own style of communication. The study of dialogue gives reason to talk about it as a multifaceted phenomenon. Replicas-stimuli and replicas-reactions, united by a single topic, have their structural and semantic features, as well as their communicative orientation. Given this specificity, certain types of DE are identified, genres of information transfer, while hidden meanings are not excluded. The basic unit of analysis of a dialogical text is a dialogical entity, as a whole communicative unit, which is a coherent sequence of speech actions that form a kind of complex speech act – an interactive or dialogue action.

Key words: *dialogue, dialogical entity, communication, question, answer, speech act, definition.*

Problem statement and relevance. The definitions of dialogical entity (DE) usually emphasize that it acts as a combination of a number of replicas, interdependent in structurally-semantic plan, that between replicas of DE there is a semantic, anaphoric or structural connection, that they are in such a structural and semantic connection in which the previous replica acts as conditional, and each of the subsequent ones in three-part or more DE, with on the one hand, it is determined by the preceding one, and on the other hand, it determines the next following it, and only the last, final remark is only conditional. Moreover, each new statement only continues the dialogue, and everything that was said before this statement forms an interpretative framework for the subsequent statement. All dialogic unity is divided into different types according to semantic and formal structural criteria in the characterization of dialogue as an element of the structure of a work of art.

Sometimes a critical attitude is expressed towards the delimitation of artistic dialogue into dialogic entities, and the unit of dialogic speech is not dialogic entity, but a thematically related dialogical block, determined on the basis of semantic. connectedness

of utterances-replicas. In a multi-replica dialogue, semantic blocks are usually distinguished, a microtome is put at the base of each such block, and the entire dialogue is considered as a system of topics united by a single topic. In this case, an attempt is made to isolate several microtomes in any dialogue [9]. The disadvantages of such studies include, first of all, weak argumentation and validity of solving the question of dialogue units. So, the topicality of our research is connected with the analysis and description of dialogical elements.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to identify the main components and peculiarities of the dialogical entity.

The presentation of the main material. It seems more acceptable to us that the main unit of analysis of a dialogical text is dialogic unity, which is a coherent sequence of speech actions that form a kind of complex speech act – an interactive or dialogical action. Linguists usually appeal to the concept of “dialogic unity” when analyzing the constructive features of dialogue and the structural and compositional characteristics of dialogue replicas – the original and the response [1;6].

However, dialogical entity, regardless of whether it consists of two, three or more replicas, is a complex of statements interconnected not only structurally-compositionally, but also meaningfully and functionally. Between the replicas of the dialogical entity, the relations “stimulus-reaction” are established. This means that each source replica generates a second, response, etc. and that the structure and semantics of the first, initiating replica to some extent determines the form and content of the second response replica, because between them there is, as a rule, an “implicative” connection [3]. The analysis of dialogical entity based on the principles of communicative linguistics, associated with the orientation on the personality of participants in speech communication, speech design, the illocutionary force inherent in each replica of the dialogue, allows us to expand the concept of dialogical entity as an element of the text. One cannot disagree with the fact that dialogical entity “is not just a union of lexically and grammatically non-independent replicas, but an integral communicative unit, consisting of statements that have their own communicative orientation and united by a single theme” [8]. At the same time, it must be taken into account that each initiating replica stimulus of a two-part dialogical entity with a single topic (or multiple-part with corresponding micro-themes) is built as an independent speech act, the illocutionary force of which extends to the response replica that closes the micro topic or single topic as a whole.

The ways of expressing the original cue are largely determined by the communicative intention of the initiator of the dialogue and can be represented by sentences of various structural-communicative types. The ways of expressing the response replica are more diverse in their communicative functions, which is to one degree or another connected with the significant communicative load of the response replicas, which are endowed with the ability to “clash” opposite points of view belonging to the participants in the dialogue, and “facilitate” their combination of “and remove” contradiction [1].

It is the response replica, structurally completing the original one, that forms the integral semantic plan of dialogical entity, which allows us to speak of its reactivity in the sense that the author of the second replica forms his reaction by experiencing and processing this or that influence of the communication partner. As a result of this, DE acquires structural and semantic interconnectedness of its replicas, relative syntactic isolation and communicative completeness.

Many scholars recognize the position that without studying the specifics of DE, not only structurally, semantically, but also functionally and pragmatically, it is impossible to get sufficiently convincing ideas about the nature and specifics of DE as a whole as an element of the text. Little attention has been paid to the analysis of these units in the linguistics of the text. The speaker’s speech is primarily coding i.e. the choice made by him from among the various language tools that are capable of performing the same function in a particular context, and the listener’s response is decoding as a reaction and result of perception of the previous statement. Both of these processes (the choice of means and perceptions) carried out by the communicants under conditions of dialogic interaction are naturally related to their experience and ideas about reality. The areas of intersection of the background knowledge of communication partners make up the fund of their common knowledge, which in the form of pragmatic presuppositions serves as a means of ensuring coherence of replicas of the dialogue text. As already noted, the encoding, decoding of the semantic component within the framework of dialogic speech is pragmatically determined, because it involves a reference to the speaker or the listener as the main pragmatic components of the speech act, their mental and social spheres. Dialogue interaction, therefore, is closely related to the pragmatic presupposition of communication and the general knowledge fund of communicants, as well as their assessment of the dialogue currently underway. In terms of language expression, the resolution of this issue is reinforced by the predisposition of dialogic speech to variability. Moreover, it is the possibility of choosing the option of utterance that provides functional and pragmatic flexibility of dialogic speech and makes dialogue a more optimal way of verbal communication and effective impact on the participant of communication. The solution to this problem becomes one of the important tasks of the study of dialogical chains as units relevant to the formation of the text of a work of art. And success in studying this problem is achievable by referring to the doctrine of speech acts.

A speech act is a unit of verbal communicative activity, a speech product that combines a single intention, a completed minimum segment of speech and the achieved result. The pragmatic function of a speech act characterizes it as an act of the influence of the speaking person on the environment, on himself and on the addressee [11].

According to J. Searle, it is advisable to distinguish illocutionary acts:

1) for the purpose of this type of act, and the concept of illocutionary purpose should be distinguished from the concept of illocutionary force;

2) by expressed psychological states (faith, intentions, desire, regret);

3) by the strength with which the illocutionary target is presented;

4) on the relationship of the speaker and the listener;

5) in relation to utterances to the interests of the speaker and the listener;

6) on relations with the rest of the discourse;

7) according to the propositional content determined by indicators of illocutionary force [13].

The allocation of all illocutionary acts allows us to determine the essence of a pragmatic approach to the description of dialogical speech: the linguist's interest in this case focuses on the content of the statements of the participants in the dialogue interaction, and not on the meanings of the word form and phrase in the composition of these statements. Hence, it is inevitable to include in the sphere of analysis of a specific speech context and taking into account such parameters of the communicative situation as the place and time of communication, as well as the personal characteristics of the addressee and addressee [4].

The study of hidden contextually determined meanings at the level of dialogue interaction has turned into an independent branch of modern pragmatically oriented research [2]. The so-called indirect speech acts.

From the perspective of the listener, it is important to adequately decode the received voice message, taking into account the many components of this message. From a semantic point of view, a dialogical replica can incorporate one- and two-pronged semantic content. According to this approach, one can distinguish between dialogical texts with one "layer" of meaning (explicit) and texts with two "layers" of meaning (explicit and implicit, hidden) [10].

In linguistic science, the concept of implicature is treated ambiguously. The concept of implicit meaning is most appropriate, in our opinion, to be defined as content that is indirectly embodied in the usual lexical and grammatical meanings of language units and which, not being directly expressed by the addressee, is derived from the explicit content of the language unit as a result of the interaction of this content with the knowledge of the addressee and information obtained from the context of the situation, communication [7].

There are two types of implicit meaning:

– implicit presuppositional meaning, denotative content of presuppositions, present in the linguistic

consciousness of communicants in the form of a proposition (judgment);

– implicit communicative meaning, implicit informative content of the statement, intended for communication and explicated in the communicative act due to the establishment of the implicature relationship between the explicit denotative-communicative and implicit presuppositional meaning of the statement [10].

On the one hand, in the process of processing the received message, the addressee establishes its true value by means of his preliminary knowledge, which he brings into dialogue communication in order to understand the speech product. On the other hand, the replica reaction to the message is realized as a conclusion that is made by the listener from the information explicated by him, obtained in the specific conditions of the dialogue.

Structural and compositional analysis of dialogical entity allows us to conclude that the dialogical text reflects the clash of intentions of its participants. Therefore, for successful communication it is advisable to take into account the problems of personal relations, manifested in dialogic communication. These problems have received sufficient coverage in modern linguistics.

Researchers also note that the dialogical form of communication is directly related to the process of meaning formation in the course of communication.

Therefore, studies of the problem of the realization of inference within the framework of dialogic unity and especially its pragmatic aspect – the role of communicants in the formation of inference also seems to be logical.

One of the most important components of dialogic speech involved in the mechanism of linking replicas of dialogic unity is its objective modality as an essential constructive feature of each sentence, which contains an indication of the relation of the content of the statement to reality [5], and also subjective modality as the relation of the speaker to the reported. The category of modality is presented as a controlled and carried out by the speaker process of selecting available means of the language. The modality of dialogic unity has a complex structure, and therefore this phenomenon is still in the field of view of linguists.

The thematic integrity of dialogical entity is a necessary condition for mutual understanding of communication partners, establishing contact between them, and the implementation of various intentions [12].

The main semantic characteristic of the dialogue – an indication of the communicative

goal lies in the meaning of the dialogical entity of propositions. Without a communicative goal, dialogue cannot function as a unit of speech of a particular genre.

The leading complex dialogic genres of oral everyday speech are usually considered to be debate, negotiation, training – teaching, storytelling and conversation. According to the main goal of the dialogue participants, the following features of each genre are distinguished:

- 1) the conviction of the partner in the dispute;
- 2) coordination of their interests with the interests of the partner, search for ways to coordinate actions in negotiations;
- 3) transmitting to the listener information in the story;
- 4) In the conversation, each of the partners has its own goals (to pass the time, to have fun).

As for training, instruction, the main thing here is to convey to the interlocutor useful information necessary from the point of view of the addressee. From a functional point of view, all possible relationships between replicas of DE can be reduced to the following main varieties:

- 1) requesting information about any object, issuing this information (in the requested or lesser amount); assessment of this information;
- 2) request for information – refusal to give out information (while the information may be absent, but may vary);
- 3) prompting to commit an action – consent or refusal to perform an action;
- 4) a statement about the relation of the person being reported to objective reality – an expression of absolute agreement with the interlocutor;
- 5) the same thing – an expression of only partial agreement with the contents of the dialogical remark of the partner;
- 6) the same thing – the expression of an opinion that is completely different in content from the content of the replica of the interlocutor.

The dialogue elements are closely related within the dialogical entity, many of them present a direct response to the preceding remark, and their construction as syntactically complete sentences would lead to a repetition of information and the syntactic structure of the preceding remarks. Therefore, ellipsis, highlighting only the most important thing in a sentence and paying attention only to the most important details, makes the responsive phrase more emotionally-coloured, more expressive, and is one of the basic principles of the spoken text, and especially reactive phrases.

Reacting utterance (response) – is a phrase or sentence, which is the response to the stimulating phrase (question, statements, offers, etc.). Responsives can be expressed in different ways: in the form of interrogative, exclamatory and negative sentences, as interjections, elliptical constructions, phraseological units etc. They are directly dependent on the stimulating or initial phrases. Emotionally-coloured reacting phrases can be not only the reaction to the stimulating phrase, but they can become the stimulating phrases themselves: *Your behavior at the lecture was intolerable! – Look at yourself! You are not better, believe me! – Me? – Don't pretend to be very surprised! – No, you should explain...* etc. As we can see from the example, all utterances are connected semantically and logically and every reacting utterance becomes a stimulating one. Responsive utterances are closely connected with the initial ones within the context [3].

Conclusions. Dialogue research is mainly related to the analysis and description of its varieties, the search for general patterns of formation and functioning of DE. A differentiated approach to each of them is characteristic of the study of this type of unities from the point of view of both functions in the texts of works and the interaction of speech-thinking tactics and communication strategies. Scientists are united in the fact that a productive analysis of dialogical speech is achievable only if the researcher studies it in close connection with the speech behavior of communicants. It is necessary to take into account factors and conditions associated with the individual qualities of the participants in communication, with their general knowledge, interactions and assumptions. In connection with the appeal of the science of language to the human factor, to a native speaker, the efforts of scientists began to be directed to the study of speech messages, taking into account their impact on the addressee. In the process of communication, it is important to take into account the correspondence factor of the dialogue form of communication of the speech situation and the principle of variability. Moreover, it is precisely the possibility of choosing the option of utterance that provides the functional-pragmatic flexibility of the dialogue. The choice of means of expression of dialogic speech allows the speaker to develop his own style of communication. The study of dialogue gives reason to talk about it as a multifaceted phenomenon. Replicas-stimuli and replicas-reactions, united by a single topic, have their structural and semantic features, as well as their communicative orientation. Given this

specificity, certain types of DE are identified, genres of information transfer, while hidden meanings are not excluded. The basic unit of analysis of a dialogical text is a dialogical entity, as a whole communicative unit, which is a coherent sequence of speech actions that form a kind of complex speech act – an interactive or dialogue action. Success in the study of dialogical

chains as units that are relevant for the formation of different types of texts of works into which these chains are included is achieved precisely by referring to the doctrine of speech acts, i.e. speech works that allow you to combine the illocutionary intentions of the communicants, a relatively complete segment of speech and the achieved result.

References:

1. Брызгунова Е.А. Диалог. Русский язык. Энциклопедия. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1979. С. 74–75.
2. Изаренков Д.И. Обучение диалогической речи: монография. Москва: Русский язык, 1981. 136 с.
3. Белова Н.С. Типы ответных реплик в составе диалогического единства с отрицательным вопросом: дис. на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.05 «Романские языки». Москва, 2010. 179 с.
4. Богачева Е.В. Вербализация намерения говорящего в диалоге: на материале английского и русского языков: дис. ... на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Москва, 2007. 172 с.
5. Гильмутдинов В.И. Безглагольные реплики-реакции в английской разговорной речи: дис. на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 «Германские языки». Горький, 1984. 223 с.
6. Головаш Л.Б. Коммуникативные средства выражения стратегии уклонения от прямого ответа: на материале английского языка: дис. ... на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Кемерово, 2008. 177 с.
7. Сарычев В.В. Реплика как структурно-семантическая единица драматургического текста: на материале ряда трагедий В. Шекспира: дис. ... на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 «Германские языки». Москва, 2009. 205 с.
8. Цирельсон Н.Ю. Взаимодействие иницирующих реплик и реплик-редакций в диалоге: на материале современного английского языка: дис. ... на соискание ученой степени канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.19 «Теория языка». Москва, 2002. 152 с.
9. Меньшиков И.И. Типология респонсивных предложений в современном русском языке. *Избранные труды по лингвистике*. Днепропетровск : Новая идеология, 2012. С. 85–100.
10. Alger Horatio. Ragged Dick or Street life in New York with the Boot-Blacks. New York: Signet classic, 1990. 186 p.
11. Arthur Hailey. Electronic resource. Access: <http://english-e-books.net/books/upper-intermediate/Airport>

Суїма І. П. ОСНОВНІ КОМПОНЕНТИ ДІАЛОГІЧНОЇ ЄДНОСТІ

Дослідження діалогу в основному пов'язане з аналізом та описом його різновидів, пошуком загальних закономірностей формування та функціонування діалогічної єдності. Для дослідження цього типу єдностей характерним є диференційований підхід до кожної з них з точки зору як функцій у тексті, так і взаємодії тактики мовленнєвого мислення та комунікаційних стратегій. Вчені мають єдину думку, що продуктивний аналіз діалогічного мовлення досяжний лише за умови вивчення його дослідником у тісному зв'язку з мовленнєвою поведінкою комунікантів. Необхідно враховувати фактори та умови, пов'язані з індивідуальними якостями учасників спілкування, з їх загальними знаннями, взаємодією та припущеннями. У зв'язку із зверненням науки про мову до людського фактору, до носія мови, зусилля вчених почали спрямовувати на вивчення мовленнєвих повідомлень з урахуванням їх впливу на адресата. У процесі спілкування важливо враховувати коефіцієнт відповідності діалогової форми спілкування мовленнєвої ситуації та принцип варіативності. Більше того, саме можливість вибору варіанту висловлювання забезпечує функціонально-прагматичну гнучкість діалогу. Вибір засобів вираження діалогічного мовлення дозволяє мовцеві виробити власний стиль спілкування. Дослідження діалогу дає підстави говорити про нього як про багатогранне явище. Репліки-стимули та репліки-реакції, об'єднані єдиною темою, мають свої структурно-сміслові особливості, а також комунікативну спрямованість. Враховуючи цю специфіку, виділяють певні види діалогічних єдностей, жанри передачі інформації, при цьому не виключаються приховані значення. Основною одиницею аналізу діалогічного тексту є діалогічна єдність як цілісна комунікативна одиниця, що являє собою цілісну послідовність мовленнєвих дій, що утворюють різновид складного мовленнєвого акту – інтерактивну або діалогічну дію.

Ключові слова: діалог, діалогічна єдність, спілкування, запитання, відповідь, мовленнєвий акт, дефініція.