
**ON THE CONCEPTS OF DIALOGUE, DISCOURSE,
SPEECH ACT AND ILLOCUTIVENESS**

Feruzakhon Sayfuddinovna Karimova*

*PhD,

Department of Philological Sciences,

Researcher of the Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore,

Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Email id: sayfuddinovna26@mail.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2022.00084.3

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the concepts of dialogue and discourse, as well as their integration on a common level with the concepts of speech act and illocutiveness. More over the article deeper analyses theoretical basis of the concepts of dialogue, discourse, speech act and illocutiveness. Author concluded that the use of concepts such as discourse, speech act, illocutive purpose, intensity, illocutive obligation, pragmatic force in pragmalinguistic research is closely related to the pragmatic situations that arise as a result of the speech context and the speech situation.

KEYWORDS: *Dialogue, Discourse, Speech Act, Illocutiveness, Pragmatic Barrier.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of the problem of dialogic speech and discourse in world linguistics is undoubtedly explained by the increasing interest of F. de Saussure in the theory of speech activity. "Although the dichotomy of language was described by W. Humboldt, the school of young grammarians, and Baudouin de Courtenay before F. de Saussure, F. de Saussure made it the center of the linguistic system" [1, p.35]. The basis of the theory of speech activity is the dichotomy of language-speech. Linguist A. Nurmanov, commenting on the concept of *speech activity* in the teachings of F. de Saussure, who played a fundamental role in the emergence of pragmatic research, and stated that "it is a whole that embodies the features of individuality and sociality, and that it consists of a unity of linguistic relations" [1: p.35]. From the second half of the twentieth century, speech activity became one of the central concepts of linguistics. That is why the interest in dialogue, speech acts in action, and the concept of discourse has also attracted the attention of researchers.

L. Raupova's research work "Discursive Analysis of Dialogic Speech" aims to reveal the characteristics of polypredicative units in the form of dialogic discourse in a sociopragmatic direction" [2]. While the study of dialogic speech in traditional linguistics is mainly analyzed in the syntactic and semantic direction, L. Raupova's work focuses on the syntactic, semantic aspects as well as the pragmatic and social aspects of the topic. The features of polypredicative units in the form of dialogic discourse in the Uzbek language are described in a sociopragmatic aspect, the role of social mental and pragmatic factors in artistic dialogic discourse is described, the formation and stages of dialogic discourse are studied and analyzed as a communicative element [3, p.8-9]. The author states that in this study, he treated the discourse as a "text surrounded by nonlinear events" and chose dialogic speech as the object of his research" [3, p.14].

2. MAIN BODY

It should be noted that the term *discourse* is interpreted differently by linguists. Commenting on the controversial relationship, Safarov agreed with V.A.Zveginsev's definition of "a region hidden behind the clouds" [4, p.215], pointing out that the discourse phenomenon has not yet been clearly

and thoroughly studied. Even though, in the scholar's view, "it is not difficult to see that the terms 'text' and 'speech activity' are used interchangeably in the definition of a discourse phenomenon." [4,p.216]. The author's views on text and discourse are summarized as follows: "The interpretation of the text as a stable, finished product, and the discourse as an ongoing process of verbal communication, makes them very different" [4, p.223].

V.S. Grigoreva's work, which focuses on the issue of discourse, explains 4 different meanings of the term that are still in scientific use today: 1. Speech in the communicative process, which implies a purely linguistic meaning. 2. Popular style discourse used by French structuralists (in the sense of debate). 3. The concept of discourse representing the text in formal linguistics. 4. One of the manifestations of verbal communication is the unity of communication. " [internet source]. It is safe to say that this classification covers all the meanings of the term discourse in linguistics, and it would now help to solve the problem much more clearly by working out what meaning they are used in the language system.

One of the works on the issues of speech communication in Uzbek linguistics is G. Toirova's dissertation "Systematic and informative in Uzbek speech communication". In this work, the author interprets speech communication as a system. The scholar describes the object of study as follows: "Verbal communication is a situational pragmatic whole consisting of a combination of linguistic (verbal) and non-linguistic (ethical, aesthetic, ethnographic) components" [5, p.13]. The scholar's view is noteworthy: "In pragmatics, the occurrence of speech units is studied in the context of discourse - the process of speech communication, the interaction of communicators and their interaction" [5, p.11]. Apparently, the author notes that the term discourse can be replaced by the term speech communication process. I do not agree with the author's opinion: "The study of speech as a process can be done only in a system of communication." [5, p.11]. After all, if we look at other areas of study of communication systems (such as psychology, medicine, jurisprudence, sociology), we have to move away from these ideas. For example, psychology studies the speech process as a psychophysiological, neuropsychological system. [6, pp.510-523].

While evaluating the speech communication process as a complex situational-pragmatic system, the author concludes that its components consist of external and internal factors. External factors include gender, level, social background, age, education, specialization, and social value of the participants, while internal factors include verbal and kinetic expressions. In our opinion, the author is inspired in this classification by the views of F. de Saussure, the founder of structural linguistics, on "external linguistics" and "internal linguistics" [1, pp.34-35]. In this work of the scientist, speech communication is interpreted as a complex situational-pragmatic system. As you know, in our linguistics there are enough ideas about paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations [7, pp.12-30].

It is known that the origin and study of the first theory of speech act in linguistics is associated with the name of J. Austin. [8, pp.22-129]. In his work, the philosopher sees the word as a moving and moving process. The word *act* is derived from the Latin word *actus*, meaning "action." J. Austin focuses on the analysis of speech act types and performance verbs.

When considering the essence of a speech act, it would be appropriate to cite Safarov's description of it: "A speech act is the pronunciation of a certain sentence in a clear communication environment" [4, p.72]. The author also agrees with J. Searl's view of the act of speech: "More precisely, the creation and use of a sign in certain conditions is a speech act, and speech acts are the basic and smallest unit of linguistic communication" [4, p.73].

In general, it can be observed that in the study of several works on the topic of speech communication, speech dialogue, which is directly related to dialogic speech, also refers to direct dialogues. Such works include the analysis of speech acts in the section "Theory of speech act" in Chapter 2 of M. Hakimov's doctoral dissertation, as well as the author's monograph "History of

Pragmalinguistic Research", published in 2020 [7, p.145].

Linguist M. Hakimov, commenting on the types of speech acts, admits that their occurrence is closely linked with the process of dialogue and polylogue. In particular, given that providing anonymous content is a good environment for dialogue, he says: "Understanding, understanding and comprehending the implicit structure in speech requires the participants in the dialogic structure, i.e. the listener (s), to express the appropriate speech acts. Therefore, the formation of a speech act is based on dialogic forms of verbal expression. Dialogue is one of the important issues in the theory of speech acts. Context, text, and dialogue are important" [7, p.45]. In fact, in speech acts or dialogues, the intention that the speaker is trying to convey to the listener does not always correspond to the content of the verbal sentence. In other words, a dictum can be given under a sentence dictum instead of another mode or response mode. This can be seen, for example, in the "incorrect answers" to the question in the question-answer dialog units: Question: What is your name? Answer:- I will not say dictation is not expressed in both parts of the dialogue units that I do not say. The second part consists of modes. "Under the concept of propositional act in speech, the term dictum is mainly used. Dictation as a linguistic term is a proposition that encompasses the main content of a sentence [7, p.70]. Due to the function of language as a system of signs, the answer in the second part is not dictum. Or in asking a tricky question in the form Your dress beautiful? - there is another purpose (not the beauty of the dress, but the act of satisfying a request) the response style of Do not interrupt, I'm working is the dictum response given to the modus. The fact that the communicative function, which is the main function of language, is not always directly performed, leads to pragmatic content. It is natural that this situation takes place in the context of dialogic speech. The dialogue environment is full of such implicit situations, in which the question of communication in the form of a single question and answer is an issue that needs to be studied separately.

The ideas related to the illocutive structure presented in the research of the linguist are of special value in the analysis of dialogic speech. "An illocutive structure is one that encompasses the intensity of the speaker, an illocutive act, usually referred to as a communicative intention or goal" [7, p.72]. Each speech act is associated with a specific illocutive function. Speech acts are "the product of speech activity, which results from dialogic speech." Speech acts consist of components such as the addressee, the addressee and the speech situation [7, p.83]. A. Baranov and G. Kreidlin, who focus on the illocutive content, introduce the concept of "illocutive compulsion" in linguistics in their research, focusing on the issue of speech acts under the influence of J. Austin's ideas. They prefer to distinguish between dialogues in illocutive free and illocutive dependent. The authors analyze the question bites of a determinative nature, which are the 2nd bite, as an absolute illocutive bite bite. At the same time, the third bite, which is the answer to the defining question, is considered to be an illocutive act. [9, pp.84-89]. In general, the reaction part of any dialog unit in the form of a stimulus-response is the dependent part relative to the stimulus part.

Another scholar, M. Kurbanova, in her monograph "Pragmalinguistic features of Uzbek children's speech" also studied the speech acts that take place in a dialogue environment on the example of children's speech [10]. In this study, the choice of speech acts specific to children's speech is based on their psychological state and age characteristics. The scientist distinguishes the pragmatic barrier in children's speech in two ways: 1. The emergence of a pragmatic barrier in children's speech. 2. Children's perception of other people's speech as a pragmatic barrier [10, p.16]. This distinction takes into account the lexical, social, and cognitive characteristics of children's and adults' speech. In particular, the prevalence of pragmatic barriers in speech with phraseological units is highlighted in the speech of school-age children. Evaluating the pragmatic barrier as a methodological tool, M. Khakimov describes it as follows:

"However, there is a 'pragmatic barrier' that interferes with the articulation of any verbal

expression, that obscures the main content of the expression, that prevents it from being clearly understood by the listener. It's just a message to the listener, a methodical phenomenon that can only be understood by the listener" [11, pp.123-124].

In our view, the pragmatic barrier is, first and foremost, an issue that needs to be assessed in terms of the significant imbalance between the worldview of the speaker and the listener in the communication process. There is also a pragmatic barrier when people who speak two languages do not know each other's language well. [12-13]

3. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the use of concepts such as discourse, speech act, illocutive purpose, intensity, illocutive obligation, pragmatic force in pragmalinguistic research is closely related to the pragmatic situations that arise as a result of the speech context and the speech situation. It is also characteristic of the nature of the system that the concepts of dialogue, discourse, and their concepts of speech act and illusion are combined on a common level, in a paradigm. The pragmatic barrier is, first and foremost, an issue that needs to be assessed in terms of the significant imbalance between the worldview of the speaker and the listener in the communication process. [14-15]. There is also a pragmatic barrier when people who speak two languages do not know each other's language well.

REFERENCES

1. Nurmonov A. Structural linguistics: roots and directions (textbook for masters in "Linguistics"). Andijon; 2006. pp. 34-35.
2. Raupova L. Discursive analysis of dialogic speech. Tashkent; 2011.
3. Raupova L. Sociopragmatic study of polypredicative units in dialogic discourse: Philol. fan. d-ri ... diss. avtoref. Tashkent; 2012. pp. 8-9.
4. Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent: State Scientific Publishing House of the National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan; 2008. p. 215.
5. Toirova G. Systematic and informative in Uzbek speech: Philol. PhD in Ph.D. ... diss. avtoref. Tashkent; 2017. p. 13.
6. Goziev E. General psychology. Tashkent; 2010. pp. 510-523.
7. Hakimov M. History of pragmalinguistic research. Fergana; 2020. 145 p.
8. Austin J. Word as action. New in foreign linguistics. Linguistic pragmatika. VIP. XVI. Moscow: Progress, 1986; pp. 22-129.
9. Baranov AN, Kreydlin GE. Illokutivnoe vinujdenie v strukture dialoga. Voprosi yazikoznaniya. Moscow: Nauka; 1992;(2):84-99.
10. Kurbanova M. Pragmatic features of Uzbek children's speech: Philol. fan. d-ri .. diss. ... avtoref., Toshkent, 2018. 71 p.
11. Hakimov M. Fundamentals of Uzbek pragmalinguistics. Tashkent: Akademnashr; 2013. pp. 123-124.
12. Mahmudov N, Nurmonov A. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. Tashkent:

Teacher; 1995. pp.12-30.

13. Kurbanova M. Pragmalinguistic features of Uzbek children's speech. Tashkent; 2018. 160 p.
14. Grigoreva VS. Discourse as an element of the communicative process: pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects. 2007. Available at: https://www.tstu.ru/book/elib/pdf/2007/k_Grigoreva.pdf
15. Rasuljanovna IN. Lacunas Occurance in Semantic Fields of Chinese and Uzbek Languages. International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research, 2019;8(11):1998-2001.