HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

COLLOQUIAL SPEECH AND ITS DIALOGIC DIVERSITY

Yaxshiyev Ashur
DSc, Professor of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
yaxshiyevashur@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6487-4021

Abstract. This article examines the nature of colloquial speech and its dialogic diversity across various communicative spheres. The study analyzes the structural, syntactic, and modal characteristics of dialogic speech, distinguishing it from monologic speech in terms of linguistic features such as elliptical constructions, incomplete utterances, repetitions, and linking elements. Particular attention is paid to the differences between everyday colloquial dialogue and professional dialogue, with the latter characterized by greater grammatical normativity, larger and more complex utterances, and a tendency toward monologic speech. The article also explores the role of modality in dialogue, including the linguistic means through which modal meanings are expressed — intonation, modal lexical units, introductory words, and syntactic models. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of H. Altmann, P. Eisenberg, A. M. Bushuy, and Ch. Bally, the study highlights the importance of investigating dialogic speech within different communicative contexts for the purposes of linguodidactics and foreign language teaching. The findings demonstrate that without a thorough understanding of the laws governing colloquial speech and text generation, the development of effective language teaching methodology remains incomplete. The article concludes that stylistic appropriateness of speech means in different communicative spheres is a fundamental condition for natural and proficient language use.

Keywords: colloquial speech, dialogic speech, monologic speech, elliptical structures, professional dialogue, modality, communicative sphere, syntactic models, linguodidactics, foreign language teaching, speech variability, replicas.

It is well known that dialogue is considered the most natural form of language existence. The primacy of this form of oral speech is determined by the social nature of language and its communicative function.

The point is that in dialogue, a specific micro-system is formed as a result of the activation of the general linguistic system at the stage of speech production. In this case, it is necessary to take into account the interpretation of the system proposed by A. M. Bushuy 3: "A system is the highest form of organization of a set of structures, ordered in a way characteristic of their organization (components are arranged according to certain rules) and organized (components are distributed according to rules along links). Moreover, as a higher form of structure organization, it is characterized by new properties: 1) a set that is a system is clearly visible as a unit defined by a certain set of corresponding properties (system indicators); 2) the distribution of words specific to realia into categories occurs not simply on the basis of rules (a rule is usually not applicable to the entire set, it is not distributed, allowing many exceptions), but on the basis of objectively existing patterns or laws with a higher degree of necessity."

Thus, dialogic speech (as opposed to monologic speech) is primarily characterized, naturally, by linguistic phenomena arising from the alternation of the roles of speaker and listener, from stimulation and response. Consequently, its construction is primarily characterized by the use of various structures

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

expressing various questions, exclamatory sentences, agreement, disagreement, and other signs of response [4, pp. 102–103].

It is known that certain linguistic phenomena also found in monologue give the character of dialogic speech to corresponding utterances. These include various elliptical (incomplete) structures, unfinished utterances, repetitions, linking elements, means of expression with a subjective-modal character, and others.

However, in dialogue, the frequency of repetition of these means is higher; in many cases their expression is different, and in some cases their functions are also different.

For example, in dialogue, compared to monologue, linking means are less frequent; rather, in their expression, personally individual ones that reflect the mutual relations of the speakers are frequently used. Through them, not only the addressee (listener) is expressed, but also the indication of their response and their involvement in the conversation process.

In recent decades, significant progress has been made in the study of colloquial speech [4, pp. 24–26]. In the course of its research, certain results have also been obtained in the field of studying dialogic speech [7, pp. 28–30]. However, since the works mentioned are oriented toward the everyday sphere of communication, less attention has been paid to the features of using the oral form of literary language in other professional spheres, including socio-cultural, professional-productive, and scientific spheres [9, pp. 18–20].

Oral speech reflects the use of linguistic means with its subject-thematic affiliation in various spheres of communication. This exerts a strong influence on the construction of colloquial speech. The analysis of dialogues occurring in various situations provides an opportunity to study their speech variability and variation as a result of the influence of individual speech situation features.

For example, for dialogues taking place in the communication situation of acquaintances in various everyday environments, the following features are primarily characteristic: the non-public nature of communication, the freedom of the speech act, its unprepared nature, the informal perception of relations between interlocutors, their direct participation in the speech act, the presence of a common apperceptive basis, and other features.

The linguistic phenomena associated with the non-verbal features of communication carried out in the everyday sphere of colloquial speech mentioned above are also well known to all.

In other communicative spheres, in other subject situations, and in a different state of mutual relations between interlocutors, professional, formal-practical, scientific, and other types of dialogues are also formed.

Professional dialogue, by its character, cannot be a clearly delineated integral type of colloquial speech in the text of dialogic speech. Along with being conditioned by the thematic and communicative situation of the professional sphere, a number of factors influence its expression, resulting in the manifestation of many of its variants.

The variable factors in colloquial speech patterned dialogically are, first of all, the following conditions: 1) the place where the dialogue takes place; 2) the openness or non-openness of the communicative situation; 3) the presence or absence of a speech subject; 4) the presence or absence of any actions during speech.

The features of least importance in shaping dialogic speech to a certain degree are the features belonging to the participants of dialogic speech. These are, first of all, the social and psychological characteristics of the communicants (those entering into communication), their degree of acquaintance with each other, the formality of relations, the presence or absence of a common apperceptive basis, their awareness of the speech subject and their attitude toward it, the degree of readiness to understand its content, the number of participants in the communication, and others [4, p. 114]. The indicated

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

factors also influence the speech realization of professional dialogue; in that case, professional dialogue (under certain conditions, it can approach free ordinary conversation, but nevertheless its expression differs considerably from dialogues in other communicative spheres, first of all from everyday-colloquial conversation).

Unlike oral dialogue, professional dialogues are characterized by a somewhat greater grammatical normativity, a larger volume and complexity of utterances, a tendency toward monologic speech, the explicateness of the plan of norms for expressing emotions (along with neutral and linguistic colloquial means), as well as bookish means of literary language and others [7, p. 12].

In the construction of professional dialogues, a number of linguistic means also found in other direction dialogues and other communicative dialogue spheres participate. However, in professional dialogues their degree of expression is different, structurally and stylistically formalized differently, and here their functions are also often left unfulfilled [9, p. 34].

In addition to the thematic-semantic composition, the construction and development of dialogue is also related to its modal aspect. The remarks (replicas) of conversation participants in many cases encompass various modal meanings and various expressions of thoughts.

The speaker's attitude to the speech subject, directed toward the listener (addressee) and toward their (previous, subsequent, expected) thought, has various indications with linguistic expression.

The means of expressing sentence modality include, first of all, speech intonation, lexical units with modal meaning and syntactic models denoting emotional state, explicit modal constructions, introductory modal words and phrases, repetition-replicas, various transpositions (the use of grammatical categories in an uncharacteristic function), words (replicas), mood, negation, and other special grammatical means.

Despite the informational designation of professional dialogues and their practical or intellectual character, some modus (mode) enters the content of utterances (this is in the view of Ch. Bally [1, p. 116]), which can especially occur during conversation not conducted in a formal situation. Here, the expression of modality in many cases has an explicit (overtly expressed structured) form. But the corresponding structures in professional dialogues characterize not only their greater or lesser degree of expression, but also their repertoire (set), expression and stylistic coloring, and sometimes the complexity of their functions, which is noted in relation to the features of professional dialogues. The expression of modal meanings through the means indicated above is here often noted by the considerable complexity of their formation and the layering of the diversity of aspects of modality.

At present, the attention of many researchers of the German language is focused on studying colloquial speech as a functional variety of language [5, pp. 10–12]. Special structural forms reflecting the flexibility of the overall speech structure, like specific lexical supplementation in German colloquial speech, demonstrate the enormous syntactic possibilities of German colloquial speech.

In recent years, linguists have been productively working on the problem of theoretical understanding of colloquial speech, studying it as a level of colloquial sub-language, as a separate special linguistic system [2, pp. 90–91]. The theory of syntax in colloquial speech can be created on the basis of the opposition of colloquial speech, i.e., literary book language, or on the basis of independent analysis of colloquial speech.

A dynamic approach to the nature of colloquial speech arouses great interest, proceeding from the view that colloquial speech as an object of linguistic research is based on a special level of radical lexical and grammatical changes in standard structures. Consequently, along with the direct description of surface structures, the methods of radical transformation of surface possibilities should be revealed through the transformation of syntactic nuclear models at the level of colloquial speech of deep structures [9, pp. 108–109].

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

According to the conclusion of A. M. Bushuy [3, p. 51], the specificity of the syntax of colloquial speech manifests itself not in structural terms, but mainly in the sphere of application of models. Indeed, in dialogic speech (as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon), invariant (unchanging) structures are recognized, as well as derivatives of specific constructions that were considered deviations from the norm twenty years ago but are now stable structural units at the level of dialogic speech as a functional variety of language. Here, sufficiently satisfactory notions about the structural features of the dialogue of colloquial speech can be obtained from observations conducted over epic prose or especially drama texts. Dialogue is a system of interconnected conversational replicas (remarks), consisting of the primary structural components of dialogue that fully reflect colloquial speech. In the dialogue that clearly demonstrates the process of colloquial speech, a shift in the boundaries of the sentence occurs, and a redistribution of logical-syntactic relations from the relations of words within one sentence to the level of relations between different sentences takes place. Therefore, the specific interest in colloquial speech first of all requires situational orientation of communication and a dialogic form. If a linguistic context and extralinguistic macro-context (co-intention) are present, incomplete, abbreviated (elliptical) sentences can be used.

Dialogic speech is emotionally colored not only due to the use of words with emotional-expressive coloring, phraseological units, and stereotyped colloquial sentences, but also due to its inherent structural features. That is why the educational dialogue, devoid of the specific features of dialogic speech, appears artificial, "bookish," and lifeless. In general, it is evident that in sufficiently developed speech skills and abilities of upper-year students, we can observe the skills of using complete sentences (with frame constructions) in dialogue replicas.

In the dialogic question-answer unit, an imitative answer is often used, which almost completely repeats the question without any initiative, for example:

1. Führt die erweiterte Oberschule zum Abitur? — Ja, die erweiterte Oberschule führt zum Abitur.
2. Hast du dir den Film… angesehen? — Ich, ich habe mir den Film schon angesehen.

However, at a higher stage of learning, the student must develop a sense of conversational style, have the ability to independently construct response replicas, i.e., show initiative in verbal communication, for example:

- A: Würden Sie auch so handeln?
- B: Offengestanden, nein (kann sein, bestimmt, das will ich meinen, etc.).
- A: Sag mal, würdest du mir deine Nachschrift borgen?
- B: Offengestanden, nicht gern (sehr gern).

The tasks of intensive teaching usually include teaching the transformation of structures of elliptical sentences (ellipses) in response replicas, as in question replicas:

a) the tendency to save valency requirements of verbs in dialogue can lead to modification (transformation to another form) in which some obligatory components may be dropped;

b) for dialogue, it is characteristic of the rhematic element that appears in the role of a sentence in the question-answer unit, while the remaining components are eliminated:

"Wann kommen Sie zurück?" — "Übermorgen" (the structural scheme of the answer follows from the question);

c) the logically important new part (rheme) is moved to the first position in the replica: Mir hat die Mutter das Buch gekauft.

Students' attention is drawn to the construction of question-answer units: they can be mutually complementary replicas. In the response replica, a new interpretation is introduced or resonates. Some replica may require formal information.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The student is tasked with avoiding imitative (mimicking) answers and using lexical synonyms. It is clear that structurally disproportionate answers to stimulating replicas require greater tension of mental activity.

Response replicas are also variable. When practicing variants of elliptical structures in response replicas, students are offered to answer "in turn," for example: "Haben Sie sich den Film angesehen?" — "Ja, ich habe es." — "Habe ich." — "Ja, schon gestern angesehen."

Here it is important to take into account that "shortened" sentences express various semantic and emotional loads. Thus, the use of the participle (gesagt) in the answer confirms that the action has exactly taken place (nicht geschrieben, nicht telegraphiert). The use of only the auxiliary verb achieves emphasis, highlighting the performance of the action, where the verb may have emphatic stress.

In general, it is evident that the study of the features of dialogic speech within various communicative spheres is of great importance for compiling educational manuals for foreign language teaching, for developing sets of educational dialogic texts and exercises. The point is that the requirement of stylistic correspondence of educational speech means to the nature of this communicative sphere and speech situation has not yet been sufficiently taken into account. In shaping everyday colloquial dialogues, the danger of applying worn-out stereotyped sentences and specific features of everyday colloquial speech in practical, formal, professional, and scientific direction dialogues is excessively increasing. However, the stylistic appropriateness of the speech means used is the primary condition for natural speech and free command of the language. That is why it should receive appropriate attention both in theoretical terms and in teaching foreign languages. In other words, without a specially deepened study of the nature of colloquial speech and the laws of text generation, linguodidactics cannot develop to the required level.

REFERENCES:

1. Sh. Bally, General Linguistics and Questions of the French Language [Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка]. Moscow: Izd-vo inostr. lit., 1955, 416 p.
2. A. M. Bushuy and A. A. Yakhshiyev, "Phraseology of Uzbek Dialogic Speech (Based on the Material of Artistic Prose)" [Фразеология узбекской диалогической речи], Tyurkologiya, Baku, no. 3, pp. 27–33, 1986.
3. A. M. Bushuy, "Defining the Role of Particles in a Sentence" [Определение роли частиц в предложении], Prepodavaniye yazyka i literatury, Tashkent, no. 6, pp. 34–40, 2005.
4. H. Altmann, Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen. Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 2008, 348 p.
5. A. Buscha, "On Questions of Abbreviation in Dialogic Text" [Zu Fragen der Verkürzung im dialogischen Text], in Probleme des Deutschunterrichts für Fortgeschrittene. Leipzig, 1997, pp. 90–100.
6. Duden. Die Grammatik, 4th ed. Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 1998, 912 p.
7. P. Eisenberg, Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2007, 520 p.
8. N. Erne, Kunst der Novelle. Wiesbaden, 2001, 474 p.
9. E. U. Grosse, Text und Kommunikation. Eine linguistische Einführung in die Funktionen der Texte. Stuttgart, 2006, 390 p.
10. R. Hessky and S. Ettinger, Deutsche Redewendungen. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2009, LIII + 327 p.
11. P. R. Lutzeier, Lexikologie, vol. 1. Tübingen: Brigitte Narr, 2009, VIII + 167 p.
12. T. Müller-Alfeld, Deutsche Grammatik. Düsseldorf: ECON, 2007, 355 p.
13. M. Schwarz, Einführung in die Kognitive Linguistik. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 2006, 338 p.