

## Colloquial Speech as a Functional Variety of Literary Language

**Ashur Yaxshiyev**

*Professor of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
Samarkand, Uzbekistan.*

**Abstract.** *This article examines dialogic speech as the primary form of spoken language. In the broadest terms, the properties of spoken language in any language can be summarized as follows: it is concrete, situationally conditioned, individually expressive, and affective. In contemporary linguistic research, dialogue, along with monologue and polylogue, is being actively developed. Studies conducted on this topic allow for the generalization of quite extensive information.*

**Keywords:** *spoken language, language, oral speech, written speech, literary language, dialogue, monologue, polylogue, utterance, syntax of dialogue, stylistics of dialogue.*

### Introduction

One of the aspects of studying spoken language, including German spoken language, could be the definition of the researcher's position regarding the concept of "speech" the presentation of their views on the relationship between language and speech, the distinction between the concepts of "written," "oral," "conversational," and "dialogic" speech, and the characteristics of the features of these types of speech. It is possible, for example, to limit oneself to the broadest definitions of language as a system and speech as the use of elements of this system in the process of communication. Thus, the concepts of "language" and "speech" will have the meaning that G. Glinz attributes to them, using the terms *langue* and *parole* in the manner of F. de Saussure (see, 1990, p. 44-45). G. Glinz rightly emphasizes the interdependence of language and speech, in that language provides primarily a stock of elements and necessary indications for their combination according to given patterns; in speech, however, the direct construction of various formations from these elements occurs in the necessary quantity. It is equally correct, as G. Glinz notes, that in each individual case, it is difficult to draw a clear boundary between a unit of language and a unit of speech due to their close interconnection (H. Glinz, 1991, p. 41).

The fact that speech and language represent two sides of the same phenomenon, form a unified whole, and are characterized by properties that are not inherently contrasting but mutually defining, is discussed, for example, by V.N. Yartseva, who points out that language contains both paradigmatic and syntagmatic groupings of linguistic units, while speech contains only syntagmatic formations. Language has a set of models according to which the "configuration of small systems in speech" is built (V.N. Yartseva, 1962, p. 50).

### Methodology

Such models are referred to by O.I. Tsakher as "basic language models," noting that they form the foundation of language, its core. Basic language models serve as templates for the creation and use of numerous similar variants in speech, performing identical functions. Speech variants are built based on the language model, but they deviate from it to a greater or lesser extent depending on the specific conditions in which the model functions (O.Kh. Tsakher, 1963, p. 12). The national literary language exists in two functional varieties or forms, which constantly interact with each other: in the form of written speech and in the form of spoken speech (N.Yu. Shvedova, 1960, p. 3; O.Kh. Tsakher, 1963, p. 10, et al.).

Defining the characteristic features of written speech, N.Yu. Shvedova notes its preparatory nature, the preliminary thought and processing that precede the fixation. Conversational speech, on the other hand, is not intended for fixation and lacks these features. N.Yu. Shvedova emphasizes its immediacy and

orientation towards the listener (or listeners). “If in written speech there is always a moment of ‘selectivity’ in the form of expression, then this moment is absent in conversational speech. This is the defining distinction between written and conversational speech,” correctly notes N.Yu. Shvedova (1960, p. 3). Following N.Yu. Shvedova (1960, p. 3) and O.Kh. Tsakher (1963, p. 10), we are not inclined to equate conversational speech with oral speech. We have already defined conversational speech above as a functional variety of the literary language. Oral speech, however, in our understanding, is the oral form of expressing thoughts, that is, simply a type of speech activity, speaking as such. It is clear from this that not everything oral, pronounced, is considered conversational speech, just as not everything written is considered written speech. For example, a report made orally cannot be classified as conversational speech. Conversely, a dialogue between the characters of a realistic literary work, recorded in written form, cannot be characterized as written speech.

The relationship between written and conversational speech, as well as the distinguishing features of the latter, have attracted the attention of many researchers, both foreign and domestic. Based on materials from different languages, scholars come to the common conclusion that there are differences of a phonetic, lexical, and syntactic nature between these two forms of speech. In general terms, the properties of conversational speech in any language are as follows: it is concrete, situationally conditioned, individually expressive, and affective. In the phonetic and grammatical structure of conversational speech, there is generally greater brevity than in written speech. The situational conditioning of conversational speech, as well as the tendency towards brevity in expressing thoughts, make it possible to use so-called incomplete sentences extensively.

### **Results and Discussions**

Dialogical speech is defined as the main form of conversational speech, and dialogical speech possesses all the features of conversational speech (E. Benveniste, 1974, p. 328-329). However, along with these, it has its own specific differences. The specificity of dialogical speech interaction determines the property of dialogue commonly called “replication,” which has its own regularities in the semantic and grammatical relations of components. These include the means of semantic interrelation between utterances and the language bindings caused by them, as well as the connections between adjacent utterances. A dialogical utterance, linked by linguistic connections to the preceding statement, is defined as a syntactic unit within a complex syntactic structure, which is a communicative unit of the dialogue and is called a dialogical unity. The simplest dialogical unity is the combination of two utterances, the first of which is relatively free in its forms, while the second has a subordinate, dependent nature, manifested in its syntactic form. Typically, the following relationships between adjacent utterances are noted: question-answer; narration (statement)-agreement, objection, confirmation, addition, repetition, clarification.

The syntactic connection between utterances, or their syntactic correlation, expressed in the form of the second utterance, consists of:

- 1) not repeating the secondary semantic elements of the first utterance;
- 2) repeating its semantic center;
- 3) adding a second utterance to the structure of the first utterance;
- 4) semantic-syntactic substitution (for example, replacing some element of the first utterance with a pronoun).

However, from the point of view of syntactic structure, dialogical speech is heterogeneous. Not all complex utterances are connected into dialogical unities (i.e., not all utterances have linguistic connections between them). Some utterances only have semantic interconnection. Not all dialogical unities have the described simplest structure (consisting of two utterances). The literature describes three- and four-member dialogical unities and also notes the possibility of combining more utterances into a dialogical unity. Thus, the terms “dialogical unity,” “first (relatively free, independent) utterance,” as used in the above sense, are widely used in the literature. Primarily, two-member dialogical unities with all the semantic and syntactic relationships between the utterances that constitute these unities are considered. In addition, some independent utterances that are not members of dialogical unities, or are

included in them as the first, relatively free utterances, are also studied.

Dialogical unities are not the only complex syntactic constructions observed in speech. G.A. Veikhman also distinguishes monological unities, observed in both conversational and authorial speech. G.A. Veikhman shows the coincidence of semantic and structural connections between the components of both dialogical and monological unities, uniting both types of these unities under the general name “syntactic unities” (G.A. Veikhman, 1961, p. 9).

In modern linguistic studies, dialogue, like monologue and polylogue, is being actively developed. The aspects of studying the language of dialogue are quite diverse (A.M. Bushuy, A.A. Yakhshiev, 1984). Information about the language of dialogue is particularly important for the interpretation of conversational speech, as dialogue (for example, reflected in the context of literary prose) serves as a valuable source of information about the operating patterns of constructing and developing living spoken language. Dialogue is a special type of text that has its own specific characteristics. These are manifested both in the structural and compositional organization of the dialogue and in its linguistic composition. The necessity of studying dialogical speech was already pointed out by L.V. Shcherba in 1915, who wrote: “The true existence of language is revealed only in dialogue. In dialogue, new words, forms, and constructions are forged” (L.V. Shcherba, 1915, Appendix, p. 4).

Dialogical speech is usually understood as “two or more sentences spoken by different people” (H.J. Heringer, 2007, p. 176). This interpretation seems sufficiently comprehensive and accurate, as “dialogue as a linguistic category is the exchange of utterances that naturally follow one another in the process of conversation” (N.Yu. Shvedova, 1960, p. 281). Overall, the study of dialogical speech is still clearly insufficient: some languages are better studied (Russian, English), while others are analyzed episodically and unevenly. Therefore, it seems appropriate to generalize those directions in the study of dialogical speech that have yielded significant results.

First of all, it should be noted that dialogue linguistics (monologue, polylogue) currently differs in the variety of analyzed texts, methods, and interpretation techniques, resulting in a significant study of the linguistic status of the dialogical (monological, polylogical) context. In particular, in-depth analysis is given to such features of dialogue as typology, structure, derivation of the components of the dialogic structural elements, ways of presenting the dialogical context, and the relationship of the dialogue with the surrounding broader context, etc. It is important to consider the following: “The topic, as the starting point for the development of the message, determines the completeness of the new information in a specific fragment of the communicative process in terms of its actual division. Although in its content, the information is already known and clearly yields to the theme – the core of the utterance, i.e., the new content of the utterance” (A.M. Bushuy, 2004, p. 27).

Both general and specific aspects of dialogue are being productively developed. Let's note the most significant of them.

First of all, this is dialogue as a communicative unit of the text. Here, the following are analyzed: dialogue as a unit of text, communication, and conversational language; linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the construction of dialogue in the light of the dichotomy “language and speech”; the reply as a unit of the dialogical context, representing a special unity; dialogue as a way of organizing multi-subjective socio-speech activity, its active sphere of use; the semantic-compositional structure of dialogue in the respective language; the structure of different types of question-answer dialogical unities and the structural-semantic organization of relations within them; interaction between dialogical replies; linguistic, logical, and psychological prerequisites for determining the type of dialogue; means of organizing speech contact in dialogue and the nature of their interaction; methods of internal and external “binding” of dialogical replies; relations of response-replies with stimulus-replies; text-forming functions of dialogue, such as the form-creating role of dialogue in constructing the artistic whole (J. Vogt, 2007, p. 10).

The connections manifested in the dialogical context are exceptionally diverse. Research conducted on this issue allows for the generalization of a considerable amount of information, characterizing such varieties of organization and means of expression of dialogical connections: logical-semantic connections

in dialogues of a specific genre, for example, in scientific dialogues; connections between monological replies and dialogue, for example, in plays, and others. Dialogue is also studied as a form of interaction. In this context, irony, insinuation, and allusion are analyzed as speech acts, as well as logical operations in the realization of intention during the dialogue, and the axiological level of dialogue.

Among the general issues of studying dialogue, it is particularly important to highlight specific dialogical types and the typology of dialogues of the speakers of the language as a whole. A deeper examination of dialogue in a typological aspect allows for a systemic interpretation of the most established types in the communicative process; to reveal the communicative significance of topics in the development of dialogical speech; to identify the influence of pragmatic factors in the distribution of communicative roles (selection of appropriate partners) in dialogue, and the nature of the selection of material for dialogical texts in relation to various communicative situations; to show their derivational features, the specifics of compositional structuring, etc. (A. Buscha, 1997, p. 119).

Data on the structuring of dialogical speech in such studies are correlated with the identification of the sequence of components that make up a specific dialogue. The models of construction of the latter are revealed, which are considered in light of the main features of speech acts. As a result, various types of dialogical texts were studied based on several languages (German, English, etc.): functional-semantic types of reply-reactions in dialogue; negative-imperative types of dialogical unities; imperative-response types of dialogical unities; diagnostic types expressing agreement-disagreement; dialogical speech containing advice or recommendation. The information thus obtained about the linguistic nature of a specific type of dialogical unity allows for its further study in comparison with other types. This makes it possible to uncover the specific features of individual dialogical types, for example, based on their actualization in different types of texts, such as in literary prose and drama, scientific texts, as well as to identify types of neutral-domestic dialogue.

Accordingly, the identified typology of dialogical unities can be considered within the texts of a single genre in a diachronic aspect. This includes, for example, the analysis of types of dialogue observed in texts from different centuries. To date, the structural composition of the dialogical type and its individual components has been comprehensively studied. Here, it seems relevant to study, first and foremost, individual dialogical fragments. These include lexico-semantic relationships between dialogical replies of different types and ways of their explicit expression; the structure of the responding (second) reply or reaction-reply of the dialogical unity; the linguistic characteristics of the fragment (component) of the dialogical unity (various replies): their syntactic structure, and more.

A special aspect involves experimental-phonetic studies of dialogue, which contribute to the identification and interpretation of such characteristics: intonational properties of the dialogical text in the process of organizing spontaneous speech; the temporal structure of the dialogical text at the level of sound, syntagma, phrase, and “meaning chunk” of the text; prosodic means of rhythmization of dialogical speech; intonation and its functions: communicative, stylistic; establishing the role of pauses in the differentiation of stylistic varieties of dialogue, for example, in distinguishing between formal-business and informal speech in oral dialogue. A comprehensive aspect of examining the linguistic and textual features of dialogue can also be highlighted. It is based on data from different levels, considered in their unity. This approach allows for a deep study of the various manifestations of the nature of dialogical (polylogical) text generation. Research on dialogue in this direction is characterized, for example, by the simultaneous analysis of such data: syntactic, lexical, and prosodic features of various dialogical unities; syntactic and phonetic features of the realization of a specific part of speech in dialogue, for instance, particles, describing their grammatical-semantic, illocutionary (nuanced), functional, and distributive properties in dialogues of different types. In this regard, A.M. Bushuy (2005, p. 34) remarks: “Particles (known in the grammars of modern languages by terms such as logical, logical-semantic, connective, modal, emphatic, etc.) draw attention as a peculiar means of organizing text, its semantic structure. They perform various functions in a sentence (signal logical stress on the word they accompany, actualize new information in context, etc.), without which achieving the necessary precision in understanding the utterance is impossible. This universal tool marks the logical predicate (theme). Without it, any



interpretation of the structure of the logical-grammatical level of the sentence will be incomplete.”

Certainly, it is important to consider other parameters as well. For example, the relationship between the morphological and lexical levels in dialogue, such as the composition of lexical actualizers (in the form of lexemes with temporal semantics, highlighting and temporal meanings (present, etc.) in dialogical speech. A productive aspect of dialogue research is also the phono-stylistic one. The data obtained from this allow for the differentiation of the dialogical text based on general and distinguishing properties of the phonetic-stylistic variety. This includes the identification of phonetic (for example, prosodic) characteristics that are specific to the main stylistic variants of dialogical speech (T. Müller – Alfeld, 2007, pp. 124-125).

Comprehensive study of dialogue is often based on linguistic, sociological, and socio-psychological aspects. As a result, knowledge about the nature of dialogue is supplemented with information about communicative boundaries, orientation toward the partner, semantic and thematic complementarity of the related replies in dialogue, modeling of replies, revealing their basic structures, relationships between individual monological acts in the overall context of a particular dialogue, principles of linguistic composition, and structural-compositional construction of replies of different types, etc. An important direction for comprehensive dialogue research is the comparative analysis of various linguistic and structural-textual data. The object of such research, conducted in different languages, might focus, for example, on grammatical features. For instance, the category of tense in dialogues in texts of different languages, such as Russian, German, and French, is specifically analyzed.

An important object of dialogue research is the characterization of its lexical features. This includes the systematization of various classifications of words found in dialogical speech, the identification of how different classes of words are distributed in dialogue, and the examination of the semantic specificity of word usage in dialogue. The role of various lexical units in the derivational construction and development of dialogical speech is also determined. Additionally, the ways of expressing emotional-expressive meaning in dialogue and the principles of creating imagery within it are identified (M. Schwartz, 2006, p. 101).

A separate aspect of studying dialogue is grammatical analysis, which involves a variety of objects of examination. Notably, these include the grammatical potential of various parts of speech, such as particles; sentence elements, their characteristics, frequency of distribution in the dialogical context, and communicative load in dialogical speech; the use of various sentence types in dialogical speech, such as complex sentences (e.g., coordination), simple full and incomplete sentences, and particularly their structural-semantic correspondence; question sentences in dialogue, for instance, their syntactic-stylistic characteristics (H.J. Weber, 2006, pp. 201-202). A task of syntactic examination of dialogical speech also includes the analysis of specific features of the component extension of replies of certain types. It has been established that syntactic expansion is conditioned by the type of dialogical replies. This was observed, for example, in the analysis of German dialogues: 1) replies to general questions, 2) replies to questions with a question word, etc. The study of grammatical categories implemented in dialogical speech aims to reveal their communicative functions, which serves as an objective basis for developing linguistic-methodological recommendations to intensify conversational speech for the relevant category of learners.

To achieve the greatest completeness of information on each aspect of dialogue analysis, it is advisable to rely on a statistical review of the material. Due to the labor-intensive nature of such analysis, statistical studies are quite rare. An example of the effectiveness of statistical analysis is the description by the German linguist A. Busha of elliptical sentences in dialogical texts (in German fiction), which allowed for an in-depth exploration of the trends in the development of dialogical construction toward linguistic economy (A. Busha, 1997, p. 99-100). Quantitative counting, aimed at determining the frequency of usage of various dialogue or monologue words in general, and individual dialogical types in relation to different situations, speech conditions, etc., also proves effective.

The aforementioned aspects of studying dialogical speech convincingly demonstrate that, to date, the theoretical foundations of general linguistics of dialogue have already been well established. As a result,

its main linguistic and speech patterns have been comprehensively revealed. Data on phonetic, grammatical, lexical, and other features of dialogue contribute to further studies of its compositional organization, text-forming potential, and functions in literary narration as well as in everyday conversation.

The conducted research in the linguistics of dialogue significantly contributes to identifying the relevant properties of dialogue as one of the units of text construction, reflecting a very specific communicative segment. This has enabled the systematization of various types of dialogical contexts, revealing their internal and external characteristics, functional features, and ways of representation in texts of various genres.

The state of research into the linguistic nature of dialogue can now be considered quite satisfactory. In general, there is already a well-established theory of linguistic interpretation of dialogue, as well as of monologue, polylogue, and related text constructions. This conclusion is undoubtedly justified if we start from a general assessment of, first of all, phonetic, grammatical, lexical, and several other linguistic aspects of dialogue interpretation in light of the general theory of text generation: "For understanding any text (utterance), three components of its informational structure are relevant, according to the integrated theory: 1) the descriptive component, i.e., the unambiguous description of the communicated phenomenon; 2) the world-creating component, which determines the communicants' attitudes toward the utterance; 3) the performative component. In accordance with these three types of information, we can also distinguish performative, world-creating, and descriptive descriptions of phenomena. To analyze phenomena, one can aim to classify them from at least two points of view: 1) distinguishing between activity, event, and state, i.e., the activity performed by someone or something, or the event experienced by them, and, consequently, the change in state; 2) distinguishing between nondiscrete and discrete phenomena (i.e., phenomena that are continuous, instantaneous, periodic, quasi-periodic, and non-periodic)" (A.A. Yaxshiyev, 2022, p. 282).

### **Conclusion**

Thus, the distinctiveness of the dialogical context is particularly convincingly demonstrated by the information already obtained about characteristics such as intonation and other prosodic means; the rhythm of dialogical speech; lexical features of different dialogical unities, the activation of specific word categories within them; the syntax of dialogue, the structure of its sentences and phrases; ways of realizing different parts of speech in dialogue; the tense system of dialogue; the stylistics of dialogue; the internal hierarchy of the dialogical context, the composition of utterances, the nature of their modeling; the emotional-expressive and figurative content of dialogue, and so on.

### **References:**

1. Benveniste, Emile. General Linguistics. – Moscow: Progress, 1974. – 447 pages.
2. Bushuy A. M., Yakhshiyev A. A. Phraseology of Uzbek Dialogical Speech (Based on the Material of Fiction Prose) // Turkology. – Baku, 1986. - No. 3. – P. 27-33.
3. Bushuy A. M. On the Functional Approach to Defining the Actual Structure of the Sentence // Teaching Language and Literature. – Tashkent, 2004. - No. 1. – P. 27-34.
4. Bushuy A. M. Defining the Role of Particles in the Sentence // Teaching Language and Literature. – Tashkent, 2005. - No. 6. – P. 34-40.
5. Bushuy A. M. Organization of Linguistic and Methodological Work on Phraseology Based on Interlinguistic Commonality // Teaching Language and Literature. – Tashkent, 2007. - No. 6. – P. 8-12.
6. Veikhman G. A. On the Issue of Syntactic Unities // Questions of Linguistics. – Moscow, 1961. - No. 2. – P. 3-15.
7. Saussure, Ferdinand de. Notes on General Linguistics. – Moscow: Progress, 1990. – 275 pages.
8. Tsakher O. K. On Language Models and Their Speech Variants // Foreign Languages in School. – Moscow, 1963. - No. 3. – P. 4-16.
9. Shvedova N. Yu. Essays on the Syntax of Russian Colloquial Speech. – Moscow: Academy of Sciences Publishing House, 1960. – 337 pages.

10. Shcherba L. V. Eastern Lusatian Dialect, Vol. 1. – Petrograd, 1915. – XXI, 194 pages. + Appendix: 54 pages.
11. Yartseva V. N. On the Relationship Between Language and Speech // Language and Speech. – Moscow, 1962. – P. 48-52.
12. Buscha A. On the Issues of Abbreviation in Dialogical Texts // Problems of Teaching German for Advanced Students. – Leipzig, 1997. – P. 90-100.
13. Glinz H. The Inner Form of German. – Bern, 1991. – 374 pages.
14. Heringer H. J. German Syntax Dependent Style. – Vol. 1. – Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 2007. – 394 pages.
15. Müller-Alfeld T. German Grammar. Düsseldorf: ECON, 2007. – 355 pages.
16. Schwartz M. Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 2006. – 338 pages.
17. Vogt, Jochen. Aspects of Narrative Prose: An Introduction to Narrative Technique and Novel Theory. – Opladen, 2007. – 394 pages.
18. Weber H. J. Dependency Grammar. – Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2006. – 362 pages.
19. Yakhshiyev A.A. The Use of Animal and Plant Names in the Phraseology of German and Uzbek Languages. Journal of Advanced Research and Stability. Volume: 02 Issue: 10. Oct – 2022. P. 282-284.