

THE FUNCTION OF DIALOGUE IN SHAKESPEAREAN DRAMA

Nurkhon Usmon kizi Khodjiyeva,

Tulinoy Asliddin kizi Zayniddinova

Students, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

Scientific adviser: Said-Fozilxon Akmalxonovich Akmalxonov

English teacher, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

ABSTRACT: *The purpose of this study are to find the information and simplification dialogue usage and content in unabridged and abridged dialogues of Shakespeare's Drama. This article used the script of drama to analyze the function of each dialogue. The result of the research could show that there were simplification of dialogue, structure and content. Also Shakespeare's plays present us with a "universe of dialogues", and the immense variety of dramatic dialogues in his works is indeed astonishing. The 'dialogic skepticism' achieving pre-eminence in the Renaissance is unquestionably related to the developing focus on the individual which is also highly characteristic of the age.*

Keywords: *Dialogue, universe of dialogues, Shakespeare's plays, persuasive dialogue, skepticism, monological dogmatism, dialogization, dramatic dialogues.*

Introduction

Dialogue is both a subject and a method of many disciplines, such as philosophy, linguistics, sociology, psychology, political science, theology, medicine, didactics, and many more. It should come as no surprise then that many attempts have been made to define dialogue. A formal definition of dialogue, which is often considered to be the "traditional" or "narrow" concept, states that dialogue is a face-to-face interaction between two or more individuals using a system of signs.

Naturally, these definitions are as varied as the sciences in which they are used.

Shakespeare's plays present us with a "universe of dialogues", and the immense variety of dramatic dialogues in his works is indeed astonishing. Within this universe, the persuasive dialogue is but one form, which, though it represents but a small number of Shakespeare's dialogues, provides some of his most memorable scenes [1]. Despite his indisputably exceptional position as a playwright, Shakespeare is also symptomatic of his time which has frequently been characterized as a dialogic period or, more specifically, as an age "giving priority to the mode of dialogic skepticism over monological dogmatism"[2]. Since dialogue is a constitutive element of drama, and drama is "the outstanding literary genre of the age", Shakespeare's universe of dialogues might be seen as one indication of the priority which dialogue had over monologue in the Renaissance [3]. The 'dialogic skepticism' achieving pre-eminence in the Renaissance is unquestionably related to the developing focus on the individual which is also highly characteristic of the age. Surely, it is quite significant in this context that Bloom ascribes the invention of the "inner self" and of "the human as we know it" to Shakespeare's dramatic art [4]. In recent years dialogue as a focus of study has received increasing attention, a development which is in part due to linguistic approaches subsumed under the terms 'discourse analysis', 'conversation analysis', or 'dialogue analysis' [5]. However, the analytical techniques developed and used in these fields have only rarely been applied to dramatic dialogue [6]. Their utilization for an analysis of Shakespeare's dramatic dialogues is, for example, convincingly undertaken by Coulthard, by Hermann, and by Gilbert [7]. Already Kennedy points out that the interactive character of Shakespeare's dramatic texts is not sufficiently considered in analyses: "Most studies of Shakespeare's verbal style show a surprising neglect of dialogue as a focus of attention."

This study's pronounced interest in matters connected with dialogue is inspired by Shakespeare's dialogic representation of persuasion [8]. Throughout his works there are scenes in which Shakespeare dramatizes persuasion in dialogic situations, that is, with the participation of the persuadee. The person who is to be persuaded is not simply present as a passive listener but actively shares in the discourse. It is this

characteristic feature of persuasive dialogues which lends a special interest and dramatic tension to these scenes [9]. The persuadee's participation in the persuasive discourse makes the view of him or her as merely a passive victim of the persuasion problematic. Rather, it is suggested that s/he too shapes the persuasive discourse and contributes to its development. Such a concept would, however, contradict the traditional assumption about persuasion as a type of communication dominated and controlled by only one speaker.

The question initially raised in this study concerning the dialogization of persuasion in Shakespeare's dramatic dialogues indicates a basic problem in analyses of persuasive dialogues in Renaissance drama. With respect to both form and quality, persuasive dialogues are not 'ideally' dialogic, but display a monologic influence. The very idea of the 'dialogization' of persuasion used in this study starts from an originally monological concept of persuasion [10]. A knowledge of the monologic background of persuasion, the persuasive speech or oratio, is important to understand the monological traces it has left on Shakespeare's persuasive dialogues.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the essential features of a dialogic form, namely the verbal interaction of several participants who share an immediate context, characterize each of these scenes. The interaction of the interlocutors is marked by regular turn-taking. Yet this formally dialogic discourse contains passages which display monologic tendencies, since one of the participants, typically the persuader, talks at great length without being interrupted by the interlocutor s/he wants to persuade. In such cases the utterances of the persuader are unusually extended and apparently go beyond the bounds of a dialogic situation. In authentic dialogues utterances of such length are not likely to occur. Moreover, it is meant to summarize the answers to the central questions of the present study in a comparison of dialogues which, due to similarities or due to their contrasts, may elucidate one another. The persuasive dialogue in Shakespeare's drama is a multifarious kind of dialogue, specifically with respect to those issues that were of central interest in this study, namely the

dialogical nature of the texts, and the persuadee's share in the persuasion. Consequently, there is a wide range of dialogic form and quality within this type of dialogues. Also, as has been revealed by the analysis, form and quality seem to be virtually unconnected with each other, so that one can frequently observe a discrepancy of form and effect.

REFERENCES

1. Shakespeare, William. The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare. Hamlet. Harold Jenkins (ed.) London and New York 1982.
2. Shakespeare, William. The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare. King Richard III. Antony Hammond (ed.) London and New York 1981.
3. Beyenburg, Ramona. Die Frauen in Shakespeare's späten Stücken: Text und Aufführung. Trier 1995.
4. Brook, G.L. The Language of Shakespeare. London 1976.
5. Doran, Madeleine. Shakespeare's Dramatic Language. Wisconsin and London 1976
6. Evans, Bertrand. Shakespeare's Comedies. Oxford 1960.
7. Gilbert, Antony J. Shakespeare's Dramatic Speech. Lewiston, Queenston, and Lampeter 1997.
8. Gregson, J.M. Public and Private Man in Shakespeare. London and Canberra 1983.
9. Kennedy, William J. Rhetorical Norms in Renaissance Literature. New Haven and London 1978.
10. Leggatt, Alexander. Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays. London and New York 1990.