

## Dialogue as a Constituent Resource for Dramatic Discourse: Language, Person And Culture

Marina R. Zheltukhina<sup>a</sup>, Anastasia V. Zinkovskaya<sup>b</sup>, Veronika V. Katermina<sup>b</sup>, Natalia B. Shershneva<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, RUSSIA; <sup>b</sup>Kuban State University, Krasnodar, RUSSIA.

### ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the description of peculiarities of a person, language and culture. The offered approach of studying the human factor in the language singles out implicit connotations and makes it possible to see the differences in the perception of the reality by the members of the nation. The idea of the language as an environment of the existence of a person with which the constant interconnection happens; the person being the center of the linguistic picture of the world as the beginning of all categorical coordinates of the language is considered to be the basic idea. Studies of dramatic dialogue as discourse, as a special speech exchange system, are hardly in evidence, even in research of the language of drama. In drama discourse dialogue is employed as a dramatic resource. The specifics of the drama dialogue are the locus of this study. The dialogue is viewed as interaction open to enormous variation. Dialogue is operative in drama; speech functioning is complex with its own specificities which are different from those in the literary field.

### KEYWORDS

Language, culture, person, dialogue, dramatic discourse, language picture of the world, connotation

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 10 July 2016  
Revised 23 August 2016  
Accepted 29 August 2016

## Introduction

The role of language in our life is very important. In fact, it would be hard to imagine life without the ability to communicate. Because language has always been present – for as long as we can remember – we seldom consider the role and impact of the specific system of symbols that we use on a daily basis. This is true for our native language system, and it is just as true when dealing with people across different language and culture backgrounds (Hall, 1973; Zinkovskaya, Tkhorik & Fanyan, 2007; Zheltukhina et al., 2016a). Language as our most fundamental human paradigm reflects and affects all our thoughts, our

**CORRESPONDENCE** Marina Rostislavovna Zheltukhina ✉ [zzmr@mail.ru](mailto:zzmr@mail.ru)

© 2016 Zheltukhina, et al. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

behavioral patterns, our societal norms, and more. Edward T. Hall (1973) specified this in his work: “Culture is communication” (Hall, 1973) and, conversely, “communication is culture”. Language is not “just words.” It enables us to establish ourselves, and ourselves, as individuals and as members of groups; it tells us how we connected to one another (Lakoff, 2000). People in the XXth century in their self-knowledge came to the understanding of the fact that culture is an activity corresponding to its idea. Culture is inseparable from other forms of people’s activity (knowledge, morality, art creativity and so on) and language in this context is a form, an important element of a national culture of a people. Semiotic entity of culture and language contributes to the fact that they possess similar functions: communicative (exchange of special information), cumulative (accumulation and storage of knowledge), adaptive (providing coordination with the world around us), directive (influence and transformation of reality), regulative (ordering a person’s behavior in a society), and productive (mastering and transformation of reality) (Kukushkina, 1984).

### Literature Review

The XX<sup>th</sup> century and especially its second half put a question about an integration of knowledge. The humankind achieved understanding that the activity bringing new values must be perceived as a set because the combination of related knowledge discovers new laws and patterns (Dibrova, 1996). Thus, psycholinguistics, ethno-linguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive and discursive linguistics, and cultural studies came to their existence.

Ethnography studies a material and spiritual culture, peculiarities of customs and culture; cultural studies are aimed at dealing with a complex study of certain countries; sociolinguistics with its first component “socio-” characterizes a science about a society and deals with the problems of interconnection between culture and language in general (Ojegov & Shvedova, 1994), because in each society language is considered to be a means of accumulation, storage, transfer of knowledge acquired by this society. That’s why “a society and social, economic and cultural changes happening in it can’t but influence different levels of a language” (Berezin & Golovin, 1979). Culture as a “set of social and spiritual achievements of people” is studied by all the above-mentioned areas of research and by culturology which is a science about “a spiritual culture of a people” (Ojegov & Shvedova, 1994). C. Kluckhohn talks about culture the following way: “culture consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values” (Kluckhohn, 1951).

Values are invisible until they become evident in behavior, but culture manifests itself in visible elements too (Zheltukhina et al., 2016b). From the many terms used to describe visible manifestations of culture, the following three, together with values, cover the total concept rather neatly: symbols, heroes, and rituals (Hofstede, 2001; Zheltukhina, 2015). Symbols are words, gestures, pictures, and objects that carry complex meanings recognized as such only by those who share the culture. Heroes are persons, alive or dead, real or imaginary, who possess characteristics, which are highly prized in a culture, and thus serve as models for behavior. Rituals are collective activities that are



technically unnecessary to the achievements of desired ends, but that within a culture are considered socially essential, keeping the individual bound within the norms of the collectivity. Culture is to a human collectivity what a personality is to an individual. Culture could be defined as the interactive aggregate of common characteristics that influence a human group's response to its environment (Hofstede, 2001).

In the English language, culture has a number of other meanings. According to R. Williams (1983),

“**Culture** is one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language. This is so partly because of its intricate historical development, in several European languages, but mainly because it has now come to be used for important concepts in several distinct intellectual disciplines and in several distinct and incompatible systems of thought.

The fw is *cultura*, L, from rw *colere*-, L. *Colere* had a range of meanings: inhabit, cultivate, protect, honour with worship. Some of these meanings eventually separated, though still with occasional overlapping, in the derived nouns. Thus, ‘inhabit’ developed through *colonus*, L to *colony*. ‘Honour with worship’ developed through *cultus*, L to *cult*. *Cultura* took on the main meaning of cultivation or tending, including, as in Cicero, *cultura animi*, though with subsidiary medieval meanings of honour and worship (cf. in English **culture** as ‘worship’ in Caxton (1483)). The French forms of *cultura* were *couture*, oF, which has since developed its own specialized meaning, and later *culture*, which by eC15 had passed into English. The primary meaning was then in husbandry, the tending of natural growth.

**Culture** in all its early uses was a noun of process: the tending of something, crops or animals. The subsidiary *coulter* - ploughshare, had travelled by a different linguistic route, from *culter*, L - ploughshare, *culter*, oE, to the variant English spellings *culter*, *colter*, *coulter* and as late as eC17 **culture** (Webster, *Duchess of Malfi*, III, ii: ‘hot burning cultures’). This provided a further basis for the important next stage of meaning, by metaphor. From eC16 the tending of natural growth was extended to a process of human development, and this, alongside the original meaning in husbandry, was the main sense until 1C18 and eC19. Thus More: ‘to the culture and profit of their minds’; Bacon: ‘the culture and manurance of minds’ (1605); Hobbes: ‘a culture of their minds’ (1651); Johnson: ‘she neglected the culture of her understanding’ (1759). At various points in this development two crucial changes occurred: first, a degree of habituation to the metaphor, which made the sense of human tending direct; second, an extension of particular processes to a general process, which the word could abstractly carry. It is of course from the latter development that the independent noun **culture** began its complicated modern history, but the process of change is so intricate, and the latencies of meaning are at times so close, that it is not possible to give any definite date” (Williams, 1983).

Language is also, “a significant spiritual part of a nation and it helps to characterize a certain epoch, certain societies” (Rosen, 1991). Language is a cultural heritage of a certain nation, nationality together with customs and traditions. Language absorbs in itself all possible combinations of manifestations of activities of a person, his thoughts, and his spirit. It marks out all the fragments of a person's life and it describes them by different means. Language gives all human action voice, achieving this in complex and subtle

ways (Wardhaugh, 1997). Multiple levels of social interaction, from international relations to intimate relationships, are borne, enabled and empowered through language. Language not only signals where we come from, what we espouse and to whom we belong, but also operates tactically and strategically to invest our individual, gender or ethnic franchise; to authorize our pilgrimage through societies' orders; and to signal to others what we want and how we intend to achieve it (Romaine, 1994). Throughout history, people have judged others – that is, consciously or unconsciously assessed their place in human society – based solely on their ethnic language, their regional dialect, indeed their personal choice of individual words. The linguistic verdict has been final and has fashioned all of human history (Trudgill, 1996). We agree with the opinion of E.S. Buneeva (1996) who believes that one of the ways of studying a language as a phenomenon of culture is “a definition of culturally significant informative attributes which find their reflection in different manifestations of a culture of a people and firstly in the language” (Buneeva, 1996).

A unique and individual image of a culture is a result of a special system of elements of an experience inherent to this particular culture. They are not unique by themselves and they are repeated in other cultures (Markaryan, 1969). As N.A. Berdyaev (1990) thinks, beyond nationality, which is understood, as an individual life the existence of a person is impossible. In addition, thanks to this national individuality, people are a part of a humanity, but being inside they become “national people”. “A national person is more than just a person, he has generic features and at the same time he possesses individually-national features”. As a result, culture cannot be according to N.A. Berdyaev (1990) abstractedly human, it is always specifically human, that is national.

National culture is usually understood as a set of social relations and values of a certain nation (Dubichinsky, 1993). Every national culture has its own importance and every national language reflects an individuality, which differentiates one national culture from another. To become a national culture it should have enough language material to transfer “both an experience of a people and an experience of a mankind” (Dubichinsky, 1993). To reveal a national image of a world or a national culture “an entity of a national life should be taken into account: environment, elements, folklore, language, imagery of poetry, interdependence of space and time – a set of national values, reference points, symbols, archetypes which defines thinking, Logos of a people (Gachev, 1988).

Language remembers and keeps secrets; the supreme sense is hidden in it. It gives us a right to talk about a cognitive memory of a word: “the role of a language in the mentality of a person and in the life of people is unique” (Kasevich 1991). A person cannot exist without a language. However, at the same time a system of verbal meanings is connected with the system of knowledge by means of relations of a cognitive interpretation. The system of verbal meanings is related to a cultural competence of people in an interpretative mode. Conceptual filling of this competence is one of the characteristic features of mentality of a person. In the language in the system with typical images, standards, stereotypes, symbols the perception of a people recognized in the context of cultural traditions is shown. And this causes the fact that not only does the language reflect reality in the form of its naïve picture of the world, not only does it show the attitude towards its fragments from the



point of view of the values but it reproduces from generations to generations cultural and national traditions of a nation – carrier of a language (Thelia, 1996).

Because of interconnection of a person and an outer world, some ideas about this world appear and a model of a world is formed. The picture of a world is many-sided and multidimensional; it connects representations of a person about different sides of reality. A language picture of the world creates a symbolic image of the reality, its interpretation. A language picture of the world coincides in general with the logical reflection in the consciousness of people. But still some peripheral parts in the language picture of the world are retained which remain beyond the logical reflection and being verbal images of things and linguistic models the relations between them vary from one language to another depending on the specific peculiarities of the latter. Through verbal images and linguistic models, an additional perception of the world can be realized and these models are a side effect of cognition, perception of reality and they add to our general picture of knowledge correcting it to some extent. “A language image is combined with the conceptual image, and a linguistic modelling of the world is combined with the logical display thus creating preconditions to reproduce a fuller and a comprehensive picture of reality in people’s mind” (Brutyán, 1968). To reveal the peculiarities of a picture of the world inherent to the representative of a certain culture it is necessary to study a person’s consciousness recorded by means of a language and consciousness which A.N. Leontyev (1976) defines as “a picture of the world where people themselves, their actions and their conditions are included”.

Images of consciousness are the units from which national and cultural structures of consciousness are built. These images are “a reflection ... of archetypes of a particular culture, which in the end determine not only the structure of consciousness of a personality as a member of the nation but define perception of the reality including another culture” (Ufimtseva, 1995). The problem of the transference of plays from culture to culture is caused not only by the necessity to translate the source text, but by finding ways of adapting them to the new cultural environment. This often leads to creation of new meanings. There are various approaches to analyzing possible ways of cultural adaptation of plays (theoretical, practical, literary, theatrical etc.). Moreover, this issue can be examined historically and synchronically, from different national and theoretical perspectives. We cannot do without looking at the dramatic discourse and its structural organization. The dialogue in the dramatic discourse requires the involvement of at least two participants who communicate through the medium of language as the etymology of the word signifies - ‘dia’ - through, ‘logos’ - word, from ‘dialegomai’ - to converse.

### ***Aim of the Study***

The aim of the study is to describe the dialogue as a constituent resource for dramatic discourse in the interconnection of language, person and culture.

### ***Research questions***

The overarching research question of this study was as follows:

Is the dialogue a constituent resource for dramatic discourse which important aspects are language, person and culture?

## Method

The material of research is made by dramatic dialogue texts of English and Russian writers. For achievement of a goal of research, we use the cognitive, discursive and semiotic approaches to the studying of the dramatic discourse. The dialogue as a discourse we characterize with the basic structural principles (interactive and interactional). The dramatic dialogue we understand as a verbal exchange between the communicative partners, a speech as a reaction to somebody else's words and as a verbal and nonverbal presentation of the character or the actor's role. In our research, we use the structural, semantic, pragmatic analysis of the dramatic interaction of characters.

The interdisciplinary research in the study of the discursive formations typology is very important in contemporary linguistics. The article sums up results that characterize the dramatic discourse as a type of discursive formation, as an object of our linguistic analysis. The methodological basis of the study includes the principal propositions on the language as a system of interrelated elements, on the dichotomy of language and speech, on the inextricable link of language and thinking, on language and reality, on the form and content unity and on the relationship of theoretical and empirical knowledge in philosophy and language. Peculiarities of dramatic discourse and the dramatic discourse model with its discursive characteristics are presented here. The dramatic discourse is described as a phenomenon with a rich explanatory potential of theoretical and applied nature. A holistic model of dramatic discourse is built upon from the specific components of discourse, which reflect cognitive-discursive characteristics of the dramatic discourse. The meaning-generating ability of the dramatic discourse is caused by its 'dipping into life', which is implemented mainly in the process of the linguocreative understanding of eventful content. The same type of the discourse is able to produce different language signs because of reflection and rethinking of the eventful content of discourse and modelling of the virtual world (Zinkovskaya, Tkhorik & Fanyan, 2007).

## Data, Analysis, and Results

The link between conversation and dialogue refers primarily to structure and not necessarily to content, function or verbal texture. But alternative speech choices provided by the form have been put to varied uses which have conditioned manifestations of it accordingly. Variations can be seen in both literary and philosophical texts in which opposing points of view, competing attitudes or intellectual positions on some questions are presented in a dialogic form for exegetic or pedagogical purposes. To linguists, who study dramatic dialogue, the conflation of speech with dialogue is fortuitous, since there is a body of work that has studied spoken speech as a discourse. As a term it has many uses and encompasses, broadly speaking, units that are larger than the basic unit of the grammar, the sentence.

Principles, norms and ways which are used to form the basis for spontaneous communication in everyday life are similar to those means which dramatists apply to build up speech types and forms in a play. The dramatic action in the general sense becomes meaningful towards real conversationalities, activated in the play and borrowed from a wider social world of relations, as theoretical reality is a part of this world. These conventionalities contain social





norms, values, behaviour and activity patterns which regulate the manner of interaction between members of a society. All these components form the ground for our understanding of the characters' speech in a theatrical performance. This common basis unites dramatists, readers, audience and actors in the process of understanding the sense of the text. This stems from the belief that the play is something interpreted but not the primary action. It means the interpretation of the dramatic language comes as a result of our communicative and linguistic competence. Thus, during the interaction, norms and rules of meaningful and appropriate speech behaviour are used to transform consecutive information volume between dramatic characters through linguistic symbols. These rules and norms serve as a communicative system comprised of interpersonal behaviour and socially caused acts.

A dialogue, as a discourse form, is characterized by a particular structure. A dialogue is interactive and interactional. It is a manner of speech exchange between the members involved in a communication process. However, its essence is more than just a character's verbal expressive means.

Studies of dramatic dialogue as discourse or as a speech exchange system are hardly in evidence, even in investigations of the language of drama. The trust of the argument has generally been to safeguard the separation of dramatic dialogue from conversation in order to preserve the latter's literary quality. The relation between these two forms has been examined contrastively literary and non-literary. Conversation and dramatic speech share areas of commonality in being speech exchange systems. This feature sets them apart from poetic genres such as the lyric or narration in the novel. Playwrights like Pinter have not only made dramatic capital out of the dramatic figures. They have also revealed the force and power of conversational resources, when they are used with dramatic skill. B. Beckerman (1970) expresses a similar concern regarding the lack of possibilities for emotional eloquence in conversation, since conversation operates under social constraints which generally forbid the expression of emotion by waiting "Conversation is primarily social, that is, intended to create an atmosphere of civilization rather than reveal inner turbulence. It also resists revelation. In conversation, confidence does not readily spring forth but must be elicited by the effort of the listener. It is not a medium for conveying passion because passion is egotistical and conversation rests on implied truce: no one is to dominate completely".

Indeed, a conversation has a social aspect of meaning and follows social norms that affect people's conduct. However, under certain circumstances these norms can be disregarded. It often happens in quarrels, in passionate political arguments, in expressions of grief, anger, love and so on. B. Beckerman (1970) appears to refer to stereotypes of polite exchanges in social settings which become a prototype for all interactions. But it is hardly the case that all day-to-day interactions are always and only passionless or that for the expression of passion in any form we must use some quotation or other from a play. The problem lies deeper than this, since the assumption appears to be that the relation between conversational and dramatic speech must be predicted upon reflections of surfaces and textures of the one in the other. The principles, norms and conventions of use which are the basis of spontaneous communication in everyday life are precisely those which are exploited and manipulated by dramatists in their constructions of speech types and forms in plays. The

ordinary speech presenting the orderly and meaningful exchange of information in everyday contexts are the resource that dramatists use to construct dialogue in plays. Drama text as part of dramatic discourse is not a mirror of action, but it is a composition (Burns, 1972) and the fabricated activities, including speech in drama need to be 'authenticated' by an audience (or reader) as credible activity in the dramatic world in which it functions. Dramatic action, broadly defined, becomes meaningful, therefore, in relation to the 'authenticating conventions' which are invoked in a play, which are drawn from the wider, social world of affairs in which dramatic activity is embedded. They imply social norms, values, modes of conduct and action which regulate how members organize their affairs, which in turn form the basis of our understanding of the speech and action of the fictional figures in the world of a play" (Burns, 1972).

Such a ground of commonality links playwright, actor, director, audience, and reader in a common effort at meaning interpretation, since what we encounter in plays is the interpreted action and not the action in the raw. In relation to dialogue, it signifies our communicative competence (Hymes 1998) as much as our linguistic competence which is at work in interpreting the language of drama. Dramatic speech cannot simply be regarded as an extension of everyday speech into drama. Drama has its own history and its own contemporary constraints for aesthetic, experimental and/or social purposes.

Dialogue in drama discourse should, therefore, be regarded more in the nature of a device, rather than as a reflector, with a world-creating, not a world-mirroring function. It is a complex device given that it is overdetermined in many ways, when it is called upon to function in the dramatic context. Further study of dramatic discourse focuses on the study of dialogue as interaction. With reference to dramatic dialogue this means that the perspective taken here is the one where the genre presupposes spoken interaction among participants in speech events. The dramatic text, as written text, addresses a context of performance which requires a change in mode of discourse - the transformation and transmutation of the written lines into the dynamics of speech, which involves more than the recitation of the lines of the text by actors.

In a 'drama' of speech exchange, members of communication perform the roles of speakers and listeners. During the dialogue they switch their roles. A speaker becomes a listener, while a former listener becomes a speaker without any changes of place, action or scenery. Here we have just a change of a 'performer'. The replacement of 'non-speaking' by 'speaking' (the switch of speaker's role to the listener's role) is the result of a speech exchange, where the answer is foreseen by the essence of the form. The consecutive exchange during such replacements shapes the structure and course of the dialogue. Expressions are linguistic units of the dialogue which can be viewed as an interactional speech act. A sentence is an abstract notion in linguistics and is determined by the language grammar system. Expressions take us back to a specific context from which grammatical sentences are abstracted. Expressions are derived from the language in action. However, sentences belong to the grammar layer. Expressions are not isolated in their use. One creates them and exchanges them in a context. They form compound units which are a part of complex units equal to speech acts. This is how they represent social and interpersonal activity and are not just an abstract whole of meaningful sentences.





Dialogue creates situations with the help of those who act them out. Here various kinds of linguistic codes are integrated with the possible codes of meaning transfer at theatre, for example, paralinguistic, verbal and non-verbal (which often depend on the performer's appearance, voice, which the deictic tie of speaker with speech makes available. The alternating issue of speech, as managed by the participants themselves in an episode or scene, creates the trajectory, the development in its specificity, of the situation and relationship itself as it unfolds in time. The management of interactional dynamics of speech is thus a major aspect of dialogic art in drama. The linguistic units of analysis appropriate to dialogue as interactional speech are utterances. The sentence is an abstract entity in linguistics, defined in relation to particular grammars, and not in absolute terms. Utterances bring back into the reckoning the contextual factors which are abstracted away by grammatical sentences. Utterances are relevant to areas of language-in-use sentences to grammars. Although further complexities can be introduced, the simple distinction made above will serve for our purposes although it must be noted that there is not always one-to-one relation between them when sentences are used in context as utterances. Utterances may be liable to false starts, slips of the tongue, incomplete so that it could be unclear as to which sentence analogue is being used.

Drama is more than dialogue, where dialogue is employed as a dramatic resource; its mechanics have a fundamental role to play and are the focus of this study. Dialogue is viewed as an interaction with a wide range of possible interpretational variations. There are many participants involved into the processes of dialogue interpretation. These might be the readers or listeners, or actors performing on stage. All of them can be mutually supportive, or mutually alienating, or ensconced within their own subjective worlds. Speakers, addressees and speech reveal aspects of meanings in the context of the situation and in the context of culture. All together they assist interpreters in finding the meaning. Where dialogue plays an operative role in drama, speech functioning is complex with its own specificities which are different to those dealt with in the literary field.

As far as this research is concerned, a dialogue (a written result of the special speech communication process) is perceived as an original text; its collective author is a part of it. A text, as a rule, is more than just a set of expressions. It is a unity characterized by integrity and entirety. In contrast to a narration created by one author (where each expression corresponds to speakers' motives and purposes), in a dialogue this unity conception is determined by the collision of two or more members' intentions. This collision does not necessarily characterizes the dialogue-dispute or any type of polemics. The differences in arrangements, unique to each partner, are practically always expressed and clearly reflected in the text.

The dialogue speech is a form in which a stylistic variety of a national language finds its real existence (spoken language, for example). The dialogical speech is a special kind of speech expression and has a number of definite linguistic characteristics. These specific features are explained by exceptional conditions and purposes of communication. The dialogue is an exchange of expressions created during the conversation. These expressions belong to different members of the described communication process. They become structurally underdetermined and, therefore, can be observed as a special

communicative complex united by structural and grammatical means. It is called a dialogical unity with a linguistic norm.

A dramatic text, being a written text, is directed towards the context of the play which helps to transform written lines into the dynamics of a spoken language. All these adjustments require more than just the actors' simple recitation of the lines. The dialogue creates situations which are equal to those constructed by the actors. Thus, a special speech code is formed. And when it is used in the dialogue, it integrates with other theater codes such as paralinguistic, kinetic and gestured means of expression. The verbal and non-verbal codes are articulated through the actors' body and voice and this is possibly due to the dietetic connection between the speaker and the speech. When the actors change the speech subject in an episode or scene, they create a trajectory which contributes to the situation development and takes into account context specifics. The management of the interactional speech dynamics is the essence of the dialogical art in drama.

Drama is a wider notion as compared to dialogue. If the dialogue is used as a source for the drama work, its components play a verbal part. The speaker, the listener and the speech acquire their meaning through the connection with the other characters, with each other, the context of the situation, the cultural context and the action. These components call interpreters to find the sense where the dialogue becomes active in drama. In this respect, speech functions in a complex way due to its different peculiarities. Drama has its own history – different plays, texts, contexts of plays, theatrical norms – and its own modern boundaries which answer esthetic, experimental and social purposes. Drama plays are those which materialize traditions across the generations as a type of activity or practice in which customs, corresponding to the tradition, find their form and are tested and repeated. Dramatic speech is composed of direct interaction within the play. The interpretation of the content of its dialogues depends on the audience and demands its presence within the discourse. The audience's presence in the play might be achieved through the audience playing the part of an 'eavesdropper' or a direct participant.

### Discussion and Conclusion

The information stream about the events on and off the stage might be revealed or concealed, together with clarity of contents and irony, which are the products of dramatic context. As a whole, the rhythm is to be drawn up and designed between and within speech acts. Each interaction has to stimulate interest towards itself and simultaneously function as an element of the whole composition. The composition itself can be different. The verbal element of drama is to be integrated with other theatrical codes using different degrees of interrelations. Moreover, the dialogue and interaction belong to the most obvious levels of drama. But they take up an intermediate position reaching other levels of perception, which are more abstract, including a content, characters and problems. The components of the play interact on various levels and, eventually, through all the speeches and actions of the dramatic actors. This is how the essence of the drama world is formed.

The manipulation and use of available descriptive means play an important role during the creation of different episodes, through which the dramatic narration is developed and the imaginary world of play is concretized. The



phenomena of 'substantiated speech' and 'speech act' can be revealed. Situational conditions of narration development shape up the specifics of speech act elements which, when taken into consideration, help to define the participants, the place of communication, its manner of development and its consequences. Speech acts used in drama discourse can always be perceived as being truthful despite the fact that this type of a discourse is more complicated than a face to face communication. Communication in the play includes a 'horizontal' dimension together with a 'vertical' one and involves recipients, audience and readers. The contexts of the dialogue are included in the context of the whole play. Speech acts exchanged by characters are the scene actions for the translators who examine the action together with the dialogue. The models of dramatic events and actual chronology respond to dramatic demands such as a necessity to create, support and reduce or intensify the recipients' effort and interest. The scene contrasts, allocation of the less and stronger affected moments, intensification of the plot in the denouement and more static moments, in which nothing happens and which repeat recurrently, depend on confrontation of the scene with the other scene or episode. These parts of the play are confronted by the other informative segments placed within a broader context. The place of events and their interrelation with the whole context influence the whole perusal. The dialogical part, directly affected by the context, is built by means of all the dialogue parts of the play.

Perhaps, it should be emphasized that the less the drama piece is built up on patterns and the more figures with independent status and detailed characteristics it has, the greater creative task producers are faced with. They have to prevent non-theatrical prejudices from receiving an artistic interpretation and to keep the audience from relying on their own prejudices instead of the play content. They have to make sure that the non-artistic world of the audience does not cancel dramatic efforts which often resist existing prejudices and change them. The director and his team – a designer, composer and others – appear here as interpreters, who try to find all the nuances of the discourse interpretation. The adequate translation of the drama discourse into the theatrical language makes the audience realise that the world of the text does not often correspond to their expectations.

Dramatic characters interact by means of speech shaped by the requirement of the situation. The options of creation and management are the fundamental aspects of dialogical dramatic art as they influence how the speech can function in the episode, act or scene. It is important, that the characters' speech, independent of linguistic structures and implicit styles, reaches its highest dramatic potential in plays where numerous resources of communication are used.

Unfinished sentences are one of the most common syntactic development tools used in a dialogue. An unfinished sentence (the break of speech) is a reflection of a live speech feature in the dialogue of the drama. The break of speech, or in other words when the speaker does not finish his or her phrase, is the peculiarity of the dialogue which distinguishes it from the author's narration. The meaning of an unfinished sentence should be clear and possess intonations of the spoken language. The successful inclusion of such unfinished sentences into the dialogue allows the author to avoid unnecessary verbose speech and to express the liveliness commonly found in the colloquial language.

Unfinished sentences in the character's speech play a crucial role in revealing the sense of a drama work. A phenomenon of meaning suppression in drama as a type of the break of speech is very significant because the audience understands the idea itself. In a drama work, as a rule, the author's words contain various explanations of something that characters did not say. Elliptical sentences can be considered a typical syntactic feature of dialogical speech in drama. It is interesting to note that authors, in general, use fewer non-normative elliptical constructions than drama writers in the dialogues of dramatic prose texts, where there can be an opportunity to render a character's description through the author's narrations. The ellipsis as a common phenomenon in colloquial language and is typically used both in drama and prose dialogues. However, some quantitative distinctions in the usage of the unfinished sentence in these two types of discourse show that drama dialogue has a more frequent use of colloquial language as compared to prose dialogue.

### Implications and Recommendations

Implications and recommendations for future studies are as follows. Based on findings of this study we can compare dramatic dialogues of many kinds of actors in different cultures. It is recommended that interdisciplinary development of research should include complex methods of analysis of dramatic discourse taking into account three aspects (language, person, culture). Complex methods are integrated into research process of dramatic discourse and should be discussed by experts in their fields.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

### Notes on contributors

**Marina Rostislavovna Zheltukhina** holds a PhD in philology and now is a full professor of Theory of English department at the Volgograd State Socio-Pedagogical University, Volgograd, Russia.

**Anastasia Vladimirovna Zinkovskaya** holds a PhD in philology and now is an associate professor of English Philology department at the Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia.

**Veronika Viktorovna Katermina** holds a PhD in philology and now is a full professor of English Philology department at the Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia.

**Natalia Borisovna Shershneva** holds a PhD in philology and now is an assistant professor of English Philology department at the Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russia.

### References

- Beckerman, B. (1970). *The Dynamics of Drama*. New York: Knopf, 274 p.
- Berdyayev, N. A. (1990). *Self-knowledge*. Moscow: International relations, 278 p.
- Berezin, F. M. & Golovin B. N. (1979). *General linguistics*. Moscow: Education, 374 p.
- Brutyan, G. A. (1968). *Hypothesis of Sapir-Whorf*. Yerevan: Luís, 472 p.
- Buneeva, E. S. (1996). *Conceptological Model of a Sign of a Seniority. Language Personality: Cultural Concepts*. Volgograd: Peremena, 273 p.
- Burns, E. (1972). *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and in Social Life*. London: Longman, 361 p.



- Dibrova, E. I. (1996). Text Phenomena: Cultural, Philological, and Psychophilological. *Philologica*, 10, 2-5.
- Dubichinsky, V. V. (1993). *Lexical parallels*. Moscow: Self-knowledge, 155 p.
- Gachev, G. D. (1988). *National Images of the World*. Moscow: Soviet Writer, 209 p.
- Hall, E. (1973). *The Silent Language*. New York: Garden City, 277 p.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. London: SAGE Publications, 285 p.
- Hymes, D. (1998). *Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 363 p.
- Kasevich, V. B. (1991). *Language and knowledge. Language and Structure of Knowledge*. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 251 p.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). *Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action. Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: CUP, 352 p.
- Kukushkina, E. I. (1984). *Knowledge, Language, Culture*. Moscow: Moscow State University, 153 p.
- Lakoff, R. T. (2000). *The Language War*. London: University of California Press, 263 p.
- Leontyev, A. A. (1976). *Signs of Integrity and Connectivity of the Text. Semantic perception of the Speech Message*. Moscow: Moscow State University, 274 p.
- Markaryan, E. S. (1969). *Sketches of the Theory of Culture*. Moscow: Thought, 367 p.
- Ojegov S. I. & Shvedova, N. I. (1994): *Explanatory Dictionary of Russian*. Moscow: Russian, 274 p.
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: OUP. 396 p.
- Rosen, E. V. (1991). *German Lexicon: History and Present*. Moscow: The higher school, 285 p.
- Thelia, V. N. (1996). *Russian Phraseology*. Moscow: Languages of the Russian Culture, 253 p.
- Trudgill, P. (1996). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. New York: OUP, 305 p.
- Ufimtseva, N. V. (1995). Russians in Eyes of Russians. *Language – System. Language – Text. Language – Ability*. Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 242-249.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1997). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: OUP, 473 p.
- Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords. A vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: OUP, 373 p.
- Zheltukhina M. R. (2015). Institutional, Stereotypical and Mythological Media Markers of Modern Society. *Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia*, April, 12 (1), 913-920.
- Zheltukhina, M. R., Krasavsky, N. A., Slyshkin, G. G. & Ponomarenko, E. B. (2016a). Utilitarian and Aesthetic Values in the Modern German Society. *IEJME-Mathematics Education*, 11(5), 1411-1418.
- Zheltukhina, M. R., Vikulova, L. G., Slyshkin, G. G. & Vasileva, E. G. (2016b). Naming as Instrument of Strengthening of the Dynastic Power in the early middle Ages. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(14), 7195-7205.
- Zinkovskaya, A. V., Tkhorik, V. I. & Fanyan N. Yu. (2007). *Language – Spirituality – Culture*. Krasnodar: Education-South, 363 p.