

FUNCTIONS OF SPEECH AND THEIR CHANGE IN THE DIALOGUE (ANALYSIS OF ONE DIALOGUE)

Danutė Valentienė

Šiauliai State College, Lithuania

Annotation

The article analyses a dialogue between a man and a woman, focusing on its semantic structure and functioning of the speech functions in the communication process. Dialogue is dominated by alternating referential, expressive, phatic and poetic functions. The dialogue begins with a referential function which is usually responded by a phatic function. At the end of the dialogue the situation is resulted by a poetic function after which following replies are based on a referential function allowing to successfully complete the communication.

Key words: *dialogue, dialogue semantics, speech functions in a dialogue*

Introduction

The aim of the research is to establish key semantic strategies of a dialogue, reflected in replies of a man / woman and resulted by strengthening or fading of individual speech features.

Research material: recorded and decrypted dialogue between a man and a woman. It has been noted for a long time that the most interesting for research are dialogues not among men or women and but between a man and a woman. These dialogues contain more interesting and importantly - more diverse constructions (especially, bearing in mind the very limited length of the replies, see: Bitinienė 2001: 18). Naturally, any dialogue has or at least must have a gamification component which is always very prominent when analyzing conversations⁷ between men and women, (Goroshko 1999, in particular p. 5-26; Кирилина 2004, in particular 114-223). Therefore, the most important **method** in for studying dialogues is the semantic analysis, which instrument becomes the change of speech functions in the communication process.

Problem of the research - semantic expression of strategies of a dialogue between a man and a woman.

Essence of a dialogue

Versatility of a dialogue. When studying the expression of information and communication in the information society, particular focus falls on a dialogue. Dialogue has always been an object not only and not so much of the speech science but more the subject of philosophy (cfr. big comprehensive work: Gutauskas, 2010, especially the chapter on the origin of the dialogue p. 164-272). Since antiquity, the dialogue was seen as an instrument of knowledge: all the works of knowledge were written in dialogue form, for example works of Plato. They have striking similarity with the works of drama: all of them contain many acting and impersonation elements, such as when one of the participants of the conversation suddenly begins to present ideas controversial to the statements he/she just presented. These features of the dialogue found in Plato's works (eg. "Cratylus") are reflected in the material analyzed in this article. This shows that the dialogue in its essence is a universal and a form of communication that changed a little thought out the history⁸.

From philosophy - to linguistics. Dialogue in communication aspect is an exchange of socially relevant information. But this simple definition contains a broad linguistic space: there are plenty of dialogue definitions, their structure is examined by a wide range of linguistic fields that often focus on different dominants, thus even in fundamental works on this topic it is emphasized that even a careful researcher touches only some aspects of this complex phenomenon (Демьянков 1992). One of these aspects are related to I-YOU roles. There are two main roles of the dialogue: (1) one who gives, and (2) one who requests (demands). The dialogue intertwines spaces of two pronouns **I-YOU**: these spaces are characterized by the fact that no participant in the dialogue can be in one of the spaces for a very long time (cfr.

⁷ Dialogues in fictional texts, particularly paying attention to the differences between men and women replies were also analyzed in the works of the author of this article: Valentienė D., 2010, *Replikų nutraukimai dialoguose*. Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti, Liepājas Universitāte, Nr. 14 (2), P. 332-339. Valentienė D., 2012, *Pakartojimų funkcijos dialoguose*. Profesinās studijas: teorija ir prakātika, ŠVK Leidybos centras, Nr.10, P. 19-24.

⁸ The drama in dialogue was also emphasized by famous philosopher Martin Buber (II, 91-99), alluding to the two types of conversation partners: the first is called by the Latin word *amicus* "friend" and the second - *hostis* "enemy, foreigner" or "adversary, rival".

observations by Buber (1970, paragraph 1.3.), because otherwise there is a risk that the dialogue as a text phenomenon will disappear overall.

Traditional dialogue analysis parameters. The article analyzes following characteristics of the dialogues: (1) response relationship with the question, (2) participants knowledge of the subject, (3) initiatives ratio of requester and responder, (4) speaker's emotional expression, (5) speakers' expression of the status in the dialogue when one of the speakers clearly has a higher status, (6) dispute strategy, denial or ways of persuasion (7) reminder of the general purpose of the conversation when one speaker tries to end the conversation or change the subject, (8) ratification or rejection of approaches, (9) change of subject when a *more* relevant topic is suggested and / or reminded.

Text of the dialogue⁹

Participants: husband and wife

Wife: Su kuo tu norėtum važiuot atostogaut?

Husband: Nežinau, dar nieko... nesugalvojuau...

<...> Pause

Wife: kam galima pasiūlyti?

Husband says something indistinctly while jawing, woman gets annoyed.

Wife: ką?!

Husband: paatostogaut nors kiek nuvažiuosim, nors porai dienų, žinai

Wife: pora dienų?

Husband: gal ilgiau.

<Pause>

Wife: aš tai norėčiau į tą Latviją. Tik kad va vaikui paso reikia. O kaip ten tiksliai vadinasi, tu žinai?

Husband: palei jūrą važiuoji ir viskas, kempingai (pikta intonacija).

Wife: papasakok ką nors

Husband: o ką aš tau papasakosiu.

Wife: bet ten nėra ten specialaus, nekaip Šventoji, pavyzdžiui

Husband: ką aš žinau (husband does not let to finish the thought, he is bored)

Wife: faina žinai dar būtų nuvažiuoti į Rundalės pilį. Ten sakė labai gražiai, matai, važiuoja tenai visokios krikštynos, visokios vestuvės.

<Pause>

Wife: eini jau?

<Attention is disrupted by the child>

Husband: brrr, paklausk, ką mama turi.

Wife: Mama neturi kišenių (happily).

Husband: Man atostogos... tada nuo liepos dešimtos ar aštuntos (husband)

Wife: Šventoj kaip užpernai? (evident question)

Husband: Paklausiu darbe... (indistinctly)

Semantic strategy of the dialogue

Note concerning scope. Why there has been only one dialogue chosen? The aim of the article is to examine in detail the dialogue in which speech functions change each other in a very short time: analysis of several dialogues would only diversify the material, but would not change the essence.

Speakers' expression of the initiative and status in the dialogue. Often one of the participants in the conversation has a higher status. Although at first glance none of the speakers has a higher status in the quoted dialogue, but deeper analysis of the text shows that a higher status is expressed implicitly - by the initiative of one of the conversation participants: it can be clearly distinguished which of the participants is *spiritus movens*, i.e. who initiates the conversation and who initiates it end. Conversation initiative is on the wife's side. The very beginning of the conversation shows that the conversation will be complicated. Therefore the wife emphasizes a general topic - having vacation in case one of the variants being unsuccessful (at the beginning there was a question not where to go but with whom). This is how immediate surrounding is being emphasized. Woman in a brief dialogue, suggests for the man three (or even three) vacation options: The first (the most abstract) - to go on vacation in general. Woman's question is pretty complicated, because it begins with the phrase *with whom?* Instead of *where? when?* Thus, it is suggested, that more than one family will go. The second

⁹ The conversation has been recorded with the hidden microphone without the participants' knowledge. Both participants are about 30 years old.

part of the dialogue only confirms that some kind of friends are being assumed (*kam galima pasiūlyti?*). In both cases, woman does not receive a clear answer and gets annoyed. Failing to steer the conversation towards *with whom?*, woman initiates a next holiday theme - direction. Man in this case is more pliable and starts a *seaside* theme, but woman clearly does not support this direction. Her suggested direction - Rundale - is no longer an object of a vacation - it is a sightseeing tour.

Dispute strategy, denial or ways of persuasion. Woman tries to convince the man by mentioning locations and activities in those places. If locations for the woman herself are not clear, then things are happening in her "feminine" world: wedding and christening. Sequence is interesting: christening is mentioned first and only then - the wedding. The latter themes, as we see from the context, are no longer relevant for her, while the mentioning of christening celebration is resulted by a child who is in the room (it is not clear whether the child is baptized or not).

The reminder of the general purpose of the conversation when one speaker tries to end the conversation or change the theme. The overall aim is reminded using the same semantics, but its expression is different. Since the conversation theme ("vacation") starts with very "feminine" syntax: (1) *su kuo tu norėtum <...>*, (2) *aš tai norėčiau į tą Latviją* (in both cases the subjunctive is mood used, allowing "expression" for the second participant in the conversation - her husband; in both cases, a subjunctive mood person is clear - the first time it is almost requested that the man would want and in the second wife's desire is shown, (3) in both cases, with the failure of dialogue's partner to "seduce", a third possible component of the subjective mood is activated - the third person: *faina žinai dar būty*. However, the woman still continues to reach her husband by using the present tense verb *žinai*.

Functions of speech and dialogue

Speech functions. Their essence and operation in the speech was first described in detail by Roman Jakobson in 1960 (Lithuanian translation Jakobson 2004), they never are completely "pure" (Labauskaitė 2013, 75, etc.), and they are more or less always intertwined and it is most noticeable in verbal (not written) dialogue (cfr. detailed theoretical analysis of speech functions by Karaliūnas 2008, 117-182).

The reference (information) speech function. The essence of this function is to report (summarize) past, current or anticipated events. This function is prominent in the analyzed dialogue in future vacation discussion and in the question with whom to spend summer holidays, when mentioning locations and remembering where the vacation was spent previous year, etc. Meanwhile, presence of other functions is much more interesting and covers a much larger part of the action.

Expressive (*often called - emotional*) speech feature is aimed to convey emotions and feelings are most closely related to the speaker and external communication system in which the speaker "comes alive" (Labauskaitė, *ibid*). Expressive function is usually not aimed towards informativeness. This function was precisely defined by phonologist Aleksas Girdenis (2003: 36-38): "When speaking we usually not only convey a purely substantive content, but also consciously or unconsciously assess it and our interlocutor, show one or another our attitude towards them" (p. 36). This function can emphasize the speaker as a representative of a certain social group, for example whether it is a man or a woman. In essence expressive function inhibits the reference function. Pauses play a very important role in this dialogue, figuratively speaking, they "tear" the dialogue and its players become obliged to start it again. So-called "non-perspective" words perform this function e.g., pronouns and phrases with no clear semantics (the man saying *o ką aš tau pasakosiu...*).

Appellative (addressing) function. As it is emphasized by Girdenis (2003: 38, a large number of literature on the subject is provided there as well), "by appellative means speaker tries to influence the listener directly: in one way or another to encourage to act him/her as well as to stimulate certain parts of their emotions and moods, not necessarily incurring them himself/herself. Sometimes this function goes under another name - *control*. "The more the interlocutor is trying to convince or change the opinion of the his/her interlocutor, the more actively latter responds to the objections or requirements, thus the stronger will be the speech control function (Labauskaitė, 79). Persuasion carries out drama function in the speech. Eg. one partner's desire to go on vacation is very prominent in the analyzed dialogue. Ways of persuasion, that there is the need of going on vacation, change when trying to mitigate the desire *not to go on vacation at all*. Appellative function is dominated in woman's phrases: *su kuo tu norėtum; nors kiek nuvažiuosim; papasakok ką nors*.

Phatic function is designed to maintain contact. Eg., this function includes conversations about the weather and so on. G. Labanauskaitė on the basis of M. Pfister's works on speech of the drama, indicates one important objective of this function - "phatic function becomes especially important when after of a successful but disturbed communication, initially it is need to establish or re-establish a contact and then the ability to "keep" the conversation becomes essential or the sole purpose of dialogue communication" (p.82). Analyzed dialogue structure shows that after several unsuccessful attempts to discuss the upcoming vacation the dialogue goes to a standstill. Conversation is rescued by two phrases that are provoked by the child. We see an interesting progression: after inserting replies as some kind of phatic element, the communicative function of following phrases strengthen, allowing efficient completion of the problem discussion. Some researchers, based on the abundant literature, indicate that one of the main objectives of the phatic function is creation of comfort and calming of the interlocutor (Karaliūnas 2008: 165-167). Discussed function is closely intertwined with the poetic function. The assumption can be made that the conflict in the dialogue is eliminated by these two functions becoming intertwined. "Representative" of phatic function in the dialogue is the husband. His speech is actually *only* aimed at maintaining a minimal communication: *nežinau, dar nieko... nesugalvoju; o ką aš tau papasakosiu; ką aš žinau.*

Poetic function messages are focused on *themselves*, i.e. the focus is not on what is reported, but *how* it is reported. When conflict comes to a standstill, a kind of *deus ex machina* (child) is activated and then two phrases become reminiscent of one of the small folklore genres - *minkles*. It seems that the question *Ko mama neturi?* belongs to the same category as well. (answer – *kišenių*). Phatic function is intertwined with poetic function and enables successful completion of communication:

- *Man atostogos... tada nuo liepos dešimtos ar aštuntos* (man)
- *Šventoj kaip užpernai* (woman)
- *Paklausiu darbe* (man)

Change of speech function and topic when a more relevant theme is suggested and / or reminded. Theme gets replaced almost by a consensus since several variations of the main theme proved to be unsuccessful, and a new theme arises spontaneously: a game with the child, asking him/her questions, which he/she does not have to answer. It looks like a mirrored reflection of husband and wife's conversation when participants of conversation (or performance) exchange roles. In this particular case, the opponents - husband and wife become united and in uniform manner try to postpone the discussed theme, understanding that the child plays only a phatic function. However, there is one element related to earlier quite polemic conversation in this phatic communication. Confrontation between *ką mama turi* (man's words) // *ko mama neturi* (woman's words) is (though the question is whether they can be considered) the reflection of an earlier dispute. However, prior to this change of the theme which is initiated by the husband, there is a clear topic change initiated by the wife. That is the question following a pause (it is possible that it also plays a phatic function) *eini jau?* This basic phrase is actually very interesting from a syntax point of view. Present tense form of the verb *eini*, unlike the other verbs in the conversation, expressed in a neutral or subjunctive mood form is used in a second person. From the lexical perspective it is also unexpected, because no "movement" was mentioned. *Jau* can be seen as an encouragement, though not as *the incentive to go right away*, but as an encouragement to change the subject, i.e. we observe a kind of a small drama being played¹⁰.

Conclusions

1. Dialogue is a complex text, which combines two things: semantic expression and its regulating speech functions.

2. The crucial role in the semantic expression of a dialogue has a dispute strategy and participants knowledge of the theme as well as clearly expressed initiative by one of the participants, giving him/her a higher status, is reflected both in vocabulary (diverse nouns, names of places) and syntax (longer and more informative sentences).

¹⁰ Expression *ką aš žinau* does not mean the knowledge itself but reluctance to speak on the subject in general. Analyzed dialogue is rich in peculiar noise elements, the role of the small child can also be considered as the noise. All of these features of a dialogue become particularly evident in the literary text (Klioštoraitytė 2006), where deeper analysis of a dialogue shows that it is a monologue dressed up as a dialogue (p. 92; emphasis in bold by Klioštoraitytė).

3. Speech functions form the dialogue as a small work of drama, lasting just a few minutes: the change of functions used by the participants allows the dialogue either to continue or revive if it comes to standstill.

References

1. Bitinienė, A. (2001). Grožinio stiliaus prozos tekstų tiesioginės kalbos sakinių ilgis ir struktūra. *Kalbotyra*, L(1), 17-28.
2. Buber, M. (1998). *Dialogo principas I: AŠ ir TU*. Vilnius: Katalikų pasaulis.
3. Buber, M. (2001). *Dialogo principas II: Dialogue*. Klausimas pavieniui; Tarpžmogiškumo pradai. Vilnius: Katalikų pasaulis.
4. Girdenis, A. (2003). *Teoriniai lietuvių fonologijos pagrindai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
5. Gutauskas, M. (2010). *Dialogo erdvė. Fenomenologinis požiūris*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.
6. Goroshko, O. (1999). *Differentiation of Male and Female Speech Styles*. Praha: Open Society Institute, 1999. Cited in: <http://rss.archives.ceu.hu/archive/00001011/01/12.pdf>
7. Jakobson, R. (2004). *Lingvistika ir poetika*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 18/19, p. 5-49.
8. Karaliūnas, S. (2008). *Kalbos vartojimas ir socialinis kontekstas*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2008.
9. Klioštoraitytė, R. (2006). *Monologų tipai Piero Paolo Pasolinio romane „Teorema“*. *Literatūra*, 48(4), 92-100.
10. Labanauskaitė, G. (2013). *Naratyvo konstravimo principai šiuolaikinėje dramaturgijoje*. PhD thesis. Vilnius: Lietuvos muzikos ir teatro akademija.
11. Демьянков, В. З. (1992). Тайна диалога (Введение). *Диалог. Теоретические проблемы и методы исследования*. Москва: ИНИОН, 10-44. Cited in: <http://www.infolex.ru/Taj.html>
12. Кирилина, А. В. (2004). *Гендерные исследования в лингвистике и теории коммуникации*. Москва: ARCHIVE.

Received: 8 May 2017

Accepted: 11 October 2017