

<https://doi.org/10.62837/2025.5.301>

**MƏMMƏDLİ SÜRƏYYA XANLAR QIZI**  
**Azərbaycan Texniki Universiteti**

**SOME WAYS OF LOGICAL-SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF THE  
CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH DIALOGICAL SPEECH  
(communicative approach)**

**Surayya Mammadli**

**Summary**

This article is written on a topic relevant to modern cognitive linguistics. It draws attention to several points that could be called strong points. As the first such point, I would like to point out the timeliness of the author's speech in the press. It is noticeable that he is thoroughly familiar with modern specialized literature, as evidenced by links to journal sources and Internet portals. As a second point, I would like to mention the correct structuring of the work. It begins with a clear definition of the basic terminological concept, and this, objectively speaking, is a completely correct approach to this topic. It is incorrect to write about ways of logico-semantic description of specific features of a chosen type of English speech without indicating the essence, role and meaning of the dialogue. So, in my opinion, there are no gaps in the logic of the scientific narrative at all. The same point generates a third one. Namely, at the very beginning of the work, the views on the subject under study are successfully presented by representatives of three different specialties – methodologists, philologists and linguists, of which, of course, the latter option is chosen for linguistic analysis.

The rest of the article is directly devoted to various ways of describing dialogical speech in the author's chosen communicative direction. Finally, we note that the article is written in a scientific and at the same time quite accessible language not only for specialists, but also for ordinary readers.

**Keywords:** monologue, dialogue, methods, communication, logical task, modality, implicit feature, explicit feature.

**İngilis dialoji nitqinin xarakterik xüsusiyyətlərinin məntiqi-semantik  
təsvirinin bəzi yolları (kommunikativ yanaşma)**

**Xülasə**

Məqalə müasir koqnitiv dilçilik üçün aktual olan mövzuya həsr olunmuşdur. Bir neçə məqam xüsusilə diqqəti cəlb edir. İlk öncə məqalənin vaxtında yazılması qeyd oluna bilər. İkinci məqam işin düzgün qurulması ilə bağlıdır. Əsas terminoloji anlayış dəqiqləşdirilir və bu, obyektiv olaraq, sözügedən mövzuya tamamilə düzgün yanaşmadır. Dialoqun mahiyyəti, rolu və əhəmiyyəti göstərilir, ingilis nitq növünün spesifik xüsusiyyətlərinin məntiqi-semantik təsviri üsulları verilir. Bunu isə üçüncü

məqam kimi qeyd etmək olar. Məhz, işin lap əvvəlində tədqiq olunan mövzu ilə bağlı üç müxtəlif ixtisasın nümayəndələri - metodistlər, filoloqlar və dilçilər tərəfindən uğurla təqdim olunur ki, bunlardan da təbii ki, lingvistik təhlil üçün sonuncu variant seçilmişdir. Məqalədə həmçinin seçilmiş kommunikativ istiqamətdə dialoq nitqinin təsvirinin müxtəlif üsullarına toxunulur. Məqalə elmi və eyni zamanda təkcə mütəxəssislər üçün deyil, adi oxucular üçün də kifayət qədər əlçatan dildə yazılmışdır.

**Açar sözlər:** monoloq, dialoq, üsullar, rabitə, məntiqi tapşırıq, modallıq, gizli xüsusiyyət, açıq xüsusiyyət

### **Некоторые способы логико-семантического описания характерных особенностей английской диалогической речи (коммуникативный подход)**

#### **Резюме**

Настоящая статья написана на актуальную для современной когнитивной лингвистики тему. В ней привлекает внимание несколько моментов, которые можно было бы назвать опорными пунктами. В качестве первого такого пункта можно указать на своевременность выступления автора в печати. В качестве второго пункта хочется отметить правильное структурирование работы. Она начинается с чёткого определения основного терминологического понятия, и это, объективно рассуждая, совершенно правильный подход к данной теме. Писать о способах логико-семантического описания специфических признаков избранного вида английской речи, не указывая на сущность, роль и значение диалога неверно. Так что никаких пробелов в логике научного повествования, по моему мнению, здесь вовсе не наблюдается. Этот же пункт порождает и третий. А именно, в самом начале работы удачно приводятся воззрения на исследуемый предмет со стороны представителей трёх разных специальностей – методистов, филологов и языковедов, из которых, понятно, для лингвистического анализа выбран последний вариант. Весь остальной материал статьи непосредственно посвящён различным способам описания диалогической речи в избранном автором коммуникативном направлении. Наконец, отметим, что статья написана научным и в то же время вполне доступным языком не только для специалистов, но и рядовых читателей.

**Ключевые слова:** монолог; диалог; методы; коммуникация; логическая задача; модальность; имплицитный признак; эксплицитный признак.

By the middle of the second decade of the 21st century, the theory of linguistics had been significantly enriched by such sections, which promoted spoken language to one of the first places. It primarily includes monologue and dialogue. In modern literary English, dialogue has its own specific features and peculiarities. If we consider them in line with the communicative approach (and this is the most

important function of dialogic speech), then we should look for and demonstrate some ways of logico-semantic description of the characteristic features of English dialogic speech. They will be discussed in our article.

First of all, let's define the basic terminology. The dialogue can be viewed from the perspective of several scientific disciplines. From a generalized cultural point of view, this is a common form of human communication, the natural need of one person to receive certain information from an interlocutor. It should be noted that this type of dialogical communication from a cultural point of view is universal. From a purely methodological point of view, it is important to note that the main goal of training young linguists or philologists is to instill skills and independent thinking skills. And for this, a thorough study of the interrelationship of various types of speech activity is necessary. Dialogue also occupies an important place among them. On the linguistic side, dialogic speech is a real, most constructive and objectively easily accessible opportunity to exchange remarks, mainly of a mutually complementary nature. Naturally, we are most interested in the latter point of view, since the main focus of our article is to find the most effective ways of forms or methods of logical and semantic description of specific features of English dialogical speech. Let's add that the communicative approach, according to the absolute majority of scientists, is quite consistent with the rules and norms of cognitive linguistics in its current state of development.

Modern linguist N.P. Gribova, in particular, testifies that "the semantic content of the dialogue consists in replicas that correlate in several directions at the same time: among themselves in structural, lexico-semantic and functional" [1, 50]. The mutual exchange of remarks is a central logical and semantic element, as if cementing dialogical speech. It should be noted, for example, that there is a significant difference between traditional English grammar, which is mainly based on "normalized" speech, and dialogue. Thus, traditional grammar standards, as a rule, focus on the specific understanding (recognition) and perception of the text by the reader or listener. But – a serious nuance – this is a type of speech that most often does not take into account the responses. In turn, the grammatical norms of dialogical speech give a clear idea of the language (in our case, English) in its completely natural, that is, nominative function. And if we take into account the communicative approach to language, then the dialogue becomes absolutely transparent, confirming the communication of two or more people as quite ordinary situations. It is not for nothing that, unlike the first type of speech, academician L.V. Shcherba equated dialogical speech to "a universal form of communication in which the life of any language boils and beats" [3, 126].

But the question is: what kind of character should replicas take in a dialogue in order to become one of the sufficiently probabilistic ways of logico-semantic description of the characteristic features of English dialogical speech? If a

communicative approach is connected to this issue, then, in our opinion, it is possible to build some constructions. For example, a dialogue based on “anticipating the situation”.

The teacher: well, I' am going to say what you ought to do.

The student: Neither am I.

The teacher: But I Know what you will do.

The student: And so do I.

The teacher: You'll get married soon and not wait.

The student: Very good!

The teacher: And you'll have a house and not a flat of rooms.

The student: O, That is what I say [4, p.12].

So, here is one of the ways to logically and semantically describe the characteristic features of English dialogical speech, constructed by us using the formula of “anticipating the situation”. The essence of the cross-references in the above dialogue is that the teacher is trying to predict his student's true thoughts in an uncomplicated but at the same time simple and logical way. Apparently, the student himself is not quite sure that he will marry soon; the teacher suggests this idea to him. That's why his brilliant guess ends with a perfectly natural exclamation.: Very good!

It would be noted that the role of the teacher in this way of creating a dialogue is also important. For example, based on the above, you can create similar ones, but with different situations. In principle, the choice with this design is endless; much depends on the goal. However, we must admit that the logic and semantics of the dialogue are disproportionately higher than its actual methodological purpose, and therefore this situation (and the dialogue is almost always situational in nature) is only one of many. The essence of the matter lies in the fact that the structure of dialogical speech is very complex, which is explained by a number of specific but interrelated factors. Surprising as it may seem at first glance, dialogue to a certain extent sometimes reflects the psychological state of the people who enter into it. However, the development of a certain skill, on the one hand, is directly related to communicants, since they are members of a certain team. On the other hand, the logic and semantics of its construction must comply with grammatical norms and rules. After all, the communication that “serves” speech production in a dialogue necessarily implies the presence of two or more opponents. Moreover, linguists fix the psychological point that communicating people should, firstly, speak the same language (here any theoretical position is inapplicable for a bilingual), and secondly, the topic of conversation should also be common.

But it turns out that there is a way to remove certain psychological, or more precisely, psycholinguistic difficulties by asking some leading questions. This method of logical and semantic description of the characteristic features of English

dialogical speech can be called a chain reaction. The essence of this method is that the first question prepares one remark, respectively; in the future, the same operation occurs with all other questions. Hence, in fact, the term “chain reaction” itself. But we hasten to warn you: all responses according to a given pattern must be constructed by the English language learner himself. To a certain extent, this reminds us of the creation of a problematic situation in Azerbaijani universities. For example:

1. She came home at 8 o'clock.  
- When did she leave home?
2. Bill works at this general plan.  
- Where does he live?

Addendum to the second question: That is what I'm interested in.

It's easy to see that one question seems to “catch” the second, preparing the next remark.

We believe that it is best to test the literacy of building a dialogue using such a way of semantically describing some of its features as setting a logical task. The correct solution of such a problem allows, at our discretion, to overcome the difficulties that arise naturally in generating and perceiving question-answer forms. Such tasks are primarily aimed at establishing linguistic operations with a sequence of logical and semantic connections between individual replicas.

Since the key word here is “logic”, the lines should be symptomatically complicated, at least compared to the previous example, which demonstrated the formula for “anticipating the situation”. Such a task must first be based on a hologram or cryptogram, which will give it the character of a puzzle. Its correct solution depends on the students' ability to solve crosswords with a preliminary logical task. Therefore, in one line, we note that it is more appropriate to apply the logical task not at the initial stage of teaching modern literary English, but upon completion of the entire course. It should be noted that the lexical and semantic content of the question-and-answer forms of English phrases is in harmony with their structural composition. Nevertheless, this alloy is a secondary feature in relation to the task itself, since it can vary within its boundaries. Today, there is a very large specialized literature on the mobility of such boundaries between logic, semantics and architectonics of dialogical speech. It is important for us to emphasize here that the organic connection of logical design components will help students better master the new speech units of the English language. The preparation of a logical task is far from a spontaneous selection of question-and-answer lines. It cannot be artificially torn out of any textbook. On the contrary, it is a path from a primary communicative goal to the inclusion of a logical task in a specific context, which, in turn, will establish an accurate answer. As such, a pre-prepared context is not separate and disparate questions and answers to them, but fragments of dialogical speech soldered together by a single logical chain. They show, among other things, a certain type of

logical-semantic connection of the question-answer unity with other types of speech patterns. In our opinion, the logical task is attractive and productive because it is a visual way of semantically defining a number of features of English dialogic speech. And in line with the communicative approach, all responses provide the necessary information about their loyalty / infidelity. To a certain extent, this dichotomy associatively reminds us of the test system for applicants from Azerbaijan, when out of five questions, one retains the right to be, so to speak, a “private truth”, but only the only one is absolutely accurate.

For example, let us give a dialogue with the following logical task: with the help of some clarifying questions, provide the interlocutor with the opportunity to specify the previous message. The information is thus divided into two parts.

- I can't translate this text -
- Why can't you translate it?
- It's so difficult.
- I want to make a cake.
- How do you make a cake, Mum?
- Well, listen and I tell you.

We would like to draw our attention to the fact that by this dialogue we are leading the interlocutor to express his point of view on an additional situation that is not indicated in the previous remark. This automatically means that the proposed task can be continued, that is, constructed, by the interlocutor himself, only according to the appropriate logical, semantic and grammatical rules.

Here is another dialogue that splits into two equal parts. In the first, the task is to express any doubt or distrust of the opponent's message; in the second, by asking again, either confirmation or refutation of the information received from the interlocutor is expected. For example:

- Who are you, stranger?
- I' am Freddi.
- Are you really Freddi?
- Yes, certainly I' am.

When we write and talk about specific ways of developing and improving dialogic speech, we most often model a certain situation. But relying on it requires adherence to certain principles. Most modern linguists agree that English dialogic speech is characterized by some understatement, the absence of an urgent need to mobilize lexemes of different parts of speech, and finally, the relative simplicity and uncomplicatedness of utterances. Linguists also believe that dialogic speech is often spontaneous and chaotic in everyday life.; It is the specialists who direct him to a more conscious process. On the other hand, their apparent unpreparedness for dialogical communication, and their forgetfulness of elementary norms, rules, and forms during listening or speaking allows them to make extensive use of a lot of

speech cliches and ready-made models. Thus, F. Leisinger rightly argued that dialogues most often consist of stereotypes, and in the same order, the same type of answers to questions are a kind of incentive to generate new meanings. Despite this categorical statement, F. Leisinger is right in principle. Indeed, the specifics of many dialogues often consist in presenting a characteristic sample for ready-made answers/stamps. However, this does not prevent the creation of a creative environment for students of modern literary English. In addition, the environment, as we know, determines the environment. Meanwhile, we must admit it is axiomatic that the logical-semantic and structural-syntactic design of a dialogical utterance often consists of speech cliches. By the way, this is quite easy to explain. Throughout the analysis of our chosen topic of the article, we tried to show that the very form of the question (with the exception of a complicated logical task) determines both the answer and its form. And if the dialogue hypothetically represents a pattern, then the question is, why repeat it? And from the point of view of grammar in any language, including English, the response is almost always the part of the sentence to which the question is actually being asked. Therefore, stencil speech stamps, projected according to the principle of an automated algorithm, come to the fore first of all. It is significant that such models/schemes of dialogic speech fully correspond to the communicative approach in the aspect that they are initially embedded in the mental abilities of a person, and then in the linguistic ones. The former, for obvious reasons, indicate the degree of human interaction directly with society; the latter (and this is also understandable) indicate the gradual development and improvement of his language skills. The symbiosis of these two large-scale concepts organizes the dialogue as a specific type of text consisting of several fragments (parts), as we have already seen, sometimes not independent in nature. Obviously, there are certain requirements for it. The most important things for us are the different forms of reflection of linguistic material. But there are quite a few of these forms by now. Within the framework of the current article, we will note the most productive ones. Namely, those that are consistent with both a communicative approach and linguistic means. In addition to what has already been noted in our work, in accordance with this synthesis, we are talking about some other ways of logico-semantic description of the characteristic features of English dialogic speech. As an illustration, let us turn to the implicit-explicit modal meaning of negation in English dialogues with an initial communicative basis. As it turns out, the main form of expression of the implicit meaning is some types of repetition. First of all, these are the so-called repetitions-repetitions. This is also one of the radical ways in which we are interested in the subject of research. According to modern professor Dilara Ismayilova, this type of dialogic speech is directly “directed at the entire propositional structure of the initiating utterance, or at its component” [2, p.84].

Under this theoretical position, the author suggests the following dialogue, taken by a linguist from fiction:

She likes me  
She likes you?  
You little snob – Snob?  
You will pay for this word [2, p.85].

Let us pay attention to the fact that the repetition-repetition carries with it an allegorical parallel. We see that the first word of the third line of the dialogue, “snob”, means a person who represents English conservatism. And the second one, immediately following it, is capitalized, and this, as we understand it, is already a person's name, not his social status. From a purely linguistic point of view, we note that all possible modal nuances in the proposed method can be complemented by shades of irony, surprise, disbelief, doubt, affirmation, denial, etc. It is important to point this out as an opportunity to enrich the implicit communicative-modal meaning of negation with the help of repetitions and repetitions. This reveals a subjective assessment of the speaker in relation to a particular communication situation. So a communicative approach to dialogue is combined with this assessment.

Characteristically, the same meaning of repetition can also be observed as an explicit way of describing a dialogue. For example:

Never believed in the UFOs?  
- Well, not; really.  
- Am I free to go? –  
- Of course.

In such a dialogue, there are cases of mutual presence of both implicitly and explicitly expressed main meaning, either confirmation of the message, or the presence of an additional modal shade.

#### **References:**

- 1.Грибова П.Н. Лингвистическая сущность диалогической речи, её роль и место в системе национального литературного языка. В сборнике: Актуальные вопросы переводоведения и практики перевода. Сборник научных статей Выпуск 3 Нижний Новгород 2013, с. 49-59.
- 2.Ismailova D.A. The implicit communicative modal meaning of negation in the dialogic speech of the English language. Scientific Thought of the Caucasus Journal, 2002, № 3, p. 84-87.
- 3.Щерба, Л.В. Избранные работы по русскому языку. М.: Учпедгиз, 1957, 387 с
4. Eckersley С.Е. Essential English. For foreign students. Book 4. Санкт-Петербург: Печатный двор, 1991, 319 с.

**Rəyçi: dos. Nuridə Novruzova**