THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION

OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

THE UZBEK STATE UNIVERSITY OF WORLD LANGUAGES

I ENGLISH FACULTY

REFERAT

THE THEME: STATISTICAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE DIALOGUES USED IN E. HEMINGWAY'S SHORT STORIES

Student: Baxtiyorov Behzod
Group: 313
Teacher: Nosirov Zuhriddin

Tashkent 2016

STATISTICAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE DIALOGUES USED IN E. HEMINGWAY'S SHORT STORIES

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Development of a science as a whole and a linguistic science, in particular is connected not only to the decision of actually scientific problems, but also with features internal and foreign policy of the state, the maintenance of the state educational standards which are to the generators of progress providing social, economic society. It forms the society capable quickly to adapt in the modern world[1].

Conditions of reforming of all education system the question of the world assistance to improvement of quality of scientific-theoretical aspect of educational process is especially actually put. Speaking about the 23rd anniversary of National Independence President I.A.Karimov has declared in the program speech "Harmoniously development of generation a basis of progress of Uzbekistan"; "... all of us realize, that achievement of the great purposes put today before us, noble aspirations it is necessary for updating a society". The effect and destiny of our reforms carried out in the name of progress and the future, results of our intentions are connected with highly skilled, conscious staff the experts who are meeting the requirements of time[2].

The present qualification paper deals with the study statistical-semantic features of the dialogues used in E.Hemingway's stories which present a certain interest both for the theoretical and for the practical language use.

The actuality of the investigation is explained on one hand by the profound interest to the function of the dialogue and its structural-semantic characteristics from the semantic, stylistic, structural point of view with the examples from Ernest Hemingway's story "The old man and the sea".

The novelty of the qualification paper is defined by concrete results of the investigation. Special emphasis is laid on various types of rendering the structural patterns of the dialogue in English language.

---

[1] Каримов И.А. Наша высшая цель –независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа// Доклад на первой сессии Олий Мажлиса Республики Узбекистан второго созыва от 22.01.2000.-Т.: Узбекистан.2000.Т.8.-С.322-340.

[2] И.А.Каримов Гармонично развитое поколение-основа прогресса Узбекистана. Ташкент. IWX.егр. 156-168

The aim of the qualification paper is to define the specific features of types of the dialogic speech in English language in the literary text.

According to this general aim the following particular tasks are put forward:

(1)   To define the notion of the sentences in English language and literary text.

(2)   To reveal specific functional peculiarities of the sentence in the material of the English language.

(3)   To study specific semantic peculiarities of the sentences in English language and literary text.

The methods of investigation used in this qualification paper are as follows: structural and semantic features of dialogues used in Ernest Hemingway's story "The old man and the sea".

The practical value of the research is that the material and the results of the given qualification paper can serve as the material for theoretical courses of lexicology, stylistics, conversational practice and translation.

The material includes:

(1)   Scientific literature on lexicology and stylistics.

(2)   The practical books of English, Russian and American authors.

The theoretical importance of the qualification paper is determined by the necessity of detailed and comprehensive analysis of the English language which form a big layer of the vocabulary and speech are very often used in literature fulfilling various structural and semantic functions.

The structure of the work the given qualification paper consists of introduction, three chapters and a conclusion which are followed by the list of literature used in the course of the research.

CHAPTER I. Review of the linguistic literature on the problems of types of speech acts in English

1.1. The problem of language and speech in linguistics

Language (Speech) is divided to certain strata or levels. The linguists distinguish basic and non-basic (sometimes they term them differently: primary and secondary) levels. This distinction depends on whether a level has got its own unit or not. If a level has its own unit then this level is qualified as basic or primary. If a level doesn't have a unit of its own then it is a non - basic or secondary level. Thus the number of levels entirely depend on how many language (or speech) units in language are. There is a number of conceptions on this issue: some scientists say that there are four units (phoneme/phone; morpheme/morph; lexeme/lex and sentence), others think that there are five units like phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, word -combinations (phrases) and sentences and still others maintain that besides the mentioned ones there are paragraphs, utterances and texts. As one can see there's no unity in the number of language and speech units. The most wide - spread opinion is that there are five language (speech) units and respectively there are five language (speech) levels, they are: phonetic/phonological; morphological; lexicological, syntax - minor and syntax - major. The levels and their units are as follows:

1. phonological/ phonetical level: phoneme/phone

2. morphological level: morpheme/morph

3. lexicological level: lexeme/lex

4. Syntax - minor: sentence

5. Syntax - major: text

Thus, non - basic or secondary level is one that has no unit of its own. Stylistics can be said to be non - basic (secondary) because this level has no its own unit. In order to achieve its aim it makes wide use of the units of the primary (basic) levels. The stylistics studies the expressive means and stylistic devices of languages. According to I.R. Galperin "The expressive means of a language are those phonetic means, morphological forms, means of word -building, and lexical,

phraseological and syntactical form, all of which function in the language for emotional or logical intensification of the utterance. These intensifying forms of the language, wrought by social usage and recognized by their semantic function have been fixed in grammars, dictionaries".

"What then is a stylistic device (SD)? It is a conscious and intentional literary use of some of the facts of the language (including expressive means) in which the most essential features (both structural and semantic) of the language forms are raised to a generalized level and thereby present a generative model. Most stylistic devices may be regarded as aiming at the further intensification of the emotional or logical emphasis contained in the corresponding expressive means".[3]

When talking about the levels one has to mention about the distinction between language and speech because the linguistics differentiates language units and speech units.

The main distinction between language and speech is in the following:

1) language is abstract and speech is concrete;

2) language is common, general for all the bearers while speech is individual;

3) language is stable, less changeable while speech tends to changes;

4) language is a closed system, its units are limited while speech tend to be openness and endless.

It is very important to take into account these distinctions when considering the   language and speech units. There are some conceptions according to which the terms of "language levels" are substituted by the term of "emic level" while the "speech levels" are substituted by "ethic levels". Very often these terms are used interchangeably.

The lowest level in the hierarchy of levels has two special terms: phonology and phonetics. Phonology is the level that deals with language units and phonetics

---

[3] Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

is the level that deals with speech units. The lowest level deals with language and speech units which are the smallest and meaningless. So, the smallest meaningless unit of language is called phoneme; the smallest meaningless unit of speech is called phone. As it's been said above the language units are abstract and limited in number which means that phonemes are abstract and that they are of definite number in languages. The speech units are concrete, changeable and actually endless. This means that language units (phonemes) are represented in speech differently which depends on the person that pronounces them and on the combinability of the phoneme.

Phonemes when pronounced in concrete speech vary from person to person, according to how he has got used to pronounce this or that sound. In linguistic theory it is explained by the term "idiolect" that is, individual dialect. Besides, there may be positional changes (combinability): depending on the sounds that precede and follow the sound that we are interested in the pronunciation of it may be different, compare: *low* and *battle*. The sound "1" will be pronounced differently in these two words because the letter "l" in the first word is placed in the initial position and in the second word it stands after the letter "t". So we face "light" (in the first word) and "dark" version (in the second case). These alternants are said to be in the complimentary distribution and they are called allophones (variants, options or alternants) of one phoneme. Thus allophone is a variant of a phoneme.

The second level in the hierarchy of strata is called morphological. There's only one term for both language and speech but the units have different terms: morpheme for language and morph for speech. This level deals with units that are also smallest but in this case they are meaningful. So the smallest meaningful unit of language is called a morpheme and the smallest meaningful unit of speech is called a morph. The morphs that have different forms, but identical (similar) meanings are united into one morpheme and called "allomorphs". The morpheme of the past tense has at least three allomorphs, they are. /t/, /d/, /id/ - Examples:

worked, phoned and wanted. The variant of the morpheme depends on the preceding sound in the word.[4]

The third level is lexicological which deals with words. Word may be a common term for language and speech units. Some linguists offer specific terms for language and speech: "lexeme" for language and "lex" for speech.

The correlation between "lexeme" and "lex" is the same as it is between "phoneme" and "phone" and "morpheme" and "morph". "Lexeme" is a language unit of the lexicological level which has a nominative function. "Lex" is a speech unit of the lexicological level which has a nominative function.

Thus, both lexeme and lex nominate something or name things, actions phenomena, quality, quantity and so on.

Examples: tree, pen, sky, red, worker, friendship, ungentlemanly and so on. An abstract lexeme "table" of language is used in speech as lex with concrete meaning of "writing table", "dinner table", "round table", "square table", and so on. There may be "allolexes" like allophones and allomorphs. Allolexes are lexes that have identical or similar meanings but different forms, compare: start, commence, begin.

To avoid confusion between "morpheme" and "lexemes" it is very important to remember that morphemes are structural units while lexemes are communicative units: morpheme are built of phonemes and they are used to build words - lexemes. Lexemes take an immediate part in shaping the thoughts, that is, in building sentences. Besides, lexemes may consist of one or more morphemes. The lexeme "tree" consists of one morpheme while the lexeme "ungentlemanly" consists of four morphemes: un - gentle - man - ly.

The next level is syntax - minor which deals with sentences. The term "Syntax - minor" is common one for both language and speech levels and their unit "sentence" is also one common term for language and speech units. The linguistics hasn't yet worked out separate terms for those purposes.

---

[4] Akhmanova O., *Syntax. Theory and method.* Moscow. 1972, 108p.

The abstract notion "sentence" of language can have concrete its representation in speech which is also called "Sentence" due to the absence of the special term. Example: "An idea of writing a letter" on the abstract language level can have its concrete representation in speech: <u>John writes a letter. *A* letter is written by John.</u>

Since one and the same idea is expressed in two different forms they are called "allo - sentences". Some authors call them grammatical synonyms. Thus, sentence is language and speech units on the syntax - minor level, which has a communicative function.

In the same way the level syntax - major can be explained. The unit of this level is text - the highest level of language and speech. "Syntax- major" represents both language and speech levels due to the absence of separate term as well as "text" is used homogeneously for both language and speech units.

The language and speech units are interconnected and interdependent. This can easily be proved by the fact that the units of lower level are used to make up or to build the units of the next higher level: phones are used as building material for morphs, and morphs are used to build lexes and the latter are used to construct sentences. Besides, the homonyms that appear in the phonetical level can be explained on the following higher level, compare: - "er" is a homonymous morph. In order to find out in which meaning it is used we'll have to use it on the lexicological level; if it is added to verbs like "teacher", "worker" then it will have one meaning but if we use it with adjectives like "higher", "lower" it will have another meaning. Before getting down to "the theoretical grammar" course one has to know the information given above.

The distinction between language and speech was made by Ferdinand de Saussure, the Swiss scholar usually credited with establishing principles of modem linguistics. **Language** is a collective body of knowledge, it is a set of basic elements, but these elements can form a great variety of combinations. In fact the number of these combinations is endless. Speech is closely connected with language, as it is the result of using the language, the result of a definite act of

speaking. Speech is individual, personal while language is common for all individuals. To illustrate the difference between language and speech let us compare a definite *game of chess* and *a set of rules* how to play chess.

Language is opposed to speech and accordingly language units are opposed to speech units. The language unit *phoneme* is opposed to the speech unit - *sound:* phoneme /s/ can sound differently in speech - /s/ and */z/).* The *sentence* is opposed to the *utterance;* the *text* is opposed to the *discourse.*

A linguistic unit can enter into relations of two different kinds. It enters into paradigmatic relations with all the units that can also occur in the same environment. PR are relations based on the principles of similarity. They exist between the units that can substitute one another. For instance, in the word-group *A PINT OF MILK* the word *PINT* is in paradigmatic relations with the words *bottle, cup,* etc. The article *A* can enter into PR with the units *the, this, one, same,* etc. According to different principles of similarity PR can be of three types: **semantic, formal** and **functional**.

a) Semantic PR are based on the similarity of meaning: *a book to read = a book for reading. He <u>used to</u> practice English every day - He <u>would</u> practice English every day.*

b) Formal PR are based on the similarity of forms. Such relations exist between the members of a <u>paradigm</u>: *man - men; play - played - will play - is playing.*

c) Functional PR are based on the similarity of function. They are established between the elements that can occur in the same position. For instance, noun determiners: *a, the, this, his, Ann's, some, each,* etc.

PR are associated with the sphere of 'language'.

[5]A linguistic unit enters into **syntagmatic** relations with other units of the same level it occurs with. SR exist at every language level. E.g. in the word-group A PINT OF MILK the word PINT contrasts SR with A, OF, MILK; within the

---

[5] Akhmanova O., *Syntax. Theory and method.* Moscow. 1972, 111p.

word PINT - P, I, N and T are in **syntagmatic** relations. SR are linear relations, that is why they are manifested in speech. They can be of three different types: **coordinate, subordinate** and **predicative**.

a) Coordinate SR exist between the homogeneous linguistic units that are equal in rank, that is, they are the relations of independence: *you* and *me;* They were *tired* but *happy.*

b) Subordinate SR are the relations of dependence when one linguistic unit depends on the other: *teach* к *er* – morphological level; *a smart student* - word-group level; predicative and subordinate clauses - sentence level.

c) Predicative SR are the relations of interdependence: primary and secondary predication.

As mentioned above, SR may be observed in utterances, which is impossible when we deal with PR. Therefore, PR are identified with 'language' while SR are identified with 'speech'.

The grammatical structure of language is a system of means used to turn linguistic units into communicative ones, in other words - the units of language into the units of speech. Such means are inflexions, affixation, word order, function words and phonological means.

Generally speaking, Indo-European languages are classified into two structural types - synthetic and analytic. Synthetic languages are defined as ones of 'internal' grammar of the word - most of grammatical meanings and grammatical relations of words are expressed with the help of inflexions. Analytical languages are those of 'external' grammar because most grammatical meanings and grammatical forms are expressed with the help of words *(will do).* However, we cannot speak of languages as purely synthetic or analytic - the English language (Modern English) possesses analytical forms as prevailing, while in the Ukrainian language synthetic devices are dominant. In the process of time English has become more analytical as compared to Old English. Analytical changes in

Modem English (especially American) are still under way.[6]

As the word is the main unit of traditional grammatical theory, it serves the basis of the distinction which is frequently drawn between morphology and syntax. Morphology deals with the internal structure of words, peculiarities of their grammatical categories and their semantics while traditional syntax deals with the rules governing combination of words in sentences (and texts in modem linguistics). We can therefore say that the word is the main unit of morphology.

It is difficult to arrive at a one-sentence definition of such a complex linguistic unit as the word. First of all, it is the main expressive unit of human language which ensures the thought-forming function of the language. It is also the basic nominative unit of language with the help of which the naming function of language is realized. As any linguistic sign the word is a level unit. In the structure of language it belongs to the upper stage of the morphological level. It is a unit of the sphere of' language' and it exists only through its speech actualization. One of the most characteristic features of the word is its indivisibility. As any other linguistic unit the word is a bilateral entity. It unites a concept and a sound image and thus has two sides - the content and expression sides: concept and sound.

1.2. Types of speech used in communicative acts

There is hardly any other term that is as ambiguous and obscure as the term *s l a n g* . Slang seems to mean everything that is below the standard of usage of present-day English.

Much has been said and written about it. This is probably due to the uncertainty of the concept itself. No one has yet given a more or less satisfactory definition of the term. Nor has it been specified by any linguist who deals with the problem of the English vocabulary.

The first thing that strikes the scholar is the fact that no other European language has singled out a special layer of vocabulary and named it slang, though all of them distinguish such groups of words as jargon, cant, and the like. Why was

[6] Breen, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research.* Harlow, England: Pearson.

it necessary to invent a special term for something that has not been clearly defined as jargon or cant have? Is this phenomenon specifically English? Has slang any special features which no other group within the non-literary vocabulary can lay claim to? The distinctions between slang and other groups of unconventional English, though perhaps subtle and sometimes difficult to grasp, should nevertheless be subjected to a more detailed linguistic specification.

Webster's "Third New International Dictionary" gives the following meanings of the term:

Slang *[origin unknown]* 1: language peculiar to a particular group: as a: the special and often secret vocabulary used by a class (as thieves, beggars) and usu. felt to be vulgar or inferior: argot; b: the jargon used by or associated with a particular trade, profession, or field of activity; 2: a non-standard vocabulary composed of words and senses characterized primarily by connotations of extreme informality and usu. a currency not limited to a particular region and composed typically of coinages or arbitrarily changed words, clipped or shortened forms, extravagant, forced or facetious figures of speech, or verbal novelties usu. experiencing quick popularity and relatively rapid decline into disuse.

The "New Oxford English Dictionary" defines slang as follows:

"a) the special vocabulary used by any set of persons of a low or disreputable character; language of a low and vulgar type. (Now merged in c. *lcantl)* b) the *cant* or *jargon* of a certain class or period; c) language of a highly colloquial type considered as below the level of standard educated speech, and consisting either of new words or of current words employed in some special sense."

As is seen from these quotations slang is represented both as a special vocabulary and as a special language. This is the first thing that causes confusion. If this is a certain lexical layer, then why should it be given the rank of language? If, on the other hand, slang is a certain language or a dialect or

even a patois, then it should be characterized not only by its peculiar use of words but also by phonetic, morphological and syntactical peculiarities.

J. B. Greenough and C. L. Kitteridge define slang in these words:

"Slang... is a peculiar kind of vagabond language, always hanging on the outskirts of legitimate speech but continually straying or forcing its way into the most respectable company."[7]

Another definition of slang which is worth quoting is one made by-Eric Partridge, the eminent student of the non-literary language.

"Slang is., much rather a spoken than a literary language. It originates, nearly always, in speech. To coin a term on a written page is almost inevitably to brand it as a neologism which will either be accepted or become a nonce-word (or phrase), but, except in the rarest instances, that term will not be slang."-

In most of the dictionaries *si.* (slang) is used as convenient stylistic notation for a word or a phrase that cannot be specified more exactly. The obscure etymology of the term itself affects its use as a stylistic notation. Whenever the notation appears in a dictionary it may serve as an indication that the unit presented is non-literary, but not pinpointed. That is the reason why the various dictionaries disagree in the use of this term when applied as a stylistic notation.:t

Any new coinage that has not gained recognition and therefore has not yet been received into standard English is easily branded as slang.

The Times of the 12th of March, 1957 gives the following illustrations of slang: *teggo* (let go), *sarge* (sergeant), I've got *a date* with that Miss Morris to-night'. But it is obvious that *teggo* is a phonetic impropriety caused by careless rapid speaking; *sarge* is a vulgar equivalent of the full form of the word; *date* is a

---

widely recognized colloquial equivalent (synonym) of the literary and even bookish *rendez-vous* (a meeting).

These different and heterogeneous phenomena united under the vague term *slang* cause natural confusion and do not encourage scholars to seek more objective criteria in order to distinguish the various stylistic layers of the English colloquial vocabulary. The confusion is made still deeper by the fact that any word or expression apparently legitimate, if used in an arbitrary, fanciful or metaphorical sense, may easily be labelled as slang. Many words formerly labelled as slang have now become legitimate units of standard English. Thus the word *kid* (=child), which was considered low slang in the nineteenth century, is now a legitimate colloquial unit of the English literary language.

Some linguists, when characterizing the most conspicuous features of slang, point out that it requires continuous innovation. It never grows stale. If a slang word or phrase does become stale, it is replaced by a new slangism. It is claimed that this satisfies the natural desire for fresh, newly created words and expressions, which give to an utterance emotional colouring and a subjective evaluation. Indeed, it seems to be in correspondence with the traditional view of English conservatism, that a special derogative term should have been coined to help preserve the "purity of standard English" by hindering the penetration into it of undesirable elements. The point is that the heterogeneous nature of the term serves as a kind of barrier which checks the natural influx of word coinages into the literary language. True, such barriers are not without their advantage in polishing up the literary language. This can be proved by the progressive role played by any conscious effort to sift innovations, some of which are indeed felt to be unnecessary, even contaminating elements in the body of the language. In this respect the American newspaper may serve as an example of how the absence of such a sifting process results in the contamination of the literary tongue of the nation with ugly redundant coinages. Such a barrier, however, sometimes turns into an obstacle which hinders the natural development of the literary language.

The term 'slang', which is widely used in English linguistic science, should be clearly specified if it is to be used as a term, i. e. it should refer to some definite notion and should be definable in explicit, simple terms. It is suggested here that the term 'slang' should be used for those forms of the English vocabulary which are either mispronounced or distorted in some way phonetically, morphologically or lexically. The term 'slang should also be used to specify some elements which may be called over-colloquial. As for the other groups of words hitherto classified as slang, they should be specified according to the universally accepted classification of the vocabulary of a language.

But this must be done by those whose mother tongue is English. They, and they only, being native speakers of the English language, are its masters and lawgivers. It is for them to place slang in its proper category by specifying its characteristic features.[8]

Slang is nothing but a deviation from the established norm at the level of the vocabulary of the language. V. V. Vinogradov writes that one of the tasks set before the branch of linguistic science that is now called stylistics, is a thorough study of all changes in vocabulary, set phrases, grammatical constructions, their functions, an evaluation of any breaking away from the established norm, and classification of mistakes and failures in word coinage.

H. Wentworth and S. Flexner in their "Dictionary of American Slang" write:

"Sometimes slang is used to escape the dull familiarity of standard words, to suggest an escape from the established routine *of* everyday life. When slang is used, our life seems a little fresher and a little more personal. Also, as at all levels of speech, slang is sometimes used for the pure joy of making sounds, or even for a need to attract attention by making noise. The sheer newness and informality of certain slang words produce pleasure.

---

[8] Barhudarov L.S. *The structure of simple sentence in modern English*. M. "Visshaya shkola", 1966, 250c.

"But more important than this expression of a more or less hidden aesthetic motive on the part of the speaker is the slang's reflection of the personality, the outward, clearly visible characteristics of the speaker. By and large, the man who uses slang is a forceful, pleasing, acceptable personality."

This quotation from a well-known scientific study of slang clearly shows that what is labelled slang is either all kinds of nonce-formations—so frequently appearing in lively everyday speech and just as quickly disappearing from the language, or jocular words and word-combinations that are formed by using the various means of word-building existing in the language and also by distorting the form or sense of existing' words. Here are some more examples of words that are considered slang:'

to take stock in— 'to be interested in, attach importance, give credence-to'

bread-basket—'the stomach' *(a jocular use)*

to do a flit—' to quit one's flat or lodgings **at night without** paying the rent or board.

rot—'nonsense!'

the cat's pyjamas—*l the* correct thing'

So broad is the term 'slang' that, according to Eric Partridge, there are many kinds of slang, e. g. Cockney, public-house, commercial, society, military, theatrical, parliamentary and others. This leadsthe author to believe that there is also a *s t a n d a r d   s l a n g,* the slang that is common to all those who, though employing received standard in their writing and speech, also use an informal language which, in fact, is no language but merely a way of speaking, using special words and phrases in some special sense. The most confusing definition of the nature of slang is the following one given by Partridge.

"...personality and one's surroundings (social or occupational) are the two co-efficients, the two chief factors, the determining causes of the nature of slang, as they are of language in general and of style."

According to this statement one may get the idea that language, style and slang all have the same nature, the same determining causes. Personality and surroundings determine:

1. the nature of the slang used by a definite person,

2. the nature of the language he uses,

3. the kind of style he writes.

There is a general tendency in England and to some extent in the US to over-estimate the significance of slang by attaching to it more significance than it deserves. Slang is regarded as the quintessence of colloquial speech and therefore stands above all the laws of grammar. Though it is regarded by some purists as a language that stands below standard English, it is highly praised nowadays as "vivid", "more flexible", "more picturesque", "richer in vocabulary" and so on.[9]

Unwittingly one arrives at the idea that slang, as used by English and Americans, is a universal term for any word or phrase which, though not yet recognized as a fact of standard English, has won general recognition as a fresh innovation quite irrespective of its nature: whether it is cant, jargon, dialect, jocular or a pure colloquialism. It is therefore important, for the sake of a scientific approach to the problem of a stylistic classification of the English vocabulary, to make a more exact discrimination between heterogeneous elements in the vocabulary, no matter how difficult it may be.

The following is an interesting example illustrating the contrast between standard English and non-literary English including slang.

In the story "By Courier" O. Henry opposes neutral and common literary words to special colloquial words and slang for a definite stylistic purpose, *viz.* to distort a message by translating the literary vocabulary of one speaker into the non-literary vocabulary of another.

---

[9] Plotkin V.Ya. *The structure of English language*.M, "Prosveshenie"2004,154 p.

'Tell her I am on my way to the station, to leave for San Francisco, where I shall join that Alaska moosehunting expedition. Tell her that, since she has commanded me neither to speak nor to write to her, I take this means of making one last appeal to her sense of justice, for the sake of what has been. Tell her that to condemn and discard one who has not deserved such treatment, without giving him her reason or a chance to explain is contrary to her nature as I believe it to be. This message was   delivered in the following manner:

"He told me to tell yer he's got his collars and cuffs in dat grip for a scoot clean out to' Frisco. Den he's goin' to shoot snowbirds in de Klondike. He says yer told h i m to send' round no more pink notes nor come hangin' over de garden gate, and he takes dis mean (sending the boy to speak for him.*) of putting yer wise. He says yer referred to him like a has-been, and never give h i m no chance to kick at de decision. He says yer swiled   him and never said why."

The contrast between what is standard English and what is crude, broken non-literary or uneducated American English has been achieved by means of setting the common literary vocabulary and also the syntactical design of the original message against jargonisms,' slang and all kinds of distortions of forms, phonetic, morphological, lexical and syntactical.

It is suggestive that there is a tendency in some modern dictionaries to replace the label *slang* by *informal* or *colloquial.* Such a practice clearly manifests the dissatisfaction of some lexicographers with the term 'slang'. This is mainly due to the ambiguity of the term.

On the other hand, some lexicographers, as has already been pointed out, still make use of the term 'slang' as a substitute for 'jargon', 'cant', 'colloquialism', 'professionalism, 'vulgar', 'dialectal'. Thus, in his dictionary Prof. Barnhart gives the label 5 to such innovations as "grab to cause (a person) to react; make an impression *on",* which, to my mind, should be classed as newspaper jargon; "grass or pot—marijuana", which are positively *cant* words (the quotation

that follows proves it quite unambiguously); "groove—something very enjoyable," "grunt— U.S. military slang", which in fact is a professionalism; "gyppy tummy, British slang,— a common intestinal upset experienced by travellers", which is a colloquialism; "hangup—a psychological or emotional problem", which is undoubtedly a professionalism which has undergone extension of meaning and now, according to Barnhart also means "any problem or difficulty, especially one that causes annoyance or irritation."

The use of the label is in this way is evidently due to the fact that Barnhart's dictionary aims not so much at discrimination between different stylistic subtleties of neologisms but mainly at fixation of lexical units which have already won general recognition through constant repetition in newspapar language.[10]

The term 'slang' is ambiguous because, to use a figurative expression, it has become a Jack of all trades and master of none.

b) Jargonisms

In the non-literary vocabulary of the English language there is a group of words that are called *jargonisms. Jargon* is a rec- ognized term for a group of words that exists in almost every language and whose aim is to preserve secrecy within one or another social group. Jargonisms are generally old words with entirely new meanings imposed on them. The traditional meaning of the words is immaterial, only the new, improvised meaning is of importance. Most of the jargonisms of any language, and of the English language too, are absolutely incomprehensible to those outside the social group which has invented them. They may be defined as a code within a code, that is special meanings of words that are imposed on the recognized code—the dictionary meaning of the words. Thus the word *grease* means 'money'; *loaf* means 'head'; *a tiger hunter* is 'a gambler'; *a lexer* is 'a student preparing for a law course'.[11]

---

[10] S.Khamzayev,O.Bektoshev., *Interpretation of the text*. T.,2007, 94 p.
[11] Galperin I.R. *Stylistics*. Moscow, "Visshaya shkola", 1977, 201 p.

Jargonisms are social in character. They are not regional. In Britain and in the US almost any social group of people has its own jargon. The following jargons are well known in the English language: the jargon of thieves and vagabonds, generally known as cant; the jargon of jazz people; the jargon of the army, known as military slang; the jargon of sportsmen, and many others.

The various jargons (which in fact are nothing but a definite group of words) remain a foreign language to the outsiders of any particular social group. It is interesting in connection with this to quote a stanza from "Don Juan" by Byron where the poet himself finds it necessary to comment on the jargonisms he has used for definite stylistic purposes.

"He from the world had cut off a great man,

Who in his time had made heroic bustle. Who in a row
like Tom could lead the van,

Booze in the ken or at the spellken hustle? Who queer a flat?
Who (spite of Bow street's ban)

On the high toby-spice so flash the muzzle? Who on a lark, with
black-eyed Sal (his blowing)

So prime, so swell, so nutty? and so knowing?"

The explanation of the words used here was made by Byron's editor because they were all jargonisms in Byron's time and no one would understand their meaning unless they were explained in normal English.

Byron wrote the following ironic comment to this stanza:

"The advance of science and of language has rendered. it unnecessary to translate the above good and true English, spoken in its original purity by the select nobility and their patrons. The following is a stanza of a song which was very popular, at least in my early days: "On the high toby-spice flash the muzzle, In spite of each gallows old scout; If you at all spell ken can't hustle, You'll be hobbled in making a Clout. . Then your Blowing will wax gallows

haughty, when she hears of your scaly mistake, She'll surely turn snitch for the forty— That her Jack may be regular weight."

If there be any gem man (gentleman) so ignorant as to require a tradition, I refer him to my old friend and corporeal pastor and master, John Jackson, Esq., Professor of pugilism; who, I trust, still retains the strength and symmetry of his model of a form, together with his good humor and athletic as well as mental accomplishments." (John Murray. "The Poetical Works of Lord Byron").

Slang, contrary to jargon, needs no translation. It is not a secret code. It is easily understood by the English-speaking community and is only regarded as something not quite regular. It must also be remembered that both jargon and slang differ from ordinary language mainly in their vocabularies. The structure of the sentences and the morphology of the language remain practically unchanged. But such is the power of words, which are the basic and most conspicuous element in the language that we begin unwittingly to speak of a separate language.

[12]Jargonisms do not always remain the possession of a given social group. Some of them migrate into other social strata and sometimes become recognized in the literary language of the nation. G. H. McKnight writes:

"The language of the underworld provided words facetiously adopted by the fashionable world, many of which, such as *fan* and *queer* and *banter* and *bluff* and *sham* and *humbug,* eventually made their way into dignified use." *

There are hundreds of words, once jargonisms or slang, which have become legitimate members of the English literary language.

Jargonisms have their definite place of abode and are therefore easily classified according to the social divisions of the given period. Almost any calling has its own jargon, i.e. its set of words with which its members intersperse their

---

[12] Galperin I.R. *Stylistics.* Moscow, "Visshaya shkola", 1977, 212 p.

speech and render it incomprehensible to outsiders. Some linguists even maintain that:

"Within the limits of any linguistic unity there are as many languages as there are groups of people thrown together by propinquity and common interests."

This is, of course, an overstatement. First of all, one should not mix up such notions as language and vocabulary. True, unknown words and phrases, if too many, may render speech unintelligible. But this fact does not raise speech to" the level of a different language.

Jargonisms, however, do break away from the accepted norms of semantic variants of words. They are a special group within the non-literary layer of words.

There is a common jargon and there are also special professional jargons. Common jargonisms have gradually lost their special quality, which is to promote secrecy and keep outsiders in the dark. In fact, there are no outsiders where common jargon is concerned. It belongs to all social groups and is therefore easily understood by everybody. That is why it is so difficult to draw a hard and fast line between slang and jargon. When a jargonism becomes common, it has passed on to a higher step on the ladder of word groups and becomes slang or colloquial.

Here are some further examples of jargon:

Piou-Piou—'a French soldier, a private in the infantry[1]. According to Eric Partridge this word has already passed from military jargon to ordinary colloquial speech.

Hummen—'a false arrest' *(American)*

Dar— *(from damned average raiser)*—'a persevering and assiduous student'. *(University jargon)*

Matlo(w)—'a sailor' *(from the French word Unatelof)*

Man and wife—'a knife' *(rhyming slang)*

Manany—'a sailor who is always putting off a job or work' *(nautical jargon) (from the Spanish word mnana*—'to-morrow')

The word *brass* in the meaning of 'money in general, cash' is not jargon inasmuch as there is an apparent semantic connection between 'the general name for all alloys of copper with tin or zinc' and *cash.* The metonymic ties between the two meanings prevent the word from being used as a special code word the same can be said of the words *joker*— 'something used to play a trick or win one's point or object with' *from card-playing; drag*—'to rob vehicles'; *to soap-box*—'to make speeches out-of-doors *standing on a soap-box* These are easily understood by native speakers and therefore fail to meet the most indispensable property of jargon words. They are slang words or perhaps colloquial.

On the other hand, such words as *soap* and *flannel* meaning 'bread' and 'cheese[1] *(naval),* and some of the words mentioned above are scarcely likely to be understood by the language community. Only those who are in the know understand such words. Therefore they can be classed as jargonisms.

It will not come amiss to mention here the words of Vandryes, a well-known French linguist, who said that "...jargon distorts words, it does not create them." Indeed, the creation of really new words is a very rare process. In almost any language you can find only a few entirely new words. It is not accidental therefore that the efforts of some poets to coin completely new words have proved to be an absolute failure, their attempts being utterly rejected by the language community.

In passing, we must remark that both slang and the various jargons of Great Britain differ much more from those of America (the United States and Canada) than the literary language in the two countries does. In fact, the most striking difference is to be observed in the non-literary layer of words and particularly in slang and jargonisms and professionalisms.

"American slang," remarks G. H. McKnight, "on the whole remains a foreign language to the Englishman. American plays such as "Is zat so" and

American novels such as "Babbitt" have had to be provided with glossaries in order to be intelligible in England. John Galsworthy in his recent novel "The Silver Spoon" makes a naturalistic use of colloquial idiom. He exhibits the rich element of native slang in the colloquial speech of England."[13]

Jargonisms, like slang and other groups of the non-literary layer, do not always remain on the outskirts of the literary language. Many words have overcome the resistance of the language lawgivers and purists and entered the standard vocabulary. Thus the words *kid, fun, queer, bluff, fib, humbug,* formerly slang words or jargonisms, are now considered common colloquial. They may be said to be dejargonized.

1.3. The Difference between a Monologue and a Dialogue

Once in a while, when a conversation with someone I care about takes an unexpected turn that is not to my liking, I am tempted to stand up and yell "C-U-U-U-U-T!"

"Excuse me," I imagine myself saying, leaning over the person's shoulder, megaphone dangling at my hip. "But you are not following the script. Your lines are, 'Yes, of course, you are right. I agree wholeheartedly. I will do (such and such). Anything to make you happy.'"

"Oh," they respond, slowly emerging from a daze. And they repeat the lines I have fed them. "Great, that's more like it," I reply. "Now say it with feeling."

Of course, my fantasy conversations are usually just that - fantasies. And they're not dialogues either; they are monologues...between me and my ego.

Although a monologue is technically defined as a "prolonged talk or discourse by a single speaker," conversations between two parties who are not really listening to each other are essentially monologues masquerading as dialogues.

Most people spend their time vacillating between monologues and dialogues - the latter being far less frequent. At least, this was the theory postulated by early

---

[13] Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

20th century existentialist philosopher Martin Buber in his signature work "I - Thou." [14]

Buber described the difference between monologues and dialogues as an "I - It" vs. "I - Thou" dynamic. In each case, the "I" represents the self - essentially, the totality of our feelings, values, and perceptions that comprise our personal daily universe.

According to Buber, the essence of existence lies in how we interact with others. The "I - It" relationship is about objectification. We relate to people as "its" every time fear and self-interest interfere with our being able to fully experience the exquisite reality of another human being. At its worst and most obvious, "I-itting" is responsible for all genres of human atrocities - genocide, homicide, domestic violence, racism, and sexism. In modern terms, "I - it" would perhaps best describe the paralysis between Republicans and Democrats, Israelis and Palestinians, gays and fundamentalists.

In our intimate or collegial relationships, however, "I-itting" can be much more insidious. Monologues can easily creep into and potentially corrupt the most innocent of conversations, often unintentionally. This usually occurs when we ignore other people's boundaries, focus too much on making a good impression, or engage with someone based on our perceptions of how well they can serve our personal needs.

Over time, "itting" can lead to feelings of alienation. Most people turn to psychotherapy either because they feel someone else is "itting" them or because they are "itting" others. Perhaps they're feeling tuned out by a spouse, engaging in empty sexual relationships, neglecting their children, or living as strangers ("its") to their authentic selves. Even as a therapist, I must monitor my own tendencies to "it" my clients by imposing my values, judgments, expectations, or need to feel competent.

---

[14] http://buber.de/en/

That's why authentic dialogue, not dueling monologues, is the healing aspect of the therapeutic relationship - or any relationship for that matter. To experience the full-bodied richness of an encounter with another person without motive or guile is what Buber describes as the "I-Thou" relationship.[15]

The "I-Thou" relationship is about letting go of agendas. It's about authenticity, mutuality, witnessing, and truth-telling. It respects differences and embraces separate but equally valid realities, which requires the courage to take risks and trust the process.

Of course, letting go of appearances and attachments to outcomes is often easier said than done. "I - Thou" thus requires a fully present "I." What does that mean? A wise friend of mine has the same birthday wish every year - to have greater intimacy with himself. Without that, he explains, he cannot be intimate with anyone else. Such is the "I - Thou" ideal.

One of the hardest things we can ever do, and the greatest act of love, is to put aside our own agendas and really listen to another person. That's why my fantasy monologues are never quite as satisfying as real-life dialogues, when the mutual exchange of feelings and perspectives can deepen, heal, and cement the bonds of friendship, partnerships, and familial relationships.

So while I may be tempted to redirect conversations that make me nervous, I know what I must ultimately do - put down my megaphone, toss out the script, take a deep breath, and say, "yes, I am listening." And mean it.

---

[15] Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHAPTER II. Statistical-semantic features of the dialogues used in Ernest Hemingway's short stories

2.1. Dialogue as a type of speech act

The stylization of colloquial language is one of the features of plays which at different stages in the history of English drama has manifested itself in different ways revealing, on the one hand, the general trends of the literary language and, on the other hand, the personal idiosyncrasies of the writer.[16]

The revival of drama began only in the second half of the 18th century. But the ultimate shaping of the play as an independent form of literary work with its own laws of functioning, with its own characteristic language features was actually completed only at the end of the 19th century. The natural conventionality of any literary work is most obvious in plays. People are made to talk to each other in front of an audience, and yet as if there were no audience. Dialogue, which, as has been pointed out, is by its very nature ephemeral, spontaneous, fleeting, is made lasting. It is intended to be reproduced many times by different actors with different interpretations. The dialogue loses its colloquial essence and remains simply conversation in form. The individualization of each character's speech then becomes of paramount importance because it is the idiosyncrasy of expression which to some extent reveals the inner, psychological and intellectual traits of the characters. The playwright seeks to approximate a natural form of dialogue, a form as close to natural living dialogue as the literary norms will allow. But at the same time he is bound by the aesthetico-cognitive function of the belles-lettres style and has to mould the conversation to suit the general aims of this style. Thus the language of plays is a stylized type of the spoken variety of language. What then is this process of stylization that the language of plays undergoes? In what language peculiarities is the stylization revealed?

---

[16] Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The analysis of the language texture of plays has shown that the most characteristic feature here is, to use the term of the theory of information, redundancy of information caused by the necessity to amplify the utterance. This is done for the sake of the audience. It has already been pointed out that the spoken language tends to curtail utterances, sometimes simplifying the syntax to fragments of sentences without even showing the character of their interrelation.

In plays the curtailment of utterances is not as extensive as it is in natural dialogue. Besides, in lively conversation, even when a prolonged utterance, a monologue, takes place, it is interspersed with the interlocutor's "signals of attention", as they may be called, for example: *yes, yeah, oh, That's right, so, I see, good, yes I know, oh-oh,fine. Oh, my goodness, oh dear, we//, well-well, We/I, I never!, and* the like.

In plays these "signals of attention" are irrelevant and therefore done away with. The monologue in plays is never interrupted by any such exclamatory words on the part of the person to whom the speech is addressed. Further, in plays the characters' utterances are general! Much longer than in ordinary conversation.

Here is a short example of a dialogue between two characters from Ernest Hemingway's short story "The old man and the sea": NURSE: She says Miss Messy invited her, sir.

CAPTAIN SHOTOVAR: And had she no friend, no parents to warn her against my daughter's invitations? This is a pretty sort of house, by heavens! A young and attractive lady is invited hero. Her luggage is left on these steps, for hours; and she herself is deposited in the poop and abandoned, tired and starving..."

This passage is typical in many ways. First of all, the matter-of-fact dialogue between the captain and the nurse gradually flows into a monologue in which elements of the spoken language and of emotive prose are merged. The monologue begins with the conjunction 'and' which serves to link the

preceding question to the monologue. The question after 'and' is more of a "question-in-the-narrative" than a real question: the captain does not expect an answer and proceeds with his monologue. Then after an exclamatory 'This is a pretty sort of house, by heavens!', which is actual, common colloquial, there again comes an utterance intended to inform the audience of the Captain's attitude towards the House and the household. Mark also the professionalism 'poop' used to characterize the language of Shotover, a retired ship's captain. In fact, there is no dialogue, or, as Prof. Jakubinsky has it, a "false dialogue", or "monological dialogue", the nurse's remark being a kind of linking sentence between the two parts of the captain's monologue. These linking remarks serve to enliven the monologue, thus making it easier to grasp the meaning of the utterance.

The monological character of the dialogue in plays becomes apparent also by the fact that two or more questions may be asked one after another, as in the following excerpts:

1. "LADY BRITOMART: Do you suppose this wicked and immoral tradition can be kept up for ever? Do you pretend that Stephen could not carry on the foundry just as well as all the other sons of big business houses?"

2. "BARBARA: Dolly: were you really in earnest about it? Would you have joined if you had never seen me?" (E. Hemingway)[17]

Needless to say, in ordinary conversation we never use a succession of question...Generally only one, perhaps two, questions are asked at a time, and if more are asked—then we already have a kind of emotional narrative; not a dialogue in the exact meaning of the word.

In ordinary conversation we generally find "sequence sentences" connected by "sequence signals". 'These signals help to establish the logical

[17] Ernest Hemingway. Selected stories. Moscow, Progress publishers,1971,98p.

reference to what was said before, thus linking all sequential series of sentences into one whole.

These sequence signals are mostly pronouns, adverbs, conjunctions, as in:

"The boy has just brought the evening *paper. It* is at the door," or: "Up to *1945* L. was with Johnson. *Since* he has worked with us." It must be remarked in passing that almost any lively dialogue will hold a sequence of sentences for only a short span, the nature of lively. These also are terms suggested by Charles Fries.[18]

Dialogue allowing digressions from the starting point. How often do we hear the phrase: "What was I going to say?" or "What was I driving at?" "How did we come to talk about this?"—to ascertain the initial topic of conversation which has been forgotten.

This is not the case in plays. The sequence of sentences reflecting the sequence of thought, being directed by the purport of the writer, will not allow any digressions from the course taken, unless this was the deliberate intention of the playwright. Therefore, unlike the real, natural spoken variety of language, the language of plays is already purposeful. The sequence signals, which are not so apparent in lively conversation, become conspicuous in the language of plays. Here is an illustrative example of a span of thought expressed in a number of sentences all linked by the pronoun *he* and all referring to the first word of the utterance 'Dunn which, in its turn, hooks the utterance to the preceding sentence:

"THE CAPTAIN: *Dunn!* I had a boatswain "whose name was *Dunn. He* was originally a pirate in China. *He* set up as a ship's chandler with stores which I have every reason *to* believe *he* store from me. No doubt *he* became rich. Are you *his* daughter?" The degree to which the norms of ordinary colloquial language are converted into those of the language of plays, that is,

---

[18] Fries Ch. The Structure of English. London, 1951, 98p.

the degree to which "the spoken language is made literary" varies at different periods in the development of drama and depends also on the idiosyncrasies of the playwright himself. Here are two illustrations, one taken from Oliver Goldsmith's play "The Good-Natured Man", an 18th century play, and the other from H. Pinter's play "The Birthday Party", a play of our time.

"MR. CROAKER: But can anything be more absurd, than to double our distresses by our apprehensions, and put it in the power of every low fellow that can scrawl ten words of wretched spelling, to torment us?"

Compare this utterance with the following:

"GOLDBERG: What's your name now? STANLEY: Joe Sharp.

GOLDBERG: Is the number 846 possible or necessary?

STANLEY: Neither.

GOLDBERG: Wrong! Is the number 846 possible or necessary?

STANLEY: Both."[19]

Almost the whole play is composed of such short questions and answers tending to reproduce an actual communicative process where the sense is vague to the outsider. Considerable effort on the part of the audience is sometimes necessary in order to follow the trend of the conversation and decode the playwright's purport.

It may be remarked in passing that there is an analogous tendency in modern emotive prose where dialogue occupies considerable space.

So in the given frame we tried to analyze statistical features of dialogues used in Ernest Hemingway's short stories.

As we can see from the given table Ernest Hemingway used dialogues in his short stories enough often.

№	Short story	%
1	Indian Camp	25

---

[19] Ernest Hemingway. Selected stories. Moscow, Progress publishers,1971,241p.

2	The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife	17
3	The Indians	24
4	The End of Something	35
5	The Battle	26
6	The Killers	19
7	A Very Short Story	21
8	In Another Country	17
9	Now I Lay Me	19
10	Soldier's Home	21
11	On the Quai at Smyrna	22
12	Fifty Grand	18
13	A Clean, Well-Lighted Place	26
14	Cat in the Rain	21
15	Hills Like White Elephants	24
16	Out of Season	18
17	A Canary for One	21
18	The Revolutionist	24
19	The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber	27

2.2. Principles of teaching dialogue and monologue

To judge by the way some people speak, there is no place for grammar in the language course nowadays; yet it is, in reality, as important as it ever was exercise of correct grammar, if he is to attain any skill of effective use of the language, but he need not know consciously formulated rules to account to him for that he does unconsciously correctly.

In order to understand a language and to express oneself correctly one must assimilate the grammar mechanism of the language studied. Indeed, one may know all the words in a sentence and yet fail to understand it, if one does not see the relation between the words in the given sentence. And vice versa, a sentence may contain one, two, and more unknown words but if one has a good knowledge of the

structure of the language one can easily guess the meaning of these words or at least find them in a dictionary.

No speaking is possible without the knowledge of grammar, without the forming of a grammar mechanism.

If learner has acquired such a mechanism, he can produce correct sentences in a foreign language. Paul Roberts writes: "Grammar is something that produces the sentences of a language. By something we mean a speaker of English. If you speak English natively, you have built into you rules of English grammar. In a sense, you are an English grammar. You possess, as an essential part of your being, a very complicated apparatus which enables you to produce infinitely many sentences, all English ones, including many that you have never specifically learned. Furthermore by applying you rule you can easily tell whether a sentence that you hear a grammatical English sentence or not."

A command of English as is envisaged by the school syllabus cannot be ensured without the study of grammar. Pupils need grammar to be able to speak, read, and write in the target language.

Lesson 1. What is a monologue or dialogue?

Objective: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the dramatic monologue and how it differs from a traditional essay.

Activities: *Monologue Definition*, *Examples from Media*, *Examples on the Page*, *Compare and Contrast Monologue Definition*

Begin with a set of questions including, "Have you ever seen a play?" "Have you noticed examples in real life, on the page, stage, or on the movie screen where one person talks for an extended period of time without another person or character speaking?" "What are some examples?"

Provide the students with the dictionary definition.

Dialogue (noun) - 1 a. soliloquy b. a dramatic sketch performed by one actor c. the routine of a stand up comic 2. a literary composition written in the form of a soliloquy 3. a long speech monopolizing conversation.

In your discussion, remember to include that the character saying a dialogue is directing their words to someone- whether it be the audience, another character onstage or offstage, or to themselves.

Examples from the Media

In this activity, you will show your students examples of monologues being performed. These examples can come from popular films or plays that have been filmed. You are the best judge of what your students will respond to.

Examples from the Page

In this activity you will provide the students with written examples. It is up to you whether or not you read them aloud first, but be sure that all the students see how the words appear on the page. Punctuation and stage directions can be great clues as to what the writer wants from the actor performing the monologue and dialogue.

Compare and Contrast

This activity is designed to show your students the difference between a first person essay and a theatrical dialogue. Have the students use a dialogue they used in the previous exercise and have them look at it next to a first person essay. Note the difference in the formalities of an essay and the character specific language of a dialogue. Some other points you may want to highlight include… The "other". Every monologue is directed toward a specific "other". It can be a single person, a group of people, the audience, etc. It is important from an acting standpoint to have a clearly defined "other"; it is helpful for the writer to make this apparent. The change. How is the character different at the end of the dialogue? Did the character discover something while speaking?

Lesson 2 Writing in dialogue Format

Objective: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the parts (beginning, middle and end) of a dialogue.

Activities: *Get Mad*, *Outline*, *Writing the dialogue, Sharing*

This particular lesson does not need to focus on creating a character other then who you are. This is intended for the students to begin to feel comfortable

writing in this format. Lesson 3 will focus on creating a different character's perspective.

Get Mad

Have students think of a time, preferably in the recent past, when they were mad, irritated, annoyed, or frustrated about something. Ask them to identify who it is they would want to talk to about this problem they were having. That person will be the audience of their monologue. Ask the students to think about how they would talk to this person. You talk differently to your parents, your teachers, your friends, even your pets.[20]

Outline

All dialogues, in their own way, have a beginning, middle and end. Ask the students to create an outline for their dialogues that include those three points. The problem does, not need to be solved by the end of the monologue but the dialogue itself should come to a conclusion.

Example

Name: Jane

What I am mad about: My brother ate the last cookie last night.

My Audience: My brother Sam

Beginning: I am going to tell Sam that I am mad at him and see if he can guess what I am talking about. I will get frustrated when he doesn't answer.

Middle: I am going to tell him that it was about the cookie and that it really hurts my feelings that he doesn't think about me before he does stuff like that.

End: I am going to tell him that he can't come to my birthday party.

Writing the Dialogue

From the information they compiled in their outline, have the students write a dialogue. You can decide the length requirements for the assignment. We suggest at least two strong paragraphs.

Sharing

---

[20] Hippodrome Theatre • www.thehipp.org Betsy Foster, Education Apprentice

As a closing exercise, you may want to ask students to share their work. This can be done one on one, in small groups, or as a class.

Lesson 3 Writing as Someone Else

Objective: Students will demonstrate the ability to create a character and write from that character's voice and point-of-view.

Activities: *What Makes a Character, Cartoon Creation, In the Pocket, Who My Character Is, What Makes a Character*

Ask the students to think of one of their favorite characters from a book, movie, play, TV show, or someone they may know and admire. They need to think about what makes that character who he or she is. Ask them to make a list of observations the make about that character's physical appearance (how they look, how they move, what they wear), personality (what are their hobbies, who are their friends, what are their goals), and background (where did they come from, what is their family like). Talk to the students about these observations and how they might inform a writer about how to write through their voice in a dialogue.

Cartoon Creation

This exercise will involve whatever art supplies, limited to whatever you may have readily available. Have the students create a character in their mind, something created out of their imaginations. Then have the students draw, color, paint etc. the character. When finished, have the students write a dialogue as if they were this character. You can specify a topic for the dialogue or allow it to be the students' choice.

In the Pocket

Have students imagine a character, this can be someone they imagine or someone they know or know of, preferably no one else in the class. Make sure they have a very clear picture in their minds. Then have them make a list of what things this character has in his or her pocket. This list should be long and detailed. For example, listing a pencil is not as descriptive as listing a yellow number 2 pencil with half of the eraser pulled off and a dull point.

The more detailed the items, the easier the second part of the exercise will be. After about two minutes of list making, the students should write a dialogue in this character's voice explaining how he/she got one of those items. Make sure the students pick "the other" they are talking to. See example below.

Example

Pocket List

- small piece of a twig

- a half eaten box of nerds candy

- a 4 times folded piece of paper from his teacher asking his parents to make an appointment, crumpled as if it had been fidgeted with many times throughout the day.

- a Derek Jeter baseball card

DIALOGUE

Oh, it was fine. Yeah, fine. Nothing is ever really new at school. I got a 90% on my science test. (pause) Well, actually, I need to tell you something and please promise you won't get mad. I have been having a real hard time in math. I just don't get it. And I, uh, haven't turned my homework in for a long time. Miss Swanson sent home this note. She says she needs you to come into school and see her. I am really sorry. I really have been trying. I know I need to work harder and I know… I thought maybe I could go for some after school help. A little late now I guess, but I am going to get better. I really want to be able to play baseball this year so I really am going to try my best.

Who My Character Is Have the student create a character. With that character in mind have them fill out the table below.

Likes

Dislikes

Hopes

Fears

After completing the organizer, have the students write a monologue in the voice of the character.

Lesson 4 Dialogues as Performances

Objective: Students will demonstrate the ability to orally communicate the written word and effectively listen. Students will evaluate and revise dialogues.

Activities: *Picture Dialogues, Peer Performances, Performance Assessment*

For this day any dialogue writing exercise can be used. The focus is one having the writer hear his or her dialogue being performed and being able to identify what he or she thinks works or doesn't work.

Picture Dialogues

For this exercise you may bring in photos for the students to use or you may ask them to bring in a photo to be used. Have the students to look at his or her photo and create a character from what they see in the picture. Have them identify "the other" they will be talking to and have them write a monologue.

Peer Performances

Have students break into teams of two. Have each of the students read their partner's dialogue aloud. The students should be reminded this is not about how well their partner performs the dialogue; instead it is meant to allow the writer to see if what they wrote, when performed, tells the audience what they were meaning to say. Sometimes what you write the first time doesn't sound the way you had envisioned it in your head.

Performance Assessment

This component is intended to help the writers understand what they would like to change in their next draft. Ask the writers to tell each other what they were surprised by when their piece was read as well as what they liked and what they want to go back and change. In this situation the writers are only commenting on their own pieces.

2.3. Principles of presenting the material on dialogue

To develop one's speech means to acquire essential patterns of speech and grammar patterns in particular. Children must use these items automatically during speech-practice. The automatic use of grammar items in our speech (oral and

written) supposes mastering some particular skills - the skills of using grammar items to express one's own thoughts, in other words to make up your sentences.

We must get so-called reproductive or active grammar skills.

A skill is treated as an automatic part of awareness. Automatization of the action is the main feature of a skill.

The nature of Automatization is characterized by that psychological structure of the action which adopts to the conditions of performing the action owing frequent experience. The action becomes more frequent, correct and accurate and the number of the operations is shortened while forming the skill the character of awareness of the action is changing, i.e. fullness of understanding is paid to the conditions and quality of performing to the control over it and regulation[21].

To form some skills is necessary to know that the process of the forming skills has some steps:

- Only some definite elements of the action are automatic.

- The Automatization occurs under more difficult conditions, when the child can't concentrate his attention on one element of the action.

- The whole structure of the action is improved and the automatization of its separate components is completed.

What features do the productive grammar skills have?

During our speech the reproductive grammar skills are formed together with lexis and intonation, they must express the speaker's intentions.

The actions in the structural setting of the lexis must be learnt.

The characteristic feature of the reproductive grammar skills is their flexibility. It doesn't depend on the level of Automatization, i.e. on perfection of skill here mean the original action: both the structure of sentence, and forms of the words are reproduced by the speaker using different lexical material. If the child reproduces sentences and different words, which have been learnt by him as "a

---

[21] Bennett, William Arthur., "Aspects of Language and language teaching."; London-New York., Cambridge univ. press, 1968

ready-made thing" he can say that there is no grammar skill. Learning the ready-made forms, word combinations and sentences occurs in the same way as learning lexis.

The grammar skill is based on the general conclusion. The grammar action can and must occur only in the definite lexical limits, on the definite lexical material. If the pupil can make up his sentence frequently, accurately and correctly from the grammatical point of view, he has got the grammar skill.

Teaching grammar at school using the theoretical knowledge brought some critical and led to confusion. All the grammatical rules were considered to be evil and there were some steps to avoid using them at school.

But when we learn grammatical items in models we use substitution and such a type of training gets rid of grammar or "neutralizes" it. By the way, teaching the skills to make up sentences by analogy is a step on the way of forming grammar skills. It isn't the lexical approach to grammar and it isn't neutralization of grammar, but using basic sentences in order to use exercises by analogy and to reduce number of grammar rules when forming the reproductive grammar skills.

To form the reproductive grammar skills we must follow such steps:

- Selection the model of sentence.

- Selection the form of the word and formation of wordforms.

- Selection the auxiliary words-preposition, articles, and etc. and their combination with principle words.

The main difficulty of the reproductive (active) grammar skills is to correspond the purposes of the statement, communicative approach (a questionan answer and so on), words, meanings, expressed by the grammatical patterns. In that case we use basic sentences, in order to answer the definite situation. The main factor of the forming of the reproductive grammar skill is that pupils need to learn the lexis of the language.

They need to learn the meanings of the words and how they are used. We must be sure that our pupils are aware of the vocabulary they need at their level and they can use the words in order to form their own sentence. Each sentence

contains a grammar structure. The mastering the grammar skill lets pupils save time and strength, energy, which can give opportunity to create. Learning a number of sentences containing the same grammatical structure and a lot of words containing the same grammatical form isn't rational. But the generalization of the grammar item can relieve the work of the mental activity and let the teacher speed up the work and the children realize creative activities[22].

During our speech the reproductive grammar skills are formed together with lexis and intonation, they must express the speaker's intentions.

The actions in the structural setting of the lexis must be learnt.

The characteristic feature of the reproductive grammar skills is their flexibility. It doesn't depend on the level of Automatization, i.e. on perfection of skill here mean the original action: both the structure of sentence, and forms of the words are reproduced by the speaker using different lexical material. If the child reproduces sentences and different words, which have been learnt by him as "a ready-made thing" he can say that there is no grammar skill. Learning the ready-made forms, word combinations and sentences occurs in the same way as learning lexis.

The grammar skill is based on the general conclusion. The grammar action can and must occur only in the definite lexical limits, on the definite lexical material. If the pupil can make up his sentence frequently, accurately and correctly from the grammatical point of view, he has got the grammar skill.

Teaching grammar at school using the theoretical knowledge brought some critical and led to confusion. All the grammatical rules were considered to be evil and there were some steps to avoid using them at school.

But when we learn grammatical items in models we use substitution and such a type of training gets rid of grammar or "neutralizes" it. By the way, teaching the skills to make up sentences by analogy is a step on the way of forming grammar skills. It isn't the lexical approach to grammar and it isn't neutralization of

---

[22] Swan M., Smith B., "Learner English. A teacher's guide to interference and other problems."; Cambridge, 1987

grammar, but using basic sentences in order to use exercises by analogy and to reduce number of grammar rules when forming the reproductive grammar skills.

To form the reproductive grammar skills we must follow such steps:

- Selection the model of sentence.

- Selection the form of the word and formation of wordforms.

- Selection the auxiliary words-preposition, articles, and etc. and their combination with principle words.

The process of creation is connected with the mastering of some speech stereotypes the grammatical substrat is hidden in basic sentences. Grammar is presented as itself. Such a presentation of grammar has its advantage: the grammar patterns of the basic sentences are connected with each other. But this approach gives pupils the opportunity to realize the grammar item better. The teaching must be based on grammar explanations and grammar rules. Grammar rules are to be understood as a special way of expressing communicative activity. The reproductive grammar skills suppose to master the grammar actions which are necessary for expressing thoughts in oral and written forms.

The automatic perception of the text supposes the reader to identify the grammar form according to the formal features of words, word combinations, sentences which must be combined with the definite meaning. One must learn the rules in order to identify different grammatical forms. Pupils should get to know their features, the ways of expressing them in the language. We teach children to read and by means of grammar. It reveals the relation between words in the sentence. Grammar is of great important when one teaches reading and auding.

The forming of the perceptive grammar and reproductive skills is quite different. The steps of the work is mastering the reproductive skills differ from the steps in mastering the perceptive skills. To master the reproductive grammar skills one should study the basic sentences or models. To master the perceptive grammar skills one should identify and analyze the grammar item. Though training is of great importance to realize the grammar item.

We have such a conclusion that the forming of grammar skills depends on training. Training is of great importance to realize the grammar item. We must use a lot of training exercises for the assimilation of grammar. We should provide the motivation of learn English, encourage children to communicate and remember that the correction of errors in the early stages of a language course may foster the following negative aspects:

- Students lose confidence when they have fear of making grammar mistakes

- Students become reluctant to take risks: they only the say the information they know they can say:

We should realize the importance of training exercises and the role of the individual approach to teaching the students. Besides, the teacher must have a clear idea of the grammar of the language, its structure and usage; everything he teaches must be based on it; he should always be conscious of introducing or practicing some point of grammar.

By all reports from the field, this unit can be a lot of fun for you and your students:

• there's performance

• there's walking in others' shoes and learning empathy Middle/High School Monologues.

• there's connecting to Farris Bueller, Bill Cosby, Lily Tomlin, Hamlet and even.

If you choose to use this unit later in the year, students might be more ready than ever to try on different personae or share their empathy about others not like themselves. In fact, monologue writing presents opportunity for students to reflect about themselves, as well as their writing. In this unit, "monologue" is broadly defined as a speech by one character (person, animal or even object) to self, an imagined other character, or the audience. A monologue should reveal significant information about the character and his or her situation, and might provoke, entertain, persuade or inform. The characters might be invented by the student, be the student, or be adapted from another source.

Dialogues are written to be heard; consequently, this unit includes several lessons focusing on fluent oral reading skills, rehearsal, revision-by-rehearsal, and performances, as well as lessons focusing on character development and identification of purpose. Hopefully, before launching into this unit you will have the opportunity to collect video and audio clips, texts of film scripts, and/or examples of monologues from short stories and novels. (Because of copyright restriction, we have not included "professional" examples in this CCG.)

The student models we do include are "works in progress" and should be discussed in terms of their potential growth as well as their strengths.

If you have access to puppets or similar stage props, have some fun with students and let them role play or perform scenes their characters (or potential characters) engage in. Content area teachers should find this unit extremely helpful as they look for "authentic" writing opportunities for students in their courses. For instance, in a social studies, humanities or science class where students research significant historical events or individuals, students could demonstrate their learning by creating a monologue from the perspective of a character (real or invented) involved in the event. Similarly, an historical character might help the audience understand her world or contributions. (Imagine Georgia O'Keeffe sharing her artistic experiences.)

CONCLUSION

Having analysed the qualification paper on theme "Patterns used in English and Uzbek dialogic speech" I came to conclusion that dialogue is a literary and theatrical form consisting of a written or spoken conversational exchange between two or more people. Its chief historical origins as narrative, philosophical or didactic device are to be found in classical Greek and Indian literature, in particular in the ancient art of rhetoric. Having lost touch almost entirely in the 19th century with its underpinnings in rhetoric, the notion of dialogue emerged transformed in the work of cultural critics such as Mikhail Bakhtin and Paulo Freire, theologians such as Martin Buber, as an existential palliative to counter atomization and social alienation in mass industrial society.Dialogue as a genre in the Middle East and Asia dates back to the year 1433 in Japan, Sumerian disputations preserved in copies from the late The *Mimes* of Herodas give us some idea of their scope.

Plato further simplified the form and reduced it to pure argumentative conversation, while leaving intact the amusing element of character-drawing. He must have begun this about the year 405 BC, and by 400 he had perfected the dialogue, especially in the cycle directly inspired by the death of Socrates, and is considered a master of the genre. All his philosophical writings, except the *Apology*, use this form.

Following Plato, the dialogue became a major literary genre in antiquity, and several important works both in Latin and in Greek were written. Soon after Plato, Xenophon wrote his own *Symposium*; also, Aristotle is said to have written several philosophical dialogues in Plato's style (none of which have survived).

Dialogue is formed by the two words 'dia' and 'logos', which can be literally interpreted as 'dual meaning' or more appropriately the 'two way flow/exchange' of meaning, which is the tone suggested by Boehm, and many modern philosophical (and management) writers.

The Platonic dialogue, as a distinct genre which features Socrates as a speaker and one or more interlocutors discussing some philosophical question,

experienced something of a rebirth in the 20th century. Authors who have recently employed it include George Santayana, in his eminent *Dialogues in Limbo* (1926, 2nd ed. 1948; this work also includes such historical figures as Alcibiades,Aristippus, Avicenna, Democritus, and Dionysius the Younger as speakers), and Iris Murdoch, who included not only Socrates and Alcibiades as interlocutors in her work *Acastos: Two Platonic Dialogues* (1986), but featured a young Plato himself as well.

The philosophic dialogue, with or without Socrates as a character, continues to be used on occasion by philosophers when attempting to write engaging, literary works of philosophy which attempt to capture the subtle nuance and lively give-and-take of discourse as it actually takes place in intellectual conversation.

Martin Buber assigns dialogue a pivotal position in his theology. His most influential work is titled *I and Thou*. Buber cherishes and promotes throughout his work dialogue not as some purposive attempt to reach conclusions or express mere points of view, but as the very prerequisite of authentic relationship between man and man, and between man and God. His concern with the profound nature of true dialogue has resulted in what is known as the philosophy of dialogue.

The physicist David Bohm originated a related form of dialogue where a group of people talk together in order to explore their assumptions of thinking, meaning, communication, and social effects. This group consists of ten to thirty people who meet for a few hours regularly or a few continuous days. Dialoguers agree to leave behind debate tactics that attempt to convince and, instead, talk from their own experience on subjects that are improvised on the spot. People form their own dialogue groups that usually are offered for free of charge. There exists an international online dialogue list server group, facilitated by Don Factor, co-author of a paper called "Dialogue - A Proposal," with David Bohm and Peter Garrett. The Russian philosopher and semiotician Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of *dialogue* emphasized the power of discourse to increase understanding of multiple perspectives and create myriad possibilities. Bakhtin held that relationships and connections exist among all living beings, and that dialogue

creates a new understanding of a situation that demands change. In his influential works, Bakhtin provided a linguistic methodology to define the dialogue, its nature and meaning.

Dialogic relations have a specific nature: they can be reduced neither to the purely logical (even if dialectical) nor to the purely linguistic (compositional-syntactic) They are possible only between complete utterances of various speaking subjects... Where there is no word and no language, there can be no dialogic relations; they cannot exist among objects or logical quantities (concepts, judgments, and so forth). Dialogic relations presuppose a language, but they do not reside within the system of language. They are impossible among elements of a language.

The Brazilian educationalist Paulo Freire, known for developing popular education, advanced dialogue as a type of pedagogy. Freire held that dialogued communication allowed students and teachers to learn from one another in an environment characterized by respect and equality. A great advocate for oppressed peoples, Freire was concerned with praxis—action that is informed and linked to people's values. Dialogued pedagogy was not only about deepening understanding; it was also about making positive changes in the world: to make it better.

Today, dialogue is used in classrooms, community centers, corporations, federal agencies, and other settings to enable people, usually in small groups, to share their perspectives and experiences about difficult issues. It is used to help people resolve long-standing conflicts and to build deeper understanding of contentious issues. Dialogue is not about judging, weighing, or making decisions, but about understanding and learning. Dialogue dispels stereotypes, builds trust, and enables people to be open to perspectives that are very different from their own.

In the past two decades, a rapidly-growing movement for dialogue has been developing. The website of the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, serves as a hub for dialogue (and deliberation) facilitators, conveners,

and trainers and houses thousands of resources on these communication methodologies.

Groups such as [Worldwide Marriage Encounter](#) and [Retrouvaille](#) use dialogue as a communication tool for married couples. Both groups teach a dialogue method that helps couples learn more about each other in non-threatening postures, which helps to foster growth in the married relationship.

Dialogue is a delicate process. Many obstacles inhibit dialogue and favor more confrontational communication forms such as discussion and debate. Common obstacles including fear, the display or exercise of power, mistrust, external influences, distractions, and poor communication conditions can all prevent dialogue from emerging.

Egalitarian dialogue is a form of discussion that takes place when different contributions are considered in terms of the validity of the arguments, rather than assessing them according to the power positions of those who advocate them. they stand out well written and they include many details in the story and they show honorship.

Structured dialogue represents a class of dialogue practices developed as a means of orienting the dialogic discourse toward problem understanding and consensual action. Whereas most traditional dialogue practices are unstructured or semi-structured, such conversational modes have been observed as insufficient for the coordination of multiple perspectives in a problem area. A disciplined form of dialogue, where participants agree to follow a framework or facilitation, enables groups to address complex problems shared in common.

Today, structured dialogue is being employed by facilitated teams for peacemaking (e.g., [Civil Society Dialogue project in Cyprus](#), Act Beyond Borders project in the Middle East, global indigenous community development, government and social policy formulation, strategic management, health care, and other complex domains. In one deployment, structured dialogue is (according to a European Union definition) "a means of mutual communication between governments and administrations including [EU institutions](#) and young people. The

aim is to get young people's contribution towards the formulation of policies relevant to young peoples lives." The application of structured dialogue requires one to differentiate the meanings of discussion and deliberation.

THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Каримов И.А. Наша высшая цель – независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа// Доклад на первой сессии Олий Мажлиса Республики Узбекистан второго созыва от 22.01.2000.-Т.: Узбекистан. 2000. Т.8.-С.322-340.

2. Akhmanova O., *Syntax. Theory and method.* Moscow. 1972, 218p.

3. Arnold I. V. *English Word.* Moscow, "Visshaya shkola", 1986, 225p.

4. Barhudarov L.S. *The structure of simple sentence in modern English.* M. "Visshaya shkola", 1966, 250p.

5. Bennett, William Arthur., "Aspects of Language and language teaching."; London-New York., Cambridge univ. press, 1968

6. Breen, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research.* Harlow, England: Pearson.

7. Breen, M., & Littlejohn, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Classroom decision-making.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8. Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson.

9. Bryant M. *Current American Usage.* N-Y. Prient press, 1968, 380p.

10. Byrd, P. (2005). Instructed grammar. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 545–562). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

11. Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

12. Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). Discourse analysis and the teaching of listening. In G.

13. Cheyf U.L. *Meaning and structure of the language.* M., "Visshaya shkola", 1975,520c.

14. Cook& B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 363–377). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

15. Ernest Hemingway. *Selected stories*. Moscow, Progress publishers, 1971, 398p.

16. Fries, C., *The structure of English*. London. 1951, 248p.

17. Francis W.N. *The structure of American English*.New York,1958, 600p.

18. Galperin I.R. *Stylistics*. Moscow, "Visshaya shkola", 1977, 311 p.

19. H. Wentworth and S. Flexner in their "Dictionary of American Slang", New York: Newbury House.

20. Hlebnokova I. B. *Morphology opposition*. M., "Prosveshenie",1969,230p.

21. Iofic B.A., Chakhoyan L.P. *Readings in the Theory of English Grammar*. Leningrad, 1972, 240p.

22. Ilyish B.A. *The structure of Modern English*. M-L.,1971,380p.

23. Ivaniova I.P. *Type and sentence in modern English*. Moscow, "Prosveshenie", 1961. 380c.

24. Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

25. Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317–334). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

26. Lazaraton, A. (2001). Teaching oral skills. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 103–115). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

27. Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 429–448.

28. Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 267–284). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

29. Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

30. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

31. Nattinger, J., & DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

32. Nida E. *Morphology*,Ann Abror, 1965, 240p.

33. Noan Chomsky. *Studies on semantics in generative grammar*. Mouton Second Printing, 1975, 205p.

34. Plotkin V.Ya. *The structure of English language*.M, "Prosveshenie"2004,240p.

35. S.Khamzayev,O.Bektoshev., *Interpretation of the text*. T.,2007, 94 p.

36. Silva, T., & Brice, C. (2004). Research in teaching writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24,* 70–106.

37. Smirnitskiy A.I. *English languages morphology*. Moscow, "Visshaya shkola"*,* 1955, 480c.

38. Swan M., Smith B., "Learner English. A teacher's guide to interference and other problems."; Cambridge, 1987

39. Tarone, E. (2005). *Speaking in a second language.* In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 485–502). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

40. Ufimseva A.A. *Word in lexico- semantic language system*. M., "Visshaya shkola",1968,220c.

41. Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching grammar in context.* Portsmouth, NH:Boynton/Cook.

42. Widdowson, H. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

INTERNET SITES:

1. www.yourdictionary.com/grammars.htm

2. Www.papyr.com/hyOxford University Pressitextbooks/eng

3. www.members.aol.com/eslkathy/esl.htm

4. Www.http.thecity.sfsu.edu

5. www.refdesk.com/factgram.htm

6. Www.suite101.com/welcome.cfm/english grammar style