

# 43

Presentation date: September, 2023  
Date of acceptance: December, 2023  
Publication date: January, 2024

## LOGICAL-SEMANTIC

COMMUNICATION FORMS IN DIALOGICAL TEXTS IN THE AZERBAIJANI AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

### FORMAS DE COMUNICACIÓN LÓGICA-SEMÁNTICA EN TEXTOS DIÁLOGOS EN LOS IDIOMAS AZERÍ E INGLÉS

Surayya Khanlar Mammadli <sup>1</sup>  
E-mail: [quliyevasura@mail.ru](mailto:quliyevasura@mail.ru)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-0972-0301>  
<sup>1</sup> Azerbaijan Technical University, Azerbaijan.

It mentions suggested (APA, seventh edition)

Mammadli, S. K. (2024). Logical-semantic communication forms in dialogical texts in the Azerbaijani and English languages. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 16 (1), 398-405.

#### ABSTRACT

Communication and language are of great importance given their fundamental role in the construction of meaning and the transmission of ideas between individuals. In this context, the dialogic approach emerges as a crucial element to understand communicative dynamics, since it focuses on the active interaction between participants. Therefore, studying dialogic texts not only allows us to unravel the complexities of communication but also provides insights into the way meaning is constructed in a verbal exchange, in addition to revealing the logical-semantic structures and relationships in discourse, offering a deeper vision of how meaningful connections are established in the communicative act. Given the above, the objective of this research is to explore the various forms of meaning relations in the construction of dialogic texts using examples from the Azerbaijani and English languages. In general, it was found that the study of dialogic texts stands as a valuable framework to analyze and understand the richness of communication through language.

**Keywords:** Dialogue speech, one-line relation in dialogue, multi-line relation in dialogue, subject unity, double replica.

#### RESUMEN

La comunicación y el lenguaje son de gran importancia dado su papel fundamental en la construcción de significado y la transmisión de ideas entre individuos. En este contexto, el enfoque dialógico surge como un elemento crucial para comprender la dinámica comunicativa, ya que se centra en la interacción activa entre los participantes. Por lo tanto, el estudio de los textos dialógicos no sólo permite desentrañar las complejidades de la comunicación, sino que también proporciona conocimientos sobre la forma en que se construye el significado en un intercambio verbal, además de revelar las estructuras y relaciones lógico-semánticas en el discurso, ofreciendo una visión más profunda de cómo En el acto comunicativo se establecen conexiones significativas. Teniendo en cuenta lo anterior, el objetivo de esta investigación es explorar las diversas formas de relaciones de significado en la construcción de textos dialógicos utilizando ejemplos de los idiomas azerbaiyano e inglés. En general, se encontró que el estudio de los textos dialógicos se erige como un marco valioso para analizar y comprender la riqueza de la comunicación a través del lenguaje.

**Palabras clave:** Discurso de diálogo, relación de una línea en el diálogo, relación de varias líneas en el diálogo, unidad de sujeto, doble réplica.

## INTRODUCTION

Communication is a vital skill that connects us to others and allows us to share information, ideas, and emotions. In this regard, language is very important since it acts as a mean that enables us to put thoughts into words. Effective communication is key to building strong relationships, whether in our personal or professional lives and it plays a crucial role in conflict resolution by opening dialogues. Since ancient times it has been noted that communication is essential to achieve common goals in communities. Specifically, our capacity for complex language have set humans apart from other species laying the foundation on which societies, organizations, and relationships were built. More recently it has been highlighted as an important factor to academic success and to boost productivity and efficiency in the workplace. Therefore, effective communication and language skills are among the most important skills the persons need to master (Akmajian et al., 2017; Cummins, 2014).

Within communication, dialogic approach refers to the form of communication made in the form of a dialogue or conversation; as opposed to the monologue where one part provides information without discussion. The term dialogic then implies a kind of interactive process of interpreting, meaning through the interplay between speaker and listener. Because of that, it has been pointed out that this approach in communication not only enriches the quality of verbal interaction, but also promotes the development of cognitive and social skills, contributing to the construction of shared meaning and solid interpersonal relationships. Just to mention, it has been effectively applied in the treatment of children with autism and speech disorders (Maul & Ambler, 2014; Skrypnyk & Lozova, 2020), in art and texts analysis (Calo, 2012; Jones, 2017), in business organizations (Pang et al., 2018), or in education (Cui & Teo, 2021; Shor & Freire, 1987; Skidmore, 2000).

Dialogical texts usually represent a unique category, characterized by complex psycholinguistic foundations since ideas formed through contemplation are expressed through dialogues. In such texts, the speech situation links psychological and linguistic elements to establish the quality of information exchange. The creation of dialogical texts relies substantially on relationships between their components, emphasizing the importance of studying logical-semantic features and textual aspects. Therefore, examining these ongoing relationships underscores the relevance of exploring dialogical texts, highlighting the dynamic interdependence between psychological and linguistic factors that shape communicative dialogues (Luckmann, 1999).

Considering the above, the research aims to explore the various forms of meaning relations in the construction of dialogical texts, using a comparative analysis of the main characteristics of one-line and multi-line relations in Azerbaijani and English languages. This goal involves a thorough examination of content and meaning relationships within dialogical texts. Specifically, we focus on analyzing the basic features of dialogical text forms in both languages, exploring formal and logical-semantic relation methods in dialogical speech. In addition, we examine intratextual relations, distinguishing between implicit and explicit relations, but also investigate local and global relation methods. With this in mind, the comparison of anaphoric and cataphoric relation methods in dialogical texts, along with the exploration of issues related to ellipticity, form an integral part of this comprehensive analysis.

## DEVELOPMENT

### The concept of relation in the text.

Text analysis has to take into account a number of features that sentence syntax cannot resolve. Such features include, among other features, the position of a separate sentence within the text, that is, its relation to other sentences and, finally, to the text as a whole. Relation plays a special role in creating the semantic integrity of the text. According to Lesova (1980, p. 34) *“the logical-semantic integrity of the text passes through intratextual relation”*. The logical-semantic relation in the text is created in its “communicative circulation”. That is, the logical-semantic relation in the text is formed in the process of communication - dialogical speech.

K. Abdullayev speaking about the method of intratextual relation, notes that “the logical-semantic method in the text gives two types of intratextual relations: chain and parallel” (Abdullayev, 1999, p. 289). In the process of components` relations in the text, the types of relations are closely connected to their structural and semantic compatibility with each other. Relation includes both syntactic and logical-syntactic methods of connectedness of components, in other words, “both syntactic and logical-syntactic methods of relation of components in the text are generally very dense and interwoven” (Abdullayev, 1999, p. 290).

In Russian linguistics, G. Y. Solganik, I. R. Galperin, Admoni, T. I. Altman, O. I. Moskolskaya, E. A. Referovskaya, G. A. Zolotova, N. D. Zarubina and others also have valuable ideas on text relation and related texts. I.R.Galperin thoroughly researched the categories of the text (cohesion, continuum) and specifically noted that there is a grammatical and content relationship between the components

of the text (Halperin, 1981, pp. 19–81). O.I. Moskalskaya also investigated the structural and semantic relation issues of the text (Moskalskaya, 1981, pp. 13–15).

T.I. Silman investigated the structure of syntactic units, the problems of connecting sentences with the help of grammatical and lexical units, and determined the grammatical and semantic means that ensure the relation of sentences on Russian language materials. T. I. Silman points out that it is more important to study the syntactic relations between the sentences in the text (the relationship between the sentences) and relates the syntactic wholes (prosaic clauses) with the composition, artistic language and style of the work (Silman, 1970).

The text is closely related to the speech-thought activity of a person, and therefore its structure reflects the logical interrelationships between the corresponding communicative actions. The content relationship of the text was extensively investigated in the research of E.V. Sidorov. He views the text as a whole subsystem of the act of speech communication. According to the author, the text should be studied as a sequence of meanings and signs that embody the interconnected pattern of the communicative activity of the addressee and the sender of information. The systematic composition of the text is the fact that it has subsystems as one of the most important aspects of its internal structure. It refers to a phraseological whole or a group of such wholes, and these parts are related to each other by content (Sidorov, 1986, p. 51).

Only the mutual syntactic connectedness of the sentences in the text is not enough for the formation of the text. It is not right to understand connectedness as only a formal relationship. The formal, psychological, semantic and logical connectedness of the elements of the text makes it a unit. Therefore, some researchers consider the repetition of elements of the text (recurrence), that is, their semantic connectedness, as the main characteristic feature. The interconnectedness of these means that bind the text also shapes the text. The stylistic differences of the texts also differentiate the means of text creation within it. If artistic texts are more characterized by associativity (hidden relation), imagery, memories, psychological means, formal and logical means of relation are more important for scientific texts.

### **Hidden and obvious relation in dialogical text.**

The characterization of a text, especially a dialogical text, cannot go without determining its main communicative intention, which is reflected in the word - communicative type. “ *Communicative intention is closely related to the nature of the communicative act, more precisely, to its two components, that is, the relationship and condition of the*

*speaker and the addressee* (Brcakova, 1979, p. 248). Both of these factors form only a psychological background for the phase of communication and understanding in verbal speech - dialogues. But in the text, they cannot become the subject of linguistic analysis. However, in the syntax of the dialogical text, their direct or indirect influence on the implementation of speech, communication, reflected in the text cannot be ignored.

In its turn, the main communicative intention, which depends on the conditions of monological or dialogical speech, also depends on the communicative type of information transfer of the speaker. (e.g story, presentation, conversation, polemic, etc.) . At the same time, of course, it takes into account both the social relations of the participants, the nature and extent of their general experience, and the nature and extent of the material knowledge of the addressee (their knowledge of the world). (Brcakova, 1979, p. 249).

This means that the choice of communicative type of the speaker (narration of an event, presentation of a problem, conversation about the current situation) is determined by the situation in which the speech is taking place. On the one hand it is limited by the type of the information topic, and on the other hand by the type of the communicative situation. In dialogical conditions, the topic of information can be broken or completed at any time by introducing new elements that deviate from the topic in the course of the intended thematic information, that is, by the addressee's speech. Therefore, the relation nature of communication can change depending on its type.

Relation is one of the basic conditions for communication, and it is also a part of the text that includes the information contained in the previous components of the text. That is, the relation in the text is a semiological category (Abdullayev, 1999, p. 250). The relation in the text comes from the unity of the subject and is connected with the development of the thematic flow. At the same time, it should be noted that the depending on the interpretation and perception of the concept of “subject” that accompanies it, relation can be understood in a narrow or very broad sense.

When relation in a text is taken in a broader sense such as “hypertheme”, the criteria for establishing relation is less definite and the relation is weaker. In the narrow sense of relation, if the small topics taken from the hypertheme are considered autonomous topics, the relation will appear closer and its violations will be more obvious. It should also be noted that the relation in the “speaker-addressee” encounter does not have the same nature. Besides the mental factors, the addressee's understanding of the text

as relevant is also related to the sufficient volume of his/her material knowledge. When they are absent, the text constructed by the speaker in correspondence with all the rules of relation is interpreted as inadequate by the addressee and loses its communicative and informative value.

For example: *Əb dü. Ağ! İzin vərəsəniz bir kəlmə xəlvəti sizə söz deyim?*

*Bəhram. Ayrılib gəlir.*

*Pəri. Bu nədir? Gizlin, xəlvəti! Bu nə deyəmdir! (Çığırır.)*

*Bəhram. Dayan görək, Pəri, bəlkə bir ciddi xəbərdir.*

*Əb dü. Ağ, əminiz qızı ölüm halındadır, sizi arzulayır.*

*Bəhram. Əb dü, sən Allah məndən əl çək. Hər saatda yürürsən Sara...*

*Pəri. Daha sən bizi təngə gətirmişsən. Əl çəkməzsənmi bizdən?*

*Əb dü. Xanım ölüm halındadır. Déyir, bəs nə eləyim?*

*Pəri. Daha bəsdir, sən itil, işlərini gör, sənə dəmişəm onun yanına getmə.*

*Əb dü. Daha nə eləyim, bağışla, xanım. [C.Cabbarlı, "Solğun çiçəklər"].*

So, a typical feature of a related text is the transfer of information on the same topic from one segment of the text to another. The next segment absorbs the content of the previous segment or segments and develops the thematic flow with new information. But it is based on the simplest scheme of communication - "someone informs someone of something" and this ensures the soft development of information. Let's take a look at the material in English language:

*Gosforth. If you'll excuse me, Councillor, - I think I'll have to pitch in to this public address system - see what I can do with it myself.*

Mr.Pearce. Yes, of course.

Gosforth. Twelve loudspeakers strung all the way round the field and not a squeak out of any of them.

In the given text, the main text is based on "news". The new news are "soft!" and gradually developed the text. The construction and connectedness of the text in the Azerbaijani language is possible with the help of special expressions in the language. For example.

*Gülnisə. Haradasan, səhərdən itmişsən tapılmırsan? Sara ölüb, yəni bu daxmadan əl çəkməzsən? Kağızı vəkil üçün apardın mı?*

*Əbdül. Kağızı göndərdim, amma bundan sonra mən sizin qulluğunuza baxmayacağam. Mənə qulluq deməyin. (Kənara.) Vallah, o qədər yanmışam ki, istəyirəm atini didəm.*

*Gülnisə. Bu nədir? Hə? Nadirüst, yoxsa Saranın bir parça kağızından qudurmuşsan?*

*Əbdül. Mən ərvəd ilə ağızbağca verməyən deyiləm. Məndən əl çək!*

*Gülnisə. Elə isə şeylərini yığıb, bu saat bu evdən çıx. Malı bölüb verəndə gəlib təhvil alarsan. Tez ol!*

*Əbdül. Məni malların keşiyini çəkmək üçün qoyublar.*

*Gülnisə. Məni həbs edəcəklər, sən şadlanırsan? Yaхşı nadirüst, mən gedirəmsə, yerimdə qızım var. Eybi yoxdur. Hər nə bilirsən, elə.*

*Əbdül (tək). Siz mənim sinəmə çarpaz dağlar çəkmişsiniz, əlbəttə ki, şadlanaram. Bircə Saranı bütün nəslinizə dəyişməzdim. [C.Cabbarlı, "Solğun çiçəklər"].*

In a given dialogue text, semantic connectedness gradually develops like a chain. The relationship is one-line, the word "paper" plays an important key role in the dialogue between Abdul and Gulnisa. It is a testament paper and it actively participates in establishing the subject line of Abdul's conversation with Gulnisa. Semantic completion in dialogical text in English is different from Azerbaijani. For example:

Basho (to the Prime Minister). I've just told him you're Prime Minister.

Prime Minister. Yes?

Basho. He wishes you prosperity and your ancestor's joy.

Prime Minister. Oo ...

As a rule, such unions are less determined and semantically complete due to the non-thematic nature of the final component. In the semantic sense, the main distinguishing feature of such a union is that the completeness/incompleteness of the whole union is expressed not in the end, but in the penultimate component as the carrier of thematic information.

### One-line and multi-line relation in dialog.

In the most elementary scheme of communication, that is, when someone says something to someone, there are points that prevent smooth communication. In any type of verbal communication, in addition to the line of transmission of "objective" information, i.e., the reference line, taking into account the presence of the addressee, there is also a desire to keep in touch with him/her, to arouse interest in what is being said and to check how much it is possible to create a single communication context. On

the other hand, the speaker's direct self-projection in any verbal communication also manifests itself in the form of automatic interpretations that more or less clearly reflect the projection of his/her "I". And so, the relation to which the abstract line of the text tends is interrupted more or less frequently by elements of contact and elements of automatic interpretation. In a continuous flow of speech, the speaker must be ready to reckon with the verbal expression reaction of the addressee at any moment.

In addition to the intersection of the reference line with the elements of communication and interpretation, one more point can be distinguished that violates the rules of relation: the speaker adds to his/her reference line another piece of text that is "not his/her own": he/she repeats the direct speech or quotation of another. For example:

*Bəhrəm. Pəri, mən ələ bilirəm ki, bir gedib onunla görüşsəm, ya-man olmaz. Yazıqdır... Məni görərsə, nə olar? Heç bir şey.*

*Pəri. Ələ isə, Bəhrəm, sən məni istəmirsən ki, onun yanına getmək istəyirsən. Ağlayır deməsinə acıdır? Ağlayanda gözünün sürməsi getməz ki! İstədiyi qədər ağlasın, nəhayət, yorulub oturacaq deyilmi?*

*Bəhrəm. Pəri! Səni istəyirəm, sevirəm, fəqət nə olursa olsun, Sara da insandır, barı nə deyəcəyini, nə olduğunu soruşum.*

*Pəri (işvə ilə durur). Ələ isə həmişəlik get! Daha mən sənini danışmıram. (Yavaş-yavaş getmək istəyir.)*

*Bəhrəm. Pəri! Getmirəm, bura gel (əlini ona uzadır, sərxoş kimi). Bir dəfə ki, mən səni sevmişəm, sevmişəm. Əl də çəkmərəm, sözümdən də çıxıram.*

*Pəri. Sübut olaraq mən Saranın bilmərrə bu evdən çıxarılmasını razı olmağını istəyirəm.*

*Bəhrəm. Pəri! Mən sənə deyirəm ki, səni istəyirəm, daha Sara bizə heç bir şey etməyəcək. Ələ bil ki, bir qulluqçudur evdə saxlamışsınız, fəqət israr edərsənsə, əlbət ki, sözünü sındırmaram.*

*Pəri. İndi inanıram ki, məni doğrudan da sevirsən. (Bəhrəmin boynunu qucaqlayır. Bəhrəm də əlini onun başına uzadır.)*

*Bəhrəm. Sevirəm, bəli! Mənsəni sevirəm! Bütün mövcudiyətimlə. Və səndən ötrü həyatımı fəda etməyə hazırım, zira ürəkdən səni sevirəm. [C.Cabbarlı, "Solğun çiçəklər"].*

Elements that interrupt the thematic flow of the reference line and thus disrupt its connection have different frequencies in special communications: in one of the extreme cases, they can suppress the reference so much that the text becomes incoherent, discounted (continuous). We have identified a special composition-speech form of dialogue with one-sided structure, which can be called dialogue-narrative. Let's take a look at examples in English:

Ben: Kawl (*He* picks up the paper.) What about this? (He refers to the paper.) A man of eighty-seven wanted to cross the road. But there was a lot of traffic, see? He couldn't see how he was going to squeeze through. So he crawled under a lorry.

Gus: He what?

Ben: He crawled under a lorry. A stationary lorry.

Gus: No?

Ben: The lorry started and<sup>1</sup> ran over him.

Gus: Go on!

Ben: That's what it says here.

The complex dialogical unity established by this one-way relation is also a clear example of the fact that it can take the form of a dialogue. All actions follow one another in a clearly defined direct chronological sequence: wanted to cross; was a lot of traffic; couldn't see; crawled; started; ran over. So, we have seen that the text of verbal communication (and probably also the text of certain types of non-fiction written communication) is not constructed along a single line relation. Surely, additions that break the relation also affect the features of the syntactic structure of the text of verbal communication and create a need to restore the broken semantic and syntactic relationships. If we break down the contactors from a certain linear text (as a union of consecutive elements), then it can be determined that a number of contactors do not form a consecutive relation. If we select the elements of automatic interpretation, their order may reflect the specific relation of the parallel flow of the speaker's thoughts. Relation in verbal communication is accompanied by gestures. K. Pisarkova draws attention to the fact that the contact "has a ritual nature and keeps the warmth of the text.

From the linear text of a speaker, we continue to consider relation in the reference line itself, which carries the main information load in communication, separating the elements of communication and automatic interpretation, directed against the coherence of the text. Relation in this line, as already mentioned, is created by the acquisition by subsequent segments of the content of what was said earlier and the content arising from the situation, or it originates from the common experience of the communicators. This operation of content integration creates one of the context aspects in which the relationship of some parts of the text to other parts of it is expressed, or a situation in which the unity of mutually placed elements is created. Relation is based on expected or assumed (necessary logical) relationships between parts of the text. First of all, time relations (simultaneous, subsequent and earlier) and

causation (cause, effect, compromise) are important here. For example:

*Sara. Əbdül əmi! Bəhrəm gəlmədimi?*

*Əbdül. Xanım, qızım, gətdim, görmədim onu, bilmirəm haradadır.*

*Sara. Əmi, bilirəm, məndən gizləyirsən. Bəhrəm mənim yanıma gəlmək istəmir.*

*Əbdül. Yox, qızım, nə danışırsən? Heç ola bilər ki, Bəhrəm sənin yanına gəlməsin?*

*Sara. Əmi, Bəhrəm mənim yanıma niyə gəlsin ki, mənim pulum yox, atam-anam yox, köməyim yox. Onda ki, var idi, istəyirdi, sonradan ki, hamı Pərinin əlinə keçdi, o da Pərinə sevdə. Daha mənim yanıma niyə gəlsin?*

*Əbdül. Qızım, qüssə çəkmə! İnşallah sağalarsən, bu işlərin hamısını ayırd elərik.*

*Sara. Əmi, bilirəm mən bir də sağalmayacağam! Daha mən ölürəm. Amma alimdə bir şey olmadığı üçün bilmirəm, sənin yaxşılığını nə ilə əvəz eləyim. Belə yaman günəmdə mənə qalan bircə sən oldun! Ax, Əbdül əmi, görürsənmi mənə nə eləyirlər? (Ağlayır.)*

*Əbdül. Mənə heç şey lazım deyil, tək sən sağalasan. Hər şey sənə qurban olsun.*

*Sara. Əmi! O sandığın içərisində mənim dünya malından bir dəst ipək paltarım və iki də qızıl üzüyüm var. Mən öləndən sonra onları özün üçün götürərsən. [C.Cabbarlı, "Solğun çiçəklər"].*

As seen, the type of relation can be expressed explicitly or implicitly in the text. V. Skalichka in one article on the syntax of discourse states that the secret or open expression method does not change anything in the essence of relation. The method of open expression has only wider possibilities for distinguishing the relationship of connected elements. In the verbal communication type, the covert method of expression prevails.

### Repetition and relevance

The relevance is built on the principle of repetition, that is, it is based on references to the text "from the left". To determine the identity of the repeated denotation, it either refers to one of the previous (given) elements, or takes the content of the entire previous sentence concisely. K.Abdullayev mentions repetitions as "a text-creating factor that ensures the structural and content connection of the components in the text, maintains the semantic meaning relationship between the components, and is related to the creation of the text between the components" [Abdullayev, 1999:p,290]. According to him, "repetition, regardless of its structural complexity or simplicity, emerges as a very solid cementing method that serves the

integrity of the text in principle" [Abdullayev, 1999:p,291]. Let's look at an example:

*Pəri. Bəhrəm! Niyə fikrə gətirmişsən? Yəni nə olub, Saranın cəncəlinəni əhvalın qarışib?*

*Bəhrəm (birdən diksinib gülür). Sən buradasan? (Ona tərəf gədir.)*

*Pəri. Gərək, Sara: "Bəhrəm, Bəhrəm", – dəyəndə sən birdən oradan çıxıb: "Nə Bəhrəm, nə dəyirsən? Əl çəkməzsənmi?" – dəyə idin. Onda daha da gözəl olardı.*

*Bəhrəm. Yox! Gözəlim! O, bir az namünasib düşərdi.*

*Pəri. Ha-ha-ha! Bilirsənmi nə qədər o biri evdə gülmüşəm! Ərizə verəcəyəm, Axunda gədəcəyəm. Bəhrəm gəlsin! Ha-ha-ha! Mən dəyirəm qız axır vaxtlarda dəli olmuşdur.*

*Bəhrəm. Nə dəyəsin biçərə? Adamın yazığı gəlir. Qalır xəlvət evdə, fikir, xülya! Gündə yüz dönüş mənim dalımca gəlir, mən də ki, o gələndə qaçıb gizlənirəm, gərək onu köçürüb əvvəlki yerində, yaxında oturdaq, yoxsa tamamilə dəli olar.*

*Pəri. Vallah, onun canı bərkdir, heç bir şey olmaz! Əgər mənim xatirimi istəyirsənsə, belə sözü söyləmə. Qoy öz yerində oturubdur.*

*Bəhrəm. Eybi yoxdur, mən bir söz demirəm, desəm də sənin sözümdən çıxıram! Sən mənə nəinki onu, bəlkə həyatını ver desən, yənə söz demirəm.*

*Pəri. O! Vallah, nə qədər sevimlisən, Bəhrəm! (Boynunu qucaqlayır. Kənara.) Bütün-bütünə mənim, mənim alimdədir. Mum kimi hər tərəfə istəsəm, ayərəm.*

*Bəhrəm. Pəri, bu axır vaxtlarda sən, nədənsə, o qədər gözəlləşmişsən ki, heç əvvəlki Pəriyə bənzəmirsən. Yox! Əvvəl sən belə dəyildin, mən səndən qaçırdım, amma indi başqa bir qiyafət almışsan.*

*Pəri. Ola bilər ki, əvvəl mənim sənə aşiq olduğumu bilmirdin, fəqət indi bizim məhəbbətimiz bir-birinə aşkar olduğu üçün, bu qədər şirinləşmişik. [C.Cabbarlı, "Solğun çiçəklər"].*

In the dialog given a substitutive type of repetition is represented by a class of substitutive words. This category of words with a purely anaphoric function is completed by pronominalizations capable of absorbing the content of all sentences (for example: this problem, this question, this topic, etc.): Cases of repeated substitutive recurrence are typical for verbal spontaneous speech. For the same type of speech, it is also a structural character in which it is a recurrent-substitute in the first position, in any case, it refers to the opposite objective situation, and only after it comes the autosemantic word. So, the zero term of implicit recursion in a dialogue text belongs to the second type of contextual ellipsis. Not repeating what was said before



it is a means of shortening and saving the communication process.

### Unity of topic in the dialogue.

When we consider the relation created by a speaker within a text, we see that in dialogical speech, characterized by the collision of replicas of two or more communicators, a special type of inter-replica relation (relation at the junction of replicas) arises. The stronger or weaker relation in dialogical communication is primarily related to the type of dialogue. In situational dialogue or polemic, a closer connection is provided by a common theme: the intention of the interlocutors to “agree” limits the possibility of quick changes of the common theme. It can be broken down into a number of subtopics, but it usually doesn't disappear. Other types of dialogue (for example, everyday conversation, basic conversation) are distinguished by a faster change of topics - the common topic breaks at a certain moment of the conversation, fades into the background, then disappears completely, then flares up again. The most common types of dialogues in speech are characterized by thematic swelling, which contributes to the specificity of inter-dialogue relation.

### CONCLUSIONS

In a dialogic text the relationships are established both, distributive among the replicas of all communicants and through pairs of replicas. The inter-replica relation in a pair involves one speaker attempting to grasp and complement the unspoken element of the previous cue. It's important to note that in a dialogical text the relational dynamics may vary between communicants. While one participant's replicas maintain a relational thread, the replicas of the second participant tend to be purely receptive. Moreover, the potential for a “false” dialogue arises when one communicator introduces a new thematic flow, diverting from the common topic and hindering the creation of inter-replica connections. In addition, a “false” dialogue may occur if speakers in a dialogical situation neglect thematic elements within shared replicas. This results in the emergence of two parallel lines of relation that remain unintegrated. Consequently, when conversations lack the essential feature of dialogue—the exchange of comments—the interaction transforms into a “false” dialogue, lacking a cohesive communicative context. This highlights the significance of maintaining thematic coherence and active engagement between communicants to ensure genuine dialogical communication.

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Abdullayev, K. M. (1999). *Theoretical problems of Azerbaijani language syntax*. Maarif Publishing House.
- Akmajian, A., Farmer, A. K., Bickmore, L., Demers, R. A., & Harnish, R. M. (2017). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication* (7th ed.). MIT Press.
- Brcakova, D. (1979). *On coherence in oral communications. Syntax of the text*. Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- Calo, C. G. (2012). From Theory to Practice: Review of the Literature on Dialogic Art. *Public Art Dialogue*, 2(1), 64–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21502552.2012.653236>
- Cui, R., & Teo, P. (2021). Dialogic education for classroom teaching: A critical review. *Language and Education*, 35(3), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1837859>
- Cummins, J. (2014). Beyond language: Academic communication and student success. *Linguistics and Education*, 26, 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.006>
- Halperin, I. R. (1981). *Text as an object of linguistic research*. Science Publishing House.
- Jones, R. A. (2017). Towards dialogic epistemology: The problem of the text. *Qualitative Research*, 17(4), 457–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794116671986>
- Lesova, L. M. (1980). *How a text is constructed*. Science Publishing House.
- Luckmann, T. (1999). Remarks on the Description and Interpretation of Dialogue. *International Sociology*, 14(4), 387–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580999014004001>
- Maul, C. A., & Ambler, K. L. (2014). Embedding Language Therapy in Dialogic Reading to Teach Morphologic Structures to Children with Language Disorders. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 35(4), 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525740114525657>
- Moskalskaya, I. O. (1981). *Text Grammar*. Science Publishing House.
- Pang, A., Shin, W., Lew, Z., & Walther, J. B. (2018). Building relationships through dialogic communication: Organizations, stakeholders, and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 24(1), 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2016.1269019>
- Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). What is the “Dialogical Method” of Teaching? *Journal of Education*, 169(3), 11–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748716900303>
- Sidorov, E. V. (1986). *Fundamentals of the system concept of text*. Science Publishing House.
- Silman, T. I. (1970). Syntactical and stylistic features of place of nouns. *Issues of Linguistics*, 4(6), 70–76.

- Skidmore, D. (2000). From Pedagogical Dialogue to Dialogical Pedagogy. *Language and Education*, 14(4), 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780008666794>
- Skrypnyk, T., & Lozova, O. (2020). Formation of Dialogic Interactions in Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Psycholinguistics*, 27(1), 237-261. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2020-27-1-237-261>