

# The history and theoretical interpretations of dialogue in literary studies

Sadulla Matyakupov

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 20 October 2024; **Accepted:** 22 December 2024; **Published:** 12 January 2025

**Abstract:** The article examines the history of dialogue in literary studies and its theoretical interpretations. On the example of world and Uzbek literary studies, theoretical views on the issues of dialogue and its artistic function, its significance in poetic speech are summarized. Scientific conclusions are drawn about the function and essence of artistic dialogue.

**Keywords:** Literary studies, dialogue, theory, scientific school, poetic speech, artistic function.

**Introduction:** The roots of dialogue are considered to be an ancient phenomenon, dating back to the first periods of interpersonal communication. It existed in the "pre-literary period," just as it existed before philosophy. According to experts, the first form of dialogue was social in nature. In a social environment where two people are together, there is a need for dialogue and mutual communication. This is the reason why the practice of dialogue and the theoretical interpretations related to it are diverse, numerous and ancient. If the first examples of social dialogue appeared in the form of communication between God and man, man and woman, father and son, then gradually it branched out in the form of communication between ruler and citizen, judge and condemned, teacher and student, preacher and listener, etc. More precisely, dialogue has existed as a condition of social life in every aspect of human life, and this process continues at a consistent pace today.

## METHOD

Based on the available materials, it can be said that the initial formalized forms of dialogue emerged in ancient Greece, particularly in interactions related to religious-mythological, philosophical, scientific, and judicial contexts. From a semantic perspective, the term "dialogue" (from the Greek dialogos – "a conversation between two or more people, a form of verbal communication") [Словарь. 9:67] is not limited to simply "a conversation between two or more individuals," as commonly defined in dictionaries.

Ancient Greek sources already recognized that it also encompassed meanings such as the relationship between two viewpoints, the interaction of opposing forces, and debates between two poles.

The dialogue presented in Plato's Symposium between Socrates and Agathon illustrates the strong foundation of this idea. Socrates, who visits the poet Agathon's home specifically for a conversation, is asked several questions by his host about God and His role in human life. Receiving satisfactory and logically inspiring answers from Socrates, Agathon becomes inspired and begins to ask poetic questions (which experts regard as one of the earliest examples of poetic dialogue in philosophy).

Socrates, admiring the meaning and metaphor in Agafon's poem, says to him: "You praised Eroth. Does it merely merit praise, or does it have flaws?" Agafon cannot answer this question. Recognizing his defeat, he said, "You're too strong. I can't argue with you!". Socrates then responded to Agafon: "No, you cannot argue with the truth, not with me, because it is impossible to argue with the truth." From the given small text, it becomes clear that during the processes of historical formation of dialogue, it showed a number of specific features: a) dialogue is not just a simple conversation between two people; b) it is built on a discussion that reflects the position of a specific person; c) it is in harmony with poetic expression even in ancient forms of communication; d) the leadership of logic and observation in dialogue.

In order to confirm this classification, we consider it necessary to cite the following thoughts of the literary critic U. Zhurakulov on the history of dialogue: "Even before M. Bakhtin, the concept of dialogue and opinions about it existed in works on philosophy, aesthetics, and literary studies. In the early periods of European philosophical and artistic thought - in the works of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle - it is clear that dialogue, in addition to its use within a specific literary genre, is the leading form of expression of philosophical thought. When the philosopher expressed his views, of course, he felt the need for an interlocutor who would encourage him to think, argue, and confirm some of his thoughts. Whether the addressee is a specific person (Socrates) like the "naked genius" in Plato's dialogues, or as a fictional-abstract interlocutor, he always retained his dialogical organizational function" [Jurakulov U. 5:74].

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

According to Platonists, Plato carved an inscription on the door of his school called "Academy" with the words: "Do not let those who are not geometers enter!" [see source 11: source]. This meant that Plato demanded that every word, thought, observation, and communication be precisely geometrically measured, in accordance with the criterion of logic. Plato's dialogical logic was formed by the contradiction between two concepts - "truth" and "false" - and the logical proof of truth. In the words of Daotima to Socrates: "Nimaki is ugly if it is not beautiful, what is good is evil if it is not good, but don't put too hard on this conclusion, otherwise you will destroy the levels between them" there is a truth about the relativity of human judgments [see: source 11]. This aspect was clearly manifested, first and foremost, in the dialogues of Plato's teacher, Socrates, and this can be fully confirmed in the debate between Socrates and the Sophist:

Socrates: Who are you?

Sophist: Master of the word.

Socrates: What does a master of words mean?

Sophist: I don't know medicine. I'll talk to the public about medicine and convince them of my word. Then the doctor comes out and talks about it, but he can't convince the crowd.

Socrates: Does your audience understand medicine?

Sophist: No. They're a crowd, they don't understand.

Socrates: So you are a master of making fools fools! [See source 11].

This passage in the treatise "Ziyofat" proves that the dialogue primarily served to distinguish between truth and falsehood, to prove the superiority of truth over

falsehood. Here, the strong logic of Socrates' words served to expose the Sophist's lies. At the same time, in the dialogue presented, the lowest level of deceit is vividly reflected in the adjectives "master of words," "foolishness of fools." Based on such processes characteristic of the history of philosophy and aesthetics, it can be concluded that the first interpretations, evaluations, and relationships in the theory of dialogue took place within dialogical processes, as a living process. The first manifestations of interpretation are directly related to the work of Aristotle. Although Aristotle did not write a direct refutation of his teacher's Socratic dialogues, he did not express an open reaction, the innovation introduced by him into the composition and content of the dialogue gives the dialogues of Aristotle an interpretative character. In a certain sense, he expresses his assessment and attitude towards his teacher's dialogues. Although Aristotle's dialogues do not reflect the problems of literature in the sense we understand today, his observations about the soul and body are one of the eternal themes of fiction.

In general, the dialogues of Neoplatonists such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus reflect on God and all the things He created. Such thoughts not only continue and complement each other, but each new interpretation also demonstrates its dialogic position in relation to the previous one. The most important thing is that they reflect the most important problems of fiction in philosophical content, artistic form. Later, it became known that proverbs, sayings, sayings, aphorisms, winged words and expressions of literature in a certain sense relied on such traditions. Indeed, in his dialogues, Aristotle called the proverb "Remains of Ancient Philosophy" [Makarova I. 7:103].

The similarity of Aristotle's dialogues to examples of folk art, their approach to literature, is directly due to the needs of the reader. To ensure the popularity of his ideas, he used folk expressions, proverbs, sayings, and sayings in his dialogues. In his dialogues, it is noticeable that he effectively used the method of syllogism (making a third logical conclusion based on two ideas): compared to "esoteric" texts, his "exoteric" writings, which are in our hands, are distinguished by their serious artistry, invented composition, and elegant syllables. Most of these texts are written in the form of dialogues. In Aristotle's work "Rhetoric," regarding the relationship between the speaker and the listener, "Like dialectology, rhetoric (the art of words) is not for some fields, but for all fields and is useful". The work of rhetoric is not to convince a single person of an idea, but to teach the methods and rules of how to convince all people of an idea (beneficial and correct)... Rhetoric is very useful for all orators (for teachers who always

preach to the groans, students, students) " [Arastu. 1:221]," he notes.

The main essence of Plotinus' philosophy, a follower of Plato and Aristotle, was the interpretation and renewal of Plato's views. In some works, influenced by the essence and inner specifics of Plato's philosophical ideas, Plotinus, like Aristotle, took Plato's works as the basis in his works. Plotinus often enlivened his words with interrogative sentences. He answers these questions with his own statements. From this perspective, it represents a dialogue of the Platonic type.

According to experts, the philosophy and aesthetics of dialogue in the 20th century refers to the theory of dialogue put forward by M. Bubur, F. Edner, I. Levenos, and M. Bakhtin. Among them, M. Bakhtin is distinguished by the vitality of the theory of dialogue, the concept of beauty in literature, and its practical closeness to the art of speech. The architecture of the concept of "action" in Bakhtin is dialogic. The minimum presence of a person in the motion process is at least two votes. The life of language, the energy that gives it the effect of vitality, is dialogue.

Kazakh scholar N. Kenzhegaraev emphasizes that "in literary studies, we should avoid the function of using the concepts of "monologue" and "dialogue" only due to their external characteristics." It is necessary to go beyond the rule that monologue is a conversation of one person, dialogue is a conversation of two people... Now it is time to pay close attention to the dialogic genesis of the monologue... Applying a question is probably not a phenomenon within the framework of a monologue. It contains autocommunication, created through the participation of the author and the "lyrical I..." The author's appeal is not only directed at the lyrical hero, it is directed at the imaginary reader or the reader of a specific time and period. Along with the real reader in real life, it will also be important for the future. Therefore, the lyrical hero has a targeted object. This means that the poem is built on the basis of dialogue" [Kenzegaraev N. 6:258], - he calls it a monodialogue.

Of course, all these processes are related to the artistic text and the driving force in it - the function of the word. Only a literary text can be a tool for such observations and conclusions. In this sense, the study of M. Bakhtin's views on the literary text and the means of creating word movement in it leads to a correct understanding of the theory of dialogue and its specifics. "Where there is no text, there is no thought and object that studies it," writes M. Bakhtin [Bakhtin M. 2:156]. According to the scientist, each text has its own subject. Therefore, it is important to interpret the

text as a way of thinking of the speaker, syllogism in the structure of the sentence, "commutations" in linguistics. In this case, the analysis and understanding of linguistic experiences between the author's subject and "another subject" plays a key role in understanding the essence of dialogue.

The significance of V. Zhirmunsky's research on the style of the lyrical work in the study of issues of poetic dialogue is unique. Most of V. Zhirmunsky's research on artistic language, speech, and style was conducted based on lyrical genres. According to his conclusion: "The construction of a poetic composition is determined not only by the systematic rhythm and stress tacts, but also by the harmonious distribution of syntactic groups in it" [Zhirmunsky V. 3:151]. If we look superficially, it seems that in V. Zhirmunsky's above conclusions, we are talking only about the linguistic features of the lyrical composition, the formal aspects of the lyrical style, and there is no talk of dialogue. However, if we pay close attention to this quotation, it becomes clear that the thought reflected in the second part of the sentence is focused on the fact that the connections between poetic texts (lines, columns, stanzas) appear not only through formal means such as rhythm and stress, but also through semantic-syntactic means. This means that the idea of the manifestation of dialogicity within the poetic text is expressed in a different form. Because the syntactic relationship, connection, and interdependence within the poetic composition, from the point of view of content, have the same characteristics as the occurrence of the dialogical relationship mentioned by M. Bakhtin within the text. According to Zhirmunsky, syntactic connections within the poetic text create the phenomenon of meaning transfer through sentences, parts of sentences, phrases in sentences, and parts of speech.

According to Uzbek happiness scholar, Professor H. Boltaboev: "At the heart of this doctrine (the doctrine of happiness is being considered) lies the concept of dialogue (Greek: диалогос - dialogos: conversation), which consists of the speech communication of the characters in the work as a component of the literary and artistic text. In a literary text, dialogue is the exchange of information in a stylistically stable verbal form, developed by the author, acquiring individuality... According to M. Bakhtin, every person is an independent subject with their own voice, worldview, and imagination. At the same time, a person exists only in communication with people, with himself, with the world" [Boltaboev H. 2:8-9].

Literary scholar U. Jurakulov, M. Bakhtin, writes about the theory of dialogue: "The novelty of M. Bakhtin's theory of dialogue lies in the fact that he revealed the

pattern of the same phenomenon occurring within a single pole based on the analysis of the work of art and the human image in it." That is, paired phenomena acquire dialogicity in a contradictory situation, and even in an isolated situation, they have an internal dialogical structure and content. In society (or in the world of a work of art), a person who has his inevitable antipode lives with his inner antipode even in a neutral state. This phenomenon is observed in the form of an internal dialogue (microdialogue) in a work of art... In any situation, in whatever form (dialogical, microdialogical, polyphonic) he communicates, he will definitely feel the image of the "other" in front of him..." [Jurakulov U. 5:75]. Based on the interpretations of two literary scholars, it can be said that this type of dialogue is important not only for the forms of communication found in epic and dramatic works, but also for revealing the laws of lyrical dialogue. At first glance, it seems that the lyrical "I" in which monologic speech is performed, lyrically expressing his feelings and attitude to reality, is in a monologic position. However, if we observe the construction and content of the lyrical speech specific to it, we see that the content of this monologic speech actually has a dialogic essence.

In our opinion, the phenomenon of dialogue observed in literary critic B. Sarimsakov's research "Ghazal-communication forms in the lyrics of Alisher Navoi" [Sarimsakov B. 8:7] also belongs to the "dramatic dialogue" type of dialogue noted by Zhirmunsky. According to the scientist, the ghazal is a new classification form of the communication ghazal genre, which is based on the features of its speech expression. A. Kozikhodzhaev's research effectively applied to Navoi's lyrics. In his article devoted to the analysis of the first ghazal in the divan "Khazoinul Maani," Navoi writes that not only one but several voices participate in the lyrical work, and the author's voice, standing in an independent position, organizes dialogical processes in the interpretation, response, and reaction state in the work [Kazikhodzhaev A. 10:4]. The dialogue between the author's voice and someone else's voice, as noted by A. Kozikhodzhaev, sometimes involves a single word, and sometimes an imperceptible gesture. Some of the views on the history and theory of dialogue are also connected to the issues of Eastern literature and classical poetics of the East, and today, with regret, it can be said that none of the Arabic sources cited by A. Kozikhodzhaev have been translated into Uzbek. Therefore, we and other researchers like us are limited to working with sources from Western and Russian scholars who have reflected on dialogue.

## CONCLUSION

Observations show that in the early stages of the

history of dialogue, it acquired a social essence. The first dialogical processes were seen as a dialogue between God and man, man and woman, father and son. Later, other manifestations of it appeared. Thus, dialogue has a real life basis as a condition for the existence of universal human life. In the next stage, dialogue moved to the level of philosophy and aesthetics. Initially, philosophical and aesthetic forms of dialogue emerged, and later interpretations formed on this basis. The first interpretations, evaluations, and relationships related to the theory of dialogue are manifested within dialogical processes, as a scientific and philosophical process.

The understanding and interpretation of the questions of the aesthetics and poetics of dialogue as a direct artistic phenomenon began to enter scientific and aesthetic works only from the 20th century. By this time, the artistic functions of dialogue in epic, lyrical, and dramatic interpretations began to be considered. At the same time, the concepts of "I" and "you," "I" and "other" were interpreted within the framework of artistic dialogue. The phenomenon of dialogue, which arose on the basis of the relationship between two subjects, played an important role. Artistic dialogue forms various forms and methods of speech communication in all literary genres, including lyrical genres, and occupies a central place in the speech processes of the work. In general, the art of words or related genres is understood as a living "speech process," "speech flow." All forms of speech have their limits. The speech boundary is defined by the "replacement of the speech subject, that is, the speaker." In the process of speech, the replacement of the speaker begins with the entry of "other" speakers or another subject of speech, which is observed in different forms in poetic speech.

## REFERENCES

- Арасту. (2018) Поэтика. Ахлоқи кабир. Риторика. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси Давлат илмий нашриёти.
- Бахтин М. (2016) Тилшунослик, филология ва бошқа гуманитар фанларда матн муаммоси (Ҳ.Болтабоев таржимаси) Филология масалалари. – Тошкент. № 4.
- Болтабоев Ҳ. (2016) XX аср адабиётшунослигида диалогизм ва Михаил Бахтиннинг адабий-эстетик таълимоти // Филология масалалари. – Тошкент. № 4.
- Жирмунский В.М. Теория стиха. – Ленинград: Сов.писатель, 1975. – 665 с.
- Жўрақулов У. (2015) Назарий поэтика масалалари. Муаллиф. Жанр. Хронотоп. – Тошкент: Ғафур Ғулом номидаги нашриёт-матбаа ижодий уйи.

Кенжеғараев Н. (2011) Абай лирикаларындағы монодиалог түрлері // Вестник КазНУ. – Алматы. № 2 (132).

Макарова И. (2023) “Народная мудрость” в диалоге Аристотеля “О философии” // Национальный исследовательский университет “Высшая школа экономики”. Платоновские исследования / Platonic Investigations 18.1  
<https://publications.hse.ru/pubs/share/direct/849439172>.

Саримсоқов Б. (2004) Алишер Навоий лирикасида ғазал-мулоқот шакллари // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент. № 2.

Словарь литературоведческих терминов. (1974) – Москва: Просвещение.

Қозихўжаев А. (2009) Ғазалнинг серовоз олами // Ўзбекистон адабиёти ва санъати. – Тошкент. № 49.