

Conflict dialogue as a scientific phenomenon and its english-russian translation

Elizaveta A .Sergeeva, Tamara I. Leontieva

Vladivostok State University of Economics, Russia

Student, Professor

E-mail: Elizaveta.Sergeeva@mail.ru, tamara.leontieva@gmail.com

Abstract: *The notion of "conflict" is part of a great number of language cultures, it is studied by different sciences. Pragmatics regards it within the frames of communication, namely, the theory of speech act, psycholinguistics is interested in conflict generation in speech, psychology investigates the reasons why conflicts appear at all, linguists research the verbal ways of expressing conflict interaction in dialogues or polylogues. The aim of this article is to find universal typified signals of conflict communication and survey their linguistic manifestation in English and in Russian. Difficulties in translating conflict dialogues and polylogues arise in connection with the differences in English and Russian mentalities, i.e. the attitude to the reasons for conflicts, the character of conflicts, the abilities to overcome them, actually all that is different, that is why the ways of expressing typical signals of conflicts in the two languages vary thus enlarging our linguistic competence. English-Russian comparative analysis is presented on the example of the play by J.B.Priestley "Time and the Conways".*

Keywords: *speech act, addressee, interlocutor, illocution, perlocution, communicative intention, presupposition, pre-communication phase, post-communication phase, break in communication, communicative failure, cognitive space, the effect of disparity, sociocultural stereotypes, conflict dialogue, conflict interaction.*

INTRODUCTION

Humanity has worked out a lot of ways of communication among which there are several varieties of dialogical interaction: everyday conversation, business talk, interview, questioning, interrogation, negotiations and many others [1]. Suffice it to say that these forms are defined by the aims and objectives of the dialogue or, to put it in other terms, the illocutions of the members of communication. More than that, the communicants act within the frames of a certain culture and in connection with the established rules of communication. And yet, in the course of a conversation conflicts may arise as a result of differences in the outlook of the interlocutors, their opinions or emotional state. Do the communicants try to stick to the conventional norms in such a case and only imply their displeasure with somebody else's views or do they show their aggressiveness openly and resort to threats? How does it happen within different nations? Do they all react somebody's irony or desire to insult in the same way? Are the signals of a conflict analogous in different cultures? What are their linguistic forms? To answer all these questions it is advisable to begin with the characteristics of a dialogue as a speech act.

THE NOTION OF A DIALOGUE AND ITS DEFINITION

In a narrow sense as a form of communication a dialogue is a form of speech in which every utterance is addressed to an interlocutor and is limited by the theme of the conversation [2]. This definition points out the most important side of the organization of a dialogue: the presence of the addressee, the common topic of the conversation, colloquial character of communication. But in the 1990s the definition of the dialogue became somewhat wider. A dialogue or dialogical speech is defined as a type of speech, consisting of the exchange of utterances, the linguistic part of which is influenced by the immediate reaction of the interlocutor, and both the speaker and the addressee are stimulated by each other. Contextual (question/answer,

agreement/disagreement) and structural connection between the utterances are typical for a dialogue [3]. As one can see this definition takes into consideration not only the presence of the addresser and the addressee, the formal and semantic unity of utterances but also the formation of the addressee's reaction under the influence of the addresser.

Dialogue as a form of speech has been studied by the leading linguists of Russia. The basic rules of it are as follows: 1 Dialogue is the form of language existence, it is connected with its social

nature and communicative function. 2 Dialogical interaction is a form of human speech activity. 3 Speech communication in the form of a dialogue is a special embodiment of the language in its specific forms, a certain speech structure.

Thus the three aspects of the language: social, communicative, and dialogical actually point to the mutual relations of the two realities - language and speech [4].

Dialogical speech is a phenomenon of colloquial speech, and as such can represent a request (for new information, or for a certain action); an order; a simple question; an exclamation - the theory of speech acts tells us a lot about it [3].

In connection with the principles of speech communication there can be two distinct types of speech interaction: cooperation and confrontation, i.e. the interlocutors' opinions either coincide or demonstrate conflicting differences. These opposing types are reflected in two models of dialogue: cooperative and conflicting.

WHAT IS A CONFLICT DIALOGUE?

A conflict dialogue is a speech act and, correspondingly, it is studied within the theory of speech acts, a part of linguistic pragmatics. Since a speech act is a kind of action it is characterized by the aim, means, results. To be a success the speech act must be relevant, otherwise the speaker faces a communicative failure.

In linguistics, the term "conflict" is studied as an expanded term "speech conflict" or even "conflict communicative act". It surveys the positions of the participants: the addresser and the addressee as well as contradictions between them. Speech conflict is the state of confrontation of the two sides in which process each side consciously and persistently acts with the view to destroy the counterpart by explicit verbal and pragmatic means. It should be noted that the linguistic expression of conflict relations between the subjects of the communicative act reflects certain pre-communication state of the sides. So a speech conflict develops in time, consequently, it has its beginning, development, culmination, and solution. The explication of the contradictions between the interlocutors is taking place mostly on verbal and speech levels, that is why it is extremely important to study speech behavior of the participants from the point of view of means and ways of expressing the contradictions formed in the pre-communication phase of the conflict development. The result of the conflict relationship may be different, so it becomes substantial to study the outcome of the conflict interaction, i.e. post-communication state of its participants [5].

Speech conflict wholly answers the requirements of a speech act by its reciprocal exchange of utterances made by the principle of illocutionary compulsion. According to RJakobson and other scholars the term "conflict communicative act" has the right to exist and its study takes into consideration its pragmatic nature including social roles, relations between the communicants and other factors [6]. The entire picture of the conflict communicative act requires three approaches: cognitive, pragmatic and linguo-cultural.

HOW DOES A CONFLICT DIALOGUE ARISE?

A dialogue obtains a conflict character when communication fails. E. Shiryayev defines "communicative failures" as the break of the communicative aim or, to put it wider, the break of the pragmatic purposes of the addresser, the absence of understanding between the communicants. It is only natural to assume that both linguistic and extralinguistic processes are involved in this phenomenon [7]. So one should look for the reasons of communicative failures in different spheres: social-cultural stereotypes of the communicants, their background knowledge, differences of their communicative competence, the psychology of sex, age, and individual traits.

A conflict dialogue often arises from the differences in the outlook and is defined by the factor of cognitive dissonance. Besides it can appear on the base of communication contact: no contact - no conflict [8].

The most important issue in understanding the theory of a conflict is comprehension and evaluation of its nature. The latter is connected with understanding the nature of a human being himself: what is leading in him - individual or social? According to M. Kagan, there is dialectal unity in the nature of a conflict of both inner (personal, individual) and exterior (social) factors. He

points out two parameters characterizing the reasons and character of conflicts. The first parameter is connected with the participants of the conflict, their behavior stimulated by a whole gamut of exterior (social) and inner (psychological) factors. Social factors include norms and traditions of a certain culture, schemes of speech behavior adopted in it, performance of social roles, defined by the social status, profession, national belonging. The inner factors are stipulated by the personal qualities of the interlocutors (psychological and communicative), their interests, intentions and opinions [8].

The second parameter is differentiation between language and speech. Language is the code common for the whole nation speaking the given language. Speech is quite different. It is individual, it depends on the performer, his/her language resources and creativity. In both language and speech there are traits which may lead to misunderstanding or even conflict, The type of speech act is judged by its result. Communication can be of two types: effective and non-effective. The latter means that the illocutionary aim may be achieved by the speaker if his intention is to insult or offend the interlocutor after which communication stops. This is the violation of "cooperative principle" of communication [9]. This idea is supported by R.Milrud who writes about politeness and impoliteness in communication. Politeness is employed to show awareness of another person's situation. Impoliteness can be interpreted as a face threatening act.

A great deal of what is communicated is determined by the social relationships of the participants. A fixed concept of communication is politeness as an indication of etiquette within a culture. Politeness can include being tactful, generous, modest or sympathetic towards each other. Politeness is the means of communication that is employed to show awareness of another person's situation Impoliteness can be interpreted as a face threatening act [10]. An impolite speech act is confrontation, i.e. one-sided or two-sided failure in confirming mutual expectations of the partners. In general, according to convention principle, the feeling of antipathy or anger must be concealed, and disagreement should be verbalized in a polite form. In conflict interaction though confrontation takes place with the break of all norms, convention principles, rules of behavior.

The verbal behavior of interlocutors wholly depends on their personal traits. For the sake of this research we can divide people into three types of individuals: 1) those having the intention of creating a conflict situation; 2) those whose tendency is to delete the conflict; 3) the people working for mutual understanding and cooperation.

When the dialogue acquires a conflict character one of the members of communication uses the following tactics: negative means of stimulating the partner's speech, domination in the conversation, concentration on his/her own utterance, calling the partner unpleasant names, using direct or indirect insults, employing the words with negative evaluating meanings, resorting to the strategy of discriminating the interlocutor, practicing aggressive intonation and violating conventional rules of conducting a dialogue [9]. As can be seen from the above mentioned tactics, conflict interaction involves verbal and non-verbal means of leading the dialogue to a failure.

In translating a conflict dialogue from one language to another we have to consider a lot of factors and find out how the universality of speech interaction is actualized in dialogues taken from specific languages, in our case in English and in Russian and what linguistic means provide the signals of conflict in these two languages.

REASONS OF COMMUNICATIVE FAILURES

In this part of the article we would like to allude to the classification of communicative failures offered by E.I.Shiryaev [7], it seems rather convincing because it illustrates the author's ability to display those reasons on the material of real life and literary works. They are very important for our future discourse.

The first one is called by him *cognitive dissonance* which is explained by people's belonging to different social layers. The author relied on the notion of "cognitive environment" introduced by D. Sperber and D.Wilson according to whom people may become antipodes if they are reared in different social environments [11]. The first form of its realization in a dialogue is intentional ignoring the same physical surrounding. The second may be qualified as holding the communicative

initiative in one's hands for a negative influence on the interlocutor. The speaker does not allow his "victim" to avoid the theme of the conversation in a natural way. A fight - that is what he wants, because his arguments are exhausted. The third one may be called as violation of sincerity principle and thus forcing a partner for the continuation of the dialogue. Shiryayev quite correctly calls it the break of the cooperative principle as one of the interlocutors dominates over the other, actually turning the dialogue into a monologue. The fourth is the effect of disparity. It appears when the partner uses the words which seem insulting to his opponent. The reason of disparity may be the difference in presupposition, i.e. one interlocutor considers the fact positive while the other treats it quite negatively. Disparity may take the form of an irrelevant remark towards the partner's words or actions or character which is again the violation of cooperative principle. Sometimes non-equivalence is caused by the inability of the speaker to understand the state of mind of the counterpart, e.g. the speaker's talkative mood may be irritating but the speaker is so involved in it that does not notice anything around himself. Such speech is irrelevant. The fifth is the intentional usage of insults or even threats. Sometimes pronouns and other determiners may play a specific role to injure a person morally, to distress him.

One more reason for the failure of the conversation is the so-called ritualization of speech. The communicative aim will not be achieved if the interlocutors speak in such a way that sincerity is not felt, sincere words are replaced by clichés and a casual choice of words.

The conflict strategies enumerated above and the means of their realization are not complete of course. Only a long and thorough investigation will enlarge the list and enrich the linguistic competence of language learners. We will make our contribution by analyzing conflict dialogues in a work of drama.

CONFLICT DIALOGUE ANALYSIS IN J.B. PRIESTLEY'S PLAY "TIME AND THE CONWAYS"

Now let us illustrate how the universality of conflict tactics is expressed in English and in Russian. J.B. Priestley's play "Time and the Conways" [12] was analyzed with the view to studying the examples of conflict dialogues or polylogues, followed with the definitions of the reasons of communicative failures and comparison of linguistic means of the two languages.

The composition of the play is very peculiar. The author in Act I places his characters in the year 1919 and makes them build fantastic plans for the future. In Act II he carries them 19 years forward, shows the inconsistency of all their dreams and in Act III brings them back to the year 1919. It is essential to mention the great role of the author's remarks in the play. They are illustrative of not only the time and place and furniture but also the mood of the characters and their inner world.

1. Hazel: I don't think mother would mind - now.

Carol: Yes she would. And I know I would. I don't want anybody to dress up and be funny in the coat father wore just before he was drowned. (*She has now folded the coat, and puts it on the window seat. Then, as she returns.*) I wonder if it's very horrible being drowned.

Hazel (*impatiently*): Oh, don't start that all over again, Carol. Don't you remember how you used to be asking that - until mother was furious?

Carol: Yes - but I was only a kid then.

Hazel: Well, now that you think you aren't a kid any longer, just stop it.

Хейзл: Я думаю, мама теперь уже не расстроится.

Кэрол: Нет, расстроится. Я бы расстроил. Мне вовсе не хочется, чтобы кто-то смеялся ради надела куртку, в которой был папа перед тем, как утонул. (*Аккуратно складывает куртку, кладет на кушетку у окна. Возвращается на середину комнаты.*) Хотела бы я знать, очень это страшно - утонуть?

Хейзл (*с досадой*): Ох, не заводи это о сначала, Кэрол. Неужели не помнишь, ты без ко про это спрашивала и совсем вывела маму терпенье.

Кэрол: Помню... но тогда я была малень reasons for conflicts. Psychology teaches us how to avoid conflict situations. Pragmatics deals with conflict speech acts and speech events.

Linguistics and the science of translation help us see the universal character of conflict dialogues and different ways of expressing them in English and in Russian. Conflict dialogue as a linguistic phenomenon demands a very careful attitude of the translator to its reasons and implied thoughts of the interlocutors.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Goyhman O.Ya. 2005. Speech Communication. Infra, M.
- [2]. Akhmanova O.S. 2007. The Dictionary of Linguistic Terms. KomKniga, M. [3]. Yartseva V.N. 1990. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. Sovetskaya Encyclopedia, M.
- [4]. Kozhina M.N. 1986. On Dialogical Character of Written Speech. Progress, M.
- [5]. Romanov A.A. 1988. Systemic Analysis of Regulatory Means of Dialogical Communication. FL AS USSR, M.
- [6]. Jacobson R.O. 1985. Speech Communication. Progress, M.
- [7]. Shiryayev E.I. 2005. The Culture of Russian Speech. Norma, M.
- [8]. Kagan M.S. 1988. The World of Communication: Problems of Relations of Individuals. Poitizdat, M. [9]. Grice G.V. 1985. Logics and Speech Communication. *New Studies of Linguistics Abroad*. Progress, M.
- [10]. Milrud R.P. 2005. Introduction in Linguistics. Drofa, M.
- [11]. Sperber D., Wilson D. 1995. Relevance. Blackwell, Oxford.
- [12]. J.B.Priestley. 1997. Time and the Conways. Translated by F. Gutiev and N. Samuelian. Manager, M.