



Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of The Linguistic Study of Monologue

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITTED 30 August 2025
ACCEPTED 24 September 2025
PUBLISHED 31 October 2025
VOLUME Vol.05 Issue10 2025

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 License.

Ikromova Gulhida Ahmadillo kizi

Senior Lecturer, Fergana State University, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This study provides a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic, communicative, and semiotic features of the dramatic monologue. As a complex form of character speech, the dramatic monologue serves not only to express inner experiences but also to develop dramatic action, deepen conflict, and directly influence the audience or reader. The paper examines the relationship between monologue and dialogue, highlighting its hidden dialogic nature and orientation toward an addressee. It also analyzes the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics of monologue, particularly psychological states expressed through modality, ellipsis, rhetorical questions, and pauses. Based on approaches in world and Uzbek linguistics and literary studies (Bakhtin, Galperin, Pfister, and others), the study reveals the multilayered and polysystemic nature of the dramatic monologue. As a result, the dramatic monologue is interpreted as an essential component of dramatic discourse and as a psycholinguistic and linguopoetic phenomenon.

Keywords: Dramatic monologue, dramatic discourse, dialogism, inner speech, communicative unit, linguopoetics, modality, syntactic construction, psychological state, semiotics, speech acts, artistic speech.

Introduction: It is well known that in a dramatic work, the monologue is one of the most complex and functionally multilayered forms of character speech and is considered an important semantic element of dramatic action. Unlike monologue in epic works, the dramatic monologue not only expresses a character's

inner experiences but also activates the stage situation, deepens conflict, and exerts a direct communicative impact on the audience or reader. Therefore, it is important to study the dramatic monologue not merely as a literary phenomenon, but as a linguistic-communicative unit.

The dramatic monologue is interpreted as a form of artistic speech within the dramatic text and is one of the key elements defining the specificity of drama poetics. In prose, monologue is often closely connected with the author's speech or the narrator's discourse, whereas in dramatic texts it is expressed directly through the character's speech without authorial mediation. In other words, in a dramatic monologue, reality is not narrated but unfolds through the process of speech. From this perspective, the dramatic monologue is not a unit opposed to dialogue, but rather a form of speech that operates alongside dialogue within the dramatic text, possessing its own linguistic and pragmatic load.

In modern linguistics, literary theory, and theater semiotics, the dramatic monologue is treated as a multifaceted speech phenomenon studied at the intersection of various disciplines. This multidimensional approach reflects the complex, multilayered, and polysystemic nature of the dramatic monologue itself. First of all, within M. Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, the monologue is not regarded as an entirely independent form of speech, but as a manifestation of dialogic thinking. According to Bakhtin, any monologue implicitly contains other voices, opposing positions, and perspectives; therefore, it is not "single-voiced" but possesses an internal dialogic force. He views the monologue as a structure that concentrates polyphony into a single point, emphasizing that the speech autonomy of a character is conditional, since the subject of the monologue is always influenced by prior contexts, social discourses, and the speech of other characters. This approach expands the semantic layers of the monologue and reveals its internal complexity and subtextual dialogic field.

I. R. Galperin connects the monologue with the logical-compositional integrity of the text, showing that theme-rheme relations, lexical repetitions, parallel syntactic constructions, and phraseological units ensure its internal coherence. Z. Y. Turayeva links the monologue to the linguopoetic features of the text, analyzing semantic development, logical sequence, and compositional centers. According to these scholars, the monologue is not merely a stage element of the dramatic text, but also an independent object of textual study.

The linguistic features of the dramatic monologue are primarily determined by its orientation toward an addressee. Although formally it is a single-speaker form, it always presupposes an explicit or implicit addressee—another character on stage, the audience, or the reader. Therefore, from a communicative perspective, it is considered a "pseudo-monologic" form. Despite having one speaker, the communicative situation retains a dialogic character. Syntactically, dramatic monologue is often characterized by ellipsis, repetition, rhetorical questions, and pauses, which serve to express the character's psychological state, inner conflict, and emotional tension. Prosodically, it is enriched by intonation, stress, timbre, and pauses, transforming it from a purely linguistic unit into stage speech.

In linguistics and literary studies, the dramatic monologue has been examined from various perspectives. M. H. Abrams defines it as a form of speech delivered by a single character that implicitly presupposes a listener. R. Langbaum considers it a poetic form that reveals a character's intentions directly through speech. M. Pfister interprets it as an internal communicative mechanism of the dramatic text, emphasizing its connection with stage action.

Within theater and drama semiotics, Keir Elam explains the dramatic monologue as a point of intersection between verbal and nonverbal signs, arguing that it forms a unified whole with movement, space, and time on stage. Ann Ubersfeld, in turn, views it as a complex form situated between reading and performance, where subtext and implicit meanings play a crucial role.

To better understand its linguistic nature, the dramatic monologue should be examined within the framework of dramatic discourse—a complex system where speech exchange, stage situation, space, time, and communicative intentions intersect. In this system, the dramatic monologue appears as a highly concentrated form of character speech, embodying a significant portion of dramatic conflict and ideological meaning. It often occurs at climactic moments, revealing the character's inner contradictions, moral choices, or psychological crises. Thus, it is not only a speech unit but also a psycholinguistic phenomenon that deepens dramatic action. Through monologue, the audience perceives the dramatic situation not through external actions but through internal thought processes.

Modality plays a central role in the linguistic structure of dramatic monologue, expressing the character's attitudes, judgments, doubts, and beliefs through modal words, verb tenses, conditional forms, and negation. As noted by Leech and Short, modal elements are key tools for depicting psychological states, especially in situations of doubt and inner conflict.

Syntactically, dramatic monologue includes both complete grammatical structures and incomplete sentences, reflecting the discontinuous and often chaotic flow of thought, which distinguishes it from the more structured syntax of epic narration.

From a pragmatic perspective, the dramatic monologue can be analyzed through speech act theory, incorporating various illocutionary acts such as assertion, command, request, threat, and self-justification. Therefore, it is a polyfunctional speech unit, where the character may simultaneously address themselves, influence another character, and communicate implicitly with the audience. From a narratological perspective, it partially fulfills a narrative function, compensating for the absence of a narrator in drama by conveying events, temporal shifts, and causal relationships.

In Uzbek linguistics and literary studies, monologue has been studied in relation to speech types, artistic structure, and psychological representation. Scholars emphasize that monologue is not merely a speech form but a complex linguopoetic phenomenon that reveals the character's inner world. D. Quronov highlights its role in uncovering internal experience rather than advancing external action. Other researchers, such as T. Boboyev and I. Sulton, view it as a key means of character development, while M. Yuldoshev analyzes it as a stylistic form of artistic speech.

Studies in Uzbek linguistics show that monologic speech has a multilayered structure, characterized by syntactic coherence, semantic density, and lexical selection. In particular, inner monologue often features condensed and emotionally charged language, reflecting the cognitive processes of the character. Thus, monologic speech is seen as a complex linguistic unit expressing the relationship between language and thought.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the dramatic monologue is a complex and multilayered linguistic, communicative, and semiotic phenomenon that plays a crucial role in revealing a character's inner world, deepening conflict, and advancing stage action. It functions not in isolation from dialogue but in close interaction with it, forming an integral part of dramatic discourse. Its linguistic structure reflects psychological states, inner contradictions, and emotional intensity. Although formally monologic, it is communicatively dialogic due to its orientation toward an addressee. Various linguistic, literary, and semiotic approaches demonstrate its significance both within the text and in stage performance. Therefore, the analysis of

dramatic monologue is essential for understanding the semantic, aesthetic, and communicative integrity of a dramatic work.

REFERENCES

1. Abrams M. H., Harpham G. A glossary of literary terms. – 10th ed. – Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, 2015. – 432 p.
2. Abrams M. H., Harpham G. A glossary of literary terms. – 11th ed. – Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, 2015. – 70 p.
3. Baldick C. The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms. – 4th ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. – 416 p.
4. Boboyev T. A. Adabiyotshunoslikka kirish. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1979.
5. Cuddon J. A. The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory. – 4th ed. – London: Penguin Books, 2000. – 1014 p.
6. Elam K. The semiotics of theatre and drama. – London: Methuen, 1980. – 112 p.
7. Langbaum R. The poetry of experience: The dramatic monologue in modern literary tradition. – London: Chatto and Windus, 1957. – 134 p.
8. Leech G., Short M. Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose. – 2nd ed. – Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2007.
9. Pfister M. The theory and analysis of drama (J. Halliday, Trans.). – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. – 233 p.
10. Prince G. A dictionary of narratology. – Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2003. – 34 p.
11. Quronov D. Adabiyotshunoslik nazariyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2018.
12. Shoimova F. The methodology for instructing foreign monologue speaking // Samarali ta'lim va barqaror innovatsiyalar jurnali. – Toshkent, 2025.
13. Ubersfeld A. Reading theatre (F. Pavis, Trans.). – Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
14. Yo'ldoshev M. Badiiy matn va uning lingvopoetik tahlili. – Toshkent: Fan, 2008.
15. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества. – М.: Искусство, 1979. – 424 с.
16. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. – М.: Наука, 1981. – 138 с.
17. Тураева З. Я. Лингвистика текста. – М.: Просвещение, 1986. – 127 с.