

*Eccles* (from the Latin *ecclesia*, i.e. *chester/ ceaster*), *Manchester, Lancashire, Chester, Cheshire, etc.* In 1807, Washington Irving, in his short story collection *Salmagundi*, compared the Village of Fools to New York City, from which time the word “*Gotham*” became one of his nicknames. “*The Suffrage State*” – Wyoming; “*the Battleground of Freedom*” – Kansas; “*Battle-Born State*” – Nevada. These nicknames well reflect the events that were decisive in determining the names of the states.

**Conclusion.** The research has shown that there is a large number of English phraseological units associated with historical events, personalities and processes. Idioms reflect national and cultural characteristics of people. Learning idioms enhances understanding native speakers and their culture and promotes the development of students’ sociocultural competence.

1. Danich, O.V. Normative picture of the world in the mirror of phraseology (based on the material of the Belarusian and Russian languages) / O.V. Danich // Language and mentality in diachrony: collection of scientific papers of the III All-Russian Scientific Seminar with international participation for young scientists, Vladimir, September 28–30, 2021 – Vladimir: Vladimir State University named after Alexander Grigorievich and Nikolai Grigorievich Stoletov, 2022. – P. 161–164. – URL: <https://rep.vsu.by/handle/123456789/33808> (Date of access: 05.11.2022).

2. Collins, C. Dictionary of idioms / C. Collins. – London: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd., 1995. – P. 513.

3. Idioms in English [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <https://skysmart.ru/articles/russian/frazeologizm>. – Date of access: 27.10.2022.

4. Kunin, A.V. English-Russian phraseological dictionary / A.V. Kunin. – Moscow: Drofa, 2005. – P. 944.

5. Zagryadskaya, N.A. The formation of phraseological competence of the future historian as an element of teaching foreign language professional communication / N.A. Zagryadskaya // The World of Science, Culture, Education. – №2 (57). – 2016. – P. 209–211.

### **SOME PECULIARITIES OF THE DIALOGUE DEVELOPMENT IN THE PLAY BY J. BUTTERWORTH “THE RIVER”**

**Kristina Tolkacheva**

VSU named after P. M. Masherov, Vitebsk, Belarus

Keywords: dialogue, dialogue type, dialogical unity, one-sided dialogue, semantic, structural and communicative coherence.

As an act of social-speech interaction dialogue has been widely analyzed and different classifications of dialogue types have been introduced so far by many Russian and foreign linguists as: I. Zaizeva [1], G. Ipsen, D. Crystal, W. Franke, G. Leech and others [2].

Nevertheless, artistic dialogues in British plays, particularly in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century are barely examined. This fact determines the relevance of the material under discussion – one of the comparatively modern plays by J. Butterworth “The River” published in 2012 [3] and that was also performed at the Royal Court Theatre Upstairs, London where it got good reviews. The purpose of the article is to define the dialogue type by analyzing semantic, structural and communicative peculiarities in the dialogue.

**Material and methods.** The material for the research is a dialogue in the mentioned play. In accordance with the aim set in the work, the main methods used in the study are: observation, generalization, semantic structure analysis, compositional analysis.

**Findings and their discussion.** Dialogue is a speech form, characterized by exchange of utterances of 2 or several participants and direct connection of these utterances with the present situation [4]. The analysis of communicants' utterances, called lines is advisable to conduct within a dialogical unity – the notion, representing a structural and semantic unit, consisting of 3 or more components of different communicants, adjusting to the center and characterized by semantic, structural and communicative coherence [5, p. 27]. The analysis of the participants' lines in the dialogical unity enables us to see the contribution of each person to the theme development more clearly, which in its turn makes it possible to specify the dialogue type according to the classification by M. Blokh, S. Polyakov, who classified the dialogues on the basis of the type of comments in the response line and distinguished active, one-sided and quasi dialogues [5, p. 40–41].

In the play under consideration we will analyze the dialogue between 2 characters, presented by the playwright as the Man and the Woman. Taking into account a limited amount of the publication, we will present one of the dialogical unities singled out in the dialogue on the basis of semantic, structural and communicative coherence:

THE WOMAN. There's a pair of gold earrings in the soap dish. Next to the soap. Silence.

THE MAN. Okay –

THE WOMAN. You don't have to say anything. Really. It's none of my business. I mean –

THE MAN. Listen –

THE WOMAN. It's no big deal.

THE MAN. Sit down. Please –

THE WOMAN. After all, we're both adults. We can be honest with each other. Can't we? I mean, can't we?

Silence.

Today on the beach, you were teaching me to cast. And I asked you, as a joke, I think... just being silly, who knows why, I asked how many other women you'd brought here. To this place. And you went quiet. You picked up a stone. So for fun, or for some other reason, some deadly serious reason, or just playing, who knows, I said come on, give me a number. I don't know why. I mean what does it matter? If I'm the third, fourth, seventh, eighth. What difference does it make? (Beat.) But I asked. (Beat.)

And you looked me straight in the eye and said do you really want to know?

And it all went silent out there on the beach and the sea was coming in I looked back at you and I was suddenly afraid. I suddenly, desperately, urgently didn't want to know. But I said yes. Tell me. (Pause.) And you told me. (Beat.) And I said come on. In all these years. Come off it. I wasn't born yesterday. (Beat.) And you said it's true. (Beat.) Afterwards, in this room we made love. When it was over, you said something. You told me something. Words which completely surprised me and scared me. And I've thought of nothing else since.

THE MAN. Yes.

THE WOMAN. You said you loved me. You said 'I love you'.

THE MAN. Yes.

Pause.

THE WOMAN. This morning you said you came to the river, and you watched me dive in the water. You said it was the most honest thing you'd ever seen and you realised you had to be as honest and truthful as that moment.

THE MAN. Yes.

THE WOMAN. That you would always try to be that.

THE MAN. Yes.

THE WOMAN. Hanging in the cupboard next door is a dress. A scarlet dress.

Under the bed, in the box there's a framed picture. A drawing of a woman. She's sitting there in that chair. She's wearing a scarlet dress. The woman in the picture. Her face has been scratched out.

Silence.

Why is her face scratched out? (Pause.) Why is her dress still here? [3, p. 42–44].

In the dialogue, consisting of 15 lines the initiative of the conversation belongs to the woman, who wants to know the owner of a pair of gold earrings found in the bathroom. Her communicative intention to find out the information is expressed implicitly and explicitly in all her lines. The anxiety caused by the finding is revealed in her 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> lines in which she interrupts the interlocutor, which is identified in the text by a symbol (–), indicated by the playwright in the beginning of the play as interrupted speech. The Man's tactics in the first 3 lines is a failed attempt to calm down the woman.

Analyzing the lines of the both communicants it should be noted that the woman's lines far more exceed the man's lines in size. The theme development happens only in the woman's lines. The man's lines don't transmit any relevant information, but they are included in the general semantic of the dialogical unity and have a retrospective communicative direction to the woman's previous utterances in the form of the expression of his attitude to the given information. This allows us to talk about the presence of the semantic coherence in the analyzing lines.

The semantic coherence is accompanied by the structural one as there is a constant reaction of the addressee to the woman's narrative lines: the Man's first 3 lines express his attempt to speak, the rest of the lines – his consent with the Woman (yes – 4 times).

**Conclusion.** Having analyzed the lines of the both characters, we can state that all theme development happens only in the utterances of one communicant, while the role of the interlocutor comes down to the expressiveness of modal reactions, mostly to the simple confirmation of the received information. This conclusion allows us to define this dialogue as a one-sided dialogue.

1. Zaitseva, I.P. Modern dramaturgical speech: structure, semantics, stylistics: autoref. diss. ... Doctor of Philology: 10.02.01 / I.P. Zaitseva. – Moscow, 2002. – P. 35. URL: <https://rep.vsu.by/handle/123456789/33838> (date of access: 05.11.2022).

2. Babayan, V.N. Main classifications of dialogues and dialogical statements of replicas / V. N. Babayan, S. L. Kruglova // Bulletin of N.A. Nekrasov KSU. – 2016. – № 3. – P. 155–159.

3. Butterworth, J. The River / J. Butterworth. – London: Nick Hern Books Limited, 2012. – P. 57.

4. Russian language. Encyclopedia / edited by F.P. Filin. – M.: The Soviet Encyclopedia, 1979. – P. 432.

5. Blokh, M. Y. The structure of dialogic speech / M. Y. Blokh, S. M. Polyakov. – Moscow: Prometheus, 1992. – P. 153.