

Dialogic – On the Dialogue Structure – An Introductory Revision of Eugeniusz Czaplejewicz Proposal

Robert Boroch

Department of Intercultural Studies in Central-Eastern Europe, Applied Linguistic Faculty, Warsaw University,
Szturmowa 4, 02-678 Warszawa, Poland
*Corresponding Author: rboroch@uw.edu.pl

Copyright © 2015 Horizon Research Publishing All rights reserved.

Abstract The article attempts to define properties of the smallest significant unit of a dialogue process in light of dialogic theory. In view of that, dialogue structure (dialogue retort and semantic deposit of a dialogue retort) has been investigated regarding its dynamic factor (feedback as a dynamising factor). Thus, dynamic element is understood in the article as a procedure: (1) [(A) → (B) → (feedback)] (2) [(A) → (B) → (feedback)] (3) [(A) → (reception) → (B_n) → (feedback)] *Desired reaction of B* (4) [(B) → (reception) → (A) → (feedback)]. Therefore, a dramatic dialogue must take the form of the following relation [(A) \mathbb{R} (B)], where A and B constitute the space of relation: $A \mathbb{R}_B$.

Keywords Dialogic, Theory of Dialogue, Structure of Dialogue, Semantic Deposit, Theory of Communicability

The above-mentioned division does not exhaust particular theoretical issue; still, it comes from the methodological pragmatism focused on the broadest approach possible [1].

Mentioning a specific object of cognition within the theoretical categories, involves the necessity of giving an abstract definition of an "object of theorising" and establishing the methodology of "theorizing" to the extent allowing for formulating rational descriptive and explanatory opinions. This seemingly obvious criterion turns out to be difficult to put into practice with traditional methods since it requires taking into consideration both "duality of drama"; that is, a literary element, and the included element of a show projection (resp. a stage play) [2]. One should understand that "duality of a dramatic work" may lead to epistemological misunderstandings since "duality of drama" is based simultaneously on its literary and theatrical nature. However, one can see fundamental differences here, which concern the method of existence of drama as a literary work designed for reader's perception, and a stage performance created according to a "literary script" and intended for spectator's perception (resp. audiovisual perception), where a dramatic story is both told and shown.

In the case of reader's perception, drama should be treated only as a literary work; here, a dramatic story is told by means of a specially formed language code – a dialogue. In the case of spectator's perception, drama should be treated as an independent (resp. autonomous) (theatrical) work. At this point, a dramatic story is told and shown by means of particular language and theatre codes. In both cases, an ontological contact point is dialogic [3]. Polish scholar Eugeniusz Czaplejewicz has proposed elementary scheme of dialogic.

In this paper, I examine the structure of a dialogue from Czaplejewicz stand. Along with, I try to bring attention to dialogue retort as well as semantic deposit (SD) as an important factor of the dialogic process in drama. In this view, Czaplejewicz proposal must be treated as rudimentary contribution to the field of study of a drama dialogue.

Czaplejewicz idea has not been given a closer critical look in Polish scientific literature. Thus, the principal aim of this

1. Introduction

The 20th century theory of literature, in its theoretical reflection on a dramatic work (*resp.* drama), has not managed to solve unequivocally the epistemic problem concerning a way of its cognition as: a) a literary work; or b) a theatrical work; or syncretic combination of these two.

The following four theoretical approaches crystallised on the basis of academic debates taking place in Poland in the second half of the 20th century:

- Literary theory of drama — treats drama as a literary work solely, recognising its object of cognition as a text;
- Theatrical theory of drama — gives drama full autonomy, recognising it as an independent piece of art; the object of cognition is a stage performance;
- Utraquistic theory — attempts to show common points of the two first proposals; when recognising a stage performance, a researcher focuses mainly on a dramatic text;
- Theory of intersemiotic translation — recoding meanings of the particular units of different linguistic systems (the semiotic approach).

paper is to recall this proposal as well as provide some critical remarks towards structure of a dramatic dialogue.

2. Theories of Dialogue –Dialogics

In the 20th century, the object of cognition of both the theory of drama and the theory of theatre became secondary meanings coded in a text; here, the notion of a text is understood according to the narrow approach (**linguistic**) and the broad approach (**semiotic vel. semiological**):

- a) Narrow understanding of a text (linguistic) means treating a text as an organized system of linguistic signs of specific properties [4];
- b) Broad understanding of a text (semiotic vel. semiological) means treating a text as an organised system of signs of a particular reference sequence [5].

The theory of drama uses the narrow understanding of a text while the theory of theatre uses the broad understanding of a text. An ontic characteristic feature of these notions is communicability.

The essence of a work of dramatic and theatrical art is communicability included in the work's structure, which has a potential of communicating something to someone.

Communicability of a literary work is understood here as relation process \mathbb{R} , joining a way in which something is communicated; to whom it is communicated and the contents of communication [6]. These items collectively constitute dialogic.

Formulating hypotheses concerning the structure of dialogue logically results from the postulates of dialogic; that is, a domain of knowledge referring to the theory of dialogue.

Below, one can find the division of the theory of dialogue established within the frameworks of dialogic by Czaplejewicz:

- a) Formal theory — distinguishes a dialogue on the basis of a number of people or characters speaking in a literary work;
- b) Formalistic theory — a dialogue is a language structure which appears in other forms of utterance;
- c) Thematic theory — is based on "editing" and "developing" a subject, e.g. dramas by Chekhov;
- d) Semantic theory — contrasting "I" with "you"; that is, using different grammatical forms;
- e) Neo-idealistic theories — "speaking while speaking"; that is, during a dialogue speech (level I), there is other dialogue taking place "inside" the character (level II);
- f) Ideological theories — a clash between different points of view;
- g) Functional theories – presenting a lively exchange of thoughts in a dialogue during particular circumstances (a dramatic situation);
- h) Pragmatic theories – joining ideological and functional theories together [7 p. 16-19].

The stance of Czaplejewicz is a particular approach to a

dialogue as a category present both in a literary work and in a stage performance, which; according to the researcher, is confirmed by functional theories of a dialogue.

3. Structure of a Dialogue

3.1. Dialogue Structure

The following understanding of a dialogue process in drama is assumed after Czaplejewicz:

- a) Dialogue is a time-space phenomenon;
- b) Dialogue is a dynamic phenomenon;
- c) Dialogue shows itself in a text and through a text; still, they do not coincide and limit each other;
- d) Dialogue is not one-way but two-way since it comprises "simultaneity and advancement";
- e) Dialogue is a way of living of the human collective;
- f) Dialogue must be perceived as a finished process, in which one can find specific phrasal entities [7, p. 20-21].

According to the above-mentioned postulates, a dialogue process in drama consists in: 1) "activity of communication participants" and 2) directing subjects of communication towards a "dialogue retort", in 3) a particular "subjective situation", which is 4) imitating "lively utterance [7, p. 33].

3.2. Dialogue Retort

Dialogue retort is the smallest meaningful semantic unit of a dialogue that is a self-running system directed towards communication. Schematically, it can be presented as follows:

X has opinions p, which are communicated to Y [7].

3.3. Semantic Deposit (SD) of a Dialogue Retort

By semantic deposit (hereinafter referred to as SD) the author understands an object in which a significant value was preserved by means of a particular code. SD is characterised by the facts that: 1) a person perceiving the object knows that what he/she perceives has a particular considerable value; 2) significance does not have a form of definition in its logical sense, which enables to "start the procedure 3) "of searching for significance" [7] [8]; 4) of limited scope of communicability.

In other words: there is such X that is of semantic deposit SD of particular semantic values of limited communicability properties.

In case of a dramatic dialogue, semantic value in semantic deposit SD is communicated by means of a particular code; code is going to be denoted in this paper by CODE word, as an expression referring both to codes in the linguistic sense and in semiotic context.

To sum up:

1. Semantic deposit SD has a specific V value;

2. Of the property of communicability C;
3. Implementation of semantic deposit SD value in a specific code CODE about the property of communicability C;
4. Semantic value V of semantic deposit SD in a specific code CODE is not equivalent to the final value V1 about added values in the process of interpretation of the initial value [8].

3.4. Feedback as a Dynamising Factor

An important element of a dialogue process which influences its dynamism is a feedback understood as specific action A, which is repeated till the desired reaction B is obtained; and then, a dialogue process is reversed.

[(A) → (B) → (feedback)]

[(A) → (B) → (feedback)]

[(A) → (reception) → (B_n) → (feedback)]

Desired reaction of B

[(B) → (reception) → (A) → (feedback)]

4. Summary

When discussing a dialogue in drama, one should consider the broadest context of the potential of show projection of a dramatic work possible; therefore, a dramatic dialogue must take a form of the following relation:

$$[(A) \mathbb{R} (B)]$$

Where A and B constitute the space of relation:

$${}_A \mathbb{R}_B$$

Here, implementation of communicability in a drama dialogue is of the following nature: a) *internal*, since a presentation of drama's portrayed reality is done through a dialogue and in a dialogue; and b) *external*, since that presentation is done for someone and by someone.

Communicability should be understood as complementary, simultaneous relation process \mathbb{R} , which joins the following categories: a) (Platonic) $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ (thinking, intention, disposition); b) (Aristotelian) $\nu\acute{o}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (ability of understanding, processes of thinking); c) (Epicurean) $\phi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (common sense, prudence); d) (stoical) $\phi\rho\omicron\nu\iota\mu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (rational actions); and e) (of Chrysippus) $\delta\epsilon\iota\zeta\iota\varsigma$ (emphasising significance) [9]. While the smallest dialogue unit has the following properties: a) temporality — it happens in a specific time; b) multi-levelness — it is hard to state that an individual sender and an individual receiver are its participants; and c) dynamism — it has possibilities of semantic correlation.

Czaplejewicz approach could be used as a theoretical groundwork for further analysis of dramatic discourse as well as a structure of a drama dialogue itself. However, it must be supplemented by a closer study of dramatic retort structure as an assemblage of semantic deposit (SD) of a dialogue retort plus feedback as a dynamising factor of a dialogue process. Discussion on the structure of dramatic dialogue leads towards further theoretical question that has been risen, for example, by Polish scholar Adam Kulawik [10]. Kulawik idea refers to so-called a “dramatic subject” which is the primary “information provider” inside the dramatic dialogue process, and it is hidden among stage directions or names of the dramatic figures.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend sincere appreciation to Ms. Alicja Chybińska (MA, Warsaw University) for the discussion on this article.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Markiewicz. “Dramat a teatr w polskich dyskusjach teoretycznych.” In J. Degler (ed.) *Problemy teorii dramatu i teatru*. Vol. 2. Wrocław 1988 pp. 258-259.
- [2] D. Ratajczak. “Sługa dwóch panów: dwoisty żywot dramatu.” In. H. Markiewicz (ed.) *Problemy teorii literatury*. Seria 4. Wrocław 1998.
- [3] F. de Toro. *Theatre Semiotics. Text and Staging in Modern Theatre*. Trans. J. Lewis. University of Toronto Press. Toronto-Buffalo 1995.
- [4] T. Dobrzyńska. *Tekst. Próba syntezy*. Warszawa 1993.
- [5] W. A. Koch. “Le texte normal, le théâtre et le film”, *Linguistic* 1968, 48, p. 40-67.
- [6] R. Boroch. “Formal Concept Analysis – Knowledge Representation – Translation”, *Annales of Arts*. Vol. 61, 6, 2013, p. 121-154.
- [7] E. Czaplejewicz. “Wprowadzenie do pragmatycznej teorii dialogu.” In E. Czaplejewicz, E. Kasperski (ed.) *Dialog w literaturze*. Warszawa 1978, p. 16-19.
- [8] R. Boroch. *W stronę semiotyzacji antropologii literatury*. Warszawa 2013.
- [9] Z. Abramowiczówna (Ed.). *Słownik grecko-polski*. Warszawa 1958-1965.
- [10] A. Kulawik. *Poetyka. Wstęp do teorii dzieła literackiego*. Kraków 1997.