

Fecha de presentación: febrero, 2022, **Fecha de Aceptación:** mayo, 2022, **Fecha de publicación:** julio, 2022

30

THE ROLE OF DIALOGUES IN THE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE OF LITERARY TEXTS

EL PAPEL DE LOS DIÁLOGOS EN LA ESTRUCTURA RETÓRICA DE LOS TEXTOS LITERARIOS

Aysel İlgar Mammadbayli¹

E-mail: mamedbeilifa@mail.ru

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9942-764X>

¹Stylistics Department at Azerbaijan University of Languages

Suggested citation (APA, 7th edition)

İlgar Mammadbayli, A. (2022). The role of dialogues in the rhetorical structure of literary texts. *Revista Conrado*, 18(87), 263-271.

ABSTRACT

In the mind of people, there is a speech mechanism in accordance with the ability of the respective language they use. In this regard dialogue has a special model of consciousness belonging to this mechanism and is one of the main factors in the organization of the rhetorical structure of text. This paper analyzes the role of dialogues in the rhetorical structure of literary texts in English, Azerbaijani, Russian and French languages. Although dialogue is a universal phenomenon from the linguistic point of view, it has certain characteristic features depending on the intellectual level of the author, his/her way of thinking, language and style. Dialogues play the role of connectors in the rhetorical structure as a unit of a macro-text, i.e. dialogue is a part of the hierarchical system belonging to a micro-text and is a part of the global system within a macro-text. In this connection, dialogues have two features: 1) Developing meaning of the previous micro-text based on the particular plot; 2) Providing a semantic basis for the continuation of the story of the subsequent micro-text. These features determine the autonomous status of dialogues in the rhetorical structure of literary texts and demonstrates the level of global connexity in the hierarchical system of literary texts. For this, dialogue has a special place both in the system of internal and external connexity within the rhetorical structure of text, and its study has a marked relevance.

Keywords:

Dialogue, rhetorical structure, literary text

RESUMEN

En la mente de las personas, hay un mecanismo de habla de acuerdo con la habilidad del idioma respectivo que usan. En este sentido el diálogo tiene un modelo especial de conciencia perteneciente a este mecanismo y es uno de los principales factores en la organización de la estructura retórica del texto. Este artículo analiza el papel de los diálogos en la estructura retórica de textos literarios en inglés, azerbaiyano, ruso y francés. Si bien el diálogo es un fenómeno universal desde el punto de vista lingüístico, tiene ciertos rasgos característicos según el nivel intelectual del autor, su forma de pensar, lenguaje y estilo. Los diálogos juegan el papel de conectores en la estructura retórica como unidad de un macrotexto, es decir, el diálogo es parte del sistema jerárquico perteneciente a un microtexto y es parte del sistema global dentro de un macrotexto. En este sentido, los diálogos tienen dos características: 1) desarrollar el significado del microtexto anterior con base en la trama particular; 2) Proporcionar una base semántica para la continuación de la historia del microtexto posterior. Estas características determinan el estatus autónomo de los diálogos en la estructura retórica de los textos literarios y demuestran el nivel de conexión global en el sistema jerárquico de los textos literarios. Para ello, el diálogo tiene un lugar especial tanto en el sistema de conexión interna como externa dentro de la estructura retórica del texto, y su estudio tiene una marcada relevancia.

Palabras clave:

Diálogo, estructura retórica, texto literario

INTRODUCTION

The study of literary discourse and texts to some extent is related to stylistic issues. In the early years of the development of text linguistics, researchers sought to identify the intersections of style with text and discourse (Hendricks, 1976, p. 37). The concept put forward in this research has been widely studied in text linguistics since the second half of the twentieth century. Later Fowler distinguished the role of social semiotics in the analysis of literary texts (Fowler, 1981, pp. 129–163). He developed his research in this area, considering literary text as a communicative phenomenon (Fowler, 1981, p. 175). Another research aspect is the sociolinguistic direction in the study of literary text and discourse, and the author of this concept is Jean Jacques Weber. In his concept, the discursive space, communicative and social status of language and language means in the discursive space of the literary text is of special importance (Weber, 1992).

Despite the theory of rhetorical structure appeared in the 80s of the XX century (Mann & Thompson, 1988) and soon gained wide popularity, its application to literary texts has been less studied. According to this theory, the descriptive structure of discourse consists of the unity of semantic relations in a network of discursive units. It is true that this theory has been criticized for not taking dialogue into account, but it gave the basic outlines of research in this direction. This concept laid out the foundation for a comparative analysis of the structure of text. Let us have a look at the basics of that theory.

Rhetorical structure of text covers three types of structures:

1. Super structure. Super structure covers the highest level of text organization. This includes the relationship between the headings and the parts that surround them.
2. Communication structures. This includes the structural connections that make up the text. The integrity of the text, starting with the purposeful arrangement of the sentences, applies here.
3. Syntactic structure. This also applies to the syntactic structure we have traditionally considered (Mann & Thompson, 1992, pp. 39–78).

The emergence of new fields in linguistics has revealed a number of unresolved issues related to linguistics. In this sense, the theory of rhetorical structure emerged as a result of both theoretical and practical need. However, the traditional view of the rhetorical structure did not provide a solution to these issues. Therefore, researchers felt necessity to develop a new approach to the theory of rhetorical structure and its applications. These developments allow us to reconsider the theory of rhetorical structure and

clarify its subtleties and to define its prospects, taking into account the critical attitudes towards this theory. Such a statement of the issue facilitates the application of this theory and enriches it theoretically. Therefore, it is important to pay attention to the theoretical issues of the theory of rhetorical structure.

Mann, one of the founders of the theory of rhetorical structure, who fully understood this need, and Taboada returned to this issue and developed a new concept in the context of the theoretical and practical requirements of the moment (Taboada & Mann, 2006). Since the 1980s, there have been significant advances in both theoretical and applied linguistics, and many issues have arisen that depend on the theory of rhetorical structure. When Thomas and Mann introduced this theory in the 1980s, they underlined its basic outlines, but time has shown that it also has new prospects, and it is necessary to return to this theory again. Therefore, in order to distinguish a new view of this theory, the first period in which the theory emerged will be conventionally named as the classical approach, later the recent development of rhetorical structural theory by Mann and others will be named as a new era. Of course, this periodization, as we have said, is conditional, the second period is a continuation of the first period. The point is that this theory has been open to development since its introduction.

The new theory of rhetorical structure begins with hypotheses about the functions of written speech, then the words, phrases, grammatical structures and other linguistic elements have been included in the text. The beginning was a very difficult and complicated process. Thomson and Mann have played an exceptional role in solving this issue. In addition to the linguistic elements mentioned above, they adapted to different applications and situations, taking into account the types of semantic and pragmatic structures.

The rhetorical structure of text studies the mechanism of connection of the language units that make up the text and its features. As we know, each language unit involved in the construction of the text has its own purpose. The relationships between these linguistic units are hierarchical, and these relationships construct the coherence of the text. In linguistics, these relations are also called coherent relations, discourse relations or connecting relations. Based on this principle in the organization of computer texts, a new level of communication system has been formed. This connection was different from the classical period of the rhetorical structure of the text.

Thus, towards the end of the twentieth century, the study of the rhetorical structure identified new research aspects.

Among them, the role of dialogues in the rhetorical structure of the text has drawn our attention. It has been mentioned earlier that one of the reasons why the theory of the rhetorical structure has been criticized by linguists is that it has never discussed dialogue. It should be noted that dialogue has been studied in sociolinguistics, semiotics, psycholinguistics and functional linguistics.

The theory of dialogue was founded in the early twentieth century by L. Sherba, L. Yakubinsky and M. Bakhtin. The social nature of dialogue was discussed at that time, and the idea about the communicative nature of language prevailed in these studies despite the overall dominance of the structuralism in linguistics. For example, Sherba (1956, p. 56) wrote that communication is impossible without a second person:

“In direct experience, on the one hand, we are given the facts of speaking, that is, the expression of our thoughts, feelings, desires, etc., and on the other, the facts of understanding this speaking. The first ones especially attract attention to themselves, and we willingly call them language. The latter usually remain in the shadows and relatively easily drop out of the field of vision even of theorists. Meanwhile, it is these processes taken together that form a single communication process”

Yakubinsky (1986, p. 32), referring to the conception that human interaction is essentially two-sided, wrote: “In essence, every interaction of people is precisely interaction; it essentially seeks to avoid one-sidedness, wants to be two-sided, dialogical and runs a monologue”. He also underlines that dialogue is more important than monologue. According to Bakhtin (1996, p. 207), dialogue is a universal event that intersects the speech of all people; it is the dialogic relationship of at least two subjects who know each other. These relationships are reflected in the replicas of the dialogue.

In the early twentieth century, dialogue was studied in terms of the social mechanism of the psyche. In addition to all these, dialogue is not a separate discourse, it is a speech communication with social, informative aspects (Myrkin, 1994, p. 41). On the other hand, the formation of text theory during this period defined a new approach to dialogue as well. According to Bakhtin (1996), the fact that dialogue is a universal phenomenon that intersects the speech of all people has become a scientific conceptual basis for the emergence of a new outlook on dialogue in the context of the basic principles of anthropocentrism. On the one hand, the position and place of dialogue in people’s speech activity, on the other hand, the universality of dialogue raises the question of its role in the rhetorical structure of the text after the emergence of text theory.

Dialogue has its own role in the construction of the text, both in terms of micro-text and macro-text. Micro-text is a very important link in the communication system of macro-text. It is an expression of segments of the macro-text with relative autonomy. In these segments, several functions of dialogue, especially their role in the rhetorical structure of the text, attract our attention. The rhetorical structure of text is the structure of the connection between the components of the text; it is versatile, and no element can be found in the text that is outside this connection. The term “rhetorical” in the term “rhetorical structure” is conditional and traditional. The conditionality of the matter is that it represents all kinds of connections in the text, on the other hand, its use can be explained by the preservation of the classical outlook on the text.

Thus, the rhetorical structure of literary text encompasses the entire network of connections between its components and dialogues have the crucial role in this context. Taking this into account the paper aims to study this role of dialogues in the rhetorical structure of literary texts in the English, Azerbaijani, Russian and French languages. For this purpose, the novels written by the famous American (F.S. Fitzgerald), Azerbaijani (I. Shikhli), Russian (L. Tolstoy) and French (V. Hugo) writers have been selected for text analysis and contrastive analysis.

DEVELOPMENT

In literary texts, sometimes the micro-text, which begins with the author’s speech, continues with a dialogue between characters. In this case, the connection between the replicas occurs in relation to the semantics of the micro-text and generally has the status of components of the text. Thus, dialogue is either all or an important part of the micro-text following the narrative of the author as seen in the example 1.

Example 1

“Tom Buchanan, who had been hovering restlessly about the room, stopped and rested his hand on my shoulder.

“What you are doing, Nick?”

“I’m a bond man.”

“Who with?”

I told him.

“Never heard of them,” he remarked decisively.

This annoyed me.

“You will,” I answered shortly.

“You will if you stay in the East.”

"Oh, I'll stay in the East, don't you worry," he said, glancing at Daisy and then back at me, as if he were alert for something more.

"I'd be a God damned fool to live anywhere else."

At this point Miss Baker said:

"Absolutely!" with such suddenness that I started—it was the first word she had uttered since I came into the room" (F.S. Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*).

This piece of literary text from S.F. Fitzgerald's *The Great Gatsby* contains a dialogue between Tom Buchanan and Nick. This micro-text is almost formed on dialogue, the development of the plot line of the work is reflected in this dialogue. The rhetoric of dialogue in this information segment is characterized by a semantic connection between the components of the text against the background of events. The event develops through dialogue and becomes a representative of the semantic-structural development of the micro-text. The micro-text ends with a dialogue and gives the start for the next micro-text. Thus, both in the context of the micro-text and macro-text, the dialogue enters a network of rhetorical connections. Let's consider another example but from a piece of literary text in the Azerbaijani language (example 2).

Example 2

"Cahandar ağa xeyli nə edəcəyini bilmədi. Ona yaxınlaşıb könlünümü alsın, yoxsa qışqırıb «səsini kəs»mi desin. Sükut xeyli çəkdi. Mələyin sakit axan göz yaşı gücləndi. Otağı hıçqırıq bürüdü. Taxtın üstündə mütəkkəyə dirsəklənən Cahandar ağanın səbri tükəndi.

- Di yaxşı, axşam-axşanı gözünün yaşım az axıt. Dur, bəri gəl görüm. Mələk yavaşca ayağa durdu. Taxla yaxınlaşıb kişinin qabağında dayandı.

- Məni niyə bədbəxt elədin? Yurduma-yuvama niyə su saldın?

Mələyin kədərli görkəmi kişini qəhərləndirdi.

- Axı sənə nə olub? - deyər soruşdu.

- Daha bundan artıq nə olacaq, el içində biabır oldum. İndi mən hansı üzle geri qayıdım? Mənim böyük tikəmi qulağım boyda eləməzlərimi?

- Sarsaq-sarsaq danışma. Sən bu evdən heç yana getməyəcəksən!

- Bəs Şamxal? - Kim? O nə qoduqdur?

Kişi qalxıb dik oturdu.

- Bir də onun adını mənim yanımda çəkmə!

- Bəs arvadını, qızın?

- Az danış, onların sənə dəxli yoxdur. Bu evin sahibi mənəm, mən də nə elədiyimi bilirəm".

Translation into English

"Jahandar agha did not know what to do. Let him approach me and win my heart, or should he shout and say, "Shut up!" The silence lasted a long time. The angel's quiet tears intensified. The room was sobbing. Leaning on the throne, the patience of Jahandar agha was exhausted.

- Well, I shed a few tears in the evening. Wait, let's see. The angel stood up slowly. He approached the throne and stood in front of the man.

- Why did you make me unhappy? Why did you flood my country?

The angel's sad appearance angered the man.

- What happened to you? he asked.

- What will happen next, I was ashamed in public. Which face did I go back to now? Can't they make my big ear the size of my ear?

- Don't talk nonsense. You will never leave this house!

- What about Shamkhal? "Who?" What the hell is that?

The man got up and sat up.

"Don't mention his name to me again!"

- What about your wife, your daughter?

"Speak less, they have nothing to do with you. I am the owner of this house, and I know what I did."

In this example, the micro-text is basically a dialogue, which, first of all, is based on the attitude context to the recent events told in the story. On the other hand, it reflects a very important point of drama in the plot in terms of the development of events. In this part, including dialogue the author creates an organic connection between the components of the micro-text, focusing on the evaluation aspects of events between the images, on the other hand, the dialogic speech of the images was managed to be exaggerated with a relative retreat of the author's prose. This method demonstrates the author's creative professionalism in the context of text pragmatics.

It is true that any fiction is the work of an author, who interrogates the characters and creates their language, way of thinking and style. However, the actualization of the dialogue by the author in the series of characters is of particular importance throughout the macro-text plot in the context of the author, time and place. The rhetorical connection in this micro-text is related to the fact that each

part of the text is connected as a constituent segment of information. On the other hand, in the context of the macro-text, the end of the micro-text with a dialogue is the exit point for the next micro-text. The reason is its connective function between the micro-texts. In the context of the macro-text, this feature covers a very important aspect of the rhetorical connection in the text.

The function dialogue performs in the rhetorical structure of the text is also universal, as dialogue itself is universal. This is evidenced not only in English, but also in the Azerbaijani, Russian and French languages. Let us have a look at examples 3,4,5,6.

Example 3

"I told her how I had stopped off in Chicago for a day on my way to East and how a dozen people had sent their love through me.

"Do they miss me?" she cried ecstatically.

"The whole town is desolate.

All the cars have the left rear wheel painted black as a mourning wreath, and there's a persistent wail all night along the north shore."

"How gorgeous!

Let's go back, Tom.

Tomorrow!"

Then she added irrelevantly:

"You ought to see the baby."

"I'd like to."

"She's asleep.

She's three years old.

Haven't you ever seen her?"

"Never."

"Well, you ought to see her.

She's" (F. S. Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*)

Example 4

"Salatın addımlarını yeyinlətdi. Arxasındakı hənirtini duyan Güləsər qanrılıb baxdı. Onlar bir-birilərinə yaxınlaşdılar. Bir müddət heç biri dinmədi. Yanaşı dayandılar. Güləsərin yanaqları qızarmışdı. Salatın onun sorğusuala başlayacağından ehtiyat edərək susdu. Hər ikisi dinməzsöyləmz yola düşdü. Salatın qabaqda gedirdi. Güləsər onun hörüklərinə, atlas koftasına, topuğuna ənən qırçınılıp ipək donuna diqqətlə baxdı. Bu gözəl paltarın ətəyi

şehə və palçığa bulanmışdı. Güləsərin heyfi gəldi. Əgər onun belə paltarı olsa, boğçaya büküb saxlayar, gündəliyə geyinib bu kökə salmazdı. Suvadağa çatanda yenə dayandılar. Su yolu sürüşkənləşmişdi. Güləsər qabağa keçdi.

- Qoy, mən düşüm, sən də səhəngini doldurum.

- Yox, yox, özüm enərəm.

- Sürüşərsən.

- Eybi yoxdur, çəkməmi soyunaram.

- Hazır mən ayağı yalınam. Salatın Güləsərin dərisi qaralmış balaca ayağına baxdı. Barmaqların arasına palçıq dolmuşdu. Xınası solmuş dırnaqları lələ batmışdı.

- Ayaqqabın yoxdurmuydu?

- Var. Palçıqdır deyən, geyinməmişəm.

Salatın sualının yersiz olduğunu başa düşüb xəcalət çəkdi. Güləsər aşağı endi. Kürün suyu bulanıb köpüklənmişdi. Ləpələrlər şıltaqlıqla atılıb-düşür, yağının sarı torpağını yalayır.

Translation into English

"Salatin slowed down. Gulesar, who heard the breathing behind, looked back. They approached each other. No one spoke for a while. They stood side by side. Gulesar's cheeks were red. Salatin was silent, fearing that she would start questioning her. They both left without saying a word. Salatin was ahead. Gulesar looked carefully at her braids, satin blouse, and pleated silk dress that fell to her ankles. The bottom of this beautiful dress was covered with dew and mud. Gulesar was sorry. If she had such a dress, she would wrap it in a bag and not wear and contaminate it like that every day. When they reached Suvadagh, they stopped again. The waterway was slippery. Gulesar stepped forward.

- Let me go down and fill your pitcher.

- No, no, I'll come down myself.

- You will slide.

- It's okay, I'll take off my shoes.

- I'm already barefoot. Salatin looked at Gulesar's small blackened feet. There was mud between her toes. Her henna-stained toenails were sunk in the mud.

- Haven't you got shoes?

- Yes, I have got. I didn't wear, as they are muddy.

Salatin was embarrassed as she realized that her question was nonsense. Gulesar came down. The water of the Kura was turbid and frothy. The waves whirred whimsically

and licked the yellow soil of the ravine. (Ismayil Shikhli. Deli Kur)

Example 5

«Степан Аркадьич ничего не ответил и только в зеркало взглянул на Матвея; во взгляде, которым они встретились в зеркале, видно было, как они понимают друг друга.»

Взгляд Степана Аркадьича как будто спрашивал:

«Это зачем ты говоришь? разве ты не знаешь?»

Матвей положил руки в карманы своей жакетки, отставил ногу и молча, добродушно, чуть-чуть улыбаясь, посмотрел на своего барина.

– Я приказал прийти в то воскресенье, а до тех пор чтобы не беспокоили вас и себя понапрасну, – сказал он, видимо, приготовленную фразу.

Степан Аркадьич понял, что Матвей хотел пошутить и обратить на себя внимание.

Разорвав телеграмму, он прочел ее, догадкой поправляя перевранные, как всегда, слова, и лицо его просияло

– Матвей, сестра Анна Аркадьевна будет завтра, -- сказал он, остановив на минуту глянцевитую, пухлую ручку цирюльника, расчищавшего розовую дорожку между длинными кудрявыми бакенбардами.

– Слава богу, – сказал Матвей, этим ответом показывая, что он понимает так же, как и барин, значение этого приезда, то есть что Анна Аркадьевна, любимая сестра Степана Аркадьича, может содействовать примирению мужа с женой.

– Одни или с супругом? – спросил Матвей.

Степан Аркадьич не мог говорить, так как цирюльник занят был верхнею губой, и поднял один палец.

Матвей в зеркало кивнул головой.

– Одни.

– Наверху приготовить?

– Дарье Александровне доложи, где прикажут.

– Дарье Александровне? – как бы с сомнением повторил Матвей.

– Да, доложи».

Translation into English

«Stepan Arkadyevitch made no reply he merely glanced at Matvey in the looking glass.

In the glance, in which their eyes met in the looking glass, it was clear that they understood one another.

Stepan Arkadyevitch's eyes seemed to ask:

“Why do you tell me that? Don't you know?”

Matvey put his hands into his jacket pockets, thrust out one leg, and gazed silently, good-humoredly, with a faint smile, he looked at his master.

“I ordered them to come on Sunday, and till then not to trouble you or themselves for nothing,” he said.

He had obviously prepared the sentence beforehand.

Stepan Arkadyevitch saw Matvey wanted to make a joke and attract attention to himself.

Tearing open the telegram, he read it through, guessing at the words, misspelt as they are always in telegrams, and his face brightened.

“Matvey, my sister Anna Arkadyevna will be here tomorrow,” he said, checking for a minute the sleek, plump hand of the barber, cutting a pink path through his long, curly whiskers.

“Thank God!” said Matvey, showing by this response that he, like his master, realized the significance of this arrival – that is, Anna Arkadyevna, the sister he was so fond of, might bring about a reconciliation between husband and wife.

“Alone, or with her husband?” inquired Matvey.

Stepan Arkadyevitch could not answer, as the barber was at work on his upper lip, and he raised one finger.

Matvey nodded at the looking glass.

“Alone.

Is the room upstairs to be got ready?”

“Inform Darya Alexandrovna: where she orders.”

“Darya Alexandrovna?”

Matthew repeated, as though in doubt.

“Yes, inform her.” (Tolstoy L. [https://studyenglishwords.com/book/Anna-Karenina.](https://studyenglishwords.com/book/Anna-Karenina))

Example 6

“Cependant les trois petites filles étaient groupées dans une posture d'anxiété profonde et de béatitude ; un événement avait lieu ; un gros ver venait de sortir de terre ; et elles avaient peur, et elles étaient en extase. Leurs fronts radieux se touchaient ; on eût dit trois têtes dans une auréole.

– Les enfants, s'écria la mère Thénardier, comme ça se connaît tout de suite ! les voilà qu'on jurerait trois sœurs ! Ce mot fut l'étincelle qu'attendait probablement l'autre mère. Elle saisit la main de la Thénardier, la regarda fixement, et lui dit :

– Voulez-vous me garder mon enfant ? La Thénardier eut un de ces mouvements surpris qui ne sont ni le consentement ni le refus. La mère de Cosette poursuivit :

– Voyez-vous, je ne peux pas emmener ma fille au pays. L'ouvrage ne le permet pas. Avec un enfant, on ne trouve pas à se placer. Ils sont si ridicules dans ce pays-là. C'est le bon Dieu qui m'a fait passer devant votre auberge. Quand j'ai vu vos petites si jolies et si propres et si contentes, cela m'a bouleversée. J'ai dit : voilà une bonne mère. C'est ça ; ça fera trois sœurs. Et puis, je ne serai pas longtemps à revenir.

Voulez-vous me garder mon enfant ?

– Il faudrait voir, dit la Thénardier.

– Je donnerais six francs par mois. Ici une voix d'homme cria du fond de la gargote

– Pas à moins de sept francs. Et six mois payés d'avance.

– Six fois sept quarante-deux, dit la Thénardier.

– Je les donnerai, dit la mère.

– Et quinze francs en dehors pour les premiers frais, ajouta la voix d'homme.

– Total cinquante-sept francs, dit la madame Thénardier. Et à travers ces chiffres, elle chantonnait vaguement : Il le faut, disait un guerrier.

– Je les donnerai, dit la mère, j'ai quatre-vingts francs. Il me restera de quoi aller au pays. En allant à pied. Je gagnerai de l'argent là-bas, et dès que j'en aurai un peu, je reviendrai chercher l'amour. La voix d'homme reprit :

– La petite a un trousseau ?

– C'est mon mari, dit la Thénardier.

– Sans doute elle a un trousseau, le pauvre trésor. J'ai bien vu que c'était votre mari. Et un beau trousseau encore ! un trousseau insensé. Tout par douzaines ; et des robes de soie comme une dame. Il est là dans mon sac de nuit.

– Il faudra le donner, reparti la voix d'homme.

– Je crois bien que je le donnerai ! dit la mère. Ce serait cela qui serait drôle si je laissais ma fille toute nue ! La face du maître apparut.

– C'est bon, dit-il. Le marché fut conclu. La mère passa la nuit à l'auberge, donna son argent et laissa son enfant,

renoua son sac de nuit dégonflé du trousseau et léger désormais, et partit le lendemain matin, comptant revenir bientôt. On arrange tranquillement ces départs-là, mais ce sont des désespoirs. Une voisine des Thénardier rencontra cette mère comme elle s'en allait, et s'en revint en disant :

– Je viens de voir une femme qui pleure dans la rue, que c'est un déchirement. Quand la mère de Cosette fut partie, l'homme dit à la femme :

– Cela va me payer mon effet de cent dix francs qui échoit demain. Il me manquait cinquante francs. Sais-tu que j'aurais eu l'huissier et un protêt ? Tu as fait là une bonne souricière avec tes petites.

– Sans m'en douter, dit la femme”.

Translation into English

“In the meantime, the three little girls were grouped in an attitude of profound anxiety and blissfulness; an event had happened; a big worm had emerged from the ground, and they were afraid; and they were in ecstasies over it. Their radiant brows touched each other; one would have said that there were three heads in one aureole.

— “How easily children get acquainted at once!” exclaimed Mother Thénardier; “one would swear that they were three sisters!” This remark was probably the spark which the other mother had been waiting for. She seized the Thénardier's hand, looked at her fixedly, and said:

— “Will you keep my child for me?” The Thénardier made one of those movements of surprise which signify neither assent nor refusal. Cosette's mother continued:

— “You see, I cannot take my daughter to the country. My work will not permit it. With a child one can find no situation. People are ridiculous in the country. It was the good God who caused me to pass your inn. When I caught sight of your little ones, so pretty, so clean, and so happy, it overwhelmed me. I said: ‘Here is a good mother. That is just the thing; that will make three sisters.’ And then, it will not be long before I return.

Will you keep my child for me?

— “I must see about it,” replied the Thénardier.

— “I will give you six francs a month.” Here a man's voice called from the depths of the cook shop:

— “Not for less than seven francs. And six months paid in advance.”

— “Six times seven makes forty-two,” said the Thénardier.

— “I will give it,” said the mother.

— “And fifteen francs in addition for preliminary expenses,” added the man’s voice

— “Total, fifty–seven francs,” said Madame Thenardier. And she hummed vaguely, with these figures: — “It must be, said a warrior.”

— “I will pay it,” said the mother. “I have eighty francs. I shall have enough left to reach the country, by travelling on foot. I shall earn money there, and as soon as I have a little, I will return for my darling.” The man’s voice resumed:

— “The little one has an outfit?”

— “That is my husband,” said the Thenardier.

— “Of course, she has an outfit, the poor treasure. —I understood perfectly that it was your husband. —And a beautiful outfit, too! a senseless outfit, everything by the dozen, and silk gowns like a lady. It is here, in my carpetbag.”

— “You must hand it over,” struck in the man’s voice again.

— “Of course, I shall give it to you,” said the mother. “It would be very queer if I were to leave my daughter quite naked!” The master’s face appeared.

— “That’s good,” said he. The bargain was concluded. The mother passed the night at the inn, gave up her money and left her child, fastened her carpetbag once more, now reduced in volume by the removal of the outfit, and light henceforth and set out on the following morning, intending to return soon. People arrange such departures tranquilly; but they are despairs! A neighbor of the Thenardiers met this mother as she was setting out, and came back with the remark:

— “I have just seen a woman crying in the street so that it was enough to rend your heart. When Cosette’s mother had taken her departure, the man said to the woman:

— “That will serve to pay my note for one hundred and ten francs which falls due tomorrow; I lacked fifty francs. Do you know that I should have had a bailiff and a protest after me? You played the mousetrap nicely with your young ones.”

— “Without suspecting it,” said the woman. (Victor Hugo. *Les Misérables*. Livre quatrième Confier, c’est quelquefois livrer.)

The rhetorical structure of the text has a mechanism regarding the role of dialogues that is typical for the literary texts in the English, Azerbaijani, Russian and French languages i.e., dialogues perform similar functions in the rhetorical structure of the literary texts under analysis. The only difference between them is the language and its typological features. The role of dialogues in the text,

their connection with the author’s narratives or their melting within the author’s narrative in line with this role are all universal.

The issue of a proper distribution of dialogue and author’s narrative and a proper adjustment to the plot of the work in literary texts plays an important role in the rhetorical structuring of these texts. In this connection, the dynamism of dialogue and its relative autonomy within microtext should be highlighted based on the analysis of these examples. The dynamism of dialogue has an important role in the rhetorical structure of text. In literary texts, stories and views oppose each other, psychological features become more effective, the events take place faster and finally, dialogue complements the information delivered in the microtext thanks to its dynamism. Thus, the dynamism of dialogue (on the level of microtext) in literary text demonstrates the impact of the size of the flow of information and cause-effect relations on the events.

Determination of the content of dialogue and its place in text by the author happens in line with the natural flow of events and gradually becomes a part of the system of connection of the events. The main point here is that dialogue is an autonomous unit within microtext, but it differs from sentence. This difference is in its structure and in the fact that it sometimes covers a large and important part of the flow of information in microtext. In this regard, the rhetorical structuring of dialogue happens in microtext and becomes a part of global hierarchy. The final position of dialogue in microtext signals its conclusion. In this case, the conclusion drawn from the whole meaning of dialogue gains a status of the conclusion of microtext. It is one of the manifestations of connectivity from the perspective of rhetorical structure of text. It also becomes a part of the system of connection between texts as another manifestation of connectivity because the final position of dialogue signals the end of the flow of information and the beginning of a new flow of information. It is one of the aspects of the system of connectivity between microtext, which demonstrates the role of dialogue in the rhetorical structure of text. In this connection, the dynamism of dialogue makes this structure more transparent.

Another important aspect of the study of dialogue in the rhetorical structure is its relative autonomy. In this context, autonomy is the result of the existence of dialogue, which becomes more obvious compared with sentence. On the other hand, the principles, and mechanisms of the structuring of dialogue demonstrates its relative autonomy. It implies that dialogue becomes a part of the rhetorical structure of text with its relative autonomy.

When Mann and Thompson introduced the theory of rhetorical structure in the 80-s of the last century, they also identified its main contours. Meanwhile, since 1980s, there have been significant advances in both theoretical and applied linguistics and many issues discussed within these studies have strong link to the theory of rhetorical structure. The recent developments in text and discourse studies have actualized the study of the role of dialogues in the rhetorical structure of any text type, including literary text. The study of the issue of the proper distribution of the author's speech in dialogue in literary texts depending on the point of view and the proper regulation of the relationship between the literary work and its plot is especially important from the point of view of the theory of rhetorical structure.

CONCLUSIONS

The universal features of dialogue in the rhetorical structure of literary texts can be summarized as follows based on the examples from the English, Azerbaijani, Russian and French languages: 1) In all texts, a dialogue begins after the author's word (after the first component of the micro-text), 2) Dialogue replicas have the status of micro-text components, 3) Dialogues can be used in different positions of the micro-text, 4) The method of communication between the components of both micro-texts is universal, 5) In both texts, dialogue, as an important part of the micro-text, expresses the role of transmitter and carrier in that segment of text hypertext, 6) They are the main links of the hierarchy in the context of the macro-text, and so on. As it can be seen, dialogues perform the same function in the rhetorical structure of the texts across languages.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1996). *Collection of Selected Works (Vol. 5)*. Star.
- Fowler, R. (1981). *Literature as social discourse*. Indiana University Press.
- Hendricks, W. O. (1976). *Grammars of style and styles of grammar*. North-Holland.
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1988). Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 8(3), 243–281. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1988.8.3.243>
- Mann, W. C., & Thompson, S. A. (1992). Rhetorical structure theory and text analysis. In W. C. Mann & S. A. Thompson, *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-raising Text* (pp. 39–78). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Myrkin, V. Y. (1994). *Language—Speech—Context—Meaning*. Arkhangelsk.
- Sherba, L. V. (1956). *Selected works on the Russian language*. Uchpedgiz.
- Taboada, M., & Mann, W. C. (2006). Applications of Rhetorical Structure Theory. *Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 567–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606064836>
- Weber, J. J. (1992). *Critical Analysis of fiction: Essays in Discourse stylistics*. Rodopi.
- Yakubinsky, L. P. (1986). *Selected works: Language and its functioning*. Zvezda.