

THE SEMANTICS OF ARGUMENTATIVE DIALOGUE AND DEFENSIVE SPEECHES

S.V. Nachernaya

Tambov State Technical University, Tambov

*Represented by Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor N.I. Kolodina*

Key words and phrases: argumentative dialogue; argumentation; communication; context; model; dialogicality; monologicality; pragmatics; speech for the defense; speech act; text; topic.

Abstract: The article discusses the semantic aspect of the model of the text rhetorical argumentation of defensive speeches in the speech genre since the speech is always made from the perspective of a particular genre, and the construction of theses, arguments and counterarguments in the dialogue session is often determined by the syntactic basis of argumentation.

Under the semantics of an argumentative dialogue we understand that its structure consists of the arguments and theses as well as the actualization of the arguments to the subject of the conversation. In the evidence the semantic component is in the foreground if the evidence itself is considered from the point of the correspondence of the expressed thoughts in it.

Structurally, the argumentation is of two types: monologue and dialogue. The monological approach to the argumentation is supported by G.A. Brutyan. However, trying to dilute the concept of “argumentation” and “dialogue”, he identified the concept of “dialogue and debate”. “It is hardly necessary to narrow the boundaries of the argumentation outside the dialogue. The dispute may be with a real opponent and with the imaginary one, with a specific opponent and a generalized one, with one interlocutor and with different participants of a possible discussion. Finally, the dispute may be with oneself. It is clear that in all these cases we deal with the argumentation, but it is not right to reduce all these forms of reasoning only to the dialogue. Besides, a centuries-old practice of mankind proves that the argumentation is presented in all possible forms of reasoning” [2, p. 32].

Undoubtedly, the argumentation takes place in all possible forms of reasoning, but the “controversy” is the most acute and intense form. Any

Начёрная Светлана Владимировна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков, e-mail: svetlana_nachrna@mail.ru, ТамбГТУ, г. Тамбов.

argumentation has a subject or theme, but the dispute is characterized not only by a specific subject but the presence of incompatible ideas about the subject. The dispute is always refuted by the opposite view, and it is always the victory of one side, since the dispute rarely pursues the truth. However, the purpose of polemics, eclecticism and sophistry is a victory over another opinion. The other side is called the adversary. But in the debate and dialogue it is called an opponent.

M. Natanson argued that the monological approach involves the consideration of any argumentative text as a minimum simplified scheme. According to him, “a monologue can consist of, at least, two statements, one of which is “derived” from another one by the argumentator. The problem of justification of such “inference” can be solved in different ways [6, p. 10].

The dialogue also discusses the problems; both the proponent and the opponent in the reasoned dialogue come to new conclusions, which are more genuine and true. Ch. Perelman supports the dialogical position in the argumentation, assuming that the dialogical approach to the argumentation implies certain requirements to be met by the interlocutor of the dialogue or the audience. He stressed that “the argumentation ... implies” meeting of the minds “when the orator is willing to encourage, rather than force or command, and the audience is eager to listen. This mutual good will should not only be common, but should also be applied to the particular issue being discussed” [7, p. 11].

The notion of dialogicality was further developed in the works of M.M. Bakhtin: “Two equal and straight words directed to the subject within one context cannot be together outside the dialogue. No matter whether they confirm each other, or mutually complement, or vice versa, contradict each other they will be in a dialogical relationship (e.g., the question – answer relationship) [1, p. 21].

L.A. Yakubinsky interpreted the dialogue in the context of human activity as one of the speech options: “Every interaction is precisely the interaction; it essentially ... aspires to be bilateral, dialogic and “flees” from monologue” [8, p. 32].

H. Johnstone’s opinion is of great interest as he pointed out that the argumentation is addressed to a particular person who can either risk changing his behavior and attitudes as a result of the intercourse or not: “By closing your mind to argumentation, you can completely avoid the risk We cannot of course be ready to accept any argumentation that faces us. But we cannot always keep our mind closed, as a person with a completely closed mind ceases to be a man” [4, p. 4].

Dialogical perspective was also supported by V.I. Kurbatov, who believed that the general model of the argumentative text should be based on the concept of interaction, suggesting the presence of at least two subjects of the argumentation, which must be assumed equal to the activity of all subjects of the argumentation [5, p. 16].

All these points of view are different, but they are not opposed to each other. They all share a common ground; all the researchers agree that the argumentative text is structured with regard for the communicative features. In the argumentation everybody has to take into account its dialogic context. Any

argumentation which is assessed should be presented and evaluated only in the context of dialogue in which this argumentation is presented.

The text of the speech for the defense is a complex communicative phenomenon, which includes certain components of the text, such as language means, the model (microtext) and the text (discourse).

The problem of understanding of Bakhtin's idea of classification of speech genres as primary or secondary is considered the most controversial, as the statement that "the primary speech genres that make up the complex are transformed and get a special character", makes it difficult to determine the secondary speech genres. But, according to E.E. Goldin, the concept of speech genre is squeezed between the concepts of speech act, text type, tone of communication and some others" [3, p. 5].

The interpretation of the speech genre as the relationship and interaction of the semantic positions gives us an opportunity to highlight the following features of the genre in the communication: the subject-topic content, the particular situation of communication, a personalized list of participants and the stable compositional form.

We conclude that the speech for the defense is a stable, historically developed type of rhetorical work, which has a compositional form. Judicial speech for the defense on these grounds and in terms of the alleged reaction of the recipient can be attributed to "the secondary genres", thus, the model will be secondary to the lexical content of the speech, and even to the semantics of text.

The speech for the defense is a special type of text where both the content of the speech and its form appear in a close unity, fulfilling the purpose pursued by the attorney, which is to justify the defendant, trying to convince the court and the jury of his innocence, specifically implementing the language system of a particular model in the semantic space of text.

The concept of the model as a theoretical concept allows making a systematic description of syntactic structures, as they reflect the properties, relationships, or the structure of the whole class of phenomena of a legal text.

References

1. Бахтин, М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества : собр. соч. / М.М. Бахтин. – М. : Искусство, 1979. – 341 с.
2. Брутян, Г.А. Аргументация / Г.А. Брутян. – Ереван : Изд-во АН АрмССР, 1984. – 105 с.
3. Гольдин, В.Е. Речь и этикет / В.Е. Гольдин. – М. : Просвещение, 1983. – 109 с.
4. Johnstone, H. Some Reflections on Argumentation / H. Johnstone // Philosophy, Rhetoric and Argumentation / H. Johnstone, M. Natanson. – Pennsylvania, 1965. – P. 4–27.
5. Курбатов, В.И. Социально-политическая аргументация (Логико-методологический анализ) / В.И. Курбатов. – Ростов н/Д : Изд-во Рост. ун-та, 1991. – 144 с.

6. Natanson, M. The Claims of Immediacy / M. Natanson // Philosophy, Rhetoric and Argumentation / H. Johnstone, M. Natanson. – Pennsylvania, 1965. – P. 17–25.

7. Perelman, Ch. The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation / Ch. Perelman, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. – London : Notre Dame, 1969. – 107 p.

8. Якубинский, Л.П. О диалогической речи / Л.П. Якубинский // Язык и его функционирование : избр. соч. В 2 т. / под ред. А.А. Леонтьева. – М., 1986. – С. 17–58.

Семантика аргументативного диалога защитительных речей

С.В. Начёрная

ФГБОУ ВПО «Тамбовский государственный технический университет», г. Тамбов

Ключевые слова и фразы: аргументативный диалог; аргументация; диалогичность; защитительная речь; коммуникация; контекст; модель; монологичность; прагматика; речевой акт; текст; топика.

Аннотация: Рассмотрены семантический аспект в модели текстовой риторической аргументации защитительных речей в рамках речевого жанра, так как речь всегда осуществляется с позиции определенного жанра, и конструирование тезисов, аргументов и контраргументов в процессе диалога определяется, чаще всего, синтаксической основой аргументации.

© С.В. Начёрная, 2011