

REPRESENTATION OF MONOLOGIC SPEECH IN ENGLISH LITERARY WORKS

Ernazarova Saodat Shermuxammedovna

Second year master student at University of Tashkent for Applied Sciences, Gavhar Str. 1, Tashkent 100081, Uzbekistan

E-mail: saodaternazarova87@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines the linguistic, stylistic, and narratological features of monologic speech in English literary works. As a central mechanism for revealing character psychology, constructing narrative authority, and shaping reader interpretation, monologic discourse has evolved across literary periods—from the classical dramatic monologue to modernist interior monologue and contemporary hybrid forms. Drawing on the theories of Bakhtin, Chatman, Leech & Short, and cognitive stylistics, this study analyses how monologic forms such as interior monologue, dramatic monologue, and extended authorial commentary function within selected texts by Shakespeare, Robert Browning, Virginia Woolf, and James Joyce. The research employs qualitative textual analysis to identify syntactic markers, discourse strategies, and representational patterns. Findings show that monologic speech operates not only as a stylistic device for personal revelation but also as a narrative strategy that manipulates focalization, temporal structure, and ideological positioning. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of how monologic discourse mediates between character consciousness and narrative meaning in English literature.

Keywords: monologic speech, interior monologue, dramatic monologue, English literature, narrative discourse, stylistics, character voice, cognitive narratology.

INTRODUCTION

Monologic speech plays a crucial role in shaping narrative meaning within English literary discourse. Unlike dialogic exchanges, monologic forms foreground a single consciousness, enabling readers to access the inner world of characters and the author's ideological stance. In classical literature, monologue traditionally served as an expressive device for revealing motives on stage; however, with the advent of psychological realism and modernism, it developed into more intricate modes, including interior monologue and stream of consciousness.[1]

The representation of monologic speech has been widely examined by literary theorists and linguists. Bakhtin (1981) differentiated monologic discourse from dialogism, emphasizing its “closed ideological position,” while modern narratologists have shifted focus to internal focalization and the linguistic encoding of consciousness. This study aims to explore how monologic speech is constructed, how it evolves across periods, and what stylistic markers authors employ to represent mental processes and personal viewpoints.[2]

METHODS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Methods

The research employs qualitative textual analysis, consisting of:

Close reading of selected primary texts from Shakespeare, Browning, Woolf, and Joyce.

Linguistic stylistic analysis, focusing on: syntactic selection, cohesive devices, deixis, modality, narrative focalization.

Comparative analysis across genres and periods.

Theoretical integration based on discourse and narratology scholarship.

The method allows identification of recurring features and interpretive patterns in monologic speech representation.[3]

Literature Review

Research on monologic discourse spans literary criticism, narratology, and stylistics.

1. Classical and Victorian Perspectives

Shakespeare's soliloquies (as noted by Bradley, 1904) provide insight into character motivation through heightened rhetorical structure.

Robert Browning's dramatic monologues (Langbaum, 1957) emphasize the tension between speaker and implied audience, revealing psychological complexity.[4]

2. Modernist and Postmodernist Theories

Dorrit Cohn (1978) identifies interior monologue as a direct form of representing consciousness.

James Joyce and Virginia Woolf, widely studied by scholars like Humphrey (1954), revolutionized monologic speech through stream-of-consciousness techniques.

3. Linguistic Stylistics

Leech & Short (2007) classify modes of speech and thought presentation, ranging from direct to free indirect forms.[5]

Fludernik (1996) uses cognitive frameworks to explain how readers reconstruct consciousness through textual cues.

4. Bakhtinian Theory

Bakhtin's concept of monologism highlights the dominance of a single ideological voice, contrasted with dialogic polyphony.

Together, these studies show that monologic speech is multidimensional, shaped by literary goals, linguistic choices, and historical context.[6]

Findings

The analysis of selected English literary works yielded the following key findings:

Monologic speech functions as a psychological lens.

Interior monologues in Joyce's *Ulysses* and Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* expose fragmented, associative mental processes.

Dramatic monologues establish rhetorical self-presentation.

Browning's speakers articulate self-justifications, creating a paradoxical blend of confession and concealment.

Shakespeare's soliloquies merge introspection with plot.

Hamlet's "To be or not to be" speech is structured around antithetical syntax, revealing cognitive conflict.[7]

Linguistic markers signal mental interiority.

These include: stream-like syntax, deixis of self ("I," "myself"), modality expressing uncertainty, asyndeton and parataxis reflecting spontaneous thought.

Monologic speech serves as a narrative strategy for ideological control.

Authorial monologues—often embedded in Victorian novels—guide reader interpretation of morals or social critique.[8]

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Monologic discourse creates a unique representational space where linguistic structure mirrors psychological depth. In dramatic monologues, the presence of an implied audience constructs an ironic gap between what the speaker intends to convey and what the reader perceives. Browning's "My Last Duchess" exemplifies this pattern through controlled rhythm and strategic pauses, revealing the Duke's authoritarian psychology.

In interior monologue, the linguistic features shift toward syntactic looseness, reflecting immediate cognition. Joyce employs ellipsis, disjointed metaphors, and sensory associations to represent pre-verbal thought, illustrating Cohn's theory of "quoted monologue." Woolf, by contrast,

intertwines interior monologue with free indirect discourse, blurring the boundary between narrator and character—an example of what Genette identifies as variable focalization.

Soliloquies, rooted in theatrical convention, combine introspective thought with rhetorical artistry. Shakespeare uses iambic pentameter and metaphorical density to elevate personal reflection into philosophical commentary, creating a hybrid form of monologic performance.[9]

Across all these types, monologic speech constructs subjectivity. It gives readers privileged access to private consciousness, while simultaneously shaping narrative authority. In modernist works, this authority decentralizes, presenting a chorus of individual voices. In Victorian dramatic monologues, however, it becomes a tool for exposing moral tension through unreliable self-presentation.

Thus, monologic speech is not merely a stylistic choice; it is a narrative architecture that determines how readers perceive characters, plot, and ideology.[10]

CONCLUSION

The representation of monologic speech in English literature demonstrates its multifunctional role as a psychological, rhetorical, and narrative device. Across different literary periods, monologic discourse evolves from structured soliloquies to experimental streams of consciousness, reflecting shifts in literary aesthetics and theories of mind.

By analyzing linguistic and stylistic mechanisms, the study highlights how monologic speech constructs character interiority, manipulates narrative focus, and conveys ideological significance. Understanding these functions provides deeper insight into the interpretive strategies of English literary texts and enriches the broader field of stylistic and narratological analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*. University of Texas Press.
2. Bradley, A. C. (1904). *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Macmillan.
3. Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and Discourse*. Cornell University Press.
4. Cohn, D. (1978). *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton University Press.
5. Fludernik, M. (1996). *Towards a “Natural” Narratology*. Routledge.
6. Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative Discourse*. Cornell University Press.
7. Humphrey, R. (1954). *Stream of Consciousness in the Modern Novel*. University of California Press.
8. Langbaum, R. (1957). *The Poetry of Experience*. Random House.
9. Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction*. Pearson Longman.
10. Woolf, V. (1925). *Mrs. Dalloway*. Hogarth Press.