

Scientific Classification and Linguistic Interpretation of Contemporary English Drama: An Interdisciplinary Approach

TURSUNOVA NAFISA SHUXRATOVNA
*Tashkent International University of Financial
Management and Technologies, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

ABSTRACT

Contemporary English drama occupies a distinctive place in current humanities research because it combines aesthetic innovation with dense linguistic and discursive complexity. While literary scholarship has examined its thematic range, dramaturgic experimentation, and cultural politics, linguistically oriented studies have focused on dialogue, deixis, interaction, implicature, and stylistic patterning. These lines of inquiry, however, have too often developed in parallel rather than in productive synthesis. This article argues that contemporary English drama should be approached through an explicitly interdisciplinary framework that integrates scientific classification with linguistic interpretation. The study first conceptualizes contemporary English drama as a late-modern and postmodern cultural formation shaped by fragmentation, social critique, identity conflict, and experimentation with theatrical form. It then proposes a systematic classification based on thematic tendencies, dramaturgic structures, aesthetic principles, and communicative strategies. The article further demonstrates that dramatic language is not merely a vehicle of plot but a mechanism of characterization, ideological confrontation, symbolic layering, and audience positioning. Through discussion of selected playwrights such as Caryl Churchill, Sarah Kane, Martin Crimp, Jez Butterworth, Debbie Tucker Green, and Lucy Prebble, the paper shows how dialogue, pause, silence, interruption, ambiguity, sociolect, and subtext

function as constitutive elements of meaning. The conclusion emphasizes that literary and linguistic methods are mutually reinforcing and that contemporary English drama is best understood as both an artistic form and a complex discursive event.

Keywords: Contemporary English drama, dramatic discourse, classification, pragmatics, stylistics, subtext, identity, interdisciplinarity.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary English drama has emerged as one of the most dynamic fields of modern literary and cultural study. Its significance lies not only in its thematic responsiveness to late-modern social anxieties, political transformation, and crises of identity, but also in its distinctive use of language as performance, conflict, and symbolic action. Unlike narrative fiction, drama presents language under conditions of embodiment, immediacy, and interaction. Every utterance is simultaneously textual and performative, literary and social, aesthetic and pragmatic. For this reason, contemporary English drama is an especially productive object of study for both literary scholarship and linguistics.

In literary studies, recent drama has been examined in relation to postmodernism, postdramatic theatre, trauma aesthetics, neoliberal culture, gender politics, memory, and the fragmentation of subjectivity. In linguistics and discourse studies, dramatic dialogue has attracted attention as a stylized representation of interaction, shaped by turn-taking, speech acts, implicature, politeness, deixis, silence, and other pragmatic mechanisms. Yet these approaches often remain methodologically separate. Literary criticism may identify ideological tensions and aesthetic strategies without fully accounting for how such tensions are linguistically organized, while linguistic analysis may illuminate conversational patterns without relating them sufficiently to dramatic form, theatricality, and cultural meaning.

The research problem addressed in this article is therefore the insufficient integration of literary and linguistic approaches in the study of contemporary English drama. The aim of the article is to develop an interdisciplinary model that combines scientific classification of contemporary English drama with a linguistically informed interpretation of its dramatic discourse. To achieve this aim, the article pursues several objectives: to define contemporary English drama as a literary and cultural phenomenon; to propose a systematic classification of its major types and tendencies; to analyze the linguistic mechanisms through which dramatic meaning is produced; and to demonstrate how discourse, style, and pragmatics contribute to characterization, conflict, ideology, and audience interpretation.

The novelty of the study lies in the attempt to unite two modes of inquiry that are too often treated as separate: taxonomic description of drama as a literary system and linguistic interpretation of drama as discourse. The argument advanced here is that classification becomes more meaningful when grounded in discursive form, and linguistic interpretation becomes more adequate when situated within generic, aesthetic, and ideological structures. Contemporary English drama, in this view, should be read not merely as a body of plays but as a differentiated field of cultural utterances whose artistic logic is inseparable from its language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of modern and contemporary drama has long been shaped by formal, semiotic, and historical approaches. Elam's *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* (1980) was foundational in establishing drama as a signifying system in which verbal language interacts with gesture, space, movement, and theatrical codes. Aston & Savona (1991) further emphasized the semiotic complexity of theatre, arguing that dramatic meaning emerges through relations among multiple sign systems rather than through dialogue alone. At the same time, Pavis (1998) contributed to the conceptual vocabulary needed for discussing

dramaturgic structures, performance codes, and theatrical signification.

Later developments in drama theory shifted attention toward the instability of representation and the changing conditions of theatrical form. Lehmann's *Postdramatic Theatre* (2006) was especially influential in theorizing drama that loosens the centrality of plot, character coherence, and mimetic continuity. Although not all contemporary English drama is postdramatic in a strict sense, Lehmann's framework is indispensable for understanding fragmentation, textual discontinuity, and the weakening of conventional dramatic teleology. In British and English-language contexts, scholars of contemporary theatre have also focused on the politics of form, violence, gender, spectatorship, and the ethics of representation, especially in relation to playwrights such as Sarah Kane, Caryl Churchill, Martin Crimp, and Mark Ravenhill.

From a linguistic perspective, dramatic discourse has been studied through stylistics, discourse analysis, and pragmatics. Short (1996) and Culpeper, Short, and Verdonk (1998) showed that literary texts, including drama, can be fruitfully examined through stylistic methods that attend to lexical patterning, register, deixis, speech presentation, and discourse organization. Burton (1980) and Herman (1995) drew attention to the ways in which dramatic dialogue imitates, stylizes, and reconfigures conversational interaction. Rather than being a transparent transcription of real speech, dialogue in drama is a crafted form of interaction whose artificiality is itself meaningful.

Pragmatic theory has also shaped the analysis of drama. Austin's speech act theory (1962) and Searle's further elaboration of illocutionary force (1969) are central for understanding utterances in drama as acts that do things rather than merely say things. Grice's theory of conversational implicature (1975) helps explain how dramatic discourse relies on indirectness, inference, and interpretive gaps. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) and Leech's work on pragmatics (1983) have been especially useful in analyzing face-threat, mitigation, dominance, and relational tension in dramatic exchanges. In many contemporary plays, conflict is structured

not only by what characters say explicitly but by how they evade, threaten, withhold, or imply.

Discourse-analytic and critical approaches have further deepened the linguistic study of drama. Fairclough (1995) and van Dijk (1998) emphasize that discourse is inseparable from social power and ideology. Applied to drama, this insight reveals how linguistic choices encode hierarchy, exclusion, resistance, and identity. Simpson (1993) likewise demonstrates that language is never ideologically neutral and that stylistic choices shape point of view, authority, and perception. In dramatic texts, where speech is the primary medium of social encounter, ideological structure is often legible in turn-taking patterns, lexical choice, address forms, irony, and silence.

Hermeneutic theory also remains relevant. Gadamer (2004) and Ricoeur (1976) remind us that interpretation involves a movement between part and whole, utterance and context, text and horizon. This is particularly important in drama, where meaning frequently resides in subtext, interruption, and stageable implication rather than in stable propositional content. Contemporary English drama often resists singular interpretation; its language is dense with ambiguity, fractured reference, and incomplete explanation.

Despite this rich body of scholarship, an important gap remains. Studies of contemporary drama frequently prioritize thematic and ideological analysis without a sustained account of discourse mechanics, while linguistically oriented studies may remain too local, focusing on specific exchanges without developing a broader classification of dramatic forms and tendencies. There is still a need for a model that explains how thematic, generic, and aesthetic classifications relate to concrete linguistic structures. This article addresses that need by treating classification and interpretation as mutually constitutive.

METHODOLOGY

This article adopts an interdisciplinary methodological framework that combines literary analysis, comparative analysis, the classification method, discourse analysis, stylistic analysis,

pragmatic interpretation, and hermeneutic interpretation. Such a composite methodology is appropriate because contemporary English drama is simultaneously a literary genre, a theatrical form, and a structured field of discourse.

Literary analysis is used to examine themes, forms, aesthetic principles, and cultural orientations within representative contemporary plays. Comparative analysis allows the article to identify recurrent features across different playwrights while also registering distinctions among dramaturgic models. The classification method is employed to construct a systematic typology of contemporary English drama on the basis of thematic tendencies, formal structures, communicative strategies, and ideological orientations.

Discourse analysis is central to the linguistic dimension of the study. It makes possible the examination of turn-taking, interactional sequencing, deixis, ellipsis, interruption, silence, and the organization of dramatic dialogue as a communicative event. Stylistic analysis is used to identify lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical features that shape tone, characterization, and aesthetic effect. Pragmatic interpretation is necessary because meaning in drama is often indirect, emerging through implicature, speech acts, politeness strategies, irony, and subtext rather than through explicit statement. Hermeneutic interpretation provides the broader interpretive frame within which local discursive details are connected to larger thematic, symbolic, and ideological patterns.

This methodological combination is especially suitable for contemporary English drama because such drama often depends on formal experimentation, textual incompleteness, and discursive tension. A purely thematic approach cannot fully explain how language produces dramatic force, while a purely linguistic approach may overlook the generic and cultural logic of the text. The present framework therefore treats dramatic language as an integral part of dramaturgy rather than as a detachable stylistic ornament.

MAIN ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Contemporary English drama as a literary and cultural phenomenon

Contemporary English drama may be defined, for the purposes of this study, as drama written in English in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, particularly within British theatrical culture, under conditions shaped by globalization, neoliberal transformation, identity politics, media saturation, and postmodern or late-modern instability. It is not a homogeneous body of work. Rather, it is a field marked by heterogeneity, generic permeability, and competing aesthetic agendas. What unites many of its major texts is less a shared doctrine than a shared sensitivity to fracture: fracture of identity, narrative continuity, social belonging, linguistic transparency, and ideological certainty.

One of the defining features of contemporary English drama is its suspicion toward stable totalities. Character is often decentered, plot is frequently discontinuous, and language resists full transparency. Plays by Sarah Kane, Martin Crimp, and Caryl Churchill exemplify this tendency in different ways. Kane's drama exposes psychic extremity and social violence through language that oscillates between brutal directness and lyrical disintegration. Crimp's plays often undermine referential stability, compelling audiences to confront narration, speculation, and verbal construction as part of the dramatic event. Churchill experiments with temporality, multiplicity, and information overload, using linguistic fragmentation to stage a fractured social world.

Yet contemporary English drama is not reducible to fragmentation alone. Alongside experimental forms, one finds powerful traditions of socially grounded realism, politically alert dramaturgy, and linguistically nuanced psychological theatre. Jez Butterworth's *Jerusalem*, for instance, combines mythic resonance with sociolectal texture and local speech rhythms; Lucy Prebble's *Enron* dramatizes financial capitalism through stylized discourse and satirical abstraction; debbie tucker green's plays frequently mobilize repetition, compression, silence, and

rhythmic speech as forms of ethical and political intensity. The contemporary field is thus best understood as plural, unstable, and internally differentiated.

Toward a scientific classification of contemporary English drama

A scientific classification of contemporary English drama should not rely on a single criterion, since the field is too complex to be organized by theme alone or by formal technique alone. A more adequate classification must be multidimensional, integrating thematic, formal, aesthetic, ideological, and communicative parameters.

At the thematic level, one can identify at least five broad tendencies. The first is socio-political drama, which addresses class, state violence, migration, race, war, institutional power, or the consequences of neoliberalism. Such drama frequently seeks to expose systemic contradictions and often combines realism with critical estrangement. The second is identity-centered drama, focused on gender, sexuality, ethnicity, memory, belonging, and the unstable formation of the self. The third is trauma and crisis drama, which stages psychic breakdown, violence, catastrophe, mourning, and the collapse of communicative norms. The fourth is metatheatrical and self-reflexive drama, concerned with representation itself, the instability of narration, and the constructedness of social reality. The fifth is techno-cultural or media-conscious drama, which explores the impact of digital culture, financial abstraction, surveillance, spectacle, and information excess on contemporary subjectivity.

At the level of dramaturgic form, contemporary English drama may be classified into realist, neo-realist, fragmented, postdramatic, and hybrid models. Realist and neo-realist plays retain relatively stable character systems and social settings, but often intensify linguistic realism by foregrounding interruption, hesitation, or class-coded speech. Fragmented drama departs from linear plotting and coherent scene progression, using disjunction and juxtaposition to produce interpretive pressure. Postdramatic texts weaken or suspend traditional dramatic

progression, replacing plot-centered organization with image, language flow, episodic accumulation, or performative eventfulness. Hybrid drama combines these modes, preserving recognizable social situations while destabilizing them through formal experimentation.

Aesthetic principles provide another classificatory axis. Some contemporary plays are governed by minimalism, where sparse language and silence create interpretive density. Others adopt excess, verbal acceleration, or polyphonic multiplication. Some pursue raw immediacy and affective shock, while others cultivate irony, distance, or documentary texture. These aesthetic principles are not superficial stylistic preferences; they are structural orientations that shape how meaning is distributed and how audiences are positioned.

An ideological and cultural classification is also necessary. Contemporary English drama may be oppositional, diagnostic, ironic, or ambivalent in relation to dominant discourse. Some plays directly challenge hegemonic narratives of nation, gender, or market rationality. Others reveal ideology less through explicit critique than through discursive contradiction and representational instability. Still others dramatize the difficulty of ideological clarity in a media-saturated culture where language itself is compromised. This ideological axis is crucial because dramatic language often stages power not only through thematic content but through unequal access to articulation, interruption, naming, and narrative authority.

Finally, contemporary drama can be classified by communicative strategy. Some plays rely on confrontational dialogue, structured by verbal contest and face-threat. Others use evasive dialogue in which meaning is displaced into subtext. Still others produce fractured communication through broken syntax, non-sequiturs, repetitions, or strategic silence. In this sense, communicative mode is not an accessory to dramatic form; it is one of its primary organizing principles.

This multidimensional model is scientific not because it reduces drama to rigid categories, but because it offers explicit criteria for comparison and analysis. It allows scholars to identify recurrent patterns without erasing singularity, and it shows that

classification in drama studies must include discourse as a constitutive dimension.

Major features of contemporary English dramaturgy

Several recurrent features emerge across these classifications. One is fragmentation. Fragmentation may affect plot, character, syntax, chronology, or perspective. In many contemporary plays, fragmentation is not merely a formal innovation but a mode of cultural diagnosis. It reflects the breakdown of stable social narratives and the difficulty of sustaining unified subjectivity under conditions of violence, mediation, and ideological overload.

A second major feature is psychological intensity. Contemporary English drama often brings audiences close to states of anxiety, compulsion, traumatic memory, or emotional extremity. This intensity is frequently achieved through linguistic compression rather than psychological explanation. Characters do not always narrate their inner life coherently; instead, inner conflict appears in hesitation, repetition, abrupt tonal shifts, lexical obsession, or speech breakdown.

A third feature is social critique. Even when contemporary plays do not adopt overtly political rhetoric, they often reveal the operations of class power, institutional domination, commodification, and symbolic exclusion. The critique may be direct, as in dramas centered on state or corporate structures, or indirect, emerging from the forms of speech available to different characters. Language becomes an index of access, legitimacy, and authority.

A fourth feature is experimentation with form and language. Contemporary playwrights often treat language not simply as dialogue but as material. Repetition, fragmentation, overlapping voices, pause, metalinguistic commentary, and rhythmic patterning become structural devices. This experimentation is especially visible in playwrights such as Churchill and Caryl Phillips, whose dramatic texts frequently resist smooth referential reading and demand attention to the sound, spacing, and pressure of utterance.

A fifth feature is the coexistence of postmodern playfulness and late-modern seriousness. Irony, parody, and self-reflexivity remain important, but they often coexist with trauma, ethical urgency, and political critique. Contemporary drama therefore occupies an unstable space between skepticism and commitment. It questions representation while still demanding response.

The linguistic structure of contemporary English drama

The linguistic analysis of contemporary English drama begins with the recognition that dramatic dialogue is a special form of discourse. It resembles conversation, but it is not ordinary conversation. It is shaped by economy, selection, patterning, and performative intention. Its meaning depends not only on semantic content but on pacing, adjacency, omission, repetition, and stageability.

Dialogue constructs meaning by distributing knowledge unevenly. Characters may know different things, conceal what they know, or misunderstand one another. Audiences are positioned within these asymmetries and must infer significance from partial information. This is why pragmatics is indispensable. A great deal of dramatic meaning is generated by implicature: what is suggested but not said, resisted but not denied, feared but not formulated. In many contemporary plays, subtext carries more interpretive weight than overt content.

Silence and pause are especially significant. Pinter's drama earlier established the theatrical power of pause and silence, but contemporary playwrights radicalize this inheritance in new directions. Silence may function as resistance, trauma, refusal, shame, affective overflow, or the limit of available language. A pause can destabilize an exchange, redistribute power, or force the audience into interpretive labor. In post-traumatic or politically charged drama, silence is often not emptiness but saturated absence.

Interruption and hesitation similarly produce dramatic force. An interrupted utterance may indicate fear, social inferiority, emotional overload, or competition for dominance. Hesitation markers, ellipsis, syntactic incompleteness, and self-repair simulate spontaneity while also dramatizing conflict between intention

and expression. These features are particularly important in plays where identity is unstable or where speech is constrained by ideology, class, or intimate pressure.

Contemporary English drama also makes rich use of irony and ambiguity. Irony may operate verbally, structurally, or ideologically. A character may say one thing and imply another, but a play may also produce irony by placing different discourses in tension without authorial resolution. Ambiguity is not a failure of clarity; it is often a deliberate strategy that preserves interpretive openness and dramatizes contested reality. Martin Crimp's plays are exemplary in this respect, as they often withhold stable referents and force audiences to confront language as an apparatus of construction, rumor, and projection.

Speech, identity, and power

One of the most revealing aspects of contemporary English drama is the way speech constructs identity. Characters do not simply possess identities that language later expresses; rather, identity is often performed, negotiated, fractured, or resisted through discourse itself. Sociolect and idiolect are therefore crucial analytical categories.

Sociolect marks social location. Accent, vocabulary, grammatical patterning, and pragmatic norms may indicate class position, regional belonging, professional identity, or institutional status. In a play like *Jerusalem*, speech rhythms and idiomatic texture help create a social world in which authority, exclusion, and belonging are linguistically encoded. Such language does not merely decorate characterization; it constitutes the social environment of the play.

Idiolect, by contrast, individualizes the speaker. Recurrent lexical choices, rhythm, self-interruption, metaphor, or verbal fixation can become signatures of consciousness. In psychologically intense drama, idiolect may reveal obsession, vulnerability, repression, or disintegration. Sarah Kane's language often moves toward the edge of articulate collapse, turning fractured utterance into a form of psychic exposure. The instability of speech becomes a mode of characterization.

Power relations are equally embedded in discourse. Dominance may manifest itself through interruption, topic control, imperative structures, mock politeness, or the capacity to define reality verbally. Subordinate characters may respond through silence, evasiveness, indirectness, or verbal excess. Critical discourse analysis is especially valuable here because it reveals how ideology is naturalized in seemingly ordinary language. Corporate discourse, bureaucratic euphemism, media cliché, therapeutic vocabulary, and market rhetoric all appear in contemporary English drama as historically specific languages of power.

Lucy Prebble's *Enron* is especially instructive because it stages the abstraction of financial capitalism through stylized and often dehumanized discourse. Language in such drama becomes performative in a double sense: it acts within the fictional world, and it exposes the performativity of real institutional language. Similarly, Churchill's work often juxtaposes disparate registers to show how ideology is distributed through language forms. A shift in register may signal not merely tonal change but a clash of social logics.

Subtext, conflict, and audience perception

Dramatic conflict is rarely exhausted by explicit disagreement. In contemporary English drama, conflict often resides in what cannot be straightforwardly stated. Subtext is therefore central. It emerges when the semantic surface of an utterance diverges from its pragmatic force or emotional charge. A seemingly banal exchange may contain accusation, desire, fear, or ideological tension. The audience's task is to read beneath the verbal surface without assuming that a hidden meaning can always be stabilized.

This has important consequences for audience perception. Because drama unfolds in time and through interaction, interpretation is dynamic. Audiences revise their understanding as new utterances reframe earlier ones. Ambiguity, repetition, and silence delay closure and produce interpretive depth. The audience is not simply informed; it is activated. Contemporary

drama frequently relies on this activation, refusing the comfort of complete explanation.

Linguistic devices also intensify dramatic tension by regulating tempo and expectation. Rapid exchange may create aggression or panic; slowed dialogue may produce dread; repetition may become ritualistic, coercive, or absurd. Ellipsis can create emotional compression, while abrupt shifts in tone can unsettle interpretive ground. In Debbie Tucker Green's work, for example, compressed verbal patterning and silence often generate moral and affective pressure more powerfully than expository statement could.

At the symbolic level, language in contemporary drama often exceeds referential function. Recurrent phrases, broken motifs, rhetorical patterns, and verbal echoes form networks of symbolic layering. A word may return with altered meaning across scenes; a silence may become emblematic of social impossibility; an interrupted phrase may crystallize the unspeakable. Such features confirm that dramatic language is not merely a medium of communication but a mode of artistic construction.

Literary and linguistic interpretation as complementary practices

The preceding analysis suggests that the scientific classification of contemporary English drama cannot remain external to language. A play's thematic tendency, formal type, or ideological orientation is realized through discourse. Likewise, linguistic interpretation cannot remain purely micro-analytic. Pause, deixis, implicature, or sociolect gain significance only when read within broader aesthetic and cultural structures.

An interdisciplinary approach therefore produces a stronger account than either discipline could provide in isolation. Literary criticism identifies the historical and aesthetic logic of dramatic form; linguistics explains how that logic is enacted in verbal interaction. Literary theory clarifies questions of representation, genre, and ideology; discourse analysis shows how these questions materialize in patterns of speech. Hermeneutics links local textual detail to larger structures of meaning without reducing ambiguity to simple message.

Contemporary English drama is especially suited to such interdisciplinary work because it repeatedly foregrounds the instability of communication itself. Its characters speak under pressure; its dialogues are shaped by power, vulnerability, and concealment; its forms are often organized around fracture and inference. To study such drama adequately, one must read language as action, style as ideology, and discourse as dramaturgy.

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that contemporary English drama should be studied through a genuinely interdisciplinary framework that combines scientific classification with linguistic interpretation. As a literary and cultural phenomenon, contemporary English drama is marked by heterogeneity, formal experimentation, psychological intensity, social critique, and discursive complexity. It cannot be adequately understood through thematic description alone, nor through narrowly formalist or exclusively linguistic methods.

The proposed classification model demonstrates that contemporary English drama may be systematically organized according to thematic tendencies, dramaturgic forms, aesthetic principles, ideological orientations, and communicative strategies. Such a model is useful because it identifies recurring structures without flattening the singularity of individual plays. It also shows that classification in drama studies must attend to discourse, since communicative mode is one of the principal ways in which dramatic form becomes legible.

The linguistic dimension of the analysis has shown that dialogue in contemporary drama functions as more than a channel of information. Through speech acts, implicature, irony, ambiguity, silence, pause, sociolect, and idiolect, language becomes a mechanism of characterization, psychological revelation, ideological confrontation, and symbolic construction. Meaning is often produced indirectly, through subtext and interactional pressure rather than explicit statement. In this sense, the dramatic text is both literary artifact and discursive event.

The broader conclusion is that literary and linguistic approaches are not competing models but complementary ones. Literary analysis clarifies the aesthetic and cultural structures of drama, while linguistic interpretation reveals the micro-mechanisms through which those structures operate. Their integration allows for a more rigorous and more nuanced understanding of contemporary English drama. At the intersection of drama studies, stylistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis, contemporary English drama appears not simply as a reflection of modern life, but as one of the most intricate verbal forms through which modern life is imagined, contested, and interpreted.

REFERENCES

- Aston, E. & Savona, G. 1991. *Theatre as Sign-system: A Semiotics of Text and Performance*. Routledge.
- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, D. 1980. *Dialogue and Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Culpeper, J., Short, M. & Verdonk, P. (Eds.) 1998. *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*. Routledge.
- Elam, K. 1980. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. Methuen.
- Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- Gadamer, H.-G. 2004. *Truth and Method*. 2nd ed. Trans. J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall. Continuum. (Original work published 1960).
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3. Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Herman, V. 1995. *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. Routledge.
- Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Lehmann, H.-T. 2006. *Postdramatic Theatre*. Trans. K. Jürs-Munby. Routledge.

- Pavis, P. 1998. *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis*. Trans. C. Shantz. University of Toronto Press.
- Ricoeur, P. 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Texas Christian University Press.
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Short, M. 1996. *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. Longman.
- Simpson, P. 1993. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage.

TURSUNOVA NAFISA SHUXRATOVNA

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR,

TASHKENT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGIES,

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <NAFISTURSUNOVA1990@GMAIL.COM>