

# Dialogization As Communicative Unity

Mardon Rakhmatov

Republic of Uzbekistan, Alfraganus University, Associate Professor of the Department of Oriental Languages, DSc., Uzbekistan

**Received:** 13 October 2025; **Accepted:** 08 November 2025; **Published:** 30 November 2025

**Abstract:** This article analyzes the linguistic elements that facilitate dialogization – the building of a strong relationship with the addressee. Dialogization in poetic speech is a special textual organization technique in which the interaction of speech subjects creates the effect of lively communication. It functions as an independent communicative unit, providing the dynamics of utterance, emotional tension, and polyphony of poetic discourse. Dialogic structures enhance expression, emphasize the lyrical hero's inner experiences, and create a multifaceted meaning. In poetry, dialogization can manifest itself in the form of rhetorical questions, appeals, imperative forms, and second-person narration. An analysis of its functions allows for a deeper understanding of the communication mechanisms in poetic texts and the characteristics of lyrical self-expression.

**Keywords:** Dialogization, poetic speech, addressee, interrogative pronouns, appeals, second-person narration, imperative form.

**Introduction:** Dialogization is closely linked to dialogue (dialogical speech), which manifests itself in the process of dialogic speech. The more dialogic elements used in dialogic speech, the more effective the communication process. Thus, dialogic speech implies a form of speech that arises from the interaction of two or more persons (subjects/communicants) and their mutual influence. This form of speech, the most ancient form of oral communication, was subsequently transferred to other forms of speech, including fiction, thereby ensuring communication between speaker and listener.

Scholarly literature suggests that poetic works are in some respects close to monologue, especially lyric, and the appearance of dialogic speech in them is considered a structural element of monologue. From this perspective, the speaker in any form of speech, including monologue, has a specific goal, that is, they want to realize their intention. This is due to the fact that the speaker's speech is addressed to someone, and its content contains the category of the addressee.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of the phenomenon of dialogism began in the second half of the 20th century, in conjunction with the emergence of a new anthropocentric scientific paradigm focused on global dialogue and interaction. Issues of dialogism (the relationship between the

author and the addressee in speech) have been sufficiently studied abroad. However, in Uzbek linguistics, we have not encountered any studies devoted to this issue. In Soviet linguistics, the idea of dialogization was developed by M. Bakhtin and other scholars. In particular, Bakhtin focused on the dialogic nature of the word in his research: he sought answers to questions such as the meaning of dialogism, its function in text, and its place in the dialogue of cultures (using works created by authors in different styles and genres as examples). The scholar noted that the idea of dialogic responsibility implies the possibility of an individual revealing their "soul" through "others," that is, self-expression. This, in turn, required the study of the patterns and principles of the transition of elements of primary oral dialogism into "many large genres—that is, secondary, very complex large genres created as a result of varying degrees of transformation of primary genres (dialogical replicas, everyday stories, correspondence, letters, and diaries)" and led to a further increase in the interest of representatives of all humanities in the processes of communication.

## DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

In the poetic work, the elements of dialogization (means of communication) that preserve the characteristics of the forms of oral dialogic speech are considered urges, pronouns, second person of the verb, interrogatives, imperative structures. Also, in the

scientific literature, language elements that imply sending speech to the addressee, participating the addressee in the process of the speech act, or encouraging him to do some activity are addressing.

Interrogatives (interrogative sentences) in lyric works are rhetorical questions. In their content, they serve to convey more poetic information than to question, and they are considered important for poetic expression. In the dialogues between the lyrical hero and his interlocutor, the original nature, charm, and slang of oral dialogic speech can be felt:

Dedim: käminä itiñ-men, külüb maña ajtur:

Navāij, ne balā xudnamā emištuk-sen? (G'S, 482)

The author made good use of the interrogative particle -mi, the Persian particle oyo, in order to create a strong rhetoric in the text of the ghazals, and the lyrical hero implies the meaning of the lover performing certain actions or being influenced by them:

Maj birlä jüzünj tim-tim ahmar-mu ekin ājā,

Jā šu'la ara bir-bir ahgar-mu ekin ājā? (G'S, 36)

In the Uzbek language, the imperative form of the verb reflects the features of dialogization more than other types of grammatical forms. This form means asking the addressee to perform an action, to encourage him to do something or to take part in an event or process. In the context of the predicate of such sentences, the addressee is seen not just as a witness, but as a person who performs an action, as an element of dialogization, it greatly helps to understand the essence of poetic works:

Xasta žānīm za'fin aňla, köñlüm afyānīn körüb,

Sorma köñlüm jarasīn, fahm et közüm qanīn körüb (G'S, 57).

The content of predicates such as "aňla", "surma", and "fahm et" in the verse contains the meaning of command and order, and in addition to the occurrence of situations expected in oral speech, i.e., encouraging the addressee to practical activities, it also provides emotional expressiveness.

Urges are also considered one of the categories that require a real interlocutor in accordance with their natural speech character. But it is correct to look at motives in poetic works as poetic names, and not as real persons or things. Urges are adapted to a new communicative situation depending on the conditions and time of poetic speech, that is, they slightly change their original meaning and function in poetic speech. The motivations included by the poet in the poetic work: the person, the events in nature and society, objects, etc., no matter how far in space and time they are, are located at such a close distance to the

interlocutor, it gives the impression that he is directly participating in the described event (object). Such urges are rhetorical addresses. For example, ej köñil, ej köz, ej aql, ej taš...; ej gardun, ej qujaš, ej ay, ej sipehr, ej čarx, ej falak...; ej šāh, ej zāhid, ej šajx, ej hakim, ej bāğbān, ej sāqij, ej muğannij, ej rāvij, ej sālik, ej majfuruš, ej qātil, ej munajjim...; Addresses to Jesus, Khizr, Masih, Majnun, Navoi, and others are also rhetorical addresses.

Ej Navāij, ka'ba-ji maqsud vaslīn istāsāñ,

Šāh-i Yāzīj qasrīnīñ dargāhi ālijšānīn öp (G'S, 67).

It is known that the use of address words in speech styles is different. It is used naturally in oral speech, and in artistic speech as an imitation of oral speech. If the forms of address in oral speech, depending on the communicative situation, the words of address fulfill the tasks of naming the person or objects to whom the speech is directed, attracting their attention, while in poetic speech, this process takes place in a slightly different way. That is, the poet first animates the addressees (persons or objects) to whom the speech is addressed, or imagines them alive and names them to address them. According to some researchers, first the poet sees a connection with his feeling, a similarity in an object/person and names it according to these characteristics and turns it into an object of address. An important part of the address form of the addressee is the poetic information in it and how it is formalized using which language element. Addresses used in Alisher Navoi's lyrics consist of traditional images - personal and object nouns:

Ej sabā, šarh ājlā avval dilsitānīmdīn xabar,

Soñra degil köñül atliñ nātavānīmdīn xabar (G'S, 179).

The form of address "ej" in Alisher Navoi's lyrical works does not imply the physical activation and attention of the addressee. The poet looks at the word of address ej as a means of creating an artistic image and description. The speech of the lyrical hero is focused on the second person:

lšq ara, ejkim, dediñ, har lahza farjād etmä, vāj,

Ut tütäškān čay bolur-mu kimsä farjād etmäšä?! (G'S, 568)

That is: "ej" is the addressee "sen". Its poetic meaning is broad: like yor<pir or pir<yor. That is, the artistic image-description takes the lead in this: "ej" is an address to the image being described.

In the context of the second person personal, dialogization is much weaker. But, the second-person pronoun sen, apart from the second person (listener), also serves to indicate the possible addressees, the general readership.

If the sentence contains the pronoun *sen* and the second person imperative forms together, the characteristic signs of dialogization appear. This is especially evident in *matla* beyts:

*Sen öz xulquṇnī tüzgil, bolma el axlāqīdīn xursand,  
Kişigā čün kişi farzandi hargiz bolmadī farzand (G'S, 115).*

*Sen* as a deictic unit allows you to refer to a definite or vague interlocutor, a person or persons, an inanimate object or abstract concepts. In the poetic text, *sen* is universal: he is the poet, the poet's heart (*qurbān köñül* - sacrificing heart, *xasta köñül* - sick heart):

*Kel-kel, ej qurbān köñül, ul qaşī jā mehrin unut,  
Čün vafādīn tartilur-sen ham barīb bir göşā tut (G'S, 71).*

Even if the dialogization in the context of the pronoun *sen* is weak, the informativeness is very high, because in such sentences the object of the image and the subject of the image are semantically united. The second person is described according to the characteristics of the subject of the image: *sen* - love, *sen*- a friend (G'S, 114); *sen* – *āludadāman-sen* (G'S, 202); *sen-mayparast*, *sen* – *devāna-sen*:

*Subh erūr sāqij-u men maxmur-men, sen majparast,  
Mana qujaş-dek žāmnī, monī' nedur bolmaqqa mast (G'S, 77).*

*Ej Navāij, sen dayī devāna-sen, köñlün dayī,*

*Gar seni zabt etsālār kim ājlāj alıaj anī zabt (G'S, 282).*

Also, dialogization is disabled or not observed in the following cases. If the content of the sentence does not refer to real reality, but has not yet been realized, but is meant to be increased, that is, if it has an unrealistic content, dialogization is almost not observed, because there is no motivation in the predicate content of such sentences. But their informativeness, poetic power of information remains.

The 1st person *-aj/āj//j* and its plural *-ajliq/ājlik* wishful forms of oral speech also have an unrealized meaning. In the "Gharoyib us-sighar" *divan*, the first person *aj/āj//j* (its plural form *-aylik* was not found) is used more often. The lyrical "men" in the first person is a lyrical subject who is highly emotional, experiencing and deeply feeling the described events:

*Sāqij ā, tut bādakim, bir lahza özümdin baraj,  
Şart bu kim, har nečā tutsaṇ labālab sipqaraj (G'S, 588).*

Historically, this form also expressed the meanings of the verb desire, wish, prayer :

*Yam elidin, jā rab, ul gülgā yubāre bolmasun,  
Bālki ānsız dahr bāyida bahāre bolmasun (G'S, 477).*

## CONCLUSION

In the system of dialogic devices in Alisher Navoi's ghazals, it is appropriate to distinguish between imperative pronouns, pronouns, the second-person form of the verb, interrogative and imperative constructions.

In oral speech, dialogic devices served to ensure the addressee's understanding of any complex speech. In lyric works, they prevented the emergence of complex speech situations that might be expected between the author and the addressee, ensuring ease of understanding or eliminating them entirely.

The study of the division of addressees into internal and external plays an important role in the analysis of a poetic work. Differences in the relationships between internal and external addressees are important for determining the semantic structure of a lyric text, as well as for determining the semantics and functions of various grammatical categories and forms in a lyric work.

## REFERENCES

1. Quronov, Dilmurod va b. 2010. *Adabiyotshunoslik lug'ati*. – T.: Akademnashr.–B.154
2. Saparniyazova, Muyassar and o. 2022. The Role of Communicative Strategy and Tactics in Name Creation // *International Journal of Social Science And Human Research*. – USA, – № 5. – P.1086-1088.
3. Ковтунова, Ирина. 2003. Семантика форм лица в языке поэзии. *Русский язык в научном общении*.1 (5): -С. 33.
4. Лутфуллаева, Дурдона ва б. 2017. *Тилшуносликда лисоний шахс муаммоси // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти*. №.6. – Б. 39-40.
5. Ниязова, Дилдора. 2020. *Бадий матнда лисоний шахс типлари: Филол. фан. б. фалс. док. ....дисс.* – Қарши. – Б. 125.
6. Рахматов, Мардон. 2023. *Поэтик синтаксис: структура ва семантика*. – Т.: Bookmany print. – B.114.
7. Рычкова, Л.В. *Общее языкознание. Субъект коммуникации как субъект определённой культуры/* [https://studopedia.su/2\\_23470\\_sub-ekt-kommunikatsii-kak-sub-ekt-opredelennoy-kulturi.html](https://studopedia.su/2_23470_sub-ekt-kommunikatsii-kak-sub-ekt-opredelennoy-kulturi.html)
8. Солганик, Г. 2014. О структуре речи (категории производителя и субъекта речи). *Экология языка и коммуникативная практика*. 1: 57–66.
9. Ҳақимов, Мухаммаджон. 2001. *Ўзбек тилида матнинг прагматик талқини: Филол. фан. д-ри ... дисс.* – Т.: – Б.63.

- 10.** Юсуфов, Бердақ. 1988. Местоимение в староузбекском литературном языке (XV-XVI вв). Автореф. дисс. ... канд. фил. наук. – Т.: – С. 6.