

ADDRESS AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Bobojonova Nargiza Jumaniyozovna

PhD student, Bukhara state university

In modern linguistics there is a constantly growing interest in the question of the status of address, i.e. about the syntactic functions of address. From the definitions given to address in many studies, it is impossible to conclude what syntactic function it performs, since address is characterized constructively, not functionally.

The grammatical nature of the address and its connection with the sentence was essentially omitted completely. If in some cases scientists raised these questions, their solution was usually limited to pointing out the lack of grammatical connection between the address and the sentence. Moreover, the term "appeal" itself, which first appeared in the "Historical Grammar of the Russian Language" by F.I., remained undisclosed. Buslaev: it was understood as either "vocative case", then "vocative word", then "word invocation", then "inserted members of a sentence" and so on.

In general courses of Russian grammar until the second half of the 19th century, it was customary to consider address together with case forms, due to which it was not delimited from the concept of "vocal case", and the very meaning of the vocative case was revealed through the definition of the main function of address - the function of the name of a person or object, to which the speaker's speech is addressed in a sentence. Thus, considering the relationship between "things" and their actions, which are designated by one or another case, M.V. Lomonosov in "Russian Grammar" defines the functions of the vocative case as follows: "When speech addresses a thing: O you, strong hand, O you, loud victory" [Lomonosov 1952,411].

N.I. Grech and A.Kh. Vostokov also talks about the vocative case. Moreover, A.Kh. Vostokov gives the following definition to the vocative case: "Vocative, showing the name of the object to which speech is addressed. For example:

"Student!Be diligent""Children!Listen to your parents and mentors!"[Vostokov 1835.21].

A.A. does not reveal the specifics of the treatment either. Potebnya. Moreover, he tends to confuse the syntactic functions of subject and address. A.A. Potebnya in his work "From Notes on Russian Grammar" states that in the language there are two cases capable of expressing the subject - nominative and vocative [Potebnya 1888.94].

In subsequent grammatical works, the attention of linguists was drawn to resolving the question of whether an address is a member of a sentence. Moreover, the issue was resolved on the basis of determining its grammatical connections with other members of the sentence and the sentence as a whole. So, D.N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy in "Syntax of the Russian Language" considers address among "words and expressions that are not part of the sentence, but adjacent to the sentence, standing with it" [Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy 1912, 292], laying the foundations for an isolationist interpretation of the linguistic nature of this unit. According to this theory, the address is considered grammatically unrelated to the sentence and is therefore excluded from the members of the sentence.

Such prominent scientists as A.A. Shakhmatov and A.M. Peshkovskiy, took a deeper approach to solving the problem of circulation. Their works contain interesting and very valuable observations on this syntactic category of language. But on the question of the relation of the appeal to the proposal and its members, they also adhered to the traditional point of view.

"An address is a word or phrase," writes A.A. Shakhmatov, - corresponding to the name of the second person, the person to whom the speaker's speech is addressed. It stands outside the sentence and is therefore not a member of the sentence" [Shakhmatov 1941,261].

This, according to the scientist, is the first reason why he does not refer the appeal to the section devoted to the consideration of phrases that are part of the sentence and secondary members of the sentence. The second reason was, according to him, that the address sometimes performs the functions of a special type of sentence: "... so, for example, the address Kolya! is equivalent to a sentence in which - and this depends on the intonation given to the word Kolya - either contains a call from a person called Kolya (Kolya, come here; Kolya, are you here, haven't you left?), or a warning (Kolya, be careful), or reproach (Kolya, shame on you! Kolya, why did you say or do that?)" [Shakhmatov 1941,261].

Address is one of the syntactic categories that is very poorly represented in the syntax of the Kabardino-Circassian language. In Kabardino-Circassian linguistics, no one has conducted a thorough study of this unit. One can name the names of such scientists as H.E. Dzasezhev, Kh.Z.Gyaurgiev, Kh.Sh. Urusov, who define address as "a word or combination of words that is not grammatically related to the members of the sentence and denotes the person or object to which speech is addressed" [Grammar of the Kabardino-Circassian literary language 1957, 14]. That is, they all adhere to an isolationist theory of the study of conversion.

In modern linguistics there is a constantly growing interest in the question of the status of address, i.e. about the syntactic functions of address. From the definitions given to address in many studies, it is impossible to conclude what syntactic function it performs, since address is characterized constructively, not functionally.

The grammatical nature of the address and its connection with the sentence was essentially omitted completely. If in some cases scientists raised these questions, their solution was usually limited to pointing out the lack of grammatical connection between the address and the sentence. Moreover, the term “appeal” itself, which first appeared in the “Historical Grammar of the Russian Language” by F.I., remained undisclosed. Buslaev: it was understood as either “vocative case”, then “vocative word”, then “word invocation”, then “inserted members of a sentence” and so on.

In general courses of Russian grammar until the second half of the 19th century, it was customary to consider address together with case forms, due to which it was not delimited from the concept of “vocal case”, and the very meaning of the vocative case was revealed through the definition of the main function of address - the function of the name of a person or object, to which the speaker's speech is addressed in a sentence. Thus, considering the relationship between “things” and their actions, which are designated by one or another case, M.V. Lomonosov in “Russian Grammar” defines the functions of the vocative case as follows: “When speech addresses a thing: O you, strong hand, O you, loud victory” [Lomonosov 1952,411].

N.I. Grech and A.Kh. Vostokov also talks about the vocative case. Moreover, A.Kh. Vostokov gives the following definition to the vocative case: “Vocative, showing the name of the object to which speech is addressed. For example:

“Student!Be diligent”“Children!Listen to your parents and mentors!”[Vostokov 1835.21].

A.A. does not reveal the specifics of the treatment either. Potebnya. Moreover, he tends to confuse the syntactic functions of subject and address. A.A. Potebnya in his work “From Notes on Russian Grammar” states that in the language there are two cases capable of expressing the subject - nominative and vocative [Potebnya 1888.94].

In subsequent grammatical works, the attention of linguists was drawn to resolving the question of whether an address is a member of a sentence. Moreover, the issue was resolved on the basis of determining its grammatical connections with other members of the sentence and the sentence as a whole. So, D.N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky in “Syntax of the Russian Language”

considers address among “words and expressions that are not part of the sentence, but adjacent to the sentence, standing with it” [Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky 1912, 292], laying the foundations for an isolationist interpretation of the linguistic nature of this unit. According to this theory, the address is considered grammatically unrelated to the sentence and is therefore excluded from the members of the sentence.

Such prominent scientists as A.A. Shakhmatov and A.M. Peshkovsky, took a deeper approach to solving the problem of circulation. Their works contain interesting and very valuable observations on this syntactic category of language. But on the question of the relation of the appeal to the proposal and its members, they also adhered to the traditional point of view.

“An address is a word or phrase,” writes A.A. Shakhmatov, - corresponding to the name of the second person, the person to whom the speaker’s speech is addressed. It stands outside the sentence and is therefore not a member of the sentence” [Shakhmatov 1941,261].

This, according to the scientist, is the first reason why he does not refer the appeal to the section devoted to the consideration of phrases that are part of the sentence and secondary members of the sentence. The second reason was, according to him, that the address sometimes performs the functions of a special type of sentence: “... so, for example, the address Kolya! is equivalent to a sentence in which - and this depends on the intonation given to the word Kolya - either contains a call from a person called Kolya (Kolya, come here; Kolya, are you here, haven’t you left?), or a warning (Kolya, be careful), or reproach (Kolya, shame on you! Kolya, why did you say or do that?)” [Shakhmatov 1941,261].

Address is one of the syntactic categories that is very poorly represented in the syntax of the Kabardino-Circassian language. In Kabardino-Circassian linguistics, no one has conducted a thorough study of this unit. One can name the names of such scientists as H.E. Dzasezhev, Kh.Z.Gyaurgiev, Kh.Sh. Urusov, who define address as “a word or combination of words that is not grammatically related to the members of the sentence and denotes the person or object to which speech is addressed” [Grammar of the Kabardino-Circassian literary language 1957, 14]. That is, they all adhere to an isolationist theory of the study of conversion.

REFERENCES:

1. Бахтин, М.М. Эстетика словесного творчества / М.М. Бахтин - М.: Искусство, 1979.
2. Бахтин, М.М. Проблемы поэтики Достоевского - М.: Русское слово, 1963.
3. Бугакова Н.В., «Категория обращения в свете когнитивной лингвистики на материале французского языка» , диссертация кандидата филологических наук, Воронеж, 2001, 230 р.
4. Гальперин, И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистических исследований / И.Р. Гальперин.- М.: Наука, 1981.-190 р.
5. Nargiza Bobojonova Jumaniyozovna. (2022). The Term Concept in Modern Linguistics. Miasto Przyszłości, 28, 297–302. <http://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/643>
6. Jumaniyozovna, B. N. . (2023). PROTOTYPE THEORY IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS . Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes, 72–74. <https://www.conferenceseries.info/index.php/online/article/view/967>
7. Jumaniyozovna, B. N. . (2023). Aristotelian Model of Categorization in Linguistics. Best Journal of Innovation in Science, Research and Development, 2(6), 358–360. <http://www.bjisrd.com/index.php/bjisrd/article/view/343>
8. Bobojonova, N. (2023). CATEGORIZATION IN ENGLISH COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 32(32). https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/9530