CLASSIFICATION OF ADDRESSING FORMS AND THEIR STRUCTURAL PRINCIPLES

Abstract: This article is devoted to the theory of addressing forms in linguistics, their features, structural principles and functions in a sentence. It gives information about the role of pronouns, verbs, nouns and nominal variants of the addressing forms, the differences between them and the inversion of address, as well as problems of their using in speech. The article has depicted the classifications of the two languages’ addressing forms.
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Introduction
Speech is one of the most important activities in human’s life. In this activity, people use different speech units to communicate or receive feedback, express their relationships and, of course, communicate with each other in such processes. The term “Addressing”, in Uzbek "Murojaat", is an Arabic word that is addressed to someone, an invitation, a call, etc [7,645]. It is also considered to be a very cynical phenomenon and is an object of study of linguistic disciplines such as structural, social and psychological linguistics, so research in linguistics is always relevant.

The basic idea of the theory of addressing is the "forms of addressing" which are linguistic terms that refer to the words or phrases, and sometimes full sentences used by speakers as linguistic terms. The forms of addressing have several functions in the speech:

1. appealing the listener to the speech (from Latin appellāre) [11];
2. nominating the listener (from Latin nominātīvus) [11];
3. expressing personal communications, such as, connotative, emotional (from Latin connotatio (n-), from connotate ‘mark in addition’; emotion based on Latin emovere, from e- (variant of ex-) ‘out’ + movere ‘move’) [11];
4. communicating, and supporting the speaker (from Latin communica(n-), from the verb communicare ‘to share’) [11]. For example: - Yoshingiz nechada, bek? (A. Qodiriy. O’tgan kunlar.) Speaking of, the several duties of appeals are clear: appealing-responding, nominally-affirmative, emotive, connotative - bek elliptical appeals person elicits eccentricities, the aesthetic function of speech - the impact of the united language is applied.

Research Methodology and Analysis of Subject Matters
According to linguist Z. A. Akbarova, addressing is to prepare the listener for information [1; 20]. However, we would like to add some more to this view, including other verbal or nonverbal forms of language (greetings, excuses, please). He performs. For example, Hey! (greeting) in English, Sagmal in German ... (the word for request), Pardon! in French (make an apology) [8;8].

In most languages, the forms of addressing are learnt in three types: 1) pronoun addresses; 2) verb addresses; 3) noun addresses (and sometimes words that are syntactically related to them).

Pronoun addresses are addressed to the interviewer, and they usually represent the second
The noun addressing forms are words that are represented by nouns. They are the most common forms of addressing used in communication. Noun addressing forms include language units represented by proper, common and abstract nouns. With this type of addressing forms, the speaker can represent the interviewee's social background, age, gender, and whether the interview is formal or informal. Noun addressing forms can be classified as follows:

1) by name (N);
2) by first name and last name (NL); 3) name + patronymic (NP);
4) occupation, rank, position, profession (ON);
5) with some abstract nouns expressing some of the abstract quality, level, or virtue of the addressee: (Your) Excellency, (Your) Grace, (Your) Honor, and so on.

Occupation terms (OT) belongs to Noun addresses are often used in the official discourse as forms of addressing that indicate the profession or job title or address of the addressee. For example, waiter in English, chauffeur in French, and водитель in Russian. They are sometimes used with other nominal options. Mr./Mrs. in English, friendship, kinship terms in Uzbek, and so on. This means that the interviewer respects the addressee.

Words related to friendship, brotherhood, kinship are also used in many languages as forms of reference nouns. For example, In Uzbek do’stim (Friend), in Turkish Arkadas (Friend), and in German Kollege (colleague), in Arab dacri (neighbour) are samples. These words represent kinship or friendship, even though the interviewees are not real relatives or friends. Occasionally, such forms of communication are also used by strangers.

The terms which the most active terms in addressing are determined by their context and function, and their speakers prefer to use them in more speech over semantic or formal forms of communication: - Хозир, жоним, ҳозир, сабр қил! - der эди Галя ишингрисаб (Н. Норматов, Кўзгудағи икковлон). In such addresses, the speaker feels closer to the listener, and almost any noun can be a form of addressing for that purpose. Although the forms of masculinity are stylized (with a certain style) and a certain normative dimension, linguistic creativity and individual imagination play an important role in the speech.

It is also important to note that some forms of addressing identify the addressee and refer to the addressee's other relative, such as отас, акаси, опаси еки қизи, ўлғи, жоним, тогаси, холаси, опаси. For example, in Arabic, Abu Ali (Ali’s father), bint Ahmed (Ahmed’s daughter), Pashto de Mohammed lur (Muhammad’s daughter), Dari pesore Abdulla (Abdullah’s son), in Uzbek Шавкатнинг дадаси (Shovkat’s father), Эркин аканинг ўлғи (Brother Erkin’s son), Элдорнинг опаси (Eldor’s sister) are often used in a family or
relative's speech. Such addresses do not often directly address the personal names of the addressee, as the speaker expresses his respect for them.

According to the nominal forms, addressing is clearly different from the above provision. We find similar variations in the addressing rules for kinship terms. For example, English kinship term grandson is rarely used as a form of addressing because the speaker prefers to name the addressee instead of grandson. A similar phenomenon is also found in Uzbek: qaynona does not come as a form of addressing to a kinship term, but instead uses ойи, ойижон, ая, хола, онажон.

In the process of negotiation, we also face addressing inversion. Addressing inversion is a special type of nominal addresses. The phrase was invented by Renzi in 1968 as a new word in the form of allocuzione inversion. Addressing inversion is a term often used by one of the kinship terms that does not represent the address but in the sense of the speaker. This phenomenon can lead to fake kinship. For example, a stranger in Uzbek is also respectfully addressed to a stranger ошон, ошон in Arabic who is an uncle (uncle). Addressing inversion does not limit fraternity terms. Anyone can speak inversion, and the addressing forms contain semantic properties that are far more relevant than the addressee. It should be noted that the inversion of kinship terms is one of the most widely used in speech. The type of inversion is an important phenomenon for the specific aspects of addressing theory.

Analysis and results

Based on the above analyzes and researches, we have given a classification of the words used in the addressing functions as follows:

In conclusion, we can say that simple forms of addressing that are simple to us and active in our everyday speech are complex language functions. They are essential for successful communication and completion of the dialogue, so every language owner should have the right and proper knowledge of how to use them.
### Impact Factor:

| Source            | Impact Factor |
|-------------------|---------------|
| ISRA (India)      | 4.971         |
| ISI (Dubai, UAE)  | 0.829         |
| GIF (Australia)   | 0.564         |
| JIF               | 1.500         |
| SIS (USA)         | 0.912         |
| PHHI (Russia)     | 0.126         |
| ESJI (KZ)         | 8.716         |
| SJIF (Morocco)    | 5.667         |
| ICV (Poland)      | 6.630         |
| PIF (India)       | 1.940         |
| IBI (India)       | 4.260         |
| OAJI (USA)        | 0.350         |
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