

Functional Analysis of Address Forms in the Family Discourse

Dilorom Sabirova

Independent Researcher

Urgench State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: *In this article, the interpretation of the address and speech statement in the family discourse is explained. Furthermore, five categories of addresses functioning within the framework of family discourse were analyzed on the basis of a semantic-pragmatic approach.*

Keywords: Address, Interlocutor, Family Discourse, Semantics, Functions

I. INTRODUCTION

It is possible to study the family discourse and address form in it only when referring to the semantics of address forms, which in fact predetermines their situational conditionality in the statement. The addresses were considered in two different, but closely related aspects, taking into account that, on the one hand, they are pragmatic operators, and on the other hand, they are usually endowed with an emotional and evaluative character and indicate the attitude of the author of the speech to his interlocutor.

Therefore, taking into account the illocutionary purpose of the speech act, the addresser uses from a set of specific addresses or "forms" his own address, which contains an estimated indicator. The assessment indicator is based on assessment as "an objectively subjective attitude of a person to an object, expressed by linguistic means explicitly or implicitly".

The analysis of practical material revealed that semantic evaluativeness, manifested in pejorative, ameliorative and neutral assessments, fixes various shades of attitude towards the addresser. The semantic and pragmatic differentiation of addresses made it possible to distinguish the following shades of evaluative: the shade of familiarity, expressing the positive emotional component of the address, emphasizing the friendly relations of the communicants; a shade of approval, reflecting a positive reaction to the addressee, his behavior, external data; hypocorptic connotation, expressing an emotional reaction on the part of the addresser, associated with intimate love feelings experienced for the interlocutor; a shade of disapproval, conveying a dismissive attitude towards the listener; a shade of irony, conveying a jokingly pejorative attitude towards the addressee; a shade of contempt expressing a purely negative attitude towards the communicant.

Addresses that do not contain any pronounced semantic evaluation were assigned by us to the group of neutral addresses. In the course of the study, the addresses were analyzed in terms of their illocutionary orientation and evaluative indicators, and on the basis of the data obtained, they were assigned to one or another category of the register. The appeals of the family discourse of three levels of relationships were presented for a detailed study in the work: communication between spouses, between parents and children and children among themselves.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Thus, the material of the study was about 350 fragments of works of art by English authors of the 20th-21st centuries, which are quoted in the British National Corpus, located on the website <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>. The following research methods were used in the work: system-structural method of linguistic description of various groups of calls, functional (communicative-semantic) method; descriptive method (methods of observation, comparison, differentiation of the studied material); method of component analysis (for the analysis of the semantic structure of the address); method of contextual analysis; method of sociolinguistic analysis; a method of direct observation of the speech practice of communicants.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

An analysis was made of the following types of English appellatives, the choice and categorization of which are based on their functional 11 features: anthroponyms, kinship terms, nicknames, emotional and evaluative appellatives.

Anthroponyms. This category of addresses includes proper names, surnames and patronymics. The practical material of our study contains 93 (51.4%) English anthroponyms. The following categories of anthroponyms were analyzed:

1. Complete (27% of the total number of analyzed English anthroponyms);
2. Elliptical (33% of English anthroponyms);
3. Suffixal (30% English anthroponyms);
4. Family names (9% English anthroponyms);

The results of the analysis of anthroponyms that function within the framework of English family discourse allow us to draw the following conclusions.

Anthroponyms perform the function of an individual nomination of the addressee, regardless of the current situation and the act of speaking. The full forms of names in both linguistic cultures are characterized by a neutral assessment, while some variants of marked names often receive a shade of disapproval. However, the full forms of marked names (capable of forming elliptical variants) can also carry an honorific connotation, setting up communicants for a high-flown style of communication or being a sign of respect for the addressee.

Unmarked names are devoid of any emotional connotations. It was revealed that communicants do not use the full name of the addressee when addressing him with a request, even if the name of the latter does not have an abbreviated version. To do this, the speaker resorts to word-formation modifications of the full name of the addressee.

The full form of the English name is characterized by a neutral assessment. Expressive words and phrases can add a touch of intimacy to a full name (Peter, dear). At the same time, full marked forms of the English name can carry a certain coldness. The short form of the English name does not carry a pejorative evaluation and is often used in combination with emotional-evaluative words that add hypocoristic properties to appellatives. If adjectives come before a proper name, the address carries the illocutionary force of disapproval, irritation, sarcasm (dear John). In postposition to a noun, adjectives carry the illocutionary force of a positive attitude, sympathy and disposition towards the addressee (Jane, darling).

The elliptical forms of English surnames (Box, Fergy) are dual: they can contain both pejorative (with a touch of irony) and ameliorative assessment. The presence in English family discourse of the overwhelming number of full and elliptical forms of the name, characterized by neutral indicators at the level of semantic evaluation, signals the priority of the vocative function of anthroponyms, designed to distinguish the addressee, identifying him among the other participants in communication.

Kinship Terms

In the study, we consider the terms of kinship in their relative meaning, when these addresses are nominations of kinship relations. The practical material of the study contains 9% of English terms of kinship from the total number of requests. The features of the functioning of kinship terms in English family discourse revealed as a result of the analysis can be commented as follows.

The use of kinship terms between spouses is rare; in such cases, appellatives contain a pejorative assessment with a touch of disapproval in English family discourse. The number of variant forms of kinship terms used as addresses in English family discourse is lower, although this does not affect the frequency of their use. The terms husband and wife are extremely rare and signal a change in the pragmatic meaning in the statement. In English family discourse, when addressing children, parents use the appellatives son and daughter, which are neutral in terms of evaluative and characterizing indicators. Just like the full and elliptical forms of the kinship terms mother, father, mam, dad, they perform a vocative function, and the illocutionary force of a speech act in this case depends on the context. Diminutives daddy, mommy, granny, that carry a positive emotional load, contain ameliorative assessment with a touch of hypocorism. In order to emphasize the marital status of the listener and at the same time demonstrate a positive attitude towards him, the addresser can combine the short form of the kinship term and the surname (poppy Bryant) in the address. Addressing each other, children in English families rarely resort to terms of kinship, more often using short forms of proper names. English family discourse has its own forms of sis (sissy) and bro, buddy – the illocutionary force

of which is aimed at expressing approval and demonstrating warm relations with older brothers and sisters. In English family discourse, the terms of kinship are not used to express extremely negative emotions on the part of the addresser. Thus, kinship terms can be called the most stable group of common nouns that function in the series of addresses. Similar in their pragmatic function to titles, they reflect the specifics of the family hierarchy and the norms of communication accepted in society. Therefore, along with the vocative function in this category of appellatives, the socio-regulatory function acquires significance. This is also evidenced by the fact that the terms of kinship are the only acceptable way in many English families for a child to address his parents. In the case when the illocutionary goal of the utterance is to ask or pray for something, the communicants use kinship terms much less often than other means of addressing with pronounced emotional characterizing indicators (diminutive forms of anthroponyms, nicknames, emotional-evaluative appeals). This testifies to the secondary role of the evaluative and characterizing function of kinship terms in English family discourse.

Nicknames

Nicknames are closely connected with figurative experiences and carry an emotional assessment. The characterizing moment is seen in each of them, but its role is secondary, since over time the communicants can forget the reasons for the emergence of the nickname and its semantic load. Addresses indicating the gender and age of the addressee also take place in English family discourse. The peculiarities of the functioning of nicknames in English family discourse revealed as a result of the analysis are as follows. The illocutionary purpose of permanent nicknames is to highlight some hypertrophied quality of the addressee, relating to his internal mental organization or external data. One of the most numerous groups of nicknames are nationwide nominations of a person's characteristics according to his external signs (Minnie), character traits (Cry-baby, Speedy), intelligence (Brake, Associate Professor, Turnip).

The names and surnames of literary heroes and historical figures can act as appellatives, for example: Newton (expert in physics), Oblomov (lazy), Gulliver (high), etc. When forming a nickname, phonetic means of expressing emotional assessment can be used - deviation from the normative pronunciation (Tatiana, Keepstintin) or the use of expressive sound combinations (Khe-Khe, Yum-Nyam, Wow-wow). The constant nicknames of family discourse, as a rule, are individual, most often found in the communication of the younger generation and contain a positive intimate-love connotation. Even those nicknames that initially contained a pejorative assessment can become neutral.

In English family discourse, zoo- and phytomorphisms based on quasi-stereotypes of these linguistic cultures (Rose) can act as constant references, their illocutionary function is to demonstrate tender feelings for the interlocutor. Occasional nicknames are always marked from the point of view of an emotional-evaluative attribute, their intentionality is consistent with the illocutionary force of the entire statement, therefore the connotations of such addresses are quite diverse (Megamind, Judas, Mastodon).

English appeals boy, my boy, lad, fellow are found in the conversation of equal family members, men of the same age and demonstrate familiar relations between communicants. When referring to a spouse or daughter, the English often use the neutral appellatives girl, my girl, young lady and the dialogic forms lass, Judy, expressing a different assessment depending on the context. In the meaning of casual address, the form old man is used, which has the pragmatic meaning of a positive attitude towards the addressee. A feature of the English family discourse is the address man, the illocution of which can be associated both with the demonstration of the addresser's antipathy towards the interlocutor, and with the expression of familiarity towards him. Thus, the category of nicknames is quite widely represented in English family discourse. Nicknames are connotative names, their main function is vocative; the evaluative element in such nicknames is visible, but its role is often secondary. Occasional nicknames, along with gender and age invocations, perform an evaluative and characterizing function in speech, and their illocutionary purpose coincides with the intention of the utterance. The socio-regulatory function is poorly expressed in this category of addresses, however, its presence is revealed by the fact that nicknames are found only at those levels of the family hierarchy where family members are equal in rights or are in conditions of indulgence of the elders to the younger.

Emotional and Evaluative Address

We included epithets, comparisons, substantiated adjectives containing the characteristics of the addressee and expressing the attitude of the speaker to the group of emotionally evaluative appeals. The practical material of the study

contains 30.6% of English emotional and evaluative appeals from the total number of appellatives. The results of the analysis of emotional and evaluative appeals functioning within the framework of English family discourse allow us to draw the following conclusions. Even in the case when such address are constantly used in speech, they do not lose their evaluative marking. The choice of positive emotional-evaluative appeals is associated with pleasant experiences that the addresser experiences when thinking about the interlocutor or at the moment of visual contact with him. In English family discourse, swear words and jargon can act as addresses, their range is quite strictly defined and associated with established norms adopted in English linguistic cultures (bastard, bitch, son of bitch). Some zoo- and phytomorphisms (goose, ram, goat) carry a pejorative assessment. A sign that falls into the focus of evaluation manifests itself as the embodiment of a value commensurate with the standard of English society. Thus, in other family discourses, the appeal tiger is characterized by a meliorative assessment, while in English it has a negative connotation and a pejorative assessment. The most common appeals with pejorative evaluation and a touch of disapproval to males are the words tiger, coon, weed, scrub, old bear, the appeals hen, horse are applicable to females. English family discourse is also characterized by the frequent use of emotional-evaluative appeals in speech, however their range is not so wide. The most common of them are dear, lovely, darling, honey, sweet. The context shows that these appellatives can be used in statements with various illocutionary purposes (nomination, request, admonition, admiration).

Often, words that are the names of food and baby animals (sugar, pumpkin, pookie, honey bunch, sweetie pie, kitten) act as addresses. These addresses are characterized by a positive assessment and contain a hint of hypocoristics. In English family discourse, there are emotional and evaluative appellatives, which, based on their semantic meaning, should cause a positive reaction from the addressee, but in family discourse they can carry a pejorative assessment (sweetie, sweet bun). Thus, in English family discourse, emotional and evaluative appeals are widespread. These appeals are always marked with either ameliorative or pejorative assessment. Therefore, the main function of emotional and evaluative address is evaluative and characterizing. Emotional and evaluative appeals of family discourse have the pragmatic meaning of establishing certain relationships depending on the goal of communication pursued by the addresser, as evidenced by the pronounced semantic polarity of some appellatives in this category. Emotional and evaluative appeals with a pejorative assessment are often occasional, since they can be swear words, jargon, they can allow comparing a person with an animal or even a representative of the plant world, and this does not always meet the goals for which appeals are used in family discourse. The vocative function for this category of appeals is secondary, as is the socio-regulatory function, which manifests itself in the fact that emotional and evaluative appeals take place only in communication between close people, often communicants of equal status. The results of the analysis allow us to draw the following conclusions.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thus, the analysis of five categories of address made it possible to identify the features of the functioning of various forms of address in English family discourse, to explore the illocutionary power of addresses based on their semantic and functional aspects, to systematize the similarities and differences of appellatives based on practical material. In general, the combination of aspectual studies made it possible to analyze an integral and interconnected system of forms of address within the framework of family discourse and thereby answer the goals and objectives set at the beginning of the work.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ahn, Y. Y. (2017). Machine learning for medical diagnosis: history, state of the art and perspective. *Korean Journal of Radiology*, 18(4), 570-576.
- [2]. Clyne, W. (2009). Language and social justice in practice. *Multilingual Matters*.
- [3]. Leech, G. (1999). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- [4]. Morford, J. P. (1997). *The visual world in American Sign Language: Linguistic structure and visual perception*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [5]. Raymond, W. D. (2016). The role of language in the perceptual organization of speech and nonspeech sounds. *Journal of Phonetics*, 59, 40-54.
- [6]. Holms, J., & Wilson, N. (2017). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.