

9-20-2020

LINGUISTIC STATUS OF ADDRESS: ADDRESS AS A SYNTACTIC UNIT

Zebo Yovkacheva PhD student

Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm>

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#), [Linguistics Commons](#), [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Yovkacheva, Zebo PhD student (2020) "LINGUISTIC STATUS OF ADDRESS: ADDRESS AS A SYNTACTIC UNIT," *Philology Matters*: Vol. 2020 : Iss. 3 , Article 12.

DOI: 10. 36078/987654449

Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm/vol2020/iss3/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Philology Matters* by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.

**Zebo Yovkacheva**PhD student, Uzbekistan State World Languages
University**LINGUISTIC STATUS OF ADDRESS:
ADDRESS AS A SYNTACTIC UNIT****ANNOTATION**

This article discusses the linguistic aspect of address. The syntactic category of address attracted the attention of Russian linguists for a long time. The object of their study was address, the natural condition for the existence of which was oral and written forms of dialogical speech. A multilateral analysis of the essence and functioning of circulation in the Russian language was first presented in the works of A.A. Shakhmatova and A.M. Peshkovsky. In modern syntactic works and academic grammars, the methods of expression and distribution of addresses in oral and written dialogical speech, their bridges in the utterance, the nature of their intonation, depending on the lexical expression, the degree of prevalence, placement in the sentence are described.

There are various approaches to the study of messages. Important are the analysis of the syntactic status of addresses (A.A. Shakhmatov, A.M. Peshkovsky), consideration of the functional aspect of the address (V.K. Kuzmicheva, O.A. Mizin), the study of address as a unit of speech etiquette (L.A. Vvedenskaya, N.I. Formanovskaya). Addressing is studied in linguistics by using a variety of approaches, each of which reveals the essence of the linguistic unit under study in a special way. A special aspect is the study of the semantic and functional features of addresses in poetic speech.

Much less attention was paid to the study of conversions in poetic speech. In the writings of such scientists as L.Yu. Maksimov, Yu.I. Levin, I.I. Kovtunov contains observations concerning the ways of expression, dissemination and functioning of references in Russian lyric poetry of the 19th - 20th centuries.

This article also examines the specifics of the

Зебо ЁвкачеваЎзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети
таянч докторанти**МУРОЖААТ КАТЕГОРИЯСИ
СИНТАКСИК БИРЛИК СИФАТИДА****АННОТАЦИЯ**

Мақолада мурожаат категориясининг лингвистик жиҳати муҳокама қилинади. Мурожаат категориясини ўрганиш замонавий тилшуносликнинг долзарб муаммоларидан биридир. Умуман олганда, мурожаатнинг синтактик категорияси узоқ вақтдан бери рус тилшуносларининг эътиборини тортиб келган. Уларнинг тадқиқот объекти мурожаатлар бўлиб, уларнинг мавжуд бўлишининг табиий шarti диалогик нутқнинг оғзаки ва ёзма шакллари бўлган. Рус тилида мурожаатнинг моҳияти ва ишлашининг кўп қиррали таҳлили биринчи бўлиб А.А. Шахматова ва А.М. Пешковский томондан кўрсатилган. Замонавий синтактик асарлар ва академик грамматикаларда мурожаатларни оғзаки ва ёзма диалогик нутқда ифода этиш ва тақсимлаш усуллари, уларнинг сўзлашувдаги кўприклари, интонация хусусияти, лектик ифодаси, тарқалиш даражаси ва гапдаги ўрнига кўра тавсифланади.

Хабарларни ўрганишда турли хил ёндашувлар мавжуд. Мурожаатларнинг синтактик ҳолатини таҳлил қилиш (А.А. Шахматов, А.М. Пешковский), мурожаатнинг функционал томонини кўриб чиқиш (В.К. Кузмичева, О.А.Мизин), мурожаатларни ахлоқ-одоб бирлиги сифатида ўрганиш (Л.А. Введенская, Н.И. Формановская) муҳим ҳисобланади. Мурожаат категорияси тилшуносликда турли хил ёндашувлардан фойдаланган ҳолда ўрганилади, уларнинг ҳар бири ўрганилаётган лингвистик бирликнинг моҳиятини махсус тарзда очиб беради. Шейрий нутқдаги мурожаатнинг семантик ва функционал хусусиятларини ўрганиш алоҳида жиҳатдир. Шейрий нутқдаги мурожаатни ўрганишга жуда кам эъ-

use of addressing in the poetic works of M. Tsvetaeva. Address to people in general represents a great variety and each type has its own syntactic, semantic and functional features. This type of address is widely used in the poet's lyrics. So, in the poetic language of M. Tsvetaeva, addresses that are expressed by common nouns in the singular can name people according to various characteristics.

Key words: address, linguistics, dialogue, speech, syntax, intonation, word, phrase.

тибор берилган. Л.Ю Максимов, Ю.И. Левин, И.И. Ковтунов каби олимларнинг асарларида XIX–XX асрлар рус лирикасида мурожаатни ифода этиш, тарқатиш ва ишлаш йўллари оид кузатувларни ўз ичига олади.

Мақолада М. Тсветаеванинг шеърини асарларида мурожаатнинг ўзига хос хусусиятлари кўриб чиқилган. Одамларга мурожаат қилиш хилма-хиллик касб этади ва ҳар бир тур ўзига хос синтактик, семантик ва функционал хусусиятларга эга. Ушбу турдаги мурожаат шоир лирикасида кенг қўлланилган.

Калит сўзлар: мурожаат категорияси, тилшунослик, диалог, нутқ, синтаксис, интонация, сўз, ибора.

INTRODUCTION

The revival of spiritual values is currently one of the main priorities of modern society. The President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Sh. M. Mirziyoyev identified the main tasks to be solved in a short time speaking about the state of affairs in the field of education and science and “taking into account the strategic importance of this area for the future of our youth, society and the country as a whole” [Sh.M Mirziyoyev, 2017; 94]. The most important tasks include the need “to form an environment that would actively promote the processes of learning, spiritual and moral enrichment and education based on true values” [Mirziyoyev Sh.M., 2017; 94], as well as “this is the further development of not only academic, but also university science” and “creation of the necessary atmosphere and conditions for widespread propaganda among the population and youth of the rich history of our country, its culture and national values, as well as the achievements of world science and literature » [Mirziyoyev Sh.M, 2017; 96]. The study of the artistic works of talented poets of the late 19th and early 20th centuries corresponds to the tasks of developing education and spirituality, training of qualified scientific and teaching personnel in the Republic of Uzbekistan.

The relevance of the topic of our research is determined by the fact that until now, linguistic scientists have not attempted a comprehensive study of the addressing, a set of subject types of addresses, forms of their expression and distribution, positions in a poem and the whole text, as well as their functions in M. Tsvetaeva's lyric poetry.

The object of the research is the address as a syntactic unit, the subject is the types of addresses, the ways of their expression and distribution in the poetic texts of M. Tsvetaeva.

The aim of the study is to examine the linguistic status of addressing. The purpose of the study predetermined the formulation of the following tasks:

- 1) characterize the status of addressing as a syntactic unit;
- 2) to identify the specifics of the use of references in poetic speech;

- 3) identify the types of addressees in poetic texts;
- 4) to determine the specifics of addressing to people in the poetic texts of M. Tsvetaeva.

MAIN PART

The syntactic category of address has attracted the attention of Russian linguists. The object of their study was appeals, the natural condition for the existence of which were oral and written forms of dialogic speech. Some researchers note such properties of the address as the absence of grammatical connections with other words in the sentence and its special intonation design, although they interpret it as a word or group / series of words. An address is traditionally called a word or a combination of words that has a person, less often an object, to which speech is addressed in a situation of direct communication.

Addressing is known as a term already in the ancient theories of language and style (Quintilian, Cicero, D. Halicarnassus) and was considered as a figure of speech used for greater persuasiveness and adornment of speech [Ibrahim Bagna, 2004; 3-6].

In the works of M.V. Lomonosov [Lomonosov M.V., 1952], A.Kh. Vostokov [Vostokov A.Kh., 1835] describes the vocative case – "vocative, showing the name of the object to which speech refers" [Vostokov A.Kh., 1835; 21], which served in the Old Russian language as a morphological means of expressing the syntactic function of the dominant word of that member of the sentence, which in the grammar of F.I. Buslaev received the term "address" [Buslaev F.I., 1875]. In general, M.V. Lomonosov, N.I. Grech, A.Kh. Vostokov, as before, this linguistic phenomenon was considered as a figure with expressive and stylistic possibilities: "With this figure you can advise, testify, promise, praise, mock, console, wish, say goodbye, regret, command, forbid, ask for forgiveness, mourn, complain, congratulate, etc." [Lomonosov M.V., 1952; 267].

For the first time the term "address" appears in the work of Buslaev, but the scientist did not give a clear definition to it. A.A. Potebnya was one of the first to express the opinion that the vocative used in the function is the subject of the predicate – the verb of the 2nd person imperative mood. A.A. Potebnya allows a shift in the syntactic function of the subject and the reference.

Subsequently, the attention of linguists was drawn to the decision of the question of whether the address is a member of the sentence. So, D.N. Ovsyannikovo-Kulikovskiy considers the address among "words and expressions that are not part of the sentence, but adjacent to the sentence, standing with it" [Ovsyannikovo-Kulikovskiy D.N., 1912; 292-293]. In Russian linguistics, since the 19th century, address is traditionally considered in the syntax section as "a grammatically independent and intonationally isolated component of a sentence or a more complex syntactic whole, denoting a person or an object to which speech is addressed" [Kruchinina I.I., 1990; 340-341].

In the future, the attention of such researchers as N.D. Arutyunova, V.V. Babaytseva, V.K. Kuzmicheva, A.I. Ostanin, A.V. Polonsky, A.F. Priyatkina, V.P. Pronichev, N.Yu. Shvedov, are attracted by such issues as the syntactic status and

functions of the address, its semantic and structural types, methods of expression, the degree of semantic load, types of intonation when addressing, the position of the address in the structure of the sentence, and connections with the rest of the sentence.

It should be noted that the reference in the syntax takes a peripheral place. As a syntactic unit, the address is not included in the system of basic constructive elements of syntax: it is not a sentence, not a phrase, not a word form in the generally accepted sense. Addresses are usually viewed along with introductory words and plug-in constructions as complicating components of the sentence.

The address in general terms has been sufficiently studied, however, primarily due to the complexity and inconsistency of the linguistic nature of the object itself, issues, including those related to the definition of constitutive signs of addresses, remain unresolved or are solved by different scientists in different ways.

A multifunctional analysis of the essence and functioning of circulation in the Russian language was first presented in the works of A.A. Shakhmatova and A.M. Peshkovsky. In particular, speaking about the role of address in dialogical speech, A.A. Shakhmatov rightly points out that it denotes the second person: “An address is a word or phrase corresponding to the name of the second person, the person to whom the speaker is addressing. It is outside the sentence and therefore is not a member of the sentence” [Shakhmatov A.A., 2014; 335]. Indeed, since the first and second persons are participants in the speech act, the connection of which is a condition of natural communication, the address, being the name of the interlocutor, is correlated only with the speaker and opposed to him as I and You.

Regarding whether the address is included in the proposal as its component or is an independent proposal, A.A. Shakhmatov notes that the address “stands outside the sentence and is not, therefore, a member of the sentence,” although it can often be included in the sentence, “the address can stand before the sentence, outside of it; but it, like introductory sentences, introductory words, can be inserted into a sentence, being in the middle of it or at the end” [Shakhmatov A.A., 2014; 336].

In some cases, the address, according to A.A. Shakhmatov, can be recognized as vocal sentences, “in which the main and only member is the address, the name of the person to whom the speech is addressed, if this name is pronounced with a special intonation, causing a complex idea, in the center of which is this person; in this thought reproach, regret, indignation can be expressed” [Shakhmatov A.A., 2014; 338].

A.M. Peshkovsky, examining the functions of address, notes that in oral colloquial speech, the incentive function is often combined with another function – the qualifying characteristic of the addressee, as a result of which “a cross between the address and the nominative predicative with the omitted “you” is obtained [Peshkovsky A.M. 1956; 362].

A.M. Peshkovsky refers to references to words and phrases that do not form either sentences or their parts. Considering the references in the system of meanings of the nominative case along with the “nominative representation” and the “nominative predicative”, the scientist notes the contradiction between their meaning and the form:

“the material address can be closely connected with the rest of speech. However, formally, his main role of motivation does not give him the opportunity to enter into a coordination, management or adherence relationship with any member of the proposal, in which it stands, and it remains, no matter how widespread it reaches, a group that is extraneous to this proposal. As for the opportunity to form a sentence on its own, then for this it is not enough independent” [Peshkovsky A.M., 2001; 408].

Special emphasis of A.M. Peshkovsky makes the specificity of the use of references in poetic speech, rightly pointing out that in it a widespread appeal or a homogeneous series of references often becomes an aesthetic or rhetorical center, absorbing the maximum of the author's emotions and feelings [Peshkovsky A.M., 2001].

Modern Russian linguists develop the ideas of A.A. Shakhmatova and A.M. Peshkovsky. In particular, V.V. Babaytseva notes that the address is more or less inherent in predicativeness, the degree of which largely determines the status of the address as a component of a proposal or as an independent proposal. One can agree with V.V. Babaytseva, when she notes that “for sentences with a minimum degree of predicativeness of references, interposition of the reference is characteristic ... sentences with the maximum degree of predicativity are vocal sentences (sentences-references)” [Babaytseva V.V., Maksimov L.Yu., 1981; 113]. Noting the semantic and grammatical aspect of vocal sentences, she recognizes the fluidity of the boundaries between them and the references.

Duality, as we can see, remains, especially in addresses with a “medium degree of predicativity,” the boundaries of which are difficult to define. But even in those cases when addresses are intonationally and graphically formed as sentences, they do not cease to be addresses. Sentences-addresses are semantically dependent, since they do not have completeness of thought and require continuation of speech, i.e., figuratively speaking, one cannot put an end to the address, it always serves for something.

N.Yu. Shvedova notes that the address, being a syntactically independent component of the sentence, is connected with the rest of the sentence not only semantically, "materially", but also syntactically. The address, in her opinion, is “the spreading member of the sentence – a name in the nominative case, possibly – with word forms depending on it, naming the person to whom the speech is addressed ... the address is not such a distributor that has nothing to do with the rest of the sentence. This connection exists and is expressed, firstly, in the fact that any sentence that informs about the action or state of a certain subject and has a verb in the form of a 2nd person as a predicate can be distributed with absolute regularity by an address that names the subject, which is indicated in the subject pronoun, or not marked completely: Куда так, кумушка, бежишь ты без оглядки? (Krilov); ... Secondly, always, in any sentence, the address forms a syntagma, or is included in the syntagma along with other words in the sentence” [Babaytseva V.V., Maksimov L.Yu., 1981;113].

However, the point of view, according to which the address is attributed to words that are grammatically unrelated to the sentence, is questioned in some works. So, A.G. Rudnev interprets the address as being neither the main nor the secondary

one, as a member of the third order sentence, which is associated with the sentence with a special type of syntactic connection – a relative connection: "the grammatical connection that is characteristic of the address is a correlative connection" [Rudnev A.G., 1959; 177].

G.P. Torsuev, exploring the intonation characteristic of references in English, notes that the reference is an independent communicative type of sentence [Torsuev G.P., 1950; 242].

V.P. Pronichev, examining the syntax of the address, refers the address to nominal one-part sentences [Pronichev V.P., 1971; 88].

According to the researcher A.F. Priyatkina, the address should be considered in two ways, so "the address in its primary function (contact establishing) cannot be considered a member of the sentence. If, with the help of inversion, a characteristic of an object is given, its signs are indicated, then a value appears that corresponds to additional predication. This predicative-characterizing meaning gives grounds to speak about the complicating role of treatment" [Priyatkina A.F., 1990; 169].

A.V. Polonsky believes that the address is the addressing centre of the sentence, which "functionally and syntactically corresponds to the nature of the determinant, which is a component of the semantic structure of the sentence and is included in its grammatical structure as a spreading member associated with the entire composition of the sentence" [Polonskiy A.V., 2000; 29-30]. In this regard, he defines the address as "a syntactic addressee determinant – a special spreading member of the sentence, which is included in the semantic structure of the sentence; has a specialized word form (vocative case) with a specific function and syntactic position in the sentence assigned to it; refers to the entire sentence structure; combined with various types of sentences" [Polonskiy A.V., 2000; 29-30].

As you know, addresses can be spread by dependent words: *Выпьем, верная подружка бедной юности моей...* (Pushkin A.S.). However, the issue of common addresses remains insufficiently researched. It should be noted that many common addresses are subject to phraseologization and are already being reproduced as integral stable combinations with phraseologically related meaning: *милостивый государь, друг мой, дорогие товарищи*.

In order to determine the syntactic status of an address, the existing uniform approaches are insufficient, a comprehensive analysis of this multidimensional unit is required, which, as Z.V. Dokhova, allows us to conclude that a change in the functional purpose and predication affects the syntactic status of the address, which leads to the allocation of three unequal constructions:

- a) addresses that perform the primary function, possessing a minimum degree of predicativity – "accompanying" members of the sentence;
- b) addresses that implement secondary functions that have a semi-predicative meaning – "concretizing" the members of the sentence;
- c) address-sentences, which contain a high degree of predicativity – the main members of the sentence [Dohova Z.V., 2007; 9].

The degree of stability of different combinations of words that are regularly

used in the address function is different, respectively, the degree of their syntactic and semantic contiguity may not be the same. However, the appellative function certainly contributes to the transformation of a non-one-word call into a complex semantically integral structure. In this case, the meaning and functions of the circulation components change qualitatively.

So, the adjectives in the addresses «дорогой друг», «милый друг» are not definitions of the noun "друг", but express the attitude of the addressee to the recipient. One can agree with N.D. Arutyunova, who writes that “such standard attributes of appellatives as милый, дорогой, любезный, уважаемый, expressing the attitude of the author of the speech to the addressee, are combined with names of any semantics (друг, брат, отец), including proper names that avoid definitions” [Arutyunova N.D., 1976; 356].

It should be clarified here that the main function of address is recognized as the nominative, nominative function, more precisely, as noted by N.D. Arutyunova, the specialized function of naming the addressee is appellative” [Arutyunova N.D., 1977; 564].

However, the appeal function is not the only function. As noted by N.Yu. Shvedova, “the main function of address – naming the person to whom speech is directed – is very often combined with expressive assessment, with the expression of the speaker's (writing) subjective attitude” [Shvedova N.Yu., 1980; 164].

N. D. Arutyunova notes the dual nature of the addresses, since “on one hand, it allows the addressee to identify himself as the recipient of the speech. On the other hand, the address often expresses the speaker's attitude towards the addressee. Functional duality leads to the fact that the appellative combines identifying components of meaning with elements of subjective assessment” [Arutyunova N.D., 1976; 356].

Note that the absolute majority of etiquette addresses is characterized not only by duality of functions, but also by wider multifunctionality.

In general, T.G. Lupashka divided all works in which address is considered as a syntactic category into three groups depending on the approach to studying a given language unit [Lupashku T.G., 2007]:

- systemic-structural (F.I. Buslaev, Z.M. Dvornaya, E.V. Krotevich, A.P. Leontiev, I.P. Maltsev, D.N. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, AM Peshkovskiy, A.A. Potebnya, A.F. Priyatkina, V.P. Pronichev, A.G. Rudnev, G.P. Torsuev, I.D. Chaplygina, A.A. Shakhmatov and others). Researchers are trying, on one hand, to classify an address to separate members of the sentence, on the other, to define it as an independent one-part sentence;

- functional, including functional-stylistic (N.I. Belunova, G.E. Gol'din, I.I. Kovtunova, M.M. Kopylenko, L. Yu. Maksimov, N.I. Formanovskaya, etc.);

- communicative-pragmatic, taking into account the addressee's factor (N.D. Arutyunova, G.I. Bogin, T.G. Vinokur, N.P. Volvak, O.I. Vorobyova, T. Yu. Gubareva, G.A. Zolotova, T.V. Shmeleva, and others) and the participation of lexical paradigms in the communicative strategy of the text (N.S. Bolotnova, I.A. Sternin, V.V. Stepanova, N.E. Sulimenko, L.I. Tolstykh, and etc).

Some researchers place the address in the syntactic system of the language, while others consider the address as belonging to the system of speech acts, speech etiquette.

Much less attention is paid to the study of addresses in poetic speech. Such scientists, as L.Yu. Maksimov, Yu.I. Levin, I.I. Kovtunov consider the ways of expression, distribution and functioning of address in Russian lyric poetry of the 19th – 20th centuries. So, L.Yu. Maksimov explores such conditions of address in poetic language as the lack of constructive ties with the members of the sentence, intonational isolation, vocative function. He notes the presence of four functional types of references in poetic speech and indicates that the functional differentiation of references is directly, although not always consistently, connected with their typological, stylistic in the historical sense and genre differentiations, as well as with the specifics of stylistic poetics.

I.I. Kovtunova rightly notes that “speech dialogue as a way of approaching and cognition explains that in the lyrics it is possible to refer to any things that exist in the world (or in ideas about the world), without any restrictions. Nevertheless, it makes sense to differentiate the main subject (thematic) varieties of references in poetry, since they have their own communicative nuances and their own semantic features in the structure of the poetic text” [Kovtunova I.I., 1986; 86].

I.I. Kovtunova identifies the most characteristic object types of addresses for Russian lyric poetry, specific for autocommunication and for those addressed to persons and objects of speech, explores the phenomena of complication of the functional potential of addresses as a result of combining addressing with nomination or predication in them.

Lyrics of M. Tsvetaeva are analyzed in the works of V.I. Ziburdaeva [Ziburdaeva V.I., 2010; Ziburdaeva V.I., 2012], in which she considers addresses taking into account the communicative structure of poetic texts, paying attention to the type of addressee and recipient, the conditions of communication.

Addresses are found in almost all poetic genres, which is quite natural and is explained by the fact that poetry is always a confidential conversation of a lyric hero with God, the Cosmos, nature, the reader, and himself.

Let's consider the peculiarities of using references in M. Tsvetaeva's poetic works. It should be noted that references to persons in general represent a great variety and each type has its own semantic and functional features. This type of address is widely used in the poet's lyrics.

In the poetic language of M. Tsvetaeva, addresses expressed by common nouns in the singular can refer to persons according to various criteria:

-Где, купец, твое роскошество?

-Во дырявом во лукошечке!

-Где, гордец, твои учености?

-Под подушкой у девчоночки!

-Где, красавец, щеки алые?

-За ночь черную растаяли [M. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

A special group is made up of nouns in the singular form, addressed to one person as a representative of an indefinite set. They call a person by profession, kind of permanent or temporary occupation:

С тобой – веление мое!

Мужайся, корабельщик юный!

Вперед в лазоревую рожь!

Ты больше, нежели Фортуну,

– Ты сердце Цезаря везешь [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

A noun address assigned to a specific person can be represented by one of the following thematic groups.

1) name the addressee according to social status, profession, etc:

Челюскинцы! Звук –

Как сжатые челюсти.

Мороз их них прет,

Медведь из них щерится [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

О, где Вы, где Вы, нежный граф?

О, Дафнис, вспомни Хлою! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Ты рыцарь, ты смелый, твой голос ручей,

С утеса стремящийся вниз.

От глаз моих темных, от дерзких речей

К невесте любимой вернись!

Я, Эва, как ветер, а ветер – ничей...

Я сон твой. О рыцарь, проснись! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

А над Волгой – заря румяная,

А над Волгой – рай.

И грохочет ватага пьяная:

– Атаман, вставай! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

In the following example, the first address, expressed by a common noun, a common adjective, is used against a background of questions, which strengthens the appellative meaning of the address, then the second address is uncommon, and it is expressed by a proper noun with a particle about, which enhances the expression of the poem as a whole.

Не люби, богатый, – бедную,

Не люби, ученый, – глупую,

Не люби, румяный, – бледную,

Не люби, хороший, – вредную.

Золотой – полушку медную! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

In this example, substantive nouns are used as references, which make up antonymic paradigms with a direct addition, which enhances the semantic significance of the poem.

Here are some more examples in which there are references by profession:

– Мореход, мореход,

Чего вдале пльвёшь? [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
 – *Мой Воин!* – *выкуплю тебя* [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Барабаничик! Бедный мальчик!
Вправо-влево не гляди! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Продаю! Продаю! Продаю!
Поспешайте, господа хорошие!
Держись, коробейники!
 – *Не дорожусь! не дорожусь! не дорожусь!* [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Спасибо тебе, Столяр,
За доску – во весь мой дар [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

2) name the person by nationality:

И услышала
Ночь – такую речь:
 – *Аль не хочешь, что ль,*
Потеснее лечь?
Ты меж наших баб –
Что жемчужинка!
Аль уж страшен так?
Я твой вечный раб,
Персияночка! Полоняночка! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
И спи, молодой, смутный мой
Сириец, стрелу смертную
Лейлами – и – лютнями
Глуша...
Не ушам смертного – [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

A special group of addresses is created on behalf of the pure "I" – subject, expressed by a plural noun and, accordingly, addressed to a plurality of persons. Several thematic groups stand out among them. Let's consider them.

1. Appeals addressed to an indefinite set of persons

Красавцы, не ездите!
Песками глуша,
Пропавшего без вести
Не скажет душа [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
На ваши поцелуи, о живые,
Я ничего не возражу – впервые [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

In this example, the expressive address to the living is expressed by a substantive adjective. It reflects the attitude of the poetess to a group of persons.

Messages addressed to a person expressed by a collective noun:

Процветай, народ, –
Твердый, как скрижаль,
Жаркий, как гранат,
Чистый, как хрусталь [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

2. Addresses expressed by metaphorical periphrastic combinations:

*Вы, идущие мимо меня,
К не моим и сомнительным чарам,
– Если б знали вы, сколько огня,
Сколько жизни, растроченной даром* [M. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

In this fragment, the address is expressed by the pronoun *вы*, followed by concretization *идущие мимо меня*.

*Идешь на меня похожий,
Глаза устремляя вниз.
Я их опускала – тоже!
Прохожий, остановись!
И кровь прилиwała к коже,
И кудри мои вились...
Я тоже была, прохожий!
Прохожий, остановись!* [M. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

3. Addressing to the younger generation:

*Милые, ранние веточки,
Гордость и счастье земли,
Деточки, грустные деточки,
О, почему вы ушли?* [M. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

This fragment also uses a complicated metaphorical address, and the third line uses the address of "деточки", followed by a repetition and refinement of "грустные деточки".

Here is another example that uses the common adjective + noun phrase "милые спутники" followed by the widespread expression "спутники чудной поры":

*Милые спутники, делившие с нами ночлег!
Версты, и версты, и версты, и черствый хлеб...
Рокот цыганских телег,
Вспять убегающих рек –
Рокот...
Не удержали вас, спутники чудной поры,
Нищие неги и нищие наши пиры* [M. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

We identified a large number of references in the works of M. Tsvetaeva to the Almighty, which was characteristic of the early work of the poetess. The general emotional nature of the poems is enhanced by the inclusion of such addresses, which are used in the form of motivating-rhetorical, interrogative-rhetorical statements, as well as in those that contain a request – a prayer.

*Царю Петру и вам, о, царь, хвала!
Но выше вас, цари, колокола* [M. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
*Христос и Бог! Я жажду чуда
Теперь, сейчас, в начале дня!
О, дай мне умереть, покуда
Вся жизнь как книга для меня.
Ты мудрый, Ты не скажешь строго:*

– "Терпи, еще не кончен срок".

Ты сам мне подал – слишком много!

Я жажду сразу – всех дорог! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Два солнца стынут, – о Господи, пощади!

– Одно – на небе, другое – в моей груди [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Бог, храни в часы прибоя –

Только Бог на звёздном троне

Так накормит вдоволь!

Бог, храни в своей ладони

Пастыря благого! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Бог! Если ты и сам – такой,

Народ моей любви

Не со святыми упокой –

С живыми оживи! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

От стрел и от чар,

От гнезд и от нор,

Богиня Иштар,

Храни мой шатёр! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Addresses to a friend or to a circle of persons close in outlook, as well as addressing to a friend of youth are frequently used in Marina Tsvetaeva's poems:

Из рук моих – нерукотворный град

Прими, мой странный, мой прекрасный брат.

Пятисоборный несравненный круг

Прими, мой древний, вдохновенный друг [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

In this fragment, the address in the form of a noun is complicated by attribute expressed by the possessive pronoun *мой* and adjectives.

Among the addresses to a friend or close people, there are many addresses to specific persons, which give a special lyricism and reality to the poetic lines. Here is a fragment from a poem dedicated to the memory of M.A. Voloshin.

Макс! мне было – так верно

Ждать на твоём крыльце! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

The use of addresses expressed by a common noun with diminutive-affectionate suffixes *-ок-* and *-ек-* reflects the emotional-evaluative attitude of the lyric subject to the receiver.

Я приду к тебе, дружочек,

За другим башмачком! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Нет, с тобой, дружочек чудный,

Не делиться мне досугом. [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Чтобы помнил не часочек, не годок –

Подарю тебе, дружочек, гребешок [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Погоди, дружок!

Не довольно ли нам камень городской толочь? [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997]

Помолись, дружок, за бессонный дом,

За окно с огнем! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Отметили ли Вы, дружок,
– Смирнее всего
Среди других дымков дымок
Дыханья моего?
Прославленный простите, друг,
Что в варежках стою! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Нет, дружочек! – Это проще,
Это пуще, чем досада:
Мне тебя уже не надо –
Оттого что, оттого что –
Мне тебя уже не надо! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

A special place in the lyrics of M. Tsvetaeva is occupied by addresses to relatives, among which we identified addressing to mother, daughter, son. Here are some fragments containing addressing to the poet's mother, Maria Alexandrovna Mein:

Все бледней лазурный остров – детство,
Мы одни на палубе стоим.
Видно, грусть оставила в наследство
Ты, о мама, девочкам своим! [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Мама, милая, не мучь же!
Мы поедem или нет?
Я большая, – мне семь лет,
Я упряма, – это лучше [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

Unusual addressing to the daughter:
Знай одно: твой взгляд широк от жара,
Паруса надулись – добрый путь!
Знай одно: что завтра будешь старой,
Остальное, деточка, – забудь [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].

It should be noted that in her address to children M. Tsvetaeva gives them life advice.

Ни к городу и ни к селу –
Езжай, мой сын, в свою страну, –
В край – всем краям наоборот!
Куда назад идти – вперед
Идти особенно – тебе
Руси не выдавшее
Дитя мое... Мое? Ее –
Дитя! То самое былье,
Которым порастает быль [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Помолитесь, дорогие дети, –
За меня в час первый и в час третий [Цветаева М., 1997].

In the lyric poems of Marina Tsvetaeva, there are addresses to poets, expressed

by both proper and common nouns. So, proper names are used when referring to specific poets.

*В утренний сонный час,
– Кажется, четверть пятого,
– Я полюбила Вас,
Анна Ахматова [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].*

Addressing to specific persons–poets is expressive, which is created by the use of interjections, repetition. The use of the names of poets in the role of address indicates the spiritual closeness of the addressee to the lyrical *я*, creates a tone of confidential conversation.

In the poetry of Marina Tsvetaeva, addresses are also used in general to the poet (an indefinite person) or to the poets of a particular country, expressed by a common noun or attributive phrase.

*Слепят глаза –
Поэт, не будь в обиде [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].
Ибо раз голос тебе, поэт,
Дан, остальное – взято [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].*

In this case, the address denoted by the word *поэт* can be perceived as an address to oneself, but within the framework of a poetic text it acquires an expansive meaning: to a poet in general or to a contemporary poet. The degree of generality can be limited by spatial boundaries:

*Милый призрак!
Я знаю, что все мне снится.
Сделай милость:
Аминь, аминь, рассыпья!
Аминь [М. Tsvetaeva, 1997].*

The addressee in most of the considered examples was the "pure self-subject"), the internal sender of the message, which is the exponent of the author's evaluative intention. In the poetry of M. Tsvetaeva, there are also poems, according to O.G. Revzina, with a role-playing self-subject, which is determined by the use of stylistic means of language, according to the stylistic canon, which allows expressing a certain type of consciousness within the framework of the chosen situation [Revzina O.G., 1989].

The characterization of the hero fills even more with a number of common, agreed-upon definitions of addresses, since, using addresses expressed by substantivized adjectives, the author emphasizes subjective characteristics, enhances and shows their significance.

It should be noted that the nouns used to express the address are written by the author with a capital letter, which gives the address a ritual character, and the poetess elevates the addressee in her message.

In cases when an address of this kind is taken out of the sentence, it acquires a special intonation and focuses on the figure of the lyric hero, the central concept that expresses the author's emotions, even more vivid and significant.

Using of the address in the middle of a sentence is also varied. In such examples, the address is more an indication of the character for the reader (listener) than a means of attracting his attention.

Addressing to poetic heroes who have their own names is also an expression of the conditional vocative function. Such addresses are a kind of poetic canon, a sign of a kind of conditionally sentimental style. So, in some poems, the address in the middle of a sentence serves as a clarification. As a rule, the author uses such address with pronoun *ТЫ* to specify who exactly the author has in mind.

In comparison with the above mentioned two types of addresses, M. Tsvetaeva uses addresses at the end of the sentence less often. Most of them are used in exclamation sentences with verbs in the imperative mood, adding the character of a call to the words of the poetess. The author shows her special attitude to the central image of the poem; the thrill and breadth of emotions are expressed by the use of a homogeneous series of addresses with some gradation in meaning at the end of the sentence.

M. Tsvetaeva often uses addresses as a trigger. A characteristic feature of her work is the use of exclamation addresses, rhetorical addresses, and repetitions.

CONCLUSION

In general, the traditional-grammatical approach to addressing allows us to identify the main structural and semantic properties, the study of which shows that the address in a number of positions occupies at least a dual position in a number of language units. Its syntactic status is vague, since the address is not an independent sentence expressing a complete thought, and is not a full-fledged member of the sentence.

As a word, the address has such features that are not characteristic to the word as a special intonation, predicativity. The lexical content of the address, which determines its semantic content, is also heterogeneous. Addresses can be conventional and occasional. Conventional addresses are units of language, occasional addresses are units of speech. As units of language and speech, we can consider those common addresses that in particular speech act receive an increment of meanings to an invariant meaning. At least functionally, the address is ambivalent as well.

The address cannot be considered only as an element of the syntactic structure, since there is a huge number of uses of the address in a variety of speech situations. The systemic-structural approach does not properly take into account the social “addressee factor”, which determines the specifics of the most numerous semantic, stylistic, and communicative-pragmatic group of addresses - address to a person (interlocutor). It is quite obvious that the semantic richness and variety of functions of addressing a person to a person is not limited to the name of the addressee and attracting his attention. There is a need to study addresses in the communicative and pragmatic aspect.

Having analyzed the use of addresses in the lyric works of M. Tsvetaeva, we came to the following conclusions. M. Tsvetaeva uses addresses at the beginning of a

poetic line. The poetess uses addresses less often at the end of the sentence. However, the poetess uses most of the addresses in exclamation sentences with verbs in the imperative mood, which gives the poet's words the character of a call. The use of a homogeneous series of references with a certain gradation in meaning at the end of sentences allows M. Tsvetaeva to show a special attitude to the central image of the poem, feelings, trepidation and breadth of emotions.

Often M. Tsvetaeva uses appeal as a trigger. A characteristic feature of her work is the use of exclamation addresses, rhetorical addresses, and repetitions.

REFERENCES

1. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. Critical analysis, strict discipline and personal responsibility should be in the activities of each leader / Report at an expanded meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers dedicated to the results of the country's socio-economic development in 2016 and the most important priority area of the economic program for 2017 // Sh.M. Mirziyoyev. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2017. – S. 94-104.
2. Arutyunova N.D. The proposal and its meaning. Logical-semantic problems. – M., 1976. – P. 356.
3. Arutyunova N.D. Nomination and text (Nomination - appeal) // Language nomination. Types of nominations. – M., 1977. – P. 564.
4. Babaytseva V.V. Russian language. Syntax and punctuation. – M., 1979. – P. 188.
5. Babaytseva V.V., Maksimov L.Yu. Syntax. Punctuation. – M., 1981. – P. 113.
6. Bagna Ibrahim. Types and functions of the Russian address as the name of the addressee in different types of literature: AKD. – M., 2004. – P. 3, 6.
7. Buslaev F.I. Historical grammar of the Russian language, 1875.
8. Dohova Z.R. Linguistic status of address (based on the Russian and Kabardino-Circassian languages): Author's abstract. diss. ... Candidate of Philological Sciences. – Nalchik, 2007.
9. Lomonosov L.V. Complete works. – ML., 1952. – T.7. – from. 267.
10. Lupashku T.G. Address and its text-forming functions in prose and poetry of A.S. Pushkin. – St. Petersburg, 2007. – 198 p.
11. Kruchinina I.I. Appeal // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary / Ed. V.N. Yartsevov. – M., 1990. – P. 340-341.
12. Kovtunova I. I. Poetic syntax. – M., 1986. – P. 86.
13. Ovsyannikovo-Kulikovskiy D.N. Syntax of the Russian language. – SPb., 1912. – P. 292-293.
14. Peshkovskiy A.M. Russian syntax in scientific coverage. Issue 7. – M., 1956.
15. Peshkovskiy A.M. Russian syntax in scientific coverage. – 8th ed., Add. – M., 2001. – p. 408.
16. Polonsky A.V. The categorical and functional essence of addressee (based on the material of the Russian language in comparison with Polish): Avtoref. dis. ... doct. philol. sciences. Oryol: Oryol state. un-t, 2000. – P. 29-30.
17. Priyatkina A.F. Russian language: Complicated sentence syntax: (Textbook for philological specialized universities). – M., 1990 – P. 169.
18. Pronichev VP Syntax of appeal. – L., 1971. – P. 88.
19. Revzina O.G. Expressive means of the poetic language of M. Tsvetaeva and their presentation in the individual author's dictionary // Language of Russian poetry of the 20th century: Sat. scientific. tr. – M., 1989.
20. Rudnev A.G. Complicated sentence syntax. – M., 1959. – P. 177.
21. Shakhmatov A.A. The syntax of the Russian language. – M.: Flinta, Nauka, 2014.
22. Shvedova N.Yu. Propagation of a sentence by including an appeal // Russian grammar. T. 2. – M., 1980. – P. 163-166.
23. Tsvetaeva M. Collected works: In 7 volumes. – M., 1997.

24. Torsuev G.P. Phonetics of the English language. – M., 1950. – P. 242.
25. Vostokov A.Kh. Russian grammar, according to the outline of his own abridged grammar, is more fully stated. – M., 1835.
26. Zaburdyeva V.I. The communicative structure of M. Tsvetaeva's poems with appeals to different addressees // 6 Vinogradov readings in the Republic of Uzbekistan. – T., 2010.
27. Zaburdyeva V.I. Appeals of a folk-poetic character in the lyrics of M. Tsvetaeva // Issues of studying the grammatical structure of the Russian language. – T., 2012.