



## PERIPHERY OF THE COGNITIVE FIELD OF ADDRESS FORMS

**Abrueva Zakhro Shokir qizi**

Researcher of Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek  
language and literature

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15576945>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 24<sup>th</sup> May 2025

Accepted: 30<sup>th</sup> May 2025

Online: 31<sup>st</sup> May 2025

### KEYWORDS

*Cognitive field, address forms, field periphery, prototype, archiseme, superseme, differential seme, component analysis.*

### ABSTRACT

*This article provides information on the cognitive field of address forms, which are an integral part of each speech situation, and the boundaries that constitute the field. The cognitive analysis of address forms is scientifically substantiated based on prototype theory. Additionally, the semantic structure of address forms is revealed through component analysis, and their archiseme and related differential semes are discussed.*

### Introduction

Address forms are linguistic units that form the basis of everyday communication. Studying them within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm allows us to examine the significance of these units in language, national-cultural knowledge expressed on a cognitive basis, and social characteristics in accordance with specific speech situations.

According to V.E. Goldin, addressing serves not for the purpose of addressing itself, but for the etiquette formalization of speech, the expression of socio-role relationships between communicants, or changing the topic of conversation. The presence of the etiquette (socio-regulatory) communicative function of address has led some researchers to believe that traditional forms of politeness (sir, madam, Mr., etc.) are at the center of the system of address forms [Olikova: 1979, 29]. Such a conclusion requires proof, since, in addition to socio-regulatory addresses, there are also anthroponymic (proper nouns), deictic (you), and emotive (evaluative) addresses [Karasik: 2002, 206]. To place a group at the center of the address field, it is necessary to convincingly prove that the function it performs is primary and fundamental. Another distinctive function of an address is that it serves as a means of attracting the addressee's attention and establishing contact with them. D. Wunderlich considered address as an independent speech act, defining its main goal as attracting and retaining the addressee's attention. In his opinion, this explains why addresses are mainly initiatory [Wunderlich: 1976, 295]. According to V.I. Karasik, the function of addresses in language is to perform an appellative function, to establish and maintain communication between the participants in communication [Karasik: 2002, 219]. L.P. Ryzhova terms the function of attracting attention as vocative [Ryzhova: 1982, 9].

### METHODS

This article uses cognitive analysis methods such as categorization, prototypical approach, and component analysis. It is important to use these analytical methods to illuminate



the cognitive basis of forms of address in the Uzbek language. Primary mechanisms such as metaphorical modeling, prototypical approach, and categorization are investigated using examples from speech of native speakers in the Uzbek language.

## **RESULTS**

When analyzing address forms from a cognitive perspective, we must first determine their prototypical meaning and study the periphery of the address field.

At the center of the address field is the nucleus, which contains the prototypical meaning of emphasizing the text's orientation towards the addressee. On the periphery of the address field, the field of inducement intersects with the emotional-evaluative and contact fields. It is in these intersecting areas that many secondary functional meanings of the word addressing the addressee are located, which are observed in the process of live communication.

At the intersection of the address field and the inducement field, there are demands (strict inducement) and requests (soft inducement). In the shared area of the address field and the communication field, the address conveys the following meanings:

- 1) encouragement to start a conversation;
- 2) the speaker's verification of the listener's understanding of their words;
- 3) encouraging the interlocutor to continue, explain, or clarify their previous thought;
- 4) preparation for the next message in order to emphasize its significance and interest the listener.

The emotional-evaluative field covers a large part of the address field, including not only the peripheral parts but also part of the field's center. This is because the addresses themselves can express emotional meanings within the framework of their main function - conveying the text's orientation towards the addressee. Along with emphasizing the focus of thought on the addressee, they manifest a wide range of emotional meanings, such as surprise, fear, anxiety, anger, pity, hatred, rage, admiration, and so on. At the edge of the intersection between the address field and the emotional-evaluative field are addresses that have completely lost their meaning of being directed to the addressee and fulfill only the secondary function of address - emotional exclamation.

The emotional-evaluative field can overlap with all other fields that share a common part with the address field. At the intersection of address, information, and emotional evaluation, there are various evaluative comments and ironic remarks. If the emotional-evaluative field merges with the field of motivation or the field of communication, then emotional motivations expressed in the form of an address, or emotional expressions-addresses with a communicative function, respectively appear. It is necessary to emphasize once again the vagueness of the field boundaries, the overlapping of some features onto others, and therefore the difficulty in determining one or another peripheral meaning of the address. Thus, the approach based on the theory of functional fields and the concept of the prototypical structure of categories is the most suitable for describing such a complex multifunctional communicative unit as address. Following this, it is logical to consider prototypes of addresses, that is, addresses at the level of the English language system.

As a result of a step-by-step analysis of the structure of lexical meaning, the following semantic groups of standard emotional addresses were identified: addresses expressing friendly and kinship relations, affectionate addresses, and



insulting addresses. In the complex of systematic addresses, the separation of the above-mentioned classes is somewhat conditional, since "describing the semantics of words, recording their inherent meanings inevitably leads to a certain degree of simplification, schematization of the actual state of reality" [Nikitin: 1984, 15].

Here it is necessary to elaborate on the technique of component analysis. This method "is a way of studying the content side of semantic units of language, the purpose of which is to divide the meaning into minimal semantic components" [Kuznetsov: 2000, 233-234]. According to this method, in the semantic structure of any word, it is possible to distinguish a common, integral feature, in other words, an archiseme, and one or more distinguishing features or semes. [Kuznetsov: 2000, 233-234].

In addition, implicative or connotative semes are usually distinguished: inherent and adherent (or potential, latent) semes. This method is based on a certain semantic triangle, reflecting three aspects of language functioning: language forms, thinking, and reality. To understand the regularities of word combinations, it is necessary to analyze the interaction of these three levels: the level of reality, the level of thinking (the content plane according to L. Hjelmslev's term) and the language level (the expression plane) [Gak: 1972, 369].

At the first level, the elements of the situation that need to be identified are distinguished, which are characterized by certain features (aspects). Within each aspect, a distinctive feature is identified. Then, one or more aspects that have the most informative power are selected and reflected in the name. For example, an action can be determined by its direction or method, or simultaneously by both aspects. In everyday communication, due to speech relations, the selection and, consequently, the naming of aspects occurs unconsciously.

The reflection of a situational element in the content plan creates a semanteme, the reflection of an aspect creates a semantic category, and the reflection of the distinguishing feature of this aspect creates a semantic component or seme. In the expression plan, a lexeme corresponds to the semanteme, and the seme can be expressed through a morpheme. In all cases, the semantic structure of a specific meaning of a word is determined by the real properties of the situational elements and the importance of these properties for speakers during speech. For clarity, it is necessary to demonstrate the component analysis algorithm by providing examples of specific forms of address. For instance, in cases where animal names are used in children's terms of endearment, the semantic load falls on the morphemes contained in them. In addresses such as "*qo'zichog'im*" (my little lamb), "*echkicham*" (my little goat), "*xo'tikcham*" (my little donkey), the root morpheme expresses the seme "animal subject," and the morpheme -cha means "*small or pleasant thing*" (semantic category - diminutive-endearing sign). Without the affectionate-diminutive form, the root morpheme itself cannot achieve the intended purpose of the address; in the semantics of the words *echki* (goat), *qo'zi* (lamb), *xo'tik* (donkey), the animal seme is an archiseme, and a negative connotation is noticeable. Typically, addressing with such animal names is a kind of cultural code, which is imprinted as a stereotype in the mental lexicon of native speakers and is used for irony, to emphasize the unacceptable aspect of the addressee's action or behavior. For example, "*goat*" is used to describe *stubbornness*, "*lamb*" is used to describe *naivety or sluggishness*, and "*donkey*" is associated with *loud, shouting voices*.



They reflect the relevant aspects of this concept. In relation to the seme, the semantic category manifests itself as a "superseme" or "archiseme." In this case, the archiseme is the seme "*animal*". However, depending on the situation, any differential seme can become relevant, come to the forefront, be included in the rheme of the sentence (new information), while other semes reflecting already known or insignificant aspects of the phenomenon for the speaker lose their communicative significance, move to the background, and may completely disappear from the semantic structure of the word. The archiseme in the given example has lost its communicative significance, and the semes "*young child*", "*adolescent*" have become actualized.

### DISCUSSION

Analysis reveals that categorization, component analysis, and the prototypical approach are interconnected mechanisms that shape forms of address. These processes enrich the semantic depth and emotional impact of address forms in communicative situations, reflecting cultural representations and cognitive universals. From this perspective, the units selected as forms of address express abstract human experiences through elements based on common cultural codes.

### CONCLUSION

The cognitive-semantic analysis of forms of address allows us to determine the level of nominative potential of the language, the process of communication, the role of the relationship between the addressee and the addresser in it, and the processes of verbalization of knowledge about the interlocutor in their thinking. In this article, the periphery of forms of address is investigated, and it has been proven that the denotation, signification, and differential semes are not rigid, and only the speech situation has the ability to elevate a certain seme to the level of an archiseme.

### References:

1. Wunderlich, D. Methodological Remarks on Speech Act Theory // Speech Acts Theory and Pragmatics. – Dordrecht, etc., 1980, – P.291-312.
2. Баракова М.Г. Лингвистическая природа и прагмакогнитивные функции обращения. Диссертация канд. филол. наук. – М., 2005. – 182 с.
3. Гак В.Г. К проблеме семантической синтагматики // Проблемы структурной лингвистики, 1971. – М., 1972. – С.369-383.
4. Гольдин В.Е. Обращение: теоретические проблемы. – Саратов, 1987. – 129 с
5. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. – Волгоград, 2002. – 286 с.
6. Кузнецов А.М. О применении метода компонентного анализа в лексике в кн.: Синхронно-сопоставительный анализ языков разных систем // БЭС «Языкознание». – М., 2000. – С.233-234.
7. Никитин М.В. О структуре лексического значения // Вопросы структуры английского языка в синхронии и диахронии. – Л., 1985. Вып. 5. – С.116-125
8. Оликова М.А. Обращение в современном английском языке. – Львов, 1979. – 84 с.
9. Рыжова Л.П. Коммуникативные особенности обращения // Содержательные аспекты предложения и текста. – Калинин, 1983. –152с.