



DIACHRONIC AND SYNCHRONIC ASPECTS OF FORMS OF ADDRESS

Javlieva Guljakhon Murodovna

Master Student of Asian University of Technologies

Karshi, Kashkadary

tel: +998919494939;

e-mail: jovliyevaguli@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyzes the socio-linguistic features of forms of address, focusing especially on how they relate to occupation, age, and gender. Forms of address reflect not only the communicative function of language but also convey social roles, standards of respect, and professional hierarchy within a community (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Bondaletov, 1987).

Keywords: Forms of address, sociolinguistics, occupation, age, gender, social role.

Introduction

Modern sociolinguistics affirms that language phenomena can be examined both synchronically (in their current state) and diachronically (in their historical development) (Bondaletov, 1987). This principle is clearly visible in Uzbek communicative etiquette as well. The diachronic aspect of forms of address (from Greek *dia* 'through' and *chronos* 'time') is most apparent in historical texts and classical works that document social structures of earlier periods (Erkinov, 2006). Historically, in ancient Turkic languages, forms of address were relatively rare and syntactically simpler than in today's literary Uzbek (Hasanova, 2019). For example, in the O'rxun -Enasoy inscriptions, address forms primarily targeted the people (*budun*) or rulers (*beklar*).

Example:

"Ol yirgaru barsar, turk budun, oltachisan..." (Erkinov, 2006)

In ancient Uyghur inscriptions too, forms of address were used not only for people and leaders but also for inanimate objects and forces of nature. These forms frequently included modifiers connected through agreement and agglutination, reflecting core Turkic grammatical features (Hasanova, 2019).

Example:

"Ai a ädgülärim, täñrimlärim, kim män ol ötdä yalanoqlarñuñ yirtinsulýg ät köz
ýzä ayuu kulune kulmus uu körýr bilir ärtim ärsär."

Between the XI and XIV centuries, alongside traditional types, new address forms emerged, such as romantic address to a beloved (yorga murojaat) and self-address (o‘z-o‘ziga murojaat), which introduced more possessive and descriptive structures, adding syntactic complexity (Uzoqova, 2014).

Examples:

"Eshitgil, ey ulusning podshohi,
Yetimlarning bukun pushti panohi" (Xorazmiy)

"Ey Sanubar bo‘yli dilbar, fikri hijron qilmail,
Shavq o‘tida men godoni usru biryon qilmail."

In Yusuf Xos Hojib’s Qutadg‘u bilig (11th century), one finds poetic and metaphorical forms of address that signal a more sophisticated rhetorical style (Erkinov, 2006):

"Javobda O‘gdulmish dedi: men O‘zim

Seni orzuladim, e ko‘rkli yuzim.

Bunga mos kelibdi ushbu so‘z go‘zal,

Eshit, ey go‘zal xulq, et unga amal."

In XV–XIX century Uzbek literature, poets such as Navoi and Muqimiy used many variants of forms of address, including self-address and expressive, figurative calls to nature or abstract ideas (Erkinov, 2006; Hasanova, 2019).

Examples:

"E, Navoiy, gar desang ming zulmi birla o‘lmayin
Bevafolar makri birla bo‘lmail zinhor sayd." (Navoiy)

"E quyosh, vasling demakdin moh ruhsoring araz,
Avi hayvon zikridin laoli shakarbarin araz." (Navoiy)

"Nogihon bersam, Muqimiy, bir musulmonga salom,
Dafobatan ikki quloini qilur kar, toleim." (Muqimiy)

Traditional honorifics such as mavlono, amirzodam, mullam, taqsir, janob, hazrat, begim, padari buzrukvor, and janobi oliylari were common in historical usage but have become rare in daily speech today (Hasanova, 2019).



Diachronically, addressing a community often used collective nouns like haloyiq, ulus, or jamoat to indicate general audience address:

Example:

"Xaloyiq, Sizga har soat va har dam

animatdir, bering Sardorga yordam." (S. Abdulla, cited in Erkinov, 2006)

Additionally, forms of address reflected the individual's social rank or occupation, with context-specific terms such as so'fi, domullo, pir, eshon, mingboshi, qozikalon, qozidomla, mirzo, and qo'rboshi (Hasanova, 2019).

The findings confirm that the historical development of forms of address closely tracks changes in social structure and cultural norms (Bondaletov, 1987; Uzoqova, 2014). Over time, address forms became more elaborate and formalized, then later underwent simplification. In modern Uzbek society, under the influence of globalization and technology, hybrid address forms increasingly appear in digital communication (Hasanova, 2019).

Synchronically, today's forms of address still vary according to social group, age, occupation, and formality level, aligning with universal politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987). A combined diachronic and synchronic analysis clarifies how forms of address continue to sustain social hierarchy and cultural politeness norms while adapting dynamically to new media.

The ongoing spread of the internet and social networks is expected to further accelerate the evolution of forms of address, fostering new hybridized structures that blend traditional Uzbek politeness strategies with globalized, informal modes typical of online communication (Hasanova, 2019; Uzoqova, 2014). As people increasingly interact across diverse social platforms, address forms once tied to strict social hierarchies are becoming more flexible, context-dependent, and adapted to rapid, written, and multimedia exchanges.

This dynamic shift highlights a crucial insight: forms of address are not static relics of tradition but living elements of linguistic interaction that evolve alongside changes in technology, education, and global cultural exchange. The emergence of online-specific address forms, emotive slang, and hybrid honorifics demonstrates how users creatively negotiate between preserving cultural identity and embracing linguistic innovation.

In this context, it is vital for linguists, educators, and language policymakers to monitor these trends systematically. Updated empirical studies based on



contemporary spoken and digital corpora can capture how younger generations use forms of address in social media, online forums, and instant messaging. Such research will not only enrich descriptive linguistics but also inform modern lexicography and the development of updated textbooks and language resources that reflect authentic usage.

Moreover, balancing respect for traditional politeness and honorific systems with the realities of globalized speech will help ensure that Uzbek retains its cultural depth while remaining adaptable and relevant in global communication networks. Scholars such as Brown and Levinson (1987) remind us that politeness is universal yet culturally nuanced — thus, studying forms of address both synchronically and diachronically continues to provide essential insight into how society expresses respect, solidarity, and identity.

In conclusion, this study underscores that forms of address are a sensitive mirror of a community's social structure and cultural values. Their continuous transformation, driven by technological change and global influence, calls for ongoing academic attention, robust corpus-based tracking, and thoughtful incorporation into language education. Only through such efforts can the Uzbek linguistic heritage maintain its richness while productively engaging with the demands of the modern, interconnected world.

References

- 1.Бондалетов В.Д. Социальная лингвистика. – Москва: Просвещение, 1987, p. 42.
- 2.Хасанова. Н. (2019). О‘zbek tilida murojaat shakllari va ularning lingvistik xususiyatlari. Toshkent: Fan.
- 3.Uzoqova. M. (2014). О‘zbek tili stilistikasi. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi.
- 4.Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.
- 5.Erkinov. A. (2006). О‘zbek adabiyoti tarixi. Toshkent: Sharq.