



XORIJY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

SEMANTIC DIFFERENCES OF MENASIV SPEECH ACTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

O'rinova Shoxsanamxon Nosirjon qizi

Doctoral student

Tashkent State Transport University

shohsanamgulomova98@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15179484>

Annotation: *This study explores the semantic differences of threat speech acts in English and Uzbek, analyzing their linguistic features, cultural contexts, and communicative functions. The research compares directness and indirectness in expressing threats, considering how cultural norms shape the perception and formulation of threats. The findings provide insights into cross-cultural communication, highlighting the complexity of understanding threats across languages.*

Keywords: *Threat speech acts, English, Uzbek, pragmatics, cross-cultural communication, directness, indirectness.*

Intoduction. Language is a fundamental tool of communication that allows individuals to express their thoughts, emotions, and intentions. Speech acts, as a part of pragmatics, are utilized to convey specific aims or goals. Among these acts, commissive or threat speech acts hold particular importance because they involve a speaker applying pressure, issuing warnings, or instilling fear in the listener. This dissertation aims to explore the semantic differences of threat speech acts in English and Uzbek. The research analyzes the linguistic characteristics, cultural contexts, and communicative functions of threats in both languages. The study seeks to understand how these acts vary structurally, pragmatically, and culturally, offering insights into the nature of directness and indirectness in threat expressions.

Main part. The theory of speech acts was first proposed by J.L. Austin in his seminal work 'How to Do Things with Words' (1962). He categorized speech acts into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts, emphasizing that language can perform actions beyond mere information exchange. Austin's ideas were further developed by J.R. Searle (1969), who expanded the classification of speech acts to include commissive acts, where speakers commit themselves to future actions. Threats are a subset of commissive acts because they compel the listener to comply to avoid negative consequences.

Subsequent research on threats has been enriched by scholars like Brown and Levinson (1987), who linked threats to the concept of 'face' in politeness theory. In their work, they examined how cultural contexts influence the strategies used to maintain or challenge social face. Similarly, Levinson (1983) and Culpeper (1996) analyzed the use of direct and indirect strategies in expressing threats, considering the



XORIJIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

impact of politeness, power dynamics, and contextual factors. In Uzbek linguistics, the study of speech acts, particularly threats, has been limited. However, scholars like Sh. Safarov (2008) have explored pragmatic aspects of the Uzbek language, while N. Jo'rayev (2015) analyzed the cultural and social nuances of threat expressions. Unlike English, where threats are often softened or mitigated to avoid legal repercussions, Uzbek threats tend to be more direct and culturally accepted in informal communication.

Threat speech acts in English are generally expressed indirectly. This indirectness serves to maintain politeness, protect the speaker's image, and minimize potential legal consequences. For example: "If you don't stop, I might have to take further action."

Here, the threat is softened by the modal verb 'might,' which allows the speaker to maintain a level of caution and ambiguity. In contrast, threats in Uzbek tend to be more direct and explicit, reflecting the cultural acceptance of open confrontation in certain contexts. For instance: "Agar ketmasang, politsiyani chaqiraman!" (If you don't leave, I'll call the police!) "Ko'rasan hali, bu yerda yurishing qiyin bo'ladi!" (You'll see, it'll be hard for you to stay here!) Such examples illustrate the higher tolerance for directness in Uzbek, especially in informal and familiar settings. In more formal or public contexts, Uzbek speakers may adopt more mitigated or strategic approaches similar to English.

Cultural factors significantly shape how threats are perceived and delivered in both languages. In English-speaking cultures, the emphasis on individual rights and legal consciousness often discourages direct threats. Indirectness is a strategy to reduce confrontations while maintaining face for both the speaker and the listener. On the other hand, Uzbek culture, which values honor, social reputation, and respect, often perceives directness as a sign of assertiveness rather than disrespect. Threats may be used not only to intimidate but also to establish boundaries, assert authority, or protect one's reputation.

Additionally, context plays a crucial role in the delivery of threats. In English, workplace settings or professional interactions strictly discourage direct threats due to legal implications. However, in more personal or informal environments, subtle threats or warnings may be employed. In Uzbek, direct threats can be part of everyday discourse, especially among peers or in hierarchical relationships, where authority and respect are emphasized.



XORIYIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

Conclusion. This analysis of threat speech acts in English and Uzbek demonstrates the complexity of cross-cultural communication. The degree of directness, cultural norms, and contextual factors all contribute to how threats are formulated and perceived. Understanding these differences is vital for effective communication, especially in multicultural interactions where misunderstandings may arise from varying interpretations of threatening language.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
6. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Nutq madaniyati va pragmatika*. Toshkent: Fan.
7. Jo'rayev, N. (2015). *O'zbek tilida kommunikativ nutq aktlari*. Toshkent: Universitet nashriyoti.
8. Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the Universality of Face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
9. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Doubleday Anchor.
10. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter.