

IDENTIFICATION OF LINGUISTIC SIGNS OF THREAT

Hasanov Beruni Gafur ugli

Master's student of the 1st stage of Tashkent University of Applied Sciences

Abstract: This article analyzes the threat as a speech act, as well as examines its linguistic features. The forms of expression, stylistic means, syntactic structures and pragmatic aspects of the threat are analyzed. The features that distinguish the threat from other speech acts are also considered.

Keywords: threat, Linguistics, speech act, pragmatics, semantics, stylistics

The threat is one of the speech acts that is common in human communication. It usually refers to an intention to signal harm to the listener or third party. There are different forms of threat, which are expressed through linguistic units. This article is aimed at linguistically analyzing a threat, identifying its structural and semantic properties.

In the modern practice of conducting forensic linguistic examinations of studies, the need to use the scientific means of the latest achievements of linguistic theory is clearly recognized. This is due to the qualitative complication and significant expansion of the range of controversial texts that need to be checked by linguistic experts. Often, the "correct" choice of linguistic theory as the methodological basis of research gives the desired result.

Thus, among the most popular categories of requirements for conducting a linguistic examination are the tasks of identifying and qualifying meaningful and colloquial signs of verbal aggression in text materials presented for analysis.

In our opinion, the methodological tools of the Postclassic, extended theory of speech actions can be of great help in solving this problem. The importance of linguistic pragmatics and the use of the ideas of the theory of speech acts is shown, for example, in works . Also, our previous studies show how pragmatics and the theory of Speech Acts "work", manifested, for example, in giving unfair information, manipulating language, in the identification and qualification of speech acts of hidden information of any kind in general ¹.

In the case of Uzbek forensic linguistic expertise, many controversial cases are also observed in the following years. The problem is that linguistic expertise in Uzbek linguistics is a field of Applied Linguistics that is now taking shape.

Linguistic expertise may not be involved in all forms of criminalism. However, there is a need for a process of linguistic expertise in areas that work with the text. Some crimes are linguistic in nature because they are carried out through language. For example, in cases such as threats, slander, insults, extortion, it is the need to carry out a linguistic examination. Investigative processes carried out with this type of crime are also defined as "language crimes"².

¹ Радбиль Т. Б., Юматов В. А. Способы выявления имплицитной информации в лингвистической экспертизе // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н. И. Лобачевского. 2014. № 3(2). С. 18-21;

² Solan L.M., Tiersma P.M. Speaking of Crime: The Language of Criminal Justice. – Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005. – P. 40-46.

A threat is an act of speech aimed at achieving a goal through intimidation with negative consequences in communication. It pragmatically expresses the intention of the speaker (the force of the illocution). To distinguish a threat from other expressions in the language, special methods of linguistic analysis are necessary.

1. Pragmatic analysis method

Pragmatics is the study of how language units are used in context. Threat pragmatically:

- Denotes intent to intimidate
- Puts pressure on the listener
- Includes items of conditionality, warning and coercion

Example:

“If you don't do what I say, you will regret it.”

The pragmatic force in this sentence: expresses a threat by warning that a negative outcome will occur.

2. Method of semantic analysis

Semantics-studies the meaning of words and sentences. In threatening statements, the following semantic signs are observed:

- Negative lexical units: "I kill", "I beat", "I punish"
- Conditional binders: "if", "if not"
- * Words expressing the consequence: "the result will be bad", "you will answer"

Method: is analyzed on the basis of the question of whether lexical units are semantically associated with negative intent.

3. Syntactic analysis method

Threatening statements often take the form of command, conditional, or emotional statements:

- Command sentence: "hurry up!"
- * Conditional sentence: "if you don't come, I'll find you myself."
- * Demonstrative sentences: "You See still!"

Method: through the grammatical structure of the sentence, the illocution force is determined.

4. Stylistic analysis method

Threatening expressions often have strong emotionality. They are:

- Hyperbola: "I will raze you!"
- * Metaphor: "I Dig Your Grave with my own hands!"
- Irony or irony: "imagine for yourself what will happen to you."

Method: with the help of stylistic means, the strength and intention of the threat are analyzed.

5. Method of contextual analysis

The meaning of a threatening sentence is determined only depending on the text and the case. For example:

"Now it's your turn." - this sentence seems simple, but can be a threat in context (for example, if someone has been avenged before).

Method: the text is taken and further sentences, the relationship between the participants in the dialogue, the situation is studied.

6. Discursive (text) analysis method

The threat fulfills certain roles within the dialogue. He is often credited with:

- Show authority
- * Control installation

- Used for the purpose of suppression of resistance.

Method: a threatening phrase is analyzed in connection with other roles in speech (command, reproach, warning).

Conclusion. To determine the act of threatening speech: the complex use of pragmatic, semantic, syntactic, stylistic, contextual, discursive analysis methods is necessary. Each method more accurately reveals the meaning, strength and intention of the threat. These approaches are effectively used to identify a threat in linguistics, literary studies, even through artificial intelligence.

The following conditions of success can be distinguished for the action of threat speech:

- 1) prerequisites: a) the presence of a certain psychological state of hostility of the speaker and the presence of an addressee or threat object; b) the physical possibility of the speaker to perform the desired action;
- 2) an important condition: a clearly defined intention (promise) to harm someone, in general, includes this act in the class of commissions (actions in which the speaker is obliged to carry out some action).;
- 3) condition of sincerity: the speaker sincerely intends to carry out this action, but not in any case, but in case of failure to fulfill the necessary requirements from his point of view;
- 4) condition of the content of the proposal: the act of threat must belong to the plan of the future time (as any other promise or motivation acts of speech).

The threat is sometimes similar to other speech acts such as command, advice, please. But the main intention in a threat is to put pressure on the listener by intimidating with a negative outcome.

In place of the conclusion, it can be said that the threat is a linguistically rich and multifaceted act of speech. It differs from other speech acts in its lexical, syntactic, stylistic and pragmatic characters. To identify a threat, it is necessary to take into account its negative intention, modal means, and emotional color. Such analysis is important in the development of mechanisms for automatic detection, analysis or response to threatening speech.

References:

1. Baranov A. N. Linguistic examination of the text: theoretical foundations and practice: textbook. manual. 3rd ed. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2011; Kanevsky B. S., Bosov A. E. Parting words of the presiding judge from the point of view of speech acts // Criminal law. 2013. No. 2. P. 97-103.
2. Radbil T. B., Yumatov V. A. Methods of identifying implicit information in linguistic examination // Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University named after N. I. Lobachevsky. 2014. No. 3(2). P. 18-21
3. Solan L. M., Tiersma P. M. Speaking of Crime: The Language of Criminal Justice. – Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005. – P. 40-46.
4. Ozhegov S. I., Shvedova N. Yu. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language: 80,000 Words and Phraseological Expressions. RAS, Vinogradov Institute of Russian Language. 15th ed., suppl. Moscow: Azbukovnik, 1998.

5. Efremova T. F. New Explanatory and Word-Formation Dictionary of the Russian Language: in 2 volumes. Moscow: Rus. language, 2000. Vol. II.
6. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. –Toshkent, G'afur G'ulom , 2023. 27-bet
7. Searle J. R. What is a Speech Act? // New in Foreign Linguistics. Issue. 17. Theory of Speech Acts / general. ed. B. Yu.