

Functional-Pragmatic Features of Verbal Aggression in English And Uzbek

Botirova Zebuniso Solijon kizi

PhD student of Andijan state university, English teacher of the department of English philology of Kokand university, Andijan branch, Uzbekistan

Received: 20 January 2026; **Accepted:** 16 February 2026; **Published:** 09 March 2026

Abstract: This article provides a comprehensive comparative-pragmatic analysis of verbal aggression and face-threatening acts in the English and Uzbek languages. Moving beyond descriptive analyses of affective vocabulary, the study synthesizes classical lexicological and stylistic theories with modern pragmatic frameworks to examine how communicative dominance and manipulation are linguistically encoded. By strictly analyzing the functional-semantic fields, syntactic models, and phraseological units that carry negative evaluative charges, the research highlights the profound linguocultural specificities of the two languages. The findings indicate that English conflict discourse predominantly employs strategies protecting individual autonomy (negative face) through structural indirectness or rigid imperatives. In contrast, the Uzbek language utilizes socially hierarchical, collectivistic models relying on metaphoric transfers and culturally bound optative formulas, aligning with national-cultural pragmatic codes.

Keywords: Verbal aggression, conflict discourse, functional pragmatics, face-threatening acts, ethnopragmatics, phraseological units, evaluative vocabulary, linguoculturology.

Introduction: In contemporary linguistics, the paradigm of pragmalinguistics necessitates examining language not merely as a neutral medium of information transfer, but as an active socio-psychological instrument capable of modifying interlocutor behavior and enforcing social hierarchies. In communicative scenarios where the cooperative principle is suspended, speakers frequently resort to specific linguistic strategies—broadly categorized as verbal aggression—to establish dominance or express affective states. The theoretical foundation for understanding the affective dimensions of language is deeply rooted in classical European and Russian linguistic traditions. Ch. Bally's foundational work on stylistics elucidated the affective character of language, asserting that subjective emotions systematically restructure the grammatical and lexical form of an utterance [2, p. 14]. Expanding upon this, V. V. Vinogradov's extensive research into the emotional-

evaluative functions of language provides a critical mechanism for categorizing how a speaker's subjective hostility is embedded into the semantic core of words [8, p. 112]. Furthermore, fixed linguistic units play a vital role in conflict discourse. The structural and semantic theories of phraseology developed by N. N. Amosova [1] and A. V. Kunin [6] demonstrate how idioms and culturally loaded phraseological units serve as ready-made cognitive templates for expressing complex negative evaluations. To contextualize these theories within the Turkic linguistic space, the present study relies heavily on the ethnopragmatic framework established by Sh. Safarov [7, p. 115], which posits that every speech act is governed by strict national-cultural codes. This synthesis provides a robust, culturally nuanced framework for comparing the functional-pragmatic mechanisms of verbal aggression in English and Uzbek based on Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory [3, p. 61].

The research employs a comparative-typological methodology combined with functional-pragmatic discourse analysis. The linguistic data comprises extracted structural models, phraseological units, and syntactic patterns from contemporary English and Uzbek literary prose, sociolinguistic corpora, and recorded conversational data.

The analytical procedure involves:

- **Pragmatic Mapping:** Identifying the illocutionary force behind specific Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs).

- **Component and Contextual Analysis:** Utilizing Amosova's concept of contextual meaning [1, p. 45] and Hakimov's principles of text pragmatics [5, p. 42] to determine how neutral words acquire negative pragmatic charges in specific communicative situations.

The comparative analysis uncovers distinct linguistic mechanisms through which cognitive models of aggression are realized in the two languages.

In the English linguocultural space, where individualistic values and personal autonomy are paramount, verbal aggression is primarily structured to challenge or defend "negative face" (the desire to be unimpeded).

- **Directive Imperative Models:** Structural patterns such as short, unmitigated imperative verbs followed by restrictive locative or temporal adverbs are used to immediately block an interlocutor's action. The pragmatic intent is not necessarily character assassination, but spatial and behavioral control.

- **Implicit Evaluative Strategies:** Following Bally's observations on affective stylistics [2], English frequently employs "cold" stylistic devices. Syntactic structures that conventionally encode compliments or agreement are inverted pragmatically through intonation and context to function as severe sarcasm [4, p. 154].

- **Phraseological Intensifiers:** According to Kunin's classification [6, p. 89], English conflict discourse heavily relies on somatic and verbal phraseological units that breach standard social registers, elevating the emotional weight of the utterance.

Contrastingly, the Uzbek language operates within a

collectivistic cultural framework characterized by strict age and status hierarchies. As Sh. Safarov asserts [7, p. 115], pragmatic intentions in Uzbek communication cannot be analyzed outside the traditional value system; hence, verbal aggression is largely regulated by communal and hierarchical norms rather than purely individualistic boundaries.

- **Metaphoric Transfers (Zoomorphisms):** The functional-semantic field of negative evaluation makes extensive use of metaphoric transfers from the animal kingdom to humans. These zoomorphisms are employed to project specific negative cognitive traits onto the interlocutor, effectively lowering their social status.

- **Formulaic Optative Constructions:** A unique feature of Uzbek verbal aggression is the utilization of traditional optative formulas (curses). These units retain a historical magical-pragmatic function, directing punitive action to supernatural forces and amplifying the psychological impact on the addressee.

- **Hierarchical Domineering Models:** Drawing on Hakimov's discourse analysis [5, p. 42] and Vinogradov's emotional-evaluative modality [8, p. 112], Uzbek speakers frequently utilize linguistic structures emphasizing age disparity. Interrogative structures challenging the interlocutor's right to speak function as tools for social discipline rather than pure hostility.

The integration of classical linguistic theories into the comparative analysis reveals a profound divergence in conflict management strategies. As established by Vinogradov [8] and Bally [2], the emotional layer of language is intrinsically linked to its grammatical structure. In English, the reliance on rigid imperatives and pragmatic irony reflects a cognitive model focused on individual boundaries.

Conversely, the Uzbek data demonstrates that classical theories of phraseology and lexicology must be contextually adapted when applied to Turkic languages. As Safarov argues [7, p. 115], ignoring the ethnopragmatic context leads to a misinterpretation of communicative intent. In Uzbek, phraseological units and evaluative vocabulary are inextricably bound to collective social structures. Expanding these classical European and Russian theories through the lens of Uzbek pragmalinguistics not only validates their

universal applicability but also highlights the necessity of localized linguistic frameworks to fully decode culturally specific discourse.

The functional-pragmatic analysis of verbal aggression in English and Uzbek elucidates that affective and face-threatening communication is governed by highly systematic, culturally bound linguistic rules. English predominantly utilizes strategies aimed at regulating personal autonomy through structural indirectness and rigid directives. The Uzbek language relies on hierarchical and collectivistic models, employing complex metaphoric transfers and culturally embedded formulaic constructions. Understanding these divergent mechanisms—grounded in the foundational theories of stylistic, phraseological, and ethnopragmatic linguistics—is essential for advancing cross-cultural pragmatics and mitigating communicative failures in translation.

REFERENCES

1. Amosova, N. N. *Osnovy angliyskoy frazeologii*. – Leningrad: Izd-vo Leningr. un-ta, 1963. – 208 p.
2. Bally, Ch. *Traité de stylistique française*. 3rd ed. – Genève: Georg et Cie, 1951. – 331 p.
3. Brown, P., Levinson, S. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 345 p.
4. Culpeper, J. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. – 292 p.
5. Hakimov, M. *O'zbek tilida matnning pragmatik xususiyatlari*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2001. – 150 p.
6. Kunin, A. V. *Angliyskaya frazeologiya: Teoreticheskiy kurs*. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1970. – 344 p.
7. Safarov, Sh. *Pragmalingvistika*. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008. – 318 p.
8. Vinogradov, V. V. *Izbrannye trudy. Leksikologiya i leksikografiya*. – Moscow: Nauka, 1977. – 312 p.