

## IDENTIFICATION OF LINGUISTIC SIGNS OF A THREAT

*Hasanov Beruniy G'ofir ugli**1st stage graduate of Tashkent University of Applied Sciences*

**Annotation:** in this article, the threat is analyzed as an act of speech and its linguistic signs are studied. Forms of expression, stylistic means, syntactic structures and pragmatic aspects of the threat are analyzed. Features that distinguish a 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<sup>1</sup>.

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"<sup>2</sup>.

In this work, we will consider the possibilities of identifying linguistic and meaningful signs of threatening speech. The threat can be considered psychologically, legally and linguistically. From a psychological point of view, a threat is the result of mental influence (violence) expressed in the

<sup>1</sup> 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;

<sup>2</sup> 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.

intimidation of an individual or a group of individuals by causing physical, material or other harm, or any inconvenient or unwanted harm for them. The threat should be perceived as actually being carried out by him (threat of physical violence, destruction of property, deprivation of money, etc.). It does not matter whether the culprit carried out the stated intentions to qualify the threat, at the time it was stated, or whether he intended to carry out the threats in the future.

The threat has the following types: 1) threat to the life of the recipient; 2) Physical damage to the recipient (threat to health); 3) moral damage to the recipient, i.e. such actions that can harm the emotional and mental state of the recipient: depriving the latter of certain rights and privileges, sanctions by institutions of power, what is happening to the recipient; 4)" mixed damage " (in this case, possible moral and physical damage to the addressee in statements of threat is combined; 5) damage to the property of the addressee.

From a linguistic point of view, the threat is interpreted as "intimidation, a promise to harm someone." harm, evil "or" evil, inconvenience " is interpreted as a promise. In the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek language, it expresses the meaning of "Prayer, danger, prayer, intimidation", derived from Arabic<sup>3</sup>

The theory of speech action considers the threat to be the speech action of the delict, i.e. verbal aggression. The threat is not cooperative, i.e. the contradictory type of standard speech act of the commission is the speech act of the obligation (the type of promise) [5].

Every speech act, J. R. Searle is characterized by certain conditions of success, compliance with which is necessary in order to find the act of speech worthy, and failure to comply with one or more conditions of success, on the contrary, leads to communicative failures. J. with R. Searle identifies four main groups of success conditions:

- 1) prerequisites are conditions that reflect objective (situational) and subjective (psychological) prerequisites, corresponding to the promotion of this illocative goal, i.e. cases of an act of speech, if not, are communicative failures;
- 2) important conditions are those that directly correspond to the communicative intention of the speaker (statement, question, motivation, commitment and expression of others in a certain linguistic form), which the speaker seeks to convey to the listener's mind using his statement;
- 3) the condition of sincerity is a condition that reflects an internal (psychological) state that may be attributed to the speaker based on the assumption of sincerity and seriousness of the act of speech;
- 4) propositional conditions are conditions that impose restrictions on the choice of language tools to perform a particular speech act (e.g., the message Act does not include a verb in the command mood, and the request Act does not include a verb in the indicative mood in the past tense, etc. <sup>4</sup>.

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;

<sup>3</sup> O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. –Toshkent, G'afur G'ulom , 2023. 27-bet.

<sup>4</sup> Серль Дж. Р. Что такое речевой акт? // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 17. Теория речевых актов / общ. ред. Б. Ю. Городецкого. М.: Прогресс, 1986. С. 160-166.

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).

#### 1. The pragmatic essence of the threat

A threat is an illocutional (intention-based) act of speech, in which the conduct associated with the implementation of a certain harm or negative consequence is estimated by the speaking person. It typically has the following illocutionary forces:

- \* Coercion
- \* Intimidation
- \* Warning

For example:

"If you forgive again, this time you will receive punishment."

In this sentence there is a warning related to the damaging result.

#### 2. Analysis of linguistic signs

##### 2.1. Lexical characters

In the expression of a threat, verbs and phrases are usually used that mean negative:

- destroy, beat, kill, punish, blow up, dismiss;
- "you will see", "the end will be bad", "you will forgive".

##### 2.2. Modal tools

In threatening sentences, modal verbs are often used:

- "must", "MUST", "MUST", "MUST", "will", "cannot", "must".

For example:

"If you do not do this, you will answer the consequences yourself."

##### 2.3. Syntactic structure

Threatening statements are often conditional (if... if) or the command takes the form of sentences:

- \* Conditional: "if you are not silent, you will leave."
- \* Command: "stop immediately, otherwise..."

##### 2.4. Stylistic tools

Emotional coloring stylistic tools are widely used when using a threat:

- Rhetorical questioning: "how many times should I tell you?"
- Hyperbola: "I will raze you!"

#### 3. Difference between threat and other speech acts

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.

Type of Speech Act	Goal	Example
<b>Order</b>	Forcing to perform the action	"Go!"
<b>Threat</b>	Harm if not done	"Go, it will be bad if not."
<b>Advice</b>	Give a useful recommendation	"It's going to be nice."

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. Баранов А. Н. Лингвистическая экспертиза текста: теоретические основания и практика: учеб. пособие. 3-е изд. М.: Флинта: Наука, 2011; Каневский Б. С., Босов А. Е. Напутственное слово председательствующего с точки зрения речевых актов // Уголовное право. 2013. № 2. С. 97-103.
2. 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
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. Ожегов С. И., Шведова Н. Ю. Толковый словарь русского языка: 80 000 слов и фразеологических выражений. РАН, Ин-т рус. яз. им. В. В. Виноградова. 15-е изд., доп. М.: Азбуковник, 1998.
5. Ефремова Т. Ф. Новый толково-словообразовательный словарь русского языка: в 2 т. М.: Рус. яз., 2000. Т. II.
6. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati. –Toshkent, G‘afur G‘ulom , 2023. 27-bet
7. Серль Дж. Р. Что такое речевой акт? // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 17. Теория речевых актов / общ. ред. Б. Ю.