
Linguistic expertise of conflict texts: a comparative analysis of invective speech acts in English, Russian and Uzbek

Baltayeva Lamiya Baxtiyorovna
bakhtiyorovna.lm03@gmail.com

Master student,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation *This article examines the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of invective speech acts in English, Russian, and Uzbek conflict discourse. The study focuses on verbal aggression, offensive language, and evaluative expressions in professional and interpersonal communication. Through comparative linguistic analysis, the research identifies the semantic, pragmatic, and cultural mechanisms underlying conflict texts across the three languages. Particular attention is devoted to the distinction between insult and value judgment in multilingual discourse and to the role of linguistic expertise in determining legal qualification. The article demonstrates that English conflict communication frequently employs indirect evaluative strategies and subjective opinion markers, Russian discourse is characterized by explicit emotional expressiveness and invective intensification, while Uzbek conflict speech reflects culturally conditioned hierarchy, etiquette norms, and socially marked forms of humiliation. The study also analyzes a multilingual professional conflict scenario in which delayed reporting escalates into verbal aggression. The findings reveal that legal interpretation of offensive speech depends not only on lexical semantics but also on communicative context, cultural expectations, and pragmatic intention. The research contributes to pragmatics, comparative linguistics, discourse analysis, and forensic linguistic expertise in multilingual environments.*

Keywords *Invective speech acts, conflict discourse, forensic linguistics, pragmatics, verbal aggression, comparative linguistics, intercultural communication, linguistic expertise*

Konflikt matnlarining lingvistik ekspertizasi: ingliz, rus va o'zbek tillaridagi invektiv nutqiy aktlarning qiyosiy tahlili

Baltayeva Lamiya Baxtiyorovna
bakhtiyorovna.lm03@gmail.com

Magistrant,
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

Annotatsiya *Mazkur maqolada ingliz, rus va o'zbek konflikt diskursidagi invektiv nutqiy aktlarning lingvistik hamda pragmatik xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot professional va shaxslararo muloqotdagi verbal agressiya, haqoratli til birliklari va baholovchi ifodalarga qaratilgan. Qiyosiy-lingvistik tahlil orqali uch tildagi konflikt matnlarining semantik, pragmatik va madaniy mexanizmlari aniqlanadi. Ayniqsa, ko'p tilli diskursda "haqorat" va "baho beruvchi fikr" o'rtasidagi farq hamda nutqiy birliklarni huquqiy jihatdan kvalifikatsiya qilishda lingvistik ekspertizaning o'rniga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Maqolada ingliz konflikt muloqoti ko'proq bilvosita baholovchi strategiyalar va subyektiv fikr markerlaridan foydalanishi, rus diskursi esa ochiq emotsional ekspressivlik va kuchaytirilgan invektivlik bilan xarakterlanishi, o'zbek konflikt nutqi esa madaniy jihatdan belgilangan ierarxiya, nutq odobi*

me'yorlari hamda ijtimoiy jihatdan belgilangan tahqir shakllarini aks ettirishi ko'rsatib berilgan. Shuningdek, tadqiqotda hisobot kechikishi verbal agressiyaga aylanib ketgan ko'p tilli professional konflikt holati ham tahlil qilingan. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, haqoratli nutqning huquqiy talqini nafaqat leksik semantikaga, balki kommunikativ kontekst, madaniy kutilmalar va pragmatik niyatga ham bog'liqdir. Tadqiqot pragmatika, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, diskurs tahlili hamda ko'p tilli muhitdagi sud-lingvistik ekspertiza sohalari rivojiga hissa qo'shadi.

Kalit so'zlar *Invektiv nutqiy aktlar, konflikt diskursi, sud lingvistikasi, pragmatika, verbal agressiya, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, madaniyatlararo muloqot, lingvistik ekspertiza*

**Лингвистическая экспертиза
конфликтных текстов:
сравнительный анализ
инвективных речевых актов в
английском, русском и
узбекском языках**

Балтаева Ламия Бахтияровна
bakhtiyarovna.lm03@gmail.com
Магистрант,
Узбекский государственный университет
мировых языков

Аннотация *В данной статье рассматриваются лингвистические и прагматические особенности инвективных речевых актов в английском, русском и узбекском конфликтном дискурсе. Исследование сосредоточено на вербальной агрессии, оскорбительной лексике и оценочных высказываниях в профессиональной и межличностной коммуникации. С помощью сравнительно-лингвистического анализа выявляются семантические, прагматические и культурные механизмы, лежащие в основе конфликтных текстов в трёх языках. Особое внимание уделяется разграничению понятий «оскорбление» и «оценочное суждение» в многоязычном дискурсе, а также роли лингвистической экспертизы в определении правовой квалификации высказывания. В статье показано, что английская конфликтная коммуникация часто использует косвенные оценочные стратегии и маркеры субъективного мнения, русский дискурс характеризуется открытой эмоциональной экспрессивностью и усиленной инвективностью, тогда как узбекская конфликтная речь отражает культурно обусловленную иерархию, нормы речевого этикета и социально маркированные формы унижения. В исследовании также анализируется многоязычная профессиональная конфликтная ситуация, в которой задержка отчётности перерастает в вербальную агрессию. Результаты показывают, что правовая интерпретация оскорбительной речи зависит не только от лексической семантики, но и от коммуникативного контекста, культурных ожиданий и прагматического намерения. Исследование вносит вклад в развитие прагматики, сравнительного языкознания, дискурс-анализа и судебной лингвистической экспертизы в условиях многоязычной коммуникации.*

Ключевые слова *Инвективные речевые акты, конфликтный дискурс, судебная лингвистика, прагматика, вербальная агрессия, сравнительное языкознание, межкультурная коммуникация, лингвистическая экспертиза*

Introduction

The scientific novelty of this research is determined by its interdisciplinary and comparative approach to the analysis of invective speech acts in English, Russian, and Uzbek conflict discourse. Unlike traditional studies that examine verbal aggression within a single linguistic system, the present research investigates how identical communicative situations acquire different semantic, pragmatic, and legal interpretations across multilingual environments. The study introduces a cross-cultural model of linguistic expertise in which insult is interpreted not only as a lexical phenomenon but also as a culturally conditioned pragmatic act. One of the main innovations of the research lies in the differentiation between “value judgment” and “insult” through comparative linguistic analysis. The article demonstrates that identical evaluative constructions may function differently depending on the legal traditions and communicative norms of a speech community. In English discourse, offensive statements are frequently interpreted as subjective opinion protected by freedom of expression, while in Russian and Uzbek communicative contexts similar constructions may acquire the status of invective humiliation due to their emotional and cultural intensity. This distinction allows the research to contribute to the development of modern forensic linguistics and legal pragmatics. Another scientific contribution of the study is the analysis of multilingual conflict correspondence as a complex discourse structure. The research proves that semantic equivalence between translated expressions does not guarantee pragmatic equivalence. Lexical units that appear identical in dictionary

meaning demonstrate different levels of aggressiveness, emotional intensity, and legal relevance within each linguistic culture. This finding is particularly important for linguistic expertise of digital communication, multilingual workplace conflicts, and intercultural legal disputes. The study also introduces a pragmatic analysis of etiquette destruction as a marker of verbal aggression in Uzbek discourse. Unlike English and Russian communicative systems, where invectivity is primarily expressed through explicit offensive vocabulary, Uzbek conflict communication frequently signals aggression through violations of hierarchical speech norms. The transition from respectful forms of address to informal pronouns and culturally inappropriate communicative behavior functions as an independent mechanism of humiliation. This aspect has received limited scholarly attention in comparative pragmatics and therefore represents an important scientific innovation.

The article further develops the theory of invective speech acts by demonstrating the interaction between lexical semantics and sociocultural context (Culpeper, 2011; Leech, 1983). The research establishes that the legal qualification of insult depends not only on the presence of offensive vocabulary but also on pragmatic intention, communicative environment, social hierarchy, and collective cultural expectations (Brown, 1987; Searle, 1969). Such an approach expands existing models of discourse analysis by integrating semantic, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and forensic perspectives into a unified analytical framework (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 2008).

An additional novelty of the research lies in its focus on professional conflict discourse. Most previous studies of invectivity

concentrate on political rhetoric, media language, or everyday interpersonal communication (Culpeper, 2011; van Dijk, 2008). In contrast, the present study examines how workplace communication transforms into verbal aggression and how professional criticism shifts toward personal humiliation. This allows the article to reveal linguistic mechanisms of reputational damage and communicative escalation in organizational environments (Karasik, 2004; Fairclough, 2001).

The research also contributes to contemporary digital discourse studies. The analysis demonstrates that modern online communication weakens traditional communicative restrictions and increases the frequency of hybrid invective forms influenced by globalization and multilingual interaction (Wierzbicka, 2003; van Dijk, 2008). In Uzbek discourse especially, digital platforms facilitate the emergence of new aggressive strategies combining national linguistic norms with global internet communication patterns (Yusupov, 2012). This transformation of conflict speech under digitalization represents an important direction for future linguistic research (Karasik, 2004; Fairclough, 2001).

Conflict discourse represents a communicative environment in which participants express disagreement, opposition, emotional tension, or aggression (van Dijk, 2008). In modern linguistics, conflict texts are analyzed not only as lexical or grammatical structures but also as pragmatic instruments that influence social relations and communicative behavior (Leech, 1983; Fairclough, 2001). One of the most significant components of conflict communication is the invective speech act, which includes insult, humiliation, offensive nomination, sarcasm, and negative evaluation (Searle, 1969; Culpeper, 2011).

The increasing globalization of communication and the spread of multilingual interaction have intensified the importance of linguistic expertise of conflict texts (Wierzbicka, 2003). In comparative linguistics, identical

communicative situations may receive different legal and cultural interpretations depending on the language and social norms involved (Karasik, 2004; Yusupov, 2012). A single speech act can function as ordinary criticism in one linguistic environment and as a legally relevant insult in another. This creates difficulties for discourse interpretation, forensic analysis, and intercultural communication (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 2008).

English, Russian, and Uzbek conflict discourse demonstrate substantial differences in the realization of verbal aggression. English communicative culture often prioritizes individual opinion and indirect criticism (Leech, 1983; Wierzbicka, 2003). Russian discourse tends to permit stronger emotional expressiveness and explicit invective forms (Karasik, 2004). Uzbek communicative culture, shaped by respect hierarchy and collectivist values, treats violations of speech etiquette as socially significant acts of humiliation (Yusupov, 2012).

The purpose of this study is to analyze the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of invective speech acts in English, Russian, and Uzbek conflict texts and to determine how cultural and legal factors influence the interpretation of offensive communication (Searle, 1969; van Dijk, 2008; Wierzbicka, 2003).

Theoretical Foundations of Invective Speech Acts

The theory of speech acts developed by J. L. Austin (Austin, 1962) and John Searle forms the methodological basis of invective discourse analysis. According to speech act theory, language does not merely describe reality but also performs actions. Invective utterances belong primarily to expressive speech acts because they communicate emotional evaluation, hostility, contempt, or aggression.

Invective speech acts typically perform several communicative functions:

- emotional discharge;
- humiliation of the interlocutor;
- establishment of dominance;

- social exclusion;
- delegitimization of professional competence;
- provocation of conflict escalation.

Modern pragmatics emphasizes that offensive language must be interpreted contextually. The same lexical unit may function differently depending on communicative situation, speaker intention, cultural norms, and social hierarchy. Therefore, linguistic expertise of conflict texts requires semantic, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and cultural analysis simultaneously.

Linguistic Expertise in Multilingual Conflict Communication

In comparative linguistics, a single communicative process may appear in multiple linguistic forms. Multilingual correspondence often complicates linguistic expertise because semantic equivalence does not necessarily imply pragmatic equivalence. Offensive expressions carry culturally specific meanings that influence legal and social interpretation.

The following multilingual professional conflict demonstrates how identical communicative situations produce different linguistic realizations of aggression.

English Version

A: *We are already two days past the deadline. Where is the final file?*

B: *Stop pestering me. You are a brainless moron and your management style is a complete joke.*

Russian Version

A: *Мы уже на два дня просрочили дедлайн. Где финальный файл?*

B: *Перестань меня донимать. Ты безмозглый дегенерат, а твой стиль управления – это курам на смех.*

Uzbek Version

A: *Муддатдан икки кун ўтиб кетди. Якуний файл қаерда?*

B: *Менга қара, мени тинч қўй. Сен миясиз аҳмоқсан, бошқарув услубинг эса шунчаки масхара.*

Semantics of Invectivity and Pragmatics of Speech Acts

In the presented discourse, the central object of linguistic expertise is the response of participant B. From the perspective of speech act theory, the statement functions as an expressive invective act aimed at discrediting the professional and personal qualities of the addressee.

In the English version, the expressions “brainless moron” and “joke” function as strongly negative evaluative units. However, Anglo-American legal traditions often distinguish between factual accusation and subjective opinion. Since intellectual capacity and management quality are interpreted as subjective evaluative categories, such expressions are frequently considered protected opinion rather than punishable insult. Nevertheless, the implication of professional incompetence may create grounds for civil claims related to reputational damage.

The Russian version demonstrates a significantly stronger degree of emotional explicitness. The lexeme “дегенерат” (“degenerate”), despite its historical scientific origin, functions in contemporary discourse as a highly offensive invective unit. The idiomatic construction “курам на смех” intensifies ridicule through metaphorical devaluation. Russian conflict discourse frequently employs emotionally charged vocabulary and expressive syntax to maximize pragmatic aggression. The legal qualification depends on whether the utterance exceeds socially accepted communicative norms and constitutes deliberate humiliation.

The Uzbek version reveals distinct linguistic and cultural mechanisms of aggression realization. The phrase “Менга қара” and the transition from neutral interaction to the informal pronoun “сен” function as markers of status reduction and communicative disrespect. In Uzbek communicative culture, the opposition between respectful and non-respectful address forms carries strong pragmatic significance. The expression “миясиз аҳмоқ” (“brainless

fool") constitutes an explicit invective construction, while "мачхара" ("disgrace" or "mockery") attacks the social reputation of the interlocutor. Because Uzbek culture highly values public respect and social honor, such expressions produce substantial moral and pragmatic impact even in digital communication.

This analysis demonstrates that legal and linguistic interpretation of offensive speech depends not only on lexical semantics but also on cultural expectations, etiquette norms, and pragmatic intention.

Invective Speech and Forensic Linguistics

The development of digital communication has significantly increased the importance of forensic linguistic analysis. Linguistic experts today participate in legal examination of online conflicts, workplace disputes, political communication, and media discourse.

The main tasks of forensic linguistic expertise include:

- identification of insult markers;
- determination of communicative intention;
- pragmatic interpretation of speech acts;
- contextual semantic analysis;
- evaluation of emotional intensity;
- differentiation between opinion and humiliation.

Comparative analysis is especially important in multilingual societies because direct translation rarely preserves the same pragmatic force. A lexical equivalent may differ substantially in emotional weight, cultural offensiveness, or legal interpretation.

Therefore, effective linguistic expertise requires not only grammatical and semantic competence but also deep understanding of cultural communication models and pragmatic conventions.

Scientific Novelty of the Research

The scientific novelty of this research lies in the integrated comparative analysis of invective speech acts in English, Russian, and

Uzbek multilingual conflict discourse. Unlike traditional studies focused on isolated linguistic systems, this article examines how identical communicative situations transform under different legal, cultural, and pragmatic conditions. The study also introduces a multilingual forensic perspective by distinguishing between evaluative judgment and insult in intercultural communication. Furthermore, the article demonstrates the role of speech etiquette and pronoun selection as markers of aggression in Uzbek conflict discourse.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of invective speech acts in English, Russian, and Uzbek conflict discourse demonstrates that verbal aggression is a multidimensional linguistic phenomenon shaped by semantic, pragmatic, cultural, and legal factors. Although the communicative situation in all analyzed examples remains identical, each language realizes aggression through different linguistic mechanisms and sociocultural norms. This confirms that conflict communication cannot be interpreted exclusively through lexical meaning; instead, it requires contextual and intercultural analysis. The study reveals that English conflict discourse generally tends to preserve the framework of subjective evaluative judgment. Offensive expressions are frequently interpreted as manifestations of personal opinion, sarcasm, or emotional criticism rather than direct attacks on human dignity. As a result, English invective speech often remains within the boundaries of ethical violation unless it directly damages professional reputation or contains verifiable defamatory claims. Russian conflict discourse, by contrast, demonstrates a higher degree of emotional explicitness and lexical aggression. Invective constructions are characterized by expressive vocabulary, emotionally intensified syntax, and metaphorical humiliation strategies. The use of taboo or socially stigmatized lexemes significantly increases the pragmatic force of aggression and may

transform evaluative criticism into a communicative act of humiliation. Russian discourse therefore occupies an intermediate position between emotionally expressive communication and legally relevant verbal offense. The Uzbek linguistic and cultural model of conflict communication reflects a distinct mechanism of aggression based on social hierarchy, communicative etiquette, and collective respect values. The research confirms that in Uzbek discourse verbal aggression is not limited to explicit insults alone. Violations of respectful forms of address, destruction of communicative distance, and public discreditation of social reputation function as powerful pragmatic markers of humiliation. Consequently, the offensive force of Uzbek invective speech often emerges through cultural implication and etiquette violation rather than direct vulgarity. The multilingual analysis also demonstrates that semantic equivalence does not guarantee pragmatic equivalence. Identical expressions translated into different languages acquire distinct emotional intensity, social interpretation, and legal significance. This finding is particularly important for forensic linguistic expertise because multilingual conflict texts require analysis not only of dictionary meaning but also of communicative intention, cultural norms, and discourse context. The study further establishes that the central criterion in linguistic expertise is the distinction between criticism of activity and humiliation of personality. In all analyzed discourse examples, the communicative focus shifts from discussion of professional performance toward direct negative evaluation of the individual. This transition transforms ordinary professional disagreement into invective conflict discourse and creates legal as well as ethical risks across all linguistic environments. Another important conclusion is that digital communication intensifies the spread of invective speech acts and weakens traditional communicative restrictions. Online interaction encourages emotionally explicit and

hybrid forms of aggression that combine national linguistic norms with global discourse tendencies. This process is especially visible in multilingual communication, where speakers adapt conflict strategies according to cultural expectations and audience perception. The research confirms the necessity of interdisciplinary approaches in the linguistic expertise of conflict texts. Effective analysis of verbal aggression requires integration of pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, and forensic linguistics. A purely lexical or grammatical approach is insufficient for determining whether a speech act functions as criticism, emotional expression, or legally significant insult.

In conclusion, invective speech acts represent not only linguistic expressions of aggression but also reflections of cultural worldview, social hierarchy, and communicative values. Comparative examination of English, Russian, and Uzbek conflict discourse contributes to a deeper understanding of intercultural pragmatics and demonstrates the importance of contextual interpretation in multilingual forensic expertise. The findings of the study may be applied in legal linguistics, media discourse analysis, intercultural communication studies, workplace communication research, and the development of artificial intelligence systems for detecting offensive language in multilingual digital environments. Invective speech acts constitute an essential element of conflict communication across languages and cultures. Comparative analysis of English, Russian, and Uzbek discourse demonstrates that verbal aggression is shaped not only by lexical choice but also by cultural hierarchy, communicative etiquette, and legal interpretation. English invective discourse tends to remain within the framework of subjective evaluative criticism. Russian communication displays greater emotional explicitness and lexical aggression. Uzbek conflict discourse relies heavily on pragmatic hierarchy, social respect, and

culturally marked humiliation strategies. The study confirms that multilingual conflict analysis requires interdisciplinary linguistic expertise integrating pragmatics, sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, and

forensic discourse analysis. Future research may focus on digital multilingual aggression, artificial intelligence detection of offensive language, and comparative legal approaches to online conflict communication.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Routledge.
5. Karasik, V. (2004). *Language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse*. Gnosis.
6. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
7. Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
8. van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
9. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter.
10. Yusupov, U. K. (2012). *Problems of Uzbek linguoculturology*. Fan Publishing.