

## LINGUISTIC LIMITS OF REPRIMAND AS A UNIT OF THEORETICAL RESEARCH AT THE PRESENT STAGE

Isroiljon Ataboyev,

Assistant of Tashkent State University of Transport

E-mail: [isroilataboyev2@gmail.com](mailto:isroilataboyev2@gmail.com)

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1194-9222>

**Abstract:** *In this article, we will consider the reprimand as a unit of theoretical research at the present stage. In the academic field, theoretical research plays a decisive role in expanding knowledge and understanding of various phenomena. One of these theoretical research units that requires attention is the accusation. Accusations are an important tool for studying and analyzing human behavior, and social dynamics, and even testing and criticizing existing theories. An accusation can be defined as an expression of dissatisfaction, criticism, or frustration with a person, idea, or social construct. This is a common aspect of the interaction of people with psychological and sociological consequences. Understanding the claims is important because it helps researchers delve deeper into the complexity of human behavior and its impact on society.*

**Keywords:** *pragma linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, literary, cultural, language, inherent, reproach, identification, synthetic approach, dissatisfaction, observance, violation.*

### INTRODUCTION

To date, linguistics has accumulated a significant amount of information about accusations as a linguistic phenomenon. The modern stage determines the diversity and synthesis of scientific approaches to the phenomenon of accusation. In the field of theoretical research, linguistic analysis plays a crucial role in understanding human communication and its impact on various aspects of society. One unit of theoretical research that has attracted attention is the reprimand - an act of expressing criticism or disapproval of a person's behavior. However, at this stage it is important to recognize the linguistic limitations of reference as a single unit of research. In this article we examine the limitations and challenges faced in the use of reference as a unit of theoretical research. As a linguistic act, references are embedded in social and cultural contexts. It is a complex form of communication that varies greatly depending on the language and community. While references can provide valuable insights into social dynamics and power structures, using references exclusively as a unit of research can lead to important nuances in communication being overlooked. One of the linguistic limitations

of references lies in the subjective nature of interpretation. Interpretations of references can vary significantly depending on factors such as cultural background, social norms and individual perception. What may seem like a reference in one culture may be interpreted differently in another culture, leading to potential misunderstandings and misrepresentations in research results. In addition, a reference often uses implicit and indirect linguistic strategies such as sarcasm, irony or subtle hints. Another linguistic limitation of reference as a research unit lies in its inherent negativity bias. Reprimands often involve criticism, blame, and punishment that can overshadow other aspects of communication. This bias can lead to an imbalance in research, where positive or encouraging forms of communication receive less attention. Neglecting positive aspects of language and focusing solely on references can hinder a full understanding of human interaction and the potential for building positive relationships. The linguistic limits of the reference also extend to questions of power and hierarchy. When it comes to reprimands, there is typically a power dynamic between the one giving the reprimand and the one receiving it. However, power dynamics can be fluid within different cultural and social contexts and understandings of references can change accordingly. Failure to take these changing power dynamics into account can lead to a one-dimensional analysis of references and miss important aspects of social relationships and influence. To overcome these linguistic limitations, researchers should broaden their horizons and include other linguistic units in their research. Approaching communication from a broader perspective that includes both positive and negative forms of interaction allows for a more nuanced understanding of human behavior and social dynamics.

**Literature review.** The majority of accusation studies were carried out by the pragma linguistic direction, as the names of many works show - “The pragmatic aspect of the verbal behavior of the German-speaking addressee in the communication situation “accusation”[1], “Pragma linguistic study of the act of accusation in Context of modern American linguistic culture”[2], “The influence of pragmatic factors on the linguistic embodiment of the communicative intention of reproach in English dialogue discourse”[3], “Tactics of reproach in the pragma linguistic aspect (based on the material of the French language) ”[4], etc. This also includes the entire range of works in which the accusation is perceived in terms of speech act theory[5]. The dissertation of the Swedish researcher Karola Henriksson sees accusations as one of the “conflictual” speech acts[6]. A significant contribution to the study of allegations is the tradition of considering this phenomenon within the framework of a comparative paradigm[7]. The works on the grammar of modality by E.V.Paducheva[8] as well as the research of Daniel Van Olmen, in particular the article “Reproachatives and imperatives”[9], in which the context is examined comparatively, have theoretical significance for understanding the accusation as a linguistic phenomenon. Accusation in imperative, wishful, and subjunctive mode. Consistent with politeness theory, Brown and Levinson[10], as well as the works of Jeffrey Leech[11] and Paul Grice [Grice 1989], consider and understand N.A.Karaziya's accusation [2] is a “Fa-treatment act” that is simultaneously caused by “observance/violation of the principles of cooperation and politeness” [2]. This view of the accusation can also be found in later works. Increasing attention has been paid to the types of discourses in which accusations are used, and work has also been done on the gendered aspects of accusations[12].

Therefore, most modern studies devoted to the accusation have a hybrid core, are based on pragma linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, literary, cultural, etc. approaches, and are synthetic. The deepening of the synthetic trend has been consistently observed in all studies of the last decades, regardless of the scientific position of their authors. This chapter does not set itself the task of choosing a primary approach or of criticizing existing theories about the nature of the accusation in favor of any of them. Its purpose is to review and systematize the information collected by modern linguistics, as well as to highlight theoretical foundations and criteria used in the selection of material in the framework of this study.

**Research methodology.** This study is dedicated to “inherent” accusations, i.e. those that are expressed using formal linguistic means and can exist in a language outside of the context. The work aims to limit the boundaries of the linguistic phenomenon under study by looking for selection criteria and analyzing the material based on them. At the same time, a significant part of the language material is rejected due to its context dependence and is outside the scope of the research work. What methodological and theoretical foundations underlie this approach to the research subject? And how is it possible to analyze such significant data sets? To answer these questions, we refer to the monograph by A.E.Kibrik “Essays on general and applied questions of linguistics (universal, typical and specific in language)”, the paragraph “On the limits of linguistics” in the chapter “Linguistic postulates”[13]. This paragraph is a kind of pragmalinguistic manifesto of a synthetic approach to linguistics. Kibrik protests against the dogmatization of the thesis “This is not linguistics” as an argument in the language discussion and formulates the famous postulate about functional boundaries: “Everything that has to do with the existence and functioning of language lies within the competence of linguistics [13]. It is not surprising that the paragraph “On the Limits of Linguistics” is often cited in works at the interface between linguistics and other areas of human knowledge to argue for a synthetic approach.

At the same time, in most cases the idea of the paragraph is understood literally: no to dogmatism in language, no to the self-limitation of linguistics, yes to expanding the scope of interdisciplinary research, yes to the integration of theoretical developments[14]. But was that the only thing A.E.Kibrik talked about? In the same paragraph, we find the words: “It is important to ensure that the acceptance of this postulate does not lead to an unlimited expansion of the competence of linguistics (i.e. the argument “This is not the case”) maintains linguistics. (13).

**Analysis and results.** But now, almost 40 years later, with the transformation of the “linguistic elites” of the 1980s long a fait accompli and the synthetic approach of pragma linguistics at the forefront of the overwhelming number of linguistic studies, we believe that it is time to remember again the words of A.E.Kibrik that the argument “This is not linguistics” retains its right to exist and that the limitless expansion of linguistic abilities is just as much a threat as the dogmatic commitment to the currently prevailing stereotype. In our opinion, this currently completely dominant stereotype has developed into a synthetic language approach within the framework of pragma linguistics, which has now become the “older paradigm” and has replaced structural, formal linguistics. Without in any way diminishing the achievements of pragma linguistics and the strengths of the synthetic approach, we must admit that the research

objects and methods of the modern era sometimes lack the clarity inherent in the objects and methods of the previous era. We see the reason for this in the blurring of the boundaries of linguistic research. Such indeterminacy is an inevitable consequence of the synthetic approach to the research topic. Even in the context of linguistics itself, the characterization and description of the research object is one of the most complex and time-consuming processes. In today's world, when the object of research is no longer purely linguistic and can be located at the intersection of two or more areas of human knowledge, the process of its “identification” becomes increasingly elusive and confusing. We see the solution to the current situation in the combination of the strengths of earlier structural linguistics with its attention to the formal side of linguistic processes and modern linguistics of a synthetic approach that uses the achievements of other disciplines and emphasizes context and subject-object relationships, communicative goals, and extralinguistic factors.

Additionally, reproach provides a unique perspective when it comes to studying theories in various fields such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and even philosophy. It serves as a critical lens through which existing theories can be re-examined, revised, or even dismantled. The ability to challenge prevailing theories and methodologies through the lens of accusation can open avenues for more comprehensive and multidimensional research approaches. In the field of psychology, for example, blame can help researchers better understand the effects of moral judgments and social pressures on individuals. By examining the reasons behind individuals' allegations, psychologists can gain insight into how they affect their self-esteem, mental health, and behavior. Likewise, blame in sociology can shed light on how social norms are created, challenged, and reinforced within different groups and societies. Batch as a unit of theoretical research also promotes interdisciplinary collaboration as it bridges the gap between different research areas. The ability to integrate claims as a research tool allows scientists to connect theories and findings from different disciplines, contributing to a more integrative and holistic understanding of human behavior.

**Conclusion and recommendations.** In summary, at this point in time, reference is indeed a unit of theoretical research that holds enormous potential for knowledge development and social change. By carefully examining the causes and consequences of allegations, researchers can consider the intricacies of human interaction and challenge existing theories. Incorporating references as a unit of theoretical research helps develop a more comprehensive framework that covers a variety of perspectives and offers opportunities for societal change. One of the main reasons that the reprimand attracts attention as a unit of theoretical research is that it provides valuable insights into the functioning of social systems. Accusations can reveal the underlying power dynamics, social norms, and values that shape human interaction. By examining the reasons for referrals, researchers can identify areas where societal change is needed or where already established theories need to be revised. While references serve as a valuable unit of theoretical research for understanding social dynamics and power structures, it is crucial to recognize their linguistic limitations. Relying solely on references as a unit of research can lead to oversimplification and misinterpretation, particularly in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic contexts. By expanding the scope of analysis to include different units of

language and adopting interdisciplinary perspectives, researchers can develop a more comprehensive understanding of human communication and its impact on society.

### References:

1. Джандалиева, Е. Ю. Прагматический аспект вербального поведения немецкоязычного адресата в коммуникативной ситуации «Упрек» // Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных и естественных наук. 2010. №11. С. 175-178 URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pragmatische-skiy-aspekt-verbalnogo-povedeniyanemetskoyazychnogo-adresata-v-kommunikativnoy-situatsii-uprek> (дата обращения: 25.03.2020).
2. Каразия, Н. А. Прагмалингвистическое исследование акта упрёка в контексте современной американской речевой культуры: диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук: 10.02.04 / Каразия Наталья Александровна, Петропавловск-Камчатский, 2004б. -214 с.
3. Науменко, Я. М. Влияние прагматических факторов на языковое воплощение коммуникативной интенции упрёка в англоязычном диалогическом дискурсе // I международная Интернет-конференция «Актуальные проблемы гуманитарного образования». 2014. URL: <http://elib.bsu.by/handle/123456789/95224> (дата обращения: 21.04.2019).
4. Чернецкий, А. Р. Тактики упрёка в прагмалингвистическом аспекте (на материале французского языка) // Весці БДПУ. Серыя 1. 2015. №3. URL: <https://core.ac.uk/reader/74334105> (дата обращения: 21.05.2019).
5. Винантова, И. В. Структурные и прагматические особенности косвенных речевых актов со значением упрёка, выраженных в форме вопроса (на материале английского языка) // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2009. № 2 (4) URL: [https://www.elibrary.ru/download/elibrary\\_15207801\\_48455941.pdf](https://www.elibrary.ru/download/elibrary_15207801_48455941.pdf) (дата обращения: 21.03.2020).
6. Henriksson, C. Konfliktäre Sprechhandlungen: eine Untersuchung der Sprechakte "Vorwurf", "Drohung" und "konfliktäre Warnung. PhD dissertation. Lunds Universitat, Stockholm-Sweden, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2004. - 188 p.
7. Давыдова, Т. А. Речевой акт упрёка в английском языке: диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук: 10.02.04 / Давыдова Татьяна Александровна. - Иркутск, 2003. - 161 с.
8. Падучева, Е. В. Модальность // Материалы к корпусной грамматике русского языка. Глагол. Часть I. Вып. I. / Отв. ред. выпуска В. А. Плунгян, ред. Н. М. Стойнова. — СПб.: Нестор-История, 2016.
9. Van Olmen, D. Reproachatives, and imperatives // Linguistics. Volume 56, Issue 1, p. 115-162. 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2017-0033> (дата обращения: 29.01.2019).
10. Brown P, Levinson S. C. Politeness: Some universals in language usage / Cambridge University Press, 1988. — xiv, 345 pages. — (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics).
11. Leech, G. H. Principles of Pragmatics / Leech G.H. – NY, London: Longman, 1983.

12. Максимюк, Е. В. Психоэмоциональное содержание жанра упрека (гендерный аспект) // Вестник ТГПУ. 2017. №11 (188). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/psihoeemotsionalnoe-soderzhanie-zhanra-uprekagendernyyu-aspekt> (дата обращения: 29.03.2019).
13. Кибрик, А. Е. Очерки по общим и прикладным вопросам языкознания. (универсальное, типовое и специфичное в языке). / М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1992. — 336 с.
14. Иссерс, О. С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. / Изд. 5-е. — М.: Издательство ЛКИ, 2008. — 288 с.