The Pragmatic Features Of The Concept Of Shame

Makhmudova Munira Badriddin qizi
Doctoral candidate, "Uzbek Language" specialization
Andijan State University
munira122699@gmail.com

Annotation
Within cognitive linguistics, concept and discourse are the central notions. Discourse unfolds in the conditions of natural communication. Because of this, it is dialogic or interactive in its very nature and always involves the sender and the receiver of the message, the speaker and the hearer, the writer and the reader. When the speaker's role is foregrounded, examining discourse from a pragmatic viewpoint becomes especially relevant.
Keywords: linguistics, pragmalinguistics, concept, concept of shame, communication, evaluation, illocutionary force, perlocutionary effect.

The pragmatist directs attention mainly to how linguistic material affects the hearer. These mechanisms can be traced through speech acts. A speech act reveals one of the defining properties of a text – its pragmatic orientation, the attitude it conveys on behalf of the speaker [1, p. 513]. The components of a speech act and the conditions under which it is produced determine the pragmatic side of the functional-semantic field of evaluation. This involves the interrelation of semantic and pragmatic information, how structural-semantic forms of linguistic units are shaped, and the roles of the evaluative, emotional, and expressive human components in a speech act [2, pp. 68–69]. Pragmatic information is filtered through the listener's conscious interpretation of events. The unity of emotional, evaluative, and expressive elements directly affects whether the speaker's intention succeeds. The axiological and volitional aspects of emotional thinking reveal its dialectical link with a person's need, as a social being, to influence the emotional-volitional and intellectual spheres of another's psyche– regulating their actions [3, p. 41]. The axiologization of linguistic signs has a noticeable impact on the interlocutor during communication [4, p. 104].

Within a pragmatic framework, an evaluative speech act is performed to trigger a certain effect in the hearer. Achieving this aim depends primarily on the content of the act. The structure of the illocutionary act contains illocutionary force, defined by N. K. Ryabtseva as an integral characteristic of an utterance's pragmatics– its grounding in the communicative situation, the speaker and the addressee, and the pragmatic and communicative load of their actions [5, pp. 82–83]. Illocutionary force carries the speaker's communicative intention. Under suitable conditions, the goal of the evaluative illocution is realized, and as a result a perlocutionary effect arises. When emotional influence is intended, perlocutionary actions are expressed through verbs of emotional state such as to irritate, to frighten, to bore, to shame, and so on [6, p. 203]. According to E. M. Wolf, perlocutionary influence and the orientation toward the interlocutor's emotional reaction are obligatory elements of evaluative speech acts [7, pp. 165–166]. Among illocutionary actions that aim at perlocutionary results, expressive acts stand out. These include utterances interpreted as evaluative: praise, approval, condemnation.
Evaluation arises naturally during communication because the speaker

expresses a subjective opinion about any given situation. Based on the idea that a word (or sentence) in a speech situation may take on any meaning with respect to the speaker's or hearer's evaluations, N. D. Arutyunova attributes a pragmatic nature to evaluation [8, p. 5]. Evaluation appears in various contexts and may surface in the semantics of a word or be displayed by a particular grammatical construction in the sentence.

When a speaker labels something as shameful, they implicitly remind the interlocutor of obligations before parents, friends, society, and others. Such obligations, understood as moral norms, do not depend on the desires of the individual or of third parties [9, p. 19]. Because of this, evaluations are often replaced by widely accepted statements that are believed to be true according to common belief [10, p. 320]. Here the evaluative target is the "common view," which reflects the norms of the existing society. Evaluations that mirror social stereotypes are also tied to obligation [7, p. 123].

In Uzbek, the idea of evaluating something as shameful is conveyed through various units, including *"uyat sizga", "sharmanda" ("shame on you")*, , and modal constructions such as *"siz uyalishingiz kerak" ("you ought to be ashamed")*, *"siz uyatga qoldingiz" ("you have brought shame on yourself")*. The expressive words representing the sub-concept of "evaluation" aim to affect the interlocutor's emotional state and reshape their behavior, since the speaker interprets the situation as a departure from moral norms.

Utterances that evaluate something as shameful generally involve reproach or admonition. The "inner psychological state" predicates underlying speech acts of condemnation, accusation, and similar functions, along with predicates of deontic modality, are grouped by S. G. Vorkachev under desiderative-evaluative predicates [11, pp. 86–92].

The evaluative speech act achieves its goal through multiple stages. The mechanism of illocutionary force can be described from three angles: the speaker, the listener, and the observer-interpreter. The speaker embeds intention and reproof into the utterance, giving it a certain tone; the listener recognizes the speaker's emotional state and degree of categoricality, evaluating the legitimacy of the reproach and choosing an appropriate communicative strategy; the interpreter assesses the speaker's words, acknowledges their intentions, and selects a strategy aligned with the inferred goal [12, p. 72].

Correct recognition of the speaker's intention by the listener creates the possibility of perlocutionary influence during evaluative speech acts. Yet interpretation is complicated by various factors. It is shaped by general pragmatic and communicative goals, a hierarchy of values, the structure of the problematic domain, the participants' social roles, and their individual psychological features [13, p. 64].

To reach the desired perlocutionary effect when labeling something shameful in a speech act, the speaker first selects the most suitable linguistic means. N. D. Arutyunova refers to utterances that compel the addressee to feel ashamed and can induce a state of embarrassment: *"Shame on you! You should be ashamed!"* Their structure contains a quasi-performative element [8, p. 69].

Through direct address, the speaker shames the interlocutor, attempting psychological influence and expecting that the resulting embarrassment will deter the inappropriate behavior [9, p. 229]. Indirect signs reflect changes in emotional state–the outward indicators of shame, such as blushing, known as the "blush of shame," which is a manifestation of perlocutionary

effect. In the following example, the character insults a young man for his naivety. By using the expression sharmandalik, she realizes the impropriety of his actions, and he experiences shame, displayed through blushing, looking downward, and other signs of discomfort.

Shameful situations often arise in relation to asymmetrical social status or age differences among communicants [8, p. 63]. The social background of speakers also influences whether the goal of the evaluative act is met; these indicators may be hierarchical (parent–child, employer–employee, teacher–student) or situational–one may feel ashamed when apologizing but act rudely toward others [14, pp. 143–159]. A person who labels something shameful implicitly positions themselves above the one responsible for the situation, which is why shame functions as a form of social devaluation. Evaluative speech acts that denote shame are shaped by the social background of the participants. Typically, those in superior positions (parents, superiors, teachers, guests) shame those in lower ones (children, subordinates, students, hosts). In such cases, attention shifts from stable social roles to situational roles.

Another factor affecting the success of the evaluative speech act is the alignment between the speaker's and receiver's value maps. A disgraced person is rejected by society; shame separates a person from the social world. Isolated from society, an individual who behaves improperly feels as though they have stepped outside the shared space.

Besides direct methods of addressing the interlocutor, indirect speech acts also exist. They are expressive in their own way and typically take the form of interrogative sentences [15, p. 250]. In such sentences, the speaker does not aim to inquire about the interlocutor's real feelings but attempts to provoke an emotional reaction. The link between shame evaluation and deontic modality explains the nature of indirect speech acts [7, p. 194]. Indirect evaluative acts arise at the intersection of interrogative modality and obligation:

Since shame is tied to a pragmatic situation, its emergence requires a certain triggering action and an associated frame–a system of expectations. The shame frame can be divided into three types:

Intentional action:

The speaker shames the listener → The listener, recognizing their guilt, feels ashamed / The listener does not recognize their behavior as wrong and feels no shame.

Unintentional action:

The speaker shames the listener while speaking to a third party → The listener unexpectedly overhears → All participants experience shame.

Unaware action:

The speaker does not intend to shame anyone → The listener interprets the words as shameful due to personal associations and feels ashamed.

Thus, languages contain established formulas that influence a person's emotional world. Appealing to the interlocutor's conscience and moral norms may alter their behavior. Because the linguistic constructions expressing the concept of shame possess pragmatic force, they carry illocutionary power, and speakers treat them as significant tools during communication.

References:

Кубрякова Е.С. Язык и знание: на пути получения знаний о языке: части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. – С. 513.

Маркелова Т.В. Семантика и прагматика средств выражения оценки в русском языке // Филологические науки. – 1995. – № 3. – С. 68-69.

Киселева Л.А. Вопросы теории речевого воздействия. – Л.: Ленинградский гос. ун-т, 1978.– С. 41.

Фетисова С.А. Аксиологизация имени цвета красный // II Общероссийская научно-практическая конференция «Современные исследования социальных проблем» с международным участием. – 2010. – С. 104.

Рябцева Н.К. Коммуникативный модус и метаречь // Логический анализ языка. Язык речевых действий. – М., 1994. – С. 82-83.

Lawrence D.H. Sons and Lovers / D. H. Lawrence. – London: Penguin Books, 1995. – P. 203.

Вольф Е. М. Функциональная семантика оценки. – 2-е изд., доп. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. – С. 165-166.

Арутюнова Н.Д. Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт – М.: Наука, 1988. – С. 5.

Булыгина Т.В. Концепт долга в поле долженствования // Логический анализ языка. Культурные концепты. – М., 1991. – С. 19

Курбатов В.И. Логика. Систематический курс. – Ростов н/Д.: Феникс, 2001. – С. 320.

Воркачев С.Г. К семантическому представлению дезиративной оценки в естественном языке // Вопросы языкознания. – 1990. – № 4. – С. 86-92.

Мурясов Р. З. Опыт анализа оценочного высказывания // Вопросы языкознания. – 2004. – № 5. –С. 72.

Кобозева И.М. Интерпретирующие речевые акты // Логический анализ языка. Язык речевых действий. – М., 1994. – С. 64

Карасик, В. И. Язык социального статуса: монография. – М.: Гнозис, 2002. – С. 143-159.

Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. – New York: Longman, 1983. – P. 250.