ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКАЯ, ПРИКЛАДНАЯ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА/THEORETICAL, APPLIED AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LINGUISTIC MODELING OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTS: ON THE EXAMPLE OF TAJIK AND ENGLISH SPEECH ETIQUETTE

Research article

Usmonova M.N.[1], *
[1] ORCID : 0009-0001-9453-3830;
[1] Khujand State University named after academician Bobojon Gafurov, Khujand, Tajikistan

* Corresponding author (usmonova1901[at]mail.ru)

Abstract

The given article dwells on issues beset with the comparative analysis of linguistic modeling of communicative acts on the example of Tajik and English speech etiquette. The empirical basis for this research is Sadriddin Aini's canonical novel "Ghulomon" a text rich in socially stratified dialogue that provides authentic examples of language in use. The methodology involves a contrastive analysis of full-sentence examples from the novel and their functional English equivalents. The study identifies and models the realization of three major classes of speech acts. The results reveal a fundamental divergence in the modeling principles of the two languages. The study concludes that effective cross-linguistic communication and translation depend on understanding and re-mapping these deep-level communicative models, rather than simply translating surface linguistic forms.

Keywords: linguistic modeling, speech act theory, comparative pragmatics, Tajik and English languages, intercultural communication.

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОГО МОДЕЛИРОВАНИЯ КОММУНИКАТИВНЫХ АКТОВ: НА ПРИМЕРЕ ТАДЖИКСКОГО И АНГЛИЙСКОГО РЕЧЕВОГО ЭТИКЕТА

Научная статья

Усмонова М.Н.[1], *
[1] ORCID : 0009-0001-9453-3830;
[1] Худжандский государственный университет имени академика Бободжана Гафурова, Худжанд, Таджикистан

* Корреспондирующий автор (usmonova1901[at]mail.ru)

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются вопросы, связанные с сопоставительным анализом лингвистического моделирования коммуникативных актов на примере таджикского и английского речевого этикета. Эмпирической базой исследования служит канонический роман Садриддина Айни «Гуломон» — текст, насыщенный социально стратифицированным диалогом и содержащий аутентичные примеры использования языка. Методология исследования включает в себя сопоставительный анализ полных предложений из романа и их функциональных английских эквивалентов. В исследовании выделяются и моделируются реализации трёх основных классов речевых актов. Результаты показывают фундаментальное расхождение в принципах моделирования двух языков. В исследовании делается вывод о том, что эффективная межъязыковая коммуникация и перевод зависят от понимания и переосмысления этих глубинных коммуникативных моделей, а не просто от перевода поверхностных языковых форм.

Ключевые слова: лингвистическое моделирование, теория речевых актов, сопоставительная прагматика, таджикский и английский языки, межкультурная коммуникация.

Introduction

A cornerstone of this approach is Speech Act Theory, pioneered by J.L. Austin (1962) and further developed by J.R. Searle (1969) [8]. This theory posits that in speaking, we do not merely say things (locutionary act), but we also perform actions (illocutionary act), such as ordering, promising, warning, or apologizing. These universal illocutionary acts, however, are realized through language-specific and culture-specific linguistic models. The way a speaker models a request in one language may be structurally and pragmatically very different from how it is modeled in another. Comparing these models provides profound insights into the typological and cultural characteristics of different linguistic communities [2], [3].

This study undertakes a comparative analysis of the linguistic models of communication in Tajik and English, two languages representing divergent linguistic and cultural paradigms. Tajik, a member of the West-Iranian language family, is embedded in a culture traditionally characterized by a high-power distance, collectivism, and high-context communication, where social hierarchy and face-saving are paramount [4]. English, particularly as a lingua franca, operates within a predominantly low-power-distance, individualistic, and low-context cultural framework, where ideals of egalitarianism and directness (mitigated by politeness strategies) are prominent [5], [10].

The central problem of the given article addresses is the systemic difference in how these two languages model illocutionary acts. An inadequate understanding of these differences leads to pragmatic failure in intercultural communication and to inaccuracies in translation that go beyond mere grammatical errors. While much contrastive research has focused on grammar and lexis, a detailed, corpus-based analysis of the pragmatic models of communication remains a relatively underexplored area for this language pair.

Research methods and principles

This study is qualitative and comparative-contrastive in its design, situated at the intersection of pragmatics, discourse analysis, and contrastive linguistics. The methodology is grounded in the principles of Speech Act Theory and is empirically driven by a corpus-based analysis.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

The primary theoretical lens for this study is Searle's classification of illocutionary acts. This framework provides a structured model for categorizing the intentions behind utterances. The given article will focus on three major classes that are most prominent in the narrative dialogues of "Ghulomon":

1. *Directives:* Speech acts designed to get the hearer to do something (e.g., orders, commands, requests, pleas).

2. *Commissives:* Speech acts that commit the speaker to some future course of action (e.g., promises, oaths, vows).

3. *Expressives:* Speech acts that express the speaker's psychological state or attitude about a state of affairs (e.g., apologies, thanks, congratulations).

For each instance, the analysis will deconstruct the linguistic "model" used to realize the speech act, examining its lexical, morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic components.

2.2. Empirical Corpus

The sole source of empirical data is the canonical Tajik novel "Ghulomon" by Sadriddin Aini (2019) [1]. This text was selected for its:

Authentic Dialogue: The novel is rich in dialogue that reflects the norms of social interaction of the period.

Social Stratification: The plot revolves around characters of vastly different social statuses, providing clear examples of how power dynamics shape language use.

Normative Language: The work is considered a benchmark of the modern Tajik literary language [7], [9].

Main results and discussion

The comparative analysis of speech act realization in "Ghulomon" reveals systematic and profound differences in the linguistic models employed by Tajik and English. The results are presented below, organized by the major classes of illocutionary acts.

3.1. Modeling Directives: Commands, Requests, and Pleas

Directives are the most socially sensitive class of speech acts, as they inherently involve an attempt to influence the hearer's behavior. The linguistic model for a directive is therefore highly dependent on the social relationship between the interlocutors.

3.1.1. The Model of a High-Status Command

This model is used by a speaker with clear institutional or social power over the hearer.

Example 1: A Judge's Order: Қозикалон ба миршаб рӯ оварда, бо овози баланд фармуд: «Ин гуноҳкорро гирифта, ба зиндон баред!» [1, P. 258] — The chief judge, turning to the chief of police, ordered in a loud voice: "Seize this criminal and take him to prison!"

Comparative Analysis:

Tajik Model:

Illocutionary Force: A direct, non-negotiable command.

Performative Verb: The narrator uses the explicit verb фармуд ('ordered'), which frames the speech act.

Grammatical Mood: The core of the model is the verb in the imperative mood (баред — 'take'). The use of the '-ед' ending (formally the 2nd person plural/polite) is directed at an official, but it does not mitigate the force; it is a formal command.

Pragmatic Context: The model's legitimacy is derived entirely from the speaker's status (қозикалон — 'chief judge'). No mitigation or politeness markers are needed or expected.

English Model:

Illocutionary Force: Identical to the Tajik.

Grammatical Mood: The model also uses the base form of the verb — the English imperative (take).

Pragmatic Context: Like the Tajik model, the force is derived from the speaker's social role (judge).

In situations of absolute and legitimate power, the linguistic models of both languages converge on the most direct form available: the imperative mood. The model is simple: Status + Imperative Verb.

3.1.2. The Model of a Low-Status Plea

This model is used by a powerless speaker addressing a powerful hearer. The goal is to issue a directive, but without any authority to do so.

Example 2: A Peasant's Plea to a Landowner: Зани деҳқон ба пои бой афтида, зорӣ карда гуфт: «Тақсир, ба хотири кӯдакони гуруснаам, раҳм кунед... Агар имкон дошта бошед, як каф орд ба мо бидиҳед» [1, P. 142] — The peasant's wife, falling at the boy's feet, pleaded tearfully: "Sir, for the sake of my hungry children, please have mercy... If you would be so gracious, could you possibly give us a handful of flour?"

Comparative Analysis:

Tajik Model: This is a complex, multi-layered model designed for maximum mitigation and deference.

Illocutionary Force: A desperate plea.

Non-Verbal Cues: The text explicitly mentions a gesture of complete submission (ба пои бой афтида — 'falling at the master's feet').

Performative Verb: The narrator uses зорӣ карда гуфт ('pleaded tearfully').

Honorifics: Use of the obligatory address term тақсир ('sir').

Core Directive 1: The phrase раҳм кунед (lit. 'do mercy') is an imperative, but its lexical content frames it as an appeal to emotion, not an order.

Core Directive 2: The second directive (бидиҳед — 'give') is wrapped in a conditional clause of possibility (Агар имкон дошта бошед — 'If you have the possibility'), a classic politeness strategy that provides the hearer an easy way to refuse.

English Model: The English model must reconstruct this sense of desperation and deference using different tools.

Lexical Choice: The verb pleaded is used instead of said. The phrase please have mercy captures the lexical content of раҳм кунед.

Modal Mitigation: The primary tool is the heavily mitigated modal construction: Could you possibly give...? This transforms the directive from an imperative into a question about ability, making it extremely indirect. Could is more polite than can; possibly is an added layer of hedging.

Politeness Formula: The phrase If you would be so gracious is a functional equivalent of the Tajik conditional clause, serving as an elaborate politeness marker.

This comparison starkly reveals the different modeling principles. The Tajik model foregrounds social status and deference through honorifics, explicit pleas, and gestures. The English model foregrounds mitigation of imposition through modality and syntactic transformation (imperative → interrogative).

3.2. Modeling Commissives: Promises and Oaths

Commissives commit the speaker to a future action. The linguistic model must convey sincerity and binding force.

Example 3: A Solemn Promise: Ҷавон ба дӯсташ нигариста, дасташро фишурд ва гуфт: «Ваъда медиҳам, ки ҳеч гоҳ сирри туро ошкор намекунам. Ба номи Худо қасам мехӯрам» [1, P. 289] — The young man looked at his friend, squeezed his hand, and said: "I promise I will never reveal your secret. I swear in the name of God".

Comparative Analysis:

Tajik Model:

Illocutionary Force: A strong, binding commitment.

Performative Verb (Compound): The model uses the explicit performative compound verb ваъда додан ('to give a promise'). The speaker says, "I give a promise".

Strengthening Act: To increase the binding force, a second, stronger commissive is used: the compound verb қасам хӯрдан (lit. 'to eat an oath'), meaning 'to swear'.

Religious Invocation: The oath is sanctified by Ба номи Худо ('In the name of God'), adding a divine witness and making the promise nearly unbreakable in that cultural context.

English Model:

Illocutionary Force: Identical.

Performative Verb (Simple): The English model uses the explicit, simplex performative verb I promise.

Strengthening Act: The second commissive is also realized with a simplex performative verb, I swear.

Religious Invocation: The phrase in the name of God is a direct translation and serves the same function of adding solemnity.

In the case of explicit performatives like promising and swearing, the models in both languages are remarkably parallel. Both rely on explicit performative verbs. The main structural difference lies in the nature of the verbs themselves: compound and periphrastic in Tajik (ваъда додан, қасам хӯрдан) versus simplex and lexical in English (to promise, to swear). This reinforces the finding that Tajik tends to distribute semantic content across a noun + light verb construction, while English condenses it into a single verb root.

3.3. Modeling Expressives: Apologies

Expressives reveal the speaker's psychological state. Apologies are particularly interesting as they are face-threatening acts for the speaker and are intended to restore social harmony.

Example 4: A Formal Apology to a Superior: Хизматгор дар назди соҳибаш ду-қат шуда гуфт: «Тақсир, гуноҳи маро бубахшед. Аз рӯи нодонӣ ин хато аз ман сар зад» [1, P. 174] — The servant, bowing low before his master, said: "Sir, please forgive my transgression. This mistake occurred due to my ignorance".

Comparative Analysis:

Tajik Model:

Illocutionary Force: A deferential apology and plea for forgiveness.

Non-Verbal Cues: The deep bow (ду-қат шуда — 'folding in two') is an integral part of the communicative model of deference.

Honorifics: The obligatory тақсир is used.

Core Formula: The apology is modeled using an imperative form, бубахшед ('forgive' — polite form), directed at the hearer. This frames the apology as a request for the hearer to perform an action (forgiving).

Account: The speaker provides an account that minimizes his agency and emphasizes his lack of knowledge (аз рӯи нодонӣ — 'due to ignorance').

English Model:

Illocutionary Force: Identical.

Non-Verbal Description: The translator must explicitly describe the gesture (bowing low) to convey the same level of deference.

Honorifics: Sir is the functional equivalent of taqcir.

Core Formula: The model can use an imperative softened by 'please' (please forgive...). Alternatively, a more common model in modern English would be a first-person statement: "I am terribly sorry for my mistake." The choice of please forgive is a better translation here, as it mirrors the Tajik focus on the hearer's action.

Account: The account is translated fairly directly.

The Tajik model for a formal apology is hearer-oriented (a request to the hearer to forgive). While a similar model exists in English, the more common modern English model is speaker-oriented (a statement of the speaker's feeling of regret, e.g., "I'm

sorry"). This subtle shift in orientation (from "you do something" to "I feel something") is a significant difference in the underlying communicative scripts [6].

Conclusion

The English communicative model, in contrast, is illocution-driven and mitigation-focused. It uses a flexible and powerful system of modality, syntax, and lexical choice to precisely calibrate the force of a speech act, guided by the cultural imperative to respect the hearer's autonomy and save face. Social hierarchy is acknowledged not through explicit markers, but through the degree of indirectness and mitigation employed.

This study contributes to the field of contrastive pragmatics by providing a detailed, corpus-based account of these differing models. It demonstrates that a meaningful comparison of communication across languages requires moving beyond surface structures to analyze the entire "linguistic package" used to perform social actions. The practical implications for intercultural communication, foreign language teaching, and translation are significant, highlighting that true fluency involves mastering not just the grammar of a language, but its models of social action.

Конфликт интересов	**Conflict of Interest**
Не указан.	None declared.
Рецензия	**Review**
Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.	All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

Список литературы / References

1. Айнй С. Ғуломон: роман / С. Айнй. — Душанбе : Адабиёти бачагона, 2019. — 488 с.
2. Карасик В.И. Языковое проявление личности / В.И. Карасик. — Москва : Гнозис, 2015. — 384 с.
3. Ларина Т.В. Англичане и русские: Язык, культура, коммуникация / Т.В. Ларина. — Москва : Языки славянских культур, 2013. — 360 с.
4. Маджидова Р.А. Социолингвистические аспекты речевого этикета в современном таджикском языке : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук / Р.А. Маджидова. — Душанбе, 2018. — 24 с.
5. Формановская Н.И. Речевое взаимодействие: коммуникация и прагматика / Н.И. Формановская. — Москва : ИКАР, 2014. — 480 с.
6. Brown P. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage / P. Brown, S.C. Levinson. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2011. — 345 p.
7. Hofstede G. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context / G. Hofstede // Online Readings in Psychology and Culture. — 2011. — Vol. 2, № 1.
8. Searle J.R. A classification of illocutionary acts / J.R. Searle // Language in Society. — 1976. — Vol. 5, № 1. — P. 1–23.
9. Perry J.R. A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar / J.R. Perry. — Leiden : Brill, 2011. — 510 p.
10. Wierzbicka A. English: Meaning and Culture / A. Wierzbicka. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010. — 352 p.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Aynī S. Ghulomon: roman [Slaves: a novel] / S. Aynī. — Dushanbe : Adabiyoti bachagona, 2019. — 488 p. [in Tajik]
2. Karasik V.I. Yazykovoe proyavlenie lichnosti [Linguistic manifestation of personality] / V.I. Karasik. — Moscow : Gnozis, 2015. — 384 p. [in Russian]
3. Larina T.V. Anglichane i russkie: Yazyk, kul'tura, kommunikatsiya [English and Russians: Language, culture, communication] / T.V. Larina. — Moscow : Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, 2013. — 360 p. [in Russian]
4. Madzhidova R.A. Sotsiolingvisticheskie aspekty rechevogo etiketa v sovremennom tadzhikskom yazyke [Sociolinguistic aspects of speech etiquette in the modern Tajik language] : abstract of the dissertation of the candidate of philological sciences / R.A. Madzhidova. — Dushanbe, 2018. — 24 p. [in Russian]
5. Formanovskaya N.I. Rechevoe vzaimodeystvie: kommunikatsiya i pragmatika [Speech interaction: communication and pragmatics] / N.I. Formanovskaya. — Moscow : IKAR, 2014. — 480 p. [in Russian]
6. Brown P. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage / P. Brown, S.C. Levinson. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2011. — 345 p.
7. Hofstede G. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context / G. Hofstede // Online Readings in Psychology and Culture. — 2011. — Vol. 2, № 1.
8. Searle J.R. A classification of illocutionary acts / J.R. Searle // Language in Society. — 1976. — Vol. 5, № 1. — P. 1–23.
9. Perry J.R. A Tajik Persian Reference Grammar / J.R. Perry. — Leiden : Brill, 2011. — 510 p.
10. Wierzbicka A. English: Meaning and Culture / A. Wierzbicka. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2010. — 352 p.