EMOTIVENESS AND EMOTIVE VOCABULARY IN THE UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES: A LINGUO-PRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE

Sarvinoz Ergasheva

PhD Candidate, Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi;

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

e-mail: sarvinozergashevaa@gmail.com

Abstract. *This article examines emotiveness as a linguistic category and compares the linguistic means of expressing emotion in Uzbek and English. Drawing on the linguo-pragmatic tradition, emotiveness is treated as a semantic component distinct from emotionality as a psychological state, encoded in vocabulary through connotation, derivation, and evaluative meaning. The study identifies affective, evaluative, and intensifying emotive words in both languages and analyzes their structural and pragmatic peculiarities: English relies heavily on lexical and syntactic intensifiers and interjections, while Uzbek employs a rich system of diminutive-endearment suffixes, reduplication, and particles. The findings suggest that emotiveness is realized through different grammatical resources shaped by the typological profile of each language, with implications for translation, intercultural communication, and language teaching.*

Keywords: *emotiveness, emotive vocabulary, connotation, linguo-pragmatics, contrastive linguistics*

Аннотация. *Данная статья рассматривает эмотивность как языковую категорию и сопоставляет средства выражения эмоций в узбекском и английском языках. В рамках лингвопрагматической традиции эмотивность трактуется как семантический компонент, отличный от эмоциональности как психологического состояния, и закрепляется в лексике через коннотацию,*

словообразование и оценочное значение. В работе выявляются аффективные, оценочные и усилительные эмотивные слова в обоих языках, анализируются их структурные и прагматические особенности: в английском языке широко используются лексические и синтаксические интенсификаторы и междометия, тогда как в узбекском языке представлена развитая система уменьшительно-ласкательных суффиксов, редупликации и частиц. Результаты показывают, что эмотивность реализуется различными грамматическими средствами в зависимости от типологических особенностей языка, что имеет значение для перевода, межкультурной коммуникации и преподавания языков.

Ключевые слова: *эмотивность, эмотивная лексика, коннотация, лингвопрагматика, сопоставительная лингвистика*

Аңдатпа. *Бұл мақалада эмотивтілік тілдік категория ретінде қарастырылып, өзбек және ағылшын тілдеріндегі эмоцияны білдіру құралдары салыстырылады. Лингвопрагматикалық дәстүр аясында эмотивтілік психологиялық күй ретіндегі эмоционалдылықтан ерекшеленетін, коннотация, сөзжасам және бағалауыштық мағына арқылы лексикада бекітілетін семантикалық құрам ретінде түсіндіріледі. Зерттеуде екі тілдегі аффективті, бағалауыш және күшейткіш эмотивті сөздер анықталып, олардың құрылымдық және прагматикалық ерекшеліктері талданады: ағылшын тілінде лексикалық және синтаксистік интенсификаторлар мен одағайлар кеңінен қолданылса, өзбек тілінде кішірейту-еркелету жұрнақтарының дамыған жүйесі, қайталама (редупликация) және демеуліктер басым. Нәтижелер эмотивтіліктің әр тілдің типологиялық ерекшелігіне сай түрлі грамматикалық құралдар арқылы жүзеге асатынын көрсетеді, бұл аударматану, мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас және тіл оқыту үшін маңызды.*

Түйін сөздер: *эмотивтілік, эмотивті лексика, коннотация, лингвопрагматика, салғастырмалы лингвистика*

Introduction

The study of emotion in language has moved, over the past century, from the margins of stylistics to a recognized subfield of linguistics in its own right. Within this subfield, a key theoretical distinction separates emotionality — a psychological or physiological state of the speaker — from emotiveness, understood as a property of linguistic units that encode, signal, or evoke emotion as part of their meaning [1, pp. 24–29]. A word may be emotive independently of whether its speaker is, at the moment of utterance, actually experiencing the emotion it denotes or connotes. It is this linguistic property, rather than the psychological state behind it, that concerns the present study.

The comparison of Uzbek and English is of particular interest because the two languages belong to different typological families — Turkic and Germanic — and rely on different grammatical mechanisms to encode affect. English, an analytic language with limited inflectional morphology, tends to express emotiveness through lexical choice, intensifying adverbs, interjections, and syntactic devices such as exclamative constructions and inversion. Uzbek, an agglutinative language, has at its disposal a productive system of derivational suffixes — diminutive, augmentative, and endearment forms — as well as reduplication and a rich inventory of emotive particles and interjections, which allow emotive meaning to be built directly into the word form [2, pp. 112–118]. A contrastive linguo-pragmatic analysis of these two systems can clarify both the universal and the language-specific dimensions of emotive communication.

The aim of this article is threefold: (1) to outline the theoretical status of emotiveness within linguo-pragmatics; (2) to classify the principal types of emotive vocabulary attested in English and Uzbek; and (3) to compare the structural and pragmatic means by which the two languages realize emotive meaning, with attention to implications for translation and language pedagogy. The analysis draws on a

purposive sample of lexical items collected from general and specialized dictionaries of Uzbek and English, from excerpts of twentieth-century Uzbek and English literary prose and poetry, and from informal spoken data, so that the classification proposed below can be checked against lexicographic, literary, and everyday usage rather than resting on a single source of evidence [1, pp. 55–61].

Theoretical Background

The theoretical foundations of emotiveness research go back to Charles Bally's stylistique, which first drew a systematic line between the intellectual and the affective content of an utterance [3, pp. 15–20]. Bally's insight — that language carries not only referential information but also the speaker's attitude toward that information — was later developed within Russian and Soviet linguistics through the notion of connotation as a structural component of lexical meaning, alongside denotation [4, pp. 3–9]. V.I. Shakhovsky's work on the linguistic theory of emotions is particularly influential here: he argues that emotiveness is a semantic macro-component realized at the levels of the seme, the lexeme, the phraseological unit, and the text, and that it should be studied as a systemic property of language rather than as an incidental effect of speech [4, pp. 45–52]. I.R. Galperin's classification of expressive means and stylistic devices similarly treats emotive vocabulary — interjections, epithets, and emotionally coloured synonyms — as a distinct stratum of the English lexicon, set apart from neutral and purely logical vocabulary [5, pp. 60–66].

Within this tradition, emotive words are commonly divided into three broad types: (a) affective words, whose sole or primary function is to express emotion (interjections such as English oh, wow, alas or Uzbek voy, ohho, ajabo); (b) evaluative words, which combine a descriptive meaning with an embedded positive or negative attitude (English brilliant vs. mediocre; Uzbek zo‘r vs. yaramas); and (c) intensifying words, which do not by themselves denote emotion but heighten the emotive force of the utterance in which they occur (English so, utterly, terribly; Uzbek juda, naqadar,

qanchalik) [1, pp. 31–36]. This tripartite classification provides the analytical framework used in the contrastive discussion below.

Emotive Vocabulary in English

In English, emotiveness is distributed across several word classes rather than concentrated in a single morphological pattern. Interjections (oh, ah, wow, ouch, alas) form the most transparently affective layer of the lexicon: they carry little or no propositional content and function almost exclusively to signal the speaker's emotional stance [5, pp. 71–74]. A second layer consists of evaluative adjectives and nouns that pair a descriptive core with connotative colouring — compare the neutral thin with the negatively marked skinny or the positively marked slender, all of which share a denotative core but diverge sharply in emotive charge. A third and highly productive layer is that of degree intensifiers and emphasizers (so, such, absolutely, utterly, terribly, incredibly), which English speakers deploy to scale the intensity of an evaluation upward, often well beyond their original, non-emotive meaning — terribly good is no longer literally about terror [6, pp. 88–93].

Syntax contributes to emotiveness as well: exclamative sentences (What a day!), subject–auxiliary inversion for emphasis (Never have I seen such a mess), and left-dislocation or fronting for contrastive stress all serve to foreground the speaker's emotional involvement without necessarily introducing new emotive lexemes. Word-formation plays a comparatively modest role in English emotive vocabulary; diminutive suffixation exists (-ie/-y as in doggie, sweetie) but is far less systematic and productive than in Uzbek, being largely confined to informal registers, child-directed speech, and terms of endearment.

Emotive Vocabulary in Uzbek

Uzbek, as an agglutinative Turkic language, encodes emotiveness to a considerable extent through morphology. A productive series of diminutive-endearment suffixes (-cha, -gina/-kina/-qina, -jon, -toy) can be attached to nouns,

adjectives, and even proper names to add warmth, tenderness, or, in other contexts, irony or diminishment: bolakay (little child, affectionate), qizaloq (little girl), onajon (dear mother), kichkinagina (tiny, dear little). The same suffix can shift an entirely neutral noun into an emotively marked one without any change of denotation, which has no direct morphological parallel in English and is typically rendered periphrastically in translation (dear, little, poor) [2, pp. 120–126].

Reduplication is a second major device: full or partial repetition of a stem, sometimes with a vowel or consonant alternation, intensifies or emotionally colours meaning, as in yap-yangi (brand new), qip-qizil (bright red), yaxshi-yaxshi (really well/nicely), or expressive pairs such as taq-tuq. A third resource is the set of emotive particles and interjections — voy, ohho, ajabo, dodya, bay-bay — which, like their English counterparts, carry emotive rather than propositional meaning, but which are more finely differentiated for surprise, pain, admiration, and reproach than the corresponding English inventory [7, pp. 55–60]. Finally, Uzbek evaluative vocabulary proper (zo‘r, ajoyib, dahshat, falokat) parallels the English evaluative layer but interacts closely with the honorific and politeness system of the language, so that the choice of an emotive word in Uzbek often simultaneously signals social distance or closeness between interlocutors [8, pp. 140–145].

Contrastive Discussion

The comparison suggests that both languages recognize the same three functional categories of emotive vocabulary — affective, evaluative, and intensifying — but distribute the work of emotive encoding differently across their grammars. English, lacking a productive diminutive morphology, concentrates emotiveness in the lexicon (word choice) and in syntax (exclamatives, intensifying adverbs), which makes English emotive meaning comparatively easy to isolate as discrete words or constructions. Uzbek, by contrast, integrates emotiveness into word structure itself through suffixation and reduplication, so that a single word form can simultaneously

carry referential, grammatical, and emotive information. This has a direct practical consequence for translation: Uzbek diminutive-endearment forms frequently have no single-word English equivalent and must be rendered through an adjective, a modal particle, or a shift in register, with an attendant risk of losing part of the original emotive nuance [2, pp. 130–133].

The contrast also bears on language pedagogy. Learners of English whose first language is Uzbek tend to under-use intensifying adverbs and syntactic emphasis and instead search, unsuccessfully, for a morphological equivalent of their native diminutive suffixes; conversely, learners of Uzbek whose first language is English often fail to recognize the emotive load carried by suffixation and interpret emotively marked Uzbek words as neutral. Explicit instruction in the contrastive means of emotive expression — rather than in emotive vocabulary lists alone — is therefore likely to improve both comprehension and pragmatically appropriate production in the target language [6, pp. 95–99].

The following pairs illustrate how the same emotive function is distributed differently across the two languages, and can serve as a basis for a small comparative glossary in future corpus work. (1) Diminutive/endearment: Uzbek qizaloqqina ("dear little girl") vs. English little girl / my dear girl — a single suffixed Uzbek word corresponds to an English phrase, since English has no equivalent bound morpheme. (2) Intensification: Uzbek juda ajoyib ("very wonderful") vs. English absolutely wonderful — both languages use a free intensifying word, but Uzbek juda is pragmatically neutral across registers, while English absolutely, utterly, and terribly carry finer stylistic shading tied to formality and speaker attitude. (3) Interjection of surprise: Uzbek voy! / ohho! vs. English wow! / oh! — functionally parallel, but the Uzbek forms are more finely differentiated for pain, admiration, and reproach than their closest English counterparts, which tend to rely on intonation and context to disambiguate. (4) Reduplication for intensity: Uzbek qip-qizil ("bright red") has no

equivalent word-formation process in English, where the same emotive intensification is achieved periphrastically (deep red, blood red) or through a separate intensifying adverb (very red indeed).

These examples support the broader claim of this article: emotiveness is a functional universal, present in some form in every natural language, but its formal realization is shaped by the grammatical resources each language happens to make available — free lexical items and syntax in English, bound morphology and reduplication in Uzbek. The typological contrast also has direct consequences for the translation of literary texts between Uzbek and English. When an Uzbek source text relies on a diminutive suffix to convey a character's tenderness toward a child, or on reduplication to intensify a description, a translator working into English cannot reproduce the device formally and must instead compensate at the lexical or syntactic level — through an added adjective, a modal particle such as just or indeed, or a shift in the surrounding register. Conversely, translating an English text rich in intensifying adverbs and exclamative syntax into Uzbek may call for the selective use of diminutive suffixation or reduplication where none existed in the source, in order to preserve the overall emotive weight of the passage rather than its literal form [2, pp. 133–138]. Recognizing emotiveness as a category realized differently, rather than absently, in the target language is therefore a precondition for translation that preserves not only propositional content but also affective meaning.

Pragmatic and Sociolinguistic Dimensions

Beyond the lexico-semantic classification discussed above, emotive vocabulary performs a set of recurrent pragmatic functions that are largely shared between the two languages, even where their formal expression differs. Four such functions are particularly salient in the data examined here.

First, an expressive function, whereby emotive vocabulary directly signals the speaker's internal state without further communicative aim — interjections in both

languages are the clearest case, but evaluative adjectives used in isolation (Terrible! / Dahshat!) serve the same function. Second, an appraisal function, by which emotive vocabulary conveys the speaker's judgment of a person, object, or event as good or bad, desirable or undesirable; this function is closely tied to what appraisal theory in pragmatics calls affect, judgement, and appreciation, and is realized in both languages through evaluative adjectives and nouns [6, pp. 101–108]. Third, a phatic-affiliative function, whereby emotive vocabulary — particularly Uzbek diminutive-endearment suffixation and English terms of endearment — signals closeness, warmth, or solidarity between interlocutors rather than describing an external state of affairs; onajon does not merely mean "mother" plus "small," but actively performs closeness in the interaction. Fourth, an intensifying-rhetorical function, by which emotive vocabulary is used strategically to persuade, emphasize, or foreground a point in argumentative or persuasive discourse, a function especially visible in political and advertising registers in both languages [8, pp. 141–147]. These four functions are not mutually exclusive: a single emotive word frequently performs more than one function simultaneously, and disambiguating between them typically requires attention to co-text, register, and the relationship between interlocutors rather than to the word form alone.

Emotive vocabulary in both languages is also sensitive to register, and this sensitivity is itself a further point of contrast. In English, emotive intensifiers such as so, totally, and super are strongly associated with informal and youth registers and are largely avoided in formal academic or official writing, where emotiveness is instead signalled more cautiously through evaluative adjectives (significant, considerable, regrettable) or hedged constructions. In Uzbek, diminutive-endearment suffixation is pervasive in informal, family, and child-directed speech but is also conventionally retained in certain formal contexts as a marker of respect and warmth toward elders or honoured addressees (otajon, ustozjon), which has no straightforward parallel in

English honorific usage [7, pp. 58–60; 8, pp. 143–145]. Gender and age also condition the use of emotive vocabulary in both languages: Uzbek diminutive forms are markedly more frequent in speech addressed to and about children, which aligns with cross-linguistic findings on the pragmatics of child-directed speech, while English shows a comparable, though morphologically much more limited, tendency toward diminutive suffixation (-ie/-y) and reduplicated baby-talk forms in the same communicative context.

Conclusion

Emotiveness is best understood as a systemic linguistic category, realized through distinct but comparable sets of lexical, morphological, and syntactic means across languages. The contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek presented here shows that while both languages distinguish affective, evaluative, and intensifying emotive vocabulary, and share the same underlying pragmatic functions, English favours lexical and syntactic encoding while Uzbek favours morphological encoding through a rich system of suffixation and reduplication. Recognizing these typological differences has practical value for literary translation, intercultural communication, and the teaching of emotive competence in both languages, and points to a need for further corpus-based contrastive work on emotive vocabulary in Uzbek and English literary and colloquial texts.

References

1. Shakhovsky V.I. Emotivny komponent znacheniya i metody ego opisaniya [The Emotive Component of Meaning and Methods of Its Description]. – Volgograd: VGPI Publishing, 1983. – 96 pp.
2. Ibrohimov S. O‘zbek tilida hissiy-baholovchi leksika [Emotive-Evaluative Vocabulary in the Uzbek Language]. – Tashkent: Fan, 2019. – 184 pp.
3. Bally Ch. Traité de stylistique française. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1909. – Vol. 1.

– 331 pp.

4. Shakhovsky V.I. Kategorizatsiya emotsiy v leksiko-semanticheskoy sisteme yazyka [Categorization of Emotions in the Lexico-Semantic System of Language]. – Voronezh: Voronezh University Press, 1987. – 192 pp.
5. Galperin I.R. Stylistics. – Moscow: Higher School, 1977. – 332 pp.
6. Wierzbicka A. Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. – 349 pp.
7. Mamatov A. O‘zbek tili undov so‘zlari [Interjections of the Uzbek Language] // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. – 2016. – No. 4. – pp. 52–61.
8. Rasulova M. Sotsiolingvisticheskie aspekty ekspressivnoy leksiki uzbekskogo yazyka [Sociolinguistic Aspects of Expressive Vocabulary in Uzbek] // Vostokovedenie. – 2020. – No. 2. – pp. 136–148.