



## LEXICAL-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF EMOTIONAL SPEECH IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LITERARY PROSE (BASED ON THE WORKS OF ABDULLA QAHHOR AND ERNEST HEMINGWAY)

Jollibaeva Gulsimkhan Bazarbay qizi

Assistant teacher, University of Innovation Technologies

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22247495>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2026

Accepted: 29<sup>th</sup> August 2026

Online: 30<sup>th</sup> August 2026

### KEYWORDS

Emotional speech, lexical pragmatics, literary discourse, Uzbek prose, English prose.

### ABSTRACT

*This article examines the lexical-pragmatic features of emotional speech in Uzbek and English literary prose through a comparative analysis of the works of Abdulla Qahhor and Ernest Hemingway. Particular attention is given to the ways emotions are encoded not only through explicitly evaluative vocabulary but also through colloquial expressions, phraseological units, repetition, intensifiers, interjections, forms of address, context-dependent lexical choices, and deliberate lexical restraint. The analysis demonstrates that Qahhor frequently constructs emotional meaning through culturally marked vocabulary, expressive nomination, irony, and socially conditioned speech, whereas Hemingway often relies on lexical economy, repetition, understatement, and emotionally neutral words whose pragmatic force becomes evident in context. Despite differences between the Uzbek and English linguistic and cultural traditions, both writers show that emotionality in literary discourse is produced through interaction between lexical meaning, communicative intention, interpersonal relations, and narrative context.*

**Introduction.** Emotional speech constitutes one of the most significant components of literary discourse because it reveals not only what characters think and feel but also how they perceive other people, social circumstances, and themselves. In literary prose, emotion is rarely expressed exclusively by words directly naming psychological states such as joy, fear, anger, sorrow, or love. It is frequently communicated indirectly

through evaluative vocabulary, lexical repetition, phraseological expressions, interjections, intensifiers, forms of address, colloquial elements, semantic contrast, irony, and even the intentional avoidance of emotionally explicit words [2, 90-91]. For this reason, the study of emotional speech requires a lexical-pragmatic approach in which lexical units are interpreted in relation to their communicative environment and the intentions of speakers.



The comparative examination of Abdulla Qahhor and Ernest Hemingway is particularly productive in this respect. Although the two writers belong to different linguistic, literary, and cultural traditions, both are distinguished by a careful economy of verbal expression and a strong dependence on contextual meaning. Qahhor's prose is deeply connected with Uzbek everyday speech, social relationships, national modes of communication, humor, satire, and culturally recognizable patterns of evaluation. Hemingway's prose, by contrast, is widely associated with lexical simplicity, restraint, understatement, repetition, and the indirect representation of psychological tension. Consequently, the emotional effect of their prose cannot be adequately explained by identifying emotionally marked words alone. The pragmatic function of apparently ordinary vocabulary must also be considered.

From a lexical-pragmatic perspective, emotional meaning may be divided into explicit and implicit forms. Explicit emotionality occurs when a lexical item itself contains an identifiable emotional or evaluative component. Words denoting affection, contempt, fear, suffering, admiration, or anger belong to this group. Implicit emotionality emerges when an otherwise relatively neutral expression acquires emotional force in a particular communicative situation. This distinction is especially important for the comparison of Qahhor and Hemingway because both authors frequently transfer the principal emotional burden from isolated lexical items to context.

In Qahhor's prose, emotional speech is closely associated with the social identity

of characters. His characters' lexical choices reveal their age, position, education, interpersonal relationships, attitudes, and emotional states simultaneously. Colloquial vocabulary therefore performs more than a realistic function. It acts as a pragmatic indicator of social distance and emotional orientation. A familiar form of address may communicate affection in one situation but irritation, superiority, mockery, or contempt in another. Similarly, words that seem semantically simple can acquire strong evaluative meanings when uttered in a conflictual social context [7].

This tendency is clearly observable in such works as *Bemor*, *O'g'ri*, *Anor*, and *Dahshat*. In these stories, emotional tension frequently develops from the characters' everyday circumstances rather than from extended psychological description. Poverty, helplessness, fear, humiliation, domestic conflict, and social inequality are represented through compressed exchanges and carefully selected lexical details. Qahhor often allows a socially meaningful word or expression to carry several functions at once. It identifies an object or person, expresses the speaker's attitude, indicates the relationship between interlocutors, and contributes to the broader emotional atmosphere of the episode [6, 147].

The lexical-pragmatic importance of evaluation is particularly noticeable in Qahhor. Positive and negative evaluations are rarely independent of the social situation. A negative designation may communicate anger, but it may equally express disappointment, contempt, irony, or a feeling of



superiority. Thus, the pragmatic meaning of evaluative vocabulary cannot be determined merely by its dictionary definition. Its actual emotional value depends on who uses it, toward whom it is directed, under what circumstances it occurs, and what consequences the utterance produces. This contextual variability makes emotional vocabulary an important instrument of characterization [1, 333-337].

Phraseological and idiomatic expressions constitute another significant layer of emotional speech in Uzbek prose. Such units are culturally important because their figurative structure often reflects conventional perceptions, everyday experience, and collective patterns of evaluation. In Qahhor's prose, phraseological expressions can intensify anger, anxiety, astonishment, ridicule, or sympathy while maintaining the natural quality of spoken Uzbek. Their emotional force is therefore simultaneously semantic, pragmatic, and cultural. Translating such expressions literally into English would often preserve their referential meaning while weakening their interpersonal or expressive effect [5, 187-192].

Interjections, particles, exclamatory expressions, and repeated lexical units also contribute substantially to Qahhor's representation of spontaneous emotion. These elements may have little independent propositional content, yet they are pragmatically powerful. They indicate hesitation, impatience, disbelief, annoyance, surprise, or psychological pressure. Repetition is especially important because it can transform an ordinary lexical item into an emotionally loaded element. A repeated word may

signal insistence, desperation, fear, anger, or an inability to formulate a more complex response. In this sense, repetition reflects not only stylistic emphasis but also the cognitive pressure experienced by a speaker.

Hemingway develops emotional speech through a partly different lexical strategy. His prose frequently avoids highly descriptive emotional vocabulary precisely where the emotional situation is most intense. In works such as *Hills Like White Elephants*, *Cat in the Rain*, *The Killers*, *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place*, *The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber*, and *The Old Man and the Sea*, seemingly ordinary words acquire considerable emotional significance because of their position in dialogue and their relationship with what remains unspoken. The reader is therefore required to infer emotions from verbal behavior rather than simply receive them through explicit naming.

*Hills Like White Elephants* provides a particularly clear example of this mechanism. The central conflict is developed through apparently simple conversation, lexical recurrence, vague references, and avoidance of direct terminology. The repeated use of ordinary words and expressions gradually exposes disagreement, anxiety, persuasion, emotional exhaustion, and unequal communicative pressure. The lexical simplicity of the dialogue should consequently not be interpreted as emotional simplicity. On the contrary, the restricted vocabulary increases pragmatic density because individual words become dependent on implication and conversational context [4].



Repetition performs a comparable function throughout Hemingway's prose. His characters often repeat the same word or short expression when communication becomes psychologically difficult. Such repetition can represent persuasion, self-protection, emotional fatigue, denial, or an attempt to maintain conversational control. The repeated lexical unit may remain semantically unchanged while its pragmatic value shifts from one occurrence to another. The first occurrence may be informative, the second defensive, and the third emotionally confrontational. Emotional meaning thus develops dynamically through discourse.

Understatement is another central lexical-pragmatic feature of Hemingway's representation of emotion. Characters may describe painful, dangerous, or psychologically significant situations in deliberately ordinary language. The discrepancy between the seriousness of the situation and the apparent neutrality of the vocabulary produces an important pragmatic effect. Emotional intensity is displaced from explicit lexical semantics into inference. What the speaker refuses or fails to verbalize becomes almost as important as what is actually said.

This feature distinguishes Hemingway from more overtly expressive forms of literary discourse. Emotional restraint does not eliminate emotion; rather, it reorganizes its linguistic realization. Simple adjectives such as good, fine, nice, or pretty, for instance, can acquire complex pragmatic meanings depending on their placement and repetition. In particular contexts, a positive adjective may cease to express genuine approval

and instead signal discomfort, avoidance, irony, or an attempt to terminate an emotionally difficult exchange. The lexical meaning remains positive at the denotative level, whereas the pragmatic meaning may become ambivalent or even negative.

Irony creates an important point of convergence between Qahhor and Hemingway. Both writers use the tension between literal lexical meaning and contextual intention, although the cultural and stylistic mechanisms are not identical. In Qahhor, irony is often closely related to social criticism and may emerge from exaggerated praise, colloquial evaluation, semantic incongruity, or the contrast between a character's words and social reality. The reader recognizes that the literal positive value of an expression is inconsistent with the represented situation. The resulting pragmatic interpretation may communicate criticism more effectively than a direct negative statement.

Hemingway's irony is generally less overt and frequently arises from conversational mismatch or understatement. A character may employ an apparently harmless expression in a situation where its inadequacy becomes meaningful. The emotional effect results from the gap between lexical surface and contextual reality. Thus, in both writers, irony demonstrates that lexical semantics alone is insufficient for interpreting emotional discourse [3].

Forms of address also provide valuable comparative evidence. Uzbek possesses a socially and culturally sensitive system in which kinship terms, respectful forms, personal names, and



other address expressions can encode social hierarchy and interpersonal proximity. In Qahhor's prose, changes in address may therefore indicate changes in emotion or social positioning. Respect can become distance, familiarity can become contempt, and affectionate nomination can become ironic depending on the situation. These lexical choices make the relationship between emotion and social structure especially visible.

English has a different address system and generally relies less on morphologically or lexically elaborate markers of social hierarchy. Hemingway consequently conveys interpersonal changes through other resources, including the repetition or omission of names, pronoun choice, short responses, evaluative adjectives, and conversational routines. The comparative evidence suggests that languages may distribute emotional-pragmatic information across different lexical resources while performing comparable communicative functions.

Another important similarity concerns the relationship between emotional speech and characterization. Neither Qahhor nor Hemingway uses emotional vocabulary merely to decorate narrative language. Lexical behavior becomes evidence about personality. A character who avoids emotionally explicit vocabulary may reveal fear, restraint, alienation, or psychological defensiveness. Another who repeatedly employs evaluative expressions may reveal irritation, authority, insecurity, or a desire to influence the interlocutor. Emotional speech therefore contributes to indirect characterization by allowing

readers to reconstruct psychological states from patterns of verbal behavior.

The differences between the two writers become clearer when emotional explicitness is considered. Qahhor tends to make greater use of culturally recognizable expressive vocabulary, colloquial resources, phraseological units, and socially marked evaluation. His emotional discourse frequently depends on the interaction between individual psychology and collective social experience. Hemingway more consistently reduces explicit emotional marking and places greater interpretive responsibility on dialogue, repetition, lexical omission, understatement, and contextual implication. Qahhor's lexical expressiveness often directs readers toward an emotional evaluation, whereas Hemingway's lexical restraint frequently requires readers to construct that evaluation themselves.

Nevertheless, reducing the contrast to "emotional Qahhor" versus "restrained Hemingway" would be inaccurate. Qahhor also achieves powerful effects through brevity, silence, and implication, while Hemingway's prose contains direct evaluative and emotional vocabulary when required by the narrative. The more significant distinction lies in dominant tendencies and in the linguistic resources made available by Uzbek and English. Both authors carefully regulate the relationship between explicit lexical meaning and implicit pragmatic meaning.

The comparative analysis also reveals that emotional speech should be examined at several interconnected levels. At the semantic level, the researcher identifies words with



inherent emotional or evaluative meanings. At the pragmatic level, attention shifts to speaker intention, interpersonal relations, presupposition, implication, and context. At the stylistic level, repetition, contrast, irony, colloquialization, phraseology, and lexical economy become relevant. At the cultural level, forms of address, conventional evaluations, idiomatic meanings, and norms of emotional expression must be considered. Separating these dimensions too sharply would obscure the actual functioning of emotional language in literary prose.

Particularly significant is the distinction between the emotion experienced by a character and the emotion produced in the reader. A character may use emotionally neutral vocabulary while the reader experiences intense anxiety because the narrative context supplies information that the character's words conceal. This phenomenon is especially characteristic of Hemingway, but it is also present in Qahhor's socially critical stories. Consequently, lexical-pragmatic analysis must distinguish between the emotive value of an expression, the emotional intention of the fictional speaker, and the emotional effect constructed by the author for the reader.

The findings demonstrate that emotional speech in the works of Abdulla Qahhor and Ernest Hemingway is a multidimensional linguistic phenomenon in which lexical meaning interacts continuously with context. Qahhor's prose shows the considerable role of colloquial and culturally marked

vocabulary, phraseological expressions, evaluative nominations, forms of address, repetition, and irony in representing emotion and social relationships. Hemingway's prose demonstrates that equally strong emotional effects can be achieved through lexical restriction, repetition, understatement, ordinary evaluative words, indirect reference, and contextually meaningful silence. Their stylistic differences therefore represent two distinct but functionally comparable ways of organizing emotional discourse.

**Conclusion.** In conclusion, the lexical-pragmatic comparison of Uzbek and English literary prose demonstrates that emotionality cannot be measured simply by counting explicitly emotive words. Some of the strongest emotions are represented by lexical units that appear neutral outside their context. In Qahhor's works, emotional vocabulary is frequently embedded in the social and cultural structures of Uzbek communication, while Hemingway often transfers emotional meaning from the lexical surface to pragmatic inference. Yet both writers employ lexical selection with exceptional functional precision. Their prose confirms that a literary word carries not only dictionary meaning but also attitude, intention, interpersonal positioning, cultural association, and contextual implication. Accordingly, a lexical-pragmatic approach provides an effective framework for explaining how emotional meaning is created, intensified, concealed, and interpreted across Uzbek and English literary traditions.



## References:

1. ABDULLA QAHHOR HIKOYALARINING TAHLILI. (2025). Modern Science and Research, 4(5), 333-337. <https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.science-research.91920>
2. Abdusalamovna, X. M. (2026, June). O 'ZBEK VA INGLIZ HIKOYACHILIGIDA MAVZU VA G 'OYA MUSHTARAKLIGI: ABDULLA QAHHOR VA ROALD DAHL HIKOYALARI MISOLIDA. In THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC-PRACTICAL CONFERENCE ON THE TOPIC "PROCESSING OF LINGUODIDACTICS, LINGUOPHILOSOPHY AND TRANSLATION STUDIES IN LINGUISTICS" (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 90-91).
3. Bani Abdo, I. M. (2015). Stylistic Issues in Two Arabic Translations of Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds).
4. Hemingway, E. (1995). The short stories of Ernest Hemingway. Simon and Schuster.
5. Kamolidinovna, A. S., & Latifovna, O. S. U. (2026). ABDULLA QAHHOR HIKOYALARIDA METAFORALAR TURLARI. Научный Импульс, 4(46), 187-192.
6. Rustamov, I., & Yakhshilikova, N. A. QAHHORNING "O'G'RI" HIKOYASI TAHLILI. In The VIII International Scientific and Practical Conference «Actual trends in science and practice», February 28–March 02, Geneva, Switzerland. 195 p. (p. 147).
7. Uyto'lsinova, S. O. Q., & Teshebaeva, D. T. U. (2026). LINGUOSEMANTIC AND LINGUOCULTURAL INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPTS OF "HAPPINESS" AND "LUCK"(BASED ON THE STORIES OF O. HENRY AND ABDULLA QAHHOR). Инновационные методики в обучении иностранным языкам: глобальные тенденции и опыт университетов шёлкового пути, 1, 1054-1056.