

PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES OF EMOTIONAL SPEECH IN LITERARY DISCOURSE (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.22244597>

Abstract. This article examines the pragmatic strategies used to express emotions in the literary discourse of Abdulla Qahhor and Ernest Hemingway. The analysis focuses on indirect speech acts, conversational implicature, repetition, irony, understatement, silence, rhetorical questions, and politeness strategies. The study shows that emotional meaning in literary discourse is frequently created not through explicit emotion vocabulary but through communicative intention, interpersonal relations, contextual implication, and reader inference. Qahhor's emotional discourse is closely associated with social hierarchy, cultural norms, economic circumstances, and interpersonal relations, whereas Hemingway frequently constructs emotional tension through restraint, omission, repetition, and silence. Despite these differences, both writers demonstrate that indirect pragmatic strategies are central to representing psychological states and emotional tension in literary prose.

Keywords: emotional speech, literary discourse, pragmatics, emotional expression, indirectness, irony, repetition, silence.

Emotional speech is an essential component of literary discourse because it communicates not only a character's feelings but also intentions, attitudes, interpersonal relationships, and social position. From a pragmatic perspective, emotions are expressed through more than explicitly emotional words. Questions, commands, repetition, irony, silence, incomplete sentences, forms of address, and indirect speech acts can convey anger, anxiety, disappointment, affection, fear, or psychological tension. The works of Abdulla Qahhor and Ernest Hemingway provide valuable material for examining these strategies because both writers achieve strong emotional effects through relatively economical linguistic means.

In Abdulla Qahhor's prose, emotional speech is closely connected with social relationships. His characters often interact within families, neighbourhoods, workplaces, and communities where age, authority, economic status, and social expectations influence communicative behaviour. Consequently, an apparently ordinary request or question may express humiliation, dissatisfaction, anxiety, or criticism. Rhetorical questions, repetition, expressive forms of address, imperatives, and irony frequently function as pragmatic indicators of emotional states [1].

This tendency is clearly observed in *Bemor*, where anxiety and helplessness are conveyed through the communicative behaviour of characters facing illness and poverty. Emotional tension develops through requests, short exchanges, repeated concerns, and the characters' inability to change their circumstances. Similarly, in *O'g'ri*, emotional speech reflects social inequality. The protagonist's restrained language, appeals, hesitation, and politeness reveal his dependence on socially more powerful individuals. Thus, emotional restraint itself becomes pragmatically significant: the character's inability to express dissatisfaction openly communicates his vulnerability [5, 447-466].

Irony is another important pragmatic strategy in Qahhor's prose. The literal meaning of an expression may differ from its intended evaluative meaning. Apparently neutral or positive statements can therefore communicate criticism, ridicule, irritation, or disapproval. The reader identifies the emotional meaning by interpreting the relationship between the utterance and its context.

Hemingway also relies heavily on indirect emotional expression, although his strategy is characterized particularly by understatement, repetition, omission, and silence. His characters rarely provide detailed explanations of their emotions. Instead, psychological tension emerges from what they avoid saying, what they repeatedly say, and how they respond to each other. Emotional meaning is therefore frequently located beneath the surface of seemingly simple dialogue.

In *Hills Like White Elephants*, for example, the central conflict is constructed through indirect speech acts, persuasion, repeated expressions, questions, and topic avoidance. The man's apparently reassuring statements can pragmatically function as pressure, while the woman's responses gradually communicate frustration and emotional exhaustion. Readers must infer the emotional conflict because much of its significance remains unstated [3].

Repetition has a particularly important pragmatic function in Hemingway's dialogue. It can signal anxiety, resistance, irritation, emotional pressure, or a desire to terminate a conversation. Likewise, silence becomes meaningful when a response is expected but not provided. Such communicative absence may express disagreement, emotional withdrawal, fear, or suppressed anger. Hemingway therefore turns what is unsaid into an important element of emotional discourse.

A similar strategy occurs in *Cat in the Rain*. The wife's repeated desire for the cat gradually suggests broader emotional dissatisfaction and unmet psychological needs. Her husband's limited responses emphasize emotional distance between them. In *A Clean, Well-Lighted Place*, short conversations and contextual implications communicate loneliness, isolation, dignity, and existential anxiety without extensive emotional description [2].

The comparison demonstrates that both Qahhor and Hemingway frequently employ indirect speech acts, repetition, implication, contextual contrast, and conversational economy. However, their dominant pragmatic tendencies differ. Qahhor's emotional discourse is strongly connected with social hierarchy, economic conditions, family relationships, and culturally determined interpersonal behaviour. His characters' emotional expressions often reveal their position within society. Hemingway's emotional discourse is more strongly associated with psychological restraint, interpersonal distance, omission, and difficulty in verbalizing private experience.

Speech-act theory helps explain these strategies. A grammatical question may pragmatically function as an accusation, reproach, appeal, or challenge. A statement may communicate disappointment or criticism, while an imperative may express fear, authority, or desperation. Therefore, the literal meaning and pragmatic force of an emotional utterance do not necessarily coincide. Conversational implicature is equally significant because characters frequently communicate emotional meanings without stating them directly.

Politeness also contributes to emotional characterization. Qahhor's socially vulnerable characters may use respectful or mitigated language even when experiencing anger or frustration because direct confrontation could threaten their social position. Hemingway's

characters often avoid direct emotional expression because revealing their feelings may threaten psychological or interpersonal stability. In both authors, indirectness consequently functions as a mechanism for managing emotional vulnerability.

The analysis shows that emotional intensity cannot be determined merely by counting emotion-related vocabulary. A short response, unanswered question, ironic statement, repeated phrase, or moment of silence may communicate greater emotional intensity than an explicit declaration of feeling. Emotional speech should therefore be analyzed through the interaction of linguistic form, communicative intention, social context, and reader inference.

Overall, Abdulla Qahhor and Ernest Hemingway demonstrate two distinctive forms of pragmatic emotional expression. Qahhor frequently connects emotion with social relations, hierarchy, hardship, and cultural patterns of communication, whereas Hemingway often constructs emotion through understatement, silence, repetition, and implication. Despite these differences, both writers demonstrate that the strongest emotional meanings are often communicated indirectly. Their works confirm that emotional speech in literary discourse is fundamentally pragmatic because its meaning emerges not only from what characters say, but also from why they say it, how they say it, what they leave unsaid, and what readers are expected to infer.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Baltayeva, I. T. (2021). Drip the role and importance of tradition in literary succession (on the example of the work of abdullaqahhor). *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(3), 1155-1161.
2. Hemingway, E. (2022). *IN OUR TIME: Ernest Hemingway*. Lebooks Editor.
3. Hemingway, E. (2017). *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Hemingway Library Edition*. Simon and Schuster.
4. Maqsudovich, M. M. (2026). ABDULLA QAHHORNING “DAXSHAT” HIKOYASIDA AYOL OBRAZINING TAHLILI VA TADQIQI. *FORMATION OF PSYCHOLOGY AND PEDAGOGY AS INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES*, 5(50), 280-283.
5. Zokirova, B. (2026). COMPACTNESS OF COMPOSITION IN THE STORIES OF RAYMOND CARVER AND ABDULLA QAHHOR. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 447-466.