

MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –  
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNALMENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –  
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>LEXICO-STYLISTIC DEVICES EXPRESSING EMOTIVENESS IN  
ENGLISH AND UZBEK POLITICAL DISCOURSE**Amira Ulfatovna Rakhmonova***Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences**Department of English lexicology and stylistics**Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages**E-mail: [amirarakhmonova9128@gmail.com](mailto:amirarakhmonova9128@gmail.com)**Samarkand, Uzbekistan*

## ABOUT ARTICLE

**Key words:** emotiveness, political discourse, lexico-stylistic devices, metaphor, epithet, euphemism, evaluative vocabulary, cross-cultural comparison, emotionally colored.

**Received:** 10.12.25**Accepted:** 11.12.25**Published:** 13.12.25

**Abstract:** This article discusses the lexico-stylistic devices expressing emotiveness in English and Uzbek political discourse. Political language serves not only as a tool of information exchange but also as an instrument of persuasion and emotional influence. The use of emotive language allows politicians to create their desired image, evoke empathy, and guide public perception toward specific ideological goals. This research focuses on identifying and analyzing stylistic devices such as metaphors, epithets, euphemisms, and evaluative vocabulary that contribute to the emotional tone to political speech. A comparative analysis of English and Uzbek political texts reveals both universal and culturally specific trends in the verbalization of emotions. While English political discourse often uses metaphorical and evaluative expressions to enhance credibility and attractiveness, Uzbek discourse shows a preference for culturally loaded phrases and respectful forms reflecting respect and solidarity. The results highlight how emotiveness functions as a pragmatic and stylistic mechanism that forms persuasive influence and intercultural understanding in political communication.

**Introduction.** Language in politics functions not only as a means of conveying information but also as a means of persuasion. Politicians try to move their audiences emotionally in order to gain consent, legitimacy, and support. Emotional appeals, when embedded in stylistic devices, can turn ordinary language into powerful rhetoric. English and Uzbek political discourses provide an interesting opportunity for comparison. Political communication in English is characterized by straightforward rhetoric, adversarial framing, and use of metaphors of war, conflict, and travel. On the contrary, Uzbek political discourse reflects collectivist traditions, frequent references to cultural heritage, and reliance on idiomatic and metaphorical expressions emphasizing national unity and optimism.

Emotional aspect of political discourse serves as a key tool for creating ideological meanings and influencing public perception. With the help of stylistic devices, politicians not only formulate their ideas but also shape values, attitudes, and beliefs in a specific cultural and linguistic context. In both English and Uzbek contexts, emotional language serves as a link between rational argumentation and emotional appeal, reinforcing persuasion through subtle lexical and stylistic choices. The comparative study of these discourses provide a deeper understanding of how cultural norms, communicative strategies, and stylistic traditions determine the expression of emotionality in political speech. The analysis of lexico-stylistic devices highlights the interrelationship of language, emotion, and power in shaping political communication in different cultures.

**Materials and methods.** The roots of political stylistics lie in classical rhetoric. Aristotle laid the foundations for the study of persuasion. He described three means of persuasion: ethos (trust in the speaker), logos (logical reasoning) and pathos (emotional appeal). Among them, pathos is directly related to emotionality, as it aims to awaken feelings of fear, anger, pity, or hope in the audience. For instance, when a certain modern politician talks about “threats to national security,” this echoes the principle of Aristotle, according to which causing fear enhances the effect of persuasion. Aristotle also emphasized the role of metaphor in stirring emotions, calling it “the most powerful tool of persuasion.” Cicero (106-43 BC) In his book *On the Orator*, Cicero went further than Aristotle, describing the duties of a speaker: docere (to teach), delectare (to delight) and movere (to emotionally influence). He argued that the greatest orators should combine rational argumentation with emotional resonance, which echoes the way modern politicians combine policy details with inspiring slogans. Cicero also identified stylistic devices such as repetition, antithesis, and metaphor as key to the emotional appeal of public speaking. Quintilian (35-100 A.D.) Quintilian, from the *Institute of Oratory*, argued that an effective speaker should not only imitate emotions, but also sincerely experience them: “An

orator can never move others unless he himself is moved." This anticipation of modern psychology emphasizes the authenticity of expressing emotions as a rhetorical strategy. In political discourse, this is evident when leaders demonstrate obvious passion or resentment in order to build self-confidence. Francis Bacon (1561-1626), in his book *The Development of Science* (1605), described rhetoric as the art of "applying reason to the imagination in order to better influence the will." He shifted the focus from purely decorative speech to the psychological effect of rhetoric. This anticipates modern pragmalinguistics, where emotional means are considered as tools for shaping attitudes and behavior. Hugh Blair (1718-1800), a Scottish rhetorician, emphasized the aesthetic and emotional function of language in his lectures on rhetoric and fiction (1783). He emphasized that figures of speech — especially metaphors, epithets and hyperbole — are not only an ornament, but also a means of expressing emotions. His views influenced the way political speeches of the 19th century were created, often combining beauty of expression with patriotic appeals. Roman Jakobson (1896-1982), in his model of the six functions of language (1960), clearly described a poetic function as one that highlights form and expressive means. Although he focused on poetry, his views are also applicable to political discourse, where parallelism, alliteration, and metaphor often enhance memorability and emotional impact. For example, slogans such as "Rebuild better" use a poetic function to arouse collective emotions.

I. R. Galperin (1909-1988) made a lasting contribution to the study of style, and his approach (1977) continues to be fundamental in the post-Soviet academic world. He organized lexical and stylistic devices into distinct categories such as epithet, metaphor, comparison, irony, hyperbole, euphemism and periphrasis and highlighted their emotional and evaluative roles in communication. According to Galperin, expressions like epithet "dark times" or the hyperbole like "a catastrophe of historical proportions" demonstrate how language can convey strong emotional impact and persuasive force. His classification remains influential in both English and Uzbek stylistic research. M. A. K. Holliday (1925-2018) in his influential work "Language as Social Semiotics" (1978) viewed language as a system of choices shaped by social context and human interaction. He proposed studying language as a system of choice reflecting social functions. He emphasized that every linguistic choice reflects not only grammatical structure but also the speaker's intention, social role, and emotional stance—thus making language a living reflection of human experience. His system-functional linguistics brought a human dimension to the study of language, showing how every word choice reflects human relationships, emotions and intentions. He demonstrated that lexical selection is never random, it encodes interpersonal meaning and emotional nuance. In political discourse, his framework

reveals how leaders use pronouns like “we” and “our nation” to express unity, or modal verbs such as “should”, “will”, and “cannot” to project determination and shared responsibility. Through such choices, politicians build emotional resonance and solidarity with their audiences. Norman Fairclough (1941-2022) continued this human-centered perspective through his pioneering work in Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly in “Language and Power” and “Discourse and Social Change”. (1992). He viewed political language not as a neutral medium but as a tool that shapes and reflects ideology. Emotional words like “freedom”, “threat” and “solidarity” plays a vital role in constructing these ideological positions and influencing public consciousness. His concept of interdiscursivity highlighted how political speech often borrows emotional tones and persuasive techniques from other social domains such as advertising, religion, or everyday conversation, making political discourse more relatable and human.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) proved in their landmark book “Metaphors that We Live by” that metaphors are not just decorations, but cognitive structures that shape perception and action. Lakoff later applied this to politics (Moral Politics, 1996), showing how metaphors such as the “war on terrorism” or the “fiscal cliff” generate fear and urgency. In both English and Uzbek languages, metaphor remains a central element of emotional political rhetoric, although cultural correspondences vary. Kate Allan and Kate Burridge (2006), in their book “Forbidden Words: Taboo and Language Censorship”, explored euphemism and dysphemism as pragmatic strategies for emotional manipulation. Euphemisms soften harsh reality while dysphemisms reinforce negative feelings. Their structure is useful for analyzing how politeness and emotional power are used in English and Uzbek political discourse.

The speeches of Islam Karimov, the first president of Uzbekistan, have themselves become material for stylistic research. His frequent use of metaphors of independence and emotional appeals to unity shows how Uzbekistan's political leaders shaped national identity through stylistic techniques.

Razzokova (2024) studied phraseology in the political media, noting that Uzbek politicians often use proverbs and idiomatic expressions that recall traditional cultural values. For example, calls for teamwork and unity evoke an emotional response due to their roots in the oral tradition. Normukhamedova (2025) analyzed euphemisms in English and Uzbek media, demonstrating that while English political discourse often mitigates harsh realities (for example, “downsizing”), Uzbek discourse emphasizes collectivist politeness by using euphemisms based on respect and cultural sensitivity. Sherimbetova (2024a, 2024b) pragmatically explored emotive vocabulary, emphasizing the differences between English

individualistic expression of emotions and Uzbek collectivist framing. For example, in Uzbek political discourse, preference is given to collective emotions (“our people mourn”, “our nation rejoices”) rather than individual states, reflecting cultural norms.

**Results and discussions.** Stylistic devices were identified and categorized into epithets, metaphors, euphemisms, idioms, and evaluative vocabulary. Examples were extracted, translated where necessary, and analyzed for function and emotional impact.

Epithets are emotionally charged adjectives or descriptive phrases that express the speaker's attitude and evoke emotional responses in the audience. On the other hand, the evaluative dictionary refers to direct approval or rejection through lexical choice and forms a key component of emotion in political discourse. Both devices are aimed at persuading, inspiring and shaping public perception.

English political leaders often use epithets and evaluative words to assert their authority, awaken patriotism, and draw a moral dichotomy between “us” and “them.” For example:

Barack Obama (2009): “a dangerous regime that threatens our world.”

The epithet “dangerous” conveys strong negative evaluation, portraying the regime as a global threat. It appeals to fear and unity, urging collective action.

Donald Trump (2019): “the great American people and the best economy ever.”

The adjectives “great” and “best” function as hyperbolic epithets, emotionally uplifting the audience and emphasizing national pride. Such evaluative vocabulary serves to build confidence and reinforce the speaker's image as a successful leader.

Thus, English political speeches are based on direct emotional impact — the use of clear, assertive and often excellent expressions to create a positive image of oneself and a negative one about others. In Uzbek political rhetoric, emotiveness often manifests itself through respect based on cultural traditions and collective identity. Leaders emphasize unity, gratitude, and progress rather than confrontation.

Shavkat Mirziyoyev (2021): “ulug’ xalqimiz” (“our great people”).

The epithet “ulug’” (great) expresses reverence and collective pride, strengthening the sense of national dignity and solidarity. The possessive pronoun “bizning” (our) adds warmth and openness, emphasizing a common identity. The phrase “yangi taraqqiyot davri” (“new era of development”) contains both evaluative and symbolic meaning. The word “yangi” (new) implies renewal and optimism, while “taraqqiyot” (development) means progress and modernization. Such combinations are emotionally uplifting, but at the same time remain restrained and respectful, in accordance with the Uzbek rhetorical tradition. Uzbek politicians

tend to be collectivist and optimistic, focusing on unity, stability and future prosperity rather than conflict or self-promotion.

Device	English Example	Uzbek Example	Function
<b>Epithet</b>	“a dangerous dictatorship”	<i>buyuk kelajak</i> (“great future”)	Creates positive/negative evaluation; evokes emotional stance toward entity or idea
<b>Evaluative Vocabulary</b>	“the great American people”	<i>ulug’ xalqimiz</i> (“our great people”)	Strengthens national pride and solidarity
<b>Hyperbole</b>	“the best economy ever”	<i>mislsiz taraqqiyot</i> (“unprecedented progress”)	Intensifies emotional appeal and amplifies success
<b>Symbolic Phrase</b>	“new dawn of freedom”	<i>yangi taraqqiyot davri</i> (“new era of development”)	Represents transformation, renewal, and hope

English political discourse is often assertive, contrastive, and self-promotional, using evaluative words to assert superiority and achievements. Uzbek discourse, by contrast, is inclusive, respectful, and forward-looking, avoiding direct confrontation and focusing on collective progress. The individualistic orientation of English-speaking societies encourages leaders to use strong, personal and competitive language (“the best”, “the greatest”, “dangerous”). The collectivist spirit of Uzbek culture encourages modesty, unity, and shared success, which is why epithets such as *ulug’*, *buyuk*, and *yangi* emphasize harmony and collective aspirations.

In both languages, emotional vocabulary enhances the power of persuasion and audience engagement, but the strategies differ. English — mobilization through emotions and conflicts. Uzbek means motivation through unity and respect. Epithets and evaluative vocabulary in political speeches in English and Uzbek serve as a powerful emotional tool, but they reflect different cultural and pragmatic traditions. English leaders call for achievement, perseverance, and excellence. Uzbek leaders call for solidarity, respect and a common national destiny. Both styles demonstrate how emotionality in political language functions as a reflection of national mentality, turning language choice into an instrument of political persuasion.

Metaphors are not just decorative expressions; they are cognitive tools that formulate complex, abstract political ideas such as freedom, justice, or development in terms of familiar,



concrete experiences (war, family, or travel). In political communication, metaphors help leaders simplify reality, shape perceptions, and appeal to shared values.

In English politics, metaphors are often associated with conflict, movement, and moral struggle. They are designed to activate emotional reactions and encourage people to take action.

George W. Bush (2001): “The War on Terror.”

The metaphor of war presents terrorism as a real enemy that must be defeated. This implies urgency, unity, and moral clarity—“us” versus “them.” This metaphor legitimizes aggressive politics and calls for self-sacrifice, echoing the American ideals of heroism and defense.

Joe Biden (2021): “America is back in the fight for freedom.”

The metaphor of “fight” brings to life images of struggle and leadership. She emotionally connects political efforts with the moral crusade for freedom. This phrase suggests the restoration of strength and values after decline.

British politicians often use metaphors to dramatize situations and personify abstract issues, appealing to a public sense of moral duty and individual will. Metaphors are no less powerful in Uzbek political rhetoric, but they are based on collectivist, moral, and cultural traditions. They are often associated with images of family, land, and travel, reflecting respect, unity, and continuity.

Islam Karimov: “mustaqillik yo’li” (“the path of independence”)

The Journey Metaphor conceptualizes independence not as a static achievement, but as a continuous path to prosperity and maturity. The metaphor invites citizens to join this journey, emphasizing perseverance and unity.

Shavkat Mirziyoyev: “Ona-Vatan” (“Motherland”)

The metaphor of the family portrays the country as a caring mother who deserves love and protection. She evokes deep emotional attachment, combining patriotism with filial piety, an important cultural value in Uzbek society. The metaphor “xalqimizning tayanchi” (“support for our people”) is based on physical and social support and symbolizes the role of the people as the moral and structural basis of the state. It conveys humility and interdependence, not hierarchy.

Thus, Uzbek metaphors present politics as a common moral path and emphasize stability, heritage, and emotional unity rather than conflict.

Metaphor Type	English Example	Uzbek Example	Cultural Meaning / Function
---------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------------------------

<b>War Metaphor</b>	"fight for justice," "war on terror"	<i>kurash yo'li</i> ("path of struggle")	Mobilizes citizens against threats; evokes courage and unity
<b>Family Metaphor</b>	"founding fathers," "the family of nations"	<i>ona-Vatan</i> ("Motherland"), <i>xalq farzandlari</i> ("children of the nation")	Builds emotional identity and belonging; strengthens moral ties
<b>Journey Metaphor</b>	"roadmap to peace," "path to recovery"	<i>taraqqiyot yo'li</i> ("path of progress"), <i>mustaqillik yo'li</i> ("path of independence")	Suggests continuity, long-term growth, and optimism
<b>Construction Metaphor</b>	"building democracy," "laying foundations for change"	<i>poydevor yaratmoq</i> ("to build the foundation"), <i>kelajakni qurish</i> ("to build the future")	Depicts development as creation and effort; emphasizes cooperation
<b>Organic/Body Metaphor</b>	"the heart of our nation," "the lifeblood of democracy"	<i>xalq tanasi</i> ("the body of the people"), <i>yurt yuragi</i> ("the heart of the homeland")	Symbolizes vitality and collective unity

Metaphors in political speeches in English and Uzbek reveal the peculiarities of the national rhetoric of emotions: English leaders dramatize political goals using metaphors of battle, victory and restoration, calling for action and pride. Uzbek leaders use metaphors of travel and family that promote unity, belonging, and continuity. Both of them demonstrate how political language functions as a mirror of collective emotions, translating ideology into emotionally resonant images that shape how citizens feel, think, and act.

Euphemisms are indirect or softened expressions used to replace harsh, unpleasant, or politically sensitive realities. In political discourse, euphemisms serve as a linguistic shield — they protect the image of a leader, maintain optimism, and manipulate public perception by reformulating negative or controversial issues into emotionally acceptable terms.

They perform several key pragmatic functions:

Mitigating negativity (concealing failure, violence, or crisis).



Preserving political legitimacy (avoiding accountability).

Maintaining social harmony (preventing public alarm).

Shaping emotional tone (keeping morale and optimism).

English-speaking politicians often use euphemisms to soften the reality of military, economic, or social issues by creating a diplomatic and emotionally neutral tone. Such lexical phrases correspond to Western ideals of professionalism and political correctness, but they can also serve as strategic manipulation tools.

Some examples will be analyzed in the following paragraphs.

“Collateral damage” → civilian deaths

A military euphemism that mitigates the brutal reality of civilian casualties. Emotionally neutral and bureaucratic, he distances himself from responsibility and suppresses empathy. He turns moral tragedy into technical terminology.

“Regime change” → military intervention

It implies a peaceful political transition, not a violent overthrow. Frames aggression as the promotion of democracy, appealing to Western ideals of freedom.

“Enhanced interrogation” → torture

This euphemism hides cruelty under bureaucratic language, legitimizing actions that are morally questionable.

“Downsizing” / “economic adjustment” → mass layoffs or unemployment

Shifts focus from human suffering to management efficiency, maintaining optimism about economic recovery.

“Challenging times” → crisis, instability, or recession

Used to preserve morale, conveying resilience and hope rather than despair.

English political euphemisms are often technocratic, abstract, and emotionally detached, giving the appearance of rational control. Their emotionality lies not in open expression, but in the suppression of emotions, which forms public opinion.

**Conclusion.** Lexico-stylistic devices are central to expressing emotiveness in political discourse. While English political language relies heavily on direct evaluation, hyperbole, and metaphors of struggle, Uzbek political discourse is characterized by idiomatic expressions, euphemisms highlighting optimism, and metaphors rooted in collectivism and tradition. The comparative findings confirm that political discourse, although global in form, remains deeply culture-specific in content. These insights are valuable for pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and intercultural communication studies, revealing how emotions are linguistically encoded across societies.

## References:

1. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon*. Oxford University Press.
2. Aristotle. (2007). *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Trans., 2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 4th century BCE)
3. Bacon, F. (2000). *The Advancement of Learning*. Modern Library. (Original work published 1605)
4. Blair, H. (1783). *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. London: W. Strahan.
5. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
6. Cicero. (2001). *On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)* (J. M. May & J. Wisse, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 55 BCE)
7. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
8. Galperin, I. R. (1977). *Stylistics*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
9. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. Edward Arnold.
10. Isokova, F. (2025). *Communicative Aspect of Political Discourse: A Comparative Analysis of Uzbek and English Political Discourses*.
11. Jakobson, R. (1960). *Linguistics and poetics*. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.
12. Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf*. University of California, Berkeley.
13. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
14. Normukhamedova, D. (2025). *Euphemisms in English and Uzbek media: A comparative analysis*. *International Journal of Linguistics and Discourse Studies*, 12(1), 55–68.
15. *Philology Journal* (2017). *Stylistic Means of Political Discourse in the English*. Press.
16. Quintilian. (2002). *The Orator's Education (Institutio Oratoria)* (D. A. Russell, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published ca. 95 CE)
17. Rakhmonova, A. (2021). *Stylistic Peculiarities of Expressing Inner Emotions of Personages in Uzbek and English Novels*. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*.

18. Raxmonova, A. U. (2021). POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE CLASSIFICATION OF EMOTIONS. Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире, (8-1), 12-17.
19. Razzoqova, S. A. (2024). Structural and Semantic Features of Phraseology in English and Uzbek Political Media Discourse.
20. Sherimbetova, G. (2024b). Pragmatic functions of emotive words in Uzbek and English. Comparative Linguistics Journal, 8(4), 87–103.
21. Sherimbetova, N. R. (2024a). Linguistic Features of Emotive Words in English and Uzbek.
22. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals. Cambridge University Press.