

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**DISCURSIVE MECHANISMS OF EVALUATION AND EMOTION EXPRESSION IN
ENGLISH AND UZBEK NARRATIVES****Nilufar Yakubovna Usarova***Assistant teacher at the faculty of Foreign philology**Kokand State University*Email address: nilufarusarova@gmail.com*Kokand, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: symbolism, metaphor, English folktales, Uzbek folktales, cultural values, universal themes, literary devices, moral lessons.

Received: 01.04.26**Accepted:** 02.04.26**Published:** 03.04.26

Abstract: This study investigates the linguistic mechanisms of evaluation, stance taking, and emotion encoding in English and Uzbek narratives through a comparative discourse-analytic and cognitive-linguistic approach. While English narratives predominantly rely on lexical markers, epistemic stance verbs, and attitudinal adjectives, Uzbek narratives demonstrate extensive use of morphological evaluative markers, evidential suffixes, and culturally grounded somatic expressions. These structural and typological differences reveal distinct ways in which narrators across the two languages position themselves toward events, construct interpersonal alignment, and convey emotional experience. Drawing on Appraisal Theory, Stance Theory, and cognitive models of emotion, the study examines how narrative voice, evaluative focus, and affective framing interact in shaping narrative meaning.

Introduction. The study of narrative evaluation and stance has undergone significant theoretical development across linguistics, discourse studies, and cognitive semantics. One of the earliest systematic frameworks derives from Labov's narrative model, which positions evaluation as an essential narrative component responsible for revealing the narrator's

attitudes toward events. Labov argues that evaluation is not an optional stylistic element, but the structural core that motivates the recounting of the narrative itself. His theory has shaped a generation of scholarship exploring how speakers mark significance, emotion, and moral positioning within stories.

Materials and Methods. The study of narrative evaluation and stance has undergone significant theoretical development across linguistics, discourse studies, and cognitive semantics. One of the earliest systematic frameworks derives from Labov's narrative model, which positions evaluation as an essential narrative component responsible for revealing the narrator's attitudes toward events. Labov argues that evaluation is not an optional stylistic element, but the structural core that motivates the recounting of the narrative itself. His theory has shaped a generation of scholarship exploring how speakers mark significance, emotion, and moral positioning within stories. Building on this foundation, Appraisal Theory developed by Martin and White provides a more granular account of how speakers express affect, judgement, and appreciation. This framework distinguishes between attitude, engagement, and graduation, offering an analytical system for understanding both explicit and implicit evaluative meanings. Within English narratives, Appraisal Theory has been particularly influential in identifying lexical and grammatical markers of evaluation such as intensifiers, modal verbs, attitudinal adjectives, and stance adverbs.

Parallel to appraisal-based approaches, Stance Theory introduced by Biber, Finegan, and later expanded by Englebretson, conceptualizes stance as the interpersonal positioning encoded through linguistic choices. Stance markers include epistemic and evidential verbs, adverbials, hedges, boosters, and discourse particles. This line of research demonstrates that narrative stancetaking is not limited to the evaluation of events but extends to the negotiation of authority, certainty, and social alignment between narrator and audience. In English discourse studies, stance has been explored through corpus-based methods, offering insights into frequency patterns and speaker-specific preferences.

In the context of Uzbek linguistics, evaluative and emotional meanings have traditionally been examined through the lens of morfologik kategoriya, baholovchi affikslar, and mazmuniy-emotsional birliklar. Uzbek is rich in derivational suffixes that encode affection, diminution, intensity, or emotional coloration, making morphological marking a central mechanism of narrative evaluation. Studies on Uzbek narratives also highlight the importance of evidentiality markers such as -mish, -kan, which play a dual role in expressing narrative distance and indicating the narrator's stance toward the reliability or source of information. This evidential

system differs significantly from English, where evidentiality is largely lexical rather than grammatical.

Recent scholarship in cognitive linguistics has expanded the study of narrative emotion encoding by analyzing emotion metaphors and conceptual models. Researchers note that Uzbek narratives frequently embed emotional meaning in culturally grounded metaphorical patterns, such as somatic expressions (*yuragi ezildi*, *ko'ngli yorishdi*) that foreground the body as the site of emotional experience. English, by contrast, often employs abstract adjectives and mental-state verbs, relying more heavily on lexical than somatic metaphors. Cross-linguistic studies emphasize that these differences reflect broader typological and cultural distinctions in how emotional experience is conceptualized and verbalized.

Within discourse analysis, scholars have increasingly focused on stance layering, voice construction, and narrative perspectivization. Recent work by Du Bois, Kärkkäinen, and Thompson demonstrates that stance is co-constructed through interaction, emerging dynamically across narrative sequences. English narratives often foreground individual subjectivity and personal perspective, while Uzbek narratives tend to balance individual and collective perspectives, frequently drawing on shared cultural norms and relational values.

Although substantial research exists in both linguistic traditions, comparative studies of English and Uzbek narrative evaluation remain limited. Few works address the intersection of evaluation, stance, and emotion encoding in a unified framework, especially within authentic narratives or corpus-based analysis. This gap underscores the need for a comprehensive cross-linguistic investigation that integrates discourse-functional approaches, cognitive semantics, and structural typology.

Results and Discussion. The analysis of English and Uzbek narrative texts revealed systematic discursive mechanisms through which evaluation and emotion are constructed, distributed and pragmatically oriented. The results demonstrate both universal tendencies in narrative evaluation and language-specific strategies shaped by grammatical structure and cultural cognition. The corpus analysis shows that evaluation in both English and Uzbek narratives is not randomly dispersed but structurally embedded in key narrative zones: (1) character introduction, (2) conflict escalation, and (3) resolution or moral reflection.

In English narratives, evaluation is predominantly encoded through:

- attributive adjectives (“cruel”, “gentle”, “ambitious”),
- adverbial intensifiers (“deeply”, “terribly”, “profoundly”),
- mental-state verbs (“felt”, “realized”, “regretted”),
- epistemic stance markers (“perhaps”, “seemed”, “apparently”).

In Uzbek narratives, evaluative meaning is more frequently realized through:

- descriptive participial constructions,
- metaphorical epithets,
- culturally marked lexemes expressing moral judgment (e.g., lexical items connoting honor, modesty, shame),
- affixational means expressing subjectivity (-gina, -ku, -da, etc.).

Quantitatively, English texts show higher frequency of explicit lexical evaluation, whereas Uzbek narratives demonstrate greater reliance on contextual and culturally inferable evaluation. This suggests that English discourse tends toward overt evaluative marking, while Uzbek narrative discourse often operates through implicature and shared cultural presuppositions.

The findings indicate that stance-taking in English narratives is frequently individualized and psychologically internalized. First-person narration intensifies subjective alignment through inner speech representation and modal constructions (“I suppose”, “I must have”, “I cannot deny”). Even in third-person narration, focalization techniques allow close alignment with a character’s evaluative perspective. In contrast, Uzbek narratives demonstrate a more relational and socially anchored stance construction. Evaluation often reflects collective norms rather than purely individual psychology. The narrator’s stance is frequently embedded in communal ethical frameworks, where emotional reactions are evaluated against social expectations (e.g., loyalty, respect for elders, patience). A notable structural difference concerns modality:

- English relies heavily on modal auxiliaries (must, might, could) to signal epistemic positioning.
- Uzbek employs modal particles, auxiliary constructions and pragmatic markers that subtly signal speaker attitude without direct assertion.

This indicates that stance in English discourse is grammatically codified, whereas in Uzbek discourse it is pragmatically layered and context-dependent. The comparative analysis reveals three dominant emotion-encoding patterns: English narratives tend to name emotions directly (anger, fear, jealousy, relief), reflecting a lexicalized emotional taxonomy. Emotional states are often verbalized through psychological verbs (“to fear”, “to resent”, “to admire”). Uzbek narratives, however, more frequently employ metaphorical and somatic imagery:

- heart-based metaphors,
- heat/cold imagery,
- burden and weight metaphors,

- natural imagery (wind, darkness, storm) to represent internal turmoil.

This suggests that Uzbek emotion discourse relies more strongly on embodied and metaphorical conceptualization, whereas English shows a higher degree of lexical abstraction. English texts demonstrate a higher occurrence of direct emotional introspection, especially in modern prose. Characters openly articulate internal states. Emotional transparency is discursively legitimized. Uzbek narratives, particularly those rooted in traditional narrative style, tend to encode emotions indirectly through:

- silence,
- action-based emotional indicators,
- dialogue implicature,
- narrator commentary implying emotional evaluation.

This difference reflects broader communicative norms: English narrative culture prioritizes psychological articulation, while Uzbek discourse often values emotional restraint and implicit understanding. Evaluation and emotion serve several discursive functions in both corpora:

- Character construction – Moral alignment is achieved through repeated evaluative clustering around protagonists or antagonists.
- Reader positioning – Evaluative cues guide the reader’s sympathy and ethical judgment.
- Narrative tension building – Emotional intensification marks climactic progression.
- Cultural value transmission – Especially evident in Uzbek texts where moral evaluation reinforces collective ideals.

Interestingly, English narratives often problematize evaluation (ambiguous morality, unreliable narrators), whereas Uzbek narratives more frequently stabilize moral evaluation, offering clearer ethical orientation. The comparative results indicate the following tendencies:

Aspect	English Narratives	Uzbek Narratives
Evaluation Type	Explicit, lexical	Contextual, culturally embedded
Emotion Encoding	Direct naming	Metaphorical & somatic
Stance	Individualized	Relational & communal
Modality	Grammaticalized	Pragmatic/particle-based
Moral Framing	Often ambiguous	More ethically stabilized

These patterns confirm that while evaluation and emotion are universal narrative components, their discursive realization is deeply language- and culture-specific. English narrative discourse foregrounds internal cognition and explicit stance articulation, which

aligns with its grammatical resources for modality and psychological verb usage. Uzbek narrative discourse foregrounds relational morality and metaphorical embodiment, reflecting cultural emphasis on social harmony and indirect expression. Thus, evaluation and emotion encoding function not merely as stylistic devices but as culturally structured cognitive-discursive patterns.

Conclusion. The findings suggest that understanding symbolism and metaphor across English and Uzbek narratives enhances cross-cultural literary analysis, offering insights into the unique ways these societies process and communicate universal themes. For readers, the symbols of light and darkness, for instance, can represent universally understandable ideas, such as knowledge and ignorance or hope and despair, yet the cultural contexts give these metaphors specific resonance within their respective societies. By bridging these culturally distinct uses of symbolism, readers gain a nuanced perspective of how different societies address issues of identity, ambition, and resilience. This comparison of symbolism in English and Uzbek narratives illustrates the transformative power of literary devices in storytelling. Symbolism and metaphor act as a universal language of sorts, yet one that retains distinct cultural meanings, thus inviting readers to appreciate the diversity within literary traditions while acknowledging shared human experiences.

References:

1. Blake, W. (1789). 'Songs of Innocence and of Experience'. London: Tate Publishing.
2. Chulpan. (1936). 'Kecha va Kunduz' ('Night and Day').
3. Dickens, C. (1859). 'A Tale of Two Cities'. London: Chapman & Hall.
4. Fitzgerald, F. S. (1925). 'The Great Gatsby'. New York: Scribner.
5. Frye, N. (1957). 'Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays'. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
6. Golding, W. (1954). 'Lord of the Flies'. London: Faber & Faber.
7. Kövecses, Z. (2002). 'Metaphor: A Practical Introduction'. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). 'Metaphors We Live By'. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
9. Leech, G. N. (1969). 'A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry'. London: Longman.
10. Ismailov, H. (1995). 'The Symbolic Language of Uzbek Literature'. Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House.
11. Qahhor, A. (1961). 'Sarob' ('Mirage').

12. Cuddon, J. A. (1999). 'The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory'. London: Penguin Books.
13. Eco, U. (1984). 'The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts'. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
14. Eagleton, T. (1983). 'Literary Theory: An Introduction'. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
15. Eikhenbaum, B. M. (1978). 'Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine'. Michigan: Ardis Publishers.
16. Jakobson, R. (1960). "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics." In 'Style in Language', edited by T. A. Sebeok, 350–377. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
17. Ricoeur, P. (1977). 'The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language'. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
18. Said, E. W. (1978). 'Orientalism'. New York: Pantheon Books.
19. Turner, M. (1996). 'The Literary Mind: The Origins of Thought and Language'. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Wellek, R., & Warren, A. (1949). 'Theory of Literature'. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company.