

NAMANGAN DAVLAT
UNIVERSITETI
ILMIY AXBOROTNOMASI, [2026-9]
ISSN:2181-1458
ISSN:2181-0427



10.00.00-FILOLOGIYA
journal.namdu.uz
PHILOLOGICAL

UDK: 8,80,800,81-11

INGLIZ VA O' ZBEK TILLARIDA QUVONCH VA QAYG' U EMOTSIYALARINI IFODALOVCHI FE'LLARNING SEMANTIK-QIYOSIY TAHLILI

Kurvonbekov Manuchexr Islomjon o' g' li
NamDCHTI mustaqil tadqiqotchisi
O' zDJTU Tarjimonlik fakulteti o' qituvchisi
E-mail: manuchexrkurvonbekov@gmail.com
ORCID:0009-0004-6184-8379

Annotatsiya: Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillarida emotsional holatni ifodalovchi fe'llarning lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari semantik, kognitiv va qiyosiy nuqtayi nazardan tadqiq etiladi. Tadqiqotda, xususan, quvonch, shodlik, xursandchilik, qayg' u, g' am, mehr, ko' ngil qolishi va ularga yaqin emotsional holatlarni ifodalovchi fe'llarning ma'no tuzilishi hamda qo' llanish xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Emotsional holatning konseptuallashuvi, tana obrazlari, metaforik motivatsiya, kollokatsion aloqalar va madaniy jihatdan shakllangan kommunikativ me'yorlarga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Tahlil natijalari shuni ko' rsatadiki, har ikki tilda asosiy insoniy emotsiyalarni konseptuallashtirishda universallik mavjud bo' lsa-da, ularning verbal ifodasi milliy-madaniy tajriba bilan belgilanadi. Ingliz tilida individual emotsional tajriba nisbatan aniq va differensial ifodalansa, o'zbek tilida emotsional holat ko' pincha ijtimoiy munosabat, tana holati, vaziyat va baholash komponentlari bilan uyg' unlashadi.

Kalit so'zlar: emotsional holat fe'llari, emotsiya, lingvokulturologiya, qiyosiy semantika, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, konseptuallashuv, madaniy model, kognitiv semantika, metafora, quvonch, qayg' u, emotsional verbalizatsiya.

СЕМАНТИКО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ГЛАГОЛОВ, ВЫРАЖАЮЩИХ ЭМОЦИИ РАДОСТИ И ГРУСТИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация: В статье исследуются лингвокультурологические особенности глаголов эмоционального состояния в английском и узбекском языках в сравнительно-семантическом, когнитивном и культурологическом аспектах. Основное внимание уделяется глаголам, вербализующим внутренние эмоциональные состояния человека, прежде всего радость, счастье, грусть, печаль, привязанность, разочарование и близкие к ним аффективные состояния. Рассматриваются семантическая структура эмоциональных глаголов, особенности концептуализации эмоций, телесная образность, метафорическая мотивация, сочетаемость и культурно обусловленные коммуникативные модели. Результаты показывают, что английский и узбекский языки обладают общими концептуальными основаниями репрезентации базовых человеческих эмоций, однако способы их языковой объективации существенно зависят от культурного опыта. В английском языке эмоциональное состояние часто представляется как индивидуальное внутреннее переживание, тогда как в узбекском языке оно теснее связано с межличностными отношениями, социальным контекстом, телесными образами и оценочностью. Полученные результаты имеют значение для сравнительной лингвистики, лингвокультурологии, когнитивной семантики и переводоведения.

Ключевые слова: глаголы эмоционального состояния, эмоция, лингвокультурология, сравнительная семантика, английский язык, узбекский язык, концептуализация, культурная модель, когнитивная семантика, метафора, радость, печаль, эмоциональная вербализация.

LINGUOCULTURAL FEATURES OF EMOTIONAL-STATE VERBS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Abstract: This article examines the linguocultural features of emotional-state verbs in English and Uzbek from a comparative semantic, cognitive, and cultural perspective. The study focuses on verbs that verbalize internally experienced emotions, particularly joy, happiness, sadness, grief, affection, disappointment, and related affective states. Attention is given to the relationship between lexical meaning, conceptualization of emotion, bodily imagery, metaphorical motivation, collocational patterns, and culturally conditioned communicative behavior. The analysis demonstrates that although English and Uzbek share a broadly comparable conceptual basis for representing fundamental human emotions, their verbalization reflects different cultural models of emotional experience and interpersonal communication. English tends to display a relatively differentiated lexical and contextual encoding of individual emotional experience, whereas Uzbek frequently combines emotional-state verbs with culturally meaningful contextual,

somatic, relational, and evaluative elements. The findings contribute to comparative linguistics, linguoculturology, cognitive semantics, and translation studies.

Keywords: emotional-state verbs, emotion, linguoculturology, comparative semantics, English, Uzbek, conceptualization, cultural model, cognitive semantics, metaphor, joy, sadness, emotional verbalization.

Introduction

Emotion constitutes one of the most fundamental dimensions of human cognition and communication. People do not merely experience emotions; they conceptualize, categorize, evaluate, verbalize, and communicate them through language. Consequently, the linguistic representation of emotion cannot be reduced to a simple correspondence between an internal psychological state and a lexical item. Emotional meaning is embedded in culturally established conceptual models, social expectations, patterns of interpersonal interaction, metaphorical structures, and conventional ways of interpreting bodily and psychological experience. Wierzbicka's influential cross-linguistic research demonstrated that emotion concepts cannot be adequately analyzed by assuming that apparently equivalent words in different languages possess identical semantic structures. Her approach emphasizes that languages provide culturally specific lexical grids and "scripts" for conceptualizing and communicating feelings.

Within this broader problem, emotional-state verbs occupy a particularly significant position. Unlike purely descriptive nouns, verbs such as *rejoice*, *delight*, *grieve*, *mourn*, *suffer*, *enjoy*, *love*, *fear*, and *regret* present emotion as an event, process, state, or experience involving a human participant. Their semantics therefore incorporates not only the name of an emotion but also information concerning the experiencer, possible stimulus, duration, intensity, intentionality, causation, and consequences of the emotional state. In this respect, emotional verbs represent a productive area at the interface of lexical semantics, syntax, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and linguoculturology.

The English and Uzbek languages provide a particularly interesting field for such comparison. They belong to different genealogical and typological traditions and have developed within different historical, social, and cultural environments. English is an Indo-European language with a highly productive system of phrasal and lexical verb formation, while Uzbek is a Turkic language characterized by extensive agglutinative morphology and a rich system of derivational and phraseological resources. Such structural differences do not mechanically determine cultural differences, but they provide different formal possibilities for organizing and expressing experience.

The central premise of the present study is that emotional-state verbs should be examined not only as lexical units but also as verbal representations of culturally organized emotional experience. Thus, the English verb *to rejoice* and the Uzbek verb *quvonmoq* may be regarded as functional equivalents at a general level, but their distribution, collocations, stylistic associations, contextual restrictions, and culturally preferred environments may differ. Similarly, *to grieve* and *qayg' urmoq* both relate to sadness, yet their conceptual and discourse profiles cannot be assumed to coincide completely. The English distinction between *be sad*, *grieve*, *mourn*, *regret*, and *feel down*, for instance, reflects different aspects of emotional experience, whereas Uzbek can distribute related meanings among *xafa bo' lmoq*, *g' amgin bo' lmoq*, *qayg' urmoq*, *kuyinmoq*, *iztirob chekmoq*, and phraseological constructions.

The aim of this article is therefore to identify and interpret the major linguocultural characteristics of emotional-state verbs in English and Uzbek. The study concentrates particularly on two broad semantic domains—joy and sadness—while also referring to adjacent emotional states where they illuminate the conceptual organization of the two languages.

The research addresses three principal questions. First, how are emotional states conceptually structured in English and Uzbek verbs? Second, what similarities and differences emerge in the semantic and contextual verbalization of joy and sadness? Third, what cultural models become visible through the collocational, metaphorical, pragmatic, and phraseological behavior of these verbs?

The significance of the research lies in its attempt to move beyond a purely lexical comparison. Previous comparative studies of emotion in English and Uzbek have increasingly emphasized the role of idioms, metaphors, pragmatics, and cultural values. Recent Uzbek scholarship, for example, identifies bodily imagery, metaphorical expression, contextual dependence, and cultural conventions as important factors in the verbalization of emotions in the two languages. The present study develops this perspective specifically around emotional-state verbs and their linguocultural semantics.

Literature Review

The linguistic study of emotion has developed at the intersection of semantics, cognitive linguistics, linguistic anthropology, psychology, and discourse analysis. One of the central theoretical questions concerns the relationship between universal human emotional experience and language-specific conceptualization. Wierzbicka argues that although humans possess broadly shared emotional capacities, the linguistic categories through which these experiences are interpreted are not necessarily universal. Languages encode culturally shaped distinctions concerning what people feel,

why they feel it, how they should express it, and how others are expected to interpret it. Her work on emotion concepts and cultural scripts has consequently become one of the principal foundations for cross-linguistic emotional semantics.

Wierzbicka's Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach is particularly relevant to the present investigation because it warns against treating English emotional vocabulary as a universal conceptual template. For example, the English words *anger*, *sadness*, *happiness*, or *fear* should not automatically be assumed to represent identical semantic categories in other languages. Instead, cross-cultural comparison requires the analyst to reconstruct the underlying cognitive scenario associated with each lexical item. This perspective is especially important when comparing English and Uzbek because apparently equivalent emotional verbs may differ in their implications concerning the cause, intensity, duration, and social acceptability of the emotion.

A second important theoretical tradition is cognitive linguistics, particularly Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Lakoff and Johnson demonstrated that metaphor is not merely an ornamental feature of literary language but a fundamental mechanism through which abstract experience is conceptualized. Emotion is one of the domains in which metaphorical conceptualization is especially productive. Kövecses' extensive work on emotion metaphors demonstrates that emotional concepts frequently involve mappings from physical force, heat, pressure, movement, possession, containment, and bodily experience to psychological states. His research further emphasizes that metaphorical structures display both universal tendencies and culturally conditioned variation.

This insight has direct implications for emotional verbs. A verb may appear semantically simple at the lexical level while participating in a larger metaphorical system. English expressions such as *burn with anger*, *burst with joy*, *sink into sadness*, and *be overwhelmed by grief* conceptualize emotion through physical force, heat, movement, and containment. Uzbek likewise employs bodily and physical imagery, although the particular images and their pragmatic distribution are shaped by local phraseological conventions. Recent research on Uzbek emotion metaphors identifies somatic, heat-pressure, pain-damage, and attachment-severance patterns as recurrent conceptual models.

Another relevant line of research concerns the semantic-syntactic structure of psychological or psych verbs. Apresjan's work on Russian psych-verbs demonstrates that the semantic structure of emotional verbs is closely related to their syntactic behavior, particularly the relationship between the Experiencer and Stimulus. Different emotion classes may organize the roles of experiencer, cause, and stimulus differently. This observation is valuable for English-Uzbek comparison because emotional verbs frequently encode a state that may be internally experienced but externally caused.

The linguistic representation of emotion is also strongly connected with phraseology. Teliya's approach to phraseological meaning stresses the interaction of denotative, connotative, evaluative, emotive, and culturally motivated components. Phraseological expressions therefore provide evidence of cultural conceptualization that cannot always be detected from isolated dictionary definitions.

Within Uzbek linguistics, lexical and phraseological studies provide an important empirical foundation for examining emotional vocabulary. Jamolxonov's *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili* provides a systematic treatment of Uzbek lexical and phraseological resources, including the structure of the literary language. Rahmatullayev's *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati* is particularly relevant to culturally marked phraseological expressions. Contemporary Uzbek lexicography is also represented by the five-volume *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*, published in 2006–2008 under the direction of A. Hojiyev and with the participation of Uzbek lexicographers.

The literature therefore suggests that an adequate analysis of emotional-state verbs requires at least four interconnected levels: lexical-semantic structure, conceptual metaphor and embodiment, syntactic-semantic relations, and cultural-pragmatic context. The present research integrates these levels rather than treating them as independent phenomena.

Research Methods

The study employs a qualitative comparative method combining semantic, cognitive-semantic, linguocultural, contextual, and contrastive analysis. The primary object of investigation is the group of English and Uzbek verbs and verb-based constructions that denote or directly participate in the representation of emotional states.

The lexical material was organized around two major emotional domains: **joy** and **sadness**. Joy was represented by such English items as *rejoice*, *enjoy*, *delight*, *celebrate*, and *cheer up*, together with related constructions, and Uzbek items such as *quvonmoq*, *xursand bo' lmoq*, *shodlanmoq*, *sevinmoq*, and *zavqlanmoq*. The sadness domain included English *grieve*, *mourn*, *regret*, *suffer*, *feel sad*, and related expressions, while the Uzbek material included *qayg' urmoq*, *xafa bo' lmoq*, *g' amgin bo' lmoq*, *kuyinmoq*, *iztirob chekmoq*, and related constructions.

The selection is not intended to establish a rigid one-to-one bilingual dictionary of emotional verbs. On the contrary, one of the central assumptions of the research is that semantic equivalence is normally gradient rather than absolute. A lexical item can share a broad emotional component with its counterpart while differing in intensity, duration, stimulus structure, stylistic register, or cultural associations.

The first analytical procedure was **componential-semantic analysis**. Each verb was examined in terms of several semantic dimensions: emotional polarity, intensity, duration, experiencer, stimulus or cause, intentionality, bodily involvement, and evaluative meaning. This makes it possible to distinguish between verbs that merely indicate a positive or negative emotional state and verbs that encode a particular scenario.

The second procedure was **contrastive analysis**. English and Uzbek items were compared according to their semantic scope and contextual behavior. The purpose was not simply to identify translation equivalents but to establish cases of semantic overlap, partial equivalence, and culture-specific specialization.

The third procedure was **cognitive-linguistic analysis**. Particular attention was given to metaphorical and metonymic patterns through which abstract emotion is conceptualized in terms of physical movement, bodily states, pressure, containment, heat, possession, or interpersonal relations. This approach follows the general cognitive-linguistic insight that abstract emotional experience is frequently structured through more concrete experiential domains. Kövecses' research is particularly relevant here because it demonstrates that emotion metaphors involve both shared embodied patterns and culturally variable realizations.

The fourth procedure was **linguocultural interpretation**. Emotional verbs were examined as elements of a culturally meaningful communicative system. This includes questions concerning emotional openness, restraint, interpersonal orientation, respect, family relations, social expectations, and the culturally appropriate expression of positive and negative emotions.

Finally, **contextual analysis** was applied to distinguish dictionary-level meaning from actual discourse meaning. This is crucial because the same emotional verb may acquire different pragmatic values depending on the participants, situation, genre, and communicative intention.

Analysis and Results

The comparative analysis demonstrates that English and Uzbek emotional-state verbs exhibit substantial semantic commonality while differing considerably in the organization of their peripheral meanings and contextual associations. The commonality derives from the embodied and broadly universal nature of human affective experience, whereas the differences emerge from culturally conventionalized ways of interpreting and communicating this experience.

A fundamental characteristic of emotional-state verbs is their relation to the **Experiencer**. In both languages, the person experiencing an emotion occupies a central semantic position. English commonly realizes this structure through constructions such as *I am happy*, *She felt sad*, *He rejoiced*, or *They grieved*. Uzbek similarly uses constructions such as *Men xursand bo'ldim*, *U xafa bo'ldi*, *U qayg'urdi*, and *Ular quvonishdi*. At this level, the languages exhibit a clear conceptual parallel: emotion is represented as something experienced by an individual.

However, the grammatical form of emotional experience does not necessarily correspond to identical conceptual organization. In English, adjectives and copular constructions are particularly common in ordinary descriptions of emotional states: *be happy*, *be sad*, *be upset*, *be delighted*. Uzbek also extensively employs adjectival and nominal predicates with *bo' lmoq*. Consequently, the conceptual category of "emotional-state verb" must include not only lexical verbs but also verb-based constructions that function semantically as predicates of psychological state.

This observation is important because Uzbek frequently distributes emotional meaning across combinations such as *xursand bo' lmoq*, *xafa bo' lmoq*, *mamnun bo' lmoq*, and *g' amgin bo' lmoq*. The emotional content therefore may be expressed through an adjective plus the copular verb rather than through a morphologically simple lexical verb. English has parallel constructions, but the distribution of lexical verbs and adjectival predicates differs.

The domain of **joy** provides especially clear evidence of lexical differentiation. English possesses a series of verbs and constructions including *rejoice*, *enjoy*, *delight*, *cheer up*, *celebrate*, and *be pleased*. These items do not form a homogeneous semantic group. *Rejoice* conventionally indicates an overtly expressed and often intense feeling of joy; *enjoy* typically involves positive experiential evaluation of an activity, situation, or object; *delight* can denote either the experience or causation of strong pleasure; *cheer up* focuses on a change toward a more positive emotional condition; and *celebrate* involves socially organized expression of positive affect.

Uzbek similarly distinguishes *quvonmoq*, *sevinmoq*, *shodlanmoq*, and *zavqlanmoq*, but these verbs are embedded in culturally meaningful contextual patterns. *Quvonmoq* can denote an emotional response to good news, success, arrival, achievement, or a positive event. *Sevinmoq* may foreground the emotional reaction itself, while *shodlanmoq* often carries a more elevated or literary tone. *Zavqlanmoq* emphasizes pleasure, enjoyment, or aesthetic/emotional gratification.

Thus, the English and Uzbek lexical fields overlap at the level of broad emotional polarity but diverge in the internal organization of the field. This confirms the general cross-linguistic principle that languages may lexicalize different aspects of an apparently universal experiential domain.

An important linguocultural distinction emerges when joy is considered in relation to **social interaction**. In English discourse, emotional statements can frequently be framed as explicit descriptions of personal experience: *I'm really happy about this*, *I'm delighted to see you*, or *I'm so pleased for you*. The speaker explicitly identifies the emotional state and its stimulus.

Uzbek also allows such direct statements, but culturally conventionalized communication often embeds joy in interpersonal relationships and situational formulas. Expressions equivalent to “I am happy for you” may be accompanied by blessings, congratulations, wishes, or references to family and communal well-being.

This difference should not be interpreted as an absolute opposition between “individualistic English” and “collectivistic Uzbek.” Such a binary would oversimplify both cultures. Rather, the relevant distinction concerns **preferred discourse framing**. Cultural models can influence the amount of contextual information expected around an emotional statement. Wierzbicka’s notion of emotional scripts is useful here: languages encode not only emotional concepts but culturally conventionalized expectations concerning when and how emotions should be expressed.

The Uzbek emotional lexicon also displays a particularly strong interaction between **emotion and interpersonal relations**. Emotional states are often linguistically interpreted through relationships with parents, children, relatives, friends, guests, and members of the wider social community. Consequently, the semantic interpretation of a verb may depend strongly on who experiences the emotion and toward whom or because of whom it is experienced.

The verb *quvonmoq*, for example, may readily occur with stimuli referring to another person’s success or well-being. A person can experience joy because a child has succeeded, because a relative has arrived, or because a guest has brought good news. The emotion therefore becomes relational rather than exclusively individual. Similar patterns exist in English, but the frequency and conventionality of such contextualization may differ.

The domain of **sadness** reveals an even more complex semantic structure. English distinguishes among *be sad*, *grieve*, *mourn*, *regret*, *suffer*, *feel down*, *be upset*, and *be heartbroken*. These expressions differ according to cause, intensity, duration, social context, and metaphorical structure. *Grieve* generally involves profound sadness, particularly associated with loss; *mourn* additionally emphasizes socially or culturally recognized expression of grief; *regret* includes a cognitive-evaluative component concerning an undesirable past action or outcome; *suffer* foregrounds the experience of pain or hardship rather than sadness alone.

Uzbek similarly possesses a rich semantic field: *qaygʻ urmoq* can indicate deep concern or sorrow; *xafa boʻ lmoq* commonly denotes being upset, offended, disappointed, or emotionally hurt; *gʻ amgin boʻ lmoq* characterizes a state of sadness; *kuyinmoq* may involve emotional pain, concern, or distress; and *iztirob chekmoq* foregrounds prolonged or intense suffering.

The contrast between *qaygʻ urmoq* and *xafa boʻ lmoq* is particularly revealing. They cannot always be translated by the same English verb. *Xafa boʻ lmoq* can refer to relatively immediate interpersonal hurt or disappointment, whereas *qaygʻ urmoq* may suggest deeper concern, sorrow, or emotional involvement. English similarly distinguishes *be upset* from *grieve*, but the semantic boundaries do not coincide perfectly.

This is a classic case of **partial lexical equivalence**. A translator who assumes that *xafa boʻ lmoq* = *be sad* in every context will inevitably lose pragmatic and cultural meaning. Depending on context, *xafa boʻ lmoq* may correspond to *be upset*, *be hurt*, *be offended*, *be disappointed*, or *feel sad*. Likewise, *qaygʻ urmoq* may correspond to *grieve*, *worry*, *mourn*, *feel sorrow*, or *be deeply concerned*.

The semantic distinction becomes even more visible when emotional verbs interact with **causation**. Compare the English constructions *The news upset her* and *She was upset by the news*. Here the stimulus can be syntactically foregrounded. Uzbek can express similar causative relations through structures such as *Bu xabar uni xafa qildi* (“This news upset her”) or *U bu xabardan xafa boʻ ldi* (“She became upset because of this news”). The conceptual roles are comparable, but the distribution of grammatical and lexical resources differs.

Emotional verbs therefore demonstrate a close connection between **semantics and syntax**. Psycholinguistic and semantic research on psych verbs has shown that emotional predicates frequently involve at least two conceptual participants: an Experiencer and a Stimulus. Apresjan’s analysis of Russian psych verbs demonstrates that the semantic characteristics of emotion clusters influence the grammatical realization of these roles. The same general principle is applicable to English and Uzbek, although each language provides its own grammatical resources for encoding the relation.

A further major feature is **bodily conceptualization**. Human beings frequently understand emotion through bodily experience. Joy may be conceptualized as elevation, expansion, lightness, movement, or overflowing; sadness may be represented as heaviness, weakness, darkness, falling, or physical pain. English contains conventional expressions such as *burst with joy*, *be overjoyed*, *feel low*, *sink into sadness*, and *break one’s heart*. These expressions reveal conceptual metaphors in which psychological experience is structured through physical domains.

Uzbek also makes extensive use of somatic imagery. Expressions involving the *heart*, *soul*, *chest*, *face*, *eyes*, and *inside* frequently participate in the representation of emotional experience. Recent cognitive research on Uzbek phraseology identifies bodily and physical domains as central to the conceptualization of emotions. This suggests that the embodied basis of emotion is broadly shared across the two languages.

Nevertheless, the **cultural interpretation of bodily imagery** can differ. The heart in both languages may be associated with emotional experience, but the conventional phraseological networks surrounding it are not identical. Uzbek

phraseology frequently connects inner emotional states with *ko' ngil*, a culturally salient concept that cannot always be reduced to the English lexical item *heart* or *mind*. The semantic field of *ko' ngil* includes aspects of inner feeling, emotional disposition, desire, affection, psychological well-being, and interpersonal sensitivity. Consequently, expressions involving *ko' ngil* may require contextual interpretation rather than literal lexical substitution.

This is one of the most important linguocultural issues in the comparison. A translator encountering *ko' ngil ko' tarildi* should not automatically translate it as "his/her heart was lifted." Depending on context, the appropriate interpretation may be "felt happier," "felt encouraged," "was cheered up," or "felt emotionally relieved." The literal image and the functional emotional meaning are not identical.

Similarly, English *feel blue* cannot simply be translated through a literal color equivalent. Its semantic value is conventionalized within English-speaking culture. Uzbek has its own culturally motivated emotional images, but these do not necessarily correspond to the same color metaphors. This illustrates Kövecses' argument that metaphorical conceptualization involves both embodied universality and culturally specific variation.

Another important dimension is **intensity**. Emotional verbs often form scalar structures. English distinguishes *like*, *love*, *adore*, and *be passionate about*; similarly, sadness can range from *feel a little down* to *be devastated* or *be overwhelmed with grief*. Uzbek also expresses emotional intensity through lexical selection, modifiers, repetition, phraseological constructions, and contextual amplification. *Xursand bo' lmoq* can be intensified by adverbs or contextual expressions, while *nihoyatda quvonmoq* or *juda qattiq qayg' urmoq* explicitly marks degree.

The two languages therefore share the cognitive concept of **emotional scale**, but the lexical boundaries within the scale are language-specific. This has direct consequences for translation. An emotionally neutral translation may weaken the original; conversely, an excessively strong translation may exaggerate the speaker's emotional state.

Another characteristic concerns **duration and temporality**. English can distinguish a temporary emotional condition from a prolonged psychological state through lexical choice: *feel sad*, *become sad*, *remain sad*, *grieve*, or *be depressed*. Uzbek similarly uses verbal aspectual and contextual resources to distinguish the onset, continuation, and change of an emotional condition: *xafa bo' ldi*, *xafa bo' lib qoldi*, *xafa bo' lib yurdi*, *qayg' urdi*, *qayg' urib yurdi*. The agglutinative structure of Uzbek permits rich combinations of verbal morphology and auxiliary constructions, making temporal and aspectual nuances particularly important.

The expression of **joy as change of state** is especially frequent in Uzbek constructions involving *bo' lmoq* and auxiliary verbs. *Xursand bo' ldi* foregrounds entry into a positive emotional state, whereas *xursand yurdi* can characterize continued emotional disposition. English has corresponding constructions—*became happy*, *felt happy*, *remained happy*—but the grammatical resources differ.

The analysis also demonstrates that emotional verbs are strongly connected with **evaluation**. An emotion is rarely linguistically neutral. To say that someone *rejoiced* presents the emotional state positively; to say that someone *was obsessed* or *was consumed by grief* may introduce negative evaluation even when the underlying emotion itself is understandable. Uzbek similarly uses lexical and phraseological resources to evaluate whether an emotional response is appropriate, excessive, sincere, restrained, or socially desirable.

This evaluative dimension becomes particularly significant in expressions of **anger, grief, and affection**, where cultural norms concerning self-control and interpersonal conduct become visible. Wierzbicka's work emphasizes that cultural scripts influence expectations concerning emotional sincerity, interpersonal warmth, spontaneity, and self-control. Thus, emotional-state verbs should be interpreted as part of culturally organized behavioral expectations rather than isolated vocabulary.

The contrast is also visible in **directness and indirectness**. English allows highly explicit emotional self-reporting: *I'm disappointed*, *I'm worried*, *I'm delighted*, *I'm hurt*. Uzbek permits equivalent direct statements but also possesses a rich system of indirect, contextual, and figurative expression. A speaker may communicate emotional dissatisfaction without explicitly naming the emotion. Such indirectness can serve politeness, interpersonal harmony, respect, or avoidance of excessive self-exposure.

This does not mean that Uzbek is inherently indirect or that English is inherently direct. Both languages employ direct and indirect strategies. The difference is better understood as a matter of **culturally preferred communicative framing**. The same emotional state can therefore receive different degrees of explicit lexical naming depending on discourse situation.

The **family and social domain** further reinforces this observation. In Uzbek communicative culture, emotional expressions frequently occur within contexts involving family relations, hospitality, respect for elders, congratulations, condolences, and collective events. Emotional verbs are consequently embedded in formulaic discourse. Expressions of joy may accompany congratulations and blessings, while expressions of sadness may occur together with condolences and culturally established forms of sympathy.

English also possesses conventionalized emotional formulas, but their linguistic structure and degree of elaboration differ. This difference becomes especially important in translation because the translator must reproduce not only propositional meaning but also the culturally appropriate emotional scenario.

The results consequently support a distinction between **lexical equivalence** and **conceptual equivalence**. Two verbs may have corresponding dictionary definitions while evoking different conceptual frames. For example, *grieve* and *qayg' urmoq* overlap semantically, but the precise cultural and contextual implications may differ. Likewise, *rejoice* and *quvonmoq* overlap in positive emotional meaning but differ in stylistic distribution and collocational behavior.

A further finding concerns **register**. English has lexical items whose emotional meaning is strongly associated with formal, literary, colloquial, or idiomatic registers. *Rejoice* is more elevated than *be happy*, while *feel down* is informal. Uzbek likewise differentiates among neutral, literary, expressive, and colloquial emotional vocabulary. *Shodlanmoq* may sound more literary or elevated than ordinary *xursand bo' lmoq*, while *axfa bo' lmoq* is highly common in everyday interaction.

This stylistic differentiation demonstrates that emotional semantics cannot be separated from **social meaning**. The choice of a verb tells the hearer not only what the speaker feels but also how the speaker positions the emotional experience within a communicative context.

The research further indicates that **phraseology functions as a cultural memory of emotional experience**. Stable expressions preserve culturally conventionalized interpretations of bodily sensations, interpersonal relations, and emotional behavior. This is why phraseological equivalents between English and Uzbek are often functional rather than literal. Comparative research on English and Uzbek phraseology similarly emphasizes the interaction of universal and national-cultural features.

From the perspective of translation, these findings are particularly consequential. Emotional verbs should not be translated mechanically according to dictionary equivalence. The translator must identify the emotional scenario, the experiencer, the stimulus, the intensity, the duration, the register, and the cultural implications. If an Uzbek source says that a character *qayg' urdi*, translating it as simply *was sad* may be grammatically correct but semantically incomplete if the context indicates deep concern or emotional suffering. Likewise, translating *I was upset* as *men qayg' urdim* in every context would exaggerate the emotional intensity.

The comparative analysis thus demonstrates that the **linguocultural meaning of emotional verbs emerges from interaction among lexical semantics, embodied cognition, cultural scripts, phraseology, syntax, pragmatics, and discourse context**. No single level is sufficient to explain their full meaning.

Conclusion

The comparative investigation of emotional-state verbs in English and Uzbek demonstrates that emotion is simultaneously a universal human experience and a culturally mediated linguistic phenomenon. Both languages possess rich lexical and grammatical resources for representing joy, sadness, affection, disappointment, grief, and other emotional states. However, the semantic organization, contextual distribution, metaphorical representation, and pragmatic use of these resources reveal important language-specific and culture-specific tendencies.

The first major finding is that emotional-state verbs exhibit **partial rather than absolute equivalence** across English and Uzbek. Broad emotional categories such as joy and sadness are recognizable in both languages, but the lexical fields surrounding them are internally structured in different ways. English differentiates among such states as *rejoice*, *enjoy*, *delight*, *grieve*, *mourn*, *regret*, and *feel upset*, while Uzbek employs semantically overlapping but culturally differentiated forms such as *quvonmoq*, *sevinmoq*, *shodlanmoq*, *zavqlanmoq*, *qayg' urmoq*, *axfa bo' lmoq*, *kuyinmoq*, and *iztirob chekmoq*.

Second, emotional verbs demonstrate the close relationship between **language and cultural conceptualization**. Following Wierzbicka's approach, emotional meanings should not be assumed to be culturally neutral. Languages provide speakers with culturally conventionalized ways of interpreting and communicating emotional experience.

Third, the analysis confirms the importance of **embodiment and conceptual metaphor**. Both English and Uzbek conceptualize emotions through physical experience, including movement, pressure, heat, bodily sensation, elevation, falling, pain, and containment. Yet the specific metaphorical expressions and phraseological networks are culturally conventionalized. This supports the view that metaphor has both universal cognitive foundations and culturally variable linguistic realizations.

Fourth, Uzbek emotional vocabulary demonstrates a particularly strong relationship between **emotion, interpersonal relations, bodily imagery, and contextual meaning**. Concepts associated with *ko' ngil*, for example, illustrate how culturally salient semantic structures may extend beyond straightforward dictionary equivalents. Such phenomena demonstrate why linguistic equivalence cannot be established solely through bilingual lexical substitution.

Fifth, the study confirms the significance of **semantic-syntactic relations**. Emotional verbs frequently encode an Experiencer and, either explicitly or implicitly, a Stimulus or Cause. The syntactic realization of these roles differs across languages, meaning that comparative research should examine not only what an emotional verb means but also how its participants are grammatically organized.

Finally, the findings have direct implications for **translation and intercultural communication**. Accurate translation of emotional-state verbs requires attention to emotional intensity, duration, causation, register, metaphorical motivation, interpersonal relations, and cultural scripts. The translator must therefore reconstruct the emotional scenario rather than simply substitute one lexical item for another.

In theoretical terms, the study supports an integrated model in which emotional-state verbs are treated as units at the intersection of **lexical semantics, cognitive conceptualization, embodied experience, cultural knowledge, and pragmatic communication**. English and Uzbek share the fundamental human capacity to experience joy and sadness, but their languages organize and communicate these experiences through culturally specific semantic and discourse patterns.

Thus, the linguocultural analysis of emotional-state verbs provides evidence that the study of emotion is not merely a peripheral area of lexical semantics. It constitutes an important means of understanding how language communities conceptualize the human inner world. Further research may extend the present analysis to anger, fear, love, shame, pride, jealousy, and hope, as well as to corpus-based investigation of emotional verbs in literary, conversational, media, and translated discourse.

Author Contributions, Conflicts of Interest, and Funding

Author Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the research concept, data analysis, and manuscript preparation. Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. Funding: This research was conducted without external funding.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

1. Kurvonbekov M.I., Turobidinova M.A. Comparative study of emotive verbs in English and Uzbek languages. NamDU ilmiy axborotnomasi. 2024. 12-son.
2. Апухтин В. Н. Психолингвистические аспекты эмоциональной лексики. – Москва: Наука, 1980.
3. Джамолхонов Х. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Тошкент: Talqin, 2005. – 260 б. Nashr ma'lumotlari universitet kutubxona katalogida ham tasdiqlangan.
4. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. – Москва: Наука, 1987. – 261 с.
5. Кёвечеш З. Метафора и эмоции: язык, культура и концептуализация. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
6. Лакофф Дж., Джонсон М. Метафоры, которыми мы живём. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
7. Мадвалиев А. (масъул муҳаррир). Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 5 жилдлик. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2006–2008. Lug' at besh jildda nashr qilingani va 2006-yildagi nashr ma'lumotlari kataloglarda qayd etilgan.
8. Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология. – Москва: Академия, 2001.
9. Рахматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли фразеологик луғати. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992. – 408 б.
10. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология: семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. – Москва: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – 284 с.

References

1. Kurvonbekov M.I., Turobidinova M.A. Comparative study of emotive verbs in English and Uzbek languages. Scientific Bulletin of NamSU, Issue 12, 2024.
2. Apukhtin, V. N. (1980). Psikholingvisticheskie aspekty emotsionalnoy leksiki [Psycholinguistic aspects of emotional vocabulary]. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Jamolxonov, H. (2005). Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili [Modern Uzbek literary language]. Tashkent: Talqin. 260 p.
4. Karaulov, Yu. N. (1987). Russkiy yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost [The Russian language and linguistic personality]. Moscow: Nauka. 261 p.
5. Kövecses, Z. (2000). Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
7. Maslova, V. A. (2001). Lingvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology]. Moscow: Akademiya.
8. Madvaliyev, A. (Ed.). (2006–2008). O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language]. 5 vols. Tashkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
9. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1992). O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati [Explanatory phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language]. Tashkent: O'qituvchi. 408 p.
10. Teliya, V. N. (1996). Russkaya frazeologiya: Semanticheskii, pragmaticheskii i lingvokulturologicheskii aspekty [Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects]. Moscow: Shkola "Yazyki russkoy kultury".