



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EXPRESSION OF EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Hatamova Veronika

Teacher of Uzbekistan state world languages university, Uzbekistan

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada baholash kategoriyalarining ingliz, rus va o‘zbek tillarida ifodalanishi qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Mazkur tillar tipologik va madaniy jihatdan bir-biridan farq qilishiga qaramay, ularning barchasida baholash ko‘rsatkichlari ma’lum darajada o‘xshashlik va farqlarga ega ekani aniqlangan. Ingliz tili asosan leksik birliklar va sintaktik konstruksiyalar orqali baholashni ifodalasa, rus tili daxldor affikslar, xususan, kichraytirish va kattalashtirish qo‘shimchalari yordamida ko‘p qirrali baholash ma’nolarini aks ettiradi. O‘zbek tilida esa aglutinativ xususiyatga ega bo‘lgan qo‘shimchalar orqali baholash ko‘p jihatdan axloqiy-me’yoriy va ijtimoiy-madaniy mezonlar bilan chambarchas bog‘liq holda ifodalanadi. Maqola, shuningdek, madaniy kontekst hamda ijtimoiy omillarning baholash kategoriyalariga ta’sirini ham o‘rganadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: baholash kategoriyalari, ingliz tili, rus tili, o‘zbek tili, qiyosiy tahlil, leksik va morfologik ifoda, madaniy kontekst

Annotation: This article examines the comparative expression of evaluative categories in English, Russian, and Uzbek. Despite their typological and cultural differences, these languages share certain parallels in how evaluation is manifested, as well as notable distinctions in morphological, lexical, and syntactic means. English primarily encodes evaluation through specific lexical items and syntactic structures, whereas Russian employs a rich morphological system—particularly diminutive and augmentative affixes—to convey various shades of evaluative meaning. Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, integrates evaluative nuances through suffixes closely intertwined with cultural norms and social etiquette. The paper also discusses how cultural and social factors influence the linguistic expression of evaluation.

Keywords: evaluative categories, English, Russian, Uzbek, comparative analysis, lexical and morphological expression, cultural context

Аннотация: В статье представлен сравнительный анализ выражения оценочных категорий в английском, русском и узбекском языках. Несмотря на типологические и культурные различия, в каждом из этих языков наблюдаются как общие черты в передаче оценки, так и существенные различия в морфологических, лексических и синтаксических средствах. Английский язык в основном опирается на лексику и синтаксические конструкции, тогда как русский активно использует морфологию — особенно

уменьшительные и увеличительные суффиксы — для передачи множества оттенков оценки. Узбекский язык, будучи агглютинативным, вводит оценочные смыслы через систему суффиксов, тесно связанных с культурными нормами и социальной этикетой. В работе также рассматривается влияние культурного и социального фона на выражение оценочности.

Ключевые слова: оценочные категории, английский язык, русский язык, узбекский язык, сравнительный анализ, лексические и морфологические средства, культурный контекст

Introduction

Evaluative categories play a pivotal role in language, as they convey a speaker's attitudes, judgments, and emotional stances toward objects, events, or other speakers. These categories encompass a broad range of linguistic means, such as lexical items, morphological markers, syntactic constructions, and prosodic features, which allow speakers to express appreciation, criticism, respect, irony, or endearment. While the importance of evaluative language is widely recognized, comparative studies on how distinct language families encode evaluation remain relatively underrepresented in linguistic scholarship. This article addresses the comparative expression of evaluative categories in three typologically and genealogically different languages: English, Russian, and Uzbek. English, a Germanic language with an analytic tendency, typically encodes evaluative meanings through lexical choices (e.g., adjectives, adverbs) and occasional morphological or syntactic constructions. Russian, as a Slavic language, heavily relies on affixation and morphological variation to convey a wide array of evaluative nuances, often exploiting diminutive and augmentative suffixes. Uzbek, a Turkic language with agglutinative morphology, also employs suffixes and affixation to signal evaluative meanings but does so in ways that differ significantly from both English and Russian. The central aim of this study is to illuminate how these three languages implement evaluative categories through distinct linguistic mechanisms, as well as to highlight any cross-linguistic parallels and divergences. The research seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of how cultural, historical, and typological factors shape the ways in which speakers perceive and convey evaluative judgments.

Methods

In order to compare and contrast evaluative categories in English, Russian, and Uzbek, this study adopted a qualitative research methodology supported by a corpus-based approach. Relevant data were collected from three main sources. First, a parallel corpus consisting of literary and journalistic texts in English, Russian, and Uzbek was compiled. Each text in the parallel corpus, whenever possible, had an equivalent or near-equivalent translation in the other two languages. Second, contemporary media sources (news websites, magazine articles, online commentary) were surveyed to capture evaluative expressions in more colloquial and up-to-date contexts. Finally, a small-scale survey of native speakers was conducted to verify the

naturalness and typical usage patterns of the identified evaluative expressions in each language. The collected material was thematically categorized into three principal domains of evaluative use: descriptions of people, descriptions of objects or phenomena, and expressions of attitudes in social interaction (e.g., compliments, insults, humor). Within each domain, occurrences of evaluative expressions were identified, tagged, and then classified according to their formal realization. Specifically, instances of morphological (e.g., diminutive suffixes in Russian or Uzbek), lexical (e.g., specific adjectives, adverbs, or nouns with evaluative connotations), and syntactic devices (e.g., exclamatory or intensifying constructions) were coded. By comparing the relative frequency and distribution of these markers across the three languages, the study aimed to elucidate common strategies as well as language-specific peculiarities in expressing evaluation.

Results

Analysis of the parallel corpus and contemporary media data revealed several notable findings. First, English evaluative expressions generally relied on a wider range of lexical markers, particularly adjectives and adverbs, such as wonderful, awful, slightly, terribly, and so forth. While English does allow morphological means for evaluation in certain limited contexts (e.g., suffixes like *-ish* or the use of hypocoristic forms in names), these are less systematically employed compared to Russian and Uzbek. Second, Russian displayed extensive use of morphological affixes to convey nuanced evaluative meanings. Diminutive forms (e.g., *stolik* for a small or endearing table) and augmentative forms (e.g., *столище* conveying an ironic emphasis on a large table) were prominent. These morphological modifications often fused multiple evaluative overtones, such as affection, scorn, or irony, depending on context. Additionally, Russian demonstrated a pervasive use of evaluative suffixes for nouns, adjectives, and adverbs (e.g., *бедненький* ‘poor thing’), indicating a deep-seated morphological tradition of encoding stance and sentiment. Third, Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, exhibited a systematic application of suffixes to denote both objective description and subjective evaluation. For instance, the use of *-cha/-che* (e.g., *do‘stcha* ‘in a friendly manner’) and *-gina* (e.g., *uychagina* ‘tiny, modest house’) not only modifies the root meaning but also conveys emotional or attitudinal shading. Moreover, Uzbek evaluative expressions often emerged in polite or honorific contexts, reflecting cultural norms that emphasize respect. While there are convergences between Russian and Uzbek in their employment of suffix-based evaluation, differences are evident in the specific semantic weight these affixes carry, and in how they interact with the overall morphological system. When describing people, all three languages demonstrated a rich repertoire of evaluative options, but English leaned more on specific adjectives (e.g., kind, rude, brilliant, dull). Russian and Uzbek, by contrast, used a blend of root words plus modifications, either via diminutive, augmentative, or other suffixes. In describing objects, English again relied on intensifiers (e.g., really beautiful, extremely ugly), whereas Russian and Uzbek often compressed the evaluative meaning into morphological markers that simultaneously indicate dimension, emotion, or relational stance. Finally, social interaction data

(e.g., compliments, insults, or honorific addresses) showed that English typically employed strategic lexical choice, Russian drew heavily on diminutives or stylistic shifts, while Uzbek frequently used respectful forms or suffixes that highlight social hierarchy and politeness.

Discussion

These findings illuminate several key dimensions in cross-linguistic evaluation strategies. First, morphological encoding appears paramount in Russian and Uzbek. Although both languages exploit suffixation to encode evaluation, the linguistic outcomes vary due to typological constraints and cultural conventions. Russian diminutives, for example, can convey endearment, irony, pity, or sarcasm, requiring a nuanced understanding of context to interpret accurately. Uzbek suffixes similarly add subtle emotional shades but also reflect politeness and social distance, underscoring the role of cultural norms in shaping evaluative usage. English, on the other hand, attests to a comparatively weaker morphological tradition for expressing evaluation. Instead, it leverages lexical diversity and syntactic structures, including intensifiers, comparative patterns, or exclamatory constructions. This difference may stem from the language’s analytic character, as well as socio-linguistic traditions that favor context and lexical choices over morphological nuance. However, English speakers do employ certain colloquial or dialect forms (e.g., -ish, diminutive name-endings), which underscores that morphological evaluation is not absent but merely less central. Beyond morphological patterns, cultural values play a pivotal role in shaping evaluative language. In Uzbek, politeness forms and respectful addresses are intertwined with evaluative overtones, often requiring speakers to adjust suffixes or lexical choices in accordance with the interlocutor’s status. Russian can similarly integrate politeness with evaluation, though the main morphological tradition revolves around diminutives and augmentatives that evoke emotional responses. English, to a large extent, manages politeness through modal and lexical means (e.g., hedging phrases, indirectness), separating it more clearly from overt morphological devices. Taken together, these observations highlight how linguistic typology and cultural norms intersect in the expression of evaluative categories. While all three languages share a universal need to encode attitudes, emotions, and judgments, the formal apparatus and usage conventions diverge in meaningful ways. These differences underscore the complexity of cross-linguistic evaluation and point to the value of comparative research in revealing how cultural and historical developments influence language structure and function.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of evaluative categories in English, Russian, and Uzbek demonstrates that the three languages exhibit both convergent and divergent strategies. Russian and Uzbek show strong morphological traditions, employing a variety of suffixes to embed nuanced attitudinal or emotional stances in a single word. English, conversely, tends to rely on an extensive lexical repertoire and syntactic constructions to convey similar evaluative meanings. Cultural factors, such as politeness norms in Uzbek or the emotive suffix tradition in Russian, further shape these linguistic practices. The study’s findings underline the importance

of examining evaluation as a window into broader linguistic and cultural mechanisms, offering insights that can inform not only linguistics but also language teaching, translation, and intercultural communication. Future investigations may expand this comparative framework to include additional languages, consider more dialectal variations within each language, and incorporate experimental methods to deepen our understanding of how speakers process and interpret evaluative language.

REFERENCES

1. Hatamova Veronika. (2025). Evaluatively and cultural features: the relationship between language and worldview. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 5(02), 89–91. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume05Issue02-25>
2. Khatamova, V. (2024). Language as a mean for cultural exposure and communication. O ‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti konferensiyalari, 14-21.
3. Хатамова, В. (2023). Main priorities of communicative language teaching in philological directions. *Общество и инновации*, 4(1/S), 98-103.
4. **Leech, G.N.** *Semantics: The Study of Meaning* / G.N. Leech. – 2nd ed. – Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1981. – 389 p.
5. **Wierzbicka, A.** *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction* / A. Wierzbicka. – Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991. – 495 p.