EMOTIONAL AND EXPRESSIVE RESOURCES OF FORGIVENESS IN UZBEK DISCOURSE: A PRAGMATIC MODEL

Sherozbek Siddiqjonovich Muminov
Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics,
Fergana State University, Uzbekistan
E-mail: sherozbek.mominov@bk.ru
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7475-1849

Abstract. This paper examines how forgiveness is verbalized and emotionally displayed in Uzbek interpersonal communication. It distinguishes requesting an apology, acknowledging a wrong, granting forgiveness, and maintaining a forgiving disposition. Drawing on speech-act theory, face-work and cultural pragmatics, the study develops a four-layer analytical model combining lexical choices, evaluative constructions, prosodic and bodily cues, and the interlocutor's response. Illustrative Uzbek dialogues show why the expression kechirdim may produce different interpersonal effects depending on responsibility, tone and subsequent conduct. The proposed model is intended for qualitative discourse annotation rather than frequency-based generalization.

Keywords: forgiveness; Uzbek discourse; expressivity; speech acts; emotional stance; reconciliation

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются речевые и эмоционально-экспрессивные средства выражения прощения в узбекском общении. Разграничены просьба о прощении, признание вины, акт прощения и устойчивая установка на примирение. На основе теории речевых актов и прагматики межличностного взаимодействия предложена четырехуровневая модель анализа: лексика, оценочные конструкции, просодические и невербальные признаки, реакция адресата. На сконструированных узбекских диалогах показано, что формула kechirdim приобретает разные значения в зависимости от ответственности говорящего, интонации и последующих действий. Модель пригодна для дальнейшего качественного анализа реальных записей речи.

Ключевые слова: прощение; узбекское общение; экспрессивность; речевые акты; эмоциональная позиция; примирение

Annotatsiya. Maqolada o‘zbek muloqotida kechirimlilikni ifodalovchi emotsional-ekspressiv vositalar pragmatik nuqtayi nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Uzr so‘rash, xatoni tan olish, kechirish akti hamda kechirimli bo‘lishga moyillik o‘zaro farqlanadi. Nutq aktlari va muloqot odobi nazariyalariga tayangan holda leksik tanlov, baholovchi konstruktsiya, prosodik-nolverbal belgi va suhbatdosh javobidan iborat to‘rt qatlamli tahlil modeli taklif etiladi. Mualliflik dialoglari «kechirdim» formulasining ma’nosi mas’uliyat, ohang va keyingi xatti-harakatga bog‘liqligini ko‘rsatadi. Natijalar keyingi korpus tadqiqotlari uchun tahliliy asos bo‘la oladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: kechirimlilik; o‘zbek muloqoti; emotsional ekspressivlik; nutq akti; munosabat; yarashish

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Introduction. Forgiveness is often described as an ethical value, yet the linguistic conditions under which it becomes recognizable are more intricate. In Uzbek discourse, a speaker may say uzr, kechiring, aybga buyurmang or afv eting when seeking pardon, whereas a recipient may respond with mayli, kechirdim or xafa emasman. These expressions do not denote the same social action. An apology identifies an offense and invites repair; an act of forgiving changes the injured party's expressed stance; a forgiving disposition characterizes a person across situations. Confusing the three levels obscures how interpersonal relations are negotiated in actual talk. The lexicographic links between uzr, afv and kechirim substantiate their partial semantic overlap but not pragmatic interchangeability [7]. The study asks which verbal and expressive resources allow speakers to communicate forgiveness in a way that an interlocutor can interpret as credible. The point of departure is the speech-act framework developed for apology strategies [1], supplemented by Goffman's account of face-work [3]. A successful repair sequence does more than convey information: it protects self-respect, acknowledges an injury and makes continued interaction possible. The novelty of the present argument is a layered model that treats expressive form and recipient uptake as interdependent, rather than equating the occurrence of a polite formula with completed reconciliation.

Classical descriptions of apology distinguish explicit illocutionary markers, explanations, responsibility-taking, offers of repair and promises of non-repetition [1]. Holmes's work demonstrates that the relative weight of an offense and the social relation between participants affect strategy selection [2]. These insights are relevant but must not be transferred mechanically from English-language corpora to Uzbek. Honorific pronouns, kinship terms, forms of respectful address and indirect mitigation may change the emotional and relational force of comparable utterances. Cultural scripts require situated interpretation rather than a ranking of cultures as more or less polite [8]. This is a qualitative, theory-guided analysis. Its material comprises documented dictionary meanings and short, author-constructed Uzbek dialogue examples designed to contrast possible interpretations. No field recordings, regional samples or participant interviews are claimed. The unit of analysis is a sequence consisting of an initiating offense or grievance, a remedial turn, a forgiveness-related response and, where relevant, a follow-up act. For each sequence, four layers are coded: L1 lexical markers, L2 emotional-evaluative construction, L3 prosodic and embodied performance, and L4 uptake and subsequent behavior. The model thereby separates observable language from hypothesized internal sincerity.

Four expressive layers of forgiveness. At the lexical level, uzr and kechirasiz tend to be recognizably remedial, while aybga buyurmang can soften the speaker's anticipated breach of etiquette. For the recipient, kechirdim performs a relatively explicit act, but xafa emasman may serve to minimize conflict without asserting that emotional hurt has disappeared. Keling, bu gapni yopaylik proposes closure of discussion; it does not logically entail forgiveness. Morphological choices also matter: the first-person declaration kechirdim differs from the imperative kechir and from the modal construction kechirsangiz. The latter leaves the recipient authority to decide and therefore frames a different relational distribution of control [6].

The second layer concerns expressive evaluation. In Men sizni ranjitganimni bilaman, uzr, the clause naming the effect on the addressee supports accountability. By contrast, Xafa bo'lgan bo'lsangiz, uzr makes the injury conditional; it can be an appropriate way to handle uncertainty, but in an established offense it can also sound distancing. An added promise such as boshqa takrorlanmaydi changes the utterance from a conventional formula into a future-oriented commitment. Intensifiers—chin dildan, juda, rostdan may increase the declared degree of regret, yet their force is not automatically reliable. Repeated intensification without responsibility may be perceived as performance rather than repair [5].

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

The third layer involves expressive realization, including pace, pausing, voice quality, eye contact and bodily orientation. These signals can support or contradict lexical content, but their meanings are not universal: direct gaze may express attention in one setting and inappropriate insistence in another. The fourth layer is interactional uptake. Consider a constructed sequence: A: «Kechirasiz, men va'damda turmadim. Bugun ishni tugataman». B: «Mayli, bu safar tushundim». A: «Rahmat, vaqtida bajaraman». The final turn indicates a practical obligation beyond the apology. Compare A: «Uzr-da, shunaqa bo'ldi» and B: «Masala hali hal bo'lmadi». Both contain a repair formula, yet only the first sequence visibly moves toward a negotiated resolution.

An expressive marker should therefore be annotated with its pragmatic function, not only its emotional intensity. Sadness, embarrassment, irritation and relief may all accompany a forgiveness sequence. A tearful apology is not necessarily more accountable than a calm one; a brief response is not necessarily less forgiving than an elaborate speech. The researcher must ask what the signal accomplishes relative to the prior offense and how the other party responds. This emphasis prevents an over-psychologized reading of isolated words and aligns evaluation with interactional evidence [3].

To refine the model, a forgiveness episode should be divided into at least three temporal moments: the immediate reaction, the negotiated response and the subsequent relationship. Immediately after a minor breach, a recipient may say «Mayli, hechqisi yo'q» to prevent unnecessary embarrassment. Following a serious breach, the same expression might be a provisional way to end an uncomfortable encounter. The difference becomes visible only when later turns reveal whether the participants agree on the meaning of that response. Consequently, analysis should annotate not just the isolated forgiving word but the opportunity to revisit the matter, the addressee's request for clarification and the presence or absence of new obligations. The model also accounts for disagreement over what counts as sufficient expressive display. One speaker may expect an extended apology including «Sizni juda ranjitdim»; another may regard an economical formulation followed by prompt repair as more respectful. Neither preference can be generalized to all Uzbek speakers. The analyst instead identifies the local norm invoked by participants and compares the actual remedial sequence with that expectation. When the injured party says «Faqat uzr aytishingiz emas, xatoni to'g'rilashingiz muhim», the utterance explicitly ranks behavioral repair over verbal intensity. The point is analytically stronger than assuming that a culturally familiar formula has the same emotional adequacy for every person [2]. A further issue is the difference between an invitation to reconcile and an enforced demand. «Meni kechirishingiz kerak» claims that the other party must grant forgiveness, whereas «Kechira olsangiz, xursand bo'lardim» leaves room for an independent response. The two constructions differ in modality and interpersonal power, even if their propositional topic is identical. This distinction matters when a speaker who holds institutional authority is the one who made the mistake. Protecting the addressee's right to postpone acceptance can be a condition of credible repair rather than evidence of communicative coldness. In this respect, forgiveness discourse connects emotional expression with conversational rights and obligations [4] [8].

Finally, expressive ambiguity should be recorded instead of eliminated by an intuitive verdict. A soft voice accompanied by the words «Uzringizni qabul qildim» may signal relief, fatigue, restraint or reluctance. Without accompanying context, it cannot tell the researcher which interpretation is correct. The proposed model therefore permits multiple provisional labels, each tied to observable features, until later interaction or participant explanation provides stronger evidence. Such disciplined uncertainty makes qualitative analysis more reliable than a taxonomy in which every utterance is forced into a fixed emotional category.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Two distinctions are especially consequential. First, forgiveness differs from excusing. When a person says Hechqisi yo‘q, aybingiz yo‘q, the utterance can cancel blame; kechirdim, in contrast, normally presupposes that something blameworthy was recognized. Second, forgiveness differs from immediate restoration of trust. Men kechirdim, lekin bu masalada yana maslahatlashamiz communicates forgiveness while maintaining a reasonable boundary. It would be an error to classify all reservations as emotional insincerity. Similarly, a recipient’s silence after an apology cannot be coded as rejection without the sequence’s timing, relationship and communicative setting. The proposed framework can inform a future Uzbek-language corpus with ethically obtained audio recordings and participant commentary. A coding sheet should record the offense type, perceived gravity, power relation, kinship or institutional roles, lexical strategy, expressive cues, recipient response and evidence of later action. Independent coders could classify functions and compare disagreements, while speaker interviews could test whether analysts’ interpretations correspond to participants’ own understandings. Until such a corpus exists, the present examples support a typology of possibilities, not claims about how often Uzbek speakers employ any particular form [4].

Conclusion. Forgiveness in Uzbek communication is best understood as a sequential and multilayered pragmatic phenomenon. Lexical formulas initiate or acknowledge repair, expressive constructions position speakers emotionally, embodied signs contextualize the utterance, and recipient uptake reveals whether reconciliation is jointly ratified. The four-layer model provides an explicit analytical vocabulary for keeping these levels apart. It also cautions against using one word, one intonation or one polite gesture as a sufficient indicator of an inner moral state. Further empirical work should test the model in naturally occurring family, educational and institutional conversations.

REFERENCES

1. Yang K. How to rebuild trust through apology: Evidence from public apology letters // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2024. – Vol. 224. – P. 36–45.
2. Yu D., Su H., Bondi M. Developing local grammars of speech acts in Italian: The case of apology // Lingua. – 2024. – Vol. 299. – Article 103672.
3. Yu D., Li L., Su H., Fuoli M. Assessing the potential of LLM-assisted annotation for corpus-based pragmatics and discourse analysis: The case of apology // International Journal of Corpus Linguistics. – 2024. – Vol. 29, No. 4. – P. 534–561.
4. Imai T., Sakura M. Roles of expressed gratitude and apologies in predicting reciprocal responsiveness // The Journal of General Psychology. – 2024. – Vol. 151, No. 4. – P. 554–567.
5. Yusupova G., Abdushukurova D. The speech act of apologizing in Korean and Uzbek languages as an important component of speech etiquette // Oriental Journal of Education. – 2025. – Vol. 5, No. 3. – P. 84–91.
6. Fareh S., Abu Guba M. N., Hamadi I., Awad A., Fareh A. Assessing the pragmatic competence of Arab learners of English: The case of apology // Cogent Arts & Humanities. – 2023. – Vol. 10, No. 1. – Article 2230540.
7. Martín Pérez L., Mavrou I. The influence of guilt and shame on L1 and L2 apology speech acts in academic contexts // Intercultural Pragmatics. – 2026. – Vol. 23, No. 1. – P. 65–92.
8. Song Y., Xu J. Comparing implicit and explicit apologies in spoken English: A local grammar approach // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2026. – Vol. 256. – P. 1–16.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.