

PRAGMATIC MODELS OF INTENSIFICATION IN ENGLISH RUSSIAN AND UZBEK FICTION

Abdullaeva Sevara Makhsudali qizi

Independent Researcher, Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

Research on intensification has developed unevenly in English, Russian, and Uzbek linguistics. English scholarship has usually described intensifiers as degree modifiers and traced their rapid renewal in usage. Russian studies have more often treated intensity as a functional semantic category connected with expressiveness, evaluation, and discourse type. Uzbek scholarship has approached the problem through pragmatology, text interpretation, and communicative intention. This article reviews these lines of work and considers what they offer for the study of fiction. The comparison shows that literary intensification cannot be reduced to adverbial amplification alone. It emerges through lexical choice, repetition, phraseology, contextual implication, and the relation between narrator, character, and reader.

Keywords: intensification, pragmatics, fiction, functional semantics, comparative linguistics

Introduction

The category of intensification looks deceptively simple. At first sight it seems to concern only words such as *very*, *so*, or *absolutely*. Yet literary discourse resists that narrow view. In fiction, meaning is strengthened not only by adverbs but also by repetition, syntactic build up, evaluative vocabulary, and context bound implication. For that reason, the problem belongs simultaneously to semantics, pragmatics, and stylistics.

The English tradition has provided a stable descriptive base for this discussion. Bolinger (1972) treated degree words as a broad system rather than an accidental list, and Partington (1993) later showed that intensifiers are historically mobile, prone to semantic bleaching, and strongly shaped by discourse habits. This line of research is especially valuable because it demonstrates that intensification is both a lexical choice and a dynamic communicative practice.

Literature Review

Russian scholarship has usually moved in a different direction. Within the functional semantic approach, the category is examined not as an isolated lexical class but as a field whose members belong to different language levels. Bondarko (2011) offered the conceptual apparatus for such analysis, while later studies of Russian discourse confirmed that the same intensifier behaves differently across communicative domains. The practical consequence is important: intensity in a novel cannot be read in the same way as intensity in journalism or academic prose.

Uzbek linguistics adds another necessary dimension. Nurmonov and Hakimov (2001) described the theoretical formation of linguistic pragmatics in Uzbek scholarship, and Safarov



(2008) as well as Hakimov (2013) placed speaker intention, contextual dependence, and communicative effect at the center of analysis. This perspective is particularly productive for fiction, where the explicit meaning of an utterance often carries a second, pragmatically stronger layer.

Recent Uzbek and Uzbekistan based studies have made the discussion more concrete. Abdullayeva (2024) interprets intensification as a set of functional semantic operations that include emphasis, strengthening, gradation, and evaluation. Abdullayeva (2025) further links intensified utterance to communicative style, which is a useful step away from purely lexical classification. Niyazova (2023), working on detective fiction, shows that figurative units, incomplete sentences, and socially marked expressions must be read pragmatically if one wants to recover the force of the text.

Discussion

When these traditions are considered together, a rather clear picture appears. English studies are strongest in tracing the lexical renewal of intensifiers and their collocational behavior. Russian studies contribute a more systematic field model. Uzbek pragmalinguistics, in turn, is especially sensitive to hidden intention, contextual pressure, and the reader's inferential work. None of these perspectives is sufficient on its own.

A comparative study of fiction in English, Russian, and Uzbek therefore needs a combined model. Field theory explains why intensification is distributed across several linguistic levels, whereas pragmatics explains why the same form can sound neutral in one scene and emotionally charged in another. For literary analysis, this combined perspective is preferable because novels rarely intensify in only one way. They accumulate force gradually, through voice, rhythm, evaluation, and discourse position.

Conclusion

The surveyed literature suggests that intensification in fiction should be studied as a functional semantic category with a strong pragmatic core. Its markers are heterogeneous, but their task is shared: they reorganize scale, attitude, and reader response. Future comparative work on English, Russian, and Uzbek prose should therefore move beyond inventories of intensifiers and focus on how intensified meaning is built in discourse.

References

1. Abdullayeva, S. (2024). *Intensification in language and speech. Academic Research in Modern Science*, 3(43), 107-109.
2. Abdullayeva, S. (2025). *Intensification of utterance as a manifestation of communicative style. The Lingua Spectrum*, 1(1), 107-111.
3. Bolinger, D. (1972). *Degree words*. Mouton.
4. Bondarko, A. V. (2011). *Functional grammar: A field approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
5. Hakimov, M. (2013). *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasining asoslari [Foundations of Uzbek pragmalinguistics]*. Akademnashr.
6. Niyazova, G. (2023). Pragmatic analysis of language elements in detective fiction. *World Bulletin of Social Sciences*, 18, 98-100.



7. Nurmonov, A., & Hakimov, M. (2001). Lingvistik pragmatikaning nazariy shakllanishi [Theoretical formation of linguistic pragmatics]. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, (4), 54-58.
8. Partington, A. (1993). Corpus evidence of language change: The case of the intensifier. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 177-192). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.64.12par>
9. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalingvistika [Pragmalinguistics]*. O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.