



SYNTACTIC EXPRESSION OF TOLERANCE IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LITERATURE

Isroilova Ugiloy Isroil kizi

PhD Student of Karshi State University

Karshi, Kashkadarya

Tel: +998906701886

Abstract

This article explores the syntactic mechanisms used to express the concept of tolerance in Uzbek and English literary texts. It compares the structural patterns, sentence constructions, and grammatical strategies that convey moral and aesthetic values, focusing on how tolerance is linguistically encoded in both traditions. Through qualitative analysis of selected literary works, the study highlights how culture-specific narratives shape syntactic choices and influence the communicative style of authors. Findings show that while both languages use similar syntactic tools—such as modal constructions, passive voice, and concessive clauses—their frequency, positioning, and pragmatic load vary, reflecting differing cultural attitudes towards tolerance and moral ambiguity.

Keywords: syntax, tolerance, sentence structure, Uzbek literature, English literature, linguistic expression, comparative analysis, literary pragmatics

Introduction

Tolerance, as both a moral ideal and a communicative act, holds a significant place in literary discourse. It reflects societal values, human dignity, and the boundaries of ethical judgment. In literature, the portrayal of tolerance is not only thematic but also structural—manifested through syntactic choices that mediate tone, stance, and ideological distance. This paper investigates how tolerance is expressed syntactically in Uzbek and English literature, identifying grammatical patterns that function as carriers of tolerant discourse.

The need for this study emerges from a broader interest in the linguistic representation of ethical values. While semantic and lexical studies of tolerance



abound, syntax remains a relatively underexplored domain. Syntax, however, is crucial for understanding how language embodies subtle moral judgments. The study focuses on how authors in both literary traditions use sentence structures to communicate tolerance, either by softening critique, expressing empathy, or delaying moral judgment.

The specific tasks of article are as follows:

- To identify the syntactic structures commonly used to express tolerance in literary texts
- To analyze how Uzbek and English authors structurally portray tolerant attitudes
- To explore the cultural or aesthetic motivations that influence syntactic differences in tolerance expression

Literature Review

The intersection between syntax and moral discourse has received growing attention. Halliday (1994) posits that grammar is not neutral; it carries ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. Syntax, as a core component of grammar, thus becomes a key mechanism for expressing attitudes, evaluations, and ideological stances.

Fowler (1986) argues that syntactic structures can reinforce or subvert dominant ideologies in literature. In the context of tolerance, syntactic elements such as modality, subordination, and passivization can soften judgment, imply hesitation, or express empathy. Fairclough (1995), in his framework of critical discourse analysis, identifies how syntactic forms like nominalization or passive voice obscure agency and thus deflect blame—a rhetorical strategy often associated with tolerant discourse.

In Uzbek linguistics, Karimov (2013) and Ismatova (2016) have explored how traditional oral and written narratives embed moral values through grammatical forms, particularly through the use of honorifics, modal verbs, and indirect speech. These strategies reflect a collectivist orientation that prizes harmony and social cohesion.

English literature, on the other hand, particularly in the post-Enlightenment period, often displays tolerance through modal verbs ("might," "could"), concessive structures ("although," "even though"), and non-assertive sentence



patterns. Lakoff (1973) discusses politeness strategies that manifest syntactically to avoid imposition or direct criticism, especially in literary dialogue.

While comparative research has focused heavily on vocabulary, metaphor, and theme (Muminov, 2019; Crystal, 2010), syntactic constructions as tools for moral positioning remain underexplored—particularly in relation to tolerance.

Methodology

This study applies a qualitative, comparative linguistic analysis of sentence structures from selected Uzbek and English literary works. The selected corpus includes the following:

In Uzbek: "O'tgan kunlar" by Abdulla Qodiriy, "Ikki eshik orasi" by O'tkir Hoshimov

In English: "Silas Marner" by George Eliot, "Mrs. Dalloway" by Virginia Woolf
These texts were chosen for their thematic engagement with social values, human relationships, and internal conflict—contexts where tolerance is discursively relevant. Passages were extracted that specifically dealt with themes such as forgiveness, coexistence, empathy, and moral ambiguity.

The analysis focused on identifying recurring syntactic forms, including:

- Modal constructions
- Passive voice and agent deletion
- Conditional and concessive clauses
- Fronting, inversion, and marked word order
- Use of indirect speech and hedging expressions

Patterns were categorized and compared across both languages, with special attention to cultural context, narrative function, and frequency. A qualitative coding approach was used to interpret how these structures contribute to the moral tone of the text.

Results and Discussion

4.1 Modal Constructions

Both Uzbek and English use modal verbs to express moral restraint, empathy, or speculative tolerance. For example, in Qodiriy's "O'tgan kunlar", constructions like "bo'lishi mumkin" (may be) or "imkon bor" (there is a possibility) serve to



suggest rather than assert, reflecting a reluctance to judge. Similarly, Woolf's narrative in "Mrs. Dalloway" frequently includes expressions such as "she might have said something kinder," implying retrospection and restrained critique.

However, English modals tend to emphasize epistemic uncertainty and subjective evaluation, whereas Uzbek modal constructions often reflect social politeness or indirectness.

4.2 Concessive and Conditional Clauses

Uzbek literature uses concessive constructions such as "garchi... bo'lsa ham" (although...) to acknowledge moral complexity. These structures help narrators suspend judgment or express partial agreement. English writers similarly employ clauses like "even though," "while," or "although" to express nuanced tolerance. In *Silas Marner*, George Eliot writes, "Even though he erred, she could not condemn him fully," creating syntactic room for moral ambiguity.

These concessive and conditional structures soften evaluative stances and align reader empathy with the narrator's hesitations.

4.3 Passive Voice and De-agentification

In English literature, passive constructions are widely used to deflect blame or responsibility: "He was misunderstood" replaces "They misunderstood him," shifting focus from actor to action. In Uzbek, similar distancing is achieved through nominalization or agent omission: "qilgan ish noto'g'ri deb hisoblanadi" (the act is considered wrong) avoids assigning personal blame.

This structural feature enhances the tone of tolerance by reducing confrontational syntax.

4.4 Word Order and Emphasis

Uzbek's relatively flexible word order allows authors to shift emphasis within the sentence. Placing the act of tolerance at the beginning or end highlights its importance or subtly suggests its difficulty. English employs inversion or fronting for similar effects: "Never had she felt such mercy," gives moral resonance to an act of understanding.

These techniques serve both aesthetic and ethical purposes, aligning syntax with emotional nuance.

Conclusion



This study reveals that syntactic expressions of tolerance are deeply embedded in the moral grammar of literature. While both Uzbek and English authors use similar grammatical tools—modality, concessives, passive forms—their function is shaped by cultural aesthetics and moral priorities. Uzbek texts tend to emphasize social harmony and indirectness, whereas English literature leans on individual moral introspection and subjective nuance.

Understanding these syntactic patterns enriches our appreciation of how language conveys ethical subtleties across cultures and how literature functions as a vehicle for moral discourse. Further research may explore diachronic changes in these patterns or extend the comparison to other language pairs.

References

1. Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
3. Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford University Press.
4. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
5. Karimov, Z. (2013). *O‘zbek adabiy tilining pragmatik xususiyatlari*. Toshkent: Fan.
6. Lakoff, R. (1973). “The Logic of Politeness; or, Minding Your P’s and Q’s.” *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292–305.
7. Muminov, B. (2019). “Comparative Analysis of Moral Concepts in English and Uzbek Proverbs.” *Philology Research Journal*, 4(2), 56–67.
8. Woolf, V. (1925). *Mrs. Dalloway*. London: Hogarth Press.
9. Qodiriy, A. (1926). *O‘tgan Kunlar*. Toshkent: Adabiyot nashriyoti.
10. Eliot, G. (1861). *Silas Marner*. London: William Blackwood & Sons.
11. Hoshimov, O. (1980). *Ikki eshik orasi*. Toshkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nashriyoti.