

***LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN
ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERATURE***

Kurbanmuratova Gulnaz Djumamuratovna

Asia International University Master Student

Email: *gulnazkurbanmuratova22@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This article examines politeness strategies in English and Uzbek literary discourse from a linguocultural perspective. The analysis demonstrates that English literary tradition prioritizes the protection of individual autonomy through indirect speech and negative politeness strategies, while Uzbek literary tradition reflects a collectivist orientation in which hierarchical respect and communal solidarity predominate. Drawing on the works of Jane Austen, Harold Pinter, Alisher Navoi, and Abdulla Qodiriy, the study reveals that despite their cultural differences, both traditions employ indirectness as a primary politeness vehicle and use politeness conventions as instruments of social critique.

Keywords: politeness strategies, linguocultural analysis, English literature, Uzbek literature, individualism, collectivism, indirect speech, literary discourse

In every culture, the relationship between language and society finds its clearest expression in the phenomenon of politeness. Politeness is not merely a matter of speaking courteously — it is a sophisticated social mechanism through which individuals regulate interpersonal relationships, establish social distance, and prevent conflict. Literary texts represent an exceptionally valuable source for studying this mechanism, since writers construct their characters' speech on the basis of real communicative norms operating within their respective societies.

Examining the English literary tradition, one observes that politeness is built primarily around the principle of “protecting individual autonomy”. Characters in

English literary texts rarely express requests directly — instead, they soften their intentions through modal verbs, conditional constructions, and indirect phrasing. This tendency is equally visible in Austen's heroines and Pinter's characters, yet it serves different purposes in each case: in Austen's work, indirect speech preserves social harmony, while in Pinter's drama it becomes a tool for concealing psychological conflict beneath a surface of impeccable courtesy.

The Uzbek literary tradition, by contrast, rests on a fundamentally different foundation. Here the central principle is “collective harmony and hierarchical respect”. In Navoi's works, forms of address are not merely grammatical categories — they function as expressions of social and spiritual order. In Qodiriy's novels, the elaborate rituals of hospitality and extended greeting formulas appear at first glance to be simple depictions of everyday life; in reality, the author elevates them to the level of literary devices through which he conveys a core value of the Uzbek worldview — the individual's consciousness of their place within the community.

Comparing the two traditions, the most fundamental distinction becomes clear: in English literature, politeness serves to protect the “individual”, while in Uzbek literature it serves to preserve the “collective” as a unified whole. This difference manifests not only at the lexical or grammatical level but in the entire logical structure of communication. When an English literary character delivers a refusal, they typically appeal to personal freedom; when an Uzbek literary character faces the same situation, they tend to refer to external obligation or established tradition.

At the same time, meaningful convergences exist between the two traditions. Both employ “indirectness” as a primary vehicle of politeness, even though the cultural motivations behind this choice differ considerably. In both traditions, authors are capable of turning politeness conventions into instruments of irony: just as Austen uses refined dialogue to critique English society, Qodiriy employs the ceremonial politeness

of traditional life to expose the contradictions embedded within his own era. In conclusion, studying politeness strategies through literary texts deepens our understanding of intercultural communication. The comparison of English and Uzbek literary traditions demonstrates that linguistic phenomena cannot be fully understood in isolation from cultural values — behind every communicative act lies the worldview of a particular society.

CONCLUSION

In the English literary tradition, politeness is constructed primarily around the principle of protecting individual autonomy. Realized through modal verbs, conditional constructions, and indirect forms of address, this strategy serves in Austen's heroines as a means of preserving social harmony, while in Pinter's dramaturgy it becomes a literary device through which psychological conflict is concealed beneath a surface of impeccable courtesy.

The Uzbek literary tradition, by contrast, is grounded in the principle of collective harmony and hierarchical respect. In Navoi's works, forms of address function as expressions of social and spiritual order, while in Qodiriy's novels the elaborate rituals of hospitality and greeting formulas are elevated to the level of artistic devices through which the author conveys the core values of the Uzbek worldview. A comparison of the two traditions reveals that the most fundamental distinction lies not merely at the lexical or grammatical level, but in the entire logical structure of communication: when an English literary character delivers a refusal, they appeal to personal freedom, whereas an Uzbek literary character tends to invoke external obligation or established tradition.

At the same time, meaningful convergences exist between the two traditions. Indirectness functions as the primary vehicle of politeness in both, and authors in each tradition demonstrate the capacity to transform politeness conventions into instruments of social critique.

The study confirms that examining the linguocultural phenomenon of politeness through literary texts deepens our understanding of intercultural communication, and reveals that behind every communicative act lies the worldview of a particular society.

REFERENCES

1. Brown P., Levinson S. C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. — 345 p. — URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/politeness/>
2. Navoi A. Khamsa. — Tashkent: Gafur Ghulam Publishing House, 1960. — URL: https://ziyouz.com/books/alisher_navoiy/
3. Qodiriy A. Days Gone By (O'tgan kunlar). — Tashkent: Uzbekistan Publishing House, 1925. — URL: https://ziyouz.com/books/abdulla_qodiriy/
4. Leech G. N. Principles of Pragmatics. — London: Longman, 1983. — 250 p. — URL: <https://archive.org/details/principlesofprag0000leec>
5. Goffman E. Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior. — New York: Anchor Books, 1967. — 270 p. — URL: <https://archive.org/details/interactionritua00goff>
6. Yusupova Z. D. Speech Etiquette and Communicative Culture in the Uzbek Language. — Tashkent: Fan Publishing House, 2015. — 180 p. — URL: <https://ziyouz.com/kutubxona/>