

## UNITY: A PRAGMATIC AND GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS OF MORAL CONTRAST IN NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

*Nazarova Lobar Shuxratovna*

*O'qituvchi, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti*

[lobar.nazarova@gmail.com](mailto:lobar.nazarova@gmail.com)

+998977579594

### **Abstract**

This paper presents a sentence-by-sentence linguistic analysis of the short narrative “Unity” from the book by Utkir Hoshimov “Daftar hoshiyasidagi bitiklar” translated by F. Bekmurodova. Drawing on key theories in pragmatics and syntax, it explores how language use—through tense, clause structure, deixis, implicature, and speech acts—constructs moral and ideological meaning. The study contrasts two scenes: one depicting human silence during the Stalinist repressions of 1937, and another portraying a group of monkeys defending one of their own. The analysis shows how grammatical precision and pragmatic nuance converge to convey themes of complicity, courage, and collective action. Ultimately, the narrative offers a powerful commentary on the human condition by suggesting that animals, not people, embody true unity.

### **Keywords**

Pragmatics, grammatical analysis, speech act theory, deixis, implicature, narrative discourse, political repression, animal solidarity

### **Introduction**

The relationship between language and ideology is one of the most compelling concerns in discourse analysis. Narrative texts, in particular, provide a unique window into how grammatical structures and pragmatic cues encode emotion, social behavior, and moral judgment. The short narrative “Unity” presents an especially fertile ground for such an analysis. By contrasting a scene of human inaction during a historical moment of terror with one of animal cooperation in nature, the text becomes more than

a story; it acts as a moral fable about societal responsibility and courage. This study aims to uncover how the narrative achieves this effect linguistically by conducting a detailed, sentence-by-sentence analysis of its grammatical constructions and pragmatic functions.

### **Materials**

The primary material analyzed is a narrative prose text titled “Unity,” from the book by Utkir Hoshimov “Daftar hoshiyasidagi bitiklar” translated by F. Bekmurodova and in English titled “Notes for a rainy day”, consisting of twenty sentences divided into two thematically distinct but structurally parallel parts. The first part represents human society under Stalinist repression, while the second part depicts a group of monkeys uniting to resist a tiger’s attack. Both parts are narrated in a simple, descriptive style that allows for close textual analysis.

### **Methods**

This study employs a qualitative, sentence-level approach that integrates grammatical and pragmatic analysis. Each sentence is analyzed for syntactic features such as tense, clause complexity, verb choice, and coordination, as well as for pragmatic features including speech acts (Austin; Searle), implicature (Grice), deixis (Levinson), and politeness or facework strategies (Brown and Levinson).

The pragmatic analysis classifies each sentence according to its speech act function (assertive, expressive, directive, etc.) and explores the implicit meanings and ideological stances conveyed through linguistic cues. Irony, stance markers, and evaluative language are examined in relation to broader social and moral contexts. These frameworks collectively allow for a comprehensive understanding of how linguistic form shapes communicative function and ideological message.

### **Results and Discussion**

The narrative opens with the sentence “There was a movie on TV.” Grammatically, this is a simple past-tense declarative sentence featuring an existential construction. Pragmatically, it introduces a seemingly neutral, observational tone. However, this calm tone is immediately disrupted by the next sentence: “It was about

the repressions of 1937.” This reference to Stalinist terror, though stated matter-of-factly, presupposes a shared historical context and signals the ideological weight of the narrative.

The text then shifts to present-tense narration: “People in black cloaks take a poor man by the armpits and drag him towards a black car...” The use of present tense lends immediacy, while visual and somatic imagery heighten emotional intensity. This is followed by “At the door, his wife is crying silently...” The adverb “silently” pragmatically encodes emotional repression and social fear, consistent with a regime where speech may invite punishment.

The line “A five or six-year-old boy is running after his father, saying, ‘Daddy, Daddy.’” features direct speech as a dramatic and emotive device. It performs an expressive speech act that embodies helplessness and emotional trauma. The shift of focus to the reactions of bystanders—“There is fear in the eyes of one, regret in another, and another looks on indifferently”—utilizes coordination to build contrast. Each noun phrase contains a different emotional response, encapsulating a spectrum of social reactions: fear, remorse, and apathy.

One of the most striking lines, “Someone turns his lips sneeringly and smiles selfishly,” introduces evaluative adverbs that carry implicit judgment. This is followed by a parenthetical metacommentary: (Someone ‘too patriotic’ who complains to authorities about ‘enemies of the people’). The use of quotation marks around “too patriotic” and “enemies of the people” is ironic, signaling the speaker's distance from the language of authoritarian propaganda (Grice). The parenthesis functions metapragmatically, providing ideological labeling and judgment without overt condemnation.

The narrative then transitions: “A long time later, I saw another movie on TV. Rather, not a movie but an ‘Animal World’ show.” The correction highlights a key narrative strategy—the use of allegory. In this second story, the reader encounters a new scene: a tiger attacks a baby monkey, but instead of silence, the monkey's scream

triggers collective action. The sentence “Dozens of monkeys rushed down... and threw themselves at the tiger” uses dynamic verbs to show decisiveness and courage.

The structural repetition between scenes—first involving humans, then monkeys—underscores the thematic reversal. Where humans remained passive, animals resist. Sentences such as “One bites, one rolls” use parataxis to show multiplicity and unity in action. The resolution—“A huge monkey grabbed a thick stick and hit the tiger on the head so hard that the tiger gave up the prey and ran away”—features causal subordination (“so... that”) to mark a clear consequence of collective effort: survival.

The final sentence, “I envied the monkeys...”, is terse but laden with moral and pragmatic force. Its elliptical form suggests emotional restraint and unspoken critique. It functions as an expressive act of shame and admiration, encapsulating the text’s moral stance.

In sum, the results of this analysis show that the power of the narrative lies in its linguistic economy: short, syntactically simple sentences loaded with pragmatic meaning. The use of tense, modality, and speech act types conveys an ideological contrast that resonates with the reader on both emotional and intellectual levels.

### Conclusion

The narrative “Unity” utilizes grammatical clarity and pragmatic depth to deliver a striking ethical message. Through sentence-level analysis, this study has shown how language functions as both structure and social action. The text moves from passive, silent suffering in the human world to active, collective resistance in the animal world. This contrast is encoded through tense shifts, direct speech, evaluative modifiers, and implicatures that evoke irony and criticism.

By concluding with the quietly powerful line “I envied the monkeys...”, the narrator suggests a moral failure on the part of human society—particularly its failure to unite against oppression. The animals, depicted as less cognitively developed beings, act with courage and solidarity that human bystanders lack. In doing so, the text reverses traditional assumptions about civilization and savagery.



The analysis affirms that even short narratives can serve as rich sites for linguistic inquiry. The strategic deployment of grammatical and pragmatic features not only enhances narrative texture but also deepens ideological impact. “Unity” thus stands as a testament to how language can articulate not just stories, but values, critiques, and hopes for a more ethically conscious society.

### **Bibliography**

Austin, J. L. “How to Do Things with Words”. Edited by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa, Harvard UP, 1962.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. “Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage”. Cambridge UP, 1987.

Grice, H. P. “Logic and Conversation. Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts”, vol. 3, edited by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58.

Levinson, Stephen C. “Pragmatics”. Cambridge UP, 1983.

Searle, John R. “Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge UP, 1979.

Utkir, Hoshimov “Notes for a rainy day” translated by F. Bekmurodova, Muharrir nashriyoti, 2023, P. 55.