ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

FORGIVENESS AS AN INTERGENERATIONAL VALUE IN UZBEK LINGUOCULTURE: PROVERBS, NARRATIVES AND EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE

Sherozbek Siddiqjonovich Muminov
Associate Professor, Department of Linguistics,
Fergana State University
E-mail: sherozbek.mominov@bk.ru
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7475-1849
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24085943

Abstract. This article explores the intergenerational circulation of forgiveness through Uzbek proverbial expressions, moral narratives and educational communication. It distinguishes the transmission of a value statement from students' ability to interpret and critically apply that value. The analysis draws on recorded proverb forms such as Yaxshida gina bo'lmas and Gina — adovatning qo'shnisi, while treating classroom examples as constructed teaching scenarios. A three-stage pedagogical model text interpretation, dialogic recontextualization and reflective transfer is proposed. Special attention is paid to avoiding moral pressure on the injured party and to recognizing the difference between forgiveness, reconciliation and restoration of trust.

Keywords: Uzbek proverbs; forgiveness; intergenerational values; cultural transmission; moral narratives; education

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается межпоколенческая передача ценности прощения через узбекские пословицы, нравоучительные рассказы и образовательный дискурс. Разграничены усвоение готового ценностного высказывания и способность интерпретировать его в конкретной ситуации. Анализируются зафиксированные формулы Yaxshida gina bo'lmas и Gina — adovatning qo'shnisi; учебные диалоги представлены как авторские иллюстрации. Предложена трехэтапная педагогическая модель: интерпретация текста, диалогическая контекстуализация и рефлексивный перенос. Подчёркивается необходимость отличать прощение от обязательного примирения и восстановления доверия, не принуждая пострадавшего к немедленному согласию.

Ключевые слова: узбекские пословицы; прощение; межпоколенческие ценности; культурная трансляция; образование

INTRODUCTION

Proverbs, moral narratives and pedagogical discourse allow communities to circulate evaluations across generations. In Uzbek linguistic culture, the social meaning of forgiveness is not confined to an individual statement such as kechirdim. It also appears in proverbial warnings against enduring resentment, exemplary stories and explanations offered by teachers and older relatives. Such texts are particularly suitable for studying value transmission because they make cultural expectations repeatable, quotable and discussable. Yet their repeated performance does not guarantee uniform interpretation or a corresponding behavioral disposition.

This article investigates how linguistic forms that evaluate resentment and forgiveness can be used to cultivate reflective interpretation rather than only memorization. The analysis differs from a study of spontaneous family talk: its objects are conventional verbal texts, educational framing and movement between a text and a new situation. Cultural-linguistic research describes how conceptualizations are maintained and reshaped through language use [5]; language-socialization theory explains why acquisition of words and participation in social practices remain

intertwined [4]. On this basis, the paper formulates a three-stage educational model that can be examined in future teaching experiments.

SOURCES AND INTERPRETATIVE METHOD

The proverb material is restricted to expressions whose wording is publicly documented. In the Uzbek explanatory dictionary entry for gina, two forms appear: «Yaxshida gina bo‘lmas» and «Gina — adovatning qo‘shnisi» [2]. The former presents non-retention of grievance as a positive ideal; the latter treats unresolved resentment as a possible neighbor of hostility. Both are compact evaluations rather than empirical descriptions of the entire population. The collection of Uzbek folk proverbs edited by Mirzayev, Musoqulov and Sarimsoqov supplies the broader genre context for studying proverbial moral reasoning [1].

The present method is interpretative and pedagogical. It considers the textual opposition, implicit agent, expected listener response and transfer from proverbial rule to situated decision. Two types of evidence are distinguished: documented proverb forms and author-constructed educational scenarios. No sampled student essays, classroom observations, controlled instruction experiment or learning-gain statistics are asserted. This boundary is necessary because the proposed model supports the plausibility of an educational mechanism, not proof of effectiveness. Future assessment would require pre-defined outcomes, age-appropriate tasks and observed changes in students’ interpretation and interaction.

PROVERBIAL MEANING AND NORMATIVE COMPLEXITY

The construction «Yaxshida gina bo‘lmas» uses a positive social category—yaxshi, the good person—to evaluate the absence of retained grievance. Its persuasive strength lies in the relationship between moral identity and emotional conduct: to be recognized as good is rhetorically associated with not nursing resentment. However, the proverb does not tell the listener how to respond when an offense has continuing consequences. It is therefore important to separate the intended moral ideal from an obligation to suppress legitimate complaint. Without such a distinction, a pedagogical interpretation may unintentionally turn the proverb into pressure on a vulnerable person.

«Gina — adovatning qo‘shnisi» organizes meaning through a spatial relationship. Neighboring does not mean identical: the proverb warns that lingering grievance may develop toward antagonism while leaving open the possibility that it will not. This semantic nuance is educationally productive. Learners can be asked to distinguish a feeling from a decision to harm, and to identify the role of dialogue in preventing escalation. The proverb does not license the assertion that all grievance is morally wrong. Resentment may be an understandable response to an unacknowledged injury; the problem concerns its management and possible transformation into enduring hostility [6]. A teacher can place the two forms in dialogue. The first offers a positive moral orientation, whereas the second warns of relational deterioration. Together, they invite questions about responsibility: Who caused the hurt? What would constitute an adequate apology? Can a harmed person forgive yet postpone renewed trust? Such questions keep the cultural value of kechirimlilik while distinguishing it from passive acceptance of mistreatment. Speech-act scholarship is useful here because an apology, an acknowledgment of forgiveness and a plan to restore conduct are separate social acts [7].

Proverbial advice becomes more interpretable when accompanied by a narrative sequence in which characters face a realistic decision. Consider the following original pedagogical vignette, written for illustration rather than attributed to folklore. A young learner promises to return a borrowed book but damages it. The owner refuses to lend another book. An elder observes the disagreement and asks the borrower to explain what occurred and how the damage might be repaired. The learner apologizes, offers to replace the book and accepts that the owner may need time before trusting again. The elder then invites both parties to interpret «Gina — adovatning qo‘shnisi» in relation to the event. The vignette converts an abstract warning into a sequence of

actions with observable responsibilities. The narrative can be evaluated at three semantic levels. At the event level, the damaged book establishes a concrete harm; at the relational level, the broken promise explains the temporary loss of trust; at the normative level, the proverb encourages consideration of whether unresolved resentment could deepen the conflict. Importantly, the story does not portray the book owner as obligated to restore trust immediately. This distinction allows learners to identify forgiveness as a possible ethical response without confusing it with an enforceable demand. The narrative thus functions as a bridge between a repeated traditional formula and an independently reasoned communicative decision [6].

A THREE-STAGE PEDAGOGICAL MODEL

Stage one is close textual interpretation. Learners identify the key lexemes, examine how the proverb is constructed, explain the social evaluation and compare it with a dictionary meaning of gina. A suitable task asks students to paraphrase the proverb in neutral language and to state what it does not say. For example, «Yaxshida gina bo‘lmas» need not mean that a good person has no feelings of hurt or must instantly reinstate trust. This exercise teaches semantic restraint: what is textually supported should be separated from assumptions supplied by the interpreter [3].

Stage two is dialogic recontextualization. Consider the constructed classroom scenario: two students prepare a presentation; one loses part of the work and apologizes, while the other remains upset. Small groups compare responses: «Mayli, unuting», «Nimani tuzatish mumkin?», and «Uzringni eshitdim, ammo ishni qayta qilish kerak». They analyze which response recognizes harm, which offers practical repair, and which leaves space for the injured student to decide. Different answers can be defensible if they account for responsibility and fairness. The exercise should not reward only the fastest verbal forgiveness, because compliance with a teacher’s expectation is not identical to morally reasoned reconciliation [9].

Stage three is reflective transfer. Students write a short note describing a new, ethically safe situation, the proverb that might be invoked, and the limits of its application. Assessment focuses on explanation rather than confession: the learner must identify the damaged relationship, distinguish personal grievance from retaliatory action, and propose a reasonable next step. Drawing on discourse-oriented pragmalinguistic analysis [8], the teacher can use a rubric with three observable dimensions—accurate proverb interpretation, acknowledgment of multiple participants’ interests, and a feasible repair proposal. No claim is made that the rubric’s score is a validated measure of forgiveness as a personality trait. It is a criterion for assessing a specific linguistic and ethical reasoning task.

Table 1. A three-stage framework for reflective teaching of forgiveness through proverbs

Stage	Text / activity	Learning evidence	Safeguard
1. Interpretation	Paraphrase proverb and key lexeme	Separates stated norm from inference	No coercive moral labeling
2. Recontextualization	Compare dialogue responses	Identifies responsibility and repair	Allows disagreement and boundaries
3. Reflective transfer	Apply to a new case	Reasoned, feasible response	Does not require personal disclosure

DISCUSSION: TRANSMISSION WITHOUT IDEALIZATION

Cultural continuity is rarely simple repetition. Proverbs survive partly because they can be reinterpreted in new relational environments, including digital learning and multilingual classrooms. A younger learner may read a traditional formulation alongside messages about

equality, psychological safety and respectful disagreement. That encounter need not indicate the erosion of cultural values; it may instead reveal a new way of reasoning about when forgiveness is appropriate and how responsibility must be demonstrated. Educational discourse can make these tensions visible through comparison and reflection rather than treating a single aphorism as a complete ethical rule [5].

A further methodological distinction concerns learning outcomes. A student who accurately explains «Gina — adovatning qo‘shnisi» has shown semantic and argumentative competence. This does not automatically show that the student is more forgiving in personal life. To measure intergenerational transmission empirically, future work would need interviews with teachers and families, longitudinal student responses and evidence that interpretations carry into everyday practices. The present article supplies a conceptual teaching design and textual analysis, while leaving questions of effectiveness open for tested pedagogical research [4]. In addition, assessment should distinguish between learners’ ability to interpret cultural expressions and their capacity to apply these interpretations in real communication. Reflective writing, classroom discussions and situational tasks may provide evidence of developing ethical reasoning. However, such instruments should be treated as indicators of educational progress rather than direct measurements of personal attitudes.

This distinction is essential for maintaining methodological validity in future studies. Another relevant factor is the influence of the social environment on learners’ interpretations. Family communication, peer relationships and teachers’ attitudes may shape how young people understand the meaning of forgiveness and responsibility. Therefore, future research should consider not only individual responses but also the contexts in which these responses develop. Such an approach would provide a broader understanding of how cultural meanings are negotiated and transmitted between generations.

CONCLUSION

Uzbek proverbial expressions offer a concise linguistic resource for discussing forgiveness across generations. Their educational potential becomes stronger when learners distinguish moral ideals from unconditional requirements and examine the difference between apology, forgiving and rebuilding trust. The proposed interpretation–recontextualization–reflection model develops linguistic understanding and ethical reasoning without requiring coerced personal disclosure or immediate absolution. Its practical value is a transferable lesson-design framework; its empirical effectiveness remains a subject for future observation and validation. Ultimately, the intergenerational transmission of forgiveness should be understood as a process of critical engagement rather than passive acceptance of inherited expressions. By connecting proverbial wisdom with contemporary communicative situations, learners can develop a more nuanced understanding of cultural identity, personal boundaries and mutual responsibility. This approach preserves the educational significance of Uzbek proverbial heritage while allowing its meanings to evolve in response to changing social and interpersonal contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Mirzayev T., Musoqulov A., Sarimsoqov B. O‘zbek xalq maqollari / Sh. Turdimov mas’ul muharrir. – Toshkent: Sharq, 2005. – 512 b.
2. Gina // Izoh.uz: O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati. – https://izoh.uz/word/gina (murojaat sanasi: 07.11.2026).

3. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati: 5 jildli / A. Madvaliyev tahriri ostida. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2006–2008.
4. Schieffelin B. B., Ochs E. Language Socialization // Annual Review of Anthropology. – 1986. – Vol. 15. – P. 163–191.
5. Sharifian F. Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017. – DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/clscc.8
6. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. 2nd ed. – Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2013.
7. Blum-Kulka S., Olshtain E. Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP) // Applied Linguistics. – 1984. – Vol. 5, No. 3. – P. 196–213. – DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196
8. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. – Toshkent: Ta’lim nashriyoti, 2008. – 320 b. – https://akbt.terdpi.uz/uz/books/768
9. Kádár D. Z., Haugh M. Understanding Politeness. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.